UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 85th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 104—PART 15

AUGUST 21, 1958, TO AUGUST 23, 1958

(PAGES 18865 TO 20026)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1958

J
11
.R
v.104
pt.15

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 85th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

THURSDAY, AUGUST 21, 1958

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Compassionate Father of us all, without whom life has no destiny but dust.

Strengthen, we pray, with Thy wisdom and might those who here speak for the Nation, that the strain of these fateful days may not break their spirits, and that no denials of human freedom now loose in the world may intimidate their souls.

When the problems which confront these servants of Thine, and of the Republic under Thee, seem insoluble; when the very principles for which brave men have died are basely betrayed, and fair dreams seem to sink into the sands of futility; still may they labor on, serene and confident, knowing while the weeping of hopes deferred may endure for a night, the joy of Thy sure victory cometh in the morning.

In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, August 20, 1958, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION ON DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the morning hour statements be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Governor, Canal Zone Government, Balboa Heights, C. Z., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Government for the period July 1, 1957, to June 30, 1958, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

The memorial of Nigel Keep, of Berkeley, Calif., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to give retirement and other benefits to former Presidents of the United States; ordered to lie on the table.

Petitions signed by W. R. Wheeler, and Carl C. Pierce, Jr., both of Bakersfield, Calif., relating to the enactment of the bill (S. 3992) to amend the organic act at Guam, and for other purposes; ordered to lie on the table.

The petition of Louise Dreiner, of La Porte, Ind., relating to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] to the bill regarding Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in convention assembled at New York City, signed by Richard L. Roudebush, commander in chief, praying for the enactment of the so-called Douglas-Payne bill, relating to the provision of aid to depressed communities; ordered to lie on the table.

PROHIBITION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE ADVERTISING IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE—PETITIONS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, several petitions signed by sundry citizens of the State of Delaware, praying for the enactment of the so-called Langer bill (S. 582) to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce. I ask unanimous consent that one of the petitions be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petitions were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and one petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, as follows:

We, the undersigned, desire to have passed the Langer bill (S. 582) which would restrict the advertising of intoxicating beverages.

(Signed by Emma B. McLean, and sundry other persons.)

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. KUCHEL, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H. R. 12281. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide an administrative site for Yosemite National Park, Calif., on lands adjacent to the park, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2491).

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. STENNIS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 386), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services, or the Military Construction Subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to military construction.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee, from September 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) employ upon a temporary basis such personnel as may be necessary; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $12,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Subsequently, Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported favorably, without amendment, the resolution (S. Res. 386) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Armed Services, and submitted a report (No. 2490) thereon; which resolution was placed on the calendar.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO CLOTURE—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS

Mr. CASE of New Jersey, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, submitted individual views on the resolution (S. Res. 17) to amend section 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, which were ordered to be printed as part 2 of Senate Report 1509.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Leon P. Miller, of West Virginia, to be attorney of the United States for the Virgin Islands.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Thirty-four postmaster nominations.

BILL INTRODUCED

A bill was introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 4320. A bill for the relief of Robert Laderlich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RENDITION OF MUSICAL COMPOSITIONS ON COIN-OPERATED MACHINES—AUTHORITY TO FILE INDIVIDUAL VIEWS AND REPRINTING OF S. REPT. 2414

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I want to call attention to the fact that there was reported to the Senate on August 15, 1958, the bill (S. 1870) to amend section 1 (e) of title 17 of the United States Code with regard to the rendition of musical compositions on coin-operated machines, being report No. 2414.

The Senator from Wisconsin is a member of the subcommittee which handled the proposed legislation, if I remember correctly. The Senator is the ranking Republican member of the committee. The Senator from Wisconsin desires to file minority or individual views. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that committee report No. 2414 may be reprinted to contain the individual views of the Senator from Wisconsin, which views will be filed shortly. Can the Senator indicate by what date the views will be ready?

Mr. WILEY. I think they will be ready tomorrow morning.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Tomorrow morning?

Mr. WILEY. Yes. I think they will be ready by then.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may file his individual views with the Secretary of the Senate, in case the Congress is adjourned, within the next week.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. HILL:

Letter entitled "In Defense of TVA," written to the editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald and published August 21, 1958.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REBUTTAL OF CHARGE BY DREW PEARSON CONCERNING FORMER LIEUTENANT COMMANDER NIXON

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, on July 4 of this year I noticed in a column by Drew Pearson a reference which he made to Vice President NIXON when he was in the Navy as contract officer negotiating with the Erco company of Maryland.

Mr. President, when I read this article which referred to Vice President NIXON I took it upon myself to check up and find out what the facts were, because this article by Pearson is a deliberate, expressed, or implied misrepresentation of the facts, all of which were matters of record and which this alleged columnist could have ascertained before he wrote this article.

The exact quotation from the article is as follows:

When Vice President NIXON was in the Navy as contract officer negotiating with the Erco company of Maryland, he borrowed $150 from the company. Such a loan is illegal. Unlike Kibler, he did not report it.

Mr. President, the facts as I have found them are as follows:

In October 1945, Mr. NIXON was then a lieutenant commander in the United States Navy, with an assignment to the Glenn Martin Co., of Baltimore, with instructions to negotiate the settlement of terminated contracts. Just on or before October 30, 1945, Commander NIXON received a telegram requesting him to appear on November 2 in California.

Because of the shortness of time involved, one W. G. Carroll, of the Engineering & Research Corp., of Maryland, volunteered and took it upon himself to make reservation and purchase an airline ticket for Commander NIXON to California with his company credit card. This he did. No priority was involved and there was no loan whatsoever. When the ticket was delivered by Mr. Carroll, Commander NIXON on that day, namely, October 30, 1945, gave to Mr. W. G. Carroll his personal check, drawn on the Corn Exchange Bank & Trust Co., terminal branch, of New York, for the sum of $128.05, in full and complete payment for air transportation to California.

So that there can be no question about this transaction and the allegedly deliberate misrepresentation by Mr. Pearson of what transpired, I am offering for the record and as a part of my remarks a photostatic copy of the check, dated October 30, 1945, which I have heretofore referred to, showing payment and cancellation.

Mr. President, here is another of the numerous deliberate, irresponsible misrepresentations which Pearson has been making in his column.

There was no loan whatever from the company to Mr. NIXON. The ticket was paid for immediately upon its delivery.

Since it was no loan, no illegality could possibly have been involved, and there was no reason whatever for Mr. NIXON to report the transaction to anyone.

At the time the transaction took place, Mr. NIXON was not "negotiating with the Erco company," as alleged in the column. His part in the contract-termination negotiations of that company had been completely finished, and no negotiations in which he was involved were pending at that time.

I think, in the interest of truth and fairness, it is important for all those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to know the extent to which Mr. Pearson goes to deliberately misrepresent matters.

I ask unanimous consent that a photostatic copy of the check I have referred to be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the copy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

No. ——

CORN EXCHANGE TRUST CO.,
TERMINAL BRANCH,
New York, October 30, 1945.

Pay to the order of W. G. Carroll, $128.05.
(One hundred twenty-eight and .05 dollars.)

RICHARD M. NIXON.

THE WORLD MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, not enough recognition has been given to the role of voluntary and private associations in promoting international understanding and in keeping the Free World free. We are inclined to regard these ambitious ends as the exclusive concern of intergovernmental organizations. President Eisenhower's people-to-people program is a healthy reminder that individual effort is often more potent than collective action.

Today I salute the World Medical Association, a private organization composed of 53 national medical associations representing 700,000 physicians all over the world. Man for man, and dollar for dollar, the World Medical Association is doing much more to improve the world health than any international organization in the field of medicine.

Two intergovernmental agencies are concerned with medicine. The World Health Organization is primarily concerned with public-health problems which either cannot be solved by national public-health authorities acting alone or which can be handled better on a cooperative basis. The International Labor Organization is primarily concerned with the task of spreading socialized medicine to areas of the world where the private physician-patient relationship is still respected.

Only the World Medical Association is working at the international level for free enterprise in medicine; for the freedom of a patient to choose his own doctor. The success of the World Medical Association makes it possible to compare standards of medical care in countries A, B, and C, where doctors are civil servants, with those prevailing in X, Y,

and Z, where free physician-patient relationships exist. The fact that we can make such comparisons is the best reason for believing that socialized medicine will be abandoned as inferior and as unworthy of a free people.

I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a table showing six differences between the World Medical Association and the World Health Organization.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE WORLD MEDICAL ASSOCIATION AND THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION?

THE WORLD MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

1. World Medical Association is an organization of national medical associations. The unit of membership is the medical association. It is completely nongovernmental. It is not part of the U. N. It is a voluntary organization.

2. World Medical Association represents the practicing medical profession.

3. World Medical Association was organized in 1947 by AMA representatives and western European medical leaders. Purpose was to exchange medical knowledge, to protect the freedom of medicine, and promote world peace.

4. Each member association sends 2 delegates, 2 alternate delegates, and observers to the General Assemblies—the supreme policy-making body of WMA.

5. The executive body is the council. This meets twice a year and comprises 11 members elected from the assembly and the president, president-elect, and treasurer.

6. World Medical Association is supported by members' dues and contributions and the annual budget is about $165,000.

THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

1. World Health Organization is an intergovernmental health agency. Unit of membership is the member and nonmember governments of the U. N. that accept the nine principles upon which WHO is founded.

2. World Health Organization represents governments in medicine.

3. World Health Organization is the result of proposal of U. N. in 1945 to create a specialized agency to deal with all matters related to health.

4. Each member government sends three delegates, chosen preferably from the national health administration of the government, to the annual World Health Assembly.

5. The executive board is the executive body and consists of 18 members elected from 18 member governments.

6. Supported by dues allocated by the U. N. scale and the budget for 1958 was $13 million.

Mr. BRICKER. The World Health Organization has done excellent work in combating and confining contagious diseases. It would be pointless to compare, on a purely quantitative basis, the work done by an organization with a $13 million budget and that done by a private organization with an annual budget of $165,000. Nevertheless, the size of the WHO's campaign against disease should not be allowed to obscure the World Medical Association's fight for medical freedom or its ability to provide almost instantaneous medical assistance in emergency situations.

The 10th birthday of the World Medical Association will fall on September 18 of this year. To signalize the anniversary of this fine organization, I ask unanimous consent for printing in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an article by Milton Golin entitled "The Story of the World Medical Association," which appeared in the September 1957, issue of the Journal of the American Medical Association.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOBLITZELL in the chair). Is there objection to the request?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STORY OF THE WORLD MEDICAL ASSOCIATION—WORLD MEDICINE COMES OF AGE—FEARLESS CONCERN FOR PATIENT IS HIGH POINT OF HARMONY IN VOICES OF 700,000 DOCTORS

(By Milton Golin)

Cuban police seize physicians as hostages. A "flu" epidemic finds the Philippine Medical Association in desperate need of drugs. Maltese doctors are threatened when they resist a move to limit patients' free choice of physician.

These recent crises carry a direct threat to the general public, not to the medical profession alone. Ten years ago, doctors of each nation usually had to slug out such problems themselves. More likely than not, there was no place outside their borders to turn for help—no voices to bespeak their troubles or to forewarn their colleagues in other lands. Massive danger to health and medical practice was only part of the handicap to physicians and their patients 10 years ago. Doctors needed to know what scientific developments in Berne, Switzerland, could benefit clinical knowledge in Kansas City, or what new medical education precept discussed in Vienna might raise the proficiency level of an intern or a budding specialist in Melbourne.

Today medicine has an international voice, the World Medical Association, a confederation of 53 national medical associations representing more than 700,000 physicians around the globe. It is sounding an alarm against those who would oppress the doctor and his patient. It is telling the story of farflung advances in medical science. It is rallying help for brother physicians who are in need.

Help was needed urgently last Memorial Day as Asian (Far Eastern) influenza was striking hundreds of thousands of Filipinos. Physicians were running out of antipyretics. Off went a frantic cable from the Philippine Medical Association to the World Medical Association headquarters in New York City: "Request immediate airlifting of antipyretics, analgesics, and if available polyvalent flu vaccine." The cable could not have arrived at a more difficult time. A long holiday weekend loomed ahead, and many pharmaceutical firms either were closed or were operating with only standby staffs. Air transportation companies had their own priority problems. There was the prospect, too, of governmental redtape in an international drug shipment.

But World Medical Association's secretary-general, Dr. Louis H. Bauer, and his staff tackled the problem with know-how. First they notified the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the redtape began disappearing. Then they found that officials of the Borroughs Wellcome & Co., Inc., of Tuckahoe, N. Y., were able to prepare a 300-pound shipment of an antipyretic analgesic for delivery to Newark airport before 5 p. m. that day. From there, a Flying Tiger cargo plane rushed the supply to San Francisco, where a Pan American Airways plane was waiting to carry it the rest of the way. On Sunday morning, before the end of the holiday weekend, the drugs were delivered to eager medical hands in Manila. The accomplishment was speedy, spontaneous, and completely voluntary.

Within hours, other pharmaceutical firms were responding: A 600-pound air shipment of analgesic from McNeil Laboratories; similar supplies arranged by E. R. Squibb & Sons; antibiotics and tranquilizers from Charles Pfizer & Co., Inc. Eli Lilly & Co. launched a "crash" weekend project in their Indianapolis laboratories, in hopes of more quickly proving the effectiveness of their influenza vaccine. And Parke, Davis & Co. authorized the Philippine Medical Association to obtain all necessary drugs from the company's Manila office. Said Dr. Bauer: "It is in the unity of purpose in such emergencies that the strength of the members of the health profession is tested—and proved equal to the task. It gives and does not count the cost; toils without resting; and asks no reward for its labor than a better and happier world for all people."

HELP FOR HUNGARIANS

Scores of Hungarian physicians certainly were asking no reward when they fled Communist butchery last fall. Many of them escaped so hurriedly that they left behind the vital papers which could show their accreditation. One of them reported: "I treated the children and youths injured in the rebellion. There was no time to fill in and file the numerous reports that the Government required—nor did I feel justified in revealing the names, addresses, and conditions of the patients who came to me. * * * I was still in my clinic after midnight when a patient's mother came to warn me that the police were on their way to arrest me for treason. I fled * * * I have no papers to prove who I am or what my education and experience has been—life, security, and freedom for my family were my only thought."

This doctor's plight illustrates a major project of the World Medical Association: A central repository for medical credentials (carrying the registrant's dated photograph, fingerprints, and notarized signature) so that physicians everywhere can prove their qualifications in case disaster strikes at their home country. "Success in this one program alone," says Dr. Bauer, "would justify the existence of WMA." For lack of such a repository, meanwhile, the WMA has been trying to establish new credentials for, and otherwise rehabilitate, Hungarian refugee physicians in the free medical world.

The World Medical Association first spoke out against the Hungarian outrage last November in a telegram to the United Nations, strongly urging "that every necessary step be taken to prevent further butchery and deportation of Hungarian citizens and that the actions of those responsible for these atrocities be strongly condemned." Soon afterward, the United Nations did just that—censured perpetrators of the terrorism. Next came World Medical Association's appeal to member associations and individual physicians that "all possible aid to Hungary through your organization * * * will be another proof of the importance the doctors of the world place on human dignity and freedom."

MATURE VOICE OF MEDICINE

This is the voice of world medicine, come of age, a voice with authoritative tone. World Medical Association's cry against oppression in Hungary is the mature call of a young adult born out of the ferment of World War II. Doctors from many nations were thrown together in the common missions of that great conflict over a decade ago. Their wartime brotherhood in arms suggested the values of a permanent international alliance of organized medicine. These physicians also felt the need to restate

medicine's universality, and to express their independence of political compulsions. There was a need, too, to assert a solidarity in repudiating the perverted medical practices which were forced against some physicians in Nazi concentration camps. (Based on a 1948 "Declaration of Geneva," World Medical Association physicians pledge: "I will retain the utmost respect for human life from the time of conception; even under threat I will not use my knowledge contrary to the laws of humanity.")

In this background will the World Medical Association observe its 10th birthday on September 18. When the World Medical Association speaks today, it is heard as the official voice of the practicing profession, listened to by such diverse global agencies as the International Labour Office, International Social Security Association, and World Health Organization. And when World Medical Association spoke out for help for Hungary's refugee doctors (sending 500 Swiss francs as a starter) it spawned offers of additional funds, medical supplies and aid, housing accommodations, and resettlement facilities from medical associations in the United States, Austria, Chile, Finland, Denmark, Cuba, and other nations.

CRISIS IN CUBA

The Cuban contribution, particularly, carries an ironic note. Even today, less than a year after the last World Medical Association general assembly in Habana, Cuban physicians are being persecuted because they, like their Hungarian colleagues, gave medical treatment to those demonstrating against the Government. Last June, the Cuban Medical Association offices were raided during a regular business session. Physicians who care for sick and wounded street rebels still are being beaten, imprisoned, and held as hostages. It is a criminal offense for the medical association to hold meetings.

The crisis in Cuba is scheduled for discussion at Istanbul, Turkey, starting September 29 when World Medical Association President J. A. Bustamante, himself a Cuban physician, opens the next general assembly under a theme of "Solidarity—The Key to Medical Advance." The World Medical Association already has pointed out that, while doctors must fulfill their duties as citizens, they are pledged to serve humanity—without regard to religion, nationality, race, social standing, or party politics. Not long ago the World Medical Association announced that while it cannot within the framework of its constitution engage in political conflicts * * * the doctors of Cuba need the moral support of every freedom-loving medical association. Since then, letters of encouragement have been arriving daily in Habana, Santiago, and other Cuban communities, reminding the doctors that colleagues in other lands are supporting them in all humanitarian efforts.

BELGIUM AND MALTA

Repeatedly, humanitarianism has shown its power in the climate of world medical opinion. In Belgium, the Government time and again has tried to create a state medical service which would force doctors to abide by all past and future ministerial regulations, and would require patients to obtain a permit before seeking medical care. So the Belgian medical profession organized its own medical insurance plan to assure free choice of physician. Not only are Belgian doctors and patients satisfied, but physicians from other countries have acclaimed the plan. This spring, World Medical Association delegate Pierre Glorieux reported: "My (Belgian) Government, recognizing that it could not control the medical profession, sent a new bill to the Parliament which * * * would remove all aspects of social security from the legislative power of Parliament. The Prime Minister has officially stated that he will respect all the conventions of the medical profession."

Not long ago the Territorial Government of Malta embarked on a campaign of threat, insult, and harassment in an effort to limit the private practice of medicine in favor of a salaried service. When the nearly 200 Maltese physicians resisted, the Prime Minister hinted that he would import physicians from abroad to carry out his plan. The World Medical Association promptly alerted the profession in neighboring countries, and the result was a governmental agreement to put aside its plans. Again, international solidarity among physicians had upheld a measure of freedom for them and their patients. (Says the World Medical Association: "Confidence in one's doctor is essential for good therapeutics, and a patient does not ordinarily have confidence in a doctor whom he is compelled to consult.")

In scattered regions of the world other physicians are gaining strength and moral support from the World Medical Association:

The Venezuelan Government revamps its social-security bill in order to include a free choice of doctor for the patient, after the Venezuelan Medical Association points out that "the best interests of the people and the profession can only be served when the legislation conforms to the 12 principles of social security established by the World Medical Association."

The Japanese Medical Association arouses physicians in scores of nations when it reports in the trilingual (English, Spanish, and French) World Medical Journal, official publication of the World Medical Association, that Government medicine methods threaten to restrict visits of Japanese patients to their doctors "in complete disregard of public opinion."

Bolstered by World Medical Association principles, the Chile medical profession has achieved a new unity in its 3-year battle against restrictive Government pressures.

OTHER PROGRAMS

It would be a mistake, judging from these events alone, to regard World Medical Association as a lobby bent only on fighting the evils of socialized medicine. Other efforts outshine its role as an alarm ringer and fighter for unfettered medical practice. One is the drive for a central repository for medical credentials. Another is sponsorship of the first World Conference on Medical Education, in London in 1953 (the second is set for 1959 in Chicago). The World Medical Association also has adopted a modernized Hippocratic oath, as well as an international code of ethics. Already successful in some South American countries, World Medical Association is continuing to help in the establishment of national medical associations elsewhere throughout the world. Currently, it is:

Promoting a freer international flow of proved therapeutic agents.

Formulating principles of cooperation between practicing physicians and public health officers.

Promoting medical research.

Observing and reporting on the activities of more than 23 other international organizations as they affect the practice of medicine.

Another World Medical Association project is universal adoption of a special emblem that will identify and protect medical units in civil defense—just as the Red Cross symbol protects units during armed conflict. The civil-defense design has been agreed upon by a joint committee of International Medicine and Pharmacy, the World Medical Association, and the International Red Cross; it already is ratified by several nations.

DO NOT CONFUSE WMA WITH WHO

World Medical Association makes a point of distinguishing itself from the World Health Organization. WHO is strictly an intergovernmental public health agency created by the United Nations and supported this year by member nations to the tune of $13,500,000. The World Medical Association, on the other hand, is completely nongovernmental in its origin of national medical associations. Operating this year on a budget of only $165,000 (little more than 1 percent of WHO's whopping expenditures), World Medical Association is the voice of the practicing profession and the individual patient. During its first 5 years, World Medical Association was pledged $250,000 by joint action of the American Medical Association board of trustees and representatives of the pharmaceutical industry. This placed the fledgling organization on sound footing. Since then, a United States committee, and supporting groups of other nations—comprising individual physicians, laymen, and corporate members—have provided backbone support to World Medical Association through dues ($10 annually per person in the United States) and voluntary activity.

One result of this individual participation is a stark awareness that what happens to the freedoms of 200 doctors and their patients on the Island of Malta, or in another part of the world, can affect the future of doctors and patients everywhere. The United States committee, approaching this year's membership goal of 10,000, thus is made up of physicians who have taken the lead in realizing that there is just as much need for boosting World Medical Association as for taking part in county, State, and National medical society activities. They know that health is a language that can be spoken everywhere. Last spring, for example, some 3,000 physicians from 48 nations including the Soviet Union kicked over all barriers of communication when they took part in an annual International Congress of Otolaryngology in Washington, D. C. The atmosphere was amicable because they had a common interest.

Similar rapport in the health field is taking place this week in Rome, where an estimated attendance of 1,000 American dentists at the Federation Dentaire Internationale is furthering President Eisenhower's people-to-people program. That program is being pursued not only by the United States committee of the World Medical Association but also by:

Thousands of United States Armed Forces medical personnel who care for local populations overseas.

American doctors who take part in demonstrations of new techniques during visits to hospitals and clinics abroad, as a means of stressing the desire of the United States to share its scientific progress.

Pharmaceutical companies which emphasize international good will in their worldwide contacts. One—Smith, Kline & French—now has television production crews assigned to film activities of American physicians abroad in private, missionary, military, foundation, and government practice. Next February the firm will present the story as a documentary, portraying doctors as United States ambassadors of good will in Japan, Korea, Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Iran, Turkey, Ethiopia, France, and Guatemala.

INSTRUMENT OF PEACE

As Dr. Albert C. Holt says in his hospital office in Bombay: "We are representing the whole medical profession in America to these people. * * * If we fail, American medicine has failed in their eyes."

Dr. Gunnar Gunderson, who is president elect of the AMA, and also a director of World Medical Association's United States

committee, puts it this way: "We can add new meaning to the M. D. degree—medical diplomacy. World peace cannot be attained until we build peace into the hearts and minds of men. Since physicians are the most intimately acquainted with the physical and mental needs of their patients, they are the most logical engineers for this great moral reconstruction project. If we more than half million physicians assume this task on an individual personal basis we may yet succeed where soldiers, statesmen, and politicians have previously failed."

EMERGENCY DROUGHT RELIEF PROGRAMS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in the closing days of the 1st session of the 85th Congress the Senate passed S. 304, the purpose of which was to provide for mandatory contributions of not less than 25 percent on the part of the States toward any further emergency drought relief programs.

The administration strongly recommended the enactment of this legislation, and I am glad to note that the House Agriculture Committee has finally taken action on this proposal and reported the bill.

The principle behind this State participation requirement was not altogether to reduce the cost of the Government's contribution, but to make the States and local communities more responsible for good administration of the program and the disbursement of relief only to those in need.

In the past, it has been disclosed that the wealthy owners of two of the Nation's most famous racehorses were recipients of relief under this 100 percent Government financed program. Each had been certified by the local communities as being in dire need to the extent that they needed this Federal assistance. Even the fabulously wealthy King Ranch in Texas was found to be on the relief roll.

In another instance about $800 in relief, or free feed, was given to an individual whose only livestock was a polo pony and a bird dog. Yet he, too, was qualified as a needy livestock owner and thereby eligible for Government relief.

Numerous other glaring abuses were called to the attention of the Senate in support of the need of this corrective legislation. These disclosures of abuses resulting from the distribution under the emergency drought relief program were so scandalous that they became embarrassing to the Democratic controlled committee, and they, in 1957, suddenly stopped the investigation, and have refused to proceed further with the exposure. Public opinion would prevent any such practices being followed if the local or State communities were paying a part of the cost.

The emergency drought relief program was administered in two phases: One provided subsidized feed to those livestock owners who were certified as being financially unable to maintain their basic herds without Government assistance. The second phase was that if, in addition to subsidized feed they needed emergency loans to tide them over the distressed period, such loans were made by the Government at a low rate of interest and with lenient terms as to collateral required. In both instances it was intended that these liberal loans and subsidized feed were to go only to those in need, and then only to help the livestock owners maintain their basic herds.

A major argument in support of that bill when considered was that its benefits were primarily intended for the small farmers; however, an examination of its administration shows that the largest percentage went to the exceptionally large owners.

The King Ranch and the owners of the racehorse Swaps certainly were not little farmers, and never should have been on the relief rolls.

Several loans ranging from $50,000 to over $1 million were approved, with the proceeds being used not only to maintain basic herds, but also for expansion.

The Fowlkes Bros., of Marfa, Tex., borrowed from the Farmers' Home Administration $1,046,605 to meet their annually recurring farm and home operating expenses. The loan was granted on the basis that it was needed to enable the partnership to maintain its basic herds throughout the drought period. However, the record shows that the partnership used $257,500 of the $1-million loan to enlarge their herd and buy additional equipment. Yet it was said that the whole purpose behind the legislation was to enable the farmer to maintain his basic herd.

In addition to granting this low collateral loan, the Fowlkes Bros. received emergency feed purchase orders with a cash valuation of over $160,000—$46,685 in 1954, $5,156 in 1955. In 1956, they did not receive any feed purchase orders, but they did receive $1,000 in ACP payments from the Government, and in 1957 they received feed purchase orders with a value of $73,760, plus another $1,000 for ACP payments, plus hay and roughage certificates redeemed in the amount of $39,179. This makes a total of $166,780 in subsidy for feed given to this corporation during the 4-year period, in addition to the emergency loan of almost $800,000.

In other words, at a time when the Government was advancing about a million dollars in loans and grants to this partnership, including $166,000 in free feed, on the basis that they were helping him to maintain his basic herd, the Government loaned him an extra quarter million dollars to expand his herd and buy more livestock to be put on the same relief program. Certainly the law was never intended to allow one farmer to use this program to expand his herd at the expense of his neighbors and the taxpayers.

A second example: O. G. Hill, O. G. Hill, Jr., and Foster Hill, of Hereford, Tex., were loaned $1,076,300 to maintain their basic herd, and during this same period, from 1954 through 1957, this group received $62,081 in free feed from the United States Government.

These are just a couple of examples of the so-called little farmers receiving benefits under the program. It should be remembered that in many areas bona fide and worthy small farmers were denied assistance and loans on the basis that there were inadequate funds available. The relief was being siphoned off in these uncontrolled areas.

I reemphasize what I have said on many previous occasions—the purpose behind the enactment of the emergency drought feed program and emergency loan program was sound in that its objective was to enable those farmers living in drought-stricken areas to maintain their basic livestock herds throughout the critical period. I voted for this program, and am perfectly willing for the Government to underwrite a major part of the cost of the grants in instances where it is necessary, and I will underwrite the principle that the Government should make loans on very lenient terms under the emergency which developed as the result of the extreme drought. But that does not mean that the program should not be closely administered to prevent abuses. When we find examples such as have been called to the attention of the Senate before, wherein operations like the multi-million-dollar King Ranch, comprising an area larger than the entire State of Delaware, is feeding its cattle on relief, it is time to call a halt.

Such irresponsible administration would not develop under a program when the local taxpayers knew that a part of their money was going to underwrite the cost. It is therefore imperative, if these programs are ever to be used again, that some State and local participation in the cost be mandatory.

I am glad that the House Agriculture Committee has at least seen fit to report this proposed legislation, which was passed by the Senate last year. The need of this legislation was strongly recommended by the administration.

I have a report listing the loans in excess of $50,000 granted under this program in the two-State area of Oklahoma and Texas, along with a report of the amount of subsidy under feed purchase program which were given as grants to the same individuals, plus the amount they received as ACP payments, and I ask unanimous consent that the entire report be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., January 13, 1958.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Attached are copies of the two reports requested in your letter of December 9, 1957. One report shows the number and amount of emergency and special livestock loans made in Oklahoma and Texas during the last 5 years. The other report lists borrowers indebted for more than $50,000 in the aggregate on these types of loans along with the purposes for which the loan funds were advanced.

Sincerely yours,

K. H. HANSEN,
Administrator.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

Borrowers in Texas owing $50,000 or more on emergency and special livestock loans

Borrower	Total amount loaned	Amount loaned for—				Unpaid balances		Amount of principal delinquent as of Jan. 17, 1958
		Annually recurring farm and home operating expenses	Purchase of livestock and equipment	Refinancing of debts	Real estate repairs and improvements	Interest	Principal	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
William E. Crews, Jr., Marfa, Tex	$255,190	$172,115	$83,075	0	0	$5,266	$61,714	$61,714
Fowlkes Bros., Marfa, Tex	1,046,605	789,105	257,500	0	0	62,080	549,144	549,144
N. B. Chaffin, Marfa, Tex	83,400	83,400	0	0	0	7,215	47,148	47,148
Carl B. Black, Marfa, Tex	114,880	85,850	29,030	0	0	1,815	52,067	24,607
W. R. Cartledge & Son, Marfa, Tex	139,320	42,820	96,500	0	0	2,134	56,882	56,882
O. G. Hill, O. G. Hill, Jr., and W. Foster Hill, Hereford, Tex	1,076,300	1,076,300	0	0	0	48,330	582,857	481,857
James L. and Lee M. Gates, Pearsall, Tex	121,120	69,720	51,400	0	0	2,647	62,627	47,475
William M. Hemphill, Jr., San Angelo, Tex	136,205	136,205	0	0	0	5,812	54,401	54,401
Lacy Bros., Benjamin, Tex	242,535	155,245	87,290	0	0	6,331	68,616	68,616
Lee R. Graves, Fort Stockton, Tex	119,620	80,720	38,900	0	0	6,309	57,497	46,493
Frank A. Perry, Iraan, Tex	121,585	85,010	36,575	0	0	5,473	50,253	50,253
Powell C. Coates, Sanderson, Tex	98,325	81,225	17,100	0	0	5,371	54,818	54,818
Harry O. Geffert, George West, Tex	104,240	44,270	59,970	0	0	5,262	56,826	56,826
D. K. McMullan, Jr., Big Lake, Tex	190,570	190,570	0	0	0	9,360	70,596	70,596
Ernest D. Goodloe, Pecos, Tex	74,900	39,400	35,500	0	0	5,739	52,746	52,746
Mike Q. Smith, Savinal, Tex	139,120	67,120	72,000	0	0	1,687	51,829	21,746
Everett Bros., Pandale, Tex	94,945	94,945	0	0	0	5,059	50,153	50,153
Lemuel E. Henderson, Pumpville, Tex	148,535	148,535	0	0	0	6,288	59,699	59,699
Charlie F. Hinds, Comstock, Tex	125,745	102,825	22,920	0	0	4,572	61,266	44,851
Ira G. Deaton, Del Rio, Tex	236,080	236,080	0	0	0	5,174	52,776	52,776
Marvin T. Ratliff, Del Rio, Tex	103,510	103,510	0	0	0	3,694	55,315	55,315
William J. Riggs, Dryden, Tex	151,075	151,075	0	0	0	5,847	47,852	47,852
Jack and Roy Deaton, Sanderson, Tex	236,240	236,240	0	0	0	5,137	62,570	62,570
Tol Murrah, Sanderson, Tex	150,160	150,160	0	0	0	7,490	64,777	64,777
Manning H. Vick, Graham, Tex	64,505	32,605	31,900	0	0	583	49,708	29,948
James C. Roark, Alpine, Tex	104,970	82,190	22,780	0	0	3,944	54,337	42,637
Levi M. Waters, Jr., and Arnold O. Waters, Meadow, Tex	186,920	181,760	5,160	0	0	1,943	57,548	57,548
L. J. Schmidt, Dalhart, Tex	93,100	53,100	40,000	0	0	1,163	87,600	19,450
Henry D. Lewis, Dumas, Tex	187,110	89,515	60,630	$16,220	$20,645	2,445	72,077	30,204

Agricultural conservation payments, dollar value of emergency feed purchase orders cashed, and dollar value of hay and roughage certificates cashed in Texas by certain farmers and ranchers

Name of borrower	Location	1953	1954		1955		1956		1957			1958
		ACP payments	Feed purchase orders redeemed	ACP payments	Feed purchase orders redeemed	ACP payments	Feed purchase orders redeemed	ACP payments	Feed purchase orders redeemed	ACP payments	Hay and roughage certificates redeemed	ACP payments
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Texas												
Wm. E. Crews, Jr	Marfa	$1,214	$3,125	$1,373	$356	$2,268	$296	$1,489	$5,553	$1,500	0	0
Fowlkes Brothers	do	0	46,683	0	5,156	0	0	1,000	73,760	1,000	$39,179	$750
N. B. Chaffin	do	0	6,996	0	64	500	205	1,142	475	1,000	946	750
Carl B. Black	do	0	1,524	0	861	0	0	0	395	247	95	0
W. R. Cartledge & Son	do	0	0	663	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
W. R. Cartledge (individually)	do	0	1,376	741	1,680	1,152	0	1,211	1,320	0	0	0
Gene Cartledge (individually)	do	0	7,632	640	300	0	0	1,125	1,998	0	0	0
O. G. Hill, O. G. Hill, Jr., and Foster Hill	Hereford	0	3,042	384	0	120	7,815	0	0,756	0	645	0
O. G. Hill, Sr. (individually)	do	0	7,057	0	2,435	0	4,050	0	7,758	0	0	0
O. G. Hill, Jr. (individually)	do	0	7,210	0	6,642	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Foster Hill (individually)	do	0	1,781	0	6,386	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
James L. and Lee M. Gates	Pearsall	0	788	1,000	0	1,500	718	0	450	0	0	0
James L. Gates (individually)	do	0	453	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
William M. Hemphill, Jr	San Angelo	500	3,053	450	1,174	353	215	0	376	0	87	0
Lacy Brothers	Benjamin	429	186	1,336	524	1,041	0	0	0	0	1,606	0
Lee R. Graves	Fort Stockton	0	795	427	447	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frank A. Perry, Jr	Iraan	0	3,992	0	0	0	775	0	380	0	3,728	0
Powell C. Coates	Sanderson	0	3,601	0	0	0	1,044	0	1,915	0	277	0
Harry O. Geffert	George West	0	1,868	0	0	0	507	0	1,313	0	0	0
D. K. McMullan, Jr	Big Lake	0	6,334	400	8,960	700	5,663	700	15,634	700	0	1,000
D. K. McMullan, Jr. and Bob Sims (partnership)	do	0	2,057	0	6,987	1,374	753	0	8,464	0	0	5
Ernest D. Goodloe	Pecos	0	1,246	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mike Q. Smith	Sabinal	600	209	584	429	239	520	0	0	0	0	0
Everett Brothers	Pandale	597	6,981	422	250	0	0	525	1,686	500	0	0
Lemuel E. Henderson	Pumpville	1,804	5,964	750	280	1,499	1,015	1,500	3,818	1,500	0	0
Charlie F. Hinds	Comstock	1,096	994	750	600	1,500	400	1,445	1,555	1,200	360	0
Ira G. Deaton	Del Rio	0	1,580	0	2,400	0	0	0	1,406	0	0	0
Ira Deaton & Sons (partnership)	do	1,000	0	500	0	0	0	799	0	0	0	0
Jack and Roy Deaton	do	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	342	0
Marvin T. Ratliff	do	621	5,737	1,200	1,374	1,350	1,932	1,500	2,955	550	1,015	1,500
William J. Riggs	Dryden	0	10,419	0	598	700	997	800	3,287	1,450	0	1,373
Tol Murrah	Sanderson	0	32,778	0	1,059	0	324	800	2,038	1,350	187	0
Manning H. Vick	Graham	0	0	420	0	0	0	0	2,064	0	360	0
James C. Roark	Alpine	1,453	1,781	0	785	0	0	605	750	577	0	470
Levi M. Waters, Jr., and Arnold O. Waters.	Meadow	0	1,717	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Levi M. Waters, Jr. (individually)	do	0	0	793	0	1,380	0	755	0	338	0	0
Arnold O. Waters (individually)	do	600	0	1,428	0	1,002	0	600	0	0	0	0
L. J. Schmidt	Dalhart	0	0	208	0	674	0	826	0	0	0	0
Henry D. Lewis	Dumas	345	130	23	0	966	0	1,060	0	402	0	386

Borrowers in Oklahoma owing $50,000 or more on emergency and special livestock loans

Borrower	Total amount loaned	Amount loaned for—				Unpaid balances		Amount of principal delinquent as of Jan. 17, 1958
		Annually recurring farm and home operating expenses	Purchase of livestock and equipment	Refinancing of debts	Real estate repairs and improvements	Interest	Principal	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Walter H. Hyatt, Beaver, Okla	$57,935	$11,196	$150	$22,459	$24,130	$1,690	$48,314	$9,879
George W. Kirton, Boyd, Okla	84,490	28,040	17,100	26,565	12,785	1,290	61,102	8,422
Robert E. Selman, Selman, Okla	128,810	125,956	1,580	0	1,274	8,386	81,737	81,737
Charles V. Word, Arnett, Okla	92,925	35,450	33,050	24,000	425	740	82,928	9,456

Agricultural conservation payments, dollar value of emergency feed purchase orders cashed, and dollar value of hay and roughage certificates cashed in Oklahoma, by certain farmers and ranchers

Name of borrower and location	1953	1954		1955		1956		1957			1958
	ACP payments	Feed purchase orders redeemed	ACP payments	Feed purchase orders redeemed	ACP payments	Feed purchase orders redeemed	ACP payments	Feed purchase orders redeemed	ACP payments	Hay and roughage certificates redeemed	ACP payments
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Walter H. Hyatt, Beaver	0	$340	0	$178	0	$2,406	0	0	0	$2,010	0
George W. Kirton, Boyd	$54	764	0	126	$1,514	440	$1,885	0	$1,048	0	0
Robert E. Selman, Selman	0	6,132	0	2,838	785	6,315	1,277	0	1,373	0	0
Charles V. Word, Arnett	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,162	0

THE SOLID RECORD OF ACCOMPLISHMENT BY MONTANA'S FRESHMAN REPRESENTATIVE, THE HONORABLE LEROY H. ANDERSON

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the solid record of accomplishment compiled by the junior member of the Montana Congressional delegation, Representative LEROY H. ANDERSON, during his first term in Congress.

Fifteen of the bills he introduced, or companion measures to them, have become law. These measures deal with major fields such as agriculture, Indian affairs, reclamation, wildlife, banking and currency, excise taxes, military affairs, and social security.

His ability has been particularly recognized here in Congress in the fields of agriculture, military affairs, fiscal policy, and veterans affairs.

He serves on the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and has appeared before many other committees, both in Senate and House, on behalf of his Montana constituents.

Let me cite an example of the kind of work he has done to further worthy development of the Nation's resources:

We have in Montana, at Benton Lake near Great Falls, a potentially wonderful breeding ground for ducks. However, except for about 1 year out of 20, the rainfall is insufficient to attract the waterfowl.

Representative ANDERSON talked this problem out with local wildlife enthusiasts and managers of a nearby irrigation system. Plans were developed to divert water from the irrigation system into the lakebed. Representative ANDERSON was instrumental in obtaining approval of this plan from the Fish and Wildlife Service. Then, the pertinent appropriations bill having already left the House of Representatives, he personally conferred with members of the Senate and House Appropriations Committees, and convinced them of the merit of this plan. Consequently appropriations for this project were made, and Montana and other States will soon share the benefits of another fine waterfowl refuge, thanks to the little publicized but effective work of Representative LEROY ANDERSON.

His many years of experience as a Montana farmer, plus his legislative experience as a member of both the senate and house of representatives in the State legislature, qualified him to step right in and help solve some of the agricultural problems so important to Montana's Second Congressional District.

He steered through the House of Representatives legislation which continued the durum-wheat program last year. Additionally, he has been particularly effective in conferences with Agriculture Department officials, such as we had on the subject of wheat grading and resealing, for the simple reason that he knows at least as much about grain and livestock as the departmental experts do.

As a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency Committee, he played an important role in obtaining approval of the area-development bill, which offers great possibilities for economically depressed communities in our State and for our Indian citizens.

As chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I have been privileged to work with Representative ANDERSON toward successful action on a number of bills relating to Montana's resources and Indian problems.

His efforts in the Interior Committee resulted in Congressional approval of bills relating to mineral development of the Crow Indian Reservation, compensation for the Crow Indians for land within the Huntley project, and exchange of land on the Huntley project as desired by a local school district. In each instance Representative ANDERSON was able to obtain approval of amendments desired by local interests.

Most important, perhaps, was Representative ANDERSON'S yeoman service on behalf of the Yellowtail Dam resolution, now signed into law. Largely because of his efforts, a settlement on payment to the Crow Indians has been reached. Next year, with his help, I am confident we will obtain construction funds for this large multipurpose dam, which will mean so much to eastern Montana, particularly the Billings-Hardin area.

One of the most important pieces of legislation approved by the 85th Congress, as regards Montana, was Representative ANDERSON'S bill—now Public Law 85–151—which provides that the Surgeon General may, instead of building hospitals merely for Indians, construct community hospitals to serve Indians and non-Indians alike, when he finds it more efficient to do so.

The first hospital to receive funds under the Anderson Act was in Polson, Mont. High on the priority list to benefit from this law, when local questions are settled, are the communities of Wolf Point and Poplar.

As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, Representative ANDERSON has an intimate acquaintance with the problems of Montana business. As a railroad worker, when a young man, he learned the problems of the laboring man the hard way.

An example of one community where both business and labor benfited from Representative ANDERSON'S efforts is Roundup, where the coal mines are producing for the Atomic Energy Commission plant at Hanford, Wash., thanks to Representative ANDERSON'S successful efforts to obtain a fair share of production, for the AEC, from this Montana community in his Congressional District.

A graduate chemical engineer with a degree from Montana State College, and advanced study in physical chemistry at California Institute of Technology, a major general in the Army Reserve, and national president of the Senior Reserve Commanders Association of the United States Army, a member of a national committee of the Presbyterian Church, LEROY ANDERSON is one of the most versatile and well-rounded men to serve in Congress. He is fair, capable, and a worker, and I am proud to serve on a delegation which includes a man who delivered so well for the people of Montana during his first term in Congress.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S STATEMENT ON THE LITTLE ROCK SCHOOL SITUATION

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, President Eisenhower's statement at his press conference yesterday shows that, once again, his plan is to use troops in integrating the Little Rock schools.

This plan is based on a misunderstanding of the conditions in that troubled city. The use of force cannot achieve any constructive goal, for the real opposition to integration is not found in lawless elements. Opposition to integration is actually the overwhelming voice of the mothers and fathers of the children, those most directly concerned. Their objection is in no spirit of defiance or lawlessness on their part. They are sincere, patriotic, and law-abiding citizens. Traditions and customs for a pattern of separate social and civic activities between the races have been handed down from mother to daughter, from father to son. This pattern has afforded generations of peaceful and harmonious cooperation among the people of the two races. These traditions cannot be erased by court orders, nor swept aside by force.

The evils of bad law have a way of multiplying and perpetuating themselves. The illegal school decision of 1954 will continue to haunt people of this country and bring division between men until corrective action is taken. The local institution which we highly regard, our public school, must again become subject to the control of the good citizens who have struggled to raise it and our educational standards to their present levels.

The Supreme Court decision which established this principle vested the control of the local situation with the district judge. The court of appeals' unfortunate and tragic decision of Monday indicates the adoption of a course which will destroy public-school education in the South. If the extreme proponents of integration, at whatever cost, continue to prevail in their insistence on rule or ruin, they will succeed only in rule and ruin of our local public-school system.

Mr. President, there was recently published a very timely editorial on the tragic situation, in the Washington Star of August 20, 1958, entitled "Little Rock's Ordeal." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LITTLE ROCK'S ORDEAL

Unless it is held in abeyance pending an appeal to the Supreme Court, the 6 to 1 ruling by the Eighth Circuit Court presumably means that Little Rock's ordeal will begin all over again 2 weeks from tomorrow.

What is presented in this situation is a potentially destructive collision between wisdom and the law.

The six appellate judges conceded that they were directly concerned only with the legality of District Judge Lemley's order for a 2½-year postponement of integration in Little Rock. They were only incidentally concerned with the consequences of their reversal of the Lemley order. The basic issue, as the majority saw it, "plainly comes down to the question of whether overt public resistance, including mob protest, constitutes sufficient cause to nullify an order of the Federal court directing the board to proceed with its integration plan. We say the time has not yet come in these United States when an order of a Federal court must be whittled away, watered down, or shamefully withdrawn in the face of violent and unlawful acts of individual citizens in opposition thereto."

This seems to say that the appellate court reversed Judge Lemley because it would not yield to mob action, and this, as a principle of law, may be valid. But we are not so sure that it is wise.

Certainly, the strong language used by the court is not likely to help the Little Rock School Board and School Superintendent Virgil Blossom in the coming school year. Both the board and the superintendent have tried throughout in complete good faith to put the integration plan into effect. The appellate court concedes this. The court also concedes that integration under Federal bayonets imposed physical and mental strain on teachers and members of Central High School's administrative staff, and that, in general, there was bedlam and turmoil in and upon the school's premises, outside the classrooms.

These were among the practical considerations which prompted Judge Lemley to grant the 2½-year postponement, and which persuaded Chief Judge Gardner of the appellate court that Judge Lemley was right in doing so. The chief judge put it this way: "The action of Judge Lemley was based on realities and on conditions, rather than theories. The exercise of his discretion should not, I think, be set aside as it seems to me it was not an abuse of discretion but rather a discretion wisely exercised under the conditions."

It may be that this gets to the heart of the matter. How much discretion did the Supreme Court intend that a district judge should have? Are the findings of a district judge to be ignored by an appellate court which does not wish to appear to be yielding to mob pressures? What, really, is the meaning of all deliberate speed, as that term was used by the Supreme Court?

If this ruling is appealed, perhaps the Supreme Court will take the case and clear up these uncertainties. We hope so. For there is no future, it seems to us, in merely sending a case of this kind back to the school authorities who have tried in good faith to implement integration and who now say, also in good faith, that they simply cannot, in the existing circumstances, cope with the problem. This kind of judicial policy can lead only to a succession of Little Rocks, with severe impairment if not the destruction of public education for both colored and white children.

DEFICIENCY IN TROOP CARRIERS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, a member of the staff of the News and Courier of Charleston, S. C., has sent me a thought-provoking article from that outstanding newspaper entitled "Fast Troop Carriers Lacked by MATS To Deploy United States Armed Forces for Battle."

Mr. President, we all know of the tragic inadequacy of the airlift for our Army and Marines. The article is but further proof of that fact. I ask unanimous consent that the article from the News and Courier be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAST TROOP CARRIERS LACKED BY MATS TO DEPLOY UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FOR BATTLE

(By Anthony Harrigan)

France is a fleck of green under the clouds as this turboprop troop carrier, loaded with a 9-ton truck needed in Lebanon, flies at 22,000 feet toward Evereux Air Base outside of Paris.

The Lockheed C–130–A plane, built in Georgia, is fast (350 miles per hour) and takes off after a short run, which is important for planes designed for use in a battle zone. But C–130–A's are few in the United States Air Force.

The fact is that the United States airlift capability is inadequate to meet the needs of the Nation in a major crisis.

The small number of planes in the pipeline to Lebanon testifies that the Military Air Transport Service should be equipped with new planes of the most advanced types.

On the flight line at Rhein-Main Air Base, Frankfurt, Germany, are 20 giant, 4-motored C–124's, the Globemasters familiar to residents of Charleston and Greenville. The propeller-driven C–124's are part of a special task force that flew to Germany from Donaldson Air Base (Greenville) to Germany within hours after President Eisenhower ordered troops into Lebanon.

Col. Roland J. Barnick, United States Air Force, a veteran of Bataan who flew B–29's in the Pacific during World War II, is commander of the task force. Within 15 minutes after the task force arrived at Rhein-Main Air Base, the first aircraft was dispatched for Lebanon.

But if Colonel Barnick and his men were ready to do their job, the United States has not demonstrated its willingness to provide aircraft in sufficient numbers.

Colonel Barnick cannot discuss the number of aircraft in the task force. But this writer, in conversation with pilots and officers handling cargo, as well as from studying scheduled flights, concludes that less than 40 C–124's are attached to the task force.

In addition to these planes operating under MATS control, the United States airlift was augmented in its early phases by approximately 40 C–130A troop carrier planes based in France, and a similar number based at Ardmore, Okla.

The C–124's can carry approximately 200 men. The C–130A's are equipped to carry 65 paratroopers with full equipment. Had all these planes been available in Europe at the time the President ordered intervention, they would have been able to airlift less than 10,000 men.

Actually, they wouldnt' have been able to airlift 10,000 men who were ready for battle.

Soldiers without machine guns, ammunition, artillery, rockets, medical units, and all the housekeeping elements of field forces are not battle forces.

A large portion of the airlift capability was devoted to military supplies, not fighting men. For instance units of Colonel Barnick's task force flew gasoline to Jordan for the support of British units in that country.

The C–124's comprising the task force have a big payload but require more refueling stops than the C–130A's. The first missions were flown across the Brenner Pass into Italy. But the Austrians protested violation of their air space. Subsequent flights had to be made via Marseilles, France; Naples, Italy; Piraeus, Greece; Adana, Turkey; and Beirut, Lebanon. The C–130A's can make the flight to Beirut nonstop, but the heavily laden C–124's cannot.

MATS has a few modern C–133A's, big brothers to the C–130's. But these were grounded during the airlift because of an accident to one which required a survey of all planes of this type. Senator STUART SYMINGTON, former Secretary of the Air Force, pointed out July 15 that the United States is ordering only 15 C–133's a year.

The MATS activity that Charlestonians know is routine overseas transport of servicemen and military dependents. This is a task for which present equipment is clearly inadequate when MATS is called on to fulfill its primary obligation—the airlift of United States military forces and their battle equipment.

One wonders what would have happened had the United States troops in Lebanon met resistance from Red volunteers or if the Chinese Reds had launched a diversionary move against some area of American interest in the Far East.

It seems that the United States would have been completely incapable of meeting its needs for airlift.

The United States has rejected the idea of a mass Army deployed at bases throughout the world. Instead, it has chosen to develop a highly mobile force armed with tactical nuclear weapons. Such is the United States intention, but the planes to airlift these troops do not exist.

To this writer, it appears that MATS is suffering from acute anemia of appropriations. The super-Constellations that fly over Charleston are beautiful planes. But a few quality planes are not a substitute for numbers when the Nation faces a crisis requiring troops.

MATS needs quality and quantity in its airfleet.

MATS hasn't a single jet transport. But it is a fact that several European airlines have jet transports.

United States airlines are in the process of equipping themselves with the Boeing 707 transport. It is precisely such equipment that MATS needs at the earliest possible date. The Boeing 707 will carry 150 passengers at 550 miles per hour. The faster the planes, the quicker the delivery, the fewer the number of planes needed in the pipeline.

It is entirely possible that the Martin *Jetmaster* seaplane, developed for the Navy, should be added to the MATS fleet. This fast seaplane would be of use in many parts of the world where airports might be inadequate or damaged.

If Americans are concerned about the equipment available to their own military, they should consider the fact that the Russians already have the TU–104 jet transport in service that flies almost twice as fast as United States military transports. Observers in Russia have also remarked on the numbers of large jet helicopters the Russians have in service.

The workhorse of the Air Force on short personnel and cargo runs is the C–47, the two-engined transport familiar to American servicemen in the last war. It is a fine plane but a far cry from a jet helicopter.

The cost of enlarging and modernizing the MATS airlift fleet is likely to be very expensive. A jet transport costs in the neighborhood of $7 million, compared with $2.5 million for a Superconstellation. But if the United States rejects a big military force, it can't fail to provide up-to-date equipment for a small, battle-ready force.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION: ADDRESS BY SENATOR SYMINGTON

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, several months ago, expecting this session of Congress to be over by this time, I accepted an invitation to speak at the 20th annual meeting of the Consolidated Rural Electric Cooperative at Mexico, Mo.

I was honored to receive the invitation and looked forward to meeting with this fine group of farm families, to discuss with them some of the work of the Congress and present to them some of my thoughts with regard to the problems of agriculture and rural electrification.

As the Members of the Senate know, we were in session from 10 o'clock the morning of August 19 until 12:15 a. m. the next morning, with 14 votes and 4 record votes during the day and evening.

Late Monday afternoon, August 18, realizing that it would be impossible for me to meet with the members of the Consolidated Rural Electric Cooperative, I talked to their manager, Mr. R. D. Buresh, and explained the situation to him. He understood. I appreciate that understanding.

My administrative assistant, Mr. Stanley Fike, did attend the meeting, however, and delivered my talk prepared for that occasion.

Since I discussed matters believed of interest to all of us, I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks prepared for the 20th annual meeting of this great cooperative printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS PREPARED BY SENATOR STUART SYMINGTON FOR DELIVERY AT THE 20TH ANNUAL MEETING CONSOLIDATED ELECTRIC CO-OP, MEXICO, MO., AUGUST 19, 1958

Thank you very much for inviting me to be with you in Mexico today as you celebrate 20 years of progress in your Consolidated Electric Co-op.

Several weeks ago, in reading the July issue of your co-op magazine, Electric Gleams, I was impressed by the growth of the Consolidated Electric Co-op since its origin in June of 1938—from a few miles of power line then to more than 1,800 miles today; and a few hundred members then to more than 4,700 members today.

I was also impressed with the way you have been paying off your debts and liquidating your loans. Yes, as stated in that article, it is indeed "a record to be proud of."

I congratulate you, the members, your board of directors, and your manager for this excellent record.

But, the success story of your co-op is typical of many hundreds of other electric co-ops throughout the country.

This is not to minimize your success. Your record emphasizes the national record of the rural electric co-ops.

REA is the success story of individual farmers, working in cooperation with their neighbors, with the assistance of their Government, overcoming obstacles, to bring electric power to rural America—to bring farm families out of the dark ages.

In 1935, when the REA was first created, only 6 percent of our Missouri farms were receiving central station electric service. Today, 23 years later, more than 95 percent of our farms have electricity.

Along with light for the farm homes, have come the many electrical appliances—refrigerator, toaster, stove, radio, television, automatic washer—all designed to ease the workload and make farm life more pleasant for all members of the family.

In addition through the power provided by rural electric co-ops, much of the drudgery associated with farming has been greatly reduced, or eliminated.

The pump handle has been replaced with an electric motor and a complete water system on many farms. The manual chores of milking, feeding, handling grain, have all been made easier.

The advent of electricity in rural America is one of the most significant accomplishments in agriculture. In the 23 years prior to the creation of the Rural Electrification Administration, productivity per man-hour of farm labor had increased 20 percent. In the 23 years since 1935, farm labor productivity has more than doubled.

Of course, there have been many other factors contributing to the sensational increase in farm productivity. Improved crop varieties, increased efficiency in livestock production, modern power machinery, improved management techniques, all have contributed to this complex of agricultural development. In 1935, one farm worker was able to produce enough food and fiber to support 10 other people. Today, that same farm worker produces enough to support 20 other people.

Despite these outstanding accomplishments, the economic gap between agriculture and other segments of our economy has not been reduced.

In other segments of the economy, increases in productive efficiency are rewarded by higher wages, and increased profits.

This has not been true in agriculture. Farm productivity has doubled since 1935, but total farm income in 1957—in terms of purchasing power—was 2 percent less than in 1935.

What is even more serious is that the farmer's economic position has degenerated in recent years as compared with other segments of our economy. For example, from 1952 to 1957, corporate profits increased 15 percent; wages increased 30 percent; interest income increased 73 percent; but net farm income declined 24 percent.

In 1957, dollar farm income was at its lowest point since 1942—15 years.

In view of this situation, is it any wonder that nearly 4 million farm people have been forced to give up their farms and their homes in the last 5 years and move elsewhere to try to find jobs which would give them a reasonable standard of living?

A number of years ago, one of our great farm leaders warned that national depressions are farm bred and farm led.

As farm income decreased, the purchasing power of farm families dropped sharply. Business for main street merchants declined. Factories and businesses throughout America have felt the effect of these depressed economic conditions.

Since 1952, farmers have suffered a total loss of income of more than $15 billion—an average of $3,000 for every farm in the United States.

How much has this contributed to the current recession and to the hardships and suffering of the millions of workers who have been and are still without jobs?

No one can be certain, but we do believe that the depressed conditions in agriculture are the result of the farm policies being put

into effect in these past 5 years. That policy has been based on a theoretical assumption that lower prices will discourage farm production.

The farmers, who have been the unwilling tools in this experiment, know how foolish is this theoretical assumption. Farmers know what their fixed costs are. They know how their operating expenses have gone up in recent years. And they know that if the price per bushel or the price per pound goes down they have to produce and sell more bushels or more pounds in order to have the same number of dollars to meet their costs and to maintain a reasonable standard of living for their families.

Despite the obvious fallacy of this theoretical approach, and ignoring the protests of farmers, farm leaders, and many of us in Congress, the Department of Agriculture has doggedly driven prices down, repeatedly asserting that production would be reduced and markets would be expanded.

Has this happened?

Let's look at the record.

From 1952 to 1957, farm prices dropped 16 percent. If the theory that lower prices would reduce production is accurate, then total production should also have declined.

But this has not happened.

Instead, between 1952 and 1957, total farm output increased 6 percent and, according to the latest Department of Agriculture crop-production report, it will increase even more this year.

The official reports of his own Department prove this part of Secretary Benson's textbook theory a colossal failure.

But what of the "expanded markets" which were to result from the lower farm prices?

The most obvious expansion has been in the Government warehouses and storage bins.

In January of 1953, the Commodity Credit Corporation's inventory of all agricultural commodities was valued at $1.1 billion. In January of 1958, after 5 years of the policies of this Administration, there was $5.4 billion of farm commodities in Government storage—an increase of 500 percent. These supplies would have been even greater had it not been for Public Law 480 and other export programs. They have moved billions of dollars of farm commodities out of CCC stocks and into foreign markets.

The failure of the present farm policy is even more evident when we examine the cost of the program.

During the 20-year period from 1933 to 1953, the cost of price support operations for the 6 basic agricultural commodities was $20 million. In the 5-year period from June of 1953 through May of 1958, price support costs on the basic commodities have been $2.4 billion.

In other words, in the 5 years under this Administration, the costs of price supports on basic commodities are 120 times greater than the costs in the previous 20 years.

At the same time, price support costs for all farm commodities have increased 445 percent.

During the 20-year period prior to the present administration, the cost of all farm price supports averaged only 35 cents per person per year. During the past 5 years, that cost has been $5.70 per year per person.

As a former businessman and as one with experience in various Government agencies, I am always interested in the type and quality of the administration of any department in the Government. Based on the record, the present administration of the Department of Agriculture is weak.

The Department has some 20 percent more employees today than it had in 1952. The administrative and other general costs associated with the price support programs have increased over 900 percent in the past 5 years—from $34 million in 1952 to $312 million in 1957.

We need to keep in mind that, while the costs of the programs were increasing at an almost incredible rate, farm prices were declining 16 percent, the parity ratio dropped 18 percent, and farm income was down 24 percent.

This is the almost unbelievable record of the policies and administration of the past 5 years.

Some informed observers assert this record has been developed to bring public ridicule and resentment against the farmer and all farm programs, so as to eventually destroy all farm programs.

Whether or not this is true, there are examples where attempts have been made to destroy certain basic elements of the overall program. One of these is very close to home for many Missouri farmers.

I am, of course, referring to the efforts of the Department of Agriculture to weaken the local farmer committee system. Many of you may recall that in 1953 regulations and directives were issued which prevented the local elected farmer committeemen from functioning as administrators of the farm program on the local level.

County committees in Missouri were ordered to hire office managers who were to assume this administrative control. County committees were suspended or fired because, in some instances, they were unwilling to accept the office manager sent by the State office.

Others were discharged on various trumped up charges.

The situation became so serious that, in the fall of 1955 and again in 1956, a special Senate Agriculture Subcommittee conducted hearings to investigate the situation.

As a result of those hearings, and based on the report issued by the subcommittee, I joined with several other Senators in introducing a bill designed to prevent some of the abuses of the county committeeman system.

In spite of vigorous opposition from the Secretary of Agriculture, this bill has been passed by the Senate, and is now awaiting House action.

Another example of the Administration's efforts to weaken or destroy important farm programs is of great concern to you and to all REA members throughout the Nation.

For several years, people closest to the REA program have felt that the present Administration was not fully sympathetic to the general concept of farmers, through cooperative effort, supplying electricity in rural areas.

Until last year, however, there had been little positive evidence of any threats directed at the REA program. Then, sometime during May of 1957, the Secretary of Agriculture asked the REA Administrator to submit all REA loan applications of $500,000 or more to the Secretary for final clearance.

This was the first time, since the creation of the REA in 1935, that the Administrator was not permitted to exercise his best judgment with regard to loan applications.

Through the years the Secretary of Agriculture has had the authority to exercise general supervision and direction over the Administrator of the REA. However, prior to 1957, no Secretary of Agriculture had tried to overrule the Administrator.

In 1953, during consideration of the Government Reorganization Plan, Secretary Benson testified before Congress that he would make no changes in the procedures relating to REA without first consulting not only the Congress but also with the farm groups concerned.

This he did not do.

When Secretary Benson told the present Administrator, Mr. Hamil, to submit loan applications, he had not consulted Congress or any farm groups. In fact, his action was kept secret for some time. Only when a local co-op questioned a delay in the processing of its loan did the information become public that the delay came in the Secretary's office where the loan had been sent for clearance.

As this change in policy was reported in the newspapers throughout the country, REA members, their co-op leaders, Members of Congress and others familiar with and sympathetic to the REA program, protested this action as an effort to weaken or destroy the REA.

Many believed this was a substantial change in REA policy, and that it posed a serious threat to the future of the program. Questions were raised as to why Secretary Benson wanted to review the larger loans, why he did not announce this change, why Congress was not consulted.

The Senate Government Operations subcommittee charged with the responsibility for keeping a check on activities of Government agencies, immediately called Secretary Benson to testify and to explain his actions.

After some time, the Secretary finally appeared and gave his explanation. But that explanation was far short of being adequate, and legislation was immediately introduced to restore REA to the independent status it had prior to 1953.

During the hearings on that legislation, witness after witness, representing REA co-ops throughout the country, testified in support of restoring the REA to an independent status.

REA members and their co-op managers were also concerned with other actions of the administration which hit at the foundation of their program.

One of these was the administration proposal of legislation which would have the effect of raising the interest rate on REA loans. The justification for this action is based on the fact that, in recent years, because of the higher interest rates under the tight-money policies, the cost of money to the Government has been above the 2 percent interest rate charged on REA and other Government loans.

However, those proposing this legislation overlook the fact that for nearly two decades the Government actually made $48 million on the 2 percent REA loans.

In addition, during our investigation we found that this proposal had not originated within the Administrator's office. Instead, it came from the Secretary of Agriculture and was sent to Mr. Hamil for his approval.

Before our committee, Hamil testified that higher interest rates would be harmful and would impede the development of REA co-ops in some areas of the country. It became rather obvious that the REA Administrator was, in effect, required to support the administration's recommendation, even though he did not believe it was in the best interests of the electrification program.

The Department of Agriculture cut by one-half the funds requested by the REA for new loans. Through the action of Congress, the entire amount needed by REA was restored.

When the REA appropriation bills came before Congress this past year, the Administrator of the program was relegated to a secondary position, while an appointed Assistant of the Secretary of Agriculture testified to the committee.

None of these incidents taken alone would be construed as a serious threat to the REA, but viewed together, they indicate the Administration's unsympathetic and perhaps hostile attitude.

This is the reason many of us in Congress believe legislation is needed to restore full authority for the functions of the program to its Administrator.

The REA program, which has provided such a great service to rural America, must not and will not become a pawn in the hands of any Secretary of Agriculture.

Even though we believe the REA concept is well established, all members, their leaders and their representatives in Congress need to be constantly on guard so that progress in the next 23 years can be as great and as significant as it has in the past 23 years.

So, too, must we be more vigilant and more emphatic in demanding overall farm policies that are sound, plus administration that will make those policies work.

In the entire farm program, we need the spirit of cooperation which has been so successful in your own consolidated electric cooperative right here in the heart of Missouri's Little Dixie.

If all of us who are interested in a fair share of American prosperity for the American farmer will but work together, with that spirit, then success will be assured.

To this cause, I pledge my full support and again thank you for the honor and privilege of presenting these thoughts today.

PROGRAM OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ACTION AT LITTLE ROCK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is time that we were very clear about the major domestic crisis referred to earlier by my colleague, the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], which could be again brought on by events in Little Rock. It is essential that there be stated in advance not only the policy of the United States, which the President has now done, but also that there be initiated a course of action endeavoring to avoid if at all possible, dire emergencies like those which faced the country when rioting occurred at Little Rock last September.

Whatever may not have been done that should have been done by the Congress when the Senate eliminated part III of the civil rights bill of 1957, the fact is that we must act now with the means we have at hand. I believe it fair to say, however, that if the President finds that Congressional action is necessary to meet any emergency at Little Rock, then he should call the Congress into special session for the purpose. The courses of action which should now be taken I respectfully suggest and urge are the following:

First. That the Civil Rights Commission hold hearings in Little Rock in conjunction with its Arkansas Advisory Council, which was appointed to advise and assist the Commission in tackling our country's most crucial domestic problem.

Second. That the Attorney General should promptly intervene as a friend of the court, preferably at the request of the school board or the court, but in the absence of either on his own responsibility and at once.

Congress has enacted a statute establishing the Civil Rights Commission with broad powers to study and recommend—calmly and deliberately—in the field of school desegregation and other fields. I think Little Rock is an ideal place for the Commission to do its work now.

Mr. President, the Department of Justice should lend the full weight of the United States Government to the current judicial proceedings, and the Attorney General should without delay apply to intervene in the Little Rock case.

The history of the 1957 disorder at Little Rock's Central High School which required Federal troops to be sent to Little Rock last September and the continuance of the position of Governor Faubus along exactly the same lines which brought on the previous emergency demand that this be done.

In that connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, the text of the statements by Governor Faubus on the Little Rock decision, made yesterday and today; and, Mr. President, preceding those statements, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, the statement of the President of the United States at his press conference yesterday, expressing the same determination which he expressed in 1957, and in that connection I asked unanimous consent that the White House statement dated October 3, 1957, be printed as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(WASHINGTON, August 20, 1958.—Following is the transcript of President Eisenhower's news conference:)

President EISENHOWER. Good morning. Please sit down.

Ladies and gentlemen, anticipating questions about this recent decision [on school integration] of the Eighth Circuit Court, I am going to read a little statement, and there will be copies of it available to you; so you don't have to take specific notes. Because there are still some phases of this case pending in the courts it would not be appropriate for me to express my view on the case itself.

This case, however, or any person's agreement or disagreement with its outcome, must not be confused with the solemn duty that all Americans have to comply with the final orders of the court. Nor should we lose sight of the fact that the maintenance of order to permit compliance with the final orders of the court is the responsibility of each State. Each State owes to its inhabitants, to its sister States and to the Union the obligation to suppress unlawful forces. It cannot by action or deliberate failure to act permit violence to frustrate the preservation of individual rights as determined by a court decree. It is my hope that each State will fulfill its own obligation with a full realization of the gravity of any other course.

Defiance of this duty would present the most serious problem, but there can be no equivocation as to the responsibility of the Federal Government in such an event. My feelings are exactly as they were a year ago. And I said then:

"The very basis of our individual rights and freedoms rests upon the certainty that the President and the executive branch of Government will support and insure the carrying out of the decisions of the Federal courts."

Every American must understand—that is the end of the quote, by the way.

Every American must understand that if an individual, a community or a State is going successfully and continuously to defy the courts, then there is anarchy.

I continue to insist that the commonsense of the individual and his feelings of civil responsibility must eventually come into play if we are to solve this problem.

I will have nothing further to say about the integration problems and specific cases that are now before the courts, not only in this one particular case—there are four others—but we will have to wait for the outcome of decisions and actions before any further comment.

[From the New York Times of Thursday, October 3, 1957]

WHITE HOUSE STATEMENT

(WASHINGTON, October 2.—Following is the text of a White House statement of legal principles guiding President Eisenhower in the school integration problem.)

1. The executive branch of the Federal Government does not participate in the formulation of plans effecting desegregation.

This function is left to the community where maximum understanding of local problems exists so that proper and effective solutions may be devised. This was clearly recognized by the United States Supreme Court when it said:

"To that end, the courts may consider problems related to administration, arising from the physical condition of the school plant, the school transportation system, personnel, revision of school districts and attendance areas into compact units to achieve a system of determining admission to the public schools on a nonracial basis, and revision of local laws and regulations which may be necessary in solving the foregoing problems. They will also consider the adequacy of any plans the defendants may propose to meet these problems and to effectuate a transition to a racially nondiscriminatory school system."

Although the Federal Government has no responsibility to initiate action to desegregate public schools or to formulate any plans for desegregation, the courts have made it clear that the Department of Justice, at the invitation of the Court, must participate in litigation involving public school desegregation for the purpose of assisting the court.

TIME IS UP TO LOCALITIES

2. The period of time within which any such plan should be put into effect likewise must be proposed by the local authorities and approved by the courts.

The Supreme Court held that admission of children to public schools on a nonracial basis should go forward with all deliberate speed. In requiring a "prompt and reasonable start to full compliance," the Court also made it clear that insincere or dilatory tactics could not be used to defeat constitutional protections and rights.

The executive branch of the Government does not play a part in these local deliberations or under existing law in the court proceedings when such plans are considered.

3. A final order of a Federal court giving effect to a desegregation public school plan must be obeyed by State authorities and all citizens as the law of the land.

The action of the Supreme Court has conclusively settled the principle that public school desegregation is, under existing constitutional provisions, the law of the land. Final orders of the Federal courts carrying out this principle must be observed.

It is the duty of the State authorities to give full aid to the enforcement of a desegregation public school plan once it is finally ordered by the court. This obligation is not open to any doubt. It is also a required responsibility of good citizenship that every person in the community respect the law and its processes. Such observance of law is fundamental to our existence as a Nation of free people under constitutional government.

GOVERNOR MAY NOT BALK COURT

4. Powers of a State governor may not be used to defeat a valid order of a Federal court.

The governors of the respective States have the primary responsibility for maintaining domestic order. However, under a pretext of maintaining order a governor may not interpose military force or permit mob violence to occur so as to prevent the final order of a Federal court from being carried out.

When an obstruction of justice has been interposed or mob violence is permitted to exist so that it is impracticable to enforce the laws by the ordinary course of judicial proceedings, the obligation of the President under the Constitution and laws is inescapable. He is obliged to use whatever means may be required by the particular situation.

TEXT OF STATEMENT BY GOVERNOR FAUBUS ON LITTLE ROCK DECISION

(LITTLE ROCK, ARK., Aug. 19.—Following is the text of a statement by Gov. Orval E. Faubus on a decision yesterday by the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals in St. Louis. The decision overturned a district court ruling that had granted a 2½-year delay in integration at Little Rock's Central High School.)

The reversal of the Lemley decision by the Federal Court of Appeals is most regrettable. The higher court's decision indicates an indifference and disregard for the will of the people that is most alarming and dangerous.

The spotlight now has shifted to the school authorities, the officials of the NAACP (National Association for the Advancement of Colored People), and the parents of the Negro children.

Any action taken by the chief executive, the legislature, or the people before the attitude of these people is known, might prove to be premature and unnecessary.

The school board now needs to take the people of the district into its confidence and let them know its intentions and its plans. Does the board intend to continue to promote the complete integration of the Little Rock school while muttering insincere, halfhearted protestations, or does it intend to fight in every legal way possible the integration by force, with such dire consequences for education in the affected schools, and the peace of the community.

For evidence of the school board's attitude I point to two quotations from the reversal ruling itself:

"This court recognizes that, following the first Brown decision the members of the board, acting in good faith, and working with the superintendent of schools, moved promptly to promulgate a plan designed to gradually bring about complete integration in the Little Rock public schools, and they are to be commended for their efforts in that regard."

At another point in the reversal we find the following language: "On August 29, 1957, on application of the board, the United States district court at Little Rock entered an order enjoining the use of the State court injunction in an attempt to block the integration plan."

SCHOOL BOARD'S ACTION

It must be noted here that it was the school board that dashed into the Federal court presided over by Judge Davies the very next day after the State court ruling, staying the execution of the plan of integration, and asked for the ruling which said in substance: "integrate forthwith, without regard for the consequences."

If the school board intends to continue to promote the complete integration of the Little Rock schools, the people are entitled to know. It is the people's business, because the schools belong to the people and not to the school board.

How many Negroes will be admitted to Central High School on opening day? If only those previously enrolled are readmitted, when will the number be raised to 90 or to 900, the latter figure being the number eligible to attend Central High School under the board's complete integration plan?

Will Negro students be admitted to Hall High School on the opening day? If so, how many? If not, when will this be done? It is necessary under the board's plan of complete integration. The delay of the plan by Judge Lemley has now been reversed, and the board is ordered to continue.

What other schools will be integrated on opening day? They are all in the plan of complete integration. When will white students be ordered to enter the Negro school? Will that be on opening day this year, and if not, when will it be done? It is a part of the plan of complete integration, drawn up by the board and approved by the Federal Court.

How many Negro students have applied for admission to white schools? Who are they and when did they apply?

Why all the secrecy surrounding these developments? Why the secret board meetings? Aren't the people entitled to know about their own school affairs?

The school board must surely realize the dire implications of any forcible integration of the schools at this time.

Although it has been ordered to continue with the integration plan, it has every right to resist the order by any and every legal means.

1. The board may use the school-assignment law, now on the statute books, which was passed by the overwhelming vote of the people at the general election of 1956.

2. Meet with the parents of the Negro students, and the officials of the NAACP who have instigated and promoted the continued integration efforts. Discuss frankly with them the situation as it now exists, with the dire consequences that may ensue as to the quality of education for the Negro students as well as others, and also the jeopardy to the peace and tranquillity of the community. These Negro parents may rise above their desires for the attainment of their immediate objectives in this matter.

Their decision, the Negro parents and the NAACP in the interest of harmony and greater good to the whole community, to allow a cooling-off period, by sending their students to school with their own race during the coming year, would do much, if not more than anyone else could do, to resolve this whole unhappy situation.

Failing in both of the above, the school board should resign as previously suggested by Judge John Pilkington, of Hope, Ark., and others and allow the people to select a new board which would have the courage to act in conformity to their wishes.

The schools are scheduled to open in less than 2 weeks from this date. If the people, the members of the legislature, or the chief executive are to have any opportunity to do anything about this situation, without the possibility of unnecessary action, or of conflicting action with the efforts of the school board, then it is necessary to know almost immediately the plans and intentions of the school board and the Negro leaders.

Surely the board has plans. If not, it has been very shortsighted indeed.

TEXT OF FAUBUS REPLY TO EISENHOWER

LITTLE ROCK, ARK., August 20.—Following is a text of a statement by Gov. Orval E. Faubus today in reply to President Eisenhower's comments at his news conference on problems raised by racial integration in the public schools:

You have asked for comment on the statement of President Eisenhower.

The free people of a democracy such as ours think of the "law of the land" in terms of laws passed by their own votes at the ballot box, or in terms of laws passed by their elected representatives.

Time after time the people of Arkansas and other States have voted overwhelmingly against forcible integration.

VIEWS ON COURT EDICT

Furthermore, many, many eminent lawyers throughout the Nation, regardless of their views on the segregation-integration question, have expressed the view that the United States Supreme Court decision of 1954 is without the basis of law. No law has ever been passed which says that all people of every section of the Nation must be forced to integrate against their wishes and regardless of the consequences, however bad they might be.

Millions of Americans hold a deep and sincere conviction that the original Supreme Court decision is illegal and violates the principles of democracy, and that the decision is not in accordance with the Constitution, which guarantees to the States certain rights—among them the field of education.

Therefore, compliance cannot be obtained by invoking the sacred name of the Constitution, or by the use of the once-magic name of Eisenhower.

DISCORD SEEN LIKELY

It is, then, inevitable that the integration of the races cannot be achieved without great discord, except by the process of evolution, which requires patience, tolerance, and understanding over a period of time. The length of time must be based upon the peculiar circumstances and conditions in each area, and the period of time required will vary from community to community and, perhaps, from State to State.

If it is the purpose of Mr. Eisenhower's statement to reaffirm his position of last fall, that it is my duty as Governor to use the military to enforce integration in any school district in this State, then I must say that my position of last fall is unchanged.

I do not interpret my constitutional duties to cover any such theory as that advanced by the President.

I do recognize my duty to preserve the peace of my State, and I shall continue to do so to the best of my ability. It is also elementary that I am bound under my oath of office to uphold the Constitution and to enforce the laws of my own State, within the framework of the Federal Constitution.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 3 minutes, to conclude my remarks on this subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, only as I have indicated can the dignity and authority of the United States be manifested well enough in advance to work out within the bounds permitted by the mandate of the Supreme Court against public school segregation some program for desegregation in the Little Rock public schools which may prove just and feasible. Without the participation of the United States Department of Justice there is every reason to suppose that the situation can deteriorate as it did in September last with a national emergency—indeed what was an international emergency—on our hands again.

I point out again, Mr. President, we hear constantly from our Southern colleagues that one must be temperate and judicious in trying to work out this situation. Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to judge the words of Governor Faubus and tell us whether they are temperate and judicious and whether the Governor himself and the people of Arkansas could not make a great contribution toward handling this controversy temperately and judiciously.

I certainly agree that should be our aim and our end, and the suggestions

I have made are directed toward such objective.

The Circuit Court for the Eighth Circuit has settled the judicial situation as to Little Rock, and most Americans will applaud the statement of Judge Matthes that in the court's opinion, "The time has not yet come in these United States when an order of a Federal court must be whittled away, watered down or safely withdrawn in the face of violent and unlawful acts of individual citizens in opposition thereto. To hold otherwise would result in accession to the demands of insurrectionists or rioters and the withholding of rights granted by the Constitution of the United States."

Not only did the court eloquently state the problem with which this country is faced in Little Rock, it went further and observed "that at no time did the (school) board seek injunctive relief against those who opposed by unlawful acts the lawful integration plan, which action apparently proved successful in the Clinton, Tenn., and Hoxie, Ark., situations."

Mr. President, the President of the United States has made clear his determination to follow the policies which he followed in September 1957. The Governor of Arkansas has made clear his intention to use all legal force at his command again to endeavor to frustrate the Federal court—and, I submit, the Constitution itself. He tried it last year with the National Guard. Now he has urged the school board to resign rather than comply with the latest order of the court. It would be folly, under those circumstances, to expect the State to ask assistance, or to expect the school board and the local authorities to ask the Attorney General to intervene.

The court itself might well ask the Justice Department to intervene as a friend of the court, but I do not believe that the Federal Government should wait at the door considering the urgency of serving notice that there must be order in the house. Under the circumstances the initiative should be taken by the executive branch. The courts have borne the full brunt of this problem long enough. They cannot be expected to perform legislative and executive functions as well.

Congress has failed, in my humble opinion, by refusing to pass an effective part 3 to the Civil Rights Act, to do its part. Part 3 would have given the Attorney General authority to participate without leave of anyone, in individual actions to enforce the 14 amendment.

Again the situation bears out what I and others have been arguing, that such a course would be in the best interests even of those opposed to integration, because it would provide an orderly process of law, with the highest authority of the United States serving notice in advance as to what would be done, and not waiting until the emergency is upon us.

The authority of the courts and of the law and that their mandates shall be obeyed is the very essence of community order. Without it, government fails the people. Even if the Congress has not acted as a body to give the Federal Government specific authority to intervene in the Little Rock school litigation, each of us nonetheless has a duty to do his part to uphold the law and its enforcement by the Federal authorities. It is for this reason that I have urged these courses of action which are designed to anticipate events rather than to react to them just as they threaten to overwhelm us.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, has the morning hour been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOBLITZELL in the chair.) Morning business has not been concluded.

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT EISENHOWER ON LITTLE ROCK INTEGRATION DECISION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senate is now debating the vital issue of Supreme Court rulings and judicial sanctity, I ask unanimous consent to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the statement made by the President of the United States on August 20, regarding the Little Rock integration decision and the crisis in school integration generally. I approve of the President's words, and I trust he will back them up with Executive action at the appropriate time.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, August 20, 1958]

EISENHOWER STATEMENT

(Following is the statement on the Little Rock integration decision and school integration generally made by President Eisenhower at his news conference this morning:)

Because there are still some phases of this case pending in the courts, it would not be appropriate for me to express my view on the case itself.

This case, however, or any person's agreement or disagreement with its outcome must not be confused with the solemn duty that all Americans have to comply with the final orders of the Court. Nor should we lose sight of the fact that the maintenance of order to permit compliance with the final orders of the Court is the responsibility of each State.

Each State owes to its inhabitants, to its sister States and to the Union the obligation to suppress unlawful forces. It cannot by action or deliberate failure to act permit violence to frustrate the preservation of individual rights as determined by a court decree. It is my hope that each State will fulfill its obligation with a full realization of the gravity of any other course.

Defiance of this duty would present the most serious problem, but there can be no equivocation as to the responsibility of the Federal Government in such an event. Our feelings are exactly as they were a year ago. As I said then:

"The very basis of our individual rights and freedoms rests upon the certainty that the President and the executive branch of Government will support and insure the carrying out of the decisions of the Federal courts."

Every American must understand that if an individual, community or State is going successfully and continuously to defy the courts, then there is anarchy.

I continue to insist that the common sense of the individual and his feeling of civic responsibility must eventually come into place if we are to solve this problem.

UNHEEDED ALARMS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to proceed for not more than 7 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. CLARK. In this morning's Washington Post appears a thoughtful article by Walter Lippmann, entitled "The Unheeded Alarms." I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of Thursday, August 21, 1958]

THE UNHEEDED ALARMS

(By Walter Lippmann)

A week ago Senator JOHN S. KENNEDY made a powerful and impassioned speech about the prediction, which is widely supported among experts, that within a few years the Soviet Union will be far ahead of us in the big strategic missiles. The period of our inferiority is estimated to be from 1960 to 1964 when the Soviet Union will, according to these estimates, have the power to destroy our Air Force and to devastate 85 percent of our industry, 43 of our 50 largest cities.

Senator KENNEDY'S speech was applauded by the Democratic Senators who took part in the debate. But it was attacked by Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART of Indiana who objected to it on the grounds that in such a public exposure Mr. KENNEDY was selling America short and giving aid and comfort to the Russians. This charge was easily disposed of because the fact of the matter is that the speech contained nothing that could be news to the Russians, nothing that has not been said publicly many times before. The most notable occasion when it was said before was on January 23 of this year, during this session of Congress, in the unanimous report of the so-called Preparedness Subcommittee.

This subcommittee heard some 70 witnesses, interviewed some 200 experts, and took about 7,000 pages of testimony. It reported unanimously that the Soviet Union leads in ballistic missiles and in the number of submarines, that it will soon surpass this country in manned bombers. It reported too what is even more significant and portentous, that "the Soviet Union has a system which enables it to develop new weapons in substantially less time than the United States" and that "the Soviet Union is producing scientists and technicians at a rate substantially greater than our own country." If this is true, the lead of the Soviet Union will increase and the gap will not be closed.

Perhaps the most important question raised by Senator KENNEDY'S speech is why, in view of the subcommittee report in January at the beginning of the session, he did not deliver this speech until August 14 at the very end of the session. What has been happening between January, when the alarm was sounded, and August when Mr. KENNEDY sounded it again? What happened, it is plain enough, is that the failure to respond to the alarm was in both parties, and that there is no discernible difference between the attitude of the Eisenhower administration and that of the Democratic opposition. A few Democratic Senators have made speeches which are on the record but the party as an organization has reacted to the warning as the President himself has reacted.

The bipartisan reaction to the discovery that the Soviet Union is forging ahead in the race of armaments has been governed, I think, by the human propensity to prefer a disagreeable fact which is still in the future to a disagreeable remedy in the present. The danger period, according to these calculations, will not begin for at least 2 years; the remedial measures to cope with it ought to have been laid down in this session of Congress. The bipartisan leadership has avoided the disagreeable remedies, hoping that somehow the alarming predictions of Senators SYMINGTON, JACKSON, and KENNEDY, and of Mr. Joseph Alsop, will not come true.

Indeed, so far as I know, there does not exist an agreed program of what the disagreeable remedies are. Mr. KENNEDY made a few suggestions but he offered no program, and although the Democratic opposition is very critical of President Eisenhower, there is no alternative Democratic program before the country.

Why is it like that? I think it is because the real problem—the relatively greater speed of Soviet technological development—cannot be overcome by a spending program alone. It would be quite easy to push Congress into new and bigger expenditures. But what the experts call the missile lag is essentially a weakness in American education and a lack of seriousness in American national purposes, when there is choice between private pleasures and the public interest. We are in competition with a new society which is in deadly earnest, and there is no use pretending that amidst our comforts and our pleasures, we are serious enough.

That is why, when the alarms are sounded, we turn over and go to sleep again.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Lippmann states that—

Within a few years the Soviet Union will be far ahead of us in the big strategic missiles. The period of our inferiority is estimated to be from 1960 to 1964 when the Soviet Union will, according to these estimates, have the power to destroy our Air Force and to devastate 85 percent of our industry, 43 of our 50 largest cities.

I believe that that is a sound statement of fact, based upon nonsecret information available to every American citizen, and buttressed by the fine research done by the Preparedness Subcommittee, headed by the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and ably abetted by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. Lippmann further concludes that—

The Soviet Union is producing scientists and technicians at a rate substantially greater than our own country.

That also is a clearly established fact, buttressed by the Encyclopedia Britannica, as well as by visits to the Soviet Union by many distinguished American educators, two of whom come from my own Commonwealth of Pennsylvania—the president of the University of Pennsylvania, Gaylord P. Hornwell, the chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh, and other distinguished Pennsylvania educators.

At that point I leave Mr. Lippmann, because he states that there is no discernible difference between the attitude of the Eisenhower administration and that of the Democratic opposition on defense and educational policy. He says that a few Democratic Senators have made speeches which are on the record, but the party as an organization has reacted to these warnings as the President himself has reacted—negatively.

I deny that allegation. I say again what I have said so many times on the floor of the Senate, that it is impossible to push water uphill. A legislative body cannot supply the zeal, the vigor, the imagination, and the implementing policy which it is the problem and duty of the Executive to furnish. No amount of money which the Congress might appropriate would make up for the feeling of smug complacency which affected the Eisenhower administration long before sputnik, and which, unfortunately, still continues.

I think we had a little indication the other night on the floor of the Senate that a guilty conscience was finally gnawing at the minds of some supporters of the administration in this body. I pray that that guilty conscience may gnaw further until, in God's good time, we find reawakened in this administration the sense of urgency which was present for a few short weeks after sputnik.

I commend my colleagues on the Foreign Relations Committee, on the Preparedness Subcommittee, and on the Armed Services Committee, for the extraordinary contribution they have made toward reawakening that sense of urgency. I hope that in some small way I have been able to aid them to a slight degree.

Mr. Lippmann continues:

The danger period in the missiles race, according to these calculations, will not begin for at least 2 years; the remedial measures to cope with it ought to have been laid down in this session of Congress.

That is correct. My friend, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and my friend, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], have pointed this out again and again on the floor of the Senate as the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] did the other day, and as the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] did in his fine speech on the question of our policy in the foreign relations field.

I suggest that, as Mr. Lippmann says that the real problem—

cannot be overcome by a spending program alone. * * * But what the experts call the missile lag is essentially a weakness in American education and a lack of seriousness in American national purposes, when there is choice between private pleasures and the public interest. We are in competition with a new society which is in deadly earnest, and there is no use pretending that amidst our comforts and our pleasures, we are serious enough.

That is why, when the alarms are sounded, we turn over and go to sleep again.

I feel very strongly indeed that it is an obligation of Members of the Senate to hammer away at the sense of national complacency which is on its way to destroying our liberties, our freedom, and our very national existence.

I suggest that—

The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars,
But in ourselves, that we are underlings.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Pennsylvania for his eloquent remarks in connection with the interesting and thought-provoking article by Mr. Lippmann. Ever since the first week the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania came to the Senate, he has joined with a group of Senators who have been constantly warning the American people that the plans and programs of this administration with respect to our position, vis-a-vis that of the growing Communist conspiracy, are not adequate to meet the danger. I am glad once again that the voice of the Senator from Pennsylvania has risen in the Senate so that the people will know the truth in connection with the most important problem we have today.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I thank my friend for his kind remarks. I point out that inadvertently—and I have no excuse for it—I overlooked mentioning the distinguished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] as two of the Members of this body who have constantly impressed upon the Senate and upon the country the dangers of a continuation of our present course in foreign policy and in national defense.

THE UNITED STATES EXHIBIT AT THE BRUSSELS WORLD'S FAIR

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I have received a most interesting letter from 20 of the young American guides serving at the Brussels World's Fair. These guides are American young people who day after day have had an opportunity to observe the foreign reactions to our exhibit in the United States pavilion there.

The letter which these young Americans have sent to me is in defense of an exhibit there entitled "Unfinished Work." These 20 guides believe that a recent policy decision to remove this exhibit was provoked by criticism emanating from the Congress, and that the decision may well destroy one of the most significant and powerful of our exhibits at the Brussels Fair.

I have avoided thus far participating in controversies which have arisen over the nature of our exhibits at the fair, but this letter is so thoughtful that I believe it deserves the most careful attention of every Member of Congress, of the Department of State, and of the United States Information Agency.

The essence of the comments of these young Americans is that our exhibit entitled "Unfinished Business" has had a heavy and favorable impact on visitors to the fair, and also, these young Americans note, "It takes courage to be honest."

I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

I intend to pursue this matter with the appropriate officials of the United States Government, and I take this op-

portunity to commend these Americans for their splendid, thoughtful letter:

BRUSSELS, BELGIUM,
August 16, 1958.

Hon. THEODORE F. GREEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR GREEN: We, the undersigned American guides at the Brussels World Fair, would like to submit a report on an exhibit in the United States Pavilion entitled "Unfinished Work." Our action has been inspired by a recent change in policy which will replace the three problems now portrayed in this exhibit (race relations, urban renewal, and conservation of natural resources) by a public-health exhibit. We understand that this change will be made because of the recommendations of some Members of Congress, the State Department, and the United States Information Agency.

Because Unfinished Work has been criticized in the United States, we believe it is imperative to present our evaluation of this exhibit which is based on our direct, personal experience. We are sending this report to you because we earnestly hope that you will understand our position and, if you see fit, take appropriate action.

Unfinished Work has been open to the public about 10 weeks (it opened late and was closed for changes), and has been seen by approximately 350,000 persons. Visitors are usually taken through it in separate language groups, ranging from 5 to 25 persons. This permits each guide to have direct contact with everyone. In brief, this exhibit is made up of three sections: (1) Introduction to the problems through newspaper clippings; (2) improvements already achieved and steps being taken toward further progress through photographs and charts; and (3) the ideal for the future through photographs. The general purpose of the exhibit is to demonstrate how the dynamics of American society resolves its problems and eventually realizes the ideals for which we stand.

In the first part, the problems are simply stated as follows:

1. The American Negro: One American citizen in 10 is descended from African slaves. These 17 million Negroes have yet to win all of the equal rights promised them by American democratic theory.

2. The Alliance With Nature: The American Continent was settled with little thought for the future of its seemingly unlimited resources; now Nature needs help from man's management to husband and renew our trees, soil, and water.

3. The Crowded City: In less than two generations, Americans have changed from a country to a city people. Three-fourths of them now live in urban areas, whose rapid growth has brought problems of congestion and of housing that is not yet up to the other standards of American life.

Throughout this exhibit, we try to be as honest as possible, admitting that many aspects of the present situation are unfortunate, but that recent changes justify optimism. For example, in the second section of the exhibit, the racial problem is discussed from three points of view—educational, political, and economical. One graph shows the increase in the number of Negro students in American universities and colleges: 27,141 in 1930 and 196,000 in 1956. The accompanying photograph depicts Negro and white students, with a Negro professor, at the University of California. The graph below shows the results of the 1954 Supreme Court decision on integration. Out of a total of 3,008 southern school districts, 761 have integrated. In explaining this graph, we say that schools in the North already were integrated, but that the South does not have a monopoly on the problem. We add that although it is a legal problem in many parts of the South, it still remains a social and economic problem in the North. On the subject of Little Rock, all heads immediately nod in recognition when this name is mentioned. Without exception, every European and Asian is familiar with this incident and all too frequently, this is as far as his knowledge extends. We add, however, that while the headlines were filled with the violence of Little Rock, there were many other communities in the South which carried out integration in a quiet and orderly manner. In these cases, usually committees of whites and Negroes cooperated in working out a long-range integration program which gave both sides adequate time to adapt to this new concept. The next photograph shows Negroes using voting machines (which fair visitors are already familiar with, having seen them in the pavilion). The accompanying chart shows the rise in the registered Negro vote in the South: 1947—595,000; 1952—1,008,614; and, 1956—1,238,038.

The next group of photographs depicts Negroes and whites working together. There is also a photograph of the New York Commission on Discrimination. We explain that many cities have such public service commissions which permit white and Negro citizens to protest against discrimination of any kind.

Another photograph shows a Negro couple in a modern, upper-middle class kitchen in a Little Rock home. In explaining these pictures, we say that they are not necessarily typical of either Negro or white living conditions but that they indicate that such standards are possible. The accompanying chart shows the rise in Negro per capita incomes: 1937, $384; 1947, $750; and 1956, $1,070, on the basis of the constant dollar. We add that there is still a large difference between the average white and Negro income, but that this gap has steadily decreased in recent years. On the corner of this wall, there are photographs of President Eisenhower, Adlai Stevenson, the Rev. Martin Luther King, and Walter Reuther with accompanying quotations. For example, Reverend King's words are: "This is not a war between the white and the Negro, but a conflict between justice and injustice. It is one of the greatest glories of America that we have the right of protest."

The other side of this structure is occupied by the housing problem and the conservation problem. In the housing section there is a photograph of the southwestern section of Washington, D. C., showing slums with the Capitol dome in the background. This same photograph was circulated in some parts of Europe and throughout Communist countries several years ago as an example of how Americans live. A scale model of a new apartment building is placed under this picture, indicating the type of housing which is replacing this section. Other photographs contrast slum areas with new housing projects. We also explain in this section how cities can participate in an urban renewal program and share part of their costs with the Federal government. The accompanying charts explain that 60 percent of all homes in the United States are occupied by their owners. There are also photographs of Levittown showing our development of large scale, low cost, one family housing projects.

In the conservation of natural resources section, there is a photograph showing soil conservation through contour plowing, a concept which is relatively new to Europeans. The accompanying chart reveals that in 1957, out of a total of 4,900,000 farmers, more than 1,700,000 of them had conservation plans. A chart also shows that the forest area now under protection is 600 million acres, compared to 387 million in 1937. A map of California is exhibited as an example of how this State is helping to solve its irrigation problems through such projects as the Shasta Dam. The adjoining chart shows that reservoir capacity has risen from 1.5 million acre-feet in 1940 to an expected 410 million in 1970.

According to the amount of space we have devoted to describing the racial problem in this report, it may appear as if it has been overemphasized. But we can explain this imbalance by the amount of interest shown in the racial problem abroad and the criticism which has been focused on the presentation of this problem by people in the United States.

In the third section of this exhibit, three large photographs communicate a loose idea of the American ideal. One wall shows Negro, white, and Oriental children dancing in a circle, hands joined. The other side shows the graceful sweep of threshers curving over a Kansas wheat field, and the third photograph is a tall, modern apartment building. The plaque reads: "American communities, like American individuals, like to emulate and surpass each other. By this process democracy's unfinished business, already partially mastered, will get done on a national scale. To be followed no doubt by other (and perhaps nobler) challenges. The goal that draws us is not utopia, but larger freedom, with more justice. Democracy is our method. Slowly, but surely, it works."

In this section we ask visitors, if they have questions about any part of the exhibit. Almost all will say, "Thank you very much," and will shake our hands. Visitors are definitely and positively affected by this experience. Others will add, "It shows the democratic and free spirit of the United States," or "You are very courageous to do this," or "Only a great country can recognize its own faults." Many, who have only heard of Little Rock, will say, "We did not realize that the Negro has made so much progress." Often it is contrasted to th Russian pavilion.

Each nationality group has a somewhat different reaction to the exhibit. Often they will admit that they have similar problems in their own countries: the British with the West Indians, the Dutch with the Indonesians, and some Belgians with the Congolese. The most interested response, however, comes from peoples from Asiatic and Communist countries. They have been told about our racial problems with more intensity and exaggeration than any other groups. Many will start out with complete skepticism and leave with an indication of new respect.

For example, a group of Indian and African students bluntly asked, "How can you call yourselves a democracy and the representatives of free peoples if you treat your Negro citizens like this?" This same group stayed and discussed the problem for more than an hour. They said that they were hesitant about coming to the United States to work and study. "If it is difficult we will come, but if it is impossible, please tell us." After the hour's discussion, although the problems had not been resolved, they had been opened up, and both sides felt as if something worthwhile had been accomplished. They came back again to say thank you. This is typical of many of the reactions we receive every day in this exhibit.

Some visitors will frankly ask, "But why do you have this problem at all?" We try to approach it from a historic, political, and economic point of view, adding, "It takes time for people to change, and it cannot be forced on them, especially in a democracy."

Sometimes people will start out almost belligerently, such as one German who said, "When the Americans came to Germany 10 years ago, they told us how terrible we were the way we treated the Jews, but you are doing the same thing with the Negroes." We made a distinction—the Germans tried to eliminate the Jew from society; we are

trying to integrate the Negro into our society.

Although American visitors are in the minority, almost all who have come to the exhibit have been impressed by it. While many may have heard critical reports before seeing the exhibit, they become convinced that it takes courage to be honest. This has been equally true of 3 housewives from Georgia as 2 law students from New York City.

In conclusion, we would like to evaluate this exhibit in terms of the larger context of the World's Fair and American foreign policy. The theme of the Exposition is a new humanism in a scientific age, and the efforts each country is making to improve the material standard and human rights of its citizens. The United States is the only country represented at the Brussels World's Fair which is engaging in this type of open self-evaluation. What has sometimes been termed as "hanging out our dirty linen" by critics of the exhibit in the United States has, on the contrary, turned out to be a powerful type of inverse propaganda. It is a total contrast to the Russian Pavilion and provides a positive answer to their twisted propaganda about us. This exhibit has succeeded in gaining for us a deep and sensitive measure of understanding and respect in the eyes of the average fair visitor.

Judging from the responses we have received when working in this exhibit, we strongly believe that the proposed changes in unfinished work will diminish our prestige abroad and will open us up to new and severe criticism because we have been forced by domestic pressure to retreat from a courageous position.

We thank you for your kind consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Michael C. Moore, Gloria H. Teal, Lawrence E. O'Neil, Madeleine May, Kibbe Fitzpatrick, Nancy Gore, Carol J. Hardin, Edward G. Janeway, Jr., Stanley Reeves, Kathleen M. Quinn, Ronald Davidson, Charles E. Butterworth, Lydia Blanchard, Henry Hammond, Beverly E. Franks, John R. Yancey, Mary-Lou Donahoo, Jane Bancroft, Armena Martin, Carleton Dallery.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

ENFORCEMENT OF STATE STATUTES PRESCRIBING CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, Senate bill 654.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 654) to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize the enforcement of State statutes prescribing criminal penalties for subversive activities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on the motion of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

IN RETROSPECT

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, the time has come for me to take my leave.

Twelve years spent in the Senate of the United States—nearly a third of a man's professional life—leave a mark which nothing will ever erase.

I am proud to have been chosen by my State of Indiana, to serve in the United States Senate.

I have made many happy associations here, and I hope they will not fade away.

Though I am sorry to leave, I am happy to return to the life of a private citizen. No people anywhere in our country care more for home and family, for private life and our local communities than the people of Indiana.

We have something of the feeling that our local communities are the hub of the universe, which was so strong among Americans in colonial and pioneer days.

It is nearly 14 years since the day in November 1944, when I first took the oath of office in this Chamber.

Those 14 years have been among the most critical in the history of the United States.

As I plan to depart, I ask myself, what does it all mean? What is happening to my country?

When I came to the Senate in 1944, the armies of the Allies had broken through the German West Wall and freed France from the enemy.

The end was in sight.

In the Pacific the Navy had begun the destruction of Japanese sea power. MacArthur and his men had started on the bloody island road to Tokyo.

Our country was the head and shield of the grand alliance.

We not only had 12 million men under arms, in every theater of the war, but we were the arsenal for all the Allied Nations.

Our farms and factories poured out rivers of goods for war. Our railroads carried them across a continent.

Our ships and the ships of the Allies braved the submarine-infested waters about England, the Arctic Coast of Russia, Africa and Latin America.

Our pilots set new records for flights over the oceans and opened the icy routes to Alaska, from which Russian pilots picked up not only planes for the defense of Moscow, but also secret reports on how to use atomic energy for war.

Though I abhor bigness as a test of American achievements, the might of our operations, at such a high level of quality, added the sense of overwhelming strength to the patriotic devotion which stirred our people.

We were fortified inwardly by the conviction that we had never used our superior power to impose our will on any other people.

We expected nothing from our sacrifices except liberty for all nations, and the peace that goes with freedom.

That year of 1944 was a truly great year in the record of our country.

Mr. President, what has happened to that America? What has happened to our courage, our clear direction and purpose, our proper pride in our accomplishments and sense of restraint in using the power that was given us?

The glory has departed. We no longer have a sense of elation. We are confused, operating at cross-purposes.

We refuse to face the harsh realities of the world we live in, and instead fall back on moralistic platitudes to hide the emptiness of our minds.

I keep asking myself why. I do not have a clear answer.

But, at least, I have tried to free my mind of cant, to strip it bare of the platitudes which are in style today.

I am willing to face the emptiness of things, because I believe that only after we have cleansed our minds of lies can new seeds begin to grow, in the little clearings where the weeds of self-deception have been cut down.

Only if we have the courage to live with the winter of our disillusionment, will we see, once again, a spring of new ideas and hope rise from the store left by our Founding Fathers.

I am not going to retrace the struggle which has gone on in Congress and the executive branch since 1944.

The point is that we have been engaged in a far greater struggle, against a far more powerful force, than consumed our full powers in the war against the axis.

We are fighting against a tidal wave of collectivism, coming out of Eastern Europe, which, if it is not stopped, will destroy all western civilization and the Christian faith on which it is based.

It must be stopped, though we do not yet see on what battlefront the present-day Huns will be halted.

You recall the story of Jacob wrestling with the angel. Jacob struggled long and hard, in the darkness, with an opponent he could not see. He was sure his strength would fail, but he fought on. With the breaking of the day, Jacob knew he had been wrestling with superhuman power, but the angel told him he had the blessing of God and would prevail.

The Communist challenge may yet prove the goad which compels us to rise out of our sloth and security, to face the dangers of the world we live in.

In many ways Congress has been the frontline of this struggle for the soul of America.

We know of the determined efforts by a little group of willful men to perpetuate in the war and postwar years the unrestrained executive power they had built up during the New Deal period and World War II.

Let me say here that I am not speaking as a Republican. I am not making a defense of my party, and I am not making any partisan criticism of the Democratic Party.

My only concern is with the question: What is happening to our country?

As I have said repeatedly, the New Deal had no common interests with the Democratic Party. New dealism is an importation from countries where the executive power was always dominant, or where rising left-wing fractions, inexperienced in politics, yielded to the childish hope that, if governments were

made strong, they would use their power to serve the interests of the people.

I said to members of my own party in 1953 that the New Dealers were interested only in the party in power.

I said they would make the same efforts to capture the Republican Party in 1953 that they made to take over the Democratic Party in 1933. I leave the rest to my colleagues.

Let us go back to November 1944. Most Americans saw only the grand coalition with its huge armies and navies and air armadas pressing forward to victory.

The Atlantic Charter promised a just peace. But little groups of men were already hard at work, to make over our Government, on the anvil of war, in their own image.

We know how the Atlantic Charter was replaced by the agreements of the Big Three at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

We know how carefully thought out plans for military government of Germany and Austria were replaced by the Morganthau plan for making Germany a pastureland and sending her scientists and others to slave labor in Russia.

We know how the trained diplomats who understood the Far East were replaced by John Carter Vincent and Lachlin Currie, Owen Lattimore, and E. C. Carter, with their precise plans for the softening up of Free China, and the abandonment of Asia to the Communists.

We know how American economic ideas of free enterprise in foreign trade were replaced by GATT and other parts of the blueprint for one economic world.

We know how our policy was directed to let Korea fall, without letting it look as if we pushed her. Our valiant fighting men in Korea resisted and defeated the screaming hordes of Red China. We know how the victory was taken away from us, in the dark recesses of collaboration between our State Department and the United Nations.

We know how the Republican Party was gradually shifted from the leadership of Ken Wherry, Robert Taft, Arthur Vandenberg, and the group of Senators who fought so bravely with them. We know how it was taken over by Paul Hoffman, and his kind, the modern Republicans, and the men in the shadows behind them.

We know how the Democratic Party was transformed from a party which accepted Franklin Roosevelt's temporary reforms, but still was committed to the Constitution, into a party managed by Harry Hopkins, Dean Acheson, Walter Reuther, and the men in the shadows behind him.

We know how brilliantly Congress brought out the facts about the Communist influence on our Government's policies. The House of Representatives supported, through every kind of pressure and abuse, the Committee on Un-American Activities. The Senate supported the Subcommittee on Internal Security, under Senator McCarran, Senator Eastland, and myself. The evidence brought out by those committees and other committees of Congress documented large areas of the Communist conspiracy within our Government.

We know the pressure which set in to destroy these committees and to besmirch the evidence the Congress had gathered, and, even, to attack the legislative power itself.

Many brave and distinguished Members of Congress were retired to private life, because they incurred the anger of the Communists, who relentlessly pursue any one who dares oppose them, until the day he dies. There is a long line of such brave, defeated, forgotten men, up to the day of infamy when Joe McCarthy was censured by his own colleagues in the Senate because someone in high office did not want him to get nearer to the secret places where Communists had power over our Armed Forces.

While this struggle was going on in our country, the Soviet rulers were busy expanding the empire of death over half the world of living men.

We remember that, even while our flyers were piloting planes over Canada to Alaska, and our seamen were going down to death in the icy waters near Murmansk, the Soviet Union had its spy network in Japan, under Richard Sorge, urging the Japanese to attack America, instead of Siberia. When Japanese planes rained death out of the morning sky on Pearl Harbor, the Soviet Union knew Siberia was safe. It moved its Asian forces to the European front.

Let every American who praises the Russian defense of Moscow remember that the Russian victory was possible only because our loyal ally, the Soviet Union, had persuaded the Japanese to attack our country.

The Soviet Union, in 1944, was so weak that it barely survived the conflict with Hitler. It survived only because America sent the extra margin of food and planes and trucks which kept the Russian armies in the field.

How did the Soviet Union repay our help, when the victory was won? Just exactly as they had said they would repay it. Lenin had long taught the Communists that they must use every nationalist war to start the world civil war. As soon as the Communists were sure we would defeat the Nazis, Soviet political leaders started their intrigues to destroy Chiang Kai-shek and conquer China. They intended that America would have no friends and no bases between Outer Mongolia and the coast of California.

They lit the fires of civil war in Korea and Southeast Asia, stirred up civil commotion in Germany, Italy, Austria, France, and England, trained their subversive followers in India, Africa, and Latin America, and brilliantly directed their traitorous fifth column and its dupes in America.

Now half the world is under the heel of their armies. A large part of the so-called Free World is so confused by their intrigues, so fearful of their vengeance, that it cannot plan a counterattack.

All over the world the simple people know the score. They know Communism is death. They will try to escape so long as they can. All over the earth they are leaving the Communist world for the Free World—voting, if you please, with their feet.

Our Government tells us Tito is a great champion of freedom; but the plain people of Yugoslavia do not understand. Every day they are walking their way to freedom.

In Germany, all the human traffic is one-way—from Communist Germany to Free Germany. We remember the pictures of the Korean refugees clinging by the hundreds to every cart and truck that left the Korea of the Communists for the land of Syngman Rhee. They are still coming. Farther south, the Chinese flee in junks from the mainland to Taiwan; yet we are asked to believe the armed forces of China, with the best modern equipment, could never return from Taiwan to the mainland.

Politically, the world is covered with a blanket of silence. There is not much debate or argument. There is only the stillness, and the soft sound of feet crossing the borders to freedom, or junks sailing in the winds to the land of hope.

Our people have not failed. Our principles have not been found wanting. Our political leaders have failed. The people have courage, and the instinct for truth. They know the greatest political earthquake in history has destroyed all landmarks. They are willing to work and to suffer. They ask of their leaders only that they be given new maps, so they can find their way over the new territory, through which, like the children of Israel, they must journey if they are to reach the promised land.

Our times call for soul-searching by both our political parties. In a crisis as deep and as wide as that of today, political leaders cannot do everything. But have they done enough?

It is the task of political parties, under the two-party system, to mediate among the many special interests, but to find answers that serve the common good.

Today, that task is, I admit, harder than it has ever been before. America is sick with a sickness that goes very deep. The sickness has spread into our schools, our industries, our unions, even our churches. But that is no excuse for failure of the political parties to do their own work.

The duty of our parties is to serve the one great political interest in our country, the interest of those Americans who ask no gifts from their country, who believe—with Cleveland—that the Government does not support the people. The people support their Government.

Have our political leaders read Plato and Aristotle and learned how old is the trick of buying the support of the people with their own money? Have they worked hard enough to see that those who promise a brave new world in our day are no different from the demagogs of Athens and Rome? Have they learned to read, in the high-minded pronouncements about peace, collective security, and a new day for the common man, the same lies and deception that have destroyed so many republics?

Do they know, but fear for their own little safety?

It is the duty of political leaders to lead the Nation to clear political thinking. They must tell the people where, in the lies and confusion, their vital interests will be found.

Behind all the fooling and the horseplay, the partisan argument, and appeals to emotion, the great American parties have served our Nation well. I hope they will again. But today the individual who is trying to understand the dangers to our country must stand alone, and do what little he can, until the parties take up their burden again.

This is no time for me to speak of what I have done, or tried to do, although I am trying, by this recounting, to find the answer for myself.

Wherever I could, I have fought vigorously the Communist penetration into American Government and American life. The records of our subcommittee and other committees tell the story of how much we uncovered.

Wherever I could find a means to weaken the communism influence on our soil, I have fought for it—in the immigration laws, in internal security legislation, in the fight to give the States their sovereign right to legislate, except where it conflicts with the national purpose. The bill before the Senate on yesterday, which I first introduced, would take from the Supreme Court the power to hear appeals in areas where the Court has deliberately restrained Congress, the executive branch, our States, our school system, and our bar examiners, from necessary and proper steps to guard our country against internal communism. That bill is not before the Senate at this time; it was defeated yesterday by a vote of 41 yeas to 49 nays. But I hope it has left its impression. That fight is not over; it still will have to be won.

In foreign affairs, I have opposed solemn agreements with men who frankly admit they regard all agreements as military feints to deceive the hated enemy. I have opposed collective security and foreign aid, because they are failures, and the record shows it. They have not strengthened American security or brought peace and good will to the world. Instead, we have exported jobs and have drained away the wealth of this country; and still the Communists go merrily on their way.

It is just as stupid for us to fall into Communist boobytraps as it would have been for President Roosevelt and his advisers to talk peace with Hitler, join him in a world government for collective security, and distribute billions of our earnings in foreign aid to keep the neutral nations from turning pro-Nazi.

I have urged at every opportunity that we take the Communists at their word, and admit they are engaged in a civil war against the world. That means we should keep from them everything which builds up their warmaking power. We cannot feed their strength by trade, diplomatic relations, summit conferences, unchallenged rulership of the satellites, and the most absurd folly of all—cultural exchange with those who have reduced all culture to obedience to the state.

I have fought against all steps leading to world government, by people afraid to make an honest appeal to Americans to abandon their Constitution. I have opposed the perversion of the treaty power into an instrument for reducing our Government to a province of a world state. I have opposed abandonment of the constitutional rights of our fighting men through status of forces treaties and agreements. I have fought all the many-pronged attempts to transform American fighting forces into police contingents, subject to control by the Security Council of the United Nations, where they would no longer be able to safeguard our country or obey our Constitution.

Finally, I have fought, wherever I saw a chance, against the weakening of America through financial waste, Government extravagance, red-ink budgets, the lies about owing our debt to ourselves, and the widespread inflation throughout our whole economy which follows fiscal dishonesty.

Congress is kept in a state of perpetual confusion, goaded to such speed the Members cannot think. But if one looks carefully, there is no confusion. The problems are really simple.

If I had to reduce everything I have learned in the last 14 years to one sentence, I could sum it up in these words, "Please do not give your Government so much money."

Easy money is the root of political corruption. Rigid control of public money is the root of political morality and political creativeness.

Corruption of governments by too much wealth is not a new problem, but a very old one. The founders of our country understood how essential it is to keep government close to poverty's edge. They put the control over expenditures into the hand of Congress for a simple reason. The Congress which appropriated the money would not have the spending of it, and could not build up an empire of pressure groups. The executive, which could misuse public money, was not permitted to appropriate it, or lay taxes to collect it.

If the New Dealers had not had too much easy money, they could never have set up emergency agencies and created the sprawling bureaucracy which devoured the old-line Federal agencies. If the Government in wartime had not had too much money, it would never have been able to put teams of one-worlders into every field of Government, to prepare the directives, to write the laws, and to make the propaganda for our postwar Tower of Babel.

If the postwar agencies had not had far too much money, they would not have been able to make our executive branch so huge, that Congress cannot control it, so secret that neither Congress, the press, nor the people can find out what is going on.

A government with too much money to spend destroys the society it governs, in two ways. A spending government corrupts the weak with the current equivalent of bread and circuses. Today we call them Federal aid and summit conferences. More important, a spending government must destroy the strong.

No spending government ever gave up spending voluntarily. If it is threatened with loss of the money it loves, a spending government will fight with everything it has to preserve its advantage. A government with billions of dollars to spend as it likes is a government with economic soldiers it can send out to make war on its own people.

It must use money as a weapon to destroy the strong, who want no dependence on government. Why should anyone be surprised when the obvious happens?

I need only mention the income tax, Federal control of expenses of industry like advertising and depreciation, Federal control of income-tax exemptions and tax-exempt foundations. Why is it that the tax-exempt foundations are almost as a unit committed to the welfare state? Let us not be naive.

The Members of this body have seen the growing demand by the public for reduced spending, and lower taxes, which reached its peak last year. Senators remember how angrily the public protested the Eisenhower budget for fiscal 1959.

Yet we have seen this year the wildest spending debauch ever engaged in by any Congress. I have chosen those words deliberately. Nothing in the New Deal, nothing in World War II, and nothing in the postwar years or Korea, is anything like as outrageous as was the spending spree of 1958.

The administration had virtually achieved a balanced budget in 1957 and was trying to pay back part of the debt that now costs us $8 billion a year in interest alone.

Where is the surplus now? Gone with the wind. The Secretary of the Treasury says we went into the red nearly $3 billion in the year just ended. The deficit will be perhaps $12 billion this year. We have thrown away the hope of a balanced budget for years to come.

I think the estimates of our deficit will prove much too low. The inflationary spirit is like a fire. Once started, it is hard to bring under control.

What is the end? We know. It is an old, old story. Always the end has been foreseeable long before the crash.

I will not repeat to you the story of inflation in Germany or France or any other country. But I say this—the financial losses of inflation are of the size of catastrophe. But they are not intolerable.

The American people could stand the loss of every dollar of their accumulated capital, and start from the bottom, to rebuild all their wealth, as Germany did after 1945.

My fear is this. The American people, like other people, cannot stand the moral deterioration, the intellectual decadence, that the flight to inflation brings. The men in Congress who pushed the American economy over the brink, from financial responsibility to runaway inflation, will have to answer for the destruction of everything political, economic, moral, intellectual that has made America strong.

Inflation in Germany was the start of Adolf Hitler's journey to the summit. In-

flation in the French Revolution led to Napoleon Bonaparte. Inflation is political suicide.

I have not said the American people are going to travel the primrose path of inflation. I say they are being pushed in that direction by wild-eyed Socialists, ambitious intellectuals, power-seeking demagogs and hidden Communists.

I say the issue is not over money. The issue is over the political sanity, the intellectual honesty, the moral decency, and the military vitality of the United States.

I am not retiring from political life because I am retiring from Washington.

As I said recently, our country is not governed by officials in the Capital. So long as America is true to itself, its strength will lie in the country, not in the Capital. Its political sovereignty will lie in the people, not in the officials. Its intellectual energy will be widespread in all parts of the Nation, not emanating in a cloud from Washington. Its spiritual strength will be in its families, its local communities, its local papers, its local schools and colleges, and symphony orchestras and baseball sandlots. Whenever the American people decide to rise up and rebel against Government that comes from their Capital City, they can end it forever.

If the day should ever come when the centralists and power seekers succeed in draining the strength of America to the Capital, I hope they will give up the sacred name of our country, and let it gather dust in the annals of history instead of being perverted to serve men not worthy of our past.

Our time will be known as one of the most decadent periods in political history, or it will be a time of great creativeness. We do not know. But let us not forget that the years immediately preceding the Constitutional Convention of 1787 have gone down in history as the Critical Period. The men who struggled with the difficulties that followed the Revolution did not know what 1787 would bring.

What Americans did once, they can do again.

The men who assembled to form the Constitutional Convention, were deeply grounded in both history and the practical affairs of life. They did not try to impose on the New World an exact model of the England of Magna Carta or Simon de Montfort, or the Parliamentary war with the Stuart kings. As men of wisdom and true scholarship, they knew the only way to preserve for new generations the virtues of the past is to understand both the deeper significance of history, and the challenge of formless new experience.

We have inherited in our Constitution and our political system something greater than that document itself, magnificent as it is. We have inherited something of the greatness of mind of the men who made our Nation. They were faced with heavy burdens, but they took from the confusions and currents of their day the best that men had learned from the past and crossed it with their clear understanding of the universe opening before us, in which we move step by step into the new world of time.

It is my hope that the people of our generation will meet the difficulties of this period of confusion and chaos with the same fiery spirit of our forefathers. I hope and believe they will recreate the spiritual life of our country, for new generations, as the voyagers from old Europe recreated the spiritual, intellectual and political achievements of the Old World in the virgin lands of America.

To leave the Senate is not to abandon the fight. Those who have been once involved in this conflict will never be able to turn away again until the fight is won.

I close with the words John Adams wrote to his wife Abigail, the day after the signing of the Declaration of Independence.

Adams wrote:

> You will think me transported with enthusiasm, but I am not. I am well aware of the toil and blood and treasure it will cost us to maintain this Declaration, and support and defend these States. Yet through all the gloom I can see the rays of ravishing light and glory.

I leave the Senate with regret. I return to my home in Indiana with hope and joy. Wherever we are, we shall continue working together, to make sure that this new birth of freedom shall not perish from the earth.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have not the words with which to express myself and my gratitude—and I think I speak for the people of my State when I say their gratitude, too—for the service of the distinguished Senator from Indiana, who will leave the Senate at the end of this session.

I believe that his speech today will go down in history as a part of the warning sign which is long overdue, not about what is happening to America, but what has happened to America.

I wonder if the Senator from Indiana will allow me to ask him a question or two in that connection.

Mr. JENNER. Certainly.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wonder if, when the Senator came to the Senate 14 years ago, even though we had been subjected to 10 or 12 years of New Deal philosophy, he did not find at that time the majority of Members of this body and the other body, the executive branch, and even the judicial branch, adhering to the words of the Preamble to the Constitution:

> We, the people of the United States—

Did the Senator not find that to be the situation, even in those days?

Mr. JENNER. I did.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Am I correct in thinking that when the Senator came here 14 years ago there was still some sanctity attached to the 10th amendment, which reads:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Was not some degree of sanctity attached to that part of the Constitution 14 years ago?

Mr. JENNER. It certainly was.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I believe in history. I am a firm believer in what is written on the front of the Archives Building "What is past is prologue. Study the past."

I am not going into ancient history. But does the Senator from Indiana remember hearing on this floor yesterday, about 18 hours ago, these words from one of our colleagues:

> But we cannot go back 75 years. We must go forward. Each year the population of this country increases by 3 million persons. Our economy is expanding and we are moving forward. We are constantly confronted with new problems.

Does the Senator remember that, vaguely?

Mr. JENNER. That is what I referred to in my remarks. That is a part of the New World philosophy which we are asked to accept, breaking loose from all fundamentals, and destroying the greatest country under God's shining sun.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wonder what our forefathers would think about us if they could see us shivering about an increase in our population, and not preparing to get along as they did when their population increased by the same or a greater percentage rate. Their problems were far greater than those we have to solve today.

I wonder if the Senator heard on the floor of the Senate yesterday these words:

> We are moving in a new age, a new era. We have been living in a new era since 1945.

Mr. JENNER. We have been living in a new era since 1787. However, that does not mean that we can safely abandon all basic principles, all keystones of constitutional government, and depart on the primrose path of inflation, in the belief that we, 170 million people, can feed, clothe, support, and elevate the standard of living of the rest of the world, and still retain our standard of living and our form of government.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is exactly the point I am trying to make in my colloquy with the Senator. I believe that words were uttered on the floor of the Senate yesterday which are dangerous words, words which have never before been heard in this Chamber, words which give us all pause and cause us to feel concern.

Let me read a little further, to see if I can refresh the Senator's memory:

> What is the value of talking about going back 75 years? We have problems enough as we move forward, and that is what we are attempting to do in connection with this legislation. We do not want to turn the clock back 150 years with this legislation.

Mr. JENNER. How many times have we heard that?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I ask the Senator, if our problems could be solved 179 years ago by the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, and the Bill of Rights, problems which were basic then and are basic today because they deal with man's spiritual strength, not his material strength, why must we depart

from that concept and say that we must change the Constitution and change the intent of the Constitution to put one branch of the Government—nay, two branches of the Government—above the branch which is supposed to represent the people?

Mr. JENNER. I thank the Senator for his remarks.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat, I wish to express my gratitude to the Senator for having expressed in so eloquent a way the fears of so many Americans. Again on the floor it was said yesterday:

> I suspect, though I could be wrong—I am not at all sure I am correct—that the stream of history, the one-world concept, and all the things which have bound us together, from space to the atom bomb and interstate commerce are carrying us inevitably to a situation in which the supremacy of the Federal Government is something we will not much longer be able to controvert because it is essential to national safety.

Is the national safety helped by the recognition on the floor of this body that our Constitution, in effect, means nothing, that what we need is a Federal bureaucracy over us?

Mr. JENNER. And then one world.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator for having yielded to me. I know that other Senators will wish to comment on what the Senator said. One of the greatest events in my life has been the friendship of the Senator from Indiana, and as he goes back to the green hills and green fields of Indiana and to the wonderful people of that State, of whom my wife is one, I hope our friendship will continue to grow and blossom throughout the years.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Indiana, not only for the speech he has just made, but for many he has made heretofore. We are taught in Holy Writ to prove all things; hold fast that which is good.

The theory of the American Constitution, including States rights, the rights of local government, the rights of the individual and adherence to a system set up under the Constitution, has proved to be good. Those who would change that concept, who would tear down State lines and would make the Federal Government powerful in all things, those who feel that this economy can be changed and divided and deviated from, have not proved their case. They have tried for many years but they have never proved that their methods can bring about a happier, healthier society than has been enjoyed under this Republic.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have been with BILL JENNER from Indiana, our home State, in many a fight. Some of them we won; some we lost. I have known BILL JENNER politically for 20 years, and I have never known a man who was a harder fighter, a harder hitter, or one who campaigned more aggressively for the things he believed in than BILL JENNER. We shall miss him here because of his aggressive fighting spirit. We all wish him well "back in Indiana." I shall be joining him one of these days. If there is anything that I or any other Senator can do for him, I am sure we shall be happy to do it. I wish him well in his new business. I hope he will not completely withdraw from politics. He should not get out of politics, and I certainly hope he will not. I am sure that every Member of the Senate wishes him health and happiness in the coming years.

Mr. JENNER. I thank my senior colleague.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, 6 years ago this summer it was my privilege to attend a dinner at the Hotel Claypool in Indianapolis to which 1,000 women from all over the State of Indiana came to help launch a campaign to speed up a campaign for the reelection of BILL JENNER to the United States Senate. On that occasion I heard the distinguished Senator from Indiana deliver a speech which, in fervor and strength, was second only to the one which he has given here today. He made certain pledges to the women of Indiana and to all the people of Indiana on that occasion when he was a candidate for reelection. I wish to say to him—and through the RECORD, to the people of Indiana—that the Senator from Indiana has done his level best to redeem every promise to carry forward the ideals which he expressed on that occasion when those 1,000 women came to wish him well in that campaign.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I wish to extend my congratulations to the able and distinguished Senator from Indiana. This is my fourth year in the Senate, and I look upon the Senator from Indiana as one of the soundest, ablest Senators within this body. He is a true patriot, a loyal citizen, an able Senator, and a great American. I regret that he has not sought reelection to the Senate of the United States. America needs more men of his type and his mind.

I am proud to have served here with the great Senator from the State of Indiana, and I wish him the finest of success and happiness in the years to come.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I have served on the Judiciary Committee with Senator JENNER for a number of years. On a great many fundamental problems we have disagreed, as we do now, within the committee, and on other legislation that has come to the floor of the Senate.

Senator JENNER has always been a man of his word. If he ever tells us anything, we know that is the way it is going to be. There could not be a more likable, charming person than he is to work with on a committee or in the Senate. I wish him good luck in his endeavors. We shall miss him in the Judiciary Committee of the Senate.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I wish to make a short statement about our colleague, Senator JENNER. I do so, first, because we came here together in 1947. Second, because he is representative of a State, the State of Indiana, which is very close to my own State, not only geographically, but in the character of its people; for there were thousands of people from the eastern seaboard who streamed through the Cumberland Gap, remained a while in Kentucky, and then passed on into Indiana. Among them was the Great Emancipator, Abraham Lincoln.

We all know that Senator JENNER is not only strong but relentless in his views, and yet outside of this Chamber he is tolerant of the views of others. No one is more kindly or friendly than BILL JENNER. In a personal sense I believe I have been his friend, and I have felt always in a personal sense that he has been my friend. I know he is an American of great patriotism and of strong convictions. He presents his vigorous views to the Senate and to the Nation. I know that he is a man who deeply loves his country. So I say as a friend to my colleague, I shall miss him, and I wish him every success.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, service in this great body has two important byproducts not often thought about either by our own Members or by the public at large. One—and of great value to the Nation—is that the Senate is a testing ground for the talent, personality, and character of the men sent here to represent the sovereign States of the Union. The scroll of statesmen in the Nation's history has been distinguished by the names of many great men whose service was rendered in this Chamber.

SENATE IS CRUCIBLE OF FRIENDSHIPS

The other is that the Senate is the crucible in which so many fine and understanding friendships are compounded.

I have been fortunate to have nearly 22 years of service in this body. What I have done here for my State and Nation will ultimately recede into history, but the treasured friendships I have made here will remain fresh in memory for all the rest of my life.

The closing days of each Congress always lay an extra strain on the heartstrings because for one reason or another some of our good friends and colleagues will not be with us when the roll of the next Congress is called.

One, who leaves this body by his own choice, is my good friend and able colleague, BILL JENNER.

COULD HAVE BEEN EASILY REELECTED

Senator JENNER was elected to the Senate three times by the people of the progressive midwestern State of Indiana. He represented them so ably that if he had chosen to remain here they would have supported him overwhelmingly.

BILL JENNER'S life and career express the good earthiness of the Indiana soil where he was born. He was raised by stern but loving parents in a day when fathers and mothers recognized their responsibility to guide their children along the straight and good road. He learned from them the simple code to fear God, love his country, and to stand on his own feet.

These are the virtues he brought to his service in this body. They are the great values which distinguish our Nation's history.

HIS CODE OF LIFE

BILL JENNER has never shirked the basic responsibilities of the devoted parent, the good citizen, and the trusted public servant. In his code of life there

is no room for the fair-weather friend, the political faddist, or the middle-of-the-roader who fears to take a positive stand.

His service in this body is distinguished by political honesty, by the courage of his convictions, by true patriotism, and by firm insistence on the sound principle of self-reliance for men and nations.

His yardsticks are his understanding of the eternal truths of life and of the principles which have molded our American Republic. These he found embodied in our heritage, in sound economic principles, in the Declaration of Independence, in the Constitution, and in Washington's Farewell Address.

And so he fought loose fiscal policies, the Socialist welfare state, distortions of the Constitution by the executive branch and by the judiciary, and the feather-brained doctrines of those who maligned the good name of liberalism.

AMONG FIRST TO RECOGNIZE RED THREAT

BILL JENNER was among the first to recognize the true nature of the Communist international conspiracy against the United States and the Free World. In his fight to expose subversion and propaganda in the Communist aim to destroy America, he gave no quarter and asked for none.

In BILL JENNER's book, the yardstick of American foreign policy is true patriotism and the national interests of the United States. He sought strength, independence, and dignity for the Nation at home and abroad.

He has been the foe of bigness in government, of bureaucracy, of welfarism and blind internationalism—not because he is out of date with the times as his critics charge—but because he believes that these developments weaken the self-reliance and individuality of men and nations.

FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES ARE ETERNAL

BILL JENNER would not deny that times have changed, but he insists that fundamental principles are eternal. In this he does not stand alone, but in the illustrious company of some of the greatest statesmen in the history of this body.

In the light of his patriotism, convictions, and forthright courage, it is no mystery that Senator JENNER became a controversial figure. There were times when his critics charged him with intemperateness.

What these critics never understood was that here is a man true to himself, a man moved by intense love for his country, devoted to fundamental principles, and determined to discharge his responsibilities to the Nation as he saw them.

Like Ezra, the celebrated Biblical character whose name he bears, BILL JENNER sought to call his countrymen back from what he believed were the errors of our times.

Progress in such a mission is not made by tip-toeing around the fringes of controversy, nor by imitating the squeak of a mouse.

GREAT MEN ALWAYS CONTROVERSIAL

So what if he were controversial and occasionally intemperate? These are controversial and intemperate times. And few men have been great in history who were not controversial.

What matters most is that BILL JENNER is honest and sincere; that he spoke out for the preservation of the Constitution; that he fought for sound economic principle; and that he held the patriotic interests of his country a sacred trust of his public service. In these things, he has met successfully the high standards of this body.

RESCUED MANY A DULL DEBATE

All Senator JENNER's friends and colleagues regret his decision not to stand for reelection. We shall miss him. He always proved to be a loyal and understanding friend. His personal integrity and good sportsmanship constantly inspired us. Many a dull debate on this floor was rescued from boredom by his earthy wit and humor.

His leaving is a temporary parting of friends. What is said here is not an epitaph on BILL JENNER's public life. He is still young with many years of public service yet before him.

This is a bon voyage as he leaves for his new undertakings, with all of us wishing him success and happiness.

And it is something of a reminder, too, that whenever he decides to return to public life, he will find many friends to welcome him.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to BILL JENNER. He has been a great advocate on the floor of the Senate for all the measures which will mean much for the betterment of our country. He has taken a great part in the development of legislation which he thought and which we thought would be best for the country as a whole. He has been a great Senator from the State of Indiana. He has been a great United States Senator. He is a great American. I am proud to say to BILL JENNER today that we are sorry he is leaving this body.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, it is a real honor and a privilege to join my colleagues in saying a few words on the floor about a man whom we all know as BILL JENNER, and who will always be known to us as BILL. I know of no man in the United States Senate, whether we have agreed with him or disagreed with him—and I have done both—who has more consistently attempted to resolve issues on the basis of the principles which our forefathers laid down in the Constitution. I believe that is something all of us should practice, for the good of our country. As a personal friend I admire him, and I can only say to him that in the choice he has made the Senate of the United States will suffer. He has made contributions to the Senate which will not be appreciated for some time. We will all miss him immensely.

BILL, all I have to say is, God bless you, and I hope you will find in your life ahead the fulfillment of your dreams and aspirations which you so richly deserve.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am very much pleased to be on the floor to join with my colleagues and friends in saying, "BILL, we are sorry to see you go. We wish for you all the best. We wish for you personal happiness and all the things which you want for your future."

The junior Senator from Indiana and I have practically had an automatic voting pair. It became a matter of interest. When we voted alike on the floor, it was something really unusual.

Yet I have a deep conviction that such a condition is the very essence of why our country is so great; that it is this amalgam of ideas which makes it great; that each of us, in his own way, has an impact upon our people and upon our time. That is the way we want it. I think I would be untrue to my own conscience if I did not say that only the Lord knows who is right.

It is only the free and fair exchanging of ideas and awaiting the mandate of the Senate, of Congress, and the country, that gives us the national virility and strength to meet the towering challenges, unmatched in history, which our country faces today.

I say to my colleague, as he leaves, that notwithstanding our disagreements on many fundamental matters of policy, I appreciate the sincerity and respect, the indefatigable energy and erudition, with which he has attacked problems in his way, as I have tried to do so in my own. I believe that in this way each of us makes his contribution to what is good for the United States and the Free World.

Mr. JENNER. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I appreciate the fact that it must be very difficult for the distinguished Senator from Indiana to take leave of the Senate. That was evident in the remarks which he made a few minutes ago.

I wish to acknowledge that it has been a privilege to enjoy the friendship of the Senator from Indiana. While holding very sharp and definite views, and perhaps opinions different from those of other Senators, he has never allowed that to interfere with his friendliness or with their having the advantage of the warmth of his friendship. I am one who appreciates that.

The Senator from Indiana has made many contributions to this body. I think of two at the moment which I should like to mention, so that if the Senator from Indiana ever looks at this RECORD he will know that I have remembered them.

I recall the days when he presided over the very important subcommittee which was investigating largely in connection with Communist activity and infiltration. Those were days when Senators were under criticism concerning the fair procedures of investigating committees. I recall particularly that the distinguished Senator from Indiana was commended by many persons, both those who agreed with him and those who did not, for the way in which he conducted the hearings over which he presided.

I recall particularly a statement made by Dr. Harry D. Gideonse, of Brooklyn College, one of the great institutions of learning in the New York area, in which he specifically said that he thought that the Senator from Indiana had conducted those hearings with eminent fairness to all concerned. I thought that was a great compliment to the Senator from

Indiana, especially as it came from so eminent a source.

Finally, I think the Committee on Finance will miss the Senator from Indiana very much. I doubt—and in private conservations other Senators have indicated to me that they doubted—that his place on that committee can be filled, from among those who remain in the Senate, by one who has the sound ideas which he has respecting matters which come under the attention of the Committee on Finance.

I congratulate the Senator from Indiana particularly upon his service on the Committee on Finance, which I believe has been only in the closing years of his membership here, but which has been extremely useful to the committee, to the Senate, and to the people of the United States.

I wish the Senator all happiness in his retirement. I hope he will not lose contact with us; nor will we lose touch with him.

Mr. JENNER. I thank the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, while I do not always agree with my friend from Indiana, I shall miss him as a Member of this body. I look to him as a friend. I have always enjoyed him as a colleague, even though at times we have differed.

Mr. JENNER. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

ORDER FOR SENATOR MARTIN OF PENNSYLVANIA TO ADDRESS THE SENATE

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I am very desirous of saying something concerning the distinguished Senator from Indiana and also the other Senators who are retiring with me at the end of the year. I ask unanimous consent that I may have the floor immediately after the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has concluded his address.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3268) to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the Senate amendment No. 36, and further insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 114 to the bill (H. R. 13450) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes; agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. GARY, Mr. TABER, Mr. BOW, and Mr. FORD were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 12212) for the relief of certain employees of the Department of the Navy, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1258. An act for the relief of M. Sgt. Robert A. Espe;

S. 1801. An act for the relief of Guerdon Plumley;

S. 3195. An act to authorize certain retired personnel of the United States Government to accept and wear decorations, presents, and other things tendered them by certain foreign countries;

S. 3776. An act to extend the time for the collection of tolls to amortize the cost, including reasonable interest and financing cost, of the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Miami, Mo.;

S. 3966. An act to amend Public Law 85-422;

S. 4169. An act to amend the act of June 10, 1938, relating to participation by the United States in the International Criminal Police Organization; and

S. 4273. An act to provide for cooperation with the European Atomic Energy Commission.

THE NATION'S SECURITY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, complacency certainly has no place in our consideration of the adequacy of our Nation's defenses now or in the future; but equally certain, we must not become panicky about them.

This last week we in the Senate have listened to discussions concerning our Nation's defenses: First, whether studies concerning methods of surrender were being conducted. The President ended that with the word "nonsense" and the Senate disposed of it by a vote of 88 to 2 against the use of any Government funds for any such study; and, second, whether our preparations for the defense of our country are adequate.

The American people have a right to all of the facts we can possibly make available. I have based my entire life in public office on the belief that the people reach right decisions once they know the facts on which to base a decision.

Our Nation's security requires a frank discussion of our capabilities, for much has been said in recent weeks estimating the possible inadequacy of our defenses in the years ahead. To make an intelligent appraisal of our Nation's defense capacity all of the facts must be known.

Policies must be debated and should be criticized—but responsible criticism must be grounded on a solid foundation of fact.

By affirming as fact what is, at best, opinion does not lead to sound action by our people.

Above all, let us not give credence to the propaganda of those who would destroy us by adopting their boasts as facts.

Surely every one competent to judge tells us that today we are sufficiently strong so that no nation will dare to attack us because of our ability to retaliate devastatingly.

But, will the day come, say in 1960 to 1964, when the Soviet can inflict damage on us without our ability to inflict great enough damage on them to stop them from attacking us? That is what some critics of our defense policies say may happen.

The fact that they can damage us we all realize. The asset that we must have is the strength to damage them sufficiently so that they will not attempt to damage us.

We will never be the underdog if we maintain confidence in ourselves, advance our science by hard, constructive research, develop new weapons, and put them into production.

We do not hide our failures—we cannot be complacent in our successes.

Our defense policies are postulated on two fundamental considerations:

First. We must maintain adequate retaliatory power, not necessarily overwhelming, but sufficient to deter attack by any nation now or in the future.

Second. We must build a strong economy, maintain strong conventional forces to back up free nations who are our friends, and maintain our defenses against the political and economic aggression so characteristic of the Soviets.

Our task is to maintain this strength, not man for man, with any potential enemy, and not bomb for bomb, but by sufficient strength—whatever that quantum may be—so that we may discourage an attack on us by any nation.

We must look at the whole spectrum of our Nation's defense, not merely one isolated aspect.

Consider for a moment a few hard facts—some recent developments—about our defense posture:

First. The intermediate-range ballistic missile is in production. And this even though our missile program was not begun until 1953. The Russians had a 5-to-10-year headstart on us.

Second. The Atlas ICBM has been successfully test-fired and a nose cone has been shot into space and returned. We have developed the ICBM with unprecedented speed.

Third. The United States has unsurpassed leadership in the application of nuclear power to naval vessels. The 1,500-mile Polaris missile-firing nuclear sub is being converted from dream to reality; and it was great news when our nuclear-powered sub, the *Nautilus*, split the North Pole under the icepack and the *Skate* followed 8 days later.

Fourth. Three American satellites are circling the globe in outer space, better instrumented, scientifically, than any of the models produced by the Russians.

Fifth. American military forces are on 24 hours' call anywhere on the globe, with mobility that all the Russian ground forces put together cannot muster.

Sixth. The Strategic Air Command is equipped with the most modern manned aircraft in the world. Our drawing boards are replete with bold, new models.

Seventh. (a) Our atomic weaponry, including nuclear depth charges, has in-

creased a thousandfold the striking power of our military forces.

(b) An atomic charge has been fired several miles into the air—a precursor of the anti-ICBM missile.

Eighth. The BOMARC, a deadly defensive missile, has been fired, with incredible accuracy, by remote control 1,500 miles away.

Ninth. Under the reorganized Pentagon, we have good reason to believe that our Nation's defenses will be administered more speedily, more efficiently, and with less waste.

Is this lack of research or—lack of progress? Does this indicate that we are headed for second best in 1960 or 1964?

So let us not sell ourselves short. The Soviets may be ahead of us in some developments. But when some persons base their conclusions on estimates of Russian efforts, as compared with our efforts, when actually the Russians' are merely estimates, and are not hard, certain evidence, then I am worried. There is a great deal of difference between making a judgment based on estimates of what we think the Soviets are doing, and making a judgment based on what we know they are doing.

Let me offer one illustration of the kind of misunderstanding which can arise. We have heard a great deal of discussion about the quantitative comparison of Russian and American ICBM strengths. Figures which have been used show 130 United States ICBM's in 1964, as compared with 2,000 Russian ICBM's in the same year.

But this, I find, is a comparison of two entirely different things, for the 130 United States ICBM's represent only our developmental objective, and do not take into account what we can mass-produce, once preproduction models are completed and a decision to concentrate on a particular missile has been made.

The Russian figure of 2,000, however, is based on estimates of the maximum number they might produce, once in full mass production.

Furthermore, preliminary production estimates on one ICBM model indicate that we can exceed the Soviet effort numerically, if desirable. The exact numbers are classified, however.

In other words, we are comparing the optimum Russian mass production capacities with what are simply our own preliminary objectives, and do not even account for what we intend to produce.

We shall never be the underdog if we keep on the job. We need more efficiency. We must cut down on waste. We must make decisions as to choice of weapons, and then must proceed to develop and produce them.

The Preparedness Committee, under our majority leader, developed 17 points where speedy decisions and more action are needed. Decisions have been made; actions have followed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield? He referred to me, and I wish to make a brief comment in that connection. Ordinarily I would wait until the conclusion of the Senator's formal statement; but I am required to leave the Chamber in a moment or two.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me say that in connection with these remarks I intend to submit a memorandum on the 17 points, and to include the unclassified material submitted in that connection. I realize that there is also a group of classified material; I have a copy of it, and so does the majority leader. However, I intend to submit for the RECORD only the unclassified material.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator from Massachusetts will yield briefly to me——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to observe that the distinguished former chairman of the Armed Services Committee [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and I have no difference of opinion about the need for adequate defense for the Nation. I commend the Senator from Massachusetts for his efforts to keep America prepared.

I commend the Defense Department, under Secretary McElroy, for its attempts and his attempts to accelerate our defense preparations.

I do have a difference of opinion, I believe, in regard to whether we are going far enough, fast enough.

So I do not think the question here is one of patriotism or dedication to one's country. The question is purely one of judgment.

I recognize that the President, the Commander in Chief, has had great experience in this field; and naturally his opinions carry great weight. However, I wish the RECORD to show now—as I have wanted it to show year after year after year—that I believe the question is one of relative strength; and I do not think America is doing as much as it should be doing now.

I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for yielding to me; I appreciate his courtesy. I commend him for his efforts to keep America strong.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do differ with him on the extent of our effort.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In the course of the remainder of my prepared remarks, I believe I shall answer some of the questions the Senator from Texas has raised.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I reviewed the Senator's prepared statement a short time ago; and I wished to make this statement to him.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I appreciate it very much.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I prefer to finish my formal statement before I yield further, Mr. President. I yielded to the majority leader because I realize that he is extremely busy, and that he had to leave the Chamber. After I conclude my prepared remarks, I shall be glad to yield to other Senators.

Mr. President, in the coming January, we must review those actions, to see whether we are still going forward as fast as we should.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the 17 points named by the Preparedness Subcommittee, together with the unclassified answers of the Department of Defense.

There being no objection, the memoranda were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.—MODERNIZE AND STRENGTHEN THE STRATEGIC AIR FORCE

Since April 3, 1958:

(1) The standard SAC alert force has been increased. The number of bombers on 15 to 30 minute alert is up 33 percent and tankers by 50 percent. In the present situation, number is higher (but classified).

(2) One ICBM training squadron and one Atlas squadron have been activated at Cooke Air Force Base. We have commenced deployment of the first Thor squadron to the United Kingdom to assist in training program. We have revised the ICBM operational concept to decrease vulnerability to enemy attack and permit greater effectiveness. (Refers to dispersal—which is classified.)

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2—STEP UP THE DISPERSAL OF SAC BASES

Since April 3, 1958, all money has been released to the construction agencies, and construction contracts are being placed as rapidly as possible.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 3.—PUTTING MORE EFFORT INTO DEVELOPING ANTIMISSILE MISSILES

(1) Appropriate modifications to missile test ranges in order to test adequately the missile when available are being determined.

(2) Program of over $200 million for Nike-Zeus for fiscal year 1959 has been approved.

(3) Management responsibility for Nike-Zeus program has been assigned to chairman, ballistic missile committee (Holaday) to provide expediting advantages possible through ballistic missile committee channels.

(4) Advanced Research Projects Agency has been directed to proceed with fundamental research phases aimed at later missile improvements.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 4.—IMPROVE EARLY WARNING SYSTEM FOR MANNED AIRCRAFT AND ACCELERATE THE DEVELOPMENTS OF AN EARLY WARNING DETECTION SYSTEM FOR BALLISTIC MISSILES

(1) Program for construction of a two-station ballistic missile early warning system and associated communications with estimated cost of over $500 million has been approved.

(2) Negotiations underway with appropriate government to increase number of stations in ballistic missile early warning system.

(3) Negotiations underway with appropriate government for improving communications with ballistic missile early warning system and distant early warning.

(4) Negotiations are underway with appropriate government for augmenting DEW line and other warning lines with more modern radars.

(5) The Argentia extension of the DEW line on the Atlantic side and the Aleutian extension on the Pacific side are in operational use.

(6) Management responsibility for the BMEWS assigned to the chairman, BMC (Holaday) in order to achieve expediting advantages through specialized organizational structure.

(7) Advanced Research Projects Agency to proceed with fundamental research phases applicable to later improvements of BMEWS.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 5.—MODERNIZE AND STRENGTHEN GROUND AND NAVAL FORCES

Army modernization by its very nature is a continuing process. This program continues and will be strengthened with the approval of the fiscal year 1959 budget. Among the advanced weapons in progress are Honest John adaption kits, battlefield radars, improved reconnaissance systems, communications, and equipment to provide increased mobility.

Since April 3, 1958:

1. On April 18 the 4th Army Missile Command (air transportable) was activated in Korea.

2. On June 20 the 40th Field Artillery Missile Group (Redstone) was deployed to the 7th United States Army in Germany. This unit has successfully fired Redstone missiles as part of its training program (two).

3. Conversion of Continental United States Nike-Ajax air defense units to Nike-Hercules was initiated and training begun. The first three Nike-Hercules batteries are now in operation.

4. By June all 24 batteries of the 6 Nike-Ajax air defense battalions in Europe were operational.

5. The F4H–1 supersonic all-weather carrier-based fighter was assigned a DOD urgency second only to the national priorities program. This priority and the comparable priority previously given to the F8U–3 will help assure early availability of the F4H–1 for evaluation of which aircraft is to be procured for the air defense mission of the Navy.

6. About 80 percent of fleet Marine forces have completed reorganizing under new concepts of amphibious warfare and tactical nuclear warfare. The remainder will be completed by the fall of this year.

7. On August 3, the *Nautilus* reached the North Pole under ice, followed by the *Skate* crossing the North Pole on August 11, 1958.

8. Army authorized to procure Mohawk airplanes.

9. Navy extends contract with Martin Co. for engineering studies on nuclear seaplane.

10. World's largest submarine *Triton* to be launched August 18, 1958. A total of 33 atomic powered subs have been authorized, the *Triton* will be the 8th launched.

STATEMENT BY GEN. NATHAN F. TWINING, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF, BEFORE THE PREPAREDNESS INVESTIGATING SUBCOMMITTEE (JOHNSON) OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, UNITED STATES SENATE, ON RECOMMENDATION NO. 6, PROVISION OF ADEQUATE AIRCRAFT FOR GROUND FORCES, JULY 24, 1958

One of the 17 recommendations of this subcommittee was that there should be provided for the Armed Forces of the United States "an adequate airlift for ground troops." In my first report to the committee on this recommendation on February 26, 1958, I stated that, as of that date, the Joint Chiefs of Staff were on record that our airlift capabilities were, in general, adequate. I further stated that the Joint Chiefs of Staff had directed that another study be made of the whole airlift problem in the light of the world situation as it exists today. On April 3, I reported that the Joint Chiefs of Staff study on airlift was still in progress and would not be completed for some time.

Any study of strategic airlift is bound to be complex, studded as it must be with assumptions that may or may not be valid in actual emergency situations. Such factors as I discussed in my testimony of April 3, as—bases, servicing facilities, stocks of gasoline and spart parts, communications, and terminals capable of receiving, unloading, and servicing the aircraft expeditiously—must be taken into account. Furthermore, these factors must be taken into account for each movement contemplated. All of the factors I enumerated vary for movements from and to different points. A very good discussion of the general factors involved in strategic airlift was given by my predecessor as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the Mahon subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations. A sanitized version of this presentation appears at pages 2049 through 2097 of that subcommittee's hearing on the Department of Defense Appropriations for 1958.

With the above as a background, let me give you a progress report on what the Joint Chiefs of Staff organization has accomplished since I last testified on this subject 2½ months ago. The Joint Staff has, all during this period, been engaged in an extensive and comprehensive study of strategic airlift under mobilization and wartime conditions. This study covers a 4-year time period, 1958 through 1962—and constitutes an overall evaluation of airlift capability versus airlift requirements for the first 2 months of a general war. The evaluation is made under two major conditions: First, when D-day follows a mobilization day of 6 months; and second, when D-day and M-day coincide. This study has been completed and coordinated throughout the Joint Staff and is currently being commented upon and cleared by the services. It should be ready for formal presentation to the Joint Chiefs within the next 2 weeks. Should the committee desire, the conclusions and recommendations of this study could be discussed in a later executive session, subsequent to consideration of the paper by the Chiefs.

In addition to the study I have outlined above, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have noted and approved a report of the joint advanced study group on United States airlift capability in a specific emergency situation in the Pacific. This group took a typical limited war situation as set forth in an existing CincPac operation plan calling for United States military participation in the defense of a Far Eastern country. The group did what we in the military call "war gaming" of this particular operation plan. In developing that portion of the study concerned with United States airlift capability to support troop deployments to the emergency area in accordance with plans, a problem allocation of airlift consistent with United States airlift capabilities in the Pacific area was utilized. The study group concluded that, with the airlift allocated, the planned deployment of forces and materiel to implement the operation plan was feasible from the airlift point of view. That is to say—they concluded we had sufficient airlift to do the job required. I wish to emphasize that this is but one limited war situation out of many possibilities. It was studied and war gamed, however, with the maximum amount of realism which can be put into such a problem. Because this is an actual, not a theoretical, war plan, the solution is very highly classified and further details cannot be given in open session.

I would like to conclude by stating that nothing which has been developed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff organization thus far has changed my opinion that we have in being and programed sufficient airlift to meet our real needs. I want the committee to know, however, that I and the Joint Chiefs of Staff as a corporate body have an open mind on this subject and our study of it is deep, thorough, and continuous.

The balancing of priorities in what we must buy to best defend the United States is one of the most difficult problems which face the Chiefs as a corporate body. If the individual services could have everything they wanted, I'm sure the Air Force would like to have more troop carrier aircraft—so would I. But, as I pointed out to this committee on February 26 of this year:

"Somewhere the Joint Chiefs as a corporate body has to make up its mind what you are going to buy."

The fact of the matter is—when the Joint Chiefs were considering in March of this year a priority list of what they would like most to buy if they were given $1.5 billion additional funds and what they would like most to buy if they were given $2.5 billion additional—troop carrier aircraft were not on any service list.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 7.—POUR MORE EFFORT INTO OUR ANTISUBMARINE PROGRAM

Since April 3, 1958, several significant steps have been taken to improve antisubmarine capabilities. All of these, primarily involving detection, are of highly classified nature.

August 4: Navy awards multimillion contract to Lockheed for P2V–7 antisub aircraft and equipment.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 8.—SET UP PRODUCTION SCHEDULES OF ATLAS, THOR, JUPITER, AND ACCELERATE DEVELOPMENT OF TITAN

(1) Successfully completed first phase of testing Atlas program with successful June missile flight. Now engaged in more complex test phase of this missile.

(2) Buildup of Atlas production rate continues.

(3) Titan, which was started later than Atlas program, is coming along in satisfactory manner.

(4) Thor program on schedule with flight test program achieving considerable success. Expect occasional flight test failure as reliability and debugging test program proceeds. Expect to meet scheduled operational deployment date.

(5) Buildup of Thor production rate continuing toward maximum approved schedule.

(6) Thor-Able, a Thor missile with a modified Vanguard second stage, successfully boosted a nose cone to a distance of over 5,000 miles giving us important nose cone reentry information.

(7) Two full-scale Jupiter nose cones have been successfully recovered after full-range flights, confirming solution of IRBM nose cone problem and providing data for further improvement.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 9.—REDUCE LEAD TIME IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF WEAPONS SYSTEMS BY CUTTING DOWN ON DECISION TIME AND BY SIMPLIFYING PROCUREMENT PROCEDURES

(1) Reorganization of the Defense Department is expected to assist materially, particularly the establishment of the Director of Defense Research and Engineering.

(2) Progress has been made in simplifying procurement procedures governing smaller transactions which impose heavy workloads on industry and government.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 10.—PROVIDE FOR A FREER EXCHANGE OF SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION BETWEEN THE NATIONS OF THE FREE WORLD

Since April 3, 1958 Congress has just (July 2) enacted Public Law 85–479, broadening the degree to which information in the atomic field can be shared with our allies. The President on July 3 submitted to the Congress a new proposed agreement for cooperation with the United Kingdom.

Under our revised national disclosure policy, the sharing of scientific information with selected allies has increased.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 11.—START WORK AT ONCE ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF A ROCKET MOTOR WITH A MILLION-POUND THRUST

Since April 3, 1958 a contract has been let with North American Aviation for develop-

ment of an engine of about 1-million pound thrust. Development of this engine is carefully coordinated between ARPA and NACA.

[Department of Defense news release of July 25, 1958]

In amplification of Defense Secretary McElroy's remarks before the Senate preparedness investigating subcommittee yesterday, the Department of Defense said today that, after careful coordination between ARPA and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the Air Force has been authorized to proceed with the development of a liquid propellant rocket engine which will produce over 1 million pounds of thrust from a single combustion chamber.

While the first application for such a large engine has not yet been definitely established, it will unquestionably be needed in this era of satellites and space vehicles. An engine of this size could be used to put up a manned satellite weighing approximately 20,000 pounds or an interplanetary vehicle weighing 5,000 pounds.

The Air Force has let a contract to the Rocketdyne Division of North American Aviation to begin development of major components for the engine, which is similar in principle to the Rocketdyne powerplants now used in the Atlas, Thor, and Jupiter missiles. One aspect of this new engine development is that the single combustion chambers may be clustered together to provide a multimillion pound thrust capability for United States military and civilian space programs of the future.

The authorization comprises only a part of the total program for high thrust engines under consideration. It is considered an interim measure to ensure continued progress in this field, while the total program was being developed between ARPA and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 12.—GIVE SERIOUS ATTENTION TO THE QUESTION OF SHELTERS AND STOCKPILES FOR CIVIL DEFENSE

This does not fall under our direct responsibility.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 13.—REORGANIZE THE STRUCTURE OF THE DEFENSE ESTABLISHMENT

Since April 3, 1958, a bill embodying most of the points in the President's proposal has now been enacted.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 14.—PROVIDE INCREASED INCENTIVES FOR THE RETENTION OF TRAINED PERSONNEL IN THE MILITARY SERVICES

Since April 3, 1958:

(1) The military pay bill (Cordiner) has been passed into law (May 20).

(2) To amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act to authorize additional deferments in certain cases (category IV).

Modern weapons have intensified our urgent need for realistic standards of initial acceptability for service whether through enlistment or induction. In the absence of this authority, the Army has been compelled to accept through induction many marginal individuals with limited training capability, requiring the Army to place them into uniform, house them, assign them basic training, and—then—after considerable initial outlay has been forced to separate them from service as inept or unsuitable.

Status: This legislation has passed both Houses and is before the President for signature.

(3) To amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to active duty agreements for Reserve officers, and for other purposes (term retention).

This proposed legislation is designed to provide an improved status for Reserve officers on active duty with the Armed Forces. It is urgently needed to raise the critically low rate of retention of Reserve officers beyond their obligated tours of duty.

Status: It has been introduced in the House as H. R. 13472. Hearings have not been set by either Senate or House Armed Services Committee.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 15.—ACCELERATE AND EXPAND RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS; PROVIDE FUNDING ON A LONG-TERM BASIS

Since Apirl 3, 1958:

(1) It is hoped that the new office of the Director of Defense Research and Engineering will help in this respect.

(2) The Department of Defense has requested increased transfer authority in the Department of Defense emergency fund from $100 million to a total of $500 million. Such an increase would enable us to move promptly in both research and development and procurement, to capitalize on any unexpected developments or important technological breakthrough.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 16.—PUT MORE EFFORT INTO DEVELOPMENT OF MANNED MISSILES

(1) X-15 rocket powered manned research aircraft development program is proceeding on schedule.

(2) Contracts have been awarded to the General Electric Co. and the North American Aviation Corp. for design of full-scale sealed capsules capable of providing environment adequate to sustain a man in space.

(3) The joint ARPA–NACA panel has continued its review of various proposals for placing a man in space with the object of achieving manned space flight at the earliest practicable date.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 17.—ACCELERATE THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE POLARIS (FBM) MISSILE SYSTEM

Since April 3, 1958:

The Polaris program is continuing to meet its demanding schedule with a remarkable degree of success thus far. To assure continued acceleration of the program in the interim preceding passage of the 1959 budget, the Navy was given special authorization of $248 million for obligation and commitment for Polaris.

The Secretary of Defense has assured the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee that this program will be carried forward at all practicable speed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, above all, America possesses an intangible quality which no totalitarian world power can share, namely, a will to win, and a belief, indeed, a conviction, in that which we know to be right. This spirit is our most formidable weapon. H-bombs can never destroy it, for freedom and liberty know no compromise.

Mr. President, let us never sacrifice, by psycho-surrender, the heritage of our great free democracy.

Instead, let us take a realistic look at the situation we face. The Communists are the aggressors. As aggressors, they may select the time for attack.

It is simple for them to concentrate on developing, for example, 1965 weapons, and to disregard today's technology. We must strike the proper balance between the weapons of the future and the weapons we need today. We cannot hope to concentrate on each year's military weaponry to the same extent that the Russians, if they choose to attack us, can concentrate on the weaponry of the one particular time they may select for attack.

Should we be drawn by fear into laying all-out effort on a particular period of time—let us say, the period from 1960 to 1964—for our primary defensive emphasis, we may then neglect the modernization of our present forces, and may invite an attack at the present time. Or we may neglect the weapons we need for defense in 1970, and may invite disaster in that year.

It is our job to strike the balance which will most effectively, at any given time, insure the security of our Nation. This is the balance that we have achieved today.

It is this balance that we must maintain each hour, each day, and each week of each year. We cannot be panicked into unwarranted emphasis on any future time, at the expense of the present time. The alternative, clearly, is to select a period of time for primary emphasis on our military development. And that, we can easily see, might well lead to disaster, because then we would either lose our present strength or lose our future strength beyond that selected period.

We can never rest on our oars. But much of our work will be undone if we pass to our people, as judgments, what are truly mere estimates.

I have confidence in the judgment of our President and his military advisers. I have faith that our scientific researchers, our leaders in education, and our industrial leaders and workers will continue with their skills and efforts to keep us in front. I have confidence in the will of our people to remain free.

The gap we have to avoid is in our will and determination. Then there will be greater security for ourselves and, we pray, more peace in the world.

We have confidence in our will to win and in our belief—indeed, our knowledge—that ours is a right and just cause. For in this knowledge lies our greatest strength; and from this strength emerges a weapon more powerful than anything a totalitarian nation can shoulder.

Mr. President, the strength of our will and determination, of our belief in ourselves and the rightness of our purpose, stands between freedom and slavery.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. First of all, I wish to commend the efforts of the Senator from Massachusetts in the entire field of military preparedness and national security. I also wish to commend him for the speech he has made in the Senate today.

I should like to draw attention, by way of emphasis, to one of the points he made. He said we have the problem of selecting weaponry and building a defense balanced for the particular danger which will face us at any particular time.

Does not he feel that one of the important values provided for in the military reorganization bill which recently was passed by Congress was the placing upon the Secretary of Defense of the responsibility for making decisions with respect to new weapons systems, so that

in spending our money and in devoting our efforts, we may concentrate on those best suited to meet our particular needs?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is one of the most important parts in the reorganization bill, in my opinion—to give that decision to the Secretary of Defense, through his administrator, for that purpose.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am reminded of one of the little stories I learned when I was a boy, which was allegedly credited to Benjamin Franklin, in which he told of the boy who went to the fair and spent all of his money buying whistles at the first stand he found when he went inside the fair gates. After he had loaded up on those whistles, he made the rounds of the stands at the fair, and saw many other whistles and other articles he wanted to buy, but he was out of money.

I have thought of that story many times in thinking about the problems of national defense. Along comes a new gadget which sometimes is attractive. Perhaps it has some value. But any nation that spends all its scientific talents and money upon a Maginot Line or on something new may use up all its money and resources and not have them available for something which is really needed. The problem of the correct exercise of judgment as to what we should spend our money on is a real one. I am glad the Senator from Massachusetts has pointed out that problem in connection with our national security.

Mr. President, supplementing what the Senator from Massachusetts has already done in the way of asking unanimous consent to have printed the 17 conclusions of the Preparedness Subcommittee, to which I was one of the subscribers, and the comments of the Defense Department thereon, I should like to ask, if I may, that following my remarks there be printed in the RECORD an interview which took place in a television broadcast, in which Professor Wiesner, of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, was interviewed by Mr. Erwin D. Canham, of the Christian Science Monitor. This contains the key paragraphs of the interrogation of Professor Wiesner, by Mr. Canham, followed by the comment of the Defense Department, which was placed in the open record of the Preparedness Subcommittee hearings.

There being no objection, the television interview and the Defense Department statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CANHAM-WIESNER INTERVIEW

The panel moderator, Mr. Erwin D. Canham, of the Christian Science Monitor, asked Professor Wiesner this question:

Mr. CANHAM. * * * In what areas are the Soviets already stronger than we?

Professor WIESNER. I presume you are talking about military areas now?

Mr. CANHAM. That's right.

Professor WIESNER. First of all I believe, although not everyone would agree with me, that the Soviets have managed to make a considerably more effective air-defense system than we have; I think it is perfectly obvious to everyone that they are ahead of us in the missile field. I believe that their limited war capability both in quality and quantity is superior to ours, and their submarine fleet is certainly a much larger one than we have at the present time.

Mr. CANHAM. If their air defense is as strong as you state, and assuming a surprise attack such as Mr. Sprague spoke of, does this mean that our capacity of retaliation is uncertain?

Professor WIESNER. At this point I do not think that is so. The situation is changing rapidly and it could be that a few years hence it would be impossible for us to do an effective retaliation.

Mr. CANHAM. You think the situation is getting worse instead of better?

Professor WIESNER. I think so; yes.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT STATEMENT ON WIESNER'S REMARKS

We would comment as follows on Professor Wiesner's remarks. His first statement is that "the Soviets have managed to make a considerably more effective air-defense system than we have." He wisely prefaces this assertion with the statement that not everyone would agree with him, since as General Twining pointed out (see p. 278 of the record), no one, including the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, really knows the answer to this question.

As Secretary McElroy pointed out in his testimony before your committee (p. 277 of the record), "* * * the Soviet Union has one problem of defense, we have another. He puts together his defense program in relationship to his need and we put ours together in relationship to our need."

Thus, any comparison of our air-defense system with that of the Soviet's should be based on an evaluation of the problems of the two powers. Taking into consideration, however, that our defense needs are different and examining all the weapons in our arsenal, offensive as well as defensive, and evaluating the Russian capabilities in the same fields from known intelligence, we conclude on the basis of the best military advice we can get that our air-defense system is superior to that of the Soviet Union.

Professor Wiesner's second comment was that "it is perfectly obvious to everyone that they are ahead of us in the missile field."

We would not concede that it is perfectly obvious. It has been stated publicly that it is probably true that the Soviets are ahead of us in the development of the intercontinental ballistic missile with a range of some 5,000 miles. Mr. McElroy made such a statement on June 6, just 2 months ago. We believe, however, that we are closing the gap in the development of this long range missile.

Our successful Atlas firing the other day is evidence of our progress in this field. There are some categories of missiles, such as air-to-air and air-to-surface, where we believe we have a definite edge on the Soviets. It is misleading to take just one category and draw conclusions from it without considering the whole missile picture.

WHAT SORT OF WAR AND WHERE?

Professor Wiesner's next statement was that the Soviet's "limited war capability both in quality and quantity is superior to ours."

It is difficult to comment on such a statement without asking the obvious question: "What sort of a limited war, fought with whose troops, and what weapons in what location of the globe?"

This is the sort of statement on which long essays could be written unless the conditions for the limited war were set forth. In some areas of the globe, we believe our limited war capability, both in quality and in quantity, is superior to the Russians', while in other areas of the globe, we would concede the opposite.

We have no quarrel with Professor Wiesner's next statement that the Soviet "submarine fleet is certainly a much larger one than we have at the present time."

On the other hand, the Soviets have nothing to match our nuclear submarines now coming off the ways in increasing numbers.

We have accelerated our Polaris program, and the Navy is bending every effort to improve its antisubmarine capability, for which additional moneys were voted by the Congress in the budget augmentation programs.

There is no doubt that the large numbers of Soviet submarines pose a great threat to our Navy, our merchant marine, and our Nation. However, our answer to this threat should not merely be to try to build a larger submarine fleet.

Of course, we disagree with Professor Wiesner's final conclusion that the military situation is getting worse instead of better.

We believe great strides have been made in the past few months and we, therefore, think if our military posture versus that of Russia has changed, it is getting better instead of worse. This is no indication of complacency on our part for we in the Department of Defense realize full well that herculean efforts must be made to keep us in favorable military balance versus the Soviet Union.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. I gather from the distinguished Senator's speech that he wants to make the point that our knowledge of Russian capability in certain areas is based on estimates. Is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Well, not entirely based on estimates; based partly on estimates of intelligence and some on facts.

Mr. JACKSON. Obviously we do not want to get into facts here, that involve problems of security.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. JACKSON. Is it not true that, generally speaking this Nation has erred on the side of underestimating Russian capability?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I know the Senator from Washington has a lot of information on this subject, but I would not say his statement is true in every respect, although it is true in some respects.

Mr. JACKSON. Not in every respect, but in some vital areas we have underestimated the capabilities of the Russians, have we not?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In some areas.

Mr. JACKSON. In trying to project our capabilities in relation to the Soviets, it is well documented that, for a long period we have underestimated the Soviets. We underestimated the time at which they were going to get the first A bomb and the first hydrogen bomb. We underestimated them on the long-range bomber, the ballistic missile, their submarine fleet, and right on down the line. I think the past record is clear. While I agree with my friend that we clearly do not want to overestimate the Russians, the truth is that, until sputnik, many of the American people did not realize the growth of Soviet military power. The fact did come home to the American people with the dramatic revelation that the Russians had developed a propulsion system far superior to anything we had.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator that we underestimated the

Russians as to the time sputnik would be launched.

Mr. JACKSON. I make this statement in all fairness, and not with any intent to be partisan. As I said, we also underestimated the Russians on the A bomb.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. However, we have overestimated them in at least one instance which I would rather not mention—a very important instance.

Mr. JACKSON. I think there has been a miscalculation with respect to what the Senator has in mind. While the Russians may have dropped off in the particular area which the Senator has in mind and which I have in mind, that fact may be the basis for the development of a new and better system.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is what we have to be ready for.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. I congratulate the distinguished Senator on his statement. In that connection, the Senator talked about our position in the field of missile development. I wonder if the Senator would permit me to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point one page of the testimony from the hearings of the Johnson subcommittee, in which Dr. Teller answered the questions of Mr. Weisl. Mr. Weisl asked the question:

Dr. Teller, why do you believe we are behind the Russians in the development of the long-range missile?

Dr. Teller replied:

That is something of a long story; and may I take the patience of the committee to answer it in more than just a few words?

Senator JOHNSON. Yes.

Then Dr. Teller made the answer which I am sure is familiar to all members of the committee. He pointed out that the Russians began a vigorous ballistic missiles development program immediately after World War II, and that we did not. His answer appears in part I, page 9, of the hearings, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, in order to conserve the time of the Senate.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY WE ARE BEHIND THE RUSSIANS

Mr. WEISL. Dr. Teller, why do you believe we are behind the Russians in the development of the long-range missile?

Dr. TELLER. That is something of a long story; and may I take the patience of the committee to answer it in more than just a few words?

Senator JOHNSON. Yes.

Dr. TELLER. I would like to say that there is a special reason, and there is a general reason.

The special reason I have already tried to indicate. The special reason is that we have not embarked on a really vigorous missile program before we had clear and definite evidence what we shall do with such a missile, how such a missile can be used.

Let me make this a little bit more complete. In 1946, right after the end of the war, we could have said: Let us develop ballistic missiles. One can go big distances, they are extremely interesting developments, some important wartime usefulness has been demonstrated by the German V–2.

Well, we did go into the development of ballistic missiles, but at an exceedingly slow and small rate. We did not start a vigorous development because it could not be proved that these missiles will be really important in the next war. We did not, if the next war comes, we did not have the really powerful explosive that would be needed in the warhead of such a missile.

Years later we finally realized that a system consisting of a guided missile and a warhead, which in the meantime has been developed, would indeed be an extremely powerful weapon. Therefore, we have determined to start a very vigorous program on the ballistic missile.

When we started this program, we went into it with quite a bit of energy and I think the efforts have paid off, and I have nothing to say about that program that would not bear out that it has been an excellent and excellently managed program, but it came too late.

The Russians have started on their ballistic-missile program, from all we know, right after the war, and they kept at it.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent, following that insertion, to have printed a table entitled "Programed Obligation Totals for United States Missiles Programs, Department of Defense, Fiscal Year 1946 Through Fiscal Year 1958" at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Programed obligation totals for United States missiles programs, Department of Defense, fiscal year 1946 through fiscal year 1958 [1]

[In millions of dollars]

	Total missile program	Surface-to-surface program [2]	Long range surface-to-surface program [2]	IRBM and program [2]
Fiscal year:				
1946 and prior	70	19	9	(3)
1947	58	20	6	----------
1948	81	36	11	----------
1949	98	45	18	----------
1950	134	65	22	----------
1951	784	186	113	----------
1952	1,058	240	143	----------
1953	1,166	406	270	3
1954	1,067	350	258	14
1955	1,470	559	376	161
1956	2,270	902	679	515
1957	4,283	2,000	1,743	[4] 1,380
1958 (preliminary)	4,638	2,100	1,928	1,400

[1] Program data contained in this table include the cost of bringing guided missile weapon systems to an operational status, combining research and development, production facility expansion and tooling, procurement, contract, and military overhead to support missile testing and certain construction costs for research and development. The figures above do not include military pay, the cost of maintaining and running operational sites, construction installations not included in research and development costs, or building or converting ships incident to the guided-missile program.

[2] Each of the above columns is a part only of the preceding column to the left.

[3] Totals less than $1,000,000 are not included above.

[4] Unusually high expenditures in fiscal year 1957 were due to a large nonrecurring capital investment in test facilities.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, in a recent speech on the floor of the Senate the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] drew some conclusions from the Lebanon operation which I believe were unwarranted and bear comment, and perhaps correction. The statement of the junior Senator from Massachusetts which I have in mind reads as follows:

It should be obvious from our Lebanon experience that we lack the sea and airlift necessary to intervene in a limited way with the speed, discrimination, and versatility which may well be needed to keep it limited—and without weakening our ultimate retaliatory power. It is shocking to realize that units entering the Lebanon pipeline at the time of the Iraqi revolt emerged at the other end to find that by then the dust had settled and we had already recognized the new regime and it was time to evacuate.

I have attempted to analyze that statement and present a statement for the RECORD in which General Twining's comments on this matter are given, and in which conclusions are reached which I think do not support the statement of the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts. I ask unanimous consent now that the entire statement of mine be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PRESCOTT BUSH

In a recent speech on the floor of the Senate Senator KENNEDY drew some conclusions from the Lebanon operation which I believe were unwarranted and bear correction.

Senator KENNEDY's statement was as follows:

"It should be obvious from our Lebanon experience that we lack the sea and airlift necessary to intervene in a limited war with the speed, discrimination, and versatility which may well be needed to keep it limited—and without weakening our ultimate retaliatory power. It is shocking to realize that units entering the Lebanon pipeline at the time of the Iraqi revolt emerged at the other end to find that by then the dust had settled and we had already recognized the new regime and it was time to evacuate."

Let me say at the outset that, as I understand the Lebanon operation from questioning officials of the Department of Defense, neither airlift nor sealift was a problem. We had both in more abundance than needed. The despatch and landing of our troops in Lebanon was effected at a deliberate and preplanned speed, executed as planned. Airlifting or sealifting of troops into Lebanon at greater speeds would not have been in consonance with the desires of our military and diplomatic planners.

I think the best description of the relationship of airlift and sealift to the Lebanon operation was given by testimony of General Twining before an executive session of the Senate Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee on Friday, July 25. This testimony, while given in executive session, has since been edited by General Twining and declassified by the Department of Defense. Senator SALTONSTALL, a member of the committee, asked Secretary McElroy and General Twining, who were witnesses together, the following question:

"Senator SALTONSTALL. Following along those lines, if you had to move substantially more of our military forces into Lebanon or anywhere in the Mideast, have we got the available airlift or would we do it by water?"

The reply by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff was as follows:

"General TWINING. We have a great deal more airlift than we could possibly use in connection with Lebanon. There is an example of the airlift problem. If we had to put a division into Lebanon on an emergency basis, what would be the fastest way to get it there from the United States? It certainly would not be by air because we

could not get it in by air. It is impossible. And there is the heart of the matter.

"The quickest way to get them into Lebanon would be to put them on a ship and send them over there or, airlift a small advance echelon and send the rest by ship. But we only have one field in the whole area. Even using it to full capacity, it would take a solid week to land a division in airplanes even if we had all the airplanes.

"So those are the problems you run into on his airlift. The Chiefs have been studying these problems through the years.

"I do not know of any place except the mainland of Europe itself where you could really launch a great massive airlift of the kind that General Gavin was talking about, 2 or 3 divisions."

The following colloquy then ensued:

"Senator SALTONSTALL. So your opinion on that question of the airlift versus the water transport, because of bases throughout the world—is still the same that you gave us 6 months ago?"

"General TWINING. That is right. Even on this small lift we had in connection with the Lebanon operation, the tactical lift, we had congestion at some of our terminals on the way over with some of these airplanes • • • If we had to put in a division somewhere in the world, Lebanon is an example for us to look at to see the difficulties • • • We could not airlift them into Lebanon. We just could not. The terminal facilities just are not there."

In this statement, General Twining has touched on the core of the problem. Careful study has shown that, for these extremely complex and complicated airlift operations the problem of terminal facilities will, in many areas of the world, establish limits upon the size and tempo of operations that can be successfully carried out.

It does not therefore, seem obvious to me, that anyone could conclude from this testimony or from the Lebanon operation itself that we lack sea and airlift to intervene in a limited war with the speed, discrimination and versatility which may be needed to keep it limited.

May I state once more that the Lebanon operation was carried out as planned and that lack of sea and airlift was not a factor. Therefore, the only conclusion which should be drawn from the Lebanon operation with respect to air and sealift is that we had all we needed for the operation as planned.

The entire Lebanon operation, airlifting 4,200 troops and 2,500 tons of cargo (1,800 Marines from the United States and 3,400 Army troops and cargo from Europe) used only a little over 100 transport aircraft. The United States has over 5,000 military type transport planes in its inventory, not to mention civil aircraft which could be used in any grave emergency.

This is more than twice as many transport aircraft as are possessed by any other nation in the world, including the Soviet Union. This does not suggest that all of these have the capacity of the transports that were used for the Lebanon operation. Many of them are older, smaller types. But even a quick comparison of the number of planes used for that operation with the total number on hand will show that we had many times the airlift capability that we actually used.

Our total airlift capacity is determined only after a most careful and searching study of the military problems we confront around the world today. Our responsible military leaders endeavor to make a reasonable provision from an overall point of view for such airlift needs—and not to be swayed by overemphasis on this, or any other major component, of our total military power.

Both military and commercial shipping were also more readily available than the troops they had to transport. Here again in numbers and types of troop ships the Free World enjoys an overwhelming superiority.

I would like to repeat the last sentence of Senator KENNEDY's paragraph on the Lebanon operation so it will be fresh in our minds:

"It is shocking to realize that units entering the Lebanon pipeline at the time of the Iraqi revolt emerged at the other end to find that by then the dust had settled and we had already recognized the new regime and it was time to evacuate."

Now I have read this statement several times and each time I return to probe its meaning. So far as I know, this Government never expressed or had any intent to intervene in the Iraqi revolt. It is a disservice to imply that we did, since the inaccuracy plays into the hands of the Soviets as they broadcast the same unfounded assertion. I cannot and do not register any shock, therefore, that our troops failed to reach Lebanon in time to intervene in Iraq. The important thing is they reached Lebanon at the time they were supposed to reach Lebanon and for the purpose they were sent there.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. A remark was made on the floor a few moments ago concerning the underestimate of the potential of the Russians. I should like to ask the senior Senator from Massachusetts if he recalls a statement by a certain columnist, whom everyone seems to love to quote at this particular time. Concerning the Russian potential about 2 years ago, the columnist made the prediction that by now the Russians would have over 800 operational Bisons. Does the Senator recall that prediction?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think I know to whom the Senator refers.

Mr. ALLOTT. Now we are told by this same columnist that the Russians have only about 250 Bisons.

A remark has also been made with respect to Russian submarines and how we have underestimated the Russians in that regard. The distinguished Senator has been a member of the Committee on Armed Services for some time. Is it not a fact that ever since World War II the Russians have been building up their submarine fleet, which was a matter of common knowledge and has been a matter of common knowledge throughout the world?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is entirely correct. Of course, the purpose of our submarines may be quite different from the purpose for which the Russians want to use submarines. There are some common purposes, but there are also completely different purposes. As I have tried to say, we have to have a balanced defense, which includes things other than submarines.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I am interested in the talk of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I appreciate that comment. I have always been interested in the talks of the Senator from Missouri, although we sometimes disagree.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I appreciate what the Senator has just said. The Senator says in his talk that he wants to present the facts. The Senator mentions a figure of 130 ICBM's in 1964 and 2,000 Russian ICBM's in 1964. Does the Senator say that the figure of 130 ICBM's in 1964 is incorrect?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not quite understand the question.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does the Senator say we plan to have more than that number of 130 ICBM's in 1964?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have checked 3 or 4 times with responsible authorities on this matter. As I understand it, those figures are the figures of ICBM's for development purposes. That is, the different missiles which are being experimented with for development purposes. As I understand the situation, when the development of any one of those instruments, or of any group of them, is perfected, the missile or missiles will go into the production stage. Perhaps a lot of other missiles now being used for development purposes will be dropped. The first chosen will be mass-produced. That is what I understand to be the situation, and that is what I tried to say.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does the Senator believe there are any plans or programs for producing, on any basis of any kind, more than 130 ICBM's by 1962?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the answer to that is "Yes." The figures of the proposals are classified. I am confident the Senator can get the figures if he wants them.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does the Senator say that we plan to make more than 130 ICBM's by 1962?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would prefer not to answer that on the floor, but it is my understanding these figures relate to development weapons. The figures as to the amounts we can produce are under security regulations.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Let me say that I have not originated these figures which the Senator referred to in his talk. I was simply asking the Senator for his opinion. As I understand the Senator, he believes the plans are to produce more than 130 ICBM's by 1962.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I say to the Senator from Missouri, who I know knows much about these things, that the 130 relates only to the developmental models planned and is not production capacity.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am sorry I did not know the Senator was going to make this talk, until I saw excerpts from it on the ticker.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Missouri, the Senator has been courteous to me at various times, but I did not send a copy of the remarks to the Senator because I had no idea when I could get the floor to deliver them.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator.

Is not the Senator, in effect, comparing the estimated Russian position with what we could produce if we changed our military schedules with respect to ICBM's?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator please repeat the question?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is the Senator not comparing the estimated Russian position with what we could produce if we changed our missile schedules?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am comparing their maximum production with what I understand is our developmental objectives. What we may then produce is classified.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota rose.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator permit me to yield to the Senator from South Dakota, who has a more elaborate answer on that subject?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, on that point my understanding is that when the Secretary of Defense makes the decision he is required to make under the Reorganization Act our schedules may be revised with respect to ICBM's or whatever the application would be of his selection of the weapons systems.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank my friend from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is the purpose of the procedure.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am simply trying to make the record clear.

Mr. President, in the talk the distinguished Senator has given, he stated the missile program was not begun until 1953. Does the Senator not know that the first contract for the intercontinental Atlas was given to Convair in 1946 or 1947?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The first program was begun in fiscal year 1946, but the total program was then only $70 million.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The program ran from 1946 up to 1953, when it was $1,166,000,000. The figure for 1958 was $5,107,000,000, and in 1959 it is estimated at approximately $6.6 billion.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point, for a question?

Mr. SYMINGTON. May I please finish the colloquy, first?

It is true, is it not, that due to the discovery and development of new weapons, it was possible to have a great change in the missile picture later?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. When the Senator says that the missile program did not start until 1953, does not the statement the Senator just made at least partially refute his statement?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Partially.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I meant to give the impression that was when the program got under way as such.

Mr. BUSH. Will the Senator permit me to comment on the very point he is discussing?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator from Missouri permit that?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I would be glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. BUSH. The important point under discussion in the remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts was in connection with the medium and long-range missiles. I think the table did show it was not until 1953 that any money was spent in that area.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is not correct.

Mr. BUSH. That is in the table, which was submitted at the hearing.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The original contract was for the Atlas intercontinental ballistic missile.

Mr. BUSH. That information is in the table submitted officially to the Johnson subcommittee. It was in the hearings. I have excerpted the information and had it printed in the RECORD.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The contract was given to the Convair Co. for the Atlas intercontinental missile in 1946 or 1947.

Mr. BUSH. Let me say to the Senator, I do not question that.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The $70 million was appropriated at that time. I was simply asking a question so that the facts would be brought out.

Mr. BUSH. I was simply saying, there must be a question about the matter.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the Senator will yield to me, I have a little personal knowledge on that point.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If the Senator from Massachusetts would prefer to yield to others, I will be glad to ask more questions when he has finished the colloquy.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Missouri has always been courteous to me.

Mr. SYMINGTON. May I continue?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator may do so.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Missouri permit me to support his statement?

Mr. SYMINGTON. If the Senator desires to support my statement, that very much influences my position in the matter.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I happened to be a member of the appropriations subcommittee which dealt with the Department of Defense in 1946 and 1947. I know the Senator from Missouri is correct in saying money was made available to the North American or Convair people for a missile project in 1946. The Senator from South Dakota was one of those who at that time protested very bitterly—and it is a matter of record in the hearings in 1947—the transfer of part of the research and development money to "Pay of the Army."

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Representative Engel, of Michigan, and I bitterly opposed that transfer because we thought that the research and development program should continue. However, the decision was dictated at that time by someone in the Budget Bureau, I suppose. It is a matter of record.

The Senator from Missouri is correct in saying that the program was started then, that the money was transferred, and that we lost valuable time in 1947 and 1948 as a result.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is correct. With only the atomic bomb, the development of the intercontinental ballistic missile program could not progress satisfactorily. It was not until the development of the hydrogen bomb plus the great savings of weight that the ballistic missile program became really practicable.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The missile program was started in 1947, canceled in 1948, reinstated in 1951, and began to operate in a bigger way in 1953.

Mr. SYMINGTON. We had the Navaho. The Senator remembers when that development started. It included the Rocketdyne engine.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I take the Senator's word for that.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The present thrust of the Atlas intercontinental ballistic missile uses the Rocketdyne engine.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So I understand.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If the development of the Rocketdyne had not been started in 1947, we would be at least 2 years further behind in the production of the Atlas ICBM would we not?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank my friend from Massachusetts.

In connection with point 4, the Senator says:

> Three American satellites are circling the globe in outer space, better instrumented, scientifically, than any of the models produced by the Russians.

I ask the Senator how he knows that?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is based upon information given to me as recently as this morning. With respect to the instrumentation of our satellites, we are using miniaturized electronic equipment, while the Russians are still using conventional vacuum tubes. I cannot explain to the Senator the details of the miniaturized electronic equipment, but that is the information which I have received.

Mr. SYMINGTON. We are engaged in a discussion of relative military strength. The Senator knows that the largest satellite we have put up has no military significance, whereas the Russian satellite has a weight which indicates the Russians have a thrust capable of use in intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator. However, our scientists report that we are getting more data from our satellites than the Russians are from theirs.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In connection with the fifth point the Senator makes, he states:

> American military forces are on 24 hours' call anywhere on the globe, with mobility that all the Russian ground forces put together cannot muster.

What is the implication of that statement?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thought over that statement fairly carefully before I made it. The implication in that statement is that we are alert today to help our friends in a situation in which our assistance might be required.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator knows, does he not, that we have sworn testimony before our committee that this

country cannot lift and properly support overseas a single division?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator that we received such testimony. I am concerned with the airlift. In the original statement that I had prepared there were some statements on that subject, but I omitted them because I thought the statement was becoming too long. There is the question of the airlift and the sealift. As I understand, in the recent landing at Beirut, we used 10 percent of our airlift, and a very small fraction of our sealift. I am sure the Senator will agree that the question involves landing fields. That is a problem in many sections of the world today. The question is, How big an airlift will be practicable and realistic to use, in view of the shortage of airfields around the world?

Mr. SYMINGTON. When the Senator says that American military forces have a mobility which all the Russian ground forces put together cannot muster, is he talking about airlift?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am talking about the airlift and the sealift combined.

Mr. SYMINGTON. There would be no reason for the Soviets to go by sea if they could go by land.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. There is no need for the Soviets to have any large airlift of a strategic nature, is there?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. A large airlift of a strategic nature?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes. In other words, their distances are shorter than ours.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Distances in Europe and Africa are shorter than ours. I am not sure that they are shorter in all parts of Africa, but certainly in certain parts.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is there any question in the Senator's mind, based upon his membership on the Armed Services Committee and other information he has available to him, that we are falling behind the Soviet Union so far as our defense strength is concerned vis-a-vis theirs?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would certainly disagree with that statement. That is what I have tried to say. I believe the Senator from Missouri, who is very well informed on all these subjects, will agree with me that all the testimony before the so-called Symington Committee and before the so-called Johnson Committee indicated that as of today and through 1958—and we hope the same situation will continue in 1959, and possibly in 1960—we are sufficiently strong so that no nation would dare to attack us. The problem will come in later years. We are never going to be an attacker Nation. Therefore we must remain prepared today. We must be prepared in 1959, 1960, and 1961. In certain respects we are not as far ahead vis-a-vis any possible opponent as regards certain weapons. On the other hand, we are very substantially ahead in the development of certain other weapons. For example, I know the Senator had the same pride I had when the *Nautilus* and *Skate* went under the North Pole. The Senator has the same pride as I have in the development of the Polaris submarine.

Those are weapons that we believe are unique insofar as we are concerned at the present time, and we hope that those weapons will be of very great value to us in the days ahead. I do not agree with the Senator that we are falling behind. I say that what we have to do is to continue our efforts, and in that, I will collaborate with the Senator from Missouri, although we differ in certain particulars.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts. It is never a pleasure to disagree with him. I am sure he is sincere in his position and I hope he thinks I am sincere in mine.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator. I know he is sincere in his position; I disagree with him perhaps only as to tempo, and certain other respects.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I ask the Senator if he did not sign a report on last January 23, the first finding of which stated:

> The Soviet Union leads the United States in the development of ballistic missiles.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I did. I signed it and I put into the RECORD, as the Senator has said, a report on the 17 points up to the present time. I know he has seen or can see the classified answers.

Mr. SYMINGTON. May I ask if the second point which he signed and agreed to on January 23, did not read as follows:

> The Soviet Union leads the United States in number of submarines, which raises the possibility of attack with modern weapons or missiles, although the indications are that we are ahead in the production of atomic submarines.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agreed with that statement then. I agree with it today. But I think the fact that we are so far ahead in the development of nuclear-powered submarines and certain other weapons for the protection of ourselves and our friends, offsets the increase in submarines on the part of the Russians.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The third point in the statement, which I believe the Senator remembers signing was:

> The Soviet Union is rapidly closing the gap in manned air power—and, at present rates, will surpass this country in a comparatively short time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I signed that statement in January. I believe the situation has somewhat changed now, as the Senator knows, but we cannot go into that subject here.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I agree that if there is a change it is in all probability because of their rapid missile development.

The fourth point, with which I think the Senator agreed is:

> The Soviet Union has a system which enables it to develop new weapons in substantially less time than the United States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We have had evidence to that effect. I believe that evidence is what might be called reasonably hard evidence. I have introduced a bill on that very subject, which I have discussed with the Senator from Missouri, and I hope that if he feels the same way as I do, we can both try to improve the bill when I introduce it again next January. I think we should make every effort to cut lead time.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Let me say I certainly agree with my able friend from Massachusetts.

I shall skip the space item and go to the final point, because at that time we did not know the Soviets were going to launch a satellite. That was in 1956. Finally the point which was unanimously adopted by the Senator from Massachusetts, as well as all other members of the committee, was:

> The Soviet Union is producing scientists and technicians at a rate substantially greater than our country.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree, and recently we passed a bill in this body, now pending in conference, which we hope and trust will improve that situation.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I have read the speech of the Senator from Massachusetts, and it is an interesting address. He talks about not being worried, but what worries me today on the floor of the Senate is that all of these matters which the Senator agreed to in January 1958, he disagreed with in January 1957.

As a result, the report which the able Senator was very helpful in formulating in 1956 was in effect discarded and considered perhaps unilateral; and I have never quite been able to figure out why it was that the Senator felt willing to sign and agree to a report in January 1958 to which in January 1957 he did not agree.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, that goes into a matter of history. I would first answer the question by saying that there again it was a question of degree. The Senator is referring to the so-called Symington committee.

Mr. SYMINGTON. It was the Subcommittee on Air Power. The counsel was picked with the Senator's approval.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There it was a question of degree. The majority report, if I may say so without being rude or in any way intemperate to my colleague, for whom I have a great regard, was so intense that I did not feel I could sign it. I wanted to sign it, and, if it had been more moderate in its tone, I would have signed it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Will the Senator yield and permit me to insert into the RECORD the language of the report of 1957 and the report of 1958?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is the Senator's privilege, and I would not disagree. I did not intend to discuss past reports, and I am sure the Senator does not want to emphasize them too much.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The statement that it was "intense" is an unfortunate charge. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to read into the RECORD and let the Senator decide as between the language of 1957 and the language of 1958.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall withdraw the word "intense." I was working hard to find a word which I thought represented what I meant. I would say the minority report was more moderate in

tone, and the majority was a little less moderate than I cared to sign.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Will the Senator from Massachusetts permit me to insert in the RECORD at this point information I have about the investigations?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Certainly. That is the Senator's privilege.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, during 1956, hearings were held to bring out both the absolute and relative facts regarding our airpower. Not only was the record of these hearings published promptly after the witnesses gave their sworn testimony, but in January 1957 a report was issued, giving findings and conclusions as based on the expert testimony previously received.

One year later, in January 1958, another important report was issued regarding our military strength.

First of all, I would compare the 6 findings in the 1958 report with findings in the 1957 report.

The 1957 report states:

The Soviet Union has exceeded the United States at least in some aspects of the ICBM and IRBM * * * has fired long-range ballistic missiles farther than we have * * * [and] they are as far, if not further, advanced in the long-range ballistic missile field.

The 1958 report states:

The Soviet Union leads the United States in the development of ballistic missiles.

The 1957 report states:

The Soviet Union is producing substantially more submarines than the United States and the testimony credits them with the capability to produce missile-launching submarines.

The 1958 report states:

The Soviet Union leads the United States in number of submarines, which raises the possibility of attack with modern weapons or missiles—although the indications are that we are ahead in the production of atomic submarines.

The 1957 report shows:

The Soviet Union is producing more combat aircraft than the United States; has thousands more aircraft in combat units than the United States; and if present plans and programs are not changed, by the period 1958–60 the Russian long range Air Force will be stronger than that of the United States and therefore we will have lost our superiority in strategic airpower.

As we both know, these figures have been checked, but we cannot discuss them in detail.

The 1958 report states:

The Soviet Union is rapidly closing the gap in manned air power—and, at present rates, will surpass this country in a comparatively short time.

The 1957 report shows:

The Soviet Union has decreased the time used between the original design and quantity production of combat aircraft as compared with the time required by the United States.

The 1958 report states:

The Soviet Union has a system which enables it to develop new weapons in substantially less time than the United States.

The 1957 report shows:

The Soviets are progressing at a faster rate than the United States in the development and production of new type scientific weapons.

The 1958 report states:

The Soviet Union has led the world into outer space.

The 1957 report states:

The Soviet Union is currently graduating twice as many trained scientists and engineers per year as the United States.

The 1958 report states:

The Soviet Union is producing scientists and technicians at a rate substantially greater than our country.

I believe the 1957 testimony was given by Dr. Killian.

This comparison shows a remarkable similarity in findings. In fact, five of the six 1958 findings are practically the same as those listed in the 1957 report. The one partial exception is that the 1957 report points up the Soviet Union's greater progress in scientific developments, while the 1958 report simply states the fact that such scientific developments have permitted the Soviet Union to lead the race into outer space.

The 1957 airport report cited a large number of findings, and pertinent portions of testimony to support those findings, and also listed 23 conclusions. It recommended that the deficiencies in military strength which had been pointed out in the findings and conclusions be corrected as promptly as possible.

The 1958 report of the Preparedness Subcommittee listed 17 principal areas upon which decisive action must be taken.

It is clear that both reports called for action to correct weaknesses in, and otherwise strengthen, our defense posture.

A comparison of the 17 points in the 1958 report with the findings and 23 conclusions in the 1957 report reveals a significant degree of similarity.

The significance of this similarity can be more fully understood when it is realized that the sworn testimony given in both hearings was based, in large measure, upon the same character and content of intelligence information. This point prompts reference to one of the conclusions in the 1957 report which was not in the 1958 report—namely:

The defenses of the United States have been weakened because of the failure to act on national intelligence information; and also because of a tendency to either ignore or underestimate Soviet military progress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, with the permission of the Senator from Massachusetts, to have inserted at this point in the RECORD a point-by-point comparison of the 17 recommendations in the 1958 report with the contents of the 1957 report.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am glad to have the Senator do that. I think the two reports must be read in full in order to understand them.

There being no objection, the comparison was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. (a) The 1958 report:

"Modernize and strengthen the Strategic Air Force."

(b) The 1957 report:

Several of the conclusions and a number of the findings for which corrective action was urged dealt with the modernization and strengthening of SAC. As example, the conclusions cited the "insufficient number of long-range modern jet bombers" and the absence of a "program to produce a sufficient number"; the failure of the United States "to produce an adequate number of jet tankers"; and the absence of "any adequate program to overcome that deficiency."

2 (a) The 1958 report:

"Step up the dispersal of SAC bases."

(b) The 1957 report:

"The United States has an insufficient air base structure. The present structure affords neither the alert status, nor that dispersal necessary for security."

3. (a) The 1958 report:

"Put more effort into developing antimissile missiles."

(b) The 1957 report:

Reference was made to "the importance of a solution to the problem of a defense against long range ballistic missiles," and also to the limitations that had been placed on many research and development programs which, in turn, had "retarded needed modernization of weapons systems," and also to the "increased vulnerability of the United States to sudden attack."

4. (a) The 1958 report:

"Improve our early warning system for manned aircraft and accelerate the development of an early warning detection system for ballistics missiles."

(b) The 1957 report:

Reference is made to the failure of the Department of Defense "to develop an adequate defense warning system."

5. (a) The 1958 report:

"Modernize and strengthen ground and naval forces."

(b) The 1957 report:

Specific reference was made in the conclusions to the inadequacy of the "direction and planning of naval strength"; the "inefficiency in defense planning * * * with respect to limited war"; the insufficiency of action taken "to maintain the mobility of the Army and enable the latter to meet overseas commitments."

6. (a) The 1958 report:

"Provide an adequate airlift for ground troops."

(b) The 1957 report:

This point was covered in the reference to "the mobility of the Army" and also in the language which points up the absence of plans for "provision for adequate airlift."

7. (a) The 1958 report:

"Pour more effort into our antisubmarine program."

(b) The 1957 report:

The report stresses the fact that the United States is vulnerable "to submarine attack against our shipping, and particularly vulnerable to submarine missile attack on military and civilian targets within our heartland."

8. (a) The 1958 report:

"Step up production schedules of Atlas, Thor, Jupiter, and accelerate the development of Titan."

(b) The 1957 report:

This report refers to "duplication, even triplication, among the 3 services in the development and production of missiles"; to "waste in the allocation to the 3 services of responsibility in the missile field"; to delay "in giving overriding priority to the ballistic missile program"; and also to the "serious loss of time as compared with the rapid progress of the Soviets in this field."

9. (a) The 1958 report:

"Reduce lead time in the development of weapon systems by cutting down on decision time and by simplifying procurement procedures."

(b) The 1957 report:

The conclusions cited the fact that the Soviet Union has "decreased the time used between the original design and quantity production of combat aircraft as compared with the time required by the United States," and also scores our relative lack of "speed and quantity of prototype development."

11. (a) The 1958 report:

"Start work at once on the development of a rocket motor with a million pounds thrust."

(b) The 1957 report:

The report points up the "extraordinary Soviet progress in the research and development field"; the failure to allow sufficient funds for development of more powerful "jet engines," of "nuclear propulsion," of "high energy fuel"; and the fact that the Russians have developed "jet engines with substantially more thrust than any the United States has in operation."

13. (a) The 1958 report:

"Reorganize the structure of the Defense Establishment."

(b) The 1957 report:

The report cites the "duplication" and "triplication" in the Department of Defense; the "waste" in the Department of Defense; the necessity to obtain "proper programing and administration in the Department of Defense"; and states that "confusion and therefore inefficiency in defense planning have developed from the vacillating defense policies."

14. (a) The 1958 report:

"Provide increased incentives for the retention of trained personnel in the military services."

(b) The 1957 report:

The report emphasizes "the growing shortage of skilled manpower" and the resultant "inadequate maintenance of aircraft"; and also the "inadequate housing and inadequate pay scales (which) are decreasing the operational effectiveness and morale of our Armed Forces."

15. (a) The 1958 report:

"Accelerate and expand research and development programs, provide funding on a long-term basis, and improve control and administration within the Department of Defense or through the establishment of an independent agency."

(b) The 1957 report:

The report scores the fact that "the Soviets are rapidly closing the qualitative gap"; and also states: "The duplicating approach characteristic of many research and development programs in the Department of Defense, along with the dollar limitations established for such programs, has retarded needed modernization of weapons systems * * * retarded important scientific breakthroughs."

17. (a) The 1958 report:

"Accelerate the development of the Polaris missile system."

(b) The 1957 report:

No specific reference was made to the Polaris missile system, as this name had not yet been applied to the Navy's efforts to adopt the Jupiter missile to use on submarines. However, the report did urge action on the ballistic-missile program, which, at that time, included the Navy's efforts to develop such a missile within the Jupiter project.

This comparison shows the similarity of coverage between 14 of the 17 points in the 1958 report and the conclusions and findings of the 1957 report. The three 1958 recommendations not specifically covered are as follows:

"10. Provide for a freer exchange of scientific and technical information between the nations of the Free World."

"12. Give serious attention to the question of shelters and stockpiles for civil defense."

"16. Put more effort in the development of manned missiles."

It will be noted that Nos. 10 and 12, while significant to an overall study of defense matters, did not come within the appropriate range of study for an airpower investigation.

As for recommendation No. 16, i. e., to increase the effort in the development of manned missiles, this would have been appropriate in an airpower investigation, and was covered indirectly in the recommendation for increased effort in airpower research and development, including both manned aircraft and missiles.

Among the 23 conclusions of the 1957 report, there were some items emphasized that were not in the 17 recommendations of the 1958 report. One of these has already been referred to—the matter of more effective use of our national intelligence information.

Another had to do with urging that financial considerations not be placed ahead of defense requirements. This called for a major policy change.

Still another was the recommendation regarding our failure to use the capacity which we have to produce and maintain airpower which is relatively stronger than that of the Soviets.

In many respects, the most important conclusion, and recommendation to correct, had to do with the failure of our Government to give the public accurate and timely information which it has the right to know.

It should be noted that the 1958 report of the Preparedness Subcommittee was agreed to, as to its findings and recommendations, by all members of the subcommittee from both sides of the aisle.

On the other hand, the minority were not willing to publicly face the facts, based on national intelligence and expert sworn testimony, as presented in the 1957 report. In fact, the minority preferred to discount these facts and, to the extent of their ability, to prevent the American people from realizing the truth of our deteriorating relative defense position. Rather, the minority decided to tell the American people that these 1957 conclusions, based on the sworn testimony of expert witnesses—many of whom were the same as appeared before the Preparedness Subcommittee—were "unduly pessimistic, and not sufficiently objective."

The minority also took the position that vast programs for modernization of our forces are now in progress (and that) we can be optimistic about them and take confidence from the many instances of solid accomplishment.

The policy illustrated by this pleasant view of the vast programs and accomplishments was followed by even greater scientific strides by the Soviets, and by cutbacks and stretchouts in our own defense program in the fields of jet bombers, jet tankers, jet fighters, ICBM's, IRBM's, and research and development.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the point I make is that some of us signed the 1956 report and published it in 1957 in order not to have any political implications. If all of us had agreed to it then, our defenses would now be 1 year farther ahead than they are. Therefore, I hope, now that certain things have happened, such as the situation in Iraq and the placing in orbit of the sputniks, we will not once more return to complacency.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator from Missouri that we must never be complacent.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I make that point to the Senator because in one of the so-called chins-up speeches of the President in the fall of 1957, the latter said that the American people would not sacrifice security to a balanced budget. I was much impressed by that statement, and hoped that something real would be done; and that we would stop making things we did not need, and start making more of the weapons which we do need.

But I was very sorry to realize, upon checking the figures, that in the first 6 months after sputnik, or roughly within that period, the amount spent for our defense is much less than in the preceeding 6 months without even allowing for the depreciation in the value of the dollar.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I respect the Senator's sincerity. We cannot be complacent. I agree with him in that statement 100 percent. I think the figures next January will show greatly increased activity. I thank the Senator from Missouri for his interest in the matter.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. At the outset, I commend the Senator from Massachusetts for his splendid contribution to the discussion of the defense posture of the country. I served on the Subcommittee on Military Preparedness and heard witnesses over a long period of months. Seventy of the highest and best qualified experts on military affairs came before the subcommittee. We had the benefit of a considerable body of classified information.

It is fair and reasonable for men to differ on conclusions as a result of such extensive testimony. But I ask the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts if it is not his opinion, as it is mine, that from an overall standpoint we are well able to defend our country under existing circumstances, and that the prospects for the future are that we will be able, through our magnificent Strategic Air Command and the developments in the missile field, to protect our country under any set of circumstances.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe we can do so today in the case of any prospective enemy. What we must do is not only to preserve our present strength, but, in the years to come, we must go forward with the development of new plans.

Mr. BARRETT. We are certainly doing that, as the Senator well knows. We are building the largest intercontinental ballistic missile base in my State of Wyoming. We have made tremendous progress in that field.

It may be that Russia has some advantage at the moment in that particular field, but we must also consider that in addition to intercontinental ballistic missiles, which are vital, so far as the Soviets are concerned, we have a capability, or will have tremendous capability, in IRBM's, and that we are in a much better position, as a result of them, in the ballistic missile field.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We have IRBM's now in production. We are preparing bases from which they can be fired effectively. We hope to develop an IRBM to be used in conjunction with the Polaris submarine. By 1960, 1961, and 1962, we hope we shall have bases throughout the world from which they can be fired.

Mr. BARRETT. I had the occasion, together with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], and other members of the Committee on Armed Services, to visit the Convair plant in California; to see their proving ground at Kanova Park. We visited also the Douglas Aircraft Co., where the Thor missile is being produced, and also the plant of North American Aviation Co.

As a result of the briefings and the information we obtained at that time, I was very much impressed by the tremendous activity and progress which is being made in this field.

I also had occasion to visit the headquarters of the Strategic Air Command at Offut Field, in Omaha.

For the foreseeable future, at least, the United States is well protected because of the splendid organization headed by Gen. Thomas S. Power, of the Strategic Air Command.

I have made an appraisal of the situation. Taking into consideration all the factors which enter into the defense of the country, and the fact that we are spending 60 percent of our budget for defense, it seems to me that we cannot take one isolated instance in the entire defense program and judge the entire program by that one factor.

I have made an appraisal of the subject. I ask the Senator from Massachusetts if he will permit me to ask unanimous consent to have my appraisal, made as a result of the hearings, printed at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will appreciate having the Senator do that. The Senator from Wyoming is a conscientious, hard-working member of the Committee on Armed Services. His opinion is of great value.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared on this subject be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the outset let us commend the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts for his splendid contribution on the matter of the defense posture of our country. As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee I attended the hearings of the preparedness subcommittee covering a period of several months. The committee heard from over 70 of the highest caliber witnesses. That committee had the benefit of testimony from the best qualified experts in and out of the Government. We had the benefit of a considerable body of testimony of a classified nature.

It is natural that reasonable men may differ in conclusions after hearing the evidence brought forth during the course of the preparedness hearings on the difficult and complex problem of national defense in these difficult and troublesome times. In order to fairly appraise the security of our country it is necessary to consider the problem from every angle and to take a broad and comprehensive view of the adequateness of our defense system. It is not only folly of the highest degree but utterly silly to give even a moments thought to the question of this country surrendering to any foreign power now or ever for that matter.

I hope and pray that this world will be spared from a devastating atomic war, but should it come, I am certain that victory will come to our colors.

I agree with our top military people that from an overall standpoint we are capable of defending our country now and will be able to do so in the future.

Our ability to retaliate depends on many interrelated factors which must be weighed and judged by our military experts. Briefly, the retaliatory forces must be of such size, such variety and such effectiveness as to destroy any nation that would dare attack us. And, Mr. President, related to these is the maintenance of a defensive system that will not only provide early warning of impending attack but will also provide the dispersal, the speed of reaction, and the protection of the retaliatory forces to preclude the possibility of their destruction on the ground.

In my judgment we must place our chief reliance at the present time on the retaliatory power represented by our manned aircraft. The conversion of the heavy bomber force to all jet B–52's will soon be completed. The 11 wings each of 30 B–36's will be replaced by 11 or more wings of B–52's each with 45 aircraft. The replacement program provides more than a 50 percent increase in the number of heavy bombers in addition to the increased capability in each aircraft.

To be realistic we must admit that the Soviet air defense will also improve. For that reason the B–52's will be equipped with air-to-ground missiles so that it will be unnecessary for them to penetrate heavily defended areas in order to reach their targets. They will be supported in their penetration by a wide array of devices such as decoys, radar seekers, and electronic countermeasures to enhance their ability to destroy their targets. We are continuing the production line of B–52's with fiscal year 1959 funds and they will continue as a very potent part of our arsenal for a good long while.

Furthermore, Mr. President, very considerable capability exists in the over 1,500 B–47 medium bombers notwithstanding the eagerness in some quarters to write them off. These aircraft operating from the continental United States bases, with aerial refueling by the KC–97 tankers, can reach a substantial number of important targets without the use of our extensive complex of overseas bases.

I am reliably informed that many of these B–47's can hit their assigned targets with 1 or 2 refuelings for their mission and not 3 or 4 as stated by the junior Senator from Massachusetts.

The B–47's will be phased out as soon as we start getting delivery of the B–58 supersonic jet bomber which is presently being procured in production quantities. In addition, Mr. President, we can look forward to the time when the replacement of the B–52's by the new supersonic intercontinental B–70 heavy bomber, designed for speeds in excess of 2,000 miles an hour at very high altitudes will take place.

As everyone knows there is a massive effort underway to provide further diversity and effectiveness in our retaliatory strength by the development and production of ballistic missiles. These missiles will be deployed by SAC to complement the bombers. The first and largest intercontinental ballistic missile base is being constructed in my State. I would be remiss if I did not refer to our solid fuel Polaris IRBM, which has tremendous importance and potential as a nuclear delivery system. And, Mr. President, before long we will be delivering IRBM's to our allies in quantity.

The Secretary of Defense assured the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations that the Polaris program will be pressed forward with all practicable speed.

While improving, diversifying and modernizing our own retaliatory forces, we are fully recognizing and reacting to the progress being made by the U. S. S. R. We have had in operation for some time and are constantly improving and modernizing an extensive radar warning system. This system has been designed and operated primarily for defense against attack by manned aircraft and air-breathing missiles. As most of my colleagues are aware, this far-flung warning system extends across the cold Arctic wastes out over the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. The system includes the Mid-Canada and Pinetree radars which, to a considerable extent, were established and are operated by our friendly neighbor to the north. We have had the closest cooperation and working relationships in the air defense field with Canada.

Nor does this warning system disregard the missile threat. Work has already started on the construction of the detection phase of a new system, including radar stations and communications lines. Development of the antimissile missile active defense system is now being accelerated and is going forward under the highest national priority.

Along with a diversity of weapons which will be enhanced by the coming of ballistic missiles into the inventory of the operating forces, there is a dispersal of their bases. Dispersal has several advantages. It requires that the attacker increase his attacking force size which greatly increases the probability of our detecting the raid. It also poses great, if not insurmountable, problems to the attacker in planning and supporting a massive attack against the dispersed force. Furthermore, dispersal of manned aircraft increases the alert capability by providing additional runways for fast takeoff.

Testimony shows that squadron dispersal for the heavy bombers and wing dispersal for the major part of the medium bombers is completely provided for in the budgets and construction is well underway in most cases.

The concept of dispersal applies not only to the manned aircraft of the Strategic Air Command, but equally well to the other elements of our strength for now and for the years to come. The missile bases are being spread geographically. The aircraft carriers, with their jet attack aircraft, are scattered over the oceans. The same principle applies to the Polaris submarines as well as to the Regulus missile launching submarines.

Let's take a look for a moment Mr. President at the position of a Soviet planner in the years of the so-called missile gap. B–52's poised on our continental bases prepared to strike in a matter of minutes against specific targets if retaliatory action is required. The picture is further complicated by Snarks and medium bombers supported by tankers. On overseas bases ringing the Soviets will be IRBM's, medium bombers of the B–47 and the supersonic B–58 types, and the air-breathing missiles. Further complicating the picture are the aircraft flying from aircraft carriers. Also coming from carriers, cruisers, and submarines strategically will be the supersonic Regulus missiles. Polaris submarines travelling thousands of miles under water move undetected into appropriate strategic locations to launch from under the water the Polaris missile at targets up to 1,500 miles away.

Weapons, warning and dispersal need another essential element to comprise a successful retaliatory force. I speak now of alertness, of that quality which contributes so much to readiness. We have extensive communications networks ever ready to relay the command words in time of crisis. We have the 15-minute alert schedules which place on our fields ready for takeoff a substantial number of SAC planes, armed, ready to go. As a necessary adjunct to these,

we have the skill and competence of our military personnel, their training and their morale.

After a visit to Offutt Field, near Omaha, I was mighty proud of the great accomplishments of General LeMay and now General Powers, in welding SAC into the world's most powerful fighting force. Every American can well be proud of that great and powerful force.

As the Senate well knows, we have recently demonstrated the alertness of our forces. The normal alert forces were maintained and I understand that during the period we placed an extraordinary additional proportion of our retaliatory forces on alerts of from 15 minutes to 2 hours.

In addition to the great premium placed on retaliatory forces that can be airborne on their missions to demolish an enemy in the warning time before an aggressor can reach us, the great importance of an effective air defense has been recognized.

Just as in the case of the retaliatory weapons, the air defense weapons have undergone continuous modernization, taking advantage of the results of technological developments. Within the next few years the interceptor forces will be completely equipped with the Century series aircraft. Furthermore, and this is of great importance, all fighter interceptors will be equipped to fire air-to-air guided missiles and rockets and a substantial number of squadrons will employ the nuclear armed rocket, Genie.

These modern interceptors constitute a very potent force. The Air Force will also have many Bomarc pilotless interceptors. Funds for several hundred of these have been appropriated by the Congress and construction has already begun on a number of bases for Bomarc in phase with the availability of the production models. I am told that the performance of Bomarc in its development test provides convincing evidence that it will be a most effective addition to our air defense forces. I have learned that in a recent test a Bomarc missile secured a direct hit on a target aircraft at a range in excess of 75 miles from the missile launching point and 1,500 miles from the electronic control point.

We know that the Army already has many Nike-Ajax ground-to-air missile installations in this country. These are being reequipped with Nike-Hercules, a nuclear armed weapon with greater range, altitude, and higher kill probability. The Army will also bring into operation during the next few years the Hawk, a ground-to-air missile system for use against low altitude targets.

All these weapons systems taken together with the constantly improving control and warning systems and the high priority programs for their extension against missiles, provide a truly formidable air defense for the United States.

I have listened with great interest to the remarks of the distinguished junior Senators from Massachusetts and from Missouri. Their work and their words attest to sincere interest in national defense which they share with all other patriotic Americans. Let me say, here and now, that I think the distinguished majority leader is entitled to great credit for the manner in which he conducted the preparedness hearings. I was privileged to participate in those hearings.

I have also noted the magnificent accomplishments of our Defense Establishment and their current programs. I have listened to the testimony of responsible military and civilian leaders. I have great confidence in our military leadership. Let no one sell America short.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I desire to read into the RECORD at this time a statement which impressed me very much, made by General Twining at the preparedness hearings last January.

It would be an unnecessary tragedy if our national policy, or the will of our allies—to say nothing of the confidence of our people in their civilian and military leaders—were weakened because of the mistaken impression that the Soviet had achieved military ascendancy over the Free World. Such a misapprehension could lead to fatal compromises in connection with disarmament negotiations and could lead to other retreats in the foreign policy field—worldwide—which would eventually destroy our security. Further, such mistaken conclusions could actually increase the probability of total war because they might result in bolder courses of Soviet action and greater opportunity for fatal miscalculation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota and Mr. SYMINGTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am surrounded by Senators from Pennsylvania. I yield first to the Senator from South Dakota for protection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I was interested in the exchange of comment with respect to the point in the 1958 report of the Subcommittee on Military Preparedness relating to ballistic missiles. I recall the executive meeting of the Committee on Armed Services when we were phrasing the report. I think, without violating any confidence of the committee, I can point out that the ultimate statement simply used the term "ballistic missiles."

Some of us—and I certainly speak for myself in that respect—had the feeling, which I still have, that while at that time the Russians might have had an advantage in the intermediate missile, they did not have a demonstrated or known advantage in the intercontinental ballistic missile. The suggestion which I made at that time was that we not cover both fields, but simply use the general term.

I am afraid that in the comments which have been made, in the reference to the report of the subcommittee, that the committee reported unanimously that the Soviet Union leads in ballistic missiles. I would not have conceded in January that Russia led in the entire field of ballistic missiles, but only in the intermediate range missiles.

At that point, I will go a step further and say that if I had only $3 to spend on intercontinental and intermediate range missiles, I would spend $2 on the Polaris, as the term or type of intermediate range missile, and I would spend the other dollar on the intercontinental ballistic missile.

If funds were limited, I would not favor spending too much on the Thor and the Jupiter, which are dependent upon bases within sufficient range. I think it is only natural that the Soviets concentrate on the intermediate range ballistic missiles, because the bases we have overseas are within the range of such missiles.

But for ourselves, I favor concentrating on the intercontinental ballistic missiles and the Polaris, which is the seagoing version of the intermediate range ballistic missile.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield so I may reply to a statement made by the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. It is seldom I am not in agreement with my friend, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], one of the most able persons on detail either in or out of Congress that I know.

But I would not want to have left on the floor of the Senate the impression that our Nation is ahead of the Soviets in the field of the intercontinental ballistic missile. If the Senator from South Dakota wishes me to justify that statement, I shall do so, although it will have to be off the floor of the Senate. But it is my belief the Soviets are years ahead of us in the field of the intercontinental ballistic missile.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Missouri may be correct, except I disagree in the case of his use of the words "years ahead."

Mr. SYMINGTON. At least, both of us agree that the Senator from South Dakota was——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not wish to leave the impression that I believe he was inaccurate.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I believe that the Senator from South Dakota was speaking of the situation as of January 1958, whereas I believe that the Senator from Massachusetts and I were speaking of more recent information. Does the Senator from Massachusetts agree?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe the Senator from South Dakota was merely clarifying the intent of the committee in defining ballistic missiles.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Let me say that I simply mean that we should not be concentrating on the intermediate range missile, which depends upon bases at a certain distance from a potential enemy, inasmuch as our ability to maintain such bases depends upon many uncertain factors.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I agree, but our plans for bases for intercontinental ballistic missiles are pitifully small.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think it will be well for the Senator from Missouri to bring up this point at the hearings next year.

Mr. SYMINGTON. After studying the matter to the best of my ability, I am convinced our present and planned relative strength is far from adequate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Earlier today, when my friend was not on the floor, I made a few comments on this subject, and based them on an article by Walter Lippmann, as published in the newspapers today.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have read the article, although I did not hear the remarks the Senator from Pennsylvania made.

Mr. CLARK. I wonder whether the Senator from Massachusetts agrees with

the following part of the article by Mr. Lippmann:

> The real problem—the relatively greater speed of Soviet technological development—cannot be overcome by a spending program alone. It would be quite easy to push Congress into new and bigger expenditures. But what the experts call the missile lag is essentially a weakness in American education and a lack of seriousness in American national purposes, when there is choice between private pleasures and the public interest. We are in competition with a new society which is in deadly earnest, and there is no use pretending that amidst our comforts and our pleasures we are serious enough.
>
> That is why, when the alarms are sounded, we turn over and go to sleep again.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with a certain part of it. I agree that we cannot be complacent. I agree that the evidence we have heard is that the Russians are producing scientists faster than our country is. I certainly hope we do not "turn over and go back to sleep." I believe we cannot be complacent. I believe we must work hard, educate our younger people, and keep all our programs developing.

Mr. CLARK. I am very happy to hear the Senator from Massachusetts make that statement, because I am sure he believes, as I do, that it is urgent that the American people be kept aware of the deadly peril they face.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania; and we must face that situation with efficiency, lack of waste, and intelligent education.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, at this time I yield to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for yielding to me.

Let me say that I have been very glad to hear the statements which have been made this afternoon by my colleagues.

I appreciate very much what the Senator from Massachusetts has said. In that connection, I should like to ask a question.

In my 50 years of military experience, I have heard a great deal about various developments. First, I heard that the Gatling gun would win wars. Next, I heard that the machinegun would win wars. Next, I heard that chemicals would win wars. Next, I heard that airplanes would win wars.

Let me ask the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts whether he is giving consideration to the worth of the ground forces of the Nation?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I hope we are. Both branches of Congress this year set the manpower strength of the Army at 900,000, whereas it was recommended for appropriation purposes at 870,000. I think this year the Congress has provided more funds for research, development, and production of weapons than has been provided for some years past. In the opinion of the Army, not all the funds for modernization of weapons and new weapons is available; I know that is true. But the funds available now for that purpose are greater than those available in the past. The question is one of degree. The funds now available for research in missiles and airplanes are greater than the funds available for research in regard to ground weapons. However, some funds have been provided for the latter purpose, although not enough yet to satisfy the Chief of Staff.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. As all of us know, both the defensive and the offensive efficiency of our forces depends on the morale of the troops. I wonder whether the Armed Services Committee is taking into consideration the effect on the people of the United States of these enormous expenditures—$40 billion for defense—which make it necessary for us, if we are ever to have a balanced budget, to curtail domestic expenditures. I wonder what consideration is being given to the ground force divisions in the Regular Army, the old, historic units of the National Guard, and the Reserves. The latter are, of course, at the home stations, and are teaching the people of the country what real defense means.

As an illustration, let me point out that I believe that the war which probably was the best fought, but with poorer discipline and organization than any other war in history, was the War Between the States. The discipline was so poor that at times one-fourth of the northern army and one-fourth of the southern army returned to their homes, without leave. Nevertheless, when fighting was to be done, there has never been as intelligent and as courageous fighting in all history as that done during those years by the armies of the North and the South.

I wonder whether the Armed Services Committee is giving thought to the word spreading over the Nation that we, the people of the Republic, fight the wars.

The people of the Nation will not fight the wars, by using complicated instruments of various kinds, unless—and I wish to stress this point to the members of the Armed Services Committee—the Nation has men who know how to operate those instruments and implements. Are we doing what must be done in order to spread word over the Nation that it is patriotic to serve in these various capacities, and that our men will do so because they love their Nation, and that that is the only way we shall ever have a successful defense?

We cannot buy either defense or offense. They depend on the spirit of the people. If we spend money in large quantities, with the result of inflation and erosion of the value of the dollar, the people become discouraged.

So I wish to inquire whether the Armed Services Committee is taking such matters into consideration.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe it is. The Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee voted to have the strength of the National Guard increased over the strength recommended by the administration; and both of those committees took a similar position in regard to the strength of the Reserves. Furthermore, we hope we are allowing more for armories than was recommended originally.

I agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania that we wish to keep up the spirit and the morale of the divisions, such as the Yankee Division, in Massachusetts; and the 28th Division, in Pennsylvania. I recall when the 28th Division left, to go overseas. It sailed from Boston; and I was there, to see it off.

I hope we are maintaining that spirit.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the Senator yielding to me. I think the unfortunate thing about this discussion, in some ways, is the injection of partisanship into it, which I believe has no place in it. I am sorry the discussion of last week injected a strong portion of partisanship into the debate. We are all loyal, patriotic Americans. We realize that there is no place here for such partisanship. But I think it should be interesting to point out that up to and including the fiscal year 1953 we had spent only $3½ billion in the development of all missiles, and that just a few million dollars of that amount had gone for the development of ballistic missiles.

I cannot help feeling that the discussion which took place last week, and part of the discussion at this time, is one of the greatest deterrents we shall have to real development. We discourage scientists. We discourage all those who are literally pouring out their life's blood in great scientific and ballistic efforts. They read in the papers that those who are speaking about it in the Senate are in effect condemning their efforts and saying their efforts are falling far behind the achievements of the Russians day by day. To me such criticism is one of the greatest deterrents to morale and real progress.

If the Senator will indulge me for just a moment, I should like to comment upon one of the real fields involved. I am not on the Armed Services Committee, but I have been a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for the last 4 years. During the last 6 or 8 months we have taken many hundreds of pages of testimony about the educational program.

I am happy to note that the conference committee has agreed upon an educational bill, which will be reported to us. In Walter Lippmann's column this morning, he said some things which have not been quoted. He said:

> There does not exist an agreed program of what the disagreeable remedies are. Mr. KENNEDY made a few suggestions but he offered no program, and although the Democratic opposition is very critical of President Eisenhower, there is no alternative Democratic program before the country.
>
> Why is it like that? I think it is because the real problem—the relatively greater speed of Soviet technological development—cannot be overcome by a spending program alone. It would be quite easy to push Congress into new and bigger expenditures. But what the experts call the missile lag is essentially a weakness in American education and a lack of seriousness in American national purposes, when there is choice between private pleasures and the public interest.

I do not think the problem has been stated more clearly anywhere in the United States. We are not doing for our

schoolchildren, in an educational way, what we should. The curricula are not as tough as they should be. Our teachers are not paid well enough. As a consequence we do not get competent teachers.

I hope the education bill will move somewhat in the direction of alleviating that problem, but the real help can only come from the thousands and thousands of individual school boards all over this country, as well as the parents, in an effort to improve the curricula for our schoolchildren, and see that our children study the subjects they should. When we do that we shall overcome the great lag which has been discussed.

I apologize to my friend for taking this time, but I feel very strongly about the matter.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What the Senator from Colorado has said is very true.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared on this matter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALLOTT

My illustrious colleague has brought to the attention of my distinguished colleagues what purports to be a weakness in our military strength during the years 1960–64. It has been asserted that this alleged weakness is caused by lagging efforts in the pursuit of our missile program. We hear much criticism of our missile program, but let's look at the facts.

Up to and including fiscal year 1953, about $3.5 billion had been provided for support of all our missile programs, with only a pitiful amount devoted to the ballistic missiles. In fact the total long-range ballistic missile effort for the 8-year period from 1945 to 1953 was on the order of a few million dollars. In the period from 1953 to 1959, this administration has devoted over $19 billion in support of the overall missile program, of which more than $5.5 billion has been devoted to the direct support of our critical ballistic missiles. These programs, their importance recognized, were placed on a crash basis. The Atlas program, which was barely started, had its development time scale cut to a third of the prior schedule from 1965 availability to availability in 1959. Additional missiles, the Titan ICBM and the IRBM's—Jupiter, Thor, Polaris—were all added to the program on a crash basis.

Many of my illustrious colleagues have shared with me the opportunity of keeping up to date through our committees on the progress of the missile programs. You have heard, for example, that the very important Polaris submarine program has been accelerated twice since its inception. I am confident that the Secretary of Defense will utilize the additional funds voted by Congress for a third acceleration of this program as soon as this can usefully be done.

Less than 3 years ago this country embarked on the development of IRBM's. Here again the operational availability dates have been advanced over those predicted at the start of the programs. Today we have demonstrated operational systems and deployment is imminent. This feat is being accomplished in less than half the time normally associated with the development of complicated weapon systems. I regret that I cannot mention our production rates for the IRBM's but they are rising rapidly.

Turning to ICBM's, we all heard just the other day of the successful Atlas test, a major milestone in this important program. Here, too, our production rate is rising. To say that the missile program is lagging at the present time is indeed an unworthy reflection on the splendid efforts of the thousands who are working long hours and struggling against time to meet our tight schedules. Let us give credit where credit is due—to the brilliant achievements of this corps of scientists, engineers, and workmen—and debit where debit is due—to those who were responsible for our late start.

According to these purported estimates the Russians will have hundreds of missiles from their production line while we will have only a relative few. The best estimates I have been able to obtain give them only a few months' lead time in the ICBM field, even with our late start, and I am not aware of any positive information which indicates that the Soviets are increasing this apparent edge. Let us ask ourselves then whether this purported estimate of their ICBM capability during the years 1960–64 is just another like the much publicized estimates of their Bison strength a few years ago. You may recall that we were told 2 years ago that they would have by now several times as many Bisons as we would have B–52's. Today, gentlemen, I am told we have several times as many B–52's as they have Bisons.

Let us not be stampeded by estimates based upon so much uncertainty, particularly as they obviously represent speculation in the absence of definite information. Such action is inappropriate to the great people we are. Rather, let us continue to trust and support our American scientists, engineers, and industry who are providing a Free World ballistic missile capability in less than half the time required by the Soviets and who are assuring the maintenance of a strong United States retaliatory capability.

THE McCLELLAN SUBSTITUTE FOR S. 654

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, it is surprising to me that there should be so much opposition to a proposal as simple and as obviously needed as that contained in the pending McClellan amendment which is, of course, of the same substance as H. R. 3 and of S. 337, of both of which I am a sponsor.

The purpose of this proposal, as has been amply explained in the recent debate, is to restore some potency to the 10th amendment to the Constitution and to give Congressional endorsement to a rule of interpretation which until recently had been generally accepted by the courts. We propose to say merely that Federal laws are supreme where they are in direct conflict with State laws or where Congress specifically has said its intention was to preempt the field, but that in the absence of these conditions the court has no right to assume that a Federal law on a subject automatically nullifies State laws on the same subject.

The need for this declaration has been made manifest by a recent series of Supreme Court decisions which have been listed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Organizations like the American Bar Association, the Organization of Chief Justices of State Courts, the National Association of State Attorneys General, and the Conference of Governors of the Forty-Eight States have endorsed H. R. 3, which is the McClellan substitute for S. 654.

The language of the proposal, as was brought out in yesterday's debate by the senior Senator from North Carolina, is based on language of a Supreme Court decision handed down in 1897 and affirmed many times since that date. It is not new or radical and there is no reason to anticipate that passage of this resolution would have an upsetting effect on any existing legislation except in areas where the courts, in pursuing certain allegedly social objectives have read into the laws of Congress an authority which was not intended and which is contrary to the spirit of the 10th amendment.

Therefore, Mr. President, I believe that businessmen need not be concerned over a possible unsettling of their established practices if the McClellan substitute or H. R. 3 becomes law. They will be in the same situation they have been in at least since 1897. But the States, which have laws of their own dealing with subversive activities, regulation of their own employees, operation of their schools, or protection of business enterprises, will be able to continue to enforce those laws as they always did until recently when the Supreme Court became a usurper of legislative power.

The Court itself, in my opinion, will profit by the mandate of Congress which this resolution would provide and will be encouraged to return to practices which will restore it to the prestige and the position in our Government which was intended by the authors of our Constitution.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope that the pending bill as altered by the McClellan amendment will be approved.

DEATH OF SEABORN L. DIGBY, FORMER MEMBER, FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, it was with deep personal regret that I learned of the passing Tuesday night of Judge Seaborn L. Digby. Judge Digby was a distinguished citizen of Louisiana. It was only last month that Judge Digby had declined an offer of reappointment as a member of the Federal Power Commission, choosing instead to return to his native State of Louisiana. His term expired on June 22 and he left Washington soon thereafter. A week ago he suffered a heart attack, and remained critically ill until stricken by a further attack which proved fatal yesterday.

Judge Digby was born on February 6, 1892, in Union Parish, La. He was educated in the public schools of Louisiana and attended Louisiana Institute of Technology briefly. Subsequently he graduated from Louisiana State University with a degree of bachelor of laws. He was admitted to the bar in 1916, and began the practice of law at Farmerville before being called into military service in 1918. Upon release from military service, he was appointed district attorney for the fourth judicial district of Louisiana to fill an unexpired term. In the same year he was elected and served a full term in this position.

In 1922 he was elected judge of this judicial district to fill an unexpired term. In 1924 he resumed the practice of law at Farmerville until 1929, at which time

he moved to Monroe. He served as city attorney from 1938 to 1948, at which time he was named commissioner of conservation. He served a 4-year term in that position, leaving the office in December 1952.

Judge Digby married Maude McLees, of Ruston, La., on May 27, 1920. He is now survived by his devoted wife and one son, James Foster.

Judge Digby was one of the most beloved of Louisianians who have served the Federal Government in Washington. He had the respect and admiration of all those who knew him well. He also had the respect of those with whom he came in contact in his official capacity as a member of the Federal Power Commission. During his entire term of office here I heard no single word of criticism, either of his performance of duties or of his personal life.

Judge and Mrs. Digby decided when they came to Washington in 1953 that they would return at the end of his term of office. I saw him on several occasions just before his return to Louisiana. He was truly resistant to "Potomac fever," and he returned to Louisiana without doubts as regards his course of action. It is for this reason that it seems especially cruel that he did not have the full opportunity of renewing his acquaintances and again taking up his life in his home State.

The State and the Nation have lost a fine public servant and citizen. At the same time, all of us can take pride in his accomplishments and contributions during his lifetime. Those of us who knew him well will feel his loss for a long time to come.

I am sure that all my colleagues share my regrets at his passing, and join me in extending condolences to his family.

ORDER THAT SENATOR FULBRIGHT BE RECOGNIZED FOLLOWING THE REMARKS OF SENATOR MARTIN OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] may be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RETIREMENT OF SENATOR MARTIN OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I cannot speak of leaving the United States Senate without deep emotion.

It reminds me of being mustered out of the United States Army or being separated from the service. I first had that experience in San Francisco in 1899, when I returned from Spanish-American War duty in the Philippines. The second time was at El Paso, Tex., after the Mexican Border campaign under that great soldier, General Pershing. The third was at Camp Dix, N. J., on my return from France at the end of World War I. And the fourth when I was stationed at Camp Hayes, Columbus, Ohio, during World War II.

At such times one feels glad to get out of the service. Men who had served together promise each other they will have frequent reunions. Unfortunately, in this uncertain life, it has never again been possible for the whole group to assemble. More than half of the fine men who were my army buddies have answered the last roll call. Taps have sounded over their honored graves.

In the 80th Congress, when I first had the honor of taking a seat in this Chamber, 16 other Republicans entered the Senate as freshman Members. That was the largest number in the history of this body.

They were Lodge, Massachusetts; Flanders, Vermont; Baldwin, Connecticut; Williams, Delaware; Ives, New York; Bricker, Ohio; Jenner, Indiana; Cooper, Kentucky; McCarthy, Wisconsin; Thye, Minnesota; Kem, Missouri; Ecton, Montana; Dworshak, Idaho; Watkins, Utah; Malone, Nevada; and Cain, of Washington.

I was the senior in point of years, and I am happy to have this opportunity to praise my colleagues of that freshman class as magnificient Americans who were sincere and patriotic in their dedication to the ideals of our country.

There were times when they differed in their approach to legislative problems, but all had the same objective—to advance the welfare of the United States and all its people.

One of this number, Joe McCarthy, has been called by his Creator to everlasting rest. In leaving the Senate, along with five others, I am wondering if we will ever again assemble on this earth. That, my friends, is in the hands of God.

I count myself most fortunate to have been close, in association and friendship, with all of our distinguished colleagues who are leaving this body.

RALPH FLANDERS is a stalwart New Englander who has high ideals and the courage to stand up for the principles to which he gives undeviating allegiance. As a fellow member of the Finance Committee, I have had the opportunity of noting his many splendid qualities. There is no doubt in my mind that he will continue to use his great talents in the future, as he has in the past, for the benefit of our country.

Long before I came to the Senate I knew ALEX SMITH and valued his friendship. We were State chairmen at the same time. We were both members of the Glenn Frank Commission. ALEX has come back into Pennsylvania to speak in my behalf when I was a candidate for public office and I have spoken for him in New Jersey. We have been brought closer together here in Washington by the affection which Mrs. Smith and Mrs. Martin have for each other. I know that he will continue to serve our country in his private life and that he will always be guided by the same patriotic motives which have shaped his distinguished career.

IRVING IVES came to the Senate with long legislative experience as one of the outstanding leaders in the New York State Assembly. Through his comprehensive knowledge of government and his deep concern for the good of all Americans he has made a great contribution to the American way of life. I am sure that he, too, will exert all the influence at his command for a better, happier America.

BILL JENNER, of Indiana, belongs to that fine group of Americans who are proud to be known as politicians. No man in this Senate has a more loyal following in his home State than Senator JENNER. He is a young man, and I sincerely hope that he will continue his public work because men of his type are so badly needed during these trying times.

BILL KNOWLAND comes from the great Pacific Coast. His people are firmly grounded in the soil of the Golden State. He has been a great leader and a hard worker. His word is his bond. His type of American statesmanship has made the United States Senate the outstanding legislative body of the world. California and the United States need BILL KNOWLAND.

I desire to thank the able and hard-working majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Texas, LYNDON JOHNSON, and the great minority leader, BILL KNOWLAND, whom I have already mentioned, for the many courtesies so generously extended to me on so many occasions.

I offer my special thanks and appreciation to one of the most distinguished Americans of our time, the chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate, HARRY BYRD.

I am proud that HARRY BYRD has been one of my fine friends in the Senate. He has a more profound knowledge of the intricacies of the Federal financial situation than any other American. I feel safe in saying that the solvency of our Nation and its economic security depend upon the ability, patriotism, and courage of men like HARRY BYRD who regard inflation and an unsound currency as a greater threat than atomic attack.

I want to pay tribute, also, to the great Senator from New Mexico, DENNIS CHAVEZ, who serves so ably and with such high regard for the national welfare as chairman of the Committee on Public Works. Under his fair and impartial leadership great things have been accomplished—great constructive public works projects that will be beneficial to all sections of our country far into the future.

I have in mind also the debt of gratitude which I owe to my colleagues of the Finance Committee and the Committee on Public Works for their patience, their helpfulness and their kindness to me at all times. It has been a real pleasure to work with such outstanding Americans.

In leaving the Senate, I do so in full appreciation of its great traditions. Here we are guided by carefully worked out rules of procedure. We are bound by certain unwritten laws and customs which really make the United States Senate the last free forum of debate in the world.

Here the right of a Member to express himself fully, without limitation on debate, is protected. Unlimited debate has frequently been criticized by Members of the Senate, and by many outside of this body. While unlimited debate has sometimes compelled me to be on duty the entire night, I feel that unlimited debate in the Senate has more arguments in favor of its rentention than against it.

I regret that sometimes there is a tendency in Congress, using the army expression, "to pass the buck." The Founding Fathers placed the legislative body first in our Constitution. For the greater good of our country it must remain first. I hope the Congress will never evade that great responsibility.

Mr. President, in conclusion and by way of farewell, I should like to read a prayer for our country, written by Gen. George Washington. I quote:

Almighty God, who has given us this good land for our heritage, we humbly beseech Thee that we may always prove ourselves a people mindful of Thy favor and glad to do Thy will.

Bless our land with honorable industry, sound learning, and pure manners.

Save us from violence, discord and confusion; from pride and arrogance, and from every evil way.

Defend our liberties, and fashion into one united people the multitudes brought out of many kindreds and tongues.

Endow with the spirit of wisdom those to whom, in Thy name, we entrust the authority of government, that there may be peace and justice at home, and that, through obedience to Thy law, we may show forth Thy praise among the nations of the earth.

In the time of prosperity fill our hearts with thankfullness, and in the day of trouble, suffer not our trust in Thee to fail; all of which we ask through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota and Mr. BUSH addressed the Chair.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I am glad to yield first to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It was my privilege some days ago to recite at some length some events in the life of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, who is leaving us at the conclusion of this term of office. I have worked with the Senator in the Committee on Public Works, and it has been a very great privilege.

I knew something of the Senator's devotion to the problems of the committee, and I knew something of the character of intelligence which the Senator is able to apply, but until I did some research as to his life in the years before he came to the Senate, I did not have a full appreciation of the very rich life of service which he has led through all the years—starting in the late 1890's, when, as a young man, he was a volunteer and served in the war against Spain, serving in the Philippines; and continuing with his career as a public official in the counties and the State of Pennsylvania, until he became Governor of that State, with a record unsurpassed by any. His military career, in which he started as a private, was signalized by the stars of a lieutenant general given to him some months ago. He was a major general when I met him in Louisiana many years ago.

The Senator's career has been remarkable. We shall miss ED MARTIN in the Senate. I really did not intend to speak at any such length as I have now, because I said so many things the other day, but I wanted to make one point.

Senator MARTIN, I say to you, it will be as impossible for you in the days ahead, after you have left the Senate of the United States, to fail to respond to the opportunities for service in your community, in your State, and in your Nation, as it has been in the past. You may no longer be serving as a Senator of the United States, but until the day you draw your last breath you will be serving the welfare of the people of the United States in whatever community and whatever capacity God, in His infinite wisdom, may place upon you.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I thank the distinguished Senator. I should like publicly to thank the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for the manner in which he has aided me in the Committee on Public Works. As Senators know, I am the senior Republican on both the Committee on Public Works and the Finance Committee. It has been necessary for me to turn over an enormous amount of work to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota in connection with my service on the Public Works Committee, and to the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] in connection with the work of the Committee on Finance. Both of them have given of their time unstintingly to aid me, and I am most appreciative.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BUSH. I have listened intently and with great interest to the comments of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania. He is a modest man. It is characteristic of him that at the time he is about to retire from the Senate he acclaims others for their great service to the Senate, with little regard for himself.

Those of us who have had the pleasure and privilege of serving with him, and to know him as a United States Senator and as a great American citizen, realize that this year the Senate will lose one of the finest, ablest, and greatest men ever to serve in this body.

The Senator from Pennsylvania has referred to his service on the Committee on Finance. In that capacity the Senator has repeatedly called the attention of the country and of the Senate, particularly, to the grave dangers which this country faces from an unsound dollar, or, to put it another way, from inflation.

It will be impossible for the Republican side of the Senate to replace him on the Committee on Finance with anyone who believes so sincerely in the dangers of inflation, or who knows more about what we should do to combat that evil. We are losing a bulwark of great strength when the Senator from Pennsylvania retires from the Committee on Finance.

Likewise, as the senior Republican on the Committee on Public Works, his service has been outstanding, and at times brilliant. I say that as one who has had the privilege for 4 years of serving on that committee with him, from the time when we first took up the new interstate and defense system of highways.

The Senator was one of those whose foresight—gained partly from his military experience and partly from his experience as Governor of Pennsylvania, as well as United States Senator—enabled him fully to understand the necessity for the establishment of that great new system of interstate highways.

It is a pleasure for me to congratulate the Senator today on his numerous accomplishments in so many fields, and to say to him that we hope we shall see him often back here when he comes to visit us in the years ahead.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I greatly appreciate the very kind words of the distinguished and able Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ERVIN. The able and distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania occupies a very warm spot in my heart. He was the first Member of the Senate to welcome me when I came to this body, and I shall always treasure the recollection of that great courtesy.

The senior Senator from Pennsylvania will carry with him from this body the admiration and affection of all his colleagues on both sides of the aisle. He will leave behind him—as he has left behind him in all his previous public service—a magnificent record which exemplifies in the highest degree the great courage which he showed on the battlefield as a soldier in several wars.

In my judgment it is a great loss to the United States for the senior Senator from Pennsylvania to retire. His service has always been characterized by high intelligence, by the greatest degree of fairness, and by the greatest degree of both moral and spiritual courage.

It is with much regret that I see the Senator retire. I wish him Godspeed during many years ahead.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I thank the distinguished Senator very much for his very kind and generous remarks.

In closing, I wish to thank all Senators who have spoken so kindly of me. Also I wish to thank all the Members of this body, on both sides of the aisle, for their universal courtesy, kindness, and helpfulness.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have listened to the fine encomiums about the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, and I agree with all of them. I said on a previous occasion that I had heard of the General but never knew him until he came to the Senate. I expected to see a man who was scarred and hardened by his military experience through the years. Instead, I find him, as has been stated, a modest and very convincing speaker, one to whom the Senate listens when he speaks. He and his dear wife I found to be very friendly souls. Life has given them many trials, but they have not taken

the thorns; they have picked the roses. Furthermore, they have reflected to others what they have learned on life's highways—friendliness, affection, love of country, fidelity, duty, and friendship. We are not saying goodbye to the Senator from Pennsylvania. We shall see him often. And as the Germans in Pennsylvania say, it is "auf wiedersehen."

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator very much for his very kind remarks.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I wish to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania. During the years I have been privileged to serve in the Senate with him, his sterling Americanism and his dedication to the service of his country and his fellow men have been a real inspiration. I know he has well earned the leisure he has earned, which I sincerely hope he and Mrs. Martin will enjoy to the fullest extent. I am sure also that he will continue to take a profound interest in preserving this Republic of ours and in promoting the security and the welfare of our country.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I thank very sincerely my distinguished colleague from Idaho. We came to the Senate at the same time, and I am sure our friendship and admiration for each other have increased through the years.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Senator on the very fine statement he has made. I assure him that the sentiments of his colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle are equally shared by his colleagues on this side of the aisle. He has been extremely courteous, helpful, and polite to all of us on our committees and on the floor of the Senate. While sometimes we have disagreed, the Senator has always been fair and frank and has always held the interests of this Nation first and foremost. We have all respected him and admired him for that, and our good wishes on this side of the aisle are every bit as strong as those of his Republican colleagues.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the pleasant remarks of the Senator from Louisiana. Our work on the Finance Committee has been very helpful to me, and I sincerely trust I made just a small contribution in the difficult work of that committee.

THE CHARACTER OF PRESENT-DAY AMERICAN LIFE, ITS ORDER OF VALUES, AND ITS SENSE OF PURPOSE AND DIRECTION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I beg the indulgence of the Senate if I do not speak loud enough to be heard throughout the Chamber; my voice has not fully recovered.

We are in the last hours of the 85th Congress. Much has been done here since we met in January of this year. Much remains to be done before we clear our desks—and perhaps our consciences—and go our several ways. For the constructive work that has been done and will still be done, all praise is due to the distinguished leader of this Chamber. Praise is also due to those who have had a part in winnowing the wheat from the chaff, so that things alien to the public interest were not allowed to pass through the legislative mill.

But if I now ask for a brief portion of the Senate's time when I know that time is running out, my apology is the subject to which I wish to address myself. It does not lie in any specific field of legislation, but rather the other way around. Rather it forms the field from which any legislation, good or bad, or any executive act, good or bad, ultimately draws its own form and substance. For my subject is the character of present-day American life—its order of values, and its sense of purpose and direction—if any.

The focal point of our present-day concern is quite naturally the foreign policy of the Nation. On August 6, last, I had read for me in the Senate some remarks I had prepared on that general subject. My points of emphasis were two. First, I suggested that we were inviting disaster if after every failure of our foreign policy, we laid the blame solely at the door of the Soviet Union. Second, I suggested that only by looking at and correcting our own shortcomings in our relationship with the rest of the world, could we hope to avoid a twin evil. One evil was that we might blunder into a catastrophic war. The other evil was, that America would find itself isolated against its own will from the rest of the world, because the rest of the world no longer trusted us.

With respect to all this, I said that the President and the Congress share the responsibility for what went wrong in past matters of foreign policy; and that they have an equal responsibility to set matters right for the future. Still, the President and the Congress—any President and any Congress—are not instruments which live and work in a closed circuit, in a political and social vacuum. Rather they rise from the people, get their title of office from the people, are responsible to the people, are constantly advised by the people, and are subject to periodic review by the people.

This, in turn, in the final analysis, means one thing; it means that except within the limits of certain discretionary powers allowed the President and the Congress, what is done or not done by them is directly related to what the people want them to do or will not allow them to do.

It is part of our litany in public life to say that the people speak with the voice of God. I do not question that. Much less do I question the institutions and practices of democracy that draw their vitality from that principle. But I would feel myself a toadying sycophant if I did not speak one plain truth. It is that the people, for some years now, have spoken with the voice of a false god—and it is a voice which has impressed itself on what government itself has been doing during this period. If things have gone wrong, the people are not without blame in the matter.

The last thing that can be said about our foreign policy in the last few years is, that it was not what the people wanted. Of course they wanted it. And what they got was exactly what they wanted—a foreign policy on the cheap, featuring a pact here, a doctrine there, and a shipment of a few guns everywhere.

The people wanted to believe that after years of cold-war strain, they were at liberty to stop thinking any more. They wanted to believe that after years of cold war sacrifice, they could bask in the artificial sunlight of a government which did not bother them with serious things. They wanted to believe that in a world full of menace, the way to get out of the line of danger was to have a government which used such energy as it had to the end that everything should stand still. And if things somehow refused to stand still, then the thing to do was to lasso what was in motion by tossing out another attitude, or another platitude.

Can anyone in this Chamber deny this? Can anyone here deny that the distinguishing feature of American society during much of the decade of the 1950's was its weakness for the easy way? Can anyone deny that in this period, we were the opposite to what our Founding Fathers had in mind for the new America?

The Founding Fathers said—and here I quote the first paragraph of the Federalist Papers:

> It seems to have been reserved to the people of this country, by their conduct and example, to decide the important question, whether societies of men are really capable of establishing good government from reflection and choice, or whether they are forever destined to depend for their constitutions on accident and force.

But I ask now: What show of reflection and choice was there in much of the decade of the 1950's when the word "egghead" became a word of abuse; when education was neglected; when intellectual excellence became a cause for suspicion; when the man in public life, or the writer, or the teacher, who dared articulate an original thought risked being accused of subversion. What show of reflection and choice was there in this period when the man of distinction was the man who had a station wagon, a second car plated with chrome, a swimming pool, a tax-free expense account, and a 21-inch color television set with the 36-inch star on its screen?

It was precisely because there was so little reflection and choice in this period, that what we got in our Government was a Government which entrusted the highest interests of state to the play of accident and force. For whenever we brought ourselves to do anything at all about a crisis that exploded before our astonished eyes, we almost automatically reached for bigger bombs and bigger bombers.

Mr. President, I am not opposed to bombers. But neither do I want SAC to become a nuclear version of the Maginot line. Yet that is what it is likely to become if the only thing we can think to do after each crisis, is to order some more arms—and then go to sleep

on the arms. And that is what SAC is tending to become when after every crisis, our highest officers of state, without regard to their own responsibilities to speak plain truths, tell the people that the crisis was really just the passing shadow of a mirage—knowing that that is what the people want to think.

A frightening historical parallel has occurred to me with increasing frequency in recent weeks. Fifteen or sixteen centuries ago, the Roman Empire was all-powerful, rich, successful—and also complacent. Neither the Roman emperors nor the Roman senate could bring themselves to be overly concerned with the crude and boorish people to the north. Emperors were judged by the public entertainment they arranged, and the wealth and substance of the empire were dissipated in lavish consumption. When anyone was so inconsiderate as to call attention to the gathering clouds on the horizon, he was denounced as a prophet of gloom and doom and purged for un-Roman activity. In 1958, the critic is charged with selling America short.

This picture is admittedly oversimplified. But in broad outline it is pertinent and valid. The fall of great civilizations runs a well-defined course. On the outside, the civilization has a hard, shining surface, full of glitter and superficial accomplishment. But inside the outer shell, invisible decay does its work. And the hard shell collapses on the empty center when that civilization collides with a challenge it no longer has the power to meet, because it was indifferent to the challenge too long.

I do not believe that we Americans are incapable of meeting the challenge of the Soviet Union and of the nationalistic revolution going on in Asia and Africa. But I say in all seriousness that we do not have much time left in which to shed our indifference and do something about it.

There is some slight ground for encouragement in the initiative which the President took in his speech before the United Nations General Assembly on August 13. I hope this will not be another flash in the pan. I hope it does not run the familiar course of the big buildup, followed by the big letdown. I hope the President's words—which are not self-executing—will be followed up relentlessly and imaginatively by action.

But in any event, much more sweeping changes need to be made, not alone in our foreign policy; but more difficult still, in our scale of social and cultural values. I say "more difficult" because social and cultural values are not reducible to sticks and stones which can be milled to one shape or another. Social and cultural values arise from habits of the heart and mind; and if there is to be a revision in them, the revision must go on in the privacy of every American's thoughts. If that kind of revision does not occur, I doubt if the necessary revision in our foreign policy, if and when it is made, can be long sustained.

Until we do revise our sense of values, we will never think we can afford to do the things which, in my judgment, we must do if we are to survive as a free nation.

Is it not ridiculous, Mr. President, that we place a higher economic value on driving a truck than on teaching school?

Is it not out of all proportion that we accord greater social prestige to a rock and roll singer than to a philosopher?

We are constantly told we cannot afford a good public school system, but we could have a very good one if we diverted to education even a fraction of what we spend on all manner of amusement and luxury. The only logical inference to be drawn from this fact is that we, as a people, would rather have the luxuries than the schools. Now, surely, Mr. President, this is getting things upside down. We are treating luxuries as necessities, and necessities as luxuries. And the irony of it is that we are not really confronted with this kind of choice. We are rich enough to have our cake and eat it too. But we have become so greedy, we want it alamode.

So, Mr. President, I say we have got to revise our scale of values. We have got to return to a reasonable sense of what is really important, as distinguished from what is merely desirable. Fundamental to this process is a change in public attitudes toward public figures. We hear a great deal in the Senate, Mr. President, about our heavy responsibilities as Senators and about the grave importance of the decisions which we make. This is all true. But I daresay there is not a Member of this body who has not heard the word "politician" used as an epithet. I daresay that there are few Members of this body who do not envy the happier standing that Mickey Mantle or Bob Hope enjoys in the Nation.

I am not being critical of Mr. Mantle, who is an estimable young man and who performs valuable services for his employers. I am simply saying that something has got to be done to bring things back into proper perspective. Some way must be found to increase public understanding of public affairs, and to develop a sense of values appropriate to the problems and decisions which confront our people.

I am frank to admit that I have no quick or easy solution to offer. There may be no solution at all. But if there is, it lies, I think, in long-term efforts in the field of education and not in superficial public relations campaigns masterminded from Madison Avenue.

Yet one of the most discouraging events of this session of Congress has been its action in regard to education. When sputnik made it dazzlingly clear that we were falling behind the Russians in at least some fields of technology, our reaction was to pass an education bill designed to take a few feeble steps toward producing more scientists and improving the teaching of languages. Now, Heaven knows this needs to be done. I voted for it. But I suggest this is another instance in which our priorities are somewhat askew.

As badly as we need scientists and linguists, we even more badly need people who are capable of evaluating the work of the scientists and of making the enormously complicated decisions—which are essentially political decisions—that are called for if we are to adjust our policies and our life to our scientific progress. The age of the amateur is over. We can no longer look to our household experiences, or to commonsense knowledge if we are to pass good judgments on the new kind of life-and-death political-scientific questions which have become the leading questions of modern government. In addition to commonsense, we need exact knowledge, which we can come by only through hard study shared in by everyone. In short, we need to become a nation of statesmen-scientists—just as much as we need atomic scientists. Unless we become a nation of statesmen-scientists, we can kiss goodby our whole traditional constitutional system for responsible power. It will be done for because only a handful of experts will make decisions for the rest of us, and we will have no exact basis for knowing whether they decided well.

It is as plain as can be that we, all of us, must either become far more knowledgeable about the world on the one hand, or revise our constitutional system on the other hand, if we are to meet successfully the kind of challenge we are now being subjected to by the Russians.

Now, Mr. President, I suppose I will be criticized for having said all this. There are those who react almost instinctively to any suggestion that we are not living in the best of all possible worlds. There will doubtless be those who think it is politically unwise to extend criticism of this kind to American society itself.

I must respectfully disagree. I think the American people can take it. Further, I think increasing numbers of them are beginning to realize they deserve it.

We have lately heard a great deal about the nuclear gap between the United States and the Soviet Union. I suggest that an equally serious gap is that which exists between the profession and the practice of the tenets of freedom in this country. We have covered over this gap with the smug complacency of the ever-easier life, with a desperate pursuit of material success, and with a moratorium on creative thinking. We have bridged this gap with an unspoken demand for rigid conformity, with an excess of self-righteous moralizing. We have covered it over with boisterous but, at heart, terrified, clinging to what is left of our technological superiority, as though it will, by some supernatural power, save us from the forces of darkness which are closing in on the world.

I remind the Senate that the influence of this country was never greater in the hearts of men throughout the world, nor the power of the words of its leaders to move men more potent, that when it had no machines or technological capacities to speak of. It was never greater than when its leaders for the most part, were deeply religious men, when life was not easy but very hard, when men were judged more by what they were than by what they had, by what they contributed of their thoughts and heart and labor to the community rather than by what they were able to get from the community, when new ideas were as welcome as new peoples to these shores.

What I am suggesting, Mr. President, is that the problem is larger than what

has gone wrong with our policies. Even more fundamental, it is what has gone wrong with our society.

We shall get policies which are attuned to the sweep of history and the ever-changing world in which we live, if Americans are reawakened, as they must be reawakened, to the larger meaning of the United States and its role in the destiny of mankind. We shall get political leaders and officials to administer these policies if Americans cease, as they must cease, to put a premium on the petty, the boisterous, the insensitive, and the fearful.

One may well ask, Mr. President, why Americans have been so long in asserting these demands for change. I do not know why, but I do know these demands will not be much longer in coming. Those of us who presume to lead, not only in Government but in education, in public information, and in all the institutions of American life must bear a major responsibility for the delay. For too long, we went along with the prevailing tides of know-nothingism. For too long, we accepted these tides, either willingly or with a sullen sense of inevitability, for fear of rocking ourselves, if not of rocking the boat.

We have gone through periods like this before in our national history, Mr. President. The decades of the 1920's and of the 1870's come readily to mind. In each case, we eventually came to our senses, went to work, and corrected a good deal of what had been wrong. Our situation is now more serious because the threat is more dangerous. Although we can take some comfort from history, we make a tragic—perhaps a fatal—mistake if we assume the inevitability of American national survival.

It is time, Mr. President, to cease going along as usual. It is time to test the slogans and the shibboleths by which we have lived this past decade, both in our relations with others and with ourselves. It is time to test them in the fires of free and open and honest discussion. Perhaps then, Mr. President, we shall get an answer to what is wrong in our foreign policy. Even more important, perhaps, we shall get an answer to what is wrong in our own national house.

I am not entirely without hope that this can be done. There are some signs that the American people are rousing themselves from the luxurious torpor which has afflicted them in recent years. All I can say is that it is high time. We have already turned off the alarm several times, and reset it for a later hour. We dare not do that again.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not intend to ask the Senator from Arkansas any questions, in the light of the usual brilliant address he has made to the Senate on the subject of foreign policy.

However, I fully agree with his comparison of the present-day United States with the last days of the old Roman Empire. We all recall, for example, that when the legions went up to the Rhine, in the beginning they went up alone, with only their battle equipment. But as the Roman Empire became rich and accustomed to more luxurious living, soon the legions brought with them the attributes of civilization, including their wives and children. The result was that, when the showdown came, the legions were vanquished, and the Germans and their allies took over.

A similar situation exists so far as American forces stationed in various parts of the world are concerned. They have the accouterments to which they are accustomed while at home. I hope the similarity will not be carried to the extreme.

The Senator has spoken about speeches being made, but nothing being done to carry through what was advocated in the speeches. I think he has raised a good point. For example, all of us are aware of the magnificent speech made by the President of the United States at the United Nations last week. He spoke about the unstable condition in the Middle East. It was an excellent speech. But the question now is, What will the follow through be?

As the Senator from Arkansas has asked, Are we to rest on that speech? Or will we do the things which must follow the procedures outlined with respect to a certain proposition or policy in that operation?

The Senator has also said that if anyone—and I am sure he was talking about the Senate—says something about defining a sense of values, he is immediately accused of selling America short. It is easy to use a phrase of that kind, but it takes brainpower, hard work, and courage to face up to the realities of our weaknesses.

I commend the Senator from Arkansas and all other Senators who have taken the floor in recent weeks to try to point out the weaknesses of our country, and to try, as best they knew how, as persons not charged with the responsibility of conducting our foreign policy, to make suggestions which will help to rectify the terrible, the difficult, the weakened position in which we find ourselves.

I again commend the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator from Montana for his comments. I particularly appreciate his reference to those who have criticized. They certainly have not criticized merely in a quarrelsome or partisan spirit. Their whole purpose has been to try to find some means of improving the deficiencies which I believe all of us realize exist.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I congratulate the Senator from Arkansas on the address he has made this afternoon. I followed it closely as he presented it.

I think he has called attention to one of the most serious dangers we face, namely, public attitudes. I associate myself, positively, with the Senator in his statement that we must revise our scale of values, that a way must be found to increase public understanding of public affairs, and that there must be a development of a sense of values appropriate to the problems and decisions which confront our people.

The Senator has pointed that up by saying that we place a higher economic value on the driving of a truck than we do on teaching school. While the Senator confesses that he does not know for certain what the answer to the question is—and it is a very reasonable, modest, and appropriate suggestion—he does offer the thought, in which I concur, that in the field of education perhaps we need more enlightenment, more public understanding, then we do in any other field. In the field of education, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas has been outstanding in his life, particularly as a Senator. I think the programs which he has sponsored in the Senate in the field of education have done much to improve the relations of the United States with other countries, particularly those countries who are our friends, and some who are perhaps not so friendly.

Again, I congratulate my good friend from Arkansas upon his splendid address. I hope it will be read by all Senators and will be widely read throughout the United States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks. With regard to education, I have always remembered—although most persons tend to forget it—that the Senate on 2 occasions specifically, and perhaps on others, but on 2 noteworthy occasions, has passed very good bills in the field of domestic education. However, it has never been possible to have them passed in the other body.

So while I am critical of what we have not done, I certainly do not mean the criticism to apply directly to this body, although I think we might have made some further efforts. But the failure has not been primarily our fault. The other body has certainly contributed to the neglect by Congress of education. The Senator from Connecticut, with his background at Yale and his other activities, is fully conscious of that. He has certainly done his part to improve education.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. I did not hear the speech of the able Senator from Arkansas. I did hear a little of what the Senator from Montana said. Being the author of the slogan that we should not sell the United States short, I presume the Senator from Montana had reference to what I have said in the past on that subject.

Although I did not hear the speech of the Senator from Arkansas, I certainly agree with that portion to which the able Senator from Connecticut just referred.

Inasmuch as the Senator from Montana has identified me as being the author of the slogan that we should not sell the United States short, I again reiterate my belief, my sincere, conscientious, honest belief, that I think we ought to criticize the United States. In fact, when we in the Senate criticize the United States, we are really criticizing ourselves, because both branches of Congress make policy. We appropriate money. If there are any weaknesses, we

ought to accept the responsibility for them. I have no objection to our doing that.

My objection is simply to the statements which are made in the Senate that we have lost face throughout the world; that the people of the world have lost confidence in us.

Is there any reason why they should not lose confidence in us, when very seldom a speech is made or comments are made pointing out our strength, our goodness, and the many fine things which we do? My observation has been that too often the opposite is the case.

We constantly talk about the things which are wrong with the United States. I listened this afternoon to the colloquy between the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. The Senator from Missouri raised six points as to which he questioned the Senator from Massachusetts very sharply, especially as to whether Russia was not superior to or ahead of the United States in the different fields he mentioned. He was attempting to prove statements which other persons had made over the years.

That is the sort of thing to which I object. I should like to hear Senators, who are capable of doing it, say good things about our defense and good things about the United States, and praise the Nation, because there is much to be said in praise of our defenses.

I believe our Nation is stronger than Russia. I base that belief upon study and observation. I was in Russia last year. I do not believe the world will permit us to be its leader or will have the respect it should have for us if we never have any kind things to say about the United States, if we never have anything good to say about the strength of the United States, but if, instead, our officials constantly state that the United States is always wrong and that the other nations are always right.

That is why I used the phrase "sell the United States short." I say to Senators, in all fairness, that I do not believe they wish to leave that impression in the world. But certainly the leaders of the Soviet Union are the world's greatest propagandists; and they repeat to the people of Russia what Senators and other high officials of our Government say.

It is one thing for a man on the street, so to speak, to make a statement; it is one thing for an editor to make a statement in an editorial published in his newspaper; but it is quite another thing for a Senator or a Member of the House of Representatives or a governor to make a critical statement. If a high official of our Government makes such a statement, the people have a right to believe that the statement is based on fact. Furthermore, the Russians use such statements by high officials of our Government to propagandize the Russian people and the peoples of the other countries of the world. That is the basis of the complaint I am making.

Certainly we should improve; there is no question of that.

On the other hand, Mr. President, when able Senators criticize—as many of them have been doing—they really are criticizing themselves, as Members of the Congress. Both political parties have had responsibility for the running of the Government during the last 26 years, since our Nation has been involved in the leadership of world affairs. So I believe the time has come when we shall have to lead from the positive, instead of from the negative or from weakness.

I hope no Senator will take personally what I have said, any more than I take personally what other Senators say.

But if Senators are to be effective, certainly they must "get hard," so to speak, and must be frank. I do not question the honesty or integrity of those who make critical statements, which I believe are proper to be made if they are coupled with praise and with saying good things about the United States. That is my position. I make no apologies for taking it. I sincerely feel that I am correct. I am not trying to limit criticism or debate. I simply say that, in my best judgment, Senators should begin to praise the United States and to point out its areas of strength, as well as its areas of weakness.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JORDAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In response to what the Senator from Indiana has stated, I wish to say that no one questions either the sincerity or the patriotism of the Senator from Indiana. But when some of us criticize and at the same time try to be constructive—although whether we succeed in doing so can be told only with the passage of time—we do not like to be accused, either directly or indirectly, of "selling the country short."

I am sure the Senator from Indiana stands for the constructive approach, and I am sure he knows that no Member of Congress would do anything to "sell America short."

But someone has to do something—as the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has been doing this afternoon, and as other Senators have done before he spoke—to try to point out the existing facts of life, to try to take the sugar coating off the cake, to try to expose the picture for what it is.

We learn from holy writ that "the truth will make you free." I believe that is a correct statement as applied to our Nation; because if we wake up in time to do the things which need to be done in the fields of education, and so forth I believe we shall take effective steps, as good citizens, to promote the welfare of the Nation.

Mr. CAPEHART. I agree that we should point out both our strengths and our weaknesses.

But my complaint is that some Senators do not couple critical statements with statements about the strength of the Nation and the good things it does. However, I believe that the people of other countries should be able to read, in the statements Senators make on the floor of the Senate, about the good things our Nation does and about its strength.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I certainly agree with the Senator from Indiana—and this point was brought out clearly in the speech made by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]—that if there is any blame, it must be shared here on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, let me say just a word in response to the comment which has been made by the Senator from Indiana.

I believe what has been accomplished in our country speaks for itself. I do not believe it would be proper or appropriate for us to prate, from time to time, here on the floor of the Senate, about the accomplishments of our country. To do so would serve no good purpose that I can think of.

The purpose of the speeches we make is to find ways to improve the Nation's policies and procedures, including its educational system.

Certainly, I do not think the educational system of our country is the worst in the world. There are many good things which I can say about it. But I do not believe our educational system is as good as it should be, or is as good as the demands upon us require.

The conditions now existing in the world require a far greater knowledge and understanding of scientific matters, international relations, and political matters, than was the case in the old days. At the time of Thomas Jefferson, education was restricted to a very few persons, who ran the country; and the people of that day had no idea of the type of mass education that is being undertaken today in the United States.

But I am convinced that the quality of our education has suffered as a result of the effort to educate everyone, and also because we have not devoted to education the resources required by it. So I say our educational system is deficient.

I say that simply because I know of no other way to arouse sufficient interest—although I may say that the interest aroused thus far has not been very successful, as far as the desired result is concerned. Certainly it would not promote the attainment of that objective to say, each day, "our educational system is fine, and needs no improvement, and nothing needs to be done about it."

I believe the Senator from Indiana misinterpreted the comments I made about existing conditions. I have never intended to convey the impression that we are not as strong as Russia or that we are less strong. It seems to me that such considerations are irrelevant. I do not know whether we have as many ICBM's as the Russians have now, or as many as the Russians will have next year or the following year. My feeling is that if we have enough to do what we are told we need to be able to do—that is to seriously, if not fatally, destroy the Russian community—then that is enough. I do not know whether we have more than enough. However, that is not the comparison I was trying to make; and I do not believe that the relative strengths—certainly, not the relative physical strengths—of the United States

and Russia are the primary consideration.

I happen to believe that the probability of a military showdown with Russia is rather remote. I do not think either country—our leaders or the Russian leaders—wish to indulge in an all-out war. I think it is in the other field that there is an all-out war—a cold war which is getting hotter every day—and it is that war which I have particularly in mind. Diplomatic relations, trade, understanding of trade, how we treat other countries, how we keep them in sympathy with the purposes of the West, our relations with our own western allies are all matters which make for strength in the nonmilitary area. It is in an area particularly to which I have tried to direct my remarks. My remarks relate to the cold war, if one wishes to call it that—the nonmilitary struggle with the Russians. I am convinced we are not doing all we ought to do in that field; that not only are we failing to gain ground, but that we are not even holding our own relative position.

I do not wish to make this a partisan matter. I would certainly be willing at the proper time, or at any time, to admit weaknesses on the part of the preceding administration. Neither administration has done this job properly. I may say I often critized the preceding administration, if the Senator will remember. I do not think the matter has anything to do with partisanship. It is merely a question of trying to develop policies on the part of this country which will improve the conduct of our foreign relations. I mean not only political relations, but economic, social, and cultural—all the activities which would strengthen this country, and strengthen it not merely in the way of making it a little stronger than Russia, but strengthen it absolutely.

Mr. President, I am ready to yield the floor——

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I may say to the Senator I was privileged to listen to his speech. I also had read it. I think it contains some thought-provoking material. I wish to comment briefly about it, and then ask a few questions.

I agree fully, on the subject of complacency, that it is our obligation not only to see to it that we in the Senate are not complacent, that is, ignorant of the changed world in which we live, and the world changing from day to day, but it should be our intention to make sure our people do not fall into a complacent notion. I think in that respect the speech of the Senator from Arkansas is a very challenging one.

The Senator referred to the matter of education. The Senator stated, with respect to that matter, the President and the Congress share the responsibility for what went wrong in past matters of foreign policy, and that they have an equal responsibility. The Senator said that the people are also to blame.

I should like to try to get a little light on the statement, because I think our foreign policy is to a large extent made by what foreigners do. In other words, without becoming particular, let us assume country X should, in the interest of America, do certain things, but as a result of certain events, action on our part is precipitated. In that respect I think possibly something the Senator from Indiana has said has some merit.

During the Roosevelt administration I felt, and during this administration I have felt, that when certain events in foreign countries occur over which we have no control, all at once action on our part is required. In view of the light that we have, the Executive, which spearheads our foreign relations, then and there, takes certain action. It is not the Executive; it is not the Congress; it is the foreigners who have created the situation which requires action on our part.

We may differ on what the action should be. If that is what the Senator has in mind, he should be more specific and say what he would have done if he had been President, or what the Congress should have done that it did not do. However, I think that, by and large, the people are a little wiser than we are. That is why they are backing the President. They sense what the situation is.

Let us consider the situation in the United Nations right now. I think the Senator from Arkansas has made some remarks about it. Who created that situation in the United Nations? Did we create it, or did the Kremlin, or the Arab countries, create it? Events took place which required action on our part. The question is, What action should we take? What should the President do? If the action he takes does not work out well, is he to blame? No; it is the same as handling a crazy mule that will not listen to reason. Certain nations will not listen to our reasoning. Are we to blame if a group which wants to assassinate will not listen to our philosophy and will not listen to what we want? Are we to blame, or are they to blame?

In that respect, I think it is fair to say that neither the President nor the Congress is to blame. It is the kicking mule that is to blame. If we cannot control the mule—referring to a certain nation as a mule—are we to blame? I would say no.

Ever since the end of the last World War we have kept the world from getting into another world war. In that respect, over and above every other consideration, it seems to me our foreign policy has been successful.

I should like to have a comment from the Senator from Arkansas in relation to the statement about scientific education. He made a very fine speech.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator from Wisconsin, may I say that one of the points I was seeking to make about education, with regard to science, is that while I favored the bill we passed, I think we should not restrict the program to scientific training and to languages. That would be a mistake. Ways must be found to accomplish a broader purpose. I like the way the Senate acted in 1947 and 1948 when it passed bills to assist basic education—elementary and secondary education in general.

On the other point, when the Senator talked about the responsibility of the people, I must say I cannot go along with his idea that all of the trouble in the Middle East or anyplace else comes about because of some other nation acting like a mule. I think there are very important forces in the Middle East—nationalism, if we want to call it that, or pan-Arabism—which exist, have existed, and which will be in existence for a long time. These forces result in substantial changes, as a result of which this country must take action. We have been tempted to either ignore or misinterpret or misunderstand the situation, up until recently. There is some sign, within the last month or two, that our leaders are beginning to realize the real facts in the Middle East.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. What I had in mind in making the analogy with respect to the mule is that we know that in the Middle East there is a difference in religion, which creates very deep schisms. We also know there is a difference in nationalities, which contributes to schismatic conditions. We also know that Arab nationalism has come into being, which is a schismatic condition. We know that the Kremlin is seeking to stir up trouble, to take over the oil of the Mideast, and to gain a pathway to Africa. We have had little or nothing to do with those things. The problem is presented. When the problem is presented by others I do not think we can say, as it has often been said, that we are to blame. That is my position.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it it always a pleasure to listen to the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas talk about problems with respect to other nations, which is a subject on which the Senator is at least as well versed as any other Member of the Senate.

Mr. President, most of my presentations on this matter have to do with the military aspect, because I am not a member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and am a member of Armed Services.

As my able friend from Arkansas so well stated, there are many deficiencies in categories other than the military field, as we consider the relationships of our country with other countries.

Our psychological warfare, for instance, is inadequate for the job to be done.

On the economic side, the talk made by the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency before the United States Chamber of Commerce last April 28 was one of the most interesting presentations of the problem made to date. Fifteen years ago the Nazi armies were 1,000 miles inside Russia. Nevertheless, that country has recovered to the point where according to Mr. Dulles in that talk, the

combined steel production of the Sino-Soviet alliance in the first quarter of 1958 exceeded the total steel production of the United States.

Think of that. We all know that steel production is the base of any industrial complex in a modern economy.

The distinguished Senator from Arkansas pointed out the grave problems incident to education and our planning in that field. I could not agree more with his position on that vital subject. After the present Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and many other experts in the military field came back from a trip to Russia 2 years ago last June, I made a point of asking each member of that group what impressed them most in Russia. Some of these men were engineers; many of them were fliers. But all were military men whose prime interest was not education.

I made a point of asking all those men what impressed them most in Russia. Without exception every member of the military group stated that what impressed them most in the Soviet Union was the degree of effort being made to educate the youth especially as compared with what we were doing in this country.

Mr. President, once again the very able and articulate Senator from Arkansas has pointed out that, in addition to our military defense, there is a great deal more we must do if we are going to successfully wage the peace. I commend and congratulate him.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief statement?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I commend the Senator from Arkansas for his very objective and timely analysis of the problem which confronts our country.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator has struck upon points which might bring adverse comment to him, but he has done so without fear.

I also subscribe to the thought that our country, over and above everything else, must be strong from a defensive standpoint to cope with whatever problem might be foisted upon us. I think secondly, however, that when we speak of education we should have primarily in mind the development of a character in our American youth which will make them fit to exercise those great prerogatives which exist for a free people in a democracy.

On the bottom of page 3 of the Senator's statement these words appear:

> Fifteen or sixteen centuries ago, the Roman Empire was all-powerful, rich, successful—and also complacent. Neither the Roman emperors nor the Roman senate could bring themselves to be overly concerned with the crude and * * * entertainment they arranged, and the wealth and substance——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is a line missing from the mimeographed copy of the speech, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There is a line missing?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The thought is contained in the statement.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The missing line is in my remarks.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It continues:

> The wealth and substance of the empire were dissipated in lavish consumption.

Let us apply that thought to our country. In Rome, the story was "Circuses and cake." Debauchery, dissipation, dancing, song, and wine were the prime thoughts of the people of Rome.

There lived beyond the Rhine a barbaric race, the Germans. They were described as being without education, barbarians who were not at all familiar with the things that meant civilization in the fourth and fifth centuries. But someone came from beyond the Rhine and said, "The people whom we describe as barbarians respect their women. They work. Their word is as good as their bond."

Those were the barbarians across the Rhine. Suddenly it came to pass that those barbarians met the Romans in battle; and the quality of work, the quality of integrity, devotion to womanhood and family reflected itself in the vigor of the defense which they made in battle.

In my judgment, education means the development of character. Let us take a look at what Congress is doing with respect to the development of character. We urge appropriations for defense and for foreign aid. I subscribe to them, because I believe that over and above anything else we must make certain that our country will not become a captive of the Soviet Union.

At the same time, out of this Congress, week after week legislation is emerging telling the people of the United States, "Luxury is your assignment in this world. Dance and song shall be your lot." I ask, Are we, by our conduct, giving an education to our children and developing the character of the American people?

I commend the Senator from Arkansas for his fearlessness in dealing with this problem. Several weeks ago I saw, either in Life or Time magazine, a quotation from a statement made by some Communist leader in the Far East. He was a rebel. He said, "We will win because we work."

What is the situation in our country? The education consists in telling our youth, "You will live even if you do not work. We will give you encouragement in the form of featherbedding practices. You will be paid more, even though you do not produce more."

I put the question to myself, "Where are we heading? What is eventually to happen to us if this program continues?"

My outline would be as follows: Let us be militarily strong. Let us help those nations which are legitimately and honestly friendly toward us. Let us return to the principles of the vigorous pioneer characters who moved from the Atlantic coast out West, to the banks of the Ohio and across the Mississippi, across the mountains of the West, over to the shores of the Pacific Ocean.

They believed in character. They believed in work, and they believed in education. Their primary thought when they met on those waters in the West was, "We have brought with us our institutions, our government, our churches and our schools."

In the stockade, there were guns on the wall and holes in the stockade wall through which the guns were fired. In one corner there was a church; in another corner was a school. Outside there was a room in which the courthouse and the government offices were housed.

From such schools came great Americans, primarily because of the character that was instilled in them.

Of course, I am concerned with the subject of education. I know of the deep interest of the Senator from Arkansas in that subject. But we tell our youth, "Study that in which you have an interest." The only interest I had when I was a boy was in playing baseball. We tell our youth "Study that which will be economically useful to you." That is fine, but there is something beyond that, as the Senator from Arkansas has said.

We can build schools with golden roofs and embellishments beyond imagination, but they will not necessarily produce an educated child. It requires more than that. It depends upon the substance within him, and the willingness to do things that are important. It is in that field that I believe we in Congress can do much to achieve that which the Senator from Arkansas suggests in his speech.

I say to the Senator from Arkansas that under no circumstances can his statement be construed as any type of political attack. It is constructive, and intended to bring to the attention of Members of Congress and the people of our country a most serious problem.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator for his remarks. He is very complimentary.

SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT OF 1958

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am gratified to hear that the President has today signed S. 3651, the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.

This is the culmination of efforts of many people over a period of almost 10 years to provide additional sources of equity-type capital and long-term loans for small business.

Because of the widespread public interest in this legislation, I had the staff of the Committee on Banking and Currency prepare a simplified statement in explanation of the act, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT OF 1958

BASIC INFORMATION

The Small Business Investment Act of 1958 is designed to aid the growth and development of small-business concerns by providing (1) long-term loans and equity-type capital to small businesses, credit which is not available through commercial banks, (2) long-term loans to State and local development companies, and (3) grants for

research and counseling in the management, financing, and operations of small businesses.

The program will be administered by the Small Business Administration, which will receive an initial appropriation of $50 million for loans and will have access to approximately $27.5 million for grants. Legislation (S. 3651) enabling the new program originated in the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, and was passed by the Congress on August 7, 1958.

SMALL-BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANIES

Formation: The principal feature of the act contemplates the formation of new private financial institutions to functions as small-business investment companies. These companies must be organized under State laws unless such laws in a particular State are incompatible with the purpose of the act, in which event a small-business investment company can be chartered by the Small Business Administration. In all cases, the new companies must receive SBA approval in order to operate under the act. Approval will depend upon the need for small-business financing in the proposed area of operation, the character and ability of the proposed management, and the existing number of such companies.

Initial capital required: Each company must have an initial paid-in capital and surplus of at least $300,000. The SBA is authorized to lend up to $150,000, which amount can be considered as part of the required initial capital. Stock in small-business investment companies may be purchased by any persons or organizations eligible to do so under other laws governing the activities of such prospective stockholders. A national bank, or a member bank of the Federal Reserve System, or a bank insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation may hold stock in a small-business investment company in an amount up to 1 percent of such bank's capital and surplus.

Borrowing power: Small-business investment companies may borrow funds to the extent permitted by SBA regulation. The SBA can lend an amount up to 50 percent of the capital and surplus of an investment company. For this purpose, any funds loaned by the SBA to become a part of capital and surplus will be treated as capital of the investment company and will not be counted as borrowings for compliance with the 50-percent limitation. Thus, a new company could be formed with a minimum of $150,000 in private funds matched by $150,000 of capital-type funds borrowed from the SBA, and the company would be eligible to borrow an additional $150,000 from the SBA.

Providing funds to small businesses: Small-business investment companies may supply funds to small businesses (as defined by the SBA) in two basic ways: (1) By purchase of debenture bonds convertible into stock of the borrowers at the option of the investment company, and (2) by loans in the conventional use of that term. All lending terms and conditions will be subject to compliance with SBA regulation. There is no statutory maximum maturity for convertible debentures, but the act limits the maturity of conventional loans to 20 years with provision for extension up to 10 years. Without approval of the SBA, no single enterprise may receive financial assistance which exceeds an amount equal to 20 percent of the combined capital and surplus of the investment company.

Tax features: By separate statute (1) investors in the small-business investment companies can treat losses in such companies as an ordinary deduction rather than an offset against capital gain, (2) the investment companies receive the same privilege on any losses on the convertible debentures or stock of small-business concerns, and (3) the investment companies are entitled to a 100-percent-dividends-received deduction.

Miscellaneous provisions: Small business investment companies are exempt from borrowing limits contained in the Investment Company Act of 1940. The Securities and Exchange Commission is given power to exempt such companies from compliance with provisions of the Securities Act of 1933 and the Trust Indenture Act of 1939.

LOANS TO STATE AND LOCAL DEVELOPMENT COMPANIES

Unsecured loans: State development companies may receive unsecured loans from the SBA up to a total amount which does not exceed the total amount borrowed by the company from all other sources. Such SBA funds shall be treated on an equal basis with funds of the highest priority borrowed by the company from any other source after the date of enactment. This latter requirement can be waived by the SBA.

Secured loans: In addition to, and separate from, the lending power described above, the SBA can make secured loans to State and local development companies. These loans must be identifiable with an ultimate small-business borrower, may not exceed $250,000, and must mature within 10 years with provision for extension up to an additional 10 years.

General requirements: All funds advanced to State and local development companies by the SBA must be used to assist small business concerns, and none of the SBA funds can be used in a way which would result in a substantial increase of unemployment in any area of the country.

GRANTS FOR RESEARCH AND COUNSELING

The act makes available approximately $27.5 million for SBA grants to a State government, State agency, State development company, or to colleges and universities. These grant funds are to be used for studies, research, and counseling concerning the managing, financing, and operation of small business enterprises. Only one grant can be made within any one State in any one year, and no grant may exceed $40,000.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 607) to provide retirement, clerical assistants, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. J. Res. 135) providing for the construction by the Department of the Interior of demonstration plants for the production, from saline or brackish waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and for other beneficial consumptive uses.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 9321. An act to amend paragraph (k) of section 403 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended; and

H. R. 12281. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide an administrative site for Yosemite National Park, Calif., on lands adjacent to the park, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 12281) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide an administrative site for Yosemite National Park, Calif., on lands adjacent to the park, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LIVING IT UP IN LAOS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a reprint from the Reader's Digest of an article which originally was published in the Wall Street Journal entitled "Living It Up in Laos."

This article is a revealing account of the weakness of some of our foreign-aid spending.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIVING IT UP IN LAOS—TINY ASIAN KINGDOM USES UNITED STATES AID TO SPLURGE ON LUXURIES

(By Igor Oganesoff)

VIENTIANE, LAOS.—The circumstances of American aid to this Southeast Asian kingdom add up to a story of flagrant misuse of United States aid funds—and of profiteering that may give Communist propagandists a weapon offsetting the anti-Communist influence the aid program was designed to have in Laos.

Laos has been ecstatically drowning in American aid ever since 1955, not long after it was carved out of what used to be Indochina. Roughly $135 million is the amount the United States has poured into the local economy.[1]

Most of the United States dollars have been turned over to the Laotian Government either for various United States-sponsored economic projects or to support the 25,000-man Royal Laotian Army. But there are peculiarities surrounding this United States aid program. Local traders buy America's aid dollars from the Laotian Government, purchase goods abroad and sell them for kip (the native currency) in Laos. Instead of raising the Laotian standard of living and providing for industrial expansion, the principal effect of United States largess has been a rather weird boom, based on nothing more solid than cash on hand and an assumption that there is more to come.

FORDS AND FEATHER DUSTERS

Sleek Cadillacs, Buicks, and Fords have been imported by the dozen, although the principal highways still are hardly more than jungle trails. Other items on last year's import list make delightfully wacky reading: 4½ tons of feather dusters, 73 tons of sporting goods, fishing tackle and thermos jugs, 180 tons of automobile covers, $13,400 worth of festival decorations, $11,500 worth of musical instruments, and thousands of dollars worth of costume jewelry.

Retail shops are stocked to their bamboo ceilings with items that the Lao have hardly ever seen before; American toothpaste, roller skates, Japanese dolls, French perfume.

A lot of the United States money went to buy products from Red China: cherries in

[1] The Laotian Government's own income is barely $13,500,000 a year.

sirup from Shantung, Five Goats beer from Canton. Much of this stuff is unsalable, but it doesn't matter; the importers have already made their profits from foreign-exchange manipulations.

THE MAGIC KIP

To understand this, one must acquaint himself with the magic kip, the highly overvalued Lao currency unit. The official exchange rate, set by the Lao Government, is 35 kip to the American dollar. But in the hard-headed money markets of Hong Kong, Bangkok, or even in Vientiane, a Lao trader can buy up to 100 kip for a dollar. This sets the stage for fantastic profits.

A Lao trader may buy 100,000 kip in the free money market for $1,000. He then applies for an import license for, say, $1,000 worth of building cement, but puts up only 35,000 kip to get the $1,000 from the Government at the official rate. This leaves him 65,000 kip before he has even moved the goods. Then he can simply sell his import license for more cash, if he wants.

If an importer decides to use his license, he still stands to profit heavily. Suppose he imports inexpensive men's shirts at $1 each. Since he buys his dollars from the Laotian Government at the official rate, each shirt costs him 35 kip. But then the free-market money values come into play. When the shirt goes on the market in Laos, it is priced at about 100 kip. So the importer has nearly tripled his money. Repeating this process under Laos' free-and-easy import rules, a businessman quickly can amass a considerable fortune.

In neighboring Bangkok, reports of collusion between foreign exporters, particularly in Hong Kong, and Laotian traders are commonplace. One source estimates that only about 20 percent of the contracts from Hong Kong are free of kickbacks to importers for underweight, underfilled or overpriced shipments, which allow the importer to further build up his foreign exchange hoard.

Many shipments, it is said, are diverted in Thailand (95 percent of Laos' imports pass through Bangkok and then are transported to Laos overland), where there is a lively demand for a wide range of goods. Other items arrive in Vientiane only to be shipped out again for greater profits. Thus, industryless Laos has become an exporter of automobiles and outboard motors.

It is estimated that well over half of the goods paid for never reach the Laotian market. "The country is now straining to absorb $12 million worth of goods, yet $35 million worth is supposed to be coming in. If all this stuff actually arrived, it would be lying all over the streets," claims Ralph A. Epstein, a management consultant with the American firm of Howell & Co. of Washington, D. C., which has sent a three-man mission here as part of a $2,576,000 United States aid project in civil administration.

Privately, local United States officials doubt that they can ever achieve a complete reform in the aid program, even after currency exchange reform. "There is still no assurance that Laos will import the things it really needs to improve the economy, rather than luxury goods," one International Cooperation Administration man admits.

A MAJOR HANDICAP

ICA officials, uneasy at the flood of unessential imports financed by the United States, did win one concession this year. They were allowed to place a representative on Laos' National Export-Import Council, with power to veto any import. The current ICA man suffers from a major handicap, however, in his job as watchdog. All the council's deliberations, and the import applications as well, are in French—a tongue for which the ICA man requires an interpreter.

Because funds have been released in lump sums by ICA, United States control has been made difficult. As a result, Lao officials, besides granting import licenses for luxury goods, often have siphoned off the funds for their own uses. There is a lush building boom going on. Leading traders and government officials (often the same people) are huddling with architects and contractors for lavish new residences or flashy additions to formerly modest homes.

CERTAIN FAVORS

It is generally agreed that some 200 or 300 leading families in Laos (population: 2 million) are getting most of the benefit from the massive import program. One ICA official admits that certain favors are granted Lao political and government leaders to keep them friendly.

Meanwhile, back in the countryside, the rank and file of the Laotians live much as they have always lived, oblivious of United States help. Their flimsy shacks are built on stilts to protect them from snakes and flooding during the rainy season. They farm rice and a few vegetables and raise chickens. ICA officials will admit that, except for a few projects, their whole program to date hasn't gone far in raising the standard of living of the general population.

CROSSING THE MEKONG

The strictly economic projects are equally beset with problems. One of the few visible results of the ICA's efforts is a $600,000 ferry system, crossing the Mekong River separating Laos and Thailand. The United States bore all the cost, including a 15-month training course and natty uniforms for the 37-man staff.

Operating costs are $4,000 a month, and revenues in the past have been only $700 to $300. United States aid funds make up the difference. The reason for the deficit is not hard to find. Only a few yards from the ferry, Chinese junks are loaded to the gunwales with crates, oil drums, and passengers. The junks are owned by a Chinese businessman who was foresighted enough to obtain a transport contract with the Thai rail monopoly, Express Transport Organization, which carries nearly all the freight to and from the Laotian border and the big market city of Bangkok.

REHABILITATING ROADS

Transport improvement is the largest single current aid project, with $5,600,000 provided by the United States. Besides the new ferry, there's a $3,700,000 plan to rehabilitate roads. Most of this has been spent for heavy earth-moving equipment, tractors, bulldozers, and shovels.

Actual roadwork is largely in the hands of an American firm which operates on contract with the Laotian Government and has a force of Okinawans on the job. The principal project is maintaining the dirt road between Vientiane and the royal capital of Luang Prabang, 150 miles north. No new roads are contemplated.

Just under $600,000 has been provided for industrial development. A small part of this has gone into mining, mineral, and power surveys, but the bulk has been paid for three diesel electric generators to be installed in Vientiane. The generators have been here, unused, since June of last year; there's no equipment around for transmission line. Continuous operation of the generators would cost the Laotian Government a sizable chunk of its normal income—another indication of the long-lasting nature of Laos' dependence on United States aid.

The Communists, of course, exploit corruption in government and riches flowing to a favored few. And Americans here are beginning to wonder how long the United States, in doling out assistance, can afford to ignore this unfortunate part of its program.

REACTION IN CONGRESS

All of the above statements were borne out in recent testimony before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. And from representatives of the United States General Accounting Office, State Department and even ICA itself, the committee brought out further serious evidence about the Laotian situation that has been hidden from the public since 1955.

Laos has insisted on an unrealistically high exchange; then, instead of getting ICA approval for all import licenses that our dollars pay for, high Laotian officials have gone into the import business themselves, quietly issued these licenses on the side, and refused to let the United States investigate what happened to the money.

Last July the General Accounting Office sent ICA a report indicating trouble in Laos and asked for comment. ICA kept the report 6 months before bothering to reply.

This spring GAO sent an investigating team to Laos. It reported there was still no adequate check on the import licenses. "The program is being badly administered," said George Staples, associate director of GAO's Civil Accounting and Auditing Division.

One of ICA's excuses is that whatever its faults, the program is holding back communism. However, a year ago the Laotian Government came to terms with the Communist Pathet Lao, with which it had been fighting, took in its leader as Minister of Planning and Procurement, and allowed the Reds to handpick two units of their own troops and integrate them into the army we support. Recently at least nine Communists were elected to the national legislature.

Through June 30, 1957, the ICA obligated $135 million for Laos, and is still disbursing aid at the same rate, as far as can be guessed—around $50 million a year—although taxpayers are not supposed to ask. The State Department has stamped such information Classified to the public.

This year Congress balked at the State Department policy of secrecy when publication of the foregoing article made it impossible to conceal the facts any longer. The Congressional consensus: only publicity can force eradication of evils such as are set forth here. "If you say there is no effective way to control diversion," Foreign Affairs Subcommittee Chairman CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin, told an ICA witness, "there are Members of Congress who will certainly give a sound, foolproof method. That is to discontinue aid."

(From a report to the Reader's Digest by Charles Stevenson.)

EXERCISE BY SUPREME COURT OF POLICYMAKING POWERS—RESOLUTION BY STATE CHIEF JUSTICES

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article in today's issue of the New York Times entitled "High Court Urged To Limit Actions."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGH COURT URGED TO LIMIT ACTIONS—CHIEF JUSTICES OF THE STATES BID FEDERAL BENCH CURB POLICYMAKING ROLE

(By Lawrence E. Davies)

PASADENA, CALIF., August 20.—The United States Supreme Court was urged today to put on the badge of judicial self-restraint.

A committee of State chief justices took the Court members to task with an expression of hope that they would stick to their tremendous strictly judicial powers and avoid exercising essentially legislative powers in questions involving State actions.

Headed by Chief Judge Frederick W. Brune, of Maryland, the committee declared that no more important obligation rested upon the Supreme Court than that of careful moderation in the exercise of its policymaking role. It expressed grave concern over the asserted exercise by the Court of almost unlimited policymaking powers.

"It has long been an American boast," said the committee report read to the 10th annual meeting of the conference of chief justices, "that we have a government of laws and not of men. We believe that any study of recent decisions of the Supreme Court will raise at least considerable doubt as to the validity of that boast."

The chief justices or their associates from 47 States, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, will be in session the rest of the week at the Huntington-Sheraton Hotel here. Arkansas, a spokesman said, was not represented because of an illness.

Chief Justice John R. Dethmers, of Michigan, the conference chairman, recalled that the committee on Federal-State relationships as affected by judicial decisions was authorized at last year's meeting in New York after some barbs had been aimed at the Supreme Court.

The study was to deal with the subject, he said, "temperately but directly and forthrightly." The 31-page resultant report read by Judge Brune was, indeed, couched in noninflammatory language but time and again it carried a sting.

The report was the subject of discussions by four conference groups during the afternoon. It is scheduled for formal action by the meeting at the closing business session Saturday.

The Brune committee itself has drawn up a resolution respectfully urging the Supreme Court to exercise "one of the greatest of all judicial powers—the power of judicial self-restraint." This will be turned over to the resolutions committee headed by Chief Justice Levi S. Udall, of Arizona, with what Justice Dethmers described as the enthusiastic support of all the Brune committee members.

Nowhere in the report was there mention of the question of racial segregation.

It was explained that committee members felt to inject this into the study would stir sectional feelings and defeat the overall purpose of the study.

Early in the report, the chief justices noted it was part of their obligation "to seek to uphold respect for law." But they went on to assert:

"We do not believe that this goes so far as to impose upon us an obligation of silence when we find ourselves unable to agree with pronouncements of the Supreme Court (even though we are bound by them), or when we see trends in decisions of that Court which we think will lead to unfortunate results."

Signing the report with Judge Brune were Chief Judge Albert Conway, of New York; Chief Justice Dethmers, Chief Justice William H. Duckworth, of Georgia; Chief Justice John E. Hickman, of Texas; Chief Justice John E. Martin, of Wisconsin; Associate Justice Martin A. Nelson, of Minnesota; Chief Justice William C. Perry, of Oregon; Chief Justice Taylor H. Stukes, of South Carolina; and Chief Justice Raymond S. Wilkins, of Massachusetts.

As consultants they had five members of the University of Chicago Law School.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I invite special attention to the one significant statement in the resolution adopted at a recent convention of chief judges, at Pasadena:

It has long been an American boast that we have a government of laws and not of men. We believe that any study of recent decisions of the Supreme Court will raise at least considerable doubt as to the validity of that boast.

This is a timely warning of the great danger to our American system under some of the recent Supreme Court rulings and coming from the Association of Chief Justices of our States this warning cannot be ignored. Unquestionably the Supreme Court has gone far afield in some of their recent decisions.

The Association of Chief Justices continued in this resolution to express grave concern over the asserted exercise by the Court of almost unlimited policymaking powers. And they urged the Court to put on the badge of "judicial self-restraint."

This committee of judges urged our Supreme Court to exercise "one of the greatest of all judicial powers—the power of judicial self-restraint."

The members of our Supreme Court would do well to read the recommendations of this group in its entirety and, I hope they will heed the advice given.

Signing this report, in addition to Judge Brune, of Maryland, were Chief Judge Albert Conway, of New York; Chief Justice Dethmers; Chief Justice William H. Duckworth, of Georgia; Chief Justice John E. Hickman, of Texas; Chief Justice John E. Martin, of Wisconsin; Associate Justice Martin A. Nelson, of Minnesota; Chief Justice William C. Perry, of Oregon; Chief Justice Taylor H. Stukes, of South Carolina; and Chief Justice Raymond S. Wilkins, of Massachusetts.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I wish to make an observation relevant to the matter to which the attention of the Senate is being directed by the able and distinguished Senator from Delaware. This is not the first time the chief justices of the 48 States have spoken on this problem. In 1952 the chief justices of the 48 States unanimously adopted a resolution asking Congress to pass legislation which would put an end to the practice whereby the lowest Federal courts can nullify the decisions of the highest courts of the States.

Again, on a second occasion, the chief justices of the 48 States adopted a second resolution on this subject, and the very strong proposals made by the committee of the chief justices of the 48 States in Pasadena, Calif., yesterday is the third time the chief justices of the 48 States of the Union have called the attention of the Nation to this serious problem in our Federal-State relationships.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, in view of the very pertinent remarks and insertions made by the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the able Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], I should like to call to the attention of the Senate a quotation which I chanced to see within the last half hour. These words were said by a great Democratic war President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson:

The history of liberty is the history of the limitation of governmental power, not the increase of it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to recommit.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, again, at this hour of the debate on the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, which, as we know, contains the provisions of two bills, S. 337 and S. 654, the latter of which is commonly known as the Bridges bill, I am constrained to say, with all the earnestness at my command, that I believe in these late days of the session of Congress, the Senate may conceivably be doing something, should it reject the motion to recommit, which will plague not only the Senate, but also the people of the country, other Senates, and other Congresses for years to come.

Should this amendment be enacted, I believe there will be chaos, there will be litigation, indeed, there will be a great compounding of litigation. We will find ourselves in an endless labyrinth of uncertainty and indecision. Conceivably, it may have a very serious effect not only upon our political institutions, but also upon the economy of the Nation itself.

I had intended speaking at considerable length upon the subject. However, after taking counsel with others who are interested in the same objectives which move others of us, I shall be brief at this time.

I should say that the lack of hearings, the failure adequately to call and hear witnesses upon both sides of this question should alone suffice to justify its being recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary for further study and consideration.

I have been asked to explain the nature of the preemption provision in this bill and other bills now before the Senate.

This is, as we know, what lawyers might call a "shotgun" approach. We know that Congress may, when Congress is so moved and desires to do so, preempt legislation in a certain field of activity. But here we are asked to invoke what is known as the doctrine of preemption, in a field so broad that it embraces virtually the entire spectrum of our legal and judicial system. That in itself would be a perilous and, indeed, a very dangerous thing to do.

I solemnly urge the Senate to do nothing which may reproach and plague us in the years to come. We do not know what effect the proposed legislation would have.

Several witnesses appeared before the House committee, where hearings were held. The House committee heard an Assistant Attorney General, the president of the Association of American Railroads, representatives of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the AFL-CIO.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. THURMOND. Did the Senator say that the Association of American Railroads is opposed?

Mr. HENNINGS. No; I said a representative of the Association of American Railroads appeared before the House committee. If I misspoke, I correct myself.

Mr. THURMOND. I misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senate committee has held no hearings whatsoever, I remind my friend from South Carolina, upon this exceedingly vital and all-embracing attempt to legislate in many areas, some of which we know not.

To me, as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, it is appalling and a source of dismay that in this 11th hour, in the dying, closing days of this session of Congress, when minds and bodies are fatigued, we should be discussing this subject. We have had a long and, I think, productive session. I believe that is generally admitted. To come in on almost the last day with a proposal such as this, I believe, reflects to every thoughtful lawyer an effort to act hastily.

I have received many communications from responsible members of the legal profession, from bar associations, and from some members of the judiciary, who urge that we not act irresponsibly on what is now proposed.

For instance, a telegram came to me a few minutes ago from the dean of the Law School of the University of Notre Dame, a great institution of standing in this country, as we all know. It reads:

> I urge you to oppose Senate consideration of bills reported out without the benefit of hearings. Specifically I urge you to oppose H. R. 3.
>
> JOSEPH O'MEARA, *Dean*.

I have received many other such telegrams.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I emphasize what the Senator from Missouri has just said about how foolish it is to legislate on so important a matter without hearings having been held by a Senate committee. I do not think there is a Member of the Senate who has any idea of what the bill at hand will do to the law of regulating labor standards; to the law having to do with labor-management relations; to the law affecting conservation of natural resources; to the law relating to public works; to the immigration and nationality laws; to the law with regard to public health and welfare; to the laws with respect to agriculture; to the law governing air commerce; to the law in the general field of interstate commerce; to the civil-rights law.

Many Senators have asked to have an amendment drafted to exempt each of a number of specific fields from this proposed shotgun give-and-take legislation, so that the field in which they are particularly interested may be exempted, because no one knows what the bill, if passed, will do in those fields.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his valuable contribution to the discussion. He is indeed eminently correct. In addition to the fields enumerated by the Senator, there are many others of which we know not and cannot at this time foresee.

Indeed, we have found that the proposed legislation is not only retrospective but prospective. It would require that Congress make a survey of State laws. Before we passed upon a given piece of proposed legislation, it would be necessary to survey all the State enactments to see whether a field existed for preemption and whether there was conflict.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President——

Mr. HENNINGS. I may say to the Senator from New York—I believe it has been said before—that we are asked to pass proposed legislation for the purpose of finding out what it means. Certainly that is not the sort of legislation for a responsible body, such as we think the Senate is, to pass.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, at this time, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. HENNINGS. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from New York, formerly the attorney general of the State of New York. I shall yield first to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], who previously asked that I yield; and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator from Ohio has resumed his seat, I gather that he does not wish to be yielded to at the moment.

Mr. HENNINGS. Very well; then I yield now to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Missouri for yielding to me.

Let me say that I have heard many questions asked about the difference between the pending bill and the so-called Butler-Jenner bill, which the Senate laid on the table on yesterday. One of the questions asked was whether the pending bill is worse or is better than the Butler-Jenner bill, and so forth, and so on.

Senators who favored the Butler-Jenner bill knew exactly what they favored and what it provided. That bill had specific application to certain Supreme Court decisions.

The difficulty with House bill 3 is that we do not know what it would amount to if it were enacted into law. Notwithstanding the elucidations which have been made so eloquently by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], and other Senators, if the pending bill were to be enacted, I am confident that next year or the year after that it would be found that the bill had 50 or 150 other applications which no one ever thought of before, but which we suddenly would find were creating confusion.

In other words, this bill is generic; it applies to everything; it is as deep as vice.

Mr. HENNINGS. Perhaps the Senator from New York will wish to say that the bill is similar to an iceberg—much of which is beneath the surface, so it is impossible to tell the extent of the underwater portion.

Mr. JAVITS. Exactly.

I believe that in the opinion of those of us who opposed the Butler-Jenner bill, the pending bill—H. R. 3—is, for that reason, even worse.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator from New York for his observations and his contributions.

Mr. President, I think some disenchantment and disillusionment is in store for the proponents of this measure. Apart from the breadth of its purpose, I do not believe it will achieve the purpose intended, namely, to remove from the courts the determination of whether a specific act of Congress preempts the field.

At this time, let me inquire whether the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] desires that I yield to him. I intended to yield to him before now.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

I wish he would describe in greater detail the extent of the hearings which were held on the bill.

Mr. HENNINGS. I shall be glad to do so.

In the first place, as I have stated, I do not know whether the Senator from Ohio was then in the Chamber—no hearings whatever were held during the 85th Congress on this bill, by either the Senate Judiciary Committee or any subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee. It is true that some hearings were held during the 84th Congress. I would have to say that, in my own judgment, although some Senators may disagree, and may take issue with me on this point—only scanty hearings were held in the 84th Congress, some 3 years ago, at a time when some of the present Members of the Senate were not Members of this body, and, indeed, when some of the present members of the Judiciary Committee were not then serving on that committee.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to inquire about the provisions of the bill which would make it retroactive. Were they discussed in the committee; or has the discussion of that phase of the matter been confined to the debate on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not wish to rely entirely on my memory, in connection with the question of whether the matter of retroactivity was discussed in the committee. But if it was, then I do not believe the discussion of it in the committee was very thorough or very protracted.

Perhaps the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has a better recollection on that score than I do. Therefore, I yield now to him, for the purpose of having him answer the question.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the McClellan bill, a similar bill, was before

the committee, but was not the subject of hearings at this session of Congress.

When the McClellan bill received final consideration by the committee, the provision for retroactivity was eliminated from the bill. So the bill, as reported to the Senate, and as now on the calendar, does not contain a retroactive application provision. The words "Acts heretofore passed" were stricken from the bill by the committee. So the bill as reported to the Senate, and as now on the calendar, applies only to future acts.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from Tennessee now is referring to S. 337 not to H. R. 3. Is not that correct?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes. At this session of Congress, no committee hearings have been held on House bill 3. In the last Congress, hearings were held on a similar bill, which had been introduced by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. But the two bills are not identical.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Were hearings held on the matter of making the proposed law retroactive?

Mr. KEFAUVER. There were no hearings.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There were no hearings of any nature whatsoever?

Mr. KEFAUVER. None on the pending bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is there available a transcript of the testimony taken in regard to House bill 3, as reported to the Senate; or is there available a transcript of the testimony taken on the substitute bill?

Mr. KEFAUVER. There were no hearings in this Congress. There were some hearings in the previous Congress.

Mr. HENNINGS. Very well; I now understand that no hearings whatever were held on it during this session.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Ohio has read the statement of the Attorney General, which was filed during the hearings held by the House committee. For the Senator's information, let me state that it was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 15, where it appears at page 13860.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let me point out that in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I tried to procure a decision which would prevent the committee from reporting to the Senate a lot of cats and dogs, so to speak.

Eventually, this session of Congress will adjourn. I favor having the Senate devote as much time as possible to the consideration of various measures which are being sent to us during the last minutes of the session, if by so doing it will be possible to keep many bad bills from being considered by the Senate.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator from Ohio for his statement. I may say that many of us have consistently opposed the reporting of this proposed legislation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It would have been better if we had adjourned 3 weeks ago. If we continue the session for another 2 weeks, it will cost the taxpayers of the Nation another $3 billion.

Mr. HENNINGS. I shall be glad to yield now to any other Senators who may wish to have me yield to them, in order to permit them to make observations.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes, I am glad to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Missouri knows that no hearings were held on House bill 3 at this session of Congress. But the identical question was gone into during the committee hearings on the Jenner-Butler bill; the subject matter covered in the hearings on the Jenner-Butler bill is the same as that in issue in connection with House bill 3 or the McClellan bill.

Mr. HENNINGS. I may say to the chairman of our committee, who knows this better than anyone else, the Judiciary Committee in its discussions of matters of constitutional law, practice, and proceeding, ranges as far and wide as a hunting dog. We go all over the lot, as the Senator knows. We touch upon all manner of things in our discussion at one time or another. We spent something like 6 or 7 weeks on S. 2646 alone, and took all of the time of the Committee on the Judiciary in so doing.

Mr. EASTLAND. But the Senator, of course, realizes that the same problem was gone into very thoroughly by the Judiciary Committee in hearings on the Jenner-Butler bill, and everyone who desired to testify, pro and con, on this question was given the opportunity.

Mr. HENNINGS. I should say that the question of whether the problem was fairly gone into or not would be a conclusion to be derived from the point of view of the one who might be hearing the testimony.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is right; but there were committee hearings on this question.

Mr. HENNINGS. The committee does go into many, many facets and many, many aspects of all of these questions, some not germane, some not directly in point, when it considers various amendments to many bills which the committee handles.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. Is it not true that at no time in the full committee hearings of the Senate Judiciary Committee did we ever discuss the full import of a bill which cuts across economic and political patterns going back 150 years, as was brought out in the debate? As a matter of fact, did we ever have a single hearing of the Senate Judiciary Committee based on the consideration of this important pending legislation?

Mr. HENNINGS. It is demonstrably true and certainly a fact that we did not have any hearings on this proposed legislation, or similar legislation dealing with preemption across the board.

Mr. CARROLL. As a matter of fact, we spent most of our time on S. 2646, the Jenner bill, which was designed primarily to curb the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court.

Mr. HENNINGS. In five areas originally; four of which were stricken in committee.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. But we went into this whole question. One facet of the proposed legislation was to curb the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. We went into the whole picture. This bill has had thorough committee hearings and thorough committee considerations.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not reflect upon the chairman when I say that, in my judgment, we did not have perhaps as thorough a discussion of it as we should have had.

Mr. EASTLAND. I am sure we could not do anything to convince the distinguished Senator from Missouri. He has his point of view. The Senator from Mississippi has his point of view. The record speaks for itself, and I think the record is a full answer to the objection that there have been inadequate hearings.

Mr. HENNINGS. I think it might be observed, too, that the Committee on the Judiciary handles something like 54 percent of the legislation which comes to the floor of the Senate. I alone happen to serve on 9 subcommittees of that committee, and I am chairman of 3 of them. Other Senators may have more subcommittees than I have. It is a very busy, very hard-working committee. Whether there is adequate or sufficient discussion on one matter or not oftimes depends on the time element. We do not have an opportunity at times to do all the things we would like to do. But this fact does remain, and I should like to emphasize this point again, there is no doubt whatever in the minds of any Member of this body that there were no hearings held upon the proposed legislation as it is before us for consideration today. Any lawyer may have read widely upon any aspect of his professional interest, and he may have discussed the subject and attended hearings and taken part in hearings; but as to the question of adequate hearings, again I say, in my judgment—and again I respectfully differ with the chairman of the committee—hearings were not held on the proposed legislation before the Senate today.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Is it not true that the Senate Judiciary Committee did not consider H. R. 3, but reported S. 337? The best evidence of the treatment we gave S. 337 is a report comprising about 300 pages, which does not in any wise go into the serious and involved economic problems which the Senator from Missouri is discussing.

As a matter of fact, even in that bill, which has now been abandoned in favor of H. R. 3, the Senator from Wyoming inserted the words "hereafter enacted," in order to strike out the retroactivity of S. 337.

So I think the record is clear that there has been only a cursory examination and consideration given to this important pending legislation.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. If the Senator will excuse me to make one observation in connection with this matter, then I shall be glad to yield.

It is not the function of the Congress to legislate only where there is a need for legislation. It seems to me that in the field of preemption we have not established a real demand or need for this legislation. I think able lawyers who are proponents of it, on reflection may even agree we know not where we are going in the future should the bill be enacted in its broad sense, as embodied in the McClellan amendment.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield now.

Mr. EASTLAND. The distinguished Senator knows that frequently, after committee hearings, an entirely new bill develops and comes out of committee from the one which was introduced.

Mr. HENNINGS. Many, many times that is true.

Mr. EASTLAND. In this case the entire question was gone into very, very carefully in hearings on the Jenner-Butler bill. In fact, as I recall—I do not want to be held to the accuracy of this statement, but as I recall—the hearings on the Jenner-Butler bill and the Bridges bill were combined.

Mr. HENNINGS. May I inquire in what respect the Senator suggests that the so-called Jenner-Butler bill dealt with preemption?

Mr. EASTLAND. I say, as I recall——

Mr. HENNINGS. The gravamen of this proposed legislation is preemption.

Mr. EASTLAND. I understand. As I recall, the hearings on the Bridges bill and the Jenner-Butler bill were combined. I can be mistakcn about that, but that is the way I recall.

Mr. HENNINGS. I do not wish to be invidious in this statement, but the RECORD certainly should reflect that when the so-called Jenner bill first came before the Committee on the Judiciary it developed upon the senior Senator from Missouri to ask what sort of hearings had been held and what the nature of those hearings had been. It developed if I mistake not, that one witness, a member of the committee, the author of the bill, and a member of the staff of the Committee on the Judiciary were the ones who testified at the hearing.

Mr. EASTLAND. What the distinguished Senator says is absolutely correct; and on motion of the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri, the bill was recommitted to the subcommittee, and extensive hearings were held on that bill, and on the very principals involved here.

Mr. HENNINGS. May I again inquire of my friend, the learned and able chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, whether any hearings were held with respect to preemption or the preemption doctrine in connection with the Jenner-Butler bill.

Mr. EASTLAND. There were some witnesses, as I recall, who testified on the Bridges bill, which, of course, deals with the doctrine of preemption. That is what I recall.

Mr. HENNINGS. I understood the Senator from Mississippi to say that in connection with the Jenner-Butler bill there had been some discussion and some hearings relating to the doctrine of preemption, or the theory of preemption.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. HENNINGS. The bill itself has nothing to do with preemption.

Mr. EASTLAND. The committee made the Bridges bill one section of the Jenner-Butler bill.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. HENNINGS. Has the distinguished Senator from Mississippi concluded?

Mr. EASTLAND. Surely.

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I would be grateful if my good friend from Mississippi would listen to the question. I ask this purely for the purpose of obtaining information.

Am I correct in my understanding that the only hearings held before the committee with respect to the doctrine of preemption were confined to the Steve Nelson case and preemption in the field of security legislation of the States?

Mr. HENNINGS. I am satisfied that is the case. I stand to be corrected if it is not true. Of course, we know that the celebrated Steven Nelson case in all likelihood generated H. R. 3, or was one very important factor in the generation of the bill.

If I recall that case correctly—and I believe I do, because I have read it and studied it—it was a decision of the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania. The Supreme Court or the highest tribunal of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania held that the State laws did not apply in the Nelson case. The Supreme Court of the United States affirmed the finding of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.

If we are going to talk about the United States Supreme Court undertaking to seek aggrandizement by occupying this field, we must remember that the Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania was the court which laid down the principle in the Steve Nelson case. Upon appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States, the Supreme Court of the United States affirmed the decision of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.

The distinguished former mayor of the city of Philadelphia, the junior Senator from Pennsylvania, probably knows something about that case and knew something about it at the time it was tried. No doubt the Senator has studied the case I ask for his confirmation as to whether the facts as I have cited them are substantially true.

Mr. CLARK. That is of course my understanding. Steve Nelson was a resident of Pittsburgh and not of Philadelphia.

Mr. HENNINGS. Since the Senator is a Pennsylvanian, he knows about the case in detail.

Mr. CLARK. Yes. We discussed the case at length on the floor yesterday.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield to my friend from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. The distinguished Senator knows that after hearings in which we went into the preemption doctrine, as I recall, the committee wrote preemption provisions into the bill. Not one time before the Judiciary Committee did the Senator from Missouri or any member of the Judiciary Committee who opposed the bill raise the question that there had been inadequate hearings. Not one time was that question raised in the committee.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I will say to the Senator from Mississippi that, as the Senator knows, I have objected rather consistently to many bills because of lack of hearings. Only last week I raised objection to a deportation bill.

I cannot recall specifically and I would not want to misinform the Senate, but as I recall, the question of preemption which came before the Judiciary Committee—and I stand to be corrected, if wrong—related only to the field of subversion or sedition, and did not cover the broad spectrum and scope which the proposed legislation now before us seeks to embrace.

Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. EASTLAND. I did not hear the entire statement of the Senator; I am sorry.

Mr. HENNINGS. I suggested that the hearings which were held related only to the question of sedition and not the broad field attempted to be covered under the mantle laid down in the pending amendment, which is in all respects H. R. 3.

As to the objections, I have no independent recollection. I recall that we have considered many measures in the committee, and I have objected to perhaps more than my share of them because of inadequate hearings, because of what I thought to be insufficient consideration of the matters, and also because I think the Committee on the Judiciary is charged with a high and solemn responsibility to come to the Senate and act responsibly after full and complete hearings and after thorough deliberation.

I think the Senate of the United States has a right to look to the Judiciary Committee for legal guidance; and it has a right to know, to believe, and to have confidence that the committee—whether the Senate agrees with the committee or not—has at least given thorough consideration to things which affect the very future of this country, its economic life and its political institutions, to an extent which we cannot at this time predict or foresee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. My position in respect to the proposed legislation is that if it were confined to statutes hereafter enacted, and also restricted to the fields

of crime and sedition, I would be in favor of its passage.

Mr. HENNINGS. If I may interrupt for a moment, I take it the Senator is not in favor of a broadside approach into realms where angels would fear to tread. We do not know where we may end if we adopt this amendment. Is that not substantially true, under all the circumstances?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator is correct. I am particularly fearful of the application of the bill in so far as transportation is concerned, and the effect upon railroads, airlines, trucking companies, and the many fields in which there may be operations under two sets of statutes. The people have to know under what law they are supposed to operate.

In this connection I note a very pertinent statement by Mr. Walsh, the Deputy Attorney General, who testified before the House committee:

Mr. WALSH. That is not an assault on a constitutional provision but when a bill attempts to encompass 150 years of jurisprudence in two sentences, then I think brevity might be an assault on a statute.

The committee members and Mr. Walsh were discussing how long it would take to examine all the State statutes to see which ones would be preempted by the new interpretation.

Mr. HENNINGS. How long did they conclude it would take?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will read what Mr. Walsh said.

Mr. HENNINGS. I would say it would be an incalculable time.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Walsh said:

I would say that this job you are suggesting for the Department of Justice is not one for a week, a month, or a year. There will be many years involved in such a job.

During that period, this bill would be in effect and private persons would be sued and would be suing each other in trying to reassert their rights which they viewed as changed under this bill.

Let each change of the law come after a period of study. The preservation of State activities is worth enough to consume all of that time. If we can relieve the Federal agencies of the strain of petty, internal regulation so that they can concentrate on truly national problems, it is worth all of the hours that we put into it. Do not change the law before we do that. Let us do that and then change the law piece by piece as we go along.

If there ever was a piece of legislation which should have some real hearings and consideration, it is this. No one knows what confusion might be caused in the field of property rights.

Mr. HENNINGS. What would the Senator suggest in the way of legislation to regulate railroads if the States were to enact their own regulations? A train going across the continent passes through several States. The regulations would have to be somehow adjusted to fit each State as the train crossed the line.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is set forth by Mr. Gregory S. Prince, vice president and general counsel of the Association of American Railroads, in a letter which was printed in the House proceedings. He says that this bill, H. R. 3, might lead to the establishment of different rates on a single commodity, depending upon the action of State courts and juries as to a reasonable rate; second, in connection with penalties, many antiquated State laws are in existence which would have application to interstate rail transportation service.

He discusses safety appliances, locomotive inspection, and hours of service. People would never know under which law they were supposed to operate. The State would have one set of regulations and the Federal Government would have another. Such regulation would affect locomotives, trains, airplanes, and trucks. So until a detailed study had been made of all the retroactive factors, people could be sued and penalized without any fault on their part.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator is eminently correct.

Mr. President, I think the debate has been most adequate. For that reason I shall not continue, in the interest of saving time. I believe the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] is about to renew his motion to recommit the bill. Before that is done, I promised to yield to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] for the presentation of a conference report.

CONSTRUCTION BY DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR OF DEMONSTRATION PLANTS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) providing for the construction by the Department of the Interior of demonstration plants for the production, from saline or brackish waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today, p. 18945, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the conference report was unanimously agreed to by all the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement dealing with the saline water demonstration program be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON CONFERENCE REPORT—S. J. RES. 135 SALINE WATER DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

In connection with the adoption of the conference report on Senate Joint Resolution 135, to authorize a saline water demonstration program, I desire to make a few comments as part of the legislative history on the measure.

First, President Eisenhower commented that new horizons were opening in the desalting of water in his address on Mideast problems before the United Nations General Assembly in New York on August 14. I attach an extract from his address at the conclusion of this satement.

Next, I reiterate the view expressed on the floor of the Senate repeatedly that the saline water conversion demonstration program provided for by Senate Joint Resolution 135 is the most important step in the national water program since the enactment of the Reclamation Law in 1902. The seawater desalting program and the treatment of brackish water at economical cost has national significance as well as international potentials that run the gauntlet from domestic and industrial rises in this country to a place as an instrument for peace and rehabilitation overseas. We must bear in mind that by 1975, the United States with a population of upward of 200 million persons will be faced with fresh water shortages for domestic, industrial, agricultural, and national defense purposes in many vital population centers and agricultural areas.

Senate Joint Resolution 135 sets the stage for tackling the problem of achieving economical means of desalting seawater in the coastal areas and treating brackish water in the interior.

The modest sum of $10 million is authorized for the construction of not less than 3 seawater desalting plants and 2 brackish water treatment plants. Each plant is to demonstrate a different process.

Responsibility is placed squarely on the shoulders of the Secretary of the Interior to implement the demonstration program promptly and effectively. Use of funds already appropriated is authorized for the employment of consultants and experts to pave the way for a decision by the Secretary as to the first plant within 6 months after the resolution is approved. A decision as to each of the other plants is to be made by the Secretary at 3-month intervals. Construction of the first demonstration plant should be under way within a year. All of us have confidence that the present Secretary of the Interior (Fred A. Seaton) a former distinguished Member of the Senate, will perfect an organization directly under him to expedite this program. We look to him for prompt and effective action.

The conferees agreed that the Congress should maintain surveillance of the program by requiring the Secretary to report promptly on each decision with respect to the type of process selected.

The principal change made in the resolution in conference is the omission of a demonstration plant in the Virgin Islands as a feature of the program. A salt water distillation plant is authorized for St. Thomas under H. R. 12226, which is now in conference.

I desire to pay tribute to the cooperation of the cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 135, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

In the House of Representatives the leadership of House Interior Committee: chairman, Representative CLAIR ENGLE, of California, Representative WAYNE ASPINALL, of Colorado, and their colleagues, contributed to the initiation of the program.

In addition to the excerpt from the President's United Nations address, I attach hereto the following news story by James Reston from the New York Times of August 14, entitled "President Hints at Gains in Sea Water Conversion," and an editorial from

the New York Daily News of August 11, entitled "Fresh Water From the Sea."

(The material referred to is as follows:)

[From the New York Times of August 14, 1958]

PRESIDENT EMPHASIZES IMPORTANCE OF SALINE WATER CONVERSION—EXTRACT FROM PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S ADDRESS TO THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON MIDDLE EAST PROBLEMS IN NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 13

I would hope that high on the agenda of this institution would be an action to meet one of the major challenges of the Near East, the great common shortage—water.

Much scientific and engineering work is already under way in the field of water development. For instance, atomic isotopes now permit us to chart the courses of great underground rivers. The new horizons are opening in the desalting of water. The ancient problem of water is on the threshold of solution. Energy, determination, and science will carry it over that threshold.

[From the New York Times of August 14, 1958]

PRESIDENT HINTS AT GAINS IN SEA WATER CONVERSION

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, August 13.—The United States Government is making genuine and even exciting progress in reducing the cost of desalting sea water and purifying brackish inland water.

This explains President Eisenhower's brief but fascinating statement to the United Nations today that the ancient problem of ending the world's water shortage is on the threshold of solution.

The experts here on the subject wish the President had used a different metaphor. They say it will be a long time before the waters of the sea can be harnessed to turn the deserts of the Middle East into the fertile lands of Biblical times. But atomic energy and new processes and machinery are now carrying the water conversion experiments from the laboratory into the realm of practical industrial and agricultural uses.

PROBLEM ONE OF EXPENSE

At the present, land-based units convert about 15 million gallons a day of sea water or brackish water into fresh water. Two of these units, capable of converting 5 million gallons a day, are situated in the oil-rich sheikdom of Kuwait on the Persian Gulf. But these units, like the sea-conversion plants on ocean liners, are immensely expensive.

The problem has been to reduce the cost of conversion from about $1.75 per thousand gallons to 50 or 75 cents, and Washington officials think this may be achieved within 5 years.

Atomic science is improving the prospect in three ways. President Eisenhower referred to one of them today. He noted that atomic isotopes were being used to chart the course of great underground rivers so they can be tapped more effectively.

Dr. R. B. Mesrobian, of the center of research and engineering of the Continental Can Co. of Chicago, has demonstrated that a small amount of radioactive material injected into undergrqund streams can be followed by instruments above ground as it courses in the water below the earth. He will explain the results of his experiments in the forthcoming atomic-energy conference in Geneva.

Recently, too, the Office of Saline Water of the Department of the Interior, and the California division of water resources signed a contract with the Flour Corp., of Whittier, Calif., for a study of a combination nuclear-reactor saline water conversion plant. It is hoped that this reactor will provide cheaper energy for the evaporation of sea water in what is called the electrodialysis process.

This process is the one totally new concept developed in recent years for the conversion of saline water. The Netherlands has been particularly successful in developing this system.

A 2,800,000-gallon-a-day plant of this type is under construction in South Africa. The United States Government has purchased similar experimental equipment from the Netherlands for use in the laboratories of the Bureau of Reclamation in Denver.

DETAILS OF PROCESS

The Department of the Interior explains the process as follows:

When most salts are dissolved in water, the solution contains submicroscopic electrically charged particles, called ions, in suspension. If an electric current is passed through such a solution, the ions having a positive charge will move by the electrical force of attraction to the negative source of current. Conversely, the negatively charged ions will move to the positive source of current.

This process makes the separation of the two types of ions more effective by using plastic ion exchange membranes. These membranes are made of a combination of plastic materials, some of which are particles carrying a positive charge.

This plastic sheet, or membrane, is impervious to water, but if it is placed in a salt solution, the positive ions can pass through the positive membrane under the driving force of electricity, but the negative ions of the solution cannot.

Conversely, a membrane made of negatively charged particles will permit the negatively charged ions from the solution to pass through but not the positive ions.

Thus a pair of these ion exchange membranes, one negative and the other positive, can form a cell. If salt water is placed between them and an electric current is applied across them, the positive and negative salt ions will move through the respectively charged membranes, leaving a less salty water in the middle and saltier water on the outside of the membranes.

By stacking these cells and repeatedly passing the water through the membranes, the salt, or brackish, water can be purified. Also, it is understood that if the membranes are so constructed as to include certain radioactive materials, the electrical current necessary will be reduced to about one-third.

Some officials here have been saying for years that exploitation of these new processes would not only help the United States solve its growing water shortage in the West, but would also dramatize Washington's effort to put its scientific knowledge to peaceful uses in the underdeveloped areas of the world.

Unfortunately, Congress has not always shown such enthusiasm for the project. Since 1952, when the experiments started in the Department of the Interior, the appropriation requests have been cut on an average of 20 percent.

Only in the last few days, however, Congress has voted $10 million to the Department of the Interior for the construction of 5 demonstration-production plants, 3 for conversion of sea water, and 2 for the conversion of brackish water.

This is more than tenfold the annual appropriations of the past and thus the program is beginning to make real progress. Even so, much more can be done. For example, while the Federal Government is to get $10 million for development of these new plants, California alone has planned an $11 billion investment in developing its water resources.

[From the New York Daily News of August 11, 1958]

FRESH WATER FROM THE SEA

Twice in the last 15 months, House committees have complained that the Department of the Interior (Fred A. Seaton, Secretary) is dragging its feet as regards studying cheap methods of turning sea water into fresh water.

Congress in 1952 set up the Office of Saline Water in the Interior Department, and since then has given it $2,850,000 for its researches.

We imagine the fact that House committees these days are controlled by Democrats, while the Interior Department is run by Republicans, has something to do with the bitterness of the committees' attacks on Mr. Seaton and his colleagues.

Be that as it may, the fresh-water problem in the United States is getting more serious all the time.

In one way or another, we use between 20 and 25 gallons of water per person per day. Industry uses enormous quantities (to make 1 ton of steel, you need 65,000 gallons of water), and agriculture soaks up almost as much as industry.

Altogether, Americans use about 250 billion gallons of water a day; and it is estimated that the figure will be 600 billion a day by 1980.

There are, of course, ways to take the salt and other impurities out of sea water and make it drinkable.

You can do the trick by simply boiling the sea water and condensing the steam that comes off it. Or you can freeze it, and the resulting ice will be salt-free—as icebergs are.

THE COST PROBLEM

Then, there is the so-called electrodialysis process, whereby impurities are eased out of salt water by electrical methods too complicated to describe here.

Up to now, all these devices are pretty expensive. But progress at cutting costs is being made.

The Maxim Silencer Co., of Hartford, Conn., claims to have developed a distillation system which can supply fresh water from the sea at around 20 cents per 1,000 gallons—fairly expensive, but not prohibitive.

A couple of research outfits at Harbor Island, N. C., think they are in sight of a 25 to 50 cents per 1,000-gallon price.

Other scientists are at work on the problem—notably Dr. LeRoy A. Bromley, of the University of California, who believes a new distillation process which he has dreamed up will eventually produce fresh water from the sea in large quantities at 25 cents to 50 cents a 1,000 gallons.

So it looks as if the cost problem will be solved sooner or later. The sooner the better, considering the large number of communities which have had to ration water from time to time, particularly during last summer's bad northeastern drought.

If Congress wants to be helpful in the matter, it can speed action on a bill which has already passed the Senate.

This measure authorizes the above-mentioned Interior Department to spend $10 million on 5 new water-conversion plants—4 in this country and 1 in some possession of ours; perhaps the Virgin Islands.

We imagine that with that kind of money and encouragement, the Interior Department would really get cracking. How about giving it the chance to do so?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wish to commend the Senator for his activity in this field, and the very excellent work

he has done. I am hopeful that the legislation will be promptly enacted.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a very brief statement which I have prepared on the subject.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

Construction of saline water conversion plants and brackish water conversion plants will contribute greatly toward a solution of the Nation's water problems.

Texans can particularly appreciate the significance of successful water conversion. We are long on floods and short on water in my home State. We have 370 miles of coastal area, but the cities along the coastal plain are hard pressed to provide water for municipal and industrial needs. We have an inland water area of 3,826 square miles, but runoff from these streams is 85 percent, and what remains is frequently brackish.

Conversion plants designed to demonstrate the reliability and the engineering, operating and economic potentials of the processes are essential to the orderly development of our resources. Successful and economical conversion of sea and brackish waters would mark a tremendous advance for us in the work we have been doing to fulfill our industrial, municipal, and agricultural water obligations.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in passing the joint resolution the House inadvertently changed one of the numerals from "1952" to "1956." The Parliamentarian tells me that the easiest way to handle the situation is by way of a Senate concurrent resolution, which I now submit, after conferring with the majority and minority leaders. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be read.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 121) submitted by Mr. ANDERSON was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, in the enrollment of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) providing for the construction by the Department of the Interior of demonstration plants for the production, from saline or brackish waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, to strike out, in the language agreed to by the conferees on House amendment numbered 15, in the second sentence beginning with the word "Unobligated", the numeral "1956" and in lieu thereof insert "1952."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considerd and agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] for yielding to me.

Mr. HENNINGS. In turn, I compliment and commend the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico for the indefatigable effort which he has shown in this field, which characterizes all his activities in this body. It is a pleasure to yield to him for the important business which he has brought before the Senate.

ENFORCEMENT OF STATE STATUTES PRESCRIBING CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 654) to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize the enforcement of State statutes prescribing criminal penalties for subversive activities.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from Colorado has asked me to yield to him. I have nothing further to say. I am preparing to yield the floor in order that the motion to recommit the bill may be renewed. Are there any other Senators who desire recognition before I yield?

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CARROLL. What is the pending business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I understand there are to be comments on this subject. I shall withhold my comments, and I thank the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, if there is to be extensive debate on the question, I have considerable more material that I desire to submit in addition to what I have already presented. May I have the attention of the majority leader, please? In conformity with what I understood to be a general understanding between the opponents and the proponents of the amendment, I expected no further debate, but if there is to be further debate, I myself have considerable in the way of additional comments to make, which would require at least an hour and a half.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I can speak for no other Senator, but I can speak for myself. I should like to reach a vote as early as possible. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] indicated that he had a brief statement of 4 or 5 minutes to make. I assume the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] has a statement to make.

Mr. HENNINGS. It is not my desire to foreclose any Senator who desires to present his views. I may say to the distinguished majority leader, as I said last night before moving to table the McClellan amendment.

As the Senator from Texas will recall, I asked if any Senators desired that I yield before the motion to table was made. Again I say it is not my intention to undertake to foreclose or estop or in any way prevent any statement being made upon this motion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the Senator agree to yield the floor so that the Senator from North Carolina may make a brief statement and the Senator from Arkansas may do likewise? The Senator can always obtain the floor.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am aware that I can. But I, too, have much more to say on this subject. Much has already been said. I am not sure the Senate needs further enlightenment on it, but I feel that although I have been living with this subject a half year or more, I can stand considerably more enlightenment on many aspects of it.

I find it a very difficult subject. The more I deal with it, and the more I study it, the more difficult it becomes. It may be a very simple matter to those not as obtuse as some of us, those who are more learned in the law, those who have had greater experience and who can read into this legislation a degree of safety and assurance, not only that it will do what its proponents claim for it, but that it will not do what some of us are well satisfied it inevitably will do; namely, seriously infringe upon and have, if not a disastrous effect, a most serious adverse impact upon the economy of this country, upon the industrial organizations of this country, upon the transportation and water interests of this country, upon agriculture, and upon fields the domain of which we know not completely at this time.

I shall content myself for the time being with what I have said on this and related subjects during the past 3 days. The debate has indeed been illuminating. The more we debate it the more we learn about the subject. To me it hoists a danger signal to the Senate, a warning and an admonition not to act irresponsibly in the closing days of this session to mar and tarnish the good record which has been made in most respects up to this point.

I now yield the floor and abide the judgment of the Chair with respect to recognizing another Senator.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I have never in my life heard so much fine oratory used to complicate simplicity. Insofar as the bill embodies the provisions of what has become popularly known as H. R. 3, it contains just two simple provisions. The bill relates only to fields in which the Constitution of the United States permits both Congress and the States to legislate. It does not relate in any way to fields in which the Federal Government, under the Constitution, has exclusive power. It does not relate in any way to fields in which the States are forbidden to act by the Constitution. I repeat that it relates only to those fields in which the Constitution of the United States permits both Congress and the States to legislate, and it recognizes the constitutional doctrine of the supremacy of conflicting Federal statutes over State statutes in fields in which both Congress and the States are permitted by the Constitution to legislate.

It lays down two tests which are rules of construction, not rules of law. One of the rules of construction applies to a case in which there is an apparent conflict between the Federal and State laws on the same subject. It says in that case the rule of construction which arose with the establishment of this Republic, and which has been observed by all judges of the Supreme Court of the

United States until recent days, shall continue to be the rule for the construction of statutes in determining, when the statutes disagree, whether State statutes shall fall under the Federal supremacy doctrine. It provides in that case that the Federal act shall not be construed to invalidate the State act unless the two are so repugnant and inconsistent with each other that both laws cannot stand. That is a sound doctrine. It is the only sensible doctrine of construction for instances where there is a supposed conflict between Federal and State laws on the same subject in a field in which both have constitutional power to legislate.

The other rule is a rule which is to be applied as a rule of construction, not as a rule of law, in instances where Congress and the State legislate upon the same subject, and there is no conflict or apparent conflict between the act of Congress and the legislation of the States. It merely says in that case Congress can make clear that it intends that the Federal Government shall preempt or occupy the entire field of legislation in that area by a simple declaration to that effect.

Instead of stirring up litigation, or engendering uncertainty, it provides a rule of law which is crystal clear and so plain that he who runs may read and not err in so doing.

The hue and cry about the supposed retroactive effects of the bill are, wasted upon a nonexistent legal ghost.

The bill, if enacted into law, would be only a rule of construction. It would in no case prevail if it appeared from the act which Congress had passed that Congress intended to preempt the entire field, even though no declaration to that effect was made in the act. It would apply only in case of ambiguity on that point, and it would operate only prospectively, that is, in the future. While it would apply in the construction of a statute enacted in the past, as well as in respect to a statute enacted in the future, it would not impose any liability of any kind on any person for any event which had occurred prior to the time the bill became law. It would impose liability only for events which would occur in the future.

Instead of being a complicated statute, the bill, if enacted into law, would avoid innumerable conflicts in the realm where Congress and the States are authorized to legislate.

The necessity for a law of this kind is well pointed out by the action taken by a committee of the chief justices of the 48 States meeting in Pasadena, Calif., yesterday. The committee, representing the chief justices of the 48 States, has approved and submitted to the chief justices, for adoption, a resolution asking the Supreme Court of the United States to exercise judicial restraint in the field of Federal and State relations. The pending bill, insofar as it incorporates within it the provisions of H. R. 3, would be the best and simplest and most direct means of promoting peace and harmony in the field of Federal and State relations, because it would provide a rule of construction under which even a layman could determine whether the Federal Government had preempted a field in which both Federal and State Governments, in the absence of Federal preemption, would have a constitutional right to act.

Therefore, instead of being likely to cause any injury and litigation, the bill, if enacted, would have exactly the opposite effect, and would be a very salutary measure to carry out the resolution proposed by the committee of the chief justices of the 48 States, and it would have a very salutary effect in perpetuating our dual system of government under which this country has grown great.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is the Senator referring to some action taken by the chief justices of the supreme courts of the several States at a previous time or is he referring to the action which was reported in the press today by a committee of chief justices?

Mr. ERVIN. Before I answer that specific question, I may say that, according to my study of the subject, the chief justices of the 48 States of the Union on two previous occasions have gone so far as to ask Congress to enact statutes which would clarify the law in the field of Federal-State relations.

Yesterday, according to a dispatch offered for the RECORD, a committee appointed by the chief justices of the 48 States, proposed for adoption a resolution which, in plain English, calls upon the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States to do something salutary in this field, namely, to exercise judicial restraint in matters arising in the fields where this problem occurs.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, is the Senator from North Carolina certain that the article was printed in the RECORD heretofore?

Mr. ERVIN. It was placed in the RECORD at the instance of the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to know that it is in the RECORD.

I noted that the meeting was held in Pasadena, Calif. Even in the atmosphere of Pasadena, the chief justices of the State courts—and I doubt not that any two of them had had more judicial experience in their lives than the present members of the Supreme Court of the United States combined had at the time they took office—filed the report and resolution respectfully imploring the Supreme Court of the United States to exercise some restraint; in other words, that they should adjudicate instead of legislate and invade the fields of the States.

Among the chief justices who approved the resolution were the chief justice of Maryland, the chief justice of New York, the chief justice of Michigan, the chief justice of Wisconsin, the chief justice of Oregon, the chief justice of Massachusetts, the chief justice of Minnesota. In addition, there were three chief justices from States that are in the South. I realize that when anyone from a southern State mentions the Supreme Court of the United States he is considered suspect. So I shall not mention the States of the chief justices from those three States. But the chief justices from the great States of New York, Michigan, Massachusetts, Oregon, Minnesota, and Wisconsin, at the annual meeting of the chief justices of the States, endorsed the resolution to which the Senator from North Carolina referred.

Because the article has already been included in the RECORD, I shall not ask to have it incorporated again, but I hope it will receive wide circulation. Some of us who have spent our lives at the law sometimes feel rather like a mother would feel to see a child suffering, when we see the Constitution and the laws tortured by interpretation of the Supreme Court of the United States. When we cry out against such decisions, we are told that the decisions of the Supreme Court are sacrosanct; that no one should question the decisions of that body in any way.

But a group of chief justices from the State supreme courts, from every area of the Nation, and who have had years of experience at the bar and on the bench, have adopted resolutions protesting the deviations of the Supreme Court of the United States.

It always struck me as being a little strange to have one characterize himself as a liberal and to take the position that any institution of Government was above criticism. That viewpoint goes back to the philosophy of the divine right of kings, a theory which we thought went out with the Bourbon dynasty in France, which held that the king could do no wrong. But self-styled liberals now adopt that philosophy and contend the Court is beyond criticism.

The Supreme Court is composed of men who hold their offices for life. Even if they had very little experience in the law or on the bench, and obtained their appointments because they were a personal friend of the President, or the President felt called on to pay a political debt, or because they happened to be a crony of the President, and are selected to serve on the Supreme Court, these liberals contend that they are from that time forward endowed with supernatural qualities and can make no mistakes, and no one should criticize them.

Thomas Jefferson was really a liberal. He would turn over in his grave to hear any such contentions by one who called himself a liberal.

Mr. ERVIN. And also Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. President, this is the third time the chief justices of the States have appealed for aid to preserve the powers of the States.

So far as I am concerned, I think every American has the right to think and to express his honest thoughts concerning anything under the sun, including decisions of Supreme Court majorities. Whenever any Member of the Senate thinks there is an encroachment upon the jurisdiction of Congress or the jurisdiction of the States or upon the jurisdiction of the judicial, or executive branch of the Federal Government he owes his country a duty to make known his view, because only in that way can

he uphold his oath to defend the Constitution.

Now, I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I believe I recollect correctly that the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] and some other Senators introduced a bill to provide that, prospectively only, it was the intent of Congress that the Federal Government would not preempt a field, unless it was specifically asseverated in the particular Federal law. Did the Senate Committee on the Judiciary report that bill to the Senate?

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator from Arkansas introduced a bill which undertakes to provide a rule of construction in that respect, both in regard to the laws heretofore passed and the laws to be hereafter enacted. The Committee on the Judiciary reported the bill with an amendment that restricted its provisions to the laws hereafter enacted by Congress, if my recollection is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. But that is not the bill before us.

Mr. KUCHEL. That bill, then, was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary and is now on the calendar.

Mr. ERVIN. Yes. The Committee on the Judiciary also reported the bill which is popularly known as the Bridges bill, and which was restricted, in this respect, to the field of sedition and subversion.

The Senator from Arkansas has offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute to the Bridges bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I shall make a few comments later. I shall not make them now. I desired to elicit this information first.

Mr. ERVIN. I now yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank my friend from North Carolina. It is always a pleasure and a delight to discuss matters with the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, who is a most valuable member of the Committee on the Judiciary. Although my views do not always agree with his, or his with mine, I believe that we can better perform our functions when there is some division of opinion, in order that truth may be separated from error.

Mr. ERVIN. I desire to thank the Senator from Missouri for his kind statement, and to return to him the compliment he has paid me.

Mr. HENNINGS. I have long cherished my friendship with the Senator from North Carolina, and I have warm regard for him. Although we have not very often found ourselves on the same side of the question in this Congress, I hope we shall have better fortune in the next Congress.

I desire to lay at rest one statement which the Senator from Georgia seemed to dwell upon when he adverted to the suggestion that there are some so-called liberals—and in some places that is not a very complimentary word—who think the Supreme Court should not be criticized. I do not consider myself a liberal or a progressive. I consider myself a Democrat. I have been a Democrat all my life. There has never been a Republican in my family. But I do not think I have to apologize for being a Democrat in what I think is the best traditional fashion of democracy. I try to live up to it. I do not always succeed. But I try to do what I think a good Democrat would do in the Jeffersonian sense, in the Jacksonian sense, in the Wilsonian sense, in the Rooseveltian sense, and in the Truman sense.

That has been one of my articles of faith all my life. So when some would apply the adjectives liberal and progressive, I say that I believe the Democratic Party is the party of change, the party of progress, the party that ventures forth, the party of new ideas, the party of venturesome, imaginative, constructive progress for the people of the Nation; and, of course, we derive our sovereignty from the people we undertake to represent.

I have repeatedly stated that I do not think the Supreme Court is infallible. In fact, member of that august body themselves do not consider it infallible, for we know there have been times when members of that body have stopped speaking to one another, and sometimes have reviled one another privately, because of differences among the members of the Court. We know that 5-to-4, 6-to-3, and other split decisions of the Court have sometimes resulted in such feelings, sometimes to such an extent that certain members of that body have said that other members of it were, in certain instances, dead wrong—just as members of other institutions can be dead wrong, and just as I have, at times, been dead wrong; and I fear that if I live long enough I shall have been dead wrong in a great many cases.

Therefore, I do not subscribe to the doctrine of infallibility as regards either the Supreme Court or any other human institution. I have criticized many of the decisions of the Supreme Court. I have been disappointed by many of its decisions. But, by the same token, even though I may be disappointed by, or in disagreement with, some decision the Court has handed down, I do not believe in the enactment of legislation which would remove from the Court some of its jurisdiction.

Mr. ERVIN. I thank the Senator from Missouri. But certainly the pending bill will not remove any jurisdiction from the Court. Instead, the bill will permit the Court to solve certain problems without difficulty.

If the bill had been law at the time of the enactment of the Smith Act, and its provisions had been complied with in that act, Pennsylvania would never have gone to the expense of prosecuting Steve Nelson. This is true because the matter would have been so clear that there would have been no controversy as to whether the Federal Government had preempted the field of sedition.

Mr. President, since my legislative duties prevent me from engaging any more in the practice of law, I am not now nearly as anxious as I used to be to see litigation stirred up. Therefore, I favor adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] even though it might constitute a negation of the prayer of the young attorney, "Stir up much strife among Thy people, O Lord, lest Thy servant perish." [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska be so kind as to withhold the suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. CURTIS. Very well.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, as a matter of good, sound, American public policy, I believe that the States of the American Union, as well as the Government of the United States, should—indeed, must—have the right to legislate in the field of antisedition and antisubversion legislation. As a Member of the United States Senate, I am prepared—indeed, I am quite anxious—to be given an opportunity to vote in favor of the pending bill, unfettered by amendments, and which, in making specific reference to Federal antisubversion legislation already enacted, states specifically and unequivocally that the Congress does not intend to preempt the field of protecting American Government, State and Federal, but, to the contrary, welcomes the partnership of State laws in ferreting out and punishing those who conspire to overthrow any segment of American Government by force or violence.

No Member of this body whether lawyer or not, has, thus far, risen to condemn the proposed bill as being illogical, untenable, unconstitutional or susceptible of the imperfect construction.

I must say that it is exceedingly distressing to me that the Senate now has before it an amendment—submitted by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]—which would add to the pending bill a vastly different, and vigorously contested, policy decision, for consideration by the Senate.

Earlier, I had my memory refreshed by my friend, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] who confirmed that there is available for consideration by the Senate a bill, now on our calendar, authored by the Senator from Arkansas, which, in simple terms, provides that, on a prospective basis only, Congress declares that it does not desire to preempt any particular field of legislation, unless it specifically says so.

It is now, unhappily, the responsibility of the Senate to deal with an amendment which would do more than merely make that legislative policy prospective, but, to the contrary, would apply that policy retroactively, as well. Thus, to a simple, understandable, logically desirable bill authorizing joint State and Federal action against subversives, we are now confronted with a complex and controversial amendment which could, whether you like it or not, result in the defeat of a needed piece of legislation.

The Department of Justice raises the questions of a highly technical, and certainly a preeminently important, nature, as a result of which the Department opposes the proposed retroactive application of such a Congressional statement of policy.

Let me quote a few paragraphs, once again, from the written comments of the Attorney General of the United States, arguing, as the top Government lawyer, against the proposed Senate amendment, which is the same thing as H. R. 3:

H. R. 3 is designed to revive certain State laws previously held unconstitutional because of their conflict with Federal statutes. It proposes to change the effect of these Federal statutes, not by openly amending them, but by passing a retroactive rule of interpretation to change the meaning the courts have given to the words now contained in these statutes without changing the words themselves. The bill is so broadly drawn that its effect cannot be foretold and if it is effective, it must change the meaning of statutes conclusively interpreted many years ago, basic statutes under which millions of dollars have been invested and under which important human relationships have become fixed.

Section 1 reads as follows:

"No act of Congress shall be construed as indicating an intent on the part of Congress to occupy the field in which such act operates, to the exclusion of all State laws on the same subject matter, unless such act contains an express provision to that effect, or unless there is a direct and positive conflict between such act and a State law so that the two cannot be reconciled or consistently stand together."

This section would attempt to apply a new rule for determining the intent of not only the present Congress or of a future Congress, but also previous Congresses whose intent is a long concluded fact not subject to change by legislative fiat. It would provide that there was no intent to occupy a field to the exclusion of State laws unless the Federal statute contains an express provision to that effect or unless there is a direct and positive conflict so that they cannot consistently stand together.

There are relatively few Federal statutes containing express provisions preempting the field. Major laws relating to interstate enterprises, and others in fields of heretofore undoubted Federal preeminence, such as bankruptcy and immigration, contain no such provisions. In these fields there is serious question as to the effect of section 1 upon heretofore existing court rules of interpretation. Whether there is any difference between the direct and positive conflict test contained in the bill, and that which the courts have heretofore applied.

There were declarations by Congressmen favoring the bill in committee and on the floor of the House that the first section of H. R. 3 is merely declaratory of existing law. Ordinarily, Congress should not be called upon to perform a useless act, especially when it would give rise to great uncertainty in so many vital areas of Federal-State relations. Some proponents of this measure believe that it will change existing law. Indeed, Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH, who introduced the bill, testified before the House Judiciary Committee that he had no interest in the bill unless it was made retroactive.

If it would change the law, then innumerable questions arise as to how far and in what fields changes in the law are intended to be wrought. These changes in a multitude of Federal-State relationships will be uncertain in extent and meaning until the courts have passed on the numerous questions raised.

The principal area in which Federal legislation comes into conflict with State legislation covering the same field is that in which the commerce power is exercised. There are, of course, many other fields in which problems of concurrent jurisdiction arise: control of aliens by requirement of registration, *Hines* v. *Davidowitz*, 312 U. S. 52; authority over immigration, *Takahashi* v. *Fish & Game Commission*, 334 U. S. 410; labor-management relations, *Garner* v. *Teamsters, Chauffeurs, etc., Union*, 346 U. S. 485.

For the farmer and the businessman in interstate commerce H. R. 3 creates the serious possibility of multiple and different regulations by 49 jurisdictions. A striking but typical example is given by the vice president and general counsel of the Association of American Railroads:

"Enactment of H. R. 3 without language excepting its application to carriers subject to part 1 of the Interstate Commerce Act such as railroads would create chaos in the field of Federal regulation of the railroads. For example, in areas now preempted by Federal legislation such as: (1) rates, H. R. 3 might lead to establishment of multitudinous rates on a single commodity depending upon the action of State courts and juries as to a reasonable rate; (2) penalties, many antiquated State laws are in existence and would have application to interstate rail transportation service if H. R. 3 were enacted, including nullifying car service orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission; (3) safety appliances and free interchange of rolling stock along railroads in this country, H. R. 3 would permit the substitution for Federal law of innumerable and conflicting State statutes requiring particular safety devices on railroad rolling stock; (4) locomotive inspections, conflicting State laws might be given full application with resulting intolerable operation conditions; (5) hours of service, the diversity of State employment laws is a matter of common knowledge and enactment of H. R. 3 would lead to untold complications and additional expense in complying therewith as compared to existing Federal law. Cannot overemphasize the undesirable nature of and chaotic condition that would be created in the field of interstate railroad transportation by enactment of H. R. 3 without language excepting its application in instances of railroads subject to the Interstate Commerce Act."

Similarly, farmers and marketers of agricultural produce complying with the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act might be subject to prosecution under numerous State laws which set up different and varying standards for compliance. (See *Savage* v. *Jones*, 225 U. S. 501.)

I suggest that it would be far better from the standpoint of the Nation to give the Members of the Senate an opportunity to sit in judgment on the intricate question of prospective versus retroactive application of antipreempting legislation in dealing with the bill on the calendar and available for consideration by the Senate, which the Senator from Arkansas has introduced, which is prospective in nature, which could be amended if a majority of the Senate determined to be retroactive as well, and which in its present form has been sent to us with the approval of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

Pending now is an unfortunate motion to recommit the subversion legislation to committee.

Mr. President, I oppose the motion to recommit, and I shall vote against adoption of the motion. If approved, that motion would kill the bill, and States would continue to be powerless to enact general antisubversion laws or to enforce antisedition laws which they have already adopted. That, as I see it, would be bad for our country.

Therefore, I am quite prepared to exercise my judgment in this way. I oppose the amendment submitted by the very able and fine Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]—although I wish that the entire question of retroactivity might be omitted from our consideration of this important piece of proposed legislation, and that retroactivity be considered as a possible amendment to his own bill, prospective only in character, which is now on our calendar.

The bill authored by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is endorsed by the Government of the United States. The Attorney General has recommended enactment of the bill. The attorneys general of the States of the Nation have requested its enactment. I unhesitatingly endorse it as good, sound American policy, and as the best means of making unmistakingly clear what the imperfect words of the present Federal laws failed properly to disclose as the intent of Congress.

So, certainly, here is a clear opportunity—if we do not muddle or meddle with amendments which, if not actually designed to put the bill "down the drain," at least will have that undesirable result—to deal with the pending bill, which, in my judgment, is in the public interest, which helps protect America against subversion and which should be enacted into law. The pending bill provides the Congress with an opportunity to determine, on an honorable policy basis, whether it wishes the States as well as the Federal Government to deal with matters of antisubversion.

Mr. President, because I desire to have an opportunity to vote in favor of that bill without amendments, I hope the motion to recommit will be rejected.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The able junior Senator from California served capably and honorably as controller of the great State of California. Therefore, it is some comfort to me to hear the Senator express sentiments akin to those I hold.

Is there anything basically wrong or erroneous with the legislative branch of the Government proceeding to protect its legislative prerogatives from judicial encroachment by providing rules of construction for legislation hereafter enacted?

Mr. KUCHEL. First of all, I thank my friend for his comment. I was in the government of California after the conclusion of World War II. I was controller of California for almost 7 years. Prior to the war I practiced law in my home community, and was in the State legislature.

I would answer my friend from Tennessee, "No." I think it is the duty of the Congress, when a law is passed, if the intention or the purpose of that act is not clear, to enact amendatory legislation of that law so the intent and purpose of the act will be crystal clear. That reminds me of something, if my able friend will let me say it.

Mr. President, some of the responsibility for the difficulty of interpreting the

purpose of legislation devolves upon those of us who are Members of the Congress and who sometimes, because of the speed with which we are required to operate and legislate, fail, with all the skill that ought to be present, to use the precise verbiage to describe the intention which we on this side of the Capitol and those on the other side of the Capitol have with respect to legislation which we enact.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. GORE. If the Congress wishes to protect its legislative prerogatives from encroachment by the judiciary through its interpretation of legislative intent, or otherwise, it can proceed to do so, and I am willing to do so in legislation hereafter enacted with a general rule of construction. But the Senator has said the Congress can wisely do so by amending such legislation as may exist regarding which there may be doubt as to intent. Would not that kind of procedure lend itself to specific correction, rather than an attempt to apply a 1- or 2-sentence bill to all legislation heretofore enacted throughout the history of this country?

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is eminently correct, and I think his point is a powerful one. It ought to appeal to all in this Chamber.

Mr. GORE. Where is there a Member of Congress who can envision the extent of the effect of H. R. 3 retroactively? Present Members and their successors in the Congress will be masters of legislation enacted in the future, but who is there who could foresee the extent of this rule of construction if it were applied to all existing law?

Mr. KUCHEL. God alone knows how it would or could or might be applied in a retroactive fashion.

Mr. GORE. What would be its effect in the field of interstate commerce?

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator touches on perhaps one of the most important fields of law, where, if retroactively applied, the amendment would, in my judgment, and in the opinion and judgment of the Senator from Tennessee, create a maelstrom of problems as to whether or not an article in interstate commerce in each instance were susceptible to regulation by State or local laws, as against laws which the Congress had enacted.

Mr. GORE. Is it correct to assume, then, that the able junior Senator from California is willing to join the junior Senator from Tennessee in enacting a reasonable rule of construction for legislation hereafter enacted, and that he is willing to deal specifically with encroachment by judicial decision with respect to legislation already in existence?

Mr. KUCHEL. I agree with what the Senator has just said. Let me say that misfortune of misjudging legislative intent has resulted on many occasions from the failure of Congress using precise and unmistakable language in the wording of legislation. Congress works at high speed. We have able staff assistance. But in the hurly-burly of a legislative session, we enact legislation whose verbiage is many times honestly susceptible to two meanings, and sometimes more. If anyone begins to assess fault for wrongful interpretation of Congressional intent of statutes, I suggest that Congress itself must assume its share of the blame.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I should like to put a question to him.

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to my good friend the able junior Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let us assume that this proposed law is enacted and, through it, the declaration is made that "no act of Congress shall be construed as indicating an intent on the part of Congress to occupy the field in which such act operates, to the exclusion of all State laws on the same subject matter, unless such act contains an express provision to that effect, or unless there is a direct and positive conflict between such act and a State law so that the two cannot be reconciled or consistently stand together."

Now let us assume that there comes before the Court a case involving the question as to whether the Federal act has preempted a particular field of governmental operation. The Court, in examining the circumstances, and reading in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the debate on the bill, finds that the act, which was enacted in the past, did contemplate a preemption of the field. Then the Court looks at the newly adopted statute and finds, after an examination of the newly adopted statute, that it cannot carry out the true intent and the true purpose Congress had when the law was enacted.

Let me state my interpretation of the situation. By this provision, making it mandatory for the Court to say there is no preemption, we affix the stamp of falsehood upon the pronouncement of the Court complying with the provisions of the act, because that pronouncement is in direct conflict with the truth as it existed when the act originally became law.

Mr. KUCHEL. I think the Senator makes a very able argument.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a comment on that particular point?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. I disagree with my able friend from Ohio. That is why I said that this bill, if enacted into law, would establish a rule of construction, not a rule of law. A rule of construction is merely a rule which enables the Court to interpret a statute in case of ambiguity.

Referring to the case which the Senator from Ohio put to the Senator from California, this bill if enacted into law would not govern such a case, because it would clearly appear from the suppositious case that Congress has preempted the field and had intended to preempt it. This is merely a rule of construction which would be applied in the case of ambiguity.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am glad to get the comments of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina. I understand what a rule of construction and what a rule of law are, but I cannot speedily subscribe to the views expressed by my distinguished colleague, because under this language no discretion is given to the Court. The Court is told, "You cannot state that the field was preempted because there is no provision in the law to that effect."

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I will be glad to yield the floor to my able friend from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I desire to make a statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. LAUSCHE. One cannot lightly cast aside the resolution adopted by the chief justices of the 48 States concerning the need for some clarification of this subject. One cannot lightly cast aside the resolution adopted by 43 governors in the 1956 governors conference calling for some action to clarify this conflict which is occurring. I repeat that 48 governors in the 1956 conference suggested that some clarification must be made as to this problem.

Likewise, we cannot cast aside the fears which reside with some Members of the Senate about the purpose in making the law retroactive in its operation. The disclosures which have been given lend emphasis to the confusion which might develop. This is a matter worthy of serious consideration, especially when it is said, "Not only prospectively, but retrospectively this law shall operate."

I feel that something must be done in this field, and it must be done on the basis of not one isolated field of action. There are probably 50 fields of action to which this has application. Regrettably, in the last 2 days we have been thinking only of 1 field and have become oblivious to the fact that the principle is applicable in probably 50 other fields of governmental function.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. If it be true, as the able Senator says, that there are 50 fields of action, can the able Senator foretell the effect of the retroactive provisions of H. R. 3 upon those 50 fields? If not, would it not be the part of wisdom for the Congress to proceed to act after study and after some knowledge of possible effect? Would it not be the part of wisdom and judicious procedure to deal specifically with those fields, in the case of existing law?

Mr. LAUSCHE. In my judgment we are going into the realm of the unknown when we are trying to foretell what a human mind, even residing in a judge, will do with the language. We would be speculating fantastically in trying to predict how the court would retrospectively apply the language.

There is great strength in the proposition that we ought to have some certainty, to the degree we can achieve it, since we are possessed of human minds, about what the impact will be.

I should like to ask the chairman of the committee, what is his view concerning a law which would cope with the problem about which complaint is made by the chief justices of the 48 States and the governors of the 48 States, in the event it is to operate only prospectively?

I ask the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] to answer the question. The Senator from Missouri stated that a bill had been proposed.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I did not understand the question was addressed to me. I do not happen to be chairman of the committee.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator is the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. HENNINGS. No. My subcommittee had no dealings with the legislation. The Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights is the subcommittee of which I am chairman.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Am I correct in my understanding that a bill which is intended to operate in the future, from the day of its passage, is on the calendar of the Senate?

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes, that bill is S. 337, as amended in the Committee on the Judiciary. I will say to the able Senator, I think he has grasped the salient and essential point. We know not whither we are drifting on this legislation. We do not know what it is likely to do. As the able Senator from Tennessee pointed out, we are legislating in utter darkness and uncertainty.

I think, as the Senator says, these matters should be given reflection, serious and sober consideration by the committees having these matters within their jurisdiction. I find this field is enormously complex. I think it is very difficult to understand.

I think the number of 50 fields the Senator mentions is a very conservative estimate, in addition to the effect on the commerce clause. If we believe there are only 50 fields, the proposed legislation may still be so far reaching that it will burgeon and spread to all areas of our life and our economy.

But I am not sure I have answered the Senator's question.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Let us keep the record straight. Many people have been talking about the bill as something which would do a great deal of irreparable injury. Someone spoke up to say that all interstate commerce laws would be involved. There is not a thing in the bill, if it were passed, which would keep the Federal Government from acting exactly as it has in the past. The only question, really, is whether we also want the States to act, when such action is not in conflict with the Federal law. That is all the bill would provide. We are confusing the issue when we talk about all the other laws on the statute books which have been passed heretofore. As I see it, the only question is whether we want the States to try to help out just a little bit in the situation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I appreciate the statement made by the Senator from South Carolina. I feel somewhat bewildered by the fact that if this is a procedural rule, as distinguished from a substantive law——

Mr. ERVIN. A rule of construction.

Mr. LAUSCHE. A rule of construction deals with procedure.

Mr. ERVIN. It deals with interpretation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If this is a procedural rule, then there is no need to make the statute retrospective, because all changes in law dealing with procedural matters are operative on cases as they come before the court. Rules of evidence, rules of pleading and rules of construction are all operative upon the cases which come before the court, and no declaration is needed to make them retrospective.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Colorado to recommit the bill to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. In the discussion last night the distinguished Senator from Colorado in his remarks said, "Let us hear from the people who will be affected by the legislation. Let us hear from the Association of American Railroads."

Mr. President, I have received a letter from the Association of American Railroads. We talk about the retroactive aspects of the matter, and we talk about those who would be most affected. This is certainly the biggest scarecrow which has been thrown up in this area.

I assume the railroads have some pretty good lawyers. I assume those lawyers give attention and study to bills which they think may adversely affect the interests of the railroads. And I assume, Mr. President, after the remarks last night, when the matter was called to their attention, there was a desire to set the record straight. I received a letter today, dated August 21, 1958, which reads:

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RAILROADS,
Washington, D. C., August 21, 1958.

Hon. JOHN L. McCLELLAN,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR McCLELLAN: The purpose of this letter is to make clear the position of the Association of American Railroads with respect to the amendment proposed by you to S. 654 on August 20, 1958.

It is my understanding that your proposed amendment would add to S. 654 the provisions of H. R. 3 as adopted by the House of Representatives on July 17, 1958. You may be assured that the Association of American Railroads does not oppose adoption by the Senate of your amendment. On the contrary, we take no position on the merits of that amendment, believing that its principle is intended to apply to much legislation in which we have no substantial interest as an industry.

When H. R. 3 was being considered on the House side we endeavored to make this position clear to the Members of the House, stating then that we took no position on the merits of that bill. We did seek an exemption that would make the bill inapplicable to acts of Congress relating to carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, believing that it was not the intention of the authors of the bill to affect longstanding Federal laws regulating interstate commerce and having years ago been held to preempt the field. At the same time we stated that, in event such amendment should fail, the railroads would not oppose the passage of the bill. I quote in part a telegram from Mr. Gregory S. Prince, vice president and general counsel, Association of American Railroads, dated July 17, 1958, to certain Members of the House of Representatives.

"In view of the numerous statements being made on the floor of the House of Representatives with respect to the position of the Association of American Railroads on H. R. 3, I wish to state in unequivocal terms our position on this bill. The Association of American Railroads takes no position on the merits of the bill. * * * Therefore, we feel that the supporters of the bill should have no objection to the amendment we advocate. In the event that amendment should fail, the railroads will not oppose the passage of the bill."

In keeping with this position, we have made no effort to obtain any amendment to H. R. 3 as it was placed before the Senate. Consequently, adoption of its provisions as an amendment to S. 654 is not opposed by the Association of American Railroads.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM M. MOLONEY,
General Solicitor.

I point out that in the past when the Supreme Court has held that the Congress, by an act, intended to preempt a field, previous decisions were not upset. The proposed legislation is not retroactive in that sense. It would be applied only in a new test of the law. It would not upset the decisions which had already been made in past cases with respect to an act of Congress. The rule of construction would affect only cases which would arise in the future. In instances in which the courts have already made findings, under the long established rule which the courts have followed, this legislation would have no effect.

I was greatly concerned by the statements of the distinguished Senator from Ohio and other Senators a moment ago. They stated that there are at least 50 fields of action in which this proposed legislation might apply. If there are 50 fields of action in which it might operate, there are 50 fields of action in which the Supreme Court can operate, just as it did in connection with the Nelson decision.

So what are we to do? Are we to do nothing? There would never have been any occasion for this bill if the Supreme Court had followed the long established precedents. All the bill would do would be to restore the long established rule of construction.

Which is the safest for the country—to settle this question by enacting into law a rule of construction, or for the Congress to take no action and permit the Supreme Court, if it cares to do so, in 49 or 50 other fields of action, again throw away a precedent of long standing and establish a new precedent, as it did in the Nelson case? I think the situation is pretty serious.

I spoke last night, and I stated that I was not offering the amendment in a spirit of criticism of the Supreme Court. I am not doing so now. Everyone listening to me now knows whether or not I have ever said a word, or whether any other Member of this body has said a word on the floor, in the way of personal criticism of the Supreme Court.

However, we know that for some of its decisions the Court is under criticism from sources which the Congress cannot ignore. I do not believe we would want to ignore the views of the Attorney

General of the United States. I do not believe we wish to disregard the governors of the 48 States. I do not believe we wish to ignore and disregard what the chief justices of the several State courts have said, and the action they have taken.

I am interested in this question only because there is a gap. Action should be taken. I should like to see this amendment voted upon on its merits. Senators say they are in favor of Senate bill 654; yet if they vote to send the bill back to committee, they know that it will be killed. It will not be enacted at this session of Congress.

Therefore I trust that the motion to recommit the bill will be defeated. The gap ought to be filled. The Congress ought not to sit silently by and take no action.

Mr. President, I shall have very little more to say. If this debate continues for a week, that is all right, if any Senators wish to continue it for that length of time. But enough has been said. Enough is known, and there is enough before the Senate to enable it to act.

Mr. THURMOND. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Is it not correct to say that the American Bar Association, composed of the leading lawyers of the United States, have passed a resolution in favor of H. R. 3, the very bill the distinguished and able Senator from Arkansas has offered as a substitute? I shall read that resolution:

Resolved, That the American Bar Association favors the enactment into law of H. R. 3, 84th Congress, 1st session, entitled "A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws," and authorizes and directs the standing committee on jurisprudence and law reform to advocate by all appropriate means its passage by the Congress of the United States.

The Senator is aware of that resolution, is he not?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes. I have been aware of its contents. I recall a number of them.

Mr. THURMOND. I assume the Senator is also aware of the action which has been taken by a number of medical associations. A typical example is a telegram to Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH, a Member of Congress from the State of Virginia, which reads in part:

Our association supports H. R. 3 as now proposed and hopes no amendments will be attached unless you think it advisable.

The Medical Society of the State of Pennsylvania and other medical societies have endorsed H. R. 3.

The distinguished Senator from Arkansas just referred to the attorneys general. The attorneys general, who advise the governors in the State governments, men in whom we all have confidence in our States, took action in this field during the 50th annual meeting of the association, which was held in Phoenix, Ariz. I read one paragraph of their resolution:

Be it resolved by the 50th annual meeting of the National Association of Attorneys General, That this association approves the enactment by Congress of legislation to clarify its intent that no future act of Congress shall be considered to exclude any State laws on the same subject matter unless such Congressional act contains an express provision to that effect, nor shall such Congressional act invalidate a provision of State law which would be valid in the absence of such act unless a power expressly granted to the Federal Government by the Constitution of the United States is involved.

I would ask the distinguished Senator from Arkansas if he is familiar with that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am sure most of the Senators are familiar with it. If the Senator will please place in the RECORD the communications approving H. R. 3 which he has, and name the parties sending them, we shall be able to move along. I do not wish to keep the Senator from reading them if he desires to do so, but he would expedite matters by naming the parties sending the communications and inserting them in the RECORD.

Mr. THURMOND. I have just one more.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Very well.

Mr. THURMOND. I have here a telegram which gives the action of the 48th Annual Governors' Conference. Here is what the governors of the States of the United States say:

Members of this conference are gravely concerned by decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States which have held that Congressional enactments supersede State laws on the matters involved and thereby preempt those fields for the Federal Government alone. Judicial interpretations of this character seriously handicap the States in the regulation and the administration of their internal affairs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the 48th Annual Governors' Conference recommend to the Congress that Federal laws should be so framed that they will not be construed to preempt any field against State action unless this intent is stated, and that exercise of national power on any subject should not bar State action on the same subject unless there is positive inconsistency.

I ask the distinguished Senator if that is not exactly what his amendment does.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is my interpretation of it, and if I did not think it would accomplish that purpose, I would not be here fighting for it.

Mr. THURMOND. I shall not read any additional telegrams or letters, but I call attention to the fact that the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association has endorsed this bill, as have also the Missouri State Chamber of Commerce, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the Wisconsin Employment Relations Board, the American Farm Bureau, the California Farm Bureau, the Kentucky Farm Bureau, the Pennsylvania Farmers Association, the South Carolina Farm Bureau, the Tennessee Farm Bureau, the Texas Farm Bureau, the Conference of American Small Business Organizations, the Medical Society of the State of Pennsylvania, the South Carolina Law Enforcement Officers Association, Association of State Labor Relations Agencies, American Cotton Manufacturers Association, Southern States Industrial Council, the National Grange, the National Industrial Council and, as I mentioned the governors' conference, and the Association of Attorneys General.

Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas if this is his interpretation of the bill, if I can state it in one simple sentence: If the Federal Government has a law on a subject and a State has a law on the same subject, the State law will not be stricken down unless 1 of 2 conditions exists: First, if the Federal act contains an express provision for exclusive jurisdiction; second, if there is a positive and direct conflict between the Federal law and the State law and the two cannot be reconciled or consistently stand together. Is that the Senator's interpretation of the amendment?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is exactly what the amendment means. I do not see how it can be interpreted otherwise.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I shall conclude my remarks by asking unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article written by Representative EDGAR W. HIESTAND, published in the Alameda (Calif.) News-Press of July 26, 1958. It deals with H. R. 3. The author has given a great deal of study to the proposal, having worked on it for a long time. It is a very splendid and convincing article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESSMAN EDGAR W. HIESTAND REPORTS THE WASHINGTON NEWS

WASHINGTON.—The most important single bill of this session of Congress, in my judgment, and one of the most important of any session in modern times, is H. R. 3. The bill states its purpose in clear and simple terms:

"No act of Congress shall be construed as indicating an intent on the part of Congress to occupy the field in which such act operates to the exclusion of all State laws on the same subject matter, unless such act contains an express provision to that effect, or unless there is direct and positive conflict between such act and the State law so that the two cannot be reconciled or consistently stand together."

Obviously this would correct the "preemption doctrine" upon which many of the much criticized decisions of the Supreme Court have been based. In one of the most recent, the notorious Steve Nelson case, the Court turned loose a convicted Communist, because he was prosecuted under Pennsylvania law, rather than the Federal Smith Act. In another case, the Court held that Alabama could no longer enforce her own State pure food law, because the Federal Government adopted such a law, thereby preempting the field and nullifying Alabama's law.

These are but two of such controversial decisions.

In these instances, the Supreme Court, not merely "in effect," but actually, nullified State law by application of the doctrine of Federal preemption. The confusion resulting from these decisions poses a very serious problem and a dangerous threat to our system of government, which is based on the premise of local self rule, and places in jeopardy that whole great body of State legislation now on the books.

Students of government know that the Founding Fathers of this Nation, when drafting the Constitution, were vitally concerned with preserving the authority of the State governments. They were fearful of centralized power and tyranny. Having just broken the yoke of one such power to earn

their freedom, they were disinclined to create a similar monster on domestic soil. Quotations of these great American patriots fill volumes. Washington, Jefferson, Adams, Franklin, Paine, and many others, were adamant, and articulate on the subject of local self government.

It is generally agreed that the Constitution would not have been ratified without the Tenth Amendment, which provides that the powers not specifically delegated to the Federal Government are reserved to the States, or to the people. I hold the opinion that we are a far stronger Nation composed of 48 sovereign Republics, than we would be as a strong, centralized, Federal despotism.

The concept of State sovereignty, so indelibly stamped on our Declaration of Independence, Constitution, and Bill of Rights by the Founding Fathers, must be preserved.

Students of government and free citizens alike, must be conscious of the increased concentration of power in our Government in Washington. This centralization has weakened State government and law enforcement, narrowed its scope of operation and depleted sources of revenue for it. As a result, the weakened States have been more and more prone to look to the Federal Government for financial aid. This aid has in most instances been willingly supplied, but of course, with Federal strings attached.

If adopted by Congress, H. R. 3 would, in part, checkmate the trend toward centralization in our Government, and proportionately strengthen the position and power of the sovereign States. Thus rejection of H. R. 3 by Congress would be a green light to the forces of centralization, and a lethal blow to the sovereign States.

H. R. 3, for which I have worked very hard, is a companion bill to my H. R. 679, and I hope we can pass it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, in conclusion, I ask that we not send the bill back to committee. The substitute should be adopted. If the bill is sent back to committee we cannot vote on its merits. I know there are honest differences of opinion. I quarrel with no one who honestly disagrees with me. I respect everyone's convictions. However, Mr. President, the bill should be voted on, and we should decide its fate on its merits. The device of returning it to committee should not be used to kill the measure at this session of Congress. I hope we will face the issue and vote our honest convictions, and thereby let the American people know that the Senate intends to do something in this matter, and not let the American people know that the Senate is not ready and is not willing to do anything about the problem.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the distinguished Senator from Arkansas mentioned my name at the outset of his remarks concerning some statements on the issue which I read into the RECORD last evening, I should like to say, as I said many times last night, that there is no source material available within the Senate to which a Senator can refer. Therefore I had to go to the House of Representatives for source material, where proper hearings have been held on the bill. I had to go for this information to the House.

I, too, have a copy of a letter which was addressed to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas by the Association of American Railroads, and it is a very significant letter. It bears out exactly what the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania has said as to what we might have confronting us if we do not recommit the bill and bring some common-sense into the situation. If we pass the bill we shall have to go through the whole judicial code, chapter by chapter, and exempt from the application of the act transportation, communications, and, as the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] said last night, even his own bill, now enacted, having to do with the civil aviation program.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARROLL. Not at the moment. I did not interrupt the Senator from Arkansas. I should like to finish my point; then I shall be happy to yield. This is what the letter addressed to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas said:

We did seek an exemption that would make the bill inapplicable to acts of Congress relating to carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, believing that it was not the intention of the authors of the bill to affect long-standing Federal laws regulating interstate commerce and having years ago been held to preempt the field.

Of course the railroads would have no objection to the bill if they could make its provisions inapplicable to themselves. This is the letter of the Association of American Railroads dated August 21, 1958. Let us see what else they said in the letter addressed to the Honorable JOHN L. McCLELLAN, this time on May 22, 1956. This is the part I read last night. I now repeat. It is from the same Association of American Railroads, with its distinguished lawyers and learned men.

I read from page 25 of the hearings of the House entitled "Federal-State Concurrent Jurisdiction," May 18, 1956:

During the last 75 years, the Congress has developed a complex and elaborate administrative system for the regulation of the railroads of this country, and during this period the courts have on numerous occasions passed upon the question of when certain railroad matters are subject to exclusive regulation by Federal law, and when they are subject to concurrent regulation by Federal law and State law. These adjudications have become an integral part of the entire system that Congress has provided for the field of national transportation.

That letter was written in connection with a bill similar to the one now pending, having to do with the question of preemption. It was an almost identical bill. I continue:

The railroads, therefore, respectfully suggest that no action be taken by the Senate Judiciary Committee that would have the effect of setting aside the legal arrangements that have been developed with such care in this field. Without attempting to be exhaustive, it is believed that the proposed bill might result in drastic changes in the fields regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission under authority of the Interstate Commerce Act, and in the fields covered by such laws as the hours of service law, the Federal employers' liability law, the safety appliance law, and no doubt many others.

This is the concluding paragraph of the letter:

In order to avoid the harmful consequences that might ensue in the field of interstate railroad transportation if this measure should be enacted, it is suggested that the bill be amended by the addition of the following language:

"This act shall not apply to laws of Congress relating to carriers by railroad subject to part I of the Interstate Commerce Act."

Now Senators can understand why the Interstate Commerce Commission opposes the bill. Now they can understand why the Department of Justice opposes the bill. That is why I read what I have just read.

I have no connection with the railroad attorneys. I read the letter from the hearings held in 1956. I submit that by their own letter dated today, they have proved the point conclusively.

I read again from the letter of August 21, 1958, in which is quoted, in part, a telegram from Mr. Gregory S. Prince, vice president and general counsel, Association of American Railroads, dated July 17, 1958, to certain Members of the House of Representatives:

Therefore, we feel that the supporters of the bill should have no objection to the amendment we advocate.

Do we advocate an amendment for the benefit of the Association of American Railroads? Is there a provision in the bill which will exempt the railroads?

If the motion to recommit is not agreed to, there will be many amendments to the bill, because we shall not only be helping the railroads; we shall be helping other methods of transportation. We shall be helping the aviation industry. We shall be moving step by step to exclude other forms of transportation and industry. Why? The answer is that we cannot legislate intelligently, in the closing days of a session, on an important matter which has never been considered by a committee of this body.

This is the argument I made last night. If the Senator from Arkansas and other Senators think this is a simple bill, then let us have some hearings. It is only 3 months until we can be back to hold them. The proposal can then be considered carefully. We can call in the legal lights and find out whether the measure is merely a rule of construction. We shall find out whether it is a simple bill. Is there something wrong with that suggestion? Why can we not wait 60 or 90 days?

I could stand here and talk for another 30 or 40 minutes, talking about the Interstate Commerce Commission, which the Senator from South Carolina has incorporated in the bill.

Again, I go to the source material in the House, because there is nothing in this body to give us the benefit of thinking.

Representative KENNETH KEATING, a distinguished Member of the House from New York, at page 14145 of the RECORD of July 17, 1958, said:

It has been said that the American Bar Association favors this bill. I have a letter from the president of the American Bar Association dated July 15, saying:

"It is not correct to say that the association has approved the bill."

If we examine the debates, we will find nothing about such a recommendation having been put before that organization. It was a group in the House of

Delegates, which has no right to commit the American Bar Association.

I received a telephone call last night from Mr. Charles Rhyne, of the American Bar Association. He has authorized me to say, in his behalf, that the American Bar Association has not endorsed H. R. 3.

Mr. President, I could continue to talk at length on this measure, because its scope is so broad and its significance so great. I could speak on this subject, as could any other Senator, hour upon hour, as each of us sought to find his way through this maze. There are many problems which confront us. I know we are tired and want to vote. Therefore, Mr. President, I shall forego further remarks. Many excellent arguments have been made.

I now yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, after the Senator read last night what he has repeated today, the Senator then said that the representatives of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Association of American Railroads had been heard. In 2 years' time they have changed their mind. They no longer oppose the bill.

Mr. CARROLL. I read from the letter of the Association of American Railroads to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] dated August 21, which is today:

> Therefore, we feel that the supporters of the bill should have no objection to the amendment we advocate.

What amendment do they advocate? They want to be exempt from the provisions of the bill. If the Senate does not recommit the bill, we shall be exempting many other fields. Mr. President, I have nothing more to say on the motion.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, this legislation has been made necessary because a decision of the United States Supreme Court, in the case of Commonwealth of Pennsylvania against Steve Nelson, enunciated a new extension of the doctrine of Federal legislative preemption, to the great joy of Communists convicted, indicted, or under investigation for violation of State antisubversive laws. The effect of that Supreme Court decision was to render unenforceable the antisubversive and antisedition laws of 42 States and Hawaii and Alaska.

This bill has just one purpose: to make sure that no State law not in direct and positive conflict with Federal statutory provisions shall be stricken down or rendered unenforceable on the theory that Congress has occupied the field in which it operates, unless the Congress has itself determined to occupy that field and has expressed its determination in legislation.

The Communist Party, U. S. A., and Communist-front organizations in this country, are the greatest opponents of this bill. They fear it and oppose it because they like things the way they are now, with no effective legislation at either the State or Federal level under which Communist activity can be controlled. If this bill is passed, the governments of the sovereign States of the Union will again be in a position to take effective action to defend themselves and the Union itself against subversion from within.

The day after the Supreme Court handed down its decision in the case of Commonwealth of Pennsylvania against Steve Nelson, the Communist Daily Worker hailed the decision as a tremendous victory.

When the Communists hailed the Nelson case as a tremendous victory, they were not thinking of it as a victory for the security of the United States; they were thinking of it as a victory for the Communist conspiracy. No one knows better than the Communists themselves how their conspiracy has been hurt and hampered by the antisubversive activities of the States.

Outstanding efforts in combatting communism have been made by many States down through the years. States which have been notable in this regard include California, Florida, Illinois, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, and Washington.

Opponents to the bill contend that because, as the minority report on similar legislation in the other body puts it:

> The power of the State to act in the area of subversion against the Federal Government was nullified in the first instance not by the Supreme Court of the United States but by the highest court of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The decision of the United States Supreme Court in Pennsylvania against Nelson can hardly be claimed to be a case of Federal aggrandizement by the Supreme Court of the United States. This argument overlooks entirely the fact that all that the Pennsylvania Supreme Court decided was the status of the Pennsylvania law; but the Supreme Court of the United States presumed to lay down general law of general applicability, which resulted in rendering unenforceable the antisubversive and antisedition statutes of 42 States and 2 Territories.

Specifically, the Supreme Court decision in the Nelson case brought about a crisis in law enforcement. In State after State, Communists who had been convicted of subversive activity were put in a position to seek and secure new trials or outright release; Communists under indictment were discharged and the indictments dismissed; and many cases against other Communists, carefully prepared after months or years of investigation, and ready or nearly ready for presentation to grand juries, were dropped because it was obvious there was no use in indicting a Communist when there was no enforceable law under which he could be convicted; and the Supreme Court decision in the Nelson case had made all State antisubversive laws unenforceable.

But the Nelson case decision did not concentrate within itself all the evils of the preemption doctrine. It is merely the latest, and probably the worst, in a series of decisions which have advanced this doctrine step by step, in recent years, despite the fact that the doctrine of preemption, as it has been expanded and applied, works counter to our basic philosophy of government.

The philosophy which best fits the constitutional and traditional theory of our form of government is that a man should be controlled most by that law which is closest to him, and least by that law which is farthest away. Wholly consonant with his philosophy is the attitude that State laws should be valid and enforceable except where they conflict directly and positively with a Federal statute, absent a specific Congressional finding of need and intention to take the particular field or area of law into Federal control. Under this philosophy, States' rights to control their own affairs through State legislation and enforcement would be unimpinged except where Congress made specific provision to the contrary, and it would then be up to the Congress to justify its assertion of Federal control.

Quite out of consonance with the traditional and constitutional American theories of government is the idea that Congress should take over control of any field in which its acts, and then leave it up to the individual States to show why the field or portions of it should be returned to them.

In the former instance—and this is the philosophy embodied in the bill now before us—Congress will act with its eyes open, and will know in advance what the results of its acts will be.

On the other hand, if we go along with the doctrine of preemption by operation of law and without any expression of intent, Congress will never be sure what it is doing, or what will be the effect of its enactments upon the rights of the States and the laws of the States.

There is a subtle and insidious twist to this doctrine of a preemption which has gone largely unnoticed.

Under the Constitution, there are two fields in which Congress may legislate: Those where Federal power is exclusive, such as foreign relations, declaration of war, naturalization, and regulation of the coinage; and fields where concurrent State and Federal jurisdiction may exist.

The tendency of the doctrine of preemption is to narrow the area of concurrent Federal and State jurisdiction and broaden the area of exclusive Federal jurisdiction. The preemption doctrine necessarily involves, to a greater or lesser degree, the idea that mere enactment of Federal legislation in a field, thereby expressing national interest and concern in the field, results in making the field exclusively a Federal one. But the constitutional delineation of certain fields of legislation as exclusively Federal necessarily implied that fields not so delineated were not intended to be exclusively Federal; so that the preemption doctrine, in gradually wearing away State jurisdiction and cutting down on States rights, is also, at the same time, blurring a distinction clearly made and undoubtedly firmly intended in the Constitution itself.

It makes sense for Congress, when it desires to take control of a particular field or sphere of legislation to the exclusion of a State law or laws, to express its intent specifically; and for the intent so expressed to then control. But when

the Congress has no intention to assert control of a particular sphere or field of legislation, and is perfectly willing that State legislation in the same field or sphere should continue to be effective and enforceable, at least to the extent that it does not conflict directly and positively with any provisions of Federal law, it most emphatically does not make sense for the Congress to acquire all power in the field merely by virtue of having acted within it, and then to have to pass new legislation in order to restore the enforceability of State statutes in the allegedly preempted area.

For the future, if there is any area of law which the Congress determines should be preempted to Federal use, to the exclusion of all State law in the field, Congress need only declare its finding in order to accomplish the result it desires. If there is some State law which the Congress wishes to supersede, in a field where the Congress is competent to legislate, Congress need only express its determination in order to supersede that State law. But if S. 337 is enacted, never again will there be imputed to the Congress an intention to preempt a field of State law in a case where Congress has neither desired to preempt nor made any provision for doing so.

There is a principle of legislative construction that courts will not favor repeal of one Federal statute by another by implication, but will try to preserve the enforceability of both statutes unless there is a clear provision for repeal contained in the latter of the two statutes. We should be just as careful to preserve State laws from repeal by implication, as the result of some Federal enactment, as we are to preserve Federal laws from repeal by subsequently enacted Federal statutes.

Opponents of this bill have made much of the contention that Congress should legislate only in response to a demonstrated need. They make this point, of course, as a preliminary to their contention that there is no need for S. 337 or any similar bill. On the contrary, the need for such legislation as this, if only to counteract the effects of the Supreme Court decision in the Nelson case, is so great that it need hardly be argued. But there is a good deal of merit in the idea that Congress should legislate only in response to a demonstrated need. Suppose we apply this principle to the question of superseding State laws. Then we would say, Congress should supersede a State law only when there is a demonstrated need. Congress should preempt a field of law, to the exclusion of existing State legislation, only when there is a demonstrated need. If we are going to live up to this principle, then of course Congress should enact legislation such as that now before us, which will avoid invalidation of a State statute or preemption of a field of legislation except where Congress has expressly found and declared a need for such a result. In other words, this argument of the opponents to the bill, when it is examined, strongly supports the enactment of the bill.

Another argument made against this bill is that it would displace the usual method of Federal-State accommodation by a blanket declaration that past and future Federal legislation will include State acts only to the extent specifically stated. The usual method of determining the enforceability of State legislation in relation to Federal enactments, opponents of this bill say, has been judicial determination on a case-by-case basis, so that evaluation may be made of the impact of Federal and State acts on one another in terms of practical operation and the national or local problems presented. This is a correct statement, but the conclusion they draw from it is wrong. What they overlook, or refuse to admit, is the fact that it was the Supreme Court of the United States which abandoned the case-by-case basis and attempted to make general law of general applicability which would render unenforcible the laws of all of the States wherever the Court chooses to say Congress has preempted the field.

Do not lose sight of the fact that wherever there is a statute which has provisions plainly at variance with Federal legislation it cannot stand against the conflicting Federal law, regardless of whether S. 337 is enacted.

And wherever there is a State statute which is vague, indefinite, uncertain, or lacking basic constitutional procedural safeguards, such statute could be attacked for its intrinsic defects, and declared unconstitutional without regard to the provisions of S. 337, if it should be enacted.

There is nothing in S. 337 which would give vitality or constitutionality to an infirm or unconstitutional State statute; and there is nothing in S. 337 which would permit a provision of State law, in irreconcilable conflict with a provision of Federal law, to stand against the Federal legislative provision.

It is important that we recognize that enactment of this bill will not involve undoing anything that Congress has done. For instance, Congress has never affirmatively declared an intention to preempt the field of antisubversive legislation, or to overthrow any State laws in this field. In this field, and in any other field where Congress has power to legislate, whenever any Act of Congress, past, present, or future, declares that Congress is taking over, that declaration of Congressional intent will be controlling, even though S. 337 has been enacted. And let me repeat that whenever it is found in any particular case that a provision of an act of Congress is in irreconcilable conflict with a provision of State law, the fact that S. 337 has been enacted into law will not prevent the courts from holding that the provision of Federal law must be enforced as against the provision of State law with which it is found to be in conflict.

No predominance of State law over Federal law in any instance of direct conflict between the two would be brought about by enactment of S. 337.

What is basic here is the question of Congressional intent. Through the growth of the doctrine of preemption, State laws have been superseded in area after area without any expression of intent by the Congress that this should happen. Unfortunately, the intent which the Supreme Court imputes to the Congress becomes and remains, in the eye of the law, the actual intent of the Congress, unless and until the Congress speaks out to the contrary. Fortunately, it is still within our power to speak out and say for ourselves what our intent is.

It is quite wrong to say that enactment of this bill would encroach upon a judicial function. The Supreme Court has a right to apply the law to the decision of particular cases, but the Court does not have the right to make law, nor does it have the right to compel the Congress to take any particular course of action the Court may think right.

Where a legislative field is one for concurrent State and Federal jurisdiction, under the Constitution, the Court can neither arbitrarily transfer it to the field of Federal jurisdiction, nor force upon the Congress an unwanted intent to claim the field as its own. The Court can, of course, declare the intention of the Congress as it comes to understand that intention. But if the intention which the Court declares is not in fact the intention of the Congress, the Congress can always enact new legislation properly declarative of its true intent.

Under this bill, if Congress has expressly preempted a field of law, all State law in that field falls. If Congress has expressly stricken down a State statute, that particular statute falls. If there is an irreconcilable conflict between a provision of Federal law and a provision of State law, the Federal provision controls and the State provision falls. But where there has been no preemption of a field, no express invalidation of a State law, and no direct and irreconcilable conflict between a Federal and a State provision, the two provisions will be allowed to operate concurrently, each in its own jurisdiction. That is all there is to it.

Now let me say a word about an amendment offered to S. 337 in committee, which involved adding the words "hereinafter enacted" at two places in this bill. Senators will find these words in italic on lines 3 and 8 of the calendar print of S. 337. This amendment was supported by the contention that its purpose is to avoid retroactivity, which sounds like a plausible reason. But the fact is that a proper distinction has not been made between retroactivity of effect, and retroactivity of application. This bill will not have retroactive effect with or without this amendment. It will have effect only from and after the date of its enactment. But without the amendment, the bill will have retroactive application; that is, it will apply as a declaration of Congressional intent with respect to statutes already on the books. If the amendment is adopted, the bill will not constitute a declaration of Congressional intent except with respect to legislation which may be passed hereafter.

To adopt the amendment, with this result, would be to make the bill a nullity. It would accomplish nothing. No declaration of Congressional intent can be binding on future Congresses, nor even on the same Congress, with respect to afterpassed legislation, if Congress wants to express a new intent. Thus,

with respect to legislation which may be passed hereafter, this bill can do nothing that Congress cannot do at the time it passes the new legislation; nor can this bill prevent Congress from expressing its current intent at that time, whatever that intent may be. That is why there is nothing to fear from this bill. Any time in the future that Congress may wish to preempt a field of legislation, or overturn a State law, in any area where Congress has legislative power, Congress will be able to do so, even though this bill has been enacted.

But the purpose of this legislation is to cure a situation which has been brought about by the Supreme Court's expansion of the doctrine of preemption and implied preemption. The Supreme Court has declared the intent of Congress as something other than what the Congress in fact intended. And the purpose of this bill is to declare the true intent of Congress with respect to preemption; to declare that Congress has not intended and does not intend to nullify State laws on a wholesale basis where it has not expressed any such intention, and has not intended and does not intend to supersede or invalidate any particular State law or provision of State law with which no Federal statute is in direct conflict, and which Congress has not specifically declared should be superseded or invalidated.

This basic objective of the bill—to cure such situations as invalidation of all State antisubversive laws by the decision in the Nelson case—cannot be accomplished unless the bill we pass has application to the laws already on the books.

It is not some possible future law which Congress may pass that has been used as the basis for rendering the sovereign States of this Union impotent to deal with communism and other subversive activity. It is laws already enacted which the Court has cited. The Court said that by merely taking action in the field of antisubversive legislation, through enactment of the Smith Act, the Internal Security Act, and the Communist Control Act, Congress has preempted this entire field and rendered the antisubversive laws of 42 States and Alaska and Hawaii unenforcible. Unless Congress declares to the contrary, this Court statement of Congressional intent will stand as a continuing bar to enforcement of State antisubversive statutes. And the same principle holds true in other areas.

Clearly, Congress must make its present declaration of intent applicable to the laws it already has passed, if it wants to accomplish its purpose of curing the evils of preemption by Court decree.

Congress can say—and this bill does say—that the declaration of intent we now make shall not apply to any case decided in the past, but only to cases decided in the future. We could not say otherwise. But if we adopt the committee amendment, we shall be adopting the Supreme Court's statement of Congressional intent to preempt fields of State law where Congress expressed no such intent and did not pass conflicting legislation.

To summarize, Mr. President, we face this situation:

The Supreme Court in the Nelson case enunciated new law of general applicability, leaving to the Federal Government alone all authority and responsibility for control or punishment of the Communist conspiracy or other subversive activity. Then, in the Yates and Schneiderman cases, the Supreme Court rendered the Smith Act unenforcible against current Communist activity. With the Internal Security Act still in litigation after 8 years because the Supreme Court refused to meet its responsibility to pass on the constitutionality of that act, there is no effective antisubversive legislation in this country today at either the State or Federal level which may be used to deter the Communist conspiracy. This is a situation which involves the gravest danger to the Nation, and is a situation which must not be allowed to continue.

If we should refuse to act in this situation, the people of this country would be justified in concluding we were satisfied with things as they are. And that is what adoption of the committee amendment will do; it will leave things as they are.

Enactment of S. 337 will not provide effective antisubversive laws at the Federal level. That will have to be handled in another way, either by enactment of the Jenner-Butler bill, S. 2646, or at least by enacting separate legislation embodying substantially the provisions of section 4 of the Jenner-Butler bill. But by simply reaffirming, as S. 337 does, the intent of Congress that the States are to be allowed concurrent jurisdiction in fields which the Congress has not affirmatively preempted, and thus restoring the future enforcibility of State antisubversive and antisedition laws, we shall be able to restore some very effective and very useful barriers against the onward march of communism toward its goal of sovietizing the United States of America.

What we have before us is basically an issue of States rights. There are forces in this country which want to see all State law superseded by Federal law. They want to see Federal controls over commerce, over labor, over agriculture, over every phase of life, enlarged and broadened until everything is run from Washington. They want to see the Federal police powers extended further and further until we arrive at the point where there is no need or room for local law enforcement, except perhaps as an adjunct to Federal power.

The goal toward which these forces are aiming is nothing less than the leviathan state; and that cannot be achieved so long as the sovereignty and the rights of the individual States of the Union are preserved. So the apostles of the leviathan state pass up no opportunity to chisel away at the rights of the individual States of the Union.

A decade ago, the late, great Senator from Nevada, Pat McCarran, wrote an article which appeared in the Journal of the American Bar Association in which he pointed out the growing trend toward what he called the "silent supersession of State powers" through the growth of the doctrine of Congressional preemption—that is, the doctrine that where Congress has enacted substantial legislation in a particular legislative field, it must be deemed to have preempted the field to the exclusion of State law. Senator McCarran warned that unless Congress took some action to stay this trend, the day would come when State laws in area after area would be rendered unenforcible not because of anything Congress said, nor because of any conflict between Federal and State law, but merely because Congress had acted in the field.

We have seen this warning borne out. The doctrine of preemption has grown and its application has been broadened. One of the most unhappy applications of this doctrine was in the case of Pennsylvania against Nelson, and the results of that decision have been so favorable to the activities of the Communist conspiracy in this country, and so dangerous to the security of the States and of the Nation as a whole, that I believe the country as a whole has been shocked into an awareness of the situation and is demanding action to correct it. Certainly we Senators who sit here with full understanding of the fact that by a single misrepresentation of the intent of the Congress, the Supreme Court has been able to render unenforcible the antisubversive laws of 42 States and Alaska and Hawaii, and who are fully aware of many other instances in which the rights of the States to enact and enforce their own laws have been taken away from them under this doctrine of Federal preemption, cannot plead unfamiliarity with the problem, or ignorance that it exists. And now that we have the opportunity to do something about it, by passing this bill, we are going to have some mighty tall explaining to do if we fail to take advantage of this opportunity.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I am ready to vote. I do not wish to shut anybody off from speaking. If no one else wishes to speak, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FULBRIGHT in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] that the bill be recommitted. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALLOTT (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. If the senior Senator from New Jersey were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. BUSH (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio

[Mr. BRICKER]. If the Senator from Ohio were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. SMATHERS (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. Were he present and voting, he would vote "yea." Were I permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and the Senators from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR and Mr. MONRONEY] are absent on official business.

I further announce that if present, and voting, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] would each vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent because of illness in the family.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine would vote "yea", and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

The respective pairs of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] have been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—41

Aiken	Green	McNamara
Anderson	Hayden	Morse
Beall	Hennings	Morton
Bennett	Humphrey	Murray
Bible	Jackson	Neuberger
Carroll	Javits	O'Mahoney
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Case, S. Dak.	Kefauver	Proxmire
Chavez	Kennedy	Purtell
Church	Langer	Saltonstall
Clark	Lausche	Symington
Cooper	Magnuson	Wiley
Dirksen	Malone	Yarborough
Douglas	Mansfield	

NAYS—40

Barrett	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Bridges	Hill	Robertson
Butler	Hoblitzell	Russell
Byrd	Jenner	Schoeppel
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Jordan	Sparkman
Curtis	Knowland	Stennis
Dworshak	Kuchel	Talmadge
Eastland	Long	Thurmond
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Thye
Ervin	Martin, Pa.	Watkins
Fulbright	McClellan	Williams
Goldwater	Mundt	
Gore	Potter	

NOT VOTING—15

Allott	Frear	Monroney
Bricker	Holland	Payne
Bush	Hruska	Smathers
Carlson	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Flanders	Kerr	Young

So Mr. CARROLL's motion to recommit was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion to recommit was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Montana to reconsider. (Putting the question)——

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. I would like to know what the motion is. I cannot hear the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. A motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the bill was recommitted. I made a motion to lay that motion on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is not debatable.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Montana to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 4249) to authorize a program for the conservation, restoration, and management of the rare Hawaiian Nene goose.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13450) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36 to the bill, and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1695. An act for the relief of Harry N. Duff;

H. R. 9950. An act for the relief of D. A. Whitaker and others; and

H. R. 11889. An act to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Minnesota State Fair and Centennial Exposition to be held at St. Paul, Minn., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 3366. An act to validate overpayments of pay and allowances made to certain officers of the Army, Navy, Naval Reserve, and Air Force, while undergoing training at civilian hospitals, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8943. An act to amend titles 10, 14, and 32, United States Code, to codify recent military law, and to improve the code;

H. R. 9370. An act to permit illustrations and films of United States and foreign obligations and securities under certain circumstances, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9817. An act relating to venue in tax refund suits by corporations.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 1493. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Charles A. Holshouser;

H. R. 2265. An act for the relief of Clifford Oesterlei;

H. R. 2269. An act for the relief of Truck & Axle Manufacturing Co.;

H. R. 4991. An act for the relief of Waldo E. Miller;

H. R. 5497. An act to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act;

H. R. 5584. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maude L. Smith;

H. R. 6238. An act to amend section 1292 of title 28 of the United States Code relating to appeals from the interlocutory orders;

H. R. 6595. An act for the relief of Markus H. Teitel;

H. R. 7178. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph D. Metzger;

H. R. 7337. An act for the relief of James McGuire;

H. R. 7374. An act for the relief of Angelo Sardo;

H. R. 7499. An act for the relief of the Cooper Tire & Rubber Co.;

H. R. 7685. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eldrey L. Whaley;

H. R. 8014. An act for the relief of Miss Edith Dorn;

H. R. 8184. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Robert B. Hall;

H. R. 8735. An act to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the District of Columbia teachers retirement and annuity fund, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9407. An act to provide additional opportunity for certain Government employees to obtain career-condtionnl and career appointments in the competitive civil service;

H. R. 9500. An act to permit certain sales and exchanges of public lands of the Territory of Hawaii to certain persons who suffered a substantial loss of real property by reason of the tidal wave of March 9, 1957;

H. R. 9822. An act to provide for holding a White House Conference on Aging to be called by the President of the United States in January 1961, to be planned and conducted by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare with the assistance and cooperation of other departments and agencies represented on the Federal Council on Aging; to assist the several States in conducting similar conferences on aging prior to the White House Conference on Aging; and for related purposes;

H. R. 9833. An act to amend section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920;

H. R. 10587. An act for the relief of Homer G. Preston;

H. R. 10733. An act for the relief of Magnolia Airport, Inc.;

H. R. 10813. An act for the relief of Maj. Anthony R. Parrish;

H. R. 10993. An act for the relief of Kiiko Nemoto;

H. R. 11078. An act to promote boating safety on the navigable waters of the United States, its Territories, and the District of Columbia; to provide coordination and cooperation with the States in the interest of

uniformity of boating laws; and for other purposes;

H. R. 11156. An act for the relief of Duncan Moore and his wife, Marjorie Moore;

H. R. 11200. An act for the relief of the estate of L. L. McCandless, deceased;

H. R. 11239. An act for the relief of James F. Moran;

H. R. 11299. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Tarsi Priori;

H. R. 12144. An act for the relief of Paul E. Nolan;

H. R. 12154. An act for the relief of Ernest T. Stephens;

H. R. 12365. An act for the relief of the estate of Suck Pil Ra;

H. R. 12632. An act authorizing Gus. A. Guerra, his heirs, legal representatives and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.;

H. R. 12655. An act for the relief of S. Jackson & Son, Inc.;

H. R. 12662. An act to provide for the acquisition of lands by the United States required for the reservoir created by the construction of Oahe Dam on the Missouri River and for rehabilitation of the Indians of the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation in South Dakota and North Dakota, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12663. An act to provide for additional payments to the Indians of the Lower Brule Sioux Reservation, S. Dak., whose lands have been acquired for the Fort Randall Dam and Reservoir project, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12867. An act for the relief of Clayton T. Wells;

H. R. 12906. An act for the relief of Anneliese Ottolenghi;

H. R. 13132. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955;

H. R. 13406. An act to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended;

H. R. 13437. An act for the relief of Bernard H. English and John E. Hayden;

H. R. 13500. An act to provide for the disposal of federally owned property of the Hanson, Company, and Houma Canals, La., and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 557. Joint resolution to amend the act of September 7, 1957 (71 Stat. 626), providing for the establishment of a Civil War Centennial Commission;

H. J. Res. 630. Joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to use certain real property in the District of Columbia for the proposed Southwest Freeway and for the redevelopment of the Southwest area in the District of Columbia;

H. J. Res. 654. Joint resolution requiring the Secretary of Commerce to submit certain recommendations for legislation for the purpose of assisting Congress to determine whether or not to reimburse States for certain highways on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; and

H. J. Res. 661. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1959—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has a conference report to present on the supplemental appropriation bill. I understand the conferees were unanimous. I hope we can act on the report promptly, and proceed to the consideration of other business this evening.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the Senate numbered 36, and the amendment of the House thereto, and numbered 114, to the bill (H. R. 13450) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate numbered 36 and the amendment of the House thereto, and numbered 114 to the bill (H. R. 13450) "making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment 114: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 114, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "$2,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 36.

CARL HAYDEN,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
STYLES BRIDGES,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
JOHN TABER,
GERALD R. FORD, JR.,
FRANK T. BOW,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Arizona to give an explanation of what the conferees did as to amendment No. 36.

Mr. HAYDEN. The amendment originally read:

No appropriation may be made to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration unless previously authorized by legislation hereafter enacted by the Congress.

The conferees added the words "for any period prior to June 30, 1960" after "National Aeronautics and Space Administration." In other words, this language would accomplish the purpose of the Senate for the period ending June 30, 1960, and not permanently.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I think so far as fiscal year 1960 is concerned, this would take care of the situation. I realize, after having served in the House of Representatives for 6 terms, and in the Senate for some 10 years, that legislation is a matter of give and take. I realize that we cannot always have everything we want.

I think it is highly desirable that Congress maintain a constant surveillance over new agencies and be at least informed as to what are their plans and what their expenditures may be. Congress should be informed prior to the time the agencies seek appropriations, so that public opinion may reflect itself.

I realize the point of view expressed in the House. I have read the debate. I am sorry to say I do not believe the House Members realized the full portent of our amendment.

In view of the fact that the distinguished chairman of the committee and the other able conferees have been able to preserve the principle for 1 year, and in view of the fact that the Special Committee on Space and Astronautics intends to act as a partner and not an adversary with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, I am willing to go along with the agreement of the conferees. I would not be frank, however, if I did not say for the record, so that all who hear may know, I think the conferees made a serious mistake when they reduced the appropriations to the extent they did for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. I think time will tell, and I want to predict that the reduction we made, below the President's budget request, will return to haunt us.

So far as I am concerned, I am not going to attempt to hold up the conference report. The authorizing committee did hear detailed evidence to justify the President's budget request. As nearly as I can tell, that detailed information was not available to the individual members of the Appropriations Committee to the same extent.

The President asked for $125 million. The Senate provided the full $125 million. We went to conference, and we settled by cutting off $45 million of the $50 million the Senate provided.

Since we live in an uncertain world, it is certainly a calculated gamble to do this. I think I should raise my voice and warn the Members of Congress who have taken that gamble that I want none of the blood on my hands which may result from our failure to take adequate steps in time.

There is not anything we can do about the matter now. We have had to accede to the views of the other body. I realize that is necessary. I think the conferees have done as good a job as they could do. I do not rise to criticize anyone. I rise to attempt to warn the people of America that in my opinion the President's budget request was too low. Then when we took a meat ax after it and cut it from $125 million to $75 million, practically a 50-percent cut, without justification, we made a serious mistake.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I want to say to the distinguished chairman of the committee that I had the pleasure of serving with him on the conference committee. I realize the strong feelings of the Senate, as demonstrated by the 86-to-0 vote yesterday.

I know that, with respect to legislation, the two Houses must reach a common ground of understanding. I believe the Senate conferees were able to do that without surrendering the principle they stood for. When a conferee is able to arrive at a common ground of agreement with the other body and does not surrender principles, I think one has been successful. Therefore, in spite of the fact that the report is not exactly as I should like to see it, it is satisfactory to the Senator from New Hampshire, both as a conferee of the committee and the ranking minority member of the Special Committee on Space and Astronautics. I am glad to join in approval.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator will agree with me that we will obtain experience for 1 year with the legislative committee; that is, the Special Committee on Space and Astronautics. The committee will pass upon the subject matter before it goes to the Committee on Appropriations, and we will have the advantage of passing an authorization bill. If that turns out to be good procedure, it can be followed afterward. We will have that experience, which we would not have if we had accepted the House amendment in the first place.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina addressed the Chair.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wish to ask the Senator from New Hampshire a question, if I may. We really had difficulty with the item the first time it came before the Appropriations Committee. I must confess that, except for the items of equipment and the things which need to be ordered, deciding what to do was sort of guesswork on my part. I was willing to go to a much lower figure. With the $80 million, certainly the agency will be able to plan between now and the first of the year. If additional funds and additional authority are necessary, there will be no difficulty in coming to the Congress in ample time for that purpose.

Mr. HAYDEN. Particularly if the Special Committee on Space and Astronautics authorizes the action.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is correct. I think we have a good arrangement.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I commend the conferees for their excellent work. Of course, we are never exactly satisfied with anything.

There was one item in the appropriation bill this year which I think the Senate and the Congress will have to do something about next year. We provided an item of $29.5 million in the Senate bill for modernization of the Post Office Department. Far more than that is needed to really modernize our post offices as they should be modernized at the present time.

Being chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, naturally I come in contact with subjects of that kind to a greater extent than other Senators. So I hope that next year the Senate will not only give $29,500,000, but will see to it that the proper amount is allowed to do a good job.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, while the House did not agree to allow any money for that purpose at this time, we did obtain the promise that if a budget estimate were to come up early in the year, it would be given early consideration by the other body, and something would probably be done about it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to inquire of the distinguished chairman what happened to the item relating to civil defense appropriations?

Mr. HAYDEN. We could not get anywhere with it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Did the Senate conferees have to accede to the House figure?

Mr. HAYDEN. We asked the House conferees to take the item back to the House, and the House overwhelmingly voted not to accept it, so we were compelled this morning to recede.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What is the figure which is allowed for civil defense appropriations?

Mr. HAYDEN. Two and one-half million dollars for emergency supplies.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Nothing for Federal contributions?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We tried very hard in the conference to put through the adjustment which was agreed to on the floor of the Senate, but the House conferees were adamant. We could not move them at all. They were very much opposed to beginning the new activity, but they took the item back to the House, and, as the distinguished chairman said, the House supported the conferees on the floor of the House, and we could do nothing further.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understood what happened early this morning. I merely wished to develop the record.

I believe that the chairman of the committee and all the other members of the committee, particularly the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], have been a fine help in arriving at an arrangement in the Senate. I regret that the funds for Federal contributions have been dropped. This is a blow to the State civil defense agencies.

Let me say to our friends in the other body that they are the ones who initiated the legislation for Federal contributions. They initiated the legislation for greater Federal appropriations. It is rather paradoxical and ironic that they are the ones who now refuse to go along; but I know that some of the Members of the other body will read the record. If the Lord grants me the right to live until next January, I shall be back here making a request before the appropriate subcommittee and committee for funds for civil defense. The administration will be doing so, too, but I should like to support it.

I note the fact that several Senators are nodding their heads. I should like to be able to register those nods as vocal assents.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] that the Senate concur in the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 36.

The motion was agreed to.

The amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 36 is as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, as amended by the House amendment thereto, insert "no appropriation may be made to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for any period prior to June 30, 1960, unless previously authorized by legislation hereafter enacted by the Congress."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a table illustrating the appropriations as they appeared in the House and Senate bills and agreed to in conference.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The supplemental appropriation bill, 1959 (H. R. 13450)

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE				
	AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE				
	SALARIES AND EXPENSES				
394	Plant and animal disease and pest control	$3,000,000	$2,000,000	$4,000,000	$3,500,000
	Meat inspection	2,100,000	1,750,000	2,100,000	1,750,000
	Total, salaries and expenses	5,100,000	3,750,000	6,100,000	5,250,000
	AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM SERVICE				
394	Emergency conservation measures	Language	Language	Language	Language

The supplemental appropriation bill, 1959 (H. R. 13450)—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—Continued				
	Soil Bank Programs				
394	Acreage reserve program	$282,800,000	$275,000,000	$279,450,000	$279,450,000
	Total, chapter I	287,900,000	278,750,000	285,550,000	284,700,000
	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE				
	Civil Aeronautics Administration				
394	Operation and regulation	12,750,000	11,735,000	12,750,000	11,735,000
394	Construction and development, additional Washington airport	53,500,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000
	Bureau of Foreign Commerce				
394	Salaries and expenses	305,000			
S. 110					
394	Export control	3,060,000	3,060,000	3,060,000	3,060,000
	Coast and Geodetic Survey				
394	Salaries and expenses	491,000	343,500	343,500	343,500
394	Construction and equipment, geomagnetic station	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
	Maritime Activities				
394	Salaries and expenses	25,000		25,000	
394	Maritime training	175,000	68,000	68,000	68,000
S. 110	War Shipping Administration liquidation	Language		Language	Language
	Bureau of Public Roads				
394	General administrative expenses	(550,000)		(550,000)	
394	Inter-American Highway	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
	National Bureau of Standards				
394	Expenses	262,000		262,000	
394	Plant and equipment	200,000	186,000	200,000	186,000
394	Construction of facilities	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
	Weather Bureau				
394	Salaries and expenses	840,000	1,840,000	1,840,000	$1,840,000
394	Establishment of meteorological facilities	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
	RELATED AGENCIES				
	Small Business Administration				
S. 110	Salaries and expenses	3,775,000		3,775,000	3,500,000
S. 110	Revolving fund	215,000,000		215,000,000	200,000,000
	Total, chapter II	305,083,000	81,932,500	302,023,500	285,432,500
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY FUNCTIONS				
	Interservice Activities				
394	Retired pay, 1958	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
394	Retired pay, 1959	18,000,000			
	Department of the Army				
394	Military personnel, 1956	8,000,000			
	Department of the Navy				
394	Medical care, 1958	(8,000,000)			
	Total, chapter III	35,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA				
	Operating Expenses				
394	Department of Public Health	(86,000)			
394	Personal services, wage-scale employees (fiscal year 1958)	(75,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)
	Miscellaneous				
394	Settlement of claims and suits	(26,701)	(26,701)	(26,701)	(26,701)
394	Judgments	(1,280)	(1,280)	(1,280)	(1,280)
394	Audited claims	(19,645)	(19,645)	(19,645)	(19,645)
	Total, chapter IV	(208,626)	(122,626)	(122,626)	(122,626)
	FOREIGN OPERATIONS				
	Department of the Army—Civil Functions				
266	Administration, Ryukyu Islands	3,150,000	2,750,000	2,850,000	2,830,000
266	Construction of utility systems, Ryukyu Islands	6,000,000	600,000	600,000	600,000
	Subtotal	9,150,000	3,350,000	3,450,000	3,430,000
	Export-Import Bank				
266	Administrative expense limitation	($2,055,000)	($2,055,000)	($2,055,000)	($2,055,000)
	Total, chapter V	9,150,000	3,350,000	3,450,000	3,430,000
	GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS				
	Executive Office of the President				
S. 110	Executive Mansion and Grounds:				
	Extraordinary alterations and repairs	100,000		100,000	100,000
	Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization:				
S. 110	Salaries and expenses	4,000,000		2,915,000	2,500,000
S. 110	Research and development	9,150,000			
S. 110	Federal contributions	9,000,000		4,000,000	
S. 110	Emergency supplies and equipment	7,188,000		2,000,000	2,000,000
	Funds Appropriated to the President				
S. 110	Translation of publications and scientific cooperation	Language		5,100,000	5,100,000

The supplemental appropriation bill, 1959 (H. R. 13450)—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action
	GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS—Continued				
	CORREGIDOR BATAAN MEMORIAL COMMISSION				
394	Salaries and expenses	$46,000		$46,000	
	Total, chapter VI	29,484,000		14,161,000	$9,700,000
	INDEPENDENT OFFICES				
	FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION				
394	Salaries and expenses	142,000	$142,000	142,000	142,000
	FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION				
394	Salaries and expenses	120,000	120,000	120,000	120,000
	GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION				
394	Public Buildings Service, operating expenses	6,400,000	3,800,000	5,800,000	5,200,000
394	Construction, public buildings	323,000	323,000	323,000	323,000
	Hospital facilities in the District of Columbia			1,020,000	1,020,000
394	Expenses, supply distribution	177,000	160,000	160,000	160,000
394	National Archives and Records Service	36,000	32,500	32,500	32,500
	HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY				
394	Federal National Mortgage Association (limitation on administrative expenses)	(800,000)	(700,000)	(700,000)	(700,000)
S. 110	Federal Housing Administration (limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses)	(4,600,000)		(4,600,000)	(4,600,000)
	Public Housing Administration:				
394	Annual contributions (fiscal year 1958)	4,300,000	3,900,000	3,900,000	3,900,000
394	Limitation on nonadministrative expenses	(750,000)	(500,000)	(500,000)	(500,000)
	INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION				
S. 110	Salaries and expenses	500,000		461,000	300,000
	NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION				
S. 112	Salaries and expenses	7,000,000		7,000,000	5,000,000
S. 112	Research and development	70,200,000		70,200,000	50,000,000
S. 112	Construction and equipment	47,800,000		47,800,000	25,000,000
	NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION				
394	Salaries and expenses	4,400,000	4,000,000	4,400,000	4,000,000
394	International Geophysical Year	2,950,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
	VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION				
394	General operating expenses	5,269,000	4,750,000	5,269,000	5,000,000
394	Inpatient care	3,486,000	3,400,000	3,400,000	3,400,000
S. 110	Grants to the Republic of the Philippines	450,000		450,000	
S. 110	Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief	1,300,000		1,300,000	1,300,000
	Total, chapter VII	154,853,000	23,127,500	154,277,500	107,397,500
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR				
	DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES				
	OFFICE OF SALINE WATER				
394	Salaries and expenses	530,000	345,000	345,000	345,000
	OFFICE OF MINERALS EXPLORATION				
S. 113	Salaries and expenses	5,000,000		4,700,000	4,000,000
	OFFICE OF OIL AND GAS				
S. 110	Salaries and expenses	53,500		18,500	18,500
	BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT				
S. 110 394	Management of lands and resources	1,000,000	200,000	885,000	885,000
	BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS				
394	Road construction and maintenance (liquidation of contract authorization)	4,000,000	1,500,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
	GEOLOGICAL SURVEY				
394	Surveys, investigations, and research	3,983,000	1,500,000	2,483,000	1,500,000
	BUREAU OF MINES				
394	Conservation and development of mineral resources	2,850,000	1,250,000	1,350,000	1,250,000
394	Health and safety	50,000			
394	Construction	11,280,000	10,905,000	10,905,000	10,905,000
	NATIONAL PARK SERVICE				
394	Management and protection	88,000		50,000	80,000
394	Construction	1,200,000		200,000	
394	Construction (liquidation of contract authorization)	10,000,000		10,000,000	5,000,000
	FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE				
	BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE				
394	Management and investigations of resources	325,625	Language	125,000	125,000
	Construction			675,000	
	BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES				
394	Management and investigations of resources	425,625	85,000	85,000	85,000
	Subtotal, Department of the Interior	40,785,750	15,785,000	35,821,500	31,163,500

The supplemental appropriation bill, 1959 (H. R. 13450)—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action
	INDEPENDENT OFFICES				
	ALASKA INTERNATIONAL ROAD AND HIGHWAY COMMISSION				
S. 110	Salaries and expenses	$240,000		$240,000	$40,000
	NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION				
394	Land, acquisition, National Capital Park, parkway, and playground system	2,000,000			
	SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION				
394	Salaries and expenses	52,800	$52,800	52,800	52,800
	HISTORICAL AND MEMORIAL COMMISSIONS				
S. 110	Boston National Historical Sites Commission	20,000		20,000	20,000
394	Civil War Centennial Commission	63,000	63,000	63,000	63,000
	Hudson-Champlain Celebration Commission			50,000	50,000
S. 110 394	Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission	742,000	142,000	642,000	350,000
	OUTDOOR RECREATION RESOURCES REVIEW COMMISSION				
S. 110	Salaries and expenses	100,000		100,000	50,000
	VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION				
S. 110	Borrowing authority	(1,500,000)			
	Total, chapter VIII	44,003,550	16,042,800	36,989,300	31,789,300
	DEPARTMENT OF LABOR				
	OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR				
394	Salaries and expenses	110,000	110,000	110,000	110,000
	BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY				
394	Salaries and expenses	347,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
394	Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration	10,600,000	20,600,000	20,600,000	20,600,000
394	Unemployment compensation for veterans	37,700,000	37,700,000	37,700,000	37,700,000
394	Unemployment compensation for Federal employees	36,300,000	36,300,000	36,300,000	36,300,000
	Total, Department of Labor	85,057,000	95,010,000	95,010,000	95,010,000
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE				
	GALLAUDET COLLEGE				
S. 110	Salaries and expenses, 1958	15,000		15,000	15,000
S. 110	Salaries and expenses	32,300		34,000	34,000
	HOWARD UNIVERSITY				
S. 110	Salaries and expenses, 1958	182,500		182,500	182,500
S. 110	Salaries and expenses	396,600		396,600	396,600
	OFFICE OF EDUCATION				
S. 115	Assistance for school construction	60,150,000		60,150,000	50,000,000
S. 115	Payments to school districts	149,700,000		149,700,000	130,000,000
S. 115	Salaries and expenses	316,000		316,000	186,500
	PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE				
	Assistance to States, general			1,000,000	
394	Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services	150,000			
394	Military pay increases, various appropriations	2,270,000		634,000	
	ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL				
394	Salaries and expenses	32,000	32,000	32,000	32,000
	SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION				
394	Limitation on salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance	(5,831,000)	(5,831,000)	(5,831,000)	(5,831,000)
	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY				
394	Salaries and expenses, office of field administration	(18,000)	(18,000)	(18,000)	(15,000)
	Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	213,244,400	32,000	212,460,100	180,846,600
	NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD				
394	Salaries and expenses	1,515,000			
	UNITED STATES SOLDIERS' HOME				
394	Limitation on operation and maintenance and capital outlay	(232,000)	(232,000)	(232,000)	(232,000)
	Total, chapter IX	299,816,400	95,042,000	307,470,100	275,856,600
	LEGISLATIVE BRANCH				
	SENATE				
	SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES				
S. 112	Committee employees	102,160		102,160	102,160
	CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE				
	Committee on Rules and Administration			200	200
S. 112	Inquiries and investigations, 1958	73,000		73,000	73,000
S. 112	Inquiries and investigations, 1959	10,000		10,000	10,000
S. 112	Stationery (revolving fund)	300		300	300
	Miscellaneous items	Language		Language	Language
	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES				
	Payment to widow of deceased member			22,500	22,500
	CONTINGENT EXPENSES				
	Stationery (revolving fund)		262,800	262,800	262,800

The supplemental appropriation bill, 1959 (H. R. 13450)—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action
	LEGISLATIVE BRANCH—Continued				
	ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL				
	CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS				
S. 112	Expansion of additional site for New Senate Office Building	$625,000		$625,000	$625,000
	CAPITOL POWER PLANT				
------	Expansion of facilities		$750,000	750,000	750,000
	LIBRARY OF CONGRESS				
------	Preservation of early American motion pictures			60,000	60,000
------	General provisions			Language	Language
	Total, chapter X	810,460	1,012,800	1,905,960	1,905,960
	ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION				
113	Operating expenses	2,443,000,000	2,375,972,000	2,418,840,000	2,397,406,000
266, 388					
388	Plant acquisition and construction	204,000,000	229,429,000	249,929,000	249,929,000
	Total, chapter XI	2,647,000,000	2,605,401,000	2,668,769,000	2,647,335,000
	PUBLIC WORKS				
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL FUNCTIONS				
	DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY				
	Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control				
------	Construction, general			1,925,000	
------	Operation and maintenance, general			70,000	70,000
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR				
	BUREAU OF RECLAMATION				
------	Construction and rehabilitation			2,500,000	
------	Loan program			4,203,000	4,203,000
	Total, chapter XII			8,698,000	4,273,000
	DEPARTMENT OF STATE				
	ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS				
394	Salaries and expenses	854,000	450,000	650,000	550,000
	PAYMENT TO GOVERNMENT OF DENMARK				
394	Payment to Government of Denmark	5,296,302	5,296,302	5,296,302	5,296,302
	INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION AND CONFERENCES				
	INTERNATIONAL CONTINGENCIES				
S. 110	International contingencies	200,000		200,000	
	Total, Department of State	6,350,302	5,746,302	6,146,302	5,846,302
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE				
	LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION				
394	Salaries and expenses, general legal activities	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
394	Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and marshals (1958)	Language	Language	Language	Language
	FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM				
394	Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons	2,066,000	2,066,000	2,066,000	2,066,000
	GENERAL PROVISIONS				
394	General provisions				
	Total, Department of Justice	2,266,000	2,266,000	2,266,000	2,266,000
	UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY				
394	Salaries and expenses	1,100,000			
S. 112	Acquisition and construction of radio facilities	22,300,000		15,000,000	10,000,000
S. 110	Payment to informational media and guaranty fund	7,000,000		5,000,000	2,500,000
	Total, United States Information Agency	30,400,000		20,000,000	12,500,000
	Total, chapter XIII	39,016,302	8,012,302	28,412,302	20,612,302
	TREASURY DEPARTMENT				
	BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT				
394	Administering the public debt	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
	BUREAU OF CUSTOMS				
394	Salaries and expenses	150,000			
	UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE				
394	Salaries and expenses, White House Police	54,000		54,000	
S. 110	Contribution for annuity benefits	Language		Language	Language
	COAST GUARD				
394	Operating expenses	6,900,000	Language	Language	Language
394	Retired pay	700,000			
394	Acquisition, construction, and improvements	150,000	150,000	399,000	150,000
	Total, Treasury Department	9,454,000	1,650,000	1,953,000	1,650,000

The supplemental appropriation bill, 1959 (H. R. 13450)—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action
	POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT				
394	Administration, regional operation, and research	$1,600,000			
394	Transportation, 1958	3,000,000			
	REIMBURSEMENT FOR PUBLIC SERVICES				
S. 110	Reimbursement for public services	171,259,000			
	PAYMENT TO POSTAL MODERNIZATION FUND				
S. 110	Payment to postal modernization fund	29,500,000		$29,500,000	
	Total, Post Office Department	205,359,000		29,500,000	
	Total, chapter XIV	214,813,000	$1,650,000	31,453,000	$1,650,000
	CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS				
S. 418 112	Claims and judgments	14,224,509	8,523,895	14,223,316	14,223,316
	GENERAL PROVISION				
S. 110	Salary increases, policemen, firemen, and teachers	Language		Language	Language
	Grand total	4,081,154,221	3,131,844,797	3,866,382,978	3,697,305,473

LUMP-SUM PAYMENT FOR ACCRUED ANNUAL LEAVE OF DECEASED EMPLOYEES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7710) to provide for the lump-sum payment of all accumulated and current accrued annual leave of deceased employees. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7710) entitled "An act to provide for the lump-sum payment of all accumulated and current accrued annual leave of deceased employees," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 1: That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 1.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In Senate amendment numbered 2 as set forth in the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "SEC. 3." and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 2."

And the Senate agree to the same.

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
DICK NEUBERGER,
RALPH YARBOROUGH,
THOMAS E. MARTIN,
THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

TOM MURRAY,
JAMES H. MORRISON,
EDWARD H. REES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the conference agreement on this bill is completely satisfactory to both Houses. The House has accepted section 3 of the bill which is a Senate amendment and the Senate has agreed to striking out section 2 of the bill because identical language is contained in another measure now awaiting approval in the House. The Senate has been assured that action will be taken on the bill pending in the House, so no purpose would be served by retention of the same provision in H. R. 7710.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BEALL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL JUDGE FOR JUVENILE COURT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7785) to provide for the appointment of an additional judge for the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7785) to provide for the appointment of an additional judge for the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5).

JOSEPH S. CLARK,
ALAN BIBLE,
JACOB K. JAVITS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

THOMAS G. ABERNETHY,
JOHN DOWDY,
JOSEPH P. O'HARA,
JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as the present occupant of the chair [Mr. BEALL] knows, it is of the greatest importance that there be an additional judge in the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia. In order to obtain that additional judge it was necessary for the Senate conferees to recede from three amendments to the House bill. The Senate conferees were unanimous in their view that they should recede, and I ask for approval of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

LOAN OF CAPTION FILMS FOR THE DEAF

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on August 26 of last year, the Senate passed S. 1889, providing in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, a loan service of caption films for the deaf. This bill was referred to the House Committee on Education and Labor which considered this legislation this year and after amending the bill in two respects, namely; by authorizing an appropriation not to exceed $250,000 and by striking out the "Advisory Council," favorably reported the bill under House number H. R. 13678 to the House. The House, on August 15, 1958, passed this bill without further amendment.

Mr. President, the House bill, H. R. 13678, is now at the President's desk. I ask the Chair to lay the House bill before the Senate and I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of H. R. 13678.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives, (H. R. 13678) to provide in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for a loan service of captioned films for the deaf, which was read twice by title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CARL EBERT AND HIS WIFE, GERTRUDE EBERT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3276) for the relief of Carl Ebert and his wife, Gertrude Ebert, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 352 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall be held to have been and to be inapplicable to Carl Ebert and his wife, Gertrude Ebert: *Provided*, That they return to the United States to reside within 3 years following the date of the enactment of this act.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on June 23, 1958, the Senate passed S. 3276, to permit two naturalized United States citizens to remain in Germany, the country of their birth, for 3 years following the date of enactment of the act without losing their United States citizenship by protracted residence abroad.

On August 19 the House of Representatives passed S. 3276, with a technical amendment which does not change the original intent of the bill as passed by the Senate.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

The motion was agreed to.

VICENTA GARCIA y PUENTE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3818) for the relief of Vicenta Garcia y Puente, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bonds, which may have issued in the case of Vicenta Garcia y Puente. From and after the date of the enactment of this act, the said Vicenta Garcia y Puente shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrant and orders have issued.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on August 11, 1958, the Senate passed S. 3818, to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to the beneficiary, who is an elderly widow residing in the United States with her children.

On August 19, 1958, the House of Representatives passed S. 3818, with an amendment to merely cancel outstanding deportation proceedings.

The amendment is acceptable, and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). The Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR CONVENING TOMORROW MORNING AT 9:30

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate convenes tomorrow, it convene at 9:30 o'clock a. m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF LATE SESSION TOMORROW AND POSSIBLE SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT ON SATURDAY NIGHT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that we expect to have a very late session tomorrow evening and that we shall make every effort to adjourn sine die by Saturday night.

I should like to have the very faithful members of the staff to be informed that we will have two more very trying days, and we may have to work around the clock. However, we have some very important proposed legislation which must be acted on.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

EXTENSION OF RENEGOTIATION ACT OF 1951

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 2544, H. R. 11749, to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 6 months, and for other purposes. I give notice now that if the motion is agreed to, I do not intend to have any action taken on the bill tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 11749) to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 6 months, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wish to give notice of the possibility that the bill dealing with the Railroad Retirement Act will be offered as an amendment to the pending bill. I wish Senators to be on notice that, while that has not definitely been determined, it is likely before we conclude consideration of H. R. 11749, to extend the Renegotiation Act, an amendment will be offered to it incorporating the substance of the railroad retirement bill reported by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator mean S. 2020 or S. 1313? There are two. S. 2020 is the technical bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have reference to Calendar 2428, S. 1313, to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act so as to provide increases in benefits and for other purposes.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] wish to be informed about it. I refer to calendar 2428, S. 1313. I do not know that that amendment will be offered, but there is a possibility of it. I shall give the minority leadership such information ahead of time as I can, although any Senator has the right to offer an amendment to any bill.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. To what bill wou'd the Railroad Retirement Act be offered as an amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. To calendar 2544, H. R. 11749, to extend the Renegotiation Act, which is a House bill.

I shall be very glad to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement to limit debate of the pending bill if Senators are disposed to do so.

One of the reasons for coming in early tomorrow morning is that I hope we will be able to dispose of the Renegotiation Act extension, the mutual security appropriation bill, the bill increasing the public debt limit, the conference report on S. 3420, dealing with Public Law 480, and the other appropriation bills, so that we may adjourn sine die on Saturday night.

With the fine cooperation I have received this week from every Member of the Senate, I have no doubt that we will be able to do it.

FINANCIAL CONDITION OF THE RAILROADS

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, last Saturday, when this body had under consideration the social security amendments of 1958, the senior Senator from Oregon sent to the desk, as an amendment to that proposed legislation, S. 1313, which would amend the Railroad Retirement Act, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act so as to provide increases in benefits and for other purposes. At that time he made certain comments regarding the history of S. 1313 and what he referred to as the "subsidy" or "handout" granted the railroads under the recently enacted legislation commonly referred to as the Smathers bill. I shall address myself to those comments.

The senior Senator from Oregon indicated in his statement that the Senate should vote on S. 1313 because in 1956 Congress had passed legislation which had to do with railroad retirement but had failed to provide funds to take care of the deficit in the railroad retirement fund which resulted from the passage of that legislation, that it was understood that at the next session of Congress legislation would be passed which would take care of that deficit, and to carry out that obligation the Senate should now consider the pending measure S. 1313.

It is true that in 1956 Congress passed legislation which granted a 10-percent increase in the annuities provided for under the railroad retirement system. No increased taxes to pay the cost of those benefits were provided in that bill. The railroads opposed the increased benefits in 1956. Notwithstanding this opposition, representatives of the railroad industry appeared in hearings on S. 1313 before the Railroad Retirement Subcommittee of the Senate Labor Committee in the spring of 1957 and stated that in the event the standard railway labor organizations had sponsored a bill in the 85th Congress only for the purpose of paying the cost of the 10 percent increased benefits the carriers would not have opposed such a proposal. In other words, if all S. 1313 had done was to pay off the deficit resulting from the 1956 legislation, the railroads would never have appeared regarding the bill. However, S. 1313 in the form introduced and also in the form reported by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is a far cry from a bill aimed at merely financing the 10-percent increase in benefits provided for 2 years ago. With respect to the railroad retirement system the bill would provide a 10-percent increase in retirement benefits over and above the 10 percent granted in 1956; it would provide an increase in the taxable compensation base from $350 to $400 a month and an increase in the rate of tax from 6¼ percent to 9 percent each for employees and employers and thus raise retirement taxes paid by the railroads by more than $175 million a year.

In regard to the unemployment system S. 1313 would provide increased and extended unemployment and sickness benefits for railroad employees; it would fix the practical minimum weekly benefit at a level above the maximum weekly benefit under all but a very few State unemployment systems; it would permit individual beneficiaries to draw several thousand dollars in benefits for one period of unemployment; it would increase the tax base; and it would increase the tax rate paid by the railroads to support the unemployment system, thereby increasing the railroads' unemployment taxes by about $85 million a year more than they are now paying. It may be that there is some obligation on this body to consider legislation aimed at paying for the costs of the 1956 amendments to the railroad retirement system, but there certainly is no obligation to consider with favor the drastic and sweeping changes in the railroad retirement and unemployment systems contained in S. 1313 in the form reported by the Labor Committee.

The senior Senator from Oregon states that he does not propose to oppose the program set forth in S. 1313 on the basis that railroad workers and retired railroad employees should subsidize the carriers on the ground that the carriers now claim they cannot afford a fair retirement system. There is, of course, a considerable difference of opinion as to what constitutes a fair retirement system for railroad employees. As everyone knows, the benefits available to railroad workers under existing law are much more generous than those available to the worker under the present social-security system and will continue to be much more generous even if the social security amendments which we considered last week become law. However, the important point, it seems to me, is that the senior Senator from Oregon is willing to impose additional payroll taxes against the railroad industry regardless of their effect on that industry. He appears to be of the view that the only fact worth being considered is what is a fair system for a particular group of employees and once having determined that fact the system should be placed in effect without any consideration being given to the impact on the employers of such employees.

Every Member of the Senate is well aware of the very critical financial situation in which the railroads now find themselves. Extended hearings were held early this year on the legislation which has now become the Transportation Act of 1958, at which time the railroads clearly showed that they needed help and they needed it quickly. The railroads' position has not improved in the interim between those hearings and the present. As a matter of fact, it has steadily declined. In the first 5 months of 1958, 42 railroads were operating in a deficit. During that same period the net income of the class I railroads was only $72 million. Additionally, operating costs are steadily increasing and traffic is continuing to decline. Railroad employment in May 1958 was about 180,000 less than it was in May 1957.

The last serious freight car shortage in this country is that which occurred in the fall of 1956. Serviceable ownership of freight cars is now 20,000 less than it was at that time and such ownership recently has been decreasing at the rate of 10,000 cars a month. Because of the decline in earnings of the carriers they have been unable to maintain their car fleet, and accordingly there are about 140,000 freight cars out of service awaiting repairs. Further, lack of money prevents them from purchasing new cars. The imposition of increased payroll taxes, such as are provided for in S. 1313, would deprive the carriers of funds already badly needed for maintenance of existing equipment and purchase of new equipment all in the best interests of the national transportation system and at a time when the national defense potential of the railroads is already a matter of concern.

The senior Senator from Oregon states that if the railroads, in order to supply the people of the country with continuing transportation which is essential to national defense, need a further subsidy along the lines of the Smathers bill he would vote for it. The Smathers bill, of course, provides no subsidy or handouts as they were referred to in the Senator's statement, and no one can point to anything in the legislation which even smacks of a subsidy or handout.

As I understand the senior Senator from Oregon, his position is that increased benefits should be granted the railroad employees even though the cost of such benefits will thereafter prevent the railroads from buying new cars and maintaining their present fleet, and then if it develops that the railroads are inadequately equipped to take care of the defense needs of the Nation a subsidy should be provided. I am unalterably opposed to such a proposition, and I am certain that the majority of the House and Senate are likewise opposed. The railroads of this country have never asked for subsidization and I cannot believe that railroad employees would favor subsidies. Subsidizing the railroad industry is outright socialism and could only lead to nationalization of not only the railroads but of the entire transportation system of this country. We have all seen the disastrous results when the transportation systems of other countries have been nationalized. Certainly the railroad industry would not favor nationalization and the railroad employees would not desire to give up their right to collective bargaining, a right that almost certainly would be lost to them under Federal operation of the carriers.

It is obvious that the railroads do not have the money to pay for the costs of S. 1313. It does not appear in the foreseeable future that they will have funds to pay those costs. It seems to me that it is far more in the best interests of the Nation's economy and of the national defense to give the railroads an opportunity to use such funds as are available to provide themselves with a car supply capable of meeting the needs of this country than it is to deprive them of such funds and in fact bankrupt a number of lines in order to provide additional retirement and unemployment benefits to a group of employees whose benefits are already substantially more liberal than those granted to workers in industries other than the railroads.

MINERALS STABILIZATION LEGISLATION

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, today is a black day for the domestic mining industry of America. By a vote of 182 to 159, the House has defeated the minerals stabilization bill, washing—at least for a year—any hopes the faltering mining industry might have held out for a Congressional lifeline.

The bill that was defeated by the House today was certainly not a cure-all for all the ills besetting our mining industry, Mr. President. In fact, it fell far short of the aims many of us had hoped to achieve in the face of great obstacles. The bill was designed to assist domestic mining by establishing a

long-range purchase program for copper, lead, zinc, acid-grade fluorspar and tungsten, as well as promoting mining and development research for beryl, chromite and columbium-tantalum from domestic mines.

While I would prefer to see legislation enacted that would call for proper protective tariff guaranties to domestic mining to meet the unfair and indiscriminate importation of foreign metals, it was felt that this measure might provide at least a semblance of relief for a distressed and near-mordant segment of our economy. Under this bill, there was the possibility that we could have salvaged something—that perhaps some mines, now closed, might have been able to reopen and prevent our country from being barren of mineral production.

I am tremendously disappointed at the House action, Mr. President, not only because of the blow that has been dealt to our own mining industry but by its implication that some House Members have a greater concern for the mining world overseas than they do for our own producers.

AUTHORIZATION TO COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE TO FILE REPORT DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be permitted to file, during the adjournment of the Senate, a report of its activities during the 85th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

ADDITIONAL EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following additional executive reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Howard W. Babcock, of Nevada, to be United States attorney for the district of Nevada, vice Franklin P. Rittenhouse; and

Russell R. Bell, of West Virginia, to be United States marshal for the southern district of West Virginia.

INCREASED DIVERSION OF WATER FROM LAKE MICHIGAN INTO ILLINOIS WATERWAY—AMENDMENTS

Mr. PROXMIRE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 2) to authorize the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT TO MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BRIDGES (for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS) submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill H. R. 13192, an act making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely, page 7, line 21, add the following new section:

"SEC. 109. The Congress hereby requests the President, from time to time during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, to review the expenditures programed by the executive branch for such fiscal year and to issue such directives to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and other officials in the executive branch of the Government as may be necessary to achieve the maximum reduction in the expenditures of the executive branch during such fiscal year consistent with the objectives of maintaining essential Government services, providing adequately for the common defense, and fostering a healthy national economy; all with a view toward achieving an aggregate, of at least 2 percent on defense appropriations and at least 4 percent on other appropriations but not more than 10 percent on any one item, reduction in the expenditures programed by the executive branch as of July 1, 1958, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to authorize executive action to decrease expenditures for interest on the public debt, veterans compensation, or pensions, Federal, and State cooperative benefit programs and expenditures from trust funds. A report of action taken under this chapter shall be contained in the 1960 budget."

Mr. BRIDGES (for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS) also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 13192, making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, August 21, 1958, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 540. An act for the relief of the board of national mission of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America;

S. 552. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., of West New York, N. J.;

S. 571. An act for the relief of George P. E. Caesar, Jr.;

S. 1258. An act for the relief of M. Sgt. Robert A. Espe;

S. 1801. An act for the relief of Guerdon Plumley;

S. 2001. An act for the relief of Alalu Duncan Dillard;

S. 2057. An act for the relief of Diana Elaine Greig;

S. 2216. An act for the relief of John C. Walsh;

S. 2517. An act to amend sections 2275 and 2276 of the Revised Statutes with respect to certain lands granted to States and Territories for public purposes;

S. 2888. An act to provide for registration, reporting, and disclosure of employee welfare and pension benefit plans;

S. 2955. An act for the relief of Kazuko Young;

S. 3004. An act for the relief of Joanna Strutynska;

S. 3195. An act to authorize certain retired personnel of the United States Government to accept and wear decorations, presents, and other things tendered them by certain foreign countries;

S. 3219. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Graham Bonnalie;

S. 3221. An act for the relief of Erika Margaretha Zintl Pearce;

S. 3300. An act for the relief of Jean Andre Paris;

S. 3308. An act for the relief of Itzhak Aronovici;

S. 3357. An act for the relief of Arturo Ernesto Audrain y Campos;

S. 3445. An act for the relief of Teruko K. Jackson;

S. 3448. An act to authorize the acquisition and disposition of certain private lands and the establishment of the size of farm units on the Seedskadee reclamation project, Wyoming, and for other purposes;

S. 3502. An act to amend the Federal Airport Act in order to extend the time for making grants under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes;

S. 3509. An act for the relief of Wong Wing Boa;

S. 3547. An act for the relief of Andrejs Pablo Mierkalus;

S. 3607. An act for the relief of Harvey L. Forden;

S. 3640. An act for the relief of Daniel (Nathaniel) Rosenzweig;

S. 3739. An act for the relief of Hermine Elmon Papazian;

S. 3743. An act for the relief of Cynthia Elizabeth Jefferson (Mimi Kurosaka) and Sylvia Elise Jefferson (Junko Tano);

S. 3768. An act for the relief of Hing Man Chau;

S. 3776. An act to extend the time for the collection of tolls to amortize the cost, including reasonable interest and financing cost, of the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Miami, Mo.;

S. 3789. An act for the relief of Donald J. Marion;

S. 3801. An act for the relief of Klara Leitner and her daughter, Sylvia Leitner;

S. 3826. An act for the relief of Concettina Iannacchino;

S. 3921. An act for the relief of Peter Tillner;

S. 3966. An act to amend Public Law 85-422;

S. 4020. An act for the relief of Kunio Inouye (Sparkman);

S. 4021. An act to establish the United States Study Commission on the Savannah, Altamaha, St. Marys, Apalachicola-Chattahoochee, and Perdido-Escambia River Basins, and intervening areas;

S. 4053. An act to extend the boundaries of the Siskiyou National Forest in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes;

S. 4071. An act to provide more effective price, production adjustment, and marketing programs for various agricultural commodities;

S. 4081. An act for the relief of Marianne (Sachiko) Fuller;

S. 4167. An act to authorize the lease of Papago tribal land to the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes;

S. 4169. An act to amend the act of June 10, 1938, relating to participation by the United States in the International Criminal Police Organization;

S. 4196. An act to amend the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933 (47 Stat. 1425), as amended, to authorize incorporation of contract

terms by reference in short-form documents; and

S. 4273. An act to provide for cooperation with the European Atomic Energy Commission.

ADJOURNMENT TO 9:30 A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if no Senator desires to address the Senate, or ask any questions, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 9:30 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, August 22, 1958, at 9:30 a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, AUGUST 21, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

I Chronicles 22: 12: *Only may the Lord give you wisdom and understanding.*

Almighty God, as we again assemble to confer and consult with one another, may we have a clear vision of Thy will and a deep concern for the good of all mankind.

We pray that in our plans and purposes we may give evidence that we are partners rather than partisans.

Grant that we may never try to escape the imperatives of our own personal responsibility as we face the crucial issues of our time.

Inspire us to affirm and apply those principles of justice and righteousness which must be paramount in all our longings and labors to build the temple of world peace.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1695. An act for the relief of Harry N. Duff;

H. R. 3366. An act to validate overpayments of pay and allowances made to certain officers of the Army, Navy, Naval Reserve, and Air Force, while undergoing training at civilian hospitals, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3571. An act for the relief of Boris F. Navratil;

H. R. 9370. An act to permit illustrations and films of United States and foreign obligations and securities under certain circumstances, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9817. An act relating to venue in tax refund suits by corporations;

H. R. 9950. An act for the relief of D. A. Whitaker and others;

H. R. 10473. An act for the relief of Hipolito C. DeBaca;

H. R. 10559. An act for the relief of Thomas Forman Screven, Julia Screven Daniels, and May Bond Screven Rhodes; and

H. J. Res. 675. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3267. An act for the relief of Vivian D. Giesey;

S. 4109. An act for the relief of Dr. Herbert H. Schafer and his wife, Irma Niemeyer Schafer; and

S. 4113. An act for the relief of Harold Pangelinian.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 469) entitled "An act to protect producers and consumers against misbranding and false advertising of the fiber content of textile fiber products, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, and Mr. BUTLER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 7710) entitled "An act to provide for the lump-sum payment of all accumulated and current accrued annual leave of deceased employees," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, and Mr. MORTON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12858) entitled "An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 12 to the foregoing bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13450) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to Senate amendments Nos. 2, 7, 14, 15, 22, 24, 42, 50, 58, and 113.

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its amendment No. 23.

The message further announced that the Senate disagrees to the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 36, further insists on its amendments Nos. 36 and 114, asks a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and reappoints as conferees on the amendments in disagreement, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. KNOWLAND.

The message further announced that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] had been appointed a conferee on the bill (S. 25) entitled "An act relating to effective dates of increases in compensation granted to wage board employees" in place of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], excused.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1959

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 13450) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, insist on the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 36, insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 114, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CANNON, THOMAS, ROONEY, GARY, TABER, FORD, and BOW.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 186]

Ashley	George	Miller, N. Y.
Avery	Glenn	Minshall
Bailey	Gordon	Mitchell
Barden	Gwinn	Morrison
Baumhart	Hale	Norrell
Beamer	Harrison, Nebr.	Pilcher
Bentley	Haskell	Powell
Blitch	Hébert	Preston
Boykin	Heriong	Prouty
Brooks, La.	Hill	Radwan
Brownson	Hillings	Rivers
Buckley	Hoffman	Roosevelt
Burdick	Hosmer	Scherer
Christopher	James	Schwengel
Clevenger	Jenkins	Scott, Pa.
Coffin	Jensen	Sheehan
Colmer	Johnson	Shuford
Coudert	Jones, Mo.	Simpson, Pa.
Curtis, Mass.	Kearney	Spence
Dies	Kilburn	Taylor
Diggs	LeCompte	Teague, Tex.
Doyle	McCarthy	Thompson, La.
Durham	McCormack	Vanik
Eberharter	McCulloch	Williams, N. Y.
Elliott	McIntire	Winstead
Engle	Macdonald	Young
Farbstein	Mason	Zelenko
Frelinghuysen	Metcalf	
Friedel	Miller, Calif.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 333 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

RETIREMENT, CLERICAL ASSISTANTS, AND FREE MAILING PRIVILIGES FOR FORMER PRESIDENTS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 607) an act to provide retirement, clerical assistants, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2657)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 607) entitled "An Act to provide retirement, clerical assistants, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States, and for other purposes", having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 1: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by the House amendment with the following changes:

Page 1, line 9, of the Senate engrossed bill, strike out all matter following the word "President" down to but not including the period in line 11, and insert in lieu thereof the words "an office staff".

Page 2, line 4, of the Senate engrossed bill, strike out all matter following the word "exceed" down to and including the period in line 10, and insert in lieu thereof "$50,000 per annum. The rate of compensation payable to any such person shall not exceed the maximum aggregate rate of compensation payable to any individual employed in the office of a Senator. Each individual appointed under this subsection to a position on the office staff of a former President shall be held and considered to be an employee of the Government of the United States for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, and the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954.".

Page 2, line 14, of the Senate engrossed bill, strike out the words "located in a Federal building".

And the House agree to the same.

Amendments numbered 3, 4, 5, and 6: That the House recede from its amendments numbered 3, 4, 5, and 6.

Amendment to the title: That the House recede from its amendment to the title of the bill.

TOM MURRAY,
JAMES H. MORRISON,
EDWARD H. REES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
MIKE MONRONEY,
DICK NEUBERGER,
FRANK CARLSON,
THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 607) entitled "An Act to provide retirement, clerical assistants, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States, and for other purposes", submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: This is a technical amendment which designates subsection (a) of the bill. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 2: The House amendment struck out subsections (b), (c), and (d) of the Senate bill which contained provisions as follows:

Subsection (b) of the Senate bill provided an office staff (administrative assistant, secretary, and other secretarial and clerical assistants) for each former President with rates of basic compensation fixed by the former President at rates which in the aggregate would not exceed the aggregate amount prescribed by law for the basic compensation of the administrative assitant, secretary, and other secretarial and clerical assistants authorized for a Senator from the least populous State of the Union, with additional compensation at the rates provided by law for employees in the offices of Senators.

Subsection (c) of the Senate bill required that the Administrator of General Services shall furnish for each former President suitable office space appropriately furnished and equipped located in a Federal building at a place within the United States to be designated by the former President.

Subsection (d) of the Senate bill provided for the conveyance free of postage within the United States, its Territories and possessions, of all mail matter sent by any former President under his written autograph signature.

The committee of conference recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to House amendment No. 2 and agree to the same with an amendment which restores the matter proposed to be stricken from the Senate engrossed bill by House amendment No. 2 (that is, subsections (b), (c), and (d) discussed above) with the changes described below and that the House agree to the same.

The changes are as follows:

First, the new subsection (b) as agreed to in conference, relating to the office staff of a former President, eliminates language which sets forth specifically the different types of employees comprising the office staff and, in lieu of such specific language, makes general reference to an office staff.

Second, the new subsection (b) as agreed to in conference, relating to the office staff of a former President, eliminates language which provides that the aggregate basic compensation of such office staff members shall not exceed the aggregate basic compensation of the office staff employees of a Senator from the least populous State and that such office staff members also shall receive additional compensation at rates provided by law for employees in offices of Senators, and, in lieu of such language, requires that the aggregate basic compensation of such office staff employees of former Presidents shall not exceed $50,000 per annum.

Third, the new subsection (b) as agreed to in conference adds a provision (not contained in the Senate bill) to the effect that the rate of compensation payable to any individual member of the office staff of a former President shall not exceed the maximum aggregate rate payable to any individual employed in the office of a Senator.

Fourth, the new subsection (b) as agreed to in conference adds a provision the purpose of which is to make it clear that the members of the office staffs of former Presidents will be entitled to the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, and the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954.

Fifth, the new subsection (c) as agreed to in conference, relating to office space for former Presidents, eliminates the restriction contained in the Senate bill requiring that such office space be located in a Federal building.

Amendment No. 4: Subsection (e) of the Senate bill provided for a pension of $10,000 a year to the widow of a former President if the widow shall waive the right to any pension or annuity under any other act of Congress. House amendment No. 4 eliminated this waiver provision. Subsection (e) of the bill as agreed to in conference restores this waiver provision and, therefore, is the same as subsection (e) of the Senate bill. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 3, 5, and 6: These amendments, which redesignated certain subsections of the bill and repealed certain existing law, were technical and clarifying amendments intended to carry out the purposes of House amendments Nos. 2 and 4. Amendments 3, 5, and 6 are eliminated from the bill as agreed to in conference as unnecessary in the light of the conference agreement with respect to amendments Nos. 2 and 4. The House recedes.

Amendment to the title: In order that the title of the bill might reflect the purpose and effect of House amendment No. 2, the House version amended the title of the bill so as to read: "An act to provide retirement benefits to former Presidents of the United States and their widows." The House amendment to the title is eliminated from the bill as agreed to in conference as unnecessary in the light of the conference agreement with respect to amendment No. 2. The House recedes.

TOM MURRAY,
JAMES H. MORRISON,
EDWARD H. REES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement on S. 607 represents a fair, reasonable, and highly desirable compromise of the matters at issue in the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on this legislation.

As passed by the Senate, this legislation provided for each former President, first, a $25,000 annual monetary allowance; second, a staff comprising an administrative assistant, a secretary, and other secretarial and clerical assistance, selected by the former President and paid at rates which in the aggregate could not exceed the aggregate amount provided by law for the staff of the office of a Senator from the least populous State; third, office space located in a Federal building at such place in the United States as the former President shall specify; and, fourth, free postage for mail sent by the former President under his written autographed signature. In addition, the Senate bill would authorize a $10,000 annuity for each widow of a former President if such widow waived all right to any other annuity or pension under any act of Congress.

The House on July 30 passed this legislation with an amendment striking out the provisions in the Senate bill for, first, staff assistants for former Presidents; second, office space for former Presidents; and, third, the franking privilege for former Presidents. This left

only the provisions for the $25,000 annual monetary allowance for each former President—which is subject to taxation—and the $10,000 annuity for each widow of a former President.

The staff provision of the Senate-passed bill, as was pointed out in the House debate on this legislation, could have involved salaries aggregating as much as $120,000 for each former President, depending on the individual salaries paid each staff member. The average amount of the aggregate staff salaries in the offices of Senators from the least populous State presently is approximately $100,000.

The conference agreement eliminates language in the Senate bill which specified the types of staff employees of former Presidents and which authorized such staff employees aggregate compensation equaling that of the office of a Senator from the least populous State. In lieu thereof, the agreement authorizes an office staff for each former President and limits the aggregate compensation of such staff to a maximum of $50,000 per annum. In other words, the staff allowance authorized in the Senate bill has been reduced by one-half in the conference agreement, which certainly is a fair and reasonable adjustment.

The conference agreement also includes a House Post Office and Civil Service Committee amendment limiting the top salary of any member of the staff of a former President to the maximum compensation payable to any individual employed in the office of a Senator.

The conference agreement clarifies an ambiguity of the Senate-passed bill—which did not specify whether or not the staff assistants provided for in that bill would be considered as Federal employees for certain purposes—by the insertion of language making clear that the office staffs of former Presidents will be eligible for coverage of the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, and the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954. This language in the conference agreement is highly desirable to clarify the law and façilitate its administration with respect to the office staffs, particularly in cases of staff personnel who have previous service covered by the acts I have mentioned.

The conference agreement restores the provision for office space, but eliminates unduly restrictive Senate language relating to space in Federal buildings. The Administrator of General Services, under this agreement, will have the necessary measure of administrative latitude in order to carry out his responsibilities for quarters for regular Government activities as well as office space for former Presidents.

The conference agreement includes the original Senate provision for a $10,000 annuity to each widow of a former President if the widow waives the right to any pension or annuity under any other act of Congress. The purpose of both the House and Senate language is identical in respect to the $10,000 annuity being the only benefit for which such widows are eligible. The Senate waiver language was adopted in the conference agreement since it will be more effective than the House language as a permanent limitation on these annuities.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation has been before the Congress, in substantially the same form, for well over 3 years. It has received very careful and extended consideration in the Post Office and Civil Service Committees of both Houses, and has passed the Senate by large majorities on two occasions. The Senate agreed to the conference report the day following the conference, with strong bipartisan support. The ranking minority member of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee stated that this legislation should have been enacted years ago and that he was pleased the legislation was before the Senate for final consideration.

Mr. Speaker, this conference agreement is a fair compromise of the differences between the two Houses. It will provide very moderate and reasonable annuities for former Presidents of the United States and the means for them to carry out the many duties and responsibilities which continue to be theirs after they leave the highest office in the Nation. I hope that we will have the same bipartisan approach that has been evidenced in the other body and that this House will approve the conference agreement.

Today the President of the United States is virtually the only officer of the Federal Government who is not covered by some kind of retirement program. He occupies the greatest office in the world. His duties are most trying and exacting. A former President is considered a dedicated statesman, available whenever desired for service to our country. The interest of the American people in the President does not cease when his term of office has ended, nor does his responsibility end when he retires. The public demands for speeches, conferences, and correspondence continue after his term of office ends.

The distinguished Speaker of the House, the majority leader and the minority leader, all three, appeared before our committee in behalf of this legislation.

I am sure that the House today will agree to this conference report. The Senate agreed to it with practically no debate. There were only two who discussed the conference report, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and also the ranking minority member of the committee, Mr. CARLSON, of Kansas. There was not a dissenting voice raised against this legislation in the other body. I feel that this House should agree to the conference report because it is only just and right that we extend this deserving consideration to our former Presidents.

Our Federal judges today retire on full salary. The members of the Supreme Court when they retire receive $35,000 per year, which is $10,000 a year more than this bill provides for a former President. Five-star generals retire on full pay with a very good staff.

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. CRETELLA. The gentleman from Tennessee indicated in his remarks that the majority leader, the Speaker of the House and the minority leader appeared in behalf of this legislation.

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct.

Mr. CRETELLA. Is it not a fact that when those gentlemen appeared before the committee the only legislation that we had to consider at that time was that of a pension allowance of $25,000 a year, that all the other fringe benefits that have been added to this bill were added later? At the time those gentlemen appeared there was no reference to franking privileges, there was no reference to staffs, and no reference made to allowance for office space; is that correct?

Mr. MURRAY. I must disagree with my friend from Connecticut. Those provisions affecting the office staff and the franking privilege were in the bill when our Speaker, our majority leader and minority leader appeared before our committee last March.

I may say also that the charge is made that this is a bill in which only one ex-President is interested, ex-President Truman. We have never heard anything from Mr. Truman about this legislation, but I have a statement which appeared in the Boston Daily Globe of Boston, Mass., of Thursday, August 7, 1958, headed "Hoover Favors Pensions for Ex-Presidents."

This is dated San Francisco, Calif., August 6, 1958, and is an Associated Press statement:

> Herbert Hoover declared today a pension ought to be given to former Presidents "and it ought to be accepted."
>
> A man of independent wealth himself, the former President told why he favors a bill now before Congress to award a $25,000 annual pension.
>
> "In recent years," observed Hoover, "former Presidents have had to take on a lot of public duties. They are semipublic servants."
>
> Mr. Hoover further said:
>
> "These days all judges retire with pensions. Generals retire with pensions.
>
> "About the only person who doesn't now have a pension is a former President.
>
> "I presume Mr. Truman and I both must write 4,000 to 5,000 letters a month—all these things are kind of a public duty."

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I would just like to say to my distinguished chairman that I have no objection to pensions for Presidents or pensions for the widows of Presidents. But, I do have great doubt as to the merits of setting up a staff, with unlimited franking privileges, because I do not believe it is necessary. And, it is on that basis that if there is a rollcall on this conference report, I shall vote against it, not because I have any objections to giving Presidents or widows of Presidents pensions.

Mr. MURRAY. Does the gentleman realize the voluminous amount of mail and the tremendous amount of letters received and written by ex-Presidents? As former President Hoover said, he gets from 4,000 to 5,000 pieces of mail a

month right now. And, would you expect the ex-President, out of this $25,000, to pay for all of that stenographic assistance and clerical assistance?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I have no objection if you give limited franking privileges, but it is my understanding that this is unlimited as it came back in this conference report.

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct. And should be unlimited.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa, who is also opposed to this legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Did former President Hoover endorse all of the frosting that you put on the cake?

Mr. MURRAY. I am reading the statement that appeared in the Boston Globe.

Mr. GROSS. Does he endorse all the fringe benefits that you put in this bill over in the Senate; all the frosting you put on the cake?

Mr. MURRAY. All I know is what this article states.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. On the matter of office space for former Presidents, the conference report says that it does not need to be in a Federal building. Is there any limitation on the amount of rental to be paid for such office space if in a private building?

Mr. MURRAY. Not at all. I am sure it will be obtained in a Federal building. At the present time former President Truman has office space in the Truman Library, which belongs to the Federal Government.

Now, this legislation has been pending before our committee for over 3 years. I do hope that the Members will back up the committee, will approve the conference report, and get through with this legislation. We have had hearing after hearing on it. We thoroughly considered it, and this conference report is a compromise, and it is fair and it is just and reasonable.

I now yield to our beloved Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am distressed that as much heat has been generated about a piece of legislation as has been displayed here today. I doubt if I would ever be more disappointed in the House of Representatives than I would today if you turned down this proposition. After discussing it with the majority leader and the minority leader, it is true that each of us went before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and endorsed this proposition. And, we endorse it today. I am certain that I speak for the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], when I say that he is for the adoption of this conference report.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the distinguished Speaker that I favor the adoption of the conference report because I believe it is necessary to accept the report to have legislation that I believe is just and desirable. I believe all Government employees are entitled to a pension, regardless of their offices.

It has been my experience to know personally 8 Presidents of the United States, 4 of them rather intimately. I know the tremendous burden that is thrust upon their shoulders in this high office. I know the very exacting demands of the office. I think any man who has served as President of the United States, no matter what his political faith, is entitled to be assured of a retirement revenue at the close of his service.

Mr. Speaker, reference has been made to Mr. Hoover. Mr. Hoover does not need this pension. He does not need any of the emoluments that go with the legislation. He is big enough to appreciate and say that there may be men coming along who will need this. We should not force them to write and lecture to gain a livelihood in their final days. I do not believe that we should be niggardly. We must not make it so that only men of great wealth can serve as President.

Some of the opposition has been based on the fear it will be misused. I have differed violently on many occasions with Mr. Truman, and I rather anticipate I shall continue to differ with him. Regardless of that fact the issue must not be determined by prejudice but with justice. Mr. Truman did serve his country in a time when few men would have liked to be President of the United States, with full knowledge of what they had to go through. He did make some notable contributions to our welfare. I think he deserves the annuity as a matter of justice, and I think it is desirable to give him clerical assistance that he may effectively do his work. A man who serves a long period never ends his public service. We must have some confidence in the men who served as President, and I believe none of these grants will be used unfairly.

I believe that we here in America want to avail ourselves of the services of our ex-Presidents as much as possible. They have attained a vast amount of wisdom that can be beneficial to this country. We want all the knowledge and wisdom possible to bring our country through the crisis of the future. I should like to see this conference report approved by an overwhelming vote. We have already recorded ourselves upon this measure in one instance. I hope that this watered-down conference report will be adopted.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield further to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I expected that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] would make that kind of a statement. There has been a great deal of talk about Mr. Truman's book. Mr. Truman had no staff. He had to hire everyone who worked for him. He had to buy every piece of paper and every stamp. He had to pay travel expenses of everybody who worked with him on his book. He did not get the benefit of the capital gains provision. He came out of it with the paltry net sum of $27,500 for the labor and the expense he went to to get that book published.

As the gentleman from Massachusetts has so well said, the President of the United States does not have any chance to pay into a retirement fund. We do. I think the most comforting thing that has ever been done for the Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States was when we passed a bill toward retiring ourselves and put ourselves under the same law as the rural carriers and the post office clerks. I think we could do nothing that would show we are bigger and better than to pass this bill at this time.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I have felt for a long time that legislation along this line was overdue. I think any of us who have had experience around here know, and I certainly have had opportunity in my much lesser capacity to know, that when you attain a position of some prominence in public life so many responsibilities and obligations follow you even when you no longer hold that official position. Certainly that would be ample reason for some reasonable arrangement for providing the quarters and the services and the mailing privileges.

I know many have thought that some of the suggestions have gone too far. There could be a difference of opinion about that. Personally, I cannot conceive of any man who has been President of the United States knowingly violating the privilege as far as the mailing is concerned. Of course, that is a matter that would constantly be within the action of the Congress to deal with.

One other thing I might say: I know that at the moment much of the attention in respect to this measure might be focused on one individual.

Wholly apart from any consideration of Mr. Truman, this legislation is for the years to come. I do not know what the financial situation of our present great President is but, as far as I am concerned, I look at this legislation as something that might one day be of very much help to him. Certainly I am not going to express any doubt or any question about what I am sure his conduct in future years will be.

I hope this conference report is adopted.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. Any man that is big enough to be President of the United States will certainly, I am sure, be honest and careful with the use of the frank if we entrust it to him. There is no man in my book, in my time, certainly, who has had the responsibility that Harry Truman has had, and I say that as a Democrat who on occasion has differed with Mr. Truman. He took his duties seriously—he studied each major question before him—and once

he made up his mind—he did not vacillate, oscillate, deviate, or hesitate. He acted promptly. He acted to save Turkey from communism. He acted when Korea was invaded. As a result of his decision to drop the atomic bomb in World War II there are tens of thousands of our boys alive and happy today. That took courage—every decision that he made demanded raw courage—intellect and a deep sense of duty to America and the world. History will call him the Andrew Jackson of his time.

Mr. MURRAY. I guess I have differed with him more than the gentleman has.

Mr. CHELF. But when you hang it all out on the clothes line; any man who is big enough to be President of the United States is big enough to carefully, conscientiously, and judiciously use the franking privilege placed in his care and custody. Likewise he will be most concerned about any needless expense on the taxpayers. I know that no former President would abuse any privilege accorded to him by the people through their representatives. I commend the gentleman from Tennessee. He seeks to legislate on principles and fairness and not on prejudice. The conferees and the committee have done a fine job. It is L. P. D.—long past due.

Mr. MURRAY. Let me say this in conclusion: Just remember that this $25,000 allowance to ex-Presidents is taxable, and the way taxes are today, that would take a sizable amount out of it.

So let us approve this conference report, as the other body has.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, no good baseball player walks back to the dugout because he happens to have two strikes on him. I say that with the greatest respect for the distinguished Speaker, the distinguished minority leader, and the chairman of my committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on S. 607.

This conference report on the proposal to institutionalize and subsidize the nonexistent office of former President reveals serious confusion as to the difference between compromise and capitulation.

The mandate given to the House conferees through the amendments to S. 607 adopted by the House July 30 was to compromise the proposed combined pension, office staff allowance, office space and franking privilege provisions of the original bill on the basis of simply a pension for former Presidents and their widows.

I hold that this was a genuine compromise between those who opposed all of the provisions of S. 607 and those who favored everything called for in that bill.

Instead of holding firm for this real compromise, the conferees have come back with what I can only describe as a surrender document. Let us see just what is in this conference report.

In the first place, what has come back to the House is approval and adoption by a majority of the conferees of every single basic feature and provision of the original bill—pension, office staff allowance, office space, and franking privilege.

So far as the basic issue debated and resolved in this House on July 30 is concerned—the basic issue of whether we are going to start the buildup of a bureaucracy around a nonexistent office—there is no compromise or concession whatsoever by the other body.

What is claimed as a compromise, namely the Senate agreement to cut the office staff allowance to a $50,000 maximum, has no bearing on this basic principle which the House had rejected and which is now reestablished.

Does anyone suppose that once the principle of such an office staff for a nonexistent office is accepted—and it is accepted in this conference report—there will be any major difficulty hereafter in raising the ante? Obviously, the dollars amount will subsequently have to be geared to inflation.

The $50,000 reduction in the office staff allowance which the other body so generously consented to is a cheap price indeed for what they bought.

So much for the claim that this is a compromise. Now let us see what the conferees have added to the bill as it went to conference from the House:

First. The conferees have restored unlimited franking privilege in lieu of the $4,000-per-month limitation imposed by the House committee amendment.

Second. The conferees have revised the provision with respect to free office space so that the office space no longer need be in a Federal building. I cannot interpret this as other than carte blanche for General Services Administration to provide such space, if a former President so requests, either by lease or by construction of new office space, with no ceiling on the cost in either event.

Third. The conference report specifically spells out the status of personnel on the office staff of a former President. It provides that they "shall be held and considered to be employees of the Government of the United States for the purpose of the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees Compensation Act, and the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954."

I do not know how it would be possible to confirm any more precisely and emphatically my statement in the earlier debate that this is the beginning of the buildup of a bureaucracy around a nonexistent office.

I hope that my colleagues will fully grasp what this involves. It means that for the first time in American history a non-office-holding citizen is to have as his employees and subordinates a permanent official entourage of Federal personnel.

In that connection, I call attention to Mr. Truman's comment to the press on August 6, relative to this pending legislation, to the effect that former Presidents should not receive less consideration in this respect than five-star admirals and generals.

I will pass over the fact that none of the five-star admirals and generals has, to my knowledge, publicly campaigned for these perquisites for themselves.

The important and highly relevant fact, it seems to me, is that the permanent rank of these officers—whether on active or inactive duty is quite incidental—was established by statute either prior to or coincident with the granting of these perquisites.

I am not aware of any corresponding statute conferring the permanent rank of President, or, as Mr. Truman prefers, of Commander in Chief, upon the temporary occupants of the White House.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of the House to Mr. Truman's tart comment, in the same interview, relative to criticism of the use which might be made of the office staff allowance. Mr. Truman is quoted as saying—and I have reduced the voltage of his remark somewhat—"I would use it anyway I please."

I will merely say of this that in the debate on July 30 I did envision the possibility of some future President taking such an attitude. Obviously, my timing was off so far as my forecast on this score was concerned.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. I am sure the gentleman has heard a great many allegations both here and in the other body regarding perversion of our Constitution. The gentleman knows that the power of this Government is in the hands of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches. The Constitution says not a single word or even mentions a fourth branch. This legislation will create a fourth one and will be an additional perversion of the spirit of the Constitution.

Mr. JOHANSEN. In my judgment it would be, and particularly in light of the statement of Benjamin Franklin at the time of the Constitutional Convention that it was the good fortune of those who, having served as President in the role of servant, would upon their retiring return to the rank of the rulers.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, this is the first time that I have been able to ascertain the real purpose of this legislation, to whom it is directed, who wants it, who needs it. We tried when the bill was previously before the House, to find out for whom this bill was designed, and nobody seemed to want to say. We tried in the committee before that to find out for whom this legislation was necessary. Nobody could tell us.

Today we learn that it is for ex-President Truman, and we saw the interesting spectacle of a couple of Democrats here in the well of the House trying to outtalk each other on the subject of who opposed him the most while he was President. I opposed him, too, but I am not going to get into that competition because I would be outclassed as between those two Democrats.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], chairman of the committee, said this is a compromise. The distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], says this is a watered-down version of

the House bill. It is neither. It is neither a compromise nor a watered-down version; this is the worst kind of surrender on the part of the House conferees.

The House approved a bill that provided $25,000-a-year pensions for ex-Presidents and $10,000 for widows. It went over to the other body and the conferees loaded it with everything the House turned down. So it is not a compromise; not a watered-down version; it is an abject surrender on the part of the House conferees.

The distinguished Speaker spoke of the pensions for Members of Congress. If I remember correctly, I am making a substantial contribution out of my pay check every month to this pension fund, and I do not recall anything in the pending bill that provides that any former President put up any money of any kind.

Yes; I learn for the first time today that this bill is for the benefit of Harry Truman who recently with his family disposed of some 220 acres of land adjacent to the Grand View (Mo.) Air Base which was conveniently located there when he was President, at a cost of some $30 million. He joined in disposing of 220 acres of farm land that is to be converted into what I understand is to be known as Truman Corners, with a shopping center, and a residential subdivision.

It is interesting to note that Congress, with a deficit of from 10 to 13 billion dollars staring it right in the face; with the Treasury confronted with extreme difficulty in refinancing $120 billion worth of Government securities, is prepared to provide a nice fat pension, a staff, unlimited free mailing privilege, and a plush office for former President Harry S Truman, who also bought in on an oil well deal down in Alabama not long ago.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to belabor this issue except to say that if this conference report is approved, I will not be surprised if a campaign is started across the country entitled "Bundles for Ex-Presidents."

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, some are opposed to this conference report because they say neither of our two living ex-Presidents need this pension and the accompanying perquisites. I believe that to be the fact. I certainly hope that neither of our living ex-Presidents is in need of this particular bill and the benefits under it. Mr. Speaker, that is all the more reason why we should adopt it at this time. Some day it may be that an ex-President will need it. We should do it now, not as a special grant to any particular individual but as a matter of principle for all time. We should do it because it is in keeping with the stature and dignity of the office of the President of the United States. We ought to do it because it is in keeping with our own dignity.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished Speaker has advised that he is distressed concerning this legislation. I am also distressed. It is with regard to pressure exerted for this measure.

I regret indeed I am not in agreement with the leadership in the House who are in support of this conference report. This legislation comes at a most inopportune time. We are within a few days of adjournment. Even so, this bill seems to be a "must" before the House adjourns.

A few days ago the House considered a Senate bill which provided for $25,000 a year for retirement benefits of former Presidents and $10,000 a year for their widows; also, approximately $100,000 for clerical hire and secretarial work, together with free office space and unlimited use of franked postage.

The House struck out all the benefits except the $25,000 for retirement benefits and $10,000 for widows of former Presidents.

The members of the conference committee, except myself, agreed to the proposal you are considering today. This proposal provides retirement benefits of $25,000 per year for former Presidents and $10,000 per year for their widows; also, $50,000 for clerk hire; also, free office space; also, free use of franked postage. I voted against the proposal and reserved the right to express my opposition to this measure today.

If you vote for this proposal, you approve not only $25,000 a year for former Presidents and $10,000 for their widows, but you add $50,000 a year for clerk hire, making $75,000 a year, and you are going to add, also, the cost of office space and furnishings and unlimited use of franked postage.

Let me repeat, if you believe the House was right only a few days ago, then you will vote against the conference report, but if you vote for the report, you are going to vote for $75,000 for former Presidents, together with free office space and unlimited use of postage.

I think the American people want to be fair with former Presidents, but in view of present conditions and circumstances, I do not believe they favor such examples of expenditure at the present time.

I just cannot go along with this proposal. It will cost a total of almost $100,000 a year. I really do not believe our former Presidents expect us to vote this legislation. Certainly not now. I think I should add with reference to so-called pressures, none of them—for or against the legislation—came from outside of Washington.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be granted permission to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENNISON. Mr. Speaker, the concept of a pension for ex-Presidents of the United States is one of which I approve. I am disturbed, however, by the fact that the House conferees on S. 607 have departed from that concept and have permitted the inclusion of fringe benefits which were not in the House version as originally passed. I believe this Nation has a responsibility to its greatest public servants, the Presidents of the United States, and I support every move to see that after their service to this country they shall not be in want. However, I am not convinced that it is the responsibility of the American people or the duty of Congress to provide an ex-President or any other retired public servant with benefits beyond an amount equal to reasonable living expenses. Before we extend additional benefits such as an unlimited franking privilege, free office space, and a free staff, serious study should be given to the full implications of such a move.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, when this bill was before the House a week or so ago, I voted in favor of the rule which allowed this measure to come on the floor for consideration.

During the course of that debate we wisely adopted an amendment striking out provisions of the bill providing former Presidents with a staff of clerical assistants and the free-mailing privilege. I supported this amendment. We retained in the bill the provision for a $25,000-a-year pension for former Presidents.

I believe that the pension provision is sound and should have been enacted a long time ago. However, I do not believe it would be wise or justified to set up a Federal bureaucracy around the nonexistent office of former President.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas had it.

So the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would hold, in strict compliance with the rules of the House, the gentlemen would be too late, because the Chair had announced his decision that the conference report had been agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEMONSTRATION PLANTS FOR PRODUCTION OF WATER

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the resolution (S. J. Res. 135) providing for the construction by the Department of the Interior of demonstration plants for the production, from saline or brackish waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, and municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement on the part of the managers of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2674)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) providing for the construction by the Department of the Interior of demonstration plants for the production, from saline or brackish waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment numbered 1.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 2, 10, 11, 11½, 12, 13, 14, and 16, and agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the language inserted by the House amendment, insert the following: "A decision with respect to the process to be utilized in the first of these five plants shall be made by the Secretary within six months after the date of approval of this joint resolution and decisions with respect to the processes to be utilized in the other plants shall follow at intervals of not more than three months. Each such decision shall be reported promptly to the Congress and the construction of the plants shall proceed as rapidly as is possible."; and the House agree to the same.

That the House recede from its amendments numbered 4, 6, 7, 8, and 9; that the Senate recede from its disagreement to amendment of the House numbered 5; and agree that item (3), subsection (b), section 1, wherein these amendments occur, be further amended so that it reads as follows:

"(3) Such plants shall be located in the following geographical areas with a view to demonstrating optimum utility from the standpoint of reliable operation, maintenance, and economic potential—

"(A) At least one plant which is designed for the conversion of sea water shall be located on the west coast of the United States, at least one such plant shall be located on the east coast thereof, and at least one such plant shall be located on the gulf coast thereof; and

"(B) at least one plant which is designed for the treatment of brackish water shall be located in the area generally described as the Northern Great Plains and at least one such plant shall be located in the arid areas of the Southwest."

And the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the language inserted by the House amendment, insert the following:

"SEC. 6. When appropriations have been made for the construction or operation and maintenance of any demonstration plant under this joint resolution, the Secretary may, in connection with such construction or operation and maintenance, enter into contracts for construction, for materials and supplies, and for miscellaneous services, which contracts may cover such periods of time as he shall consider necessary but under which the liability of the United States shall be contingent upon appropriations being available therefor. Unobligated appropriations heretofore made to carry out the Act of July 3, 1956 (66 Stat. 328), as amended (42 U. S. C. 1951 and following) shall be available for administrative and technical services, including travel expenses and the procurement of the services of experts, consultants, and organizations thereof in accordance with section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 806), as amended (5 U. S. C. 55a), in connection with carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution."

And the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill, and agree to the same.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
LEO W. O'BRIEN,
JAMES A. HALEY,
A. L. MILLER,
JOHN J. RHODES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JAMES E. MURRAY,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) providing for the construction of demonstration plants for the production, from saline or brackish waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The conference committee accepted, for the most part, the amendments of the House to the Senate-passed resolution, and the language agreed upon does not materially change the House-approved legislation. In several instances language of the House amendments was modified. The House amendments and the actions of the conference committee thereon are discussed in the following paragraphs.

The House inserted the word "experimental" in front of the words "demonstration plants" to make it clear that the plants to be constructed would not necessarily represent the ultimate state of perfection in a given process. The conference committee agreed to leave out the word "experimental" on the basis that the term "demonstration plant" is defined in the legislation and that it would not be appropriate to qualify further this definition.

The House added language requiring each plant to demonstrate a different process so that there would be no duplication of plants in the various geographical locations. The conference committee agreed to accept this House language.

A provision in the Senate-passed resolution would have required the Secretary to make decisions within 6 months after enactment on all processes to be demonstrated. The House modified this provision to require the decision on 1 process in 6 months, with the other decisions to follow at intervals of not to exceed 6 months. The conference committee agreed to the House language requiring the selection of the first process in 6 months but modified the language with respect to the other decisions to provide that they follow at intervals of not to exceed 3 months. The conference committee further modified the language to require that the Secretary's decisions be promptly reported to the Congress.

With respect to the geographical location of the sea-water-conversion plants, the Senate placed 1 of the plants on the west coast, 1 on the east or gulf coast, and 1 in the Virgin Islands or some other territory or island area of the United States. The conference committee deleted the Virgin Islands or other island area as a location for one of the sea-water-conversion plants on the basis that authority for construction of a sea-water-conversion plant to meet the immediate need of the Virgin Islands for a supplemental water supply is included in other pending legislation, and adopted language locating the 3 sea-water plants; 1 on the west coast, 1 on the east coast, and 1 on the gulf coast.

With respect to the location of the brackish-water-treatment plants, the Senate located one in the Northern Great Plains area and one in the Southwest. The House deleted this language, leaving the decision with respect to location of these plants to the Secretary of the Interior. The conference committee accepted the Senate language placing 1 plant in the Northern Great Plains area and 1 plant in the Southwest.

The language added by the House to authorize acceptance of financial and other assistance from any State or public agency was accepted by the conference committee.

The Senate resolution included language terminating the program and the authority of the Secretary provided in the legislation 5 years after enactment. The House extended this period to 7 years. The conference committee accepted the House amendment.

The House amendment permitting the Secretary to enter into contracts for construction or for materials and supplies covering more than 1 year and contingent upon the appropriation of funds was accepted by the conference committee with the added provision that funds presently available to the Secretary for the continuing saline-water-research program could be used for administrative and technical services necessary to initiate this program.

Other minor clarifying language added by the House was agreed to by the conference committee.

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
LEO W. O'BRIEN,
JAMES A. HALEY,
A. L. MILLER,
JOHN J. RHODES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, a question has been raised concerning the effect of the conference committee amendment to section 6 of Senate Joint Resolution 135. Specifically, the question is whether the second sentence of that amendment contains a limitation on expenditure of funds for travel purposes. My answer is that it does not contain such a limitation and was not intended to do so. All that the amendment does is to insure that funds already appropriated for carrying out the saline-water program shall be available for getting this new aspect of the program under way. It is a means of permitting necessary expenses for initial administrative and technical services to be met pending consideration next year of a regularly submitted appropriation request for this work. Travel is sometimes a necessary part of such expenses. It would probably not have been necessary to include specific mention of travel, but it seemed desirable to make our intent 100-percent clear—namely, that there should be no excuse for not getting the program off the ground on even a faint argument that moneys were not available for travel expenses. The amendment does not specify the amount to be available for

this purpose but leaves this to the reasonable judgment of the Secretary of the Interior.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DOMESTIC MINERALS BILL OF 1958

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 4036) to stabilize production of copper, lead, zinc, acid-grade fluorspar, and tungsten from domestic mines.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 4036, with Mr. EVINS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read down to and including line 4 of the bill.

The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "Stabilization".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, now we are up against a lot of pressure. Pressure has been swelled; thinking people cannot be influenced by pressure. I hope this House will do some thinking on this bill.

I have found out overnight that this copper situation is rolling along and that they are working 6 days a week. Developments have come about in the use of copper in such things as sewage lines, and that sort of thing, because they can handle that stuff to so much better advantage with copper. Copper is something that will last longer than the other metals. So that these people are just rolling at the present time. I suppose that we ought to provide a subsidy for those who are rolling, rather than to try to use our heads and approach this matter from an intelligent standpoint.

Frankly, I cannot go along with any scheme that provides so many varieties of subsidies. The trouble with the whole situation is that if we are going to provide a subsidy for all these things that are provided for in this bill, we are going to have to spread ourselves out. We are going to have to provide subsidies for every single item of consumption in the United States, and we will be completely bankrupt before we get through with that kind of an operation.

Let us show some capacity to stand up and do our legislating on its merits, and try not to do it on the basis of pressure and influence.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PILLION. I have here a report from the Bureau of Mines dated February 1958, in relation to one metal in this bill; and the other metals are pretty much in the same situation. I am referring to employment in the copper industry. The Bureau of Mines report which is very recent states that in 1955 total employment was 28,900. In 1957 instead of having unemployment, that employment has jumped to 32,400. In most of these metals employment is greater than it was in 1955 which was considered a good year for employment.

Mr. TABER. There is an item on the news ticker out in the lobby which indicates that the Kennecott Copper Co. has gone on a 6-day week, something they did not do during wartime. Let us get together and use our heads. Let us get a little backbone in us and turn this bill down. Let us not make fools of ourselves.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened intently to the debate during the past couple of days on this important measure because, believe me, I wanted to accommodate myself to the viewpoint of my friends who are so vitally interested in this problem. I know the problem they have in the mining industry, and I am willing to admit that it is a pressing problem. But I find myself in a situation where if I accommodate myself to the viewpoint of my friends in favor of this particular legislation, I cannot accommodate my conscience.

Down deep in my heart, Mr. Chairman, I believe this is bad legislation. I believe it is bad legislation because it is preferential. It takes one segment of American industry, and granted it is an important segment, and places it in a class entirely by itself.

I do not blame my friends who are so concerned about the plight of the mining industry in their Districts, but what about other segments of the mining industry not covered by this legislation? And what about plywood, in my particular District? What about plywood in the Districts of others here, in other sections of the country?

I told my friends in the plywood industry that for the good of America I must vote for the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. I did not have any tacit understanding that my industry would be granted any particular privilege. I told my people I was going to vote for reciprocal trade for the good of America. I was told that my people could go before the Tariff Commission. I was told that if they presented a case they would be granted special benefits and privileges. I was told that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act would be so liberalized from the industry's viewpoint that we could look forward to some relief.

Why do we say to those in the plywood industry, "You can go through these regular channels," but we say to those in other segments of American industry, "You have these special benefits and these special privileges"?

What about the pottery industry? The people engaged in that industry are not great scions of wealth. They do not have great lobbying organizations representing them. But they have a case, and they have an important case.

What about the people in the fishing industry? I was at a committee meeting with some of my distinguished colleagues not long ago and we were talking about the plight of the little fishermen in this country. One of the gentlemen present—a fisherman, told us that when he went to the State Department to get relief the State Department told him, "Well, you had just better find some other business to get into."

What I am saying is, I do not doubt that many industries are in great difficulty, but why take one group of industries and treat them on a preferential basis? We might need an entirely new plan to solve the difficulties in which we find ourselves. I know that American industry is more and more being faced with this impossible burden of meeting the needs of their laborers, paying decent wages, and having to compete with foreign imports. But what about taking care of all of our American industry? What about taking care of coal, or, in my particular District, plywood, or tung oil? In my home county at one time tung oil was produced to a greater extent than in any other part of the Union, but because of foreign imports the business is just about put out of existence at the present time. It is a little industry. It needs protection. If it is right to protect one segment of American industry with one particular set of rules, I submit to you in all decency, in the spirit of democracy, in the spirit of answering the question not of who is right but what is right, let us conceive of a plan that is fair and equitable to all of American industry. Let us renounce this costly preferential legislation.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 4036 be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HAYS of Ohio moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I do this in the interest of conserving time, because I believe this bill should be killed and I think we ought to do it now, because we have a lot of important things before us if we are going to adjourn any time in the near future.

The House has already turned down the Brannan plan pretty emphatically, and this is nothing more or less than a Brannan plan for metals.

That is exactly what it amounts to. It picks out a certain group of employees

only to subsidize. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] gave you a list of the unemployed in the categories of metals contained in this bill. I look at his list and his source was the Bureau of Labor Statistics. It shows in this group there is a net unemployment over 1955 of 5,000 miners exactly. This bill carries an appropriation of a half billion dollars. If you divide 5,000 into a half billion dollars, what they are asking the Congress to do is to spend $100,000 per miner to put these fellows back to work. Now that is just the way it figures out. That is pretty expensive putting back to work. At a matter of fact, I would rather vote for a bill to give them all $5,000 apiece and let them stay home because then you could save $450 million for the taxpayers. What is the truth about this? The truth about the bill is that it is a direct subsidy to the mine operators and, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] pointed out on the floor of the House yesterday, an indirect subsidy to those who dabble in mining stocks. That is what you are asking the Congress to do. If there are people here who believe what they say they believe, that the Government is going in the red at a fantastic rate and we ought to stop, this is a good place to stop because if this bill passes, there is a precedent for every industry that has a little recession to come in and get a subsidy. Certainly, if we pass a subsidy for this favored group, you could not in good conscience refuse to give anybody else a subsidy.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I wonder why the gentleman does not introduce an amendment to include the pottery industry in Ohio, which I understand is having considerable difficulty meeting foreign competition and in which industry there are hundreds of men unemployed.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I would introduce it if we had a chance to pass it, but I am a realist and there were not enough of us from the pottery districts for them to need our vote to pass the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. So we were not approached. You might just about put it in the category: You are not against bribery in principle except when you are left out of it. And I am just realistic enough to know that they did not need the pottery votes and my amendment would not have a chance of passage. Besides that I am not amenable to bribery.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I am very glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PILLION. I call to the attention of the gentleman from Ohio that the statistics of the Bureau of Mines as of February 1958, indicates that instead of having a net loss of employment, there has actually been a net gain of employment in the mining of these metals of about 3,000 between the years 1955 and 1957, and the only area where there has been an appreciable loss of employment, of course, has been in tungsten which, as the gentleman knows, we have such a tremendous stockpile of it that we do not know what to do with it.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

Mr. Chairman, this motion which is offered by the gentleman from Ohio is one of a series of efforts which I am sure will be made this afternoon to either cripple or destroy this legislation on which the House has been working for 2 days. I would like to answer for a moment or two, if I might, several of the arguments that have been advanced on the floor today against this legislation.

In the first place, the gentleman from Florida who spoke so eloquently just a few minutes ago, and who is one of my dear friends in the House, asked the House this question: Why do not these industries have to go to the Tariff Commission? He left the implication with you that the mining industries of America have not gone to the Tariff Commission and sought relief. I am speaking to you here today for 2,600 unemployed lead and zinc miners, and mill and smelter workers in the Second District of Oklahoma, who represent and work in an industry that has twice gone to the Tariff Commission in the last 4 years. In 1954, they went to the Tariff Commission. They made a case. They got a unanimous finding that they were being destroyed by imports and were in need of relief, but they could get no relief.

In 1957, doing what the gentleman from Florida said they ought to do, they went again before the Tariff Commission. Once again they spent long hours and long days making a case before the Tariff Commission. They got a unanimous finding again that they were being destroyed by the unrestricted imports and that they were entitled to relief, but they have not been given any relief. So we are asking in the Congress today that the Congress give these miners the relief that the Tariff Commission said they should receive and which they have not been given.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman tell us who refused to follow the findings of the Tariff Commission?

Mr. EDMONDSON. There is one further point I want to touch on, then I will yield to my friend.

The reason they are in this trouble, the reason our domestic miners are in the distressed condition they are in today is the manner in which we have been administering our foreign aid and the reciprocal-trade programs which have been supported by many of my colleagues, on the floor today.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I would like to say to my friend that his industry is not the only one that has gone to the Tariff Commission and has been turned down time and time again. Many of us around here find ourselves in the same position.

Mr. EDMONDSON. If my friend from Florida brings before the committee the case of an industry that is jeopardized I shall be glad to give it favorable consideration on the floor.

But to get back to the bill under consideration, here we have a program that has been reported to Congress, that has been passed by the other body overwhelmingly, and we are asking this House to give us a chance to make this case and to give to the American miners and to give to the American producers a chance to continue. That is the plea we make to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Not at this time.

Mr. Chairman, we are subsidizing production in foreign countries. At this very time our Government is buying minerals from foreign sources, foreign producers, and is paying 5 or 6 cents above the market price for lead and zinc, and this is being done under so-called procurement contracts of long standing, which certainly amount to a liberal form of foreign aid. Programs to stimulate foreign production of metals have been adopted and generously appropriated for here in the past. I say it is time we did something for the American miner and the American producer. Let us adopt this bill here today and defeat these unworkable amendments.

I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I just want to say to the gentleman that I voted against the reciprocal-trade treaty before the gentleman was a Member of this body, and several times since he has come here.

Mr. EDMONDSON. May I say to my friend from Ohio that I, too, voted against the reciprocal-trade treaty bill, when its extension was last before this House, without needed safeguards for our own industry.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The gentleman has invited all the supporters of the bill——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired. All time on the preferential motion has expired.

The question is on the motion to strike out the enacting clause.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HAYS of Ohio) there were—ayes 77, noes 76.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ROGERS of Texas and Mr. HAYS of Ohio.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 108, noes 98.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. EVINS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 4036) to stabilize production of copper, lead, zinc, acid-grade fluorspar, and

tungsten from domestic mines, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 171, nays 174, not voting 84, as follows:

[Roll No. 187]

YEAS—171

Abbitt	Fascell	Natcher
Abernethy	Fenton	Neal
Adair	Flynt	Nicholson
Alexander	Fogarty	Nimtz
Alger	Forand	Norblad
Andersen, H. Carl	Ford	O'Hara, Minn.
Andrews	Forrester	O'Konski
Ashmore	Gary	Ostertag
Bailey	Gathings	Pelly
Baldwin	Gavin	Philbin
Bass, N. H.	Grant	Pillion
Bates	Green, Oreg.	Poff
Becker	Griffin	Polk
Bennett, Fla.	Gross	Quie
Betts	Gwinn	Rabaut
Blatnik	Haley	Ray
Boland	Harden	Reed
Bolton	Hardy	Riehlman
Bonner	Harrison, Va.	Riley
Bosch	Harvey	Robeson, Va.
Bow	Haskell	Robison, N. Y.
Bray	Hays, Ohio	Robsion, Ky.
Broomfield	Hess	Rogers, Fla.
Brown, Ga.	Hiestand	Rooney
Brown, Ohio	Hoeven	Sadlak
Broyhill	Holt	St. George
Bush	Huddleston	Saylor
Byrne, Ill.	Hull	Schenck
Byrnes, Wis.	Hyde	Scott, N. C.
Cannon	Johansen	Seely-Brown
Carrigg	Jonas	Selden
Cederberg	Kean	Sikes
Chamberlain	Keating	Siler
Chiperfield	Kelly, N. Y.	Simpson, Ill.
Church	Kilgore	Smith, Calif.
Collier	Kirwan	Smith, Va.
Cramer	Kitchin	Springer
Cretella	Lafore	Staggers
Cunningham, Iowa	Laird	Stauffer
	Lane	Taber
	Lankford	Talle
Cunningham, Nebr.	Lipscomb	Teague, Calif.
	McDonough	Tewes
Curtin	McGregor	Thomas
Curtis, Mass.	McIntosh	Tuck
Dague	McMillan	Utt
Davis, Ga.	Mack, Wash.	Van Pelt
Delaney	Mahon	Van Zandt
Dennison	Matthews	Vinson
Denton	May	Vursell
Devereux	Meader	Westland
Dingell	Michel	Wharton
Donohue	Miller, Md.	Whitener
Dorn, N. Y.	Moore	Whitten
Dorn, S. C.	Morano	Williams, Miss.
Dowdy	Multer	Wilson, Calif.
Eberharter	Mumma	Wilson, Ind.
Fallon	Murray	Younger

NAYS—174

Addonizio	Breeding	Dixon
Albert	Brooks, Tex.	Dollinger
Allen, Calif.	Brown, Mo.	Dooley
Allen, Ill.	Burleson	Dwyer
Anderson, Mont.	Byrd	Edmondson
	Byrne, Pa.	Elliott
Anfuso	Canfield	Everett
Arends	Carnahan	Evins
Aspinall	Celler	Feighan
Auchincloss	Chelf	Fino
Ayres	Chenoweth	Fisher
Baker	Christopher	Flood
Baring	Clark	Fountain
Barrett	Coad	Frazier
Bass, Tenn.	Cooley	Fulton
Beckworth	Corbett	Garmatz
Belcher	Curtis, Mo.	Granahan
Bennett, Mich.	Dawson, Ill.	Gray
Berry	Dawson, Utah	Green, Pa.
Boggs	Delay	Gregory
Bolling	Dent	Griffiths
Boyle	Diggs	Gubser
Hagen	Magnuson	Rogers, Tex.
Halleck	Mailliard	Rutherford
Harris	Marshall	Santangelo
Hays, Ark.	Martin	Saund
Healey	Merrow	Scrivner
Hemphill	Metcalf	Scudder
Heselton	Miller, Nebr.	Sheppard
Holifield	Mills	Sieminski
Holland	Montoya	Sisk
Holmes	Morgan	Smith, Kans.
Holtzman	Morris	Smith, Miss.
Horan	Moss	Steed
Ikard	Moulder	Sullivan
Jackson	Nix	Teller
Jarman	Norrell	Thompson, N. J.
Jennings	O'Brien, Ill.	Thompson, Tex.
Jones, Ala.	O'Brien, N. Y.	Thomson, Wyo.
Judd	O'Hara, Ill.	Thornberry
Karsten	Osmers	Tollefson
Kearns	Passman	Trimble
Kee	Patman	Udall
Kilday	Patterson	Ullman
King	Perkins	Vorys
Kluczynski	Pfost	Walter
Knox	Poage	Watts
Knutson	Porter	Weaver
Krueger	Price	Widnall
Landrum	Rains	Wier
Lennon	Reece, Tenn.	Wigglesworth
Lesinski	Rees, Kans.	Willis
Libonati	Reuss	Withrow
Loser	Rhodes, Ariz.	Wolverton
McFall	Rhodes, Pa.	Wright
McGovern	Roberts	Yates
Machrowicz	Rodino	Zablocki
Mack, Ill.	Rogers, Colo.	
Madden	Rogers, Mass.	

NOT VOTING—84

Ashley	Gordon	Minshall
Avery	Hale	Mitchell
Barden	Harrison, Nebr.	Morrison
Baumhart	Hébert	O'Neill
Beamer	Henderson	Pilcher
Bentley	Herlong	Powell
Blitch	Hill	Preston
Boykin	Hillings	Prouty
Brooks, La.	Hoffman	Radwan
Brownson	Hosmer	Rivers
Buckley	James	Roosevelt
Budge	Jenkins	Scherer
Burdick	Jensen	Schwengel
Clevenger	Johnson	Scott, Pa.
Coffin	Jones, Mo.	Sheehan
Colmer	Kearney	Shelley
Coudert	Keogh	Shuford
Davis, Tenn.	Kilburn	Simpson, Pa.
Derounian	Latham	Spence
Dies	LeCompte	Taylor
Doyle	McCarthy	Teague, Tex.
Durham	McCormack	Thompson, La.
Engle	McCulloch	Vanik
Farbstein	McIntire	Wainwright
Frelinghuysen	Macdonald	Williams, N. Y.
Friedel	Mason	Winstead
George	Miller, Calif.	Young
Glenn	Miller, N. Y.	Zelenko

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Johnson for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Zelenko for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Mr. Farbstein for, with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana against.

Mr. Winstead for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Colmer for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Bentley for, with Mr. Durham against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Roosevelt against.

Mr. Hosmer for, with Mr. Engle against.

Mr. Frelinghuysen for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. Beamer for, with Mr. Doyle against.

Mr. Scherer for, with Mr. George against.

Mr. Sheehan for, with Mr. Boykin against.

Mr. Wainwright for, with Mr. Hillings against.

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Herlong for, with Mr. Glenn against.

Mr. Derounian for, with Mr. Friedel against.

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Hill against.

Mr. Henderson for, with Mr. Coffin against.

Mr. Preston for, with Mr. Scott of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Pilcher for, with Mr. Mitchell against.

Mr. Williams of New York for, with Mr. McCarthy against.

Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Ashley against.

Mr. James for, with Mr. Jensen against.

Mr. Rivers for, with Mr. Gordon against.

Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Shelley against.

Mr. McCulloch for, with Mr. Vanik against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Avery.

Mr. Spence with Mr. Baumhart.

Mr. Barden with Mr. Radwan.

Mrs. Blitch with Mr. Prouty.

Mr. Brooks of Louisiana with Mr. McIntire.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Brownson.

Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Budge.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Hale.

Mr. Dies with Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. Shuford with Mr. Harrison of Nebraska.

Mr. Young with Mr. Clevenger.

Mr. NORRELL, Mr. BYRD, MR. AUCHINCLOSS, and Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The bill follows:

TITLE I

SEC. 101. (a) The Secretary of the Interior shall provide for stabilization payments to producers of ores or concentrates of lead, zinc, acid-grade fluorspar (fluorspar containing 97 percent or more calcium fluoride on a dry weight basis), and tungsten trioxide produced from domestic mines, as provided in this title.

(b) Upon presentation of evidence satisfactory to the Secretary of a sale of newly mined domestic ores, or concentrates produced therefrom, of lead, zinc, acid-grade fluorspar, and tungsten trioxide, the producer of such ores or concentrates shall be paid (if the market price of the material produced therefrom at the time of the sale was less than the stabilization price set forth hereinafter) an amount equal to but not exceeding the difference between the amount actually received by the producer from the sale and an amount, as determined by the Secretary, which the producer would have received for such ores and concentrates had the market price of the material produced therefrom at the time of sale been equal to the stabilization price as shown in the following schedule:

Material stabilization price

Lead (common), 15½ cents per pound, New York, N. Y.

Zinc (prime western), 13½ cents per pound, East St. Louis, Ill.

Fluorspar (acid-grade), $53 per short ton, f. o. b. point of shipment.

Tungsten trioxide, $36 per short ton, f. o. b. shipping point.

(c) If a producer further processes such ores or concentrates without effecting a sale, the equivalent and competitive market value of such ores or concentrates, as determined by the Secretary, at the time of such further processing shall be used in lieu of the amount which would have been received in

the case of a sale, for the purpose of computing payments.

SEC. 102. (a) Subject to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, no stabilization payments under this title shall be made on sales, or further processing in lieu of sales, for any 1 year with respect to any production the recoverable content of which is in excess of the following annual limitations:

(1) Three hundred and fifty thousand tons of lead;

(2) Five hundred and fifty thousand tons of zinc;

(3) One hundred and eighty thousand tons of acid-grade fluorspar;

(4) Three hundred and seventy-five thousand short ton units of tungsten trioxide.

(b) No stabilization payments under this title shall be made on any domestically produced material which is sold to or eligible for sale to the United States Government, or any agency thereof, pursuant to a contract made under the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act, or the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956. Any such material shall be applied to reduce the annual limitations specified in this section, and the quarterly limitations as fixed by the Secretary.

SEC. 103. (a) For purposes of administration the Secretary may fix quarterly limitations on the total amounts of each material on which stabilization payments are made for the purpose of achieving stabilization in the annual rates of production.

(b) Where sales of any material exceed such quarterly limitations, the Secretary may adjust stabilization payments to producers for that quarter so as to distribute the benefits of the program equitably among the producers, but stabilization payments shall not be denied on any sales of any producer during such quarter whose sales did not exceed the following quantities: Lead, 1,250 tons; zinc, 1,250 tons; fluorspar (acid-grade), 1,250 tons; and tungsten trioxide, 3,000 short-ton units.

(c) Whenever the total production from domestic mines of any of the minerals to which this title applies exceeds the quarterly limitation in any one quarter, the Secretary may establish, for succeeding quarters, limitations on the quantities for each producer that will be eligible for stabilization payments, but no producer shall have a quarterly limitation for any mineral less than the quantity set forth for that mineral in the preceding subsection.

SEC. 104. (a) In the case of tungsten trioxide, stabilization payments on the sales of any 1 producer shall be limited to 15,000 short-ton units per quarter from production originating in any 1 mining district: *Provided*, That in the event eligible sales from newly mined production is less than the quarterly limitation for this material, as established by the Secretary, the Secretary, at his option and under regulations issued pursuant to this act, may make stabilization payments on sales of tungsten ores and concentrates from the inventory of producers which were produced after July 1, 1956, but prior to the effective date of this title. In no event shall payments on sales from such inventories exceed an aggregate of 25,000 short-ton units to any 1 producer from production originating in any 1 mining district, nor shall payments on sales from such inventories, together with sales from newly mined production, exceed in any quarter an aggregate of 15,000 short-ton units for any 1 producer from production originating in any 1 mining district.

SEC. 105. No stabilization payment made under this title on the recoverable content of any ores or concentrates shall exceed the following: Lead, 3.9 cents per pound; zinc, 2.9 cents per pound; fluorspar (acid-grade), $13 per short ton; and tungsten trioxide, $18 per short-ton unit of WO_3.

SEC. 106. Whenever the Secretary determines that the total quarterly production of any of the materials on which stabilization payments are to be made, as provided in this title, has exceeded the quarterly limitation for each of 2 successive quarters by an amount in excess of that shown in the following schedule: Lead, 9,000 tons; zinc, 15,000 tons; fluorspar (acid-grade), 5,000 tons; tungsten trioxide, 55,000 short-ton units, he shall provide that all stabilization payments on such materials sold thereafter shall be suspended until such time as he shall be satisfied that the annual rate of production from domestic mines will approximate the amounts set forth in section 102 (a).

SEC. 107. The provisions of this title shall take effect on the first day of the first quarter next following the date of enactment of this act and shall terminate on June 30, 1963.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. (a) In addition to any payments under title I of this act, the Secretary shall make limited tonnage payments, upon presentation of evidence satisfactory to him of a sale of newly mined ores, or concentrates produced therefrom, as provided in this section.

(b) (1) Such payments shall be made to producers of lead, as follows:

(A) As long as the market price for common lead at New York, N. Y., as determined by the Secretary is at or below 15½ cents per pound, at the rate of 1.1250 cents per pound on not to exceed 500 tons per quarter per producer; or

(B) As long as such market price is above 15½ cents per pound but is below 17 cents per pound, at the rate provided in clause (A) reduced by an amount equal to 75 percent of the amount by which such market price exceeds 15½ cents per pound, on not to exceed 500 tons per quarter per producer.

(2) No payment shall be made under the provisions of this section to producers of lead when such market price is equal to, or exceeds, 17 cents per pound.

(c) (1) Such payments shall be made to producers of zinc, as follows:

(A) As long as the market price for prime western zinc at East Saint Louis, Ill., as determined by the Secretary, is at or below 13½ cents per pound, at the rate of .5500 cent per pound on not to exceed 500 tons per quarter per producer;

(B) As long as such market price is above 13½ cents per pound, but is below 14½ cents per pound, at the rate provided in the preceding clause (A) reduced by an amount equal to 55 percent of the amount by which such market price exceeds 13½ cents per pound, on not to exceed 500 tons per quarter per producer.

(2) No payment shall be made under the provisions of this section to producers of zinc when such market price is equal to or exceeds 14½ cents per pound.

(d) Such payments shall be made to any producer of tungsten trioxide who has not sold more than 250 units thereof during any quarter, at the rate of $4 per unit on the number of units produced by such producer in such quarter.

SEC. 202. The provisions of this title shall take effect on the first day of the first quarter next following the date of enactment of this act, and shall terminate on June 30, 1963.

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary is hereby authorized and directed to establish and maintain a program to purchase not more than 150,000 short tons of refined copper produced from ores mined in the United States its Territories, and possessions, of such types as he deems desirable meeting the same specifications for purchases of refined copper as are or may be in effect pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act. Such purchases shall be made at the market price, but not to exceed 27½ cents per pound, delivered Connecticut Valley.

SEC. 302. All copper purchased pursuant to the authority of this title shall be turned over to the supplemental stockpile in accordance with the provisions of the act of July 10, 1954 (Public Law 480, 83d Congress (68 Stat. 454)), as amended.

SEC. 303. The provisions of this title shall take effect upon the date of enactment of this act, and shall terminate on June 30, 1959.

TITLE IV

SEC. 401. The Secretary is hereby authorized to establish and promulgate such regulations and require such reports as he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, but such regulations shall assure equitable distribution of the benefits of the programs provided by this act throughout the domestic industries affected.

SEC. 402. The Secretary may delegate any of the functions authorized by this act to the Administrator of General Services.

SEC. 403. (a) For the purposes of this act—

(1) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) The term "producer" means any individual, partnership, corporation, or other legal entity engaged in producing ores or concentrates from domestic mines and in selling the material produced in normal commercial channels.

(3) The term "sale" means a bona fide transfer for value of ores and concentrates from a producer to a processing plant.

(4) The term "domestic mine" means any single operating unit producing ores from properties located within the United States, its Territories, or possessions, and operating in one State or mining district.

(5) The term "newly mined" means domestic material processed into concentrates or severed from the land subsequent to the date of enactment of this act, but shall not exclude normal inventories of crude ore. The term does not refer to material recovered from mine dumps, mill tailings, or from smelter slags and residues derived from material mined prior to the date of enactment of this act.

(6) The term "quarter" means the calendar periods commencing on the first day of the months of January, April, July, and October.

(b) For the purposes of sections 103 and 201 of this act, the Secretary may determine what constitutes a single operating unit producing ores, and, in the event that more than one producer claims payment for sales from production of a single operating unit, the Secretary may determine the quantity of sales for each such producer to which the above limitations shall apply.

(c) For purposes of sections 103 and 201 of this act, sales of concentrates produced from ores sold to a mill or processing plant in accordance with regulations issued pursuant to this act shall not be considered as the sales of the owner of the mill, but shall be considered as the sales of the producer of the ores.

SEC. 404. In order to finance programs authorized under this act, the Secretary is authorized and empowered to issue to the Secretary of the Treasury notes and obligations in an amount not exceeding $350 million outstanding at any one time. Such notes and other obligations shall be in such forms and denominations, have such maturities, and be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided*, That such notes and other obligations may be redeemed by the Secretary at his option before maturity in such manner as may be stipulated in such notes

or other obligations. Such notes and other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury taking into consideration the current average yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of such notes and other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to purchase any notes or other obligations issued by the Secretary hereunder and for such purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such act are extended to include any purchases of such notes and other obligations.

SEC. 405. No payment shall be made under this act after December 31, 1963.

SEC. 406. The Secretary shall make an annual report with respect to operations under this act as soon as practicable after July 1 of each of the years 1959 to 1963 inclusive to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives. Any such report shall contain such recommendations as the Secretary may deem appropriate.

SEC. 407. Any person who willfully violates any provision of this act or any regulation issued under this act shall upon conviction be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both.

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to stabilize production of copper, lead, zinc, acid-grade fluorspar and tungsten and to promote mining and development research for beryl, chromite, and columbium-tantalum from domestic mines."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 6, strike the word "produced" and insert the word "producible."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 12, strike the word "produced" and insert the word "producible."

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I voted for the rule which made the consideration of this bill in order, but I am opposed to the bill. I voted to make the bill in order because I certainly thought that there should be brought to the attention of every Member of this Congress and to the country the plight that the lead and zinc people are in. It seemed to me that the discussion that would be possible under general debate would make information with respect to the plight of those industries available to the country.

There can be no question but what the lead and zinc industries are being seriously injured. It has been found on two separate occasions by a duly constituted Commission of our Government, which held hearings and made findings that the industry is being seriously injured.

I do not think, however, that we have placed the proper emphasis on the question of why or how it is being injured or that this bill even considers the cause of the injury. What did the Tariff Commission find and why did it find it and what were its recommendations? The Tariff Commission found in 1954 by a unanimous decision, and they found again this year, in April, by a unanimous decision that the lead and zinc industry was being injured. Why? Because of imports, low-priced imports, imports produced at low cost in some foreign country. That is why we have the problem. That is why they are being injured. There was a unanimous decision to that effect.

Let me quote from the report of the United States Tariff Commission to the President under date of April 24, 1958:

As a result of the investigation, including the hearings:

(1) The Commission unanimously finds that, as a result in part of the customs treatment reflecting the concessions granted thereon in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, unmanufactured lead and unmanufactured zinc are being imported into the United States in such increased quantities, both actual and relative to domestic production, as to cause serious injury to the respective domestic industries producing like or directly competitive products;

(2) Commissioners Brossard, Talbot, and Schreiber find that, in order to remedy such serious injury, it is necessary, for an indefinite period, that unmanufactured lead and unmanufactured zinc be subject to duty at the maximum rates permissible under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (see table 3 in the statistical appendix), and, in addition, that such unmanufactured lead and unmanufactured zinc be subject to quantitative limitations as set forth in table C on page 80; and

(3) Commissioners Sutton, Jones, and Dowling find that, in order to remedy such serious injury, it is necessary, for an indefinite period, that unmanufactured lead and unmanufactured zinc be subject to duty at the rates originally imposed by the Tariff Act of 1930 (see table 3), without quantitative limitations of any kind.

You will note that the Commission found that the lead and zinc industry was being injured as a result of the increased importation of lead and zinc as a result of concessions or reductions in the tariff on lead and zinc contained in the General Agreement on Tariff and Trade.

Let me call the attention of this Congress to the fact that we have a law on the statute books. It is the law today, it has been the law since 1951, and it will be the law for the next 4 years. I refer you to section 6 of the Trade Agreements Act of 1951. This section provides that no reduction or concession made under the Trade Agreements Act shall be permitted to continue in effect when the product on which the concession has been granted is, as a result, in whole or in part, of the duty or other customs treatment reflecting such concession, being imported in such increased quantities as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry. That provision is continued under the Trade Agreements Act Extension which was passed by this Congress and which was signed by the President yesterday.

I would point out to you also that the law authorizes the President to take action to increase the duties where injury is resulting from increased imports.

Now, Mr. Chairman, note the recommendation made by the Tariff Commission as to what should be done to relieve the lead and zinc industry under the present circumstances. This recommendation was made as recently as April 24 of this year. The Commission was unanimous in its recommendation that the duty on lead and zinc imports should be increased at least to the rate originally imposed by the Tariff Act of 1930. Three of the Commissioners recommended that the duty should be increased to the maximum rates permissible and, in addition, that quantitative limitations or quotas should be imposed. I should point out that nothing has been done by the President to date to carry out this recommendation.

You will note that the Tariff Commission does not recommend getting into a Brannan plan, an incentive payment or a subsidy program. They recommend meeting this problem in the historical American way, namely, the imposition of duties.

The mess we are in today is a direct result, Mr. Chairman, of the bad faith of the administration as far as the administration of the trade-agreements program is concerned. I said on this floor last June 10 when the extension of the Trade Agreements Act was before the House:

Until we get something that will assure us that the escape clause is meaningful, until we have assurance that section 6 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 is carried out in spirit and in letter, I shall oppose further extensions of this act.

I was prompted to make that statement and oppose extension of the Trade Agreements Act when it was before this House last June because of the existence of situations exactly like the situation that now exists with respect to the lead and zinc industry.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this situation we have today in the field of lead and zinc is a result of the failure of the escape clause to function under the administration of the Trade Agreements Act. This is not the only industry that is so affected. There are other industries. And if you are going to give this type of special relief; if you are going to start subsidizing industries that are injured as a result of imports, you will open up the greatest floodgates this country has ever seen and you will reverse the historic policy of this country.

If you say, as you, in effect, say by this bill, that any industry injured as a result of the importation of goods produced by cheap labor abroad will be subsidized to make up the price differential, there is no end to the burden that

you are going to place on the American economy and the American taxpayers. We cannot stand it. Why should you start on this road today?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Briefly, I yield to the gentlemen from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I take no offense at what the gentleman is saying. I think he is right. But suppose this bill should become law, and then the administration accepted its responsibilities to proceed under the escape and peril clauses, then this bill would not cost the taxpayers anything, would it?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. That is right. But I would force the President to carry out the present law; I would not give him the alternative. If I were to offer any alternative, I would say pass the bill H. R. 6894 that was before the Committee on Ways and Means last year, on which we had hearings and which has been sitting in that committee, to take care of the lead and zinc situation, by imposing an import tax on the imports. And that is still available to the Congress. The President has ample authority to increase duties and impose quotas. That is the type of relief that should be pursued. We should not get into the completely unrealistic approach that is offered by this bill.

The way to solve any problem is to attack the cause of that problem. This bill does not attack the cause. Even should this bill become law, the problem facing the lead and zinc industry will remain because the cause of their problem will still remain. This country will still permit the importation of lead and zinc at prices which make it impossible for the domestic industry to compete.

The proposal before us is a poor substitute for appropriate and effective action imposing a proper restriction on imports.

Industry should not be forced to accept the temporary and ineffective relief provided by this proposal. It is entitled to protection through the historical American method of duties and quotas on imports.

The American taxpayer should not be burdened by the additional cost of almost one-half billion dollars authorized by this legislation. The imposition of a duty would correct the problem, and, in addition, produce a revenue to the Treasury. This legislation drains the Treasury.

Mr. Chairman, either the President should accept the responsibility that is placed on him as part of the Trade Agreements Act and take effective action carrying out the recommendations of the Tariff Commission, or this Congress should pass bill H. R. 6894 imposing import taxes on lead and zinc. Such alternative actions would not only be effective, but they would be permanently effective because they attack the heart of the problem, the increased foreign imports.

If we pass this bill we will only be delaying the day of reckoning because the basic problem will still remain with us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] has again expired.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to take the floor; but during the debate some things have been said and I would not feel quite right if I did not do my best to correct them.

A statement has been made to the effect that a subsidy is a less regressive method of handling a trade situation than a tariff. As a matter of fact, the converse is true. There was testimony by expert witnesses before our Subcommittee on Tariff and Trade, of which the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] is chairman. The question I put to many of them was: Of all the barriers to trade we have, whether it be a license, a quota, a subsidy, or what, do you not agree that the least restrictive and most liberal is the tariff? The answer was invariably, "Yes."

Of course, anyone who studies trade matters will recognize that that is the case.

We have an unusual situation in regard to lead and zinc, for this reason: Only 30 percent of the domestic market is filled by our domestic production. Seventy percent is always going to come from abroad. We are talking about a balance. The administration made it clear when they supported and sent up this program that they were agreeing with the findings of the Tariff Commission that damage had been done to the lead and zinc industry.

The only argument that faces this Congress today and, I might say faces the administration, is, having conceded that the industry has been injured and that it needs help; how is the best way to help them? I want to talk about what is the difference—the economic difference—between a tariff and a subsidy. Number one, a subsidy or a license or a quota means that the industry and the individual companies and the people involved and the labor unions have to come to a bureaucracy in order to plead their case and to prove their case. That is one of the most regressive forms of trade barriers while a tariff once it is imposed is available to all the people to figure out as best they can how they are going to fit into that particular program. That is one reason the subsidy program is one of the last kind of programs to adopt because our people have to come to a bureaucracy for decision instead of allowing the law of supply and demand to enter into the picture. The second economic difference is this, and this is important. A subsidy is imposed upon the whole society, upon all of the taxpayers, while a tariff places the cost essentially on the consumers of that product involved. I think from the standpoint of good economics and those who believe in the private enterprise system and want to keep it as free as possible that the burden should be imposed upon the consumers of that particular item. In that way, incidentally, if you have materials that might replace a particular kind of material in our economy, the price of any subsidy is borne by that particular product. There is the big, basic difference. As far as our foreign friends are concerned, there is no distinction between a subsidy and a tariff because we are saying we are going to try to preserve the 30 percent of the domestic market for the domestic producers whether you do it with a tariff or whether you do it with a subsidy. So the sole issue before us, I submit, is which method is the better method and which is the best method under the private enterprise system.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. What the gentleman is saying is that there is no question at all that the lead and zinc industry is in dire straits; is that not correct?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That has been agreed and I do not think anyone would be correct in coming into the well of the House and saying otherwise because whichever side you are on, whether it be for subsidy or for tariff, that has been agreed to.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. In other words, what we are doing is quibbling about what we are going to do to save the patient and there is no question in the mind of anyone that if relief is not granted either through a tariff or by a subsidy that the lead and zinc mines of this country are going to close up and the taxpayers of the country are going to pay for it in the end.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I think that is true, but I do not regard it as quibbling over which method. I think we have some very basic political and economic factors involved in the decision as to which course we are going to take.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the passage of S. 4036, which provides for the payment of subsidies, under certain circumstances, to the producers of a limited number of minerals.

I oppose the bill because the recently-extended trade agreements program, which I also opposed, provides far better means of protecting the jobs of workmen threatened by excessive imports of the very same minerals, if the administration would only employ them.

My colleagues will recall that during the recent debate on the trade program, I fought for the adoption of much more stringent guaranties than are contained in the legislation signed into law by the President yesterday. My paramount concern was to require the Executive to

act in those cases where relief is justified. As the law stands, we are forced to depend upon voluntary action on the part of the administration.

Is it not reasonable to suggest that we be realistic and take action as provided under present law to protect the jobs of American workingmen?

The existing law provides that the President may impose a quota which would limit imports of the minerals in question, thereby enlarging the market for domestic producers to the extent that imports are restricted.

As a matter of policy, the administration refuses to impose quotas on the grounds that to do so would injure foreign producers. The fact is that S. 4036—the legislation we have before us—would injure foreign producers in exactly the same degree as would be the case if protection were granted to American producers under provisions of our present trade law.

The gentleman from Texas has decleared that S. 4036 is not a stockpile bill. On the contrary, he says, it is a bill to assist in the disposal of minerals produced from American mines. If my friend is correct, this can only mean that the minerals produced and sold by reason of the subsidies provided in S. 4036 are intended to, and would most certainly, supplant minerals now coming into the United States at low tariff rates.

Therefore, it will be recognized that foreign producers would be injured just as much under S. 4036 as they would be under the imposition of either quotas or increases in import duties. Inasmuch as the subsidies called for in this bill would cost over $500 million, it seems ridiculous to me for us to impose this further burden on our taxpayers when the net result would be to endanger friendly relations with certain foreign countries. Apparently, the reaction of our foreign friends would be the same and they would be so minded no matter what course we might choose to follow here in the United States to assist our domestic mineral producers.

We should keep in mind that H. R. 12591, the Trade Agreements Act of 1958 which was signed by the President yesterday, also contains a specific provision which would permit the President to convert specific duties to an equivalent ad valorem rate based on 1934 price levels. It would provide the kind of protection our minerals industry deserves, if the administration could be induced to invoke its authority. By so doing, our taxpayers would be ahead in the amount of $500 million.

No one, I am sure, is more aware of the need of maintaining a strong minerals-mining industry than I. Unlike other industries, when mines are closed, they become flooded and deterioration sets in very rapidly. Closed mines are exceedingly difficult to reopen. Our mobilization base has always included a strong mining industry. The stockpile has been designed to supplement a mining industry, not to supplant it.

The bill before us might give some temporary relief to the mining industry, but in good conscience, no one could support it since there are so many other alternatives in the Trade Agreements Act to provide relief for this important segment of our economy.

Prior to the passage of H. R. 12591, the Tariff Commission could not recommend any substantial relief for mineral producers except for imposition of quotas. They could operate only within the specific duties imposed in the 1930 act. In 1930 the specific tariff represented a very substantial measure of protection based on the prevailing world price for lead, zinc, and copper. Because of inflation, the restoration of the 1930 specific rate, even if it were increased by 50 percent, would still afford very little real protection.

The provision to which I referred earlier—the Purtell amendment—would permit the conversion of all specific duties to an equivalent ad valorem rate based on the 1934 price levels. As I inferred, this amendment makes the entire mineral subsidy program unnecessary, as it authorizes the President to provide substantial relief for lead, zinc, copper, and other distressed mineral industries. It has always been my opinion that we should not concern ourselves with relief for a specific industry, but should rather direct our efforts to afford help for everyone. The Purtell amendment places everyone on the same ad valorem basis.

Prior law provided a base period of January 1, 1945, and permitted the President, upon recommendation of the Tariff Commission to establish a duty rate of 50 percent above the base for articles with respect to which a successful escape clause action has been maintained.

The measure we adopted makes substantial relief possible. For the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to cite examples.

In the case of lead in pig and bars, the specific rate of duty on January 1, 1934, was 2⅛ cents per pound on lead content. The ad valorem equivalent of that specific duty was 113 percent. Increasing that ad valorem equivalent by 50 percent would mean that an ad valorem equivalent of 169.5 percent could be applied in the case of lead. Converting the possible ad valorem equivalent back to a comparable specific rate of duty would produce 22.4 cents per pound on lead content. This is compared to the $3\frac{3}{16}$ cents per pound that would have been the maximum duty possible under the former law.

This section similarly offers opportunity for realistic protection in the case of zinc block, pigs, or slabs. The rate of duty in effect on January 1, 1934, was 1¾ cents per pound. Its ad valorem equivalent was 53.5 percent. Increasing the ad valorem equivalent by 50 percent produces 80.25 percent and converting that latter percentage into a specific duty results in a figure of 9.23 cents per pound. This is compared with a 2.625 cents per pound maximum specific duty that would have been possible previously.

In the case of copper, refined, ingots, plates, and bars, the rate of duty on January 1, 1934, was 4 cents per pound. The ad valorem equivalent was 54.6 percent, which, when increased by 50 percent, produces an ad valorem rate of 81.9 percent. This latter percentage produces a current specific rate equivalent of 24.5 cents per pound.

It is clear that the Trade Agreements Act gives the Tariff Commission ample power to grant substantial relief to distressed American mineral producers. Furthermore, the act provides for Congressional review of escape-clause actions. If the Tariff Commission should recommend relief which the President did not feel disposed to grant, a mechanism has been established for Congressional consideration of his finding, although I would be the first to recognize its practical limitations.

The trade agreements extension embodied in H. R. 12591 also includes this significant language in respect to industries affecting our national security:

> If the President is advised by the Director (of Defense Mobilization and Civilian Defense) that, as a result of his investigation, the Director is of the opinion that the article is being imported into the United States in such quantities or under such circumstances as to threaten to impair the national security, the President shall take the required action unless he determines that the article is not being imported into the United States in such quantities or under such circumstances as to threaten to impair the national security.

Needless to say, producers of all the minerals covered by the legislation now before us would qualify under this national defense amendment.

In view of the fact, Mr. Chairman, that we find we have several possibilities of affording help to our domestic minerals industries under existing law, it seems clear to me that we should exhaust these alternatives before embarking on new programs which might establish unfortunate precedents for the future involving commitments for the expenditure of untold billions of dollars.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I am constrained to say that the proposal now before us is the outgrowth of certain promises made earlier in an attempt to influence votes on the legislation to extend the trade-agreements program. I cannot believe that any of my colleagues will permit themselves to be imposed upon in this manner.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, every day in the last 3 days about this time I have come to the well of the House to get this particular discussion back in category. This is not a relief bill. This is not a bill to cure unemployment. This is a bill to save a very basic industry needed for the defense of the United States of America. In these few words, I will try to tell you what this bill is about. It is undoubtedly a fact that this industry is needed for defense. The industry is in difficulty because of foreign competition. That has not been disputed by anybody. The industry has gone to the Tariff Commission and has tried in every way it possibly could to get aid under the tariff laws. That has not been disputed by anyone. The only thing which is then in dispute is what we do about it. As the gentleman from Utah said very aptly, while we worry about the remedy, the patient is going to die. As I said a few days ago, this is not a patient which is easily resur-

rected. You can take land out of cultivation, but you can bring it back into cultivation comparatively easily.

But you let a mine go out of production and you have it flooded, you have the timbers rotting, you have the machinery rusted; and, believe me, all you have left is an ore deposit in the ground, and it takes about as much money to put it back into production as it took to put it into production in the first place.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. BAKER. Am I correct in saying it is the view of the gentleman that it is far better to have a fair import duty than to have this bill, but if we cannot get the duty—and it looks at the moment that we cannot—then it is imperative that we get this bill?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That was my next point.

Mr. BAKER. If the gentleman will yield again, may I say further that I join with the gentleman. I am a member of the Ways and Means Committee and heard all this evidence. I cannot see where we are going to get the relief that is needed through a tariff, which is the proper remedy, and that is the reason I am supporting this bill.

Mr. RHODES or Arizona. I do not find myself in disagreement with many of the things said by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], nor do I find myself in disagreement with many of the things said by my good friend from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS]; but the fact remains that we tried and tried desperately to get help through the Tariff Commission but we have been unable to get it. This is the only answer which we see; and, because of the necessity to save this industry for the future of the United States of America all we can do at this particular time, as far as I can see, is to vote this bill out and to pass it on the floor of the House.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman knows I am sympathetic to the program.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Indeed the gentleman is.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. It seems to me one of the problems here in passing this legislation is, the gentleman I am sure will concede, that it is but a stopgap, is it not? The problem is still with us, namely, imports of production produced at prices lower than we can possibly pay.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman is absolutely correct. This is only stopgap legislation. Other Members have said it is only stopgap legislation, but it is the kind of stopgap necessary to save a very sick business from dying altogether.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Then why not extend this for 1 year and next year come back and lay the problem again before the Ways and Means Committee? That would be the direct way to cure the problem.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is a very good question. The only answer to that is that it requires a considerable investment even to keep one of these mines going when it is losing money. Under a 1-year program you would not find very many mines that are now losing money which would be willing to stay; in other words, a 1-year program is no more of an answer to the problem than is stopgap legislation to which the gentleman referred. The answer is, as the gentleman stated, a change in the tariff policies of the United States. But we have no chance right now of getting a change made, and it is a matter of doing something at this time to keep this industry from going down the drain. Believe me, if it goes down the drain the taxpayers of this country are going to be paying more money for lead and zinc as imports in the future than they now can imagine. The gentleman will remember a few years ago when one of our great allies released its stockpile of lead and zinc on the world market and broke the market. We had to act then to save lead and zinc by stockpile purchases, because to fail to do so would have placed our economy at the mercy of a world market which could have gone out of sight.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman has presented the case for lead and zinc, and we deeply sympathize with the existing situation but why should we pass discriminatory legislation for one particular phase of our economic or industrial life? What I am calling to the gentleman's attention is the pottery industry in Ohio which has just as many difficulties as the lead and zinc industry. The textile industry in New England is in a very depressed condition. This morning my attention was called to the fact that the Wamsutta plant in New Bedford was just closed the other day and a thousand people are out of employment. They have no place to go, they had no recourse to other work. It too is a very serious situation.

Why should not the textile industry also receive the preferential treatment the gentleman asks for lead and zinc?

Why are not the coal mines of Pennsylvania that are in the same category?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Will the gentleman yield me some of my time?

Mr. GAVIN. Why does not the coal industry receive some help? Therefore I say to you, and I asked for these 2 minutes, why should we not include all phases of our economic life along with lead and zinc? Why be discriminatory?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. May I answer the gentleman?

Mr. GAVIN. All the industries need assistance.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I have tried to answer that question 3 days running at this particular hour of the day. The reason is because all of the industries which the gentleman has mentioned, although they are sick, maybe sicker than ours, have nothing to do with defense. If this bill cannot be justified as a defense measure, I agree with the gentleman it cannot be justified to take care of one industry as against all the other industries.

Mr. GAVIN. We have ample stockpiles to take care of our defense needs.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. No. I pointed out to the gentleman 2 days ago that these stockpiles are somebody's educated guess as to what might be needed in the case of war. An educated guess is only as good as any other guess. The only way to defend this country adequately is to have an industry which is capable of producing the metals so badly needed for war production in the event our ships are being sunk as they were in World War II.

Mr. GAVIN. When the gentleman started his discussion, he said this was not a stockpiling bill. He said that it is an incentive program.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I did not say it was an incentive program.

Mr. GAVIN. That is what it has been referred to as being.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. It is a program to keep an industry going which is vital to the defense of this country.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman will admit if this legislation is enacted it will not cure the problem except on a temporary basis?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. GAVIN. It is not the answer, it is not the solution.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I never said it was the answer. I agree with the gentleman; it is a stopgap proposition.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to follow the gentleman from Arizona, because I believe if you just shuffle this thing down to one point on why there is a so-called need for this bill, it is the fictitious argument presented by the gentleman from Arizona, approached from the standpoint of national defense.

I did something perhaps that many of you did not do. I read every page and every speech given in this Congress when the reciprocal trade agreements bill was up for consideration. Sixty-nine times in that debate the question was raised on how these reciprocal trade agreements were going to affect our national defense. The question was raised 69 times if you had any industry in the United States of America that is being hurt by reciprocal trade agreements—that is, these imports—what protection under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, is that industry, which is so vital, going to have under that bill?

Sixty-nine times the advocates of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act reiterated, again and again, and referred to the section and paragraph, to the words in the bill stating that just as soon as it is indicated that any industry in the United States of America is being hurt by imports under the Reciprocal Trade

Agreements Act, an industry that is vital to our national defense, there is an escape clause, and the President of the United States of America can take immediate action to save that industry.

Sixty-nine times the proponents of the bill assured us that there was that protection in the reciprocal trade agreements bill. Now, 1 of 2 things is true. Either the advocates of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act were telling falsehoods; or, No. 2, the President of the United States of America is incompetent to judge whether an industry is vital to our national defense. These are the only two conclusions that can be drawn.

I say to you that the proponents of this pending bill have not made a case that this industry is vital to the defense of our country. If it were, you have an escape clause set out and promised 69 times in the process of the debate on the reciprocal trade agreements bill that an industry in the United States of America, vital to our national defense, has nothing to worry about because we have an airtight provision in this bill to take care of them, if they are adversely affected.

The gentleman from Texas stated you have to have this bill because we have the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Now we come to the core of the whole thing. There is a hidden reason, obvious only to those who know and care what is going on, why you have to have this bill.

This bill is a payoff to the doubtful Congressmen and Senators who voted for the Trade Act. Without this promised payoff, the trade agreement never would have become law. This is in addition to the $87 million payoff to copper interest on the eve of the final vote to sway doubting Congressmen.

One thing I cannot understand, particularly from the gentleman on my side, is this. Whenever we have a bill up here which affects the general economy of all of the people, what do they do? We had a bill here, the community facilities bill, and I thought that the roof was going to come off the Chamber of the House over here, because we were trying to do something for all communities, all segments of society. Who opposed it? Some of the very people coming down here now and pleading for special consideration for their communities. They are asking a giveaway of $100,000 per man to put 1 man to work: total cost $650 million.

Let me tell you something, my friends, in conclusion. Everybody is being hurt by these reciprocal trade agreements, and I say to you now we are either going to fall together or we are going to exist together. We are not going to get along by taking up one segment, one group of people, one industry, and pass special legislation for them. Let me tell you, with the special consideration that they have already given oil, with the special consideration that they are now giving metals, they have enough votes to keep the reciprocal trade agreement in effect forever. They don't need any other votes. If this bill passes any chance for relief for others is gone forever.

We had a good bill here. The community facilities bill. It helped everyone and every community. It was not a handout. It was in the nature of loans. Some of the very people who are in favor of spending $100,000 to put 1 man to work, now voted against that bill that would have done so much for the whole United States of America. This present bill is not legislation—it is a payoff and should be deplored by the Congress as a whole.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. Boggs, who has been very active in behalf of this bill—at least, he was yesterday—I have not a single mine in the District I have the honor to represent.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. In a minute.

Mr. BOGGS. I am still active for it.

Mr. GROSS. Just a minute. I will yield later. I have not a single mine in the District I represent. But, unlike the gentleman from Louisiana, I am not a free trader.

Mr. BOGGS. Am I?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, and I wonder what the gentleman from Louisiana has in store for the knitting mill in my District that is being severely injured by the imports of knit gloves and mittens from the cheap labor of Hong Kong, Japan, and Italy. I do not know whether these products are handled through International House in New Orleans that apparently does a lot of curbstone brokerage in imports. But, I do know that American products are being hurt, and I do not see any relief for them.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS], a little while ago said that anyone who voted for the so-called Reciprocal Trade legislation ought to vote for this bill. It is not incumbent upon them to do any such thing for they could expect that the industries of this country would be protected under the terms of that bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Gladly.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Is the gentleman saying that the people who voted for the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act had no concern at all for American business and were more interested in foreign trade?

Mr. GROSS. I said that they had a right to expect that the provisions of that act would be properly administered.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Would not that objection lie if they were to vote against their own interests?

Mr. GROSS. I am saying that they have a right to expect that the law be administered according to the terms of that law.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield, if you want to tell me about International House.

Mr. BOGGS. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS. Am I to imply from the gentleman's statement that if there was some provision in here for a knitting mill in his District, he would be for the bill?

Mr. GROSS. No, I would not be for the bill because it is a raid upon the Treasury which in turn results from the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act. I am not a special pleader.

Mr. BOGGS. You are not voting on reciprocal trade agreements today.

Mr. GROSS. No more than I would expect to find quotas in this bill to take care of the Louisiana sugar producers.

Mr. BOGGS. Did the gentleman vote for the reciprocal trade agreements bill?

Mr. GROSS. Of course I did not vote for it.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. The gentleman does know that this is an administration measure, and he knows that the White House endorses it and that the Interior Department endorses it.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, yes. But that still does not make any difference to the gentleman from Iowa. Right is right and wrong is wrong, and this $650 million handout will not correct the basic trouble which is foreign imports.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, and I should like to ask this question, too. One of the distinguished gentlemen a moment ago inferred that only lead and zinc were essential to national defense. I certainly think that the gentleman's knitting mill and all of the textile industry and the woolen industry are also essential.

Mr. GROSS. What I am trying to say to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] is that I do not come here as a special pleader.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I am a little bit confused, because the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] stated very frankly and honestly, honorable gentleman that he always is, that he is a free-trader. Then I also heard the gentleman from Iowa say, "Well, how about the sugar quotas?" In other words, what the gentleman from Iowa really means is that the gentleman from Louisiana is a freetrader for everything except sugar.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Wisconsin has stated the case exactly.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. PILLION. I think perhaps we ought to clarify the relationship of this program to the national defense. The national defense has been mentioned here a number of times. Referring to the report on this bill, nowhere do I find any reference to this program being necessary or desirable for the national defense. I find no approval, no letter of approval from the Department of Defense. This program is wholly outside of the Department of Defense requirements. I think the House ought to know that, and I think it ought to be made clear here that this has nothing to do national defense.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take but a very few minutes to speak on this question. We have wrestled with this lead and zinc tariff proposition for a long time in the Committee on Ways and Means. I am in deep sympathy with the condition of these mines. In fact, I worked so hard trying to get relief for them on the tariff that a delegation from the mining districts of the West came to pay their respects to me for what I had tried to do for them.

Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for this body. I have been in it a good many years. It is called the greatest legislative body in the world. It can only remain so if we preserve the rules of this House. I want to call attention to this. Every time we have had a war, the power of Congress has been weakened because great powers have been given to the Executive. We are told that they have surrendered those powers, but after all, there is a left over of power in the Executive that has watered down the strength of this Congress. There is not any question about it in my mind. I have seen it and I think many of the older Members have seen it, too.

I think it is more important to preserve the integrity of this House by bringing legislation in here under the rules, by having hearings before the proper committees and getting to the very bottom of these matters than to surrender to the Executive. I am not revealing any secrets; I do not know how many Members there are on the floor—I would not ask them to raise their hands—who have received letters and calls from the departments downtown and told what to do, at least by inference. And sometimes there are great promises made. I have seen it happen here in Congress after the wars. I have seen legislation pushed through by promises that if they were privately made, handled in that way, it might be called bribery. We have to stop the practice in order to protect the integrity, the good will and the reputation of this House.

I have a little quotation here. It says:

> That which raises a country, that which strengthens a country, and that which dignifies a country—that which spreads her power, creates her moral influence, and makes her respected and submitted to, bends the hearts of millions, bows down the pride of nations to her—the instrument of obedience, the fountain of supremacy, the true crown and scepter of a nation is character.

The only way we can preserve character in this legislative body is to follow the orderly procedure of the House rules. When there comes a time that the bureaus downtown can put the pressure on here and bring in such a piece of legislation as we have here, even though it may bring some relief, that is not the way it should be handled, and everybody on this floor knows it. If they can do it in one case they can do it in another, and they will keep doing it every time they want to put something over on the House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, in the name of the people of the United States, we cannot afford to surrender the power and the integrity and the character of this great legislative body.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BAKER. In my judgment, no greater man ever served in this body than the distinguished gentleman just addressing us. May I ask one question: Does the gentleman agree with me that this important and serious problem must be solved by the Congress?

Mr. REED. It must be, of course. I agree to that. It must be solved in the honorable way.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. NEAL. In line with what has been said by the gentleman from New York, admitting that the Congress surrendered its power over tariff questions, admitting that we made a mistake, does it not appear to the gentleman that this legislation is nothing more than an attempt on the part of the Congress to correct a mistake which has been made and has continued since the adoption of the Trade Agreements Act?

Mr. BOGGS. First, I will not admit we made a mistake, but, assuming one was made, I think this legislation should be passed.

I should like to join with the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee in a word of tribute to the gentleman from New York. I know of no man who has served our country with greater ability or greater integrity than has the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I should like to associate myself with the gentleman in his statement. I know that I speak the sentiment and the feeling of everyone on this side of the House in echoing the words of the gentleman from Louisiana with respect to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman.

One of the really great pleasures of my life has been to be associated for many years with the gentleman from New York and to know his wife and his family, and also to have had the privilege of agreeing with him and disagreeing with him. On this subject, as everyone knows, I have disagreed with the gentleman from New York.

This is a subject that over the years has lent itself to a great deal of emotionalism and, shall I say, "catagonizing."

I also admire the gentleman from Iowa. I do doubt if there is any Member who follows legislation with more diligence than the gentleman from Iowa. But just a moment ago he thought he was using a bad term when he talked about a freetrader. I do not plead guilty to being or not being a freetrader or of being or not being a protectionist, but I will say this: I am not really concerned about these words. They do not frighten me. If advocating the trade-agreements program, which is a program of reciprocity——

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I thought the gentleman pleaded guilty of being a freetrader a few moments ago.

Mr. BOGGS. Will the gentleman please listen to me? If this is pleading guilty, then I plead guilty. If advocating the trade-agreements program, which protects 4 million American jobs and provides markets for American industry and agriculture; which has also been advocated by the United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers, the President of the United States, by most of the great industrial leaders of this country, by the labor organizations, and which passed the House just recently by a vote of 317 to 92—if that means I am a freetrader, then I plead guilty.

Because, believe you me, I am for the trade-agreements program. I was for it last week and last year and as long as the people of my District honor me with the privilege of serving here, I intend to be for it.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman believe that section 6 of Trade Agreements Act should be carried out and also that the escape-clause provision under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Act should be carried out?

Mr. BOGGS. That is one of those "Do you beat your wife" questions?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I just asked you whether you believe they should be carried out.

Mr. BOGGS. Certainly, I believe that and I believe they are being carried out. The President of the United States under the provisions of the act has full discretion in that respect, as the gentleman from Wisconsin well knows.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. He does not under section 6.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further.

Mr. Chairman, I do not understand how someone who is opposed to the trade-agreements program should use this opposition as a basis for being opposed to this bill. Apparently, the gentleman from Iowa was opposed to the trade-agreements program because of a knitting mill in his District. I have no complaint about that. If his knitting mill makes it necessary for him to be against the trade-agreements program, that is all right with me. But why should he be against this program?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, one of the best expositions of this bill, I thought, was made a few moments ago

by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS]. He pointed out the economic considerations involved in a tariff and the economic considerations involved in this type of approach. There is nothing new about this. There is nothing radical about this. If anyone will examine our economic system, he would know that this method has been employed time and time again in our free-enterprise economy. The gentleman from Missouri, I gather, reached the conclusion that he preferred the tariff approach to this approach. He gave certain data to which I do not subscribe as chairman of the subcommittee upon which the gentleman served. When you impose a tariff, you do a whole variety of things. In this particular instance, in the case of the sliding-scale excise tax recommended by the administration last year and turned down by the Committee on Ways and Means, what would you have done? No. 1, you offended all of our friends abroad. Now I know some people feel we would be just as well off without any friends. I do not. I have not come to that conclusion. If anyone has any doubt about it, talk to the people in Peru. This had much to do with the demonstrations involving the Vice President of the United States upon his visit there this year. The gentleman from Missouri went to Canada last October with some of the rest of us on the subcommittee. He talked to the present Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Diefenbaker. He talked to the party leaders of both parties in Canada. The gentleman from Missouri heard about lead and zinc in Canada.

Subsequently the gentleman from Michigan and I went to Peru, and we went to Chile; we heard about copper, we heard about lead and zinc. So this is just something you cannot disassociate from our friends abroad, much as you would like to. It is a fact which exists.

What about the tariff approach? Not only do you offend all these people, but also the cost is much greater, because the cost then must be paid on every pound consumed.

Who is the biggest customer for these metals and minerals? The Defense Department which buys much of them, so far as the Government is concerned. A tariff would therefore cost the Government of the United States, by paying the increased cost, more than every penny which is authorized in this bill. In addition to that, however, from a cost point of view, every consumer who buys 1 pound of any one of these metals would be required to pay the whole cost.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. What is this, a subsidy for the Defense Department?

Mr. BOGGS. This is an effort to satisfy as best we can our commitments here and abroad and to maintain an industry which even the gentleman from Iowa admits is an essential industry.

Mr. GROSS. I am saying that this must be a subsidy, and I am asking the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana if it is a subsidy for the Defense Department.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman from Louisiana admits that it is a subsidy if the prices drop below certain levels.

Mr. GROSS. For the Defense Department.

Mr. BOGGS. For the mines and workers. Let me pass to other arguments which have been advanced here in the last several days: It is that certain other segments of the economy possibly might need similar treatment.

It seems to me that we are always called upon to stand on our own feet. It seems to me that if there are other industries, other groups which are entitled to consideration, then they should not scuttle this program which is recognized as necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, the bill, S. 4036, to stabilize production of copper, lead, zinc and tungsten presents some difficult problems for the Members of the House. One serious question which troubles me greatly has been touched upon during the debate on the measure. That has to do with the flight of capital from the United States to foreign nations for investment there.

I realize that there are many reasons for private capital investing abroad. Three of them arise from actions of Congress itself. They are our high tax rate, our reciprocal trade legislation and our foreign aid program. The first two almost compel private capital to go abroad. The third encourages it.

It has been pointed out during this debate that the bulk of imports of copper, lead and zinc from abroad come from mines owned and operated by American capital. Because of lower wage rates and costs in foreign lands these imports can undersell our own minerals. As a consequence, the United States mining industry can't compete and is threatened with closure. To keep the industry in production it is proposed by the pending measure that we subsidize it to the extent of perhaps $500 million. The basis for the proposal is chiefly that critical defense minerals are involved and that in the interests of national defense we must keep our own mines in operation so that we need not depend entirely upon foreign nations during an emergency. The House may decide that this must be done.

Involved in this matter, however, is a more far-reaching problem. How many of our industries, because of high taxes and reciprocal trade legislation, will move abroad? In 1949 our Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries heard testimony to the effect that imports of foreign fish products had caused some United States establishments in New England to close up. It was predicted that they would move to Canada. This they have now done, and are sending their products into this country to compete with those of their former associates in New England. The fishing industry in that area is in such dire straits because of these imports that there is some question whether it can long survive.

The same thing is occurring in the plywood industry. Last year 656 million square feet of plywood was imported into this country. Foreign plywood can easily undersell domestic plywood because of lower wages and costs. Now, because they can no longer compete, some American plywood people are either building or will build plywood plants abroad in such countries as Australia, Turkey, South America, and Japan. They will produce for the American market and will offer further competition to the remaining United States plywood plants.

We know that the American automobile industry has built plants abroad. How many other United States industries are undergoing or will undergo similar experiences, I do not know. It is reasonable to assume there are many. Whatever the number, United States jobs are lost and the United States economy adversely affected. I urge Congress to make a thorough study of the forced flight of United States capital which is invested in industries abroad and then competes for United States markets.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending bill and all amendments thereto close at 4:30.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I am going to object because if the gentleman will limit debate and get down to the amendments we will be through before that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close at 4 o'clock.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending bill and all amendments thereto cease at 4 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 2, strike out the word "such", and insert "shipment to producer's processing plant for."

Page 3, line 6, strike the subsection designation "(a)."

Page 3, line 9, strike out the word "for", and insert "in."

Page 8, line 17, strike out the word "produced", and insert "sold."

Page 8, following line 18, insert a new section reading as follows:

"SEC. 202. Payments may be made to any producer in accordance with the provisions

of this title without regard to the provisions of section 106 of this act."

Page 8, line 19, renumber "SEC. 202." as "SEC. 203."

Page 9, following line 19, insert a new title reading as follows:

"TITLE IV

"SEC. 401. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to establish and maintain a program of incentive payments to domestic producers of beryl, chromite and columbium-tantalum in order to promote mining and development research for these minerals, as provided in this title.

"SEC. 402. (a) The production incentive payments authorized by this title shall be made for the following minerals newly mined from deposits located within the United States, its Territories and possessions, in the amount and subject to limitations herein specified:

"(1) For beryl concentrates (10 percent BeO basis), $70 per short ton, with premiums and penalties as set forth in the regulations issued pursuant to this act, for not to exceed an aggregate of 1,000 short tons annually. No incentive payment shall be made in a calendar year on a quantity in excess of 150 short tons produced by any one producer and originating in any one mining district from properties controlled by such producer.

"(2) For commercial grade, metallurgical chromite (46 percent basis), $35 per long dry ton, with premiums and penalties as set forth in the regulations issued pursuant to this act, for not to exceed an aggregate of 50,000 long dry tons annually. No incentive payment shall be made in a calendar year on a quantity in excess of 10,000 long dry tons produced by any one producer and originating in any one mining district from properties controlled by such producer.

"(3) For commercially acceptable columbium-tantalum concentrates (basis 50 percent contained combined pentoxides), $2.35 per pound of contained combined pentoxides with ratios of Ta_2O_5–Cb_2O_5, premiums and penalties as set forth in regulations issued pursuant to this act, for not to exceed an aggregate of 50,000 pounds annually. No incentive payment shall be made in a calendar year on a quantity in excess of 10,000 pounds produced by any one producer and originating in any one mining district from properties controlled by such producer.

"(b) The incentive payment programs shall not be initiated until the termination of existing purchase programs of the Federal Government for these materials, respectively, set forth in regulations issued under authority of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act (53 Stat. 811), as amended; the Defense Production Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 798), as amended; and the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 579).

"(c) No incentive payment shall be made pursuant to the provisions of this title except upon presentation of evidence satisfactory to the Secretary that the material has been produced and sold to a consumer, mill or processing plant, or dealer in chromite, beryl, or columbium-tantalum ores or concentrates in accordance with regulations issued under this act.

"SEC. 403. The provisions of this title shall take effect on the first day of the first quarter next following the date of enactment of this act, and shall terminate on June 30, 1963."

Page 9, line 20, strike out "Title IV", and insert "Title V."

Page 9, line 21, renumber "SEC. 401." as "SEC. 501.".

Page 10, line 5, renumber "SEC. 402." as "SEC. 502.".

Page 10, line 8, renumber "SEC. 403." as "SEC. 503.".

Page 10, line 17, add a new sentence reading as follows:

"In the event that a producer further processes ores or concentrates a sale shall be deemed to have occurred when such ores or concentrates are shipped to the processing plant.

Page 11, line 7, strike out "103 and 201", and insert "103, 201 and 402".

Page 11, line 8, following the word "determine" insert "what constitutes a mining district and".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 11, line 20, strike out all of section 404 through page 12, line 19, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 504. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated from any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary, not to exceed $650 million, to carry out the provisions of this act."

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Texas to the committee amendment: Page 15, line 11, strike out "$650 million" and insert in lieu thereof "$458 million."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, line 20, renumber "SEC. 405." as "SEC. 505."

Page 12, line 22, renumber "SEC. 406." as "Sec. 506." strike out the words "The Secretary shall make an annual report with respect to operations under this act as soon as practicable after July 1 of each of the years 1959 to 1963 inclusive" and insert in lieu thereof "The Secretary shall make semiannual reports with respect to operations under this act not later than March 1 and September 1 of each year."

Page 13, line 4, renumber "SEC. 407." as "SEC. 507."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to stabilize production of copper, lead, zinc, acid-grade fluorspar and tungsten and to promote mining and development research for beryl, chromite and columbium-tantalum from domestic mines."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. SAYLOR.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman. I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAYLOR: Page 4, after line 18, insert: "*Provided*, no producer shall receive stabilization payments on any sales in any one quarter in excess of the quantity specified in this section."

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, the members of the committee have stated that it was their desire to make sure that this legislation would help small producers, and they adopted the preceding section 103 (b) which limits the amounts that may be produced in any one quarter. Now, all my amendment does is to say that the language that is contained in that section means what it says and that any producer, shall be limited to those amounts in section 103 (b).

Now, to show you how loosely this bill is drawn this amendment has a strange and startling effect. The present cost of the bill as estimated by the Department of the Interior for lead, zinc, fluorspar—acid grade—and tungsten trioxide is $296 million. If this amendment is adopted to make sure that each producer shall only be paid for 5,000 tons of lead and zinc, fluorspar and tungsten, this means that 95 percent of the production will go to small producers, and the payments, instead of being $296 million as specified in the bill, will be reduced to no more than $73,520,000, or a net saving of $222,480,000.

Now, unless this is to be a bonanza for several of the large mineral producers and if the committee means that this is a matter of defense and that they actually need small mines for defense and increased production then let us see to it that the payments go to small mines and do not go to a handful of big producers.

In 1956, 659 mines—95 percent of mines—produced less than 5,000 tons each of lead and zinc for a total production of 238,000 tons, or 27 percent of total domestic production of 895,000 tons.

If stabilization payments were limited to production of up to 5,000 tons annually for each mine—which would cover full production of 95 percent of the mines—the 5-year cost, for lead and zinc, would be $73.5 million instead of $296 million under the bill which sets no maximum on the amount which can be paid each producer.

5-year period

	Bill		Tons	Proposed limitation to cover 95 percent of mines cost	Saving (additional amount that would go to large producers) only 5 percent of mines
	Tons	Cost—Interior estimate			
Lead	1,750,000	$136,500,000	475,000	$32,050,000	$104,450,000
Zinc	2,775,000	159,500,000	715,000	41,470,000	118,030,000
Total	4,525,000	296,000,000	1,190,000	73,520,000	−222,480,000

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I will be happy to.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I was so interested in the gentleman's argument that the committee will accept his amendment.

Mr. SAYLOR. I am delighted to hear that, but I am more interested, if the amendment is accepted and we go to

conference, that you stand up and fight for it then?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Of course, that is going to depend on what transpires. That is a bridge we will cross when we get to it. I am not making any commitment to anyone in this House as to what is going to happen in the future, even as to adjournment. I want to say this, if the gentleman wants us to accept his amendment, we will be very glad to do so.

Mr. SAYLOR. I will be happy to have it accepted, and I hope that if the gentleman is one of the conferees—and I feel sure that he will be—he will see that this amendment is kept in the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. This amendment raises a question in my mind as to whether or not you are attempting to do something for the people who work in the mines, who are employed in the mines, or whether you are striving to do something for the mine owners.

If the gentleman is trying to do something for the people who are employed in the mining industry, then it seems to me he is defeating his purpose because his amendment is too restrictive.

Mr. SAYLOR. This amendment is not restrictive. It just says that the section 103 (b) actually means what it says. If the gentleman will read it, he will see that that is all the proviso assures.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. My question applies to section 32 as well as the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. SAYLOR. Then the gentleman had better ask the committee what they are trying to do.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I understand that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is a member of the committee.

Mr. SAYLOR. I am a member of the committee, but I am opposed to the bill. I am trying to improve the bill a little so that if it does pass we will have something we can live with, and not be a windfall to the large operators.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. There is a serious question in my mind whether the gentleman's amendment will do something for that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOLAND: On page 1, line 10, strike out the words "and tungsten trioxide."

On page 2, line 4, strike out the words "and tungsten trioxide."

On page 2, strike out all of lines 22 and 23.

On page 3, strike out all of lines 16 and 17.

On page 4, line 18, strike out "and tungsten trioxide, three thousand short-ton units."

On page 5, beginning on line 3, strike out all of section 104 down to and including line 22.

On page 6, strike out all of line 3.

On page 6, line 11, strike out "tungsten trioxide, fifty-five thousand short-ton units."

On page 8, beginning with line 14, strike out all of paragraph (d) down to and including line 18.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the chairman of the committee will accept this amendment?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I cannot accept it, because it is too long and involved. But let me ask the gentleman a question. What is the general purport of it?

Mr. BOLAND. The general purport of it is to strike out price support for tungsten in this bill—just tungsten; that is all.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. We could not accept that.

Mr. BOLAND. I have no illusions about the passage of this bill. There have been too many shotgun weddings over the past 3 days which assure that this bill will be passed. All I want to do is to make it more acceptable, perhaps, to the American people.

I have listened to this debate during the past couple of days. I have been here every minute while this debate has been going on. There has been no justification made for tungsten in this bill. Today, in the heat of all the arguments that have been made by the proponents of this bill, all of them have been leveled at lead and zinc. And I think at times they have made a good case and I congratulate them on the case that they have made. But there have been no arguments made here in favor of tungsten.

It has been said that this is a national defense bill, that this is necessary for the security of the United States. If that is so, it certainly does not apply to tungsten because in the stockpile which the United States Government has—and no one can deny that with reference to tungsten this bill is a stockpile bill—we have 177 percent of our needs. All of the testimony developed by the Senate, and I am sure some of the testimony developed by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, points up the fact that the stockpile is big enough for at least 19 years. Some of the members of the committee who are carrying the ball for this bill have said that this was a national defense bill and that a failure to vote for this would weaken our defense posture. With reference to tungsten nothing could be further from the truth.

The record is clear, and so clear that all who run can see.

Do you know that we have enough tungsten in the stockpile, even using the present average of 25 pounds for every jet engine necessary for our national defense——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed the time that was allotted to me.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the time allotted to the gentleman from Rhode Island is transferred to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe it has been the rule of the House to transfer time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already ruled that the gentleman can transfer his time to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. You have had all the time here the past couple of days.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I have not taken any time.

Mr. BOLAND. The committee has.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair had not known of the objection of the gentleman from Nebraska at the time he ruled.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I was on my feet objecting, because it is against the rules of the House to transfer time.

The CHAIRMAN. Was the gentleman on his feet at the time the gentleman from Rhode Island made the request?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes; I was.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I do this only to yield at this time to my distinguished friend from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND]. I just wish to say that if there was ever a move made to help defeat this bill, that objection to giving my time to Mr. BOLAND should be it. If the bill is defeated, the gentleman from Nebraska can take credit for defeating it.

Mr. BOLAND. I thank the gentleman from Rhode Island. I am surprised the gentleman from Nebraska should try to foreclose me from stating the facts which I intend to present to the Committee.

There is enough tungsten in the stockpile now, even at the present average of 25 pounds per jet engine, to build 2,300,000 airplane engines; or, we have enough tungsten in the stockpile now to last 192 years for the purpose of building jet engines.

What about shielding atomic aircraft? Something has been said about that, that tungsten is necessary for that; and it is. It is a great metal. But even if 10 tons of tungsten were used in a single aircraft, we have enough in surplus alone to build 5,750 atomic aircraft. No one knows how soon or how far in the future our Nation will accomplish a breakthrough in the atomic aircraft field. We all hope that it will be soon. But no matter what the time, the national reserve of the tungsten stockpile is large enough to supply the needs of this project—and is way beyond the needs.

Much will be made here by the supporters of the bill that we are crippling our security if this bill fails or if tungsten is knocked out of the proposal. This just is not so. Every last Member

of this House is interested in maintaining a strong defense structure and no Member wants or desires to weaken it. But there is a limit beyond which we should not go. And we are now far beyond that limit with respect to the critical material that is essential to supply the new and modern sinews of war. That metal is tungsten. We have more than enough for jet engines and atomic aircraft shields.

Mr. Chairman, here is a real chance to save $35,250,000. That is the amount of the subsidy that will be awarded under this proposal for tungsten. The proponents will come up here and say that it is only a pittance, a small amount. It is only seven million and a couple of hundred thousands dollars a year for the next 4 years. But the fact of the matter is that it adds up to $35,250,000.

Is that all it is going to cost the people of America? Is that all, as we have been assured, it is going to cost? Of course this is not it at all, because in the Senate hearings, when this bill was before the Senate, the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Fred Seaton, was testifying and he said in response to a question by the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada that he would think that legislation which would increase the stabilization price in the years to come would be good legislation. Those were the remarks of the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Seaton. Under this bill, the stabilization price for tungsten is $36 per short ton. I want the Members of the House to know that is the highest range for tungsten since 1953. This is one metal that is not essential at this time. This is one metal that should be knocked out of this bill.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I speak in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] which would exclude tungsten from the benefits proposed by this legislation. I speak as the representative of a district which has many tungsten mines.

The principal justification for the subsidies proposed in this bill is that they relate to commodities which are vital to our defense program in time of peace and to a war program in time of war to the extent that the possibilities of interruption of supply dictate the maintenance of a domestic source of supply. A further premise is the fact that domestic mines once shut down are hard to reopen in timely fashion if salvageable at all and the fact that discovery of needed additional supply sources depends upon continuous activity which will exist only with a sufficient price incentive.

In my opinion tungsten is the most military of the metals described in this bill. The description of its uses contained in the report of the committee compared to the uses of the other metals dealt with in this legislation and described in such report will demonstrate that conclusion. It is used in temperature resistant alloys, as an ingredient of cutting tools and in the fabrication of armor piercing shells and electronic devices.

Currently all domestic production is shut down with the exception of a small supply secured as the byproduct of molybdenum mining and one small separate operation. Domestic tungsten mines are generally small. There are over 700 producers.

The proponent of this amendment states that we have huge oversupplies of tungsten trioxide secured as the result of a Government stockpiling operation. It is true that we have stockpiled supplies, but it cannot be demonstrated that these are oversupplies. With the rapid development of our electronic needs and the increased uses for temperature resistant alloys in guns, missiles, and aircraft it would be foolish to state that we were oversupplied.

A further point of significance is that the bulk of tungsten is produced in the United States, Bolivia, Korea, and Red China. No supplies are available from Red China nor will they be so available. In the event of emergency, the hope of supplies from Korea would be remote indeed. Bolivian supplies would be only a slightly less insecure prospect.

In view of the needs of our Defense Establishment and the proven need of a Government program to sustain tungsten mining in this country I would respectfully urge the defeat of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I want to say now I had no objection to the transferring of time in the regular order, but for any Member to come on the floor of the House and transfer their time without standing in the well of the House, that is the reason I objected. If anybody else wants to transfer their time to me and stand in the well, I will be glad for them to do that.

Mr. Chairman, now as to tungsten. I would like to call your attention to tungsten, where tungsten can be found, and where it now comes from; 95 percent of the tungsten of the world is located in Russia, Red China, Korea, and Bolivia. We get our needs from Korea and Bolivia. At one time this country had 200 small tungsten mines, but not today. They are closed. We have 15 percent that comes from this country. There is one captive mine in Alabama that is now partially closed. What is tungsten used for? It is one of the higher melting metals, in the higher ranges of melting facilities used in guided missile cones that go out into outer space and come back; yes, alive or not alive, destroyed or intact. And the 192-year supply of tungsten in this country is fantastic. That is not the case.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I decline to yield.

Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. Is it not true that 75 percent of the consumption of tungsten which we used last year, according to the estimates, came from outside the United States and not from Red China or from Russia but from production outside the United States?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman is correct. Most of it came from Bolivia and Korea. I am sure the Members of the House would not want the industry in this country to be dependent upon getting tungsten from Korea, Bolivia, or any other country.

Having a good supply of tungsten on hand is like having a good fat bank account. The amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GAVIN), there were—ayes 52, noes 42.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COAD: On page 9, strike out lines 1 through 19.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered simply takes out the title which provides for the supports for copper. Mr. Chairman, I voted for the rule providing for the consideration of this bill by the House. A few moments ago I voted not to strike out the enacting clause. But, Mr. Chairman, I have been in attendance faithfully during the past 3 days and I have not heard anyone who has made a case for copper under the provisions of this bill. I believe those who are for this bill and those who are against this bill can both vote for this amendment. We have heard a great deal about copper. We have heard what has been happening on the stock market in the last few days concerning the price of copper stocks.

I know that the dividends which have been paid on copper stocks in the last several years have not indicated whatsoever that they are suffering and that they need assistance. We know that there is already in effect through the Interior Department a stockpiling program for copper that amounts to $82,500,000.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COAD. I cannot yield.

We know that under the provisions of this bill this is only a support program to add to the profits of the copper industry, those who are already in command of a copper program that is not now suffering.

If we believe in this bill, and I have voted to bring it in here and I voted not to strike out the enacting clause, if we want to help this bill then we will vote to take out this section on copper. I do not believe there is anyone who can really

justify this title being in this bill in the form in which it is written.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not have a pound of copper in my district, but I know that there is justification for the copper portion of this bill. I know, for example, that the copper company that is showing the big gains on the stock market that we have heard a lot of talk about is a copper company that is against this bill, that appears to be more interested in its foreign production than its mines in the United States.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. I regret very much that I have not any time in which to answer the gentleman from Iowa that I have not taken any time on the floor but I have consistently extended my remarks in the RECORD.

The Anaconda Copper Co., which is in my district, has consistently lost. Their consolidated statement has been such that if they had not had Anaconda Aluminum Co. and their lumber company operations, they would have lost all their profit. They are closing down mines in Montana, mines more than a mile deep. Those mines are flooded; the machinery is rusted, and those mines will be lost forever if this $150,000 purchase does not remain in this bill.

This copper is money in the bank, and I will wager that if this bill passes—and it is only an authorization bill—if this bill passes and this title remains in the bill, the price will go above 27½ cents; this surplus will all vanish from the market, the mines will open, and the Government will not have to buy a single pound of copper.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. UDALL. The only facts before the House on the copper situation come from the Office of Defense Mobilization which has stated only this week that we have only 75 percent of the amount currently calculated as needed for an adequate copper stockpile. This fact has not been controverted by anyone during the 3 days of this debate.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Furthermore, we used a lot more copper in a single year of World War II than we have in our maximum stockpile objective for copper at the present time. For the sake of the country we must look ahead to the future and keep the copper mines in production in this country. The only reason we have seen additional investments in foreign mines is because we have made it so attractive for people to invest in foreign countries that they prefer to invest there rather than in production in our own country.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HAYS of Ohio) there were—ayes 28, noes 63.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to make a correction, if I can. The statement was made here that there was only about one tungsten mine in the United States. When the tungsten subsidy was killed by the Congress after it had cost us $220 million since 1951, there were 122 mines producing tungsten in 1 State, Nevada. In fact it is well known that tungsten is "coming out of our ears."

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT] for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLYNT: On page 15, after line 11, insert a new section to be appropriately numbered reading as follows: "SEC. . No payment shall be made under this act to any producer which shall declare any dividends or transfer any funds to a surplus account, during the calendar or fiscal year in which it applies for or receives any payment hereunder."

And renumber the remaining sections.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia desire to be heard?

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, may I say that the amendment is as germane to the bill as the provision in the bill which precedes the point at which the amendment is offered, providing a time limit on the disbursement of payments under the act. My amendment would simply provide and place a limitation on eligible producers who can participate under the proceeds of the act. I may say further, its purpose is to prevent speculation and the profits from speculation at the cost of the taxpayers who shall pay the $650 million provided in this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. EVINS). The Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair has examined the amendment, which has been read, and overrules the point of order.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, if the proponents of this legislation are sincere about companies being in distress, they ought to accept this amendment without any further argument.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. No. I want the author of the amendment to say something about it.

Mr. ASPINALL. He should have stated that ahead of this.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding to me for the purpose of offering this amendment and for the opportunity of speaking briefly on it.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will show this bill for exactly what it is, a $650 million windfall to the large producers who will undoubtedly receive the major benefits from it. If this amendment is adopted it will provide that the bulk of the funds carried in this bill will go to prevent unemployment and put people back to work in an essential industry in this country.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLYNT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Would it be possible for a mine to operate at a profit and to receive payments under the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. FLYNT. I will answer the gentleman's question by saying that the answer would depend on the situation in each particular case; but I, for one, do not want to vote $650 million of tax money to promote speculation in the New York stockmarket. I just do not believe that it is a proper expenditure of tax money, and I do not believe it is morally right.

On yesterday the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and others either read extracts from news that came in on the ticker in the Speaker's lobby or otherwise commented on the fact that certain mining stocks rose on yesterday and that the rise was attributed to belief that the administration-sponsored minerals bill would pass. Along with every Member of this House, I want American industries and enterprises to prosper and flourish, but I do not believe that it is good legislation to provide windfalls to selected groups at the expense of public funds.

The estimated $14-billion deficit for fiscal 1959 is already much too big, and I do not believe that the additional $650 million which this bill would provide should be added to the staggering deficit that already confronts us.

One final point is that this amendment is necessary if relief is to be provided where relief is either necessary or desirable from the standpoint of the public interest. The sponsors and advocates of the bill have said that it is designed to benefit interests which are shrinking or suffering. This amendment would have the effect of guaranteeing that kind of help by restricting expenditure of Federal funds to companies and areas where relief is genuinely needed.

This amendment would put teeth into the bill to provide for employment and prevent forced shutting down of mine operations. It would channel the funds provided for in the bill into the direction where such funds are truly needed, rather than indiscriminately where larger and more profitable producers would seek and obtain the lion's share or the major portion of the funds provided.

It is possible that the amendment will not cure the many defects and deficiencies which appear in the bill, but it would certainly make it a better bill than it is in its present form.

I urge the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LENNON) there were—ayes 64, noes 50.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ROGERS of Texas and Mr. FLYNT.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 79, noes 59.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE].

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Amendment offered by Mr. KILGORE: Strike out the words "acid-grade fluorspar," from the title.

On page 1, line 8, strike out the words "acid-grade fluorspar (fluorspar", strike out all of line 9, and strike out the words "dry weight basis)," in line 10.

On page 2, lines 3 and 4, strike out the words "acid-grade fluorspar."

On page 2 strike out line 20, and on line 21 strike out the words "point of shipment."

On page 3 strike out line 14 and the word "fluorspar;" on line 15.

On page 3, line 16, strike out "(4)", and replace with "(3)."

On page 4 strike out line 17 and the word "tons;" on line 18.

On page 6, line 2, strike out the words "fluorspar (acid-grade), $13.00 per short ton."

On page 6, line 10, strike out the words "fluorspar (acid-grade), five thousand", and the word "tons;" on line 11.

On page 16, in the second line below line 3, strike out the words "acid-grade fluorspar."

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to explain the amendment in lieu of its being read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of conservation of time of the Committee I have asked that I might explain the amendment rather than it being read, because it is a complicated amendment but simple in its application. This amendment would strike from the bill acid-grade fluorspar wherever it may appear. It appears in some 9 or 10 places in the bill. The adoption of the amendment would take out from under the proposed subsidy in this bill any subsidy for acid-grade fluorspar.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say these things about acid-grade fluorspar by way of distinguishing the condition that this industry finds itself in as compared to the situation that has been described to this committee for several days with respect to the other mining industries.

Acid-grade fluorspar is being produced in this country at a higher rate now than it was the year before and at a higher rate than it was produced in any prior year in the history of its production.

The price at which it is selling today is only 7 percent lower than was the price at the height of the Korean conflict.

If there is any considerable unemployment in this industry today it cannot exceed some 500 or 600 persons.

I became considerably interested in acid-grade fluorspar by reason of the fact that about 50 to 70 percent of all known world deposits of fluorspar are in Mexico and there is imported into the United States through my district, at least a considerable portion of the acid-grade fluorspar used in this country. When examining into these questions I learned these facts about increased production, satisfactory price, and the absence of any considerable unemployment in the industry, the belief on the part of everybody that the demand for fluorspar would go up, and these additional facts that I think are quite interesting.

This bill would not in any manner affect 60 percent of the acid-grade fluorspar production in the United States because it is from captive mines. This production would go on even if you had a downturn, I should assume.

That would mean that with this legislation we are talking about only 40 percent of the production of acid-grade fluorspar in the United States if we assume that 100 percent of the production sought to be bolstered by this bill would cease if the fluorspar part of this legislation is not passed.

Everyone agrees that fluorspar is quite significant to many phases of national defense and that the utilization of it will continue to increase. The Secretary of Interior has indicated that he wants to stabilize domestic production at about 180,000 tons annually. Domestic production last year was 190,000 tons. It is believed that capacity production of domestic acid-grade fluorspar does not greatly exceed 200,000 tons. This means that in the absence of major new deposits in the United States, and it should be be pointed out in passing that there have been no such deposits discovered since World War II, that a large part of our needs must be fulfilled from imports.

In this respect we are fortunate that Mexico can supply those needs. The supply route can be over land within Mexico and over land in the United States or within the inland waterways in the United States. This would make it appear that the maintenance of our trade relationship with Mexico so that we can continue to purchase acid-grade fluorspar from that country would be most important to national defense. It would appear then that without the subsidy sought to be provided in this bill for acid-grade fluorspar that this country can maintain a domestic industry and can maintain a trade relationship with a friendly foreign country to augment our needs of this strategic material, and over a safe supply route.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE]. This is a bad amendment and should be defeated. The gentleman has offered this amendment to protect the importers of fluorspar from Mexico. Since the gentleman's district borders on the side of Mexico and I know he has workers in his district handling these imports, I cannot blame him for offering the amendment. However, let me call to the attention of the House that foreign imports have already choked off 90 percent of the domestic market for fluorspar. What do we want to do, give them all of the market? If you adopt this amendment that is precisely what you will do eventually. We have a stockpile program that will run only until December 31 of this year on acid-grade fluorspar. After that our mines will be forced to close unless we can pass this bill or get other remedy.

If our mines are forced to close we will be dependent upon Mexico, Italy, Spain, and Germany for this strategic material in case of an emergency.

In the limited time I have I would like to tell you a little about the important role flourspar is playing in our defense effort.

Acid grade fluorspar is essential in peacetime as well as wartime. Without it we cannot produce aluminum, atomic energy, hydrofluorine acid, fluorine for the chemical industry as well as many, many other essential products. The Atomic Energy Commission's report to Congress made it perfectly clear that a supply of acid grade fluorspar was just as essential to the atomic energy program as was a supply of uranium.

Dr. Wernher von Braun, the leading light in our missile and rocket program, had this to say about fluorine: "It is impossible for us to have too much fluorine if we are to successfully maintain our missile and rocket program necessary to defend this country against aggression."

I ask the Members of this House if they want to jeopardize this small but vital industry by failing to include fluorspar in this minerals program. From the temperament expressed here this afternoon it appears that the opponents of this measure will attempt to adopt all amendments in order to weaken the bill and eventually cause its defeat. I hope you will take a good look at the need to preserve our domestic mining industry and support the legislation before us without all these crippling amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE].

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—ayes 91, noes 51.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], said there were 120 tungsten mines operating in Nevada. There were a year or two years ago, but they are all closed now.

There is only one tungsten mine now, a captive mine in Alabama, that is under partial operation.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. All I want to say, Mr. Chairman, and I am not going

to impose any more on the good nature of the Committee because I think all has been said on this bill that can be said, is what I said before: This is a defense bill. This is not an unemployment bill or a relief bill for anybody. This is a bill which will save a very basic industry for the defense of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say to my good friend that all has not been said that could be said about this bill. There is still a lot to be said.

I call the attention of my friend from Texas, who spoke about this legislation going to conference, to the fact—that we are not so certain—about its going to conference until the votes are recorded; so I think the gentleman's statement is premature.

They ask us what the bill will do or what the bill is about.

Here is a statement and it comes from an authoritative source:

> This proposal calls for a program of incentive payments designed to maintain a small domestic production of minerals as an adjunct to Government research programs. The payments will provide an incentive to domestic producers to advance both research and exploration for these highly strategic commodities.

That is what the bill does. This is not stockpiling in any sense, so they say, however, it is an incentive to stockpile more of these minerals that have been referred to here today. Really, this is a discriminatory piece of legislation. It is going to cost the American taxpayers between 500 and 700 million dollars. It is discriminatory in favor of the lead and zinc industry. We have just as many difficulties in the pottery industry of Ohio and in the textile industry of the New England States, and in the coal mining regions of Pennsylvania and they are entitled to and should be given just as much consideration as the lead and zinc industry. Why should these minerals receive preferential treatment? But, let us give careful thought to our vote today. Here is an opportunity to save $500 million to $700 million. We are facing a deficit next year of $12 billion or $13 billion. Here is a chance to save some money for the taxpayers back home. The man who by the sweat of his brow must earn the money to pay the taxes to meet the cost of such unnecessary programs as proposed here today. Let us give Mr. Taxpayer a little consideration in your final vote today. I sincerely trust that this legislation will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, we are coming to the close of a debate that has been very heated and a debate which, I think, is very well for the House of Representatives to have gotten into. The first thing I want to say is this. This bill is an administration bill. It was handed to our committee by the Secretary of the Interior. We worked on it long and hard hours to put it into shape because we felt it was vital to the interest of this country. Now we are moving into an age, as I told you before, of high heat resistant metals. You struck tungsten out of this bill. Let me tell you what you have done. Over 50 percent of the tungsten in the world is owned by Russia and Red China. Now, of course, it is not bad at all to let Russia and Red China get ahead of us on that. So also let them get ahead of us on columbium and let them get ahead of us on tantalum that we have to import 99 percent of what we use. And let them get ahead of us on beryl and everything else—just so long as you do not infringe on some fellow's particular district. I tell you this is a bill for America. It has America written all over it. When you vote against this bill, you are not voting against some deficit or something like that, but you are voting against America. That is the reason the administration sent it up here.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. As I understand it, this bill contains nothing for the manganese industry; is that correct?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. There is a manganese program in effect and when the time comes and we need to work on that, we will work on it, and if it had been necessary to include it in the bill, we would have put it in because it is very important.

Mr. JENNINGS. Does the gentleman not also agree that we do need a long-range program on manganese because it is the most strategic of all the strategic metals and we are only producing 15 percent of the manganese in this country, which is so vitally needed.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. We need a long-term program on all of these minerals. But, this is the only thing we were left with after the administration told us that they would give us a long-term proposition, they did not do it. Then they did not do it on the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. I am not going to stand up here as a Member of the Congress and sell our vital industries down the drain simply to help some importer in some foreign country. I am not going to do it.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I arise in support of this mineral stabilization bill because I believe it to be the minimum requirement for a basic industry. Failure to act favorably on this legislation at this time condemns one of our most basic industries to almost certain death. I think this legislation has been very adequately explained and so I shall not attempt to enter into the technical details of the problem. I am of course primarily concerned with the plight of chrome producers and tungsten mines in my own area. At the present time they are closed down, at a great loss not only to mine owners, to the employees of the mines, but in my opinion to the detriment of all Americans. As has been explained, we are not proposing this bill as a welfare measure or as an antidote to unemployment, yet at the same time information given at the committee hearings would indicate that this stabilization program could effect the welfare of hundreds of thousands of people and ultimately the security of all of us. We are faced again with the situation where a segment of American industry is being sacrificed on the altar of diplomacy, in an effort to assist our foreign policy. I have supported reciprocal trade, believing in the necessity of that type of program. However, we must take offsetting measures to protect our own people and our own industries, else we lose the economic strength we are attempting to sustain. Contrary to the statements, Mr. Chairman, of some of the opponents of this program, it does not represent a windfall for any one person or any single group of people, but as has been explained, the legislation is rather to offer primary assistance to the small owner and the small producer of basic minerals. I plead with you, my colleagues, to support this legislation and give this program a chance.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] said on the first day of debate on this bill that he did not know what this bill would do or what it was intended to do.

Let me tell you that it is intended to insure the jobs and incomes of some 22,000 people in one county in the Congressional District I represent. Shoshone County is a one-industry county—a lead-zinc county. Its entire economy is built around the payrolls of the lead-zinc mines and smelters. At stake here today is not just the jobs of the men in the mines and the smelters, and the security of their families, or the economic stability of the mining companies—at stake here today is the security of every person and every family in the county.

This bill does not provide a subsidy for foreign-mined ores. It provides a subsidy only for domestic-mined ores.

Some Members have said this is a bill to provide subsidies for the big companies. This is not a big company bill.

It sets a quarterly limitation on the amount of ore on which a subsidy may be paid. This means that the bill will be particularly helpful to small- and middle-sized operators.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure it is not the intention of this Congress to allow our domestic mines and metals industries to wither on the vine and die.

Nor is it the intention of this body, I am sure, to deny our American citizens the opportunity of earning their livelihood in our domestic mines so that workers in other countries may be assured a job in their mines.

Much of the expansion in foreign metals production has been financed by the United States Government. This means that money has been taken out of the pocket of the American miner to finance a development which is now taking his job from him. No wonder there is bitterness in Shoshone County, in my State of Idaho, today.

The mine companies and the mine workers have not been able to get any relief from the flood of cheaply-mined foreign ores coming into this country under any existing law or through any existing administrative channel. Domestic mines can produce all but 30 per-

cent of our consumption of lead and zinc. Yet, because we do nothing to protect our domestic industry, 70 percent of our domestic consumption is coming from imports.

In my opinion, Congress should now pass this bill because it is the only fair thing to do. But aside from the equities in the matter, we should pass it because minerals are vital elements in the security and economic welfare of our country. Should overseas supplies be diminished or cut off in a defense crisis, adequate domestic sources of lead and zinc would become crucial to our national survival.

Mr. Chairman, I shall cast my vote for S. 4036. I am not willing to bequeath to future generations, as a monument to the folly of this Congress, a long valley of ghost towns in northern Idaho, and other lead-zinc producing areas in this country.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I join in supporting the minerals subsidy bill now before us.

I do this with the hope and belief that by so doing some consideration will be given the coal industry. Thus we may strike the first blow at the depressing recession in both the bituminous and the anthracite coal fields, not alone in Pennsylvania but in every State where coal is of major importance to the general welfare of the people.

I have tried along with others to have Congress pass a coal research bill, which must come within the very near future or the whole coal economy may well suffer irreparable harm.

The future needs for fuel, regardless of oil, gas or nuclear energy, will largely depend upon coal for fulfillment.

Coal has been and for the foreseeable future will remain, the number one fuel of the heavy productive industries.

With a fairly complete knowledge of the needs of the coal industry, I appeal to the membership to give serious and favorable consideration to this amendment.

Even if we do not achieve our aim of passing a coal commission bill at this session I shall support the minerals subsidy bill because it starts our thinking in the right direction.

Sooner or later we must give the same consideration, in times of need, to the mining industry that we are giving to agriculture, wool growing, shipbuilding, and other activities that are supported by public funds. Sooner or later the coal industry will be recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. EVINS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 4036) to stabilize production of copper, lead, zinc, acid-grade fluorspar, and tungsten from domestic mines, pursuant to House Resolution 689, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 159, nays 182, answering "present" 1, not voting 87, as follows:

[Roll No. 188]

YEAS—159

Addonizio	Garmatz	Norrell
Albert	Granahan	O'Brien, Ill.
Allen, Calif.	Gray	O'Hara, Ill.
Allen, Ill.	Green, Pa.	Osmers
Anderson, Mont.	Gregory	Patman
Anfuso	Griffiths	Patterson
Arends	Gubser	Perkins
Aspinall	Hagen	Pfost
Ayres	Halleck	Poage
Baker	Hays, Ark.	Porter
Baring	Healey	Price
Barrett	Hemphill	Reece, Tenn.
Bass, Tenn.	Holifield	Rees, Kans.
Beckworth	Holland	Rhodes, Ariz.
Belcher	Holmes	Roberts
Bennett, Mich.	Holtzman	Rodino
Berry	Horan	Rogers, Colo.
Boggs	Ikard	Rogers, Mass.
Bolling	Jackson	Rogers, Tex.
Boyle	Jarman	Santangelo
Breeding	Jennings	Saund
Brooks, Tex.	Jones, Ala.	Scrivner
Brown, Mo.	Judd	Scudder
Burleson	Karsten	Shelley
Byrne, Pa.	Kearns	Sieminski
Canfield	Kee	Sisk
Carnahan	Kilgore	Smith, Kans.
Celler	King	Smith, Miss.
Chelf	Kluczynski	Spence
Chenoweth	Knox	Steed
Christopher	Knutson	Sullivan
Clark	Krueger	Teller
Coad	Landrum	Thompson, N. J.
Cooley	Lesinski	Thompson, Tex.
Corbett	Libonati	Thomson, Wyo.
Dawson, Ill.	Loser	Thornberry
Dawson, Utah	McFall	Tollefson
Dellay	Machrowicz	Trimble
Dent	Madden	Udall
Diggs	Magnuson	Ullman
Dixon	Mailliard	Vorys
Dollinger	Marshall	Walter
Dooley	Martin	Watts
Edmondson	Merrow	Weaver
Elliott	Metcalf	Widnall
Everett	Miller, Nebr.	Wier
Evins	Mills	Wigglesworth
Fino	Montoya	Willis
Fisher	Morgan	Withrow
Flood	Morris	Wolverton
Fountain	Moss	Wright
Frazier	Moulder	Yates
Fulton	Multer	
	Nix	

NAYS—182

Abbitt	Broyhill	Dingell
Abernethy	Bush	Donohue
Adair	Byrd	Dorn, N. Y.
Alexander	Byrne, Ill.	Dorn, S. C.
Alger	Byrnes, Wis.	Dowdy
Andersen, H. Carl	Cannon	Dwyer
Andrews	Carrigg	Eberharter
Ashmore	Cederberg	Fallon
Auchincloss	Chamberlain	Fascell
Bailey	Chiperfield	Feighan
Baldwin	Church	Fenton
Bass, N. H.	Collier	Flynt
Bates	Cramer	Fogarty
Becker	Cretella	Forand
Bennett, Fla.	Cunningham, Iowa	Ford
Betts	Cunningham, Nebr.	Forrester
Blatnik	Curtin	Gary
Boland	Curtis, Mass.	Gathings
Bolton	Curtis, Mo.	Gavin
Bonner	Dague	Grant
Bosch	Davis, Ga.	Green, Oreg.
Bow	Delaney	Griffin
Bray	Dennison	Gross
Broomfield	Denton	Gwinn
Brown, Ga.	Devereux	Haley
Brown, Ohio		Harden
Harris	Meader	Sadlak
Harrison, Va.	Michel	St. George
Harvey	Miller, Md.	Saylor
Hays, Ohio	Moore	Schenck
Heselton	Morano	Scott, N. C.
Hess	Mumma	Seely-Brown
Hiestand	Murray	Selden
Hoeven	Natcher	Sikes
Holt	Neal	Siler
Huddleston	Nicholson	Simpson, Ill.
Hull	Nimtz	Smith, Calif.
Hyde	Norblad	Smith, Va.
Johansen	O'Hara, Minn.	Springer
Jonas	O'Konski	Staggers
Kean	Ostertag	Taber
Keating	Passman	Talle
Kelly, N. Y.	Pelly	Teague, Calif.
Kilday	Philbin	Tewes
Kirwan	Pillion	Thomas
Kitchin	Poff	Tuck
Lafore	Polk	Utt
Laird	Quie	Van Pelt
Lane	Rabaut	Van Zandt
Lankford	Ray	Vinson
Lennon	Reed	Vursell
Lipscomb	Reuss	Westland
McDonough	Rhodes, Pa.	Wharton
McGovern	Richlman	Whitener
McIntosh	Riley	Whitten
McMillan	Robeson, Va.	Williams, Miss.
Mack, Ill.	Robison, N. Y.	Wilson, Calif.
Mack, Wash.	Robsion, Ky.	Wilson, Ind.
Mahon	Rogers, Fla.	Younger
Matthews	Rooney	Zablocki
May	Rutherford	

ANSWERING "PRESENT"—1

O'Brien, N. Y.

NOT VOTING—87

Ashley	Hale	Minshall
Avery	Harrison, Nebr.	Mitchell
Barden	Haskell	Morrison
Baumhart	Hébert	O'Neill
Beamer	Henderson	Pilcher
Bentley	Herlong	Powell
Blitch	Hill	Preston
Boykin	Hillings	Prouty
Brooks, La.	Hoffman	Radwan
Brownson	Hosmer	Rains
Buckley	James	Rivers
Budge	Jenkins	Roosevelt
Burdick	Jensen	Scherer
Clevenger	Johnson	Schwengel
Coffin	Jones, Mo.	Scott, Pa.
Colmer	Kearney	Sheehan
Coudert	Keogh	Sheppard
Davis, Tenn.	Kilburn	Shuford
Derounian	Latham	Simpson, Pa.
Dies	LeCompte	Stauffer
Doyle	McCarthy	Taylor
Durham	McCormack	Teague, Tex.
Engle	McCulloch	Thompson, La.
Farbstein	McGregor	Vanik
Frelinghuysen	McIntire	Wainwright
Friedel	Macdonald	Williams, N. Y.
George	Mason	Winstead
Glenn	Miller, Calif.	Young
Gordon	Miller, N. Y.	Zelenko

So the bill was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Johnson of Wisconsin against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Zelenko against.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana for, with Mr. Farbstein against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Winstead against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Colmer against.

Mr. Durham for, with Mr. Bentley against.

Mr. Roosevelt for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. Engle for, with Mr. Hosmer against.

Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Frelinghuysen against.

Mr. Doyle for, with Mr. Beamer against.

Mr. Mitchell for, with Mr. Scherer against.

Mr. Glenn for, with Mr. Pilcher against.

Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Preston against.

Mr. Hill for, with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Friedel for, with Mr. Rivers against.

Mr. George for, with Mr. Sheehan against.

Mr. Scott of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Henderson against.

Mr. McCarthy for, with Mr. Derounian against.

Mr. Ashley for, with Mr. Wainwright against.
Mr. Jensen for, with Mr. Stauffer against.
Mr. Gordon for, with Mr. Vanik against.
Mr. Coffin for, with Mr. Herlong against.
Mr. Boykin for, with Mr. O'Brien of New York against.
Mr. Burdick for, with Mr. Coudert against.
Mr. Hillings for, with Mr. Rains against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Hale.
Mr. Young with Mr. Avery.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Baumhart.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Harrison of Nebraska.
Mrs. Blitch with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Barden with Mr. McGregor.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Brooks of Louisiana with Mr. McIntire.
Mr. Shuford with Mr. Mason.

Mr. REUSS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I voted "No." I have a live pair with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." Therefore, I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 121. Concurrent resolution authorizing a change in the enrollment of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) providing for the construction by the Department of the Interior of demonstration plants for the production, from saline or brackish waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumption uses.

CONSERVATION OF THE RARE HAWAIIAN NENE GOOSE

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 4249) to authorize a program for the conservation, restoration, and management of the rare Hawaiian Nene goose, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object; will the gentleman tell us what this bill does?

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to authorize a program of research, propagation, and management for the Hawaiian Nene goose. At the present time, there are only about 50 geese at large in the entire Territory of Hawaii, and their continued existence is threatened in the absence of a program for their management. Up to the present, voluntary efforts by private individuals and very small grants by the Territory of Hawaii have served to keep the species from following the passenger pigeon into extinction. Existing funds that might be used are not available because of regulations of the Fish and Wildlife Service and, in the absence of this authorization, necessary steps for the propagation of the species cannot be undertaken.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whereas there are less than 50 Nene geese in the wild state in the Territory of Hawaii, and this unique, native species of waterfowl is threatened with imminent extinction, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to promote a program of research, propagation, and management necessary to effect the restoration of this threatened species in its natural habitat.

SEC. 2. The sum of $15,000 per annum is hereby authorized to be appropriated each year for a period of 5 years to carry out the purposes of this act.

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, S. 4249 and H. R. 11584 are identical bills to authorize a program for the conservation, restoration, and management of the rare Hawaiian Nene goose—Branta sandvicensis—which is now considered one of the rarest species of waterfowl in the world.

I want to take advantage of this opportunity to commend the chairman and members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House for their expeditious and gracious consideration of this bill and its prompt reporting to this House. I want to also acknowledge the kind courtesy of the senior Senator from Washington, the Honorable WARREN MAGNUSON, for his introduction of the Senate bill which was promptly considered by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the other body which the Senator from Washington is chairman. The diligence and great interest of Chairman MAGNUSON and the members of his committee are gratefully acknowledged.

By action of the Territorial Legislature in 1955 the Nene, or Hawaiian goose, was named the official bird of Hawaii.

The history of the effort to preserve the vanishing species of wildlife in the United States is one of too little too late. The Nene was abundant at one time on the slopes of Mauna Loa and Hualalai in Hawaii and Haleakala in Maui.

Over the past several decades this magnificent waterfowl has declined seriously in numbers due to several factors, including indiscriminate hunting in past years, changes in land use, and the increase of predators, such as mongooses, wild pigs and dogs. The bird was formerly a migratory one but became at some time in the distant past a resident of Hawaii.

Today, as a result of extensive efforts, there are less than 50 birds in the wild state. Two captive flocks are in existence, one owned by Mr. Herbert C. Shipman, of Hawaii, and the other by the Wildfowl Trust, Slimbridge, Gloucestershire, England. This latter flock was started from a male and 2 females in 1950.

In 1955, with the help of interested conservationists in Hawaii and on the mainland, grants to the total amount of $8,000 to finance an ecological survey were secured through the Yale University Bishop Museum Fellowship, Pan American Section of the International Committee for Bird Preservation, the Guggenheim Foundation, and the McInerny Foundation. Dr. William H. Elder, professor of zoology at the University of Michigan, conducted the study and made a four-step recommendation.

The Legislature of Hawaii and the Territorial administration have made material contributions of effort and money to the preservation of the Nene and its reestablishment. Since July 1, 1949, to June 30, 1958, $22,865 has been expended through the fish and game division of the board of agriculture and forestry. The budget request for the 1958–59 biennium is $17,000.

Within the last month an agreement was made with the Bishop estate and C. Brewer & Co., owners of the land where the Nene is found in the wild state, for the establishment of a sanctuary which will be maintained and controlled by the fish and game division of the Territorial government. The two owners of the land are allowing the use of their property without compensation. Hawaii has done its part with the means at its command. The Federal assistance is needed so that competent personnel can be assigned to the task of permanently restoring the Nene and seeing the job through. This can be done by enactment of S. 4249 and H. R. 11584.

The Wildlife Management Institute, the National Parks Association, the National Audubon Society, the Wildfowl Trust of England, the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs, the Izaak Walton League of America, among others, have expressed their support of the bills. The Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, has recommended enactment of the bills, and the Bureau of the Budget interposes no objection.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

OPERATING ASSIGNMENT OF THE NUCLEAR SHIP "SAVANNAH"

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago there was enacted a bill, which I introduced in the spring of 1955, to authorize the construction of an atomic merchant ship powered by a specially designed advanced type of reactor. This first great application of nuclear power to shipping was to be a practical merchant vessel of combination passenger and cargo design capable of providing shipping services on routes essential for maintaining the flow of the foreign

commerce of the United States. The authorization took the form of an amendment to title VII of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, since it was intended that the ship would be in furtherance of our national maritime policy as laid down by the Congress in that act.

The creation of the ship was to be a joint project with the Atomic Energy Commission responsible for the nuclear reactor and the Department of Commerce responsible for design and construction of the vessel itself and all of its other equipment and machinery.

This important project is now under way. She was christened the Nuclear Ship *Savannah* at her keel-laying in Camden, N. J., on National Maritime Day, May 22, of this year. She is scheduled to be launched next year and be ready for operation in 1960.

The *Savannah*, in her construction and operation, will be the laboratory in which the American merchant marine in the nuclear age will be developed. Upon completion it is contemplated that she will operate to various areas throught the world in demonstration of the peaceful uses of the miracle power of atomic energy.

We are fortunate that through the effective operation of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of an American-flag, citizen-owned merchant marine, there are long-established and experienced operators serving essential trade routes with wholly owned and operated American-flag passenger and freight vessels serving Western Europe, the Mediterranean, the east and west coasts of South America, the Far East, Australia, Africa, and around the world.

Thus, there are logically available many companies ready, able, and willing to perform their share in their partnership with the Government in carrying out our national policy. Among them are major companies whose very names bespeak of our country: United States Lines, American Export Lines, and American President Lines.

In view of the foregoing, therefore, I was greatly disturbed—I might even say I was shocked—when it was announced by the Maritime Administration and the Atomic Energy Commission 2 or 3 weeks ago that States Marine Corporation of Delaware has been selected as the general agent for the operation of the nuclear ship *Savannah*, under a negotiated operating agreement.

At this point I want to make it perfectly clear that my reaction to the announcement implies no criticism of States Marine as an operating steamship company. Nor do I suggest that the proposed assignment of the vessel is not within the letter of the law.

On the basis of information which has come to my attention, there are, however, certain aspects of this proposition which I consider to be highly questionable.

First, it is the intent of the 1936 act that the American merchant marine shall be owned and operated under the United States flag by citizens of the United States. Provisions of the shipping laws implement this intent by strict requirements regarding citizenship. Further to assure the very highest degree of American control, the 1936 act provides that it shall be unlawful for any contractor receiving an operating differential subsidy, or for any charterer of vessels under that act, or any holding company, subsidiary, affiliate, or associate of such contractor or such charterer, or any officer, director, agent, or executive thereof, directly or indirectly to own, charter, act as agent or broker for, or operate any foreign-flag vessel which competes with any American-flag service determined to be essential under the act.

It is my understanding States Marine Lines operates about 15 American-flag ships of its own, plus 24 more through its wholly owned subsidiary, Isthmian Lines, Inc. Some 40 to 50 American-flag ships are said to be operated under charter. And an additional 4 or 5 are operated through a berth agency with Bloomfield Steamship Company. But the States Marine fleet of 122 vessels includes somewhere between 30 and 40 foreign-flag ships, operated through foreign connections and affiliations which makes it presently ineligible to receive operating subsidy or charter vessels under the 1936 act. In the operation of both its American and foreign-flag ships, this company uses foreign shipping firms as its agents abroad, and in turn acts as United States agents for them.

According to Fortune Magazine, in South Africa, for example, States Marine, headed by Henry Mercer of New York, helped set up a company for an old friend, former British Air Marshal Harris. As the Fortune article says:

> Mercer was instrumental in getting some ships from the United States Maritime Commission for the South African company, and the two firms whack up 50/50 such cargo as they can corral that is headed either east or west between the United States and South Africa.

Only by resorting to the broad authority in the Federal Maritime Board to use general agents to operate vessels owned by the United States for experimental or testing purposes, can the assignment of the nuclear ship *Savannah* to States Marine rather than to an American operator without foreign connections be legally justified.

While flexibility of authority is undoubtedly desirable in connection with the development, trial and testing of vessels for experimental purposes, no facts have come to my attention which would justify the assignment of a vessel having the significance of the nuclear ship *Savannah* to an operator who because of extensive foreign-flag affiliations cannot meet the tests laid down in the 1936 act, when there are fully-qualified wholly-owned American steamship companies available to perform this important function.

In this connection, it is my understanding that an interagency operator selection board of the Maritime Administration and the Atomic Energy Commission was appointed to review and analyze the replies of the seven operators indicating an interest in operating the *Savannah*. It is further my understanding that this Board unanimously recommended American President Lines, Limited, as first choice and United States Lines Company as second choice, on the basis of the many factors involved, but with particular reference to basic trade routes and extent of experience with passenger operations. Moreover, these two companies have already made substantial studies in connection with nuclear propelled vessels. Unfortunately, I cannot vouch for the accuracy of the conclusions which I have been told were contained in the report of the interagency board, because I have been unable to obtain a copy of the report. I have requested the Maritime Administrator to furnish me with a copy of the board's report with the background justifications for the final selection of an operator. This has been denied me.

Nonetheless, it is a well-known fact that States Marine does not now, and never has, engaged in the operation of passenger vessels, although I believe the Isthmian subsidiary carries some passengers on its 12-passenger freighters. I am at a loss to understand the decision that has been made.

The publicity attending the announcement of the assignment of the vessel states that in the handling of future passenger travel, Matson Navigation Co. would act with States Marine. Again I cannot understand why other qualified American passenger operators should have been passed over in favor of a company that had indicated no interest in operating the vessel.

The picture becomes even more cloudy and confusing when it is realized that the able and distinguished new Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Honorable John A. McCone, is a man with extensive shipping interests. Mr. McCone's shipping companies are Joshua Hendy Corp., and Panama Pacific Tankers which are engaged directly or through subsidiaries in the shipping business as owners, charterers and operators of ships under both foreign and American flag. The Hendy vessels are employed in the distribution of chemicals, crude oil and refined petroleum products, and iron ore and bauxite. At the time of his nomination for the Atomic Energy Commission post, Mr. McCone was engaged in a very active partnership with Mr. Mercer, the head of States Marine Lines. According to the August 1958 issue of Fortune:

> With Mr. Mercer's support, Mr. McCone had plunged ahead with a plan to make Joshua Hendy one of the most important seagoing ore carriers. Its trade prospered. It was hauling iron ore from Venezuela and Peru, bauxite from Jamaica, and chemicals in the intercoastal trade.

The nomination hearings before the Senate Section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on July 2 of this year do not go into detail except to show that Mr. McCone has divested himself of his control of the two shipping corporations to the extent of placing his stock in them in an irrevocable trust with the trust department of the California Bank of Los Angeles. I have no concern with the arrangements made by Mr. McCone to meet the technical requirements of the law in regard to the difficult problem of avoiding conflicts of interests

faced by so many able and successful businessmen when called to public service. However, the facts concerning the intimate business relationships which have existed between Mr. McCone and Mr. Mercer raise certain obvious questions when we seek to find the answer to the apparently illogical assignment of the nuclear ship *Savannah* to States Marine Lines by the Department of Commerce and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Another recent development seems to shed further light on a picture that becomes more complicated as it is examined. As recently as August 14, 1958, the president of Matson Orient Line, Inc., an applicant for operating subsidy from United States Atlantic ports to the Far East, announced that Matson Navigation Co. and Isthmian Lines, Inc., will each acquire a 50-percent ownership of Matson Orient. Matson Navigation and Isthmian will buy 100 percent of the common stock of Matson Orient, Inc., for $8½ million, with which Matson Orient then proposes to purchase three vessels from each Matson Navigation and Isthmian with which to commence its new service and will have $1 million left over as working capital. The officers and directors of Matson Orient Line are also officers or directors of one or more of Matson Navigation Co., Isthmian Lines, Inc., and States Marine Corp. Perhaps this new development explains why Matson Navigation Co., which expressed no interest in operating the *Savannah*, should nevertheless be designated to act with States Marine in the handling of future passenger travel.

Mr. Speaker, even though I have no reason to believe that any law has been violated by the decision of the Secretary of Commerce to select States Marines Lines as operating agent for the nuclear ship *Savannah* in preference to exclusively American-flag lines, which to me are seemingly more logical and qualified, the known circumstances in this matter are of great interest to me and I feel that they must be to the Members of Congress generally.

I do not know whether there was any undue pressure from any source that caused this situation to be brought about; but I can assure you that I intend to follow the future course of arrangements relative to the development and operation of our first nuclear merchant ship with even more intense interest than I heretofore have since I introduced the original authorizing legislation.

There is not now, and I doubt if there ever has been, any Member of this Congress more devoted to the cause of developing and maintaining a strong American-flag merchant marine. The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 is an excellent law if administered properly and carefully. But if it is not, I fear that we might again find ourselves confronted with the disgraceful situation that brought about the Black investigation of 1934 and 1935, with its disclosures of complicated corporate subterfuges and favoritism diverting the purposes of the then existing law which Congress had passed in the hopes of developing an adequate, stable, and efficient merchant marine to serve the needs of the commerce and defense of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I will watch with interest to see who plucks the plum.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1959

Mr. CANNON submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 13450) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2686)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate numbered 36 and the amendment of the House thereto, and numbered 114, to the bill (H. R. 13450) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 114: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 114, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$2,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 36.

CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
JOHN TABER,
GERALD R. FORD, Jr.,
FRANT T. BOW,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
STYLES BRIDGES,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13450) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

CHAPTER VII

Independent offices

National Aeronautics and Space Administration

Amendment No. 36: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER XIII

United States Information Agency

Payment to Informational Media Guaranty Fund

Amendment No. 114: Appropriates $2,500,000 instead of $5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
JOHN TABER,
GERALD R. FORD, Jr.,
FRANK T. BOW,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the conference report on the bill (H. R. 13450) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the conference report.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, this report is the result of the further conference with the other body on the supplemental appropriation bill for 1959.

On yesterday the House and the Senate disposed of all other differences on the bill. The report now before the House disposes of the two remaining amendments—Nos. 36 and 114.

Amendment 36 originally provided that in the future, no appropriation could be made to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration unless first authorized by law hereafter enacted. The House on yesterday refused to subscribe to that provision. The Senate further insisted. In the pending report, the managers reach agreement on language limiting the life of the provision to appropriations for any period up to June 30, 1960. Since appropriations for fiscal 1959 are already adopted, the provision will have no practical effect until the next Congress, at which time there will be opportunity to further consider the matter.

Amendment 114 inserted $5 million for further payment to the informational mediums guaranty fund under supervision of the United States Information Agency. The House had not considered the item and on yesterday, refused to concur. The Senate further insisted. The pending report proposes $2,500,000 for the item, a compromise of one-half.

Mr. Speaker, the managers would of course have preferred to sustain the will of the House, but as with most proposed legislation, when the other body continues to insist, the only practical solution is compromise. On both amendments, we believe we secured a reasonable compromise.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, and by way of summary, the final appropriation totals for the bill in relation to the budget estimates and the House and Senate versions are as follows:

Budget estimates (including some not considered by House)	$4,081,154,221
House bill	3,131,844,797
Senate bill	3,866,382,978
Conference total (final)	3,697,305,478
Conference total compared to budget estimates	−383,848,743

Mr. Speaker, the final total is a reduction of nearly 10 percent below total budget estimates. And to repeat briefly the statement of yesterday, this bill is more of a regular annual bill than a supplemental bill. It is only incidentally a supplemental bill. Nearly 85 percent of the conference total represents the regular annual appropriations for several agencies and activities. And of the abnormally large increase over the House bill, approximately 90 percent represents amounts not considered by the House when the bill was first here.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment 36: Page 22, line 19, insert: "No appropriation may be made to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration unless previously authorized by legislation hereafter enacted by the Congress."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, as amended by the House amendment thereto, insert:

"No appropriation may be made to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for any period prior to June 30, 1960, unless previously authorized by legislation hereafter enacted by the Congress."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, this is the matter we discussed and voted on yesterday where the vote in the House was 236 to 126 to reject the Senate amendment which would have required that from here on in the National Space Agency would have to come to the Congress and get an annual authorization as well as an annual appropriation.

Subsequent to our action in the House the matter went back to the Senate, and the Senate by a vote of 86 to nothing insisted upon their provision in the bill. As a consequence the issue again went to conference. The Senate conferees started out by insisting upon their position, but they gradually modified it until they were willing at one point to make it a 3-year extension of their language or a 3-year abrogation of the basic Space Agency law.

I think the House conferees by getting a concession from the Senate conferees have accomplished considerable under this new language. Only for fiscal year 1960—that is one more year—must there be an annual authorization prior to an appropriation.

It is not what I wanted, because I personally feel that the basic law is sound, but we all know that when you go to conference you have to achieve what is practical; and, in my opinion, the House conferees prevailed to a very substantial degree.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. May I say I think the conferees worked out a very fair compromise, and I am sure that the Members on this side who are on the Space Committee go along with you.

Mr. FORD. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I want to commend the gentleman for the fight he put up for sound essential practice, and I want to urge that this 1-year delay be not made a permanent arrangement. I think it is a very serious interference with matters vitally affecting our national defense, and I can only hope and pray that during this next year we will not be hamstrung in trying to do what we need to do by having to go through four committees to get it done.

I think it would be much preferable to have stood on our position, as I know the gentleman from Michigan does, but I realize also that we must make some concessions in order to get legislation.

Mr. FORD. It is my opinion that this 1-year trial run will prove the unsoundness of following the Senate position.

Mr. KEATING. I am sure it will.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I just want to compliment the gentleman on the fight he has made. It is a substantial piece of legislation for which he is arguing. The original bill probably authorized this, and this, as I said the other day, is a trial.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to say to the gentleman from Michigan that I feel this is a step backward from the original authorization language which was adopted by the House and reported by the Space Committee. I believe this new Agency in the next year will spend all of its time justifying authorizations and appropriation requests before the United States Congress instead of getting on with the vital work this country needs to do in the field of space activity.

Mr. FORD. My views coincide with those of the gentleman from Wisconsin. But we were faced with a practical problem and I think we did the best we could in extending the Senate language for 1 year to prove the unsoundness of the Senate position.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the only addition to the Senate provision is the inclusion of the phrase "for any period prior to June 30, 1960." The effect of it, of course, as I said, is to leave the whole matter for the next Congress. The Congress will be free to further consider the matter in the next session.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF THE ADJUTANT GENERAL OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 13666) to amend title 32 of the United States Code to permit the appointment of the adjutant general of Puerto Rico as provided by the laws of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY]?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain what this does?

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, at the present time the adjutant general of Puerto Rico is required to be appointed by the President of the United States. This bill would simply permit the Governor of Puerto Rico to appoint the adjutant general of Puerto Rico.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter 3, section 314 (b) of title 32 of the United States Code is amended by striking from the first and second sentences thereof the words "Puerto Rico," and the preceding commas.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD a letter addressed to the Honorable CARL VINSON, chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, signed by Hugh M. Milton II, Acting Secretary of the Army, as follows:

AUGUST 21, 1958.

Hon. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your request to the Secretary of Defense for the views of the Department of Defense with respect to H. R. 13666, 85th Congress, a bill "To amend title 32 of the United States Code to permit the appointment of the Adjutant General of Puerto Rico as provided by the laws of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico." The Secretary of Defense has delegated to the Department of the Army the responsibility for expressing the views of the Department of Defense thereon.

The purpose of the bill is to remove the present legal requirement that the Adjutant General of Puerto Rico shall be appointed by the President. This would permit the Governor of Puerto Rico to appoint the adjutant general of the Commonwealth as provided by its laws.

The Department of the Army, on behalf of the Department of Defense has no objection to the above-mentioned bill. However, it should be noted that the bill is substantially identical to section 2 of H. R. 10906, 85th Congress, a bill to provide that the National Guard of Puerto Rico shall be subject to the same provisions as apply to the National Guard of each of the States, as to which a similar report was made to your committee on August 18, 1958.

The enactment of this legislation will cause no increase in the budgetary requirements for the Department of Defense.

This report has been coordinated within the Department of Defense in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

HUGH M. MILTON II,
Acting Secretary of the Army.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MINNESOTA STATE FAIR AND CENTENNIAL EXPOSITION

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 11889), to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Minnesota State Fair and Centennial Exposition to be held at St. Paul, Minn., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 4, after line 6, insert:

"SEC. 7. Paragraph 1798, Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S. C., title 19, sec. 1201, par. 1798), is further amended by redesignating subparagraph (h) as subparagraph (i), and by inserting a new subparagraph (h) to read as follows:

"'(h) Automobiles rented by any resident of the United States while abroad may be imported into the United States by or on behalf of such resident for the transportation of such resident, his family and guests, and such incidental carriage of articles as may be appropriate to his personal use of the automobile without payment of duty, for such temporary periods as the Secretary of the Treasury by regulation may prescribe. Any automobile exempted from duty under this subparagraph which is used otherwise than for a purpose herein expressed or is not returned abroad within the time and manner as the Secretary may prescribe by regulation, or the value of such automobile (to be recovered from the importer), shall be subject to forfeiture to the United States.'"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, in the form in which it passed the House of Representatives, the purpose of H. R. 11889 was to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Minnesota State Fair and Centennial Exposition to be admitted without payment of tariff.

The Senate added one substantive amendment to this bill. The purpose of this amendment, according to the report of the Senate Finance Committee, is to permit residents to bring into the United States, without payment of duty or posting of bond and for temporary periods only, automobiles rented abroad. Under present law residents on a short trip back into the United States from adjacent countries with automobiles rented abroad must either pay duty on the rented vehicle or place it under bond.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I have concurred in the request that the House agree to the Senate amendment to this legislation. As passed by the House H. R. 11889 provided for the duty-free entry of articles for exhibition at the Minnesota State Fair and Centennial Exposition in St. Paul, Minn. The Senate has provided an amendment to this legislation which would permit residents of the United States to bring into the United States for temporary periods automobiles rented abroad without the requirement of a duty payment or the posting of a bond. With respect to the Senate amendment it is provided that the Secretary of the Treasury shall issue regulations to provide for the manner in which this entry privilege shall operate. It is my expectation that those regulations will make it clear that such entry of rented vehicles shall only be allowed in connection with incidental crossings and will not be the means for the establishment of a pattern of operating in the United States automobiles that have been rented in a foreign country.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in Senate Concurrent Resolution 109, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that consideration should immediately be given by the General Assembly of the United Nations to the development, within its permanent structure, of such organization and procedures as will enable the United Nations promptly to employ suitable United Nations forces for such purposes as observation and patrol in situations that threaten international peace and security.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

HOW TO OBTAIN FINANCING UNDER THE SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT OF 1958

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, today an important new small-business measure has taken its place among the Federal statutes. The President only a few minutes ago signed the small business investment bill which both the House and the Senate passed on August 7.

We have already received a great number of inquiries from people all over the country—small-business people and others—who are interested in forming a small-business investment company which this act provides for.

The staff of our Small Business Committee has prepared an explanation of this act, what it authorizes and how the provisions of the act will work. This is in the form of questions and answers that any small-business man can understand. It appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in a speech I made several days ago.

I am inserting this in the RECORD because I know it will be useful to the other Members in answering questions from their constituents about how the new small-business-financing program will work.

I hope that our committee will have printed copies of this statement available if the Members of the House should find that the statement is useful.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution now under consideration is House Concurrent Resolution 373, substituted for Senate Concurrent Resolution 109. This resolution expresses the sense of the Congress that consideration should immediately be given by the General Assembly of the United Nations to the development, within its permanent structure, of such organization and procedures as will enable the United Nations promptly to employ suitable United Nations forces for such purposes as observation and patrol in situations that threaten international peace and security.

The resolution in its present form represents the culmination of a long period of study by the Committee on Foreign Affairs and by a number of Members of the House of Representatives who do not belong to the Committee on Foreign Affairs who have shown a marked interest in a United Nations force. During the 85th Congress resolutions expressing approval of the concept of a United Nations force have been introduced by the following Members of the House: Hon. ROBERT HALE; Hon. EDNA F. KELLY of New York; Hon. CHESTER E. MERROW; Hon. HENRY S. REUSS; Hon. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT; Hon. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN; Hon. PETER W. RODINO, Jr.; Hon. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO, and Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL, as well as by myself. These resolutions have been considered by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The committee has also given close attention to the experience of the United Nations with the United Nations Emergency Force in the area of the border between Israel and Egypt, as well as the operation of the United Nations Observation Group in Lebanon.

Because of the great interest in the matter of a United Nations force shown by Members of the House of Representatives and by the public generally, the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, of which I have the honor to serve as chairman, held hearings on July 24 and July 25 of this year at which testimony was received from officials and individuals who are particularly well informed on this matter.

On the basis of its study of recent developments and with careful consideration to the recommendations of the

experts who testified before the subcommittee, the Committee on Foreign Affairs drafted House Concurrent Resolution 373 in its present form.

The resolution indicates the desire of the Congress that permanent arrangements be made so that a United Nations observation and patrol force may be brought into service promptly whenever future circumstances make such action desirable. The resolution does not make specific recommendations as to the nature or organization of the force except to make clear that a force limited to observation and patrol functions is contemplated. The Committee on Foreign Affairs believes that favorable action by the Congress on this resolution will give encouragement to the United States delegation to the United Nations and to other nations of the world who recognize the value of such a force in the world of today.

Approval of this resolution does not involve any major financial commitment on the part of the United States. The present United Nations Emergency Force in the area of the Israel-Egyptian border consists of between 5,000 and 6,000 men and costs the United Nations $25 million per year to maintain. This cost is assessed among all the 81 United Nations members at the regular scale of assessments. The United States share is 32.51 percent. It was my privilege to serve as a member of the United States delegation to the United Nations General Assembly last year, and as a result of my observations at that time, I am convinced that the overwhelming majority of the nations of the world do not want the United States to assume too large a share of the responsibility for financing any United Nations force. These nations recognize that unless a United Nations force represents the entire United Nations membership it cannot perform its function. If such a force should come to be regarded as being dominated by the United States its usefulness would be greatly diminished.

My experience at the United Nations last fall also convinced me that there is no perceptible sentiment among the nations of the world today in favor of a United Nations army large enough and strong enough to withstand armed aggression. This resolution specifically indicates approval of an observation and patrol force. I do not believe that the world situation is such that a United Nations force could or should attempt anything more. So far as I have been able to observe, the overwhelming majority of the governments represented at the United Nations share this view.

The purpose of this resolution is to give encouragement so that necessary immediate action can and will be taken. I share the belief of many, that had the United Nations been prepared to act more quickly in Lebanon, the crisis there might have been prevented from reaching an acute stage. If the United Nations is ready to act immediately in the future when a crisis threatens, such action may have a profound effect upon the people of the world and the security of the United States. I hope that this resolution will be approved by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARNAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. Would it be at all possible, under the provisions of this resolution, to examine whether or not Soviet Russia should withdraw her troops from Poland and Hungary?

Mr. CARNAHAN. That would be a matter which could be considered by the United Nations if they took up the consideration of this subject.

Mr. FLOOD. Would there be any inclination in your committee, in view of the action taken on this resolution, and commendably so, to examine even at this late hour a resolution I just introduced this week to indicate the feeling of this House that the American delegation should be so instructed with reference to Poland and Hungary?

Mr. CARNAHAN. If there were time, I assure the gentleman we would be glad to consider the resolution.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARNAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. In view of the context of this resolution, with reference to the question asked by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, in December of 1956, I believe, the United Nations passed a resolution demanding that the Russians get out of the enforced occupation of Hungary. I was wondering, in view of the fact that the Russians did not do so and would not even permit a United Nations inspection team to go into Hungary, if it would not be more appropriate if we, the Congress, went on record requesting the Department of State to ask our Ambassador Lodge to present a resolution to the United Nations to the effect that the Russians should get out of Hungary and, in the event that they would not, they should be expelled from the United Nations.

Mr. CARNAHAN. I would answer the gentleman that the question of expelling a member of the United Nations is a question that would be considered by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARNAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FLYNT. Does this mean that American youth could be conscripted or drafted under selective service to serve in the United Nations police force?

Mr. CARNAHAN. Not unless the force would be made up of units committed by the member nations and a unit was committed by the United States.

Mr. FLYNT. Would that be possible?

Mr. CARNAHAN. Under this resolution, in our report we recommend that no forces from the big powers be admitted as members of the force.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks in the RECORD on this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusets.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I would like to ask if this would be a permanent force to be sent anywhere in the world by the United Nations?

Mr. VORYS. No. It is generally not contemplated that it would be that sort of force, as far as fighting is concerned. I shall have more to say about the nature of the force in a few minutes.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BALDWIN. Can the gentleman tell me what kind of vote in the United Nations would be required to direct this force to go to some particular area?

Mr. VORYS. I imagine a majority vote in the Security Council, including all of the permanent members, or a two-thirds vote in the General Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Committee on Foreign Affairs for the resolution they have brought out; that is, by comparison with the resolution that was adopted by the other body. It is my hope that if adopted the conferees will insist upon the House version.

However, it is impossible for me to understand the necessity for any resolution on this subject. I should like to ask the question as to why under articles 43, 44, and 45 of the United Nations Charter, there is not complete authority to establish, if necessary, a United Nations police force. Can the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN] or the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] tell me why we should be confronted with a resolution of this nature at any time?

Mr. CARNAHAN. The United Nations has the authority granted under the charter, as the gentleman says. This resolution is only a guide to our delegates to the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VORYS. There has been a complete breakdown under articles 43 to 47 to attempt to set up a United Nations force. I think that they had something like 253 meetings and finally went out of business because, as you can imagine, of Russian objections.

Mr. GROSS. This is what I think about the United Nations Charter, articles 43, 44, and 45, and the establishment of a police force: Alger Hiss, who was one of the chief architects of the charter, deliberately left out any provision for financing a U. N. police force. It is my opinion that this resolution is before us today for the purpose of saying indirectly: "Just go ahead and organize a United Nations police force and the American taxpayers will put up

the money for it." And we certainly have been doing a good job of putting up the money.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN] says the assessment for this outfit would be on a basis of a United States contribution of 32 percent plus, is that right?

Mr. CARNAHAN. Thirty-two and fifty-one one-hundredths percent.

Mr. GROSS. But the gentleman from Missouri did not mention the voluntary contributions that American taxpayers have made to the existing United Nations Emergency Force.

Mr. CARNAHAN. The expenses of the force for the current year are assessed against all of the members on the scale of assessment.

Mr. GROSS. And the Russians and their satellites have not paid one thin dime of their assessments, have they?

Mr. CARNAHAN. Whether or not they pay their assessment is something we have nothing to do with.

Mr. GROSS. No, and a good many others have not, but we stepped right up with a voluntary contribution. We put up $13 million out of approximately $15 million in total voluntary contributions.

I heard the President of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the gentleman from New Zealand, on television last Sunday. He seemed very much in favor of the establishment of a permanent police force, but he did not say anything about New Zealand's helping to finance it. How much did New Zealand put into the voluntary contribution to the present emergency force? The munificent sum of $27,950 while Americans were being taken for $13 million.

Other nations are not carrying their share of the load on the basis of either voluntary contributions or assessments. We are holding the sack. What this resolution is designed to do is say that we approve a United Nations police force, and we put up the money.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I should like to ask the gentleman 2 or 3 very quick questions: Is it not true that American forces were part of an emergency United Nations force in the Korean war?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; and Americans sustained 90 percent of the casualties and all the financing of that war.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Is it not true that there are American soldiers and airmen who served in that combat who are still prisoners of the Red Chinese?

Mr. GROSS. That is my understanding.

Mr. JOHANSEN. May I ask the gentleman if it is his judgment that if any of the members of this proposed emergency force are captured in line of duty the United Nations will go to their rescue?

Mr. GROSS. Of course not.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. The gentleman cited the instance of New Zealand paying such a small amount to contribute to the upkeep of this United Nations emergency police force. It is quite possible that any country that had a unit in the emergency force would have a lower assessment by reason of the fact they did have that unit in it.

Mr. GROSS. I was not talking about an assessment; I was talking about a voluntary contribution.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Will the gentleman tell the House whether the United States has a unit in the U. N. expeditionary force now maintaining peace on the border between Israel and Egypt?

Mr. GROSS. No.

Mr. JUDD. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman can get his own time to enlarge on that. It is not the U. N. force that is maintaining peace between Israel and Egypt or anywhere else.

Mr. JUDD. I merely want to point out that actually the money we have contributed to the support of that U. N. force is infinitesimal in comparison with what it is costing us to have our own troops in Lebanon, and our own position in that part of the world would be much stronger, I believe, if the forces in Lebanon were U. N. units, rather than just United States units.

Mr. GROSS. Pull the Sixth Fleet out of the Mediterranean and see how much effect your wonderful U. N. organization has on the situation.

Mr. Speaker, in the hearings before the Foreign Affairs Committee on this resolution I discovered a word that is very interesting.

I believe it was spoken by a gentleman by the name of Johnson who was testifying and he said that if the Communist states persisted in their refusal to pay their assessments to the U. N. emergency force there would certainly be a "shortfall" of funds.

From here on out let us not talk about a Treasury deficit. Let us adopt this new word that has been coined by the internationalists and make our own deficit a little more palatable by calling it just a "shortfall."

Mr. Speaker, there is no necessity for this resolution. There is ample authority in the United Nations Charter for the establishment of a police force. I repeat that the real purpose of this resolution is to say indirectly that Uncle Sap will pay the bills even though the cash drawer is becoming more bare every day.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution expresses the approval of the Congress of the idea that a United Nations force suitable for such purposes as observation and patrol should be on hand whenever situations exist that threaten international peace and security.

I believe that all of us have been impressed with the effective service which has been rendered by the United Nations Emergency Force in the area of the border between Egypt and Israel. There are many who believe that had a United Nations observation and patrol force been on call when the crisis in Lebanon began to develop, conditions in the Middle East might not have reached the acute stage which exists there today.

The resolution is general in its terms and avoids specific recommendations. A subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN], held 2 days of hearings on the general problem of a United Nations force at which expert testimony was received. During the course of these hearings a number of the problems to be solved and obstacles to be overcome if a United Nations force is to be established were pointed out. Most of these problems and obstacles will have to be worked out slowly within the United Nations as a result of negotiation among the 81 governments concerned.

Approval of this resolution does not commit the Congress to anything but the approval of the general idea of a limited observation and patrol force. The available evidence indicates that there is no discernible sentiment within the United Nations in favor of the creation of a United Nations army capable of withstanding armed aggression in a shooting war. The reasons for not having such an army are discussed in detail in the committee report on the resolution. None of the larger nations in the world under the conditions that prevail today wants to see an armed force established under United Nations control which might conceivably be used against its own interests.

Approval of this resolution does not involve any commitment on the part of the United States to underwrite the major part of the cost of a United Nations observation and patrol force. It is pretty generally agreed among the nations of the world that any United Nations force to be effective must represent and be supported by the United Nations as a whole. If such a force were to be financed primarily by the United States or any other of the larger nations or even any limited group of nations, there would be the danger that a force so financed was subservient to its financial backers.

In my judgment, an expression by the Congress that the United Nations act promptly to take those measures which can be taken immediately to make an observation and patrol force readily available would give encouragement not only to our own delegation to the United Nations but to other United Nations members who are favorable to the concept of such force. I hope the resolution will be overwhelmingly approved.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this resolution, but I should like to say I would be a lot happier about it and the whole procedure at the United Nations if the State Department had asserted themselves as they were urged to do by certain members of our committee.

In this meeting in the General Assembly, they should have said to the Soviet Union, "If you want us to pull our troops out of Lebanon we might be in a mood to do that about the same moment you start pulling your troops out of Poland and Hungary." But now we let ourselves get on the defensive. We did not say anything about their shortcomings. As the Scripps-Howard papers said in an editorial in yesterday's papers across this Nation, we suffered a defeat. Why we were not more aggressive in holding up to the world that the great aggressors, the aggressors for a long period of time, and those continuing to be the aggressors are the Soviet Union, I do not know, but we just seem not to do that.

I merely took this time to point out that certainly the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs had advised the State Department that we felt this way about it, and it is no fault of ours if they have not done this in the United Nations.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I agree that we should take advantage of every opportunity to put the Soviet Union on the defensive because of its outrageous behavior in keeping its aggressive forces in Hungary. But I do not believe it would have been wise for our State Department to have done what the gentleman has urged, because if we were to say at the United Nations, "We will pull out of Lebanon if you Russians pull out of Hungary," it might appear that, in a sense, we were saying that we are in Lebanon improperly, the same as they are improperly in Hungary, whereas we are not in Lebanon improperly. We are in Lebanon at the request of the democratically elected Government of Lebanon, while the Russians invaded Hungary against the wishes of both its government and its people.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I do not want to get into an argument on semantics with the gentleman, but it should have been worded in some way to have brought to the attention of the world that these people who are so sanctimoniously calling us aggressors are murderers and aggressors of the worst sort. We passed up an opportunity even to mention it.

Mr. JUDD. And we should still do what the gentleman suggests.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we are helping to make history by the vote on this resolution today.

Our President, in his great speech in the United Nations, said "I believe this assembly should take action looking toward the creation of a standby United Nations Peace force—in existence, ready for call by countries fearful for their security."

The Senate was ahead of him. They have already passed a resolution advocating such a force. The least the House can do is to stand behind him, and the Senate, by passing this resolution overwhelmingly.

This is not as strong as the Senate version. We do not commit ourselves to a force substantially like the present United Nations Emergency Force of approximately 6,000 on the Israeli-Egyptian border, which cost us over $13 million the first year. We do not commit ourselves to any plan. We do not submit any plan. Neither did the President. Our hearings developed, as pointed out in our report, that a permanent United Nation's fighting force to deal with major aggression, is not a possibility now. I happen to think that all that is needed now is a permanent headquarters planning staff for calling up and giving logistic support to limited national contingents capable of observation and patrol, from smaller nations willing and able to supply such contingents, when the Security Council or the Assembly calls for action. But I also think that it would be unwise for the United States officially to propose, or sponsor, or underwrite, any particular plan at this time. There are many complications, as explained in our excellent committee report. This is a time for quiet and careful study, and group evolution of a plan, rather than for either of the great powers to invite a prestige and propaganda battle by a specific proposal.

Therefore, although our resolution is cautious, and general in its terms, it is timely, not timid. It calls for immediate consideration of the problem, without attempting to dictate the solution.

Contrary to what some have feared or claimed, we make no commitment as to payment, but I am sure that our share of financing any observation and patrol force within the terms of our resolution would cost us less than our Lebanon expeditions, less than a world war.

Let us face it: When a threat to international peace occurs with Communist encouragement, and a country calls for help, we have just three alternatives; first, handle it ourselves, as we did in Lebanon; second, forget it, and let the Communists take over; or, third, have a United Nations force to handle it.

We do not want to do it all ourselves; we are not going to stand by and do nothing; the only thinkable alternative for us is a United Nations peace force. The Assembly has heard from the Senate and the President; the House must speak up today, and pass this resolution.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Who will be the commander in chief? And who will direct these forces? And on whose order will they move into any particular area where international peace is threatened?

Mr. VORYS. That would have to be worked out, as we point out in our resolution. We certainly would not have a permanent commander in chief. Nor would we make the Secretary General commander in chief. It has to be worked out on the basis of the situations as they arise.

For instance, it was quite clear in our hearings that while a number of the smaller nations would be willing tentatively to train and have prepared contingents to serve, none of the United Nations would be willing at this time in world history to commit a contingent in advance that would go into action in any and every emergency that might arise.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Does the gentleman believe that this force, if it is once brought into being, would be on immediate call and be as quickly assigned to an important duty as the Marines were in Lebanon?

Mr. VORYS. Oh, no. It might be possible if the logistics were well planned in advance. The sort of question the gentleman is bringing up is what caused us to recommend immediate study of this matter.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Is not the organization ready to do these things now under the charter, to raise a task force or whatever it may be called, a police force, or something? They have the right to do it now without any resolution from the United States Government.

Mr. VORYS. You might say they did it in Korea, they did it in the Israeli-Arab situation. What is needed is a little more advance planning so that it can be done promptly and so that in emergency situations we can have plans that will work without tying the hands of this country or others in advance.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken during this debate may have the right to revise and extend their remarks, and that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their remarks on this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 373 expresses the sense of Congress that the General Assembly of the United Nations should develop within its permanent structure such organization and procedures as will enable the United Nations promptly to employ suitable United Nations forces for such purposes as observation and patrol in situations that threaten international peace and security.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs has voted unanimously in favor of this resolution.

If such a United Nations force had been established at the time of the Lebanon crisis in all probability it would not have been necessary for us to land troops in Lebanon or the British in Jordan. The course of recent events in the Middle East might have been materially altered. Such a force was used effectively at the time of the Suez crisis in 1956.

Experience demonstrates that in the future situations may develop which will require on short notice the services of such a United Nations force; and the ability to have such a force ready to act quickly may determine the difference between peace and war.

This resolution does not prescribe the exact nature of such a force or its precise function but it does reflect the desire of Congress that the United Nations support whatever action is necessary to enable suitable United Nations forces to be used promptly for observation and patrol where international peace and security are threatened.

In my judgment if this is done it will be an important step toward maintaining world peace.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, this is a timely and important resolution. I am strongly in favor of it. Strong approval by Congress of the principle of an international police force will demonstrate to the world this Nation's unswerving dedication to peace and our willingness to explore all means for preserving peace. It will back up the President's endorsement of this idea.

Perhaps never before in the history of the world was there greater need for calm, objective, and broadminded thought on this possible avenue for helping to achieve a more just and secure international order. It is a time which demands that all nations of good will demonstrate their ability to see the broader picture and to contribute wholeheartedly to all efforts to prevent war and promote world harmony. I think it is extremely important that we approve this resolution to show the whole world that the United States does have the breadth of vision and the sincere desire necessary to preserve mankind from destruction.

Right here in our own hemisphere we have witnessed an example of how cooperative efforts in international security can pay large dividends in terms of friendly relations and absence of warfare. All the peace-loving nations of the world would do well to examine with care the experience of the nations of South America in carrying out their self-imposed system of inter-American policing.

Operating through a collective defense pact, commonly known as the Rio Treaty, and through the machinery of the Organization of American States, this policing program has been in large measure both effective and generally acceptable. By means of voting sanctions, of dispatching investigating committees, and of careful use of military observers, the nations of Latin America have successfully nipped in the bud a number of potentially incendiary situations among nations of this area.

One reason the Rio Treaty has operated so successfully is that it provides a flexible system of inter-American policing which tailors the means to the situation. The fact that sanctions can be imposed up to and including the use of collective armed forces has had the effect of eliminating the danger of aggression among the neighbors of this section of the world. In addition, the Americas have coordinated their policies to defend themselves against any extra-hemisphere threat. Since the end of World War II no other nations in the world have enjoyed the freedom from fear of aggression from their neighbors and the world as have the Americas.

When the United Nations was organized in 1945 procedures similar in many respects to the inter-American system were envisaged for maintaining peace. The U. N. idea, based on certain fundamental principles, provided procedures for peaceful settlement and for arriving at decisions to enforce the peace. This idea also anticipated the creation of forces to maintain the peace when the use of force became necessary.

It soon became apparent, however, that there was a fundamental division within the United Nations between nations which cherished their independence and desired a stable international order, and the power ambitions and aggressive ideology of the Soviet bloc. This expansionist combination succeeded in subverting and taking over a long list of independent governments. The result was that political consensus, the necessary base for any international policing action, was absent in the world community. Attempts to create world collective security by agreement among the great powers were thus doomed to failure from the start.

However, repeated efforts were made to gain approval of some sort of world-wide army to help maintain order and security. Whenever fighting has started or is threatened in some sector of the world, agitation has begun afresh for the creation of a U. N. army to be dispatched to the scene to calm the troubled situation. These proposals always revive whenever—as in the instance of Korea, Hungary, Egypt, or the present Middle East crisis—the need becomes too obvious and too urgent to ignore.

One extremely useful precedent has been provided in the case of the United Nations Emergency Force, which has done so much to maintain stability and peace in areas of acute tension between Egypt and Israel. The relative success of this force in patrolling the uneasy cease-fire has drawn praise from many governments. Its long-range value, however, can best be measured in terms of the use to which the time gained will be put to solve the complex problems afflicting that area, and the use to which we can put the experience gained by this adventure in international policing.

The 13 years of experience in the United Nations has demonstrated conclusively that politically speaking, it is a house divided. A gulf separates those nations which believe in the U. N. Charter principle of independence and those which in practice deny that principle—which really believe in a Communist world hegemony, controlled and directed from Moscow and Peking. The Soviet Union has demonstrated it will do all within its power to exclude from its captive domain any international policing action, even to the extent of barring an investigating committee, such as in the case of Hungary in 1956.

Most recently, of course, the Soviet conspiracy has blocked efforts to organize and dispatch a U. N. peace force to the troubled Middle East, in an effort to calm the potentially explosive situation there. However, this barrier to world unanimity on an international police force should not discourage us. We should not regard the opposition of the Soviet Union to these peace efforts as an insurmountable barrier. We should press forward with all the vigor at our command to gain support for this principle from all men of good will who sincerely desire peace. On the other hand, I believe we are completely justified in questioning the motives of those nations of the world who, by their intransigent attitude, have repeatedly blocked attempts to create the international force which may well represent a key to the future peace of the world.

The United States most recently through the President's General Assembly address, has repeatedly demonstrated its willingness to participate in an international army for peace. That willingness can be decisively reaffirmed by our approval of House Concurrent Resolution 373 today.

Certainly recent developments in the Near East provide sufficient demonstration of the tremendous need for some sort of a peace force. It should, of course, be under the control of the United Nations, ready to move instantly in case of an international emergency at the request of a member government which believes itself threatened by outside aggression.

In a world contracted by speedy communications, in a world in which even the smallest nations possess the terribly destructive weapons of modern war, any international disturbance—however localized—can spread like a plague and thus present a real threat to world stability. The only feasible answer to this challenge to the peace of the world is to provide a U. N. force capable of so spreading a U. N. mantle over an embattled state as to inhibit—if not directly to prevent—a coup d'etat, infiltration by indirect aggression, or other untoward pressures from outside the Nation, such as we have witnessed recently in the Near East.

A U. N. police force need not be a huge, all-powerful army. It might not number more than 50,000 or 60,000. It might perhaps be found best to establish a firm nucleus at all times centered under one command, with other forces in the individual countries, available upon call.

It is my firm conviction that the smaller nations of the world must form the backbone of any international force. This will prevent the bigger powers running the risk of being dragged into a nuclear conflict which could doom all mankind.

Such an international police army could not—and should not—fight wars. It could not prevent isolated assassinations planned by outside aggressors such as we have recently witnessed.

But a permanent U. N. police force can serve as an effective deterrent to hostilities, could be a focus for the moral opinion of the world, and could serve numerous practical uses in observation, patrol, and guard duty between potentially hostile states.

Certainly, in the light of the dangers inherent in man's vast technological and material progress, we must search with imagination and foresight for the an-

swers to the enigmas of world peace. Today we have too little of either—at a time when we stand in desperate need of both.

There has been sufficient study and experience concerning an international police force. There is plenty of evidence to show how great a factor it could be in preserving peace. No nation of good will can in good conscience oppose the creation of such a force.

The time is running short. Each new crisis brings us closer to the potential horrors of a World War III. The next international brush fire may set off that worldwide conflagration if the nations of the world do not rise to the occasion.

A permanent United Nations police force provides a new, decisive means by which the nations of the world which sincerely believe in peace can provide the machinery to quarantine regional conflicts and thus better insure their solution. The resolution before us provides a tangible means for this body to signify support of this key means to preserve the peace of the world.

I want to commend the committee for its diligence in reporting out this measure at this most pertinent time. I urge its resounding approval by this body. By our action today we will place the people of America squarely behind the goal of a permanent United Nations peace force—one of the strong sure hopes for the peace for which all men of good will hope and pray.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to remark that we have just listened to one of the last speeches in this Chamber of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], who in two decades of service on the Committee on Foreign Affairs has made a contribution to his country that will be remembered in history. I am supporting the resolution sponsored and so eloquently presented by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN], but I am supporting it all the more ardently because its passage is urged by the gentleman from Ohio in one of his last appearances in the well of the House.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, there could not be a better time for the House to express itself in favor of a United Nations police force, as envisaged by House Concurrent Resolution 373. Because of President Eisenhower's constructive program for the Middle East advanced before the United Nations General Assembly last week, Congressional backing needs to be expressed. In a statement before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on July 24, 1958, in support of a United Nations police force, I said:

> The duties of such a force would be as much moral as military. It could police a disputed area as does the present United Nations emergency force in Egypt and Israel. It could act as a border patrol as does the present United Nations observation group in Lebanon. By being in existence beforehand, it could avoid hasty improvisation after damaging unilateral action has been taken.
>
> The resolution is particularly timely because a United Nations police force could be the cornerstone of a more constructive policy for the Middle East. Immediately, I would hope that U. N. Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold's proposal to augment the observation group now in Lebanon is speedily implemented to prevent infiltration of the borders of Lebanon, and that our United States forces can be withdrawn. But a permanent United Nations police force is necessary so that further action to maintain order in the Middle East, or elsewhere, could be taken under the moral authority of the United Nations.
>
> A permanent United Nations police force should be accompanied by two other United Nations policies which it is high time we supported and brought into being—a United Nations Middle East Development Authority, to channel economic aid to the Middle East on a basis that involves a community of countries both on the giving and receiving end; and a United Nations Commission to regulate and keep down the flow of arms into the Middle East, from whatever source.
>
> We should accompany this U. N. action for a police force, for arms control, and for economic aid in the Middle East, by making clear that we recognize the need and desire of the Arab world for a place in the sun, and that instead of fighting Arab nationalism we hope to channel it constructively. We should make clear that the oil wealth of the Middle East need present no problem—they need to sell it to the West, and the West needs to buy from them. To the extent that its benefits can be spread through all the countries of the Arab world, and through all ranks of Arab society, so much the better. Our continued determination to defend Israel from attack need in no way detract from our determination to meet the basic Arab desire for dignity and progress. If this new policy requires us to concentrate less on rulers and more on the masses of people, that, too, seems in keeping with the American tradition.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that House Concurrent Resolution 373 will pass by an overwhelming vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing Senate Concurrent Resolution 109 as amended?

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that in the opinion of the Chair two-thirds had voted in the affirmative.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present. The doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant-at-Arms will notify absent members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 299, nays 20, answering "present" 1, not voting 109, as follows:

[Roll No. 189]

YEAS—299

Abbitt	Baker	Bosch
Abernethy	Baldwin	Bow
Adair	Baring	Boyle
Addonizio	Barrett	Bray
Albert	Bass, N. H.	Breeding
Alexander	Bass, Tenn.	Brooks, Tex.
Allen, Calif.	Bates	Broomfield
Allen, Ill.	Becker	Brown, Ga.
Andersen, H. Carl	Beckworth	Brown, Mo.
	Belcher	Brown, Ohio
Anderson, Mont.	Bennett, Fla.	Broyhill
	Bennett, Mich.	Budge
Andrews	Berry	Burleson
Anfuso	Betts	Bush
Arends	Blatnik	Byrd
Ashmore	Boggs	Byrne, Ill.
Aspinall	Boland	Byrne, Pa.
Auchincloss	Boiling	Byrnes, Wis.
Ayres	Bolton	Canfield
Bailey	Bonner	Cannon
Carnahan	Holtzman	Price
Carrigg	Horan	Quie
Cederberg	Huddleston	Rabaut
Celler	Hull	Ray
Chamberlain	Hyde	Reece, Tenn.
Chelf	Ikard	Reed
Chenoweth	Jackson	Rees, Kans.
Chiperfield	Jarman	Reuss
Church	Jennings	Rhodes, Ariz.
Coad	Jonas	Rhodes, Pa.
Collier	Jones, Ala.	Riehlman
Cooley	Judd	Riley
Corbett	Karsten	Roberts
Cramer	Keating	Robeson, Va.
Cretella	Kee	Robison, N. Y.
Cunningham, Iowa	Kelly, N. Y.	Robsion, Ky.
	Kilday	Rodino
Curtin	Kilgore	Rogers, Colo.
Curtis, Mass.	King	Rogers, Fla.
Curtis, Mo.	Kirwan	Rogers, Mass.
Dague	Knox	Rogers, Tex.
Dawson, Ill.	Knutson	Rooney
Dawson, Utah	Lafore	Rutherford
Delaney	Laird	Sadlak
Dellay	Lane	Santangelo
Dennison	Lankford	St. George
Dent	Lesinski	Saund
Denton	Libonati	Saylor
Devereux	Lipscomb	Schenck
Diggs	Loser	Scherer
Dingell	McDonough	Scrivener
Dixon	McFall	Scudder
Donohue	McGovern	Seely-Brown
Dooley	McIntosh	Selden
Dorn, N. Y.	Mack, Ill.	Sheppard
Dwyer	Mack, Wash.	Sieminski
Edmondson	Madden	Sikes
Elliott	Magnuson	Siler
Everett	Mahon	Simpson, Ill.
Evins	Mailliard	Sisk
Fallon	Marshall	Smith, Miss.
Fascell	Martin	Smith, Va.
Feighan	Matthews	Springer
Fenton	May	Staggers
Fino	Meader	Sullivan
Fisher	Merrow	Taber
Flood	Michel	Talle
Fogarty	Miller, Md.	Teague, Calif.
Forand	Miller, Nebr.	Teller
Ford	Mills	Tewes
Fountain	Montoya	Thompson, N. J.
Frazier	Moore	Thompson, Tex.
Fulton	Morano	Thomson, Wyo.
Gary	Morgan	Thornberry
Gathings	Morris	Tollefson
Gavin	Moss	Trimble
Granahan	Moulder	Tuck
Grant	Multer	Udall
Gray	Mumma	Ullman
Green, Oreg.	Murray	Van Zandt
Green, Pa.	Natcher	Vorys
Griffin	Neal	Vursell
Griffiths	Nimtz	Walter
Gubser	Nix	Watts
Gwinn	Norblad	Weaver
Hagen	O'Brien, Ill.	Westland
Haley	O'Brien, N. Y.	Wharton
Halleck	O'Hara, Ill.	Whitener
Harden	O'Konski	Widnall
Hardy	Ostertag	Wier
Harris	Patman	Wigglesworth
Harrison, Va.	Patterson	Willis
Haskell	Pelly	Wilson, Calif.
Hays, Ark.	Perkins	Wilson, Ind.
Hays, Ohio	Pfost	Withrow
Heselton	Philbin	Wolverton
Hiestand	Pillion	Wright
Hoeven	Poage	Yates
Holland	Poff	Younger
Holmes	Polk	Zablocki
Holt	Porter	

NAYS—20

Davis, Ga.	Johansen	Scott, N. C.
Dorn, S. C.	Kitchin	Smith, Calif.
Dowdy	Krueger	Smith, Kans.
Flynt	Landrum	Utt
Forrester	Lennon	Van Pelt
Gross	Nicholson	Williams, Miss.
Hemphill	O'Hara, Minn.	

ANSWERING "PRESENT"—1

Alger

NOT VOTING—109

Ashley	Buckley	Davis, Tenn.
Avery	Burdick	Derounian
Barden	Christopher	Dies
Baumhart	Clark	Dollinger
Beamer	Clevenger	Doyle
Bentley	Coffin	Durham
Blitch	Colmer	Eberharter
Boykin	Coudert	Engle
Brooks, La.	Cunningham, Nebr.	Farbstein
Brownson		Frelinghuysen

Friedel	Keogh	Prouty
Garmatz	Kilburn	Radwan
George	Kluczynski	Rains
Glenn	Latham	Rivers
Gordon	LeCompte	Roosevelt
Gregory	McCarthy	Schwengel
Hale	McCormack	Scott, Pa.
Harrison, Nebr.	McCulloch	Sheehan
Harvey	McGregor	Shelley
Healey	McIntire	Shuford
Hébert	McMillan	Simpson, Pa.
Henderson	Macdonald	Spence
Herlong	Machrowicz	Stauffer
Hess	Mason	Steed
Hill	Metcalf	Taylor
Hillings	Miller, Calif.	Teague, Tex.
Hoffman	Miller, N. Y.	Thomas
Holifield	Minshall	Thompson, La.
Hosmer	Mitchell	Vanik
James	Morrison	Vinson
Jenkins	Norrell	Wainwright
Jensen	O'Neill	Whitten
Johnson	Osmers	Williams, N. Y.
Jones, Mo.	Passman	Winstead
Kean	Pilcher	Young
Kearney	Powell	Zelenko
Kearns	Preston	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Baumhart.
Mr. Healey with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Friedel with Mr. Kean.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Glenn.
Mr. Preston with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mrs. Blitch with Mr. Henderson.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. McGregor.
Mr. Brooks of Louisiana with Mr. Derounian.
Mr. Teague with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Young with Mr. George.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Harrison of Nebraska.
Mr. Winstead with Mr. Hale.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Sheehan.
Mr. Coffin with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Doyle with Mr. Jensen.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Kearns.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Engle with Mr. Stauffer.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. McIntire.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Hillings.
Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Bentley.
Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Machrowicz with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Beamer.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Avery.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Scott of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Prouty.
Mr. Durham with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Wainwright.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Brownson.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Clevenger.
Mr. Johnson with Mr. James.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Hill.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Williams of New York.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Cunningham of Nebraska.
Mr. Barden with Mr. Jenkins.
Mr. Vanik with Mr. Schwengel.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Radwan.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Thomas with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Metcalf with Mr. LeCompte.

Mr. REES of Kansas changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. UTT changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

S. 3021

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 3021) for the relief of Stanislawa Wojczul be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

CONSIDERATION OF INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL TOMORROW UNDER SUSPENSION OF THE RULES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker tomorrow to recognize for a motion to suspend the rules and pass the independent offices appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

HOUSE LEADERSHIP FAILURE TO PERMIT CONSIDERATION OF ADEQUATE ANTIRACKETEERING LABOR LEGISLATION BEFORE ADJOURNMENT SHOULD RESULT IN THE PRESIDENT'S CALL OF A SPECIAL SESSION OF CONGRESS TO MEET THIS CRITICAL LEGISLATIVE PROBLEM

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this opint in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and written about the Kennedy-Ives bill and the refusal of the House to be stampeded into accepting the politically inspired, take-it-or-leave-it, labor dictated and labor whitewash of racketeering within the unions.

I favor strong antiracketeering labor legislation that fully carries out the recommendations of the McClellan committee and incorporates the labor reform recommendations the President has made unsuccessfully to Congress for years. The Kennedy-Ives bill does neither but rather is a surrender to the demands of Walter Reuther, and would amount to the condonation of the atrocities of such unscrupulous labor bosses as Jimmy Hoffa.

The shortcomings of the bill, which was brought up under a rule that permitted only 40 minutes of debate on a 48-page bill after the bill had been held by the Democrat Speaker on his desk without opportunity for committee consideration for 40 days and 40 nights, and under a rule that excluded amendments to strengthen the bill, are so numerous that no conscientious legislator could swallow it.

Some of the inadequacies are:

First. That the bill did not carry out the labor reform recommendations of the McClellan committee and thus would not have gotten rid of the Hoffas and the racketeering in unions.

Second. That the bill had no enforcement sanctions on unions that retain officers who file false or misleading financial reports to the Secretary of Labor.

Third. That the bill failed to provide for democratic elections by union members on matters vital to them.

Fourth. It tried to preempt the whole field of State labor laws, completely overturning States rights and responsibilities in this field, and overburdening the NLRB with work not administered in the States.

Fifth. It did not outlaw organizational or racketeer picketing even in cases when the parties to a dispute did not want such picketing.

Sixth. It did nothing to tighten up inadequate secondary boycott provisions of the present law.

Seventh. It placed management under penalty of $10,000 fine for any action that might be construed as favoring the employee when the timing of such action coincided with union attempts to organize his employees, thus denying employees of many benefits otherwise obtainable.

Eighth. It provided for no penalties for improper union leadership activities by only requiring reporting and disclosure of such activities to the Secretary of Labor, with no power in the Secretary to penalize improper activities.

Ninth. It failed to provide for guarantee of trust funds against labor leader raiding by setting such funds up as trust funds.

From this, it can be clearly seen that the bill needed strengthening and clarification, particularly in the light of the fact that the Senate debated the bill for 5 days and added 28 amendments on the floor, none of which had been studied and carefully prepared after adequate hearings.

I refuse to be a party to the liberal Democrat-Labor conspiracy to fool the people of this country who have arisen in righteous and rightful indignation over the racketeering disclosures before the McClellan committee into settling for this whitewash of labor racketeering approach. Surely, to pass this milktoast bill this session would prevent effective legislation.

I cannot too strongly urge the leadership of the House to permit the Members of Congress who are devotedly interested in strong antiracketeering legislation to vote on a bill this session, under a rule that permits full debate and needed strengthening amendments. To deny Members the opportunity to so legislate is to deny the millions of Americans who have not been taken in by the Reuthers, the ADA and the liberal prolabor Democrats by their propaganda drive to pass a weak whitewash bill, the Kennedy-Ives bill, their right to be represented in Congress.

I call upon the House leaders to exercise responsible leadership and to report the Senate bill under an open rule this session. If the leadership refuses to do this, I am prepared to and intend to use every persuasive effort to prevail on the President to call a special session to consider this matter at the earliest possible date.

CODE OF MILITARY LAW

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 8943) to amend titles 10, 14, and 32, United States Code, to codify recent military law, and to improve the code, with Senate amendments thereto, and ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the Senate amendments or their printing in the RECORD, and that the Senate amendments be concurred in.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to dispensing with the printing of the Senate amendments in the RECORD?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana to concur in the Senate amendments?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VENUE IN TAX REFUND SUITS

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9817) relating to venue in tax refund suits by corporations, together with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 2, lines 1 and 2, after "business" insert "or principal office or agency."

Page 2, lines 2 and 3, after "business" insert "or principal office or agency."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain what this bill is?

Mr. WILLIS. This bill has to do with jurisdiction in tax refund cases. The gentleman will remember that there is confusion under present law as to where an action may be brought for tax refunds by corporations. The bill as we passed it would have required that the venue be in the district where the principal office or business was conducted. The Senate amendment simply adds the phrase "or agency."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF CERTAIN UNITED STATES AND FOREIGN OBLIGATIONS AND SECURITIES

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9370) to permit illustrations and films of United States and foreign obligations and securities under certain circumstances, and for other purposes, together with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 2, line 13, after "illustrations" insert ", except those of stamps."

Page 2, line 16, strike out "stamp or other."

Page 2, line 18, after "their" insert "final."

Page 2, line 20, strike out "except" and insert "but not."

Page 2, line 21, after "purposes" insert "except philatelic advertising."

Page 3, line 15, after "to," insert "uncanceled."

Page 3, line 16, strike out "canceled or."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the Senate amendments?

Mr. WILLIS. The effect of the Senate amendments generally is as follows:

The purpose of the first and second amendments is to continue in effect the situation under existing law whereby foreign stamps may be illustrated for certain purposes and under certain conditions without limitation as to the size of the illustrations. Illustrations of United States stamps would also be permitted in the same manner. With respect to the latter, illustrations at the present time are limited under regulations issued pursuant to the section being amended to a size less than three-quarters or more than 1½ the size of the genuine stamp. Representations have been made to this committee by philatelists and stamp dealers that postage stamp albums, catalogs, and other literature now in existence contain illustrations of foreign postage stamps in exact size as permitted under existing law, which publications would become subject to forfeiture if the bill became law in the form that it passed the House. Therefore, these amendments are designed to correct that situation. Moreover, the amendments to paragraph (1) of the first section of the bill would remove the existing size restrictions with respect to the illustration of United States stamps, inasmuch as there appears to be no logical reason to retain this restriction. The Treasury Department has indicated it has no objection to these amendments.

The purpose of the third amendment is to make clear that it would not be necessary to destroy negatives and plates used in making the illustrations that would be permitted until after their final use. The committee has been informed that plates used to make stamp albums, for example, are used several times over during a period of time and the amendment would remove any possible doubt as to whether that practice can be continued.

The purpose of the fourth and fifth amendments is to permit the filming of stamps for advertising purposes. Postage stamp dealers have pointed out that without these amendments, they would be unable to show pictures of their products, that is, postage stamps, in advertising on such mediums as television. Since a special exception is made under existing law which permits illustrations of stamps in connection with advertising in printed publications, it would appear logical to permit such use in other mediums which have been developed since the original enactment of the prohibitions.

The purpose of the sixth and seventh amendments is to limit the definition contained in section 3 of the bill to uncanceled stamps of foreign governments whether or not demonetized. One of the principal practical effects of section 3 of the bill as referred to this committee would have been to prohibit completely colored illustrations of foreign postage stamps. Philatelists and stamp dealers have made strong representations to the committee that the complete prohibition of colored illustrations would have a highly adverse effect upon the stamp industry, particularly in the promotion of the sale of stamps through the use of colored illustrations of stamps. The Treasury Department, at whose instance this legislation was introduced, has contended, on the other hand, that United States and foreign postage stamps should receive uniform treatment under the laws of the United States and that whether or not an act is criminal under our laws should not depend on the law or act of a foreign government. These amendments are a compromise between those two positions, and one of its principal practical effects would be to permit the use of colored illustrations of canceled stamps of foreign governments. Under the amendments to section 3, it would not be necessary for the Treasury Department to resort to the law or acts of a foreign country, as it would be possible to determine the legality of a reproduction by whether or not it was cancel on its face. The amendments proposed to the new section 15 of title 18, United States Code, will have the effect of removing canceled foreign stamps from the purview of section 504 and, therefore, it will be possible to freely illustrate canceled foreign stamps in color for any legitimate purpose.

The purpose of the proposed legislation, as amended, is to—

(1) Permit black and white illustrations of revenue stamps of the United States for philatelic and numismatic purposes;

(2) Permit black and white illustrations of United States and foreign paper money and other obligations and securities for educational, historical, and newsworthy purposes; and

(3) Permit motion picture films, microfilms, and slides of United States and foreign postage and revenue stamps, paper money, and other obligations and securities, except films in connection with advertising. The proposed legislation would also amend existing law to make clear that uncanceled foreign postage and revenue stamps are obligations and securities of foreign governments

within the meaning of the counterfeiting statutes of the United States.

The Department of the Treasury submitted a draft of this proposal and recommended its enactment. That Department will have initial responsibility for the administration of these provisions.

Section 1 of the bill is divided into two parts. Paragraph (1) will permit the printing, publishing, or importation of black and white illustrations of postage, revenue stamps, and other obligations and securities of the United States and of a foreign government, bank, or corporation for philatelic, numismatic, educational, historical, or news-worthy purposes in articles, books, journals, newspapers, or albums; but not for advertising purposes except illustrations of stamps and paper money in the advertising of legitimate dealers in stamps or coins or of publishers or dealers in philatelic or numismatic articles, books, etc.

Such illustrations may not, except as to stamps, be of the same size of the matter which they illustrate but must be of a size either less than three-fourths or more than 1½ in linear dimension of each part of such stamp, obligation, or security. The negatives and plates used in making the illustrations must be destroyed after final use.

Paragraph (2) permits the making or importation, except for advertising purposes, of film, microfilms, etc., for use on a screen or telecast of postage or revenue stamps and other obligations and securities of the United States and of a foreign government, bank, or corporation. No reproductions may be made from such films, etc., under this paragraph without the permission of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Section 2 of the bill is a drafting provision and amends the chapter analysis of chapter 25 of title 18 of the United States Code to reflect the change made in the catchline to the revised section of the code set out in section 1 of the bill.

Section 3 contains a definition of the term "obligation or other security of any foreign government" so as to include uncanceled stamps of foreign governments whether or not demonetized.

Section 4 of the bill, like section 2, is a drafting provision, and amends the chapter analysis of chapter 1, title 18 of the code to reflect the catchline of the new section 15 of title 18 as set forth in section 3 of the bill.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORTS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill S. 3420, to extend and amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill S. 1411 to amend the act of August 26, 1950, relating to the suspension of employment of civilian personnel of the United States in the interest of national security.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

SCIENCE CLUBS FOR BOYS AND GIRLS

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 13191 to require the Commissioner of Education to encourage, foster, and assist in the establishment of clubs for boys and girls especially interested in science.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has the gentleman cleared this with the gentleman from Minnesota who objected to this bill last evening?

Mr. WRIGHT. I have cleared it with the leadership and with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I might say that I did not object to the bill last night. I asked that the bill be put over until today for consideration.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman one question. This provides for an annual appropriation of $50,000. Does the gentleman think this will go on indefinitely? Can we have some assurance from the gentleman that this appropriation of $50,000 will not be sought indefinitely?

Mr. WRIGHT. It is not anticipated that this will be an indefinite authorization. It is only an authorization, and, of course, the appropriations will have to be approved individually. It is anticipated by the committee that this charter for the future scientists of America will be about the same as the farm clubs of America and there will be no need to continue this.

Mr. GROSS. It is anticipated that within a reasonable time the appropriation will cease?

Mr. WRIGHT. That is true.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to strengthen future scientific accomplishment in our Nation by assisting in the development of a body of boys and girls with a special interest in science, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each fiscal year thereafter, such sums, not in excess of $50,000, as may be necessary to enable the Commissioner of Education to encourage, foster, and assist in the establishment in localities throughout the Nation of clubs which are composed of boys and girls who have an especial interest in science.

SEC. 2. (a) The Commissioner of Education shall carry out his duties under the first section with a view to the ultimate chartering by the Congress of a corporation, similar to the Future Farmers of America, which will seek to—

(1) develop an interest in science on the part of the young people of America.

(2) provide an opportunity for the exchange of scientific information and ideas among members of the clubs,

(3) encourage the promotion of science fairs at which members of the clubs may display their scientific works and projects, and

(4) develop an awareness of the satisfactions to be derived through a career devoted to science.

(b) The Commissioner of Education may utilize any of the personnel and facilities of the Office of Education in carrying out this act.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has been shocked and alarmed by the recent disclosures that Russia not only is closing the scientific gap which long existed between our two countries but, in terms of graduates in the scientific and technological fields, actually is outstripping us.

This bodes ill for the future. It indicates that, unless we can discover means to stimulate and encourage the development of the inherent intellectual capacities of our youth, another generation may awaken to a world in which complete scientific mastery will lie in the hands of a godless colossus.

It could be fatal for unchallenged scientific supremacy to fall to such a nation, devoid of the humanities and the sense of decent restraint which, in the interest of the future of mankind, must be the inseparable companions of scientific discovery.

It therefore devolves upon us to discover and develop the means, within the framework of our traditional Democratic society, to accelerate scientific inquiry among our youth to the end that we may keep pace and either retain or regain the leadership in this vital field.

This bill is an attempt to discover one such efficacious approach.

THE PROBLEM

Verifiable reports have made us aware of enormously increased emphasis upon basic scientific studies in the Soviet public schools and of rapidly increasing numbers of scientists and engineers being graduated annually by Soviet colleges. One major aspect of this achievement, when compared with our own situation, is the deadly serious manner in which the Russian teenager has been induced to regard his studies. The reports disclose that the Soviet student in the secondary schools is frequently studying until late at night and 6 days each week to master the 4 years of advanced mathematics, physics, chemistry, and so forth, which are required of him.

While it is true that these schools are regimented, totalitarian, and humorless, we would make a serious mistake to underestimate their efficiency. It is by means of these mental sweatshops that Russia has, in just 30 years, emerged from almost 75 percent illiteracy—about equal to Indochina—to one of the two

really great powers on earth. The illiteracy rate in the Soviet Union today is estimated to be between 2.5 percent and 5 percent which does not compare badly with our own rate of about 2.5 percent today.

We would not imitate their basic educational system which is shaped solely in the interest of the State and in complete disregard of the needs of the individual child, but only at our peril would we ignore the basic fact that Russia has made the rewards of intellectual accomplishment so attractive that her youth are working with extreme diligence to keep up with an extraordinarily difficult curriculum. They have managed to provide incentives which induce all their children to stretch their intellectual capacities to the utmost.

As of the present moment, our reservoir of technicians and scientists is larger than theirs, but while our public schools appear to be decelerating in this field and emphasizing such things as ballroom dancing and driver education, the Russians are gaining by leaps and bounds. In the past year, Soviet college graduates in the technical, scientific, and engineering fields exceeded ours by almost 2 to 1:

THE AIM

Our aim in light of this situation must be twofold. First, we must manage to stimulate and encourage more studious application to scientific studies in our public schools and to do this within the basic framework of our democratic school system.

Secondly, we must contrive a means of locating the gifted students with inclinations in this direction at a relatively early age and provide an early method of challenging their latent interests and channeling their energies into projects and courses of constructive study.

We would lose the fundamental thing we seek to protect if we were merely to mimic the Soviet method of dangling material financial reward in the faces of relatively impoverished students and ordering them to exert their utmost energies. To achieve these aims in the traditional American way, we must cause the scientifically inclined student to want to achieve by creating a program in which he can experience the thrill of achievement and find prestige in the eyes of his contemporaries.

THE METHOD

In devising a workable method to realize this aim, it seems to me that we can build upon our own experience. In the Vocational Agriculture program, we have successfully challenged and stimulated many hundreds of thousands of American youngsters to achievement which they otherwise would not have attained.

In essence this proposal is simple. It would provide for the scientifically adapted students in all the communities throughout our Nation the same essential type of program which was provided for the depression stricken farm youngsters in our agriculture communities as early as 1936 by the Vocational Agriculture and Home Economics legislation.

The Vocational Agriculture program has worked with considerable success through some 10,000 secondary schools in the small cities and agricultural areas throughout the United States. It has given the farm-oriented youngster a pride in self-improvement, a sense of belonging, and a program in which he and his friends may work together and experience the real fun of accomplishment on after-school projects which they themselves have selected with the approval of their vocational agriculture instructors.

In this way, this familiar program has stimulated youthful achievement and demonstrated the actual pleasure of accomplishment to the youthful mind by lifting this level of activity above the often dull and prosaic level of classroom assignments. Under this program, local clubs have been sponsored in which teenage youngsters have found acceptance in the eyes of their fellow students by outstanding accomplishment. Fairs have been sponsored at which the students from different schools have proudly displayed their projects. At these fairs a sense of healthy interscholastic competition has been developed, and the youngsters have known the thrill of representing their schools in such competitions.

That the program has found acceptance with the students themselves is known by anyone who has had close associations in the rural communities of our nation and seen the youngsters proudly wearing the packets and displaying the emblems which they have won by their own achievements.

I would envision a similar program to avail the nation of the scientific interests of our youth by similarly encouraging local clubs of Future Scientists of America—FSA—along the general pattern that the Future Farmers of America—FFA—have so successfully developed.

If interscholastic competitions should result at science fairs throughout the nation, studious youngsters might begin to know the thrill and the incentive which today impel most American boys to want to develop skill and mastery in such sports as football, basketball, etc.

To put it simply and perhaps a bit facetiously, I believe we need to develop a climate in which "cheer leaders for slide rule teams" would not be so farfetched a notion as it would appear to be today.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

D. A. WHITAKER AND OTHERS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 9950) for the relief of D. A. Whitaker and others, with Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 4, after line 6, insert:

"Nothing contained in this act shall be construed as an implication of liability on the part of the Government of the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRY N. DUFF

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1695) for the relief of Harry N. Duff, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 10, after "act." insert "The enactment of this act shall not be construed as any inference of liability on the part of the Government of the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VALIDATING OVERPAYMENTS OF PAY AND ALLOWANCES MADE TO CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE ARMY, NAVY, NAVAL RESERVE, AND AIR FORCE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3366) to validate overpayments of pay and allowances made to certain officers of the Army, Navy, Naval Reserve, and Air Force, while undergoing training at civilian hospitals, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, lines 8 and 9, and page 2, line 1, strike out "received compensation from that hospital (including meals and living quarters in kind)."

Page 2, line 1, after "such" insert "compensation."

Page 2, line 5, after "as" insert "such compensation."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VIVIAN D. GIESEY

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3287) for the relief of Vivian D. Giesey.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the

gentleman if the Department report on this bill is favorable or unfavorable?

Mr. LANE. I may say to the gentleman from Virginia that this comes in with the approval of the Civil Service Commission. This is a rather unique case and they have placed their stamp of approval on it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Civil Service Commission is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the civil service retirement and disability fund, to Vivian D. Giesey, an annuity equal to the annuity which she would have received under the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, if her husband, William C. Giesey, had continued to serve as an employee of the United States until his death on September 29, 1954, and had retired on that date, the said William C. Giesey having served as an employee of the United States for approximately 20 years until he was separated from Federal employment on July 31, 1954.

(b) There shall be deducted and withheld from the annuity authorized under the first section of this act an amount equal to the amount of any refund of contributions which have been made on account of the death of the said William C. Giesey.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TOWN OF PORTSMOUTH, R. I.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2836) for the relief of the town of Portsmouth, R. I.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the town of Portsmouth, R. I., the sum of $3,433.50, representing the amount due such town from the Public Housing Administration as payments in lieu of taxes for projects RI–1–D–1 and RI–2–D–1, Melville Trailer Park, Portsmouth, R. I., for the period between February 1, 1956, and August 31, 1956: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANE: On page 1, line 6, strike out the following: "the amount due such town from the Public Housing Administration as."

Page 1, line 11, strike out the following: "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE DENIAL OF PASSPORTS

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in this morning's Washington Post purported to analyze a bill on the denial of passports sponsored by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] and myself.

The bill clearly sets forth in section 5 a Congressional finding that the international Communist movement is dedicated to weakening and ultimately dominating the United States; that it constitutes a clear, present, and continuing danger to the security of the United States; and that its agents and supporters use passports to promote the objectives of international communism. For these reasons the bill provides that passports may be denied, and I repeat, may be denied, to such individuals.

Recent court decision noted the lack of legislation authorizing the Secretary of State to deny passports to Communists or Communist supporters. This bill is designed to fill that gap.

The editorial refers to the bill as dubious legislation. Are the objectives of the Communists dubious? Are the means by which they seek to achieve these objectives dubious?

Those who helped perfect this bill were fully mindful of the rights of individuals as well as the security of the United States. The bill lists three categories of persons to whom the Secretary of State may deny a passport: (1) a member or former member of the Communist Party; (2) an individual who is affiliated with the Communist Party; (3) an individual who knowingly engages or has engaged since 1948 in activities intended to further the international Communist movement.

Note, however, that two important qualifications are in the bill. First, it must be determined that the activities or presence abroad of the individuals listed in these three categories would be harmful to the security of the United States. Second, the denial of the passport, as I have already indicated, is not mandatory. The Secretary is authorized to deny passports.

The date 1948 was included because it was that year that Czechoslovakia fell to the Communists. That event made clear to everyone, including most editorial writers, the real nature of the Communist conspiracy. Finally, the bill provides for an administrative review before a passport can be denied. If the passport is denied, the bill provides for a court review.

The issue involved in drafting legislation of this type may be expressed rather simply, namely, to balance the rights of the individual against those of the country to protect itself not from some theoretical attack but from a very real and evident danger.

If the editorial writer thinks there is no such danger, he will undoubtedly write followup editorials advocating the elimination of United States Information Agency, a heavy reduction in our military expenditures and in our Mutual Security Program.

The purposes, the guaranties, and the restrictions in this bill are clear. The editorial writer, not the bill, has fuzzy restrictions.

DR. ERNEST S. GRIFFITH

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD, to be followed by the remarks of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PORTER], the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORANO].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Dr. Ernest S. Griffith, who will retire this fall as Director of the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress. Dr. Griffith leaves the Hill to assume the deanship of the School of International Service at American University. We heartily congratulate him as he transfers his courageous leadership to another highly responsible position, but we are deeply sorry to lose his keen judgment and tireless energies in behalf of the Congress.

Dr. Griffith came to the Legislative Reference Service in 1940 and the high recommendations which preceded him were not overstatements. His value to the Members of the House and Senate, their office and committee staffs, steadily increased as he pushed forward to fulfill the obligations of LRS to the Congress.

I recommend that each Member of this body read with discernment the memorandum which Dr. Griffith prepared on the achievements, problems, potential, and recommendations of the Legislative Reference Service. This document was printed on July 1 by the Committee on House Administration. There is much food for thought in Dr. Griffith's valedictory. Throughout this report, and likewise throughout his career with us, he has placed emphasis on the fact that Congress is the key decision-making institution of the Nation.

Dr. Griffith was born in Utica, N. Y., the son of George and Elizabeth Stacey Griffith. His father died when he was seven and his schoolteacher mother directed her efforts to give her family the best of knowledge and the highest ideals.

It was from an atmosphere of honesty, scholarly thought, and love for his fellow man that Dr. Griffith entered Hamilton College, where he received the A. B. degree. He was appointed a Rhodes scholar and received his Ph. D. degree from Oxford University. Dr. Griffith spent 5 years in Great Britain, acting as warden of the university set-

tlements, Liverpool, England, while he was obtaining his Oxford education.

Ernest Griffith became associate professor of political science at Syracuse University. After a period as visiting professor of government at Harvard University, he returned to Syracuse as dean of its lower division, and also taught comparative government. He was called to Washington, D. C., in 1935 to become dean of the American University Graduate School. He continued to teach political science.

After coming to the Library of Congress as Director of the Legislative Reference Service in 1940, Dr. Griffith did not cut himself off entirely from his love for the teaching profession. He has been a lecturer at Swarthmore College, and at New York, Oxford, Birmingham, and Manchester Universities, as well as the Universities of Oslo and Swansea.

His interests and activities have directed him to hold membership in many professional associations. Among these are the American Political Science Association, National Municipal League, American Society of Public Administrators, and the National Academy of Economics and Political Science.

Other affiliations include the Wilderness Society, Phi Beta Kappa, Phi Kappa Phi, Delta Upsilon, the Methodist Church, the Authors' Club, and the Potomac Appalachian Trail Club. I am told he enjoys the reputation of a record-holding mountain climber.

It would be impossible to mention the numerous articles which Dr. Griffith has written and published. Among the books on government to his credit are: The Modern Government in Action (1942); Congress: Its Contemporary Role (1951); and The American System of Government (1953). He is editor and coauthor of Research in Political Science (1948), and coeditor of the Congressional Anthology (1955).

It was in 1946 that the Congressional Reorganization Act increased appropriations for the service which Dr. Griffith headed. It was then that the work of LRS began to draw public attention. Back in 1915 the Service had fewer than 12 persons on its staff and a budget of only $25,000. In 1947 Dr. Griffith directed his staff of 150 in the answering of 23,382 requests. I need not tell you that the number of requests now handled by the Service is much beyond that 1947 figure. It is my understanding that, from July 1957 through June 1958, 68,879 requests were processed.

It is particularly apparent to the membership of the House Committee on Administration that Dr. Griffith commands the respect of both Democrats and Republicans. He has exerted every effort to give impartial information to the Congress.

The handling of large problems of national and international scope and overseeing the operations of LRS have never been regarded by Dr. Griffith as a burden. He has carried his heavy responsibilities with an astounding amount of enthusiasm. I personally have always found Ernest Griffith courteous, efficient, prompt, and thorough. His immediate and intelligent responses to governmental problems have been most gratifying. He is known to the members of the House Administration Committee as a counsel of unusual qualifications.

I consider it an honor to have known and worked with Dr. Griffith and extend to him and his fine family sincere best wishes for the future.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly happy on this occasion to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to Dr. Ernest S. Griffith, who has served faithfully as Director of the Legislative Reference Service since 1940. He leaves a fine heritage of factfinding to his successor, Dr. Hugh Elsbree.

Few public servants are entitled to the degree of tribute that we extend to Dr. Griffith—and few there are who more justly deserve it. He has led a most active life in behalf of good government. He is an honest and courageous man. He has brought added dignity to the Congress of the United States in his dealings with us.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Griffith's fine and consistent service to the Congress as Director of the Legislative Reference Service during the past 18 years deserves special recognition. He has greatly increased our opportunities to serve this Nation, through his leadership of the Legislative Reference Service and his desire to listen and understand the problems facing each individual Member of Congress. We are constantly facing changes—changes all over the world. Dr. Griffith has always been aggressive in seeking out ways in which the Legislative Reference Service could help us in finding the right and just solution to these many complex problems. We wish him continued success at American University and give him our deep thanks.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, in a free society there is no escape from responsibility. The responsibility of an elected representative in the Congress of the United States is heavy, and through the years makes more and more demands on the individual Member. Dr. Griffith's willingness to help us lighten our loads deserves our sober appreciation. We shall miss his assistance and his ardent aid in behalf of good government.

MORE AND MORE IT LOOKS LIKE KENNEDY IN SIXTY

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully call to the attention of all my colleagues in the House a recent article which appeared first in the New York Times and then was reprinted in many of the country's outstanding newspapers, including my own home newspaper, the Providence Journal.

It is an article written by James Reston, a newsman held in the highest esteem by all his associates, and by all in public life in Washington. It is a thoughtful and well-reasoned article pointing out the great strides which Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY of Massachusetts has made toward the Presidency of the United States. He already has won enthusiastic support for the presidential nomination by the Democratic Party, and I am confident the vast majority of the American voters will be genuinely thrilled to have the opportunity to vote for this brilliant young man to be their President at a time when we need youth and vigor and intelligence to guide our country through its manifold difficulties, at home and abroad.

KENNEDY'S PROGRESS

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON.—JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY, the Lochinvar of Back Bay, is riding off with quite a few honors at the end of his first term in the Senate.

Even his competitors in the Senate for the 1960 Democratic Presidential nomination—there is one in almost every seat—concede that he has made more progress in this session than any other Democratic candidate.

Washington is rough and unscientific about these things, but at the end of every session it has a way of sensing who has gone up during the session and who has declined. The pros seem to be summarizing it this weekend about as follows:

Up, Democratic: KENNEDY, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, and Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota.

Down, Democratic: Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, who is temporarily out of new issues, and Senator STUART SYMINGTON, who was expected to exploit his excellent defense record better than he has.

Incidentally, it may be significant that even those professionals who were saying privately 2 years ago that Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois, was finished, are now guessing that there will be so many new candidates in 1960 that he may very well get a third nomination after the newer candidates kill each other off in the first 10 ballots.

On the Republican side, the main development seems to be the rise of Vice President NIXON in relation to the decline of Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND. It is noted here that Mr. NIXON has been extremely quiet recently, apparently on the theory that there is nothing he can say about Sherman Adams or the Middle East that will be both truthful and helpful to his candidacy.

The only significant change in the picture, however, is in the position of Senator KENNEDY. Senator JOHNSON'S sense of the big issue and his uncanny gift of parliamentary maneuver are undoubtedly the greatest personal achievements of the session, but health and geography are against him. Senator HUMPHREY'S record on disarmament and his perceptive criticism of the administration's Middle East policy have enhanced his reputation, but his popularity still lies on the left, and the mood of the country is far from radical.

Hence the relative progress of Senator KENNEDY. When he arrived in the Senate in 1953 he established himself as the rookie of the year and this was about the way he was regarded until the Democratic convention of 1956.

The pros, who are older and therefore allergic to rookies, thought he was too young—35 when he came in, 41 now—and some of them even thought he was too pretty. Also he read, and even wrote, books, and spoke to people at Harvard—all of which encouraged the professionals to wonder whether he was tough enough for the big time.

The Democratic liberals were skeptical. Some of them criticized his wealth—as if he were responsible for that—and others, like Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, were unhappy

about his silence on the McCarthy issue. Even when he won the Pulitzer Prize for writing a book on senatorial heroes, called Profiles in Courage, it was noted that he never mentioned McCarthy and the liberal gag was that he had more profile than courage.

None of this amused Senator KENNEDY, who doesn't have the toughest skin in town, but he endured. He won the support of LYNDON JOHNSON in the Democratic convention, almost got the Vice Presidential nomination there; and took his licking gracefully before a vast television audience. Then he came back here and went to work.

In the first session of the 85th Congress he made a speech about Algeria which Democratic foreign policy experts such as Dean Acheson thought was naive and even silly. But in the second session he was much more effective.

He took on the tough job of drafting and piloting a labor bill through the Senate. He made an exhaustive personal study of the problem. He fought and won a battle with George Meany of the AFL–CIO on his bill. He took on and licked Secretary of Labor Mitchell in the process, and while all this failed to prevail against the massive prejudice of several powerful groups in the House, he did get it through the Senate and won the unanimous respect of his colleagues in the process.

In the field of foreign affairs, he came up with an imaginative India aid bill, outmaneuvered the State Department on a controversy over revising trade with the Iron Curtain countries, and last week made one of the most effective speeches of the session in criticism of the administration's foreign and defense policies.

Incidentally, it is significant that when Senator HOMER CAPEHART of Indiana condemned this speech as giving aid to the enemy, Senators on both sides of the aisle defended Senator KENNEDY in a way they would have hesitated to do a couple of years ago.

Meanwhile, he has been moving out into the country in a conscious and well-planned campaign to meet the Democratic State political leaders. And en route he has been calmly talking about the question of his Roman Catholic religion and its relation to the presidency.

In short, Senator KENNEDY is on the make; he makes no pretense about it, and he dismisses out of hand the suggestion that he is young enough to wait for some other presidential campaign.

He has been lucky, in that he has come to the center of the stage when the cast of presidential characters is not the best in the history of the Republic. He has arrived, too, when political leaders, analyzing President Eisenhower's political success, are impressed with the power of personality in an age of television campaigning.

So he is not for waiting until some other year, when newer and perhaps tougher competition will arrive. He is swinging for the fences now, and by general agreement his batting average in this session has been pretty good.

RETIREMENT OF HUBERT B. SCUDDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of giving the members of the California delegation and the other Members of the House, especially the Committee on Public Works, an opportunity to express their views concerning one of the members of our delegation who is retiring, Mr. HUBERT SCUDDER. This is the third attempt I have made to obtain this time, but due to the pressure of legislative business it has been difficult to obtain it. But, I feel that we have a certain amount of obligation in saying a word in behalf of one of our colleagues who has chosen to retire.

Mr. Speaker, HUBERT SCUDDER has given 46 years of his life to public service. He began his public career as superintendent of utilities in his hometown. He served on the city council and was elected mayor of his city. He has a record in World War I of having served from November 1920 until the end of the war in the coast artillery. Following that he served 16 years in the California State Legislature with credit to himself and to the State of California, and having devoted himself to interests that were beneficial to the economy of the State, he was considered by the governor and appointed real estate commissioner for the State of California. Following that he served up to the present time, 16 years, in the Congress of the United States, and all of us who know him, know him to be a gentle gentleman, the type of man whom we can always approach, whom we can obtain advice from. He has served with great credit on the Committee on Public Works and also as a member of the Republican Policy Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure there are many Members here who desire to express themselves concerning his retirement, and I yield now to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to join in paying my word of tribute and respect and admiration for the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER]. I have had the privilege of serving with him since he came to the Congress. We occupied adjoining offices in the Old House Office Building. I am sure that I, like many others, have been impressed by the conscientious nature of his service, and I am sure that his ability will be missed not only on the great committee of this body on which he served but also in the body at large. I join with his other friends and colleagues in wishing him the fullest measure of success and happiness in the years to come.

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like very much to join with those who are paying tribute today to Congressman SCUDDER, of California. I believe I speak for the entire Ohio delegation when I say to you that we feel that we are losing a very able Member of the House of Representatives in his retirement. It has been my pleasure to serve with HUBERT SCUDDER on the House Republican Policy Committee for a number of years where his wisdom and his advice and his good common sense has contributed greatly not only to the benefit of his party but to the benefit of the entire Congress and the country as a whole.

I join in wishing him Godspeed, a happy retirement and a lengthy and healthy life.

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Before I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] let me say that this ceremony today is not for the purpose of writing an obituary. It is not the end of anything; it is the beginning of something. In my opinion, it is the beginning of an opportunity for HUBERT SCUDDER to enjoy a certain type of freedom, independence, and liberty that he has been denied as a public servant for 46 years. From here on, HUBERT SCUDDER can tell Mr. So-and-So out in his district to go jump in the lake if he does not like his opinion. He can also be very independent as to where he goes and when he comes, without any criticism from his neighbors. It is the type of freedom I know he will enjoy for many years of good health. I just wanted to make the point clear that this is not the end of anything; it is the beginning of something.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleagues from California in paying tribute to our colleague, Mr. HUBERT SCUDDER, who is retiring from Congress voluntarily this year. I want to pay a personal tribute, because when I came here with the 83d Congress there was no one who was more helpful to me as a freshman, with advice and counsel, than Mr. SCUDDER. He was always ready to advise, to tell me the ways of the House, and I owe a great debt of gratitude for all the things he did for me as a freshman.

I hope he has a long life of pleasure; traveling and doing the things that I know he wants to do. Forty-six years in public service is a long time, and I know of no one who has served with greater integrity in the public interest than Mr. SCUDDER.

Mr. MCDONOUGH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCDONOUGH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, all of us will deeply miss HUBERT SCUDDER. He has had not only a distinguished career in this body as an able and conscientious Member of Congress, but he is, certainly a kindly, fine, high principled gentleman in every sense of the word.

Mr. MCDONOUGH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCDONOUGH. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Democratic members of the Committee on Public Works, on which our colleague, HUBERT SCUDDER, has served for a number of years, I want to express our deep regret that he is leaving Congress.

Also I wish to express our appreciation of the many happy hours of fellowship we have had on the committee and for

the contributions which Mr. SCUDDER has made to our deliberations. I want to wish him and his lovely wife every good thing in the years to come.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege during the last 4 years to serve on the Committee on Public Works with HUBERT SCUDDER. Coming into the committee as a new member, I found HUBERT was of tremendous aid and assistance to me in providing guidance and giving me an understanding of the work of the committee.

I have also had the privilege, as a member of the committee, during a recess to visit HUBERT SCUDDER's district and to see something of the projects then under construction in that district. HUBERT SCUDDER has a very large district, one of about 400 miles of seacoast, with many harbor and flood-control problems. He has served his district extremely well.

I have seen him time and time again in the committee, work to see that his district was properly taken care of from the standpoint of harbor developments and flood-control projects. At the same time he has shown a deep understanding and appreciation of the needs of all parts of the country. It has been a privilege to serve with him. He has been an inspiration to me. I wish him and his lovely wife a great deal of pleasure in the years ahead.

At the request of Mr. BALDWIN, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY], chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], and the gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD] were granted permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am highly honored today to join in the well-deserved tribute being paid to my colleague, HUBERT B. SCUDDER, of California, on the occasion of his retirement from the Congress.

It is a special privilege to be here today, particularly because of the fact that I am chairman of the House Public Works Committee of which HUBERT SCUDDER has served with distinction for the last four terms in Congress.

During his 8 years of service I have found HUBERT SCUDDER to be an intelligent hard-working member of the committee. He has contributed greatly to the legislation that the committee has brought to this floor over the last 8 years. All of the members of the committee on Public Works have found HUBERT to be a worthy representative, not only of his district but also of his State and of the Nation.

Above and beyond his duties in the Congress, we have found HUBERT SCUDDER to be a man of the finest character who has greeted one and all with a cheerie word and has tried in his every day life to be a real friend to his fellowman. May I again express my well wishes to HUBERT SCUDDER on his retirement and wish to HUBERT and his wife all the best that life may hold in the years to come.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join in the tribute being tendered today to HUBERT B. SCUDDER, who has announced that he is retiring from the Congress at the close of this session. During the last four Congresses, the 82d, 83d, 84th, and 85th, it has been my pleasure to serve side by side with HUBERT SCUDDER on the Committee on Public Works. During this period I have had an opportunity to observe him, not only as a legislator, but also as a man. In both categories I am happy to say that he is A–1. HUBERT SCUDDER proved during his years on the Public Works Committee that he was a conscientious hard worker, devoted public servant interested not only in the welfare of the district that he represented, but the country as a whole. His contributions to the committee were valuable; his sincerity made him an effective member; and the record shows that his accomplishments were many. As a man I have found him to be a fine, kindly gentleman always ready with a good word and one who took an interest in all things that make for a well-rounded life.

HUBERT SCUDDER has served his district, his State, and his country well during his 10-year service in Congress. May I wish to HUBERT SCUDDER and his lovely wife all the best that life may hold in future years and as he leaves this Congress, I am sure that he goes with the best wishes of all those who have known him.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in paying respect to our friend, the gentleman from California's First District, HUBERT SCUDDER. I was born in his district and, with other members of my family, still own a sheep ranch in that district. In some ways I have considered myself his constituent, as well as his friend and colleague.

We wish our distinguished friend the best of everything in the years ahead, as he concludes many decades of devoted public service to the people of California.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with Members of the California delegation in paying tribute here to our beloved colleague from California, HUBERT B. SCUDDER.

In the adjournment rush, we become so involved with a multiplicity of problems, big and small, that we may neglect matters of real importance—such as saying what one feels about a friend who will not be serving in Congress next year. For that reason, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in saluting Mr. SCUDDER who, during his 10 years as Representative from the First Congressional District of California, has rendered a real service both to our State and to the Nation. During my 6 years in Congress his friendship and kindly advice have been deeply appreciated. He will be missed by all who have had the privilege of knowing him. My best wishes go with him.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join today in the tributes being paid HUBERT SCUDDER upon his retirement from Congress.

It has been my pleasure to serve with him for 8 years on the Committee on Public Works. He has always been an indefatigable worker, devoted to the concept of working for the best interest of his country as a United States Representative.

I have had the pleasure of visiting with HUBERT in his district, and I know of the great regard that is held for him by the people of his part of California.

Let me wish Mr. and Mrs. Scudder every happiness in this change of scenery.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in saying thanks to HUBERT SCUDDER for the help he has given his fellow Members, particularly the new Members. He has spent most of his lifetime in the public service, and has been sincere and dedicated to that endeavor. We all wish him many happy years in his retirement. I personally wish him years of happiness as he retires to his district in the frigid wastes of northern California. He represents the extreme northern part of the State and I the extreme southern part, but from north to south we all admire and love HUBERT SCUDDER.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, for the past 10 years Congressman HUBERT SCUDDER and I have been the closest of friends. Throughout most of those years he has sat next to me on the powerful House Committee on Public Works. We for many years have played golf together whenever there was opportunity to do so. We have made many trips of inspection together on public-works projects.

HUBERT SCUDDER has become one of my most prized friends in the Congress. Through constant association, I know him well and everything I know about him is good.

HUBERT SCUDDER is always a gentleman. He is a pleasant man to be with, to play with, and to work with. His sunny disposition and fine character I am certain have endeared him to every Member of this House. To know HUBERT SCUDDER is to like him and the longer and better they know him the greater their liking for him and their admiration for his integrity, ability, and patriotism.

Congressman SCUDDER was a member of the California State Legislature for many years before his people sent him to Congress. He is an experienced legislator of inquiring mind and of outstanding integrity and courage. He has accomplished much for the people of his district, his State, and the Nation during his 10 years in Congress.

Mrs. Mack joins me in wishing HUBERT SCUDDER and his charming wife, Helen, great happiness and the best of health in the years ahead. It has been a great privilege for Mrs. Mack and me to have

known them so intimately and to have enjoyed their friendship.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed feelings that I take the floor today to assist in bidding a fond farewell and Godspeed to our friend and colleague, HUBERT SCUDDER. I regret as a citizen that this Nation is to lose the services of this outstanding and respected legislator. I regret also that those of us who consider ourselves his friends will not have our everyday close contacts with him that we have had in the past. However, I am pleased that HUBERT and Mrs. Scudder will now receive a well-earned rest, earned, as the gentleman now occupying the well of the House has said, after 46 long years of faithful service.

I know that HUBERT probably does not remember this one incident, but when I came here in the 83d Congress as a very young and, I might add, a very green freshman Member of Congress, I had a conversation here on the floor of this House with him which impressed me greatly. When I asked him about the work and the career on which I was starting, HUBERT had this advice: "Always vote your conscience. Never worry about the politics." I think that advice probably best describes the type of United States Congressman that HUBERT SCUDDER has been. He has voted his conscience and has placed politics in the background. No greater tribute can be made to a man than to have that kind of record after he retires after 46 years in public office. My best wishes to you and Mrs. Scudder, HUBERT, May the many, many years ahead be bountiful ones for both of you.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I thank our colleague.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me to join my colleague in bidding Hubert and Helen Scudder Godspeed and God bless them. HUBERT has proven himself to be a very faithful and diligent public servant. He has been constructive in all his actions. He has been a genuinely faithful public servant. The only thing I have against HUBERT is that he can outdrive me on the golf course, but I forgive you for that, HUBERT, and may you have many, many happy days from here on.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I thank our colleague from Washington.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues from both the Democratic and Republican side of the aisle today in paying tribute to HUBERT SCUDDER. HUBERT, as we know, comes from the applesauce capital of California, Sebastopol—but that is where the applesauce stops. HUBERT has been the most dedicated Member of the California delegation in the Congress of the United States. HUBERT SCUDDER has represented California and the Republican policy committee for many years and he has done an outstanding job. My Congressional colleagues from all over the United States pay a great deal of respect and give a great deal of attention to HUBERT'S recommendations. He has been very helpful not only in doing things for his own district but in being always on the job, too, for the entire State of California. He has always been ready to get down and get the job done and get it done on a very high moral, spiritual and ethical plane, which everybody here appreciates. We know that he will continue as he has shown by being here on the job until the very last, to contribute to our community out there in California and the State as he has always done. We always are glad to see HUBERT because he has a smile and a kind word, like my good friend, CHARLIE GUBSER. This is probably some thing that HUBERT does not remember, but about 11 or 12 years ago when I was president of the Young Republicans of California, I came to Washington. I had never met a Congressman before. I met the California delegation. They were all pretty busy as Congressmen get, and as I have been myself ever since I came to the Congress. But only one man took the time out to spend several hours with this very young and neophyte politician and that was HUBERT. He spent over 2 hours with me explaining what was going on here in the Capitol and what politics was all about. I will never forget that. He has had a great deal of influence on my Congressional political career because there was a human being, a public servant, who really took time out for a young fellow from down south whom he had never met before. I was very grateful. I want to bid fond farewell to HUBERT SCUDDER and you know we will always welcome your advice and consultation.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I thank our colleague from California.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the chairman of our delegation at this time for giving us an opportunity to express our deep appreciation for the work HUBERT SCUDDER has rendered not only to his own district but to the State of California and to our Nation. I had the privilege of serving in the California State legislature with HUBERT some 25 years ago for several years. There we worked together with the so-called California economy bloc during the depression. We had a very successful session. After retiring from the State legislature, HUBERT became the commissioner of real estate for the State of California. Any of you people who have dealt with real estate matters know some of the pretty clever operators we have in southern California and they know that he had to do a terrific job in order to avoid scandals in the department of the real estate commissioner. HUBERT discharged his duties well and to the credit of his office and to the credit of the State of California. In the Congress he has rendered great service to his people. He has been constant in his work, ever present, ever helpful to his colleagues not only from the State of California but to his colleagues from all over the United States.

I want to join in paying tribute to HUBERT and wishing Mrs. Scudder and HUBERT the finest days of their lives as they retire in California and do the things they have long wanted to do.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I thank the gentleman from California. I am sure if we had had a normal legislative situation in the House today there would have been more present who would like to have expressed their views.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to HUBERT SCUDDER. I believe we both came to the Congress together some 8 years ago, and we had offices across the corridor from each other. I became well acquainted with him at that time and have enjoyed serving with him across the aisle for these 8 years.

I have enjoyed his friendship and I feel that I really know about his ability. I think he is one of the most competent men who has served in the House of Representatives, and I would like to join with the California delegation and all of his friends here in the Congress in wishing him much good luck and enjoyment in the years ahead.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the eulogy of my colleague on the Public Works Committee, Representative HUBERT SCUDDER.

It has been my privilege to serve with Congressman SCUDDER for a number of years and to become personally acquainted with him and his lovely wife. Congressman SCUDDER has done an excellent job. He has very ably represented not only his Congressional District but the people of the Nation. He has saved us many millions of dollars. His wise counsel has been very effective in determining expenditures that are justifiable and we in Congress will miss HUBERT SCUDDER. I extend to him and Mrs. Scudder our sincere best wishes and I hope that they will have many years of pleasant retirement.

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my note of regret because of the loss to the House of Representatives, the State of California, and the Nation as a whole occasioned by the determination of Mr. SCUDDER to retire from office when his present term has ended.

HUBERT SCUDDER had been a valuable public servant in the State of California before he came to Congress. His services at that time had been sufficiently long and sufficiently valuable that he was, in a sense, entitled to retire then from all further active public service. He was persuaded, however, to take on the additional burdens as a Representative in Congress, a position which he has filled well and ably and at some sacrifice to himself.

He and his wife have been most delightful companions in Washington over

the years and their return to California will be regretted by many who have been their friends in Washington. My best wishes go with them for the years to come.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to one of the outstanding Members of the Congress upon his retirement, the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER]. I shall always cherish my service with him in the House and it has been a real privilege to work closely with such a dedicated public servant. On behalf of the people of this country and my constituents in California, I extend to Mr. SCUDDER and his gracious wife my best wishes in his future plans and congratulations on a job well done.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I note the retirement of HUBERT B. SCUDDER as a Member of the House of Representatives. During the 10 years that Mr. SCUDDER has been a Member of this body he has rendered distinguished service to the District which he has had the honor to represent and to the people of the Nation at large.

Mr. SCUDDER came to the Congress with a splendid record of achievement in local and State affairs that well equipped him for distinguished service in this House. He has at all times been zealous in promoting the interest of the people of his District and keenly aware to the great responsibility that has rested upon Members of Congress during the period for which he has served.

I extend to him my best wishes that in his time of retirement he will have health, happiness, and success in large measure.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to serve on the same committee with our colleague, HUBERT SCUDDER, the gentleman from California, for a number of years and so have had an opportunity to see him at work. He always contributed much that was worthwhile to our discussions, and in his questioning of witnesses who appeared before us, his gentility and good commonsense were always in evidence. He is a conscientious and honest thinker, and by his character and pleasant manner he made many friends who regret his decision not to seek reelection.

I trust that the days to come may be rich in happiness and contentment and I hope he will visit us from time to time and keep fresh the friendships he has made here.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it was with regret that I learned that one of the very fine and able members of the Public Works Committee, Representative HUBERT SCUDDER was retiring. It has been a privilege to have served with him and as a relatively new member of the House Public Works Committee, I have valued his wise counsel. He has indeed rendered a fine service to his District and to the people of the Nation.

I join with his many friends in wishing for him many pleasant years of retirement and in saying he will be greatly missed in the Congress, and especially in the Public Works Committee.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to join again with my colleagues in paying tribute to the Honorable HUBERT B. SCUDDER, of California, who is voluntarily retiring from public life.

It has been my privilege to serve on the same committee with Congressman SCUDDER and words fail me when I attempt to express my appreciation of his fine cooperation and his sincere endeavors in behalf of good legislation in our committee and in this Congress.

HUBERT, you have done a great job, and I wish you every success and every pleasure in your retirement.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I personally feel that HUBERT SCUDDER has been a great asset to the California delegation. As I said a moment ago in a facetious mood I trust that he will enjoy the freedom he would like and that many of us in public service are denied. It will be a new life for him to feel that he can go and come where he pleases, as he pleases, say and do what he pleases, and enjoy the freedom of a private citizen and write to his Congressman and tell him how to run the Nation. He will not be jumping every 5 minutes at 3 bells. He can sleep as long as he pleases in the morning. He can get out and play golf or go fishing whenever he pleases.

HUBERT, I hope you are blessed with many many years of vigorous health to enjoy that freedom we hope will be yours.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that those Members who have spoken during my special order may revise and extend their remarks and that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their remarks in tribute to Mr. SCUDDER.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

FCC SHOULD REVIEW ACTION WHICH DENIED FIRST CLASS TV SERVICE TO CAPITAL OF ILLINOIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the record regarding television channel 2, Springfield, Ill., seems to present clear evidence that many irregularities were involved in the transfer of channel 2 from Springfield to St. Louis. This action occurred while Mr. George C. McConnaughey was Chairman of the Commission and Mr. Richard A. Mack of Florida was a member of this Commission. The Chairman at that time admitted there was outside pressure for what he referred to as deintermixture.

Section 307 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U. S. C. 307 B) requires the Federal Communications Commission to distribute frequencies among the several States and communities in order that the result will be a fair, efficient, and equitable distribution of service to each. The Federal Communications Commission has failed to do this with respect to Springfield, Ill.

The allocation of frequencies to Springfield, Ill., has a long unusual history. Restricting my statement here to the highlights of this history, I can say that until channel 2 was moved from Springfield, Ill., to St. Louis in 1957, Springfield was always allocated a VHF channel. As the capital of one of our most important States, this was as it should be. Springfield is entitled to first-class TV service.

The first commercial TV allocation, as early as 1945, allocated two channels to Springfield—channels 8 and 10. In 1952, the sixth report and order of the Federal Communications Commission modified channel assignments and substituted VHF channel 2 and UHF channel 20 in Springfield, for channels 8 and 10. At that time a proposal was considered that channel 2 be put in St. Louis, Mo. This was rightly rejected.

People in my District applied for a license to operate on channel 2 in Springfield, and a long contested comparative hearing took place covering a period of more than 3½ years. It is not my purpose to discuss the merits of the comparative hearing, but only the loss of channel 2 to the city of Springfield.

Channel 2 was taken from Springfield under the guise of deintermixture. Deintermixture does not exist today in Springfield, Ill., and undoubtedly the city will not be deintermixed. Several VHF stations are received in this city. In view of this, channel 2 should be returned to Springfield, Ill., as a matter of simple justice under section 307 (b) of the Communications Act.

The Federal Communications Commission should move channel 2 back to Springfield, Ill., by setting aside the order of deintermixture that moved channel 2 to St. Louis.

The Special Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight has brought out, and this is a matter of public record, that the principal officer of Signal Hill Telecasting Co., of St. Louis, Mo., practically lived at the Federal Communications Commission. Mr. Harry Tennenbaum was the principal officer. He contacted Commissioners—not once, but he has admitted privately entertaining all of the Commissioners many, many times. Some of the arguments he and his representatives presented were never made a matter of record and persons opposing the move of channel 2 from Springfield to St. Louis were unable to answer the arguments as they didn't even know about them. As a matter of fact, Mr. Tennenbaum went out and hired a former Commissioner to represent him before the Commission—and this was not made a matter of record. The attorneys opposing the move of channel 2 from Springfield did not know this former Commissioner was a representative of Signal Hill Telecasting. In fact, the main attorneys of record for Signal Hill Telecasting did not know he had been employed. He filed no appearance. The Federal Communications Commission did not know of his employment. This is highly unusual. Their first question is—what work did he do? Other matters have intervened to prevent the subcommittee from developing this. The FCC should do so.

It appears that Mr. Harry Tennenbaum and Signal Hill Telecasting were very certain of what the results of the deintermixture proceeding would be. They started to negotiate for the purchase of channel 2 equipment over 3 months prior to the decision of the Federal Communications Commission, but what is even more difficult to understand is that they started to negotiate for the purchase of channel 2 equipment prior to the time for filing comments against moving channel 2 from Springfield, Ill. Mr. Tennenbaum and Signal Hill Telecasting started to negotiate for such equipment in October 1956. Some of the comments to be filed by the parties were not due until November 30 and December 3, 1956.

Signal Hill Telecasting also took another unusual step prior to the decision. It negotiated for, and signed an affiliation contract with the American Broadcasting Co. prior to the FCC decision. Mr. Paul Pelteson, a major stockholder in Signal Hill Telecasting called this a "secret" contract.

In addition to the above, there were other strange events. The rulemaking procedure to move channel 2 from Springfield to St. Louis, was started on June 25, 1956, but this rulemaking proceeding did not mention channel 36 in St. Louis—the channel then being used by Signal Hill Telecasting Corp. In the ordinary course of events one would expect a UHF operator to oppose the move of a VHF station to its city, but strangely, on September 4, 1956, Signal Hill Telecasting filed a pleading in the rulemaking proceeding in which it supported the move. This most unusual situation appeared to clear itself up on October 10, 1956. The FCC added channel 36, St. Louis, to the rulemaking proceeding. This had to be done in order for Signal Hill Telecasting to be allowed to operate on channel 2 as a substitute for channel 36. Also unusual about this matter is that there was no record request for this action at the FCC. There was no engineering data submitted to the FCC to support the rulemaking to move channel 36 from St. Louis to Springfield. There were representatives making ex parte representations as to engineering data. Other parties had no opportunity to answer these representations. The exact genesis of all the action has not been pinned down. This, the FCC should do.

In addition to all of the above, the Commission at the time it added channel 36 to the rulemaking proceeding, disavowed any intention of changing Signal Hill Telecasting's authorization to channel 2. The opposite result was reached. In connection with the rulemaking proceeding, it should be pointed out that the attorney general of the State of Illinois took part in the proceeding and stressed that Missouri had roughly twice as many VHF channels as Illinois, despite having a population only half as great. The Illinois attorney general also pointed out that St. Louis already had 4 VHF channels while Springfield had only 1. The obvious conclusion reached by the attorney general, and that should have been reached by the FCC, was that Springfield's need was far greater than St. Louis, and that in view of the mandate of section 307 (b) of the Communications Act, channel 2 should remain in Springfield.

Another more important point is that with the move of channel 2 to St. Louis, that city now has a surplus of VHF channels. There are only three networks and a fourth commercial channel must go without a network.

Lastly, I want to point this out to the House. A party to this proceeding ended up with a license. The proceeding was an adjudicatory proceeding as defined in the Administrative Procedure Act. Section 409 (c) 2 of the Communications Act forbids certain types of ex parte representation by parties to proceedings. Major stockholders and representatives of Signal Hill Telecasting Corp. admit violations of section 409 (c) 2. With respect to these violations, it is very clear to me that the FCC should set aside its deintermixture order which moved channel 2 from Springfield to St. Louis and granted Signal Hill Telecasting a license to operate in St. Louis on channel 2. For this I cite some very pertinent language from *Root Refining Co.* v. *Universal Oil Products Co.* (169 F. 2d 514 (C. A. 3)), certiorari denied, volume 335, United States, page 912, wherein the court, in effect stated, with respect to ex parte contacts, that from the moment an application for a license makes ex parte contacts, he ceases to depend on the justice of his case; he seeks discriminatory and favored treatment; he becomes a corrupter of the Government itself and is fortunate if he loses no more than the license he seeks to obtain.

Deliberate attempts to influence decisions outside of a record and outside of proper procedures is obviously a violation of our concepts of justice.

In conclusion, after the Commission sets aside its order of deintermixture, it should leave channel 2 in Springfield where it belongs—under the mandate of section 307 (b) of the Communications Act which requires a fair distribution of frequencies.

TAX AVERAGING LEGISLATION—A MORE REALISTIC APPLICATION OF THE ABILITY-TO-PAY PRINCIPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have been concerned for some time about the rigorous effect of our taxing statutes on those citizens who have fluctuating incomes. Because of this concern I introduced H. R. 126, which contains a plan which will allow a taxpayer whose taxable income for any one year exceeds 150 percent of his average taxable income for the past 5 years to spread the excess over a 6-year period. It is my feeling that such a plan would be a more realistic application of the ability-to-pay principle to those with fluctuating incomes. This plan, like many others, has been criticized by some because of the fear of complicating an already complex 1040 form and also because of anticipated administrative difficulties in administering the plan.

I have considered this matter for some time and because I feel it is important that this averaging principle be written into the taxing code I am introducing today a much more simplified averaging plan. It is proposed that an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 contain the new section 1348. This new section would afford some relief to taxpayers with fluctuating incomes.

The proposed section is modeled along the lines of sections 1301, 1302, and 1303, all of which permit a limited form of averaging for compensation received from an employment, income from an invention or artistic work, and income from back pay. These provisions, however, permit averaging only as to income which is attributable to several taxable years. They are of no benefit to the taxpayer whose income is attributable only to the taxable year but which fluctuates considerably from year to year. It is probable that these sections were enacted for this reason—that they apply only to income which was earned over several years—or attributable thereto—and would consequently affect only a very few taxpayers. As a result, the existing income-averaging sections are stated in simple terms and do not present administrative complications.

Complicated income averaging formulas have had no success in Congress. No such plan has as yet been enacted into law. To be seriously considered by Congress and the Treasury, any averaging plan must meet the tests of simplicity and administrative feasibility. The present Federal individual income tax return, form 1040, is sufficiently complicated as it is. Millions of taxpayers experience yearly difficulty with it, even though most of them have no more to do than report wages subject to withholding, subtract deductions, and claim exemptions. Moreover, as the number of individual taxpayers filing returns increases, the overworked and understaffed Internal Revenue Service must process more returns, conduct more field audits, and attempt to bring a great measure of order into an inherently chaotic situation. Any proposed change which would mean additional man-hours spent in policing returns is sure to elicit little enthusiasm in the office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. This proposed amendment is based upon sections of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which have been tested successfully in the administrative laboratory. Furthermore, this proposal is simple, workable, and would require the addition of only 3 or 4 lines to the present form 1040.

This amendment would permit income averaging tax relief to individuals with fluctuating incomes based on a percentage of increase in the taxable income of the taxable year over the taxable income of the preceding year. The selection of a percentage for such a provision should be based on the knowledge that such a proposal is an experiment and that time will be needed to determine whether the provision is simple enough to be understood by taxpayers and administratively enforcible by the

Internal Revenue Service. It is suggested that an initial percentage of 50 percent be used. Thus, when a taxpayer's taxable income increased by 50 percent or more over the preceding year's taxable income, he would automatically become entitled to compute his income under section 1348. Experience will tell whether the percentage increase is too large or too small. If substantial numbers of taxpayers were able to qualify and loss of revenue reached serious proportions, the qualifying percentage could be raised to, for example, 100 percent and the number of taxpayers entitled to use the provision would be immediately reduced. On the other hand, if the plan proved administratively feasible and brought a greater measure of compliance with the income tax laws, the required percentage could be lowered so as to entitle additional taxpayers to the relief afforded.

Once the percentage-increase requirement had been met, the taxpayer would compute his tax as if he had received the taxable income ratably over the taxable year and the preceding taxable year. In effect, this would mean that the increase in taxable income from the preceding year to the current taxable year would be divided in half—for purposes of the section 1348 computation—with one-half of the increase allocated to the preceding taxable year and the other half allocated to the current taxable year. The total tax burden of the taxpayer computing his tax under section 1348 would then be the same as if he had received equal amounts of income in the preceding taxable year and in the current taxable year. For example, if A had taxable income of $8,000 in the taxable year and had had $4,000 of taxable income in the preceding taxable year, under proposed new section 1348 he would allocate the increase—$4,000—equally between both years. As a result, he would pay the same total income tax for the 2-year period as he would have paid if he had received $6,000 taxable income in each of those years.

Initially, 2 years, including the taxable year, is a sufficient number of years over which to permit allocation of the increase in taxable income. There is no necessity for using a time period in terms of months—as section 1301 now provides—because there is no question of determining when a particular project or employment giving rise to income began. If the taxpayer qualified for section 1348 treatment by meeting the required percentage of income increase, he would be automatically entitled to spread back the increase over the statutory period. Of course, a spread back which involves only 2 years will not bring substantial relief to some taxpayers who may have extreme jumps in income from one year to the next. For them, a 5-year spread-back period, or perhaps even longer, would be desirable. But the number of years selected need not be permanent. If experience shows that the 2-year period is inadequate, it can always be lengthened.

The computation of income tax under proposed new section 1348 will be well known by the taxpayers who have taken advantage of existing sections 1301, 1302, and 1303. The proposed new section does not require that amended returns be filed for prior years, nor does it provide that income received in the taxable year but allocated to prior years is excluded from tax in the taxable year. Under proposed new section 1348, the taxpayer concerned would report all of his income and pay all of his tax liability for the taxable year, but would compute it as if he had received a part of it ratably over the taxable year and the preceding taxable year. Nor does the proposed new section permit the taxpayer to compute the tax on the spread-back income at the rates applicable only to the amount of income allocated to prior years. For example, if taxpayer A is permitted to spread taxable income of $10,000 ratably over the 2-year period, he will add $5,000 to his taxable income for the preceding year and pay tax on the $5,000 spread-back amount at the rate applicable to the spread-back income plus the taxable income already reported for that year. Thus, if A received $5,000 in the preceding taxable year, the addition of the $5,000 spread-back income would result in a tax rate applicable to $10,000 of taxable income. A simple illustration will more effectively show the mechanics of the computation.

Assume that taxpayer A receives $5,000 taxable income in 1957 and $15,000 taxable income in 1958.

TAX LIABILITY COMPUTATION FOR 1957 AND 1958 UNDER PRESENT LAW

Year	Taxable income	Tax liability
1957	$5,000	$1,100
1958	$15,000	4,730
	Total, $20,000	5,830

TAX LIABILITY COMPUTATION UNDER PROPOSED NEW SEC. 1348

1957	$5,000	$1,100
1958	$5,000 (from 1957) $5,000 (increase allocated to 1957) $10,000	2,640
	Less tax paid in 1957	1,100
	Tax on $5,000 increase allocated to 1957	1,540
	$5,000 (increase allocated to 1958) $5,000 (for 1958) $10,000 (tax on this amount)	2,640
	Total tax payable for 1958	4,180
	Add tax paid for 1957	1,100
	Total	5,280

Under proposed new section 1348, taxpayer A would have a tax saving of $550. Also, it is apparent that by using new section 1348, he would pay the same tax he would have paid if he had received $10,000 taxable income in each of the years 1957 and 1958.

The relief proposed in new section 1348 would be simple to explain on form 1040 and easy to administer. The only changes which would be required could be made on page 2 of form 1040 under the heading "Tax Computation." Line 5 under that heading is entitled "Taxable Income." After line 5 the following lines could be inserted:

"5a. Taxable income of preceding year (line 5 of preceding year's return).

"5b. Excess of line 5 over line 5a.

"5c. If amount on line 5b is 50 percent or more of amount on line 5a, compute tax on amount on line 5b as if this amount had been received one-half in taxable year and one-half in preceding year.

"6. Tax on amount on line 5 (less amount on line 5b if line 5c is used).

"Total tax—."

New section 1348 could thus be incorporated into form 1040 in less space than was required to provide for the retirement income provision. An explanatory note in the information pamphlet and a simple illustration should be sufficient to explain the steps involved in computing income tax liability under proposed new section 1348.

There would be little additional auditing involved of those returns which took advantage of the section 1348 computation, for the face of the return would disclose the taxable income of the current taxable year, the taxable income of the preceding year, and the percentage of increase. If any audit was necessary, it would be a simple matter to check the return for the prior year and compare the taxable income in that return with the taxable income disclosed on the face of the return for current year. Since internal revenue personnel are accustomed to dealing with computations under existing sections 1301, 1302, and 1303, they would have no difficulty in checking computations under the proposed new section. Prior difficulties with section 1301 have stemmed from determinations by the Commissioner that compensation was not received from a particular project or that not more than 80 percent of it was received in 1 taxable year. The use of new section 1348 would not involve any of these administrative questions. The only condition precedent to the use of the section would be the required percentage of taxable income increase.

Proposed new section 1348 would have no effect on the withholding provisions. Taxpayers receiving wages and salaries would follow the same procedures for reporting income taxes withheld. The only difference would be that if they qualified under section 1348, their computation of tax liability under that section might entitle them to refunds. This is a common occurrence under existing sections 1301, 1302, and 1303 and the Internal Revenue Service is well-equipped to deal with it. Nor would the proposal hamper payments of estimated tax. Again, taxpayers would follow familiar procedure, but if at the end of the year they qualified under new section 1348, they would be entitled to recompute their tax liability and claim any refunds due.

New section 1348 has an additional advantage in that it is not based in any way on source of income. For example, an individual who receives the proceeds of an endowment policy is now allowed under section 72 (e) (3) of the 1954 code to pay a tax computed as if the income had been received over a 3-year period. Such a provision unfairly discriminates against other taxpayers similarly situated. Holders of United States savings bonds may receive 10 or 20 years of interest in the 1 year in which the bond is cashed. Should they not be entitled to

spread back the interest income they received if the recipient of endowment proceeds is so favored? Accumulated dividends on preferred stocks are also lumpy in character and large amounts are likely to be received in 1 year. Are the recipients of such dividends also not entitled to similar averaging relief? Obviously, to base income averaging relief on type of income received—no matter how irregularly the income is likely to arrive in the hands of the taxpayer—is a certain way to create unfairness and discrimination among taxpayers. As a result, disgruntled taxpayers will bring pressure to have their types of income qualified for averaging relief. The proposal to use new section 1348 on the basis of percentage of taxable income increase is free from any such infirmity and will extend relief to any taxpayer who qualifies by reason of a substantial jump in income, regardless of the source of that income.

It can be argued that the benefit proposed applies only to a year which represents a substantial increase over a prior year and that new section 1348 makes no provision for taxpayers who may have many lean years and then many fat ones in succession. This is quite true, for a taxpayer whose income jumped from $5,000 to $15,000 in 1 year and then remained at the latter level for several years, would receive the benefit of new section 1348 in only 1 taxable year. However, the suggested plan does not purport to provide adequate relief for those taxpayers who may enjoy several years of stable prosperity after several years of poverty. Those taxpayers who reach an income peak which lasts for only a few years would benefit more from some form of deferred compensation arrangement whereby they could postpone the collection of some of their income in peak years to later years when earning power seriously declines. Professional athletes are a classic example of this group of taxpayers. Their peak earning periods are often less than 10 years. Nevertheless, the purpose of proposed new section 1348 is to grant relief to those taxpayers who pay substantially higher burdens because of income increases from year to year. Many taxpayers who enjoy only limited periods of high earnings would find that their incomes fluctuated sufficiently to entitle them to the benefits of the proposed section on many occasions. For example, a baseball player who entered the major leagues at an $8,000 salary; made the grade and jumped to $13,000 the next year; had a good season which justified a rise in income to $22,000; and then became a star at $35,000; would be entitled to spread back his income under new section 1348 in each year of increase.

The proposed new section makes no provision for declining incomes. However, the taxpayer with declining income is paying a substantially smaller amount of tax as his income declines. Just as the progressive rates operate to take more of a taxpayer's taxable dollar as he goes up the scale, so does the system benefit him by taking less as he goes down. Furthermore, whenever he recovers and increases his income substantially, he may qualify for section 1348 relief and save some of his increased income. Greater equity would probably be accomplished if some overall averaging scheme could be devised which provided for income averaging on the downswing as well as the upswing. But any such plan would be complicated and sure to cause serious questions of administrability. However, the proposed new section would give considerable relief to persons with constantly fluctuating incomes like farmers. For example, 1 year a farmer makes $4,000, let us say, the next year $10,000, the next $10,000, then drops again to $4,000, then jumps to $10,000 again. Both years when he jumped from $4,000 to $10,000 he would get the benefit of this averaging provision.

Loss of revenue is not a serious objection to the proposed new section 1348. Even under the more extensive averaging systems which range over many years and which include such devices as moving averages, carryovers of unused exemptions and the like, experts have estimated that only about 1 million taxpayers would be affected. Because the percentage of increase in taxable income to qualify under proposed section 1348 would be at least 50 percent, or even higher if necessary, it is submitted that far fewer than 1 million taxpayers would be entitled to its benefits. Of these, none would save large amounts of taxable income because of the restriction of spread back to 2 years. Certainly some revenue would be lost, but because of the limited applicability of new section 1348, it is submitted that the loss would be inconsequential.

The observation that the majority of taxpayers would be unaffected by new section 1348 also disposes of the argument that averaging proposals run counter to and have an adverse effect on the flexibility of the progressive income tax system. The argument is that in a period of rising incomes, the progressive rates will drain off much of the increase and reduce inflationary pressures, but that if taxpayers are permitted to average incomes, the countercyclical effect of the progressive rate structure will be blunted. This argument might have some validity if millions of taxpayers experiencing minor income fluctuations were permitted to spread back their incomes. Because of the restricted nature of new section 1348, however, the few taxpayers who will qualify will not receive tax benefits of sufficient magnitude to have any appreciable effect on the flexibility of the progressive income tax system.

One further limitation of new section 1348 should be noted. As proposed, access to the section is denied to even those taxpayers who would otherwise qualify if any of the tax payable in the taxable year is limited by any other provisions permitting income averaging. The purpose of this restriction is to prevent double relief in cases where a taxpayer would receive, for example, compensation which qualified for relief under section 1301 and his taxable income for that year also qualified under proposed new section 1348. The proposed plan would require such taxpayers to elect which form of averaging benefit they wished to have. They should not be entitled to the benefits of two averaging provisions on the same income.

Although the proposal to create a limited form of income averaging under proposed new section 1348 will apply to relatively few taxpayers, these few are justly entitled to tax relief. For years they have borne more than their fair share of the tax burden because they have occupations which produce incomes in irregular quantities. Relief which is fair and is long overdue should never be denied because the beneficiaries will be few.

Dynamic growth in the economy is frequently due to individual ambition and personal effort. These efforts often result in financial success which is a boon both to the individual who achieves it and to the Nation. The tax system should offer some incentive to the taxpayer who is willing to work toward higher income; who is willing to risk his time, his brains, and his money for ultimate reward. Yet our progressive income tax rates have a stifling effect on such incentives, and because of the requirements of national defense and a growing Federal budget, those progressive rates must remain relatively high. The simple averaging scheme proposed in these paragraphs should restore some of the incentive which may have been lost by capable and industrious individuals because it affords them a recognition of their successful efforts. The plan permits them, not unlimited tax privileges, but some relief when their success results in a substantial increase in income. The plan is simple and puts no burden on the Government either in terms of substantial loss of revenue or in loss of manpower hours to enforce it. New section 1348, in sum, offers an opportunity to afford tax relief where it is needed, where it is workable, and where it is justifiable.

THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to report on some of the highlights of the work this session of the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works; to review briefly progress being made on the expanded Federal-aid highway program; and comments on the benefits which will flow from this construction program to all of the people of the Nation.

First, let me say that I am grateful to all members of the subcommittee and of the Public Works Committee for the cooperation extended to me on highway matters in this Congress and for their earnest and effective work at all times. I especially appreciate the unfailing help and courtesy rendered by my distinguished colleague, the former chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR].

I wish, also, Mr. Speaker, to express my pleasure at the cooperation the sub-

committee and I have received consistently from the Federal Highway Administrator, Bertram D. Tallamy, who has been directing a difficult and complex program in a most efficient manner.

The Committee on Public Works and our subcommittee have held numerous hearings during this session and have maintained a careful watch on administrative activities growing out of previous legislation. The chief positive achievement this year has been, of course, enactment of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958.

Important, also, has been the committee's consideration and approval and subsequent enactment of a bill introduced by me which establishes a formula on which apportionments of Federal funds to the States for the Interstate System may be made for fiscal 1961. Under the bill this would be accomplished by approving the 1958 cost estimates for the Interstate System as a basis for the 1961 allocation of Federal-aid funds. The purpose of this legislation is to keep the interstate program accelerated; to give the highway departments and industry continued assurance of availability of funds so that work can be planned ahead. It also changes the date for submission of the next cost estimates from January 2, 1962 to January 2, 1961.

The committee worked hard this year on a bill to codify all of the Federal highway laws enacted since 1916. This has been passed. The objective is to bring together the mass of laws for more simplified administration. The result will be an especial service to the highway departments.

The committee, while not having legislative jurisdiction, has maintained a keen concern for protection of the highway trust fund against raids by Federal agencies for nonroadbuilding purposes. We believe that it is only fair and just to highway users who are being taxed to finance this program that the integrity of the fund be safeguarded.

Other major legislation approved by the committee in this session includes first, an authorization of $10 million to complete the Inter-American Highway; second, an authorization of $4 million to complete the Rama Road in Nicaragua; third, an extension from 5 to 7 years of the period in advance of actual construction when rights-of-way may be secured for the Interstate System; fourth, legislation, as part of the 1958 Highway Act, offering the States an incentive to control outdoor advertising along the interstate highways; and fifth, a directive to the Secretary of Commerce to provide Congress next January with recommendations as to how the Federal Government might proceed to reimburse States for toll and free roads already built on the Interstate System, provided such reimbursement might be approved sometime in the future.

In its deliberations in this Congress, the committee has benefited by information and advice offered cooperatively by many national organizations including such as the American Association of State Highway Officials and the American Road Builders' Association which speak with authority for highway administrators and engineers and for components of the highway industry, respectively.

Mr. Speaker, in 1956, Congress took bold, realistic steps to increase assistance to the States for improvement of the Nation's highways.

The Federal Government had, of course, been extending modest aid to the States for roadbuilding since 1916. But during World War II, new work was halted and existing roads were held to be largely expendable. The result was a serious deterioration of all of our streets and highways—State trunk routes, rural roads, and city streets. In 1946, we had 34 million cars, trucks, and buses operating on these deficient highways. While there were some increases in Federal aid for new roads in 1952 and 1954, the automotive population by 1956 had jumped to 62 million. We were caught in traffic jams from coast to coast and were threatened with traffic strangulation in our cities. Tragically, traffic deaths soared to 40,000 and more per year, injuries ran into astronomical figures, and the Nation's bill for human and property damages resulting from accidents on our highways reached $4 billion annually. The number of motor vehicles continued to increase and promised to exceed 100 million within 20 years.

This intolerable situation, which many States were financially unable to correct, led to a reappraisal of the Federal role in highway development.

Following World War II, toll roads began to be built at a rapid rate in areas where they were economically feasible. These were expressways that, in most instances, gave the driving public knowledge of the safety and efficiency of controlled-access highways of modern design.

Traffic conditions, as well as military and civil defense considerations, pointed to the need for a national system of modern controlled-access expressways.

In the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956, Congress authorized a 13-year program of new construction to complete a modern-designed Interstate Highway System of 41,000 miles which would touch every State, all but 6 of the State capitals and 90 percent of the cities of over 50,000 population. When finished, the expressways will carry 20 percent of the Nation's highway traffic.

Because of the urgent need, from the viewpoint of the country's economy and its defense, the Federal Government agreed to assume 90 percent of the cost of this system of superroads. It was estimated that the total cost would approximate $27 billion over a 13- to 15-year period, an estimate since revised to nearly $40 billion.

This marked the start of a tremendous program of public works. It was left to the States to initiate the projects, let the contracts, and complete the job within prescribed Federal standards.

In addition, Congress authorized an acceleration of the historic 50-percent Federal—50 percent State fund matching program for construction of primary highways, secondary or farm-to-market roads, and certain city streets. Further, with slight increases, it continued the program of improvement of forest highways, park roads, and other routes through public lands areas, this work to be accomplished largely with Federal funds alone.

Mr. Speaker, your Committee on Public Works and its Subcommittee on Roads, of which I have the honor to be chairman, labored hard through the 84th Congress on details of this legislation. The revenue features, which were exceedingly complex, were ably and expeditiously handled by the Ways and Means Committee. A most important action, initiated by that committee, was the establishment of a Highway Trust Fund in the Treasury Department to serve as a repository for certain highway user tax revenues earmarked for the new road program.

Following are the Federal funds authorized and made available for the new program during the first 2 years, or through June 30, 1958:

Interstate System	$4,900,000,000
Primary system	832,500,000
Secondary system	555,000,000
Urban extensions of primary and secondary systems	462,500,000
Public domain roads	217,000,000
Emergency projects on primary, secondary, and urban highways only	515,000,000
Total	7,482,000,000

Of the above total, $1,125,000,000 represents funds authorized in the 1956 Highway Act for fiscal 1957 and thus supplemented previous authorizations for that year. Also $726 million of the above total represents funds authorized in the 1958 Highway Act for fiscal 1959 and thus supplemented the 1956 authorizations for that year. However, the $7,500,000,000 is the actual amount, in round figures, that Congress authorized and the Secretary of Commerce made available to the States for the new road program in a 2-year period.

On August 1, 1958, the Secretary apportioned Federal aid to the States for fiscal 1960, as authorized in the Highway Acts of 1956 and 1958. The new allocations are as follows:

Interstate System	$2,500,000,000
Primary system	405,000,000
Secondary system	270,000,000
Urban extensions of primary and secondary systems	225,000,000
Total	3,400,000,000

It is seen, therefore, that due to the 1956 and 1958 Highway Acts, some $10,900,000,000 in Federal funds has been authorized and made available to the States for all types of road building on the Federal-aid systems. Matched with State funds, this provides a program in excess of $14,500,000,000.

I have cited these figures, with minimum detail, to help underscore the magnitude of the program in which we are now heavily engaged. In 2 fast-moving years, approximately one-fifth of the funds estimated to be needed to complete the Interstate System have been made available to the States.

I am hopeful that Congress will see fit not only to carry on its part in getting this massive job through to completion on schedule but will also approve a continued modest annual step-up, at a rate of at least $25 million for

improvements of the primary highways, secondary roads and city streets.

The emergency program, undertaken this year, was a temporary measure aimed at providing quick jobs. In this action, which was part of the 1958 Highway Act, Congress authorized $400 million in Federal aid to be granted to the States on a two-thirds–one-third Federal-State matching basis for rapid construction on primary, secondary and urban road projects. To further assist the States which might need it, an additional $115 million was authorized as a fund from which States might borrow up to two-thirds of their contribution. Such borrowing is to be repaid to the Federal Government through equal annual deductions from the States' regular apportionments in fiscal 1961 and 1962. The major stipulation on projects to be financed under this temporary program is that they must be placed under construction contract by this December 1 and scheduled for completion by December 1, 1959.

As the foregoing indicates, the Federal highway program at the current time is divided into three categories:

First. The Interstate System construction financed 90 percent by the Federal Government;

Second. The emergency primary, secondary, and urban road construction financed 66⅔ percent by the Federal Government; and

Third. The regular primary, secondary, and urban road construction financed 50 percent by the Federal Government.

Work on the Interstate System is now going ahead in a satisfying way, with projects under construction all across the country. It was a slow starter because by the nature of its design and location, a heavy amount of advance engineering had to be accomplished and extensive and often expensive properties had to be acquired for rights-of-way. These two factors, coupled with lack of full public understanding and support and new administrative problems at Federal, State, and local levels, contributed to a dragging start. But, as of June 30, 1958, ending 2 full years of the expanded program, $2.47 billion in construction contracts had been advertised, $1.15 billion had been obligated for rights-of-way, and $322 million had been committed for preliminary engineering. As of the first of this month, August 1, 1958, 1,950 project miles at a cost of $505 million had been completed and another $1.77 billion was represented in construction under way on 3,160 project miles.

As one who has followed progress of the Interstate System program with great interest, I am pleased to report that it is now beginning to hit its stride. If there are no delaying interruptions at the legislative level, it should continue to swing along for another 10 years at a rate of high and steady accomplishment.

The temporary emergency program which involves mostly lighter, quicker construction projects is also coming along well. As of last week, $235 million of the $400 million in Federal funds had been definitely committed to specific projects, with contract letting soon to follow. Of the $115 million in Federal funds available to the States for short-term borrowing, about $62 million had been spoken for. The program, the projects of which must all be under contract by December 1, is slightly ahead of schedule and will probably move with increasing speed in the coming weeks.

The regular primary, secondary, and urban road projects—financed 50–50 by Federal and State governments—are advancing excellently. This has been the case right along. In the full fiscal years 1957 and 1958 a total in excess of $3 billion in construction contracts was advertised, calling for 46,568 project miles of road and 8,045 bridges. Almost $180 million was set aside for rights-of-way and $81 million for advance engineering.

According to an estimate by the Bureau of Public Roads, capital expenditure for highways on all the Federal-aid systems will accelerate annually in the years immediately ahead. The figures for the years 1956 to 1962 inclusive are as follows:

Calendar year	Federal aid	State matching funds	Total
1956	$770,000,000	$691,000,000	$1,461,000,000
1957	1,268,000,000	843,000,000	2,111,000,000
1958	1,817,000,000	944,000,000	2,761,000,000
1959	2,811,000,000	1,163,000,000	3,974,000,000
1960	3,019,000,000	1,050,000,000	4,039,000,000
1961	3,285,000,000	1,097,000,000	4,382,000,000
1962	3,434,000,000	1,135,000,000	4,569,000,000

Including non-Federal-aid expenditures the total capital investment for all streets and highways for the 7-year period is:

Calendar year	*Total capital expenditures*
1956	$5,013,000,000
1957	5,659,000,000
1958	6,202,000,000
1959	7,051,000,000
1960	7,341,000,000
1961	7,738,000,000
1962	8,092,000,000

It is indeed impressive to note that within the next 5 years—including 1958—the staggering sum of $36½ billion will be spent in improving our Nation's highways. Such a vast and sustained public works program could readily be the key to continuing prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the roads subcommittee, it is gratifying for me to report to the House in so favorable a way on the progress and outlook for the great road program.

Mr. Speaker, the tremendous Federal-aid highway program, which is of course in addition to the continuing locally financed road programs of the States, counties, and cities and to the building under private financing of toll roads, bridges and tunnels, is about to make its really significant impact on the Nation's economy.

It is conservatively estimated that highway construction, by the contract method, provides 228,600,000 man-hours of work, or 5,715,000 40-hour workweeks of employment for each $1 billion invested. If we assume that the total capital outlay for all roadbuilding in the country this fiscal year will reach $6 billion, that means over 1,370,000,000 man-hours of work in the 12-month period. Roughly speaking, we may expect the jobs to be divided about evenly between onsite and direct offsite employment.

When we consider that this is a long-range effort, with at least another 10 years of high-level productivity, and further that we have not yet reached what may be expected to be the height of the plateau on which the program will be sustained, then it is apparent that this will be a program providing a great many jobs over a long period.

It should also be remembered that the highway construction dollar is perhaps the most rewarding dollar spent in a community. Not only does it provide an immediate local economic stimulant and a high ratio of onsite and offsite employment but the end result is a capital investment of lasting value.

The American Road Builders' Association has estimated that the new 13-year program will utilize 50 million tons of steel, 1.5 billion barrels of cement, 130 million tons of bituminous material, 10 billion tons of aggregate, 13 billion gallons of petroleum products, 2 billion pounds of explosives, 75 million gallons of paint, and 12 million traffic signs. In addition there will be a big market for such diversified items as aluminum, seeds, fertilizer, chemicals, engineering tools, electronic computers, photographic supplies, and many others.

It is needless to say that increasing work will be opened up for the Nation's 6,000 highway contractors. The recent step-up in projects, however, indicates that competition in bidding will continue to be keen with resultant benefit to the taxpayers. Future business should remain good for banks, financing companies and bonding and surety houses.

Such an outlook is encouraging to the advancement of the country's economy. Highway work is especially desirable in this respect because it is distributed into every corner of all the States.

Nothing, however, in direct economic advantages compares with the saving of lives and the prevention of human injuries which will result from the construction of the modern highways and streets. It has already been demonstrated that the traffic death rate on divided lane, controlled-access expressways of the type to be constructed on most of the Interstate System is less than one-half that of other road and streets. This means the reduction in fatalities on the 41,000-mile Interstate System alone would represent a saving of 4,000 lives a year at least. Further, on this system the reduction in accidents and in human injury may be calculated to result in a saving of three-quarters of a billion dollars annually. On these modern roads, pedestrian deaths, fatalities at intersections and railroads and headon collisions would be virtually eliminated.

Motorists on the new interstate highways will be able to move along without costly stops and starts and it is estimated that the reduced operating costs will result in a saving of a half-billion dollars annually. Truckers are expected to operate at a saving of over three-quarters of a billion dollars annually.

Practically all kinds of goods will reach their destination in sound condition and of course more quickly. Farm produce, especially, will reach the market fresher and in better condition. Consumers should benefit from lower prices due to reduced shipping costs. There is no question in my mind that the increased efficiency of highway transport that will be made possible by the expressways will benefit all of our people.

Questions arise as to whether the super-highways which will bypass some communities will hurt downtown business. Experience thus far indicates this will not be the case. With the through-traffic expressways, shoppers actually reach downtown stores more easily and quickly. Spurs and loops running off the expressways to downtown areas bring people in minutes to the stores, hotels, offices, and theaters. Furthermore, the off-expressway streets are not crowded with through traffic that only wants to get in or out of the city anyway and does not wish to stop. Parking space is more available and driving conditions are improved.

Here is an example that has been cited to me: The California Highway Department sometime ago studied the effect on over 200 businesses located some distance from a 4-mile stretch of controlled-access expressway bypassing North Sacramento. Previously, the North Sacramento businesses had been directly on a major State route carrying through traffic. After the bypassing expressway had been built, for the first year traffic on the old road fell off 44 percent and business dropped. However, the next 2 years business volume jumped 31 percent. The Highway Department's report said that not only did the rate of increase in number of business establishments in North Sacramento considerably exceed the countywide rate but the increase in gross volume of business was so much greater than the county rate of increase that the volume of all business per establishment in the city showed a gain of 20 percent as compared with less than 10 percent in the county during the same period.

Experience with freeways and turnpikes already built proves that they encourage industrial and residential development close by and that property values rise. In New York, land values along much of the throughway moved from $600 to $6,000 an acre. Boston's circumferential highway boosted property values 700 percent. Along the Baltimore-Washington Parkway, land that was acquired for right-of-way at $250 an acre is selling now for $3,500 an acre. Land near the Eastshore Freeway between San Jose and Oakland, Calif., rose from $500 an acre before the road was built to as high as $40,000 an acre after the road was completed.

With highways such as the Interstate System will provide, it will be increasingly practical to locate industries, shopping centers and office buildings miles from a town or city. Workers and customers can reach them quickly. Decentralization of existing industries in cities will mostly affect those plants situated in blighted areas that need to be redeveloped. Industries and business concerns now favorably located in cities need not fear a dislocation of residences, customers or labor forces. The trend, instead, will be toward development of new industries and businesses adjacent to the expressways and that trend will be in harmony with a dynamic and expanding economy.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this country are going to benefit directly and indirectly by these great new thoroughfares to an extent far in excess of benefits ever before derived from any program of public works. Interstate and cross-country auto trips will be made without stop signs, stop lights or intersections at grade. Motor tours to our vast parks and State scenic and recreational areas will be in a volume dwarfing anything we know now. Social and cultural betterment is bound to be stimulated.

The big road program is now moving into high gear. The new modern-designed highways will delight the public and serve the Nation richly for many decades to come. No sounder public-works investment in America has ever been made.

SUGAR GROVE AND GREEN BANK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, I should like to review briefly the development of the National Radio Astronomy Observatory at Green Bank, W. Va. I wish to deal with the process by which the geographical site was selected inasmuch as I have observed efforts on the part of certain individuals to make it appear that the facility has been located at Green Bank on the basis of political considerations. There are some persons who would like to make the citizens of West Virginia believe that the State is indebted to the present national administration for the location of this facility within the borders of West Virginia. These individuals, in their politically inspired efforts to mislead the voters, continually point to the Green Bank Radio Astronomy facility as one that has been given to West Virginia by the Eisenhower administration. The impression sought to be created is that West Virginians should be indebted to the Eisenhower administration for this installation and that they might not have received it had the administration of the Federal Government remained under the control of the Democratic Party.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think credit should always be given where credit is due; however, where no political influence and no political considerations are involved I do not believe that the people of a State should be led to believe that they are indebted to any particular political party for the location of facilities within the State. The location of the Green Bank facility was decided upon on the basis of purely nonpolitical factors.

With reference to the decision to locate the National Radio Astronomy facility at Green Bank, W. Va., I wish to insert in the RECORD a letter addressed to me on July 9, 1958, by Mr. James M. Mitchell, Associate Director, Management and Public Affairs, National Science Foundation, Washington, D. C. Mr. Mitchell's letter is as follows:

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION,
Washington, D. C., July 9, 1958.

The Honorable ROBERT C. BYRD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BYRD: This is in reply to a request from your office for information about the selection of the site of the National Radio Astronomy Observatory in Green Bank, W. Va. The following information was taken from a publication entitled "Plan for a Radio Astronomy Observatory," prepared for the National Science Foundation. This publication is dated August 1956, and was prepared by Associated Universities, Inc. (AUI). The member universities of AUI are: Columbia, Cornell, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Pennsylvania, Princeton, Rochester, and Yale. The president is Dr. Lloyd V. Berkner.

The basic specifications for the site for the Radio Astronomy Observatory were derived from a series of studies and discussions among scientists and engineers who are members of or associated with the steering committee of AUI. The specifications included rather detailed statements on radio noise, the general geographical location from the standpoint of research in astronomy, the amount of snow and ice that would create loads on the radio telescopes, the presence or absence of strong winds that might cause the development of dangerous vibrations in large structural units, the amount of humidity, the amount of land necessary for the telescopes and arrays, and the general surroundings which should provide as many as possible of the attributes of a university campus.

In the spring of 1955, an ad hoc panel was formed by AUI to assist in the search for possible sites. Including the panel members, those who actively participated in all or part of the search were:

H. L. Alden, University of Virginia; J. E. Campbell, et al, Tennessee Valley Authority; C. E. Cutts, National Science Foundation; E. R. Dyer, University of Virginia; R. M. Emberson, Associated Universities, Inc.; H. I. Ewen, Harvard College Observatory; F. T. Haddock, Naval Research Laboratory; J. P. Hagen, Naval Research Laboratory; Wm. Hardiman, State geologist, Tennessee; R. A. Laurence, geological survey, Knoxville; Wm. McGill, State geologist, Virginia; W. A. Nelson, University of Virginia; P. H. Price, State geologist, West Virginia; C. K. Seyfert, Vanderbilt University; P. van de Kamp, National Science Foundation.

The astronomers of this panel enlisted the assistance of associates who had personal knowledge of the region under search, among whom were the State geologists of Virginia, Tennessee, and West Virginia.

The initial search, based on a study of geological survey maps and on personal knowledge of promising areas, soon discovered a total of 20 possibilities. After the list had been narrowed substantially, all the panel members who could make the trip inspected six sites by car. The sites were rated on a number of points and final ratings developed. By December 1955, the survey had collected a great deal of information about the five most promising sites. The following is a direct quote from the AUI report mentioned in paragraph one:

"Site 18, Green Bank, is a triangular-shaped valley, about 4 miles across at the southern base and extending about 3 miles northward. Deer Creek Valley on the west side is some 50 feet below the average elevation of about 2,700 feet. Mountains of 4,000 or more feet rise in multiple folds in all directions. The site would be easy to develop for all parts of the facility, including the

installations of arrays. There are about 125 houses, stores, churches, and other buildings in the valley, so the level of internal activity is relatively low. On the basis of the radio noise measurements, Green Bank is clearly the first preference; it is first on the basis of the population studies, and the population has been decreasing in recent years; it is first on the basis of the location of nearby towns and cities, and first or second on the basis of airport activities. Although Green Bank offers a good school, churches, and two stores, Marlington 30 miles to the south, or Elkins 50 miles by car to the north, would provide for most staff requirements. Elkins offers both air and rail transportation; Davis-Elkins College is located there. The University of West Virginia at Morgantown, is approximately 100 miles distant."

The Steering Committee of AUI met in the Board Room of the National Science Foundation on Tuesday, December 13, 1955, and after discussion the committee voted unanimously for the selection of Green Bank as the site for the observatory. This recommendation was subsequently approved by the National Science Board.

I hope this is the information you require. We shall be glad to supply any further details upon request.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES M. MITCHELL,
Associate Director.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to include for the RECORD excerpts from a statement of Mr. Allen T. Waterman, Director, National Science Foundation, before the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee on July 14, 1958. They are as follows:

The original concept of the National Radio Astronomy Observatory now located at Green Bank grew out of two conferences held in 1954. The first was held in Washington in January 1954 under the sponsorship of the National Science Foundation, the Carnegie Institution of Washington, and the California Institute of Technology to examine into the state of research in astronomy in the United States, the scientific problems to be considered, and the need for large-scale radio telescopes. The conference brought out the need for large antennas if significant research is to be carried out in radio astronomy.

As the result of this conference, Associated Universities, Inc., was requested by a group of scientists from Harvard, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and the Naval Research Laboratory to act on their behalf in exploring with the National Science Foundation the feasibility of a radio astronomy facility that would be available to scientists throughout the country.

These developments formed the basis for a second conference held in New York in May 1954 and which in turn led to a study undertaken by AUI with two primary objectives: (1) studies of the design and limiting characteristics of large steerable radio telescopes; and (2) a search for and selection of a suitable site for an observatory together with the preparation of a possible plan for its development.

The basic specifications for the site were developed from a series of studies and discussions among the participating scientists and engineers. The specification of paramount importance was of course freedom from radio noise and electrical interference. The fundamental sensitivities to which radio telescopes can operate on any frequency are directly proportional to the ratio of the desired signal to external noise. Therefore, the usefulness of the site is inversely proportional to the interference noise.

The necessary conditions to avoid such noise include the following:

1. Isolation from inhabitants whose work would generate electrical interference and from high tension power lines.

2. The site should be at least 50 miles distant from any city or other concentration of people or industries, and should be separated from more distant concentrations by mountain ranges.

3. The site should not be near commercial air routes, nor in a region where commerce or industry are likely to intrude or grow in the future.

4. The site should be in a valley surrounded by high ranges of mountains on all sides, if possible, to reduce diffraction of tropospheric propagation into the valley.

In addition, the site needed to be located sufficiently far south to permit observation of the milky way while still permitting research involving the aurorae, ionospheric scintillation, and polar blackouts. The site also required a climate without excessive snow and ice, freedom from high winds, and of reasonable mildness and low humidity.

Finally, the site should be located in an area most readily accessible to the majority of astronomers.

Consequently, the criteria established by the search requirements of the telescope materially reduced the geographic possibilities for the site.

The physical requirements of the site are twofold: First, the total acreage must be large enough so that a number of independent research projects can be under way concurrently without interference; secondly, that the site include large, relatively flat areas suitable for the installation of arrays required for observations at long wavelengths.

In the spring of 1955, an ad hoc panel was formed to assist in the search for possible sites. The membership was composed of representatives from the University of Virginia, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the National Science Foundation, Associated Universities Incorporated, Harvard University, the Naval Research Laboratory, Vanderbilt University, the Geological Survey, and the State Geologists of Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia.

In addition to the site survey carried on by the ad hoc panel, independent surveys were made by the United States Forest Service and the Geological Survey to make certain that all possible sites were considered and to determine whether any land already owned by the Government might be suitable.

In all a total of 30 possible sites in 5 States were considered. Radio noise measurements were made by an independent firm to determine comparative noise level data at the sites.

By the end of 1955 the site possibilities had been narrowed to 5 that seemed to be the most promising. Inspection trips were made to these sites during December and the Steering Committee unanimously voted to recommend Green Bank, W. Va., to the Foundation as the best possible site for the establishment of a National Radio Astronomy Observatory. The site at Green Bank is almost ideal as indicated by the following rating for the 3 best sites:

	Green-Bank, W. Va.	Deer-field, Va.	Massa-nutten, Va.
Radio noise measurements	1	2	3
Population studies	1	2	3
Airport activities	1-2	1-2	3
Mountain shielding	1	2	3

In August 1956, a report, Plan for a Radio Astronomy Observatory, was submitted to the Foundation by Associated Universities, Inc., which included the results of the site survey which I have outlined, studies of telescope designs, and a plan for the establishment and operation of a National Radio Astronomy Observatory. Four million dollars was appropriated for construction of the Observatory in fiscal year 1957, and on November 17, 1956, the National Science Foundation entered into a contract with Associated Universities, Inc., for the construction and operation of the National Radio Astronomy Observatory.

As soon as the contract was signed, arrangements were made with the Corps of Army Engineers to acquire the land for the site. The site consists of approximately 2,700 acres, almost all of which has been acquired. Ceremonies marking the beginning of construction of this facility were held on October 17, 1957.

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing letter and statement reveal that the location of the Green Bank National Radio Astronomy Observatory was selected upon the basis of scientific criteria and not upon the basis of any political considerations. Politics in no way entered into or influenced the location of the facility.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I also wish to speak briefly about the location of the naval installation at Sugar Grove, W. Va. It should be emphasized that the decision to locate this naval installation in West Virginia was made before the year 1957. I desire to insert at this point in the RECORD a colloquy which took place on the floor of this House in 1956. The colloquy is to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 102, part 5, page 6233. Remember that this discussion occurred during a debate on the military installations authorization bill and that, in point of time, this was before the November 1956 elections. The following colloquy will illustrate the point I want to make:

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I feel that I would be remiss in my duty as a citizen of the State of West Virginia and as one of the State's Representatives in the Congress of the United States, if I failed at this time to register a vigorous protest against the pending legislation. I speak not only for myself but I speak the sentiments of the entire West Virginia delegation.

Some 2 years ago when we were considering a military construction bill, I had projects proposed for West Virginia. I was told at that time if I did not press those projects there would be something included in the next proposal. I find, Mr. Chairman, considering this particular bill H. R. 9893, and the committee report accompanying it, that once more West Virginia is being treated not only as a stepchild, as I said 2 years ago, but now we are down to the category of a fosterchild and soon we will be just a ward of the Government.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from the Sixth District of West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment my colleague, the gentleman who represents the Third District of West Virginia, on his forthright and timely remarks. He has been trying for a long time to have recognition given toward West Virginia as a State which has many advantages to offer in regard to certain types of military installations. I, too, have been disturbed and concerned at not finding anything listed in this bill for West Virginia. My State, of all the 48 States, is the 1 State that has apparently been omitted, and I know that this cannot be a matter of oversight. The citi-

zens of my State have made their share of the contributions to our national welfare in time of peace, and they have made their share of the sacrifices in time of war. They rightfully expect to receive a just proportion of the appropriations for military installations, but they have been disapointed. It is common knowledge that the economy of West Virginia has been seriously impaired by the closing down of coal mines throughout the past 3 or 4 years. Inasmuch as we have heard it said that a chain is only as strong as its weakest link, is it not important to the economy of the body politic that every segment of that economy be healthy and stable? It is not important to the economy of the whole Nation that the economy of a single State like West Virginia be lifted out of the doldrums? I should think that this would be imperative, not only from the standpoint of the economic welfare of the country but also from the standpoint of our country's defense. I, therefore, add my protest to that of my distinguished colleague, and I hope that our protests will be heard by those whose responsibility it is to give consideration to the location of military installations, and consideration to the authorization of expenditures for military projects. West Virginians do not ask for mercy. We only ask to be given justice.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. May I state to the Committee, to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia, and to the country at large, that there is an item in this bill for West Virginia. It is a classified item, it is one of the most classified in all of the classified items referred to in the bill, and it involves immediately an expenditure of about $1,500,000, and will ultimately cost $20 million. I cannot discuss any more about it. West Virginia has not a single military installation in it until this bill becomes law.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman VINSON, Chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, stated on April 12, 1956, in reply to statements by Congressman BAILEY and me, that the classified item, later revealed to be the naval installation at Sugar Grove, was an item to be located in West Virginia.

Again, I wish to emphasize that this decision to locate the naval installation in West Virginia was made before the November 1956 elections.

INTEGRATION OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN THE SOUTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, according to the newspapers of yesterday, our President warned the South that he would not tolerate any violence in the integration of public schools. In other words, any reasonable person would interpret that warning to mean that he stands ready to invade the South with force and arms.

Inasmuch as I know of no violence in the South at this time, that outburst can only be explained as being the result of an enthusiastic desire to threaten my section of the country. I observe here, however, that the South seems to be the only section in this world that the President sees fit to taunt or to challenge. A short time ago, Cuban rebels held as prisoners and hostages many of our American boys; a short time ago East Germany held in captivity some of our American fliers; Red China still holds American boys as prisoners. It is a little strange, but the President has never seen fit to threaten any of them with our military forces. Only the South does he threaten to visit with guns and bayonets.

As far as Georgia is concerned, the President need not anticipate any violence whatsoever concerning the integration of public schools. We do not intend to violate any edict of the legislating Supreme Court, although every honest lawyer knows the ruling to be complete usurpation of authority. If necessary, we will abolish the public school system. We will do that—and will continue to educate our children. Merely going to a school is of no importance. The privilege of going to a school where the teachers are loyal citizens, believing in the Constitution, a republican form of government, and Christianity is of transcending importance. That kind we will provide. We do not want and we do not intend to have any public schools that the President stands guard over with troops, or any that teach communism is only a political theory, or any that teach one-world government. We have educated our citizens before without Federal intervention or aid. We will do it again.

It is a little strange to a person who loves America to take note of the fact that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 18, 1958, page 18233, shows that the President nominated Maxwell M. Rabb of Massachusetts as a representative of the United States of America to the 10th Session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. This is the same Max Rabb who was a member of the President's cabinet and adviser on minority group affairs and who did more than any living man toward urging that troops be sent to Little Rock. He is the same Max Rabb who was formerly the head of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, an organization committed to the mongrelization of the races. The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization is the same crowd now enthusiastically spending American taxpayers' money to prove that there are no differences in the races. It is the same group that advocated the abolishing of labeling of blood of the various races and insisted that the Red Cross put all of the various blood into the same bottle. This is the same Max Rabb, then in the President's cabinet, who well knew—many days before troops were sent into Little Rock—that the Little Rock police apprehended a man in civilian clothes at the Central High School area who, in truth and in fact, was Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker, later the commander of the 101st Airborne in the famous battle of Little Rock. I hold in my files a letter dated June 3, 1958, written by J. E. Bastion, Jr., Brigadier General, G. S., Deputy Chief of Legislative Liaison, stating that the Secretary of the Army had asked him to reply to my inquiry concerning the presence of General Walker in Little Rock at the time noted in my letter to the Secretary dated April 30, 1958. That letter, in the fourth paragraph thereof, admitted that, prior to the President's order calling out the troops, General Walker, dressed in civilian clothes, was stopped near Central High School. That was far more of an admission than I had ever hoped to get. I here and now charge that General Walker had no business whatever around Central High School, and that certainly his actions must have been peculiar enough to excite the interest of the police authorities. It is the same Max Rabb who knew that Lee Torch and his wife—both alleged Communists who refused to answer questions before a Congressional committee concerning their Communist activities—were in Little Rock and were the ones assisting in bringing the Negro children into the schoolrooms.

On August 20, 1958, I heard unchallenged statements made on the floor of the House to the effect that the OWI had been the most infiltrated agency in our Government and that this agency had spent millions of taxpayers' dollars to penetrate the Iron Curtain with the Voice of America—that this agency was telling us they were penetrating the Curtain and that what they said was completely untrue. This has not excited our President. It would appear to any Georgian that the President would be more concerned with Communists in government and would hasten to discover if treason was being committed by persons in Government agencies. Sad to relate, he evidences no concern.

During the present session, the House Judiciary Committee brought to the floor of this House many pieces of legislation designed to correct spurious decisions of an outrageous Supreme Court, and the House passed all of that legislation. To the credit of the House, it passed legislation permitting the Government to discharge the disloyal from Government positions. Virtually all of this legislation languishes over on the Senate side and adjournment will probably carry all of this legislation down the drain. The President could assist in passing that legislation. He could insist that Congress not adjourn until that legislation is written upon the statute books of this country.

It is ironic, indeed, that the President finds only the South the section that he chooses to chastise.

The views of the President and appointees of the President concerning the domination of our public schools are the reasons why that great Georgian, Congressman PHIL LANDRUM, has courageously led the fight against the regimentation of our schools, and every well wisher for the schools of America and the youth of America should be proud of him.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago this country was rescued from disaster by an allout effort to create new jobs, improve existing ones, and eliminate conditions which forced one-third of our people to be ill clothed, ill fed, and ill housed.

Today the same picture faces many once again. The Secretary of Labor wrote me a few days ago that in Los Angeles some 35,000 people had lost their jobs in the aircraft industry alone. He went on to say the only hope for these people depends primarily upon general economic recovery, including renewed expansion in such other important industries in the area as machinery, metals, and motor vehicles.

Unfortunately, today, the President and his administration have no plans and exert no effort to cure this growing problem of paramount importance to millions of Americans. We have seen the President threaten the Congress with a veto if it passed a real unemployment compensation bill, a job-creating bill to build community facilities, a housing bill that would have helped many industries, as well as individuals. The President's Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare forced the Congress by threat of veto to restrict the increase of social security payments to a much lower figure than is needed. This is not to say that a few good measures have not been passed—they have. Indeed, the list is long, but the legislation is not bold enough to meet the challenge of today's unemployment situation.

Today we have automation with us. Fewer people can produce the necessary output of goods, reducing the employment in some industries by as much as one-half.

What we need then is a vigorous full-employment program to create new jobs, reduce the hours of the workweek without reducing workers' purchasing power, expand existing and create new industries resulting from the latest scientific advances. We should overhaul our social-security system. We should demand that the bill passed to help small businesses be administered with vigor, thus creating more new jobs. We should not again let interest rates rise to stifle expanding enterprise.

Frankly, I do not have too much hope that this will be done by an administration so closely allied to big business and big bombers. But the people can indicate their will by the kind of Congress they elect this November. In 1960 they can restore to the White House real leadership, with the knowledge and know-how to keep all the people working all the time and to provide adequate incomes for those who have retired.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BURNS for period from August 22 to 25, inclusive, on account of the death of mother and interment rites.

To Mr. SAYLOR for Friday, August 22, 1958, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MACK of Illinois, for 30 minutes, today.

To Mr. CURTIS of Missouri, for 10 minutes, today.

To Mr. FORRESTER for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following the legislative business and other special orders heretofore entered into, I might have permission to address the House for 30 minutes for the purpose of paying tribute to Representative KARL M. LECOMPTE of Iowa, who is retiring from Congress at the end of this session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, for 15 minutes, tomorrow.

Mr. PATMAN on the last day of the session and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BYRD, for 20 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BLATNIK.

Mr. WALTER.

Mr. ASPINALL.

Mr. EDMONDSON in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FALLON.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.

Mr. MCGOVERN in two instances, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida.

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. KEAN.

Mr. KEATING.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas.

Mrs. KEE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SANTANGELO and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WESTLAND.

Mr. PILLION.

Mr. DONOHUE and to include extraneous matter.

(At the request of Mr. BALDWIN and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. FORD.

Mr. COLLIER

Mr. KEARNS.

At the request of Mr. MACK of Illinois, the following Member was granted permission to extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter, as follows:

Mr. ANFUSO.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3287. An act for the relief of Vivian D. Giesey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 4109. An act for the relief of Dr. Herbert H. Schafer and his wife, Irma Niemeyer Schafer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 4113. An act for the relief of Harold Pangelinian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1493. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Charles A. Holshouser;

H. R. 2265. An act for the relief of Clifford Oesterlei;

H. R. 2269. An act for the relief of Truck & Axle Manufacturing Co.;

H. R. 4991. An act for the relief of Waldo E. Miller;

H. R. 5497. An act to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act;

H. R. 5584. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maude L. Smith;

H. R. 6238. An act to amend section 1292 of title 28 of the United States Code relating to appeals from interlocutory orders;

H. R. 6595. An act for the relief of Markus H. Teitel;

H. R. 7178. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph D. Metzger.

H. R. 7337. An act for the relief of James McGuire;

H. R. 7374. An act for the relief of Angelo Sardo;

H. R. 7499. An act for the relief of the Cooper Tire & Rubber Co.;

H. R. 7685. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eldrey L. Whaley;

H. R. 8014. An act for the relief of Miss Edith Dorn;

H. R. 8184. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Robert B. Hall;

H. R. 8735. An act to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9407. An act to provide additional opportunity for certain Government employees to obtain career-conditional and career appointments in the competitive civil service;

H. R. 9500. An act to permit certain sales and exchanges of public lands of the Territory of Hawaii to certain persons who suffered a substantial loss of real property by reason of the tidal wave of March 9, 1957;

H. R. 9822. An act to provide for holding a White House Conference on Aging to be called by the President of the United States in January 1961, to be planned and conducted by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare with the assistance and cooperation of other departments and agencies represented on the Federal Council on Aging; to assist the several States in conducting similar conferences on aging prior to the White House Conference on Aging; and for related purposes;

H. R. 9833. An act to amend section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920;

H. R. 10587. An act for the relief of Homer G. Preston;

H. R. 10733. An act for the relief of Magnolia Airport, Inc.;

H. R. 10813. An act for the relief of Maj. Anthony R. Parrish;

H. R. 10993. An act for the relief of Kiiko Nemoto;

H. R. 11078. An act to promote boating safety on the navigable waters of the United States, its Territories, and the District of Columbia; to provide coordination and cooperation with the States in the interest of uniformity of boating laws; and for other purposes;

H. R. 11156. An act for the relief of Duncan Moore and his wife, Marjorie Moore;

H. R. 11200. An act for the relief of the estate of L. L. McCandless, deceased;

H. R. 11239. An act for the relief of James F. Moran;

H. R. 11299. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Tarsi Priori;

H. R. 12144. An act for the relief of Paul E. Nolan;

H. R. 12154. An act for the relief of Ernest T. Stephens;

H. R. 12365. An act for the relief of the estate of Suck Pil Ra;

H. R. 12632. An act authorizing Gus A. Guerra, his heirs, legal representatives and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.;

H. R. 12655. An act for the relief of S. Jackson & Son, Inc.;

H. R. 12662. An act to provide for the acquisition of lands by the United States required for the reservoir created by the construction of Oahe Dam on the Missouri River and for rehabilitation of the Indians of the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation in South Dakota and North Dakota, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12363. An act to provide for additional payments to the Indians of the Lower Brule Sioux Reservation, S. Dak., whose lands have been acquired for the Fort Randall Dam and Reservoir project, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12867. An act for the relief of Clayton T. Wells;

H. R. 12906. An act for the relief of Anneliese Ottolenghi;

H. R. 13132. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955;

H. R. 13406. An act to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended;

H. R. 13437. An act for the relief of Bernard H. English and John E. Hayden;

H. R. 13500. An act to provide for the disposal of federally owned property of the Hanson, Co., and Houma Canals, La., and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 557. Joint resolution to amend the act of September 7, 1957 (71 Stat. 626), providing for the establishment of a Civil War Centennial Commission;

H. J. Res. 630. Joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to use certain real property in the District of Columbia for the proposed Southwest Freeway and for the redevelopment of the southwest area in the District of Columbia;

H. J. Res. 654. Joint resolution requiring the Secretary of Commerce to submit certain recommendations for legislation for the purpose of assisting Congress to determine whether or not to reimburse States for certain highways on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; and

H. J. Res. 661. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1258. An act for the relief of M. Sgt. Robert A. Espe;

S. 1801. An act for the relief of Guerdon Plumley;

S. 3195. An act to authorize certain retired personnel of the United States Government to accept and wear decorations, presents, and other things tendered them by certain foreign countries;

S. 3776. An act to extend the time for the collection of tolls to amortize the cost, including reasonable interest and financing cost, of the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Miami, Mo.;

S. 3966. An act to amend Public Law 85-422;

S. 4169. An act to amend the act of June 10, 1938, relating to participation by the United States in the International Criminal Police Organization; and

S. 4273. An act to provide for cooperation with the European Atomic Energy Commission.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 7125. An act to make technical changes in the Federal excise tax laws, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13518. An act to incorporate the Blinded Veterans Association; and

H. J. Res. 585. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to conduct studies and render a report on service to Santa Clara, San Benito, Santa Cruz, and Monterey Counties from the Central Valley project, California.

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill H. R. 13247 to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs; and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, August 22, 1958, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2254. A letter from the Governor, Canal Zone Government, transmitting a report of claims paid by the Canal Zone Government for the period July 1, 1957, to June 30, 1958, pursuant to section 2673 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2255. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for promotion of economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands"; to the Committee on Armed Forces.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ASPINALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 12899. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, and to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the financing, construction, and operation of additional works for joint use with the State of California, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2682). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 7035. A bill to amend the Code of Law for the District of Columbia by modifying the provisions relating to the attachment and garnishment of wages, salaries, and commissions of judgment debtors, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2683). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SELDEN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 13760. A bill to provide for the denial of passports to persons knowingly engaged in activities intended to further the international Communist movement; with amendment (Rept. No. 2684). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 10614. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property in the State of Florida to Sumter County, Fla.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2685). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CANNON: Committee of conference. H. R. 13450. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2686). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MURRAY: Committee of conference. S. 1411. An act to amend the act of August 26, 1950, relating to the suspension of employment of civilian personnel of the United States in the interest of national security (Rept. No. 2687). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BARDEN: Committee of conference. H. R. 13247. A bill to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs; and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2688). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 13836. A bill to authorize an adjustment in the repayment obligation of the Pine River Irrigation District, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 13837. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Juniper unit of the Yampa-White project as a participating project of the Colorado River storage project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 13838. A bill to provide that certain real property of the United States situated

in the State of Nevada shall be held in trust for members of the Fort McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone Tribe of Indians of the Fort McDermitt Indian Reservation, Nev.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 13839. A bill to establish an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for Water Pollution Control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 13840. A bill to encourage expansion of teaching in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HASKELL:

H. R. 13841. A bill to prohibit convicted felons from holding union office or employment; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 13842. A bill to prohibit eavesdropping under certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 13843. A bill to authorize the payment of supplemental unemployment compensation to unemployed persons attending industrial training courses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 13844. A bill to direct the Atomic Energy Commission to provide a portable, nuclear power reactor for use at the United States Naval Air Facility, McMurdo Sound, Antarctica, for heating and power generating purposes at that base; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. PORTER:

H. R. 13845. A bill to authorize an Under Secretary of State for Western Hemisphere Affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SAUND:

H. R. 13846. A bill to provide for the assessment of costs against the United States in the case entitled "United States Against Fallbrook Public Utility District"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 13847. A bill to provide for Government loans to enable certain holders of national service life insurance or United States Government life insurance to pay the premiums hereafter accruing thereon; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 13848. A bill to equalize the pay of retired members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H. R. 13849. A bill for the relief of May Hourani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 13850. A bill for the relief of Blanka Krickovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 13851. A bill for the relief of Brunetta A. Shaw; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 13852. A bill for the relief of Romeo Magagna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 13853. A bill for the relief of Jean Malandrino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 13854. A bill for the relief of Ruth Adams, Joseph Adams, and Thomas Herbert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 13855. A bill for the relief of Anthony Corn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Regulating Eavesdropping Under Federal Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 21, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to protect the right of privacy of every citizen against unauthorized invasion. This measure would greatly expand the concept of existing wiretapping laws and represent the first effort by the Federal Government to deal with new techniques which have been developed for snooping into the affairs of the people. At the same time it is designed to provide a procedure under which eavesdropping may be engaged in for legitimate law enforcement purposes. It is my hope that this bill will serve as a basis for shielding the public from unknown interlopers without interfering with the fullest use of scientific methods of crime detection.

The bill is closely modeled after several antieavesdropping laws recently adopted in New York as a result of the pioneering work of a New York State legislative committee. I am not committed to any of the particular provisions of the bill as it is now drawn and I offer it at this time merely as a framework within which the House Committee on the Judiciary may consider the subject. I am sure that many changes will have to be made before definitive legislation is enacted.

Under the terms of the bill, unauthorized eavesdropping would be a Federal criminal offense if it occurs in any area under Federal jurisdiction, or is for the purpose of aiding or abetting or perpetrating any Federal offense, or involves the facilities of interstate commerce. It contains detailed provisions for obtaining court orders for eavesdropping under conditions paralleling those applicable to warrants for searchers and seizures. There are also several provisions in the bill which make it clear that it is not intended to supersede pertinent State laws.

We cannot avoid coming to grips with this subject any longer. Many scandals have come to light in recent years growing out of the use of various eavesdropping devices for illegitimate purposes. The Nation was shocked to discover that existing laws are not even adequate to deal with a former chief investigator for a committee of this body who was caught redhanded in the act of bugging a committee witness.

This insidious practice represents a direct threat to the personal liberties of the people. Unauthorized eavesdropping is a blatant infringement of the right of privacy. We still have a long way to go in working out the best solutions for this problem but the complexities of the task must not deter Congressional action. By introducing the bill at this time, it will be possible for the House Committee on the Judiciary to undertake a comprehensive study during the recess of Congress. This legislation can then be made one of the first orders of business when the new Congress convenes in January.

Congress Moves To Assist Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 21, 1958

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr Speaker, this has been a significant Congress so far as the welfare of small business is concerned. In at least three significant areas we have passed legislation of definite benefit to small-business interests.

First of all, the Small Business Administration, which was set up in 1953 as a temporary agency has now become a permanent, independent Federal agency. The ceiling on the individual loans which the Small Business Administration may grant has been raised from $250,000 to $350,000. Furthermore, the interest rate has been reduced from 6 percent to 5½ percent.

Secondly the Small Business Administration has been authorized $250 million to furnish long-term equity capital to small business. It has been provided that these funds will not go directly to individual business but to investment concerns that will in turn allocate the long-term capital to small companies. The investment companies must be formed by at least 10 persons and have a minimum capital of $300,000, one-half of which may be secured from the Small Business Administration.

Thirdly, small business was given significant tax relief by the 85th Congress. That tax relief will come in the following forms:

First. Faster tax writeoffs on new equipment in the first year after its purchase.

Second. Extension from 2 to 3 years of the time for which a loss may be be applied against previous income to gain a retroactive tax refund.

Third. Ten years instead of 15 months in which to pay estate taxes on a business held by a few persons.

Fourth. An increase from $60,000 to $100,000 on the amount of earnings that may be retained instead of being distributed without high tax charges.

Mr. Speaker, I think these programs will be of significant assistance to our small business concerns. I hope that we will continue to make additional progress

in the next session of the Congress. As the author of legislation designed to create a permanent standing committee on small business in the House of Representatives, I am most interested in all matters relating to the welfare of this important sector of our economy.

Control of Dutch-Elm Disease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 21, 1958

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have been seriously disturbed by the fact that thousands of elm trees in Michigan are threatened with destruction by Dutch-elm disease. In a recent article in the Grand Rapids Herald, the situation was well covered. In the first section of this article entitled "Elm Disease Fanning Out," a staff writer, Robert J. McKenzie said:

A thousand or so elm trees bordering Kent County roads and in county parks will die this summer. Next summer more will die. And the summer after, probably still more.

The predictions come from George W. Mueller, a forester for the Kent County Road Commission, who has seen more and more of the umbrella-like shade trees die each year since Dutch-elm disease, the killer, made its first Kent County appearance 4 years ago.

Threatened are thousands of elms that make Kent's roads and parks scenic and shady, not to mention thousands more on private property. The private trees are out of bounds for the road commission.

Once an elm catches the disease there's no hope, it's done for.

"Maybe in a few weeks," Mueller said. "Maybe in 2 or 3 years at most. And there's only one thing to be done—saw down the tree and burn it."

On July 24 I had the privilege of attending and addressing in Grand Rapids a meeting of township officials from Kent and Ottawa Counties. At that time several supervisors including Mr. Floyd Stevens of Paris Township asked me what the Federal Government is doing on this problem and whether more could be done in the solution of this spreading difficulty. On my return to Washington I looked into the matter and found the following:

Federal and State research workers have studied Dutch-elm disease and its insect associates for the past 25 years. In miscellaneous release 12, February 1957, of the Central States Forest Experiment Station, Forest Service, entitled "Dutch-Elm Disease Control," Russell R. Whitten, entomologist, reports that:

The objective of these investigations was an effective and economical means for preventing or at least reducing the tremendous losses caused by these pests. Methods of control have been developed but there are still many problems which only more research can solve. For example, probably the most effective way to control Dutch elm disease would be to cure elm trees after they became diseased. Thus far research has failed to find such a cure, but indications are that such a treatment may eventually be developed. At the present time, however, the only known way to combat Dutch elm disease is through its insect carriers, an indirect method but one that has proved to be effective.

It is because of these indications that there may be developed an effective way to control the disease by curing the elms after they have become diseased that I address the House today.

At the present time the only sure way to control Dutch elm disease is to control its insect carriers, the Europe elm bark beetle. While there is no cure for elm trees once they become infected with Dutch elm disease, spraying healthy trees with DDT sprays is effective in protecting them against the disease. The DDT gets at the beetles; only burning the tree can get at the fungus that grows in the elms' water-conducting tissues, plugs them, and causes the tree to wilt and die.

The use of DDT has certain disadvantages. It can poison wildlife and special protection must be taken for birds and fish wherever it is used. It may "puddle" under the trees being sprayed, poisoning birds which come to drink.

Spraying a huge elm takes special high-pressure spray equipment and in many cases the trees are inaccessible to this equipment.

I was pleased to learn that the Office of Forest Insect Research of the Forest Service is carrying on further research in an attempt to find a substitute for DDT. The sum of $9,000 appears in its 1959 budget for this purpose and the work will be done in the New England States.

Work is also being done by the Forest Service in cooperation with the Agricultural Research Service in breeding disease resistant elms. This may be a long-term answer to the problem, but it will not save today's trees.

Incidentally, the Christian Buisman Elm and the Chinese Elm have been found to be highly resistant to Dutch elm disease.

The Agricultural Research Service, both at Beltsville, Md., and at Columbus, Ohio, has been engaged in experimentation for a number of years in an effort to get at the fungus in Dutch elm disease and thus cure the tree once it had become diseased. It is in this area that there seems to be the most fertile field for additional work and for which I believe the Congress should supply additional funds.

In the Plant Disease Reporter of May 15, 1958, volume 42, No. 5, is a technical article entitled "Inhibition of Growth of Ceratocycstis Ulmi in Vitro by Residues From Extracts of Soil and of Plants Growing in Soil Treated With Captan or Orthocide 50 W." In this article Drs. Curtis May, John G. Palmer, and Edward Hacskaylo describe their experiments in the use of "Captan" as a systemic fungicide that may control Dutch elm disease. There is evidence that a fungicide may be found which can be distributed around an infected tree, be absorbed through the root system into the trunk, branches, and leaves to destroy the fungus.

It seems to me that it is most important and essential that this research be expanded.

In fiscal 1950 the Agricultural Research Service spent $39,500 on work on Dutch elm disease. In 1955 the amount was $53,600. By fiscal 1958 this had risen to $73,300 and for the current fiscal year $75,600 is budgeted for this work.

While the dollars spent have increased 92 percent since 1950, we all know that costs have also increased so there has been far from a 92-percent expansion in the work since 1950.

I have been assured by administrators and technicians in the Department of Agriculture that additional funds can profitably and effectively be used in further research. More testing can be done; more trees can be utilized, and more labor put into the experiments if the money were available.

To double the amount of Federal money spent annually on this essential research would mean increase of only $75,600.

I hope that the Department will make such a request to the Bureau of the Budget next year. I intend to ask the House Committee on Appropriations to increase research funds in this area by that amount in fiscal year 1960. In the meantime I will contact the Forest Service and the Department of Agriculture urging that any uncommitted emergency funds be made available promptly for an expansion of this essential work.

Dr. Walter Purviance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 21, 1958

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my remarks today are paradoxically both sad and happy. It is my sad duty to report to this body the passing of one of the great men of my generation. It was with real grief I learned of the death of Dr. Walter Purviance of Pampa, Tex., which is my home town. It is with real joy and satisfaction I recall the beauty of his life and what he has meant to me and my family—both personally and professionally.

Dr. Purviance came to the Panhandle of Texas in the early years of this century from Grant City, Ill., where he practiced several years before his health failed. He bought a drugstore in Pampa which he operated until World War I when he was commissioned in the Army Medical Corps. He served magnificently with a field hospital unit and saw battle at Coblenz and the Rhine. After returning to Pampa after the war he worked in the First National Bank a short time before returning to medical practice, and, along with Dr. Archie Cole and Dr. J. D. Kelley, was instrumental in establishing Pampa's first hospital. Later Dr. Purviance built a fine clinic in Pampa which still bears his name. These facts are mere statistics, however, in the broad visage of this man's life.

The driving purpose in the life of Dr. Purviance was service to his fellow man.

He accomplished this in so many ways, but it was always accomplished to the benefit of the recipient and with the subjection of the donor. All his days on earth were spent, literally, in giving of himself to others. He enjoyed the complete confidence of my children and I know of no greater tribute which can be paid to any man than for him to claim the confidence of a child. His greatest reward in this life was the satisfaction he derived in fulfilling the admonition of the Master, "Love thy neighbor." His reward currently, and for eternity, is, doubtless, in rich portion.

I know that all the Members of this honorable body join me, as well as the great host of persons whose good fortune it was to know Dr. Purviance, in expressing sympathy to Mrs. Purviance, and in satisfaction for the example of his days among us.

National Cultural Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 21, 1958

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, since Congress governs Washington, and does in Washington in a legislative way what other communities do for themselves, it must face its obligation and problem of cultural facilities as well as such matters as roads, public buildings, salaries of police, schoolteachers, and so forth.

At the very least, it should not be a roadblock which prevents the citizens of Washington and throughout the Nation, who may be interested in contributing money for a National Cultural Center, from actually doing so.

New York City expects to raise $75 million from the citizens of this country for the Lincoln Square Center of the Performing Arts. It has indeed raised some $35 million to date.

Proof that the plan incorporated in this legislation is sound is evidenced by the Lincoln Square Center project in New York City, and the National Gallery of Art in Washington, D. C.

This legislation is, in fact, based on the act approved March 24, 1937, establishing the National Gallery of Art.

In addition, the National Cultural Center will charge admission just as any theater or movie house does. Thus it will be self-supporting.

The Federal Government will not be called upon to subsidize the National Cultural Center—just as it is not called upon to subsidize any of the 382 civic and cultural centers in cities and towns of our country from coast to coast.

Another thing. This bill proposes that the Federal Government contribute some land along the Potomac River, and that the District of Columbia government likewise contribute some land now in private ownership. The District government would repay the Federal Government for land bought with Capper-Crampton funds.

It was brought out in the hearing that the same principle is involved here as when the Congress granted land on the Capitol Grounds for the Bell-Tower Memorial to Senator Taft.

The Federal Government gave land for the National Gallery or Art and Andrew Mellon and his associates have given that magnificent building and the priceless art collections. Not a penny of Federal money, not a cent of taxes, went into the construction of the National Gallery of Art.

Furthermore, by an amendment adopted by the Committee on Public Works, there is a termination date of 5 years for the Cultural Center. This provision adds commendable strength to the bill. Twelve years ago when I first came to the Congress I proposed similar legislation, and I have been an ardent supporter of the efforts of others to make a Cultural Center a reality. I think this bill, in its entirety, is one of the most significant and sound which this body has considered. Actually all that is involved is the contribution of the land owned by the Federal Government—land which has no significant buildings on it. Never before have we been able to secure so much for so little.

The Euratom Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 21, 1958

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the action taken by the House approving legislation implementing the Euratom program, I would like to say a few words from the point of view of the United States uranium-ore producers. During the public hearings the Joint Committee received helpful testimony from Mr. Jess Larson, president of the Uranium Institute of America, accompanied by Mr. Gordon Weller, executive vice president. Their testimony appears at pages 250–254 of the hearings by the Joint Committee.

The domestic uranium-ore producers, including those in my own district of western Colorado, recognize that their future depends upon an expanding atomic-power program. Because the Euratom program will provide research and development assistance, and should help hasten the day when atomic power will be more widely installed both abroad and here in the United States it constitutes a good step.

However, I hope that the AEC will continue efforts to develop natural uranium reactors in order that our uranium-ore producers will be able to make direct sales to the customer rather than just to the United States Government. All of the uranium in this program so far is enriched uranium, to be sold directly by the United States Government to the Euratom users.

Also, I hope that a vigorous atomic-power-development program will be continued in this country, both by private industry and the Government, in order that atomic power may soon be developed, with resulting benefits both to the United States and the peoples of the Free World.

Interim Report on the Administration of Public Law 85–316

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 21, 1958

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit an interim report on the administration of the act of September 11, 1957—Public Law 85–316.

Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary, in charge of legislation relating to immigration and nationality matters, is exercising continuous scrutiny of administrative operations authorized under the act of September 11, 1957—Public Law 85–316—and is pleased to submit for the information of the Members of the House an informal report on the effect of that law.

Public Law 85–316 is a special immigration statute designed mainly to expedite the admission into the United States of orphaned children adopted by United States citizens as well as to facilitate the entry of highly skilled persons and certain close relatives of United States citizens and aliens lawfully residing in this country.

Public Law 85–316 also contains a provision under which special nonquota immigrant visas allocated, but not used, under the expired Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, have been reallocated to specifically defined classes of aliens. Certain provisions of Public Law 85–316 are designed to remain a part of our permanent immigration statutes, while other provisions of the same law are temporary. Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary intends to investigate the advisability of extending some of these temporary provisions, should the continuous study of the administration of the law warrant such extension.

Further, Public Law 85–316 vested in the Attorney General of the United States certain discretionary powers to waive, under prescribed circumstances, specified grounds for exclusion of aliens, mostly in the case where the enforcement of exclusion would tend to create hardship to close relatives of the excluded alien, such relatives being United States citizens or lawfully residing aliens.

For the purpose of efficient and expeditious administration of the statute, the Attorney General of the United States has sought and obtained the concurrence of the Secretary of State in the assignment of officers of the Immigra-

tion and Naturalization Service to certain United States consular offices abroad so that an interrogation of aliens applying for relief under Public Law 85–316 and a determination of their eligibility to benefit from the waivers therein provided could be made without the necessity of forwarding of each case to the central office of the Immigration and Naturalization Service for action.

Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary was pleased to note that the Secretary of State has agreed to the assignment of duly authorized immigration officers to the United States consular offices at Frankfort, Germany; Vienna, Austria; Rome, Italy; Naples, Italy; Athens, Greece; Mexico City, Mexico; Havana, Cuba; and Tokyo, Japan. It is understood that the Secretary of State is willing to consider an expansion of this useful program, should the caseload pending before other United States consulate offices warrant such step.

Statistics embracing the period of time from the enactment date of the act of September 11, 1957, until the end of fiscal year 1958—June 30, 1958—indicate that 1,878 orphans adopted by United States citizens have obtained permanent residence in this country under the law.

One thousand and sixty-one of those orphans had been adopted abroad and 110 orphans entered the United States without the benefit of foreign adoption decrees but must be adopted in the appropriate State courts. Seven hundred and seven orphans previously admitted into the United States under the parole provision of the Walter-McCarran Act, have now obtained the adjustment of their immigration status.

Of the total number of orphans who benefited under the law, 86 percent were natives of four countries as follows: Korea, 863; Japan, 348; Greece, 253; and Italy, 146. The 1,878 orphans admitted into the United States were composed of 929 males and 949 females, and the median age of the adopted orphans is 3.4 years, as compared with the statutory limitation of 14 years of age.

The orphans admitted into the United States were distributed throughout the entire continental United States, Hawaii, and the United States possessions. The largest concentration is noted in California, 474; with New York, 165; Texas, 100; and Oregon, 94. About half of the Korean orphans and one-third of the Japanese orphans were adopted in the States of California, Washington, and Oregon, while New York is the principal State of residence of Greek and Italian orphans.

Two sections of Public Law 85–316 were designed to facilitate the entry of immigrants chargeable to the first, second, and third preference portions of the immigration quotas allocated to various countries. That purpose was achieved by converting the preferential quota immigrant cases pending on July 1, 1957, into nonquota status. Under these provisions of Public Law 85–316, the United States labor force has so far gained 2,153 highly skilled immigrants. The principal occupational skills of these aliens, who have now become permanent residents of the United States, are: engineers, 446; physicians and surgeons, 321; tailors, 177; professors and teachers, 160; nurses, 96; chemists, 72; toolmakers and dyemakers, 71; religious workers, 53; and so forth. Italy, China, the Philippines, Turkey, Greece, and Hungary were the principal countries of birth of the skilled immigrants admitted into the United States; 842 of the alien skilled specialists were born in the various countries of Asia.

Under the provisions of Public Law 85–316 affecting close relatives of United States citizens and lawfully residing aliens—second and third preference—2,301 parents of United States citizens and 13,909 spouses and children of permanently residing aliens were admitted into the United States. By far, the greatest number in this category were natives of Italy, 75 percent; while 3 percent were natives of Greece; 2.7 percent natives of Poland; and 2 percent Yugoslavia.

Under the provisions of Public Law 85–316 authorizing the Attorney General to grant waivers of grounds for exclusion in compassionate cases, a total of 377 applications were approved pursuant to sections 5 and 7 of Public Law 85–316, probably eliminating that number of private bills from the Congressional calendars. The principal nationalities represented among the beneficiaries of waivers were Germans, Italians, Mexicans and Japanese, in that order.

Four hundred and ninety-one alien members of the immediate families of United States citizens or lawfully resident aliens were admitted under the waivers of the Attorney General applicable in cases of aliens affected with tuberculosis where the United States Public Health Service has agreed to the granting of a waiver and safeguards were provided in accordance with the requirements of the statute. A report has been submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary on each of the cases where this type of waiver was used.

Section 15 of Public Law 85–316 authorized the issuance of 18,656 special nonquota visas to 3 categories of immigrants: First, German expellees; second, Dutch nationals who are refugees from Indonesia or are closely related to United States citizens, or permanently residing aliens within a defined degree of consanguinity; and third, to refugee-escapees who fled from a Communist or a Communist-dominated country, or from any country within the general area of the Middle East, and who cannot return to such country or to such area because of fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion.

As of August 15, 1958, 257 immigrant visas were issued to German expellees out of an authorized total of 2,500 such visas; 969 immigrant visas out of an authorized total of 1,600 such visas were issued to Dutch immigrants, and 252 visas were issued to refugee-escapees out of an authorized total of 14,556 visas. An additional 8,497 cases involving refugee-escapees are currently in the processing state. The initial action involving a preliminary approval of applications has been taken by the Department of State and the applicants are now being screened by appropriate agencies for the purpose of establishing their eligibility to receive immigrant visas under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

In Defense of TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 21, 1958

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a most timely, enlightening, and excellent letter written by Hon. ROBERT E. JONES, which was published in today's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN DEFENSE OF TVA

The anti-TVA letter in the Washington Post of August 14 by Richard W. Smith states it is "common knowledge" that the Tennessee River "flows through 7 States and drains 48." Mr. Smith, who is the manager of the deceptively dubbed national resources department of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, seems more at home with figures of speech than with facts. Mr. Smith's assertions are thoroughly confused, erroneous, and distorted.

He asserts that "navigation benefits to the Nation do not equal the costs." Answer: According to the 1957 Annual TVA Report, the total Federal costs of operating and maintaining the Tennessee River Waterway for the previous year were $3.8 million. Savings to shippers during that year amounted to $16.2 million over those costs and represented a return of over 11½ percent on the depreciated navigation investment of $136,868,693.

Mr. Smith asserts that TVA controls floods by permanently flooding almost as much land as might be flooded by a 500-year frequency flood. Answer: The 1957 annual TVA report estimates that since 1936 TVA dams have averted flood damage at Chattanooga alone of about $120 million plus about $12 million for the lower Ohio and Mississippi Basins. These two amounts alone already equal about 70 percent of the total of $184 million invested in the flood-control features of the TVA system.

Mr. Smith asserts that TVA does not sell only "surplus hydroelectric power." Answer: TVA transmits over 56 percent of its total power to the atomic energy plants at Oak Ridge and Paducah, to the Army Redstone Arsenal which is developing the Jupiter ballistic missiles and to the Air Force wind tunnel center at Tullahoma as well as to the heavy industries of the Tennessee Valley area which are so important to our national defense.

Mr. Smith asserts that TVA sells its power cheap. Answer: Congress directed TVA to make its power available—at the lowest possible rates and in such manner as to encourage increased domestic and rural use of electricity. TVA has done just that, and at the same time has earned a substantial return on the Federal investment.

Mr. Smith asserts that TVA pays no interest on the taxpayers' money invested in

electric plants. Answer: The TVA revenue bill now before Congress would provide that the TVA make annual interest payments to the Treasury on the outstanding appropriation investment in power facilities.

Mr. Smith asserts that TVA pays no Federal taxes and makes only token payments in lieu of State and local taxes. Answer: TVA as a Government agency of course pays no "taxes," but it does pay substantial sums to Federal, State, and local governments. For example, in fiscal 1957, TVA paid $30 million out of power proceeds into the Federal Treasury, and 5 percent of its gross revenues (exclusive of revenues derived from sales to the Federal Government itself), amounting to $4.7 million, to State and local governments.

ROBERT E. JONES,
United States Representative from Alabama.
WASHINGTON.

Senator H. Alexander Smith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KEAN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 21, 1958

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, the Senate of the United States will miss H. ALEXANDER SMITH, for during his 14 years in that body he has served the Nation well. New Jersey not only holds him in deep affection but is proud of his achievements.

Born in New York City, the son of a prominent physician, ALEX SMITH'S first ties with New Jersey came when he attended Princeton University. His most charming and devoted wife was a summer resident of Monmouth County, and it was in a church in Monmouth Beach that they were married.

In his early years, Senator SMITH suffered from a severe illness which necessitated his living for several years in Colorado and which resulted in a continued interest by him in the welfare of that State.

Perhaps it was his need for careful living in those early days which has resulted in his present rugged health at the age of 78.

Completely cured he returned East where he practiced law.

During the days after World War I, ALEX SMITH worked closely with Herbert Hoover in his relief work.

In his beloved Princeton where he made his home he was called upon to lecture on international affairs at the University.

His interest in Republican politics led him to be first Republican State treasurer, then chairman of the Republican State committee. With the death of United States Senator Warren Barbour, ALEX SMITH was elected in 1944 to complete his unfinished term; and was reelected by substantial majorities in 1946 and 1952.

His knowledge of education led to his being immediately placed on the Committee on Education and Public Welfare, on which he has since served as chairman and is now ranking Republican member.

His knowledge of foreign affairs was soon recognized by his colleagues and put to use by his election to the Foreign Relations Committee.

Senator SMITH served on the Subcommittee on the Far East where his advice and counsel have been of great help in that troubled area. He took many trips to that part of the world and once had the pleasure of greeting a fighting GI on the battlefields of Korea—his grandson.

Senator SMITH sponsored and was instrumental in having enacted into law legislation for the exchange of foreign students. But in every phase of foreign relations his advice has been sought and listened to.

His close friendship with Secretary of State Dulles always stood him in good stead.

ALEX SMITH'S particular characteristics have always been kindness, understanding and tolerance of the views of others—but with an unswerving adherence to what he believed was right. Truly he may be called a Christian gentleman.

Though he is now seeking less arduous duties in future years I am sure that his talents, experience and ability will continue to be used toward our country's welfare.

ALEXANDER SMITH can look back with great satisfaction to his work in the Senate during the past 14 of the most critical years in the life of our Republic.

He has served New Jersey well. He has served our Nation well. I pray that he and his devoted wife may have together many more years of a happy and useful life.

Imports "Under" Program Quota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 21, 1958

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, for the last 9 consecutive months, crude-oil imports are supposed to be under the quota set by the voluntary imports program. June imports are reported 1,900 barrels a day under the quota of 934,100 barrels a day.

The fact is that crude-oil imports into districts I–IV, the only area in which anything approaching realistic curbs were set, are some 23,000 barrels a day in excess of the quota.

By lumping crude imports for district V along with the districts I–IV it is possible to justify the conclusion that imports are under the quota. But it is generally recognized that the district V quota is far too high, as even the imporing companies are declining to bring in that much oil because of the oversupply there.

And if crude imports are under the quota overall, is that not itself evidence that somebody's quota is too high—not that the program is a success?

Not long ago when crude-oil imports into district V reached such enormous proportions, resulting in the big glut, domestic independents were admonished by the Government administrators for lumping district V in with the districts I–IV crude imports. They were told they were being unfair in refusing to consider only the success of the program in districts I–IV. Now that the shoe is on the other foot, domestic independents are told it is unreasonable of them to measure the success of the program in terms of the districts I–IV quota.

If the program's real success is to be considered, why not include oil products as well as crude. There we see an almost 50 percent increase during the last year. And the ratio of total imports to production has jumped from the 16.6 percent ratio in 1954 to over 24 percent in 1958.

Boating Regulations and the Coast Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 21, 1958

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members, views that I have received from a number of my constituents regarding the regulations that have been adopted by the Coast Guard pursuant to Public Law 519 of the 84th Congress—CG–249, 46 CFR 7949–7980—asking that these regulations be suspended.

Public Law 519 was approved May 10, 1956, and authorized by the Coast Guard to provide certain regulations to carry out the purposes of the act. After several revisions, the regulations became effective as of June 1, 1958. Notices were sent out by the Coast Guard suggesting that all boatowners require an inspection. Following this inspection, the Coast Guard wrote letters to the boatowners indicating numerous changes in the boat and addition of equipment to bring the vessel within the requirements of CG–249. I have been advised by some of my constituents that the letters they received listed in some instances more than 40 deficiencies found by the Coast Guard inspector on boats which have proven their seaworthiness by safe and efficient service. Also, in many instances, compliance with the regulations will exceed the sum of $5,000 per boat.

In view of the high taxes and overhead costs, the highly competitive character of the business which is seasonal in many areas, I am advised it is difficult for the boat industry to meet the requirements laid down in the regulations. Furthermore, it has been stated that some of the items required to be installed are not available.

Hearings were held in the Senate on these regulations on March 19, 1958, and the report of that hearing states:

The end result of the undefined and ambiguous regulations might be unjust enforcement, possible disrespect for the law and the administering agency, uncertainty, resent-

ment, and anxiety—none of which aid the cause of safety.

Reading further, on page 58 of the Senate report:

Even the most casual reviewer of the revised CG–249 must admit that many of the regulations are lengthy, confusing, and subject to more than one interpretation.

The members of the industry who have contacted me have asked that we express our concern to the Coast Guard so that these regulations may be postponed in their effective date until October 1, 1958, allowing time for revision in the regulations.

Aid for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 21, 1958

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include copy of my newsletter Keenotes which was released today.

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

After several years of evading the issue, Congress has finally gotten around to passing urgently needed legislation to aid and assist small business.

Unfortunately, the question of tax relief for the Nation's 4 million small-business firms and a system of making the right kind of capital available had become a political football. Both political parties spoke approvingly of the problems of small business but when it came to facing up to needs of this important segment of our economy, words were louder than deeds.

I am pleased that this year action was taken. Tax relief was voted and a cooperative plan for providing long-term capital was spelled out by law. I am hopeful the program can stem the rising tide of bankruptcy for small business and help the smaller concerns compete on a more even basis with the giant corporations.

On taxes, Congress provided faster tax writeoffs on new equipment the first year after its purchase; extension from 2 to 3 years the period for which a loss may be carried back and applied against previous income to gain a retroactive tax refund; 10 years instead of 15 months in which to pay estate taxes on a business held by a few persons; an increase from $60,000 to $100,000 on the amount of earnings that may be retained, instead of being distributed, without stiff tax charges.

These new tax provisions should be of substantial assistance to small business. The longer period for paying estate taxes, for example, will enable families to retain a business instead of being forced to sell it to raise enough money to pay this particular tax. This change in itself should save many small-business firms each year.

As for credit, the Small Business Administration has been given $250 million in loan authority to furnish long-term equity capital to small business. The funds will not go directly to individual businesses but to investment companies which will funnel long-term capital to small companies unable to obtain the needed financing elsewhere. Small Business Administration requires that these privately owned and organized investment companies put up a substantial share of the money.

In addition, Congress also made the Small Business Administration a permanent agency, raised from $250,000 to $350,000 the ceiling on individual loans by the agency itself and lowered the interest rate from 6 to 5½ percent.

I enthusiastically supported all of these bills, some of which passed in the closing days of the session. Congress should be concerned with small business. Prosperous small businesses give to the national economy a buoyancy and a sound foundation which large concerns cannot provide by themselves. The absorption of small businesses by large concerns is an alarming trend.

What Congress has done is to equalize the competition between large and small businesses. Large corporations have never had any difficulty in obtaining venture capital from banks, usually at preferred rates of interest. Also, tax laws have given the larger companies a break over the small firms.

And the bill is designed for genuinely small business, too. Small business is defined as follows: A wholesaler with annual sales of less than $5 million; a retailer or dealer in services with a volume of less than $1 million; a construction company whose annual receipts for the last 3 years has been less than $5 million; manufacturers with 250 or fewer employees.

Under these rules, tax benefits and credit will go to those firms which Congress intended should have them.

Retirement of Hal Holmes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 21, 1958

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I regret I was not present when my colleagues from Washington, Mr. PELLY and Mr. TOLLEFSON, made their farewell remarks concerning our colleague, HAL HOLMES, and would like to add mine at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I regret sincerely that HAL HOLMES has decided to relinquish his seat in the Congress. I am sure this regret is shared not only by the other Members of Congress from the State of Washington and his other colleagues in the House of Representatives, but also by the people of the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Washington.

HAL HOLMES has rendered a devoted service to the people of this District for many years and the wisdom which he brought to this body and his devotion to his constituents has been most outstanding. He is a man of many abilities—rancher, cowboy, teacher, football player, and Congressman. His broad character has been of tremendous value in facing the many problems which come before any Congressman.

HAL has been a close, personal friend of mine during my 6 years in Congress and his absence will be a great personal loss to me. My greatest wish is that he and his charming wife, Margaret, will have success and happiness in the days ahead.

The Kennedy-Ives Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 21, 1958

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, the Kennedy-Ives bill which recently failed of passage in the House was, of course, a most controversial measure and I wish to present my observations on this matter.

After this bill was passed by the Senate it remained on the Speaker's desk for 40 days before it was referred to the House Committee on Education and Labor for consideration. This delay, naturally, because of the approaching adjournment of Congress, jeopardized the chances of any adequate hearings on the measure, and deliberate consideration by the committee. At the last meeting held by the committee this bill was brought up for discussion and report and the members of the committee making up the majority voted unanimously against it. Later, a bill sponsored by the Republican minority on the committee and which had the approval of the administration, was called for consideration and again the 16 Democrats representing the majority voted against it. It would appear from this unanimous action on the part of the Democrat majority that there was no desire whatever to permit the House to consider any labor legislation.

A few days later for some undisclosed reason, the Democrat leadership decided that the Kennedy-Ives bill should be brought out for consideration on the floor under the suspension of the rules procedure, which does not permit any amendment except by the Member who calls up the legislation, and debate is limited to 40 minutes divided so that each side receives maximum time of 20 minutes apiece. This bill is 48 pages long and under this procedure the Members of the House were asked to vote on this comprehensive and far-reaching legislation which had not had any consideration by the appropriate committee of the House.

In this connection I think the remarks of the majority chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor are most pertinent and informative. His statement on the floor of the House was as follows:

Mr. Speaker, I come before you today as probably a deposed chairman of a slapped-down committee. I shall try to restrain myself as best I can in what I have to say. I do not wish to offend anyone.

Mr. Speaker, the committee of which I am privileged to be chairman has been a hard-working committee this year. We have turned out much beneficial legislation and we have been busy, and no one can say otherwise. I do not like to see the committee put in the plight that it now is in. Maybe I am a little out of line with the leadership but when it comes to a question of my convictions about things for the good of the country, that takes precedence. I do not wish for this to be a Democrat or a Republican situation. I happen to be a Democrat

and I have been one all my life. I have always believed that good democracy is good sense. And, now where are we?

Here is a bill that was passed by the Senate. Then it came to the House. I think it came to the House somewhere about June 18, 1958. It was referred to my committee on July 28, 1958, at that time we were in the midst of trying to get out the education bill, trying to get out the welfare insurance pension bill, with the announcement concurred in by, certainly, the majority leader, that we were expected to adjourn and get away from here about August 9.

And I am going to say this: Not a single person connected with the leadership of this House requested me to bring the Kennedy-Ives bill out. I think they readily realized the realities of the situation. I have no criticism. To me it was perfectly obvious, and to everyone who was familiar with the situation, that you could not take a piece of legislation that involves as much as this one does, study it, learn something about it, and come out with a sensible conclusion in any period of 4 or 5 or 10 days. It was simply not in the cards and, so far as that is concerned, all of us knew it.

At the time it came up—and I have no criticism for anyone's slowness—the committee was busy as everybody else was busy, so far as that is concerned. What disturbs me and rocks me is that we are called upon on the floor of this House to take a bill that is so vital, that is the most dangerous and the most far-reaching piece of legislation in the field of labor and management that has come to this floor since the Taft-Hartley bill, a bill of 48 pages, we are called upon to understand it and to do the wise thing and to keep faith with America in 40 minutes. I cannot refrain from saying that it is an insult to the House and no compliment to their intelligence to expect them to do this thing.

How are you going to justify passing a bill, including prison sentences and $10,000 fines, with the power vested in one man, to deal with industry, to deal with management, to deal with labor, as he sees fit?

The RECORD does not reveal that anyone challenged the chairman's statement and estimate of the situation.

Because of the inadequate consideration given to this very important measure, together with provisions contained therein which would not be in the interest of the public, the workingman, or management, I was compelled to vote against this legislation and I express the fervent hope that one of the first pieces of business in the new Congress will be the consideration of wholesome, adequate, fair, and comprehensive legislation which will be for the benefit of the workingman, the management, and the general public.

Telephone Excise Tax Should Have Been Repealed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 21, 1958

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to a very serious omission on the part of this Congress. I refer to our failure to enact my bill, H. R. 12577, which would eliminate the excise tax on telephone and telegraph communications.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most unfair taxes ever enacted by the United States Congress. It is a luxury tax, but one imposed on something that is no longer a luxury, but is a necessity in many homes and businesses in America.

Many businessmen cannot continue to operate without the telephone. No housewife, living in a remote area, would be safe without a telephone. To millions of homes the telephone is an essential, a vital part of everyday living.

And yet, this so-called luxury tax is still with us. I think this failure to remove this most unfair, inequitable tax is one of the most serious failures of the 85th Congress. I hope the 86th will show more concern for the people. I hope this next Congress makes this the first order of business.

Ukraine Versus Bolshevik Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 21, 1958

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, August 17, it was my privilege to address a gathering of Americans of Ukranian descent under the sponsorship of the American Friends of the Anti-Bolshevik Block of Nations.

This group unanimously adopted a resolution condemning the Bolshevik exploitations of the Ukranian people and of the people of the satellite nations.

There is every reason to believe that Soviet Russia would be faced with serious internal disorders and resistance on the part of a large segment of the captive peoples which are now being held under a captive subjugation. My address to these people of Ukranian origin amplifies these thoughts:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished and reverend guests, and my fellow Americans, it is a high privilege to join with you in this manifestation to protest and to condemn communism: Of every shade, in every form, wherever it may exist.

This occasion marks the 25th year since the Soviet Communist Government perpetuated its historic and diabolic mass murder upon the helpless people of the Ukraine. It was in the year 1933 that the Communist Government imposed collectivization upon the Ukrainian farms.

The Bolshevik agents collected and confiscated all the grains, all the livestock and all other food to create an artificial famine. To implement this fiendish plan, the Communist agents carried on a reign of terror to enforce immediate obedience of the peasants to the collective farm system.

This brutal, inhuman campaign caused the deaths of more than 4 million Ukrainian men, women, and children.

Although Stalin was the leader of the Soviet in 1933, the chief executioner, the man who carried out this plan of operation, was the smiling Mr. Khrushchev.

Yes, the same Mr. Khrushchev who talks of "peace" one day, and threatens to "bury us" the next day.

Yes, it is the same Mr. Khrushchev who less than 2 years ago ordered Soviet troops and tanks to murder thousands of defenseless Hungarian children and patriots fighting for their liberation.

Yes, it is the same Bolshevik regime that ordered the massacre of 15,000 Polish officers in the Katyn forest.

Yes, it is the same Mr. Khrushchev who recently asked President Eisenhower to attend a summit conference and then withdrew the demand when Red China applied pressure.

I am sure that we all look back upon these events with a deep sorrow for those who were so brutally murdered. We sympathize with those who must continue to live in the shadow of Communist terror.

We are not gathered here to merely express our sympathy and our sorrow.

We are, each of us, anxious to take any reasonable measure leading toward the liberation of the captive peoples of the Ukraine, Estonia, Latvia, Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria and Roumania.

But this is not our basic problem. Our immediate concern is that of survival. How can we block the expansion of Communist power throughout the world. How can we halt the infiltration of Communist ideology in our schools, in our Government and among our people?

Before answering these questions, we must assess and evaluate the strength and the weakness of the Communist system. We must first look around the world. Every nation, every province has its cadres of Communists and their fellow-traveling agents. In Italy, in France, in Indonesia, in Finland, and in many other countries, the Communist Party is strong enough to be on the verge of seizing political control.

They are sufficiently strong in many countries to paralyze and neutralize efforts to aid the United States in any political or military effort.

The Communists Party carries on a campaign of agitation and propaganda by means of newspapers, magazines, radio and libraries, with trained agents in every nation on this earth.

The Communist tyranny, today, controls the manpower and resources of one-third of this world.

It dominates a population of more than 200 million in the Soviet. It exercises control over more than 100 million people in the captive satellite countries of Europe.

The Soviet has a coordinate ally of 600 million people in Red China.

The Soviet has an army that is considerably larger than that of the United States. It is well trained, fully and superbly equipped.

It has a fleet of 500 submarines. This is far more than the combined submarine fleets of the rest of the world.

It has more fighter planes than all other nations combined.

The Soviet has beaten the United States and all other nations in the development of rocket propulsion power.

I cite these facts only for the purpose of showing that we cannot afford to underestimate the military potential of the Communist bloc.

On the other side of the ledger, the United States maintains a most powerful navy.

We continue our superiority in atomic power. The United States maintains a powerful bombing fleet on air bases, which encircle the periphery of the Soviet.

Our total capacity far surpasses that of the Soviet. However, the Soviet is gaining on the United States in the expansion of heavy industry and war potential.

We possess the strength that comes from a free people.

It is generally conceded that the Communist bloc of nations would have a mili-

tary superiority in the event of a war restricted to conventional weapons.

We believe that the United States would have military superiority in the event of a war including the use of atomic power.

This is the reason that the Soviet continues its worldwide agitation campaign to limit further development of atomic power.

What can we as a nation, what can we as individual citizens, do to prevent war, to maintain a just peace, to block further infiltration and expansion of communism?

We must first be able to recognize the menace and the dangers of the Communist military and economic power. Then we should try to spot and recognize the Communist Party line in our schools, in our labor unions, in our Government, so that we do not support their programs designed to create dissension, disunity, and weakness among our people.

We must become as dedicated and determined to preserve our liberties, our way of life as the Communists are to destroy us.

We in the United States have a noble mission. We carry the responsibility of preserving all religions and the morality and the ethics of religion for all mankind.

We have the responsibility of preserving constitutional government and its freedom for all mankind.

If this Nation does not survive, religion, morality and liberty will perish for centuries to come.

We must continue to allocate a large portion of our income to maintain a superiority of military power. However, we should not tolerate wastages in our defense program.

We should eliminate frills and luxuries.

We should curb excessive profits.

We should not lose sight of the fact that the primary purpose of a defense program is to acquire weapons with a maximum firepower and to train men to use them with a maximum efficiency.

We should have an economic policy that will encourage the expansion and growth of our plant capacity and our transportation system.

We must prevent the imminent danger of a runaway inflation due to fiscal irresponsibility.

We should stabilize the purchasing power of the dollar and put a stop to the ever-increasing cost of living.

We must realize that the cost of living cannot be stabilized if we cheapen the dollar by deficits of $15 billion such as anticipated this fiscal year.

We cannot stabilize the cost of living if wages continue to rise faster than the production of the wage earner.

The workingman, the labor union official, the stockholder, the corporation official, all have a social responsibility to limit wages and profits to reasonable limits.

The defense program should not be permitted to become a field day for corporate or labor profiteering.

We should, each of us, be prepared to make our own unselfish sacrifice toward the cause of just peace, if possible, and to the preservation of our freedom at any cost.

There is one aspect of this struggle between communism and the Free World that we, perhaps, have failed to give proper attention and emphasis.

We should not ignore the possibility of capitalizing upon the discontent among the more than 75 nationalities grouped together in the Soviet domination.

This demonstration here today is proof that the Ukrainian people would certainly welcome liberation.

The riots of 1956 in Poznan, Poland; the recent revolution in Hungary; the thousands of Germans fleeing from Communist Germany every month, are positive indications that the Soviet would face serious defections and active resistance among the satellite nations in any crisis.

There are many conflicting interests between the Soviet and Red China. The expanding population of China must seek its agricultural needs and its mineral resources in Siberia, Manchuria, Mongolia and Sinkiang. There will be increasing pressures upon Russia from Red China.

We should exploit these differences wherever we can and encourage Red China to orient her ambitions toward the vast resources of the Soviet.

This meeting today will help to keep alive the hopes of the people within the Soviet orbit. It unites each of us in a noble cause. We can, today, rededicate ourselves to continue to fight for freedom and to fight against the darkness of communism.

We are grateful to the officers of the Ukrainian congress and to the officers and to the membership of the American friends of the anti-Bolshevik block of nations for their continuing efforts toward these objectives.

A Proposed Harbor Facilities Insurance Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 21, 1958

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the present demand for marine facilities is forcing local communities to curtail drastically boating and smaller commercial shipping activities in many areas of the country. Public municipalities and private operators of marine facilities are finding it increasingly difficult to finance new installations because of the high cost of new construction large enough to accommodate the new boating public as well as the large number of smaller commercial craft, particularly in our severely depressed fishing industry. This is forcing many communities to propose inadeqaute facilities, resulting in an increasing rate of failure, unsanitary conditions, and loss of value.

A MORTGAGE INSURANCE PROGRAM

Yesterday I introduced a bill, H. R. 13827, which has been referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, wherein I propose a mortgage insurance program to aid the construction of privately financed and developed marine facilities serving local communities which will be effective in solving this problem. This program would be established similar to FHA mortgage insurance programs on a self-sustaining basis with insurance fees and premiums designed to cover costs and provide reserves for estimated losses and would be under the authority of the Community Facilities Administration. Mortgage amounts would be set at a maximum of 90 percent of CFA's estimate of value of the system. Maximum term and amount of insured mortgage would be at the discretion of the CFA Commissioner. It is contemplated that the program will be designed to provide an overall commitment for a system to serve an area or community with advances to be insured for sections of the system as needed during the development of the area.

CFA would limit its mortgage insurance to the actual facilities so that the mortgage would be secured by an operating business entity and real estate upon which the actual plants are installed. I believe that such a system of mortgage insurance would involve little, if any, additional risk on the part of the agency.

Ownership of such systems would rest in a privately owned corporation so long as the CFA insurance is in force and would be regulated by a State commission or in its absence by arrangements satisfactory to the CFA Commissioner.

The program would cover the construction of new facilities where needed. It would also cover refinancing transactions for the purpose of needed expansion and rehabilitation of existing systems. As such, this program would promote and assist the growth, improvement, and services of harbor facilities for the Nation. It would stimulate the initiation of new systems as well as the growth and integration of existing facilities.

Such a plan for mortgage insurance would help to overcome the problem of a series of small disconnected facilities which are too costly to integrate into a single facility when this becomes necessary in the public interest.

The program would substantially alleviate the present shortage of adequate harbor facilities for our boating, commerical craft and shipping interest. This program is designed to serve not only new marina, but also new docks, warehousing, and shipping facilities.

I would like to emphasize that this is a mortgage-insurance program that is self-sustaining through its mortgage premium feature. The Commissioner is authorized to charge a premium for the insurance authorized by this program, and is also authorized to charge a fee for appraisals on property which is offered for insurance. Thus the operation and administration of this program will not cost the taxpayers of this country any money in appropriations or additional funds. Actually it will provide much needed additional harbor facilities which will bring new revenue to local communities.

A Report to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 21, 1958

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, it has become a tradition with me, at the conclusion of each Congress, to report to the people of my District regarding its accomplishments, my efforts in behalf of the constituents, and my views on major legislation.

While this report is rather lengthy, it nevertheless reflects the very extensive activities of the 85th Congress and the amount of work necessary in these times

to be a full-time Congressman. It has always been my aim to represent the interests of all the people. While I am proud to be a Democrat, I never once asked a constituent who sought my help what his political affiliation was. His need was all that concerned me.

The Eighth Congressional District in Brooklyn includes Greenpoint, the Navy Yard area, parts of Bushwick and Williamsburg. It is made up of low-income families, of various religious faiths and national origins, but all good and loyal Americans. I am honored to be their Representative in Congress.

I.—THE INTERNATIONAL SCENE

Humanity's most pressing problem today is world peace. While the world is nominally at peace, there is much tension in many areas which is stirred up by Soviet Russia or its stooges. Furthering the cause of peace and a lessening of international tension have been among my primary aims in Congress, coupled with support for the defense efforts of the Free World. The security of our Nation comes first, hence the American people must never relax their guard for a moment.

Communist aggression and subversion are a constant threat to the security of all free nations, and against this threat the people of the Free World must be adequately protected. In this connection, we must never forget the enslaved people of Poland, Hungary, and other countries behind the Iron Curtain in whose hearts the spark and the spirit of freedom still kindles. For this reason, I successfully supported aid to the Polish people by way of surplus food commodities. The only restriction I imposed was that the people knew who their benefactors were.

During the past year, in addresses on the floor of Congress and before organizations, I have proposed various plans and resolutions dealing with international affairs. Among them were:

First. That the United States should pursue an open foreign policy which will clearly delineate its relations with friendly nations, neutral countries, and the Communist bloc, so that no nation shall ever make a miscalculation as a result of not knowing how we stand on a particular situation.

Second. That the United States should reaffirm its traditional opposition to colonialism and restate its policy for the expansion of freedom throughout the world.

Third. That the United States should call together a world youth convention to promote better relations, education, scientific knowledge, and understanding among the youth of all nations.

Improvement in the relations with the Latin American countries is badly needed. To achieve this, I have recently introduced a resolution to establish a Pan-American Parliamentary Association, to be made up of parliamentary representatives of all countries of the Western Hemisphere, which is to seek better understanding among the peoples of the hemisphere, expand educational and scientific programs, develop closer cultural and trade relations, encourage tourism, help raise the standard of living, and so forth. This proposal has already been approved by the State Department, by leaders of Congress, and many Latin American leaders. This matter will be vigorously pursued in the coming months.

II.—THE ECONOMIC SITUATION

Among the measures I supported to combat the economic recession are: speeding up the work on the 41,000-mile superhighway construction program; an emergency $1.8 billion housing program to provide badly needed housing in urban areas; an additional 13 weeks of unemployment compensation for those who have exhausted their benefits; extension of loans and grants for redevelopment aid for areas having large unemployment; loans and other assistance to the railroad industry where there were huge layoffs of workers; increased the lending authority of the Small Business Administration and reduced the interest rates on loans to small business.

There were some other less important measures, but I felt that more should have been done to alleviate the situation. Additonal steps I advocated were: a huge public works program, including a large hospital construction program; more low-income public housing projects; reduction of taxes by increasing the tax exemption from $600 to $800 for all taxpayers and their dependents; full employment planning to eliminate unemployment; tax relief for small-business men to enable them to stay in business; a special tax deduction to parents for expenses up to $1,000 for college tuition for their children.

III.—SOCIAL SECURITY

Help to the aged is today a major national problem. There are nearly 12 million elderly and retired citizens now drawing monthly social security payments, and before very long their number will reach 15 million. Many others in this age group would prefer to retire, but they cannot afford to do so because the benefits are insufficient to cover their needs. Incidentally, one of my major arguments in favor of larger social security payments is that by encouraging those over 65 who are still working to retire it would make possible for younger people to fill their jobs and help to eliminate unemployment.

Although I was pleased to see Congress grant a 7 percent increase in social security payments, it is far from enough. This is evidenced by the fact that about 1½ million persons who could qualify for retirement prefer to keep on working. At the last moment I tried to increase it at least to 10 percent, arguing that since Congress gave a 10 percent increase in salaries to Federal and postal workers to allow for the increase in the cost of living in recent years it could do no less for our elderly people. I was given the assurance that further increases could be expected next year.

It is my belief that the whole social security system should be overhauled and brought into step with the times and needs of the people. For this reason, I introduced in May 1958 a bill to achieve two major purposes:

First. Reduce the retirement age for men and women to 62, but with full benefits.

Second. Increase the monthly payments by 40 percent for all. This would give our older citizens more purchasing power, it would help the economy, and it would encourage many of them to retire with greater security. This is a goal for which we should all strive.

IV.—THE CONSUMER AND THE COST OF LIVING

Another major problem which is a source of great worry to millions of families is the continued high cost of living. In 1958 it reached an all-time high, and there is no indication of a reduction in the foreseeable future. We have had a most unusual situation: An economic recession on the one hand, and a rising cost of living on the other. The most regrettable part is that the Eisenhower administration refused to take effective measures to stop this raid on the consumer public.

I brought this matter to the attention last year of the Committee on Agriculture, of which I am a member, and urged that a subcommittee be designated to study consumer problems and food cost trends. Subsequently, a Consumers Study Subcommittee was set up and I was appointed as chairman. This is a watchdog committee to study trends and situations, and to make recommendations. We have held hearings on the high cost of food, on marketing problems, on disposal of surplus food abroad by charitable organizations, on food stamp plans for the needy, etc. It is the committee's belief that by the very nature of its hearings it contributed toward holding the line on food prices, so that in recent months the cost of living has risen only a fraction.

Our subcommittee has also made several important recommendations:

First. To stockpile quantities of food in underground shelters in various areas for civilian survival in the event of war or other emergencies.

Second. Distribution of surplus food commodities to the elderly, the needy, and the undernourished through the use of a food stamp plan, which would improve their diet and raise their level of health.

Third. Modernize marketing facilities for food commodities in the cities to provide more sanitary conditions and to reduce the prices of basic foods because of savings in handling and transportation.

Fourth. Extend the work of our voluntary agencies abroad in distributing surplus foods and winning friends for America.

I favored legislation to authorize $75 million annually for the special school milk program for children to improve their nutrition, also the dairy products program for the Armed Forces, and extension of the Agricultural Trade Development Act—Public Law 480—through which we sell and distribute surplus foods abroad to help underdeveloped and needy areas, such as Poland, Italy, Israel, Ghana, India, and others.

V.—CIVIL RIGHTS

For the first time in over 80 years, since the Civil War, Congress has enacted a civil-rights measure. In the future we must adopt measures to strengthen our civil-rights laws and enforce them.

I had introduced a bill which calls for abolition of the poll tax, outlawing of mob violence, and establishment of a fair employment commission to eliminate discrimination based on race, color, religion, or national origin. These rights must be safeguarded. We cannot permit second-class citizenship in a democratic America. The protection of our civil liberties would also serve as a great weapon in our foreign policy, particularly in Asia and Africa. Incidents such as Little Rock and the bombing of churches and synagogues in the South only damage our prestige abroad and our democracy at home. Such incidents must not be repeated.

VI.—EDUCATION AND YOUTH

One of the most challenging problems facing the Nation is the current school crisis. There is a shortage of classrooms, a shortage of teachers, and our teachers are underpaid. We must provide better educational facilities for our children, especially for the 2½ million children who study in overcrowded schools or attend half-day sessions. Unfortunately, the present administration has not exerted itself too much in obtaining aid to education and the construction of schools. The welfare of our children demands the enactment of such legislation. American children are entitled to an adequate education, not a half-education. School construction has not kept pace with the growing school population, and this problem is growing worse and is affecting our educational standards.

It is very poor policy to economize at the expense of our children and to the detriment of the Nation's security. Soviet achievements in the fields of science and education have demonstrated this false economy to us quite dramatically in the past year. Our shortcomings in education are all too evident.

For this reason, I supported the scholarship bill to expand the opportunities for education to meet a critical national need by aiding needy students through loans and scholarships. I have also introduced several bills which would provide important aid in these fields; a bill to grant a tax deduction to parents for expenses up to $1,000 incurred in connection with the college education of their children, which would help low-income people provide their children with a college education; a bill to establish a United States Science Academy along the lines of West Point and the Naval Academy to train men and women for scientific careers in national defense; a bill to provide assistance to dependent children over 18 to continue their education.

I have also introduced a bill for the establishment of a junior corps of cadets in the Armed Forces for 100,000 youngsters, 14 to 18 years old, who are to enlist with the consent of their parents for 2 years. They would be trained as technicians and mechanics in various fields and later apply this training in civilian trades. It would provide many opportunities for such youngsters and help decrease juvenile delinquency. I also supported the bill to prohibit the manufacture or transportation of switchblade knives as a means of curbing crime and delinquency.

VII.—POSTAL AND FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The 10 percent pay increase approved this year for postal and Federal employees had my full support. This raise should have been given them sooner to account for the increase in the cost of living in recent years. I continually urged and supported all efforts for a pay raise and on several occasions introduced bills to that effect. Congress acted wisely in approving the raise, plus the retroactive payments.

Another measure which had my strong support was H. R. 607 providing for a 10 percent increase in the annuities of retired Government workers. This too was a well-deserving and long overdue increase for people who are living on a limited income.

Among bills of interest to Government workers which I introduced are: to permit all Government employees to retire on full annuities after completing 30 years of service, regardless of age; to amend the Hatch Act by eliminating certain restrictions on political activities of Federal and State employees; to allow Government workers from 2 to 4 hours off from their duties, without loss of pay or annual leave, in order to vote in national and local elections. In addition, I favor recognition of Government employee unions, health insurance for Federal workers, and establishment of a system of merit promotion.

VIII.—VETERANS LEGISLATION

A number of important measures have been adopted by the 85th Congress to benefit our war veterans, the most significant of which are: Public Law 168 increases the rates of compensation for service-connected disabilities for veterans of all wars; Public Law 209 liberalizes marriage requirements for widows applying for pension or other benefits; Public Law 364 provides direct loans for veterans housing, increases the amount of such loans, and lowers the downpayments for FHA housing; Public Law 462 increases salaries of medical and nursing staffs at VA hospitals; also a law to increase burial allowance for deceased veterans from $150 to $250.

I should also like to see legislation enacted to extend GI educational benefits to World War II and Korean war veterans who were prevented from obtaining or completing such education prior to changes in the law, as well as those now serving in the Armed Forces who should be entitled to these benefits; also my bill H. R. 2385 to provide VA benefits to those who served in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps. I am strongly opposed to any cuts in benefits to veterans and their dependents.

For my efforts on behalf of veterans, the American Legion of Kings County—Brooklyn—presented its Americanism award to me on June 20, 1958. It reads as follows:

The American Legion of Kings County Americanism Committee awards this citation to Hon. VICTOR ANFUSO for his outstanding contribution to the work of Americanism activities, for his personal interest, loyal devotion, and general support of Americanism programs, and for his high qualities of honor, courage, leadership, service, and character in the preservation and protection of the fundamental institutions of our Government.

For this honor I am very grateful.

IX.—POLAND AND EASTERN EUROPE

The people of Poland and other Eastern European countries, now occupied by Russia, are undergoing severe suffering, ruthless suppression of their human rights, and genocidal extermination practiced against them by the Communists. These nations, especially Poland, have a long tradition of friendship for the American people. For this reason, I favored the extension of Public Law 480 which made possible the sale of some of our surplus agricultural products to Poland, thereby benefiting the Polish people.

By providing food for the people of Poland we can best encourage them to keep up their struggle for freedom. If hunger spreads, it would only be an invitation to Moscow to take over complete control. We can strengthen Poland by helping her become less dependent on Russia. Under Public Law 480 Poland is able to purchase surplus foods from us for its distressed people. It is important to note that leading Polish organizations in the United States supported this legislation to aid the Polish people, despite the fact that the Polish Government is Communist.

The president of the Polish American Congress, Mr. Charles Rozmarek, wrote to me as follows on June 28, 1957:

Please accept these words of thanks and appreciation from the Polish American Congress for your heart-stirring address on the floor of the House of Representatives in behalf of giving Poland economic assistance in her difficult transition from Communist bondage to a certain measure of freedom.

Your eulogy of Pulaski and Kosciusko, and your praise of Poland's 1,000-year-long spiritual relationship with Western civilization, will be gratefully remembered by Americans of Polish origin for years to come.

On a number of occasions I introduced bills in Congress to grant legal residence in this country to persons of Polish and other Eastern European origin who succeeded in escaping from their Communist-dominated homelands. Several years ago I introduced such a bill for the former master of the ship *Batory*, Jan Cwiklinski, who left the ship and was subsequently granted asylum in the United States. In June 1958 Congress passed my bill in behalf of six Polish seamen who were given legal residence. The Right Reverend Msgr. Felix F. Burant, president of the Polish American Immigration and Relief Committee of New York, wrote to me on July 2, 1958:

Referring to our previous correspondence pertaining to your bill H. R. 4969 for the relief of six Polish sailors * * *. We are very happy indeed to be able to congratulate you

for everything you have done for our committee not only in this particular case but also in the past.

In connection with several notable anniversaries, I protested on the floor of Congress against Communist enslavement of Eastern European nations. This was done on May 3, the anniversary of Polish Constitution Day; on June 15, anniversary of Soviet invasion of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia in 1940; on January 22, anniversary of the proclamation of the Ukraine Republic in 1918; on March 25, anniversary of establishment of the Byelorussian Republic in 1918; on February 16, anniversary of founding of Lithuanian Republic in 1918. On all these anniversaries I expressed the wish and hope for their early liberation from Communist bondage and our solidarity with these oppressed peoples, including also Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and others.

On April 27, 1958, it was my privilege and honor to receive the Liberty award given to me by Governor Averell Harriman of New York on behalf of the nationalities division of the Democratic National Committee for championing the cause of minority and nationality groups. In accepting this award, I stressed that the immigrant and nationality groups could render a unique service in combating Communist propaganda, but we are not utilizing sufficiently their talents and ideas.

X.—ISRAEL AND THE MIDDLE EAST

All of us are deeply concerned over the situation in the Middle East. Peace in this area would serve a four-fold purpose: it would be in the best interests of the United States and the Free World by safeguarding our strategic bases and the flow of oil; it would help keep Russia out of there; it would assure the survival of Israel as a free and independent state; and it would make possible the economic development of the region for the benefit of all nations. Unfortunately, the Middle East does not know peace and is under constant tension.

In recent years I have on several occasions spoken up in behalf of Israel. After the Suez crisis, when the United States was considering sanctions, I protested that it would strangle Israel economically and it would be morally unjustified. I protested against Egypt when it launched a reign of terror against the Jews, and also against Saudi Arabia for its discrimination of American military personnel of the Jewish faith.

As direct aid to Israel, I was among the first to urge the United States to resume economic aid and to lift the ban on tourism to Israel. As a member of the House Agriculture Committee I vigorously fought for approval of the Agricultural Trade Development Act—Public Law 480—under which Israel has purchased from the United States surplus food commodities in the amount of $92.6 million in the last 3 years. This food was sold to Israel, as it is to other countries, at reduced rates and it has helped raise the level of food consumption there and bolster its economy. In the current year Israel's purchases of surplus food under the law will be upward of $40 million.

When the United States landed marines in Lebanon in July, it was my feeling that this was the only course left open to our Government if it wanted to avoid the whole area from falling under Russian control which would have endangered the position and security of the whole Free World. By now it is clear that the Egyptian dictator Nasser is no friend of ours, and never will be. It is too bad that we stopped Britain, France, and Israel in 1956 when they were on the verge of freeing the Suez Canal and routing Nasser. If we felt strong enough to intervene in the Middle East now, we certainly were just as strong 2 years ago. Had we not interfered then, there would have been no Nasser today, no civil war in Lebanon, no coup in Iraq, no threat to Jordan, no danger to Israel's survival, no crisis in the Middle East, and no United States Marines there.

While not a single Arab State has proved to be a strong and dependable ally of the United States, Israel remains a stanch and reliable friend. For this reason, we should give her some of our modern weapons and sign a military pact with her to assure Israel's security and existence and to help stabilize the situation in the Middle East.

XI.—ITALY

The Republic of Italy maintains a very important and strategic position in Europe and the Mediterranean area, and therefore plays a major role in world affairs. Italy is today one of the stanchest friends and allies of the United States, despite the fact that it has the second largest Communist Party next to that of Russia. On the eve of the parliamentary elections in Italy in May 1958, I sent a special appeal to the Italian people urging them to support the Christian Democratic Party and other parties which are for democracy and against communism. This appeal was circulated extensively in the Italian press and other mediums of information. I was very happy to know that the parties standing for democracy emerged victorious and that Amintore Fanfani, leader of the Christian Democratic Party, became the head of the new government.

Prime Minister Fanfani visited the United States at the end of July. He held consultations with top American leaders, including President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles, and addressed both Houses of Congress. I was appointed by Speaker SAM RAYBURN to serve on the honorary committee to escort the Prime Minister into the House Chamber. Under Fanfani's leadership the friendship between Italy and the United States will grow even stronger. I am firmly convinced that in the near future Italy will emerge as one of the big three of the Western World.

I was greatly honored last year when the Government of Italy bestowed upon me an award as commander of the Order of Merit for my efforts in behalf of the Italian people. On July 16, 1957, the House of Representatives officially approved the acceptance of this award.

XII.—MISCELLANEOUS ISSUES

The following are additional issues on which I took a stand in the 85th Congress:

Introduced bills to completely revise the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act to eliminate the national origins quota system and other discriminatory features. Last year Congress approved some minor changes in the law which would allow about 60,000 immigrants to enter the United States as hardship cases and unification of families. This year some 30,000 Hungarian refugees were enabled to adjust their legal status. I supported these measures.

In the field of labor legislation, I supported the bill for disclosure of employee welfare and pension funds of unions and business firms, in order to protect the interests of 80 million workers who benefit from these funds; also the Kennedy-Ives bill which sought to eliminate racketeering and other evil practices. I favored the extension of minimum wage coverage to include all those earning substandard wages.

Other important measures which I supported were: Medical research in cancer, mental health, arthritis, heart disease and others; extension of the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act; elimination of water pollution; flood control; Niagara power development for the benefit of consumers in New York State; national defense education bill; omnibus housing bill to provide badly needed housing and eradicate slums; the airport aid bill to improve the Nation's airports during the next 5 years; reorganization of the Defense Department; and statehood for Alaska.

I strongly opposed reductions in the strength of the National Guard; cuts in appropriations affecting the needs of aged people, veterans benefits, health and welfare programs of the Nation; also the Natural Gas Act, which would have increased the cost of gas to city consumers; curtailment of civil rights, and others.

Wherever possible I protested against racial and religious hatred. When my attention was called to a certain film which contained derogatory remarks about Americans of Italian origin, I protested vigorously on the floor of Congress. A similar protest was raised when hate sheets were being sent through the mail to incite racial and religious hatred against Jews, Negroes, and other minority groups. I urged the adoption of legislation to forbid the use of United States mails for such purposes.

Among measures I introduced are: To declare October 12 of each year as a legal holiday throughout the Nation, to be known as Columbus Day—it is observed only in certain States, but is not a national holiday; to designate December 15 of each year as Bill of Rights Day in honor of the first 10 amendments to the United States Constitution establishing the basic freedoms of the American people; to add the name of the explorer Giovanni da Verrazano, who discovered the harbor of New York in 1524, to the Hudson-Champlain celebration in New York in 1959.

I have always been on the alert to help the workers at the Brooklyn Navy Yard, located in my District, by using all possible effort to dissuade the Navy Department from mass layoffs of workers and maintaining a high level of employment.

In spite of the legislative pressure—and this has been one of the most productive Congresses—the personal problems of my constituents were never neglected. Many services were performed for individuals who sought my help in matters dealing with housing needs, servicemen's hardship cases, disability pensions, immigration, obtaining Government publications for students, and the like. These matters were handled courteously and efficiently through my offices in Washington and New York.

CONCLUSION

This is the record of service of your Representative in Congress. Any comments or views either on this record or on matters of public interest are always welcome.

Why I Am a Democrat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 21, 1958

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

WHY I AM A DEMOCRAT

(Address by Representative EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States House of Representatives, before the 13th biennial State convention of the Affiliated Young Democrats, Inc., of New York State, Hotel Piccadilly, New York, August 16, 1958)

To discuss with a group of Young Democrats the reasons why I am a Democrat appeals to me as peculiarly appropriate. If any single quality distinguishes our great party from the Republicans, it is that we are the party of the young at heart. Are not the traits of youthfulness—vigor, imagination, generosity, the courage to experiment—exemplified by the New Deal and the Fair Deal, in contrast to the lassitude, caution, indecision and inertia of the present administration?

These differences are not a matter of chronological age. They are of the spirit. When I review the interests which have absorbed me for most of my 36 years in Congress—immigration, civil rights, civil liberties, the control of monopoly, and a self-respecting and peaceable relationship of earned leadership between our own and other peoples—I find that the very issues that concern me today are the issues that interested me in 1922, when I first ran for office as a Democrat.

There is nothing more important than people. This, I believe, is the great truth toward which democracy strives. We Democrats remain young at heart because, as a party, we have always maintained an abiding concern for the aspirations of the American people—for peace, security, and a decent way of life—for the aspirations of all the people, not excluding the alien, nor the worker or the unemployed, nor the schoolchild or the student, nor racial or religious minorities, whatever their origin. Because the needs of the people are real to us, we abhor reference to unemployed workers as "bird dogs" and "kennel dogs," and we have no patience with the Republican trickle down theory under which "What is good for General Motors is good for the United States." Because, as Democrats we tend to trust the people, we have become the one party that the people can trust.

In my many years in Washington, I have served in both Democratic and Republican Congresses, under Democratic administrations, and for the last 6 years, under a Republican administration. Nothing in my entire public life more vividly illustrates the basic difference between the two political parties than what has happened during the past 6 years under the Great Crusade.

As a nation, we are faced with the critical challenge of the 20th century—that of giving enlightened leadership to the Free World against the twofold threat of Communist attrition and nuclear war. To meet this challenge we must be secure in our defense and must invest our dealings with other nations with a meaningful and constructive foreign policy. How has the present administration met this challenge? It has irresponsibly dissipated our defensive strength in a riot of budgeteering and our international good will in an orgy of brinkmanship. Every day our power and prestige fall lower.

In his state of the Union message, the President said: "We have now a broadly based and efficient defensive strength, including a great deterrent power * * * We intend to assure that our vigilance, power, and technical excellence keep abreast of any realistic threat that we may face."

These words sound hollow indeed, in light of the fact that in a few short years our unchallenged military supremacy first shrank, then disappeared, then turned into what all concede is now a perilous inferiority. It can no longer be concealed that during the next 6 years Soviet missile striking power will be many times our own; their defensive strength much greater than our own; our deterrent bomber strength only slightly greater than theirs. For a long time the administration has known of the decline of our power compared with that of the Soviets. To this day it has not told us the facts and it dares not tell us the facts. Because this administration is incapable of action, it is incapable of truth.

The National Defense had been made into a budgetary debating point and sacrificed to a bookkeeper's sense of fitness.

A further suicidal avoidance of reality is found in our foreign policy—or rather lack of it. Our Secretary of State—truly the world's most misguided missile—now regularly marches us to the brink of war, and then calls on the United Nations to bail us out. Our international behavior proves to be neither consistent nor effective—except to dismay our friends and allies and alienate those whom we must win to friendship.

Nasser is a case in point. The Eisenhower-Dulles team promised him vast economic aid; withdrew the promise, then saved him from sure defeat at the hands of Israel—uncompromising ally of the West—and France and Britain. Will we next throw Israel to the wolves in the interest of an Arab unity from which only Nasser can profit, and from which our friends and allies must surely suffer?

We Democrats had a foreign policy—a policy that won and kept us friends among the small nations and at least the respect of our adversaries. Time was when every European metropolis boasted its "Avenue President Wilson" or its "Avenue President Roosevelt' 'in tribute to our friendship and aid. Under the present administration, these are all too often placarded with the slogan "Yankee Go Home." And in Latin America the good-neighbor policy of Hull has given way to the stoning and egging of our official representatives on what were meant as friendly visits.

Many excuses are offered for these catastrophic developments, but no amount of buck-passing or explanation can absolve us of the responsibility to give firm and courageous direction to the course of world history. Surely, it is time for a change.

On the domestic front, indecision and lack of leadership by the absentee landlord of the White House are aggravated by a critical split within his own party. There are Republicans and modern Republicans. A modern Republican thinks his party can win votes by borrowing time-tested Democratic policies—proposing a little added unemployment insurance, a little aid to education, a little liberalization of immigration, a little firmness in dealing with arrant disregard of Federal law. Himself a so-called modern Republican, the President talks the language of liberalism but reposes the execution of his policies in men who disagree with them—traditional Republicans who sabotage and set at naught his avowed liberal aims. Nor does he or his administration fight for his policies when they are jeopardized. The plain truth is that this is an administration of, by, and for big business—and in the old style.

In the old Republican tradition it turns its back on the fact of over five million unemployed. This is the way of Hoover, embellished with smooth new techniques of Madison Avenue to delude us into thinking that all is well. To cope with the highest cost of living of all time the President gently asks labor, then industry, not to overreach.

Under the present administration, big business benefits from such windfalls as the notorious Dixon-Yates giveaway and the $65 million a year increase in long-distance phone rates granted the telephone company by the Federal Communications Commission, without even a hearing, a few months after this administration came into office. Big business violators of the antitrust laws also benefit from soft settlements of their cases by the Department of Justice. Witness, for example, the revelations before our antitrust subcommittee concerning preferential treatment accorded A. T. & T. Meanwhile the small-business man has struggled along under a tax law enacted by a Republican Congress in 1954, and shot through with big business allowances and loopholes. By contrast, the present Democratic Congress will, I am confident, enact before adjournment a tax relief measure specially tailored to the needs of small business.

Business failures, bankruptcies, and home foreclosures continue to rise. Yet this Republican administration which in its first 5 years spent more money than did President Truman in 7 years and 9 months—during which he had to fight the Korean war—displays a thrift bordering on the miserly when it comes to asking funds for such programs as social security, educational incentives, and schools. Apparently the sputnik has taught them nothing. The accountant's neurosis remains dominant—a compulsive insistence on balancing the budget at a low level. Hardly an imaginative approach to the problem of expanding the effective national effort to meet the challenge of our times.

There has been imported into the highest places of our Government the psychology of big business, with a resulting tendency to accept the easy morality of the open expense account. While no administration has been wholly free from the taint of conflict of interest, the present one appears to be setting a record in this respect. Not less than a dozen high-ranking members of the Eisenhower official family, including the Assistant President of the United States, have been caught at such offenses as interceding with agencies in behalf of persons from whom

they had received expensive gifts; accepting extended hospitality from persons with whom they do Government business; ruling in favor of parties from whom they have received cash and property; and seeking or securing valuable Government contracts and favors for themselves, their families and their friends. Yet, although some have resigned, none has been fired. To commemorate this Eisenhower-Nixon double standard of political morality, a plaque should be placed in the White House reading "Sherman Adams slipped here."

The inactivity of the present Department of Justice—its general failure to present to grand juries the many cases of impropriety involving high officials of the present administration which Congressional investigations have brought to light, is most disconcerting. Indeed, there is growing concern that the Department is becoming a political arm instead of an agency dedicated to the fair and impartial administration of justice.

It is essential, for all the reasons I have outlined, to give the Democratic Party a real working majority in Congress in the coming elections. Next, we must lay the groundwork for putting a Democratic administration in Washington 2 years hence. Lest anybody underrate the importance of this task, I remind you that the alternative will likely be RICHARD NIXON—alone reason enough for being a Democrat.

The East Front Matter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 21, 1958

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, there continues to be misleading information on the subject of the east front extension of the Capitol, and thoughtless people continue to minimize the urgency of the need for the approved restoration plan.

Casual treatment of the facts is not unusual in the Washington Post, but it is hard to understand why some architects cannot face the truth concerning the acute need for this extension plan.

As was repeatedly pointed out when this resolution originally passed both Houses of Congress—and on numerous subsequent occasions—time and weather have wreaked havoc with moldings, ornaments, cornices, banisters, and with the structurally soft sandstone blocks themselves.

Columns have cracked on the east front and cracks have extended even down into the foundations structures. Cracks in the sandstone walls in some cases penetrate the full thickness and are no longer hideable under paint and other superficial coverings. Plaster which has been used so many times in the past for temporary repair is no longer feasible and where it has been used previously it has now rotted to the extent of permitting entrance of insects, small rodents, and so forth.

Not only will this plan save the original design as our Capitol was laid out in the beginning, but it will provide a better, safer, new exterior wall, a full 32 feet east of the present structure. This 32½ feet of additional floor space is gravely needed for expanding legislative activities.

Let me emphasize, too, that this extension would permit the Capitol to remain in appearance exactly as it has these 150 years. The center facade would not be changed in any respect, and this assurance by the Architect of the Capitol and by consulting engineers and architects has brought this project the overwhelming endorsement of expert professional opinion throughout America.

As our colleague, Chairman CANNON, informed the House some weeks ago, this great Capitol building has been changed many times in its history. It was drastically changed immediately following the great fire of 1814; the subsequent increased width of the east portico completely changed the design of the east front; and the 1864 addition of the House and Senate wings may never have been envisioned by the original planners. The center steps of this same controversial east front had already been exchanged for granite steps as early as 1915; and as recently as 1950 the House as well as the Senate Chambers were completely renovated and modernized.

These are only a few examples, Mr. Speaker, of changes for the better which have been made in our beloved Capitol building. Since these alterations prove conclusively that the American people have never hesitated to make changes when a decided improvement would be the result, and since the entire east front is endangered by present decay, and since both great Houses of the Congress urgently need the additional space, I would like without reservation to take my stand in support of this extension. I also offer my congratulations to Speaker RAYBURN for having courageously led the move for this much needed reform in the face of much unfair and unreasonable criticism.

The outrageous criticism directed against our Speaker in this matter is much stronger evidence against the fairness and vision of his critics than it is against the extension plan.

Rather than the censure directed against Speaker RAYBURN by some quarters on this matter, I predict that history will accord to him the gratitude and appreciation of the American people for his foresight and his fortitude in planning and working for the preservation of our great National Capitol building.

Water Pollution Control Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 21, 1958

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the failure of this Congress to enact legislation to expand the construction grant program under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is extremely unfortunate.

Two years ago I introduced legislation authorizing a $1 billion, 10-year program of Federal assistance to States and local communities to aid them in the construction of needed sewage-treatment facilities. Facts and figures available to us at that time proved, Mr. Speaker, that in order to clean up the backlog of construction needs in this one area would require the type of Federal assistance I recommended. By the time the bill was enacted the amount was cut in half. Still we considered it a great step forward in the battle against water pollution.

The program as administered by the Public Health Service has proved a great success. As of June 30, 1,038 grants totaling $85,321,862 have been made for projects worth $387,212,811. That is better than a 4 to 1 return on the Federal investment—a truly remarkable situation. Yet we are doing only half the job. We should be spending at the rate of $500 million each year in order to clear up the backlog of construction within the next 10 years. To stimulate and encourage such a rate of local and State expenditures the Federal Government should contribute $100 million a year for the next 10 years as its share of the responsibility for keeping our rivers and streams clean. The current Federal program is getting along on just one leg.

To bolster it, and add the other leg, I introduced this year H. R. 13420 which would add to the present program $50 million each year thus restoring the amount I had originally recommended 2 years ago and which now has been proven by independent surveys and studies to be exactly what was needed. The Committee on Public Works held hearings on the bill and it was favorably reported by a 21 to 7 vote. The testimony on the bill, Mr. Speaker, was overwhelmingly favorable. Seldom have I seen such complete support for a piece of legislation which just 2 years ago was highly controversial. Only the National Association of Manufacturers, the chamber of commerce, and the administration opposed my bill. The administration took the position that since the President has recommended that the program be scrapped entirely next year it could not very well support a bill doubling the program this year.

It was truly gratifying, Mr. Speaker, on the other hand, to hear and see the tremendous support the program has engendered among conservationists, State and local public health officials, municipal and civic groups. Even the President's Advisory Board on Water Pollution Control has endorsed the principle of Federal aid in this field despite the President's published views to the contrary. It just cannot be, Mr. Speaker, that so many people of such solid reputation and experience in this field who support the bill can be wrong while those few who represent mainly big industry polluters can be right.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that one of the first orders of business of the 86th Congress will be approval of legislation expanding the construction program under Public Law 660 along the lines I proposed this year in my bill H. R.

13420. If we are to adequately cope with the ever-increasing problem of water pollution such action must be taken.

Another matter of great importance in this field is the administrative setup within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as regards water-pollution control activities. In the Public Works Committee report on H. R. 9540 in the 84th Congress it was pointed out that "The Committee intends to watch carefully the progress and development of the national water-pollution-control program and particularly the supporting role of the Federal Government. The committee believes that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should place a high priority on the objectives of the program authorized by the bill and will diligently carry out its role in this Federal-State cooperative activity by providing a constructive program within an appropriate administrative framework."

Mr. Speaker, the administrative framework within which this program functions is restrictive and detrimental to the overall operation of the pollution-control program. This program, which requires over $60 million a year, and is so vital to the Nation's future growth, is buried so deep in the morass of agency bureaucracy that it is often difficult to find out just where it is.

Consider the maze you must follow, Mr. Speaker, to find those who administer this program. They are in the Water Supply and Water Pollution Control Program Section of the Division of Sanitary Engineering Services of the Bureau of State Services of the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Today I have introduced a bill to solve this problem. My bill would establish an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for Water Pollution Control. It would assign the water pollution control functions of the Public Health Service to a new Office for Water Pollution Control. Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that it is time that due recognition be given to the water pollution control functions of the Federal establishment responsible for this activity. At the present time the water pollution control functions are conducted by a small suboffice in the Public Health Service, manned, by the way, by some of the hardest working, most intelligent, and sincere public servants I have ever met. Despite their activity the Federal water pollution program is never going to be as effective as it should be until top governmental policy men are giving this problem their day-to-day attention.

After years of urging by national conservation organizations, the Congress in 1956 strengthened the fish and wildlife functions of the Federal Government by establishing within the Department of Interior the office of Assistant Secretary of Fish and Wildlife. My bill would have a similar objective in the field of water pollution control. The bill would also establish a Commissioner for Water Pollution Control which would be comparable with existing Commissioners in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the fields of social security, education, and food and drugs. It is believed that the protection of our water and of public health most certainly is as important as the protection of our fish and wildlife. If this bill is adopted, it will go far toward rehabilitating the waters of this Nation for legitimate uses through a strengthened Federal-State cooperative program.

A Way to Equality for Puerto Ricans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 21, 1958

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the failure of Congress to pass the Kennedy-Ives labor bill which protects against corruption of so-called union leaders, while retaining labor's right to regulate their internal affairs, is one of the shortcomings of the 85th Congress. If Congress does not pass a labor bill organized and unorganized labor groups will, as a result, continue to be exploited and to suffer. Many of these groups are exploited because they lack information or because they cannot comprehend or evaluate available information.

An important segment of my Congressional District is populated by Americans of Spanish descent. Many Puerto Ricans are striving to obtain equal opportunity in this great country of ours. I am happy to assist them in obtaining the realization of our American dream, equal opportunity to advance by reason of ability without regard to race, color, religion, or sex.

I have found these people, not only in my community but also in Puerto Rico, to be a very religious people. Four years ago I had the good fortune to visit Puerto Rico. I arrived on Easter Sunday and joined the people in prayer in their beautiful holy church. I saw the people in prayer. I saw them in the piazza or square engaging in their religious festivals. Because of their devotedly religious backgrounds and their practice, our Secretary of State or our President need not request us to grant $200 million or any less sum to fight communism. These people and their Spanish brethren in the Caribbean are natural enemies of the atheistic Communists.

I found the Puerto Ricans to be very hospitable and very friendly. Their homes are open with a welcome sign awaiting the visitor. Upon my visit to the senate and assembly in San Juan the legislators extended a most cordial welcome to a New York State legislator. The charming mayor of San Juan and the tireless governor of Puerto Rico were more than kind. They demonstrated the same characteristics which the poor and rich on that island demonstrate daily.

Let no one underestimate the contribution by Puerto Ricans to our America. Their sons have fought valiantly on the battlefield and they have made their sacrifices. They have earned their citizenship.

Without their help and without their labor hotels, resorts, and industry would find great difficulty to get along. They are a valuable asset to our economy. Like all new peoples to our shores, their lot has been a difficult one. Their inability to speak the English language and the lack of economic opportunities create certain problems. These problems are gradually being solved. Like all peoples who appreciate opportunities which the United States affords, they are advancing on all fronts—in schools, in business, and in politics.

In New York there are an estimated 900,000 Spanish-speaking people, about half the population of Madrid, Spain. Some 700,000 of these are Puerto Rican. Cubans, estimated at 100,000, comprise the second largest group. Of the 725,235 pupils enrolled in elementary and junior high schools in New York last September, 101,671 were Puerto Ricans. Of the 45,000 attending adult-education classes in the evening last March, 11,000 were Puerto Ricans.

A total of 80,563 pupils in New York schools (including high schools) as of last October, were classified as non-English speaking. These ranged from pupils unable to speak any English to those who could speak English well enough for most situations, but still had to make a conscious effort to avoid the forms of some foreign language. School officials said Spanish-speaking pupils were preponderant in the total.

Spanish is spoken in almost all Puerto Rican homes, but over 50 percent of these are reported to be bilingual. There is an average of 5.1 persons per Puerto Rican family. The Puerto Rican population is a young population; about one-third of the Puerto Ricans are under 10 years, over half are under 24 years, and two-thirds are under 35 years. The Puerto Rican labor force is estimated at 260,000. About 50,000 are employed in the garment industry, 25,000 in the restaurant and hotel business, and about 15,000 in the laundry business. About 73 percent of Spanish-speaking families read a Spanish newspaper exclusively and 14 percent read English and Spanish newspapers. Approximately 79 percent of Spanish-speaking families own television sets, and virtually 100 percent own radios. My district boasts of the only Puerto Rican district leader, Tony Mendez, the only assembly candidate, Jose Ramos Lopez, and two judges, Emilio Nunez and Manuel A. Gomez.

I was overjoyed to see that one of the great television systems, WRCA-TV Channel 4, has initiated a program to aid the Spanish-speaking population to learn English or to speak better English. The title of its program, which began on August 11 is "Aquí Se Habla Inglés." This program will create an incentive to viewers to build a greater working English vocabulary and to provide a greater sense of participation. The television company has programed a daily word game whereby the viewer must identify in English a number of household objects shown each morning on the program. When listed correctly, and in the sequence shown, the first letters of each

object will spell out a Spanish word. The viewer submits his list of words, plus the English translation of the key Spanish word, and if correct, will receive a prize. This method of learning English is easy and fun.

If this program proves successful, more Spanish people of the laboring class will be able to speak English. Consequently, they will have the ability to inform themselves as to the facts and to separate the honest labor leaders from the selfish labor baron who pretends to help them in their quest for recognition and continued employment.

I urge my Puerto Rican friends to avail themselves of television, a very effective instrument of education. A mastery of the English language is an effective way to equality for the Puerto Ricans.

A Report on the 85th Congress by Congressman George McGovern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 21, 1958

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, as we near the end of the 85th Congress, I wish to follow the custom of many of my colleagues in the House of Representatives and report to my constituents on my activities during this first term in Congress. I include at this point a letter to the people of the First Congressional District of South Dakota:

DEAR FRIEND: It is with deep gratitude to you that I complete my first term as your Representative in the United States Congress. To be named by the people for service in the finest parliamentary body in the world is a high privilege. We are reminded of that privilege by the stirring monuments to America's greatness here in the Capital, the Lincoln Memorial, with its spirit of compassion for the people; the Washington Monument, symbolizing the courage of our first President; the Jefferson Memorial, with its protest against "any form of tyranny over the mind of man"; the Tomb of the Unknowns, where those "known but to God" silently challenge us to work harder for a world where young men and their loved ones can live out their lives free from the terror of war.

During the 20 months that I have worked for you in Washington, I have never once turned onto Pennsylvania Avenue en route to my office without thrilling to the majestic Capitol dome that symbolizes freedom and representative government for the American people. I take this opportunity at the end of my first term to thank you for this experience and to give an accounting of my stewardship.

Let me make it clear that this report is not intended as a boastful document—although, like all politicians I will try to claim credit for as many good things as possible. There is no one of the other 434 Members of the House of Representatives, Republicans and Democrats alike, who could not teach me something about the legislative process. I am the first to admit that this first term has been a trial-and-error experience in which I have made my quota of mistakes. Everyone who has ever served in Congress readily agrees that the first term is largely a learning process. It is my hope, however, that the growth and accomplishments will outweigh the shortcomings.

A PRODUCTIVE CONGRESS

One fact is certain—the 85th Congress has been one of the most productive sessions in many years. This Congress passed the first civil-rights code in 82 years, put the reciprocal trade program on a more permanent footing, and admitted Alaska to the Union—the first State to be admitted in nearly half a century. With the launching of the sputnik, Congress moved quickly to establish a National Space Agency and to improve the coordination of atomic development with our allies.

I am pleased that this has not been a Congress marked by partisan, political wrangles. Bipartisanship in the interest of the Nation has been the keynote of both House Speaker RAYBURN and Senate Majority Leader JOHNSON. President Eisenhower told Congress at the beginning of this session that there were three "must" pieces of legislation he wanted passed by Congress: (1) Reorganization of our military defense; (2) extension of reciprocal trade on a more permanent basis; and (3) a sound mutual security program. I was happy to support the President on all three of these programs and am delighted that the Congress met the President's challenge. It has been my constant aim to put the Nation's welfare above partisan or selfish considerations.

TWO BIGGEST FAILURES OF 85TH CONGRESS

The two biggest failures of the 85th Congress were in the vital fields of agriculture and labor reform. I worked long and hard for a truly effective program for the family farmer and for a moderate labor reform bill that would clean out the crooks in the otherwise honest labor-management field. We failed in both of these areas. Congress, discouraged by Presidential vetoes of farm price support programs, finally yielded to Secretary Benson and came up with a last-minute bill that is largely worthless. I fear it will have the effect of depressing farm prices and glutting our markets with cheap feed that will in turn depress cattle and hog prices. Several years of bad drought in the Southwest created a livestock shortage that has lifted prices in our part of the country, but as herds are rebuilt and cheap feed floods onto the market, we know from past experience that if the Department of Agriculture has no program, the results are bad.

Now, let's look briefly at the basic legislative areas of the Congress in which your Congressman was most deeply involved.

AGRICULTURE

Agriculture, is of course, the No. 1 industry in South Dakota. The welfare of all of us depends upon the prosperity of the farmer. For that reason, I have concentrated more effort on agricultural problems than any other single field.

1. My first act as a Member of Congress was to introduce a bill calling for an investigation of the price spread between the cost of groceries and the prices received by farmers. That investigation conducted by the Anfuso subcommittee revealed that it is not high farm price supports or high profits for grocers that are at fault. It is the big take of processing, food handling, packaging, and other middlemen operations that account for the rising cost of food at the same time that farm prices have dropped.

2. Early last year during action on the farm bill, I introduced the family farm parity amendment which came within four votes of passing the House. It provided price support protection to the family-size farmer at a reasonable level.

3. This spring, I worked hard for a bill sponsored by myself and a colleague from a metropolitan area which would have offered price protection to the farmer on all commodities up to the level produced by the average family-size farmer. Hearings were held on my bill before the full Agriculture Committee.

4. I am pleased that Congress extended the Wool Act until 1962. The food-stamp plan to utilize farm surpluses in feeding needy Americans was unfortunately defeated. On the brighter side, the Public Law 480 program, which permits the sale of American farm surpluses for foreign currencies has been expanded and extended.

EDUCATION

As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, I have worked hard for better schools for America. To me, there is no more urgent public responsibility than to give our children the best education that exists anywhere in the world. I do not want to see a ruthless Communist Russia devoting more time and resources to the education of the young than we do in our free way of life. Our future is built upon the minds of the boys and girls in our schools and colleges.

1. The National Defense Education Act passed by the Congress after extensive hearings by our committee, will help give America better schools and colleges without jeopardizing the precious principle of local control of education. I insisted that this bill be broadened beyond aid to science students because I believe that America needs not only good scientists, but good teachers, ministers, farmers, journalists, and other trained people to help us find the best ways of living in peace with our neighbors.

2. I am the author of a new program passed by the Congress which will help us meet the need for trained teachers to work with mentally retarded children. There are a million of these little folks in the United States and most of them can become useful, happy citizens if we can increase the number of specially trained teachers and specially equipped classrooms to teach them.

3. I am the author of a bill passed by this Congress that authorizes the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to add captions to films that are loaned to schools for the deaf. These films can be loaned to deaf persons in any State and the captions will enable those hard of hearing to follow the movie and profit from its cultural and educational value.

SMALL BUSINESS

The 85th Congress has passed three major provisions benefiting small-business men that make this the best small-business Congress in many years:

(1) The Small Business Administration has been made a permanent agency, its loan ceiling has been raised from $250,000 to $350,000 and interest reduced from 6 to 5½ percent.

(2) Long-term equity capital will now be made available to small business through privately formed investment groups that must comprise 10 or more persons.

(3) Small business has been given substantial tax relief, including faster tax writeoffs on new equipment in the first year after purchase, extension from 2 to 3 years of the period for which a loss may be carried back and applied against previous income to gain retroactive tax refund, 10 years, instead of 15 months in which to pay estate taxes on a business held by a few persons, an increase from $60,000 to $100,000 on the amount of earnings that may be retained instead of distributed without stiff tax charges.

Believing strongly in the importance of our small-business economy, I have worked hard for the above programs. Strong antimonopoly safeguards and other small-business defenses have seemed essential to me. I am the author of a bill which would create a permanent standing committee in the House to study the problems of small busi-

ness. I testified twice before the Rules Committee on this bill.

SOCIAL SECURITY

If there is any group in America that is entitled to the special consideration of our Government, it is those who are too old to work or for other reasons cannot care for their own needs.

Congress increased the social-security benefits by 7 percent to help our older citizens meet in part the rising cost of living. This measure also provided assistance for handicapped persons or those in need under the public-assistance program.

In my testimony before the Ways and Means Committee in support of an improved social-security program, I cited some of the many letters that our office has received from older people in South Dakota who are having difficulty getting even the bare necessities of life on their present payments.

LABOR

Congress passed a major bill requiring full disclosure and accounting of all funds invested by unions or management groups in pension and welfare funds.

On the negative side, the House unfortunately killed a second major labor reform bill which was designed to crack down on some of the hoodlum tactics revealed by the McClellan committee. I helped lead the fight which brought the bill to the House floor for a vote after it was believed to be dead in the Labor Committee. It seems to me that next to our failure to secure a solid farm bill, the House defeat of this moderate labor reform bill was our greatest failure. The bill was not perfect, but, as Senator McCLELLAN said, it was the best we could hope for in this session. I hope that the next Congress will move quickly to put the crooks out of business. They constitute a threat to an otherwise honest American labor movement.

INDIAN LEGISLATION

My bill, H. R. 12670, passed the Congress and will provide compensation to the Crow Creek Sioux Tribe for land and property which they lost in the flooding of the area that comprises the Fort Randall Reservoir. I am also the sponsor of a point 4 for American Indians resolution which provides for ducational, vocational, economic, and technical assistance to American Indians similar to those programs that we have made available to many foreign countries.

CONSERVATION AND WILDLIFE

Congressman HENRY REUSS, of Wisconsin, and I have been working for legislation that would provide just compensation to farmers who are willing to leave undrained pothole areas and wetlands that are valuable to wildlife. At the present time, farmers are paid for draining wetlands and they may be paid for creating wetlands, but there is no provision to compensate a farmer who would be willing to maintain a wetlands area that already exists on his farm. Legislation sponsored by Representative REUSS and myself is designed to correct this strange situation.

I am also a supporter of the duck stamp bill passed by the 85th Congress which will provide greater revenues for acquisition of game refuge areas. With several of my colleagues, I have joined in sponsoring another good measure, the wilderness preservation bill.

While I have been from the first critical of those who regard the Soil Bank as a substitute for a good price-support program, I have always supported the conservation reserve feature of the program and was pleased to support the continuance of that phase of the program in this Congress.

VETERANS

My efforts in the field of veterans' affairs have been concentrated on stopping arbitrary cuts by the Budget Bureau in essential veterans services that represent the will of Congress. We have been waging a hard fight against proposed cuts in hospital services to veterans that include our hospital program in South Dakota. These administration-ordered cuts were not approved by Congress and represent a clear cut defiance of the intent of the Congress. I have also supported legislation designed to extend equal benefits to veterans, their dependents and survivors of all wars.

RIVER DEVELOPMENT AND REA

I have supported continued appropriations for our Missouri River development program and sought expanded appropriations to begin construction of Big Bend Dam and complete the Oahe irrigation study. Flood-control projects at Sioux Falls and on the Vermillion and James Rivers have been strongly supported by my office. With the junior Senator from South Dakota, I have sponsored legislation to correct bank erosion along the Missouri in the Elk Point area.

It has seemed to me that rural electrification and rural telephone service have been fundamental in the growth of South Dakota during the past two decades. For that reason, I have done my very best to advance the interests of these two groups. Last year, I was instrumental in securing a very substantial reduction in the amount of equity finances required of rural telephone associations. This will save rural telephone users many thousands of dollars and expedite the expansion of rural telephone service.

I was responsible for an amendment to the 1958 rivers and harbors and flood-control bill which has been hailed by REA leaders as a significant step in the defense of our rural-electrification program. This amendment maintains the principle laid down 50 years ago by Theodore Roosevelt, which gives first claim on benefits from a Federal dam to the public through such groups as rural-electric associations and municipalities.

ECONOMY

In view of the fact that 78 percent of our national budget is spent on military matters, it has always seemed to me that any substantial savings in Federal spending would have to come in this area. Since coming to Washington, I have seen considerable evidence of waste, extravagance, and duplication in the military services. On the basis of careful studies of some of the Hoover Commission findings, I introduced last year a bill that would create a central, civilian purchasing agency in the Defense Department to do the purchasing for all the defense forces. I believe that such a program could save many millions of dollars in eliminating duplication and overlapping of purchasing. The President's defense reorganization bill, which I strongly supported, will save us a great deal of money and give us a better Defense Establishment in the process, but I believe that there is much progress still to be made in the field of greater efficiency and economy in our sprawling Defense Establishment at the Pentagon.

WORLD PEACE

The most important work in this or any other Congress is our work for a peaceful world. This Congress very wisely extended the Public Law 480 program. The more we can use our agricultural abundance in a hungry world, the better chance there is of removing some of the breeding grounds of communism and war.

I am strongly in favor of the President's current Middle East plan to stabilize that area with a regional economic development program and a United Nations police force. As one who was given the opportunity to travel for 3 weeks in the Middle East during the Easter recess of the Congress a year ago, I am convinced that it is the world's No. 1 trouble spot. We have not had a firm, constructive policy in that area until now. This Congress has done a great deal to point the way toward a more workable policy for the Middle East. I close this report on the 85th Congress with the prayerful hope that we can continue to use the great power of this Nation on the side of peace in the most effective manner possible.

Again, my warm thanks to you for the privilege of serving you in the Congress. I hope to see you during my travel in South Dakota this fall.

Your friend and Representative in Congress,

GEORGE MCGOVERN.

A Report to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 21, 1958

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I desire to include a summary report of my activities and speeches during this 85th Congress. I understand the Joint Committee on Printing has issued a regulation on "retrenchment in extensions;" I shall do my best to stay within the rule, while complying with the duty I have.

A MORAL OBLIGATION

In my conscientious judgment, the Biblical mandate to "render an account of thy stewardship" imposes upon every responsible public officeholder a moral obligation. Throughout my own public life, I have consistently complied with and fulfilled that obligation.

It is clearly impossible, in the time and space allowed, to record in detail my every word and action. According to the Clerk, over 15,000 measures were introduced in this Congress, and over 800 bills were considered in the House. Obviously, I cannot comment on all of them, but I shall present and reveal my personal stand and action upon some of the more important and more highly publicized legislative issues of 1957–58.

THE DUTY OF DECLARATION

Mr. Speaker, it has ever seemed to me that one of the associate duties of an individual in this high office is to make an advance declaration, prediction, if you will, of what he believes ought to occur in the Congress and list the measures to which the highest priority of action should be given in the national interest. I attempt to carry out this duty through the mediums of the newspapers in my District to whom I customarily give interviews on January 1 of each year.

On these particular days in the past 2 years, I informed my people, as cooperatively recorded, among others, in the columns of the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram and Gazette of my opinion that the main objective of this Congress and the administration should be to seek "success in halting hostilities in the Middle East in cooperation with the United Nations for the preservation of honorable peace and the avoidance of all-out atomic warfare."

As outstanding and high priority of action issues, I listed, among others, prompt immediate initiation of an accelerated missile research and production program; genuine unification of the armed services; the enactment of a civil rights law; a determined effort to substitute loan program for the "giveaway" principle underlying present foreign aid relation; measures to contain and erase the unemployment trend; sensible extension of reciprocal trade, with reasonable safeguards against further economic hardships on home industries; laws to encourage gifted students in the pursuit of scientific study; legislation to provide closer and more protective control over the funds entrusted to labor union leaders by their membership; the granting of tax relief to small businesses; a legislative review, for restriction of inflationary factors creating abnormally high living costs; and a continuing reasonable essential public works program, especially for flood control.

I also predicted that "political bickering for partisan advantage will be kept to a minimum." "The purposeful selectivity of the American voters in choosing a Republican administration with a Democratic House and practically an evenly divided Senate gives evidence of the very strong desire and expectation of our people that these two departments of Government shall work in patriotic cooperation and avoid petty partisanship from either side."

Mr. Speaker, it is a matter not so much of personal, but more of patriotic satisfaction to me that substantial action was taken upon practically all of the legislative objectives I advocated, as outlined above. Also, according to the great majority of independent authorities the wholesome cooperation between the legislative and executive departments of the Government in this Congress has set a record and precedent of bipartisan accomplishment that will stand forever as a highlight of American legislative history.

THE MIDDLE EAST SITUATION

Mr. Speaker, at the outset of this Congress, as mentioned above, I expressed the opinion, on January 1, 1957, that the principal international aim of the executive department and legislative department, together, should be to try to halt hostilities in the Middle East in cooperation with the United Nations. Early in January, the Chief Executive requested the Congress to act on a resolution authorizing the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations of the Middle East to strengthen the defense of their independence. On Tuesday, January 29, 1957, this resolution was presented to the House, and there follows an extract from my remarks in support of the resolution:

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt, of course, that the closest and most effective cooperation between this body and the executive department should be promoted in our common patriotic purpose of containing the spread of international communism and particularly in the Middle East area. Any unnecessary display of great difference or serious controversy on this matter between our two departments of Government could very probably be most effectively used by the devilish propaganda machines of the Kremlin.

Inasmuch as the substance of the resolution is an expression of trust and confidence in the Presidential judgment, and to avoid the danger of any vicious Communist distortion of disagreement, I feel that the resolution should be supported, and I earnestly hope the Chief Executive and administration officials will reveal their full justification of it at the earliest opportunity for the understanding of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, within the scope and spirit of this resolution, Public Law 7, of the 85th Congress, the Chief Executive, on July 14, 1958, issued an order for the landing of American troops in Lebanon, and I include here an excerpt from my remarks in the House about this action, on July 15, 1958, urging that the best and wisest place in which to seek a permanent solution of the problems of Lebanon and the whole Middle East was within the United Nations.

Tuesday, July 15, 1958

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it may or may not be an unfortunate matter that the President's best wisdom has ordered our troops into Lebanon, but it is useless to argue about that now. Our clear patriotic course now is to go along with the President in a demonstration of unity, while permanent solution of the problem is sought within the United Nations. We can thus, at least, try to prevent any additional triumphs of Soviet propaganda.

We may be certain that the Russians will make the most of our entrance into Lebanon and try to convince the rest of the world that it is an imperialist gesture toward war and not, as it is truly meant to be, an attempt to promote peace.

It is vitally important that we show the world that we will not reject even the germ of an idea or a proposal that could help the cause of peace.

The forum in which that can be accomplished is the United Nations, and I most earnestly hope that the President will insist that any negotiations be conducted within that international organization, originated for that purpose.

Meanwhile, let us pray divine guidance for the President in this historical hour while we remain united behind him.

Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of recent history that the President did present the problem to the United Nations where they are even now debating it while American troops are being withdrawn from Lebanon. Let us pray that, through thorough discussion between the United States, Russia, and all the other members, a peaceful solution of the turmoil in the Middle East will be amicably and cooperatively worked out.

Mr. Speaker, in the remaining time permitted, for the sake of brevity, I shall attempt to reveal in summary an account of my actions and remarks on significant legislative issues, not so much in any chronological order, but more in accord with their essential importance and the prominence they achieved in the minds of our people.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT REORGANIZATION FOR ESSENTIAL MILITARY UNITY

Mr. Speaker, on May 22, 1958, the Armed Services Committee reported a bill recommending reorganization of the Defense Department to promote unity and efficiency. Within these past few years, nothing has been more disturbing to the Congress, or demoralizing of the people's confidence, than the obvious jealousies and rivalries that existed among the various military services resulting, unfortunately, in dangerous lags in our cold war efforts and staggering extravagances in waste of money and time. The President, himself, recommended remedial action and, in the face of the frightening display of Russian scientific superiority in missile research and development, the need for such action was clearly imperative. A great step forward in the elimination of interservice rivalries and for their closer coordination, especially in the field of missile research, was taken through final passage of this measure on August 6, 1958. The following is an extract from my remarks in the House, July 15, 1958, on this vital subject:

Tuesday, July 15, 1958

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, in the near future we will be called upon to exercise our responsibility of enacting legislation essentially needed to provide military unity and restrain the unhappy rivalries existing among the separate branches of our armed services.

We can each have sincere and conscientious differences as to the precise legislative provisions to accomplish the desired objective.

It is our clear duty to conscientiously attempt the enactment of a measure that will remove, so far as reasonably possible, the disastrous jealousies that admittedly exist among the services, and that will provide for the centralization of research and development under one director, in order to stop the appalling waste of the taxpayers' money due to the duplication of efforts and absurd competition among the services in this vital field of Russian challenge.

In our exhortations for unity among the armed services, it is encumbent upon us to show an example of unity here, to restore the confidence of the American people in the Congress and in the military forces. Let us resolve our differences and patriotically provide a bill that will do the job.

ANTIRECESSION ACTION

Mr. Speaker, short of the catastrophe of atomic war, there could be no greater calamity affect this Nation, and the Free World, than an economic recession here of major proportion. Beyond the terrible hardships, with which most of us here are well acquainted from our memories of the thirties, that are thereby visited upon American families, a persistent economic decline would furnish suffocating propaganda to the Russians against "American capitalism", and seriously undermine the confidence of the Free World in the destiny of the United States.

Particularly in the later part of 1957, and throughout the early months of 1958, it became obvious that we were experiencing a most serious economic depression, readjustment, decline, or whatever name you choose to call it. The fact was that some 5 million, and more, heads of families were out of work, and the prospects of early reemployment for them were vague and dim. With the consequent reduction in purchasing power, there was immediate adverse

action of retrenchment in commercial sales volume and industrial production. Without the initiation of prompt measures by the Federal Government, it was clear that we were facing the very grave danger of prolonged economic collapse.

In such an emergency it is my conviction that the Federal Government has a real responsibility, through appropriate legislative and executive department programs, first to grant reasonable assistance to distressed American families, and then attempt to stimulate and bolster the overall economic situation through every proper means.

I am happy to say, that although, in my opinion, this Government did not go far enough, a substantial effort was made by the Congress to assist our people and improve the economy, with a certain limited encouragement from the executive department.

A multitude of proposals designed to help the unemployed and spur the economy were introduced in the Congress. Some very worthy and effective ones, such as the Community Facilities Act, and the Omnibus Housing Act, were, unfortunately, defeated, even though a great many Members, including myself, advocated and supported them. Several important bills, including the extension, through State grants, of unemployment benefits for an additional 16 weeks, were adopted and I voted in favor of them.

Extracts of my comments in support of these measures follow:

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT

Tuesday, July 15, 1958

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, we can ill afford another major defeat by the Kremlin, particularly in the field of propaganda against our claim and desire for leadership in the areas of economic development and social justice. Unhappily, most authorities agree we are gravely threatened with such further defeat unless a federally encouraged effective program to alleviate national conditions of substantial unemployment in certain economically depressed areas is promptly initiated.

Over the past decade increasing evidence has developed to convincingly demonstrate that our vaunted boast of having the highest living standards anywhere is in danger of being exploded and exploited as another American capitalistic myth. May Divine Providence, a determined Congress, and a united people, forbid.

It is most unhappily apparent that substantial economic decline is visiting increasing hardship and lowering the living standards in large areas of the country, particularly in New England, along the eastern seaboard, and in certain southern sections. There are varied causes for this catastrophe but principal among them are the migration of industry from New England, technological changes, such as those affecting the coal industry, and the disjointed advantages, through our foreign trade program, given to foreign competitors of multitudinous domestic industries.

All of these causes add up to chronic unemployment and permanently distressed areas which present a double threat against our internal development and our external security.

Clearly then, chronic unemployment and permanent depression anywhere in our economy is a subject of national concern and primarily so in this emergency struggle with Russia.

Responding to this challenge, in patriotic thought and purpose, a great many Members, including myself, have filed legislative proposals designed to forestall and prevent this economic tragedy.

In summary, this program would include loans for industrial projects, grants for public facilities, and financial assistance, through the cooperation of the Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Departments, to expand vocational training programs.

Most of these provisions, with added features, are contained in the Senate-passed bill, S. 3683, now waiting upon our action in the House. At stake is our continuing national well-being and high morale, our world reputation of providing equal opportunity for all our citizens, and our ability to defend ourselves and assume the offensive in the vitally important propaganda battle with Russia. I most earnestly urge that this measure will be presented to and adopted by this House before any further idea of adjournment is entertained.

Mr. Speaker, this measure passed the House on August 15, 1958.

EMERGENCY HOUSING ACT

March 19, 1958

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, because of the very serious proportions to which our unemployment situation has developed over these past several months I introduced, in the House, an emergency housing bill, H. R. 11395. The objectives of my bill are substantially the same as those embodied in this legislation before us.

This bill, as well as my own measure, is designed to stimulate the general economy in this emergency period by increasing the market for homes and thereby revive the home-building industry.

Our economy, it is obvious, has unhappily declined to a point which can no longer be ignored as a slight recession or a temporary adjustment. At this hour it is useless to consume time by attempting to fix the blame for such disaster or otherwise indulge in partisan dispute. Unemployment is reaching disastrous stages in my own State and throughout other major sections of the country. With over 5 million presently unemployed throughout the Nation, and those numbers are being added to daily, I submit that the time has come for action instead of words. The proposals in this measure before us cannot be termed rash or irresponsible pump priming by even the wildest imagination.

It is equally clear that the nature of the lating effect upon many other associated inhousing industry is such that it has a stimulated housing industry upon our unemployment situation would be prompt and substantial.

Mr. Speaker, there is no need for me or anyone else to emphasize the fundamental benefits accruing to the Nation as a whole through the encouragement of private home ownership. Let us remember that there are still over 9 million World War II veterans, with their families, who have not yet exercised their entitlement to purchase a home through the medium of Veterans' Administration home mortgage financing. With regard to and consideration of them I earnestly hope that interest rates will be maintained at a level that will not be discouraging to them as well as countless millions of other potential homeowners.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the serious economic slump the country is suffering from; in view of the need for a stimulus of home construction; in view of the importance to the Nation of increasing family home ownership; and primarily because of the immediate and salutary effect a reactivated housing construction industry would have upon our distressed economy I urge prompt approval of this measure. The need is now, the hour is urgent, this is the time for action.

Mr. Speaker, this bill passed the House on March 19, 1958, and is now Public Law 364, of the 85th Congress.

THE HOUSING ACT OF 1958

Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, as we progress toward the conclusion of this session, I most earnestly hope that the so-called omnibus housing bill of 1958, recently acted upon in the Senate, will not be overlooked in the log-jam that so often accompanies the rush toward adjournment. Failure to act on this bill, in my opinion, would be placing an unhappy and unnecessary blemish upon an otherwise commonly admitted constructive record of this 85th Congress.

One basic reason, among many, why action on this measure is vitally important is the admitted effect it would have as a further antirecession bulwark and production and employment stimulus.

The emergency housing bill that was earlier passed has demonstrated that a stimulation of the building industry, with the associated trades affected, is one of the wisest and most economical methods through which any further deterioration of our overall economy can be restrained.

This housing bill would undoubtedly assist in the revival of our lagging economy by encouraging investment activity in the construction field, with an accompanying increase in production and employment.

Embodied also in this housing bill is the foundation purpose of promoting better housing throughout the country, giving further impetus to operating programs designed to combat slum areas, and providing needed assistance to the continuation and expansion of the veterans home loan program.

Another primary objective of the measure is to further the advancement of scientific and academic knowledge, by helping our hard-pressed institutions of higher learning to provide the vitally needed dormitories, classrooms, and scientific laboratories which are pitifully inadequate to meet the ever-increasing enrollment. Obviously, one of our essential national goals is to compete with, and surpass, the scientific achievements and progress of Soviet Russia, and we cannot hope to do it unless the fullest facilities are made available to students through our colleges and universities.

In this most blessed country in the world, we have only begun to attack the problems of providing decent housing for our elderly citizens, expanding FHA insurance, encouraging wider recognition of the necessity of urban renewal, and relocating families displaced by wholesome and healthy slum clearance.

The foundation unit of any nation is the family. The best guaranty of wholesome family life is a home of their own in decent surroundings. Reasonable encouragement of better housing for American families and American citizens, is one of the wisest investments we can make toward the future safety and progress of this great country. In order to make this wise investment, I hope that the housing bill will be presented to us for debate and action at the earliest possible date.

ACCELERATING THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY PROGRAM

April 3, 1958

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, this legislation, H. R. 9821, with accompanying conference report, is substantially the same as the measure, H. R. 11418, which I introduced and in support of which I submitted testimony before the House Public Works Committee recently.

The fundamental purpose of this bill is, as you know, to provide authorization for the immediate acceleration of the rate of highway construction on the Federal-aid primary and secondary road systems that is already in progress. There is certainly no dispute about the long-range economic or security value of this program.

It is, admittedly, an emergency anti-recession measure. I do not think there is much doubt in this body about the current existence of an economic recession, readjustment, transition, "slight depression," or whatever other name you please to attach to describe the alarming fact that millions of Americans are out of work. In my State and area we are unfortunately too familiar with this recession which is visiting severe economic hardships upon thousands of families whose working heads have long exhausted their unemployment compensation allowances, meager as they are and brief as they last.

It may be there are a few provisions in the bill and report that we cannot all agree upon. The fundamental fact is that by passage and initiation of the bill into action it is authoritatively estimated hundreds of thousands of creative work opportunities will be promptly developed for American taxpayers now unemployed. The economic emergency is here whether we like it or not; millions of workers are without weekly pay envelopes now; this is a sound economic recovery assistance step; we have a moral responsibility and a high legislative duty to our own people in this catastrophe. I most earnestly hope this House will promptly act without extended delay to grant the help this bill will give to so many of our citizens who are desperately in need now.

Mr. Speaker, this measure was finally approved on April 16, 1958 and is now Public Law 381, of the 85th Congress.

LEGISLATION FOR THE GOOD OF ALL AMERICANS

Mr. Speaker, it has, these past several years, too often and too unhappily, appeared to me that in the zeal and zest to sustain our faltering foreign policy too many hasty programs, of too great, too extravagant, and too expensive a nature have been approved to assist foreign nations. I have consistently, in this period, warned that in our concentration upon the rehabilitation of the Free World there has been too great a neglect of the interests and welfare of our own American people and I have attempted to point out that the most important strength, underlying any foreign policy, is a continuation and encouragement of a high morale among our own citizens. If they lose confidence in this Government and its officials, then we are, indeed, in dire trouble.

The Chief Executive told the people of this country upon his assumption of that high office that his yardstick of measurement of Government actions would be "is this good for all Americans?" Shortly after he made this patriotic pronouncement, I urged that the Congress adopt it as our rule of action also.

At this point, I would like to list a few of the measures we dealt with that, in my opinion, were primarily designed for the good of all Americans, and include excerpts from my remarks on them at the time they were under consideration here.

SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASES

July 31, 1958

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, H. R. 13549, to further improve and expand our social-security system, and to express the hope that benefits will be increased, by appropriate amendment, to at least 10 percent.

As one who has consistently supported the improvements in this social-security program since becoming a Member of this body, I am particularly pleased that the measure before us recommends increases in the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits, and that it also proposes the added provision of granting benefits for the dependents of disabled workers. In recognition of the necessity for constant review to expand this Christian program, I am also glad to note that the committee proposes further improvements in the public assistance, maternal, and child-welfare provisions.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that marks this country as a God-fearing and God-caring Nation in contrast to the slave state of Communist atheism is our legislative achievements in the fields of social and economic justice. In the propaganda battles that are currently being waged between ourselves and the Soviets, in which we are, unhappily, too often on the losing end, it is imperative for the retention of our position and our prestige as the leader of the Free World that we maintain constant progress in our fundamental legislative programs for national welfare and development. We have a chance to take a forward step along this road today by supporting this bill.

The basic objective of our social-security system is to enable our retired American workers and the disabled to retain self-respect and reasonable economic independence in the sunset years of their lives and in time of adversity. In a constantly changing economy this objective is impossible of accomplishment if upward adjustments in the laws are not made to keep pace with the increases in the cost of the articles and services that are essential to a decent existence in a free and blessed Nation.

If we cannot all agree on the various amendments of sincere intent to improve the bill, let us in good will compromise our differences and approve the substance without unnecessarily extending this debate. There will be recurring opportunities in the future to make further improvements as the needs are demonstrated. Let us do our job today as well as we can while we look toward the future in good mind and with good heart.

AID TO SMALL BUSINESS

Thursday, August 7, 1958

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, as I stated here a couple of weeks ago, the hour is desperate for the continuing life of small business in the dynamic economy that has developed in this country through the past decade.

The small businesses in this Nation are in pearance because, at this moment, they have grave danger of disintegration and disapno way of obtaining equity capital and long-term credit which they vitally need for any hope of survival. Although many words of sympathetic encouragement have been spoken here in the Congresses of recent history, legislative response and recognition of small business has been too long delayed.

It is and has been obvious, for a long time, from committee hearings, independent reports, and the persevering pleas of small business throughout the country, that their fundamental requirements cannot be extended by commercial banks or the Small Business Administration, as presently constituted.

I am not going the repeat the provisions of the bill, which have already been explained at length. It is in substance a good bill and an earnest attempt to grant material help in an emergency situation, although it does not go as far as a great many of us would like.

I earnestly believe it is practically the unanimous intention of the Congress to preserve the traditions of small business in the economic life and history of this country; this is an opportunity to do so.

The financial problems of small businesses all over the United States are very, very serious and this legislation is essential for their cure. I urge you to adopt this conference report so that life-preserving help may be granted to a basic segment of our economy at the earliest possible minute.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT REFORM

Wednesday, July 23, 1958

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, in the enactment of legislation under our democratic processes we have come to expect the efforts of special groups to interject their passions, prejudices, and particular interests. As conscientious legislators it is our duty to closely examine these pressures and concentrate our attention upon the enactment of a reasonable compromise designed primarily to inspire observance of the law with good will because of its essentially impartial nature.

In this respect there is pending before us a so-called labor-management reform bill which was approved in the Senate by an overwhelming bipartisan vote of 88 to 1. No one with good sense claims that this measure is perfect but, even according to a great many members of the Industrial Relations Research Association, it unquestionably, if adopted, would contribute to union reform and sound industrial relations. However many contentious provisions the measure may be said to contain, it undoubtedly occupies a middle and compromise ground between the extreme demands of employer and union groups. Its enactment would tend to restrain a great many of the worst abuses plaguing some of the country's largest unions and it would provide more control by union members over the affairs of their organizations. Certainly it would discourage the unbridled ambitions of those few unscrupulous individuals whose main objective appears to be personal use of big union trust funds for their own interest.

There are also provisions in this bill placing additional restrictions upon unwarranted management practices; provisions designed to prevent scheming employers from entering into collusive arrangement with any tempted union official for the purpose of perverting real collective bargaining.

The revelations of the McClellan committee have demonstrated the need for reasonable legislation to encourage labor-management internal activity reform. The general public expects a responsive impartial reaction of the Congress to that need. The great majority of labor unions have taken the first and biggest step in the best method of correction, from within, by their adoption of strict ethical codes of practice. With a temperate measure of impartial and reasonable—which is always the wisest—legislative encouragement we can entertain good hope for increasing good will and cooperation between labor and management for the national benefit. In pursuit of that wholesome objective, I most earnestly hope that this labor-management reform bill will be presented to the House before adjournment, so that it may be discussed, debated, and acted upon in accord with our democratic legislative traditions.

HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

August 14, 1958

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I urge the unanimous adoption of this amended ver-

sion of H. R. 8002, which provides for improved methods of stating budget estimates and estimates for deficiency and supplemental appropriations.

To those of us who were privileged to support the creation of the original Hoover Commission, this measure represents another forward step in a chief objective of the Commission to continuously introduce modern methods of financial accounting practices in place of the outmoded and antiquated system that was too long permitted to bewilder the understanding of Congress, prevent the constitutional control of the Congress over Government spending, and conceal great waste of the taxpayers' money.

One of the basic responsibilities of the Congress is to exercise the greatest care in and control of the tremendous financial spending of the Federal Government, especially in these emergency years. All authorities agree that rigid accounting practices is the best approach to Congressional understanding of Government financial operations and Congressional insurance, by appropriate legislative measures that not $1 of the hard-earned taxpayers' money will be spent needlessly, wastefully, corruptly, or extravagantly. This measure is at least one more step along the hard road to that Congressional duty achievement. I hope you will all approve the taking of this step without further delay.

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

Tuesday, July 15, 1958

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, unquestionably one of the most challenging legislative subjects that has faced this Congress, and several preceding ones, is finding ways and means through which the Federal Government can reasonably and sensibly extend desperately needed assistance to the several States to advance their educational standards and provide adequate educational facilities.

However, the dramatic Soviet demonstration of scientific achievement has inspired, I think, a more responsive mind and attitude to this problem, both in the Members of this body and the general public. It would seem that the time has come for us to resolve our differences on such a vitally important national necessity and fulfill our legislative responsibility.

In my opinion, an excellent opportunity to do so is presented to us in the form of the measure I understand is being today reported out of the House Education and Labor Committee, H. R. 13247.

In summary, this bill is designed to provide Federal scholarships and also student loan funds to enable superior students without finances to attend college. Its emphasis is placed upon the teaching and study of science, mathematics, and foreign languages. It would improve testing and counseling in secondary and elementary schools and it would help train more college teachers.

No matter on what other phases of the problem we may have some differences, I believe that there is no single Member of the Congress who would question the foundation importance of education to a progressive future for this great Nation.

I most earnestly hope that both the Congress and the administration will join their efforts toward the enactment of the substance, at least, of this bill as a united action in concern for the basic welfare and continuing development of this country.

PROTECTING THE CIVIL RIGHTS OF ALL AMERICANS

(Excerpts from House speech)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is clear. It is to make more certain that rights guaranteed by the Constitution and laws of the United States will be enjoyed by all, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin.

It is directed at no particular section of America. Certainly no area of the country can claim achievement of full equality under law. The Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives recognizes its distinct duty to enact wise legislation which will guarantee that the words of promise spoken by the Constitution will be fulfilled in every corner of the Nation. It is also realized that American leadership of the Free World is aided greatly by practical demonstrations of our historic commitment to the ideal of equality under law.

I, therefore, sincerely hope that any temporary passions, prejudices, or partisanship will be put aside today in order that we may render a historical legislative accomplishment in our own national interest and also provide a legislative inspiration to all peoples everywhere on this blessed earth.

ANTI-INFLATION ACTION OR RUINATION

Tuesday, June 25, 1957

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, the constantly increasing costs of living have concentrated attention upon the grave danger of inflation and the vital necessity to take reasonable action against threatening economic catastrophe.

It is obvious that some of the methods proposed to control inflation are either unpalatable to the majority of Americans, outside of wartime, or antiquated. Therefore, a resurvey and restudy of all the economic factors involved is imperative and it is vitally important that it be done now before it is too late.

Many of us have the conviction that such a study could best be conducted by committees of the Congress rather than any select commission appointed by the President; perhaps it would be of value to have both.

In any case, let us cease any petty and partisan quarrels about authority and responsibility and initiate an investigative project speedily before our economic structure deteriorates beyond repair.

OUR OBLIGATION TO THE VETERAN AND DEPENDENTS

(Excerpts from speech in the House)

Mr. Speaker, I and a great many other Members of this House have become deeply disturbed by the increasing publicity and propaganda questioning the continuation and cost-of-living adjustments and other benefits being reasonably accorded our veterans.

I do not believe that the people of this country now wish to turn their backs in forgetfulness of the substantial sacrifices made by our war veterans and their dependents in protecting this Nation from armed enemies. On the contrary, I believe the great majority of the American people realize there is only one safeguard for this Nation in time of emergency, and that is the willingness of American men and women to fight and die to preserve our national security. I am sure they further understand that the efficiency of our fighting men is governed by the morale of their families and dependents. In these tense days of international turmoil, it is not only just but patriotically wise to inspire the veteran of the future with the example of our real concern for the veteran of the past.

Mr. Speaker, there is legislation pending to extend farm, home, and business loan guaranties for our veterans, to continue vocational rehabilitation adjustment assistance, to raise the ratings and pensions of the disabled war veterans and dependent allowances, as well as income limitations, in accord with our increased basic living costs. There is pending legislation to extend simple justice to Spanish-American War veterans and their widows, who are trying to eke out a bare existence on some $54 per month.

These, and other beneficial measures, such as the so-called War Orphans Education Act, should be enacted without delay. Most of the pending bills are substantially sound and beneficial and are intended to discharge our just obligation to the war veteran and his family. I shall continue to work in support of their enactment as the best investment we can make to insure our national security.

Mr. Speaker, a number of important measures have been adopted by the 85th Congress to benefit our war veterans, the most significant of which are: Public Law 168 increases the rates of compensation for service-connected disabilities for veterans for all wars; Public Law 209 liberalizes marriage requirements for widows applying for pension or other benefits; Public Law 364 provides direct loans for veterans' housing, increases the amount of such loans, and lowers the down-payments for FHA housing; Public Law 462 increases salaries of medical and nursing staffs at VA hospitals; also a law to increase burial allowance for deceased veterans from $150 to $250.

FLOOD PROTECTION OF LIVES AND PROPERTY

Mr. Speaker, on August 19 and 20 of 1955, the whole northeast area, including my own State and home city of Worcester, Mass., was visited by overwhelming floods in the wake of a torrential downpour of continuous rainfall through the 3 preceding days and nights. In that terrible catastrophe several lives were lost in my home area, family tragedies were numerous, and the amount of property damage staggered the imagination to assess.

In a speech in this House on May 22, 1956, I voiced my opinion that the necessity for flood control and protection action had obviously become one of the most pressing domestic problems and the responsibility of the Federal Government to assist the various States and municipalities of the Nation in solving that problem was great.

The Congress recognized this obligation and over these past few years has annually approved public works appropriations for flood control and protection proposals throughout the Nation.

In the national interest, I vigorously supported the approval of all these projects and quite naturally had a particular interest in the protection of the people and the property in my own home city of Worcester, where we have repeatedly suffered tremendous damage from unrestrained floodwaters.

At my initiation, in cooperation with local and State officials, the Army Corps of Engineers surveyed our Worcester area and recommended the construction of a flood diversionary tunnel which would practically eliminate the danger of flood ravages in the future.

I am including below excerpts from my speeches in the House in support of flood protection legislation and a summary of the appropriations approved for the construction of the Worcester flood diversionary tunnel.

(House speech, June 19, 1957)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I most sincerely hope that this public works appropriation bill for fiscal year 1958 will be overwhelmingly approved by the House today.

I speak in particular appeal for the approval of the flood relief and protection projects included in this measure that are so vitally important to so many people throughout this country. I am, of course, quite naturally concerned for the extension of assistance in protection of the lives, safety, and physical properties of the people in my own area, while at the same time extending my deepest sympathy and full support to the people of the other sections of the country who well understand the tragedy of heavy loss of life and property destruction that follows in the wake of these terrible floods, hurricanes, and other disasters from uncontrolled elements.

I express the sentiments of the people of my area in extending our gratitude to the distinguished chairman and industrious members of the committee who have recommended the approval of $1,500,000 to begin actual construction of the Worcester, Mass., flood-diversionary tunnel.

The people of my home city of Worcester and surrounding area are, unfortunately, only too well acquainted with the havoc that is wrought by raging floods.

It is an unpleasant experience to be an eyewitness to the tragedy that is visited upon a community, its people, and its property when roaring waters pour uncontrolled over bridges, and through the streets. We had this terrible experience in August of 1955 and, please God, with the completion of this tunnel it will never happen again.

The aftermath of such flood occurrence in loss of life, property damage, lost employment, and lost business is staggering to the imagination even in its effect upon an average community.

It is entirely beyond human imagination when we try to picture the amount of destruction of life and damage to property that has occurred so frequently, in recent years, in all the several States throughout the Nation. Financial losses, which can never be precisely measured, would unquestionably be up in the billions. We cannot, of course, even approach the placing of any material value upon the loss of life accompanying these tragedies.

Commonsense reflection makes it convincingly clear that the prevention and control problems of these natural disasters cannot be local or statewide but must be regional and national.

All of the people and communities who have so suffered very well appreciate that neither the individual victim nor the burdened State can alone or together survive and recover from the devastating impact of flood destruction.

They realize, as did this conscientious committee, the necessity of reasonable assistance being extended from the Federal Government to help them construct proper facilities to prevent the recurring damage and disaster of floods.

I earnestly hope and urge that the measure be approved without further extended debate.

(House speech, June 19, 1958)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I most earnestly urge and hope that the full appropriation contained in this bill will be approved by the House without any extended delay.

Few of us need to be reminded that flood control and natural disaster protection has, indeed, these past few years become one of our most pressing domestic problems. We have increasingly recognized that the responsibility of the Federal Government in aiding the various States and municipalities throughout the country toward a solution of that problem is great.

The extraordinary and unfortunate rapidity with which the numerous visitations of the wildest elements of nature have followed one upon another throughout the country, particularly in Massachusetts and New England, has projected the imperative necessity of Federal legislation for assistance in flood control to the heights of national and Congressional consciousness. I have several times recited here the figures concerning the unfortunate deaths, and the millions of dollars of property destruction, that have resulted from ravaging floods. These personal tragedies and economic catastrophes could have been avoided in the past; there can be no excuse for their repetition in the future if we fulfill our obligations to the people we represent.

In the light of the billions of dollars that we have generously granted toward the rehabilitation of foreign nations, it would be a national disgrace if the imperative and immediate needs of our New England and other flood-ravaged regions are not provided for with full Federal assistance before disaster strikes again.

Yearly appropriations for Worcester flood diversionary tunnel

Fiscal year	Amount	Purpose
1956	$60,000	Surveying and planning.
1957	840,000	Begin construction.
1958	1,766,000	Continue construction.
1959	2,534,000	Complete construction, estimated June 1959.

CONGRESS SHOULD NOT ADJOURN WHILE VITAL PROBLEMS REMAIN UNSOLVED

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to adjournment sine die of the House of Representatives at this time. In my opinion we should, if anything, only recess so that we may be readily available to meet projecting problems as they arise or be given definite assurance of recall to immediate session in the event any grave emergency develops.

BILLS INTRODUCED IN 85TH CONGRESS

Mr. Speaker, limitations of space and time prevent me from further dwelling on multitudinous other bills that were discussed, but I shall personally report to my people on them at length and in detail, during the next 2 months.

However, this summary would be highly inadequate if I did not list, in part, some of the bills I introduced in the 85th Congress. They follow:

H. Con. Res. 12. A concurrent resolution favoring universal disarmament.

H. Con. Res. 93. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that efforts should be made to invite Spain to membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

H. J. Res. 32. A joint resolution to establish a Northeastern United States Watershed Development and Flood Protection Commission.

H. R. 613. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Foreign Service Academy.

H. R. 614. A bill to provide for programs of public facilities construction which will stimulate employment in areas having a substantial surplus of labor.

H. R. 615. A bill to provide for loans to enable needy and scholastically qualified students to continue post-high-school education.

H. R. 1104. A bill to indemnify drivers of motor vehicles of the postal service against liability for damages arising out of the operation of such vehicles in the performance of official duties.

H. R. 1105. A bill to provide assistance to communities, industries, business enterprises, and individuals to facilitate adjustments made necessary by the trade policy of the United States.

H. R. 1106. A bill to amend section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, so as to provide that all quota numbers not used in any year shall be made available to immigrants in oversubscribed areas in the following year.

H. R. 1107. A bill to provide for emergency Federal financial assistance to the States and Territories in the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities urgently needed because of overcrowding, and to encourage full and efficient use of State and local resources in meeting school construction needs.

H. R. 3483. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund.

H. R. 3765. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped and to define its duties.

H. R. 8868. A bill to remove the present $1,000 limitation which prevents the settlement of certain claims arising out of the crash of an aircraft belonging to the United States at Worcester, Mass., on July 18, 1957.

H. R. 9575. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide for making payments in lieu of taxes with respect to certain industrial manufacturing plants owned by the United States.

H. R. 9858. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind.

H. R. 10680. A bill to check the growth of unemployment by providing for Federal assistance to States and local governments for the construction of needed public works and public improvements.

H. R. 10856. A bill to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program.

H. R. 11395. A bill to stimulate residential construction.

H. R. 11418. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to increase the mileage of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways.

H. R. 13677. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education.

CONCLUSION—TIMELY COUNSEL FROM A GREAT AMERICAN

Mr. Speaker, the words of wise authority remain forever as comforting beacons of guidance in troubled, distressing hours. A counseling message to all Americans is contained in the following extract from a speech given at Harvard University graduation exercises on June 30, 1910, by the late great Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes:

"The most important agencies of democracy are, after all, not the organs of government, but the influences that shape public opinion. * * * Democracy must prize its public life. It has stripped it almost altogether of ceremonial and of meaningless and absurd forms. It has placed the public officer in a position of power, to be used for service. * * * Having surrounded him with none of the pomp which makes appeal to the thoughtless and ignorant, it must invest him with the higher honor which should be the reward of fidelity. Those who cultivate the true democratic spirit will be as earnest in their support of faithful officers as they are unsparing in their condemnation of the faithless."

SENATE

FRIDAY, AUGUST 22, 1958

The Senate met at 9:30 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in all the hectic issues which crowd these feverish times, in this quiet moment at the day's threshold, we would hush all strident noises that we may hear the still small voice of the eternal. Then, hearing Thy summons, send us forth anew to this anguished generation to speak for Thee.

In this great hour of human destiny, solemnize us with a sense of a glorious mission to do our part in averting a global catastrophe, as in Thy mercy our willful world may be given a last chance to choose life. May it be in Thy providence that our America, desiring nothing but a just peace for herself and for all the world, with all her material and spiritual might, may come to the kingdom in such a time as this. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, August 21, 1958, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 3287) for the relief of Vivian D. Giesey.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2836) for the relief of the town of Portsmouth, R. I., with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 109) to express the sense of the Congress on the establishment of the United Nations force, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 13191. An act to require the Commissioner of Education to encourage, foster, and assist in the establishment of clubs for boys and girls especially interested in science; and

H. R. 13666. An act to amend title 32 of the United States Code to permit the appointment of the Adjutant General of Puerto Rico as provided by the laws of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 607) to provide retirement, clerical assistance, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule there will be the usual morning hour for the introduction of bills and the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Paul Kearney, of Oregon, to be United States marshal for the district of Oregon, vice Harold Sexton; and

Edward J. Donovan, of New York, to be a member of the Board of Parole, vice Harvey G. Straub.

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Joseph C. Satterthwaite, of Michigan, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nominations of 9 officers for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral in the Navy, as well as the temporary appointment of 2 major generals and permanent appointment of 2 major generals and 9 brigadier generals in the Marine Corps.

In addition, I report favorably a total of 19 major generals and 32 brigadier generals for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army.

I ask that these nominations be printed on the Executive Calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations will be placed on the calendar, as requested by the Senator from Mississippi.

The nominations placed on the calendar are as follows:

Allan S. Chrisman, and sundry other officers of the Staff Corps of the Navy for temporary appointment to the grade of rear admiral;

Wallace M. Greene, Jr., and sundry other officers, for temporary and permanent appointment in the Marine Corps;

Brig. Gen. William H. Harrison, and sundry other officers, for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers in the Army; and

Brig. Gen. Aloysius Maximius Brumbaugh, and sundry other officers, for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Committee on Armed Services has reported the promotion list reference No. 144 containing general officer nominations in the Army Reserve. The committee deleted from the list the name of Brig. Gen. William Henry Naylor who was nominated to the rank of major general in the Reserve. I would like to offer the following comments with respect to the action of the committee.

First. The deletion was entirely without prejudice to the right of a promotion board to recommend General Naylor for promotion to major general at a future time. The Army representative indicated that the Army recognized the nature of the committee's action and further indicated that the deletion would not cause any change in General Naylor's present assignment nor would it adversely affect his reconsideration for promotion at a future date.

Second. The committee recognizes that General Naylor has been a member of the Reserve since 1929 and had a fine record in World War II and during the Korean emergency, and since December 1, 1956, has made a good record as Commander of the 76th Infantry Division. The committee's action should not be construed as reflecting in any way on the character or ability of General Naylor.

Third. The sole reason for the committee's action in not approving the nomination at this time is because of the fact that General Naylor earned no reserve points during the period of May 1952 to December 1956. The Army stated that General Naylor requested that he be placed in the retired Reserve and did not request an assignment during the 3½-year period which would permit him to earn reserve points. It was stated that his failure to participate and earn points was due to his business commitments.

The subcommittee considers that participation as reflected in the point system is a vital part of the entire Reserve program. In order to maintain the highest possible standards for the Reserve program the committee must exercise great care, except in unusual circumstances, in waiving the requirement for point participation in the Reserves. It is the requirements of the point system that the committee must rigidly maintain.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

John Nichol Irwin II, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense, vice Mansfield D. Sprague.

By Mr. BUSH, from the Committee on Armed Services:

J. Roy Price, of New York, to be Assistant Director of the Office of Defense and Civilian Mobilization; and

Kenneth T. Downs, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Director of the Office of Defense and Civilian Mobilisation.

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Hugh M. Milton II, of New Mexico, to be Under Secretary of the Army, vice Charles C. Finucane.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably a total of 4,039 nominations for temporary and permanent promotion and appointment in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force.

Since these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk for the information of any Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Maine.

The nominations ordered to lie on the desk are as follows:

Paul W. Albert, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States;

Donald R. Bautts, and sundry other Reserve officers, for permanent appointment in the Navy;

Benjamin B. Manchester III, and sundry other officers, for temporary appointment in the Marine Corps, in the grade of colonel; and

Eugene E. Moring, Jr., and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Air Force.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Raymond L. Rhodes to be Comptroller of Customs with headquarters at New York, N. Y.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Philip A. Hoghaug to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 34, with headquarters at Pembina, N. Dak.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations under this heading are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Carlton G. Beall, of Maryland, to be United States marshal for the District of Columbia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Brig. Gen. Robert G. MacDonnell, United States Army (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers) to be president and senior member of the California Debris Commission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Leon P. Miller to be attorney of the United States for the Virgin Islands.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Howard W. Babcock to be United States attorney for the district of Nevada.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT IN RYUKYU ISLANDS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for promotion of economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

S. 2765. A bill to provide for the promotion of certain persons who participated in the defense of the Philippines (Rept. No. 2492).

By Mr. BRIDGES, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H. R. 7544. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever," approved February 28, 1929, by including therein the name of Roger P. Ames (Rept. No. 2493).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 4321. A bill to establish an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for Water Pollution Control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 4322. A bill for the relief of Bertha Glickmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT TO MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. WATKINS submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill, H. R. 13192, making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 2, line 23, strike out "200,000,000;" and insert in lieu thereof: "202,500,000: *Provided*, That the President is authorized and requested to use such funds as are necessary in order to negotiate and carry out agreements with foreign nations in order to alleviate economic hardships experienced by workers in foreign countries whose production is adversely affected by action hereafter taken under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended (escape clasue provision);"

On page 4, line 5, immediately before the semicolon, insert the following: "*Provided*, That the President is authorized and requested to use such funds as are necessary in order to negotiate and carry out agreements with foreign nations in order to alleviate economic hardships experienced by workers in foreign countries whose production is adversely affected by action hereafter taken under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended (escape clause provision)."

Mr. WATKINS also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 13192, making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

ADMINISTRATIVE SITE FOR YOSEMITE NATIONAL PARK—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. MALONE, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. KERR, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MORTON, and Mr. MORSE) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 12281) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide an administrative site for Yosemite National Park, Calif., on lands adjacent to the park, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed.

AUTHORITY FOR SELECT COMMITTEE ON IMPROPER ACTIVITIES IN LABOR-MANAGEMENT FIELD, THE SENATE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS, AND COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO SUBMIT INTERIM REPORTS SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field and the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, or the full Committee on Government Operations, be authorized to file interim reports during the adjourned period of the 85th Congress, 2d session, and that they be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

Two tables relating to fair margins for retailers, fair prices for consumers, and also flexible pricing with fair trade enforcement.

By Mr. BYRD:

Letter dated August 19, 1958, from James P. Richards, president and executive director of the Tobacco Institute to Senator DOUGLAS, relating to tobacco taxes.

By Mr. BEALL:

Statement prepared by himself regarding the 1958 Multiple Sclerosis Hope Chest.

By Mr. GORE:

Letter written by him to Tom J. Hitch, president of the Tennessee Farm Bureau Federation.

PROCEDURE IN CONNECTION WITH CONSIDERATION OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BILL AND OTHER MEASURES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of both the majority leader and the minority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator has my attention.

Mr. MORSE. If, as, and when Senate bill 1313, the railroad retirement bill, comes to the floor of the Senate, today or tomorrow, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. David Screiber, who is the expert who sat with the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and who is thoroughly familiar with all the many actuarial technicalities involved in the legislation, sit alongside me during the consideration of the bill, so that he will be able to answer, through me, any of the technical questions which may arise in connection with the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have no objection. That is a practice which is followed upon occasion in the Senate. I am very happy to consent to the request.

While the Senator is on his feet, I should like to inquire how much debate he anticipates in connection with this measure, so that I may indicate to other Members when a vote may be expected, assuming that the Senate proceeds to consider the bill shortly.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Oregon will require a maximum of 15 minutes, but he hopes it will require not more than 10 minutes to explain the bill. I have no way of knowing how much time will be consumed by questions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Would the Senator from Oregon be agreeable to a time limit?

Mr. MORSE. That would be perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Would it be agreeable to the minority leader?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am not prepared to enter into such an agreement at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am not submitting the request at this time. I am merely inquiring whether or not such a limitation would be desirable.

It is planned to consider an appropriation bill, the mutual-security bill, conference reports, the Chicago diversion bill, and a number of other measures with respect to which we have promised consideration. If possible, we would like to consider them all and adjourn by tomorrow night.

Of course, any one Senator can prevent such adjournment if he so desires. I shall ask the proponents of the various measures to give consideration to the situation, and be prepared to proceed.

Most of these measures have been before the Senate for some time, and the Senate is generally familiar with them. I should appreciate it very much if the minority leader would be kind enough to follow his usual custom of conferring with Senators on his side of the aisle who are interested in the various measures. I should like to confer with him in a few minutes to see if we can reach an agreement for limitation of debate on the railroad retirement bill and vote it up or down within a reasonable time. The proponents believe they have the votes necessary to pass it, and the opponents believe they have the votes necessary to kill it. We can determine that after a reasonable time by calling the roll.

Following the disposition of the railroad retirement bill, I should like to take up one of the appropriation bills today. I should like to explore the situation with respect to all the bills which it is planned to consider. I see no reason why we could not obtain agreements for a time limitation with respect to all of them.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, has the Senate acted upon my request?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

NATIONAL RAILROAD HALL OF FAME AND MUSEUM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Mr. C. J. Keenan, of Portland, Oreg., bringing to my attention the National Railroad Hall of Fame and Museum, Inc., which Mr. Keenan is founding in Portland almost singlehandedly. This is indeed commendable because it relates to the preservation of our American past, and the history of our railroads is of immense interest to all of us, but especially to oldtimers in the railroad industry and a legion of railroading fans. I find Mr. Keenan's zeal especially inspiring since he is 83 years of age.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Keenan's letter and an article entitled "Coach of Fame Is New Attraction at Griffith Park's Travel Town" be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL RAILROAD HALL OF FAME AND MUSEUM, INC.,
Portland, Oreg., July 25, 1958.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SENATOR: The placement of the Coach of Fame in Travel Town, Los Angeles, was the forerunner for founding the National Railroad Hall of Fame and Museum. It was also employed as a criterion for future plans.

The Sellwood-Oaks area of Portland will soon be developed by the city of Portland into a recreational and historical empire. The city has offered to donate land therein to the National Railroad Hall of Fame and Museum. We believe the location is one of the best in the country. It is situated between the Sellwood Bluffs and the Willamette River. It will also contain a locomotive and coach museum and have its own operating railroad.

Contributions pledged for the construction of the hall and museum are not enough to complete the building. In our case, is there any provision in the Federal laws for matching our funds?

We will need plenty of space for various exhibits relating to the immortals enshrined and many other items allied to the railroads of public interest. There will be photographs, paintings, etchings, and cartoons of assorted subjects.

The museum is to be a national institution—not only a sanctuary for railroads' rarest items, but also a haven for scholars, historians, and enthusiasts. The library will offer a large collection of books on railroads. People interested in miniatures and curios will find them in the museum.

There will be a philatelic railroad section for exhibition of postage stamps issued by all nations honoring persons who have made significant contributions to the railroads of the world.

The National Railroad Hall of Fame and Museum is America's heritage relating to railroads of the past and the future. It is recognized by the Association of American Railroads * * * and we respectfully request that a resolution of recognition be considered by Congress as follows: The procurement and maintenance of buildings and railway coaches as a museum and historical shrine relating to persons who have made significant contributions to American railroads; the selection and enshrinement of such persons; the collection, display, and maintenance of pictures, plaques, monuments, biographical sketches, and other items concerning such persons; and exhibiting the same to the public.

Ten highly qualified representatives serve on the electoral committee to select eligibles for hall of fame awards. The elections are

held annually. The election of the first candidates to membership in the hall of fame has just been completed. Those honored are Abraham Lincoln, Horatio Allen, Col. John Stevens, and John Garrett. The results of all future elections will be announced on February 22 of each year.

All board members are well known for their wide interest and knowledge of railroads. Two are associate editors of Portland's leading newspapers.

Portland as the home of the National Railroad Hall of Fame and Museum would draw many people from other countries as well as from all States of this Nation.

With kind regards and best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

C. J. KEENAN.

[From Association of American Railroads for railway employee magazine editors, May 1958]

COACH OF FAME IS NEW ATTRACTION AT GRIFFITH PARK'S TRAVEL TOWN

The thousands of vacationists, sightseers, railroaders, and railroad fans who visit famous Travel Town of Griffith Park in Los Angeles are finding a new and unique attraction this season, thanks to the persistence, enterprise, and enthusiasm of C. J. "Jeff" Keenan, an 83-year-old former railroadman of Portland, Oreg.

The new attraction is the Coach of Fame, a veteran railroad car which served for many years as a dining car on the Broadway Limited, Spirit of St. Louis, and other famous trains of the Pennsylvania Railroad, and which from now on will carry exhibits honoring the men and women who have made significant contributions to the romance of railroading.

The selection of persons to be thus honored will be made after the most careful study by an impartial committee which is now being organized through the efforts of Mr. Keenan. In a press release issued by the recreation and park department of the city of Los Angeles, it is stated that ever since he first broached the idea of a Coach of Fame 10 years ago, Mr. Keenan has received encouragement from railway executives and others with whom he has discussed the subject.

TRAVEL TOWN SELECTED AFTER NATIONWIDE SURVEY

"I believe that each year we should honor one or more who have contributed to the romance of railroading," said Mr. Keenan in the interview. "They would not necessarily be railroad men; they could be anybody, an editor possibly."

The Coach of Fame is a gift of the Pennsylvania Railroad. Before making its final trip from Philadelphia to Los Angeles over the Pennsylvania and Santa Fe lines, the car was completely overhauled and repainted by the donor.

Griffith Park's Travel Town, a facility of the recreation and park department of the city of Los Angeles, was selected as the logical location for the Coach of Fame after a nationwide survey conducted by Mr. Keenan.

Railroad men and women who desire to submit names of logical candidates for recognition by the Coach of Fame can do so through the editor of this magazine. Such names will be forwarded to the committee as soon as it is organized.

THE MIDDLE EAST SITUATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks correspondence which I have received on the Middle East situation, which I intend to refer to later today when I make a brief speech on the Middle East situation and the United Nations action in respect thereto.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOVATO, CALIF., *July 24, 1958.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: At a recent meeting of the Novato chapter of the Marin Democratic Assembly, the following principles were enunciated.

We oppose the present policy of Democratic leaders in following a temporizing "togetherness" in foreign policy.

We favor establishment of a Democratic foreign policy which is in no way and no longer a bipartisan policy.

We demand that United States' troops now stationed in Lebanon be withdrawn.

We urge that the United Nations be the arbiter for all international decisions in regard to Lebanon.

We recommend that foreign aid and technical assistance be given through the United Nations and not solely by the United States.

We insist upon a return to the traditional American policy of protecting the rights of individual countries to self-determination.

We urge a revival of the traditional American policy of recognition of all de facto governments.

Only in this way can the United States regain international respect and good will which have been severely damaged by our unfortunate bipartisan foreign policy.

As workers in numerous Democratic campaigns, we feel certain that these policies will meet with popular support.

Very truly yours,

ERNEST SCHALLINGER
(For Novato Chapter, Marin Democratic Assembly).

FIRST UNITARIAN CHURCH,
Portland, Oreg., July 26, 1958.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: If you have been reading the Oregonian editorials you will be familiar with the issue with which the enclosed letter deals.

Knowing your stand in this matter, we the undersigned, thought you would be interested in our point of view.

Cordially yours,

FORD LEWIS.

PORTLAND, OREG., *July 23, 1958.*

EDITOR,
The Oregonian,
Portland, Oreg.

SIR: In a recent editorial, the Oregonian justified the sending of United States armed forces into Lebanon "on firm moral ground." We should like to insert a modest question mark after this phrase. It is easy for nations to confuse their own self-interest with the cause of world peace, or even the will of God. Newspapers, we think, ought to be on constant guard against this temptation.

There are, however, some very real moral issues involved. We believe that the United Nations, imperfect and slow moving as it is, still remains our best hope for reconciling differences among nations peacefully and constructively. If this is true, we have a moral obligation to support it and make it more effective. When we bypass it for the sake of expedience, we weaken it. Furthermore, forgetting altruism altogether for the moment, we weaken our own position in world opinion and encourage the suspicion that the moral that most concerns us in this instance is spelled "m-o-r-e o-i-l."

Other moral considerations suggest themselves. One of the principal obligations of citizenship is the duty of scrutinizing the conduct of government to support it when it is right and oppose it when wrong. To attach morality too quickly to this act of armed intervention may relieve us of the necessity of thinking the issue through, but the searching questions still remain. How long are the troops to remain there? Will we send forces to Turkey, Jordan, and Iran upon request? Will we leave Lebanon this fall if President Chamoun's successor, assuming Chamoun is sincere in saying he will not run for reelection, requests it? The overall cause of free institutions is not served by an uncritical endorsement of our present position in the Middle East simply because it is an accomplished fact.

There may be compelling reasons for our intervention related to world peace and security. If so, the Government has an obligation—a moral one, we think—to state what they are, beyond the strategic necessity of guarding petroleum supplies which it declares flatly we do not need for peaceful purposes.

Is our object to stop the spread of Nasser's influence? If so, it was a mistake to stop the British, French, and Israeli march on the Suez in November 1956. Do we seek to encourage Israel's commendable effort to bring democracy to the Middle East? This hardly seems to comport with our continuous efforts to cultivate the favor of Ibn Saud, one of the world's most autocratic rulers, including the extravagant ovation we gave him during his recent visit to this country.

We urge an honest and realistic appraisal of this and all other applications of our foreign policy. We deplore a facile readiness to rationalize questionable diplomacy after the fact. Most of all, we decry the careless use of an honorable term to serve as an expedient of the moment. The concept of morality has operated as a vast power for good in men's lives for thousands of years. We dare not compromise it by misuse. We shall need it intact in the days and years ahead as we seek to build ever stronger the brotherhood of man and the commonwealth of God.

Sincerely yours,

Rev. WILLIAM B. CATE, Ph. D.,
Executive Secretary,
Portland Council of Churches.
Rt. Rev. A. RAYMOND GRANT, D. D.,
Bishop, Portland Area of the Methodist Church.
Rev. FORD LEWIS, Ph. D.,
Associate Minister,
First Unitarian Church, Portland.
Rev. V. LOUIS LIVINGSTON,
Rector, St. David's Episcopal Church, Portland.
Rev. JAMES MCCOBB,
Associate Minister,
First Methodist Church, Portland.
Rabbi JULIUS J. NODEL,
Temple Beth Israel, Portland.
Rev. LAURENCE E. NYE, D. D.
Minister, First Methodist Church, Portland.

ITHACA, N. Y., *August 8, 1958.*

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Committee on Foreign Relations,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you very much for your kind letter of July 28 and the enclosed tear sheets from the RECORD. We are indeed grateful for the boost you gave us.

Recently your sister spoke at the Tompkins County Democratic picnic. My wife went to the picnic. She came back enthusiastic about and delighted with Mrs. Kline's address.

We are sending President Eisenhower another telegram on the Mideast today—this time 67 of us. I enclose a copy of the release.

You certainly have every reason to be proud of your part in the debate on the Middle East situation. Again I say more power to you and very best wishes.

Sincerely,

MORRIS A. COPELAND.

AUGUST 9, 1958.

Sixty-seven college and university teachers yesterday sent President Eisenhower a telegram urging him to continue to press for an immediate summit conference and to propose there a bold, new, seven-point program for the Mideast. The points they suggested include a declaration by the Security Council of support of the independence of all present Mideast nations; a Security Council ban on the competitive supplying of arms to the Mideast and restriction on movements of troops and arms in the Mideast; establishment of a permanent international police force and of an arms-control authority; inauguration of a stringless billion-a-year grant in aid and mutual assistance program for Mideast economic development; and clothing the Secretary General with broad interim authority while the police force is being established.

The signers of the telegram are faculty members of 17 colleges and universities and teachers of a wide range of subjects. The signers include lawyers, philosophers, and physical scientists, engineers and political scientists, sociologists and economists, psychologists and statisticians, as well as representatives of a number of other fields. They include among other prominent persons two past presidents of the American Economic Association and one past president of the American Statistical Association.

The signers are members of the faculties of the following institutions: Amherst, Buffalo, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Cornell, Goucher, Maryland, Michigan, Mount Holyoke, New Paltz, New School, Northwestern, North Carolina, Oregon, Texas, and Yale.

The telegram was organized by a group of six economists and other social scientists at Cornell University who had sent an earlier telegram to the President protesting the adverse international effects of the landings in Lebanon and Jordan and urging a constructive Mideast policy. Since the organizers, Prof. John A. Brittain, Morris A. Copeland, Douglas F. Dowd, Norman Kaplan, Royal E. Montgomery, and Chandler Morse, were pressed for time, the sixty-odd signers are somewhat concentrated—geographically at Cornell and by field in economics.

The organizers are inviting others to join in supporting this seven-point Mideast program.

A copy of the telegram is attached.

President DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

People throughout the world want you to act constructively and assume world leadership. Situation is ripe for you to continue to press for immediate summit conference and to propose there a world peace promoting program that is bold, new, and not anticipated by Khrushchev.

We the undersigned college and university teachers respectfully urge you to propose there the following actions. First, that Security Council declare its support of the independence of each Mideast nation now a member of the United Nations. The declaration to recognize that the people of any nation have the right if their government should no longer be acceptable to them to institute a new government and that any two or more nations, should they so desire, have the right to unite. Second, that Security Council declare that under present conditions in Mideast competitive provision of arms by outside powers and the movement of arms and armed forces across the borders of Mideast countries may constitute a threat to world peace. Third, that Security Council establish an arms control authority to regulate international movement of arms under rules to be prescribed by the Council and that Council request that all Mideast countries in importing arms and all nations in exporting arms to the Mideast do so only under the supervision of this authority and subject to Council's prescribed rules. Fourth, that Security Council establish a permanent international police force to act as the Council or Assembly may direct and specifically to act on request of any Mideast country to prevent the movement of arms across its borders except for arms shipments made under the supervision of arms control authority. Fifth, that Security Council after establishing this police force seek the pledge of all nations to refrain from sending armed forces across the borders of Mideast countries without prior approval of the Council or Assembly. Sixth, that Security Council establish under aegis of an activated SUNFED a Mideast economic development fund to administer without political strings and for the benefit of the masses of the people a continuing international grant program of the order of magnitude of $1 billion a year, including contributions by Mideast countries themselves. Seventh, that Security Council authorize and direct Secretary General, pending establishment of permanent United Nations police force, to take such steps as he may deem necessary to prevent movement of arms into any country against its will.

Gardner Ackley, Leonard P. Adams, Clarence E. Ayres, Curt F. Beck, Warren J. Bilkey, Donald J. Blake, Rudolph C. Blitz, Kenneth E. Boulding, John A. Brittain, Nelson H. Bryant, Edwin A. Burtt, Richard E. Caves, Robert Campbell, Morris A. Copeland, Donald E. Cullen, John H. Dalton, William Tucker Dean, Melvin G. de Chazeau, Ronald Donovan, Douglas F. Dowd, Robert R. Edminster, Robert Eisner, Thomas I. Emerson, Robert H. Ferguson, Leslie Fishman, Harrop A. Freeman, Dorothy C. Goodwin, James J. Gibson, Everett D. Hawkins, Forest G. Hill, Alfred E. Kahn, Norman Kaplan, William W. Lambert, F. A. Long, Robert B. MacLeod, John W. McConnell, Emil A. Mesics, Frank B. Miller, Norman Miller, Royal E. Montgomery, Chandler Morse, Arthur E. Nilsson, Oscar Ornati, Robert Palmer, Robert V. Presthus, Elinor Pancoast, John Power, Louis S. Reed, William E. Reifsnyder, Emmett J. Rice, R. R. Rohmberg, Louis R. Salkever, Karl de Schweinitz, Jr., Albert J. Silverman, Morris Singer, Alpheus W. Smith, Warren L. Smith, George Strauss, Gordon F. Streib, George Rogers Taylor, N. Arnold Tolles, Colston E. Warne, William F. Whyte, Bertram F. Willcox, Walter F. Willcox, George Winter, G. W. Zinke.

WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE
FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM,
Washington, D. C., August 1, 1958

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom has been greatly disturbed about the Middle East crisis and the sending of United States troops to Lebanon.

The enclosed working paper on the current crisis in the Middle East prepared by the national executive, policy, and legislative committees on July 18 and the resolution passed by the annual meeting of our organization at Lawrence College, Appleton, Wis., June 20–24, 1958, will express our concern and offer some suggestions for immediate and long-term solutions.

We would encourage every effort for peaceful settlement through the United Nations and we hope for an assurance that such military action will not be taken again.

Respectfully yours,

MRS. ALEXANDER STEWART,
Legislative Secretary.

WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE
FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM,
Washington, D. C., July 25, 1958.

Re: Lebanon.

To: The President of the United States; the Secretary of State; His Excellency Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge, permanent representative at the United Nations; Senator Theodore Francis Green, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations; Representative Thomas E. Morgan, House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, United States section, in annual meeting June 20–24, 1958, at Appleton, Wis., commends the prompt response of the United Nations to the request of Lebanon to send a peace team to that country and is gratified that the personal visit of Dag Hammarskjold has had a calming effect upon the disturbances in that country. We urge the United States representatives to the United Nations to support the request, which the Lebanese Government has indicated it will make, for a United Nations police force sufficient to seal off the borders of the country and to prevent shipment of arms from any source. We oppose any move on the part of the United States Government which implies its intention to take unilateral action in the Lebanese crisis, and we urge our Government to contribute to the reduction of tensions in the area by refraining from the shipment of arms to Lebanon.

WORKING PAPER ON CURRENT CRISIS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Suggested by an emergency meeting of the national executive, policy, and legislative committees of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, United States section, 2006 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa., July 18, 1958.

The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom believes that military force or threat of force offers no solution to conflicts and tensions which abound in the world today. It deplores the unilateral action taken by the United States in landing the Marines in Lebanon, bypassing the United Nations, and bringing into the Middle East, already overburdened by tensions and needs too long unmet, an element which can only increase the conflict, delay solutions and which offers no answer either to the conflict or the real needs of the area.

The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom reaffirms its support of the United Nations because it believes that only through nations working together by the process of negotiation, conciliation, arbitration and judicial review can the peace, freedom and security of all the peoples best be guaranteed.

In order to establish the basis for negotiation, conciliation and arbitration, it is necessary to define the problem to be negotiated and the specific objectives sought by the powers involved. Since no such clarification of objectives has been made, the stated reasons for the action of the United States have not been adequate to justify such extreme and dangerous measures.

1. Landing 9,500 United States troops in a foreign country cannot be justified by any of the stated reasons.

(a) "To protect United States citizens." Diplomatic arrangements for police protection and for emergency evacuation plans are more effective and less provocative than armed intervention in the atmosphere of civil disturbance.

(b) "To encourage the Lebanese Government in defense of Lebanese sovereignty and integrity." Though facts indicate the situation in Lebanon was internal rebellion (caused by Chamoun's alleged efforts to change the constitution to permit his reelection), and although the situation had obtained for some weeks and was reportedly near solution with agreement on elections scheduled July 24, it was in fact only after the coup in Iraq that United States troops were requested by Chamoun and ordered into Lebanon.

2. Question may also be raised as to the manner in which the President acted. Even though the Eisenhower doctrine does not apply to this situation, it should be noted that when the President asked Congress to approve the Eisenhower doctrine (a measure the League opposed vigorously), he promised that if any armed intervention became necessary under this doctrine he would first consult Congress. His presenting Congressional leaders with a fait accompli in this instance and the curtailment of critical discussion of foreign policy in the House is scarcely within the democratic tradition.

3. The reported request from Lebanon for United States aid was made by President Chamoun on the advice of his cabinet, but as the record of the vote (only 26 out of 66 in favor) indicates, it was not supported by the Lebanese Parliament.

4. The administration has stated through its Ambassador at the United Nations as well as by the spokesmen in Washington that action has been taken in accord or at least in the spirit of article 51 of the United Nations Charter which provides for measures of self-defense. Since the language of article 51 of the United Nations Charter specifically defines the condition for the exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defense as "armed attack against a member of the United Nations" and does not provide for such collective action in the event of "indirect aggression" or "internal rebellion", the claim of the application of article 51 is invalid and it cannot honestly be construed to apply to United States action in this instance.

5. In view of Mr. Lodge's insistence throughout that the aim and intent of United States action has been to insure the territorial integrity and political independence of Lebanon and that troops would remain only until the United Nations could take effective action, the following resolutions and information from the Security Council are significant.

(a) The resolution adopted by the Security Council June 11 seems adequate to authorize the Secretary General to increase the United Nations observer forces to patrol the Lebanese borders to whatever extent may be deemed necessary to "insure that there is no illegal infiltration of personnel or supply of arms or other materiel across the Lebanese borders."

(b) The Japanese resolution, although vetoed in the Security Council July 22, did serve to point out the belief in the adequacy of an expanded observer force to meet the United Nations' responsibility in the area. In connection with the resolution the Japanese delegate made clear that it did not empower the Secretary General to create an International Peace Force.

(c) The Secretary General announced in the Security Council July 21 that he had already taken steps to enlarge the observer group and to take measures to increase its effectiveness.

(d) The Swedish resolution, while voted down July 18, pointed out the fact that the very presence of United States troops, evidence itself of unilateral threat of military force, makes it impossible for the United Nations forces to operate. (See editorial The Uncalculated Risk, the Wall Street Journal, July 18).

Having said all of this we still find ourselves confronted with the question of what next in the Middle East. In an attempt to answer this question, to offer an effective solution to the current crisis and a long-range program directed toward meeting the real needs of the area, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom makes the following recommendations:

1. Withdrawal of troops: United States troops should be immediately withdrawn from Lebanon and an agreement should be sought through the United Nations for the withdrawal of all foreign troops from the area.

2. Full discussion in the United Nations: Every opportunity should be pursued for full discussion through the United Nations necessary to achieve agreements which will lead to solutions in the Middle East. To secure this, we recommend the holding, under the aegis of the United Nations, conferences at all levels, including a summit conference, in which both major powers and Arab leaders are represented and the calling of a special session of the General Assembly, if necessary.

The United States should welcome full discussion on this issue, in which it is so unhappily involved, just as in the past it has encouraged full discussion of issues in which other nations were involved. Further, the authority of the United Nations must be strengthened by the voluntary submission by our Government to it.

3. Strengthening United Nations action for Middle East solution:

(a) Support United Nations observer force and encourage the Secretary General in his efforts to expand it and make it more effective.

(b) Reject all proposals for a United Nations military force or army which would lead to greater conflict instead of solution.

(c) If forces other than the observer force are deemened necessary, recommend a force similar to the UNEF used in the Suez crisis.

(d) Seek an international agreement for a regional arms embargo and the removal of all foreign military bases, troops, etc., from the area.

4. Development of a new United States Middle East policy: The United States must abandon its emphasis on military pacts in its Middle East policy and the vague and ill-defined doctrine of indirect aggression must not be a determining factor in a new United States foreign policy. Instead a new policy must be based on traditional United States support of self-determination; recognition that Pan-Arabism is not necessarily to be regarded as identified with communism; that where they desire it, Arab countries should be free to unite and to be neutral; and recognition that a neutral Pan-Arabism will increase the opportunity for peace and security in the whole area including Israel.

5. Support for regional economic development plan: A regional economic development plan for the entire Middle East, including Israel, through the United Nations, would help in meeting the basic economic needs in the area, in directing national energies into constructive channels and in easing Arab-Israeli tensions.

THE PASSPORT SITUATION—THE NELSON CASE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have received a letter from one of our country's outstanding scholars in the field of comparative international law, Prof. Reginald Parker, of the College of Law of Willamette University, at Salem, Oreg.

I ask that his letter, enclosing a letter to the editor of the Salem Statesman, and published in the July 26, 1958, issue of that newspaper, on the subject of the United States Supreme Court and the Nelson case; also an article entitled "The Right To Go Abroad: To Have and To Hold a Passport," written by Mr. Parker, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILLAMETTE UNIVERSITY,
Salem, Oreg., July 26, 1958.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you very much for the tearsheets from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I was deeply moved at the kind words you found for me and my, I assure you, modest qualifications in international law.

I injured my arm and can type only with difficulty (not that I ever could type well); I am shorn of any secretarial help during the summer; my wife does not type; my elder daughter is abroad; and my younger daughter finds no time for me as she works in a cannery. Hence, in giving you a summary of thoughts on the passport situation, I am forced to confine myself to a bare minimum, much to my regret.

I. Introduction: (a) Existing law, to be valid, must be authorized by higher law, e. g., a regulation must be authorized by a statute, a statute by the Constitution, etc.; and, de lege ferenda, law intended to be enacted should be politically desirable.

(a) i. The Secretary of State's passport regulations were not authorized by any statute. Therefore, they were invalid. *Kent v. Dulles* (87 S. Ct. 1113 (June 16, 1958).) This is now settled.

ii. The last paragraph of the Kent case opinion speaks, by dictum, of a "constitutional right of the citizen" (to travel) and it emphasizes the "important constitutional questions" that would have arisen had there been a statute to authorize the Secretary's regulations.

And indeed, such a statute would be unconstitutional. It must be assumed, and it has been so held by good authority, that the Founding Fathers intended to incorporate into the Constitution and its first 10 amendments at least all those liberties which British subjects enjoyed at the time of the Revolution. No Englishman has been denied a passport since the early 17th century—since 1606—because it was thought that Magna Carta guaranteed the unrestricted right to go abroad. There were at times statutes to restrict the freedom to travel; but the last one was repealed in 1606. The writ of ne exeat regno, of uncertain origin, was at times obtained by the Crown in a chancery court to prevent subversives from going abroad ("because we are given to understand that you design to go privately into foreign parts and intend to prosecute there many things prejudicial to us"). By the middle of the 17th century, however, this writ had fallen into disuse. Story and all other American commentators agree that its use in America has been confined to restraining absconding debtors from leaving the jurisdiction without putting up bond.

The Secretary's assertion that the denial or confiscation of passport is an exercise of foreign policymaking is neither correct nor relevant. It is irrelevant in that even the management of foreign policy can validly be done only without encroaching upon civil liberties; and it is incorrect, because, while it may be conceded that our boycott of entire countries (e. g., Hungary or China) may be an expression of foreign policy, however silly, it cannot be asserted that to deny a passport to one or the other individual has anything to do with a country's foreign policy. It polices those individuals rather than the foreign nation.

(b) The enactment of a law enabling the Secretary to restrict foreign travel would not only be invalid but also highly undesirable. No other western democracy—none of them—denies passports to its citizens for political or any other reason other than a pending criminal prosecution. The Red Dean of Canterbury travels freely in the world and nobody in Britain dreams of denying him this inherent right of an Englishman. The only Commonwealth member that has enacted legislation enabling the Government to deny or restrict passports is the Union of South Africa. Is that the example we ought to follow or rather that of England, France, Switzerland, West Germany, Austria, Italy, Holland, Belgium, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, etc.?

I traveled in many of those countries last summer. I did research on the spot and I can testify that I received the same answer everywhere: "It is unthinkable that we deny one of our citizens a passport, be he a Communist or a Fascist, as long as neither a warrant nor an unserved sentence is outstanding against him."

II. For documentation I beg to send you under separate cover several pieces that contain a great deal of research, to-wit: my article; the petitioners' brief in the Kent case; and the decision below, including the well-written dissent of Judge Bazelon.

Please do not hesitate to call on me if I can be of further help.

Good luck. And apologies for the bad typing.

Sincerely yours,

REGINALD PARKER.

P. S.—The enclosed clipping from the Statesman might interest you in connection with the anti-Supreme Court witch hunt.

R. P.

[From the Salem (Oreg.) Statesman of July 26, 1958]

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT AFFIRMED STATE COURT IN STEVE NELSON CASE

To the EDITOR:

The frequently heard assertion that the Supreme Court in the Nelson case encroached upon or destroyed State rights is nonsense if not deliberate falsehood.

Steve Nelson was found guilty by a Pennsylvania trial court of sedition against the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and sentenced to 20 years. The Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, however, set the conviction aside. The decision can be looked up either in 377 Pa. 58 or in 104 A. 2d 133 (1954). Four of the five State supreme court justices decided that this was not a local crime but, if any crime was committed at all, "it is a crime against the Nation. As such, it should be prosecuted and punished in the Federal courts." Thus ruled the State court.

This State court decision was affirmed by the United States Supreme Court in *Pennsylvania* v. *Nelson* (350 U. S. 497 (1956)). The State's attorney general had thought that his own State court was wrong and he sought redress in the United States Court; and the latter affirmed the State court's holding, mainly on the same grounds on which the decision below was based. In other words, the United States Supreme Court, far from changing State law as interpreted by the State court, affirmed it.

REGINALD PARKER,
Professor of Law, Willamette University.

THE RIGHT TO GO ABROAD: TO HAVE AND TO HOLD A PASSPORT

(By Reginald Parker*)

"Whereas in other countries totalitarianism erupted with revolutionary violence and then set to work immediately to wipe out the traces of a freedom-loving past, the process in the United States is taking an evolutionary form." (Report Jungk, Tomorrow Is Already Here 5 (1954)).

I. FREEDOM OF EMIGRATION AND IMMIGRATION HISTORICALLY

It can be said to be characteristic of the police state that its subjects may do only what they are expressly permitted to do, whereas under a "free" or constitutional system of government the law gives the citizens a wide latitude of action, and acts to be forbidden must be expressly prohibited. Traveling abroad, for instance, was one of the activities carefully supervised by the more or less benevolent tyrant of bygone police state days to prevent his subjects from becoming infected with foreign and new, and hence presumably dangerous, ideas. This system, however, had many loopholes and exceptions; the curtains were not iron in those days.[1] Governmental techniques, however, have become effective, and thus the modern totalitarian government usually takes great pains to leave no loopholes at its borders. A Pole or Czech as outspokenly opposed to his government as, say, Voltaire or the brothers Grimm were to theirs probably could not even remain alive in his country today; but if he did, he most assuredly would not be allowed to go abroad.

The exclusion of citizens from going abroad and getting acquainted with the outer world is indeed the central meaning of the phrase "Iron Curtain," coined, or at any rate, made popular, by Winston Churchill in his famous speech at Fulton, Mo., on March 5, 1946. The exclusion of aliens from coming into a country, on the other hand, is a regrettable characteristic of our time in general, but not of the Iron Curtain.

Churchill spoke in a country on whose economic aid England was then depending. Had he meant to refer to Iron Curtain countries as states preventing others from coming in to "see for themselves," the reference would have been inaccurate if applied to the Russian attitude, and in fact would have represented an undiplomatic allusion to the United States. The truth is that the exclusion of sundry classes of aliens, especially for political reasons, has been our practice to an increasing degree for a long time,[2] whereas the Soviet Union, at least up to the time of the Second World War, gave anybody who asked for it a tourist visa of many months' validity. Indeed, she maintained "Intourist" offices throughout the world for the very purpose of attracting visitors to the land of the bolsheviks, and I have never heard that any applicant was investigated or even so much as asked whether he was "bourgeois" or otherwise anti-Communist. After the war Russia closed her borders to tourists for several years.[3] At the present time, visitors apparently are admitted on a restricted basis only.[4]

No comparable freedom of ingress has existed in this country for a long time, either before or after the McCarran Act,[5] and it is a bit wearisome to read time and again in newspapers and magazines the admonition to Russia and her allies that they "should lift the Iron Curtain by throwing the borders open and letting people (or even "folks") see that they have nothing to hide." Hospitality might as well begin at home.

A recent International Architects' Congress took place in Lisbon, the capital of fascist, anti-Communist Portugal, with 3 Poles and 6 Russians attending.[6] It could not have happened here.[7] Men like Maxim Gorki were allowed not only to live for many years in Mussolini's Italy, but also to write there for Soviet magazines. The Gorkis or radicals like Pablo Picasso and evidently now Charlie Chaplin will not be welcome in our country until we recapture a more mature sense of proportions.[8] Thus, "Iron Curtain" may be a phrase of many ramifications, but as far as its original meaning is concerned it denotes a state that keeps the inhabitants at home, in one huge prison as it were.

A free country, although as we have seen it may restrict the influx of foreigners, permits its citizens to go abroad at will. True freedom—freedom from any governmental supervision—exists where no permit whatever is needed, as was the case in most countries until the First World War.[9] A situation not essentially inconsistent with freedom can be found in present-day western Europe, where going abroad is subject to a permit which can be denied merely on specific grounds preestablished by law, such as for evading a criminal sentence.[10]

II. EMIGRATION AND THE DEMOCRATIC THEORY

The totalitarian state typically demands that its subjects act at all times in the interest of the state. As a matter of fact, this attitude may be said to be the ultimate criterion of totalitarianism. Hence, under that form of rule the Government has a right to expect that its subjects abroad will act always "in the best interest" of their state,

---

*B. A., 1922, LL. B., 1926, J. D., 1927, University of Vienna. Private law practice. Vienna, 1927–38. Research assistant, Louisiana State University Law School, 1938–39, Attorney, Treasury Department, 1942–43. Member, firm of Lord, Bissell & Kadyk, Chicago, 1943–44. Attorney, NLRB, 1944–48. Professor of Law, Columbus University, 1946–48. Professor of Law, University of Arkansas, 1949–51. Lecturer in law, Northeastern University, 1951–53. Professor of law, Willamette University College of Law, 1953 to present. Author, Administrative Law (1952); Questions and Answers on Labor Law (2d ed. 1951); and many articles in various legal periodicals. Admitted to District of Columbia, Illinois, and Massachusetts bars. Member, American Law Institute, Committee on Code of Ethics, and National Panel of Arbitrators, American Arbitration Association.

[1] See, e. g., the Grillparzer story told infra, p. 862.

[2] See the list of statutes, commencing with 1 Stat. 570 (1798), in Note, 3 Utah L. Revised 349 (1953).

[3] The President of the New York State Chamber of Commerce gave a plausible explanation of Russia's postwar isolation against foreigners. Grimm, *Russia Seen From Within: An Account of a Relief Mission Visit*, 429 International Conciliation 119, 122–126 (1947).

[4] Eleven Americans visited Russia between January 1 and August 13, 1953. New York Times, August 14, 1953, p. 3, col. 6. The news item does not state, however, how many other foreigners from Western European countries visited Russia in that period.

[5] 8 U. S. C. secs. 1101–1503 (1952), especially secs. 1221-1130.

[6] New York Times, Sept. 21, 1953, p. 4, col. 7.

[7] The recent appearance in this country of Russian chess players is no more than an apparent exception in view of the severe travel restrictions that were placed on those guests in New York and in view of the very limited duration and purpose of their entry permits. New York Times, June 9, 1954, p. 44, col. 3.

[8] For an array of biting comments on America's Paper Curtain by some of the world's leading brains, see 8 Bull. Atomic Scientists 210–258 (1952), and the review of it by Professor Chafee in 101 University of Pennsylvania Law Review 703 (1953).

[9] See Comment, Passport Refusals for Political Reasons: Constitutional Issues and Judicial Review, 61 Yale Law Journal 171, 172 n.5 (1952).

[10] Id. at 171–172.

and consequently it is privileged to deny the right to go abroad to those not likely to be true agents for the totalitarian state.[11]

Long ago Congress recognized that the citizens' right of free egress is the only status consonant with true freedom. A law of 1868, never yet repealed, in somewhat rolling language states that "the right of expatriation is a natural and inherent right of all people, indispensable to the enjoyment of the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."[12] To be sure, the philosophy of the statute was aimed mainly at those foreign governments which had claimed the continuous allegiance of their former subjects who had become naturalized Americans. Yet the fact remains that we have a law on our books that gives every man a right to expatriate himself whenever he pleases. But how can he—without being allowed to go abroad? To most Americans the question of expatriation—in the broader sense of the word, including the mere transfer of domicile abroad without change of citizenship—may seem remote. Still we must bear in mind that every 17 minutes 1 person emigrates from God's country.[13]

If, however, the above quoted statute establishes that an American may emigrate whenever he pleases, then why should he not be permitted to undertake short business or pleasure trips, solely as his own "agent" rather than that of the state? Surely we, of all countries, are not to become unmindful of the humanist ideal, incorporated into the United Nations' Declaration of Human Rights, that "[e]veryone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country."[14]

A denial for political reasons of the right to go abroad, moreover, would be violative of the democratic theory of state for additional reasons. First, and quite generally speaking, it constitutes a flagrant and patent instance of punishment for a not unlawful political activity. If a citizen engages in an illegal political act, such as treason, sedition, or a conspiracy to overthrow the government, he ought to be punished after due process of law, and hence might properly be imprisoned and consequently restrained from movement internally or abroad. If, however, his acts are merely disliked by the rulers, without being unlawful, then in a democracy it is not up to the government to invoke sanctions against him just the same by denying him the right to go abroad, for "[u]nder our system even Government must operate within the law."[15]

Second, even if the denial for mere political reasons of the right to travel to another country were formally lawful, it nevertheless would be in conflict with the essential elements of a democracy—the freedom of the citizen to gather information and to associate with whomever he wants. "For a state to be democratic it is not sufficient that the citizens thereof should participate directly or indirectly in the formation of the will of the state; in addition the constitution must guarantee to the citizens freedom of conscience, of speech, the press and, especially, freedom of association."[16]

III. CURRENT STATE DEPARTMENT POLICY

A. Specific instances

Despite the considerations suggested in part II, it has been the practice of our Department of State to deny citizens the right to go or stay abroad whenever it found that the intended trip or further sojourn would not be in the best interest of the United States. A thorough survey in the Yale Law Journal lists many recent cases of this sort.[17] Since then, under the impact of the Bauer case,[18] the Department has issued new passport regulations which, however, have not altered the substantive law to any noticeable extent.[19]

Thus, it was reported, long after the Bauer decision, that the mere fact that a passport applicant, about whom derogatory information has been received, works for the United Nations delays the issuance of his passport for personal and pleasure trips by as much as 3 months, i. e., until his American loyalty investigation as a staff worker is concluded.[20] Mr. Arthur Miller, a playwright and Pulitzer Prize winner, who received wide acclaim for his Death of a Salesman, was refused a passport, to go to Brussels to see his own play.[21] (In other words, Crucible may be seen abroad by anybody except its author.) The passport of the Daily Worker's European editor was taken away from him on his return from abroad, because his further travel was not in the best interest of the United States.[22] It is not easy to see how the new procedural safeguards, especially a hearing before the adverse step was taken,[23] could have been observed in this case of a man who was absent until the decision was executed. Nor does it seem to be consonant with what would appear to be the still legally existing freedom of the Daily Worker's press.[24]

One Miss Hepburn's passport was not renewed because, again, that would not have been in the national interest, since she had allegedly engaged in the internal political affairs of Guatemala.[25] This would more properly seem to be a matter of concern for Guatemala rather than for our Government; moreover, it appears that Miss Hepburn's past activities, whatever they were, were not in disharmony with the Guatemalan government then in power, for she protested to that very government when she learned of the State Department's decision.[26] Is it to be the case that if an American, as is done daily, expresses approval of and makes speeches for, say, the conservative governments of France or Western Germany, or even for Franco, he may keep his passport, but not so if he does the same on behalf of a leftist government in Guatemala?

The diplomatic passport of Federal Judge William Clark was taken away from him with the aid of the Franco police after he had been deprived (whether rightfully or wrongfully is not relevant here) of his American judgeship in Germany, despite his desire to stay in Western Europe for some further time; and his application for another, ordinary passport was denied, because the State Department held that Judge Clark's expressed desire to state his views in Germany on the right of bail and speedy trial in general and particularly for American citizens residing in Germany as well as on his equally clear position decrying discrimination against members of minority groups, especially Jews, would be inimical to the best interests of the United States.[27] The State Department, in its correspondence with the applicant ruled that the appropriate place for such public representations as Judge Clark had intended to make is in the United States.[28] On this point Judge Clark rejoined, "How silly can our Government be?" inasmuch as it could not effectively prevent him from making known his views to the German press, even without going abroad.[29] May his optimism prevail—may there never come a time when raison d'état will forcibly prevent Americans, including Federal judges, from expressing certain opinions to a foreign public, even through the mails or to the press.

B. The Communist danger as an excuse

A justification of all these cases, to which many others can be added, may perhaps, in the opinion of some people, be found in our struggle with world communism. It could be argued—unconvincingly, I believe—that there exists such a real emergency as would justify legislation authorizing extraordinary restrictions on those of our citizens who are not in conformity with what the State Department deems to be a desirable standard of citizenry. Such an argument, however—that to fight communism we must hit both Communists and leftwingers, as well as those who are merely suspected of being leftwingers—would not cover the full size of the actual policy of the American passport au-

---

[11] The above abstraction is not necessarily in accord with the facts as they exist everywhere in totalitarian states. The Communist countries, as is well known, do not even take the chance of seeing whether a subject would be a suitable state's agent, but exclude everyone not a foreign-affairs official from going abroad. Fascist countries, on the other hand, in the past have displayed, to this author's personal knowledge, varying degrees of self-confidence, as it were. Nazi Germany and Dollfuss-Schuschnigg Austria placed a few obstacles in the path of foreign-travel desires. The same is true of modern Argentina. In Mussolini's Italy, however, passport applications were carefully scrutinized and granted only to loyal adherents of the Government, and the same practice prevails today in Franco's Spain.

[12] Revised Statutes, sec. 1999 (1875), 8 U. S. C., sec. 800 (1941). This law has never been repealed, even though neither the 1952 edition of the U. S. C. nor its 1954 supplement contains it. The editors of the Code, and of the U. S. C. A. carry instead of sec. 800 a note saying that its subject matter "is now covered by secs. 1482 and 1483 of this title." This is patently incorrect, inasmuch as secs. 1482 and 1483 refer merely to the loss of nationality and not to the right of expatriation.

[13] New York Times, Aug. 11, 1953, p. 1, col. 2.

[14] Art. 13 (2) of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. 43 Am. J. Int'l L. 127, 129 (Supp. 1949).

[15] *Yanish* v. *Barber* (73 Sup. Ct. 1105, 1108 (1953)). Until now, the case has not been published in the official reporter, though it was decided more than 18 months ago.

[16] Kelsan, the Political Theory of Bolshevism 7 (1948). The book has rightly been called by all odds the best critical analysis of the political theory of Marx and Engels, and of its later development by Lenin and Stalin. Ebenstein, Introduction to Political Philosophy 313 (1952).

[17] Comment, 61 Yale Law Journal, 171, 174–178 (1952).

[18] *Bauer* v. *Acheson* (106 F. Supp. 445 (D. D. C. 1952)), 28 N. Y. U. L. Q. Rev. 752 (1953), 14 University of Pittsburgh Law Review 444 (1953).

[19] 22 Code of Federal Regulations, secs. 51.135–51.143 (Supp. 1954).

[20] New York Times, August 1, 1953, p. 1, col. 6, 7; p. 4, col. 4.

[21] New York Times, March 31, 1954, p. 25, col. 1.

[22] New York Times, August 8, 1953, p. 7, col. 1.

[23] Code of Federal Regulations, secs. 51.135–51.143 (Supp. 1954).

[24] *Yanish* v. *Barber* (73 Sup. Ct. 1105, 1108 (1953)) speaks of "a lawful job with a Communist paper." And the Internal Security Act decrees that neither membership nor even the holding of an office in the Communist Party shall constitute per se a violation of any criminal statute (50 U. S. C. sec. 783 (f) (1952)).

[25] New York Times, Sept. 7, 1953, p. 8, col. 2.

[26] New York Times, Sept. 24, 1953, p. 10, col. 7.

[27] Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction, p. 10, *Clark* v. *Dulles* (Civil No. 3620, D. D. C., 1954).

[28] Ibid.

[29] Id. at 13.

thorities. The best-interest-of-Government reasoning was used in at least one recent instance known to newspaper readers against a rightwinger, and it was used at a time when there was no shred of an emergency.

Senator McCarthy's personal informant, one Davis, who had been employed to report on Communist connections of American diplomats in Switzerland, was sentenced to a jail term by a Swiss court in Geneva.[30] Upon his release, his American passport was canceled by the American authorities with the same standard reasoning as in the other cases mentioned above.[31] It is true, Davis was ordered deported from Switzerland; but he had committed no crime against our laws. For all the State Department ought to care, he should have been able to move to Spain or Argentina, where he might have found heart-warming sympathy.

In 1936, when I practiced law in Vienna (probably the only native-born American who was ever a member of the Austrian bar), an American client was referred to me by a friend in the American consulate. He was in jail pending the investigation of alleged communistic activities in violation of Schuschnigg's law for the protection of the (then totalitarian) state. My repeated attempts to persuade the American consul general to see to it that the client be released on bail or that he at least get a speedy trial were in vain. The trial, without a jury took place only 9 months after the client's arrest. Judge Standhartinger, however, had preserved his judicial independence. Upon the evidence, the client was acquitted. Yet the prosecutor appealed and the client, over my protests, remained in jail for another 4 months until the acquittal became final.

My annoyance that during all those 13 months the American consul had not moved a finger for a man who, after all, owned an American passport, turned out to be misplaced in both regards. My client no longer owned a passport, and the consul had, indeed, moved more than a finger. He had, through the Vienna police, seized the passport and canceled it "except for one return trip to the United States." Moreover, the validity was "restricted to 13 days." My inquiry merely produced the answer that this was in accordance with "the law and practice in such cases." I could learn neither what law the consular official had in mind, nor what he meant by "such cases." My client had never been accused of anything that was a crime in the United States, and even the Austrian courts had acquitted him. Yet, by mere administrative punishment, he was effectively deprived of the right to travel and to stay abroad.

IV. LEGALITY OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT'S POSITION

If the practices outlined above were covered by law, then it would be proper to question whether we had forsaken the democratic way of law and life, for, as has been pointed out above, this type of administrative decision is contrary to the very heart of our idea of state which guarantees freedom of association, of factfinding, of dissenting and nonconforming, of expatriation, and of pursuing one's happiness, which indubitably includes the liberty to take a vacation or attend meetings abroad. Fortunately, the State Department's practice is not grounded in any law.

A. Historical background of the passport document

Before investigating the legal angle of a passport denial, however, we must of course know what a passport is. A passport has been defined as a kind of qualified document of identification, as a "document issued in the name of the Sovereign on the responsibility of a Minister of the Crown to a named individual, intended to be presented to the governments of foreign nations and to be used for that individual's protection as a British subject in foreign countries. * * *"[32] It is a government's "* * * request, that the bearer of it may pass safely and freely."[33] On, the other hand, it has also been termed "a license" to leave. "And such licenses are called passports."[34] The definition of a passport as an identification is of course always correct. But in various countries at various times the passport constituted also a foreign (or even domestic) travel license.

In continental Europe, for instance, the passport was a necessary prerequisite for any trip abroad until the end of the police-state era. This policy was most persistently carried out in the classic country of the Metternich time—Austria. We get a vivid account of the omnipresent guiding hand of all-father state in those days from the memoirs (published many decades after his death) of the Austrian classical poet, Franz Grillparzer,[35] who in 1819 felt the urge common to all classical poets: to go to Italy. However, he was known in high quarters to be a liberal, albeit ever so faintly. A report to the Emperor by Count Chorinski, the court chamber president, was made recommending the issuance of a passport to the promising young poet.

Grillparzer, however, did not wait for the dubious outcome, but left Vienna immediately upon the advice of Count Stadion, the minister of finance and friend of Metternich, who told him to obtain a provisional document from the Vienna police; the formal passport would be issued later. Grillparzer got merely a sealed letter in Vienna, which he was to present to the police in Graz. There the letter was read and sealed again, and Grillparzer was told that he should present it in Laibach,[36] where it was read and resealed once more. The same formality took place in Trieste. ("I would have very much liked to know what was being said in that sealed letter.") In view of these delays our poet missed the steamboat in Trieste and had to take a commercial trabacolo, whatever that was, to get to Venice. The Imperial Austrian Governor of that province and city, one Count Goëss, a genial, humane person, at least showed full understanding for Grillparzer's anxiety. He issued the passport upon his own responsibility, and Grillparzer was able to go abroad, i. e., to Rome and Naples.[37]

I have narrated this story not merely to illustrate the law and customs of those days in a foreign country, but also to demonstrate the one advantage which, albeit from a rather undemocratic point of view, the Metternich system had: it provided ample exceptions for the Grillparzers. Beethoven was most certainly a radical in his day, and quite anti-Austrian at times ("from the Emperor to the bootblack, all the Viennese are worthless,"[38] he told a visitor); but archdukes protected him.[39] Kant, the professor in a royal Prussian university, had all the freedom from religion he wanted and he could accept an honorary citizenship from Jacobin France and stay in office. The police state was hard on the common man, but it did make discriminating allowances for the Charlie Chaplins, the Pablo Picassos, the Joliot-Curies, or the Robesons of the day. This, at least, was a definite advantage, pro tanto, for society's tomorrow. The cultured conservative government which administered the classic police state understood these things. Mediocre, if not vulgar, bureaucracy has yet to manifest any comparable saving grace for the tomorrow it may indiscriminately cast away.

Metternich and his kind disappeared and passports on the continent around the 1860's, except in Czarist Russia, became what they remained until World War I—mere documents of identification. In actual fact very few travelers bothered to obtain passports, which were entirely optional.

The period of the First World War revived passports as a foreign travel requirement everywhere in Europe. Yet, while a traveler was required to have a passport, it was still regarded as a mere requirement of identification rather than as a license, at least in the democratically organized countries.[40] A passport was necessary to cross the border, but the police were not permitted to refuse its issuance except for reasons based on criminal law. The Government of the Republic of Austria once tried to treat passports as licenses that could be denied, but this attempt was judicially defeated. In May 1925, a group of railroad employees—and consequently Government officials—accepted an invitation of the Soviet railroad workers' union to visit Russia. They applied for passports, but the Federal Chancellery, after a search in the office of the Communist Party, found that the journey was in fact intended to be for the purposes of a propaganda that appears to endanger the public tranquillity and order and eventually the safety of this State.

While this holding (incidentally, somewhat more elaborate and colorably sound than our "best interest of the state") was no doubt not unfounded at all, it was not upheld in the Constitutional Court, to which the applicants appealed. That court, in an opinion written by Hans Kelsen, held that the constitutionally guaranteed freedom of movement included the freedom not only to emigrate, but also to leave the country for short periods of time.

"The argument that there exists no constitutionally guaranteed right to be issued a passport is per se true, yet * * * in view of the regulation * * * under which Austrian citizens may not leave the country without passports * * * these passport regulations would be unconstitutional. * * * There is no reason so to hold."[41]

B. Passports in the United States

In the United States, until World War I, passports were issued merely for identification and convenience and I have found no governmental attempt till then to prevent a citizen not charged with a violation of criminal law from going abroad.[42] In 1918, however, a statute decreed that, "when the

---

[30] New York Times, 1951, Feb. 13, p. 9, col. 4; Feb. 14, p. 7, col. 1; July 27, p. 4, col. 7; Oct. 10, p. 6, col. 3; Oct. 14, p. 25, col. 1; Oct. 16, p. 3, col. 5.

[31] New York Times, Oct. 18, 1951, p. 20, col. 4.

[32] *Rex* v. *Brailsford* ((1905) 2 K. B. 730, 745).

[33] *Urtetiqui* v. *D'Arbel*, 9 Pet. 692, 698 (U. S. 1835).

[34] 1 Fitz-Herbert, The New Natura Brevium, 85.

[35] 1794–1872.

[36] Now Ljubljana, Yugoslavia.

[37] Grillparzer, Selbstbiographie und Bildnisse 99–101, 245–246 (Böck and Englmann ed. 1923).

[38] Beethoven: Letters, Journals and Conversations 102 (Hamburger ed. 1952).

[39] And this although he had dedicated his Third Symphony to Napoleon Bonaparte, the protagonist, as Beethoven thought, of the French Revolution, who had beaten Austria's armies in many a battle.

[40] For a good illustration, see the Austrian decision quoted at note 41; and see Comment, 61 Yale Law Journal 171 (1952).

[41] 5 Sammlung der Erkenntnisse des Verfassungsgerichtshofes 137, 138–141 (Dec. 14, 1925).

[42] See Note, 41 Geo. Law Journal 63, 70–74 (1952); Comment, 61 Yale Law Journal 171 (1952). In 1932 a citizen was found to be in contempt of court because he had refused to come back to the United States from Paris and testify as a material witness in a criminal case. *Blackmer* v. *United States* (284 U. S. 421 (1932)), 32 Col. Law Review 747.

United States is at war," upon the President's finding and proclamation that the public safety so requires, it should be unlawful and a criminal violation for any citizen to depart or attempt to depart from or to enter the United States unless he bore a valid passport.[43]

Until that time it had been the practice of the Government to issue passports—then mere letters of identification and recommendation, as it were—in its discretion. The law of 1918 made passports mandatory, but its language did not authorize the Government to refuse passports.[44] In nontotalitarian Europe the enactment of similar laws merely meant that the governments would now control the influx and egress of aliens, but not of citizens; passports were issued, rather than granted, upon application to citizens not in default of criminal or military draft law. Nowhere in Western Europe, as far as I can determine, have passport matters been regarded as having anything to do with foreign affairs. Passports, like automobile licenses, are obtained from the local police authorities upon payment of a fee and after checking the applicant's criminal record, if any.

In America, the older idea of a passport as a kind of privilege or letter of recommendation to be granted only to him who is in good graces with the Government was not harmful to liberty as long as one could travel effectively without passports. The above-mentioned law,[45] combined with the increasing practice of nearly all foreign countries to require travelers to bear passports, changed this situation radically. The American statute and proclamation made passports a lawful prerequisite to travel to foreign countries; the laws of, and effective control of entry into, foreign countries (including our own country in regard to entering aliens) made them a legal and factual necessity. The legislative passport necessity was at times the weaker one, for the World War I law was allowed to lapse,[46] though this is not yet true of its World War II successor,[47] but even if it were not a crime to go abroad without the State Department's license, it would not be possible as long as foreign countries require the presentation of a passport,[48] a practice not likely to be discontinued in our lifetime.

Thus, as a leftover from the past when a passport was an elegant superfluity, and no more than a letter of recommendation from our foreign office, there has been transferred into the practice governing the modern passport—now legally and factually necessary for foreign travel—the conception of the Department of State that the issuance of this paper depends on the "absolute discretion" of the Government exercised pursuant to its management of foreign affairs.[49]

C. The common-law right to a passport

1. In England: However, "even government must operate within the law," [50] and the practice of the American passport authorities is valid only if authorized by law. The common law does not authorize restrictions on the citizens' foreign travel "in the best interest" of the state. On the contrary, and in contrast to continental developments until the latter 19th century, it has been the law of England for a long time that Englishmen have had free egress from the country. Traditionally, this right has been regarded as grounded in the Magna Carta.[51] It is of course clear that the authors of article 30 of the charter [52] were far from having in mind the granting of the right of free travel. But the charter was permitted to develop beyond the original intentions of its makers. Had it been otherwise, it never would have become what it was by the time of both Coke and the American Revolution: the Great Charter of Civil Liberties.[53]

Article 30 speaks of omnes mercatores to have free exit from England, and Coke still thought that this "concerneth merchant strangers" only.[54] Yet a 14th century statute had already declared that "all merchant strangers and privies [55] may come and go into England, after the Tenour of the Great Charter." [56] Thus an Englishman, if he were a merchant, could freely come and leave. This, however, would have bestowed upon them a privilege not enjoyed by other classes, for instance, aristocrats. Hakewill argued in 1610 that the law must apply to Englishmen alike, whether or not they are merchants.[57]

The new construction was evidently successful, and English law by the 17th century had developed a fundamental freedom from which it has not yet deviated. This fruit of amending and liberally construing an article of a medieval charter proves, incidentally, that "[t]he whole of the Constitutional History of England is a commentary on this charter" [58] although in the peculiar English common law fashion of a commentary that prefers pro forma to cling to old concepts and letters.

We cannot, however, conclude our brief examination of English law without paying attention to the ominous Writ of Ne Exeat Regno.[59] By this writ, indeed, the king in days long bygone could, and in days still farther past actually did, as Fitz-Herbert explains, "command a man that he go not beyond the seas or out of the realm without a license" by issuing a writ containing about the following language: "Because we are given to understand that you design to go privately into foreign parts and intend to prosecute there many things prejudicial to us * * *." The addressee of the writ, however, "may come into the Chancery" and after proper procedure obtain a "license to leave." [60]

The origin of the writ is obscure, though we know that Richard II gave it a statutory basis.[61] Various English kings have used it for political reasons at various times,[62] and Coke still treated it as lex terrae,[63] though actual cases of its application could hardly be found in his day. Be this as it may, however, while under James I a statute was enacted against the sending of children to Catholic seminaries abroad,[64] which was a year later broadened so as to outlaw the sending abroad of children for whatever purpose,[65] in 1606 "one act made in the fifth year of King Richard the Second, concerning the restraint of passage of his Majesty's subjects out of this realm, and every ordinance, provision, article or clause therein contained, shall be from henceforth utterly repealed." [66]

With this the statutory basis of the writ, in its original political meaning, had ceased to be law. A mere semblance of it degenerated, as it were, into an equitable restraint of absconding debtors. Later authorities mention the writ only in this connection and make it clear that this is to be regarded as its only lawful use.[67] In other words, the royal prerogative which had been especially strong under Edward III, had gradually melted away in the sun of the Magna Carta theory that an Englishman is free to leave England if he so desires. This has been the law of England to this day, ever since about the year 150 before our Constitution.

---

[43] 40 Stat. 559 (1918). And see the Browder case, infra, note 46.

[44] For cases under that law, see note 83 infra.

[45] See note 43 supra.

[46] See *Browder* v. *United States* (312 U. S. 335, 339 (1941)).

[47] See the history of the post-World War II passport restrictions in Note, 41 Geo. Go. Law Journal 63, 79–83 (1952). The present law is based on 8 U. S. C. sec. 1185 (1952), which during a war or national emergency proclaimed by the President makes it unlawful for citizens to enter or depart from the United States without a valid passport. Pursuant to this law, President Truman issued a proclamation—his last—to the effect that the national emergency still exists (18 Fed. Reg. 489 (1953), 1953 U. S. Code Cong. & Adm. News 915 (1953)).

[48] *Bauer* v. *Acheson* (106 F. Supp. 445, 451 (D. D. C. 1952)), makes it quite clear that the factual impossibility of traveling abroad without a passport is tantamount to being legally prevented from traveling.

[49] See e. g., *Perkins V. Elg* (307 U. S. 325, 349–350 (1939)), *Bauer V. Acheson*, supra, note 48 at 449.

[50] *Yanish* v. *Barber* (73 Sup. Ct. 1105, 1108 (1953)).

[51] Bl. Comm. *134, *265; 1 Fitz-Herbert, the New Natura Brevium *85; Kyle, Magna Carta, 23 Miss. L. J. 81, 98 (1952). See also Beames, a Brief View of the Writ Ne Exeat Regno 1 (1st ed. 1812). And see Hakewill, infra, note 57.

[52] I. e., of the Great Charter of Henry III (1225), which corresponds to art. 41 of John Lackland's Charter (1215). For a text, critical study of Magna Carta up to Coke's time, see Thompson, Magna Carta: Its Role in the Making of the English Constitution, 1300–1629 (1948). For a scholarly evaluation of the changes, see Radin, the Myth of Magna Carta, 60 Harv. L. Rev. 1060 (1947).

[53] See notes 58, 73 infra.

[54] 2 Co. Inst., *57.

[55] Marchantz aliens et priveez, meaning "denizens" or "natives." 2 Edw. III, c. 9 (1328).

[56] Ibid.

[57] Hakewill's Argument in The Case of Impositions (1606–1610), n. 2 State Trials 371, 407, 455–458 (Howell ed. 1816). And see McKechnie, Magna Carta: A Commentary on the Great Charter of King John 400 (2d ed. 1914).

[58] Le Boutillier, American Democracy and Natural Law 138 (1950); McIlwain, The High Court of Parliament 54 (1910); 1 Pollock and Maitland, The History of English Law 172–173 (2d ed. 189); Stubbs, Select Charters 296 (8th ed. 1895); Pound Magna Carta and Constitutional Guarantees of Liberty 9 (Speech, Library of Congress, Dec. 15, 1946, press release No. 381).

[59] The writ could also be called ne exeat e (or a) regno. The phrase ne exeat regnum, sometimes encountered, is, of course, an ungrammatical barbarism.

[60] Fitz-Herbert, The New Natura Brevium *85 n. 50. Beames, A Brief View of the Writ Ne Exeat Regno 1 (1st ed. 1812), rightly observes that the writ is contrary to the spirit of the common law, which allowed every man to depart the realm at his pleasure.

[61] 5 Ric. H, c. 2 (1381).

[62] See the survey in note, 41 Geo. Law Journal 63, 64–70 (1952).

[63] 2 Co. Inst. *54. For authority, Coke cites the Register, p. 89 (i. e., Registrum brevium tam originalium quam judicialium 89–90 (4th ed. 1687)), which, however, is inconclusive in that it merely deals with writs against runaway priests and monks.

[64] 1 Jac. I, c. 4/VI (1604).

[65] 3 Jac I, c. 5/XVI (1605) ("to prevent their good education in England, or for any other cause").

[66] 4 Jac. I, c. I/XXII (1606).

[67] See *Dick* v. *Swinton* (1 V. & B. 371, 35 Eng. Rep. 145 (ch. 1813)); *Collinson* v. ——— (18 Ves. 354, 34 Eng. Rep. 351 (ch. 1811)); *Nailor's Case, Holt, K. B.* (404, 90 Eng. Rep. 1172 (1701)); 20 Eng. & Emp. Dig. 541 et seq.; 3 Story, Commentaries on Equity Jurisprudence, 506–509 (14 ed., Lyon, 1918).

2. In the United States: As to the United States, it is at once clear that we have no royal prerogative,[68] and certainly no political writ of ne exeat regno. The position of the writ in this country is best described by Story:

"The writ of the [sic] ne exeat regno is also in use in America, where it is treated not as a prerogative writ but as a writ of right in the cases in which it is properly grantable.

"In general, it may be stated that the writ of ne exeat regno will not be granted unless in cases of equitable debts and claims."[69]

The writ has been continued, for this equitable purpose only, in the Federal Judicial Codes for about 150 years.[70] The present Judicial Code does not mention it expressly.[71]

Nor can it be doubted that the liberties of "British political folklore—Magna Carta, the common law guarantees of civil liberties * * *"[72] have been adopted by the Fathers of our constitutional system.[73] In short, it would be untenable to argue that the freedoms of the common Englishman at the time of the American Revolution were not to be regarded as the minimum of what our revolutionaries wished to accomplish and finally did embody in our Bill of Rights. It is true that freedom of locomotion is not expressly mentioned in our Constitution or in the Bill of Rights; yet the Supreme Court has made it plain that this very freedom, at least as far as movement from State to State is concerned, is protected by the 14th amendment.[74]

In short, in the absence in our system of law of anything in the nature of the political writ of ne exeat regno, the State Department has no common-law right to prevent citizens from going abroad. Nor is there an enabling statute to this effect.[75] And if there were one—if our lawmakers would want the United States to fall back to the level of legal civilization that has not existed in Western Europe for a long time, or in England for more than 200 years—such a statute, it is submitted, would be unconstitutional.

D. Lack of statutory basis for the Government's policy

As we have said, at the present time there is no statute on the books that would allow the State Department to restrain citizens other than registered Communists from going abroad.[76] The possibility of judicial restraint, such as against fugitives from justice, absconding debtors, or witnesses under subpena,[77] is of no relevance to our topic.

The validity of the Internal Security Act, which makes the mere application (!) for a passport by a member of a registered Communist organization [78] a crime, hinges on the theory that the Communist Party is a criminal conspiracy. It concerns relatively few people [79] and will not be discussed here.[80]

If the wartime statutes making the leaving of the country without a valid passport a crime [81] are to be held constitutional, they cannot be construed as authorizing the Government to restrain arbitrarily the citizens' freedom of foreign travel. The language of the wartime statutes [82] does not warrant such a construction, nor would their purpose. The legitimate object of a statute requiring the use of passports is to facilitate law enforcement against fugitives from justice, including draft evaders. If a war emergency so warrants, a government might forbid any travel or any foriegn travel, or it might forbid travel by all males or by certain age groups. The constitutionality of such a statute is quite conceivable, but that is a far cry from giving an agency a blanket authority, especially when we are at war only technically, to deny citizens the right to go abroad except "in the best interest" of the country. Dicta in a few cases involving other matters that seem to suggest different views [83] do not have the force of constitutional amendments.

CONCLUSION

As a matter of fact, the State Department itself has admitted that, at least in the absence of a statute so prescribing, it has no authority to prevent Americans from traveling abroad. In two recent cases the State Department presented the argument that the mere denial of a passport by the State Department is not per se a denial of the right to go abroad.[84] This argument cannot be taken seriously. It has been ably refuted in the Bauer case:

"It is unrealistic to contend that denial of an American passport does not restrict the plaintiff's right to travel abroad. Legal rights may be violated by unlawful public action although such action makes no direct demands on the individual. [Citing *Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Comm.* v. *McGrath* (341 U. S. 123 (1951)).] Passports are required in many countries, and as long ago as 1929 the State Department advised American citizens leaving the United States for a country where passports are not required to carry a passport, except in travel to Canada or Mexico, and for use to facilitate reentry into the United States." (Citing *Browder* v. *United States* (312 U. S. 335 (1941)).) [85]

In other respects, however, the Bauer case has not put the matter to a satisfactory end. Quite aside from implicitly asserting that a statute may constitutionally authorize passport denials, and without setting forth reasons for this dictum, the decision merely holds that the revocation of the plaintiff's passport without any notice and hearing, as well as the refusal to renew her passport without an opportunity to be heard, was without authority of law and in violation of due process.[86]

The idea that a hearing would somehow make the practice of the State Department constitutional is totally unconvincing on two grounds. First, a passport applicant is not usually in a position to wait for many months for a hearing before the Board of Passport Appeals now established as a result of the Bauer decision.[87] The reference to such a hearing may well be tantamount to a denial. Second, however, and of even greater importance, is the consideration that there is nothing in the Passport Division's new regulations that would suggest that such a hearing would be based on anything but the State Department's theory of arbitrary discretion to be exercised "in the best interests" of the State. In other words, under the regulations, even where applicable,[88]

---

[68] This is clear now beyond doubt through *Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co.* v. *Sawyer* (343 U. S. 579 (1952)). And see Parker, Administrative Law, 85–87 (1952) (discussion of President's "prerogative").

[69] 3 Story, Commentaries on Equity Jurisprudence, 509 (14 ed., Lyon, 1918).

[70] The writ was embodied in section 5 of the 1793 amendment to the Judicial Code of 1789 (1 Stat. 334 (1793)). It, as well as its successors, stipulated that the writ shall not be granted "unless a suit in equity is commenced." Judicial Code (sec. 261, 36 Stat. 1162 (1911)), 28 U. S. C., sec. 376 (1940)). And see *Ginsberg & Sons* v. *Popkin* (285 U. S. 204, 208, 209 (1932)) ("at common law it was simply a writ to obtain equitable bail"); *Gooding* v. *Reid Murdock & Co.* (177 Fed. 684, 686 (7th Cir. 1910)). See also *Lamar* v. *Lamar* (123 Ga. 827, 51 S. E. 763 (1905) (not a prerogative writ in America)); *Samuel* v. *Wiley* (50 N. H. 353, 355 (1873) semble, Comment, (1951) University of Illinois Labor Forum 659).)

[71] 28 U. S. C. sec. 1651 (a) (courts may "* * * issue all writs necessary or appropriate in aid of their respective jurisdiction and agreeable to usages and principles of law.")

[72] Krout, The American Bill of Rights in Great Expressions of Human Rights 135, 138 (MacIver ed. 1950).

[73] *Ibid.*; Le Boutillier, American Democracy and Natural Law 120, 137 (1950); Brebner, Magna Carta in Great Expressions of Human Rights 61, 68 (MacIver ed. 9150); Kent, The Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizens, id. at 145, 161–165; Pound, Magna Carta and Constitutional Guarantees of Liberty 15–17 (Speech, Library of Congress, Dec. 15, 1946, Press Release No. 381).

[74] See *United States* v. *Wheeler* (254 U. S. 281, 299, (1920)); *Twining* v. *New York* (211 U. S. 78, 97 (1908)); *Slaughter-House Cases* (16 Wall. 36, 79 (U. S. 1872)); *Paul* v. *Virginia* (8 Wall. 168, 180 (U. S. 1868)); *Crandall* v. *Nevada* (6 Wall. 35 (U. S. 1867)). Rutledge, Freedom of the Movement of Workers: Freedom of Passage Within the United States (1953) Wash. U. L. Q. 270. And see the Austrian decision quoted supra, note 41.

[75] 22 U. S. C., sec. 211a (1952), merely authorizes the State Department, consuls, etc. to issue passports ("* * * may grant and issue * * *"); and sec. 212 is superscribed "Who entitled to passport." Its text is confined to the prohibition to issue passports to non-Americans. No severe restriction of an important liberty can be inferred from these provisions.

[76] See note 78 infra.

[77] See note 70 supra (38 Am. Jur. 617, 618–619 (1941)). Title 18, U. S. C., sec. 1073 1952), makes it a crime to travel abroad with the intent to avoid criminal prosecution, custody, or confinement after conviction of certain crimes, or the giving of testimony in a felony case. *Hermans* v. *United States* (163 F. 2d 228 (6th Cir.), cert. denied, 332 U. S. 801 (1947)). Punishment for contempt of an American citizen in Paris who refused to return to the United States to testify in a criminal case was upheld in *Blackmer* v. *United States* (284 U. S. 421 (1932); see Comment, 32 Col. L. Rev. 747 (1932)).

[78] 50 U. S. C., secs. 781, 782 (5), 785, 797 (1952).

[79] Until recently "* * * only the Communist Party of the United States has been ordered to register by the Subversive Activities Control Board, and the issue of passport denial under the provisions of the act has not arisen." Note, 41 Geo. Law Journal 63, 80 (1952). At the time of this writing, other proceedings are pending.

[80] For a discussion see Comment, 61 Yale Law Journal 171, 196–198 (1952).

[81] See note 47, supra.

[82] See note 48, supra.

[83] See *Perkins* v. *Elg* (307 U. S. 325, 350 (1939) ("the Secretary's discretion with respect to the issue of a passport," but the case merely decided the plaintiff's American citizenship)); *Blackmer* v. *United States* (284 U. S. 421 (1932) (the sovereign's power to require a citizen's return in a case merely deciding a court's power to summon an American witness from abroad)); *Miller* v. *Sinjen* (289 Fed. 388 (8th Cir. 1923) (passport discretion recognized through State Department's refusal was grounded in plaintiff's not being a citizen)); *Bauer* v. *Acheson* (106 F. Supp. 445, 449 (D. D. C. 1952) (passport a "purely political document" addressed to foreign powers)).

[84] *Bauer* v. *Acheson* (supra note 83); *Transcript of Record in Robeson* v. *Acheson* (Civil No. 5500–50, D. D. C., 1950).

[85] *Bauer* v. *Acheson* (supra note 83 at 451).

[86] *Bauer* v. *Acheson* (supra note 83).

[87] 22 Code Federal Register secs. 51.135–51.146 (Supp. 1954).

[88] The entire regulation is limited to issuance of passports to Communist supporters and probable law violators (22 Code Federal

if a supposed radical after months of waiting and correspondence finally gets a hearing, the Passport Division, or the Board of Passport Appeals, "after consultation with other interested offices," will advise him of the decision "as specifically as within the judgment of the Department of State security considerations permit." [30]

Such a procedure has no semblance of a safeguard of substantive constitutional rights.[31] In other words, even if the new passport regulations would comply with procedural due process—which they assuredly do not—they are not consonant with substantive due process. In short, even as Congress may not enact law "providing that no Republican, Jew or Negro shall be appointed to Federal office," [32] it may not arbitrarily deny to citizens the right to hold speeches, to join religious groups, or to go abroad, even if such a denial should be preceded by a hearing.[33]

Passports are travel identifications that have truly very little to do with our foreign policy, or even security. Spies and traitors do not usually travel abroad. Rather, they remain inconspicuously at home, as recent unfortunate cases have amply demonstrated. It will certainly not help our role as a model to others that, of all the British Commonwealth countries, the Union of South Africa appears to be the first to plan to bring its passport laws "into line with United States legislation to control travel abroad." [34]

POLITICAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Oregon in his remarks on the floor of the Senate on August 19 referred to a report on political campaign contributions in the 1956 elections, which had been prepared by the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Committee on Rules and Administration. In concluding his statement he asked unanimous consent that excerpts from the report of the Senate subcommittee, followed by a series of exhibits contained therein, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I was surprised, in examining this material, to find that none of the glaring errors which I had brought to the attention of the Senate on March 29, 1957, had been corrected. In discussing the report of the subcommittee at that time I said:

I must advise the Senate that these findings are based on inaccurate statistics. The data compiled by the subcommittee contains double counting, inconsistent reporting of the same data on different tables, and such gross errors as the inclusion of individuals as members of groups to which they do not belong and, similarly, the exclusion of others. I have found significant errors in every table, which, in my judgment, render them of very doubtful value.

I also said:

Mr. President, I am convinced that the majority members of the subcommittee relied upon their staff and apparently did little checking of the figures. Hence, they have produced a statistical monstrosity.

I documented the errors in the subcommittee's report with numerous charts and tables. They were not unsupported charges.

On April 1, the distinguished junior Senator from Montana commented on my analysis and said:

The subcommittee wishes to thank the senior Senator from the State of Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] for calling to the attention of the subcommittee any errors or omissions which exist in the report. In the event there should be a reprint of the subcommittee's report, every effort will be made to correct such errors or omissions and to make the reprint as nearly perfect as possible.

More than 16 months have elapsed in which these corrections could have been made. Apparently the subcommittee concluded that the document could not be corrected and still serve the purpose for which it was intended. No further prints were submitted to the Senate. Yet the identical errors which I reported to the Senate on March 29, 1957, are contained in the tables which were placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, on April 29, 1957, in a statement to the Senate replying to questions by the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee who was the chairman of the subcommittee at the time the report was prepared, I said:

Mr. President, my colleague in attempting to determine the motive for my remarks on March 29 said: "I say, further, that we may take notice of the fact that there is now an unfilled demand for several thousand copies of the report of the subcommittee, and we may well question whether or not the secondary motive is to discourage a reprinting to satisfy these thousands of requests." (P. 5003.)

My only motive in addressing the Senate was to show that this report, in its present form, is misleading and inaccurate. The Senator from Tennessee is correct in assuming that I would oppose the reprinting of the committee print as a Senate document, since I know that it contains many errors which I have detected, and I have good reason to believe that there are additional errors which a complete audit would disclose.

I feel as strongly today about including known errors in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as I did toward printing these tables as a Senate document.

Without attempting again to recapitulate all of the obvious statistical errors, let me comment on just a few which show that no effort of any kind was made to correct the material prepared by the subcommittee before including these tables in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

For example, on page 18405 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a table is presented showing the contributions by members of the Du Pont family. The table indicates total contributions to the Republican Party of $248,423. If the junior Senator from Oregon had studied my remarks he would have noted the following facts. I said:

However, the subcommittee made a special investigation of the Du Pont family. They say on page 65:

"In the case of the Du Pont family, the names of over 900 members of the family were checked against the list of contributors."

Only 73 contributors are listed. This is a mere 8 percent of the names subjected to this check. This would not support the charge of unusual family political activity.

Mr. President, let me read you a few of the names of Wilmington, Del., citizens shown on exhibits 12 or 26 as having contributed to the Democrats, and whose contributions were not included in the table on page 65 as members of the Du Pont family. First let us take page 26–4; Alexis I. du Pont Bayard, $500; Elizabeth du Pont Bayard, $2,500. Then let me turn to exhibit 12, page 69, of the report, and we find Mr. J. H. Tyler McConnell who contributed $7,250.

The list on page 65 includes in-laws as well as direct descendants. Crawford H. Greenewalt is included in the family as he married a Du Pont girl. If we are to follow this definition, then the Du Pont family also includes Mr. J. H. Tyler McConnell, who married the daughter of William du Pont, J. H. Tyler McConnell not only made a contribution of $7,250 to the Democratic Party, but he was their candidate for the Governor of Delaware in the last election. Mr. President, the list showing the contributions by the Du Pont family is obviously incorrect, when we find these glaring errors.

If we use the subcommittee's definition of what constitutes family relationships, the Democratic Party nominated a member of this illustrious family, who is also an officer of the Hercules Powder Co., for high political office.

I also said:

The Senator from Tennessee expresses surprise that three members of the Du Pont family, whose family connection the subcommittee had not noted, contributed financial support to the Democratic Party. On March 29 I showed that one of these individuals, Mr. J. H. Tyler McConnell, was the Democratic gubernatorial candidate in Delaware last fall. It is surprising that the subcommittee was not aware that Alexis I. du Pont Bayard served as the Democratic Lieutenant Governor of Delaware during the period 1949 to 1952. He was also the Democratic candidate for United States Senator in the 1952 general election.

The subcommittee in its report referred to the fact that "in the case of the Du Pont family, the names of over 900 members of the family were checked against the list of contributors" (p. 65).

There are 900 members of the family because it is one of America's oldest families. Eleuthere Irenee du Pont de Nemours, a refugee from a French dictatorship, established a factory to make gunpowder in this country in 1802. I might add that the first Du Pont to settle in the United States was a close friend of Thomas Jefferson, who many regard as founder of the Democratic party.

Since the Du Pont family has been mentioned so prominently in the subcommittee's report and in the subsequent remarks by the junior Senator from Tennessee, may I also add that members of this family have served in this body. Henry Algernon du Pont was elected to the United States Senate from Delaware on June 13, 1906, and served until March 3, 1917. His cousin, Thomas Coleman du Pont, was Senator from Delaware from July 7, 1921, to November 7, 1922. He was elected to the United States Senate in 1924 and served from March 4, 1925, until his resignation on December 9, 1928.

On page 18412, the junior Senator from Oregon included the subcommittee

---

Register secs. 51.135, 51.136 (Supp. 1954)). Hence, only subversives and suspects must get a "hearing"; citizens like Judge Clark do not. See *Clark* v. *Dulles* (Civil No. 2620, D. D. C., 1954).

[30] 22 Code Federal Register secs. 51.137–51.138 (Supp. 1954).

[31] See also Barnett. *Passport Administration and the Courts* (32 Ore. L. Rev. 193. (1953)).

[32] *United Pub. Workers* v. *Mitchell* (330 U. S. 75, 100 (1947)).

[33] For a discussion of the modern scope of substantial due process under the fifth amendment, see The Constitution of the United States of America: Analysis and Interpretation 853–864 (Corwin ed. 1953).

[34] New York Times, September 12, 1954, p. 17, col. 2.

exhibit 16, which showed contributions by officials of the 47 leading underwriters of investment bonds. The errors which I brought to the attention of the Senate on this original exhibit were not corrected in the tables which the junior Senator from Oregon placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I said:

Mr. President, let me invite attention of the Senate to exhibit 16. It appears on page 73 and is entitled "Nineteen Hundred and Fifty-six Political Contribution of $500 and Over by Officials of the 47 Leading Underwriters of Investment Bonds."

The subcommittee leaves the impression that officials allegedly affiliated with these companies contributed $237,800 to the Republicans, and that the Democrats only received a mere $2,000 from these people. This listing further reinforces the attempt to characterize everyone in the investment banking business probably as a Republican. This is a tactic which has no place in a Senate document—at least, that is the way I feel—particularly if the facts in the report itself refute the subcommittee's statement.

In examining this exhibit I noted that A. M. Kidder & Co., of New York, is listed, and the statement is made that there had been no contributors. I am sure that many Senators will remember the stories which appeared in the newspapers last fall announcing that Mrs. Charles U. Bay had been made president of Kidder & Co. This was a noteworthy event, as Mrs. Bay is the first woman to head a leading underwriting firm. She has just been named the chairman of the executive committee of the American Export Lines, and her picture appeared on the cover of the magazine Business Week in a recent issue. Mrs. Bay is shown in the the subcommittee's exhibit 26–4 as having made contributions to the Democrats totaling $7,000. This contribution by Mrs. Bay, an important and sizable contribution, was omitted from the subcommittee's exhibit 12. Mrs. Bay is an able and very distinguished woman. I would think that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would appreciate her. She has a long Democratic background, her late husband having served as the American Ambassador to Norway from June 1946 until June 1953.

I have noted other omissions. Benjamin J. Buttenweiser is shown on page 26–7 as having contributed $1,000 to the Democrats, but he is not included in the total for Kuhn, Loeb & Co. Mr. Gordon Dean, the former head of the Atomic Energy Commission, is shown on page 26–11 as having contributed $1,000 to the Democrats, but his name is not included on page 75 as an officer of Lehman Bros.

The few errors which I have just discussed total $9,000. This is 4½ times the amount the subcommittee shows as having been contributed to the Democratic Party by members of investment firms. In other words, Mr. President, this figure is off by at least 450 percent.

On page 18414 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, exhibit 17 is reproduced. It shows the contributions made by officials of the 37 leading advertising agencies. All of the contributions shown were made to the Republican Party. The largest contribution shown is by Charles M. White, allegedly an official of the Campbell Ewald Co., in the amount of $11,350. I reviewed this table in my remarks to the Senate and I will repeat my findings with respect to Mr. White's connection with the Campbell Ewald Co., I said:

A casual inspection of the list shows that the largest single contribution of $11,350 was made by an individual by the name of Charles M. White of Washington, an alleged officer of the Campbell Ewald Agency. Examination of exhibit 12 shows a Charles M. White, the president of the Republic Steel Company of Cleveland, Ohio, as having made a contribution in the amount of $11,350. An examination of exhibit 26, page 185, shows a C. M. White, of Washington, D. C., as having made a contribution of $1,000. The address shown is 1625 K Street NW. This happens to be the Washington address of the Republic Steel Co., and this is obviously the same C. M. White who is responsible for the other listings on pages 26–185.

The magazine Printers' Ink apparently checked with the Campbell-Ewald Co. and learned that they had no official by the name of C. M. White. My own investigation reveals that the only Charles M. White in the Campbell-Ewald Agency was a young man about 20 who had been employed in their Washington, D. C. office. I hardly think he qualifies for this contribution, although he might. I merely wish to point this out.

Mr. President, exhibit 19 of the report appears on page 18416 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It shows political contributions by officials of the 100 largest military prime contractors. My analysis of this table showed the following obvious errors which I brought to the attention of the Senate.

I said:

In exhibit 19, the list showing the 100 largest military prime contractors, a contribution of $21,000 for Mr. A. P. Sloan, Jr., appears under Du Pont (E. I.) de Nemours & Co., and again under General Motors Corp. A contribution of $33,000 by Mr. Richard K. Mellon was included in the total for General Motors Corp. and again in the total for Gulf Oil Corp. A contribution by Mr. Henry Ford II, of $18,899 was counted twice, once under the Ford Motor Co., and again under the General Electric Co. The multiple counting of just these 4 individual contributions distorts the dollar total for the Republicans shown in exhibit 19 by $112,399, an error of 10 percent. There are many similar errors.

One does not have to be a skilled statistician to detect that there is something radically wrong with exhibit 19, showing total contributions to all parties by officials of the 100 largest military prime contractors, totaling more than 61 percent of the similar contributions by the officials associated with all of the 225 largest corporations in the United States, after the duplicate listings had been eliminated.

The junior Senator from Oregon included the subcommittee's exhibit 20 on page 18419 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This exhibit reportedly showed contributions by officials of the 88 corporations participating in the atomic energy program. Once against there were obvious errors which I brought to the attention of the Senate. I said:

In exhibit 20, there is a further glaring example of multiple counting. This exhibit shows the officials of the 88 corporations participating in the atomic-energy program. A single $500 contribution by Mr. Walker L. Cisler contributed $2,000 to the Republican total, as it was shown under Burroughs Corp., Detroit Edison Co., Fruehauf Trailer Co., and the Holley Carburetor Co.

Such multiple counting is completely indefensible and deceptive. The text written by the subcommittee which refers to these tabulations has no meaning whatsoever.

It is distressing that an attempt would be made to reproduce these discredited tables in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 16 months after the errors had been called to the attention of the subcommittee without any attempt whatsoever to correct them. As chairman of the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee, I have an obligation to see to it that these misleading data are not presented to the American electorate as the product of scholarly research.

Significant errors were found throughout the report and in view of the statement by the distinguished junior Senator from Montana to which I have already referred, the Senate had every reason to believe that these tables would not be reprinted without correction and editing. In my statements last year, I emphasized that the errors which I found were merely the result of a casual inspection of the report.

I said:

In the preparation of these remarks, I have not examined any of the reports which were filed with the Clerk of the House, nor have I seen any of the special questionnaires which were sent by the subcommittee to those individuals who were shown in the reports on file with the Clerk of the House as having contributed $5,000 or more. I have merely spot-checked the report itself, and have confined my supplemental reference to Who's Who and financial manuals such as Moody's and the Directory of Directors. I have made no attempt to correct the report. That would be impossible without redoing the entire study based on an examination of the reports and questionnaires. I am merely showing that the subcommittee's report, as published, is not only inaccurate, but also highly misleading.

Mr. President, I wish to repeat so that there can be no misunderstanding that the errors which I cited do not constitute an audit of this report. Without a complete audit by qualified people the statistical data which has been reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 19 serves no useful purpose other than to provide very dubious campaign material for the Democratic Party.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The statement of the Senator from Kansas in regard to our colloquy earlier in the session is correct. I wish to point out, however, that the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections has been unable to get authority to have a reprint made of the original report made by the subcommittee. I assure the Senator from Kansas that if we ever get that permission, any legitimate and proper changes will be made in the report.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I do appreciate very much what the distinguished Senator from Montana has said. It is always in character for him to bring these matters to the attention of the Senate in a most fair and proper light, and I am glad he has done so in this instance. I did think that in fairness, in view of what had been said before, the errors and discrepancies which appeared in the original report could and should be corrected, and that I should bring this matter to the attention of the Senate.

SENATORS BRIDGES AND SPARKMAN OFFER CONSTRUCTIVE PROPOSALS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the August 15 issue of the Christian Science Monitor there appears an editorial entitled "A Strong Lead in the Mid-East." The first paragraph reads:

The heart of President Eisenhower's program concerning the Middle East is its provision for a regional economic development institution under Arab leadership and using American and other aid. Other points are necessary in a protective way to give constructive energies and opportunity to work; but this is the "forward look."

In view of the action taken by the 10 Arab nations in the United Nations, I believe this is a good time to call attention again to the statement made on the floor of the Senate by the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] some 3 weeks ago, when he advocated the creation of an organization somewhat on the basis of what is now proposed under the leadership of the Arabs, for the purpose of doing for themselves what must be done to bring peace and stability to that area. I believe, therefore, that due credit should be given to the initiative shown by the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire for the statement he made on the floor of the Senate at that time.

In the same editorial there is a paragraph relative to the President's proposal for the creation of a standby United Nations police force. As Senators know, the House yesterday passed a resolution seeking to bring about the creation of a U. N. police force. The Senate also, on three occasions, has endorsed such a proposal made by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. He likewise should be given credit for the initiative he has shown, and which has now been taken up by the administration with respect to this particularly difficult area. My purpose in making these remarks at this time is to show that constructive proposals in the field of foreign policy have been made by individual Senators on the floor of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STRONG LEAD IN THE MID-EAST

The heart of President Eisenhower's program concerning the Middle East is its provision for a regional economic development institution under Arab leadership and using American and other aid. Other points are necessary in a protective way to give constructive energies an opportunity to work; but this is the forward look.

This proposal, assuming that Americans will back the President, as we believe they will, represents several forward steps in United States policy. It moves beyond direct two-nation agreements which many countries feared as tying them too tightly to American purposes. It invokes United Nations sponsorship for a multi-nation organization. It emphasizes that the institution must be governed by the Arab States and that its goal must be Arab goals.

There is good precedent for the type of organization Mr. Eisenhower suggests. It could follow the lines of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, which made successful use of the Marshall plan funds in programs which the European nations in concert formulated for themselves. In the Middle East presumably some resources would come from the oil-producing nations, and there would be a mutual interest in efficient operation.

The President has presented a sound case for the creation of a standby United Nations peace force. The situation in Lebanon, like the earlier Suez crisis, has clearly demonstrated the need for such a body if the members of the U. N. are to discharge their responsibility of protecting other nations from aggression. There is equally good reason for a monitoring organization to deal with the problem of inflammatory radio broadcasts which exceed the rights of free speech by inciting to violence.

The American position in Lebanon has benefited throughout from the expressed willingness to withdraw as soon as U. N. action could assure peace. It may be noted that Mr. Eisenhower spoke only of preserving peace in Jordan, not necessarily of guaranteeing the existence of the present regime. It may be that matters there have gone so far that preservation of that rather artificial state is unrealistic.

A breakup of Jordan could precipitate severe tests in the Middle East. It would raise most acutely the risk of an armed clash between Israel and the United Arab Republic over parts of Palestine. Here enters the desirability of the study the President proposed of U. N. measures to control and if possible prevent a threatening arms race between the Arab states and Israel.

If the debate now to ensue in the U. N. can produce actions and attitudes that will gain time there is hope for peaceful and constructive solutions in the Middle East. A habit of cooperation in a Mid-East regional development institution could eventually extend to other areas of Arab thought. The satisfaction of attaining industrial and agricultural advancement, which incidentally could greatly alleviate the refugee problem, should soften some of the sharpnesses of Arab nationalism.

We hope the proposals advanced by President Eisenhower will receive a thoughtful hearing and careful consideration in the Middle East.

DAY OF ST. STEPHEN—HUNGARIAN NATIONAL HOLIDAY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Tuesday marked the occasion of the great Hungarian national holiday, which honors the saint who was the first King of Hungary.

Stephen I reigned from 1001 to 1038, and the Hungarian state dates from his reign. He is celebrated for this work of bringing Christianity to Hungary—a work continued from his father's beginning. Stephen's crown, sent to him by Pope Sylvester II, remained for centuries as the sacred symbol of Hungarian national existence.

Today, we are well aware, a dark cloud hangs over the homeland of the great Hungarian people. Less than 2 years after the courageous uprising of Hungary's freedom-loving people, Soviet armed might has brutally and completely suppressed the desires for liberty and national self-expression which lie so deeply in the Hungarian spirit. The recently announced executions of two great freedom-loving Hungarian leaders is tragic evidence that the forces of international communism intend to use every means of brutality and terror to keep the Hungarian longing for freedom under firm suppression.

On this Hungarian national holiday, the United States joins the rest of the Free World in saluting this great Hungarian national spirit, which sinister forces may suppress but never kill. We must pledge never to relax our efforts—through every peaceful and lawful means—to help this great nation win true national independence once again. We must send our message to all peoples behind the Iron Curtain to reassure them that a primary objective of our international policy is to help them achieve and guarantee their national independence and self-expression.

But even though the world's political situation unfortunately makes it impossible to realize this goal immediately, there are tasks which we can perform now and problems we can face now.

We must give every support to international action to solve the desperate problems of refugees from the 1956 Hungarian revolution who remain, still unsettled, in Austria and elsewhere in Europe. America has done much to help the Hungarian freedom fighters who were driven from their homeland, and it has opened its doors to great numbers of them. But this job is not finished.

Our administration must be prepared with a plan of action for any future uprising such as Hungary's. Our unfortunate lack of preparation in 1956 made is impossible for the United States to take the positive role it should have filled in the international diplomatic negotiations following the revolution. The United States must, of course, support the United Nation's resolutions on Hungary.

Mr. President, I want to join with my colleagues in this body and with Americans everywhere to extend our hopes and prayers to the courageous people of Hungary that brutality and terror may soon be banished from their lives, that their nation will once again be numbered among the independent nations of the world, and that their great traditions of liberty and freedom will once again prevail in their homeland.

A PROPOSAL FOR AN IMPARTIAL TEST OF KREBIOZEN AS A CURE FOR CANCER

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the dispute over the relative merits of Krebiozen as a cure for cancer has been both prolonged and heated. The eminent physiologist Dr. A. C. Ivy has made widespread tests and reported results which apparently showed that Krebiozen had been helpful in treating an appreciable number of patients. The American Medical Association on the other hand has violently denounced the preparation and its sponsor Dr. Ivy, while a committee of the National Research Council has declared on the basis of the AMA reports that it could find "no evidence of any curative effects and no palliative effects attributable to the drug itself."

The public is therefore bewildered and this popular confusion has been intensified by the bitterness of the attacks and

counterattacks which have been made as well as by the mistakes and errors which have been committed by both sides.

I believe that Dr. Durovic, the developer of Krebiozen, and the scientific director of the Duga Laboratories, Inc., in Illinois, should have made public the manufacturing details of his drug and that he should not have sought to collect large sums for alleged expenses of development in South America. I also agree that whoever was responsible for issuing the press release at the initial conference announcing the first set of results made excessive claims and that it was not in scientific good taste.

But the opponents of Krebiozen have also been guilty of errors. False statements of fact have apparently been made about numerous cases alleged to have been treated with Krebiozen in an effort to discredit the use of that preparation.

Of one thing I feel certain. Dr. Ivy is not only a world famous physiologist and scientist, but on the basis of a long acquaintanceship with him, I trust his personal integrity. I also remember the way in which the organized medical profession disparaged the great discoveries of Pasteur, Lister and many other great path breakers and sought to defame their characters.

The issue is too important for us to allow possible discoveries to be prevented from being appraised because of opposition by the official branches of medicine. If Krebiozen is worthless, it should of course be discarded and discredited. If it has merit, it should be used to reduce the number of deaths and the pain now caused by this most terrible of modern diseases.

The only way to find out the truth is by an adequate series of scientific tests. Dr. Ivy has proposed such a trial to the American Cancer Society, but he has insisted upon a neutral committee to evaluate the results. This seems to me as a layman, to be eminently fair, but I shall not go into the reasons why it was not adopted, nor shall I criticize any motives in connection with it.

The Public Health Service and the National Institutes of Health would seem to be the logical body to conduct such tests.

I therefore propose:

First. That the National Institutes for Health conduct a sample test of Krebiozen upon 200 more or less terminal cancer cases who come to them for treatment and for whom at present there are no other means of relief.

Second. That 100 of these cases be treated with ampules of Krebiozen administered at regular intervals and that the other 100 be given ampules containing only mineral oil, the comfort of all patients being meticulously maintained.

Third. That the Public Health Institute and Dr. Ivy would select an outstanding biostatistician who would work with the advisers to help design the details of the test and who would be the only person who would know which patients received Krebiozen and which did not, and that these lists should be placed in a sealed envelope in a safe to be opened at a later date by the biostatistician in the presence of the advisers the selection of whom as hereinafter provided.

Fourth. That Dr. Ivy and a representative of the medical profession chosen by the Public Health Service should serve in an advisory diagnostic and therapeutic capacity, but should have no knowledge of the identity of the cases.

Fifth. That at the end of a period of time determined by the advisers the case histories of the patients, whether or not they had received Krebiozen, should be submitted to Dr. Ivy for inspection. This should include photographs where possible. Dr. Ivy would then be asked to identitfy the 100 cases which he believed had received Krebiozen. He would naturally select those which had shown the most improvement or where pain had been most alleviated.

The sealed envelope should then be taken from the safe by the biostatistician and opened, and Dr. Ivy's list should be compared with the actual lists and the degree of agreement or disagreement announced. A comparative study should also be made of the 100 cases which were and the 100 cases which were not treated with Krebiozen.

Sixth. That following this, if Dr. Ivy so requests, the Public Health Service examine the records compiled by Dr. Ivy of other cases which have been treated with Krebiozen, appraise the results, and publish the findings.

I submit that this is a fair proposal. It would permit an impartial and definitive testing. It can do no harm. It may do great good. I call upon Dr. Ivy and the Public Health Service to accept the terms of this test.

I intend to follow up this matter.

THE INDIANA SAND DUNES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the fourth of a series of articles on the subject of the Indiana sand dunes, written by Richard Lewis, and published in the Chicago Sun-Times of August 20, 1958. This article describes the battle of the dunes and raises the question whether the last remnant of the dunes shall be turned over to the steel mills for an industrial city or whether the dunes are to be saved for the people of the United States.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BATTLE OF THE DUNES—TINY COMMUNITY BATTLES TO KEEP INDUSTRY OUT

(By Richard Lewis)

The tiny community of Ogden Dunes, Ind., is fighting singlehanded a zoning battle to keep industry off the Indiana Dunes.

It has zoned steel plants out of bounds within 2 miles of its corporate limits.

The action affects Bethlehem Steel Corp.'s estimated $350 million expansion program and the State of Indiana's $36 million harbor plan on the last 3½ miles of undeveloped duneland between Gary and the Indiana Dunes State Park. The park is some 50 miles southeast of Chicago.

LAUNCH ZONING PLAN

Bethlehem and two other steel companies owning land in the zoned area are attempting through the courts to nullify the Ogden Dunes zoning ordinance.

Porter County officials have responded, too. They have launched a countywide master zoning plan designed to supersede the Ogden Dunes zoning ordinance insofar as it applies to the 2-mile fringe zone beyond the town's boundaries.

Ogden Dunes has thus become the center of a second front in the battle of the dunes between the forces of industrialization and persons who want to conserve natural resources.

On another front, United States Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS (Democrat, of Illinois) has asked Congress to set aside the site of the Bethlehem and Indiana seaport developments as a national park, to be known as the Indiana Dunes National Monument.

FIVE HUNDRED ACRES OF DUNES

Ogden Dunes perches on 500 acres of Indiana dunes beside Lake Michigan 3 miles east of the Gary city limits. Its population is listed as 788 permanent residents. About 135 more spend summers there.

Three years ago, the town's plan commission began drawing up a master plan to save the community from being encircled by industry. It adopted a master zoning plan July 1, 1957, prohibiting steelmaking within 2 miles of the town limits.

The plan commission acted under a section of the Indiana planning code giving communities jurisdiction over fringe territory in the absence of a countywide zoning plan.

The Ogden Dunes ordinance takes a 1,100-acre bite out of the 4,000 acres Bethlehem has acquired to expand into the Midwest.

RESIDENTIAL ZONING

This acreage, lying within 2 miles of the town's corporate boundary, has been zoned for residential property. The master plan also prohibits industrial processes involved in steelmaking and fabricating within the 2-mile limit.

Indiana's proposed harbor is affected because State legislation has made its development contingent on industrialization of the dunes.

Bethlehem reacted promptly to dislodge this monkey wrench in the machinery of its expansion program. The firm was joined by other industrial landowners in the 2-mile limit.

Six suits contesting the validity of the master plan and asking that it be set aside have been filed in Porter County circuit court.

FILES THREE SUITS

Two were brought by the Lake Shore Development Corp. of Indianapolis, Bethlehem's land-buying agent, which holds title to 350 acres affected by the master plan. A third suit was filed on behalf of a trust in the Farmers State Bank of Valparaiso, Ind., another Bethelehem agent, claiming 750 acres are affected.

In addition, Inland Steel Co. has brought 2 suits and Midwest Steel Co., 1. Inland has 830 acres in the zoned area which were acquired in 1919 and Midwest has about 1,000 acres.

CITE POPULATION

The pattern of contention in the suit, as set by Lake Shore's complaint, is that the Ogden Dunes master plan is unreasonable because the land where it prohibits industry is suited only for industrial use.

Moreover, Lake Shore contends, "the standards, restrictions, and regulations for industry in the master plan * * * are so exacting and unrealistic as to be confiscatory."

In an answering brief, Ogden Dunes contends that the population of the Calumet industrial region is overflowing into Porter County and that suitable residential areas to house the overflow is needed more urgently than industrial sites.

"The petitioner," says Ogden Dunes, "would apparently consider it wholly appropriate that all of this population should be housed within the shadow of a steel mill

chimney in the tradition of the last century."

While these issues were pending, the Porter County Board created a County Plan Commission, the first one of the county's history.

O. K. MASTER PLAN

The commission was granted authority to draw a master plan for the entire county. Such a plan would supersede all fringe zoning by towns outside their corporate limits under the State planning code.

Thus it would nullify the Ogden Dunes zoning restrictions insofar as they applied to the steel company lands and other property within 2 miles of the town boundaries.

During consideration of the county zoning project, it was proposed that Bethlehem contribute $25,000 toward the cost of preparing a county master zoning plan.

OFFER WITHDRAWN

The offer was made by James W. Chester, Valparaiso attorney, who represented Bethlehem's Lake Shore Development Corp. in land acquisition and also in the lawsuits against Ogden Dunes.

Chester told the Sun-Times he later withdrew the offer. He said he did not wish it to appear that Bethlehem was trying to influence the county in the zoning of the steel lands.

The county then proceeded to develop a master plan on its own, according to Gale Morgan of Chesterton, County Plan Commission secretary.

The plan commission has employed Metropolitan Planners, Inc., of Indianapolis to draw the master plan and the county, so far, is paying the bill, said Frank Ferguson of Valparaiso, county board representative on the commission.

"We didn't think it would be proper to use funds from Bethlehem," Ferguson said.

NO CONNECTION

He said the county master plan idea had no connection with the Ogden Dunes zoning dispute.

"We've been needing a master plan in this county for a long time," he said. "The northwest section is growing like Topsy with overflow from Lake County."

Plan commissioners expect it will take 18 months and numerous public hearings before the master plan is completed.

Attorney Chester and Walter S. Ricks, secretary-manager of the Valparaiso Chamber of Commerce, are confident that the steel lands will be zoned for industrial use. That will put Ogden Dunes out of the battle, they believe.

The citizens of Ogden Dunes, high in their dune-perched homes overlooking the lake, are watching and waiting.

THE TEAM SPORTS BILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, when the crush of adjournment comes, obviously many bills fall by the wayside. This inevitable experience indicates that certain measures will have to be given renewed attention when the 86th Congress convenes.

I indicated the other day that I was a little frustrated because at this session action was not taken on S. 4070, introduced by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], which relates to team sports.

I indicated this week that I might revive it in amended form, particularly with reference to its connection with television and radio programs, and that he might attempt to attach it to a bill on the calendar. I indicated my thought that that was not the best procedure. But when we come to the shank end of the session, sometimes a more justifiable interest will dictate that perhaps that is the only way the matter can be handled.

I had in mind offering the team sports bill to what is known as the food additive bill, H. R. 13254, which has already passed the House. There has been tremendous interest in the additive subject, particularly on the part of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Mr. Flemming and other persons have called me about it. I have heard from all sections of the country with reference to the bill.

When I suggested that I would propose the team sports bill as an amendment to the additive bill, that did not indicate that I was opposed to the additive bill; in fact, I favor that bill, as do many other Senators. I hope favorable action can be taken on it before this session is concluded.

I announce now that I will certainly not permit my interest in the team sports bill to blind me to the fact that the food additive bill should receive favorable action at this session.

I might find a more appropriate vehicle to which to attach the team sports bill, if that can be done. If no action can be taken on the team sports bill at this session, at least an early start will have been made toward its consideration by the Committee on the Judiciary next year.

I again express my appreciation to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] for the lengthy hearings which he conducted so late in the session, indicating his interest in the subject of the team sports and the necessity for doing something in the fields of hockey, football, and baseball.

Mr. President, I shall amplify this statement by adding thereto some excerpts from an opinion by Judge Grim, United States district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, because I think they are appropriate in any consideration of this matter.

The sports bill was recently tabled by the Senate Judiciary Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee due to the fact that so little time remains in this session of Congress. Since I indicated my intention to propose the sports bill as an amendment to the food-additive bill, I have received assurances from Senator KEFAUVER, chairman of the subcommittee, Senator O'MAHONEY, and other members of the subcommittee that they will work to secure passage by the Senate of some kind of a sports bill next year. In view of these assurances, and also in view of the fact that I do not wish to jeopardize the consideration of the food additive bill by the Senate at this session I shall therefore withdraw my amendment. I desire at this time to say a few words in further explanation of the need to exempt professional team sports from the antitrust laws and to point out that 50 Senators have cosponsored the original sports bill.

Professional sports' need for an exemption from the antitrust laws is eloquently explained in Judge Grim's 1953 football decision, wherein he stated:

Professional football is a unique type of business. Like other professional sports which are organized on a league basis it has problems which no other business has. The ordinary business makes every effort to sell as much of its product or services as it can. In the course of doing this it may and often does put many of its competitors out of business. The ordinary businessman is not troubled by the knowledge that he is doing so well that his competitors are being driven out of business.

Professional teams in a league, however, must not compete too well with each other in a business way. On the playing field, of course, they must compete as hard as they can all the time. But it is not necessary and indeed it is unwise for all the teams to compete as hard as they can against each other in a business way. The stronger teams would be likely to drive the weaker ones into financial failure. If this should happen not only would the weaker teams fail, but eventually the whole league, both the weaker and the stronger teams, would fail, because without a league no team can operate profitably.

As Judge Grim emphasized, professional sports are a unique type of business. It would be unwise for the teams in a league to compete as hard as they can against each other except on the playing field. If they did, the stronger teams would be likely to drive the weaker ones into financial failure and eventually the whole league would fail. Without competition on the playing field, public enthusiasm for sports diminishes, attendance falls off and, as a consequence, players' salaries and owners' profits decline. The self-interest of professional team sports is thus the strongest force assuring competition rather than monopoly. Teams in a league cannot afford to put their competitors out of business.

All team sports have learned that, in order to preserve competition on the playing field, it is necessary to employ certain restrictive devices relating to the selection and retention of players by teams, assignment of territories and so forth. These restrictive devices are designed to promote competition, not to stifle it. This is the essential difference between professional team sports and ordinary businesses.

Application of the antitrust laws to the sports aspects of professional team sports would have exactly the opposite effect from that which it has on ordinary businesses. The purpose of applying the antitrust laws to ordinary commercial businesses is to preserve competition in the public interest. This same public interest can be served only by exempting the sports aspects of professional team sports from the antitrust laws.

PUBLIC LAW 480 AND THE PRODUCTION OF WHEAT, FEED GRAINS, AND OTHER PRODUCTS

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, in a statement to the Senate on July 18, 1958, I pointed out that the authorization for Public Law 480 came to an end on June 30, 1958.

Insofar as authorizations under Public Law 480 are concerned, since June 30 the Department of Agriculture has been unable to go ahead or even to make plans for future activity, under this law.

In an announcement on July 20, 1958, the Secretary of Agriculture said the Department was then holding a large backlog of requests from friendly for-

eign nations to purchase surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currency, under title 1 of Public Law 480. The requests at that time were in excess of $600 million, at cost to the Commodity Credit Corporation. These requests were for substantial quantities of wheat, feed grains and other agricultural products. Those of us who have been following production trends, especially in the case of wheat and feed grains, will recall that these two agricultural commodities have been in large surplus supply up to this time. This year, there is being harvested perhaps the greatest wheat crop in the Nation's history. The feed grain crop, while yet to be harvested, promises to be a bumper one, also.

Since the enactment of Public Law 480, which I originally introduced, together with other Senators who were cosponsors of the bill, this country has been able to expand greatly the consumption of wheat from the farms of the United States. We have been able to move great quantities to friendly foreign countries where it has been badly needed. Thus, the United States has performed a double service by, first, giving an expanded export market to our wheat producers, and second, by strengthening our relationships with friendly foreign nations at a time when such friends are badly needed.

In the 1957 fiscal year, the United States achieved an alltime high record in exporting wheat and its flour equivalent, totaling 550 million bushels, valued at almost $1 billion. These exports were equivalent to 55 percent of the national wheat production for that year. These exports of wheat, for the first time in 5 years, made it possible to reduce the national wheat surplus stock, by over 100 million bushels.

In the 1958 fiscal year that ended on June 30, wheat exports under title 1 totaled 175 million bushels. This amount represented about 44 percent of our total wheat exports for the year.

The wheat and other agricultural commodity exports for the 1958 fiscal year might have been greater, had the authority contained in Senate bill 3420, passed by the Senate on March 20, been promptly enacted by the House. You will recall, Mr. President, that Senate bill 3420 provided for an additional authorization of $500 million for the remainder of the fiscal year 1958, or until June 30, 1958. Without this additional authority, the Department was unable to process applications.

The failure of the Congress, up to this date, to extend Public Law 480 has done much harm, especially to the American wheat farmer, in that it has deprived him of the benefits to be derived from an expanded market during the period when there was no authorization to make sales of wheat and other agricultural commodities under the terms of Public Law 480.

How much of the request for the purchase of $600 million have been lost to this country, I cannot say. I hope these requests have but been held in abeyance, pending the authorization of an extension of this law.

Mr. President, I have been informed that today the Senate will have an opportunity to pass on the conference report on Public Law 480. I hope it will be approved, if it comes before this body in satisfactory form.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. THYE. I desire to commend the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] for his remarks in regard to the conference committee's agreement on what we normally refer to as Public Law 480. It was the distinguished Senator from Kansas who first authored Public Law 480, which has served the Nation and the American farmers so well. It has aided in developing markets abroad. It has helped us dispose of surplus commodities which otherwise we would not have been able to sell. It has brought the much-needed food to some areas of the world where there was a deficit of food and fiber.

The distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is to be commended for first having conceived the plan, which is embodied in Public Law 480, to dispose of surplus agricultural commodities.

Mr. President, I am a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as is the distinguished Senator from Kansas. I was a member of the conference committee which reached agreement with the House conferees on the conference report as of last evening, August 21.

The House will act first. We anticipate that the House will act early today, and that then the Senate will have an opportunity to act on the conference report.

Mr. President, I highly commend the distinguished Senator from Kansas. I, too, expect to speak on the matter when the conference report has been agreed to.

Mr. President, if I may have the permission of the Senator from Kansas to make a request at this time, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter which I received from the clerk of the village of Hibbings, E. Arthur Anderson, and a resolution adopted by that village body.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VILLAGE OF HIBBING,
Hibbing, Minn., August 19, 1958.

Hon. Edward J. THYE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THYE: As directed by the Hibbing Village Council I am attaching for your information a copy of a resolution adopted by our governing body on August 14, 1958, having to do with an appropriation of additional funds by Congress to the Department of the Interior, to be utilized for the operation of construction projects and other projects, either planned or in the process of planning, for the Superior National Forest.

We consider the acquisition of these additional funds will be of material benefit to Iron Range communities in the relief of the prevalent unemployment situation at this time.

The resolution is submitted to you with a request that you do whatever is within your power or jurisdiction in furthering the matter in question.

Your cooperation is solicited and will be sincerely appreciated.

Respectfully yours,
E. ARTHUR ANDERSON,
Village Clerk.

Trustee Gandsey offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

Resolution

Whereas the Congress of the United States is considering an appropriation of additional funds to the Department of the Interior to be used for the operation of construction projects and other projects which are planned, or are in the planning stages, for the Superior National Forest; and

Whereas there is at present a very considerable unemployment problem on the iron range in Minnesota, and which will likely become more acute during this coming winter; and

Whereas the Village Council of the Village of Hibbing believes that if additional money is appropriated by Congress for this purpose, it will do much to relieve the unemployment situation on the iron range, generally, and in the Hibbing area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Village Council of the Village of Hibbing, St. Louis County, Minn., That the Congress of the United States be asked to appropriate additional funds for the Department of the Interior, to be used for the operation of construction projects in the Superior National Forest; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to United States Senators HUBERT HUMPHREY and EDWARD J. THYE, and to Congressman JOHN A. BLATNIK and Congresswoman COYA KNUTSON, asking them to give every assistance toward securing these additional funds.

The motion to adopt the foregoing resolution was duly supported by Clerk Anderson, and, upon being put to vote, carried.

JOHN J. SPANISH,
CLAUDE J. GRAVES,
GLADYS GANDSEY,
Trustees.
E. ARTHUR ANDERSON,
Clerk.
J. J. TAVEGGIA,
Mayor.

Adopted and passed this 14th day of August 1958.

J. J. TAVEGGIA, *Mayor.*

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I wish to thank very much my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Minnesota, for his kind remarks.

I recall most definitely that when Public Law 480 was first before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, it was the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] who at that time not only expressed a desire that we work out something along the lines of Public Law 480, but also stood up in the committee from time to time, on many, many occasions during the formative period of that legislation, and worked for its success.

The Senator from Minnesota will recall that the Senate passed that bill, but that then it remained in the House for the better part of a year.

I want the other Members of the Senate, as well as all those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to know that the senior Senator from Minnesota, Senator ED THYE, took a very prominent and aggressive part in formulating and working out this proposed legislation;

and I was delighted when he was appointed one of the conferees on the bill.

I have been informed that from that conference has come a measure which provides a workable program; and I understand that the conference report will be before the Senate after the House passes on it.

I desire to acknowledge the outstanding contributions which have been made by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and to thank him publicly for the interest he has always manifested in this law.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I am grateful to the senior Senator from Kansas for yielding to me, and also for his remarks regarding my assistance in bringing about the enactment of this legislation.

THE LABOR REFORM BILL

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed, during the morning hour, to address the Senate for 5 minutes in addition to the normal time permitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered, and the Senator from Massachusetts may proceed.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, only the Jimmy Hoffas and the Nathan Shefermans can find satisfaction in the failure of this Congress to pass the labor reform bill, generally known as the Kennedy-Ives bill. Honest union members, informed business men, responsible labor leaders, law enforcement officers, and the general public—all of these will suffer as the result of this bill's death in the House of Representatives.

Those who voted against the bill and those who lobbied for its defeat must bear a heavy responsibility during the coming months when racketeering and gangsterism in the labor movement continue unchecked. I cannot believe that the American people will accept some technical or procedural argument offered by way of excuse for the defeat of a bill which would have put Mr. Hoffa and his ilk out of business.

No two experts in labor affairs could probably agree on a draft bill in this controversial and sensitive area. Therefore, it was natural that criticism and controversy should surround it. As the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] put it during the debate in the Senate:

> Each Senator, no doubt, feels that if he were privileged to write it he could improve on this measure.

In the same colloquy, he expressed what I believe all of us felt, when he said:

> I say let us take what we know all of us want, and pass the bill, and then move on.

And the Senate did just that, and passed the bill by an 88-to-1 vote.

That this bill displeases extremists is not surprising, for these same extremists have been the ones who have prevented the enactment of any progressive labor legislation since 1947. But this bill passed the Senate precisely because the Members of this body demonstrated, in the words of Business Week magazine, how "wise guidance in the public interest can be substituted for concern over wide apart partisan positions."

The Kennedy-Ives bill, as it passed the Senate, was a strong, bipartisan measure. Whatever may be said about what the Congress might do on some other bill at some other time, this bill represented a real opportunity for effective labor reform in this Congress. The failure to enact it only means that Hoffa and the handful of irresponsible and arrogant labor leaders who plague an otherwise clean labor movement will continue to operate.

Of one thing we may be sure: Next year, there will be more scandals, more racketeering, more abuses by the hoodlums who have infiltrated a tiny fringe of the American labor movement. But we shall lack an effective remedy to stop them; and those who defeated this bill are apparently willing to assume responsibility for tying our hands.

More union funds will be embezzled or otherwise misused next year, and the members and the public will know nothing about it.

More union elections will be rigged next year, and nothing will be done about it.

More ex-convicts will serve as union officers; more Nathan Shefferman middlemen will take payoffs; more picket lines will be set up for extortionate purposes; more trusteeships will be used for Jimmy Hoffa-type power plays; more Johnny Dio paper locals will be established to front for racketeers; but we shall be able to do nothing about it.

The results of nearly 2 years of McClellan committee hearings, of several weeks of hearings, discussion, and drafting by the Labor Committee, of long, constructive debates on the Senate floor; all this is to go for naught, because of the short-sighted opposition stemming mostly from one party and one interest group.

PROVISIONS OF THE KENNEDY-IVES BILL

No one who thoughtfully examined the Kennedy-Ives bill could doubt its effectiveness as a labor-reform measure. The key provisions of the bill, as passed by the Senate, included the following:

First. Comprehensive detailed disclosure to members, press, public, and law enforcement agencies of union financial data.

Second. Full reports by union officers on any personal conflict-of-interest transactions.

Third. Criminal sanctions for embezzlement of union funds, false reporting, false entries in books, failure to report, or destruction of union books.

Fourth. Suits by union members for recovery of funds embezzled or misappropriated by union officers.

Fifth. Prohibition of loans by employers or unions to union officers.

Sixth. Secret ballot for the election of all union officers or of the convention delegates who select them.

Seventh. Due notice of all union elections, and real opportunity to nominate opposing candidates.

Eighth. Requirement that union officers be elected by secret ballot every 4 years, by international unions; and every 3 years, by local unions.

Ninth. Prohibition on the use of union funds to support candidacy of any union officer.

Tenth. Prohibition of service as union officers of persons convicted of felony.

Eleventh. Power to Secretary of Labor to institute court action to set aside improper elections, and conduct new elections.

Twelfth. Limit on union trusteeships to 18 months.

Thirteenth. Mandatory annual report to Secretary and union members on every trusteeship, the reasons for its establishment, continuance, and operation.

Fourteenth. Prohibition on counting votes of delegates of trustee bodies unless delegates elected by secret ballot, and on transfer of funds from trusteed local union to international except normal dues and assessments.

Fifteenth. Power to Secretary of Labor to begin a court proceeding to break improper trusteeships.

Sixteenth. Prohibition of picketing for extortion or to secure payoff from employer.

Seventeenth. Prohibition of solicitation or payment of fictitious fees for unloading cargo from interstate carriers.

Eighteenth. Public financial reports of the operations of Shefferman-type middlemen; and a prohibition of channeling bribes and improper influence through such middlemen.

Nineteenth. Elimination of the "no man's land" problem which prevented NLRB action on local labor racketeering, by directing the NLRB to exercise its full jurisdiction under the Taft-Hartley Act.

A STRONG LABOR REFORM BILL

It will be noted that this bill would have implemented every one of the McClellan Committee's legislative recommendations not yet acted on, inasmuch as the welfare fund protection bill had already been passed.

The McClellan committee legislative recommendations were as follows and I quote from the report:

LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

The United States Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor and Management Field recommends that the Congress of the United States give attention to the passage of legislation to curb abuses uncovered in five areas during our first year of hearings.

These recommendations are—

1. Legislation to regulate and control pension, health, and welfare funds;

2. Legislation to regulate and control union funds;

3. Legislation to insure union democracy;

4. Legislation to curb activities of middlemen in labor-management disputes;

5. Legislation to clarify the "no man's land" in labor-management relations.

It must be noted that the committee has explored a number of other areas in labor-management relations and plans to present legislative proposals covering those areas at a future time. For instance, much testimony has been heard during past months on the infiltration of gangsters and racketeers into the labor movement. Additional testimony on this subject will be heard during the coming year and this, along with other subjects of committee interest, such as some phases of organizational picketing on which we have already had some testimony, will

provide the basis for further legislative recommendations.

The bill rejected by the House implemented all but the first of these recommendations which was already far advanced in the legislative process. This bill would have accomplished the following:

First. It provided for complete financial disclosure by unions, with broad investigative powers for the Secretary of Labor to insure compliance;

Second. It imposed strict standards of union democracy, including free elections by secret ballot and the regulation of trusteeships;

Third. It curbed labor-management middlemen;

Fourth. It provided an effective solution to the "no man's land" problem.

The bill, as passed by the Senate, was recognized by knowledgeable men on both sides of the aisle as an effective instrument of labor reform. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] said of the bill:

If enacted, and properly administered, it will drive many unreformed ex-convicts, racketeers, gangsters, and crooked officials out of the union movement and strengthen the position of honest, decent unionism, and its leaders.

Senator KNOWLAND, the distinguished minority leader, indicated that the bill marked "real progress" and said, "In the final analysis, the workers will be the ones who will suffer if Congress does not finally act on legislation of this sort at this session." And the ranking Republican member of our Senate Committee on Labor, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], has termed the bill "one of the important landmarks of this Congress."

TAFT-HARTLEY AMENDMENTS

There have been objections that this bill does not go far enough—that it does not restrict labor's rights in the field of collective bargaining or political activity. But the Senate demonstrated repeatedly that it regarded this as a labor reform bill, designed primarily to carry out the recommendations of the McClellan committee—and that it should not be loaded down with broad new measures in the various areas of industrial relations.

The Taft-Hartley amendments contained in the bill were placed in it at the repeated urging of administration spokesmen. The Secretary of Labor in his appearance before our committee insisted on the inclusion of these amendments as did the ranking minority member of our committee, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] both in committee and on the floor of the Senate.

The following excerpt, for instance, is taken from page 32 of the hearings before our committee:

Senator KENNEDY. I will say to the Secretary, the Secretary knows quite well that I would be delighted to see reforms in the Taft-Hartley law, which are long overdue.

The legislative recommendations of the McClellan committee include five areas: Legislation to regulate control of pension, health, and welfare funds, which, as I have said, we have done something about.

Second, to legislate to regulate control of union funds; and three, legislation to insure union democracy; and four, legislation to curb activities of middlemen in labor-management relations; and five, legislation to clarify the "no man's land" in labor-management relations.

I will say that if it is the desire of any member of the committee to offer amendments on any question, when the subcommittee finally meets to decide on legislation, that, of course, is his privilege.

I am merely hoping to the extent possible that we will attempt to confine ourselves to this immediate challenge.

From our experience since 1947, I am aware of the error of attempting a full-scale revision of the Taft-Hartley Act which, I believe, ought to take place.

Now, it may be possible, if the subcommittee could reach a consensus, we could do something about matters like non-Communist affidavits, and the right of economic strikers, and the problem of the building trades, and matters about which I think there is quite general agreement.

However, I am anxious that we do not get into too broad a field, because the result will be that nothing will be done.

Secretary MITCHELL. Certainly, in my answers to questions, I will abide by the chairman's ruling.

Senator KENNEDY. It is not a ruling. It is just an expression of hope.

Secretary MITCHELL. I would like to say it is the reason why I thought it was to the interest of all concerned to unfold a complete labor-management program, in my opinion this program should be approached in the broadest way.

All of the recommendations we have made, we think, are needed reforms.

And again, on page 278, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] had this to say:

I do want to emphasize the importance of giving serious consideration to the entire program contained in S. 3097, S. 3098, and S. 3099 which I introduced for the administration. * * *

For this reason I agree with the distinguished chairman, Mr. KENNEDY, that in the time available, it is impossible to write a major revision of the Taft-Hartley Act, especially if consideration is to be given to the recommendations of the McClellan committee dealing with the urgent problems of racketeering and union democracy, and such testimony as we received from Senator KNOWLAND yesterday, and Senator McCLELLAN yesterday in their splendid presentation before this committee.

However, although the administration's proposals do not contemplate a major revision of Taft-Hartley, some of them are directed at specific, long-standing inequities and deficiencies, the correction of which are of immediate urgency.

This being so, I hope that it will be possible for us to deal with these proposals at this time.

The only major recommendations of the administration not included in the bill related to organizational picketing and secondary boycotts. But the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] has clearly indicated that the question of secondary boycotts and picketing would be the subject of future investigations by the committee, and consequently, action on these two specific areas was deferred. I refer the Members of the Senate to page 11319 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD where this whole matter was discussed, and I quote from Senator McCLELLAN's speech on that page:

Our committee has only begun to investigate that particular area. We have received some testimony regarding it, and I have repeatedly stated that the secondary boycott problem must be dealt with.

But it is my theory that if we are to have good legislation, we must give it some care and thought. That is all I am asking for.

If the Senate is now to try to legislate at this session, by means of this bill, in the entire labor and management field, then the select committee should be discharged, because then there would be nothing left for it to do.

I want to have good legislation enacted, and I want the Senate to go into this field. But I repeat that I want these proposals properly investigated and considered, rather than to take hasty action and get bad legislation enacted.

OTHER CRITICISMS

Exaggerated criticism came from some quarters about the provisions of the bill requiring reports from employers concerning deals with labor-management middlemen. This provision of the bill prohibited nothing; it merely required information to be reported from employers concerning dealings with what the McClellan committee report called shadowy figures. Neither did this provision in any way interfere with normal employer-employee relations, nor was it ever intended to do so.

Another provision of the bill, clearly designed to prohibit bribes by employers to prevent unionization, was requested by National Labor Relations Board representatives when they appeared before the McClellan committee. This unambiguous antibribery section certainly did not preclude normal wage or other payments as was charged by some.

KENNEDY-IVES STRONGEST AVAILABLE BILL

The hard facts of the matter are that the Kennedy-Ives bill was not only the strongest bill which could pass the Congress—and the only bill which could be enacted at this Congress—it was also the strongest bill available. In most key areas it was much stronger than the proposals of the administration. Permit me to list some of them:

First. The administration proposals contained no effective regulation of trusteeships. This bill set strict standards and provided means by which union members could protect themselves against arbitrary imposition of trusteeships by international unions.

Second. The administration's bill contained weak and ineffective provisions to protect union members' voting providing only a report from a union that it follows its own rules for elections. The Senate-passed bill, on the other hand, would have required secret periodic elections of all important union officers. It went further and provided machinery to upset improperly held elections and established a method by which new elections could be held.

Third. The administration's bill merely reenacted present law dealing with union financial reports while the Senate-passed bill contained a comprehensive reporting requirement including reports by union officers of conflicts of interest.

Fourth. The administration bill contained a very limited provision requiring employers to report only payments to any union officer or employee. This is already covered by section 302 of Taft-Hartley. The Senate-passed bill, on the

other hand, contained a strong, detailed provision requiring employers and middlemen to report transactions and arrangements as well as payments and expenditures for activities intended to influence or affect employees in the exercise of rights guaranteed by the Labor Act.

Fifth. The Senate-passed bill contained a strong specific provision against "shakedown picketing" in general and against unlawful exactions from interstate truckers. These safeguards were not specifically covered in the administration bill.

Sixth. The Senate-passed bill specifically prevented convicted criminals from holding union office. This subject is not covered by the administration bill.

Seventh. The Senate-passed bill contained a specific prohibition against using union funds to influence union elections. The administration bill was silent on this subject.

Eighth. The Senate-passed bill contained specific provisions making it a criminal offense to refuse to submit to the Secretary of Labor records, and to refuse to permit the Secretary of Labor to enter and inspect books and accounts. The administration bill would have required the Secretary to resort to protracted court proceedings for this purpose.

Ninth. The Senate-passed bill contained strong criminal penalties against false entries in union books and against destruction of records. The administration bill was either silent or contained much weaker provisions dealing with this subject.

Tenth. The Senate-passed bill contained provisions designed to encourage unions to enforce strict codes of ethical practices binding upon affiliates and members. The administration bill was silent on the subject.

Eleventh. The Senate-passed bill contained a strong provision directing the Labor Board to exercise its jurisdiction in situations warranting such action and presently not covered by reason of the Board's refusal to exercise its statutory jurisdiction. The administration bill would have perpetuated the present Board-created "no man's land" by ceding jurisdiction to States, 36 of which have no State labor relations laws. This would mean applying greatly dissimilar State labor laws ranging from New York's pro-labor, closed shop law to restrictive right-to-work statutes on the books in several States. More importantly it would have left thousands of employers and employees in such major industrial States as California and Illinois without the protection of a uniform national labor law.

Mr. President, neither Senator IVES nor I have ever sought to make this labor reform measure a partisan political issue. We knew that there was too much at stake. I have cited these comparisons with the administration bill to demonstrate that the bill rejected by the House yesterday was a strong and effective measure.

Until this week, it was never a party measure. The bill had a bipartisan origin and sponsorship, and included the recommendations of the President as well as those of the bipartisan McClellan committee. It was reported by the Senate Labor Committee with only one dissenting vote. It passed the Senate with only one dissenting vote. It received the endorsement of those members on both sides of the aisle who have taken a special interest in labor affairs.

But now partisanship has killed the labor-reform bill. Two-thirds of the Members were required to pass the bill in the other body. More than two-thirds of the Democrats supported the bill. More than three-fourths of the Republicans opposed it.

This is a fantastic performance. The Republicans have long assailed the Democratic Party for its supposed labor ties. They have long cried out for labor reform. They have long assailed the Democratic Congressional leadership for not passing a bill to implement the findings of the McClellan committee. Now, finally given an opportunity to vote for labor reform—for a bill that would have crippled the free-wheeling operations of Mr. Hoffa and his ilk—they chose to defeat the bill and preserve the issue.

I have already commented on the false propaganda campaign against this bill, initiated by the NAM, Retail Federation, and United States Chamber of Commerce. Their success in planting fear and confusion on the Republican side—regarding a bill thoroughly and carefully considered here before it passed 88 to 1—has now been demonstrated.

But none of this would have been possible had it not been for the sabotage of the bill effectively worked by the official Republican spokesman on labor affairs, Secretary of Labor James Mitchell.

Mr. Mitchell has talked long and piously about the need for labor reform. He has sought to give the credit for action in carrying out the McClellan committee recommendations to the Republican administration. He has sought to place the blame for inaction upon the Democratic Congressional leadership. But the facts of the matter are that the chief stumbling block to labor reform legislation in this Congress has been Secretary Mitchell.

At no time has he lifted one finger in favor of this bill. At no time has he urged his party members in either house to vote for the bill. He first attempted to sabotage the bill from Geneva, calling it "weak and ineffective," after it had been reported out of committee by a nearly unanimous vote. He has continued these negative and misleading comments up to this very week. Finally, at the crucial moment in the House debate, just before the vote on the measure, he authorized a statement on the floor of the other body calling the bill a "bad bill". The inevitable result of his intervention followed: 79 percent of the Republican Members voted against the bill.

The reason is plain: Mr. Mitchell did not want a labor reform bill. His contradictory public statements about the legislation were designed to kill the only bill that could pass, appease those anti-labor elements in his party that wanted a more restrictive bill, and maintain a synthetic political issue. For Mr. Mitchell's true attitude on labor reform was disclosed at an academic seminar some months ago. The opposition to labor reform legislation which he expressed at that meeting has since been reported in the press, and I have independently checked these quotations and found them to be accurate. At that meeting Mr. Mitchell opposed democracy in labor unions, stating it could lead to "anarchy." He opposed receiving authority to disclose union financial reports, saying he would "prefer to defer this." He opposed effective labor reform legislation, stating that he did "not think anybody is going to be able to write and pass legislation that will correct the evils that the McClellan committee has uncovered. My job is to quiet the hysteria so we do not get the kind of legislation that would be dangerous to the American labor movement. Maybe the right way to put it is: 'Feed a little innocuous legislation to the lions, and this may give us the time to put the thing in the right perspective.' "

The President is reported as having stated yesterday that the bill had four shortcomings. However, Mr. President, examination of the record indicates that the President has been inadequately briefed.

First, contrary to the President's contention the bill does contain very adequate power to enforce the standards imposed in it. Under the bill, the Secretary is authorized to make investigations, enter and inspect records and is specifically directed to compile the reports required by the bill when any person responsible for making a report neglects to do so. The bill also contains stiff criminal penalties which if properly administered will compel adherence to standards.

Second, contrary to the President's statement the bill does deal with shakedown picketing in section 603. The problems of secondary boycotts I have already discussed.

Third, the President complains about the Taft-Hartley amendments in the bill. The fact of the matter is that the Taft-Hartley amendments contained in this bill, as I have already pointed out, are all based on recommendations in the President's own labor message of last January, or have been recommended in the past by prominent Republican labor spokesmen. That message called for restoring the right of economic strikers to vote—so did this bill. It called for prehire contracts in the construction industry—so did this bill and so on.

Fourth, the President mentions the no-man's-land problem. The solution proposed by the administration was at first favored but later rejected by our committee, for it would have turned over to the States jurisdiction in interstate labor matters where no labor law exists. Thousands of workers and employees, under the administration proposal, would have been left without the protection of a uniform national labor law.

It is unfortunate that misleading charges and analysis which ignored the many sections on which there was general agreement, has killed a bipartisan

bill desperately needed by the American working people and public, regardless of party. I can only say that constructive labor reform legislation will be brought forward again next year; and I can only hope that it will pass the Congress in 1959 with the same constructive spirit that enabled it to pass the Senate by 88 to 1 this year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point two editorials and an article on that subject.

There being no objection, the editorials and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of August 21, 1958]

LABOR REFORM: LOSS AND GAIN

The cause of labor reform has received a blow from the House of Representatives, but a boost from organized labor. The House has failed, as the President reminded its Members yesterday, in its manifest duty to pass a moderate bill to curb union abuses. On the other hand, the executive council of the AFL–CIO has served the public well—and labor, too—by its prohibition of any alliances between its affiliates and the Teamsters' Union, previously expelled for corruption.

The Kennedy-Ives bill, which the House killed, may have had its defects, but, by and large, it was a promising answer to the overwhelming demand for Congressional action. Its passage in the Senate by 88 to 1 and then its defeat in the House were resultants of a complex of forces and pressures, largely below the surface of the news. Some of them, however, have been evident—for example, the strange partnership of Mr. Hoffa and his teamsters with the National Association of Manufacturers and the chamber of commerce to oppose the measure.

But the public can hardly be blamed for holding the leadership of the Democratic majority of the House largely responsible for the defeat of the bill. After all, Speaker RAYBURN'S delay in sending it to the Committee on Education and Labor and the committee's failure to act when it came to them were damaging enough. The final suspension of the House rules, with limited debate and no chance for amendment, gave the bill's opponents excuses for complaint.

The Democratic candidates in the next election will have plenty to explain for their party, but, after all, 77 percent of the House Republicans who voted were against the bill.

But if the failure of Congress to act has left inviting legal doors open to further labor-union misdeeds, the AFL–CIO's action will certainly discourage them. It would have been a national calamity if teamster corruption should have been rewarded by continued cooperation from the federation's affiliates. We applaud this further evidence of organized labor's campaign to keep its own ranks clean, even if Congress fails to support the cause. But good can come of that if it intensifies the demand for effective action in Washington.

[From the Washington Daily News of August 21, 1958]

LABOR ANGRY WITH MITCHELL

(By John Herling)

FOREST PARK, PA., August 21.—The top leadership of the AFL–CIO met this week with two leading Cabinet officials of the Eisenhower administration: Secretary of State Dulles and Labor Secretary Mitchell.

The Dulles meeting was scheduled months ago as a sort of counterappearance to Dean Acheson's last May. At that time, President Truman's Secretary of State discussed international affairs with the United States labor spokesman. Last time Mr. Dulles appeared before an important labor body was 1953 when he spoke to the AFL convention in St. Louis.

The Dulles and Acheson labor seminars indicate important recognition given by the Federal Government to the significant role organized labor plays in the making of American foreign policy opinion. During the past year, AFL–CIO President George Meany was a member of the United States delegation to the United Nations Assembly. Starting next month, George M. Harrison, Railway Clerks president and chairman of the AFL–CIO International Relations Committee, becomes the labor U. N. delegate.

While all the diplomatic niceties were observed by the AFL–CIO council members, even in the question-and-answer period with Mr. Dulles, the plans laid for Mr. Mitchell's reception were somewhat on the rough side.

The reason for the vehemence and hostility which the labor spokesmen now feel toward the Labor Secretary was his surprise turnabout opposition to the Kennedy-Ives bill in the House just 3 days before.

When word came here that Representative WALTER JUDD, of Minnesota, had taken the floor armed with a statement from Mr. Mitchell that he was bitterly disappointed in a suspension of rules, the uproar and dismay on the House floor was as nothing as to the reaction which greeted the Mitchell statement at the AFL–CIO executive council.

Top leaders like Mr. Meany, Auto Workers President Walter Reuther, International Ladies Garment Workers Union President David Dubinsky, whose union's summer home—Unity House—is the site of this meeting, expressed their surprise and shock. Some considered this a doublecross of massive proportions.

Others echoed the angry statement of Republican Senator IRVING IVES, of New York, who declared that the defeat of the Kennedy-Ives bill in the House was a triumph for gangsterism.

The AFL–CIO executive council charged that the defeat was due to an unholy alliance of the NAM, the chamber of commerce, the reactionary Republican leadership of the House, the teamsters, and the United Mine Workers which wrecked the bill. Then the council hit hard at Ike's labor adviser: "We deplore the role of Secretary of Labor Mitchell, whose opposition to constructive reform legislation was obviously politically inspired."

All this was the prelude to the frontal attack on Labor Secretary Mitchell informally and at the scheduled meeting of the executive council. When word came of what some called the Mitchell betrayal, there was a strong inclination to cancel his invitation to appear before the council. Other, more calculating minds, however, prevailed. Mr. Meany said with a slight smile, "Our official statement on Mr. Mitchell is just mild."

Face to face, in a confrontation scene with the Secretary of Labor, 24 angry men, behind closed doors, were grimly determined to make it clear that Mr. Mitchell, who had become regarded in labor circles as a good Secretary of Labor, was now to be considered a Republican politician, following his party line in opposition to union-management reform.

[From the Evening Star of Wednesday, August 20, 1958]

SORRY SHOW

If any cause has been served by the House defeat of the Kennedy-Ives labor reform bill, it is not that of the public interest. Similarly, it is not that of the rank and file of union labor—the No. 1 victims of the racketeering and corruption in union administration which the measure was designed, in some degree at least, to curb. It is not that of management that has complained so often of union practices, but belatedly turned its organized weight against this moderate start at compulsory reform. And if there is political advantage to be gained from the sorry record in the House, or in the on-again-off-again position taken by the administration, it is difficult to see how either party can make any clear claim to it.

From the beginning, this legislation was recognized as relatively mild and directed only at some of the outstanding abuses revealed by the McClellan committee inquiry in the Senate. It was not "union busting" legislation, but it represented a start at imposing restraints upon misuse of union power, by hoodlum leaderships, comparable to restraints which have been imposed in past times against predatory industrial and financial interests. The measure was approved by an 88-to-1 vote in the Senate, where its bipartisan sponsors were strongly supported by Chairman MCCLELLAN. In the House, there were no comparably powerful advocates and, quite evidently, strong forces in opposition.

The result, in short, is that Congress has failed to do a job that needed doing. The need will be there, however, until some Congress musters the political courage to do the job. Meanwhile, those who managed this year's defeat may reflect upon Senator IVES' evaluation that their action "is an open invitation to all criminals to make the most of their opportunities in the labor-management field."

NEED FOR A NEW FARM PROGRAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the most urgent tasks that is left undone as Congress adjourns is to meet the need for a new farm program. American agriculture has gone backward some more during this session of Congress.

Figures now are available which show the terrible cost to dairy producers of the severe and unjustified cut in their income which the Secretary of Agriculture imposed by his reduction of price supports for dairy products on April 1.

Mr. President, the cost to dairy producers in the United States, as a result of the reduction in the price they receive for milk since a year ago, has totaled $58.4 million during the first 4 months since the cut in dairy supports.

My own State of Wisconsin, as America's foremost dairy State, has suffered most of all. Mr. President, the milk producers in Wisconsin alone have lost $8½ million in income during these 4 months as a direct consequence of Secretary Benson's unwarranted action.

This is $8½ million that Wisconsin dairy farmers had last year, but will not have in 1958 for supporting their families, paying their taxes, paying their farm-operating expenses, supporting their churches, and providing for the education of their children and their own security in their old age.

This is $8½ million that has been ripped out of the cash registers of the small-business man on Main Street in every Wisconsin town and village and small city. It is $8½ million that is not available to purchase automobiles and refrigerators and clothing and the other products of our industry.

I want to emphasize that the economic damage which is being suffered in Wisconsin is not limited to Wisconsin alone. It is spread over every part of the Nation

where dairy products are produced and sold. In 4 months' time alone, Mr. Benson's unjustified cut in dairy-farm income has drained a total of $58.4 million out of the buying power of American agriculture. I ask unanimous consent to have two tables I have prepared showing these facts printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE A

Loss to U. S. dairy farmers resulting from cut in support price ordered into effect Apr. 1, 1958

Month	Amount average farm price in 1958 is below same month in 1957, for—			Total loss in value to farmers, all milk sold, millions
	All milk wholesale, hundredweight	Manufacturing milk, hundredweight	Butterfat, pound	
April	$0.10	$0.16	$0.017	$14.0
May	.10	.17	.018	14.8
June	.10	.16	.018	15.6
July	.14	.14	.017	14.0
Total loss to United States milk producers, 4 months				58.4

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture agricultural prices and crop production.

TABLE B

Loss to Wisconsin dairy farmers resulting from cut in support price of Apr. 1, 1958

Month	Price reduction per hundredweight, 1957 to 1958, average farm price in Wisconsin	Production of milk, million pounds	Loss to producers in Wisconsin
April	$0.10	1,685	$1,685,000
May	.15	1,879	2,818,000
June	.13	1,812	2,355,000
July	.10	1,551	1,551,000
Total loss to Wisconsin in producers, 4 months			8,419,000

Source: Agricultural prices and monthly crop reports, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This would be bad enough, Mr. President, if the injustice and wrong were limited to farmers alone. Some might even justify it if the consumers of this Nation had received the benefit of the farmers' loss.

But the consumers have not received what has been taken away from the farmers.

Even worse, the consumers have had to pay higher prices than ever for the dairy products they buy in their retail grocery stores.

Mr. President, in the past 4 months alone, American consumers have been compelled to pay $47.9 million more for the dairy products they have purchased than those same products would have cost at the prices of 1 year before.

I ask unanimous consent to have a table which presents the figures to back up this important economic fact printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

TABLE C.—*United States consumers pay more for dairy products at retail in 1958 than same month of 1957*

Product	April		May		June		July [1]		August [1]	
	1957	1958	1957	1958	1957	1958	1957	1958	1957	1958
	Cents	Cents	Cents	Cents	Cents	Cents	Cents	Cents	Cents	Cents
Milk (store, quart)	23.1	23.6	22.8	23.3	22.7	23.3	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]
Milk (delivered)	24.6	24.9	24.4	24.8	24.4	24.8	24.5	25.1	24.6	25.3
Ice cream, pint	29.3	29.7	29.4	29.7	29.5	29.6	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]
Butter, pound	73.9	73.9	74.0	73.6	73.8	73.5	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]
Cheese, American, pound	57.4	58.2	57.4	58.0	57.6	58.1	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]
Milk, evaporated, 14½-ounce can	14.4	15.1	14.5	15.1	14.6	15.1	[2]	[2]	[2]	[2]

[1] BLS Consumer price figures not available for July and August 1958. Figures supplied are from U. S. Department of Agriculture fluid milk and cream report, July and August 1958.
[2] Not available.

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor.

NOTE.—BLS Consumer Price Index for dairy products: In April 1958, 1.8 percent higher than in April 1957; in May 1958, 1.6 percent higher than in May 1957; in June 1958, 1.5 percent higher than in June 1957.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This, Mr. President, is a double-barreled economic injustice of the first order.

The farmer gets less. The consumer pays more.

What has become of the income that has been taken away from the farmer? What has become of the extra prices that consumers are forced to pay?

It has gone exactly where all the rest of the farm income has gone that Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson has pried loose from American farmers in the past 5 years. It has gone exactly where the rest of the additional prices that consumers have been forced to pay during this same period has gone. It has gone into the pockets of the middlemen who buy the farmers' products and sell them to the housewives of America.

In the past 4 months alone, since the latest reduction in prices for dairy products which Secretary Benson has imposed upon the dairy farmers, the middlemen have pocketed $106.3 million more than they would have received for their share of the housewife's milk and butter money at the farm and retail prices that prevailed just 1 year ago.

Never in all history has one man done so much for the rich corporations which squeeze the farmers of America with one hand, while they shake more and more and more, in higher and higher and higher food prices, out of the aprons of America's housewives.

I ask unanimous consent to have a table summarizing the effect upon farmers, consumers, and the middlemen printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE D

Loss to United States dairy farmers, added cost to consumers, and gain by middlemen resulting from price changes following reduction of dairy supports Apr. 1, 1958

Month	Change from 1957 to same month of 1958 (millions of dollars)		
	Loss in value to farmers, all milk sold	Added cost to consumers for dairy products	Total increase in middlemen's margin on dairy products
April	14.0	13.5	27.5
May	14.8	12.0	26.8

Loss to United States dairy farmers, added cost to consumers, and gain by middlemen resulting from price changes following reduction of dairy supports, etc.—Continued

Month	Change from 1957 to same month of 1958 (millions of dollars)		
	Loss in value to farmers, all milk sold	Added cost to consumers for dairy products	Total increase in middlemen's margin on dairy products
June	15.6	11.2	26.8
July	14.0	11.2	25.2
Total	58.4	47.9	106.3

Source: Based on statistics of Bureau of Labor Statistics and U. S. Department of Agriculture. July consumer cost is a projection of figures for June 1958, which is considered conservative since fluid milk and cream report, U. S. Department of Agriculture, for both July and August shows margin between 1957 and 1958 retail price of fluid milk is increasing. BLS figures for other dairy commodities not yet available for July.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Ezra Taft Benson is the not the farmers' Secretary of Agriculture. He is not the housewife's Sectary of Agriculture. He has served the middlemen who exploit them both, he has served them with devotion, and he has served them well.

He has loaded the Department of Agriculture payroll with more employees than it has ever had before in history—and he has stuffed the Department's advisory committees with spokesmen for the middlemen. He has weakened the representation of farmers in his own advisory councils, and he has crippled the democratic influence of the farmers in their own administrative farmer committees.

And throughout this fantastic career, he has distinguished himself above all else as a mammoth spender of the taxpayer's money.

The total expenditures of the Department of Agriculture just 7 years ago—in 1951—were $650 million. Mr. President, the estimated expenditures in Mr. Benson's Department of Agriculture in the current fiscal year are more than 10 times as great.

I have had these figures compiled at my request by the Department of Agriculture itself. They show that expenditures for the Department in the current

fiscal year are estimated at $6,521,000,000. I ask unanimous consent to have these figures printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE E

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Budget estimates, appropriations and expenditures, fiscal years 1951–59

[Millions of dollars]

Fiscal year		Annual appropriations for regular activities	Loan authorizations	Special activities [1]	Restoration of CCC capital impairment	Permanent appropriations	Commodity Credit Corporation and other revolving funds	Total
1951	Budget estimates	817.0	631.0		66.7	120.8		1,635.5
	Appropriations	740.5	444.5		66.7	124.2		1,375.9
	Expenditures	753.2	422.0			57.4	−582.8	649.8
1952	Budget estimates	866.8	262.0	114.6	427.0	164.9	30.0	1,865.3
	Appropriations	790.0	278.2	111.0	421.5	181.1	30.0	1,817.8
	Expenditures	734.9	395.4	110.2		56.2	−145.5	1,151.2
1953	Budget estimates	752.8	244.0	196.4	120.0	205.3		1,518.5
	Appropriations	740.2	256.5	195.4	109.4	208.9		1,510.4
	Expenditures	752.0	397.9	195.9		109.8	1,761.6	3,217.2
1954	Budget estimates	726.3	305.0	179.6	110.0	201.9	150.0	1,672.7
	Appropriations	751.4	422.5	179.6	96.2	202.6	130.0	1,782.3
	Expenditures	694.1	390.7	179.8		209.6	1,442.9	2,917.1
1955	Budget estimates	714.9	280.5	132.1	642.0	209.9		1,979.3
	Appropriations	738.6	398.0	132.1	550.2	207.7		2,026.5
	Expenditures	780.2	341.9	132.1		87.1	3,295.2	4,636.5
1956	Budget estimates	788.3	410.2	184.2	1.6	194.2		1,580.3
	Appropriations	809.4	408.0	184.2	1.6	198.7		1,601.9
	Expenditures	823.3	367.1	183.9		210.9	3,591.6	5,176.8
1957	Budget estimates	950.8	585.3	270.8	929.3	266.9	13.0	3,016.1
	Appropriations	924.5	1,993.5	270.8	929.3	246.0	13.0	3,583.1
	Expenditures	1,467.6	490.8	270.8		215.9	2,560.8	5,005.9
1958	Budget estimates	2,013.4	474.5	3,156.2	1,239.8	306.5		7,190.3
	Appropriations	1,732.9	448.5	3,156.5	1,239.8	294.1		6,871.7
	Expenditures	1,542.5	541.5	2,588.7		199.0	15.7	4,887.4
1959	Budget estimates	1,965.2	381.0		1,760.4	306.1		4,412.7
	Appropriations	[2] 1,847.8	594.0		1,760.4	306.1		4,508.3
	Expenditures (estimated)	1,793.6	646.0			252.5	3,828.4	6,520.5

[1] Represents reimbursements to Commodity Credit Corporation chiefly for prior-year costs of special commodity-disposal programs financed by CCC.

[2] Includes supplemental appropriations in accordance with the Department's request to the Senate Appropriations Committee. Budget estimates and estimated expenditures also include these supplemental items.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Just this week, Mr. President, I read an article written by an eminent American journalist. The point he made is that Ezra Taft Benson has been so highly successful that he has become a prominent contender for the Vice Presidential nomination on the Republican ticket in 1960.

I do not doubt the sincerity of this journalist. But I think he is wrong.

I wish these newspapermen who glorify Benson would measure his record against what has happened to the farmers of America since he took office in 1953.

I wish they would measure his record against what has happened to the housewife's food budget since he took office in 1953.

Most of all, I wish they would measure Mr. Benson's record against the promises that President Eisenhower made to the farmers of America when he was campaigning for their votes in 1952.

Certainly the President is an honorable man. Certainly he intended to carry out his campaign promises. And certainly he must have expected his Secretary of Agriculture to strive faithfully to implement those promises.

Secretary Benson has not done so. He has acted in direct contradiction to specific pledges by the President. He has moved in the opposite general direction from that promised by the President.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a verbatim transcript from General Eisenhower's most significant farm speech of 1952 inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Following are the major specific promises to farmers made by President Eisenhower in his 1952 election campaign; quoted directly from the official text of his speech at the national plowing contest, Kasson, Minn., September 6, 1952:

"And here and now, without any 'ifs' or 'buts,' I say to you that I stand behind—and the Republican Party stands behind—the price-support laws now on the books. This includes the amendment to the basic Farm Act, passed by votes of both parties in Congress, to continue through 1954 the price supports on basic commodities at 90 percent of parity. These price supports are only fair to the farmer to underwrite the exceptional risk he is now taking

"I firmly believe that agriculture is entitled to a fair, full share of the national income and it must be a policy of Government to help agriculture achieve this goal. And a fair share is not merely 90 percent of parity—but full parity.

"We must find sound methods of obtaining greater protection for our diversified farms. They yield the rich variety of meat, milk, eggs, fruits, and vegetables that support our nutritious national diet. As provided in the Republican platform, the nonperishable crops so important to the diversified farmer—crops such as oats, barley, rye, and soybeans—should be given the same protection as available to the major cash crops.

"The Democrats keep saying, 'There is no way of protecting perishables except through the Brannan plan.' But we can and will find a sound way to do the job without indulging in the moral bankruptcy of the Brannan plan.

"I give you this positive assurance: The Republican Party will use all the power it legitimately can use to see that American farmers obtain their full share of the income produced by a stable, prosperous country."

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday it was my privilege to exchange a few ideas with the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] in relation to what he referred to as the lack in our foreign policy. At that time I brought out the fact, which I think is very important, that conditions which we face throughout the world are generated by other people and other governments.

Among other things, I mentioned the Mid-East, with its racial influences for disintegration, the trouble between Israel and the Arabs, the influence of the Kremlin in seeking to take over the Mid-East, which has such large resources of oil, in attempting to penetrate that area, as it has attempted to penetrate every place else on the globe, with the sole objective in the Mid-East of getting a clutch hold on that portion of the globe, and particularly a clutch hold on the oil of that area. If the Soviets succeeded in doing so, of course, unless something were developed to meet the threat, the Soviets would have a clutch hold on Europe.

Among other things in the Mid-East is the ferment due to the desire of nationalism. We did not create the ferment. There is also the ferment due to economic conditions. We did not create the desire to obtain a higher level of living.

Consequently, when we seek remedies for situations, let us not say that we lack in our searching for what is appropriate to meet the problem head on, whether it be economic, political, or otherwise; let us say that the situation which exists has brought about conditions over which we have had no control.

I was pleased to note an editorial in the New York Times of today, in the last paragraph of which this idea is very much brought to the front. The editorial states:

The more pertinent question is whether this resolution—

The resolution of the Arab nations—

accepted by the Soviets and Nasser, will really stop them from continuing the policies that led to the crisis in the first place.

The editorial continues:

Their record for living up to pledges offers little optimism on that score.

Are we to blame? Is our foreign policy to blame for the lack of moral responsibility on the part of the Kremlin, on the part of Nasser and on the part of the Arab nations? I think what we have to do always, when failure seems to be on hand, is to diagnose the situation. If a man is sick, one must prescribe a remedy. The condition in the Mid-East is analogous to that of a sick man. We did not create the sickness. What we have been trying to do through the decades, by the expenditure of some $60 billion, is to see if we could provide an antidote for the illness.

I continue reading the editorial:

Their record for living up to pledges offers little optimism on that score. The American and British troops did stop them from engulfing Lebanon and Jordan—

Let me add, are we to blame because they wanted to engulf Lebanon and Jordan? No. We should be given credit for having stopped that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The 3 minutes allotted to the Senator from Wisconsin have expired. Does the Senator desire additional time?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WILEY. I should like to read again the sentence I had started to read:

The American and British troops did stop them from engulfing Lebanon and Jordan and may have even brought home to them the grave danger of their policies. In taking over the task of guarding Middle Eastern peace and security, the United Nations has assumed a grave responsibility, and one can only hope that it will prove equal to it.

I have one additional thought to suggest. I hope the Arab nations will see the need for genuinely carrying out in a responsible manner the plan they have submitted. I hope there will be a rebirth of responsibility, and that the Arab nations will keep faith and keep their word.

As I said on the floor a few days ago, it is our obligation to see to it that we remain alert and awake.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the New York Times be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ARAB PLAN FOR THE ARABS

The emergency session of the United Nations General Assembly has ended in a surprising climax by producing an all-Arab solution to the present crisis in the Middle East, which seems to be the best available at this time—if it will work. This solution is embodied in a resolution submitted by 10 Arab States, including embattled Lebanon and Jordan, and unanimously adopted by the Assembly as a promise of better things to come.

In effect this resolution, which is an Arab adaptation of the Western-backed Norwegian plan and embodies key points suggested by both President Eisenhower and Secretary General Hammarskjold, does the following:

It ignores and therewith repudiates the Soviet effort to steer the Assembly into a demand for the immediate withdrawal of the American and British troops in Lebanon and Jordan which would have implied a condemnation of their presence in these countries as aggression.

Instead, by invoking both the United Nations Charter and the Arab League pact, it enjoins both the Soviets and President Nasser to respect the established Arab governments and to abstain from interfering in their affairs with a view to changing them, as also provided in the various Assembly resolutions cited by President Eisenhower against fomenting civil strife.

It calls on Secretary General Hammarskjold to make such practical arrangements as would adequately help in upholding the purposes and principles of the charter in relation to Lebanon and Jordan in the present circumstances, which means upholding their sovereignty and independence against direct or indirect attack.

It specifically provides that such arrangements to master the present circumstances—created by Nasser's Soviet-backed drive for empire—are to create a new basis to facilitate the withdrawal of the American and British troops, which in effect vindicates their presence as long as the present circumstances prevail.

Finally, the resolution endorses President Eisenhower's proposal for a regional economic development agency for the Arab states.

What the practical arrangements are to be is for Secretary General Hammarskjold to determine in agreement with the affected Arab states. Since Jordan objects to any United Nations force on its soil and instead calls for assistance to its own army, the President's proposal for a United Nations peace force and avoidance of a new arms race in the area is sidetracked for the present. But to see in this a defeat for the United States patently represents an overly pessimistic view of American policy.

The more pertinent question is whether this resolution, accepted by the Soviets and Nasser, will really stop them from continuing the policies that led to the crisis in the first place. Their record for living up to pledges offers little optimism on that score. The American and British troops did stop them from engulfing Lebanon and Jordan and may have even brought home to them the grave danger of their policies. In taking over the task of guarding Middle Eastern peace and security, the United Nations has assumed a grave responsibility, and one can only hope that it will prove equal to it.

SENATOR MARTIN OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I was unable to be present in the Chamber yesterday when some of my colleagues paid tribute to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]. I cannot let this opportunity pass without paying tribute to him. In the 4 years in which I have been a Member of this body I have enjoyed no more pleasant association than my association with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, not only as an individual but as a Senator. I shall remember him and cherish his friendship as long as I shall live. I think I shall remember him particularly for his very fine and delicate sense of balance, not only in the field of the armed services, in which he has been active and interested all his life as a member in one capacity or another, but also I shall remember him as a very fine and good adviser upon the Finance Committee.

My wife and I both have enjoyed the friendship of Senator MARTIN and Mrs. Martin, and I take this occasion to wish him well, and to wish him the best of success in the new life which he has chosen for himself away from the United States Senate, which has been his complete life for these many years.

CLARIFICATION OF OIL-IMPORT STATISTICS

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, during the hearings before the Senate Finance Committee on the extension of the Trade Agreements Act, conflicting and misleading information was presented with respect to imports of petroleum.

Correct information in this regard is important in evaluating the effectiveness of the voluntary oil-import program. In order to clarify this situation and to make the facts available to those in Congress concerned with this problem, I recently requested the Secretary of Commerce to furnish information which would show the effectiveness of the voluntary program.

On August 12 I received a letter from Frederick H. Mueller, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, enclosing two tables obtained from the Department of the Interior setting forth monthly figures with respect to the relationship of domestic crude production to, first, crude-oil imports and, second, petroleum-product imports, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Relationship of crude production to crude and product imports

[Thousands of barrels per day]

UNITED STATES TOTAL

	Crude production	Crude imports	Product imports			Total imports	Crude imports percent of production	Total imports percent of production
			Residual	Other	Total			
1957—July	6,864	1,217	358	63	421	1,638	17.7	23.9
August	6,776	1,299	359	79	438	1,737	19.2	25.6
September	6,886	1,072	336	80	416	1,488	15.6	21.6
October	6,842	1,055	430	74	504	1,559	15.4	22.8
November	6,816	941	470	116	586	1,527	13.8	22.4
December	6,929	1,049	622	82	704	1,753	15.1	25.2
Average	6,852	1,107	436	82	518	1,625	16.2	23.7

Relationship of crude production to crude and product imports—Continued

[Thousands of barrels per day]

UNITED STATES TOTAL

	Crude production	Crude imports	Product imports			Total imports	Crude imports percent of production	Total imports percent of production
			Residual	Other	Total			
1958—January	6,865	1,024	660	133	793	1,817	14.9	26.5
February	6,809	830	640	143	783	1,613	12.2	23.7
March	6,273	1,012	500	118	618	1,630	16.1	26.0
April	6,288	861	555	205	760	1,621	13.7	25.8
May	6,233	935	484	190	674	1,455	15.0	23.3
June (estimated)	6,327	937	403	310	713	1,650	14.8	26.1
Average	6,462	935	539	183	722	1,657	14.5	25.6

STOCKS OF ALL OILS

[Thousands of barrels]

	Stocks	Inventory change	Change per day
June 30, 1957	802,384		
Dec. 31, 1957	841,317	+38,933	+212
May 31, 1958	767,822	[1] 73,495	−487
For the period		−34,562	−103

[1] 5 months.

Relationship of crude production to crude and product imports

[Thousands of barrels per day]

DISTRICT I THROUGH DISTRICT IV

	Crude production	Crude imports	Product imports			Total imports	Crude imports percent of production	Total import percent of production
			Residual	Other	Total			
1957—July	5,939	878	358	63	421	1,299	14.8	21.9
August	5,847	1,003	359	79	438	1,441	17.2	24.6
September	5,952	781	336	68	404	1,185	13.1	19.9
October	5,915	793	430	70	500	1,293	13.4	21.9
November	5,886	671	470	111	581	1,252	11.4	21.3
December	6,001	788	622	76	698	1,486	13.1	24.8
Average	5,923	820	429	78	507	1,327	13.8	22.4
1958—January	5,951	854	600	123	783	1,637	14.4	27.5
February	5,923	684	640	137	777	1,461	11.5	24.7
March	5,399	860	500	110	610	1,470	15.9	27.2
April	5,429	721	555	182	737	1,458	13.3	26.9
May	5,383	752	387	169	556	1,308	14.0	24.3
June (estimate)	5,495	737	403	264	667	1,404	13.4	25.6
Average	5,593	770	522	164	686	1,456	13.8	26.0

STOCKS OF ALL OILS

[Thousands of barrels]

	Stocks	Inventory change	Change per day
June 30, 1957	694,170		
Dec. 31, 1957	703,338	+9,168	+50
May 31, 1958	625,879	[1] −77,459	−513
For the period		−68,291	−204

[1] 5 months.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, it will be noted that the first table applies to the entire United States. The second table applies to districts I-IV, which is that portion of the United States east of the Rockies.

The first table shows that total imports into the United States during the last 6 months of 1957 amounted to 23.7 percent of domestic production. For the first 6 months of 1958, total imports increased to 25.6 percent of domestic production.

The voluntary program to limit oil imports was inaugurated in July 1957. The above information from official Government sources shows that during the period in which this program has been effective, total oil imports have increased rather than decreased. Total imports averaged 32,000 barrels daily higher in the second 6 months of the program than in the first 6 months.

There is another important fact to observe from these official statistics. While total petroleum imports increased 32,000 barrels daily, United States crude oil production decreased 390,000 barrels daily. This reduction in domestic production was necessary because of excessive imports and in order to correct burdensome inventories of above-ground stocks.

The extent to which oil imports during the past 12 months have increased over prior periods is shown in the following table:

Period	Ratio of crude oil and petroleum product imports to production (percent)
1936–41	4.9
1942–45	4.9
1946–53	12.6
1954	16.6
1955	18.3
1956	20.1
1957 (last 6 months)	23.7
1958 (first 6 months)	25.6

The statistical information furnished by Assistant Secretary Mueller shows that while imports of crude petroleum have shown a commendable drop since the voluntary oil import program has been in effect, relief to the domestic industry unfortunately has been more than offset by the large increase in refined product imports. Comparing the first 6 months of the program with the second 6 months, crude oil imports show a decrease of 172,000 barrels daily. However, product imports show an increase of 204,000 barrels daily which more than offsets the reduction made in crude oil imports.

The second table supplied to me by Assistant Secretary Mueller, which covers districts I–IV—the eastern portion of the United States—shows during the 12 months ending in June imports of crude oil into this area amounted to 13.8 percent of crude production. The President's Cabinet Committee which instituted the voluntary program recommended that crude oil imports into districts I–IV be limited to 12 percent of production in that area. Many of us have felt that the goal set by the committee and adopted by the President of 12 percent, was too high. Without arguing that point, it is extremely disturbing to see that the program has not even attained the goal set. This information shows that in the eastern part of the United States crude oil imports alone have exceeded the goal by some 100,000 barrels daily. At the same time product imports into these districts have increased at an alarming degree.

These facts concerning the effectiveness of the voluntary program to limit oil imports fully justify the recent action of Congress in strengthening the Defense Amendment, section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955.

This new law, together with the facts outlined by Assistant Secretary Mueller, place a responsibility on the Administration to make an early reappraisal of the oil import problem.

ADMIRAL HYMAN G. RICKOVER

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, during the past 2 weeks, many references have been made to the fight in 1953 to obtain the promotion of Admiral Rickover.

In 1953 the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] made a special appearance before the Armed Services Committee to present the Rickover story to his colleagues. Senator JACKSON played a key role in the fight to retain the services of Admiral Rickover. His address to the committee was—and is today—an impressive document which should be read by all those concerned for our scientific and technical progress.

I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief excerpt from the Atomic Submarine and Admiral Rickover, by Clay Blair, Jr. This excerpt includes the text of the statement by Senator JACKSON before the Committee on Armed Services.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When the committee finally met in closed session, many of its members had more than simply a casual interest in the case and were impatient to question the Navy brass, especially Admiral Wallin. They had been impressed by the willingness of the members of the naval group to lay their Government careers on the block, simply to set the record straight. When Senator JACKSON (not a member of the committee) rose to make a special address, the Senators listened attentively. Behind closed doors, JACKSON addressed the distinguished group thus:

"I am not here as an advocate of Captain Rickover. My only acquaintance with him has been completely official, in connection with my previous work on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

"I am here as a former member of the Reactor Development Subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy which has jurisdiction over the atomic-submarine program—and as one intensely interested in the atomic defenses and the atomic progress for peace in our country.

"I am here as an advocate of the kind of program which will achieve scientific victories for the Navy and the United States in the future—scientific victories as important as battle victories of the past. Today scientific progress spells military strength, and to cite two obvious examples, our part in World War II began with a disaster, in part because our military was not familiar enough with the capabilities of radar. It ended with a revolution—the dropping of two atomic bombs on Nagasaki and Hiroshima. Both were examples of the application of science to military needs. In one, we had failed to master our technology; in one, we had.

"This association of science and the military has raised many problems, and we all know they are not easy problems.

"But there is one lesson you learn almost as soon as you look into the problem of research and development for the sake of national security: scientific genius is not to be found and developed solely through the ordinary course of military conformity and the philosophy of never sticking your neck out. If slavish acceptance of barnacle-encrusted views, if going along with past and traditional methods, if striving to make one's manners and methods go along in complete uniformity with the rest of the service—if these things are to be the price of promotion in the technical branches of the services, I honestly fear for the security of our country.

"German science once led the world; Hitler reined it through trying to regiment minds which cannot be regimented and fruitful at the same time. Long before we bombed the Nazi laboratories, Hitler had blown them to bits by requiring conformity to the theories of the past. The men who wanted to build him an atomic bomb were not listened to; in some important fields Hitler relied on the weapons of the past; Europe's nonconformist refugees—Lise Meitner, Leo Szilard, Hans Bethe, and Einstein, and others—built the weapons of the future.

"Today we know that Russia captured parts of 75 snorkel submarines of the latest model the Nazis built. She has the weapon of the past—and it is a formidable one. But does she have the industry and the science to build the weapon of the future—the atomic submarine? We do not know. But we know the atomic submarine is more than a match for the snorkel.

"Has America the genius to build the atomic submarine—and the atomic aircraft carrier? Yes, we have, if we use it. But while our science and engineering leads the world, we should remember what Germany did, and what Russia herself apparently is now doing—smothering her original technical minds beneath a blanket of uniformity.

"The gist of my feeling is this: Effective scientists and effective engineers do not behave like puppets. We should not expect it of them. But nonetheless the best minds of the military must understand the best minds of our technology.

"Toeing the line, total obedience, and total conformity may be essential to success in battle—but they are not the factors which make for great forward strides in technical battles.

"Original minds, men with imagination, men with the driving genius to get revolutionary things done, must be able to find a place in the armed services—and they must be able to bring forward and advocate their fresh ideas without fear of reprisal.

"Today I believe the case of Captain Rickover is a prime example of how not to treat splendid creative technical officers in the armed services.

"The captain has twice been bypassed for promotion to the rank of read admiral, and younger officers of his project have likewise served for long period without promotion. The whole project has been treated as an orphan. In the Air Force the man who heads a similar project and performs the same work as Rickover does has the rank of general—and yet the Air Force project is not going nearly as well.

"Having been passed over twice, Rickover is scheduled to be retired.

"The truth of the matter is that the Navy atomic-power program only began to move when Rickover and the charter members of what became the Rickover team, went to Oak Ridge in 1946. He has led the atomic-power program ever since.

"To get more trained men, he was instrumental in starting the School of Reactor Technology. He returned to Washington and there took on, single-handed, the job of convincing the high command of the Navy. Later he had a somewhat similar struggle to convince the Atomic Energy Commission to start on actual construction of the atomic reactor.

"Meanwhile he assembled an unparalleled crew of young technicians, naval officers, and civilians, who today know as much about atomic power as any similar group in the country. The strangest fact of all is that not even at other places in the Atomic Energy Commission is there more progress than there is on the Rickover project. Speed toward peacetime uses of atomic power is also at stake in this case.

"Rickover has proved a wizard at getting the right men to overcome technical obstacles, and he has proved an administrative dynamo in meeting production schedules.

"It was Rickover who insisted that the pilot plant be built in a space to fit a submarine hull; not first built in a larger space and followed by a second plant based on the experience of the first. This saved years of precious time, although it made a much tougher project.

"It was Rickover who conceived and executed the unique arrangement whereby his unit is a component part of both the Navy and the Atomic Energy Commission. People working for the services and the civilian agency work side by side. This has been an enormous help in the peculiar nature of this assignment.

"Time and again Rickover has insisted on surmounting technical problems others thought impossible. He has insisted that the whole submarine be designed to be simple in operation—so it can be operated by ordinary seamen, not doctors of philosophy. They are well on the way to such a powerplant and sub—with obvious advantages for the civilian powerplants to come. Time and

again he has insisted that his people do the impossible.

"On the administrative side, Rickover has been tireless in selling the facts and theories of atomic power to the Navy's high command and in bringing together as one great team the Navy, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Westinghouse, General Electric, and Electric Boat Co.'s, and all the other groups pushing this program. Admiral Wallin's statement describes several historic letters and speeches by the Secretary of the Navy, by Admiral Nimitz, by Admiral Mills, who formerly headed the Bureau of Ships. But it does not say that almost every one of these letters and milestones in authorizing the atomic submarine were written in, or based on, reports prepared in Rickover's office and nowhere else. At most places of decision it was Rickover who had gone personally, a man with a mission, on repeated visits to the officials concerned, and persuaded them to take the decisive steps. Don't forget, either, the atomic-propelled carrier—for which Rickover had fought as hard as the submarine and which today is going forward.

"I respectfully urge this committee to make a detailed and thorough investigation of this entire matter."

JACKSON'S speech was followed by a carefully chosen list of questions, which he suggested that the committee address to the Navy. Among the questions: "Just who are the several Navy captains who have been in the program since its inception?" "How many of the admirals who passed on the qualification of Rickover for admiral had ever seen any of the atomic installations, or the nuclear-powered devices Rickover and his group had created?" "Was it not true that most of the acts ascribed to the Bureau of Ships were actually performed by Captain Rickover and his group?" And so on.

The committee became fully aroused.

CIVIL DEFENSE PROCLAMATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks, on behalf of my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], a proclamation of New York Elks Lodge No. 1, relating to civil defense.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELKS NEW YORK LODGE NO. 1

PROCLAMATION—CIVIL DEFENSE

Whereas New York Lodge No. 1, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks at the regular meeting held on Wednesday evening, August 20, 1958, at 353 West 57th Street, New York City, N. Y., passed and adopted a resolution urging all officers and members to actively participate and cooperate with all local civil defense directors for the protection of life and property throughout the State of New York against enemy attack, including chemical, biological, and radiological attack, as follows:

Whereas at the 94th session of the Grand Lodge Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the United States of America, held in New York City, N. Y., at the Hotel Sheraton Astor, from July 6 to July 10, 1958, inclusive, it adopted a resolution reading as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the board of grand trustees of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, with the approval of the grand exalted ruler, be authorized to levy an assessment not exceeding $1 per year from each of the 1,200,000 members of our order, such funds to be expended by the Elks National Service Commission for the purpose of national defense and the welfare of the Nation, if an emergency should occur, and that the grand exalted ruler, with the approval of the board of trustees, be authorized to augment the sum so made by an amount not to exceed $25,000 from the grand lodge fund, to be expended at the discretion of the commission, for the same purpose"; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States enacted into law, the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, which became effective January 12, 1951, and which was merged into the Office of Defense and Civilian Mobilization by Executive order of the President. This law sets forth that it is the policy and intent of Congress that the responsibility for civil defense shall be vested jointly in the Federal Government and the several States and their political subdivisions. It further declared that the Federal Government shall provide necessary direction, coordination and guidance, as amended by the Congress on July 28, 1958; and

Whereas the Legislature of the State of New York enacted the New York Defense Emergency Act, laws of 1951, chapter 784, establishing the New York Defense Council, continuing the State Civil Defense Commission, providing for State and local governmental powers during the defense emergency; and

Whereas the Legislature of the State of New York has found that there exists a serious danger that this State will be subjected to enemy attack, including chemical, biological, and radiological attack; and

Whereas the legislatures of other States have also passed similar legislation and have found that a serious danger exists, making them subject to enemy attack; and

Whereas the defense of the United States of America, in this thermonuclear age is the immediate concern of all patriotic American citizens: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the officers and members of New York Lodge No. 1, B. P. O. E. are urged to offer the cooperation of our lodge to the Honorable Leo A. Hoegh, Director of the Office of Defense and Civilian Mobilization, Washington, D. C.; Maj. Gen. Ralph J. Olson, president, National Association of State Civil Defense Directors, and the Director of Civilian Defense for the State of Wisconsin, State Capitol, Madison, Wis.; and Lt. Gen. C. R. Huebner, immediate past president of said national association, and the director of the New York State Civil Defense Commission, 124 East 28th Street, New York City, N. Y.; and be it further

Resolved, That New York Lodge No. 1, immediately appeal to the Grand Lodge, B. P. O. E., all State Elks associations, and all subordinate lodges, to cooperate with all local civil defense directors in all target-support areas and all civil defense jurisdictions thereof; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be mailed to the President and Vice President of the United States and the various Federal interested agencies; the Honorable Averell Harriman, Governor of the State of New York; and to the governors of the several States; Director Leo A. Hoegh; Maj. Gen. Ralph J. Olson; Lt. Gen. C. R. Huebner; the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the majority and minority leaders of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives and the interested chairmen of the various committees of both Houses; the majority and minority leaders of the New York State Senate and the New York State Assembly; the speaker of the assembly and the interested chairmen of the various committees of both the senate and the assembly; Mr. Horace R. Wisely, grand exalted ruler, and the secretary of the Grand Lodge of the B. P. O. E. of America; Hon. James T. Hallinan, P. G. E. R., and chairman of the Elks National Service Commission; Mr. James R. Nicholson, P. G. E. R., and general manager of the Elks magazine, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.; and such organizations as the chambers of commerce, Kiwanis, Rotary, American Legion, Masons, Eagles, Odd Fellows, Red Men, Knights of Columbus, Knights of Pythias, business and professional men and women organizations throughout the United States, and parents' associations.

In testimony whereof, I, Raymond Tese, exalted ruler, and Eugene C. Heffernan, past exalted ruler and secretary, have hereunto set our hands and caused the seal of said New York Lodge No. 1, Benevolent and Protective Order of the Elks, to be hereunto affixed, the 20th day of August, in the year of our Lord, one thousand nine hundred and fifty-eight, the 183d year of the independence of the United States of America.

RAYMOND TESE, *Exalted Ruler.*
EUGENE C. HEFFERNAN, *Secretary.*

A SALUTE TO CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, it is so easy to criticize when it is found that someone's performance is not up to standard, as is frequently done by Members of Congress and the general public about those people working for the Federal Government.

We should take note on occasion to compliment those who are carrying on the everyday services of government when performance far exceeds what is considered normal.

I make particular reference to civil service employees in the State of Colorado. Both the executive branch and Congress have attempted to reduce Federal expenditures by pruning budget requests from departments and agencies of government. This has necessitated carrying on with fewer personnel doing as much as or more than had been done previously.

Let me cite specifically the Denver FHA office, headed by Charles F. Warden, Director, which serves the entire State of Colorado. In May, June, and July of 1957 they had processed to completion 1,563 applications for mortgage insurance. In this same period this year they processed 4,763 cases. In these months the Denver office attained production ratios of 20.5, 25.8, and 28.5, as compared to national averages of 18.3, 20.9, and 21.2.

The tremendous upsurge in home building and home financing activities has not been matched by increases in staff of FHA offices. Yet, under severe handicaps, the loyal employees have performed magnificently and served well the home-buying public.

While I have specific figures only for the Federal Housing Administration, I am sure that employees in other agencies have done as well under equally trying circumstances.

Some national and area statistics would denote very clearly, Mr. President, what has been happening in the housing economy, and support my belief that there is due the Federal employee an accolade for superior performance.

At its employment peak in 1957, FHA received for 1 month slightly under 30,000 applications, and completed them at the rate of 5.2 cases per processing employee. At its peak in 1958, the receipts for 1 month have been just over 100,000 which were processed at the rate of 21.2

per processing employee; four times the production for the same period of last year.

We must remember also that, in addition to the caseload of home mortgage applications cited above, these FHA offices also processed projects under Rental, Military, Urban Renewal, Elderly, and Cooperative Sections of the National Housing Act. Capehart military housing and housing for the elderly have been particularly active programs in Colorado.

This birds-eye view demonstrates, Mr. President, that one element of our economy is vigorous to the extent that its activities exceed that of prior prosperity years, a condition which I am sure obtains in more segments of the economy than the proponents of gloom care to admit.

Let me close by reiterating my admiration for those Federal employees in Colorado, and throughout the Nation who, under handicaps of more work with fewer people, are doing so well in the field of public service.

THE LATE JOHN J. PARKER, CHIEF JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH DISTRICT

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on March 17, 1958, one of America's greatest jurists of all time, John J. Parker, Chief Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, passed from the scene of his earthly labors. His contributions to the law will last as long as our constitutional system endures. In order that legal historians of the future may have convenient access to some appraisals of the life and services of this great judge made by those who knew him while he walked among us in the flesh, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks the following:

A Tribute to John J. Parker, which was delivered by his longtime friend, Dr. Frank P. Graham, a former member of this body, at a memorial service conducted in the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit at Richmond, Va., on April 22, 1958.

A Tribute to John J. Parker, which was delivered by his longtime associate on the bench, Judge Morris A. Soper, at the memorial service conducted in the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit at Richmond, Va., on April 22, 1958.

An article by Don Oberdorfer entitled "John Parker Was a Judicial Giant," which appeared in the Charlotte Observer for March 18, 1958.

An article by Harry Golden entitled "Great Tar Heel: John J. Parker," which appeared in the Charlotte Observer for March 18, 1958.

Contemporary editorials from the Asheville Citizen, the Carolina Israelite, the Charlotte Observer, the Greensboro Daily News, the Morganton News-Herald, the Winston-Salem Journal, the Charleston Evening Post, the Charleston News and Courier, the Christian Science Monitor, the Northern Virginia Sun, the Washington Evening Star, and the Washington Post.

Extracts from contemporary editorials from the Richmond Times-Dispatch, the Gastonia Gazette, the Knoxville News-Sentinel, the Durham Herald, the Raleigh News and Observer, and the Monroe Journal, which were collected in the Charlotte Observer for March 23, 1958.

There being no objection, the tributes, articles, and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greensboro Daily News of May 4, 1958]

A TRIBUTE TO JOHN J. PARKER: "ONE OF THE GREATEST JURISTS OF OUR TIME"

(One of the great North Carolinians of our generation died recently in Washington. At a memorial service for him in Richmond, Va., last month, another great Tar Heel, his college classmate and friend, extolled his worth.)

(By Dr. Frank Porter Graham, United Nations Mediator)

We gather here not so much in the sorrow of our grievous loss, deep and personal to us all, but more in the resilient joy of his friendship, the fond recollection of everlasting associations, the nobility of his character, and in the triumph of his spirit over defeat and tragedy, time and circumstance.

In this brief compass of his life and within my own limitations, I am not adequate to do more than suggest the origin, the quality, and the range of the life and services of this man. Starting with little money and no pull, by sheer integrity of work and relentless will, he climbed the judicial heights of his time but never lost the common touch and remained loyal to old friends and appreciative of their meaning in their common life.

John Parker, by personal sympathy and by the unpretentious life of his father, a highly respected merchant in the small historic town of Monroe, was proudly a man of the people in the full dignity of our North Carolina democracy.

UP FROM POVERTY

Characteristic of many North Carolina families who triumphed over their small incomes in a resurgent State on the way up from post bellum poverty into a more general well-being through education and industry, he seldom spoke either of poverty or lineage. Through his mother and his descent from Colonial Albemarle, he had either direct or collateral heritage from a professor of Oriental languages at the University of Glasgow, a colonial governor who served the longest period of any governor in the history of North Carolina, and a post-Revolutionary governor who was one of the leading Federalists of his day. The Associate Justice of the Supreme Court from North Carolina appointed by George Washington is still the only North Carolinian who has sat on that Court, which his descendant, John J. Parker, missed by one vote in the Senate of the United States.

From the still vivid day of our first meeting on the old Cape Fear and Yadkin Valley Railroad in 1904 to the memorable day of our last conversation in New York the Saturday before he died, he became the sort of friend who illuminated the human pilgrimage with the light of a high-intent, the warmth of a joyous comradeship and the loyalty that was most sure when the road was most rough.

ON GUARD AT OLD EAST

Clearly I can see him now, when I was a freshman at the University of North Carolina and he was the leader of the junior class, standing in the doorway of the middle entrance of the oldest State university building in America, in which then roomed a number of other freshmen—Bob Bryant, Lunsford Long, David Oliver, Curtis Howard, Oscar Coffin, Richard Eames, Walter Currie, Macaulay Costner and Charles Tillett, all staunch friends of Parker throughout their lives. There he stood, in his tall strength and dignity, on guard that no marauding sophomores should subject any freshman in the Old East to the indignities of the barbarous hazing of those traditional days, now long gone at Chapel Hill. He even chose two freshmen, Kemp Battle and me, to be his joint agents in selling clothes for Strouse Brothers of Baltimore, thereby earning our clothes during our college years. With all his pressing need for his hard-earned money, his measurements of the clothes which he merchandised were known on the campus to be "all wool and a yard wide."

John Parker and Charles Tillett were distinguished as the two hardest working students and the most consistently regular in their daily routine and personal habits. You could tell the time of day by the schedule of their movements, studies and exercise. John Parker was always a prodigious worker with little or no waste motion, but with time for a friendly chat, a bit of fun and a helping hand. He led his class in scholarship, won the Greek Prize, the Bryan Prize, and the Mangum Medal in oratory.

ZEST FOR SCHOLARSHIP

He was president of the Dialectic Literary and Debating Society, famous since the close of the 18th century. Parker's inaugural address, as president of the Di in the early 20th century, was reminiscent of the brilliant address of another president of the Dialectic Society and first honor man of his class in the early 19th century, James K. Polk of the class of 1816. John Parker, as a student, had a zest for discussion, for polemics on almost any subject, religious, philosophical, literary, political, economic, and especially on the hot current issues of student life, its freedoms and responsibilities. With E. S. W. Dameron, he was a winner in intercollegiate debates with the University of Georgia; with W. P. Stacy, later chief justice of North Carolina Supreme Court, he won the intercollegiate debate with George Washington University. Parker was one of those student leaders who helped to build in Chapel Hill a campus climate of opinion and attitudes in which excellence in scholarship, literature, debate and leadership were no less renowned among students than triumphs in intercollegiate athletics.

PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE

Foremost leader of the insurgent nonfraternity democracy of the University of North Carolina, he was throughout life a champion of the equal freedom and dignity of the individual person. He was essentially a progressive conservative who would conserve the best of our heritage and advance the fairest of our hopes. For him progressive measures were not to be the exhibitions of superficial novelty and passing popularity, but, in their deeper meaning, were to be the revelation of enduring values of equal freedom and justice under law for all.

To the University of North Carolina, for more than 50 years he gave the utmost of his mind and heart, whether as a foremost student, a most devoted alumnus, or a never-failing trustee and guiding spirit on the executive committee of the board, where he championed with Josephus Daniels, Max Gardner, Cameron Morrison, and others, the responsible freedom of the administration and the faculty, and the consolidation of the University at Chapel Hill, the North Carolina State College in Raleigh, and the Woman's College in Greensboro into one three-fold university of the people of North Carolina. Second only to the love which he ever gave to his saintly mother, and his

devoted wife, Maria, who sustained him in the heights and depths of their beautiful life together, was the love he gave his alma mater.

For John Parker the transitions of leadership were a natural evolution from high responsibility in a campus democracy to leadership in one of the original historic States to eminent influence in the Federal Union of States and in the international affairs of the free concert of nations.

NEVER EMBITTERED

As a Republican in a dominantly Democratic State, his defeats in strenuous high-level political campaigns for Congress, for State attorney general, and for governor, never embittered but rather schooled him for later victories of the spirit over disappointments and sorrows which might have undermined the character of a man without his high faith in the democratic process, generous understanding, and dauntless courage. With wisdom tempered by experience, preeminent became his services on the court of the fourth circuit in which he served as the chief judge, the senior Federal judge, and the judicial peer under 4 of the 14 Chief Justices of the Supreme Court. He wrote some 1,500 opinions, unsurpassed in numbers and epochal in basic cases for civil liberties, religious freedom, the right of the National Government and the local community to cooperate in the use of public money for public power, and for the right of a member of a labor union to sue the union for damages on account of discrimination because of race.

BEFORE AND AFTER

It was a part of his loyalty to the Constitution, the courts, and the law of the land that he, as a circuit judge, supported the position of the Supreme Court as it stood before and then as it stood after the epoch-making decision of 1954. It is notable that following the decision of the Supreme Court, in the hot southern area of civil rights, the chief justice for the fourth circuit, second only to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, wrote the basic opinions which provided the clear-cut interpretations and feasible implementation of the historic decision which did not compel integration but did prohibit legal segregation in the public schools on account of race or color.

Almost unanimous has been the judgment of Federal and State judges and lawyers, that, in the improvement of the procedures and administration of justice in the Federal courts, Judge Parker stands preeminent in the history of American jurisprudence.

It is recalled that an eminent English jurist, who sat with Judge Parker, the alternate American judge on the international tribunal for the trial of the Nazi leaders charged with war crimes against humanity, himself visited the United States in tribute to the quiet but profound character of the eminently judicial services of Judge Parker on that tribunal.

The life and service of John Parker today add to the democratic meaning of the homes and public schools of Monroe, N. C., the rock walls and ivied halls of the University of North Carolina, the Federal Building and Queens Road of Charlotte, and to the court of the fourth circuit in this capital on the James River in old Virginia, whose flag of responsible representative government under law must ever fly free and high in the modern world.

Over this hall now hovers the immortal spirit of John Johnston Parker. About this bench and these seats will always cluster the precious memories of a gracious gentleman, a learned scholar, and one of the great jurists of our time.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN J. PARKER, BY JUDGE MORRIS A. SOPER

To speak of Judge Parker with reverence and affection in this company of distinguished men of the law in this place, where he spoke with so much authority, is a compelling need to those of us who sat with him on this court. But we cannot be expected to speak objectively or adequately, for the terrible wrench of his sudden passing is too recent and the sense of our personal loss is too immediate and too deep. At this very moment it is hardly possible to realize that an important meeting is taking place in his courtroom without his commanding presence in the chair.

We are bewildered as to how we shall carry on without him. The truth of the matter is that we shall not be able to carry on as he did in many related fields; and it is this fact that sets him apart as a great and meaningful figure in the law in the past 40 years. To be the chief judge of one of the important courts of the country, to lead in the hearing of litigated cases, in the writing of opinions, and in the administration of the affairs of a busy Federal circuit would seem to be enough to satisfy any man; but it was not enough to satisfy Judge Parker, or to exhaust his abundant energies. You have been told of the astounding campaign which he conducted to improve the administration of justice, not merely in the Federal courts, but more particularly in the State courts, when he literally crossed the country from coast to coast and moved the legal profession with the intensity of his conviction that the courts of the country should be more efficiently conducted. We felt the impulse here in the east. Chief Justice Hudgins, who with all his colleagues honors us with his presence today, responded to the call when he came to head the historic court which sits on Virginia's beautiful Capitol Hill. Maryland responded to it by establishing a self-conscious modern system of courts with the chief judge of the State at the head. I have never heard a more powerful speech than that which Judge Parker delivered when he came to Baltimore to speak on this subject. So it was throughout the country. It seemed as if some titanic Atlas had shifted the columns which support the overarching canopy of the law and let in the wholesome light of day.

This specific project was perhaps his greatest voluntary contribution to the life of the law as portrayed in the judicial establishment of the country; but only those who were near to him could realize the number and variety of the responses which he made year after year to speak on legal subjects and enliven legal gatherings of leading lawyers in all sections of the country. When he scented danger to our constitutional structure, as in the proposed Bricker Amendment, he poured into the opposition every resource that his well-stocked mind and his superb equipment as a public speaker could command.

Added to this, as you have been told, was his part in the administration of the American Law Institute, the most important and rewarding project of our time for the clarification of the substantive law which governs the life of the Nation. It was inevitable that a judge of his stature should be called upon to give of his wisdom and experience, and equally inevitable that a man of his character should respond without stint.

Only those who served with him on the Judicial Conference of the United States, under four successive Chief Justices, can know how much work was piled on his broad shoulders as chairman of numerous committees in the past quarter of a century—much of it tedious, laborious, time-consuming, and unseen even by the legal profession. Time and time again when he came back to us from these meetings he was aweary of the burdens that he had brought with him. But never did he refuse to carry more than his fair share.

All of these things combined to produce a press of business and responsibility that in the end proved to be to much for even his extraordinary strength and determination. It was in complete harmony with the part he played in the drama of public affairs that when the sudden crash came he was in the midst of a laborious journey in the interest of the profession. It was a tragic but yet a glorious end of a great career, and we take some comfort in the fact that when he was stricken he fell almost literally into the arms of the youngest member of this court, who in the long reach of the years ahead may succeed to the place he held. Judge Haynsworth can attest the fact that Judge Parker gave his life in the performances of labors over and above the call of duty.

It has been a great challenge and a rich experience to be a member of this court which stood at the very heart of his work. It was not difficult for him to lead the court, for all he had to do was to be himself. However, that self was no ordinary person, and the work was no ordinary performance but, rather, the fulfillment of the main purpose of his life. For recreation he seemed to have no need, and his great natural abilities were directed with such intensity that his associates of necessity gave of their best to keep in the running. He never entered this court room without being prepared, and frequently this meant work into the midnight hours, almost as if it was his part to present the cases to the court, rather than to listen to what others had prepared for his hearing. Often counsel were well-nigh taken off their feet by his swift understanding of the crucial point of the controversy. Sometimes it must have seemed to them that the case was decided before they were heard, for it was quite impossible for one of his experience not to form some opinion from reading the briefs, and he had no hesitancy in disclosing what was in his mind. This served a useful purpose, for, in truth, his mind was still in balance. Not infrequently, I am sure, one side was surprised and the other was disappointed when the decision came down, to learn that he had adopted the opposing view. What they had seen was the working of a powerful mind seeking to find the right answer.

He was never inattentive or indifferent, no matter how trival the matter or unimportant the business before him. Indeed, those who sat with him came to realize that the weakness or ineptness of the parties or their attorneys made a strong appeal to the generous warmth of his inner nature so that he was wont to lend a helping hand.

And when the going was rough, and the issues were intricate and hard to understand, he was quite willing to disregard the rules and let counsel run over the allotted time. He listened with equal interest to one side as to the other, even suggesting arguments and illustration to the side with which he obviously disagreed. A hearing to him was a part of the judicial process; but it was part of his job and he enjoyed it.

He was learned in the law but his learning was not his master, it was his servant. It did not blind him to the equities of the case before him, and one was always conscious of a mighty effort on his part to cut through the complexities of factual detail and the mass of precedents to reach a fair and just conclusion. Any rule of law that seemed to stand in the way was suspect, and the full strength of his mind was put forth to show that it was not applicable without impairing the structure of the law.

He had extraordinary ability in condensing into brief compass the essential elements of a complicated situation, and his array of legal principles with supporting authorities marched with such power that even in a close case the conclusion seemed inevitable. Every opinion was written in longhand with

scrupulous care and then examined and re-examined so as to be free from error, and phrased in the most attractive style. His last opinion was still in manuscript when he was stricken. It was in the hands of Miss Jennie Beam, his faithful secretary who, during his entire judicial career of 33 years, was able, alone, in some marvelous way, to handle all of his manifold business. It was waiting for his last finishing touches. It will be published as it came from his hand. All of the 1,500 opinions which he wrote were prepared in this way. Covering every field of Federal litigation during decades of rapidly expanding governmental power, they constitute a great body of legal writing that has profoundly influenced all of the Federal courts, not excepting the Supreme Court itself.

Let me say again that this was work enough for any ordinary man. Some years ago in Richmond, in an important gathering of judicial officers, the scholarly chief judge of a great State was heard to say that he was profoundly concerned with every opinion that emanated from his court, lest some error should creep in and mar the symmetry of the law, and that this work absorbed all of his energies, leaving none for the supervisory administration of the courts of the State. There can be no doubt that the speaker rendered a great public service when he expended all the energy at his command in supervising the output of his court. Judge Parker, on the other hand, was able to do all this and more beside. No opinion came from his court, whether he sat in the case or not, that he did not examine and, if need be, criticize with meticulous care; but, in addition, he was forever on the watch to detect unwarranted delays in the prosecution of cases throughout the circuit, and ever diligent in seeing that the overburden of one district judge was lightened by the aid of his colleagues in other areas.

Besides all this, the great lift to the life of the law which he gave by setting up the judicial conference, as we know it in the fourth circuit, was of inestimable value. It was a great achievement to bring together every year from five historic States the Federal judges and the judges from the State supreme courts, the leading law officers in their governments, the Federal prosecuting attorneys, the leaders in legal education, and lawyers in active practice in the entire area, to discuss important questions in procedural reform and related social problems. Men were lifted up from their absorbing personal concerns so as to be able to see the legal profession as a whole and to realize the importance of the law as the essential governing force of society. So great and so manifest have been the benefits that the Judicial Conference has become an established fixture in every Federal circuit and in many of the States of the Union.

One might easily infer that these accomplishments could come from a man of rare ability and dignity but with little room for human sympathies. This, however, would not be true of our friend and colleague. No one ever entered his chambers without receiving a welcoming smile. He was never too busy to listen. His working day might be lengthened in the process, but that was his cheerful contribution of which you were not told. He had a genuine affection for his fellow man. Every little child that passed him on the street brought to his countenance a heartwarming smile.

This is the man we have lost and we shall mourn his passing. Yet we rejoice that our profession, our circuit, this very court, has given to the Nation a man whose great abilities were given without stint and without deviation to the single purpose of serving the establishment of the law that justice may be done among men.

I have spoken for the court today at the request of Judge Sobeloff, whose addition to the court gave Judge Parker much satisfaction. Let me express on behalf of all the members of the court the comfort and pride we take in the contributions that have been made today by the Chief Justice of the United States and by other distinguished speakers at this ceremony. Our hearts are touched also by the presence of those who loved Judge Parker and valued his career. In the 67 years of the court's existence he was the youngest man ever to be called to sit upon its bench and he served longer, both as a member and chief judge of the court, than any other man. By reason of these facts, as well as his extraordinary services to the cause of justice, he gave to this court a prestige and standing amongst the appellate courts of the Nation which, but for him, it would never have attained. None are more conscious of this fact than Judge Dobie and myself, who for many years rejoiced to be his colleagues. Judge Dobie regrets that he is unable to be present but he has asked us to say that he regarded Judge Parker as really one of the great American judges whose ability was only exceeded by his character.

It is fitting that the formal memorial prepared by Judge Bobbitt and his committee and all of these proceedings be deposited with the clerk of this court to serve as a permanent record of the life and works of our leader and beloved friend.

And, now, Mr. Chief Justice, may this action be authorized by the court and in honor of Judge Parker may the court now stand adjourned.

[From the Charlotte Observer of March 18, 1958]

HE PUT PROGRESS INTO COURTS—JOHN PARKER WAS A JUDICIAL GIANT

(By Don Oberdorfer)

WASHINGTON.—The humble citizen who stands before the bar of justice in any Federal courtroom in the land is today poorer because John J. Parker is dead.

It is generally agreed in top legal circles here that Judge Parker, more than any single man in recent years, helped keep the Federal courts from falling hopelessly behind the times.

He never achieved the eminence of the bench of the Supreme Court of the United States, in whose great marble domain this is being written.

But John Johnston Parker, cut off from Supreme Court service by what history views as a disgraceful and unjustified political attack grew to be a taller figure in American justice than many of the men who have occupied this top United States bench.

On several occasions, he has set important policy for the Supreme Court.

In the famous case of *Barnette* v. *West Virginia State Board of Education*, for instance, Parker upheld the right of religious liberty, holding that schools could not require a flag salute against the religious principles of some children. The Supreme Court reversed one of its prior decisions to agree with him.

In the celebrated "Buzzard Roost" case arising in Greenwood County, S. C., Parker helped establish the legal principle that Congress has the power to make loans and grants for construction work in the public interest, a principle of great practical effect today.

Duke Power Co. had sued to prevent the old WPA from granting and loaning money to Greenwood County to construct a powerplant at Buzzard Roost Falls. Parker's decision upholding the project also made clear the principle that a private corporation can't challenge the power of Congress just because the operations of Congress may cause competition with private business.

Even more famous than some of his famous cases, however, are the many years of Parker's work in improving the administration of justice.

The court reporters who sit today to transcribe testimony in all Federal court cases are there largely because of Parker, for instance.

He was responsible for writing and supporting before Congress the measure that created the Federal court reporting system. Prior to that time, court reporters had been hired on a day-to-day basis by contending lawyers in Federal court. In many cases there was no reporter and hence no verbatim record as a basis for appeal.

Without Judge Parker, it is likely that Federal judges would have far less discretion than they do in handling the thousands of young offenders who come before the Federal bar of justice.

Parker was responsible for drafting and supporting the Federal Youth Correction Act, which has allowed judges to use leeway in seeking to reform as well as punish youthful offenders.

There are many other examples of legal principles, some of them technical but considered of first importance, that exist today because of the imagination and courage of Judge Parker.

He was first chairman and guiding light of the American Bar Association's epoch-making committee on judicial administration.

This committee was a mighty force in reforming the administration of justice since its creation under Parker in 1938. Later Parker helped establish State committees on court reform all over the Nation, committees which were often referred to as the "Judge Parker committee."

Behind the limelight Parker was a tremendously influential figure.

A five-member advisory committee to the Judicial Conference of senior court judges has key responsibilities in overhauling the operation of the courts. The Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court is one member. Parker has been another since it was created.

Few laymen ever knew it, but Parker had a major—if not critical—role in the post-war trials of the Nazi war criminals at Nuremberg.

Parker was alternate member of the military tribunal for the United States, a title which is deceptive because alternative members had nearly all the duties of full members.

Sir Norman Birkett, a British representative on the tribunal which tried the top Nazis, later recalled:

"The real work of the tribunal was done out of sight.

"In the closed sessions of the court, decisions of the greatest moment had to be taken; and it was there that Judge Parker's contribution frequently was decisive."

Birkett remembered that because of Parker's tremendous knowledge of the principles of law, his common sense and understanding, in the course of time the Russian and French judges on the tribunal turned to Judge Parker when conflicts of law or procedure arose.

Always every inch a judge, mindful that the rights of any accused man must be protected, Parker was disturbed one night at a party when a Russian judge proposed a toast to the conviction of the Nazi war criminals.

"I'll not drink to that," Parker announced in his forceful personal speech that could make an offender cower. And he didn't.

Giant that he was, Judge Parker rarely took credit in public for the advances which were so much the work of his brilliant mind and busy hand.

He never stopped fighting, however, for a system of justice without unnecessary delay, without bias or favor of any kind.

He had called a special meeting Monday of some top Federal judges to work out im-

portant problems to be met at the meeting of the powerful Judicial Conference of the United States which begins here today.

Judge Parker died at 9 a. m. Monday, but the meeting he called to improve justice went on. There is little doubt that John Johnston Parker, one of the true judicial giants of the age, would have liked that.

[From the Charlotte Observer of March 18, 1958]

GREAT TARHEEL: JOHN J. PARKER—HE BREATHED THE LAW OF AMERICA

(Harry Golden, editor of the Carolina Israelite, was a close personal friend of Judge John J. Parker. He wrote the following at the request of the Observer.)

(By Harry Golden)

A few months after the death of Senator William E. Borah, of Idaho, the news dispatches stated that the Senator had left a great fortune, well over $1 million. This was the time for me to remind Judge Parker that Senator Borah, on the testimony of Mr. William E. Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, had tipped the scales of the balance against the confirmation of Judge Parker to the United States Supreme Court. Judge Parker did not show the slightest trace of self-righteousness, and refused to join, even for a single moment, in any searching of the soul of the late Senator Borah. He said: "Senator Borah made a lot of money as a young lawyer, and during his entire career as a Senator he must have made some wise investments."

It is interesting to note that both Senator Borah and the president of the American Federation of Labor publicly acknowledged the grievous mistake they had made in stopping Judge John J. Parker from mounting the Supreme Court bench. They had both forgotten for the moment that we are a Nation of laws and not of men and that Judge Parker's decision in a certain yellow-dog contract case in the State of North Carolina was following the existence of the statutes on the books and had nothing whatever to do with his personal opinions, if any, or with the righteousness of the cause, if any.

Judge Parker said that law and law alone will do it for us, and by that he meant the maintenance of America, the greatest experiment in government in the history of human progression. As a jurist, and acknowledged one of the greatest in America, he refused to editorialize, and he refused to express his own views, whatever they might have been, in the jurisprudence with which he was charged, and the obligation to maintain the integrity of the American courts, which he placed only slightly below that of his religious faith.

Judge Parker's true greatness lies in the fact that he never once lost his balance, his sense of humor and his high optimism, despite the fact that he suffered the greatest disappointment in the history of an American lawyer—that of being denied, unjustifiably, a seat on our highest Court. In addition, this serious disappointment was followed by the great tragedy of having one of his sons, a graduate lawyer, die as a result of a terrible accident.

During his career on the bench, Judge Parker has sat in on the hearings and the disposition of nearly 4,000 cases and has written about 1,500 opinions, covering every branch of the law.

His stature in the State of North Carolina was such that long before the famous Eisenhower "coat-tails," Judge John J. Parker polled a total of 44 percent of the electorate of North Carolina, running on the Republican ticket for governor.

It is no coincidence that Life magazine several months ago, in writing a story of the great jurists of America, used full page photographs of only two men, Judge Learned Hand of New York and Judge John J. Parker of North Carolina. Both of these men, in their judicial opinions, gave the American people on three or four momentous occasions, that long "second look" on problems confronting our Republic, which has always worked so well for the preservation of the political and economic freedom of our people.

When President Roosevelt was confronted with a technical legal problem in making a firm decision between the Comptroller General and the War Shipping Administration as to the rules to be applied to the valuation of vessels requisitioned by the United States, he appointed Judge Learned Hand of New York, Judge Joseph C. Hutcheson of Texas and Judge John J. Parker of North Carolina to make the decision for him.

When President Truman sought the highest legal authority in America for the trial of the Nazi officials charged with war crimes he appointed Judge John J. Parker as the associate judge with the Attorney General, Mr. Biddle; and in that capacity Judge Parker attended all of the sessions of the tribunal and participated in all of its deliberations.

When the Eisenhower administration was embattled in its defense against the Bricker amendment which would have invalidated the torturous efforts of millions of people who are still fighting for a successful "concert of Nation," Judge John J. Parker presented a brief to the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee, which together with his appearance before that committee ended the danger of the Bricker amendment and led to a statement by the leader of the Democratic opposition—Mr. Dean Acheson: "A true liberal with a heart and a head, and his feet on the ground."

Judge John J. Parker was a very great man, probably the greatest man this Tar Heel society has produced in this century. Sir Norman Birkett, Britain's member of the Nurenburg Tribunal, visited America "For the purpose of paying small tribute to Judge John J. Parker of North Carolina."

[From the Asheville Citizen of Wednesday, March 19, 1958]

JUDGE JOHN JOHNSTON PARKER

John Johnston Parker, of Charlotte, chief judge of the Fourth Circuit of the United States Court of Appeals, was a statesman in the field of law, a philosopher whose high attainments aided in the interpretation and the advancement of constitutional democracy in America.

North Carolina, his native State, has cause to mourn his passing. It is a national loss, for he was among the country's ablest and most distinguished jurists.

Judge Parker played a significant role in the political and judicial history of this State.

Lefler and Newsome, in their history of North Carolina, point out that for decades after the War Between the States North Carolina felt estranged from the Federal Government. The Federal courts were regarded as alien tribunals and were distrusted.

The heated political conflicts centering about the Federal courts gradually decreased as personnel changes were made.

Among those who rose to the Federal bench were circuit court Judges Jeter C. Pritchard, of Asheville, in 1904, and John J. Parker, in 1925. These, with new district court judges, caused a change in attitude, for they brought the Federal judiciary into more sympathetic and popular relations to the State.

Both Judges Pritchard and Parker were men of great ability and high character and held the confidence and respect of the people.

Had justice been done in his case, Judge Parker would have gone to the United States Supreme Court bench and it is thought likely he would have become Chief Justice because of his eminent qualifications.

President Hoover nominated Judge Parker for Associate Justice of the Supreme Court in 1930, but he failed of confirmation by the Senate because of opposition that developed from a decision he made in a labor dispute case. It was an unjustified rejection of a man whose entire career was marked by probity and high intellectual attainments.

A Republican in politics, Judge Parker was no extremist. He was in the order of a middle-of-the-roader, a man who had high regard for both human rights and property rights. As his old philosophy professor, Horace Williams, of the University of North Carolina, told President Hoover in 1930, he could be expected to give first consideration to human rights.

The scholarly and kindly jurist was a firm believer in the ideals of the American form of government. In an interview with an Asheville Citizen reporter in 1943, he expressed his political philosophy in these words:

"Democracy is more than a form of government. It is a philosophy of life. It is based on the worth and dignity of the individual. It carries with it the open door of opportunity and the principle of justice for every man * * *. It * * * believes that only through the free flowering of the human spirit can true welfare and happiness be attained."

Judge Parker, an uncommon man, had faith in the common man. He fought for his chance and his right to attain fullest development in a democracy where government is through the rule of law and the consent of the governed.

[From the Carolina Israelite of May–June 1958]

JUDGE JOHN J. PARKER

When the fourth circuit Federal court held sessions in Charlotte, Presiding Judge John J. Parker would take a long walk every evening after dinner. His regular route took him within a block of my house, and if he was alone, I joined him for part of the way. I walked along with him even though he had warned me that he had already outlived three walking partners. But, as it must come to all of us, our last walking partner is always the one who survives us.

On other occasions Judge Parker and I had lunch in the local Chinese restaurant, and after we gave the order he always said: "Well, now, where did we leave off?" He said this seriously, with the same emphasis that he used while sitting on the bench: "Well, now, where did we leave off?" And this meant that we were to continue our discussion of a bit of philosophy or the Bible. An Episcopalian vestryman, Judge Parker had introduced me to the Old Testament. I began to dig in and literally memorize the Book of Job so that I might enter into the spirit of things with some degree of intelligence. Judge Parker was fascinated by the Book of Job. "It should be in every bar examination," he said, and I followed up each of our discussions with a typewritten report to him.

I scrupulously avoided discussing any matter which was under review before his court and this, of course, included most of the segregation cases of our modern era. It would be a disservice to his memory if I were to take any liberties with Judge Parker's personal views on the integration of the public schools of the South, except in terms of the viewpoint of the southern majority. But having said that, we must also say this: that once there was law (in the form of a Supreme Court decision), then you had better not tamper with it. "I believe in Jesus Christ and in the Constitution of the United States," he once told me, and it was good to know that a man with such a creed was sitting in a place where decisions were made for us.

What is there to say about Judge Parker that has not already been said by his colleagues of bench and bar, including Chief Justice Earl Warren and many of the distinguished lawyers and jurists of the English-speaking world? I would only like to add this one idea: Judge John Parker cared. He cared about what was going on; he cared about America; and he cared about people. And when we understand the full implications of his deep concern and the fact that he also did something about it (associate judge at the Nuremberg trials of the Nazis; striking the most decisive blow against the Bricker amendment, etc.), then we can also understand the full extent of the very great loss to his family, his friends, and to the Nation.

There was the time a year or so before his death when the judge appeared particularly worried. Judge Simon Sobeloff's confirmation by the United States Senate was being held up by several southern Senators on the Judiciary Committee. "I must have Simon on my court," Judge Parker told me, and he repeated this with such intensity that, in perspective, it appears as though he were actually putting his hand on the shoulder of his successor. "I must have Simon on my court," and then a most remarkable letter to the Judiciary Committee from Judge Frank Winslow of Rocky Mount (N. C.), which broke the log-jam; the interlocking friendships of a lifetime, Judge Parker, Dr. Frank Graham, Kemp Battel, Judge Francis Clarkson, Dr. Otho Ross, Judge William Bobbitt, Mrs. Charles Tillett, Ambassador Hershel Johnson, and Judge Frank Winslow—old-time Tar Heels interested in an embattled judge from Baltimore whose parents were immigrant Jews from Russia, and what a story this is—of America. And what an awesome responsibility for the new presiding judge of the Fourth Circuit Court, Judge Simon Sobeloff, when he reads this article.

All of this may have reflected his own ordeal of 30 years before, because Judge Parker experienced one of the greatest disappointments an American in public life has ever faced.

President Herbert Hoover had appointed him to the United States Supreme Court and he failed of confirmation by a single vote. Senator Borah of Idaho and William Green of the American Federation of Labor, had tipped the balance against Judge Parker's confirmation. Eventually each man acknowledged that he had made a mistake. They had forgotten for a moment that we are a nation of laws and not of men, and that Judge Parker's decision in a certain labor case in North Carolina was based on the existing statutes on the books. And the most remarkable thing about this great man was that he never lost his optimism, his love for humanity, and his great capacity for fellowship, even when he spoke of the men who stopped his confirmation. He never stopped working for a single moment, and he never once lost his sense of humor.

When we used to meet on the street, I took off my hat and then there was always this slow and deliberate business of Judge Parker shifting his cane from one hand to the other hand so that he could lift his hat, too. And what a sustaining memory this is, and how wonderful that I could have earned the right to call this man "my devoted friend." This indeed could happen only in America.

[From the Charlotte Observer of Tuesday, March 18, 1958]

THE WORLD HAS TOO FEW MEN OF JOHN PARKER'S STATURE

Many qualities were blended together in John J. Parker to produce one of the truly great American jurists.

Perhaps the most important was a massive intellect which enabled him to absorb and retain both the basic principles and the complex fine points of the law, and to apply them with discernment to the new legal issues of a changing society.

Another was a calm, unruffled temperament which permitted of no play of emotions in judicial affairs.

Still another was his tremendous personal dignity and the respect it inspired.

To these qualities were added a clear perspective of the sweep of human history, an unswerving belief in the importance of individual liberty, a profound understanding of the role of the judiciary in the American democracy and complete dedication to his job.

That was John Parker the judge.

John Parker the man was warm, friendly, a merry teller of stories and anecdotes, a devoted husband and father, and a devout churchman.

Elsewhere in this newspaper will be found a detailed account of John Parker's life and achievements, an evaluation of his contributions to American jurisprudence, and an explanation of his historic role in the school-segregation litigation.

In a sense, it was a supreme irony for John Parker to inherit the difficult and unwanted job of applying the 1954 and 1955 Supreme Court decisions.

Parker believed that the separate but equal doctrine which grew out of the 1896 *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*, was the law of the land. His original ruling in the Clarendon County, S. C., school case still stands as the classic exposition of that doctrine. In that ruling, incidentally, he gave voice to a principle too often ignored these days, i. e., if separate but equal is no longer right or no longer wise, it should be changed by legislative action, not by judicial interpretation.

The Supreme Court reversed Parker's decision, one of the few times that ever happened.

It was no secret to his friends that Parker disagreed with the Supreme Court's reasoning in the school cases, but there was but one course of action for him. As he told the patent bar in New York City in 1957:

"At the head of the judicial system stands the Supreme Court of the United States, and the decisions of that Court must be accepted as to the meaning of the Constitution. You can't have even a baseball game without an umpire to interpret and apply the rules, and you can't have constitutional government without the authority somewhere to interpret and apply the Constitution.

"Final authority to do this is vested in the Supreme Court, whose duty it is to apply the great principles of government which the Constitution embodies to the changing conditions of the times, with power on its part to overrule even its own prior decisions, when in the light of better understanding or changed conditions they are deemed by it to be erroneous."

And so there fell to Judge Parker's lot a primary responsibility for applying the Supreme Court decision to complex school cases in South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, and Maryland, a responsibility he shouldered with good grace and was carrying out with wisdom and understanding at the time of his death.

Just as Lincoln's death proved to be a blow to the defeated South, John Parker's death is a tragic loss at another tortured period in the southern region's tortured history.

John Parker saw far beyond the boundaries of his region and his Nation, however.

From World War II until his death, he was a forceful and persuasive spokesman for greater American participation in world affairs. He believed in a new world order based not on selfishness and force but on law and reason, and right.

In that same patent bar address, Parker said:

"We in the United States had as well realize that the leadership of civilization which was Britain's task for a hundred years has devolved upon us, and that for us to fail to accept it is to turn the Free World over to Russia and to slavery.

"There should be no question in the mind of anyone as to our duty in this crisis. We must go forward. We must make ourselves strong. We must unite the Free World against Communist aggression. We must build throughout the free nations a world order which will endure."

As he had on so many previous occasions, Parker challenged the assembled lawyers and judges to measure up to the responsibility of leadership.

It was a challenge he could well afford to make, for his whole life was a brilliant record of enlightened and intelligent leadership.

We will miss John Parker. The world has too few men of his stature.

[From the Charlotte Observer of Thursday, May 1, 1958]

SOCIETY BASED UPON LAW BEST HOPE FOR FREEMEN

("What is law? Law is not a mere collection of rules and forms and precedents. Law is the life principle of organized society—the categorical imperative which prescribes how organized society must live." John J. Parker.)

In thousands of communities across the Nation today, the first national Law Day will be observed.

From dusty law books, from long-neglected history books, from moments of thought and contemplation too seldom enjoyed by busy men, will come the ideas and ideals for a restatement of the most basic principles of the American system—liberty under law.

Different men will phrase their ideas in different words as they speak or write on Law Day.

But they will all be saying what Andrew Jackson once told a hard-bitten, frontier jury:

"Do what is right between these parties. That is what the law always means."

Law Day is largely the labor of Mecklenburg native Charles Sylvanus Rhyne, current president of the American Bar Association.

Rhyne's inspiration came from his deep concern over the failure of the law to regulate and protect society in three areas of human activity:

1. Juvenile delinquency: "The runaway events in this field stem basically from lack of respect for the law. Not ignorance of the law, but an ignoring of the law."

2. Traffic slaughter on the highways: "This is a terrible toll to pay for disrespect for traffic law—a tremendous, unnecessary waste of the human and material resources of our Nation."

3. Use of weapons to settle disputes between nations: "In this age of missiles, nuclear bombs, and man-made 'moons,' law must replace weapons or worldwide devastation is certain to occur with the outbreak of the next war."

Rhyne's immediate objective for Law Day is to remind the American people and other free peoples everywhere that individual freedom can exist only under a government of law, the fundamental concept that so distinguishes our system from Communist slavery.

Hence, it was no coincidence that May 1 was selected as the date. It will, to the extent that it is observed, counteract the worldwide propaganda effect of May Day in Communist lands.

But his longer range objective, one to which he has devoted much of his 100,000

miles of travel and many of his 180 speeches since becoming ABA president 9 months ago, is to stir interest in a world system based upon law which ultimately would settle disputes between nations just as disputes between individuals are settled in our land today.

Significantly, the late Judge John J. Parker of Charlotte had spent much time in his last years working toward the same objective. The quote which precedes this editorial came from the last speech he wrote. It was entitled "Law in the World Community." Death prevented its delivery.

A world system based on law and justice may lie beyond the capacities of the human race because it would require:

1. Adequate judicial machinery for the settlement, on the basis of reason, of disputes of an international character.

2. Adequate legislative machinery for bringing to bear the intelligence of mankind upon the solution of international problems; and

3. Adequate organization of force for the preservation of peace and the enforcement of law.

Each of these might well involve the surrender of more national sovereignty than any of the free nations, including the United States, are ready to give up. All three would obviously be rejected by the Communist nations.

Even so, beginnings have been made.

The United Nations Charter itself, the Court of International Justice, the treaty creating the European Economic Community, the Charter of the Organization of American States represent small steps toward judicial machinery.

The General Assembly of the United Nations has no power to pass laws, but it does provide a place where the world's problems can be explored and debated.

And after Korea and Suez, it is not beyond possibility that there will one day be an international police power to enforce the preservation of peace under law.

The high ideals that will be voiced by thousands of speakers today cannot be dismissed as idle and fanciful dreams. We must look to the future; the past, and the present offer nothing but wars and the threats of more wars.

Surely the human race deserves something better.

[From the Greensboro Daily News of Tuesday, March 18, 1958]

JOHN J. PARKER: "TO WHOM MUCH IS GIVEN"

The death of the Honorable John J. Parker, senior judge of the Fourth United States Circuit Court of Appeals, could have occurred at no more inopportune moment than on a weekend when new American terrorists were bombing Jewish community centers in Nashville and Miami.

Judge Parker's life was a paean of praise and a hymn of support for the idea of justice and brotherhood. He had delivered from his judicial bench and in other public forums numerous sermons on justice. They should be ringing today in the ears of American citizens who resort to cowardly bombings in the night and threats of violence against the law.

Judge Parker spoke often of the greatness of America, and he knew whence it stemmed. America is not great, he said on one occasion, "because of the strength of Army or Navy or Air Force, not because of wealth of field or forest or mine or factory, not because of the splendor of her cities or the culture of her institutions of learning, but because in her heart of hearts she still believes in the sovereignty of the individual soul and the open door of opportunity for every man. Freedom of thought, freedom of speech, freedom of conscience—the right of every man to be secure in his person and in his home against unreasonable exercise of power, the right to public trial and to be confronted by one's accusers, the right not to be deprived of life or liberty or property but by the law of the land—the general law which hears before it condemns, proceeds upon inquiry and renders judgment only after trial—these are the things that make America great, and these are but the application in the realm of government of the principles of democracy, the spirit of good will and brotherhood, and equal opportunity under the law."

These are words worth remembering and rereading here in the tragic aftermath of Judge Parker's death. But, in truth, they are words for the ages. For they sum up the total worth of Western civilization for an America designated by strength and philosophy as protector and guardian of this great heritage.

The measure by which America tolerates bombings and other acts of terrorism is the measure by which she fails to protect the soul of her greatness. Her cities may fall into dust, her natural abundance may shrink, but these ideas will remain throughout all time as a standard to which the wise and the oppressed of all ages may repair.

The measure of Judge Parker's greatness as judge and citizen lies in his championship of these causes throughout a long and productive life. There is much to be said about his peripheral activities—the services he rendered his adopted community of Charlotte, his church, his beloved North Carolina, his university at Chapel Hill, but the central theme of his life is anchored in the broad realm of the law.

Many will remember the great mistake of history which swirled around Judge Parker's appointment to the United States Supreme Court by President Hoover and the narrow margin of defeat of his confirmation by the United States Senate—by two votes. That historic episode is full of irony. For there is reason to believe that had Judge Parker been on the High Court since 1927 he would have long since been its Chief Justice, and the quality of many decisions handed down in recent years by the Court may have been changed.

Judge Parker, it seemed from his decisions before and since, was greatly disturbed by the school integration cases. There is no reason to believe he did not understand fully the moral implications of second-class citizenship, but there is ample reason to believe he also knew the law. Another eminent jurist who should have been on the high court with Judge Parker—Judge Learned Hand—has recently delivered a series of lectures at Harvard University which bears directly on this question.

If these two towering figures of the legal profession had long since been part of our High Court, how different the tide of events could have been. The great principles of brotherhood would have never lain unprotected; but these wise men, gazing directly to the heart of the complexities, may have devised means of avoiding the head-on collisions and the emotional violence which now characterize our time.

With all his greatness of mind John J. Parker was a lighthearted gentleman, full of subterranean humor and appreciation of the foibles of man. His own life exemplified his two favorite Bible passages, often quoted in his speeches.

One typifies his humility—that basic ingredient of all great men: "Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall."

The other typifies his own understanding of the role of men endowed with unusual capacities: "To whom much is given of him much also is required."

In Judge Parker's death North Carolina loses one of her genuinely great sons; the Federal judiciary one of its keenest minds; the Nation a wise man of exceedingly great worth. There will be none soon to fill the void.

[From the News-Herald of March 21, 1958]

A GIANT PASSED THIS WAY

North Carolina has lost a great citizen in the passing of John J. Parker, senior judge of the Fourth United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

He probably has done more than any single North Carolinian in the last half century to add dignity to and respect for the law.

He was a Republican—but Democrats and Republicans alike revered this practitioner of justice and brotherhood.

Ironically, this giant who passed this way, failed to achieve his one big ambition—a seat on the United States Supreme Court. He failed to get Senate confirmation in Herbert Hoover's administration by two votes.

He was passed over again by the Eisenhower administration.

Yet this most eminent among jurists did not let it embitter him, as it might have a lesser man.

He stood stalwart in his beliefs. He felt that it was the court's prerogative to uphold laws, determine their constitutionality, not to try to make them.

Of the recent United States Supreme Court segregation decisions, he said the doctrine of "separate but equal" might have needed changing but that it was a duty of Congress to have done it by law, not a function of the Court to do by decree.

He set the pattern for racial cases in Federal courts with his definition of what the Supreme Court had done. This was in the now-famous Parker dictum.

"It is important," he said, "that we point out exactly what the Supreme Court has decided and what it has not decided in this [segregation] case.

"It has not decided that the States must mix persons of different races in the schools or must require them to attend schools or must deprive them of the right of choosing the schools they attend.

"What it has decided, and all that it has decided, is that a State may not deny to any person on account of race the right to attend any school that it maintains * * * the Constitution, in other words, does not require integration. It merely forbids discrimination.

"It does not forbid such segregation as occurs as the result of voluntary action. It merely forbids the use of governmental power to enforce segregation."

Judge Parker's ruling—that has stood unchallenged for 3 years—may have been his most important, because it helped put the court decision that many were calling the "law of the land" and a "mandate to integrate" in its proper perspective.

He possessed one of the keenest legal minds of his generation. And he took part in many important decisions.

Always, they bore out his philosophy that held that brotherhood and respect for the individual man must be upheld to effect true justice.

He believed that America's greatness did not stem from power of guns and wealth, "but because in her heart of hearts she still believes in the sovereignty of the individual soul and the open door of opportunity for every man."

"Freedom of thought, freedom of speech, freedom of conscience—the right of every man to be secure in his person and in his home against unreasonable exercise of power, the right to public trial and to be confronted by one's accusers, the right not to be deprived of life or liberty or property but by the law of the land—the general law which hears before it condemns, proceeds upon inquiry and renders judgment only after trial—these are the things that make

America great, and these are but the application in the realm of government of the principles of democracy, the spirit of good will and brotherhood, and equal opportunity under the law."

If Judge Parker had done nothing more than pen those words, he would have done a great service.

For these are words that every practitioner of the law should memorize. They are words that every American should take to heart, and broadcast throughout the world.

They tell the story of America better than any that might be written by even the most adept of the Madison Avenue propagandists.

Judge Parker did yeoman's work for his church, his State, his university.

But it was in the realm of the law that he was—as they say in the Southwest—a man who "sits tall in the saddle."

Perhaps the Greensboro News expressed it best with these words:

"In Judge Parker's death North Carolina loses one of her genuinely great sons; the Federal judiciary one of its keenest minds; the Nation a wise man of exceedingly great worth."

To which we might add that every individual lost one of his greatest advocates before the bar.

He was as near as you could get to the irreplaceable man.

[From the Winston-Salem Journal, of Wednesday, March 19, 1958]

JUDGE PARKER

Judge John J. Parker was denied through a tragic error the right to sit on the bench of the United States Supreme Court to which he had been nominated by President Hoover. But this brilliant Tar Heel jurist was not embittered by this defeat. He grew in stature and lived to prove himself as one of the truly great judges of the Federal judiciary.

In his death the entire Nation suffers serious loss. But Judge Parker will be especially missed in the South which has looked to him for legal light and guidance in working out the problems created by the public school desegregation decision of the Supreme Court.

Judge Parker was much more than a lawyer and judge. He was a statesman of broad vision and tall stature. Every phase of human welfare and progress was of deep interest and concern to him. A kind, genial man who loved all human beings, he was a strong advocate of wider American participation in world affairs. He pinned his hopes for man in a new world order "based not on selfishness and force but on law and reason and right."

But it is as one of the Nation's ablest authorities on constitutional law that Judge Parker will be best remembered. His ruling in the Clarendon County, S. C., case is believed to have set a guiding principle to govern the action of school officials in the South as they move to meet the legal problems involved in the desegregation of public schools.

In this ruling, now become famous as the "Parker dictum," he said:

"It is important that we point out exactly what the Supreme Court has decided and what it has not decided in this (segregation) case.

"It has not decided that the Federal courts are to take over or regulate the public schools of the State.

"It has not decided that the States must mix persons of different races in the schools or must require them to attend schools or must deprive them of the right of choosing schools they attend.

"What it has decided, and all that it has decided, is that a State may not deny to any person on account of race the right to attend any school that it maintains * * * the Constitution, in other words, does not require integration. It merely forbids discrimination.

"It does not forbid such segregation as occurs as the result of voluntary action. It merely forbids the use of governmental power to enforce segregation."

This has not been challenged in the nearly 3 years since it was handed down. The State of North Carolina has based its pupil-assignment program upon it. Many southern legal scholars feel that good-faith observance of the antidiscrimination principle set forth by Judge Parker will enable communities in the South to meet the requirements of the Supreme Court with a minimum of litigation or social dissension. If so, this may become Judge Parker's greatest and most lasting contribution to the social progress of the South and the Nation.

[From the Charleston Evening Post of Tuesday, March 18, 1958]

DEATH TAKES JUDGE J. J. PARKER

The death of Judge John J. Parker removes from the Federal judiciary one of the ablest men who ever sat on the American bench.

Had legal training, knowledge of the law and Constitution, a truly judicial mind, and devotion to duty been the criterion, Judge Parker would have been appointed to the United States Supreme Court and would have brought to that tribunal qualities that have been sadly lacking in recent years.

Nominated for such an appointment by President Hoover in 1930, Judge Parker failed of confirmation as a consequence of a bitter and malicious opposition on the part of the NAACP and certain labor leaders. On several subsequent occasions bar groups endorsed him for a seat on the High Court, but to no avail. He presided over the Fourth United States Federal Circuit Court for more than 25 years in his long and distinguished career on the bench. He came to be known as one of the Nation's foremost authorities on both Federal and State constitutional law. Just recently he was in Charleston for a special session of his court.

Judge Parker's respect for the United States Constitution was exemplified when, as a member of a three-judge court, he was one of the two-judge majority which upheld school segregation on the principle of "separate but equal" facilities. He, with Judge George B. Timmerman, pointed to the fact that the Supreme Court had established that principle on several occasions and that it had been long accepted as the fundamental law of the land.

Judge Parker refused to let any nonjudicial ideology sway his judgment. He felt that a judge should not usurp legislative functions.

In the decision which the Supreme Court arbitrarily reversed—and at the same time reversed earlier Supreme Courts—Judge Parker said:

"The constitutional principle is the same now that it has been throughout this period, and if conditions have changed so that segregation is no longer wise, this is a matter for the legislatures and not for the courts. The members of the judiciary have no more right to read their ideas of sociology into the Constitution than their ideas of economics."

The Supreme Court's disregard of that principle has let loose tragic evils upon the country.

Well may the Nation mourn the loss of a judge in whom integrity and ability were so strikingly joined.

[From the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier of Tuesday, March 18, 1958]

JUDGE JOHN J. PARKER

Chief Judge John J. Parker of the United States Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, who died yesterday following a heart attack, at the age of 72, was a jurist's jurist. He had been nominated once for the United States Supreme Court, endorsed many times, but never appointed. In 1954 the South Carolina Bar Association endorsed him for the vacancy caused by the death of Justice Robert J. Jackson.

Judge Parker presided at a special term of the circuit court in Charleston only 2 weeks ago. He was his usual vigorous self. His learning in the law, unshatterable integrity, and devotion to the dignity and impartiality of the judicial office made him one of the finest judges in the land.

Judge Parker was held in the highest esteem throughout the legal profession. To the layman, a chief judge of a United States circuit court may seem a remote figure. Actually, Judge Parker decided cases with a wisdom and a prudence that helped safeguard both the rights of ordinary citizens and the conditions of peace and civic order which make rights worthwhile.

President Herbert Hoover nominated Judge Parker for the High Bench in 1930. But a shameful alliance of the NAACP and the American Federation of Labor blocked approval by the United States Senate in a 41–39 vote.

A lesser man than John J. Parker, of Charlotte, N. C., might have been embittered by failure to attain the office he so richly deserved. Judge Parker, however, was a man in the classical mold who put his whole being into the performance of the duties life offered.

Judge Parker's host of friends, the legal profession, and the ordinary citizens who profited from his wise moderation and stern constitutionalism—all will miss him.

Of him it can be said in proud tones: He was a judge.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of March 19, 1958]

FOUNDATION BUILDER

Cranks may make revolutions. And crusaders often serve the essential purpose of breaking through thickets where most of us shrink from going. But the building that endures on ground thus opened is usually done by men who have come slowly and convinced themselves on every step of the way.

Few better examples could be found than John J. Parker, who for a quarter of a century served as chief judge of the Fourth United States Circuit Court of Appeals, comprising five Southeastern States.

He was born and educated in North Carolina, was appointed a Federal judge by President Coolidge, and named to the Supreme Court by President Hoover. The Senate, by a 2-vote margin, refused to confirm him for this office as a result of determined opposition by organized labor and by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Yet Judge Parker in later years handed down several important decisions welcomed by political liberals, and in 1947 declared all-white primary elections illegal. Eight years later his elucidation of the Supreme Court decision declaring unconstitutional racial segregation in the public schools promises to prove historic. He said in part:

"It is our duty now to accept the law as declared by the Supreme Court. * * * Nothing in the Constitution or the decision of the Supreme Court takes away from the people freedom to choose the schools they attend. The Constitution, in other words, does not require integration. It merely forbids discrimination."

Upon the foundation laid down in this opinion both white and Negro, North and South, can find accommodation in dignity and good conscience.

[From the Northern Virginia Sun of Thursday, March 20, 1958]

JOHN J. PARKER—AN ELEGY TO A GREAT JUDGE

A remarkable transformation sometimes occurs when a lawyer puts on the robes of a judge. Conservatives, when divorced from their private interests and pressures, often write liberal opinions, and men who were ardent liberals frequently become conservatives.

The reason for this is that few of us have a chance to analyze what our real thoughts are. It is not unusual for our economic interests, associations, and the pressures of environment to obscure our real views even from ourselves.

Because of this, men selected for the bench are given economic security and tenure, so that the best in their natures may emerge. And one admires a judge who in the quiet of his chamber admits that his previous thinking was not always right.

Such a man was Chief Judge John J. Parker, of the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals at Charlotte, N. C., who died Monday, and whose jurisdiction included northern Virginia. Thirty years ago, Judge Parker held views so conservative that, when President Hoover nominated him to the Supreme Court, liberals in Congress and elsewhere raised such a storm of opposition that the nomination had to be withdrawn.

If anyone had reason to dislike liberals and the liberal viewpoint, it was Judge Parker. Yet as he reasoned through the stormy and turbulent cases that marked his later years on the appellate bench, he generally leaned to the liberal side.

Recently, he had been very firm in declaring public-school segregation unconstitutional; he ordered its immediate end in areas covered by cases before his court.

One of these areas was Arlington County.

Judge Parker ruled as he interpreted the law—whether or not his interpretation went against his own preconceived opinions or against popular opinion in his jurisdiction.

Northern Virginians will remember Judge Parkers' Arlington school decision for many years, and they will disagree with each other on the soundness and wisdom of this decision. But they join the rest of the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals area in honoring Judge Parker for his intellectual honesty, and for his honest, objective, and fearless interpretation of the law.

[From the Evening Star of Tuesday, March 18, 1958]

CHIEF JUDGE PARKER

The career of Chief Judge John J. Parker, dead after a heart attack here, should teach a never-to-be-forgotten lesson respecting the frailty of contemporary judgments.

Back in the spring of 1930 the Senate, dividing 41 to 39, rejected the nomination of Judge Parker to a place on the Supreme Court. The Senate's liberals—including such men as Borah, La Follette, Norris, Barkley, and Black—banded together against Judge Parker because he was alleged to be antilabor and anti-Negro. The Senate Judiciary Committee listened to testimony against the nomination from witnesses representing organized labor and the NAACP. Then it voted 10 to 4 to refuse to permit Judge Parker to testify in his own behalf. All in all, it was a sorry performance and a shameful miscarriage of justice.

Judge Parker lived to confound his liberal critics, however, and some of them stated publicly that they regretted having voted against him. The antilabor charge was based on an opinion he wrote for the fourth circuit court of appeals upholding the so-called "yellow dog" contracts—contracts under which coal miners agreed not to join the United Mine Workers if given jobs. His defenders of that day said he was merely following the rules laid down by the Supreme Court, and it is a fact that the Court, then including such men as Brandeis and Holmes, refused to review the decision. This had the effect of upholding it. The anti-Negro charge was equally flimsy and destined, in time, to be refuted by Judge Parker's firm adherence to the Supreme Court's ruling in the school cases. But the Senate of 1930 was in no mood to listen—not even when the late Carter Glass, up for reelection, took the floor and said: "Situated as I am, it would be easier to vote against Judge Parker than to vote for him. But I have tried in vain to find some reason to vote against him which would satisfy my conscience."

Time has been much kinder to this truly liberal jurist than was the contemporary judgment. The American Bar Association a few years ago awarded him its gold medal for conspicuous service to American jurisprudence. This, we think, gives the true measure of the man.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of Tuesday, March 18, 1958]

JOHN J. PARKER

The untimely death of Judge John J. Parker at 72 removes one of the most respected figures in American jurisprudence. His Olympian stature was measured by the poise and equanimity with which he bore what, to a lesser man, would surely have been a crushing disappointment—the Senate's rejection of his nomination to the Supreme Court in 1930. Falsely denounced as foe of labor and minority groups because as a circuit court judge he faithfully followed an unpopular Supreme Court ruling in the so-called yellow-dog-contract case growing out of a strike in West Virginia, he missed confirmation by a vote of 41 to 39.

He accepted the injustice without rancor or protest, returned to his seat on the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and proceeded in the ensuing 28 years to confound his critics by a record of libertarian statesmanship on the bench. In one of the most recent of his opinions this soft-spoken North Carolinian affirmed lower court decrees in Arlington and Charlottesville ordering desegregation of the public schools.

Judge Parker's judicial services—in addition to his 32 years on the court of appeals and his constant interest in improved judicial administration—included a period as alternate United States member of the tribunal which tried the German war criminals at Nuremberg in 1946. He brought to that experiment in international justice the best traditions of American respect for individual rights and for the concept of due process. Only recently he was elected to the presidency of the National Conference on Citizenship—a civic enterprise to which he had for many years made rich contributions of eloquence and inspiration. Among his fellow jurists, as well as generally among Americans who came in contact with his work, none commanded greater respect or warmth of affection than this genial and salty philosopher whose life was given to the exacting and exalting discipline of the law.

[From the Charlotte Observer of March 23, 1958]

FROM THE NEWSPAPERS—TRIBUTE TO JUDGE PARKER

(Newspapers in the South Atlantic States have paid eloquent tribute to Judge John J. Parker, who died in Washington last Monday.)

(Below are excerpts from a few of them.)

Richmond Times-Dispatch: "One of the tragedies of modern American history occurred in 1930 when the United States Senate by a vote of 41 to 39 rejected the late Judge John J. Parker's appointment to the Supreme Court. * * * Judge Parker would almost certainly have been Chief Justice, instead of Earl Warren, and the meaning of this will be apparent to any student of the Court's strange aberrations of the past several years."

Gastonia Gazette: "The Nation will miss Judge John J. Parker. He was a great judge * * * and possessed one of the keenest legal intellects of our generation."

Knoxville News Sentinel: "In the light of some of the more political appointments which have been made to the Supreme Court, it is a pity he never was elevated. But his failure to gain this distinction was more than compensated by the prestige and respect he obtained by his obviously stellar talents."

Durham Herald: "The loss to public life of men like Judge Parker is grievous. But he leaves an example of brilliant, honorable, and distinguished service as a standard by which his successors may model their careers. That is a contribution more enduring than his actual work."

Raleigh News and Observer: "Judge Parker missed his greatest ambition but North Carolina and the Nation will long remember him as a great judge, who became greater after personal disappointment."

Charlotte News: "John Johnston Parker's legacy was a vision of faith in the full promise of American life. Consequently he left us all extraordinarily wealthy. In fair weather and foul, he lived his faith with remarkable fidelity. * * * In defending the principles embodied in the United States Constitution, no man has ever fought with such tenacity and grace. 'It is easy enough to believe in freedom of religion for Episcopalians or Baptists or Presbyterians. The test is whether we believe in that freedom for Mohammedans or Buddhists or atheists. It is easy enough to believe in free speech for Republicans and Democrats. The rub comes when it is applied to Communists and Fascists and others whose teaching is hostile to our institutions.' "

Monroe Journal: "It should be especially noted with deep gratitude the indelible mark his pioneering decisions has made on tempering the course of the Supreme Court's edict on integration with sound logic and practicality."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have discussed with the minority leader the desirability of acting upon the railroad-retirement proposal, S. 1313, and the wisdom of offering it as an amendment to the Renegotiation Act. So that we can get a test of it, we have concluded that we should have the retirement bill offered as an amendment to another bill, so as not to involve the Renegotiation Act. There is a proposed unanimous-consent agreement at the desk, and I ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement

will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the proposed agreement, as follows:

Ordered, That, effective when the Senate proceeds to the consideration of the bill H. R. 12728, to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Act, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received: *Provided further, however*, That in the event the text of the railroad retirement bill (S. 1313) is offered as an amendment to the pending bill, it shall, notwithstanding the provision herein as to germaneness, be considered to be in order.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 1½ hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. THYE. If the conference report comes over from the House on Public Law 480, it will, of course, be a privileged matter, and the unfinished business would be temporarily laid aside to permit action on the conference report, would it not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the conference report were called up, it would not be affected by the proposed agreement. I expect to call it up some time today. I would have called it up last night if it had been available.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I should like to have about 15 or 20 minutes to speak on the conference report. Would I be privileged to have that time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Oh, yes. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement would not affect the conference report; and I know that the Senate would be delighted to have the observations of the Senator from Minnesota in connection with Public Law 480, with respect to which he has been so active.

Mr. THYE. I commend the Senator for trying to obtain a unanimous-consent agreement. I think it would expedite matters.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I hope we can dispose of the railroad retirement bill, so that we can consider the mutual security bill; and I hope Senators can agree on a reasonable limitation of time on the mutual security bill. It must go to conference, and there will be some delay.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire if there is any particular reason why the railroad retirement bill should be considered as an amendment to another bill, and not be considered by itself. Some of us have reservations with respect to the advisability of passing the railroad retirement bill. On the other hand, we join in support of the longshoremen's bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will explain that.

Mr. ALLOTT. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement leaves us in a very peculiar situation, a paradoxical situation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. ALLOTT. I wonder if the two measures could not be considered separately. I am not opposing the concept of a unanimous consent agreement. I think it is desirable.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I agree with the Senator. I think the situation is unusual.

However, only a few hours remain in this session. The committee of the other body has acted, and our committee has acted. It is necessary to whittle down and redraft some of the provisions of the Senate bill, which will be offered as an amendment. In order to give the other body some opportunity to consider the proposed legislation, it will be offered as an amendment to a House bill. The renegotiation bill will also be considered.

On the other hand, if the proposed legislation should not meet with the approval of the other body, or if it should not meet with the approval of the President, we would have the problem of a veto.

The minority leader and I looked over the calendar in an attempt to find a House bill which we thought was relatively noncontroversial to which the railroad retirement bill could be offered as an amendment. We took the matter up with the sponsors of the legislation, and they are prepared to present it and defend it, and have it offered as an amendment to the House bill. In that way the Senate will have an opportunity to express itself. I believe it is felt on both sides that the vote may go one way or the other. It was decided that it would be appropriate to devote an hour or two, or perhaps 3 hours, to the consideration of the measure, and let the judgment of the Senate prevail.

I agree with the Senator from Colorado that if it were early in the session we would proceed to consider a Senate bill. But if we should proceed to consider a Senate bill, we would displease all those interested in the legislation, because it would then have to be referred to a committee by the Speaker of the House. The committee would not meet, and the effect would be the same as that of recommitting the bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. But would the effect be the same? We would be forcing upon the House the acceptance of a bill which has not been fully considered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No; a bill has been considered fully in the House committee, and the committee has reported the bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. A railroad retirement bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes, a railroad retirement bill. And the leaders of the House and the leaders of the Senate are agreeable to the provisions in both bills. I believe the Senate bill was considerably more liberal than the House bill. There are some differences. I am not familiar with the details, but there has been agreement as to the provisions. It has been agreed that the railroad retirement bill may be offered as an amendment to the House bill. This procedure would be merely a matter of the House expressing itself with respect to its own bill, as modified.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I shall not object.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am very grateful to the Senator.

Mr. ALLOTT. However, I wish to make my own position very clear because of what I believe this measure would do to the railroad retirement fund itself and to railroad workers. I may find it necessary not to vote for this proposal, in which event I would be forced to oppose the longshoremen's bill. The longshoremen do not operate in Colorado, so they are not my constituents, but I would not want to do them harm. However, I may find myself in the position of having to vote against the bill in order to express my convictions upon what I believe is the more important of the two bills, which is the railroad retirement bill. I appreciate the Senator's fine remarks.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I appreciate the Senator's position, and I think there is merit in it. I appreciate his courtesy and understanding of our problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous consent agreement?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question. I did not hear all of the proposed unanimous consent agreement. How much time would be allowed?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. An hour on each amendment and an hour and a half on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous consent agreement? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2547, H. R. 12728.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 12728) to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, with respect to the payment of compensation in cases where third persons are liable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 33 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act is amended to read as follows:

"COMPENSATION WHERE THIRD PARTIES ARE LIABLE

"SEC. 33. (a) The right to compensation and to other benefits under this act whether for disability or death shall not be affected by the fact that the injury or death was caused under circumstances creating a legal liability in some person other than the employer or someone not in the same employ to pay damages therefor, such person hereinafter being referred to as the 'third party.' The payment of furnishing of benefits and the respective rights and interests of the beneficiary under this act and of the employer or carrier, in respect of the cause of action and the damages recovered, shall be as provided for by this section.

"(b) A beneficiary under this act in disability and death cases, or the legal representative of a deceased employee in a death case in which there is no beneficiary entitled to death benefits and in which an obligation exists upon the employer to make payment into the special fund established under section 44, shall have the right to proceed to settle or to enforce the liability of the third party by appropriate proceedings, provided that proceedings are instituted not later than 6 months after the date the cause of action accrues, unless otherwise provided in this section. If the employer or carrier prior to the expiration of the 6 months' period referred to shall have accepted liability for the payment of benefits or for the special fund payment, and shall have made payment under an award made pursuant to this act, and the beneficiary or such legal representative shall not have settled with the third party or instituted proceedings within such 6 months' period, then all right of the beneficiary against the third party shall pass by assignment to the employer to be enforced by him. The employer shall have a right in any case in which there is no person entitled to compensation for death and the employer has paid funeral expenses or made payment into the said special fund to petition for the appointment of an administrator or other legal representative (if none has been appointed) to institute proceedings against a third party, and shall have a pecuniary interest in respect to the cause of action accruing to the estate, widow, or next of kin and in damages recovered to the extent of any funeral expenses paid on account of the death of the employee and on account of the payment into said special fund, whether or not any such payment was made pursuant to an award.

"(c) In cases in which benefits have been paid by an employer without an award, no assignment of a beneficiary's cause of action shall take place under the conditions specified in subsection (b) until 90 days prior to the running of the statute of limitations affecting the cause of action. In such a case, the employer who has paid or furnished benefits shall give notice in writing to the deputy commissioner and to all other parties in interest of his intention to institute a proceeding against the third party. If no proceeding has been instituted prior to such 90-day period such notice shall operate as an assignment of the cause of action to the employer, effective on the 90th day prior to the running of the applicable statute of limitations.

"(d) In any case in which the employer (or the carrier by subrogation as hereinafter provided) receiving the assignment of the cause of action fails, refuses or neglects to sue upon or to compromise or settle the cause on or before the 30th day prior to the running of the statute of limitations affecting the cause, the right of action shall be deemed to have been reassigned on such 30th day to the person in whom the right originated.

"(e) For the purpose of determining and applying credits, as hereinafter provided, in respect to the amount recovered against the third party by settlement, suit or otherwise, no attorney's fee or item of cost in connection with a third party settlement or suit shall be considered unless approved as reasonable by the deputy commissioner. In the event recovery of damages by suit or settlement is made against the third party, whether by the person in whom the cause of action accrued or by the employer through assignment or by the carrier through subrogation, before any crediting of the sum recovered against future benefits there shall be deducted the necessary expenses incident to realization of the recovery, such as reasonable attorney's fee and costs as approved by the deputy commissioner. If the beneficiary makes the recovery, he shall also be entitled to retain one-third of the proceeds after deduction of expenses as approved. If the employer or carrier makes the recovery, he shall be entitled to retain, after deducting expenses as approved, a sum equal to benefits paid by him in the case under this act and one-fifth of the proceeds less the expenses. From the net proceeds after all such deductions, the beneficiary making the recovery shall reimburse the employer to the extent of the compensation and other benefits paid for by the employer as approved by the deputy commissioner, and any balance remaining thereafter shall be applied as a credit against future compensation for the same injury or death. If the employer, after all such deductions, shall have remaining in his possession a balance of the recovery, such balance, which shall serve as a credit against the payment of future benefits for the injury or death on account of which the recovery was made, shall be paid forthwith to the beneficiary or, if deceased, to his estate, unless the deputy commissioner shall require the employer to establish a trust fund consisting of such balance or any part thereof deemed necessary to defray the cost of future benefits for the same injury or death, any remaining balance to be paid to the employee or to his estate.

"(f) No settlement or compromise of a claim against a third party shall be made either before or after institution of proceedings without the written consent of the beneficiary (if the claim is prosecuted by the employer) or without the written consent of the employer (if the claim is prosecuted by the beneficiary). If settlement is made without such written consent and objection to the settlement is made in writing to the deputy commissioner, the deputy commissioner shall determine whether the amount agreed upon in settlement with the third party is reasonable, considering all facts and circumstances in the case. Upon finding that such amount is reasonable, the amount recovered shall be disposed of and credited as provided in subsection (e). If found not reasonable, the deputy commissioner shall determine what amount of settlement would have been reasonable under the circumstances and shall compute the allowances and credits on the basis of such amount, in the manner provided in subsection (e); and either the beneficiary or the employer shall have an action as for debt against the other for any unpaid residual net amounts found due by the deputy commissioner after computation under subsection (e).

"(g) In any proceeding against a third party, whether brought by the beneficiary, or the employer (or carrier), or by legal representative, widow or next of kin, any party to the proceedings under this act having a claim against the proceeds or amount recoverable from the third party shall have a lien against the amount recovered to the extent of his claim. Such lien shall be claimed by filing a notice in such proceeding and by serving a copy upon the parties to the court proceedings.

"(h) Where the employer is insured, the insurance carrier which has paid compensation or furnished benefits under this act shall be subrogated to all the rights of the employer under this section. Any reference in this section to the employer shall for the purposes of this section be deemed to include the insurance carrier.

"(i) The right to compensation or benefits under this act shall be the exclusive remedy to an employee when he is injured or to his eligible survivors or legal representatives if he is killed by the negligence or wrong of another in the same employ."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without the time being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill is now before the Senate, and the unanimous-consent agreement is in effect.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the essential feature of the pending bill is to give an employee injured by reason of the negligence of a third party the opportunity to bring suit against such third party, and at the same time to receive his workmen's compensation benefits under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act. He must bring such suit against the third party not later than 6 months after the date when the cause of action accrues. After this time, under certain circumstances, the right of action shall pass by assignment to the employer to be enforced by him.

At the present time under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act a worker who is injured is entitled to compensation, but if he elects to receive the compensation, he is denied the right to institute a suit against a

third party whose negligence may have caused him injury.

The effect of the pending bill is to entitle him to receive his compensation and also to institute a suit within a reasonable period of time. It did not seem to the House of Representatives, which passed the bill unanimously, or to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate, which approved the bill unanimously, that merely because a worker receives compensation under the Longshoremen's Act as a result of an injury, he should be denied the right to institute a suit against a third party who may have caused him injury.

It seems to me that the proposed legislation is in the public interest, and that it provides a great improvement which closes a loophole in the present act. The Senate should follow the example of the House and pass the proposed legislation.

I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time, provided the other side is prepared to yield back its time.

I wish to make it absolutely clear that under the bill an employee making a recovery after paying attorney's fees and other costs would retain one-third of the net recovery. He would then be obligated to reimburse the employer for compensation or benefits paid, and he would retain the balance of the recovery after deducting the compensation paid.

In other words the employee would receive all of the recovery except the costs of making it and the amount which he pays to the employer for benefits and compensation paid to him by the employer for the injury.

Any amounts accruing to an employee as a result of a third party suit under this bill would be credited against any future liability which the employer might have for the same—I repeat the same—injury or death.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). Does the Senator desire to have time yielded to him?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I intend to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the bill of the Senator from Massachusetts. The amendment is a substitute for S. 1313, which is at the desk. I suggest that my amendment in the nature of a substitute be read by title only, because I shall explain it in some detail.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. THURMOND. Would the Senator object to my asking that copies of the report on the bill be circulated? I do not believe they are on the desks. I think that should be done if the bill is to be taken up now.

Mr. MORSE. I thought they were on the desks of Senators. If not, they will be distributed at once.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Oregon desire to yield himself?

Mr. MORSE. I will start with 10 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to have the attachés on both sides of the aisle make certain that copies of the report on the bill, which are available, as well as copies of the bill itself, are delivered to the desk of each Senator. Of course, they can be obtained by Senators coming to the desk, but it would be more convenient to have them delivered to the desk of each Senator.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I should like to ask one question before the Senator from Oregon starts: Is the amendment which the Senator has sent to the desk the bill S. 1313?

Mr. MORSE. The amendment I have sent to the desk is a modification of S. 1313. I am about to explain the modification.

Mr. ALLOTT. Then, it is not S. 1313 as reported by the committee?

Mr. MORSE. Not as reported to the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have the yeas and nays on the amendment of the Senator from Oregon, so that all Senators may know that at the conclusion of the unanimous-consent agreement there will be a vote?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Oregon that the unanimous-consent agreement provides that S. 1313 shall be offered. It is the opinion of the Chair that the amendment of the Senator from Oregon would be out of order until S. 1313 has been offered. Does the Senator from Oregon now offer his amendment as a substitute?

Mr. MORSE. I call up S. 1313 as an amendment, and I notify the Senate that when it has been called up, I will offer my amendment in the nature of a substitute for S. 1313.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon still does not have S. 1313 before the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. I now offer it as an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon desire to have his amendment stated or printed in the RECORD?

Mr. MORSE. I ask that the amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be printed.

The amendment is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

PART I—AMENDMENTS TO THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT OF 1937

SECTION 1. (a) Section 2 (a) 3 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is amended to read as follows:

"3. Individuals who will have attained the age of 60 and will have completed 30 years of service or, in the case of women, who will have attained the age of 62 and will have completed less than 30 years of service, but the annuity of such individual shall be reduced by one one-hundred-and-eightieth for each calendar month that he or she is under age 65 when the annuity begins to accrue."

(b) Section 2 (d) of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "If pursuant to the third sentence of this subsection an annuity was not paid to an individual with respect to 1 or more months in any calendar year, and it is subsequently established that the total amount of such individual's earnings during such year as determined in accordance with that sentence (but exclusive of earnings for services described in the first sentence of this subsection) did not exceed $1,200, the annuity with respect to such month or months, and any deduction imposed by reason of the failure to report earnings for such month or months under the fifth sentence of this subsection, shall then be payable. If the total amount of such individual's earnings during such year (exclusive of earnings for services described in the first sentence of this subsection) is in excess of $1,200, the number of months in such year with respect to which an annuity is not payable by reason of such third and fifth sentences shall not exceed 1 month for each $100 of such excess, treating the last $50 or more of such excess as $100; and if the amount of the annuity has changed during such year, any payments of annuity which become payable solely by reason of the limitation contained in this sentence shall be made first with respect to the month or months for which the annuity is larger."

(c) Section 2 (e) of such act is amended by striking out "than an amount" and inserting in lieu thereof "than 110 percent of an amount."

(d) Section 2 (g) of such act is amended by inserting after "wife under age 65" the following: "(other than a wife who is receiving such annuity by reason of an election under subsection (h))."

(e) Section 2 of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) A spouse who would be entitled to an annuity under subsection (e) if she or he had attained the age of 65 may elect upon or after attaining the age of 62 to receive such annuity, but the annuity in any such case shall be reduced by one one-hundred-and-eightieth for each calendar month that the spouse is under age 65 when the annuity begins to accrue."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 3 (a) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is amended (1) by striking out "3.04," "2.28," and "1.52" and inserting in lieu thereof "3.35," "2.51," and "1.67," respectively; and (2) by striking out "200" and inserting in lieu thereof "$250."

(b) Section 3 (c) of such act is amended by inserting after "or in excess or $350 for any month after June 30, 1954," the following: "and before January 1, 1959, or in excess of $400 for any month after December 31, 1958,."

(c) Section 3 (e) of such act is amended (1) by striking out "$4.55," "$75.90," and "his monthly compensation" and inserting in lieu thereof "$5.00," "$83.50" and "110 per cent of his monthly compensation," respectively; (2) by striking out "is less than the amount, or the additional amount" and inserting in lieu thereof "is less than 110 percent of the amount, or 110 percent of the additional amount"; (3) by inserting after "age 65," the following: "women entitled to spouse's annuities pursuant to elections made under subsection (h) of section 2 to be entitled to wife's insurance benefits determined under section 202 (q) of the Social Security Act,"; and (4) by striking out "such amount or such additional amount" and inserting in lieu thereof "110 percent of such amount or 110 percent of such additional amount."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 5 (f) (1) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is amended (1) by striking out of the first sentence the following: "who will have died leaving no widow, widower, child, or parent who would on proper application therefor be entitled

to receive an annuity under this section for the month in which such death occurred"; (2) by inserting in the first sentence after "10 times the employee's basic amount" the following: ", but not to exceed a total of $750,"; and (3) by striking out the fourth sentence.

(b) Section 5 (f) (2) of such act is amended by striking out "and 7 percent of his or her compensation after December 31, 1946 (exclusive in both cases of compensation in excess of $300 for any month before July 1, 1954, and in the latter case in excess of $350 for any month after June 30, 1954)," and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "plus 7 percent of his or her compensation paid after December 31, 1946, and before January 1, 1960, plus 8 percent of his or her compensation paid after December 31, 1959 (exclusive of compensation in excess of $300 for any month before July 1, 1954, and in excess of $350 for any month after June 30, 1954, and before January 1, 1960, and in excess of $400 for any month after December 31, 1959),."

(c) Section 5 (h) of such act is amended by striking out "$33", "$176", and "$15.40" wherever they appear and inserting in lieu thereof "$36.30", "$193.60", and "$16.95", respectively.

(d) Section 5 (l) (1) (ii) of such act is amended by striking out "or in which month he engaged on seven or more different calendar days in noncovered remunerative activity outside the United States (as defined in section 203 (k) of the Social Security Act)" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "or, having engaged in any activity outside the United States, would be charged under such section 203 (e) with any earnings derived from such activity if it had been an activity within the United States."

(e) Clause (A) (i) of section 5 (l) (9) of such act is amended by striking out the word "and" appearing after "July 1, 1954," and by inserting after "June 30, 1954," the following: "and before January 1, 1959, and any excess over $400 for any calendar month after December 31, 1958."

(f) Clause (A) (ii) of section 5 (l) (9) of such act is amended (1) by inserting "and before 1959" after "1954" where it first appears; (2) by inserting after "$4,200" where it first appears the following: ", or for any calendar year after 1958 is less than $4,800,"; (3) by striking out "$350" and inserting in lieu thereof "$400"; and (4) by striking out "and $4,200 for years after 1954 by" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", $4,200 for years after 1954 and before 1959, and $4,800 for years after 1958, by."

(g) Section 5 (l) (10) of such act is amended by striking out "44", "11", "$350", "$15.40", "$36.66", "$27.50", and "$14.66" wherever they appear and inserting in lieu thereof "49", "12", "$400", "$16.95", "$40.33", "$30.25", and "$16.13", respectively.

SEC. 4. All pensions under section 6 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, all joint and survivor annuities and survivor annuities deriving from joint and survivor annuities under that act awarded before January 1, 1959, all widows' and widowers' insurance annuities which began to accrue before January 1, 1959, and which, in accordance with the proviso in section 5 (a) or section 5 (b) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, are payable in the amount of the spouse's annuity to which the widow or widower was entitled, and all annuities under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935, are increased by 10 percent.

SEC. 5. (a) The amendments made by section 1 (other than subsection (b) thereof), by subsections (a) and (c) of section 2, and by subsections (c) and (d) of section 3 shall be effective only with respect to annuities (not including annuities to which section 4 applies) accruing for months after December 1958. The amendment made by subsection (b) of section 1 shall be effective with respect to annuities accruing during the calendar year 1959 and subsequent calendar years. The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) of section 3 shall be effective only with respect to lump-sum payments (under sections 5 (f) (1) and 5 (f) (2) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937) in the case of deaths occurring after December 1958. The amendments made by subsection (g) of section 3 shall be effective only with respect to annuities accruing for months after December 1958 and lump-sum payments (under section 5 (f) (1) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937) in the case of deaths occurring after December 1958. Section 4 shall be effective only with respect to pensions due in calendar months after December 1958 and annuities accruing for months after November 1958.

(b) All recertifications required by reason of the amendments made by this part shall be made by the Railroad Retirement Board without application therefor.

PART II—AMENDMENTS TO THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT TAX ACT

SEC. 201. (a) Sections 3201, 3202 (a), 3211, and 3221 of the Railroad Retirement Tax Act are each amended (1) by striking out "after December 31, 1951" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "after December 31, 1959", and (2) by striking out "$350" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$400."

(b) Sections 3202 (a) and 3221 of such act are each further amended by striking out "after 1954" and inserting in lieu thereof "after 1959."

(c) Sections 3201 and 3221 of such act are each further amended by striking out "6¼ percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "7½ percent."

(d) Section 3201 of such act is further amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu of such period a colon and the following: *"Provided,* That the rate of tax imposed by this section shall be increased, with respect to compensation paid after December 31, 1964, for services rendered after such date, by a number of percentage points (including fractional points) equal at any given time to the number of percentage points (including fractional points) by which the rate of the tax imposed with respect to wages by section 3101 at such time exceeds the rate provided by paragraph (2) of such section 3101 as amended by the Social Security Amendments of 1956."

(e) Section 3211 of such act is further amended by striking out "12½ percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "15 percent", and by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu of such period a colon and the following: *"Provided,* That the rate of tax imposed by this section shall be increased, with respect to compensation paid after December 31, 1964, for services rendered after such date, by a number of percentage points (including fractional points) equal at any given time to twice the number of percentage points (including fractional points) by which the rate of the tax imposed with respect to wages by section 3101 at such time exceeds the rate provided by paragraph (2) of such section 3101 as amended by the Social Security Amendments of 1956."

(f) Section 3221 of such act is further amended by inserting "(a)" before "In addition", and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) The rate of tax imposed by subsection (a) shall be increased, with respect to compensation paid after December 31, 1964, for services rendered after such date, by a number of percentage points (including fractional points) equal at any given time to the number of percentage points (including fractional points) by which the rate of the tax imposed with respect to wages by section 3111 at such time exceeds the rate provided by paragraph (2) of such section 3111 as amended by the Social Security Amendments of 1956."

SEC. 202. The amendments made by section 201 shall, except as otherwise provided in such amendments, be effective only with respect to compensation paid after December 31, 1959, for services rendered after such date.

PART III—AMENDMENTS TO THE RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

SEC. 301. Section 1 (i) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by striking out the proviso in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof ": *Provided, however,* That in computing the compensation paid to any employee, no part of any month's compensation in excess of $300 for any month before July 1, 1954, or in excess of $350 for any month after June 30, 1954, and before July 1, 1958, or in excess of $400 for any month after June 30, 1958, shall be recognized."

SEC. 302. (a) Section 2 (a) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by striking out the language between "(i)" and "(ii)" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "for each day of unemployment in excess of 4 during any registration period, and."

(b) Section 2 (a) of such act is further amended by striking out columns I and II and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Column I total compensation	*"Column II daily benefit rate*
$500 to 699.99	$4.50
700 to 999.99	5.00
1,000 to 1,299.99	5.50
1,300 to 1,599.99	6.00
1,600 to 1,899.99	6.50
1,900 to 2,199.99	7.00
2,200 to 2,499.99	7.50
2,500 to 2,799.99	8.00
2,800 to 3,099.99	8.50
3,100 to 3,499.99	9.00
3,500 to 3,999.99	9.50
4,000 and over	10.20."

(c) The proviso in such section 2 (a) is amended by striking out "50" and "$8.50" and inserting in lieu thereof "60" and "$10.20," respectively.

SEC. 303. Section 2 (c) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu of such period a colon and the following: *"And provided further,* That, with respect to an employee who has 10 or more years of service as defined in section 1 (f) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, who did not voluntarily leave work without good cause or voluntarily retire, and who had current rights to normal benefits for days of unemployment in a benefit year but has exhausted such rights, the benefit year in which such rights are exhausted shall be deemed not to be ended until the last day of the extended benefit period determined under the following schedule, and the maximum number of days of, and amount of payment for, unemployment within such benefit year for which benefits may be paid to the employee shall be enlarged to include all compensable days of unemployment within such extended benefit period:

"If the employee's 'years of service' total—	The extended benefit period shall begin on the 1st day of unemployment following the day on which the employee exhausted his then current rights to normal benefits for days of unemployment and shall continue for successive 14-day periods (each of which periods shall constitute a registration period) until the number of such 14-day periods totals—
10 and less than 15	13
15 and over	26

but no such extended benefit period shall extend beyond the beginning of the first registration period in a benefit year in which the employee is again qualified for benefits in accordance with section 3 of this act on the basis of compensation earned after the first of such successive 14-day periods has begun. For an employee who has 10 or more years of service, who did not voluntarily leave work without good cause or voluntarily retire, who has 14 or more consecutive days of unemployment, and who is not a 'qualified employee' for the general benefit year current when such unemployment commences but is or becomes a 'qualified employee' for the next succeeding general benefit year, such succeeding benefit year shall, in his case, begin on the first day of the month in which such unemployment commences."

SEC. 304. Section 3 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by striking out "$400" and inserting in lieu thereof "$500."

SEC. 305. Section 4 (a-2) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by striking out subdivision (iv), and by striking out the semicolon at the end of subdivision (iii) and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

SEC. 306. Section 8 (a) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended (1) by inserting after "June 30, 1954" where it first appears the following: ", and before July 1, 1958, and is not in excess of $400 for any calendar month paid by him to any employee for services rendered to him after June 30, 1958"; (2) by inserting after "June 30, 1954" where it appears for the second time the following: ", and before July 1, 1958, and to not more than $400 for any month after June 30, 1958"; (3) by inserting after "June 30, 1954" where it appears for the third time the following: ", and before July 1, 1958, or less than $400 if such month is after June 30, 1958"; (4) by striking out "1947" in paragraph 2 and inserting in lieu thereof "1958"; and (5) by striking out the table (except the column headings) in such paragraph 2 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"$450,000,000 or more	2 percent
$400,000,000 or more but less than $450,000,000	2½ percent
$350,000,000 or more but less than $400,000,000	3 percent
$300,000,000 or more but less than $350,000,000	3½ percent
Less than $300,000,000	4 percent."

SEC. 307. Section 8 (b) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended (1) by striking out "3 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "4 percent"; and (2) by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence the following: ", and before January 1, 1959, and as is not in excess of $400 paid to him for services rendered as an employee representative in any calendar month after December 31, 1958."

SEC. 308. The amendments made by sections 302, 303, and 305 shall be effective with respect to benefits accruing in general benefit years which begin after the benefit year ending June 30, 1958, and in extended benefit periods which begin after December 31, 1957. The amendment made by section 304 shall be effective with respect to base years after the base year ending December 31, 1957. The amendment made by clause (1) of section 307 shall apply with respect to compensation paid for services rendered in calendar months after December 31, 1958. The amendment made by clause (5) of section 306 shall be effective with respect to compensation paid for services rendered in calendar months after December 31, 1958.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now offer the amendments which I send to the desk as a substitute for S. 1313, the amendments which have been previously printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In accordance with the previous request of the Senator from Oregon, the amendments in the nature of a substitute will be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The bill as it would be amended is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

PART I—AMENDMENTS TO THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT OF 1937

SECTION 1. (a) Section 2 (a) 3 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is amended to read as follows:

"3. Individuals who will have attained the age of 60 and will have completed 30 years of service or, in the case of women, who will have attained the age of 62 and will have completed less than 30 years of service, but the annuity of such individual shall be reduced by one one-hundred-and-eightieth for each calendar month that he or she is under age 65 when the annuity begins to accrue."

(b) Section 2 (d) of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "If pursuant to the third sentence of this subsection an annuity was not paid to an individual with respect to one or more months in any calendar year, and it is subsequently established that the total amount of such individual's earnings during such year as determined in accordance with that sentence (but exclusive of earnings for services described in the first sentence of this subsection) did not exceed $1,200, the annuity with respect to such month or months, and any deduction imposed by reason of the failure to report earnings for such month or months under the fifth sentence of this subsection, shall then be payable. If the total amount of such individual's earnings during such year (exclusive of earnings for services described in the first sentence of this subsection) is in excess of $1,200, the number of months in such year with respect to which an annuity is not payable by reason of such third and fifth sentences shall not exceed 1 month for each $100 of such excess, treating the last $50 or more of such excess as $100; and if the amount of the annuity has changed during such year, any payments of annuity which become payable solely by reason of the limitation contained in this sentence shall be made first with respect to the month or months for which the annuity is larger."

(c) Section 2 (e) of such act is amended by striking out "than an amount" and inserting in lieu thereof "than 110 percent of an amount."

(d) Section 2 (g) of such act is amended by inserting after "wife under age 65" the following: "(other than a wife who is receiving such annuity by reason of an election under subsection (h))."

(e) Section 2 of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) A spouse who would be entitled to an annuity under subsection (e) if she or he had attained the age of 65 may elect upon or after attaining the age of 62 to receive such annuity, but the annuity in any such case shall be reduced by one one-hundred-and-eightieth for each calendar month that the spouse is under age 65 when the annuity begins to accrue."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 3 (a) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is amended (1) by striking out "3.04", "2.28", and "1.52" and inserting in lieu thereof "3.35", "2.51", and "1.67", respectively; and (2) by striking out "200" and inserting in lieu thereof "$250."

(b) Section 3 (c) of such act is amended by inserting after "or in excess of $350 for any month after June 30, 1954," the following: "and before January 1, 1959, or in excess of $400 for any month after December 31, 1958."

(c) Section 3 (e) of such act is amended (1) by striking out "$4.55", "$75.90", and "his monthly compensation" and inserting in lieu thereof "$5.00", "$83.50" and "110 percent of his monthly compensation", respectively; (2) by striking out "is less than the amount, or the additional amounts" and inserting in lieu thereof "is less than 110 percent of the amount, or 110 percent of the additional amount"; (3) by inserting after "age 65", the following: "women entitled to spouse's annuities pursuant to elections made under subsection (h) of section 2 to be entitled to wife's insurance benefits determined under section 202 (q) of the Social Security Act,"; and (4) by striking out "such amount or such additional amount" and inserting in lieu thereof "110 percent of such amount or 110 percent of such additional amount."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 5 (f) (2) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is amended by striking out "and 7 percent of his or her compensation after December 31, 1946 (exclusive in both cases of compensation in excess of $300 for any month before July 1, 1954, and in the latter case in excess of $350 for any month after June 30, 1954)," and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "plus 7 percent of his or her compensation paid after December 31, 1946, and before January 1, 1959, plus 7½ percent of his or her compensation paid after December 31, 1958, and before January 1, 1962, plus 8 percent of his or her compensation paid after December 31, 1961 (exclusive of compensation in excess of $300 for any month before July 1, 1954, and in excess of $350 for any month after June 30, 1954, and before January 1, 1959, and in excess of $400 for any month after December 21, 1958)."

(b) Section 5 (h) of such act is amended by striking out "$33", "$176", and "$15.40" wherever they appear and inserting in lieu thereof "$36.30", "$193.60", and "$16.95", respectively.

(c) Section 5 (l) (1) (ii) of such act is amended by striking out "or in which month he engaged on seven or more different calendar days in noncovered remunerative activity outside the United States (as defined in section 203 (k) of the Social Security Act)" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "or, having engaged in any activity outside the United States, would be charged under such section 203 (e) with any earnings derived from such activity if it had been an activity within the United States."

(d) Clause (A) (i) of section 5 (l) (9) of such act is amended by striking out the word "and" appearing after "July 1, 1954," and by inserting after "June 30, 1954," the following: "and before January 1, 1959, and any excess over $400 for any calendar month after December 31, 1958."

(e) Clause (A) (ii) of section 5 (l) (9) of such act is amended (1) by inserting "and before 1959" after "1954" where it first appears; (2) by inserting after "$4,200" where it first appears the following: ", or for any calendar year after 1958 is less than $4,800,"; (3) by striking out "$350" and inserting in lieu thereof "$400"; and (4) by striking out "and $4,200 for years after 1954, by" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", $4,200 for years after 1954 and before 1959, and $4,800 for years after 1958, by."

(f) Section 5 (l) (10) of such act is amended by striking out "44", "11", "$350", "$15.40", "$36.66", "$27.50", and "$14.66" wherever they appear and inserting in lieu thereof "49", "12", "$400", "$16.95", "$40.33", "$30.25", and "$16.13", respectively.

SEC. 4. All pensions under section 6 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, all joint and survivor annuities and survivor annuities deriving from joint and survivor annuities

under that act awarded before January 1, 1959, all widows' and widowers' insurance annuities which began to accrue before February 1, 1959, and which, in accordance with the proviso in section 5 (a) or section 5 (b) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, are payable in the amount of the spouse's annuity to which the widow or widower was entitled, and all annuities under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935, are increased by 10 percent.

SEC. 5. (a) The amendments made by section 1 (other than subsection (b) thereof), by subsections (a) and (c) of section 2, and by subsections (b) and (c) of section 3 shall be effective only with respect to annuities (not including annuities to which section 4 applies) accruing for months after December 1958. The amendment made by subsection (b) of section 1 shall be effective with respect to annuities accruing during the calendar year 1959 and subsequent calendar years. The amendment made by subsection (a) of section 3 shall be effective only with respect to lump-sum payments (under section 5 (f) (2) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937) in the case of deaths occurring after December 1958. The amendments made by subsection (f) of section 3 shall be effective only with respect to annuities accruing for months after December 1958 and lump-sum payments (under section 5 (f) (1) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937) in the case of deaths occurring after December 1958. Section 4 shall be effective only with respect to pensions due in calendar months after January 1959 and annuities accruing for months after December 1958.

(b) All recertifications required by reason of the amendments made by this part shall be made by the Railroad Retirement Board without application therefor.

PART II—AMENDMENTS TO THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT TAX ACT

SEC. 201. (a) Section 3201 of the Railroad Retirement Tax Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3201. Rate of tax.

"In addition to other taxes, there is hereby imposed on the income of every employee a tax equal to:

"(1) 6¾ percent of so much of the compensation paid to such employee for services rendered by him after December 31, 1958, and before January 1, 1962, and

"(2) 7¼ percent of so much of the compensation paid to such employee for services rendered by him after December 31, 1961, as is not in excess of $400 for any calendar month: *Provided*, That the rate of tax imposed by this section shall be increased, with respect to compensation paid for services rendered after December 31, 1964, by a number of percentage points (including fractional points) equal to any given time to the number of percentage points (including fractional points) by which the rate of the tax imposed with respect to wages by section 3101 at such time exceeds the rate provided by paragraph (2) of such section 3101 as amended by the social security amendments of 1956."

(b) Section 3202 (a) of the Railroad Retirement Tax Act is amended (1) by striking out "after December 31, 1954" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "after December 31, 1958"; (2) by striking out "$350" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$400"; (3) by striking out "after 1954" and inserting in lieu thereof "after 1958."

(c) Section 3211 of the Railroad Retirement Tax Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3211. Rate of tax.

"In addition to other taxes, there is hereby imposed on the income of each employee representative a tax equal to—

"(1) 13½ percent of so much of the compensation paid to such employee representative for services rendered by him after December 31, 1958, and before January 1, 1962, and

"(2) 14½ percent of so much of the compensation paid to such employee representative for services rendered by him after December 31, 1961,

as is not in excess of $400 for any calendar month: *Provided*, That the rate of tax imposed by this section shall be increased, with respect to compensation paid for services rendered after December 31, 1964, by a number of percentage points (including fractional points) equal at any given time to twice the number of percentage points (including fractional points) by which the rate of the tax imposed with respect to wages by section 3101 at such time exceeds the rate provided by paragraph (2) of such section 3101 as amended by the social security amendments of 1956."

(d) (1) Section 3221 of the Railroad Retirement Tax Act is amended by striking out "In addition to" and all that follows down through "$350" the first time it appears, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) In addition to other taxes, there is hereby imposed on every employer an excise tax, with respect to having individuals in his employ, equal to:

"(1) 6¾ percent of so much of the compensation paid by such employer for services rendered to him after December 31, 1958, and before January 1, 1962, and

"(2) 7¼ percent of so much of the compensation paid by such employer for services rendered to him after December 31, 1961, as is, with respect to any employee for any calendar month, not in excess of $400."

(2) Such section 3221 is further amended (A) by striking out "1954" wherever else it appears in that section and inserting in lieu thereof "1958"; (B) by striking out "$350" wherever else it appears in that section and inserting in lieu thereof "$400"; and (C) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) The rate of tax imposed by subsection (a) shall be increased, with respect to compensation paid for services rendered after December 31, 1964, by a number of percentage points (including fractional points) equal at any given time to the number of percentage points (including fractional points) by which the rate of the tax imposed with respect to wages by section 3111 at such time exceeds the rate provided by paragraph (2) of such section 3111 as amended by the social-security amendments of 1956."

SEC. 202. The amendments made by section 201 shall, except as otherwise provided in such amendments, be effective only with respect to compensation paid after December 31, 1958, for services rendered after such date.

PART III—AMENDMENTS TO THE RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

SEC. 301. Section 1 (1) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by striking out the proviso in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof ": *Provided, however*, That in computing the compensation paid to any employee, no part of any month's compensation in excess of $300 for any month before July 1, 1954, or in excess of $350 for any month after June 30, 1954, and before January 1, 1959, or in excess of $400 for any month after December 31, 1958, shall be recognized."

SEC. 302. (a) Section 2 (a) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by striking out the language between "(i)" and "(ii)" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "for each day of unemployment in excess of 4 during any registration period, and."

(b) Section 2 (a) of such act is further amended by striking out columns I and II and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Column I Total Compensation	"Column II Daily Benefit Rate
$500 to $699.99	$4.50
700 to 999.99	5.00
1,000 to 1,299.99	5.50
1,300 to 1,599.99	6.00
1,600 to 1,899.99	6.50
1,900 to 2,199.99	7.00
2,200 to 2,499.99	7.50
2,500 to 2,799.99	8.00
2,800 to 3,099.99	8.50
3,100 to 3,499.99	9.00
3,500 to 3,999.99	9.50
4,000 and over	10.20."

(c) The proviso in such section 2 (a) is amended by striking out "50" and "$8.50" and inserting in lieu thereof "60" and "$10.20," respectively.

SEC. 303 (a). Section 2 (c) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu of such period a colon and the following: "*And provided further*, That, with respect to an employee who has 10 or more years of service as defined in section 1 (f) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, who did not voluntarily leave work without good cause or voluntarily retire, and who had current rights to normal benefits for days of unemployment in a benefit year but has exhausted such rights, the benefit year in which such rights are exhausted shall be deemed not to be ended until the last day of the extended benefit period determined under the following schedule, and the maximum number of days of, and amount of payment for, unemployment within such benefit year for which benefits may be paid to the employee shall be enlarged to include all compensable days of unemployment within such extended benefit period:

"If the employee's 'years of service' total—	The extended benefit period shall begin on the 1st day of unemployment following the day on which the employee exhausted his then current rights to normal benefits for days of unemployment and shall continue for successive 14-day periods (each of which periods shall constitute a registration period) until the number of such 14-day periods totals—
10 and less than 15	7 (but not more than 65)
15 and over	13 days

but no such extended benefit period shall extend beyond the beginning of the first registration period in a benefit year in which the employee is again qualified for benefits in accordance with section 3 of this act on the basis of compensation earned after the first of such successive 14-day periods has begun. For an employee who has 10 or more years of service, who did not voluntarily leave work without good cause or voluntarily retire, who has 14 or more consecutive days of unemployment, and who is not a 'qualified employee' for the general benefit year current when such unemployment commences but is or becomes a 'qualified employee' for the next succeeding general benefit year, such succeeding benefit year shall, in his case, begin on the 1st day of the month in which such unemployment commences."

"(b) An employee who has less than 10 years of service as defined in section 1 (f) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, and who has after June 30, 1957, exhausted (within the meaning prescribed by the Railroad Retirement Board by regulation) his rights to unemployment benefits, shall be paid unemployment benefits for days of unemployment, not exceeding 65, which occur in registration periods beginning on or after June 19, 1958, and before April 1, 1959, and

which would not be days with respect to which he would be held entitled otherwise to receive unemployment benefits under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, except that an employee who has filed, and established, a first claim for benefits under the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958 may not thereafter establish a claim under this subsection, and an employee who has registered for, and established, a claim for benefits under this subsection may not thereafter establish a claim under the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958. Except to the extent inconsistent with this subsection, the provisions of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act shall be applicable in the administration of this subsection.

"(c) The Secretary of Labor, upon request, shall furnish the Board information deemed necessary by the Board for the administration of the provisions of subsection (b) hereof, and the Board, upon request, shall furnish the Secretary of Labor information deemed necessary by the Secretary for the administration of the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958."

SEC. 304. Section 3 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by striking out "$400" and inserting in lieu thereof "$500."

SEC. 305. Section 4 (a-2) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by striking out subdivision (iv), and by striking out the semicolon at the end of subdivision (iii) and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

SEC. 306. Section 8 (a) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended (1) by inserting after "June 30, 1954" where it first appears the following: ", and before January 1, 1959, and is not in excess of $400 for any calendar month paid by him to any employee for services rendered to him after December 31, 1958"; (2) by inserting after "June 30, 1954" where it appears for the second time the following: ", and before January 1, 1959, and to not more than $400 for any month after December 31, 1958"; (3) by inserting after "June 30, 1954" where it appears for the third time the following: ", and before January 1, 1959, or less than $400 if such month is after December 31, 1958"; (4) by striking out "1947" in paragraph 2 and inserting in lieu thereof "1958"; and (5) by striking out the table (except the column headings) in such paragraph 2 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"$450,000,000 or more	1½ percent
$400,000,000 or more but less than $450,000,000	2 percent
$350,000,000 or more but less than $400,000,000	2½ percent
$300,000,000 or more but less than $350,000,000	3 percent
Less than $300,000,000	3½ percent."

SEC. 307. Section 8 (b) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended (1) by striking out "3 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "3½ per centum"; and (2) by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence the following: ", and before January 1, 1959, and as is not in excess of $400 paid to him for services rendered as an employee representative in any calendar month after December 31, 1958."

SEC. 308. The amendments made by sections 302, 303 (a), and 305 shall be effective with respect to benefits accruing in general benefit years which begin after the benefit year ending June 30, 1958, and in extended benefit periods which begin after December 31, 1957. The amendment made by section 304 shall be effective with respect to base years after the base year ending December 31, 1957. The amendment made by clause (1) of section 307 shall apply with respect to compensation paid for services rendered in calendar months after December 31, 1958.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio will state it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is the agreement on the allocation of time, which I understand was made with reference to the original bill, applicable to the amendment in the nature of a substitute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time allotted to any amendment on the longshoremen's bill is 1 hour, the time to be equally divided.

Mr. LAUSCHE. When was the agreement made on the original bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. During the morning hour, approximately 30 minutes ago.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then, do I understand correctly that the time on the railroad retirement bill will be limited to 1 hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One hour and a half on the passage of the bill; 1 hour on the railroad retirement bill, since it has been offered as an amendment; and 1 hour on any other amendment offered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the RECORD will show that night before last I stated on the floor of the Senate that I would offer the substitute now pending as an amendment to S. 1313 when the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the railroad-retirement bill. I shall be very brief in my explanation of the bill. Because of the highly technical nature of the bill, I prefer to explain it first, and shall answer questions after I have completed the explanation of the bill.

Every Senator knows me well enough to know that I never knowingly conceal from the Senate any feature or any fact connected with any bill I am sponsoring; but I wish to explain the parliamentary situation.

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare reported to the Senate, by a vote of 8 to 5, S. 1313. The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported a bill somewhat at variance with S. 1313.

The majority leader and some other leaders in Congress asked me to confer with the chairman of the House committee, Representative OREN HARRIS, to see what the two of us, at least, could agree upon as a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate bill, which could be considered by both bodies of Congress in the interest of getting some legislation passed.

I take full responsibility for what I am saying. I pass no buck to anyone. I am giving the parliamentary facts as to what we have done in the rush of the closing days of this session of Congress in order to get some legislation passed.

The substitute I am offering is a substitute which the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is willing to stand for in the House. It represents a considerable markdown of the Senate bill. It represents a great saving over the cost of the Senate bill, if we want to look at it from that standpoint.

I have offered the amendment in the nature of a substitute, and I shall now proceed to explain it. But first, if any of my colleagues have any questions as to the procedure I follow, they certainly are entitled to ask them now.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have only had the opportunity to glance quickly at the explanation furnished us on the proposed amendment to S. 1313. Am I correct in observing that the tax period has been moved up to January 1, 1959?

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator will permit me to explain the matter, I think much time can be saved. Will the Senator permit me to make my explanation, and then ask me such questions as he desires to propound?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I must attend an executive meeting of the Rackets Committee, and I wanted to clear up the one point. The major objection I had was that we were jeopardizing the fund by not moving up the tax period at the same time the benefits started.

Mr. MORSE. The answer I have given the Senator is only partially correct. We are proposing to raise the tax to 6¾ percent on January 1, 1959, and then to 7¼ percent on January 1, 1962. We thought if we brought it up to 6¾ percent on January 1, 1959, that would give us, for the period of time involved, the actuarial soundness which is needed for that period.

Then when the figure is brought up to 7¼ percent on January 1, 1962, we will have taken up any lag between January 1, 1959, and January 1, 1962, so that by January 1, 1962, the fund will be actuarially sound, save and except for .57. I shall say something about that in my explanation; but suffice, for now, to say that actuarial experts advise us that any figure less than 1.0 is a figure which can be ignored in connection with the balancing of a fund as huge as this, just as in the case of the social-security fund. Actuaries pay no attention to any imbalance less than 1 percent.

If the figures I have stated shall be adopted, the so-called imbalance will be .57 percent, but the actuaries say to ignore that, because that figure shifts back and forth in a fund as large as this, depending on the number of people who die, the number of people who are unemployed, and so on.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am very happy that the Senator from Oregon has made this change. As he knows, he and I have discussed this subject. I was very much worried about the actuarial soundness of the fund. It is one of our better funds. I do not want to see it become depleted to the point where it might disappear in from 4 to 7 years. I commend the Senator for changing at least that portion of the bill.

I regret that I cannot remain to hear the rest of the Senator's explanation, because I have a previous commitment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], who is an able member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to feel that when he returns, he can meet me in the cloakroom and can examine the matter further with me, if there is

any point on which he is not clear. I urge that he do so, because if there is anything that I am exceedingly careful about, it is that when I serve as the chairman of a subcommittee, as I have in this instance, I wish my colleagues to know every step I have taken. But as is the case with the Senator from Arizona, I have been caught in the last minute rush, in the effort to work out a measure which will be fair. So I stand on my responsibility in that connection.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Since the Senator from Oregon has invited comments at this time, I shall do so now, rather than speak at a later time.

I wish to say now that my own efforts for the enactment of some railroad legislation date from the time when I entered the Senate and became a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

All that I regret about the situation is that after I have worked hard on this matter, and have studied it, and have spent endless hours in my office and in commitee with the senior Senator from Oregon, and, in addition, have done everything I could to accelerate the consideration of this piece of proposed legislation, it is a little disconcerting, to say the least, to walk onto the floor of the Senate this morning, in anticipation that Senate bill 1313 would be considered, and to have the chairman of the subcommittee tell me—for the first time—that he has a substitute proposal which he wishes to have adopted—without an opportunity for me to consult the Railroad Retirement Board or its actuaries or attorneys; or to consult about the matter with the members of the railroad industry, who certainly are vitally interested in this matter; or, as a matter of fact, to consult with anyone except myself.

I realize that the Senator from Oregon is under great compulsion in connection with this matter.

On the other hand, the matter is an extremely complicated one; and it can be considered intelligently by the Senate only when all the Members are present, and when we are able to have their undivided attention for 3 or 4 hours at one time. Under those circumstances I think the Senate could vote intelligently on the matter. But when less time is available, it will be almost impossible for the Senate to do so, in view of the complexities involved.

I think the Senator from Oregon will agree with me on that point.

Mr. MORSE. I fully understand, and I appreciate the viewpoint the Senator from Colorado has expressed. I extend to him my sincere personal apologies for the fact that I have not talked to him in advance of our discussion at this time. However, I wish to say that I placed the amendment in the nature of a substitute in the RECORD the day before yesterday; and I have talked to as many Senators as I could find to talk to. The fact that I have not found the Senator from Colorado is no fault of his, but is my fault; and I assume the responsibility for it.

But let me say that any modification of Senate bill 1313 that is proposed by means of this amendment in the nature of a substitute is in the direction of the provision the Senator from Colorado proposed in the committee; that is to say, the amendment in the nature of a substitute will not increase any of the costs or benefits provided by Senate bill 1313, but, on the contrary, will reduce them. Any modification proposed by the amendment in the nature of a substitute is in the direction of yielding to the House proposal, with the result that the amendment in the nature of a substitute will be less costly, provides for fewer benefits, and is what may be called a cutback of Senate bill 1313, in the direction of favoring the House bill.

Mr. President, I freely acknowledge that the Senator's criticism of me is justified; and I accept it. However, I wish to say that I have not entered into any agreement—either temporary or permanent—with the chairman of the House committee, Representative OREN HARRIS, with respect to increasing the benefits provided by Senate bill 1313. Therefore, from that point of view, I do not think I am Peck's Bad Boy.

Mr. ALLOTT. I was not implying that the Senator from Oregon is Peck's Bad Boy.

Mr. MORSE. I did not mean to indicate that the Senator from Colorado was implying that.

Mr. ALLOTT. But, inasmuch as the Senator from Oregon has invited comment——

Mr. MORSE. Yes; and it is only fair for Senators to comment.

Mr. ALLOTT. Therefore, I wish to comment on the situation.

The Senate is about to legislate on one of the most complex subjects on which it could legislate; and I, for one, did not have an opportunity—and I do not think any other Members did—to study the amendment in the nature of a substitute. I saw the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as submitted by the Senator from Oregon. But, inasmuch as I have been a member of the conference committee on the education bill, and was tied up in that conference committee from early yesterday morning until late in the afternoon, I have not had an opportunity to inquire about the Senator's amendment in the nature of a substitute. I attempted, once, to get some information about it; but I have not yet been able to do so.

So we shall simply have to proceed to consider the matter and to vote on it as best we can.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say, in addition, that the Senate is in the process of taking action on Senate bill 1313, as modified. The committee report, which includes both the majority report and the minority views on Senate bill 1313, is available to all Senators. Therefore, the parliamentary situation in regard to our consideration of this measure is identical to the parliamentary situation in regard to the consideration of many, many other bills by the Senate. In other words, the normal procedure is that the committee concerned submits its report; and amendments to the measure, as reported by the committee, are submitted on the floor of the Senate—amendments either to increase or to decrease, so to speak.

All the recommendations in connection with this subject that are now before the Senate call for cutbacks.

Therefore, the situation in regard to this bill is no different from that in regard to other measures which are brought up on the floor of the Senate, when amendments to them are submitted on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. ALLOTT. I agree that in that respect there is no difference between this situation and the situation when an amendment in the nature of a substitute is submitted on the floor of the Senate to some other bill under consideration by this body.

The only difference is that most bills can be understood after a brief amount of study, especially when one has been considering them previously. On the other hand, it is impossible to consider adequately and to understand the Senator's amendment—as I am sure he will agree—without considerable study.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I recognize the sincerity of the Senator from Oregon in proposing that Senate bill 1313 be added to the longshoremen's bill. The Senator from Oregon knows that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been studying, for practically 4 months, the problems concerning the transportation industry, especially the railroad industry. In the committee's hearings, considerable testimony was taken concerning the plight of the railroads as a consequence of the burden the railroads have to bear in providing a retirement fund which, in many instances, provides benefits which by far exceed those provided by other funds.

Rather substantial testimony was given about hours of employment and conditions of payment, which in some instances provide a full day's pay for working only 1½ hours.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Ohio will yield for just a moment, I wish to comment on a procedural matter.

I wish the Senator from Ohio to have time to present his views on this matter. However, we are operating under the provisions of a unanimous-consent agreement which limits the amount of time available. I need sufficient time to explain the amendment. In addition, I want the Senator from Ohio to have time in which to speak at the beginning of my remarks. Therefore, may we have an understanding that the time taken by the Senator from Ohio will be yielded from the time available to those who are in opposition to the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Ohio whatever time he needs; and if he finds that he needs more time than I am able to yield to him, we shall try to have time yielded to him by others.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator from Texas hear what I have to say regarding what is before the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Very well.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If this matter is to have proper attention it will require the careful scrutiny of all Senators while the discussion is in progress. We have the anomalous situation of Senators being told that the longshoremen's bill is to be considered, and the longshoremen's bill is not a matter of controversy that would cause a Senator to object to a consent agreement on the limitation of time. But here we have a situation where the railroad retirement bill is pulled in as an appendage to the longshoremen's bill, and the agreement on time is made to apply.

I frankly state to my colleagues that when the railroad retirement bill is passed upon there will not be adequate knowledge of its implications possessed by Senators to insure an intelligent casting of votes on the bill. The bill is far more complicated than the one on which we spent 2 days, and yet there is a consent agreement of 1 hour on the amendment, with the promise that additional time will be given, solely for the purpose of bringing it before the Senate in the last 48 hours of its session. I say this is a method of ramming a bill through.

I had a right to believe that when the consent agreement was made on the longshoremen's bill, there would not be tied to it, as a caboose, the railroad bill. I may want to vote for the retirement bill, but before I do so I would like to get complete enlightenment of its full implications.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not know how a Senator had a right to believe he would not be given that opportunity. All Senators were informed by a quorum call. It was explained in some detail, and the Senator from Colorado stated his understanding of what the situation would be. It was known by every Senator, who realized what was going on, that the bill was going to be offered as an amendment, and that time would be allotted to it. The selection of the bill itself was made by the minority leader. We offered the amendment last night to the renegotiation bill. The Senate does not sit idle and do nothing the last 48 hours of its session. And who is there to say it is going to be in session only 48 hours more, anyway?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I think the Senator from Texas will have to agree with me that many bills of lesser importance were pending before, and were passed by the Senate without consent agreements as to time for debate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I certainly agree. I agree there are many more that are going to be passed without consent agreements on time. I have had it indelibly impressed on me that some Senators do not want some bills passed at all, but I have an obligation to bring them before the Senate.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is not the situation. My arguments are directed to the proposition that on this important bill there should not be a 1 hour or a 2 hour limitation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. And any Senator of the 96 can so state and there will be no such agreement; but I cannot personally go and pack them into the Chamber. I had a quorum call. After conferring with the leadership, with the committee, with the authors of the amendment, with everybody I know who had any interest in it, an agreement was entered into. I see no reason why reasonable debate, if that is what is wanted, cannot be obtained. If a Senator wants delay, then we can delay, but what I want is to have a majority of the Senate have the right to express itself before an agreement is entered into.

If the Senator was present, he heard it; if he was not, I will tell him: The Senator from Colorado stated what the parliamentary situation would be if the railroad retirement bill was offered as an amendment, and made a rather specific statement concerning it. So every Senator had due notice upon it, and nothing was rammed through.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Ohio suggests that the Senator from Colorado stated it was not until this morning that he learned about the proposal to offer the bill as an amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think that is a correct statement. The Senator from Colorado will learn other things through the day. Last night we offered the railroad retirement proposal as an amendment to the renegotiation bill, because it was a House bill. That is the customary procedure in the last days of a session, when a House committee has spent months on a bill and has reported a bill and when a Senate committee has spent time on a bill and has reported it. We gave public notice to everybody. What happened? This morning the minority leader expressed the wish that the amendment not be offered to the renegotiation bill, but to another House bill. So, after conferring with the author of the bill which came over from the House, the one who is handling it in the Senate, and Members of both parties, we called a quorum. We proposed a unanimous-consent request.

I am not responsible if Senators will not come when a quorum is called, so each Senator present, who desires to do so, can discuss the proposed agreement.

The Senator from Colorado pointed out that we are to have a vote on the railroad retirement bill. The Senator from Oregon pointed out he had ample time to discuss it. Twice as much time was provided as the proponents wished. Twice as much time was provided as was originally proposed.

I know the Senator's position. If he wants additional time, we will get it for him. We are not going to get certain bills. We are going to call up the Renegotiation Act, the debt-limitation bill, and the mutual-security bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Texas knows I am a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. He knows the committee spent 4 months on the retirement problem. The railroads begged for subsidies to such an extent that there was some inclination to start giving them subsidies. I opposed them. I opposed the extent of the loans proposed to be given. I want the railroads to be able to stand on their own feet, without the Government having to give subsidies to them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I point out that there was a report that the railroads thought they had the votes to beat the bill. So far as I am concerned, it is a matter for a majority of the Senate to determine. Both sides claim they have the votes to win—both those who wish to pass it, and those who wish to defeat it. It was the purpose of the majority leader, since the policy committee had cleared the bill, to bring it before the Senate by motion, so each Senator would have an opportunity to go on record.

If the Senator wants to go on record as supporting a bill that will make railroads more fiscally sound, he can do so. I have no objection. All I want is to see that a majority of Senators will have an opportunity to have their opinions reflected.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My purpose is to try to stop the mad march on giving subsidies to every segment of the economy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. My purpose is to represent a majority of the Members of the Senate. So far as the Senator's stopping a mad march is concerned, it is a matter for him. I have no objection. I am sure that every Senator will agree with that general broad statement. Nobody wants to be mad. Nobody wants to have a mad march. There are some subsidies for railroads and for other segments of our economy.

We do have to face up to the problem, and each Senator can reflect his own viewpoint.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The votes have been gathered for or against the measure. I do not know which way the vote will go. I have spoken to no one about the matter. My knowledge of the subject has been gathered from the hearings we have had, and from the reports.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. When I made the motion to proceed to consider the Renegotiation Act extension last night, and when I stated last night that the railroad retirement bill would be offered as an amendment, I served notice on every Senator who would listen and every Senator, if he would not listen, who would read, that we intended to seek a unanimous-consent agreement. I followed that public notice, which was published on page 18936 of the RECORD, with the quorum call this morning. I gave notice of what was going to happen. We discussed it with all persons interested. We had debate on the matter before the agreement was entered into; the agreement then was unanimously entered into.

I say no criticism should properly be made, unless it is determined that the leader must personally notify each Senator at least three times. Twice ought to be sufficient.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is not the situation at all, may I respectfully say to the leader. Last night I voted to table the bill on which there was so much controversy, because I anticipated the

important bills which are still pending before the Congress would be considered during this session.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The bills will be considered. The Senator has announced this as one of the important bills. That was announced a week ago, when the policy committee met. Public notice was given in the RECORD that the committee had cleared this particular bill. Public notice was given that the committee had cleared other bills.

As a result of that public notice, there has been some delay. I have heard some Senators say we must delay so that we will not come to a vote on some bills. The Senator from Texas is going to try to permit each Member of the Senate to have his views reflected on a yea-and-nay vote on all the bills he has publicly announced the policy committee has cleared, if that is possible.

There is a bill in which the Senator from Michigan is interested. The Senator does not want to see the bill passed at this session. The Senator from Arkansas wants to see the bill passed during this session. My purpose is to have the bill considered, to let the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Michigan discuss it, and to let a majority prevail. I thought that was the democratic system.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I recognize the problem of the majority leader. He has my sympathy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But that does not cause me to lose sight of the fact that as to important bills there should not be this limitation of time of 1 hour.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Very well.

Mr. LAUSCHE. While on less important bills, unlimited time is granted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Very well. If that is the position of the Senate and the course which the Senate wants to follow, so far as I am concerned, we can stay here and talk and talk and talk until January. Notice has been given as to this bill. The proponents of the bill thought a reasonable time was provided. All the opponents of the bill I could get to come to the Chamber to transact business thought it was a reasonable time. Every Member of the Senate thought it was a reasonable time, including the minority leader and including the Senator from Colorado. We adjusted the time. The original proposal called for less time. Each Senator present, after a quorum call, agreed to the proposal.

This procedure will be followed from time to time. The Senator from Ohio and others, on their own responsibility, can present their views and enter their objections. All I must do is try to present a schedule which is reasonable, which is fair, which does not delay, and which tries to get the public business transacted.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I hope the Senator from Texas does not imply that the junior Senator from Ohio talks and talks and talks on this floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas does not imply anything about the junior Senator from Ohio, but the Senator from Texas is a realist, and the Senator from Texas knows that if we expect to finish the public business in a reasonable time, and certainly if we expect to finish by Saturday night, it is going to be necessary to have some unanimous-consent agreements. The Senator has announced that. The Senator has served notice on all Senators. As to some bills, unanimous-consent agreements will be made. As to some bills, the agreements will not be made. When the agreements are not made, I have performed my responsibility by asking for them.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The junior Senator from Ohio has attempted, in the 20 months he has been in the Senate, to husband time. He has not talked; he has listened. He has attempted to speak when he thought he had something which was pertinent and worthy of being said.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have no disagreement with the statement of the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield whatever time I may need, from the time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have no disagreement with the statement of the Senator from Ohio about himself and about his own economy. I have made no implication concerning the Senator. I am talking about the necessity for having an orderly procedure and unanimous-consent agreements if we are to conclude with the business we have cleared this week. We do not have to. A majority of Senators, I think, want to. I think usually a majority prevails. But the Senator from Texas does not want to.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I think the Senator from Texas will have to admit that the junior Senator from Ohio last night, in order to expedite the business of the Senate, with great reluctance, took the position on the bill he did assume.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I would not have to admit it, because I do not have to do things, but I will say to the Senator I am delighted to admit it, and I want to commend the Senator from Ohio for his wisdom last night.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The word was current that unless something were done last night we would have been jammed. It was the purpose of the Senator, of course, not to have the Senate jammed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think the Senator was correct in his position last night, and my vote will show that.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the Senator yield to me for one more comment, and then I will be through?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I want to ask the Senator from Ohio if he was present in the Chamber when the unanimous-consent agreement was entered into.

Mr. LAUSCHE. No, I was not present in the Chamber when the unanimous-consent agreement was entered into. In that respect I am much in the position in which the Senator from Oregon found himself one week ago, when he made the announcement he would object to any unanimous-consent agreements unless certain basic conditions were met.

Mr. MORSE. One of the conditions was a quorum call. There was a quorum call this morning.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There was a quorum call.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Ohio does not contemplate talking inordinately on the bill. I want to listen to what the committee members have to say pro and con on the item. I want to know on what I am going to vote before I cast my vote.

Mr. MORSE. I think the Senator from Ohio knows my personal fondness for him is such that when we disagree on a matter such as this it pains me, because I do not think the Senator from Ohio intends what might be interpreted as some implication in his remarks. I would like to get the matter cleared up.

I will point out to the Senator from Ohio that there is nothing out of the ordinary in the use of unanimous-consent agreements. The practice as to unanimous consent agreements, as a matter of policy in the Senate, is to adopt them in connection with major legislation, complicated legislation, highly detailed legislation. Most of the unanimous-consent agreements are made with respect to major pieces of proposed legislation, much more complicated than the bill presently under consideration, even though this bill is highly complicated. There is nothing new in the procedure we are following.

Secondly, I think adequate notice, as the majority leader said, has been given to every Member of the Senate. I, as chairman of the subcommittee, served notice day before yesterday, when I offered by substitute amendments, as to my course of action. The majority leader served notice last night as to his course of action.

The Senator has available to him the committee reports and the committee hearings.

The Senator mentioned the fact that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce had held hearings on the railroad situation for some 4 months or more.

My subcommittee has held hearings on this bill for more than a year. I do not know how a bill could possibly receive more careful and thorough attention than my subcommittee has given to this highly technical bill.

The subject matter is a recurring subject matter in the Senate. The former chairman of my subcommittee was the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. His predecessor was the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

In 1956 we passed the legislation which gave rise to the need for some legislation this year, because the 1956 legislation left a deficit in the fund. It was understood that in this session of Congress we would enact legislation to take

care of that deficit. My amendment would do that. It would do some other things, which I shall explain in a moment, if I am permitted to proceed with the explanation.

I do not want the RECORD to stand with any implication that either the majority leader or the senior Senator from Oregon has followed any course of action with regard to this matter, which is not in accordance with the policy of the Senate, followed time and time again in connection with major legislation, and invariably followed in the closing days of each Congress.

If the Senator will look at the RECORD for the closing days of Congresses for the past 10 years, he will find that most of the major pieces of legislation handled in the last 10 days have been handled under unanimous-consent agreements.

We are not concealing from the Senator from Ohio all the facts he needs for an intelligent vote on the bill. We shall not have time to discuss it in detail in the debate. That is never done under unanimous-consent agreements in connection with major legislation. We place upon Senators' desks reading material which they can read as a supplement to the explanation of the bill, and then they can reach their own judgment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 11:30 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

EXTENSION OF RENEGOTIATION ACT OF 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11749) to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 6 months, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the hour of 11:30 having arrived, 2 hours after the beginning of today's session, I ask unanimous consent that the business before the Senate be continued, and that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12728) to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, with respect to the payment of compensation in cases where third persons are liable.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I should like to say one further word. I understand that for the past 10 years, or even longer, important bills have been tied together, and there has been a limitation of debate by unanimous consent. But I am reminded of what the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] said the other day, to the effect that there should be a constitutional amendment making all laws passed in the last 10 days of Congress invalid. It would do the country a great deal of good.

Mr. MORSE. There is no such law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to make an announcement. The Senator from Oregon has used 5 minutes of his own time, the remainder of the time having been allotted to the Senator from Ohio by the majority leader, on the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining on my amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 25 minutes remaining on his amendment.

PEREMPTORY CHALLENGES IN CIVIL CASES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] has a non-controversial conference report to submit. I ask unanimous consent that it may be considered at this time, without the time consumed running against the proponents or opponents of my amendment.

Mr. EASTLAND. If it requires any time, I shall withhold it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3368) to amend section 1870 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the district courts to allow additional peremptory challenges in civil cases to multiple plaintiffs as well as multiple defendants. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today, p. 19220.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the conference report?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, as the Senate passed the bill, it adopted an amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. Under that amendment, if property were taken and the court found that the compensation was inadequate, the Government would be divested of title. That provision was eliminated in conference, and a provision was added which would force the Government, when property is taken, to deposit an adequate sum as compensation.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, has the Senator from Indiana been notified that the conference report would be considered at this time?

Mr. EASTLAND. He has already agreed to it; and the majority and minority leaders are in agreement.

Mr. ALLOTT. I merely wished to make inquiry for the sake of the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement on behalf of the managers on the part of the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER ON H. R. 3368 IN BEHALF OF MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE SENATE

Simply stated, the amendment permits a judicial review of the good faith of the Government estimate of just compensation for the land summarily acquired under the Declaration of Taking Act. It is believed elementary that the Government, in all of its dealing should act with the most scrupulous good faith and that the good faith requirement is of special importance when ever the Government exercises its sovereign power of eminent domain.

It is recognized that each such case must of necessity be judged on its own merits, and that no single standard can be equitably applied to all such cases. For example, in cases where the Government through its sovereign power of eminent domain seizes property designed and constructed by agreement for Government use, normal appraisals based on the price a prudent buyer would pay cannot be used. The costs to the Government of similar property openly and competitively procured at the time of taking, as well as the value to the Government of the property condemned, is manifestly the fairest measure of just compensation, both to the Government and the owner.

Whereas, this measure is equitable in such cases, normal appraisals may be more equitable in other types of cases. It is never the function of the Department of Justice or any other branch of Government to exercise the great power of eminent domain to obtain property at confiscatory or even bargain prices. Rather, a bona fide effort should be made by all branches of Government concerned to fairly ascertain just compensation and protect equally the rights of the taxpayer and property owner, as well as the Government. The very nature of the determinations of estimates filed under this statute renders the judicial review thereof vital for the protection of the constitutional rights of the citizens of the United States.

It is also the intention of the conferees that this amendment will in no way affect the Government's power in quick taking of property under the Declaration of Taking Act, for the Government will in no way be divested or required to divest itself of title.

FORMER SHAREHOLDERS OF GOSHEN VENEER CO., INDIANA—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], chairman of the Judiciary Committee, desires to submit another conference report. It is highly privileged. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is in the Chamber. The Sen-

ate passed one version of the bill and the House passed another. The figures in the House bill are much lower than those in the Senate bill. It is desired to accept the House version. The conferees have agreed. I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at this time, without time being charged to either side, to call up that conference report and have action taken upon it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6282) for the relief of the former shareholders and debenture note holders of the Goshen Veneer Co., an Indiana corporation. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6282) for the relief of the former shareholders and debenture note holders of the Goshen Veneer Co., an Indiana corporation, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
JOHN M. BUTLER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

THOMAS J. LANE,
HAROLD D. DONOHUE,
RICHARD H. POFF,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12728) to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, with respect to the payment of compensation in cases where third persons are liable.

Mr. MORSE. I believe I am a good enough parliamentarian to know the parliamentary situation in which I find myself. If I yield further I will not be able to complete an explanation of my amendment. Therefore, I will not yield further until I have completed my explanation. After that I shall be happy to yield.

I turn to part I of the Railroad Retirement Act:

1. All annuities (age and disability retirement, spouses', and survivors'), and pensions under the Railroad Retirement Act would be increased by 10 percent.

2. By reason of the increase in the factors for computing survivor annuities, the insurance lump sum would also be increased by 10 percent; but the original provision for providing an insurance lump sum in all cases, up to a maximum of $750, has been deleted.

In other words, we have reduced the cost of S. 1313 by eliminating this provision.

3. The residual lump sum would be increased to reflect the increase in the maximum creditable and taxable monthly compensation.

What is the residual lump sum? Consider the situation of a railroad worker who has contributed $3,000 in taxes to the fund. He dies after receiving benefits of, say, $1,000, leaving no one else entitled to benefits. Under the operation of the program his estate, or his designee would get $2,000, which is the residual lump sum stated in the bill. There has always been a provision for his estate to get what he actually had paid in over and above what would come to him and his family in benefits under the operation of the fund. So in my hypothetical case his estate would get the $2,000, which is the difference between the benefits paid and the amount he had paid into the fund.

4. An employee who was retired on an annuity by reason of disability, would not lose the annuity for any month in which he earned more than $100 in outside employment if his total earnings in the year, which includes such month, does not exceed $1,200; and if such earnings exceed $1,200, the annuitant would not lose more than one month's annuity for each $100 of such excess, treating the last $50 or more of such excess as $100.

Let me briefly explain this technical matter in this way. Under the pending amendment, if an annuitant should earn $125 a month, he would still be eligible for his payments, provided that his total amount for the year did not exceed $1,200. In other words, what we are changing here is the amount of money he can earn each month. The present amount is $100. He can now earn more than $100 a month and still be eligible under the fund, provided his total earning on the side for the year does not exceed the present ceiling of $1,200. In other words, we have not changed the annual earning ceiling.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. No; I announced I would not yield until I had completed my presentation, because I am pressed for time. I believe a complete presentation will make the matter clearer anyway.

5. Women railroad employees with less than 30 years of service, would be eligible for annuities at age 62 rather than age 65, but the annuity would be on a reduced basis. (Women with 30 years of service are now, and will continue to be, eligible for full retirement at age 60.)

All we have done, in principle, is to bring the Railroad Retirement Act into conformity with the provisions of the Social Security Act in regard to the payment of women at a reduced rate at the age of 62.

6. A spouse's annuity would be payable at age 62, rather than age 65, upon election of the spouse to receive such annuity on a reduced basis;

We bring that in line with social security.

7. The maximum creditable compensation under the act would be increased from $350 to $400 a month, effective with respect to compensation for service after December 1958.

That is a very important change from the standpoint of the soundness of the fund, because, of course, it means that taxes are going to be applied on a broader base and will bring in more money.

8. For survivor beneficiaries who work outside the United States the work limitations on benefits would be the same as are now provided for work in the United States.

That item simply covers the Canadian railroad situation. These workers belong to the same organization. Unless the same policies apply to workers on the American lines running through Canada as well as on the American lines in the United States, there will be a discriminatory factor which will cause great discontent, and the amendment simply brings them into line together.

Now I should like to say a few words on the Railroad Retirement Tax Act.

Let me stress why it is necessary to have some legislation. In 1956 we passed railroad retirement legislation, but we left the fund in a deficit. Congress knew it was leaving the fund in a deficit situation. There was no binding commitment, but the debates will show that there was a recognition on the part of Congress that, come this session of Congress, we would pass some legislation which would take care of the deficit. This proposal does that. I wish to make it clear that it does take care of the deficit created in 1956.

In order to provide funds for the proposed increases in benefits, and to take care of any present deficiency in the Railroad Retirement Account, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act would be amended as follows:

"1. The tax base would be increased from the present maximum of $350 a month to $400, effective with respect to compensation for service after December 1958.

"2. The tax rates on employers and employees would be increased from the present 6¼ percent of payroll on each side, up to $350 a month, to 6¾ percent of payroll on each side, up to $400 a month, effective with respect to compensation for service after December 1958 and before January 1, 1962; and to 7¼ percent thereafter."

This deals with the point the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] made earlier this morning. He took a very firm position in committee, and many of us told him that we thought there was great merit to his position. However, under S. 1313, we postponed payment until January 1, 1960. The House provided for payment on January 1, 1959.

The compromise proposal between the House and the Senate version, which is contained in the present substitute, would be as follows:

The tax would be raised from the present 6¼ percent to 6¾ percent, effective January 1, 1959. By 1962, the bill would increase the rate from 6¾ percent to 7¼ percent.

I should also like to point out that in S. 1313 the Senate committee proposed a tax rate of 7½ percent. That rate would be necessary if all the benefits provided in S. 1313 had had to be paid. However, having reduced those benefits, we have also reduced the cost of the bill, and therefore it is possible to have a lower tax rate. In order to make the fund actuarially sound, the tax rate will be 7¼ percent effective January 1, 1962, but 6¾ percent beginning January 1, 1959.

I wish Senators to note this particularly, because I do not want anyone to misunderstand. The tax rate will make the fund actuarially sound, even though there will still be a 0.57 deficiency. As I said earlier, any figure of 1 or less is never considered a threat to the actuarial soundness of a fund such as this, because any fund of this size will always vary to some extent, depending upon the number of people who die in any given year. The unemployment compensation phase of it is a separate problem and the level of that separate fund will depend on the level of employment in the industry.

I call your attention, however, to the fact that the actuarial deficiency in the retirement fund under the substitute bill would be only 0.57 percent of payroll.

Third, the tax rates on employee representatives would be increased from the present 12½ percent of payroll, up to $350 a month, to 13½ percent of payroll, up to $400 a month, effective with respect to compensation for services after December 1958, and before January 1, 1962; and to 14½ percent thereafter.

Those increases of taxes on employees are necessarily to make this an actuarially sound fund. Do not ever forget in this debate that we are not talking about Government money. We are talking about contributions made by the railroads and their employees to the retirement fund. In all the collective bargaining negotiations between the brotherhoods and the railroads, do not forget that those collective bargaining relations are colored, and have been for years, by the fact that the workers and the companies have this financial stake in the railroad retirement fund. They consider it, of course, a part, really, of their assets, in relation to what will happen to them in old age.

Fourth, an additional increase in tax rates with respect to compensation paid for service beginning January 1, 1965, is provided, but such increase would be conditioned upon, and would be equal to, the number of percentage points, including fractional points, of the increase in the rate of social-security employment taxes, which, as now scheduled, would not be effective before 1965.

The reason for this proposed conditional increase is that if social-security taxes increase as scheduled, the retirement account will be charged correspondingly more under the financial interchange arrangement, and to the extent of such increases scheduled for 1965 and thereafter it is necessary to increase retirement taxes to the same extent on compensation paid after 1964 in order to continue on an actuarially sound basis.

Throughout the hearings during our consideration of the bill, we have tried to bring railroad retirement and social security into line, keeping in mind the differential which has always existed between the two. But when we have finished with the bill, the railroad retirement benefits and tax rates will continue to be higher. This differential has always existed between railroad retirement and social security.

Ah, it is said, why not make the two funds the same? We had simply better face up to the fact that for years the railroad workers of the country have received a different legislative treatment from that received by people under social security. Why? Because the railroad workers are engaged in a vital public utility, essential to the economy, essential to the defense of the Nation. They are bound by the Railway Labor Act of 1926, which greatly limits their use of economic action in labor disputes.

I should say, as I have studied the history of railroad legislation, that it was clearly in the minds of Congress in those early days, when they passed this special labor legislation, that certain benefits should be given to the railroad workers, if the workers in turn were to give up certain economic freedom which workers have in industries which are not public utlities or industries which are vested, as we say, with a public interest.

So it was asked at our committee hearings, and I have heard it asked by some of my colleagues in the Senate, Why not apply the same rules that are applied in automobile plants or in steel mills, or in other mass-production industries throughout the country? The vital difference is that the workers in those mills and plants are not subject to any such restrictions as exist, for example, in the Railroad Labor Act of 1926.

The last point I wish to make is this. Who among us will deny that Congress always has given certain preferential treatment to railroad workers?

They have led the way in making many labor reforms in this country, and in connection with a large amount of labor legislation.

Now I come to part III of the bill, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. In order to improve the lot of the unemployed railroad workers, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act would be amended as follows. First, the daily benefit rate would be increased from 50 percent of compensation for the employee's last employment in a base year, to 60 percent of such compensation.

Second. The maximum daily benefit rate would be increased from $8.50 to $10.20.

Third. Sundays and holidays would be treated as days of unemployment for unemployment purposes.

Fourth. The number of days for which benefits may be paid in the first registration period in a benefit year would be 10—instead of 7—the same as in subsequent registration periods in the same benefit year.

Fifth. For a career railroad employee—one with at least 10 years of railroad service—who is out of work through no fault of his own, the bill would extend the period during which he may receive benefits. These extended periods would vary in length, depending, generally, on the length of the beneficiary's previous employment, so that an unemployed man with 10 but less than 15 years of service would receive an additional 13 weeks and an employee with 15 or more years of service would receive benefits for an additional 26 weeks. For employees with less than 10 years, the bill provides 13 weeks of benefits. But this is limited to those who after June 30, 1957, exhausted their rights to benefits, and only to registration periods beginning after June 19, 1958, and before April 1, 1959.

Let me summarize these unemployment insurance benefits by saying that the amendment in the nature of a substitute for S. 1313 cuts down the unemployment insurance benefits of S. 1313 by a little more than 50 percent. In other words, by the substitute amendment, we have reduced the cost to the railroads, so far as extending the periods for unemployment insurance benefits are concerned, by more than 50 percent. That is one reason, of course, why a saving can be made—in a sense, we can say they are savings—in the cost of the bill, because it is less beneficial to the railroad workers than is S. 1313.

Six. The minimum earnings in a base year which would qualify an employee for benefits in the benefit year would be increased from $400 to $500.

Seven. The maximum taxable earnings in a month would be increased from $350 to $400.

Eight. The contribution rate would be increased to 1½ percent of creditable compensation when the balance in the railroad unemployment insurance account would total $450 million or more; and this rate would be increased, by steps, to 3½ percent of such compensation when the balance in the account fell below $300 million.

I come now to my last point. What about costs? Senators ask, what will it cost? The Railroad Retirement Board has submitted to us figures on the cost.

The level of cost of the House provision on unemployment insurance and social security would be $200 million, which is 3.72 percent of the taxable payroll, which amounts to $55 million more than at present.

The bill adds a cost to the railroads of $85 million to the present cost, effective for the calendar year 1959. Under the substitute bill the railroads, in 1959, would have to pay $29 million in additional taxes under the Unemployment Insurance Act, and $56 million under the Retirement Act.

By 1962 the additional retirement tax will be $86 million.

Now as to the retirement figures. The net cost of benefits payable—not administrative cost—would be 17.14 percent of payroll. The tax rate under the bill, as specified, would amount to a level of

16.57 of payroll; leaving, as I have said before, an actuarial deficiency of 0.57 percent.

The level taxes the railroads would have to pay on an annual basis would amount to $145 million a year; that is the additional amount on a level basis.

All of the retirement figures do not take into account House bill 13549, the social-security bill, which was sent to the President recently. This measure would add to the present deficiency, but the Board does not have the exact figure available.

But I repeat that the additional cost to the railroads for 1959 will be $29 million for the unemployment-insurance amendments, and $56 million for the Railroad Retirement Act amendments—or a total of $85 million; and in 1962, an additional $30 million, for Railroad Retirement Act amendments, would be added to the cost to the railroads.

I close by saying that the issue I leave with the Senate is this: Does this measure represent a fair retirement program for the railroad employees and a fair unemployment-insurance program for the railroad employees? If the answer of Senators to that question is "Yes," then I respectfully say that all the arguments of the railroads—namely, that they cannot stand the cost—in my judgment do not constitute sufficient basis for voting against passage of this measure, because we have no right to ask the employees to subsidize the railroads, by means of having the employees receive less than a fair unemployment insurance and railroad retirement program.

If the railroads need more subsidy, then let us face that fact. The contribution the railroads make to the economy and to the defense of the country is such that we should give them a subsidy, if it is needed. I have never been afraid of the word "subsidy," if the payment of a subsidy is necessary in the protection of the public interest.

Only a short time ago the Senate provided subsidies for the railroads—I do not care how differently others may wish to describe that measure—by means of the Smathers bill, which is nothing less than a subsidy measure. If we did not go far enough in the Smathers bill, then, come January, we can go further.

But, Mr. President, as I said to Mr. Symes, the president of the Pennsylvania Railroad, when he was testifying before us in the subcommittee, I am perfectly willing to go further in helping defray the cost of the additional boxcars which are needed for the defense of the Nation. I do not believe the railroads should be expected to provide them; I think they should be provided by means of taxpayers' dollars.

So I close this opening statement by saying that I am offering the Senate a measure which provides a fair unemployment compensation program, and represents a fair adjustment between the original Senate bill and the House bill. I offer it to the Senate, and recommend that the Senate adopt my amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield one-half a minute to me?

Mr. MORSE. If I have time to yield. Let me inquire how much time I have remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The time available to the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania one-half a minute on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for one-half minute.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I appreciate my colleague's courtesy; I realize the lack of time, in view of the limitation under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Let me say that, although I am not an expert of this subject, I wish to commend the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for his clear and lucid explanation of this measure. I wish to state that I am in complete agreement with his view. I shall not take further time.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield time to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am one of the sponsors of S. 1313, a bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act. Also, I served as a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Labor, which conducted hearings on the bill for almost a year. After the subcommittee hearings, the bill was reported by the subcommittee to the full committee, and again we had a thorough discussion of the bill.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has explained in detail the amendment he has submitted. I believe he is correct in saying that the first question for the Senate to determine is whether the amendment he has submitted to the Railroad Retirement Act is a fair and a just one to the railway employees. I wish to state, on the basis of my participation in the hearings for over a year, that I believe the changes his amendment proposes are fair.

If the Senate agrees that the amendment is fair and just then there will be, in substance, only two questions before the Senate. Those questions are, first, what about the actuarial deficit in the railroad retirement fund and, second, what effect will the amendment have on the railroads?

The railroad retirement fund has a balance of approximately $3,600 million. The Senator from Oregon has said—and I believe he is correct—that the actuarial deficit is such that, over a period of years, it will have no real effect on the solvency of the railway retirement fund. Am I correct as to that?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. Second, as to the cost to the railroads, I believe the Senator from Oregon has stated that the additional cost to the railroads in the first year would be $29 million.

Mr. MORSE. Twenty-nine million dollars.

Mr. COOPER. Twenty-nine million dollars for the additional unemployment insurance benefits?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; for the unemployment insurance benefits; and $56 million for the retirement benefits.

Mr. COOPER. Or a total of $85 million?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct; and an additional $30 million in 1962 to finance retirement benefits.

Mr. COOPER. I wish to say to the Senate that after a year and one-half of consideration in the Committee on Labor on S. 1313, a bill, which I joined in introducing, to amend and increase retirement and unemployment benefits to railway employees, I believe the amendment of the Senator from Oregon should be adopted. I will vote for it and for S. 1313 on final passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wish to ask the Senator from Oregon some questions about the compromise proposal he has submitted.

First, I wish to point out that the majority policy committee cleared Senate bill 1313 by a unanimous vote; and notice was given to the Senate and to the country that a vote on that bill, or at least an attempt to have the bill brought to a vote in the Senate, could be expected.

I now understand that a compromise amendment in the nature of a substitute has been offered to Senate bill 1313, and that the compromise amendment would reduce the effect of the provisions of that bill.

Are the following statements correct: First, Senate bill 1313 provides that the railroad retirement taxes shall be 7½ percent; and the compromise will reduce them to 7¼ percent.

Mr. MORSE. Seven and one-fourth percent, but six and three-fourths percent as of January 1, 1959, and seven and one-fourth percent as of January 1, 1962.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand.

The compromise is offered as an amendment to Senate bill 1313, which the majority policy committee cleared unanimously.

I come now to my second question. The 7½-percent rate provided by Senate bill 1313 would be effective January 1, 1960. The compromise provides that one-half of that impact shall be delayed for a period of 3 years, until January 1962. Is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Third, Senate bill 1313 provides for a liberalization of the insurance lump-sum benefit in the Railroad Retirement System. That is eliminated by the compromise, as I understand. Is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Fourth, the unemployment insurance tax rate provided by Senate bill 1313 is a maximum of 4 percent; that provided by the compromise is a maximum of 3½ percent. Is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Therefore, the total increase in this item is cut exactly in half. Is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Fifth, the extended unemployment insurance benefits provided by Senate bill 1313 are, by means of the compromise, reduced by exactly one-half. Is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Through the years, since the Congress has provided the Railroad Retirement System, does the Senator from Oregon know what the attitude of the railroads has been toward attempts to improve the Railroad Retirement Act and the benefits provided by that act to the workers?

Mr. MORSE. The argument of the Association of American Railroads always is that the railroads cannot afford it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In other words, their argument has been the same as the one we have heard them make year after year after year, whenever the Congress attempts to make a step in the right direction.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Such an attitude reminds me of the days when I was a secretary in the House of Representatives, and when, on the floor of the House, when the first social-security bill was being considered, I heard Members say that it was socialism.

Let me say that I supported the efforts to provide relief to the American railroads, and I am proud of the relief that I voted for them. No attempt was made to keep that bill from being brought up by way of motion. We allowed time for the consideration of that measure. We provided tax relief for the railroads. We have taken action on the requests the railroads have made.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute for Senate bill 1313 reduces the benefits provided by Senate bill 1313.

I wish to observe—and now I speak to the railroads, who know that I am their friend: I believe in free enterprise, and I believe in the railroad industry, although I do not think that industry has been quite as modern as it might have been. But the railroads must realize that we cannot look at this problem solely from their point of view. We must try to reach a solution which deals justly and fairly with all—the railroads and their employees.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I should like to have some time yielded to me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield one-half minute to the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER [Mr. COOPER in the chair]. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized for one-half minute.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon has, in response to the questions asked by the majority leader, stated the relationship which the pending amendment in the nature of a substitute bears to Senate bill 1313.

Can the Senator from Oregon indicate briefly how the cost of the amendment in the nature of a substitute compares with the cost of the House bill?

Mr. MORSE. The substitute bill is practically the House bill, save and except that the House committee recommended 7 percent and we recommended 10 percent increase in retirement benefits. The 10 percent has been retained, so far as that figure is concerned, but when we take into account the reduction of other benefits in the substitute, including the elimination of the provision for payment of the lump-sum insurance amount in all cases up to $750, I would say it would be reasonable to state that the cost of the 10 percent increase would be reduced from what it would have otherwise been.

Mr. COTTON. Am I correctly informed that the Senator from Oregon is saying the proposal is a reduction in the Senate bill in both benefits and costs; but is it a very slight reduction or increase as compared with the House bill?

Mr. MORSE. There is a reduction of the benefits contained in the Senate bill, but a slight increase of those contained in the House bill.

Mr. COTTON. As between the Senate and the House bill?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. I am prepared to yield the floor.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. May I ask what the status of the time is, and then may I ask the advice of the majority leader as to how to proceed with respect to the time allotted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time allotted on the amendment has expired.

Mr. MORSE. How much time is left to the opposition?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ten minutes are left to the proponents and twenty-five minutes to the opponents.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute on the bill to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator. I first want to congratulate the Senator from Oregon on his explanation of a very complicated piece of proposed legislation. In the report a great deal is stated about the increased cost of living. Since the last time the railroad workers have had any increases in benefits, will the Senator explain how much increase in cost of living has been, to the best of his information?

Mr. MORSE. The 10 percent increase was adopted to take care of that increase in the cost of living, plus additional benefits. My recollection is that the cost of living increase was 7 percent. I think that is why the House fixed the amount at 7 percent.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In other words, what the Senator is saying is that the increase in benefits provided in the bill, in view of the fact that there may have to be a compromise to some extent in conference with the House, will just about represent the increase in the cost of living, as indicated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics reports, since the act was amended the last time. Is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. Frankly, I think 7 percent would take care of the increased cost of living, and the additional percentage granted in the Senate bill would take care of additional benefits which we think are long overdue.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Are some of the benefits delayed in their application? When do they become effective?

Mr. MORSE. I did not mention it in my speech, but we have taken away entirely retroactivity of increases in the retirement benefits under the Senate bill. There is no retroactivity under the Senate bill at all; the increases in retirement benefits will be effective next January.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas permit me to yield some time on the bill to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How much time does the Senator desire?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Two or three minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 3 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How are the unemployment benefits to be paid? On the basis of daily or weekly pay?

Mr. MORSE. On the basis of daily pay.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the daily unemployment benefit pay under the existing law?

Mr. MORSE. Eight dollars and fifty cents, and we raised it to $10.20.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is, the increase is from $8.50 to $10.20 in unemployment benefits?

Mr. MORSE. Let me check those figures.

If the Senator will turn to page 34 of the committee report, where there is a table showing the present daily benefit starting at $3.50 and running to $8.50, those amounts have been changed, under the committee bill, so that the $8.50 becomes $10.20, and the other brackets therein shown have been changed proportionately.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That would be a $1.70 increase on a present base of $8.50, or a 20 percent increase?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; but it covers the $4,000 and over bracket.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The unemployed person who is getting $8.50 in the upper bracket has had his unemployment benefit increased by 20 percent, so far as the unemployment benefit is concerned.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Something was said by the Senator from Oregon about Saturdays and Sundays. Will the Senator from Oregon tell me whether, under

existing law, unemployment benefits are paid for Saturdays and Sundays?

Mr. MORSE. They are paid at the present time if they are preceded and followed by days of unemployment. Otherwise they are not.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What would the new bill do?

Mr. MORSE. The new bill would increase the number of days in a 14-day period. It will still be 10 days, but Sundays will be included in the calculation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Under the present law Sundays are not included under certain conditions; but under the proposed new law they would be?

Mr. MORSE. They would be; but under the present law, they are included if they are immediately preceded and followed by unemployment. Let us suppose now that X worked on Saturday, but his unemployment started on Sunday and went on to Monday and Tuesday. Under our proposed law, his unemployment would start on Sunday. Under the old law, it would not, because it had not been immediately preceded by unemployment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Can the Senator tell me what the average per day percentage increase is for all brackets of employees on unemployment compensation?

Mr. MORSE. I shall refer to my expert.

I do not think the Senator was present this morning when I asked permission to have one of the experts from the Railroad Retirement Board, who served with us for months on the committee, sit on the floor of the Senate to answer such technical questions as the Senator is now raising. None of us on the committee purport to have that information. But I have the answer now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I assume responsibility for yielding 1 additional minute on the bill to the Senator.

The 20 percent the Senator from Ohio has picked out, applies to the upper bracket. We do not have the average worked out for which the Senator from Ohio has asked.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator is not able to tell what the increase is percentagewise for the lower bracket employees?

Mr. MORSE. On page 34 of the report there is a table which is explained as follows:

The benefits payable to any such employee for each such day of unemployment or sickness shall be the amount appearing in the following table in column II on the line on which, in column I, appears the compensation range containing his total compensation with respect to employment in his base year:

[Column I—total compensation:

	Column II *Daily benefit rate*
$400 to $499.99	$3.50
$500 to $749.99	4.00
$750 to $999.99	4.50
$1,000 to $1,299.99	5.00
$1,300 to $1,599.99	5.50
$1,600 to $1,999.99	6.00
$2,000 to $2,499.99	6.50
$2,500 to $2,999.99	7.00
$3,000 to $3,499.99	7.50
$3,500 to $3,999.99	8.00
$4,000 and over	8.50]

Column I—total compensation:

	Column II *Daily benefit rate*
$500 to $699.99	$4.50
$700 to $999.99	5.00
$1,000 to $1,299.99	5.50
$1,300 to $1,599.99	6.00
$1,600 to $1,899.99	6.50
$1,900 to $2,199.99	7.00
$2,200 to $2,499.99	7.50
$2,500 to $2,799.99	8.00
$2,800 to $3,099.99	8.50
$3,100 to $3,499.99	9.00
$3,500 to $3,999.99	9.50
$4,000 and over	10.20

If the Senator will look down the revised column, below the first table, he will observe that the daily benefit rate would be $4.50.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. The $3.50 would become $4.50. The $4 would become $5. The figures in italic are the new figures. The rate goes to $10.20, from $8.50.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield another 2 minutes, please?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The employee who is now receiving $3.50 a day would be given $4.50, would he?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct. The Senator will observe that there is a change in earnings which must be kept in mind. There is a change in the earnings level. The $400 to $499.99 under the old table would be changed to $500 to $699.99. We have increased the earnings on the basis of which the payments will be made.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is, there has been an increase in the amount on which the employee and the railroad must contribute?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So there has been a liberalization, first, of the amount of the earnings covered; second, of the compensation paid; and, third, of the days for which payment can be received?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct. Let me correct the RECORD in one regard. When we are dealing with unemployment insurance benefits we are dealing with contributions only from the carriers and not from the workers. The contributions for retirement benefits are 50–50, but contributions for unemployment insurance benefits are 100 percent employer contributions or carrier contributions.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The subject we have thus far been discussing must all be covered by contributions made by the employer and not at all by the employee?

Mr. MORSE. That has always been true of railroad unemployment compensation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. To summarize again, the increase would be 20 percent for the very highest paid employee. According to my calculations the increase would be more than 20 percent for the employees in the lower-paid categories.

Mr. MORSE. It would be, unless we take into account the modification of the additional total compensation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Can the Senator tell me whether any other employment fund in the country in the last year has increased its benefits by 20 percent?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, while the Senator is consulting with regard to the question, may I have the attention of the acting minority leader?

In a colloquy a few minutes ago with the Senator from Ohio we consumed 30 minutes time. I wonder if we could ask that we be granted an additional 30 minutes time, to be equally divided, on the bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am not sure the time will be needed. I would be prepared to agree to the request at a later time. I do not think the time will be needed on the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have a commitment to give the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] 15 minutes. I was under the impression that we were talking on the amendment, and that the Senator from Oregon had the floor. That was the case, but the time was charged against the bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. If time is needed later, I will not object.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. The best answer I can give to the Senator from Ohio is that we do not know of any such plan, other than what Congress has already passed with regard to emergency unemployment insurance benefit provisions for the States. The States in cooperation with the Federal Government could extend the period for the payment of benefits. I am advised those would be tantamount to increases, if the States followed the provisions of the law we passed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I must frankly confess that my mind was incapable of digesting the rather heavy material which was submitted in the Senator's talk. Obviously the Senator from Oregon has not completely digested it in his mind, because he has to seek the help of an actuarial expert.

Mr. MORSE. I will say to my friend from Ohio on that subject that if he and I lived with the problem for 10 years he and I would still be consulting the expert.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I could not, because of the rapidity with which the case was presented, digest it. I think it must be admitted one would have to read and study the analysis given in order to have an intelligent grasp of it.

Will the Senator repeat the highlights of the increases which will be granted in the benefits, in the nature of social security?

Mr. MORSE. In the nature of retirement?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have in mind the increase in the daily unemployment compensation.

Mr. MORSE. First, on the retirement matter, the bill would provide for a 10-percent increase in retirement benefits for all employees; that is, the substitute would provide for that increase.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. COOPER in the chair). The Senator will suspend. The Senate will be in order.

Senators will take their seats. Staff members will take their seats. Talk will cease around the sides of the Chamber and in the galleries, so that the Senator from Ohio will have an opportunity to question the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Oregon will have an opportunity to explain the bill. Let there be order in the Chamber.

The Senator from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. MORSE. We are talking about retirement benefits.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. We would increase the tax payments for both the employees and the employers from 6¼ percent as of now to 6¾ percent effective January 1, 1959.

We would increase that further to 7¼ percent January 1, 1962. That would be necessary to make the retirement fund actuarially sound within the 0.57 percent I have already explained.

Third, the base of $350 of monthly earnings would be increased to $400 of monthly earnings, which would mean the bringing in of more tax returns as a contribution to the fund in order to assure it would be actuarially sound.

We would eliminate entirely the provision which would increase the number of beneficiaries for the insurance lump sum benefit, in other words, the so-called funeral fund. The Senate bill would have provided as much as $750 to persons not entitled to such lump sum under present law. Mr. Schreiber points out that the present eligibility provisions for the insurance lump sum would remain unchanged.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If I may interrupt, on the subject of eliminating benefits, the funeral fund benefit would be eliminated, is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. The increase in the number of persons eligible for the funeral fund benefit is eliminated.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The increase?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In the hearings which were conducted testimony was given that under the benefit fund compensation was paid in maternity cases of women employees.

Mr. MORSE. That would not be changed. We have not changed that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That would not be changed?

Mr. MORSE. We have not increased it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It has not been increased?

Mr. MORSE. I give the Senator my word that to the best of my knowledge—and if I do not have some knowledge on the matter now it is only because it is pretty hard to drill it into my head—I have stated to the Senator every change from the basic law.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The base on which the percentage of contribution is calculated has been increased?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And the percentage of contribution has been increased?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The increases, both with respect to the employer and the employee, are contemplated to be adequate to place the fund in actuarial soundness, except that it is anticipated that there will be a deficit of 0.57.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct. Some such deficiency will be found in any retirement fund of any size, no matter what effort is made to keep it in balance, because it varies with the number of people who retire in any given period.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will that deficit actuarially continue in existence after the time the maximum contribution period is reached, according to the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Yes, it will still continue. I point out to the Senator that the law itself requires a 3-year actuarial reanalysis; and if it reaches the point after 1962 where there is need for additional legislation, the Board will come back to Congress, as it always does. The present deficit is 3.20 percent. That was created in part by the 1956 amendments. There has been a reappraisal, and this legislation is necessary, in part, to take care of the deficit which was created in 1956. We all knew that we were creating a deficit in 1956. That question was fully discussed in Congress.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In 1956 the compensation was increased, and it was known that an actuarial deficit was created; also it was known that if such actuarial deficit continued, the fund would go defunct.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But it was the purpose of the Congress in 1956 to allow the increase, and at a later time impose the additional burden of contributions. That is what we are doing now.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Can the Senator tell me what is the contribution increase, percentagewise, which will begin in 1959? Is it 7½?

Mr. MORSE. No. It is 6¾ on January 1, 1959, and 7¼ on January 1, 1962.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Seven and a quarter is the maximum, which will be reached in 1962?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Can the Senator give me a recitation of the dollar-wise increase in payments? If it is in the report, I can find it.

Mr. MORSE. The additional cost to the railroads for unemployment insurance would be $29 million for 1959. The additional cost in 1959 for retirement is $56 million, with an additional $30 million in 1962.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That would make a total of $85 million for 1959.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let us go to 1962, and get the figures.

Mr. MORSE. There would be a $30 million additional.

Mr. LAUSCHE. With that additional contribution, what would be the increase, dollar-wise, in benefits on retirement pay?

Mr. MORSE. Ten percent, whatever that figures out.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the maximum retirement pay now being received?

Mr. MORSE. The maximum is $185. The average is $119. The disability compensation is less. It is around $65.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The maximum is $185?

Mr. MORSE. Yes. I may say that we thrashed out this question in committee. The figures were discussed in committee. We insisted that the Board send someone to us who could discuss the subject with us. Mr. Schreiber came before the committee, and we cross-examined him at great length. I am satisfied. I hold in my hand the table which was furnished by the Board in response to our demand at the committee hearings. It sets forth the average retirement benefits, as follows: age 65 and over, $119; age 60 to 64, $113; total and permanent disability, average, $65. Then there are some occupational disabilities and spouse benefits. If the Senator desires to have me read them, I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. LAUSCHE. No.

Mr. MORSE. I am talking about the worker. The maximum for age 65 and over is $185, and the average is $119.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The average is $119, and the bill provides for a 10-percent increase.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is there any graduation of that 10 percent in future years?

Mr. MORSE. No. It is a blanket 10 percent.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I think that gives me the information I desire. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Ohio for his patience with me. I have lived with these figures for so many months that it is very difficult to keep them straight, but I am sure that every statement I have made here today will be borne out by the record.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let me ask one further question. Was the decision to make this increase of 20 percent in the unemployment pay for the highest paid employees, and more than 20 percent to the lower brackets, at all controverted? Was the wisdom of it questioned?

Mr. MORSE. Oh, yes. I do not think there is anything in the bill that was not controverted.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I think those are all the questions that I have. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. I yield the floor.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as may be necessary.

I realize that in the discussion of a subject of this type it is easy to inject into the discussion elements which are extraneous to the subject matter itself. I was sorry a while ago to see injected the extraneous argument in which the railroads were in effect depicted as a group which desired to prey upon their employees, because it has no place here.

I wish to make my own position clear. First, I have never worked for a railroad, I have never owned any stock in a railroad, I have never owned any bonds of any railroad, and do not anticipate doing so.

Second, I have spent as much time in the past 4 years talking with railroad employees and their representatives as I have spent talking with representatives of railroad management.

It is not easy to take the position which I feel in good conscience I must

take. It is certainly not an easy political decision to make, if one looks at the issue from a political standpoint. Nevertheless, after a consideration of all the factors, I have felt that it was necessary for someone to state on the floor of the Senate what we are actually doing, and to say it without trying to raise any false strawmen to knock down, whether those strawmen be raised on behalf of the railroads themselves, or whether they be raised on behalf of the men who are employed by the railroads.

I have spoken previously about the situation in which we find ourselves, and I say here it is humanly impossible for anyone, including the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], to be sure of knowing what he is voting for here today. It is humanly impossible. Though this is not said in criticism of the Senator from Oregon, this lack of knowledge is displayed by the fact that it is necessary for him to have one of the counsel of the Railroad Retirement Board on the floor to advise constantly as to the effect of each question which is asked, because the subject is so complicated that only a person who spends his life with the subject can possibly even begin to answer those questions.

Therefore I find myself in the position of being able to say with respect to the Senator's amendment only that it probably is less burdensome and less onerous than S. 1313. When S. 1313 was reported to the Senate I joined with other Senators in certain minority views.

I believe at this time it is necessary to review the history of what has happened in the past 3 years. In 1956, in the 84th Congress, we had pending before us in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare a proposal to amend the Railroad Retirement Act. I was a minority member of that committee. Control of the proposal was not under my jurisdiction. I cooperated in every respect to secure a determination regarding that proposed legislation, as I have as to all legislation which comes before us.

At the conclusion of the 84th Congress, within the last few days, if my recollection serves me right, it appeared that we would not be able to report a bill. What all the difficulties and the ramifications were I cannot say, but at that time the junior Senator from Massachusetts, who I see is now on the floor, was chairman of the Railroad Retirement Subcommittee. I know that he was having his troubles trying to get a bill which could be reported. My recollection is that representatives of both the railroads and the brotherhoods met with the junior Senator from Massachusetts and myself in the hallway outside the Labor Committee room, and there made a joint proposition to us, which was extended to the committee, that if we would raise the railroad retirement 10 percent, which was badly needed—and we were convinced it was needed—they would proceed immediately at the beginning of the next Congress to make the fund financially sound.

The Senator from Massachusetts acted in good faith, as did I. We told the other members of the subcommittee about this problem. We reported to the Senate a bill, which was passed, to raise the benefits 10 percent, and we told the United States Senate that what we were doing would run the fund into a deficit of roughly $85 million a year for part of a year, so that the beneficiaries could get their benefits, and that when we returned at the beginning of 1957, we would make the fund actuarially sound.

At that time, the representatives of both the brotherhoods and the railroads made us their pledge in word, and later confirmed by letters to the chairman of the committee that they would return in January of 1957, a year and a half ago, and make the fund sound.

My only real interest in the matter is to take care of the people for whom the fund was created. When we returned in 1957, a bill was introduced, which became S. 1313. There were many bills introduced.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to make this statement in behalf of the Senator from Colorado in connection with the comment he has made, that he has been interested only in the people who are affected. Although he and I disagree on many parts of the bill, as long as the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is in the chair, I believe the RECORD should show that when we discovered that the bill in its present form did not benefit a certain group of people—my recollection is that between 7,000 and 10,000 people are involved—the Senator from Colorado said—and I quote him verbatim—"It is not right. We ought to do something about it. We ought to propose an amendment." The Senator said that he may have to be against the final bill, but, he said, "If we are going to have any bill at all, this amendment ought to be included in it."

The Senator from Colorado, the Senator from Kentucky, and the senior Senator from Oregon agreed upon an amendment. It was adopted and is contained in the pending bill. Therefore we can say to the group of people, from whom all of us have heard a great many times by correspondence, that we have protected their interests in the bill. I should like to have the Senator from Colorado get his full share of the credit for that result. It is in line with the statement he has made, that throughout the hearings he has said, "I am interested only in the effect it will have on the people involved." He deserves that this statement by me be made at this time.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks. I have served on no subcommittee in which the members of the subcommittee have worked harder than on the subcommittee which dealt with the pending bill. I do not know of any bill in connection with which members worked harder to get a bill to the floor, even though some disagreed with the philosophy the bill was taking. We agreed that we wanted to do something for the people.

What is the situation? First of all, S. 1313, which we are considering, raises the tax on the individual worker from 6¼ percent to 7½ percent. That is not too bad, in one way, if we can make the fund sound. If we were to levy a tax today of 7½ percent—I am speaking of the retirement fund now—upon the employer and 7½ percent upon the employee, we would make the fund sound.

However, we are not doing that. We did not do it in S. 1313, and we are not doing it here. What we are saying to these people is this: "We raised your benefits in 1956 by 10 percent. We ran the fund $75 million a year into the red for the remainder of 1956 and for 1957 and for 1958."

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator be kind enough to repeat that last statement?

Mr. ALLOTT. I will be happy to repeat it. The statement I have just made is that by our action in 1956 we ran the fund into the red and have run it into the red up to this very moment in the amount of $75 million a year. Who is the fund for? It is for the employees. If we are to continue to operate the fund on a deficiency basis, we will get to the point at some time where the benefits will be paid from one place only, and that is from the United States Treasury.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point to call attention to a figure?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator referred to the deficit for 1956. From 1956 the deficit has increased, and today it is $170 million. The bill I have offered would eliminate that deficit.

Mr. LAUSCHE. One hundred and seventy million dollars as against a total fund of how much?

Mr. MORSE. I was about to say $3 billion, but I am informed it is $3,600,000,000.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield for a question?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Do I correctly understand that the increase in the retirement payments in 1956 was 10 percent?

Mr. ALLOTT. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the bill give a minimum increase of 20 percent to the higher brackets, and in some instances 30 percent to the lower brackets?

Mr. MORSE. No. The Senator from Ohio is making the same mistake I have made over and over again in the last year. The 20 percent, about which he is speaking, deals with the unemployment insurance benefits. The 10-percent increase is straight across the board on retirement.

Mr. ALLOTT. The 10-percent increase is upon retirement. What the Senator from Ohio wants to know, I feel sure, is what it was in 1956.

Mr. LAUSCHE. On unemployment insurance. What was the percentage of increase in unemployment payments in 1956?

Mr. MORSE. None. The increase in 1956 was in retirement payments. As the Senator from Colorado has said, it was 10 percent.

Mr. ALLOTT. I wish to compare what is proposed in the bill with what is proposed by the amendment. Then I want to ascertain whether we are doing what is best for the fund and for the employees.

I should like, in introducing ourselves to that question, first to discuss the question which has been raised about the condition of the railroads.

I have no brief to hold, as I tried to explain a few moments ago, for the railroads as such. I have not now and I have never had any interest which would give me cause to hold a brief for them. But the railroads are a private business, and they can only pay their employees good wages and pay them retirement benefits if and when the railroads are profitable. The only other alternative is to let the railroads run themselves down to the place where the Government will have to subsidize them.

I have had this argument made to me: Congress this year removed the 3-percent tax on transportation. There is no reason why that amount of money should not go into the railroad retirement fund.

Of course, that is a silly, ridiculous argument. First, the railroads did not get the benefit of the 3-percent tax. Second, the only benefits which they get from the removal of the tax are, indirectly, by way of additional business which may come to the railroads.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. As the Senator from Colorado knows, I have always shared his point of view. I have never shared the point of view that the 3-percent transportation tax should now inure to the benefit of the railroad retirement fund.

Mr. ALLOTT. No; the Senator is correct in that statement. I will try to point out in a moment where the Senator from Oregon and I part ways.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I think it is proper for the RECORD to show clearly that the elimination of the 3-percent transportation tax inures to the benefit of the shippers, not of the railroads.

Mr. ALLOTT. My own personal opinion is that it will inure to the benefit of the general public, particularly of a great many farmers, more than it will result in any increase in freight. But that is another question.

It stands undisputed that the financial situation of some of the class I railroads, particularly in the eastern part of the Nation, is very precarious. S. 1313 would have imposed additional taxes of $185 million a year upon them. Yet for the first part of 1958 the net income of all class I railroads was only $72 million. In other words, S. 1313 will impose upon the railroads a burden which is about twice as much—I repeat: about twice as much—as the net income of all class I railroads in the United States for the first 5 months of this year.

Anyone who runs his own business, on the basis of the income and the outgo, even the housewife who has to run her household, knows that a time comes when we must quit kidding ourselves.

The question is, with respect to the railroad retirement fund, When are we going to quit kidding ourselves? The Senator from Oregon has just said that the total deficit in the railroad retirement fund is $175 million. Let me show what it is according to my information. Actuarially, the deficiency in S. 1313—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Colorado has expired, if it includes the 14 minutes consumed by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I did not yield myself 14 minutes; I yielded myself as much time as I needed.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I believe I have 15 minutes allocated to me. I will yield my time to the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty minutes was allotted to each side on the amendment. If the 14 minutes used by the Senator from Ohio to propound a question to the Senator from Oregon was included, the 30 minutes of the Senator from Colorado has expired.

Mr. ALLOTT. I have control of the time on this side. I have yielded no time to any Senator except myself.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from South Carolina offered to yield time which has been allotted to him. I want the Senator from Colorado to have time. I suggest that the Senator from Colorado offer now the amendment he offered in committee, take time on that amendment, and then decide later whether he wants to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute and ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

PART I—AMENDMENTS TO THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT OF 1937

SECTION 1. (a) Section 2 (a) 3 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is amended to read as follows:

"3. Individuals who will have attained the age of 60 and will have completed 30 years of service or, in the case of women, who will have attained the age of 62 and will have completed less than 30 years of service, but the annuity of such individual shall be reduced by one one-hundred-and-eightieth for each calendar month that he or she is under age 65 when the annuity begins to accrue."

(b) Section 2 (g) of such act is amended by inserting after "wife under age 65" the following: "(other than a wife who is receiving such annuity by reason of an election under subsection (h))."

(c) Section 2 of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) A spouse who would be entitled to an annuity under subsection (e) if she or he had attained the age of 65 may elect upon or after attaining the age of 62 to receive such annuity, but the annuity in any such case shall be reduced by one one-hundred-and-eightieth for each calendar month that the spouse is under age 65 when the annuity begins to accrue."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 3 (e) of such act is amended by striking out "his monthly compensation" and inserting in lieu thereof "110 percent of his monthly compensation."

(b) All widows' and widowers' insurance annuities which, in accordance with the proviso in section 5 (a) or section 5 (b) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, are payable in the amount of the spouse's annuity to which the widow or widower was entitled, shall be increased by 10 percent.

SEC. 3. (a) The amendments made by sections 1 and 2 shall be effective only with respect to annuities accruing for months after August 1958.

(b) All recertifications required by reason of the amendments made by this part shall be made by the Railroad Retirement Board without application therefor.

PART II—AMENDMENTS TO THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT TAX ACT

SEC. 201. (a) Sections 3201 and 3221 of the Railroad Retirement Tax Act are each amended by striking out "6¼ percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "7.85 percent."

(b) Section 3211 of such act is amended by striking out "12½ percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "15.70 percent."

SEC. 202. The amendments made by section 201 shall be effective only with respect to compensation paid after June 30, 1959, for services rendered after such date.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Colorado be granted an extra 14 minutes because of the time consumed by the interruption of the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have a statement of the time situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon, all time of the proponent, the Senator from Oregon, has expired. The Senator from Colorado has 14 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does any time remain on the bill?

Mr. ALLOTT. I will respond to that question. So far as I am concerned, I have yielded no time on the bill yet.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is the Senator from Colorado prepared to share 15 minutes on the bill? Our time was consumed in another colloquy.

Mr. ALLOTT. I assured the Senator from Texas that we would do that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the Senator yield me 15 minutes of his time on the bill?

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I reserve that time at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proponents have only 5 minutes remaining on the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. But the Senator from Colorado has control of the time on the other side. Even though he may be opposed, he has arranged that the Democrats may control 15 minutes and the Republicans may control 15 minutes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, when the interruption occurred, I was starting to discuss what S. 1313 would have done further to the railroad retirement fund. As the information was given to us, it would have created an actuarial deficit, or a red figure, 0.25, which is approximately $14 million a year.

Senate bill 1313, with the Morse amendment included, is estimated at 0.57, or approximately $32 million a year. Is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. Very well.

Mr. President, this fund has been running into the red at the rate of $75 million a year. But now it is proposed that we not only not make the fund actuarially sound, but, instead, by means of the pending amendment, run the fund into the red to the extent of a total amount of $32 million a year. I simply cannot understand the thinking behind such a proposal.

Certainly the day will come when the railroad workers will want additional benefits. But in view of the way the pending measure is arranged, the workers will not be able to obtain those benefits unless they obtain them from the Treasury of the United States.

Certainly we wish the program to be a sound one. The workers not only will have to make the increased payments—the amendment provides for an increase, on January 1, to 6¾ percent, for both the railroads and the employees—but, under the pending proposal, the payments will have to be increased to 7¼ percent on January 1, 1962.

At the hearings, which we have held almost continuously during the last 4 years, I learned that the bad part about the proposal now before us is that actually, in order to make the fund sound, not only are the increases now proposed necessary, but when the social-security program is adjusted in 1965, each of the parties to the program we are now considering—both the railroads and their employees—will—each of them—have to increase their payments to 9 percent.

Therefore, Mr. President, is it any wonder why I have been slow to embrace such a proposal?

I have received many letters from railroad employees who apparently have gotten the idea that all they need to do is get Congress to pass a bill to provide for such a raise, and the raise will at once be received by them—that the matter is as simple as that. But when I replied to their letters, I told them what the new raises are to be and what the raises will cost them. Their replies, almost without exception, have been, "In that case, we don't want this; we can't stand such a raise."

Of course I am almost compelled to vote for the pending amendment, because it is not as bad as Senate bill 1313.

But I believe the time has come when we must answer both ourselves and the people.

Although many of my constituents who are railroad workers will feel disappointed at the stand which I feel I am forced to take on the pending measure, the day will surely come when they will thank me for taking steps to make this fund actuarily sound. I believe it is about time for us to do all we can to bring some sanity into this program.

So I cannot go along with the position taken by my friends on the other side of the aisle—namely, that the Government should subsidize this program. What in the world is the use of slaving for months and months—as the committee did, under the leadership of the distinguished junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]—in an effort to provide some relief for the railroads, and then, by means of the proposal before us today, vote the railroads into a worse position than the one they were in when the so-called Smathers bill was passed, earlier this year. Such a procedure makes no sense to me. I cannot understand how, under such a proposal, the eventual result could be anything except Government ownership of the railroads.

A few minutes ago the majority leader said, in substance, that the railroads always overstate their case. Well, Mr. President, let me say that I have been a lawyer too long not to know that when anyone tries to persuade someone else about a particular proposition, the advocate always overstates his case. Certainly that is true of both the representatives of the railroad brotherhoods and the representatives of the railroads themselves.

But there is no question that today we have an opportunity to bring this fund into balance or to push it farther from imbalance.

It has been stated that the recession will be only a short one; and that the railroads soon will be making money again, and that they can afford the program now proposed.

However, Mr. President, rather than take a chance on pushing one or more of the railroads into receivership, I prefer to have the proposed additional benefits postponed for 4 months—namely, until January 1, 1959, at the convening of the 86th Congress—instead of taking a chance on having to subsidize 5, 6, or 7 of the class I railroads.

Mr. President, the amendment I submitted in the committee would have brought this fund into balance. I wonder whether the Senator from Oregon will be willing to accept my amendment, which will put into effect immediately the taxes which are required if the fund is to be brought into balance. In other words, will he be willing to accept the amendment, which will immediately put into effect the 6¼-percent tax on the parties, which his proposal would put into effect on January 1, 1962, after the proposed benefits will have been in effect.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I cannot accept the amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado, and there are two reasons why I cannot accept it. The first reason is that the House proposal follows the tax structure I have provided in my substitute; and we must face the fact that if legislation in this field is to be enacted at this session, the Senate must keep the House proposal and the Senate proposal in complete agreement, especially at this late hour.

Second, I would not accept the amendment suggested by the Senator from Colorado because, as the Senator from Colorado knows, as the result of our discussion in the committee, I was convinced that some delay of the tax payment is very much to be desired, and I think that will be fair for the railroads.

The Senator from Colorado will also recall that the railroad president who testified at the hearings was opposed to the bill. But, in the course of my examination of him, he pointed out that if such a bill were to be enacted, he would hope there would be some deferment.

My amendment provides for a deferment.

Therefore, I cannot accept the amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Oregon will, upon further reflection and consideration, agree to accept the amendment I have proposed. I realize that my amendment may not have been prepared with all the care which normally would be used, for we are overburdened with work as we approach the end of the session, and therefore it is necessary to act very hastily.

Certainly I wish my position to be clearly understood. I know this proposal would work a hardship on the railroads right now, but I sincerely believe that the Congress should immediately take steps to bring the fund into balance.

In about 3 years, I believe our railroad workers are going to find themselves in the position of having been hoaxed, because right now they are going to get another 10-percent increase, which will mean they will have had their benefits raised 20 percent in the last 2 years, if this proposal is passed. Then they will get a very slight increase in taxes on January 1. Then, in 1962, they will get another "slug" of taxes, but no increase in benefits. And in 1965, depending upon adjustments in social security, their taxes will go up to 9 percent. Let there be no mistake about what is going to happen. Let the record be spread out, let the record be set out and shown to these people, so they will know what the effect of this bill will be.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield a bit of time to me so I may put a question to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is the Senator from Oregon of the opinion that under the present fiscal condition of the railroads, they are capable of absorbing this $85 million additional burden without laying off workers or without increasing their rates?

Mr. MORSE. I do not know about their having to increase rates, but the Interstate Commerce Commission was set up by the Congress to determine the rate needs of the railroads, and increase them when the railroads can show a good case. In my judgment, the argument that if we do this the railroads are going to lay off workers is a stereotyped argument. It is a fear argument. I do not accept it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is the Senator from Oregon of the opinion that the railroads are in such fiscal condition as to carry the increased load of $85 million? If they are not, how will they meet it?

Mr. MORSE. In my judgment, the railroads are in a fiscal position to do it.

It may be necessary for some of them to borrow money for a temporary period.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. The analysis we made of the fiscal data given to us by the railroads left the majority of the committee under the impression that the railroads were in a position to do it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If I understood the Senator from Oregon correctly, he said it makes no difference whether the railroads are or are not able to pay; this increase should be granted even though it becomes necessary for the Government to give the railroads, by way of subsidy, the money the railroads would need to finance the program.

Mr. MORSE. Or a rate increase, or whatever steps are necessary. I would say "Yes" to the question of the Senator from Ohio.

I go back to the great doctrine laid down by Brandeis in 1910, which has prevailed ever since as a basic tenet of American arbitration law in the field of wages. The question we should ask is, "What is a fair wage or fair retirement or fair unemployment compensation for the worker?" In other words, as Brandeis asked, "What is a wage of health and decency?" The same principle applies here. If we are satisfied the bill provides a fair, deserved, retirement or unemployment benefit program for the workers, it is my judgment we have no right to say to the workers, "You cannot get it. You have got to subsidize the railroads by taking less than is fair."

Our first responsibility in a field such as this is to provide fair treatment for the workers. Then if the railroads end up in a situation where they are in financial difficulty, let them go to the Interstate Commerce Commission. Let them bring another Smathers bill to the floor of the Senate. But let us not penalize the railroad worker.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is, the first attempt at relief would be made before the Interstate Commerce Commission. If relief were not granted there, then the railroads would have to go to Congress and ask Congress to give them the money?

Mr. MORSE. They always have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired. The yeas and nays have been ordered——

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Shall we first yield back the remaining time, before we have a quorum call?

Mr. ALLOTT. I have no time left.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired on the Morse substitute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from Colorado want to yield back his time?

Mr. ALLOTT. I want to get a quorum call before we vote on the substitute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator from Colorado will withhold his request for a quorum call, I should like to yield 1 minute to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. ALLOTT. I withhold my request.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am confident that this bill is not in the best interest of the railroad workers or the railroads or the public. My individual minority views are expressed in the report. Instead of taking the time of the Senate to make an address on this subject, I ask unanimous consent to place my individual minority views on this subject in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the individual minority views were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIVIDUAL MINORITY VIEWS OF SENATOR STROM THURMOND

In 1956, Congress was presented with a bill to increase by an increment of 10 percent the benefits payable under railroad retirement for workers who were not already retired. There was no provision in that measure to provide the necessary financing for the increased benefits which were authorized. The committee which reported the bill, however, assured this body that, in the following session, a bill to provide the necessary financing would be reported and, further, that both the representatives of the railroad workers and the railroad management had agreed to support such legislation.

The bill before this body is, in substance, the proposal of the representatives of the railroad workers for financing the 1956 increase in benefits. It does contain that financing which was promised. It also contains an additional 10-percent increase in retirement benefits for both retired workers and those not yet retired, as well as increased benefits under unemployment compensation. Increased contributions to pay for the 1956 benefit increases, and for the increases in benefits included in this bill, are also provided.

Due to the inclusion of increased benefits, this bill is promoted as being in the supposed interest of the railroad workers. It is my opinion that rather than being in the workers' interest, this bill constitutes a drastic blow to the welfare of railroad workers throughout the Nation.

At the present time, railroad workers are contributing 6¼ percent of their first $350 monthly salary toward this retirement plan. Under this bill, their contribution rate will increase initially to 7½ percent on the first $400 of monthly earnings; it will subsequently increase again to a figure in excess of 9 percent on the first $400 of monthly earnings. In this inflationary period, it is extremely doubtful that the increased benefits can offset this dangerously high contribution rate.

The testimony before the committee indicates conclusively that, as a result of this bill, the increased cost to the railroads will cause considerable additional unemployment among railroad workers. The testimony shows that the railroads have already cut expenditures to the minimum by deferring major and minor repairs, by slashing capital expenditures, and, to some extent, by reducing the level of employment. The increase in cost imposed by this bill, according to the railroads' testimony, must necessarily be borne by a further reduction in employment.

Illustrative of this testimony is that of Mr. James M. Symes, president of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. Mr. Symes testified that the Pennsylvania Railroad had operated in the red for 8 consecutive months beginning November 1957, with a total deficit in these months of approximately $28 million; and that July would also show a deficit of between $4 million and $5 million. Mr. Symes further testified that the accumulation of a 4 cents per hour increase on wages, effective on May 1, and an additional 8 cents an hour increase scheduled for November 1, would add $25 million to the Pennsylvania's normal annual wage bill. He then testified:

"If Senate bill 1313 is passed, it adds another $14 million to our annual payroll costs.

"If $40 million additional is added to our annual wage cost, on top of our present unsatisfactory showing, it can mean only one thing: additional unemployment, with accompanying deferred maintenance."

The Pennsylvania is one of the largest railroads. The situation is substantially the same with the smaller railroads. This is illustrated by the testimony of Mr. Glen P. Brock, president of the Gulf, Mobile & Ohio Railroad Co., which had a net income in the first 6 months of 1958 of $326,000. S. 1313, according to Mr. Brock's testimony, will add an estimated $1,163,000 labor cost for this railroad. In response to questions concerning increased unemployment as a result of this bill, Mr. Brock responded:

"Mr. BROCK. For each cent an hour on an annual basis, our cost is $200,000. Here we see in the neighborhood of 12 cents plus approximately 9. This is 21. That is $4,200,000. Our average employee receives $5,500 a year. We would have to reduce someplace between 600 and 1,000 employees.

"Senator THURMOND. If S. 1313 passes, do you mean to say that you would have to eliminate from your rolls, to cut off from your payroll between—how many? How many people did you say?

"Mr. BROCK. Up to 1,000, to make up this $3,00,006, of which only $1,162,000 is due to S. 1313. In other words, a third of a 1,000, or about 333 employees, would be riding on this bill.

"Senator THURMOND. So, over 300 men would lose their jobs if this bill passes, approximately; is that right?

"Mr. BROCK. That is correct."

The testimony further shows that additional costs imposed by this bill on the railroads will result in the bankruptcy of some carriers, and threaten others with insolvency. This testimony stands unrefuted. This bill will, therefore, assure either that the railroads most adversely affected will fail as a result of insolvency, thereby eliminating innumerable jobs, or, in the alternative, the Federal Government will be forced to use taxpayers' money to subsidize or nationalize the railroads, in which event the railroad workers stand a chance of losing their most effective weapon for their own welfare; to wit: collective bargaining.

I realize that there are some Members of this body who do not shrink from the thought of subsidizing the railroads with taxpayers' money. The chairman of the Railroad Retirement Subcommittee stated in the open hearings that he was willing to vote a subsidy for our rail carriers. I am not.

The committee has recognized the dire and perilous straits to which the railroads will be reduced financially by this bill, and this is evidenced by the fact that the effective date of the increased rates as to unemployment compensation is deferred by the bill until January 1, 1959, and the effective date of the increased rates as to retirement has been deferred until January 1, 1960. This tacit admission, through postponement, indicates that the committee, in recommending this bill, is reluctant to face the realities of what they here undertake. We cannot forever postpone the date of reckoning. The passage of this bill is not in the interest of the railroad workers, the public interest, or the interest of the railroads. It can only have a detrimental effect on all interests. The apparent political appeal of the bill is, also, illusory, for our railroad workers will be the first to feel the brunt of its disastrous effects.

STROM THURMOND.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. ALLOTT. I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ALLOTT. With respect to the amendment which I sent to the desk and withdrew, is it in order to offer the amendment at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment would not be in order. The Morse substitute is an amendment of the second degree.

Mr. ALLOTT. May I inquire, would the amendment be in order after the vote upon the pending amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is not informed as to the language of the amendment. After a vote is taken it will be in order to offer an amendment.

If the Senator desires to offer his amendment now as a perfecting amendment to the original bill reported by the committee, it would take precedence over both substitutes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, in view of the fact that I may not be able to offer the amendment at another time, I offer a perfecting amendment to the committee bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to insert at the proper place:

PART I.—AMENDMENTS TO THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT OF 1937

SECTION 1. (a) Section 2 (a) 3 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is amended to read as follows:

"3. Individuals who will have attained the age of 60 and will have completed 30 years of service or, in the case of women, who will have attained the age of 62 and will have completed less than 30 years of service, but the annuity of such individual shall be reduced by one one-hundred-and-eightieth for each calendar month that he or she is under age 65 when the annuity begins to accrue."

(b) Section 2 (g) of such act is amended by inserting after "wife under age 65" the following: "(other than a wife who is receiving such annuity by reason of an election under subsection (h))."

(c) Section 2 of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) A spouse who would be entitled to an annuity under subsection (e) if she or he had attained the age of 65 may elect upon or after attaining the age of 62 to receive such annuity, but the annuity in any such case shall be reduced by one one-hundred-and-eightieth for each calendar month that the spouse is under age 65 when the annuity begins to accrue."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 3 (e) of such act is amended by striking out "his monthly compensation" and inserting in lieu thereof "110 percent of his monthly compensation."

(b) All widows' and widowers' insurance annuities which, in accordance with the proviso in section 5 (a) or section 5 (b) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, are payable in the amount of the spouse's annuity to which the widow or widower was entitled, shall be increased by 10 percent.

SEC. 3. (a) The amendments made by sections 1 and 2 shall be effective only with respect to annuities accruing for months after August 1958.

(b) All recertifications required by reason of the amendments made by this part shall be made by the Railroad Retirement Board without application therefor.

PART II.—AMENDMENTS TO THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT TAX ACT

SEC. 201. (a) Sections 3201 and 3221 of the Railroad Retirement Tax Act are each amended by striking out "6¼ percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "7.85 percent."

(b) Section 3211 of such act is amended by striking out "12½ percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "15.70 percent."

SEC. 202. The amendments made by section 201 shall be effective only with respect to compensation paid after June 30, 1959, for services rendered after such date.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, in view of the fact that most of the Members of the Senate are available, I now ask unanimous consent that the rules be suspended, if necessary, so that I may offer my amendment, which has just been read, after the Senate has voted upon the Morse substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado? The Chair hears none, and it will be in order for the amendment to be offered in the event the Morse substitute is agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes while I have the attention of my colleagues.

I should like to point out, in conclusion, that the real principle at issue is whether we are going to fulfill our obligation of 2 years ago to place the fund in balance. The fund has been running $75 million a year out of balance and in the red because of the 1956 amendment to the act increasing benefits by 10 percent.

If the Morse proposal is adopted, the fund will continue to run $32 million a year in the red, on an actuarial deficit of 0.57. In other words, the fund will continue to run $32 million a year in the red.

Such a procedure can eventually lead only to the financing of the railroads or to the taking over of the railroads by the Federal Government. If, as the proponents say, the railroad position is going to improve so rapidly that they can take care of this matter, I say in view of the very complex nature of the amendment which was offered yesterday, the explanation of which became available this morning, the only thing for the Senate to do is put this off 4 months and then provide the additional benefits, after the situation has improved.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Colorado speaks about a $32 million deficit. From the actuarial standpoint a 0.57 deficit, when we are considering a $3.6 billion fund, is extremely small. The advice I have received is that the 0.57 deficit presents no threat to the financial soundness of the system because in a fund so large one will always have either a deficit or a surplus, ranging between a 1 to a 0.1. A 0.57 deficit does not make the fund actuarially unsound.

May I say that we are confronted with a situation in which we have reason to adopt the substitute, in conformity with what the chairman of the House committee finds it possible to accept. The real issue is whether Congress will vote for a railroad retirement and unemployment compensation bill which a substantial majority of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee has decided is a fair bill and one which ought to be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 seconds.

In order that there may be no misunderstanding about how I am going to vote, I want to say frankly that I am going to vote for the amendment as the lesser of evils. I would not want to mislead any of my colleagues as to what my intentions are, when I vote for the amendment. The final bill, I believe, should not be agreed to.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield for a question?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is a fact, is it not, that the Morse amendment is less severe, in the fiscal burden which would be imposed upon the workers and the railroads, than is the original bill?

Mr. ALLOTT. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The original bill would have imposed a financial burden of $185 million. The Morse amendment would impose a burden of $85 million on the railroads for the first year.

Mr. ALLOTT. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will state it.

Mr. PASTORE. What is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. All time for debate has expired. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CAPEHART (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Delaware [Mr.

FREAR], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware would vote "yea," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] would each vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent because of illness in his family.

The pair of the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] has been previously announced.

On this vote, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Delaware would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 80, nays 2, as follows:

YEAS—80

Aiken	Hayden	Mundt
Allott	Hennings	Murray
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Barrett	Hill	O'Mahoney
Beall	Hoblitzell	Pastore
Bennett	Humphrey	Potter
Bible	Jackson	Proxmire
Bridges	Javits	Purtell
Bush	Johnson, Tex.	Revercomb
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Carroll	Jordan	Russell
Case, N. J.	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kerr	Smathers
Church	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Cooper	Langer	Sparkman
Cotton	Lausche	Stennis
Curtis	Long	Symington
Douglas	Magnuson	Talmadge
Dworshak	Malone	Thurmond
Eastland	Mansfield	Thye
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Watkins
Ervin	McClellan	Wiley
Fulbright	McNamara	Williams
Goldwater	Monroney	Yarborough
Gore	Morse	Young
Green	Morton	

NAYS—2

Dirksen Knowland

NOT VOTING—14

Bricker	Flanders	Jenner
Butler	Frear	Martin, Pa.
Capehart	Holland	Payne
Carlson	Hruska	Smith, N. J.
Clark	Ives	

So Mr. MORSE's modified amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the substitute amendment was adopted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to table was agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senator from Colorado has the right to offer his amendment if he desires to do so.

Mr. ALLOTT. I understand I have the right to offer my amendment at any time prior to the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I am sure that all Senators are concerned about the needs and requirements of retired railroad workers and those about to be retired. What should be done for them must strike a balance on what the traffic can bear, what is just to the younger workers with respect to the amount they can pay, what, if anything, can be absorbed by the railroads, and what is fair to the users of the railroads, who are largely the shippers of freight.

Mr. President, may we have order?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have order? I cannot hear the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). The Senate will be in order. Senators who desire to converse will retire to the cloakroom. Attachés of the Senate who have no business on the floor will retire. The Senator from Nebraska may continue.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, in determining what is just and right for the railroad worker, and how that fits in with the younger workers who pay the bill and the shipping public creates many problems which merit consideration. Some of these problems are of sufficient importance to lead us to conclude that we should not legislate on this subject in the closing days of the session of this Congress.

Congress will meet again in 4 months. Perhaps at that time we will know with a little more certainty than we know now what has been gained, if anything, as a result of the recent railroad legislation Congress passed to help that industry, and of course that industry is made up of the workers and the management.

The proposal before us is in two parts. The amendment which the Senate has adopted actually makes little change in the committee bill so far as the retirement portion is concerned. The benefits will be raised by 10 percent. I understand it does eliminate the lump sum survivor benefits. To that extent it is less costly upon the workers and management alike. It is also true that, so far as the amendment which has been adopted is concerned, the immediate tax raise is not as great as the committee bill provides. However, the costs of the program are not determined by the tax rates or the contribution rates. The costs are determined by the benefits which are paid and the collections. If they fall short in an early period, they create further problems at a later time. I believe I am correct in saying that at the present time the railroad worker who is paid the maximum amount now has deducted from his paycheck about $21.86 under the amendment which the Senate has adopted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, on my time?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator and I have cooperated on these railroad matters before. The Senator spoke about the effect of the bill on cost. The substitute would reduce the tax rate from 7½ percent, in the Senate bill, to a final 7¼ percent, with 6¾ percent on January 1, 1959.

It also raises the monthly base from $350 to $400, which results in the long run, in a substantial benefit to the fund.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator from Oregon. I am aware of the facts he has stated.

With that increase in the face of the proposed increase in taxes, we have this result:

A worker now drawing $350 or more a month is having a deduction of $21.88 made. It will be deducted on the first $400 hereafter, and in 1959 the deduction will be $27 a month. By 1962 it will be $30 a month.

We must keep in mind that in any retirement program we owe an obligation to the young, the old, the middle aged, and everyone else concerned. Perhaps the younger workers favor an increase in the amount of their deduction to $30. I do not know. But I believe many of the workers are supporting families. Many of them are attempting to educate their children. Many of them are buying homes. They are making contributions to worthwhile causes in the community. Every deduction from their paychecks is a grim reality in their households.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 5 minutes allotted to the Senator from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield the Senator 5 minutes on the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. Perhaps an increase for some of the older workers, under proper circumstances, is desirable and, no doubt, justified. But I do not like to see hasty action taken on the floor of the Senate in the closing hours of Congress. I firmly believe that the greatest thing we can do for retired persons or persons about to retire, whether they be railroad workers, schoolteachers, farmers, carpenters, or professional men, is to stop inflation. Inflation is the great fear of retired persons today. They fear that their retirement checks, their savings, or their life insurance annuities will not buy very much in later years. I believe Congress owes an obligation to such people in that regard. I do not believe we have met it. This and other proposed legislation definitely does not move in that direction.

The proposal before us will have some effect on the railroads. The fact that they are in serious financial trouble is one of the best known economic facts of life. If that is not true, why did Congress act as it did some weeks ago on a bill to provide relief for them?

My information is that the net working capital of the railroads, which amounted to $934 million at the end of

1955, has been reduced to $336 million by April 1958. The net working capital, on April 30, 1958, was equivalent to only about 2 weeks' cash requirements for operating expenses and taxes.

Some persons might suggest that the railroads absorb this increase or a part of it. Perhaps some railroads can, but there seems to be considerable doubt about that. What else can they do? They can raise rates, which means primarily to raise freight rates. But I believe great portions of our economy have had about all the freight raises they can take.

I come from an area which is right in the center of the United States. We are about as far from deep water transportation as one can get. What happens to the railroad industry means much to the interior of the country. It means much to the railroad workers. If the railroads cannot absorb this increase, and if it is not advisable to raise rates, what next?

There are those who express the fear that as this burden becomes greater, it can only result in a layoff of railroad workers and fewer jobs. On account of decreasing revenues and increasing operating costs already experienced, the railroads have found it necessary to reduce employment. The class I railroads reported for May 1958, 179,000 fewer workers than the total for May 1957, and 239,000 below the figure for May 1956.

Some of the executives who have opposed the bill predict that additional layoffs will be necessary.

In that connection, I have received a telegram from Mr. Russell L. Dearmont, president of the Missouri Pacific Railroad Co., which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LOUIS, MO., *August 21, 1958.*

Hon. CARL T. CURTIS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I am greatly concerned at efforts being made to pass S. 1313, during the last few days of the current session. If this is done, many railroads, including my own, will face a very critical situation. Missouri-Pacific earnings for the first 7 months this year were more than $600,000, less than enough to cover interest and mandatory charges for the period. Currently there is no improvement in our carloadings. Under the terms of this bill, Missouri-Pacific annual taxes for railroad retirement and unemployment insurance would be increased $4,355,000. Such an increase in our tax burden would place us at a serious competitive disadvantage with other modes of transportation who would pay only one-third as much for social security and only one-fourth as much for unemployment insurance. It would require that we reduce our service and lay off at least 700 men. We operate in your good State and this action will therefore necessarily contribute to unemployment there and over our system generally. In view of the fact that the last real hearing on this bill was in the spring of 1957 and since that time the railroad picture has become much more critical, full and fair consideration of the matter should be undertaken before Congress acts. I will appreciate your careful consideration of this whole matter.

RUSSELL L. DEARMONT,
President, Missouri Pacific Railroad Co.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, Mr. Dearmont states that it will be necessary for the Missouri Pacific Railroad to reduce its service and to lay off at least 700 more men. I do not know that he is accurate. Perhaps his fears are beyond the realities. But if a part of his fears were to come true, and men who are supporting families and are taking a vital part in the activities of the various communities are laid off, that is a matter worthy of our consideration in determining the question, At what level of retirement benefit do we reach that point of justice which is just to the younger worker, to the public, to the older workers, and to everybody else concerned?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 5 minutes allotted to the Senator from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest that this matter go over until Congress meets again. I do not believe these many difficult problems can be met in the manner in which we are trying to meet them today and tomorrow.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed at this point in the RECORD a table of figures on employment and the number of persons on retirement pension rolls.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

National railroad industry figures, from the files of the Association of American Railroads:

Employee annuitants	346,369
Old railroad pensions	1,626
Wives and husbands annuitants	125,107
Aged widows and widowers	174,889
Widowed mothers	11,388
Children	43,056
Parents	1,091
Survivors	3,441
Total	706,967
Employees as of May 1958	836,504

One hundred and eighty thousand out of work in June 1958 as compared to the same month a year ago.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes on the bill.

When S. 1313 was reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I did not go along with the majority in reporting it to the Senate. I joined with other members of the committee in expressing our dislike of the bill, mainly because the taxing period did not start until January 1960, which would have added greatly to the annual deficits in the fund.

The railroad retirement fund has been one of the soundest funds in the country for retired persons. I have repeatedly expressed my concern lest Congress do something which would injure rather than help the fund.

I believe the Morse amendment in the nature of a substitute, which has just been agreed to, makes the bill palatable. I can remove my objections to the original bill because of that amendment. I think the distinguished Senator from Oregon rendered the retired railroad workers and those who are about to retire a great service by offering the amendment. I wish we could have adopted an amendment like that in committee as the final bill.

I simply wanted to express my appreciation for the offering of the amendment, and to say that my objections have been pretty much removed by the amendment.

I intend to vote for the passage of the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's statement concerning the present version of the bill. However, credit does not go to the Senator from Oregon nearly so much as it does to the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], who came to me and explained the parliamentary situation which existed between the Senate and the House, and who asked me to work out an arrangement with Representative HARRIS, chairman of the House committee. That has been done. The result is the Morse substitute. I want the Senator from Texas to be given full credit for his leadership in this matter, too.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time the Senator from Oregon has yielded to himself has expired.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wish to take enough time to state that I agree with the Senator from Oregon.

I, too, wish to pay my respects and extend my praise to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], who has worked long and diligently on the bill. I believe he knows as much about the subject as does any Member of either body; and I believe it is due to his perseverance and intelligent approach and dedicated service in connection with the problem that we have finally reached a measure which we can accept.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to pay tribute both to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and to all the other members of the subcommittee, all of whom have made very substantial contributions.

Mr. President, at this time I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] spoke of the fact that the workers will have to take $27, and finally $30, out of their monthly checks, in order to pay for this program. However, I point out that they are already paying at the rate of 6¼ percent, which amounts to more than $20 out of each monthly check. Furthermore, the payments must be increased, in order to bring the fund into balance.

I respectfully point out that the Senator from Nebraska overlooked that point. The fund is now $170 million in the red, in part, because of the action the Congress took in 1956, without increasing the rate to make it possible to bring the fund into balance. So the picture is not as dark as the Senator from Nebraska has painted it.

Certainly we must increase the rate to some extent. The increase now proposed of one-half percent in 1959 will amount to 50 cents per $100 of income, up to $400 a month.

Mr. President, the railroad workers always have insisted on having a better retirement program than other groups have had, and the railroad workers always have been willing to pay for their program. I wish to state that an increase from 6¼ percent to 7¼ percent by January 1, 1962, is a most reasonable adjustment of this matter.

Last of all, Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time the Senator from Oregon has yielded to himself has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional one-half minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for an additional one-half minute.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let us not forget that the spokesmen for the railroad workers are the ones who are urging that the Congress make this change. So when we vote for the change now proposed, I believe, we shall be voting in accordance with the desires of the railroad workers.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I should like to be yielded 5 minutes on the bill.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes on the bill.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry: How much time will then remain under my control?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona will have 10 minutes remaining under his control, after the Senator from Colorado speaks for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I shall be brief.

I wish that there shall be no doubt about my stand on this matter, and the reasons for my stand.

I believe the record shows clearly that all the members of the committee have done everything within their power to bring this bill to the floor of the Senate; and that if they had had their way, the bill would ave been before the Senate a year ago.

Now the time has come when we must ask ourselves whether we wish to continue deluding the railroad workers, or whether we wish to place the fund on a sound basis.

I repeat that the fund has been running into the red to the extent of $75 million a year; and if the pending amendment is adopted, the fund will still be running into the red—in the latter case, at the rate of $32 million a year.

A year ago, the Congress voted a 10-percent increase in connection with this fund. The measure now before the Senate calls for a further 10-percent increase. We must remember that both the workers and the railroads must pay for these increases. But I believe we are not facing our responsibilities and are not doing the job we should be doing, because, in my opinion, we are not being honest with ourselves.

Two years ago, the Congress voted to provide an increase in connection with this fund, but did not provide for increasing the taxes.

Now, by means of the pending proposal, the taxes imposed in connection with this program will not be increased until January 1, 1959, even though the existing deficit in the fund far exceeds $100 million.

Furthermore, the pending proposal would delude the workers again, because they will not have to pay the increased tax until 1959; and subsequently, in 1962, the tax will be increased to 7¼ percent. But the workers are not told that by the year 1965, they will have to pay at the rate of 9 percent or in the neighborhood of 9 percent. Furthermore, by that time benefits they will receive by means of this measure will have been used up. I predict that before then, the workers will be requesting further increases, in order to cover the increases in the cost of living which, in all probability, will occur before then.

Therefore, by the method now proposed, we shall be feeding the fires of inflation, in the case of this one field.

Under these circumstances, Mr. President, I shall have to vote against the pending amendment. I could not do otherwise. But I believe the time will certainly come when the railroad workers will say to me, "We thank you for the efforts you made to put the fund on a sound actuarial basis." Mr. President, that is what I am trying to do.

I state frankly that the amendment of the Senator from Oregon——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Colorado has expired.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I should like to have a few minutes more yielded to me.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. President, as I was saying, I state frankly that the amendment of the Senator from Oregon is much more palatable than the bill previously before the Senate. But, even so, under this amendment the fund will be running into the red at the rate of $32 million a year, whereas in the past the fund has been running into the red at the rate of $75 million a year.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have understood the views of the Senator from Colorado in respect to increasing the so-called deficit. However, I point out that the added cost will be insignificant, in that even though there may now be a 0.57 percent deficit, in 2 years we may find that the deficit is no longer 0.57, but is zero; or by that time there even might be a surplus.

When the fund is $3,600,000,000 and an actuarial deficit of only 0.57 exists, a fund of that size can swing back and forth between a deficit and a surplus, depending on how many die and how many retire, and depending on the number of the employees.

Although the allegation keeps coming up in debate that adoption of my substitute will result in the fund ending up with a $32 million a year deficit, that will not be the case for all years. A surplus may result. But as of the present time there would be a 0.57 deficit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Morse amendment, S. 1313, as amended by his substitute.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his request?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. ALLOTT. I ask the acting minority leader, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], if he will yield me 1 minute for an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Colorado.

(Mr. ALLOTT made a statement, which appears elsewhere in the RECORD under the heading "A Salute to Civil Service Employees.")

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Reprensentatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 25) relating to effective dates of increases in compensation granted to wage board employees.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1411) to amend the act of August 26, 1950, relating to the suspension of employment of civilian personnel of the United States in the interest of national security.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7710) to provide for the lump-sum payment of all accumulated and current accrued annual leave of deceased employees.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 13856) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolu-

tions, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 7720. An act for the relief of Viola Belger;

H. R. 8381. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to correct unintended benefits and hardships and to make technical amendments, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9147. An act to provide for the disposal of certain Federal property in the Boulder City area, to provide assistance in the establishment of a municipality incorporated under the laws of Nevada, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11009. An act to provide for the establishment of Grand Portage National Monument in the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12207. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Alto Ross and children and for E. B. Ard and his daughter, Mrs. Joan Ard Nichols;

H. R. 12216. An act to designate the dam and reservoir to be constructed on the Cumberland River, near Carthage, Tenn., as the Cordell Hull Dam and Reservoir, and to establish the United States Study Commission on the Neches, Trinity, Brazos, Colorado, Guadalupe-San Antonio, Nueces, and San Jacinto River Basins, and intervening areas;

H. R. 12303. An act to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands;

H. R. 12670. An act to provide for additional payments to the Indians of the Crow Creek Sioux Reservation, South Dakota, whose lands have been acquired for the Fort Randall Dam and Reservoir project, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12883. An act to provide for certain improvements relating to the Capitol Power Plant and its distribution systems;

H. R. 13549. An act to increase benefits under the Federal Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance System, to improve the actuarial status of the trust funds of such system, and otherwise improve such system; to amend the public assistance and maternal and child health and welfare provisions of the Social Security Act; and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 653. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 659. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 13856) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXTENSION OF RENEGOTIATION ACT OF 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11749) to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 6 months, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on this vote.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Morse amendment, S. 1313, as amended by his substitute. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. Aiken voted in the affirmative when his name was called.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Morse amendment, S. 1313, as amended by his substitute. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The question now is on final passage of S. 1313?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. The question is on the amendment, S. 1313, as amended by the Morse substitute, which would be exactly the same thing as the matter adopted by a vote of 80 to 2 a few minutes ago.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Do I correctly understand the yeas and nays have been ordered on the Morse substitute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That was the action of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the yeas and nays be rescinded. Those who want a yea-and-nay vote should ask for it on final passage.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota object?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota objects.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ALLOTT. As I understood the situation earlier this morning, the present situation is that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] offered S. 1313 as an amendment to the so-called Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, and then offered an amendment by way of a substitute. Is not the vote a vote upon the substitute which has been adopted as an amendment to the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the Morse amendment, as amended.

Mr. ALLOTT. Which is an amendment. The amendment offered was offered as an amendment to the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, H. R. 12728.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CURTIS. Is the bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, H. R. 12728, now before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Do I correctly understand that if we proceed to a yea-and-nay vote, as ordered by the Senate, what we will be doing will be voting on the Morse amendment, which is something we have already voted on?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And there is objection to withdrawing the order for the yeas and nays?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it a correct statement that the Morse substitute reduced the figures in the original Morse bill, which had been offered as an amendment to the longshoremen's bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. A further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would a vote of "yea" definitely tie in the modified Morse proposal to the Longshoremen's bill and would a vote of "nay" eliminate it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AIKEN. Is not a rollcall in progress? My name was called, and I voted quite clearly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator has voted, no interruption of the yea and nay vote can be made.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CURTIS. If the longshoremen's bill is not before the Senate, how can Senate bill 1313, as amended, be attached to it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A bill by that number is before the Senate, but not at the present time, on this vote.

Mr. CURTIS. That was not my inquiry. Is this vote intended to attach Senate bill 1313 as an amendment to the longshoremen's bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed by the Parliamentarian that the parliamentary situation at the present time is as follows:

The question upon which the yeas and and nays have been ordered is on agreeing to the Morse amendment, namely, Senate bill 1313, as amended by the substitute of the Senator from Oregon. Subsequent to that vote, the parliamentary situation would then involve a vote on the committee amendment to the longshoremen's bill, as amended.

Mr. MORSE and Mr. ALLOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. If, by the yea and nay vote which is in process, or about to take place, the majority votes in favor of the Morse amendment, they will be voting to add the Morse amendment to the longshoremen's bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, that was the question I wished to make clear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. AIKEN (when his name was called). Mr. President, I have already voted. I am not going to vote every time someone changes his mind. I have voted, and I insist upon it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk has no record of the vote of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Then the clerk is mistaken, because I voted very clearly. I vote again. I vote "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will continue the call of the roll.

The rollcall was resumed.

Mr. CAPEHART (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE]. If present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "yea" and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] would vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent because of illness in his family.

The pair of the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] has been previously announced.

On this vote, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Florida would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay" and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 68, nays 14, as follows:

YEAS—68

Aiken	Hill	Neuberger
Anderson	Hoblitzell	O'Mahoney
Barrett	Humphrey	Pastore
Beall	Jackson	Potter
Bible	Javits	Proxmire
Bridges	Johnson, Tex.	Purtell
Bush	Johnston, S. C.	Revercomb
Carroll	Jordan	Russell
Case, N. J.	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Church	Kennedy	Schoeppel
Clark	Kerr	Smathers
Cooper	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Langer	Sparkman
Douglas	Long	Stennis
Dworshak	Magnuson	Symington
Eastland	Malone	Talmadge
Ervin	Mansfield	Thye
Fulbright	McClellan	Watkins
Goldwater	McNamara	Wiley
Gore	Monroney	Williams
Green	Morse	Yarborough
Hayden	Mundt	Young
Hennings	Murray	

NAYS—14

Allott	Dirksen	Martin, Iowa
Bennett	Ellender	Morton
Byrd	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Case, S. Dak.	Knowland	Thurmond
Curtis	Lausche	

NOT VOTING—14

Bricker	Flanders	Jenner
Butler	Frear	Martin, Pa.
Capehart	Holland	Payne
Carlson	Hruska	Smith, N. J.
Chavez	Ives	

So Mr. MORSE's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to table was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, to clear up the parliamentary situation, am I correct in my understanding that the vote just taken results in the adoption of S. 1313 as an amendment of the committee amendment to the longshoremen's bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Am I correct in my understanding that if the committee amendment to the longshoremen's bill shall be rejected, the Morse amendment will be rejected along with it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Then, if the Morse amendment were to be added to the longshoremen's bill, it would be necessary to add it to the House version of the longshoremen's bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. I wished to call that situation to the attention of the Senate. I shall bide my time and see what action the Senate takes on the committee amendment to the longshoremen's bill. I agree with the position of the Senator from Connecticut in regard to that bill, and have so notified him. But I want my colleagues to recognize the situation. I shall offer S. 1313 as an amendment to the House bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment, as amended by the Morse amendment, is open to further amendment.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Connecticut proposes to amend the language proposed to be stricken by the committee, as follows:

On page 4, line 13, in both places where it appears, strike out "two-thirds" and insert "four-fifths."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators will refrain from conversation. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, the bill as it came to us from the House provided that when an employer is assigned a cause of action and makes a recovery, he is entitled to retain one-third of the net proceeds plus a sum equal to the benefits he has paid. The amendment I have offered merely changes the figure from one-third to one-fifth, or 20 percent. The amendment was agreed to in committee.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut. It is a strengthening amendment.

Mr. PURTELL. I ask for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut restate his explanation of the amendment?

Mr. PURTELL. As the House bill came to the Senate for consideration in committee, it provided that when an employer is assigned a cause of action and makes a recovery, he is entitled to retain one-third of the net proceeds. The amendment is in conformity with the thinking of the Senate committee, as will be noted when the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] makes a subsequent motion. The amendment reduces the amount from one-third to one-fifth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the opposition desire to yield back its time?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, since the committee amendments to the bill were essentially technical in nature, and because of the necessity for expediting the passage of this important bill, I suggest that the Senate reject the committee substitute and adopt the bill as passed by the House, with the perfecting amendment of the Senator from Con-

necticut, which we have just accepted, and the amendment, as amended, of the Senator from Oregon, which the Senate has also accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment to the longshoremen's bill, as amended by the Morse substitute.

The committee amendment, as amended by the Morse substitute, was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Is the parliamentary situation now such that the Senate is about ready to vote on the passage of the longshoremen's bill in the House version? And if so, is S. 1313 with the Morse amendment a part of the House bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Oregon restate his parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MORSE. First, is the Senate now in the position where it could be ready for a vote on the passage of the longshoremen's bill in the form of the House version?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The answer is in the negative.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Presiding Officer please state what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment took the place of the House bill.

Mr. MORSE. And that included the Morse amendment, did it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. May I ask the Senator from Connecticut if he intends to propose any further modification in the longshoremen's bill?

Mr. PURTELL. The proposed further amendment was made by the Senator from Massachusetts, who reported the bill from the committee. I have no other amendment to offer.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Has the Senate agreed to the amendment——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota will suspend until the Senate comes to order.

Will the Senator now restate his parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Did not the Chair state that the Senate had agreed to the Purtell amendment as a perfecting amendment to the original House text of the bill H. R. 12728?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Might I ask whether the committee amendment, as amended by the Morse substitute, embraces the same change with regard to the two-thirds and the four-fifths as the Purtell amendment made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from South Dakota be patient while the Chair tries to restore order, so that the Chair might hear the Senator's parliamentary inquiry?

The Chair also desires the attention of the Parliamentarian.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield for the purpose of a quorum call?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to advise the Senate that the interesting conversation we have had at the desk with the Parliamentarian causes us to propose the following parliamentary action: It would seem that this is the appropriate time for me to move that the text of Senate bill 1313, as amended, be added, as a new title, to House bill 12728, the House of Representatives longshoremen's bill. I so move.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, as I understand the motion, if it is agreed to, we shall actually save time, for the effect of the motion will be to add to the text received by us from the House the language of the Morse substitute, which previously has been approved by the Senate, by means of a yea-and-nay vote.

Is that correct, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, it seems to me that that is a desirable means of expediting action, regardless of the effect on the final disposition of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now comes on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts will state it.

Mr. KENNEDY. It is my understanding that on this vote, a vote "No" will be to reject the Senate substitute and to pass the House bill, as amended by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; a vote "No" will be in favor of restoring the House text, as amended.

Mr. KENNEDY. So a vote "No" would result——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would result in the course the Senator from Massachusetts desires to have taken.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to emphasize what the Senator from Massachusetts said a moment ago, namely, that those of us who are desirous of having the House of Representatives longshoremen's bill passed, with the text of Senate bill 1313, as amended, added to it as an amendment, will vote "no" on the question now pending. If a majority vote "no" on the pending question, then the Senate will be in a position to adopt the House version, as amended; and in that way the Senate will get rid of the Senate committee amendment version of the longshoremen's bill.

Is my understanding correct, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The understanding of the Senator from Oregon is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the Senate committee version contained a number of technical amendments which are not of importance. In order to expedite the business of the Congress, it is suggested that, in order to make it possible for the Senate to act on the bill which has been passed by the House, Senators vote "no" on the pending question.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the problem has been presented to us, let me state that if a majority vote "no," on the pending question, the Senate will then be in a position to take care of the matter it thought it took care of by means of the first vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. House bill 12728 is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is, Shall the bill (H. R. 12728) pass?

Mr. McNAMARA. On this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. McNAMARA. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. McNAMARA. I ask for the yeas and nays on passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass? The

yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CAPEHART (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. If present and voting the Senator from Florida would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] would vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent because of illness in his family.

The pair of the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] has been previously announced.

On this vote, the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay," and the Senator from Florida would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 71, nays 12, as follows:

YEAS—71

Aiken	Hennings	Murray
Anderson	Hill	Neuberger
Barrett	Hoblitzell	O'Mahoney
Beall	Humphrey	Pastore
Bible	Jackson	Potter
Bridges	Javits	Proxmire
Bush	Johnson, Tex.	Purtell
Carroll	Johnston, S. C.	Revercomb
Case, N. J.	Jordan	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kennedy	Schoeppel
Church	Kerr	Smathers
Clark	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Cooper	Langer	Sparkman
Cotton	Long	Stennis
Douglas	Magnuson	Symington
Dworshak	Malone	Talmadge
Eastland	Mansfield	Thye
Ervin	McClellan	Watkins
Fulbright	McNamara	Wiley
Goldwater	Monroney	Williams
Gore	Morse	Yarborough
Green	Morton	Young
Hayden	Mundt	

NAYS—12

Allott	Dirksen	Lausche
Bennett	Ellender	Martin, Iowa
Byrd	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Curtis	Knowland	Thurmond

NOT VOTING—13

Bricker	Frear	Martin, Pa.
Butler	Holland	Payne
Capehart	Hruska	Smith, N. J.
Carlson	Ives	
Flanders	Jenner	

So the bill (H. R. 12728) was passed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Oregon to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 3712) to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of the Rama Road in Nicaragua.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1864. An act to authorize an increase in the membership of the Board of Appeals of the Patent Office; to provide increased salaries for certain officers and employees of the Patent Office; and for other purposes;

S. 3335. An act to provide for a National Cultural Center which will be constructed, with funds raised by voluntary contributions, on a site made available in the District of Columbia; and

S. 3379. An act to provide for adjustments in the annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 3942. An act for the relief of certain aliens distressed as the result of natural calamity in the Azores Islands, and for other purposes; and

S. 4039. An act to authorize the expenditure of funds through grants for support of scientific research, and for other purposes.

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13247) to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs; and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of August 23, 1958, pp. 19597–19605, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the conference report was signed by all the Senate conferees. With the exception of the scholarship provision, the bill is substantially the same as the bill which passed the Senate. The scholarship provision went out of the bill entirely.

The House had previously stricken the scholarship provision from the bill. When the provision was before the Senate, as we know, the provision as written into the bill by the Senate committee was very seriously changed by the Cooper amendment. The bargaining power of the Senate conferees was stripped. Therefore, without bargaining power and with the scholarship provision seriously damaged, the result was that the scholarship provision went out of the bill.

The loan provision provides that a student may receive a loan on the basis of ability and need, not to exceed $1,000. Over a period of time the student cannot borrow more than $5,000. The loan would be repaid over a 10-year period, beginning 1 year after the borrower left college, with an interest rate of 3 percent. Up to 50 percent of the loan could be forgiven if the borrower should teach in a public elementary or secondary school. The forgiveness feature would operate at 10 percent a year until 50 percent of the loan had been forgiven.

The language of the statute sets forth clearly the requirements which must be met before a student will be eligible for a loan, in these words:

Such a loan shall be made only to a student who (A) is in need of the amount of the loan to pursue a course of study at such institution, and (B) is capable, in the opinion of the institution, of maintaining good standing in such course of study, and (C) has been accepted for enrollment as a full-time student at such institution or, in the case of a student already attending such institution, is in good standing and in full-time attendance there either as an undergraduate or graduate student;

In other words, the loans shall go only to eligible students in institutions who are in need thereof. In the selection of students to receive loans from such student loan fund, special consideration will be given to (a) students with a superior academic background who express a desire to teach in elementary or secondary schools and (b) students whose academic background indicates a superior capacity or preparation in science, mathematics, engineering, or a modern foreign language.

The other provisions of the bill are substantially the same as those of the bill passed by the Senate.

TITLE III—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE PURCHASE OF SCIENCE TEACHING EQUIPMENT

The conference report would authorize $70 million, first, for making grants to State educational agencies for the purpose of acquiring laboratories and other special equipment, including audio-visual materials and equipment and printed materials, other than textbooks, suitable for use in public elementary and secondary schools to provide education in science, mathematics, or modern foreign language; and, second, for making loans to nonprofit elementary or secondary schools for the purchase of science teaching equipment.

Grants made to the States would be required to be matched on a dollar-for-dollar basis. Twelve percent of the appropriation would be reserved for making the above-mentioned loans to provide nonprofit elementary or secondary schools. These loans would be repaid over a period of up to 10 years. Five million dollars is authorized to be used for administration and for the expansion or improvement of supervisory or related services in public elementary and secondary schools in the fields of science, mathematics, or modern foreign language.

TITLE IV—NATIONAL DEFENSE FELLOWSHIPS

The conference report would authorize 1,000 fellowships the first year and 1,500 for each of the succeeding years for graduate students who are interested in teaching at the college or university level.

TITLE V—GUIDANCE, COUNSELING AND TESTING

The conference report authorizes $15 million a year for 4 years for making grants to State educational agencies, with matching by the States on a dollar-for-dollar basis after the first year, for a program directed at identifying outstanding students, advising them concerning courses, and encouraging them to attend college.

Six million dollars would be authorized for institutes for the training of guidance and counseling personnel.

TITLE VI—LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

The conference report authorizes the Commissioner to contract with institutions of higher education for the establishment and operation by them of centers for instruction in languages now rarely taught in the United States and for instruction in other fields to provide a full understanding of the areas in which such languages are commonly spoken.

The conference report authorizes foreign language institutes for advanced training, for individuals engaged in or preparing to engage in the teaching, or supervising or training of teachers, of any modern foreign language in elementary schools. Seven million two hundred and fifty thousand dollars would be authorized for each of the 4 years of this program.

TITLE VII—RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION IN MORE EFFECTIVE UTILIZATION OF TELEVISION, RADIO, MOTION PICTURES, AND RELATED MEDIA FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

The conference report authorizes the appropriation of $3 million for fiscal 1959 and $5 million for each of the 3 succeeding years to enable the Commissioner to conduct, assist, and foster research and experimentation in the development and evaluation of projects involving new media of communication which proves of value to education at all levels.

TITLE VIII—AREA VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

The conference report amends the George-Barden Act by adding a new title III to it. Under this new title, $15 million is authorized to be appropriated each fiscal year to allow States and local areas to conduct less-than-college-grade courses designed to fit individuals for useful employment as technicians and skilled workers in occupations requiring scientific or technical knowledge.

TITLE IX—SCIENCE INFORMATION SERVICE

The conference report would direct the National Science Foundation to establish a Science Information Service. The Service will be responsible for providing for indexing, abstracting, translating, and other services leading to a more effective dissemination of scientific information. The Science Information Service would also undertake programs to develop new or improved methods, including mechanized systems, for making scientific information available.

The Senate bill authorized the appointment of a number of additional supergrade positions in the Office of Education. Both House and Senate conferees agreed that such positions should be authorized to enable the Commissioner of Education to hire highly competent men to administer the new programs authorized by this legislation. However, because of the parliamentary situation it was decided to leave this provision out of the conference report. This should not be taken to mean that the conferees believed that such additional positions will not be necessary.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask that I may be permitted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Colorado, who at the present time is the ranking minority member of the conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to say on the floor of the Senate what a great job I think the chairman of the committee did in the conference committee. We had three long, hard days of conference in an effort to reconcile not only differences between the House and Senate, but also differences among the House Members themselves, and differences among the Senate conferees. I believe that a great result has been accomplished.

What has happened, really, is a change in emphasis. The emphasis of the bill has shifted. We had thought that through the scholarships we could provide a real impetus to tougher and better curriculums, and better scholarship in our primary and secondary schools. In the bill as agreed to by the conferees, I think the emphasis has shifted a little more toward helping to produce better teachers, better schools, and better courses. I am not sure that in the long run emphasis on the other features may not be just as important.

I wished to pay my respects to the Senator from Alabama, who, during the 3 days of the conference, did a marvelous job. I believe we succeeded in retaining as much of the best part of the bill as we could possibly keep.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator from Colorado. The Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Alabama worked as teammates on the bill. We started as teammates on the very first day of the hearing. We spent many days in the hearings, and many days considering the bill in committee. Then we worked together closely on the floor. In the conferences committee the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Alabama worked together. If any credit is due, the Senator from Colorado certainly shares in such credit.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. What is the difference in total cost, as between the conference recommendation and the Senate bill?

Mr. HILL. Before I try to give a specific answer, let me say that this bill is a 4-year bill, but it has certain so-called "phasing-out" periods. Under the provisions of the bill embodied in the conference report, a young man may receive a loan the third year of the bill, to go on to college. If he receives it the third year of the bill, he will have a right to go beyond the fourth year, which is the basic period of the bill, in order that he may finish his college course. But without getting into the "phasing-out" period, I should say that the bill as originally passed by the Senate involved a cost for the 4-year period of $1,101,090,000. The bill embodied in the conference report involves a total cost of $887,090,000. In other words, the cost of the bill embodied in the conference report is at least $214 million less than the cost of the bill passed by the Senate.

However, there is one point I wish to emphasize, so that every Senator will know it. There is the so-called "phasing-out" period, and it is not possible to know what the phasing-out may cost.

There is another point which I wish to emphasize. So far the loans are calculated as a part of the cost; yet, the transactions being loans, we expect most of the money to be paid back, with 3 percent interest.

Mr. WATKINS. If they were all paid back, what would be the cost?

Mr. HILL. The loans for the 4-year period amount to $295 million. However, as I stated, a student, in the illustration which I use, who received his loan in the third year would be entitled to get his loan the fourth year of the bill, and he would be entitled to continue and finish his course. So in addition to the $295 million, some additional loan funds will be used. However, the purpose of the bill is that the loans shall be paid back unless the borrower should engage

in teaching in a public secondary or elementary school. In that case up to 50 percent of the loan would be forgiven.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator mentioned the fact that there had been a shift in emphasis. What was that shift?

Mr. HILL. I believe that what our distinguished friend from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] had in mind—and he can speak better for himself than I can—was the shift from scholarships to loans. In the bill which we brought to the floor of the Senate we were seeking to challenge the youth of America, the boys and girls in our secondary and elementary schools, by offering an award or prize of a scholarship. This was not only to challenge the boys and girls, but to challenge the parents, the idea being that if we challenged the parents, they would not only encourage and stimulate their boys and girls, but would also do all they could to make sure that the schools to which their children went were a little better, and to provide more of the difficult courses in science, mathematics, and foreign languages.

There would also be a challenge to the school officials, who would want to see the graduates of their schools win as many awards and prizes as possible.

Mr. WATKINS. Would the help given under the terms of the bill be largely in the field of science and mathematics?

Mr. HILL. We provide an incentive for students who have the proper academic background. Let me read the Senator the exact language from section 204 (4) of the bill.

Under this section the agreement with the institution of higher education would:

(4) provide that in the selection of students to receive loans from such student loan fund special consideration shall be given to (A) students with a superior academic background who express a desire to teach in elementary or secondary schools, and (B) students whose academic background indicates a superior capacity or preparation in science, mathematics, engineering, or a modern foreign language.

Such students would receive special consideration. There might be more applicants than could be provided with loans. If there were not enough money to take care of all the applicants, those in the categories to which I have referred would receive special consideration.

Mr. WATKINS. I voted against the bill when it was before the Senate, but I believe that striking out the grants for scholarships probably has improved it. The Senator may not agree with that view. I believe, on the whole, that the emphasis is in the right place, on loans, and providing more and better teachers for science, mathematics, and the languages. I believe I could now vote for the bill.

Mr. HILL. Notwithstanding the great esteem in which I hold the Senator from Utah, I must say that I strongly and emphatically disagree with his opinion. I believe that the bill would be better if it had a strong scholarship provision such as was in the bill reported by the Senate committee.

The Senator from Utah asked a question to which the Senator from Colorado had previously addressed himself. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alabama for yielding to me. I had previously commented on this subject.

With the striking of the scholarship feature, it has been found that the emphasis of the bill has shifted.

The emphasis which is left is highly desirable, and I believe most Senators will find this a very desirable bill.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. The Senator from Alabama will recall that when the bill was before the Senate we had a colloquy as to whether junior colleges would be able to receive funds under title IV for laboratory equipment and things of that kind. The House had such a provision in its bill. It is my understanding that the conferees accepted that House provision. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. The Senator's understanding is correct. The bill provides:

For purposes of sections 301 through 304, the term "secondary school" may include a public junior college as determined under State law.

I believe that is what the Senator from Michigan had in mind. I am very happy to say to him that that provision is in the bill.

Mr. POTTER. I wish to thank the Senator, because that provision will be of great benefit to States like Michigan. If the Senator would indulge me for one more minute, I should like to make a unanimous-consent request. I ask unanimous consent to have included in the record statements by me and others concerning industry's support of higher education, and I ask that the statements appear following the vote on the conference report.

Mr. HILL. I make the same request, that the material appear following the vote on the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the adoption of the conference report.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Under the provisions of the bill, how can a student borrow money?

Mr. HILL. He can borrow up to $1,000 a year.

Mr. LANGER. What are the mechanics involved? To whom does he apply?

Mr. HILL. He first must be admitted to an institution of higher education. He first must be admitted. When he is admitted to the institution, he makes application for a loan.

Mr. LANGER. Must he sign a note?

Mr. HILL. Of course, he promises to pay back the loan. He does not have to get an endorser, unless under the applicable State law his signature would not create a binding obligation, if that is what the Senator has in mind.

Mr. LANGER. He can get a loan of $1,000. That would be $4,000 in 4 years. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. That is correct. Under the bill, if he takes a course which requires 5 years—some courses, such as engineering require another year—he can get $1,000 for that fifth year also. He can borrow up to $1,000 a year, based on his need, but not more than a total of $5,000.

Mr. LANGER. If the student applying is a minor, does anyone have to sign a note for him?

Mr. HILL. No; he signs his own note and may not be required to secure an endorser or to provide security unless he is a minor and his signature would not, under applicable State law, create a binding obligation.

Mr. LANGER. When must the note be repaid?

Mr. HILL. It is repaid over a 10-year period after he leaves college.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I, too, join with other Members of the Senate in recognition of the patient work of the distinguished Senator from Alabama in bringing the bill to final passage in the Senate. I voted to report the bill from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I voted for it on passage in the Senate. Of course I shall vote for the conference report.

My purpose in rising is to direct attention to a statement which the distinguished Senator from Alabama made in his presentation of the conference report, and a statement which is attributed to him by the New York Times today. The statement attributed to the Senator is this: "The Cooper amendment on the floor of the Senate seriously damaged the scholarship bill and stripped the Senate conferees of their bargaining power with the House conferees."

I was not a member of the conference committee, and therefore I am not able to speak of the conference deliberation. However, having read the House debate at the time of the passage of the House bill, and having noted the firm position the House took, I differ with my distinguished friend. I doubt very much that there was any intention upon the part of the House or on the part of its conferees to accept any scholarship provisions.

If the House conferees were not willing to accept the amendment which I had offered in the Senate, and which had been accepted by the Senate, providing for scholarship grants of $250 a year, or a total of $1,000 in 4 years, plus—and I emphasize the plus because it always seems to be left out—plus the additional loan of $750 a year, or a total of $3,000 for 4 years, an amendment which would cost the Government between $80 million and $200 million less than the Senate committee version, I doubt very much that the House conferees would have accepted the more grandiose scholarship

provisions of the Senate committee—which the Senator favored.

I do not wish to go over old ground, but there has been some discussion of this subject, and I will take a minute or two to discuss the matter.

When the House considered the education bill, it struck out the scholarship title entirely. The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare had the matter before it. There was a very thorough discussion of the scholarship title. My position has been consistent. I offered an amendment in committee that the fellowship section should be on a basis of 50 percent grants, and 50 percent loans. The committee unanimously accepted the amendment. I also offered an amendment in committee providing that the scholarship title, title II, should be based on 50 percent grants, and 50 percent loans. That was not accepted by the committee. Then, on the floor of the Senate I offered an amendment which provided $250 in grants a year and $750 in loans, which would make available $1,000 a year to a student receiving a scholarship award. The Senate accepted my amendment.

I should like to tell the Senate why I offered the amendment because I did not go into detail, on the floor of the Senate on the evening when the Senate considered the bill. I offered it, first, because I believe the inclusion of loans is more in conformity with the American tradition than a system of outright grants, up to $1,000. I believe it just that funds and the opportunity for education should be available for the deserving and, I might say, needier applicants, and that preference and emphasis should be in that direction, rather than in one which would provide thousand-dollar grants without regard to need.

I had other reasons. I believe the bill was loose in its scholarship provisions. There were no clear standards established for the determination of eligibility for scholarship awards. The decision in each case would be made by a commission appointed by the governor of the State. After an award had been made and a scholarship granted, the committee bill provided, the continuance of the grant for the succeeding 3 years would not be determined by the university or college which the student might attend, on his scholarship, but by the committee appointed by the State.

I believe these rather loose provisions, without requirement for high standards, and I believe a grant plus a loan would attract the more serious and deserving students. Students who really want to go to college, would be willing to take the loan provision, which could be made available to them.

I did not consider it at the time, but I later thought that the House, having taken a very strong position against grants, might be more favorably inclined to the amendment I offered. They were not. But I wanted to make the statement. I believe reasonable grants plus loans, are more in the American tradition than the award of large grants.

I believe this is a helpful bill. I believe it will help materially to overcome a serious deficiency in teachers in the universities, and in the high schools, as well. I hope it will result in an improvement in the curricula of the secondary schools.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator. I always am sorry when I find myself in disagreement with the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. The House did not have a yea-and-nay vote on the motion to strike out the scholarship provisions of the House bill. That was accomplished by a division, not by a yea-and-nay vote.

To be perfectly frank, I think the Senator's amendment seriously damaged the concept and the basis of the scholarship plan as embodied in the Senate committee bill. I think the amendment stripped the Senate conferees of bargaining power. When we go into a conference with the House, we cannot go stripped down. If we do, we cannot bargain, or get anything in return.

So far as the loan provision in the Senator's amendment is concerned, such a provision was already in the Senate committee bill, because that bill permitted any student who received a scholarship to apply for a loan under the loan provisions of the bill; and if he showed that he had need for the loan, there was no reason why he should not get the loan under the loan provision of the Senate bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Alabama has rendered a great service to the country in getting the bill through conference. This is the first major bill for assistance to education which will actually have been enacted. The Senator from Alabama has sponsored many bills in the Senate, but I believe this is the first major bill of this nature.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Alabama have joined in the sponsorship of many bills.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I compliment the Senator from Alabama for his success in this instance. He deserves great credit. I know he feels, as I feel, that this is not exactly the kind of bill we would have favored had we had our own way. We would have liked to provide assistance to education in general, and in a broader sense than is provided in this bill. Nevertheless, I am delighted that the bill has reached the point of acceptance.

I should like to ask the Senator 1 or 2 questions. On the subject of loans to students, are any restrictions placed on the nature of the studies which the students must undertake? Must they study science, for example?

Mr. HILL. No; there is no restriction as to the studies they may undertake. There is this provision, as I have said and wish to emphasize: In the making of loans, a preference is accorded students whose academic background indicates a superior capacity or preparation in science, mathematics, engineering, and modern foreign languages. In selecting the applicants for the loans, the students who are to benefit from the loans, those having such a background of preparation will receive special consideration. There is no restriction on which courses the borrower may select. It is entirely his own choice.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Suppose two students apply, one of whom is an excellent student not specializing in science, the other a mediocre student. Would the mediocre student still be given preference to the one who is not specializing in science but is of a far better capacity?

Mr. HILL. That would depend. The Senator used the word "mediocre." Whether the student was mediocre would depend upon how well he had performed in the sciences, or mathematics, or engineering, or a modern foreign language. If the other student was brilliant and capable and showed far more capacity to serve our country, more particularly to serve in a position vital to the national defense, I would say such a student would be selected.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think it is important to show that the bill does not absolutely bar the student who is interested in a general liberal education.

Mr. HILL. When I opened the debate on the Senate bill, the bill which was under consideration by the Senate, I stated that the Federal Government from the very beginning had responsibility for the national defense and for the conduct of foreign affairs. Ten years ago, speaking on the Senate floor, I said America's first line of defense was the scientist's laboratory. I said foreign affairs were no longer foreign, and that what we were seeking to do was to meet our responsibility for defense, for the conduct of foreign affairs. Then I emphasized, too, that that did not mean that there was any depreciation of the need and necessity for the humanities and the other many important subjects. If America is to be strong, then we must strengthen the whole line. We must strengthen the whole front of education.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator for that statement. I believe the Senator mentioned this subject, but I want to clarify it in my own mind. These loans may be paid off at the rate of 20 percent a year by anyone who enters the teaching profession. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. He may pay off up to 50 percent of the loan over a period of time at the rate of 10 percent of the loan for each year of teaching. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Twenty percent of half the loan.

Mr. HILL. The bill the committee reported to the Senate and the bill as it passed the Senate provided that the whole loan might be forgivable if the recipient taught for 5 years. However, the House bill had no provision with respect to forgiveness of the loans, and the conferees asked many questions about what their reception might be if they went back to the House with such a provision. So we had to compromise that problem and accommodate our views to theirs.

We came out of the conference with a report which embodies forgiveness of one-half of the loan provided the recipient of the loan teaches in a public elementary or secondary school.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the report provide for grants to communities for the installation of equipment, or are they only for research?

Mr. HILL. The conference report in title VII provides for research and experimentation in more effective utilization of modern communication mediums for educational purposes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. A research program.

Mr. HILL. Primarily experimental research, to assist and foster research and experimentation in the development of the entire area, including not only television, which is most important, but also the audiovisual medium.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have been asked by the authorities in my hometown about the possibility of getting television in the high school. Would this bill render consultation advice to those people?

Mr. HILL. I should say they could receive consultation and advice and have the benefit of the research and experimentation carried on.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the Senator yield before he leaves that subject?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] knows the Senate passed a bill allowing grants-in-aid for educational TV. That bill was reported by the House committee last week, but unfortunately the House, I understand, was in such a position that the bill could not be taken up. We assure the Senator that when January comes, that subject will be the first order of business in our committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have one additional question. Will this measure have any effect on the quality of the curriculums in the schools? Does it provide for guidance and counseling of the schools in regard to their curriculums?

Mr. HILL. No. The guidance and counseling will apply to the individual students. We have such a program now; we have had it for many years under our vocational educational system. As the Senator from Arkansas knows, that program was first established in 1917. It is a partnership program with the Federal Government, the States and the local communities, all of which are sharing in the cost of the program. The guiding and counseling are for the purpose of helping the individual students ascertain their best talents, and then to study the courses which will best develop their talents and also will best serve the Nation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will this measure have any effect upon the selection of the able students? To put the question another way, is it intended to help develop better methods of ascertaining which students are of superior capacity?

Mr. HILL. That certainly would be one result; yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will this measure provide assistance to the authorities in the schools?

Mr. HILL. In the States; yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. To locate and develop the best students?

Mr. HILL. Yes. The Senator from Arkansas has given much thought to this subject, and speaks with much authority on it; and I believe he will agree with me that one of our greatest problems is to locate the best students, and then, to stimulate, encourage, and challenge them to do their best to develop their talents to the maximum, always with the thought in mind of rendering the greatest possible service to the Nation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Alabama is quite correct.

The problem of providing sufficient incentives to such students is in my opinion, a most serious one. I do not know that much can be done about it by means of this measure; but certainly that problem is of major concern to the whole country.

Mr. HILL. I say to my distinguished friend that that is the basic concept behind the scholarship program which was embodied in the bill the Senate committee reported to the Senate and also in the bill as passed by the Senate.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I believe I would be derelict in the performance of my duty if I did not rise to utter a protest about the conference report, because it does not go nearly far enough in the direction of meeting the challenge the Russians have posed to us in the field of education.

The Congress has appropriated more than $40 billion for purposes of defense; and in that regard the Congress added to that appropriation bill $1 billion which the administration did not request.

But in connection with Congressional consideration of the education bill, suddenly the Congress becomes more parsimonious in dealing with a program which the country requires if it is to meet the Soviet challenge, not only in terms of defense and economic matters, but also in terms of cultural matters and as regards every other phase of activity in our lives.

I utter this protest because I believe the country should understand that the conference report will not foot the bill; and, next year, the Congress will have to take even greater steps in order to cover the ground it is not covering today.

Certainly provisions for scholarships are needed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from New York introduced a scholarship bill which had many fine features.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Alabama. I may say that, together with my colleague from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], I introduced on March 27, 1957, the first student-loan act, the Education Loan Act of 1957 (S. 1727).

We polled 200 universities on that bill; and, uniformly, they replied, "Student loans are fine; but we also need scholarships, in order to get into college at least 50 percent of the meritorious high-school graduates who are not now coming to college. If Members of Congress really want to do what we say we want to do, we must take steps to enable at least 50 percent of the meritorious high-school students who are not now going to college to enter college."

So the omission of the scholarship provisions is a very serious one; and I hope we shall not give up in our efforts to obtain the enactment of such provisions, because they are very greatly needed. We must provide for the college administrator the opportunity for both student loans and scholarships.

Furthermore, I desire to point out that no Federal aid is being provided for school construction. We talk about attracting people to the teaching profession, but we give them second-rate schools in which to teach; and we deprive the States of the resources with which to provide adequate salaries in order to encourage the teachers to remain in the teaching profession.

So, Mr. President, let us understand that the conference report is only a beginning—in a very real sense. Let no Senator delude himself into thinking that when he votes for adoption of the conference report, he votes to meet the monumental challenge the Russians have posed to us.

The fair-haired boys are the ones who will go to college; but under the provisions of the conference report, not enough young Americans will go to college.

However, some of the very wisest provisions of the bill are those which provide aid for vocational education. I believe those provisions are very good, and will be very helpful.

I only add, Mr. President, that we must go forward in making provision for scholarships and for Federal aid to school construction, in addition to doing more to improve the student-aid program.

The bill I introduced, S. 1727, contained provisions for what I called an FHA-type educational program; it would have guaranteed the loans to be made to students by banks and savings-and-loan associations throughout the Nation. After all, a young American who is educated has a lifetime ahead of him, and his future constitutes just as good security as does a house on which an FHA mortgage loan is placed.

We should expand the program enormously. Even $260 million could be of real help to great numbers of students.

So I hope very much that the Senator from Alabama, with his great interest in this field, will move forward, at the next session, in terms of the enactment of provisions for an FHA-type program, as well as for enactment of the other programs.

I thank the Senator from Alabama very much indeed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New York knows—as a student of history—that seldom, in connection with the handling of a new piece of legislation, is it possible to provide in the original act for all that its authors wish to have provided by it. In other words, it is necessary to make a start, and then to build on it.

I may say that the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the chairman of the Education Subcommittee, of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, is outstanding in his devotion to the cause of education. No Member of the Senate has been more devoted to that cause or has worked more in behalf of it or has made greater contributions to it than has the distinguished senior Senator from Montana.

I am certain that his subcommittee, as well as our full committee, will keep constantly in mind all that the distinguished Senator from New York has said this afternoon.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, by way of conclusion, let me say to the Senator from Alabama that at no time in American history has a measure of the type we are advocating been enacted into law.

It is all very well for the distinguished ranking Democratic member of the Foreign Relations Committee and other members to say the Nation is falling behind and many of us are deeply conscious of these reverses, too; and that we are short on new ideas and are not measuring up to our responsibilities. But such comments are only effective as they move us to action.

The educational program we are advocating is one which will pay off. The issue we raise is whether the Government is helping with the education of the people, and whether the Government is providing sufficient funds to do that job. I merely wish to point that out.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, no one regretted more than did I to see the Senate take the action it did when it adopted the Cooper amendment, the other evening, and then passed the bill, and thus very severely damaged the scholarship provision. I thought that provision went very much to the heart of the problem the Senator from New York has discussed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I believe that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] have debated that matter sufficiently; so I shall not get into that debate.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, inasmuch as I mentioned the name of the Senator from Kentucky, I yield now to him.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the Senate voted and accepted my amendment. So it became the Senate amendment, not just the Cooper amendment.

I stated my reasons when I offered the amendment; and I assume that when the Senate voted for the amendment, it accepted at least to some degree those reasons.

I return to my point; and I say—and say with respect for the Senator, it is my information—and I have heard this since the meeting of the conference committee—there never was any intention on the part of the House conferees to adopt the provisions for the scholarship program. Perhaps the Senate conferees should have insisted more strongly for the preservation of the scholarship concept which was provided in the bill by my amendment. I make that point.

At this time I should like to join my friend, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], in saying that the conference report is a good one. It makes a start, although it does not meet the educational needs of the country.

In these last days, we have heard critical speeches in the Senate—not only of foreign policy, but of the direction of thought in the Nation, the character of the people, and the culture of our people.

If there are defects in our life, I suggest there is a way in which a universal effort can be made by the Congress to raise the level. It is in the field of education. An effort should be made to lift the standards of curriculums in the elementary and high schools of our country. We cannot raise them. We cannot force local schools to do it. But, as I have suggested several times, if the President of the United States could appoint a commission of great scholars and educators, not to study the defects of our educational system, for they have been studied enough, but to meet with governors and the heads of the educational systems of the States, to work with them, to encourage them, to urge them to take the necessary steps to lift the standards of curriculums in the secondary schools, perhaps something might be accomplished.

And adequate financing is necessary to improve our school programs. We shall have to determine whether we are willing to aid the States in school construction and teachers' salaries, if we really mean to raise the standards of education in this country.

I have always supported and voted for such measures. I shall continue to do so. We have not met the greatest challenge of our Nation—that of education. We have not even approached it. I hope in the future we shall do what is necessary.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama a question. I have great confidence in the Senator. I think he is to be highly commended for the work he has done. What disturbs me about the conference report is that it seemed to me the important parts of the bill were the provisions under which Federal money would go to the individual student, and that the froth and the furbelows—although I do not mean that literally—consisted of provisions by which money would be channeled into State educational systems for various purposes—for guidance, counsel, and for various activities which the States can handle.

What I fear is that back from conference has come a bill which further reduces the heart of the bill—that is, the money going to the individual student—but which retains provisions for money being channeled into State educational systems.

Will the Senator give me his comments on that question?

Mr. HILL. As the Senator has heard me state, I regret the loss of the scholarship provision in the bill, but I wish to say to him that the great emphasis in the bill is still on the individual student. The loan program is devoted to the development of, and a challenge to and stimulus of, the individual student. The other programs to which the Senator from New Hampshire has referred have as their objective the development of the individual student to prepare him for service to the country.

Mr. COTTON. Approximately what proportion of the money provided in the bill will go to individual students, and what proportion will be channeled into the educational systems of the several States?

Mr. HILL. I could give the Senator a breakdown. For instance, there is a provision for grants, on a 50–50 matching basis, for the purpose of providing science equipment and audio-visual aids in high school. The purpose of such a program is not to help the particular school, but to help the student who is taking a course in physics, biology, or other science, so he may have the equipment to do his best work in that course.

Mr. COTTON. I recognize that the purpose is to help students in education. I appreciate the argument of the Senator. But to bring the matter down to brass tacks, what proportion of the money provided in the bill would go to the individual students—not to State educational systems for equipment, but to the individual students—in loans or otherwise, and what proportion would go to the State educational systems?

Mr. HILL. There is provision for loans which will go directly to the individual students. Funds, for instance, are provided for fellowships. That money goes to the individual students taking graduate courses, primarily for teaching purposes. That money goes to the individual.

Mr. COTTON. Would the Senator say 25 percent of the Federal money will go to individuals, or 35 percent?

Mr. HILL. I would not want to hazard a guess on figures. I would have to sit down and compute the matter, in order to give the Senator an intelligent answer. If he wants me to compute it and put it in the RECORD, I shall do so. I would not want to say the amount would be 25 percent without at least having had an opportunity to sit down and check the figures.

Mr. COTTON. I voted for the bill with some qualms. However, I feel the "guts" of the bill, if the Senator will pardon the expression, the language with respect to scholarships, is cut out, and I almost feel I must vote against the conference report. I hope to be reassured by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. The intestinal fortitude in this bill is for the individual student.

Mr. COTTON. I will say to my friend that intestinal fortitude is fine, but I am asking about money.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. If the Senator will kindly turn to page 20 of the report, I should like to ask him a question.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. BUSH. Under section 303, which appears on that page, subparagraph (3), on the fourth line of that subparagraph, words have been inserted in the bill the

Senate passed, reading "as determined by the State board for such State."

So that the subparagraph reads:

For the training of individuals designed to fit them for useful employment as highly skilled technicians in recognized occupations requiring scientific knowledge, as determined by the State board for such State, in fields necessary for the national defense.

The language "as determined by the State board for such State" was inserted in that section by the conferees. Will the Senator tell me why those words were put in there?

Mr. HILL. This language was worked out with the House conferees. The whole intent and purpose of the language is to train highly skilled technicians for the national defense. With reference to the added language, "as determined by the State board for such State," I think the Senator will agree with me we do not want someone in Washington to fix the curriculums in our schools, whether the schools be in Connecticut, Colorado, Alabama, or any other State. I am sure the Senator will agree with me that the curriculums should be fixed by the State authorities. However, subject to that restriction, the funds are to be used for the training of individuals designed to fit them for useful employment as highly skilled technicians in recognized occupations requiring scientific knowledge in fields necessary for the national defese.

Mr. BUSH. Will the Senator from Alabama assure me the purpose of that language is not designed to expand existing programs?

Mr. HILL. No; it is not designed to expand programs such as now exist for example in agriculture or home economics. It is designed to provide assistance to area vocational programs in recognized occupations requiring scientific or technical knowledge.

Mr. BUSH. There is no question about that?

Mr. HILL. There is no question about that.

Mr. BUSH. The only other question I have, if the Senator will permit me to ask it, relates to the same paragraph. After the words "highly skilled technicians" there were deleted from our draft of the bill the words "or semiprofessional personnel, which might be laboratory technicians. I wondered why that language was eliminated.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may answer that question?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am sure the Senator from Connecticut is aware I was very much of the opinion the amendment should be offered.

Mr. BUSH. Indeed. The Senator was very helpful.

Mr. ALLOTT. I should like to answer the question in this way. First of all, this language is partly a compromise, as all language coming from a conference committee must be.

The item we wanted to get in the report was exactly what the Senator from Connecticut has in mind. We wanted to provide for highly skilled technicians. In other words, this is not to provide merely for training skilled workers in carpentry or lathe work. Actually, we want to train skilled technicians. The words "or semiprofessional personnel" were taken out. In the interim report of the President's Advisory Committee and in other places, these words were not used. Through common usage, "skilled technicians" has come to have a very specific meaning. It implies a skill and a technical ability above a high-school grade, with some scientific knowledge, instead of a simple manual dexterity. We want to bridge the gap between the skilled worker and the skilled scientist.

Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. BUSH. That answers my question and satisfies my mind.

I thank both distinguished Senators.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to the adoption of the conference report on H. R. 13247, a bill to provide Federal financial aid to education. Though I was and am opposed to Federal aid to education, since the States have never delegated the field of education to the Federal Government, I find an additional serious objection to the education bill agreed to by the Senate conferees.

The Senate conferees have agreed to accept certain provisions of the House bill which can have no other effect than to cause further deterioration of race relations, which have already been severely damaged. Mr. President, I refer to the provision in the House bill which has been agreed to by the Senate conferees and which provides that student loan funds shall be administered by institutions of higher education, instead of by State commissions as was provided in the Senate bill. Under the House provision Federal moneys would be allocated to public and private institutions of higher education, for the purpose of making educational loans to students in attendance at the institutions.

The House method of administration causes me grave concern, Mr. President, because the administration now in power—or any future administration—could deny loan funds to any educational institution which follows a policy of segregation. The denial could be very simply accomplished by an Executive order requiring the United States Commissioner of Education to withhold loan funds from any segregated institution. The same objective could be accomplished by the Commissioner of Education, himself, by means of an administrative regulation issued by him.

In the face of such an order, or administrative regulation, southern colleges would have to forego the benefits of the loan funds and likewise students in attendance at such colleges would have to forego the benefits of educational assistance loans. As a consequence, southern citizens would be taxed to establish loan funds which their children could not even use.

To say that such an Executive order or administrative regulation would never be issued does not allay my fears concerning this matter. I recall that statements of similar purport were made shortly prior to the dispatch of troops to Little Rock.

The fact is that there is nothing in the conference version of the bill, or in any Federal law, to prevent this administration, or any future administration, from denying loan funds to institutions which practice segregation. In view of the fact that political considerations outweigh good judgment in the councils of national administrations, it would be most unwise to adopt the proposed procedure regarding loan funds.

Mr. President, I do not charge that the loan fund administrative procedure has been purposely selected to bring about the consequences which I have described. Nonetheless, I would consider it a breach of faith with the people whom I represent, as well as a failure to meet my obligations to my Senate colleagues, if I did not point out the dangers which lie ahead if the administrative procedure agreed to by the Senate and House conferees is permitted to become law.

For these reasons, I feel that the Senate conferees should make a further effort to have the loan funds administered by State commissions, and, failing in that, should endeavor to have the loan fund title stricken from the bill altogether. Finally, Mr. President, I express my strongest and most sincere hope that the conference report will not be adopted.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I shall not delay the Senate, but I wish to say, as I have tried to emphasize before, that it is clear, it is definite, it is positive, and it is absolute that for a student to receive a loan under the bill the student must first have been accepted for enrollment in a college or must be in the college. In other words, the student is in before any question of eligibility for the loan arises.

The argument which the distinguished Senator from South Carolina has made could be made equally as well against the college housing program or against the Federal impacted area program. We passed a bill through the Senate within the last 30 days as to the latter program. I heard nothing from the Senator from South Carolina in the way of opposition to that bill. The argument could be made against that bill just as well as it is made against the education bill.

The argument the Senator from South Carolina has made could be made against the Vocational Education Act. Incidentally, it is interesting to recall that the basic Vocational Education Act, first passed in 1917, was fathered by the late Senator Ed Smith, of South Carolina. The act is known as the Smith-Hughes Act. That is the basic Vocational Education Act. One of the most important amendments to that act was the George-Barden Act, fathered by the late and beloved Senator whom we so much esteemed and revered, the late Senator George of Georgia. Every argument made this afternoon against the education bill could be made against the Smith-Hughes Act, against the George-Barden Act, and against the act which the Congress passed less than 30 days ago, the Federal Impacted Area Act.

The same argument could be made against the School Lunch Program Act.

The argument could be made against the great Land Grant College Act, which has meant so much to this country. Perhaps the greatest landmark in education, so far as the Federal Government is concerned, was the Morrill Act, and the many amendments enlarging, extending, and augmenting that act. The same argument made by the Senator from South Carolina this afternoon could be made against that act and against the many amendments to the act.

The same argument could be made against all the different research grants made by the Federal Government—research grants to Clemson College in South Carolina, research grants to the University of South Carolina, and research grants to many other institutions throughout the country, not only in agriculture but in medicine, medical research, and many other fields of activity.

The same argument could be made against the grants which are made by the Atomic Energy Commission. Many grants are made to colleges and educational institutions.

The same argument could be made against the National Science Foundation Act. We reported from the committee a few days ago an amendment to the National Science Foundation Act, which would strengthen and fortify the act in making some of the grants being made today to our colleges and educational institutions, but I heard no word of protest from the Senator from South Carolina, although the argument applied to that act as well as it might apply to this bill.

The same arguments might be made by the Senator from South Carolina against the Defense Department and its many programs providing scholarships for the strengthening of the national defense. The same arguments might be made with respect to many acts of Congress.

Seven or eight years ago I had a check made. Even at that time there were more than 125 acts of Congress providing some form of aid by the Federal Government to our schools and colleges, or to education. The argument of the Senator from South Carolina might well be made today against any of those acts.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I deem it appropriate to say at this time that final passage of this bill, with which the security of the country is so identified, will stand as one of the great goals of accomplishment of one of the ablest and most distinguished Members of the Senate.

The senior Senator from Alabama has labored long and hard, but fruitfully. The conference report which the Senate is about to approve is the climactic act which will send to the President of the United States a far-reaching bill which will not only enrich the lives of many American boys and girls, but will add vastly to the strength and security of the United States, involved, as it is, in a cold-war contest in which progress in technological education is vital to the security, strength, and defense not only of America, but of the Free World.

I congratulate the able senior Senator from Alabama and recognize him as one of the great and fruitful Members of the United States Congress.

Mr. HILL. I thank my good friend. He has certainly proved his friendship this afternoon. I am deeply grateful to him for his most generous words. I appreciate them not only because they come from a friend, but even more particularly, because they come from one who, throughout his life, has been so devoted to the cause of education. No Member of this body has worked or fought harder to advance the cause of education than has the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. It has been a great privilege to serve on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, particularly on the Education Subcommittee with the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama.

Hearings were held lasting about 7½ weeks. The distinguished Senator from Alabama was patient. His inquiries were searching. He brought before the committee many American educators, outstanding leaders in the military field, college presidents, leading officials of the Association of Colleges, and representatives of every branch of the educational life of this country.

The evidence showed conclusively that we needed to do something about education in the United States. I do not remember a single witness who did not believe we should do something. They varied in the methods they would use. Some thought fellowship to be more important than scholarships. Many thought that direct grants to colleges for construction would be more important than scholarships. They varied only in the methods they would pursue to strengthen our educational system.

Writers in magazines and many leading newspapers in America, in commenting on the achievements of this Congress, state that the opportunity which this Congress had was to do something about education, and that our lack in that field, as a people, was greater than in any other branch of the great subjects on which we legislate.

Those writers pointed out that the realization last fall, with the launching of the satellites, that we needed to do something about education, had begun to lag. Public interest had begun to lag, and these writers pointed out that it was up to Congress to alert the American people.

We are making a timid step of less than $1 billion for a 4-year program, but it is the most advanced step since the Land Grant College Act of the 1860's. It is a long forward step.

I believe the country expects the Congress to do something to stimulate public education. It is done in this bill, in such a way as to preserve local control, and yet provide the impetus of a national surge.

In my own State there has been considerable sentiment against Federal aid to education; but when the Land Grant College Act was passed during the War Between the States, the first public State-supported institution of higher learning in my State which actually opened its doors to students was the Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College, which opened in 1871, under the Land Grant College Act.

Under the stimulus of that Federal aid, many other publicly supported colleges then opened their doors.

I hope that a similar result will be achieved this time. With a little Federal stimulus I hope we can produce a great deal of State and local action, in the cities, counties, and local school districts, as well as in the junior colleges.

This bill will stimulate learning. It will stimulate teaching. It will stimulate achievement. I regret that the provision for scholarships was eliminated; but we have left a provision for loans. A loan is a scholarship of a type. When I attended college we thought a scholarship was a loan. I call these loans loan-scholarships. They will stimulate a desire on the part of students to get a loan and go to college.

There are many different types of scholarships. Quite a number of colleges have athletic scholarships. Some colleges have as many as 200 band scholarships. The scholarships provided for in the bill are in the field of intellectual endeavor. The bill is a beginning, an incentive to scholarship in institutions of higher learning. I do not mean to intimate that such institutions lack scholarship, but this bill places the national stamp on it. Scholarship is what the Nation wants.

Again I thank the distinguished Senator from Alabama for his leadership in this field. Think what it will mean to the American people. He has had the patience and tact to draw together many distinguished witnesses before his committee, leaders in all branches of education from all over the country.

I believe that his unfailing courtesy to everyone enabled him to do more than any other person or combination of persons. He is responsible, more than anyone else, for the fact that such a bill is before the Senate. It is the result of the leadership of the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas for his kind words. He has been a devoted member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. He made many fine contributions to the bill. He not only sat with us during the many long days of hearings and executive sessions of the committee, but he was one of the conferees on the bill. He was a most important member of the team which brings this bill to the floor of the Senate today.

I thank the Senator from Texas, and congratulate him for the many fine contributions he made to the bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I am delighted to yield to my colleague.

Mr. SPARKMAN. At this late hour I do not intend to take much of the time of the Senate, but I do wish to allow this

opportunity to pass without expressing my feeling of graitude for the great job which has been done under the able leadership of my senior colleague from Alabama in bringing to us, for the first time, in completed form, an education bill.

This is not a short-term accomplishment. I remember that 22 years ago, when I first ran for Congress, I had written on the back of my little campaign card a few planks. One of them was "Federal Aid for Education Without Federal Control."

When I came to Congress my colleague was here as the senior Member in the House of Representatives from my State. He became one of the leaders in the cause of Federal aid to education. He has not ceased to work for that purpose and has advocated it during the years which have passed since that time.

It was 12 years ago that there was first put through the Senate a Federal aid to education bill. That was followed a year later with another bill. However, this is the first time that a bill of this magnitude has cleared both Houses and is now about to become an act of Congress.

I agree with what the distinguished chairman, my colleague from Alabama, has said, that the bill certainly does not satisfy us. Probably it does not completely satisfy anyone. However, it is a great step forward. It is a great accomplishment, one which I believe will go far toward strengthening our country and securing our national welfare countrywide.

I wish to commend and congratulate my distinguished colleague, and those who have worked with him, for having accomplished this result.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague for his very kind and generous words. He and I have been closely associated together for a good many years, and through all those years we have worked in the closest cooperation and in the closest teamwork on behalf of the cause of education, in trying to do something for our schools and for our colleges and for our children. True education has had no more loyal and devoted friend than my colleague from Alabama.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. For 14 years I have worked in the Senate with the senior Senator from Alabama on education and health legislation. On our committee we know the Senator from Alabama as the leader in the Senate in both of those fields. Sometimes facetiously and good-naturedly, and always with a meaningful point, we refer to the Senator from Alabama in our committee either as Dr. HILL or Professor HILL. Those two titles pretty well label the standing he has in the Senate in his conscientious and able statesmanship in these fields.

The pending bill is the best bill we could get this year. It is not as good as some of us wanted. The chairman himself would have preferred a far better bill, could he have had one. However, the final result shows how right the chairman was through all our deliberations this year when he kept pointing out to us that the bill he sponsored in the first instance was probably even more than we could get from the House.

I want him and his colleagues on the committee to know that in January they can count on me to continue to work shoulder and shoulder with them for much-needed health and education legislation.

Mr. HILL. The distinguished Senator from Oregon is a real professor. He taught for many years and was the dean of the Oregon Law School. He brought to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare a magnificent background of experience, with knowledge in the field of education. He was always working and fighting for the cause of education. He has made innumerable contributions to the cause. I express my appreciation and my thanks and my congratulations to him.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I wish to say a word in reply to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Alabama. I agree that an Executive order could be issued cutting off Federal funds which are now going to impacted areas or into State programs of vocational education. However, the question I ask is why adopt another program—and this is a new program—which will give further opportunity for such an order to be issued.

Back in 1917 the vocational education program was born. It was born during the war as a temporary measure, to provide for the training of mechanics and other skilled people. Then finally it became a permanent law, and it has been on the statute books ever since. The new program provided by H. R. 13247 is more than a specialist program. It is a general program. It is the beginning—and I want to emphasize this to my colleagues—of general Federal aid to education. If that is what my colleagues want, then I presume they will vote for the conference report. If that is not what they want, I presume they will vote against the conference report.

The word "education" is not even mentioned in the United States Constitution. The field of education has never been delegated to the Federal Government. And, as all Senators know, the Federal Government has only those powers which are delegated to it by the Constitution.

Merely because in the past action has been taken which was contrary to the Constitution is no reason why we should go into another program, a new program, which also contravenes the Constitution. If any Senator can give me the authority for the Federal Government to go into the field of education, I should like to hear him express it. It has been mentioned that the program is designed to protect the national security and provide for national defense. Is it in the interest of national security? Is it tied to national defense? If this program were tied to national defense, I could understand how it might come within the authority delegated to Congress in the Constitution. However, there is no provision in the bill, so far as I know, which will require a student to take courses related to national defense. I believe the distinguished Senator from Arkansas asked that question of the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Alabama stated that a student could take any course he selects. After a student obtains a loan, derived from Federal moneys, what reason is there to believe he will take courses in science or enginering or similar subjects which will promote national defense? He cannot be compelled to do so by the terms of the bill. The student could take a course in social welfare or in flower arranging, for example.

Furthermore, after he has finished his course, what requirement is there in the bill that he go into national defense work, either with the Government or with private research, or in any other way? I do not know of any provision in the bill which makes it a requirement for the recipient under the bill to serve in a capacity directly beneficial to the national defense.

Therefore, if a student is not required to take courses in science or engineering or other fields directly related to national defense, and if he can take any course he wishes to take, and is not required to apply his knowledge in some position in national defense, what right has the Federal Government to furnish money for his education?

As I said, education is not the responsibility of the Federal Government. Education is the responsibility of the school districts, in the first place, then of the counties, and finally of the States of this Nation. It is the responsibility of the local subdivisions of the States and the States themselves, and not of the Federal Government.

Unless the educational purposes are directly related to national defense, there is no reason for the Federal Government to enter this field or for us to appropriate money for that purpose. This new program is another wedge into existing educational systems which will eventually plunge the Federal Government into the general field of education. In my opinion such a result would be one of the worst things that could happen.

It has been said that there would be Federal aid without Federal control. How do we know that any day, even the day after the bill became law, the Office of Education will not issue a regulation or, that an Executive order will not be issued, providing that no Federal funds will henceforth go to impacted areas or to vocational schools which practice segregation?

In the first place, the Federal Government has no business in a field belonging to the States. In the second place, the program would jeopardize certain schools which will have to pay for the education of the children in other States beyond their boundaries.

Therefore, speaking for myself, I want to be on record as being opposed to the conference report.

Mr. HILL subsequently said: Mr. President, no one worked longer, harder, or more devotedly on the education bill, on which the Senate has just taken final

action, by means of its approval of the conference report, than did the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. Unfortunately, and much to his regret, it was impossible for him to be present today.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, immediately prior to the vote on the conference report, a statement in behalf of the conference report, as prepared by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

I am deeply gratified that the Senate and House conferees have today agreed upon an education bill. I believe the bill will provide significant help in strengthening the American education system in the interests of national security.

Except for the omission of scholarships, the bill reported by the conference committee closely parallels the recommendations of the President. I sincerely regret that we were unable to obtain a limited scholarship program which would have given national recognition to intellectual achievement. However, I am convinced that the conference bill is a positive step toward meeting our most pressing educational needs.

The bill seeks to mobilize our potential resources of talented manpower more effectively through the establishment of several related programs, including:

1. A broad student-loan program to assure that all qualified students may obtain a higher education, and to reduce the number of able students who drop out of college due to financial hardship.

2. Grants to the States to strengthen mathematics, science, and foreign language instruction in the elementary and secondary schools.

3. A selective program of fellowships to reduce the critical shortage of college-level teachers.

4. Regular testing to identify the aptitudes of all secondary schoolchildren, and strengthened guidance and counseling programs to insure that students are encouraged to pursue their maximum intellectual development.

5. Institutes to strengthen the teaching of modern foreign languages, and centers of area studies to produce the trained personnel needed for overseas service in government and industry.

The bill also provides for research in the educational use of television and other audio-visual techniques, training of additional scientific technicians under the vocational education program, translation and dissemination of scientific information from abroad, and improvement of the collection of statistical data for the proper evaluation of our educational strengths and weaknesses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] has a pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea" and the Senator from Delaware would vote "nay."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "yea" and the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 15, as follows:

YEAS—66

Aiken	Hennings	McNamara
Allott	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Barrett	Hill	Morse
Beall	Hoblitzell	Morton
Bennett	Humphrey	Mundt
Bush	Jackson	Murray
Carroll	Javits	Neuberger
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Chavez	Jordan	Potter
Church	Kefauver	Proxmire
Clark	Kennedy	Purtell
Cooper	Kerr	Revercomb
Cotton	Knowland	Saltonstall
Dirksen	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Langer	Sparkman
Ellender	Lausche	Symington
Ervin	Long	Thye
Fulbright	Magnuson	Watkins
Gore	Mansfield	Wiley
Green	Martin, Iowa	Yarborough
Hayden	McClellan	Young

NAYS—15

Bible	Dworshak	Schoeppel
Bridges	Eastland	Stennis
Byrd	Goldwater	Talmadge
Capehart	Malone	Thurmond
Curtis	Russell	Williams

NOT VOTING—15

Anderson	Frear	Martin, Pa.
Bricker	Holland	Payne
Butler	Hruska	Robertson
Carlson	Ives	Smathers
Flanders	Jenner	Smith, N. J.

So the report was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the conference report was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. CLARK in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

EXHIBIT A

INDUSTRY SUPPORTS HIGHER EDUCATION

Russia's scientific achievements have awakened America to the need of training more scientists and engineers. Many programs have been suggested including Federal scholarships for gifted students in science and engineering.

I am impressed by the fact that so many of our leading corporations, foundations, and other groups have taken steps to assist worthy but needy students to develop their God-given talents.

Four years ago, the General Motors Corp. inaugurated a program of scholarships. Today there are more than 3,000 potential scientists and engineers who are pursuing scientific studies with General Motors' assistance. The General Motors scholarship program shows that American industry is meeting its obligation to provide the talent to meet its future needs.

I believe that a statement prepared by the General Motors Corp. on the operation of its scholarship program since its inauguration 4 years ago is of such interest that I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

More than 3,000 potential scientists and engineers are in school with General Motors assistance now that GM's expanded program of aid to higher education has become fully operative, President Harlow H. Curtice said today.

"These GM scholars represent the highly skilled men and women of tomorrow who will push back the limitless frontiers of space, unlock the energy of the sun, and advance our technology for the benefit of man everywhere," he said.

Mr. Curtice took note of GM's contribution in the world race for technical skills in announcing the winners of 114 4-year college scholarships under the corporation's national scholarship plan.

These winners, all of them honor students, will join 302 others selected under another scholarship program—the GM college plan—at colleges and universities across the land where 1,200 GM scholarship holders from the previous 3 years already are preparing for their careers.

Almost 70 percent of all scholarship winners so far have indicated career choices in the scientific and engineering fields. This ratio has held steady or increased each year of the program. With a revolving total of 1,600 scholarship winners in college each year, the number in scientific and engineering fields should exceed 1,000 annually, Mr. Curtice said. Equally important are the remainder who have chosen careers in teaching, business and other professions.

In addition to the estimated 1,000 scholarship winners taking scientific and engineering courses, some 2,300 students are enrolled at General Motors Institute in Flint, Mich., which offers cooperative courses in engineering. General Motors has operated this school for 37 years.

"In the minds of all our scholarship winners and in the minds of tens of thousands like them at our colleges and universities lies the stake of the Free World," Mr. Curtice declared. "Never before in our history have we so desperately needed brain power. Our young people must be prepared to out-think and out-do their Soviet counterparts if we are to win the race of survival."

The scholarship winners announced today have already demonstrated some of this ability. More than half ranked first in their high school graduating classes, or were

straight A students. Another 40 edited school publications, many were outstanding athletes, and practically all were leaders in student government and their church organizations.

Their outstanding secondary school record is matched by the scholastic aptitude demonstrated by GM scholarship holders now in college. Based on the first 2 years of the program, one-third of the award winners are in the upper 5 percent of their classes, one-half in the upper 10 percent and four-fifths in the upper 25 percent.

GM scholarship winners under both the college and national plans receive $200 to $2,000 a year, depending upon each student's need. All private colleges and universities which have GM scholarship winners, get unrestricted annual grants-in-aid of $500 to $800 for each scholarship winner. Total cost of GM's program of support to higher education is more than $5 million a year.

The national plan winners, who are free to choose any accredited college they desire, were selected on the basis of national competitive examinations taken by more than 20,000 high school boys and girls in all 48 States, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia. Final selection from semifinalists was made by a panel of 16 distinguished educators at Princeton, N. J., on the basis of scholastic records and leadership qualities.

Three hundred and two additional scholarships under the college plan are awarded each year by a selected list of 180 colleges and universities. Student benefits are determined the same way under both programs. Students are free to choose their courses of study and are under no obligation of future employment by GM.

In addition to its scholarships plans, General Motors makes grants-in-aid to State and regional associations of colleges, the United Negro College Fund, and the National Fund for Medical Education which benefit 155 other colleges.

ESTABLISHMENT OF UNITED NATIONS FORCE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House on Senate Concurrent Resolution 109.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 109) to express the sense of the Congress on the establishment of the United Nations force, which were, to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That it is the sense of the Congress that consideration should immediately be given by the General Assembly of the United Nations to the development, within its permanent structure, of such organization and procedures as will enable the United Nations promptly to employ suitable United Nations forces for such purposes as observation and patrol in situations that threaten international peace and security.

And to strike out the preamble.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

ADJUSTMENT IN ANNUITIES UNDER FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on Senate bill 3379.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3379) to provide for adjustments in the annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system, which was, on page 3, after line 7, to insert:

SEC. 5. No annuity of a retired officer shall be increased under any section of this act in an amount in excess of $500 per annum. No annuity of a survivor annuitant shall be increased under any section of this Act in an amount in excess of $250 per annum.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

THE HOUSING BILL

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce, out of order, a bill, which is introduced by me, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]; and I ask that the bill lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and lie on the table, as requested by the Senator from Alabama.

The bill (S. 4323) to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the renewal of urban communities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. FULBRIGHT), was received, read the first time by its title, and ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, let me say that the bill is introduced in an effort to have a housing bill passed by Congress at this session. We have had numerous conferences. The bill I have introduced today is greatly pared down or reduced in the amounts provided, as compared with the provisions of the bill the Senate has passed. However, the substance of the bill I have introduced today is the same as the substance of the bill the Senate has passed.

A bill which in many respects provided for even more than did the bill the Senate passed lacked only 6 votes of obtaining a two-thirds vote in the House of Representatives.

It seems to me that the bill I have introduced this afternoon, modest though it is, is greatly needed in order to keep housing going until the next session of Congress convenes in January; and certainly this bill should be able to clear the barriers in both Houses.

It is my hope that it will be possible for us to submit this bill as an amendment to some House bill which comes before us, and then send the House bill, as thus amended, back to the House, and thus give the House membership an opportunity to determine whether a housing bill will be passed at this session of Congress.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have examined the bill the able Senator from Alabama has introduced. As he has said, the amounts provided by it are substantially less than those provided by the bill the Senate has passed; and those changes should, in my opinion, be sufficient to make this bill quite acceptable.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. How does the new bill deal with the acquisition of military housing?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The bill retains the language as it passed the Senate, with the exception of the suggestion which was made by the Senator from South Dakota that the appointment of the Commissioners be made by the court, rather than upon nomination by the parties concerned.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have just examined the text of the bill as it is at the desk. I note the change is made that the parties to be appointed by the court, in case a commission is used, would be qualified disinterested persons. That is good. But in the military construction bill we used the word "may" instead of "shall." The language in the print as it is at the desk now uses the word "shall," which would be objectionable, and which would be contradictory to what the Senate provided in the military construction bill.

Would the Senator object to changing the word "shall" to "may"?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I would object. Of course, that is something which can be handled when the bill comes up, if it does come up, in the form of an amendment. I may point out to the Senator that the military construction bill as it passed the Senate had the word "shall" in it. It was in the conference that the word was changed to "may." I certainly objected to it, and I still object to it, because I think, as a matter of right, the person whose property is being taken ought to have that privilege.

We have examined the laws in connection with condemnation and other proceedings. We find in those cases it is a matter of right. I believe where the Government is told it can step in and take property away from people, the person from whom the property is being taken by the Government ought to have the right—not the discretion—to ask that the value of the property be fixed by a commission. I certainly would argue for that right; but it is something which can be handled when the proposed amendment is under discussion.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of course, the Senator may introduce the bill in any form he wishes, but I think the court should not be told it must use commissioners. I would be in favor of

the Senator's proposal, but I do not think the court should be told that it must. If the bill comes up, I shall certainly express my opinions on the matter and try to develop that argument, which was persuasive in conference.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. It is difficult to hear in this Chamber today.

Did the Senator introduce his proposal as a new bill or as an amendment?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I introduced it as a bill, but I said I hoped to add it as an amendment to some bill from the House that comes to the Senate, in order that it might go back to the House and that the House might have an opportunity to vote on it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Do I understand correctly that the Senator's bill changes the formula for the acquisition of Wherry housing projects?

Mr. SPARKMAN. We simply restate the language contained in the housing bill which passed the Senate before the Armed Services Committee handled this matter. May I remind the Senator from Georgia that the military construction bill, as it passed the Senate, had the same provisions in it so far as concerns giving the persons the right to name the commissioners.

Mr. RUSSELL. That was the result of a clerical error which transpired in committee; but I had heard—and many rumors become rampant at this late date in the session—that the formula for fixing the valuation of Wherry housing units is altered in this bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not want to quibble, but when the Senator talks about altering, I point out that the Senate has agreed to the language in the housing bill as it passed the Senate. We are using the same language which was adopted by the Senate in that bill. It is true the wording is not the same, but if the Senator will read the debates in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when the military construction bill was under consideration, I think he will find that the able Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] said these things would be taken into consideration, which simply meant that consideration shall be given to replacement value and fair depreciation.

So far as I know, that is the only place we depart from what the Senator has called the formula. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], who was handling the military construction bill, which was passed, had said these would be factors taken into consideration, along with any other factors which might be controlling on a court, wherever the case was being tried.

Mr. RUSSELL. I dislike to appear in opposition to anything proposed by the distinguished Senator from Alabama, but it seems to me there is going to be a clash of opinion in the committees with respect to the Wherry housing projects.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Armed Services Committee would take over the Wherry housing jurisdiction, I think our committee would be pleased to get rid of it. But I remind the Senator Wherry housing started in the Banking and Currency Committee. The measure was introduced originally by Senator Wherry and Senator Maybank jointly. The Banking and Currency Committee referred it to the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. What is before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] has the floor.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The committees have joint jurisdiction. I would be glad to have the question of jurisdiction cleared as between the two committees. I have never liked Wherry housing. I did not like the proposition written into the law that gave the Armed Services Committee the right to take it over—in fact, ordered it to take it over. I have not liked it, but I do believe if we are going to take over the property, then adequate compensation ought to be paid to the owners of the projects.

Mr. RUSSELL. The owners have recourse to law. They are privileged to go before a jury and make their case.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And wait from 2 to 4 years to get compensation.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Government has to pay into the court the amount found owing to the owners.

Mr. President, I realize this bill cannot pass as a separate bill, and will have to be appended to some other measure; but for the time being, I object to the second reading of the bill today.

Mr. President, I hope the objection is noted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection will be noted.

Mr. RUSSELL. I objected to the second reading of the bill today. I want to make that clear for the record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over for a second reading.

Mr. RUSSELL subsequently said: Mr. President, a few moments ago I objected to the second reading of the housing bill, introduced by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. I have consulted with the Committee on Armed Services and members of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I wish to withdraw my objection.

Mr. LAUSCHE subsequently said: Mr. President, I have not had an opportunity to obtain an analysis of the bill. I do not know what it contains. On that basis, I object to the second reading of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS DISTRESSED AS THE RESULT OF NATURAL CALAMITY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendments of the House to S. 3942.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3942) for the relief of certain aliens distressed as the result of natural calamity in the Azores Islands, and for other purposes, which were, on page 1, line 4, after "issued" insert "(A)"; on page 1, line 6, after "act," insert "and (B) a number of special nonquota immigrant visas not to exceed the annual quota allocated under the Immigration and Nationality Act to the quota area of the Netherlands to aliens specified in section 3 of the act"; on page 1, line 6, strike out "immigrants," and insert "immigrants"; on page 1, line 7, strike out "and to their spouses and their" and insert "The spouse of any such alien and his"; on page 1, line 10, strike out "1953" and insert "1958"; on page 1, line 10, after "them" insert ", may be issued special nonquota immigrant visas notwithstanding the numerical limitations herein provided"; on page 1, line 11, after "under" insert "clause (A) of section 1 of"; on page 2, line 3, strike out "January 1, 1958" and insert "September 1, 1958"; on page 2, after line 5, insert:

SEC. 3. Visas authorized to be issued under clause (B) of section 1 of this act shall be issued only to nationals or citizens of the Netherlands who have been displaced from their usual place of abode in the Republic of Indonesia subsequent to January 1, 1949, and who were residing in continental Netherlands on the enactment date of this act.

On page 2, line 6, strike out "3" and insert "4"; on page 2, line 6, strike out "by" where it appears the first time and insert "to be issued under"; on page 2, after line 14, insert:

SEC. 5. Aliens receiving visas under clause (A) of this act shall be exempt from paying the fees prescribed in paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 281 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

On page 2, line 15, strike out "4" and insert "6"; on page 2, line 19, strike out "5" and insert "1"; on page 2, line 20, strike out "December 31, 1959", and insert "June 30, 1960."

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of certain distressed aliens."

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on August 6, 1958, the Senate passed S. 3942, to provide for the issuance of 1,500 special nonquota immigrant visas prior to December 31, 1959, to certain nationals of Portugal, and to their spouses and children, who have been displaced from their usual place of abode in the Azores Islands as a result of earthquakes and volcanic eruptions.

The House of Representatives passed S. 3942, with amendments, to provide for the issuance of an additional number of special nonquota immigrant visas not to exceed the annual quota allocated under the Immigration and Nationality Act to the quota area of the Netherlands to certain nationals or citizens of the Netherlands who have been displaced from their usual place of abode in the Republic of Indonesia subsequent to January 1, 1949, and who were residing in continental Netherlands on the enactment date of this act.

The bill was also amended to extend the cutoff date to June 30, 1960; to exempt the aliens receiving visas under this act from the payment of fees prescribed in the Immigration and Nationality Act; and to provide for the issuance of special nonquota visas to families of principal applicants without regard to the numerical limitation.

Under the bill as passed by the House of Representatives, approximately 4,500 principal applicants would be eligible to receive the special nonquota visas authorized to be issued under this act.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to Senate bill 3942.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Mississippi. [Putting the question.]

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have some questions I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, may we have order, so I can hear the distinguished Senator?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend until there is order. Senators will please desist from talking or leave the Chamber.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask the Presiding Officer to have persons sit down in the Chamber, so we can hear what these bills are all about.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators will please resume their seats or retire to the rear of the Chamber. The Senator will suspend until the Senate comes to order.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask what is contained in the House amendments?

Mr. EASTLAND. The House amendments add to the Netherlands quota 3,136 people of Dutch nationality. That includes the principal applicants plus their wives and children, people who were run out of Indonesia. Generally the people are technicians, professional people of Dutch blood who were run out of Indonesia.

The proposal is supported by the administration and by the State Department.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I had occasion, when the bill was before the Senate, to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that it represented a preferential treatment for some people who were going to be admitted from the Azores. We have now added to that some people who are refugees from what were the Dutch East Indies.

Each of these objectives is desirable. At the same time, as I stated to the Senate at the time, one is informed that any effort to deal with general immigration problems by using the vehicle which is provided by the bill or by the conference report will result in killing the measure, which is desirable on its own. No person like myself, who is interested in the deep problems of people, is going to take that chance. I know it is not an idle threat. I am sure the result would actually occur. So I did not seek to make the bill or to make the conference report a vehicle for far more inclusive immigration action.

At the same time, it should be made clear that far more inclusive immigration action in the interest of the United States is urgently required. Therefore, when the Senator from Mississippi was gracious enough to tell me he was going to bring the matter up, I arranged to ask him some questions as to what we might expect in January of next year in respect of an opportunity to get some immigration legislation which is urgently required by the national interest. I should like to propound these questions.

The first matter to which I think we must direct our attention in all fairness is the situation of 200,000 refugees from behind the iron curtain who are nonresettled in Europe, who are the subject of a most comprehensive report issued by the Zellerbach Commission on the European refugee situation, sponsored by the International Rescue Committee.

Mr. EASTLAND. We gave them 14,000 members in the act which was passed last year. The administration is still filling that quota. The quota is not yet full.

I will tell the distinguished Senator I hope that in January the Immigration Subcommittee will go thoroughly into the question of immigration.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the committee go thoroughly into the question of these particular refugee escapees, covered by a very extensive report involving a very important factor in the cold war between us and the Soviet Union?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes. We will go thoroughly into that matter.

Mr. JAVITS. With a sympathetic view toward trying to do something about it?

Mr. EASTLAND. With a view to attempting to do the right thing by all people.

Mr. JAVITS. With respect to the law we now have on the books, the Refugee Act as extended 2 years, which expires in July of 1959, as of July 28 last there were 12,524 applicants under the section of the law for the 14,556 visas available, and only 252 visas had been issued.

In short, we constantly stymie ourselves with a tremendously slow executive operation in this field.

Mr. EASTLAND. It is a slow executive operation. That is the fault of the Department of State and not of the law. I am going into the matter to see what can be done to speed the process up.

Mr. JAVITS. The second point of vital importance is the situation of some 70,000 to 80,000 people of the so-called fourth preference category. These are individuals who principally come from Italy and Greece, who have reached majority or are married, sons and daughters, brothers or sisters of United States citizens. In the particular cases of these two quotas, Italian and Greek, there cannot even be met the first, second, and third preferences. Hence there is a tremendous pileup of close relatives of United States citizens, 70,000 to 80,000, awaiting some action by the Congress. May we have some expression as to the intention of the committee on that subject?

Mr. EASTLAND. I will state, as chairman of the Immigration Subcommittee and of the Judiciary Committee, that I intend to go very carefully into that subject.

Mr. JAVITS. Again, with the idea of trying to do something about it?

Mr. EASTLAND. Surely.

Mr. JAVITS. Finally, Mr. President, I know the views of the Senator from Mississippi on the question of the quota system of the United States, but nevertheless a great many of us feel that maintaining, as we do, the 1920 census—3 censuses before the last—as the basis for establishing nationality quotas, which arbitrarily cuts off some 65,000 additional opportunities for worthy immigration into the United States, is simply wrong. The administration is against it. I think a great body of opinion in the country is against it.

May we ask the Senator from Mississippi whether he will afford a hearing early in the next session of Congress on the entire question of the quota system?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes. I am going into the quota system. I want to be perfectly frank; the Senator from Mississippi is opposed to changing the quota system.

Mr. JAVITS. I understand.

Mr. EASTLAND. I am only one member of the Judiciary Committee, 1 of 15. This will be a decision the committee will have to make.

Mr. JAVITS. I will say, although the Senator is 1 of 15 members, I wish he were on our side.

Nonetheless, Mr. President, I appreciate the fact, and I take the Senator's word for the fact, that we will seriously have an opportunity to tackle these three matters.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator, and I have no objection to the approval of the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

PROTECTION OF PRODUCERS AND CONSUMERS AGAINST MISBRANDING AND FALSE ADVERTISING OF FIBER CONTENT OF TEXTILE FIBER PRODUCTS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 469) to protect producers and consumers against misbranding and false advertising of the fiber content of textile fiber products, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 469) to protect producers and consumers against misbranding and false advertising of the fiber content of textile fiber products, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to rec-

ommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 12, and 15.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 5, 7, 13, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

On page 2, line 14, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "(f)" and insert "(g)."

On page 2, line 17, of the Senate engrossed amendments, after the word "product" where it appears the second time insert a comma.

On page 2, line 19, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out the comma after "animal."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

On page 3, line 4, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "(g)" and insert "(h)."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

On page 3, line 15, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "4 (g);" and insert "4 (h)."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "furniture, mattresses, and box springs."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

On page 3, line 21, of the Senate engrossed amendments, after "under" insert a comma.

And the Senate agree to the same.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
MIKE MONRONEY,
ALAN BIBLE,
ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL,
JOHN M. BUTLER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

OREN HARRIS,
JOHN BELL WILLIAMS,
PETER F. MACK, JR.
CHAS A. WOLVERTON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on this bill, the Senate conferees receded on amendments Nos. 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 12, and 15. The House conferees receded on amendments Nos. 4, 5, 7, 13, 16, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23. The House also receded on amendments Nos. 10, 11, 14, 17, and 18, with amendments. These amendments are minor, and are to correct punctuation, properly designate subsections, or to clear the wording of parts of the bill.

Mr. President, section 12 of the legislation designates exemptions. Since there was so much interest in exemption No. 2, as agreed to by the conference, it will read "outer coverings of furniture, mattresses and box springs;". The conferees decided to use the descriptive term "outer coverings of furniture" rather than upholsteries for the simple reason that while upholsteries does include the coverings of furniture, it also includes draperies and curtains.

Exemption No. 6 has to do with floor coverings. So that the Senate will understand clearly the effect of the conference agreement, this exemption will now read "backings of, and paddings and cushions to be used under, floor coverings."

The bill as approved by the conferees is much the same as the bill your committee brought to the floor of the Senate plus the amendments made on the floor at the recommendation of the committee. We believe we have improved the bill. We believe that the bill will protect the consumer in purchasing household textile products and that it is essential and necessary legislation. I move that the Senate approve the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

TRAVEL EXPENSES OF CIVILIAN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1903) to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, relating to travel expenses of civilian officers and employees assigned to duty posts outside the continental United States, which were, on page 2, line 1, strike out "transportation for himself and" and insert "round trip travel for himself and transportation of", and on page 2, line 9, strike out "or serving the unexpired portion of his term."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, S. 1903, a bill to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, relating to the travel expense of employees assigned to duty outside the continental United States, is at the desk with technical amendments approved by the House.

The House amendments in no way change the substance of the bill. Approval was suggested by the Bureau of the Budget and the Comptroller General and the amendments should, in my opinion, be accepted by the Senate.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

EFFECTIVE DATES OF COMPENSATION INCREASES FOR WAGE BOARD EMPLOYEES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 25) relating to effective dates of increases in compensation granted to wage board employees. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, this measure is designed to establish a day certain for increases in compensation granted wage-board employees. The Senate version fixed the day as the beginning of the first pay period occurring on or after the 30th day, exclusive of Saturdays and Sundays, following the date on which the wage survey was first ordered.

The House version fixed the day as of the beginning of the first pay period occurring on or after the 45th day following the date on which the collection of data started.

The conference agreement accepted the 45 days contained in the House version, but provides that it shall be from the date the collection of data is officially ordered.

This is, in effect, a compromise between the Senate and the House versions.

The Senate accepted this compromise somewhat reluctantly. It did so without prejudice to further consideration of the problem at an early date, should it be found that agencies—particularly the Department of Defense—are not responding fully to the desire of Congress that wage-board surveys be conducted expeditiously and that increases resulting therefrom be put into effect promptly.

I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3335), to provide for a National Cultural Center which will be constructed, with funds raised by voluntary contributions, on a site made available in the District of Columbia which was, on page 6, after line 21, insert:

TERMINATION

SEC. 7. (a) This act shall cease to be effective, and all offices created by this act and all appointments made under this act shall terminate, if the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution does not find that sufficient funds to construct the National Cultural Center have been received by the trustees of the National Cultural Center within 5 years after the date of enactment of this act.

(b) If the offices of trustees of the National Cultural Center terminate under the provisions of subsection (a), all funds and property (real and personal) accepted by the trustees of the National Cultural Center under section 5 (a), and income therefrom, shall vest in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution and shall be used by the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to carry out the purposes of the act entitled "An act to provide for the transfer of the Civil Service Commission building in the District of Columbia to the Smithsonian Institution to house certain art collections of the Smithsonian Institution," approved March 28, 1958, and for the acquisition of works of art to be housed in the building referred to in such act.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the amendment of the House has been cleared by the leadership on both sides. It has the approval of everyone concerned; and the chairman of the Committee on Public Works [Mr. CHAVEZ] asked me to move that the Senate concur in the House amendment. I so move.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Michigan for the very fine work he has done in handling H. R. 3335, with respect to which the Senate has just concurred in the House amendment. The Senator from Michigan has worked very hard on the bill, and I think it will provide a very great addition to the city of Washington and to the Nation. I thank the Senator from Michigan for all the work he did.

Mr. McNAMARA. I thank the Senator.

NATIONAL CAPITAL CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I was unfortunately absent from the floor of the Senate at the time S. 3335, for the establishment of a National Capital Center for the Performing Arts, was passed. Because of my interest in the legislation and also in the tenants who will be displaced by the acquisition of the land required, I should like to ask the distinguished able manager of the bill on the floor, the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] 1 or 2 questions about it, which I hope will be considered as a part of the legislative history of the act.

As I understand, the bill provides that the National Capital Center for the Performing Arts shall be given a period of 5 years in which private individuals will raise the money for the establishment of the cultural center to be located in the Foggy Bottom area.

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator from Oklahoma is absolutely correct about the 5-year period. However, I wish to point out that the Commission now has enough money on hand to purchase the slightly more than one acre which is privately held. The remainder of the property already belongs to the Government. Therefore the purchase may be made at any time.

Mr. MONRONEY. The point about which I was asking the Senator was whether the tenants having small businesses—I have reference to the historic gallery, the waxworks—will be permitted to continue in that location as a lessor from the Government until such time as the property is actually needed for the construction of the Cultural Arts Center.

Mr. McNAMARA. As I understood the action of the committee, it was that the tenants could remain until such time as the property was actually needed; and, of course, that would involve, as the Senator from Oklahoma points out, raising the necessary funds to proceed with the project. However, I would not encourage the tenants to rely too much on that, because there is an indication that the money will be raised rapidly.

But there is no reason in the world why the tenants should not remain there. They might become tenants of the United States Government and continue as such on a month-to-month basis.

Mr. MONRONEY. Until the contractors are ready to go to work, and the land is needed for the actual construction, the tenants would prefer to remain there, if the property were to remain idle, until such time as construction begins. If it is the opinion of the Senator from Michigan that that will be permitted under the bill, I deeply appreciate his courtesy in extending this information to me at this later time.

Mr. McNAMARA. That is definitely my understanding. I am sure the situation will continue in the manner in which the Senator has outlined.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT REGARDING SUSPENSION OF ATOMIC AND HYDROGEN WEAPONS TESTING

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the President of the United States has just issued a statement of the highest significance regarding a suspension of atomic and hydrogen weapons testing.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

The United States welcomes the successful conclusion of the Geneva meeting of experts who have been considering whether and how nuclear weapons tests could be detected. Their conclusions indicate that, if there were an agreement to eliminate such tests, its effective supervision and enforcement would be technically possible.

This is a most important conclusion, the more so because it is concurred in by the experts of the Soviet Union. Progress in the field of disarmament agreements depends upon the ability to establish effective international controls and the willingness of the countries concerned to accept those controls. The fact therefore of an agreement on technical possibilities of inspection and control opens up a prospect of progress in the vitally important field of disarmament.

The United States, taking account of the Geneva conclusions, is prepared to proceed promptly to negotiate an agreement with other nations which have tested nuclear weapons for the suspension of nuclear weapons tests and the actual establishment of an international control system on the basis of the experts' report.

If this is accepted in principle by the other nations which have tested nuclear weapons, then in order to facilitate the detailed negotiations the United States is prepared, unless testing is resumed by the Soviet Union, to withhold further testing on its part of atomic and hydrogen weapons for a period of 1 year from the beginning of the negotiations.

As part of the agreement to be negotiated, and on a basis of reciprocity, the United States would be further prepared to suspend the testing of nuclear weapons on a year-by-year basis subject to a determination at the beginning of each year: (A) the agreed inspection system is installed and working effectively; and (B) satisfactory progress is being made in reaching agreement on and implementing major and substantial arms control measures such as the United States has long sought. The agreement should also deal with the problem of detonations for peaceful purposes, as distinct from weapons tests.

Our negotiators will be instructed and ready by October 31 this year to open negotiations with other similarly instructed negotiators.

As the United States has frequently made clear, the suspension of testing of atomic and hydrogen weapons is not, in itself, a measure of disarmament or a limitation of armament. An agreement in this respect is significant if it leads to other and more substantial agreements relating to limitation and reduction of fissionable material for weapons and to other essential phases of disarmament. It is in this hope that the United States makes this proposal.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I take this opportunity to congratulate the President for this new and constructive advance in American policy. The President has demonstrated genuine leadership on this issue and has given American disarmament policy new vitality and stature. The announcement of the cessation of nuclear-weapons testing comes at a most appropriate time.

On this occasion it seems to me, Mr. President, that the Senate, generally, and the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament, in particular, have cause for a considerable amount of gratification. The Senate Disarmament Subcommittee has pioneered in the proposals which, today, have been accepted and promulgated by the White House.

It is not often that a legislative body or a legislative committee can play a significant role in initiating foreign policy. I believe that today's events demonstrate that the Senate subcommittee has done so on two significant issues: First, the separation from our complicated disarmament package of the issue of a safeguarded inspection of bomb tests; and, second, the emphasis on detailed preparations for the structure and functioning of an inspection system.

SEPARATION OF TEST ISSUE

On September 6, 1957, in its interim report on the Control and Reduction of Armaments, the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament unanimously stated:

The subcommittee has concluded that a disarmament agreement must include meas-

ures to test the observance of its provisions. Measures for inspection, adequate to safeguard each separate disarmament proposal in the package may, however, when added together, be so extensive as to be impractical or unacceptable.

Two months later, on November 4, 1957, I wrote to President Eisenhower as follows:

I would like to suggest, Mr. President, that the United States, after consulting with its allies, declare its willingness to negotiate separately on a ban on nuclear-weapons tests for a 2-year period with the only condition being agreement on an effective inspection system with United Nations supervision to insure that the ban is being scrupulously observed.

It is my belief that such a proposal would be a safe and reasonable one. It would be a concrete step toward ending the arms race. It would also enable the people of this and other countries to learn more clearly whether the Soviet Union is truly ready to accept effective inspection. We cannot challenge the intentions of the Soviet Union on inspection unless we are in a position to negotiate on a test ban irrespective of the other measures in the Four Power disarmament proposal.

The importance of reaching an independent agreement on the suspension of tests apart from the other complications of our disarmament package has been stressed again and again.

Consequently, we have particular cause for rejoicing that the administration, after months of internal debate, has at last resolved the dispute in favor of the position we here in the Senate have espoused.

I note in this connection the following paragraph from the President's statement this afternoon:

The United States, taking account of the Geneva conclusions, is prepared to proceed promptly to negotiate an agreement with other nations which have tested nuclear weapons for the suspension of nuclear-weapons tests and the actual establishment of an international control system on the basis of the experts' report.

If this is accepted in principle by other nations which have tested nuclear weapons, then in order to facilitate the detailed negotiations the United States is prepared, unless testing is resumed by the Soviet Union, to withhold further testing on its part of atomic and hydrogen weapons for a period of 1 year from the beginning of the negotiations.

As part of the agreement to be negotiated, and on a basis of reciprocity, the United States would be further prepared to suspend the testing of nuclear weapons on a year-by-year basis subject to a determination at the beginning of each year: (A) the agreed inspection system is installed and working effectively; and (B) satisfactory progress is being made in reaching agreement on and implementing major and substantial arms-control measures such as the United States has long sought. The agreement should also deal with the problem of detonations for peaceful purposes, as distinct from weapons tests.

Our negotiators will be instructed and ready by October 31 this year to open negotiations with other similarly instructed negotiators.

The President deserves our highest commendation for this new policy position.

INSPECTION DETAILS

In its interim report of September 6, 1957, to which I have already referred, the Disarmament Subcommittee also stressed the critical importance of inspection. The report uses the following language:

The subcommittee has received to date few details from the executive branch on inspection provisions * * * The subcommittee strongly recommends that if inspection plans have not yet been prepared, an effort be made promptly by the executive branch to draw up blueprints for various types of inspection systems now under consideration.

Repeatedly during the intervening months, we have urged the administration to take the lead in initiating and participating in technical scientific talks on the feasibility of inspection. For instance, on February 4, 1958, I said on the Senate floor:

We should seek to determine what kind of inspection system the Soviet leaders envisage. Is it the type we agreed to in the Korean armistice? If it is, then we and the world should realize that the Soviets are trying to pull the wool over our eyes. The Korean inspection system, as we have since learned to our sorrow, was inadequate. Perhaps the Communists never intended it to work. However, if the Soviets have in mind another type of inspection system and are prepared to consider an inspection system which we believe is adequate, then we should know that too. Above all, when the Soviet indicates a willingness to accept inspection as a component part of a proposal for the cessation of nuclear testing then let us pursue the proposal to its most intimate and minute detail.

All these efforts, too, came to fruition when the United States technical experts sat down for talks on the inspection issue with other experts at Geneva last month.

I ask unanimous consent that the communique issued yesterday following the Geneva talks, and the statements by Dr. James B. Fisk, head of the United States delegation, and Professor Fedorov, head of the Soviet delegation, and Secretary General Hammarskjold, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the communique was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNIQUE AND COMMENTS IN GENEVA

GENEVA, August 21.—Following are the texts of the communique issued by Dr. James B. Fisk, head of the United States delegation, and Dr. Yevgeny K. Federov, head of the Soviet delegation, and a message from Dag Hammarskjold, Secretary General of the United Nations:

COMMUNIQUE

"The conference of experts to study the possibility of detecting violations of a possible agreement on the suspension of nuclear tests, which began its work in the Palais des Nations at Geneva on July 1, concluded its work on August 21, 1958.

"The conference expressed its appreciation for the good offices of the Secretary General of the United Nations, carried out through his personal representative, Mr. [T. G.] Narayanan, and for the efficient services rendered by the United Nations secretariat staff attached to the conference.

"In the course of the work of the conference there was an exchange of opinions on the question of the various methods of detecting nuclear explosions.

"The conference came to the conclusion that the methods of detecting nuclear explosions available at the present time, viz: the method of collecting samples of radioactive debris, the method of recording seismic, acoustic and hydroacoustic waves, and the radio signal method, together with the use of on-site inspection of unidentified events which might be suspected of being nuclear explosions, make it possible, within certain specific limits, to detect and identify nuclear explosions, and it recommends the use of these methods in a control system.

"The conference noted that the combined use of the various methods considerably facilitates detection and identification of nuclear explosions."

Improvements are expected

"The conference of experts noted that the effectiveness of the methods considered will increase in course of time with improvement of measuring techniques and with study of the characteristics of natural phenomena which cause interference when explosions are detected.

"The conference has adopted an agreed conclusion regarding the technical equipment of the control system necessary for the detection and identification of nuclear explosions.

"The conference of experts reached the conclusion that it is technically feasible to set up, with certain capabilities and limitations, a workable and effective control system for the detection of violations of a possible agreement on the worldwide cessation of nuclear weapons tests.

"It was established in this connection that a network of control posts which were equipped with all the necessary apparatus appropriate to the various methods of detection of nuclear explosions should be disposed on continents and on islands, as well as on a few ships in oceans.

"The experts came to the conclusion that the control system should be under the direction of an international control organ which would ensure the coordination of the activities of the control system and the functioning of the system in such a way that it would satisfy the necessary technical requirements.

"On August 21, 1958, the conference of experts adopted a final report for consideration by governments. The report will be made public at a time to be determined by governments."

STATEMENT BY DR. FISK

"The conference of experts has completed its work. We on the Western side are gratified that the task set for this conference, which began its work 7 weeks ago, has been successfully accomplished.

"That task was to seek a common understanding of the technical problems, involved in the detection and identification of nuclear explosions.

"We have now reached such a common understanding, which is embodied in the report we have just agreed upon and which we are now transmitting to our governments.

"My colleagues and I are hopeful that this report, which carefully examines and sets forth the capabilities and limitations of present methods of detecting nuclear explosions, will prove helpful to all of our governments in their future consideration of this important subject.

"As scientists we have sought here to establish the facts pertinent to our subject, and to draw from them sound and logical conclusions regarding a system of control."

Many questions asked

"We have heard a large number of scientific presentations from many members of the conference, and we have asked many questions in order to understand and criticize the scientific accuracy of the matters being discussed.

"We have worked together in writing conclusions on each part of our work, as it was completed, and on the final report, seeking thereby to present to governments the scientific facts and the significant measure of agreement that we have been able to reach on a system of control.

"I speak for all of those on the Western side when I express our satisfaction at the friendly and cooperative working relationships which we have enjoyed with our colleagues on the other side of the table.

"In closing, I am anxious to express our warm appreciation and thanks to Ambassador [Pier] Spinelli [of the United Nations office in Geneva] and to the personal representative of the Secretary General, Mr. [T. G.] Narayanan, for his good offices, and to Miss [Constance] Rhodes, Mr. [Henri A.] Cornil and the rest of the secretariat of the United Nations who have assisted the conference, for the efficient services which they have rendered us over these weeks.

"We are likewise grateful to the Confederation of Switzerland and to the cantonal authorities of Geneva for permitting this conference to be held in such lovely and undisturbed surroundings.

STATEMENT BY PROFESSOR FEDOROV

"I should like to say a few words at this juncture on behalf of the delegation of the Soviet Union and on behalf of the delegations of Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Rumania.

"The prevention of war and the maintenance of a stable and permanent peace among the peoples is an extremely important problem and task of our time. The universal cessation of nuclear weapons tests will make a considerable, positive, and definite contribution to the solution of this problem.

"Bearing in mind the fact that the Soviet Union, as it is well known, has halted the testing of nuclear weapons, without awaiting any examination of the possibility of detecting tests of nuclear explosions, the Government of the Soviet Union and the Governments of Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Rumania, in order to accept the wishes of the Western powers which connected a decision on the universal cessation of nuclear tests with the technical possibilities of detecting nuclear explosions, instructed their experts to discuss together with the experts of the Western countries the question of the detection of nuclear explosions and the establishment of a corresponding control system.

Arguments are revealed

"We have spent considerable time in studying these matters and we have discussed, in this connection, a large number of scientific and technical questions. We have frequently had lengthy arguments and we have been very critical about the effectiveness and various limitations of one or another method. However, we have always arrived at agreed conclusions.

"We note with particular satisfaction that the spirit of mutual comprehension and cooperation was characteristic of our joint efforts from the beginning of the conference to its very successful end.

"What is the basic conclusion which can be drawn following the completion of our lengthy task? The conclusion is very simple and very clear.

"A nuclear explosion, including an explosion of small magnitude, can be detected, and the establishment of an effective control system which would make it possible to have an inspection and a checking of the maintenance of an agreement on the universal cessation of nuclear-weapons tests is a quite feasible undertaking and one which would not be particularly complicated.

"In certain instances the task of detecting and identifying nuclear explosions of small yields is relatively simple, in others, specific difficulties are involved.

"However, no matter where a possible violator attempted to conceal an atomic explosion—under the water, on the earth, and the cosmic space—100,000 kilometers (62,500 miles) from the earth—he will nowhere be guaranteed from exposure."

Moral factors omitted

"The means by which these problems are to be resolved is indicated in our proposals which we have adopted as technical experts, we have not discussed factors of a moral or social character.

"Nevertheless, these factors are of great significance, and in this connection we bear in mind the desire of the overwhelming majority of humanity today to prevent an atomic war and to support every means directed toward such an objective.

"We are convinced that no single government which will undertake a commitment to cease the testing of nuclear weapons will disregard such commitment and thus challenge the whole world.

"Our delegation has received numerous letters from many countries, among them letters from workers, businessmen, children, and housewives. All of these letters express the one common hope that the experts will work in such a manner that there may be no more nuclear weapons explosions and no more war.

"We are very happy to feel that our work has made a certain contribution, possibly a modest and limited one, toward the solution of this tremendous task which is the concern of all humanity.

"In conclusion, may I express, on behalf of the delegation of the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Rumania, our gratitude to the Government of Switzerland and to the authorities of the canton and city of Geneva for the hospitality and attention which they have bestowed on us.

"We also express our thanks to the director of the European office of the United Nations, Mr. Spinelli, and the representative of the Secretary General, Mr. Narayanan, for their cooperation and the assistance which they have given to the Conference in the course of its work. We are grateful also to the interpreters, the verbatim reporters, the typists, and all the other members of the secretariat of the United Nations who have given us their assistance.

"This concludes the work of our Conference. I should now like to call on Mr. Spinelli, director of the European office of the United Nations, who wishes to make a statement."

STATEMENT BY MR. HAMMARSKJOLD

"Now that your task is drawing to a successful close, I am very glad to have this opportunity of extending to all of you my personal congratulations on your solid accomplishment.

"It was, indeed, my hope, when I expected to be able to come to Geneva during the second half of July, to respond to your kind invitation to be present at your conference and share with you some of my thoughts on the problem on which you have been engaged, and which you have now so successfully resolved as far as its technical aspects are concerned. However, for reasons known to you, I could not undertake that trip.

"I have, nevertheless, kept myself regularly informed of the progress of your work through Mr. T. G. Narayanan, who has represented me at your conference as my personal representative.

"A controlled suspension of nuclear weapons tests represents one aspect—and an important aspect—of the disarmament problem as it is now pending before the United Nations. The whole question of disarmament has been a matter of continuing and increasing concern to us all."

Disarmament dent seen

"Your successful resolution of questions connected with the possibility of detecting violations of a possible agreement on the suspension of nuclear tests will, I have no doubt, be a signal contribution in making an effective dent in the hitherto rather intractable problem of disarmament.

"It will hereafter lie with the governments concerned and the United Nations to follow through the opening you have created. I have every hope that in due course they will, indeed, make the necessary constructive effort.

"I am looking forward to receiving from the governments concerned the report of your conference which I shall submit to the General Assembly and the Security Council.

"Finally, may I again convey my sense of deep gratification at your success, which I know has been achieved by the patient exercise of mutual good faith, willingness of each side to understand the other's point of view, and by an objective and scientific approach to the problems that have confronted you. By the manner in which you have done your work and by the results you have achieved, you have well served the central purpose of the United Nations and its charter."

Mr. HUMPHREY. I also ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that an article by John W. Finney, "180 Sites Urged for Atomic Check," which appears in this morning's New York Times, be printed in the RECORD, at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY SITES URGED FOR ATOMIC CHECK—EAST-WEST EXPERTS CONCLUDE EFFECTIVE POLICE SYSTEM ON BAN IS POSSIBLE

(By John W. Finney)

GENEVA, August 21.—Western and Eastern scientists ended their technical talks today with the joint conclusion that an international ban on the testing of nuclear weapons could be policed effectively.

For monitoring any international agreement to suspend such tests, the scientists recommended a world detection system of about 180 stations situated on all the major land masses and oceans of the world.

The scientists agreed that such a detection network would not provide a foolproof guarantee against any violation of the agreement but would give a high degree of assurance that a clandestine atomic test anywhere in the world would be detected—from a small 1-kiloton explosion to the mighty hydrogen bomb.

RISK SEEN FOR VIOLATOR

In a still secret report, summarizing their conclusions, the scientists said their proposed detection system would "convince any violator of a nuclear test ban that he would run the risk of exposure, regardless of precautionary measures taken."

These scientific conclusions make up one of the few concrete agreements to emerge from 12 years of East-West disarmament negotiations. The agreement is the result of nearly 8 weeks of technical, nonpolitical discussions on the feasibility of detecting secret atomic tests.

As a result of this scientific-level accord it seems more likely than ever that the East and the West will take a "first step" toward disarmament by agreeing to suspend atomic tests under international control.

At the insistence of the United States, which first proposed the Geneva conference last spring, the scientific talks were carefully divorced from any commitment to enter into an atomic test ban. Western diplomats at the conference, however, are now privately conceding that the scientific agreement will almost inevitably lead to diplomatic negotiations on an atomic test suspension.

UNITED STATES QUESTIONS ANSWERED

The talks have served to answer United States questions about the feasibility of policing an atomic test ban. In turn, the Soviet Union has agreed in principle that such a test ban should be internationally

supervised, including the establishment of control posts within the territory of Communist nations.

The diplomatic significance of the scientific accord was pointed up in a message sent to the conferees by Dag Hammarskjold, Secretary General of the United Nations, congratulating the scientists on their solid accomplishment. Mr. Hammarskjold wrote:

"Your successful resolution of questions connected with the possibility of detecting violations of a possible agreement on the suspension of nuclear tests will, I have no doubt, be a signal contribution in making an effective dent in the hitherto rather intractable problem of disarmament.

"It will hereafter lie with the governments concerned and the United Nations to follow through the opening you have created. I have every hope that in due course they will indeed make the necessary constructive effort."

A communique issued after today's final meeting said that the two sides had "reached the conclusion that it is technically possible to set up, with certain capabilities and limitations, a workable and effective control system for the detection of violations of a possible agreement on the worldwide cessation of nuclear-weapons tests."

For such a system the conferees recommended a network of control posts that would be equipped with various detection instruments and be "disposed on continents and on islands, as well as on a few ships in oceans," the communique went on.

The scientists recommended that four presently available detection methods be included in a control system: the collection of radioactive debris, the seismological recording of earth shock waves created by underground and near-surface explosions, the registration of acoustic air waves generated by above-surface explosions and hydroacoustic waves created by underwater explosions, and the detection of the electromagnetic radiation given off by above-surface explosions in the form of light and low-frequency radio waves.

A key point to emerge from the communiqué was that this detection network should be supplemented by "on-site inspection of unidentified events which might be suspected of being nuclear explosions."

Thus, for the first time the Soviet bloc specifically agreed to the necessity of mobility for inspection teams. Mobility has been a cardinal feature of United States inspection proposals on the ground that suspicious evidence might be detected by control posts that could be verified only by on-the-spot investigation.

LIMITATIONS ARE CONCEDED

In their communique, the scientists conceded there would be "certain specific limits" in the capabilities of such a control system to detect and identify nuclear explosions.

They said, however, that combined use of the various detection methods "considerably facilitates the detection and identification of nuclear explosions."

Furthermore, they said, the effectiveness of the detection methods would increase in time, with improvement of measuring techniques and more study of natural phenomena such as earthquakes, volcanic explosions, and meteorites, which could interfere with or confuse the detection of atomic explosions.

The scientists recommended that the control system be under the direction of "an international control organ." At the insistence of the western delegation, however, the details of such an international agency were left to any subsequent diplomatic negotiations.

As proposed by the scientists, any suspected violation detected by a control post would be reported to the headquarters of the international agency, which could send out inspection teams to make an on-the-spot investigation.

The detailed recommendations of the scientists were contained in a 40-page report, which was not made public immediately.

Conference sources disclosed, however, that the conclusion contained in the report was virtually paraphrased in a statement by Prof. Yevgeny K. Fedorov, head of the Soviet bloc delegation.

FEDOROV REMARKS QUOTED

The basic conclusion to be drawn from the talks is that "a nuclear explosion, including an explosion of small magnitude, can be detected, and the establishment of an effective control system * * * is a quite feasible undertaking and one which would not be particularly complicated," Professor Fedorov said. He added:

"In certain instances the task of detecting and identifying nuclear explosions of small yields is comparatively simple; in others, specific difficulties are involved.

"However, no matter where a possible violator attempted to conceal his atomic explosion—under the water, under the earth or in the cosmic space 100,000 kilometers (62,500 miles) from the earth—he will nowhere be guaranteed from exposure."

In the report the scientists were said to have recommended that a control system be made up of about 180 detection stations. The stations would be situated in all major land masses, including four in Antarctica, on oceanic islands, and in 10 ships at sea.

The stations would be situated 600 to 2,100 miles apart, according to the report. The stations would be spaced most closely in land areas, particularly in earthquake and volcanic regions. They would be farthest apart in the about 40 proposed oceanic island sites.

As proposed in the report, there would be 6 stations in Europe, 7 in Australia, 16 in Africa, 37 in Asia and 40 in North and South America.

Within the Asian land mass some stations obviously would have to be situated in Communist China, a point that is likely to complicate any future negotiations. However, in keeping with the nonpolitical nature of the talks the scientists discussed only general land areas rather than specific national territories for the location of the stations.

PLANES TO AID IN POLICING

The ground control posts would be supplemented by monitoring planes that would fly over international waters off the major land masses to pick up any radioactive debris from an atomic explosion.

Such a detection network would be designed to detect atomic explosions with a force of 1 kiloton—equal to 1,000 tons of TNT—and larger, conference sources disclosed.

The scientists were said to have agreed that this detection system would provide virtually complete assurance of detecting any atomic explosion of 1 kiloton or larger exploded above the surface to an altitude of about 10 miles.

They were said to have agreed that there was some chance that the control system would not detect very small explosions detonated deep underground or high in the air. They noted in their report, however, that on-the-site investigation would compensate to an extent for some of these detection uncertainties.

PROPAGANDA BARRAGE EXPECTED

The concluding statements by both sides gave a harbinger of the propaganda-loaded diplomatic exchange that is almost certain to follow between Moscow and Washington as they maneuver over entering into diplomatic negotiations.

In his statement, Professor Fedorov laid considerable emphasis on the "common hope" in the world that there would be no more nuclear tests. A test cessation would make a considerable contribution to the prevention of war, he remarked.

With contrasting avoidance of the underlying political issues, Dr. James B. Fisk, chairman of the western delegation, noted that the conference had successfully fulfilled its assigned task of reaching "a common understanding" of the technical problems involved in the detection of atomic explosions. He expressed hope that the conference's report on methods of detecting atomic explosions "will prove helpful to all of our governments in their future consideration of this important subject."

The conference was attended by scientists from the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Rumania, the United States, Britain, Canada, and France.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the tremendously encouraging results of the Geneva Conference were appropriately recognized by the President in his statement this morning. I refer to the opening two paragraphs of that statement:

The United States welcomes the successful conclusion of the Geneva meeting of experts who have been considering whether and how nuclear weapons tests could be detected. Their conclusions indicate that, if there were an agreement to eliminate such tests, its effective supervision and enforcement would be technically possible.

This is a most important conclusion, the more so because it is concurred in by the experts of the Soviet Union. Progress in the field of disarmament agreements depends upon the ability to establish effective international controls and the willingness of the countries concerned to accept those controls. The fact therefore of an agreement on technical possibilities of inspection and control opens up a prospect of progress in the vitally important field of disarmament.

The Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament has persevered when others have doubted. We can only hope that future events will prove to be as auspicious as these Geneva beginnings.

TEST SUSPENSION AND DISARMAMENT

Finally, Mr. President, there is one point in this historic statement by the President where I must disagree slightly. The last paragraph of the President's message states that "the suspension of testing of atomic and hydrogen weapons is not, in itself, a measure of disarmament or a limitation of armament. An agreement in this respect is significant if it leads to other and more substantial agreements relating to limitation and reduction of fissionable material for weapons and to other essential phases of disarmament."

I agree with the President that a suspension of tests should and must lead to other disarmament measures, but I do not accept the idea that a suspension of nuclear weapons tests is insignificant as a disarmament measure.

In the preface of a staff study of the Disarmament Subcommittee, issued in June 1958, I said:

A suspension of nuclear weapons tests would constitute a meaningful disarmament measure.

The arms race of today is primarily a qualitative race. I would like again to quote from this same preface:

Each nation is attempting to develop the most destructive weapons, or the most precise weapons, or the weapons with the longest range, or weapons with some other special

quality. The quantity of armaments is important, but it is the constant improvement in quality, or even the development of entirely new weapons, which causes a nation to expend some of its best resources and energies in an effort to keep up to date.

Therefore, I repeat, a suspension of nuclear tests would be significant as a step toward a solution of the disarmament problem. It would greatly impede, if not prohibit, the development of new types of nuclear weapons; it would also prevent the development of nuclear weapons by any nation which has not already made the tests essential to proving new weapons.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I hope that the Nation will rise to congratulate our President for the statement he has made today, and will support his efforts to negotiate a truly effective and reliable system to control the suspension of nuclear weapons tests.

We now await acceptance of the President's offer on the part of the Soviet Union and the other countries concerned.

CONSOLIDATION INTO ONE ACT ALL LAWS ADMINISTERED BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9700) to consolidate into one act all of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes, which were, on page 2 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in the matter following the center heading "Chapter 1—General", strike out "Dependent parents" and insert in lieu thereof the following "Dependent parents and dependent husbands"; on page 7 of the Senate engrossed amendment—

(1) Strike out "§ 102. Dependent parents" and insert in lieu thereof "§ 102. Dependent parents and dependent husbands"; (2) immediately after "(a)" in section 102 (a), insert "(1)"; (3) in section 102 (b)—

(A) strike out "(b)" and insert "(2)"; (B) after "denied" strike out "(1)" and insert "(A)";

(C) after "remarriage, or" strike out "(2)" and insert "(B)"; and (4) in section 102 (c), strike out "(c)" and insert "(3)"; and strike out "section" and insert in lieu thereof "subsection"; (5) add at the end of section 102 the following new subsection:

(b) For the purposes of this title (except chs. 19 and 33), (1) the term "wife" includes the husband of any female veteran if such husband is incapable of self-maintenance and is permanently incapable of self-support due to mental or physical disability; and (2) the term "widow" includes the widower of any female veteran if such widower is incapable of self-maintenance and was permanently incapable of self-support due to physical or mental disability at the time of the veteran's death.

On page 23 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in subsection (m) of section 314, immediately before "or has suffered blindness in both eyes" insert the following "or has suffered blindness in both eyes having only light perception,"; on page 40 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in paragraph (3) of section 501, strike out "Veteran" and insert "veteran"; on page 54 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in subsection (a) of section 624, strike out ", except that he may furnish necessary hospital care and medical services for service-connected disabilities incurred during a period of war to veterans who are citizens of the United States temporarily sojourning or residing abroad"; on page 55 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in section 631, (1) strike out "(a)"; and (2) strike out "If agreement is reached to modify the plan of assistance as provided for in paragraph (1) of section 632, the total of grants for 1958 up to July 1 may be as much as $1,000,000."; on page 56 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in paragraph (1) of section 632, strike out "must be entered into before July 1, 1958,"; on page 62 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in section 712, strike out "cansecutive" and insert in lieu thereof "consecutive"; on page 63 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in section 715 (1) strike out "or 621"; (2) strike out "$5" and insert in lieu thereof "$10"; and (3) strike out "Policies" and insert in lieu thereof "The total disability provision authorized under this section shall not be added to a policy containing the total disability coverage heretofore issued under section 602 (v) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, except upon surrender of such total disability coverage, proof of good health satisfactory to the Administrator, and payment of such extra premiums as the Administrator shall determine is required in such cases. Participating policies"; on page 68 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in subsection (b) of section 721, strike out "heretofore to hereafter" and insert in lieu thereof "heretofore or hereafter"; on page 71 of the Senate engrossed amendment, (1) in paragraph (2) of subsection (b) of section 722, strike out "paragraph (1)" and insert in lieu thereof "subsection (b) (1) of this section"; and (2) in paragraph (3) of subsection (b) of section 722, strike out "subsection (b)" and insert in lieu thereof "this subsection"; on page 72 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in subsection (a) of section 723, strike out all that follows "(4) such insurance" and insert in lieu thereof "and any total disability provision added thereto shall be on a nonparticipating basis and all premiums and other collections therefor shall be credited to a revolving fund in the Treasury of the United States and the payments on such term insurance and any total disability provision added thereto shall be made directly from such fund. Appropriations to such fund are hereby authorized"; on page 88 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in subsection (a) of section 902, strike out "$150" and insert in lieu thereof "$250"; on page 88 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in subsection (a) of section 903, strike out "$150" and insert in lieu thereof "$250"; on page 92 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in section 1506, strike out "and prosthesis," and insert in lieu thereof "and prosthesis"; on page 93 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in section 1506, strike out "or prosthesis", and insert in lieu thereof "or prosthesis"; on page 93 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in section 1507, strike out "interest," and insert in lieu thereof "interest and"; on page 97 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in subsection (a) of section 1612, immediately at the end thereof insert "Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, any otherwise eligible veteran whom the Administrator determines to have been prevented from initiating a program of education or training under this chapter within the period prescribed by this subsection because he had not met the nature of discharge requirements of section 1601 (a) (2) (B) of this title before a change, correction, or modification of a discharge or dismissal made pursuant to section 1553 of title 10, the correction of the military records of the proper service department under section 1552 of title 10, or other corrective action by competent authority, shall be permitted to initiate a program of education or training under this chapter within 3 years after whichever is later, September 1, 1958, or the date his discharge or dismissal was so changed, corrected, or modified."; on page 98 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in section 1613, strike out all that follows "earlier" and insert in lieu thereof ", except that any veteran who is eligible to initiate a program of education or training by reason of the second sentence of section 1612 (a) of this title shall be permitted to pursue, subject to the other provisions of this chapter, such program for a period of not more than 5 years after the date of initiation thereof; but in no event shall education or training be afforded under this chapter after January 31, 1965."; on page 119 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in the table of contents below section 1669, immediately below "1736. Discontinuance of allowances." insert the following:

1737. Specialized vocational training courses.

On page 122 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in subsection (a) of section 1712, (1) strike out "(3) (A)" and insert in lieu thereof "(4) (A)"; and (2) strike out "(2) if he had not reached his twenty-third birthday on June" and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(2) if he has a mental or physical handicap, and the Administrator determines that his best interests will be served by pursuing a program of special restorative training or a specialized course of vocational training approved under section 1737 of this title, such period may begin before his eighteenth birthday, but not before his fourteenth birthday;

(3) if he had not reached his twenty-third birthday on June

On page 129 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in section 1735, strike out all of subsection (a) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(a) An eligible person shall receive the benefits of this subchapter while enrolled in a course of education offered by an educational institution only if such course (1) is approved in accordance with the provisions of this section, or (2) is approved for the enrollment of the particular individual under the provisions of section 1737 of this title.

On page 129 of the Senate engrossed amendment immediately after section 1736, insert the following:

§ 1737. Specialized vocational training courses

Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (b) and (c) of section 1735 of this title, the Administrator may approve a specialized course of vocational training leading to a predetermined vocational objective for the enrollment of an eligible person under this subchapter if he finds that such course, either alone or when combined with other courses, constitutes a program of education which is suitable for that person and is required because of a mental or physical handicap.

On page 161 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in the table of contents immediately above section 2101, strike out "2104. Administration of chapter." and insert in lieu thereof the following:

2104. Time limitations.
2105. Administration of chapter.

On page 163 of the Senate engrossed amendment, strike out "§ 2104. Administration of chapter" and insert in lieu thereof the following:

§ 2104. Time limitations

Any member of the Armed Forces entitled to mustering-out payment who was discharged or relieved from active service under honorable conditions before July 16, 1952, shall, if application therefor is made before July 17, 1959, be paid such mustering-out payment by the Secretary concerned beginning within one month after application has been received and approved. No member of the Armed Forces shall receive mustering-out payment under this chapter more than once, and such payment shall accrue and the amount thereof shall be computed as of the time of discharge for the purpose of effecting a permanent separation from the service or of ultimate relief from active service or, at the option of such member, for the purpose of enlistment, reenlistment, or appointment in a regular component of the Armed Forces.

§ 2105. Administration of chapter

On page 174 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in subsection (a) of section 3109, strike out "Seventy-sixth Congress,"; on page 217 of the Senate engrossed amendment, add at the end of section 5 the following new subsection:

(c) Amendments effective after August 18, 1958, made to any provision of law replaced by title 38, United States Code, shall, notwithstanding the repeal of such provision by section 14 of this Act, supersede the corresponding provisions of title 38, United States Code, to the extent that such amendments are inconsistent therewith.

On page 219 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in subsection (a) of section 12, (1) strike out "veteran who" and insert "veteran (1) who"; and (2) immediately before the period at the end of such subsection insert the following: ", or (2) whose discharge or dismissal is changed, corrected, or modified before February 1, 1965, pursuant to section 1552 or 1553 of title 10, United States Code, or by other corrective action by competent authority"; on pages 220, 221, and 222 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in subsections (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i) (1), (i) (2), (j), (k), (m), (n), (o), (p), (r), (s) (1), (t), and (u) of section 13, strike out "title 38" each place it appears and insert in lieu thereof "title 38, United States Code"; on page 220 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in subsection (i) of section 13, immediately below paragraph (2), insert the following:

(3) (A) Subsection (g) of section 1511 of such Act is amended by striking out "title V of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 (38 U. S. C. 1011 et seq.)" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "chapter 43 of title 38, United States Code".

(B) Subsection (h) of such section 1511 is amended by striking out "232 of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 (38 U. S. C. 942), a subsistence allowance under part VII or part VIII of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, or an educational assistance allowance under the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act of 1956 (38 U. S. C. 1031 et seq.)" and inserting in lieu thereof "1632 of title 38, United States Code, a subsistence allowance under chapter 31 of such title 38 or under part VIII of Veterans Regulations Numbered 1 (a), or an educational assistance allowance under chapter 35 of such title 38".

(C) Subsection (i) of such section 1511 is amended by striking out "title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 (38 U. S. C. 991 et seq.)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subchapter I of chapter 41 of title 38, United States Code."

On page 221 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in subsection (o) of section 13, (1) insert "(1)" immediately after "(o)"; and (2) insert immediately below such subsection the following new paragraphs:

(2) Paragraph (23) of such section 202 is amended by striking out "Classification Act of 1923, as amended, pursuant to Public Law 636, 79th Congress, approved August 7, 1946, as amended" and inserting in lieu thereof "Classification Act of 1949, pursuant to section 4202 of title 38, United States Code."

(3) Paragraph (25) of such section 202 is amended by striking out "section 14 (b) of Public Law 293, 79th Congress, approved January 3, 1946, as amended by Public Law 722, 80th Congress, approved June 19, 1948" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 4114 (b) of title 38, United States Code."

On page 222 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in subsection (v) of section 13, strike out paragraph (1) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(1) By amending section 1441 by striking out "1115" and inserting in lieu thereof "415 (g)."

On page 224 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in subsection (x) of section 13, strike out "(x)" and insert in lieu thereof "(w)", and on page 233 of the Senate engrossed amendment, in section 14, immediately below paragraph (119), insert the following new paragraphs:

(120) Section 2 of the act of August 14, 1958 (Public Law 85-652).

(121) Section 2 of the act of August 18, 1958 (Public Law 85-674), except that such repeal shall not permit payment of the $250 burial allowance under sections 902 or 903 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to deaths occurring before August 19, 1958, as to which the amount authorized by the laws in effect on the date of death shall apply.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this bill is a codification of the veterans' laws. The amendments made by the House are merely technical in nature.

I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF RENEGOTIATION ACT OF 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11749) to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 6 months, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 2, line 1, after the word "Inserting", to insert "the"; at the beginning of line 3, to insert "Section 103 (b) of such act is amended by inserting 'the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration,' after 'the Administrator of General Services'"; in line 6, after the word "The", to strike out "amendment" and insert "amendments"; and after line 13, to strike out:

SEC. 3. Judicial review of Tax Court decisions in renegotiation cases.

(a) In general: The second sentence of section 108 of such act (50 U. S. C., App. sec. 1218) is amended to read as follows: "Upon such filing such court shall have exclusive jurisdiction, by order, to determine the amount, if any, of such excessive profits received or accrued by the contractor or subcontractor, and such determination shall not be reviewed or redetermined by any court or agency except that it may be reviewed as provided in subsections (a) and (c) of section 7482 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954."

(b) Conforming amendment: The fourth sentence of such section 108 is amended by striking out "finally".

(c) Effective date: The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply with respect to decisions rendered by the Tax Court of the United States after June 30, 1958.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, first I ask that a statement by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] be printed in the RECORD at this point. It is a statement explaining his vote with respect to the extension of the Renegotiation Act.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SALTONSTALL

Mr. President, I am supporting the pending measure to extend the Renegotiation Act because it is quite apparent that the Defense Department needs this continued authority in many instances. However, I have filed legislation separately as part of a bill calling for several changes in our procurement laws to exempt certain types of contracts from the renegotiation procedure. I have not offered the amendment which is contained in my procurement amendment bill, S. 4294, at this time inasmuch as the renegotiation exemptions proposed must be considered in context with the other suggestions embodied in S. 4294. I do wish to express, however, at this time my belief that certain types of contracts should be exempted from renegotiation procedures, notably incentive contracts.

I hope that the Senate will favorably consider these proposals as a part of a broader procurement reform measure, even though the basic act giving renegotiation authority is extended at this time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I understand from an examination of the bill that the committee is reporting it with an amendment to strike out what was proposed as section 3, proposing the judicial review of tax-court decisions in renegotiation cases.

Mr. BYRD. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I express the hope that when the bill goes to conference the Senate conferees will insist upon their position. The pending bill proposes to extend the Renegotiation Act for 6 months. In the Senate committee's report I note an excerpt from the report of the House Ways and Means Committee, giving the reason for not extending the act for more than 6 months. I quote from the Senate committee report, which quotes a paragraph from the report of the House Ways and Means Committee:

> The bill limits the extension of renegotiation to a period of 6 months because it is the intention of your committee to undertake a broad review of the entire subject of renegotiation early in the next Congress. At that time consideration will be given to the scope, objectives, and procedures of renegotiation and to possible amendments including those proposed at the hearing on the present bill.

Mr. President, if the reason for granting a 6-months' extension is in order that the committees may undertake a broad review of the entire subject, it seems to me that it would be entirely inconsistent in this bill. It proposes something which would entirely revolutionize the concept and the procedure in connection with renegotiation cases.

If the purpose is to give time for a broad review, why should the bill propose to prejudge the question of appeal and review of decisions of the Tax Court? I think the Senate Committee on Finance is entirely sound in striking that provision from the bill. I would be disappointed if the Senate were to recede from that position in conference.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from South Dakota, who is the father of the Renegotiation Act, that the reasons he has just given impelled the Senate Finance Committee to strike from the bill the right to take an appeal. So far as the chairman is concerned, the Senate conferees will certainly insist upon striking the provision providing for the right to take an appeal.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do not wish to prolong the discussion, but if the Senator will indulge me for a few more observations, I will say that not only would the inclusion in this bill of the 6 months' extension prejudge the entire issue, but it would create a discriminatory situation by establishing an appellate right in respect of the cases which might happen to arise during the 6 months' extension. It would not establish it with respect to previous cases, unless we opened up the entire field of prior decisions. It would prejudge the situation so far as the future is concerned, by creating a discriminatory situation with respect to future cases.

To establish an appellate jurisdiction over the Tax Court on renegotiation reveals, it seems to me, a misunderstanding of what is involved. Normal judicial courts do not have the tax accountants, the engineers, and the standards for evaluating the various matters which enter into costs, which the Tax Court has. That is why the Tax Court was selected as the appellate court for reviewing decisions of the price adjustment boards. The use of renegotiation involves the exercise of judgment. Courts must be courts dealing with matters of record. There might be in evidence or there might not be in evidence previous decisions of renegotiation boards. A court could consider only those which were of record. I applaud and commend the Committee on Finance for pointing out the issue involved and for striking that provision from the bill. I certainly hope that in conference their wishes will prevail.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from South Dakota has made a very strong argument. I feel certain that the conferees on the part of the Senate will insist on striking that provision.

An extension beyond the present limit has been requested by the President and recommended by the Defense Department because the defense expenditures of $39 billion for the fiscal year 1958 and $40.5 billion for the fiscal year 1959 are greater in amount than ever before in our peacetime history and because it is difficult to determine accurately the proper price of new and experimental weapons in the aircraft, missile, and space fields when the contracts are awarded. However, it is realized that the process of renegotiation while needed now is not satisfactory as a permanent part of our Federal law. The determination of excessive profits depends in the main upon the judgment of men rather than upon rules of law. The House bill extends the period through June 30, 1959. In the report of the House Ways and Means Committee, it is stated that—

> The bill limits the extension of renegotiation to a period of 6 months because it is the intention of your committee to undertake a broad review of the entire subject of renegotiation early in the next Congress. At that time consideration will be given to the scope, objectives, and procedures of renegotiation and to possible amendments including those proposed at the hearing on the present bill.

The committee has made a technical amendment to the House bill to make it certain that the act will apply to the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, as well as the other agencies now covered. The only substantive amendment to the House bill made by the committee is the elimination of section 3, which provides a review by the United States Courts of Appeals of decisions of the Tax Court as to the determination of excessive profits. The right to appeal Tax Court decisions to the Courts of Appeals is now limited under the existing law to constitutional questions and questions of law. Because of problems which may be involved in reviewing determinations of excessive profits by the Courts of Appeals and the fact that the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation recommended in 1956 that no appeal should be allowed to the Courts of Appeals on the determination of excessive profits by the Tax Court, your committee believes that this subject should also be further considered in connection with the study to be made in the next Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point a comprehensive statement of the views of the Committee on Finance as to why the appeals should not be included in the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

OBJECTION TO HAVING UNITED STATES COURTS OF APPEALS REVIEW DETERMINATIONS OF EXCESSIVE PROFITS BY THE TAX COURT

The Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation made a report to the Congress on renegotiation procedure on May 31, 1956, pursuant to section 6 of Public Law 216, approved August 3, 1955, and recommended that the present procedure for the determination of excessive profits by the Tax Court, with no appeal therefrom to the Court of Appeals, should be retained.

1. The determination of excessive profits involves an act of discretion. It was granted to the Tax Court because it is in the executive branch of the Government and has the power to exercise administrative determinations which are not of a judicial nature.

2. The renegotiation law gives jurisdiction to the Tax Court which is entirely independent of the Renegotiation Board, and thus affords the contractor an independent determination of excessive profits. The determination of the Tax Court is a de novo proceeding.

3. If jurisdiction is granted to the United States Courts of Appeals to determine excessive profits, there will be further delay in settling renegotiation cases, by at least 1 year, and more if the proceedings are protracted in the Courts of Appeals or if the case goes to the Supreme Court.

4. The Renegotiation Board as well as a contractor will have the right to appeal any adverse decision. This may delay final settlement of a renegotiation proceeding for at least 1 year—more if the case then goes to the Supreme Court.

5. Contractors in many cases employ public accountants for the renegotiation proceedings. These accountants (certified public accountants) are permitted to practice before the Tax Court. If the Renegotiation Board should file an appeal these contractors would have to engage legal counsel in all cases, or the contractor might select lawyers even in the Tax Court proceedings because of the right to appeal to the Courts of Appeals.

6. Granting the right to appeal at the present time places a premium on delay. Many contractors who have entered into voluntary settlements with the Renegotiation Board might not have done so had there been a right of appeal beyond the Tax Court. It is not now possible to reopen all of these proceedings.

7. If the right to appeal is granted, it is difficult to determine whether the Courts of Appeals could not exercise discretion in redetermining the amount of excessive profits rather than simply approving or disapproving the Tax Court's redetermination. The Courts of Appeals should not have discretionary power with respect to excessive profits but the appeal power as incorporated in the House bill could not safely be reworded without extensive study.

8. The right of appeal on the issue of excessive profits has not heretofore been approved by the Finance Committee. The Renegotiation Act of 1948 which was in force only for a limited period of time did contain a broad right of appeal approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee but no appeal was taken to the Courts of Appeals under that act. The 1948 act was superseded by the 1951 act which provided as in the case of other acts reported by the Senate Finance Committee that no appeal should lie beyond the Tax Court on the determination of excessive profits.

9. Granting the right to appeal on the question of excessive profits at this time would lend an air of permanency to the Renegotiation Act, which is only intended to be of a temporary nature because of the large volume of defense contracts.

10. If the right of appeal is to be granted, a study may disclose that such rights should be extended to cases falling under acts prior to the Renegotiation Act of 1951.

11. If the right of appeal is deleted now, pending further study, it will not be difficult to add it next session if that becomes desirable.

EXCHANGE OF LANDS AT ROCHESTER FISH-CULTURAL STATION, INDIANA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, my attention has been called to a bill to which there is no opposition. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 2549, H. R. 13475.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill H. R. 13475, to authorize an exchange of lands at the Rochester Fish-Cultural Station, Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a brief explanation of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of this bill is to authorize the Department of the Interior to effect an exchange of lands at the Rochester, Ind., Fish Cultural Station. In exchange for 51.03 acres of cropland that is presently unused and for which there is no prospective use, the station would acquire 8 acres of land in front of the station and fronting on the highway, through which runs the canal supplying the hatchery with water. It was testified at the hearings before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries that the Fish and Wildlife Service had sought the parcel involved for a number of years as a protection for its water supply but had been unable to reach any agreement with the city of Rochester, the owner. The present bill achieves the objective of obtaining the desired land at the expense of the transfer of unused acreage of approximately equal value, according to the Fish and Wildlife Service.

This legislation was unanimously approved by the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee following public hearings, and passed the House without objection on August 15. It was the wholehearted support of the Senators from Indiana.

The favorable report from the Secretary of the Interior is set forth below for the information of the Senate. Attention is directed to the statement in that letter that—

"Before consummating this exchange (of land) we would have a further evaluation made of the properties in order to assure an exchange of properties that are of approximately equal value."

The testimony of Fish and Wildlife Service officials before the House committee was to the effect that the United States-held land was valued at $17,860, and the city-owned property was valued at $18,100.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1438. An act to amend section 544 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the bonds of United States marshals;

S. 1985. An act to authorize the preparation of plans and specifications for the construction of a building for a National Air Museum for the Smithsonian Institution, and all other work incidental thereto;

S. 2114. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), as amended, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to acquire land for field sites, to undertake construction and improvement of buildings, and for other activities;

S. 3295. An act to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 in order to increase the authorization for the fisheries loan fund established under such act;

S. 4085. An act to amend the act of May 17, 1954 (68 Stat. 98), providing for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of old St. Louis, Mo., and for other purposes; and

S. 4096. An act to amend section 4201 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the annual rate of compensation of members of the Board of Parole.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2719) to provide for the payment of bounties on dogfish sharks to control the depredations of this species on the fisheries of the Pacific coast, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3680) to provide for participation of the United States in the World Science-Pan Pacific Exposition to be held at Seattle, Wash., in 1961, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7450) to make the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act amendments of 1957 applicable to retired former members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police force, the White House Police force, and the United States Secret Service; and to their widows, widowers, and children; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MCMILLAN, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, and Mr. BROYHILL were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3420) to extend and amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 469) to protect producers and consumers against misbranding and false advertising of the fiber content of textile fiber products, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3368) to amend section 1870 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the district courts to allow additional peremptory challenges in civil cases to multiple plaintiffs as well as multiple defendants.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10473) for the relief of Hipolito C. DeBaca.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12126) to provide further protection against the introduction and dissemination of livestock diseases, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions of the Senate:

S. Con. Res. 37. Concurrent resolution favoring Congressional recognition of the Baseball Hall of Fame, located at Cooperstown, N. Y.;

S. Con. Res. 102. Concurrent resolution accepting the statue of Dr. Florence Rena Sabin, to be placed in the Statuary Hall collection;

S. Con. Res. 103. Concurrent resolution to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of the late Dr. Florence Rena Sabin and authorizing ceremonies on such occasion;

S. Con. Res. 111. Concurrent resolution to print the final report of the Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Committee on Foreign Relations as a Senate document, with additional copies; and

S. Con. Res. 121. Concurrent resolution authorizing a change in the enrollment of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) providing for the construction by the Department of the Interior of demonstration plants for the production, from saline or brackish waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 3276. An act for the relief of Carl Ebert and his wife, Gertrude Ebert;

S. 3287. An act for the relief of Vivian D. Giesey;

S. 3818. An act for the relief of Vicenta Garcia y Puente;

S. 4249. An act to authorize a program for the conservation, restoration, and management of the rare Hawaiian Nene goose; and

S. J. Res. 135. Joint resolution providing for the construction of demonstration plants for the production, from saline or brackish waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses.

EXTENSION OF RENEGOTIATION ACT OF 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11749) to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 6 months, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 3. Period for filing claims for credit or refund of overpayments of income tax resulting from renegotiation.

(a) Amendment of 1954 code: Section 6511 (d) (2) (A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to special period of limitations with respect to net operating loss carrybacks) is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence thereof the following: "; except that if a net operating loss carryback is created by the elimination of excessive profits by a renegotiation (as defined in section 1481 (a) (1) (A)), the period shall not expire before September 1, 1959, or the expiration of the 12th month following the month in which the agreement or order for the elimination of such excessive profits becomes final, whichever is the later."

(b) Amendment of 1939 code: Section 322 (b) (6) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 (relating to special period of limitations with respect to net operating loss carrybacks) is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence thereof the following: "; except that if a net operating loss carryback is created by the elimination of excessive profits by a renegotiation (as defined in section 3806 (a) (1) (A)), the period shall not expire before September 1, 1959, or the expiration of the 12th month following the month in which the agreement or order for the elimination of such excessive profits becomes final, whichever is the later."

(c) Effective dates: The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to claims for credit or refund resulting from the elimination of excessive profits by renegotiation to which section 6511 (d) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 applies. The amendment made by subsection (b) shall apply with respect to claims for credit or refund resulting from the elimination of excessive profits by renegotiation to which section 322 (b) (6) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 applies, but only with respect to claims resulting from renegotiations of excessive profits received or accrued for taxable years ending after December 31, 1952.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The amendment has been discussed with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend. The Senate will be in order. Attachés of the Senate will please refrain from conversation. Members of the Senate who desire to converse will please retire to the cloakroom. The Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Presiding Officer. The amendment has been discussed with the chairman of the Committee on Finance, and he has informed me that he believes it should come up as a separate piece of proposed legislation, not as an amendment to the pending bill. I have offered it as an amendment because the longer the matter is delayed the longer the possibility will exist that no settlement will be made on very justifiable claims. It involves many industries. An identical bill was passed in the other body. It is H. R. 13173, introduced by the majority leader of the other House, Mr. MCCORMACK.

As I understand, the administration has no opposition to the bill, according to Mr. Stam, counsel of the Committee on Finance. I believe the Treasury Department recognizes that the Internal Revenue Code should be amended to adjust an inequity which has grown out of an apparent inadvertence on the part of Congress at the time of the preparation and adoption of the Internal Revenue Code. The amendment is directed toward claims for refund which arise out of the renegotiation proceedings. There are plants in the State of Minnesota which are affected. I have a letter indicating the nature of one of the problems which have arisen as a result of the inequity in our present tax laws on the subject of renegotiation and the refunds which have accrued under such renegotiation. I shall read a paragraph from the letter from one company which is affected. It states:

The allocation by the Board to X Co. of excessive profits of approximately $1,600,000 results in its having an operating loss for the year and consequently a net operating loss carryback to the year 1952. This would ordinarily give rise to a claim for refund for overpayment of tax in 1952, but by this late date, under existing law, the statute of limitations has run on the right to obtain such refund and the net operating loss carryback is worthless.

In other words, under present tax law there is what is called an operating loss carryback provision, which can be utilized to make adjustments when renegotiation board decisions have resulted in a substantial operating loss.

In this particular instance it means a difference in tax credit of many thousands of dollars for the one company I have mentioned. This is only one of many such instances. It is something which, it seems to me, should be corrected.

I know the argument can be made, "Well, let us do it next year." That may be a very good suggestion. But each year that we put off these matters we apply the old maxim: "Justice delayed is justice denied." It becomes ever more true.

So, since the other House has passed the bill, I believe unanimously, and since it was reported by the House Committee on Ways and Means unanimously, and there seems to be no adverse report on the part of the administration, the Bureau of the Budget, the Treasury, or the Internal Revenue Service, it seems to me it is desirable and proper to include this amendment in the bill before the Senate, the extension of the Renegotiation Act.

I feel certain there would be no objection in the House, because this is a House bill, which has been prepared in the form of an amendment to a Senate bill. Therefore, I ask that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. BYRD. I do not wish to prejudice the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota, but I hope he will not press too hard to place it in the bill. My objection is that the amendment is retroactive. It opens up closed cases. It goes back to 1953. If we go back to 1953 to open up such cases, then, it seems to me, we should go back to the beginning of the Renegotiation Act, which was about 1941. Why stop at 1953?

As a member of the Committee on Finance, I have always been very careful to consider any proposed retroactive legislation which will open up closed cases. If that is done in one case, it will have to be done in others. I can see no justification for going back to 1953, because the Renegotiation Act first became effective in 1941. Cases can be found in 1952, 1950, and 1945.

The Committee on Finance will be glad to give consideration to the proposed legislation when Congress next convenes, but I hope such a provision will not be included in the present bill. This is not a tax bill; it relates to the extending of the Renegotiation Act for a period of 6 months. I certainly am opposed to including a retroactive feature without full hearings having first been held by the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I appreciate the views of the Senator from Virginia. I know he is sympathetic to the general purposes of this particular proposal. Rather than have the proposal prejudiced by an adverse vote, which I am afraid might result because of our great respect for the views of the Senator from Virginia on technical matters, I shall urge that the chairman of the committee give me assurance now that in the next Congress, with the reintroduction of this particular measure, prompt consideration will be given to it, consideration which, I trust, will result in favorable action.

Mr. BYRD. I shall be glad to give that assurance.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Virginia gives me that assurance. On that basis, I withdraw my amendment. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Virginia in giving me this assurance and consideration. I wanted to get the matter before the Senate, because I think we have a just case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be

no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 11479) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer [Mr. TALMADGE in the chair] appointed Mr. BYRD, Mr. KERR, Mr. FREAR, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, and Mr. WILLIAMS conferees on the part of the Senate.

ESTATE OF A. A. ALEXANDER

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, at the request of, and after consultation with, the majority leader, I have been asked to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 2517, H. R. 9262, which is a private claim bill. The purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay the estate of A. A. Alexander the sum of $1,131.50 in settlement of all claims against the United States based on damage done to furniture and household goods belonging to the late A. A. Alexander when that property was shipped from the Territory of the Virgin Islands when Mr. Alexander resigned as Governor of the Territory.

The report of the committee shows that the Department of the Interior has written a letter concerning his claim. The Bureau of the Budget has no objection.

When the bill was called on the call of the calendar the other day, an objection was entered by the majority calendar committee. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] tells me that he has discussed the matter with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], who has no objection to having the matter taken up on motion. Therefore, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 2517, H. R. 9262.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9262) for the relief of the estate of A. A. Alexander.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS THROUGH GRANTS FOR SUPPORT OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 4039) to authorize the expenditure of funds through grants for support of scientific research, and for other purposes, which were, on page 1, line 4, strike out "engaged in making" and insert "authorized to enter into"; on page 2, line 13, strike out "Committee on Appropriations and to the Committees on Government Operations" and insert "appropriate committees", and on page 2, line 17, strike out "section 1" and insert "the first section."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House. They are technical in nature and in no way change the substance or purpose of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on concurring in the amendments of the House.

The amendments were concurred in.

AMENDMENT OF PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT, 1921, AS AMENDED

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, after consultation with the leaders on both sides, with the members of the Committee on the Judiciary, and with the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 9020.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair) laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 9020) to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wyoming.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on May 15, the Senate passed a bill amending the Packers and Stockyards Act. The bill was introduced by the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] and myself. Hearings were held by the Committee on the Judiciary. After long consideration, the measure was passed by the Senate and sent to the House.

The House, however, did not act upon the Senate bill. The problem of amending the Packers and Stockyards Act was considered by both the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Indeed, I think the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce also gave consideration to the measure. But instead of taking up the Senate bill and amending it, the House passed its own bill, H. R. 9020.

I have consulted, as I said, with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the leadership on both sides. I am now prepared to ask that the Senate pass H. R. 9020.

The result of the debate, of the action of the Senate, and the consideration of the problem in the committees of both Houses will be an improvement in the present law. I think it would be a mistake to allow this Congress to adjourn without having taken action in the nature of progress as contained in the bill.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. As a matter of fact, a part of the Senate bill, at least, is embodied in the House bill. I refer to the part with respect to chainstores.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. The loophole in the present law, by which chainstores escape regulation by the Federal Trade Commission on nonmeat products, is closed in the House bill.

Mr. WATKINS. At least that much progress will be made if the House bill shall be passed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That much progress will be made. The Federal Trade Commission is given authority to regulate oleomargarine, margarine, and the so-called hot pursuit amendment, as is provided by the House bill.

By that, it is meant that concurrent jurisdiction between the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Agriculture is preserved. In one case, the Federal Trade Commission, before proceeding, will consult the Secretary of Agriculture; in the other case, the Secretary of Agriculture, before proceeding, will consult the Federal Trade Commission—so as to avoid duplication. This provision constitutes progress; and I believe the provision should be retained.

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to say that, although it constitutes progress, I hope that sometime we are able to have enacted into law the remaining provisions of the bill which was passed by the Senate. But we shall have to deal with them at some other time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; at another session of Congress.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the bill provides for a rather agreeable division of jurisdiction between the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Agriculture. I know the bill is acceptable to the House, and I know that the agencies concerned can well live with the provisions of the bill.

So I am agreeable to the request of the Senator from Wyoming that the bill be passed. After the bill is passed, if any weaknesses develop, or if, under the provisions of the bill, a satisfactory job is not done, I shall join him, next year, in proposing improvements in the program.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois is very kind; and, naturally, what he has stated will be the purpose of the subcommittee in charge of the bill.

Mr. President, I call for the third reading and passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 9020) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12226) to amend the Virgin Islands Corporation Act (63 Stat. 350), and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of August 23, 1958, p. 19619.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—although I shall not object—may we have an explanation of the report?

Mr. JACKSON. Certainly.

Let me say that the report makes two changes in the bill as passed by the Senate.

The first change the report makes is in the provision voted by the Senate in regard to the saline water distillation plant to be built by the Virgin Islands Corporation. The Senate conferees agreed to delete specific reference to the power features of the saline water distillation plant to be built by the Virgin Islands Corporation. Such reference in the bill is unnecesary, because the Corporation has authority, under existing law, to construct and operate power facilities.

The other change pertains to the sale of the corporate assets. Under the Senate version, such sales of assets would have to be made at public auction. Under the conference report, such sales, when in a value exceeding $500, could be made at public auction or pursuant to sealed bids, after public advertisement in either case. Sales of assets amounting to less than $500 could be consummated without public auction or competitive bids. The word "property," as used in the conferees' version of the Senate amendment No. 2, refers to assets of the Corporation, not to products grown or produced in the Corporation's business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the report.

The report was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS TO FILE TWO REPORTS DURING THE SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Select Committee on Small Business, I ask unanimous consent that the committee be given authority to file two reports during the sine die adjournment of Congress. The first of these reports will be entitled "The Role of Small Business in Defense Missile Procurement"; the second will be entitled "Government Procurement—1958."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida? Without objection, it is so ordered.

SECOND ANNUAL CONGRESS ON BETTER LIVING

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to a unique event which will take place here in Washington next October, and which deserves advance recognition, since we shall not be in session at that time.

From October 6 through October 8, 100 housewives from the 48 States and Alaska will attend the second annual Congress on Better Living. This congress consists of women delegates who represent the families of America, and whose chief aim is to further the link between American industry and those families and their needs in the constant search for new and more universal ways of better living. The Congress on Better Living was developed from the pioneer effort convened in 1956 by the Federal Government's Housing and Home Finance Agency. The project is continuing under the sponsorship of McCall's magazine, who will maintain it as an annual public service.

Today, when all of us are deeply concerned with all efforts that strengthen our economic structure and advance the cause of efficient and progressive distribution of consumer goods, it is noteworthy that the Congress on Better Living already has done much to give manufacturers and retailers information on what their customers want. In addition, it has already inspired a most productive home building effort—the Congress on Better Living home certification program.

Those of us who are in Washington at that time will, I am sure, want to greet the charming representatives of our respective States who will come to Washington—as we do—to talk, to voice their views, and to get something done. More power to them and to the industries which help these women build and furnish the homes that are the source of our national leadership.

PROGRAM TO ALLEVIATE CONDITIONS OF UNEMPLOYMENT AND UNDEREMPLOYMENT IN CERTAIN DEPRESSED AREAS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on Senate bill 3683.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3683) to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas, which were, on page 2, line 24, strike out " 'Commissioner' " and insert " 'Commissioner')"; on page 5, line 25, strike out all after "States" over through and including "States)" in line 1, page 6; on page 7, line 25, strike out "in substantial" and insert "to any extent in"; on page 8, line 13, strike out "Except as provided in subsection (c), such" and insert "Such"; on page 9, line 6, strike out "section 12" and insert "section 11"; on page 9, strike out lines 19 through 22, inclusive, and insert:

(7) Such loans shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury which shall not be greater than the current average yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities as computed (in the case of any loan) at the end of the month preceding the month in which the loan is made, plus one-quarter of 1 percent per annum;

On page 11, strike out line 13 over through and including line 5, on page 12; on page 12, line 6, strike out "(d)" and insert "(c)"; on page 12, line 6, strike out "raised under section 9" and insert "appropriated under section 8"; on page 12, strike out line 14 over through and including line 17, on page 14; on page 14, line 19, strike out "SEC. 8." and insert "SEC. 7."; on page 16, lines 15 and 16, strike out "(including a loan under section 7 of this act)"; on page 16, after line 25, insert:

(e) No financial assistance shall be extended under this section with respect to any public facility which would compete with an existing privately owned public utility rendering a service to the public at rates or charges subject to regulation by a State regulatory body, unless the State regulatory body determines that in the area to be served by the public facility for which the financial assistance is to be extended there is a need for an increase in such service (taking into consideration reasonably foreseeable future needs) which the existing public utility is not able to meet through its existing facilities or through an expansion which it is prepared to undertake.

On page 17, strike out line 2 over through and including line 4, on page 18, and insert "SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $200 million to provide funds for loans under this act."; on page 18, line 6, strike out "SEC. 10." and insert "SEC. 9."; on page 18, line 23, strike out "SEC. 11." and insert "SEC. 10."; on page 19, line 3, strike out "may" and insert "shall"; on page 19, line 4, strike out all after "staff" down through and including "purpose" in line 7, and insert ", including persons whose services are procured under section 11 (10)"; on page 19, line 11, strike out "SEC. 12." and insert "SEC. 11."; on page 22, line 8, strike out "sections 6 and 7" and insert "section 6"; on page 23, line 10, strike out "SEC. 13." and insert "SEC. 12."; on page 24, line 5, strike out "SEC. 14" and insert "SEC. 13."; on page 24, line 12, after "municipality" insert "or part thereof"; on page 25, line 5, strike out "in substantial" and insert "to any extent in"; on page 26, line 8, strike out "act." " and insert "act."; on page 26, strike out lines 9 through 12, inclusive, and insert:

"(f) Not more than 10 per centum of the funds authorized for capital grants under section 103 after June 1, 1958, shall be available to provide financial assistance under this section."

On page 26, line 14, strike out "SEC. 15." and insert "SEC. 14."; on page 26, line 21, strike out "SEC. 16." and insert "SEC. 15."; on page 27, strike out line 22 over through and including line 13, on page 28.

On page 28, line 15, strike out "SEC. 18." and insert "SEC. 16."; on page 30, line 3, strike out "SEC. 19." and insert "SEC. 17."; on page 30, line 23, strike out "SEC. 20." and insert "SEC. 18."; on page 31, line 12, strike out "SEC. 21." and insert "SEC. 19."; on page 32, line 4, strike out "SEC. 22." and insert "SEC. 20."; on page 32, line 8, strike out "SEC. 23." and insert "SEC. 21."; and on page 32, after line 20, insert:

RECORDS AN AUDIT

SEC. 22. (a) Each recipient of assistance under section 6 or 7 of this act shall keep such records as the Commissioner shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and the disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

(b) The Commissioner and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient that are pertinent to assistance received under section 6 or 7 of this act.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Illinois tell us what the amendments amount to?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, I shall be glad to. This is the area redevelopment bill, which was passed by this body, and subsequently was passed by the House of Representatives with three major amendments.

In the first place, in accordance with the general policy of the House, the House amended the proposed industrial and rural area loan fund provisions, by providing instead for an authorization for the appropriation of funds to make such loans.

Second, the House deleted the Senate provision for a $100 million loan fund for public facilities to aid in attracting private enterprises to these areas.

Third, the House deleted a Senate provision for the payment of retraining payments to persons not entitled to unemployment compensation, but who are receiving training for new jobs.

The House also adopted an amendment prohibiting any public facility grant which would compete with an existing private utility; an amendment requiring that each recipient of assistance keep prescribed records, subject to review by the Commissioner and the Comptroller General; an amendment revising the wording in the provision in respect to plant relocation; an amendment eliminating the Senate limitation of 300 rural redevelopment counties——

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from Illinois will yield further, let me ask whether he proposes that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct; I do.

Mr. CURTIS. And that is all?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is all.

Mr. CURTIS. And no other changes?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may submit, for printing in the RECORD, a statement in explanation of the purpose of the bill and the changes made by the House amendments, and also a supplemental memorandum which analyzes the House changes in the measure in more detail.

There being no objection, the statement and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS

I know that all Senate sponsors and supporters of the area redevelopment bill, S. 3683, were gratified by the favorable action taken on last Friday by the House of Representatives on that bill.

This is another long step forward in our country's effort to restore economic strength and stability to the areas, both rural and industrial, that have long suffered from excessive unemployment and underemployment. It looks to the renewal of private enterprises in these areas under the stimulus of Government loans and technical assistance—enterprises which will give to these communities the work opportunities by which they seek to help themselves.

It is a further source of gratification to us that in its action on last Friday the House approved the major programs of assistance proposed in the Senate bill.

Significant changes were made in the bill by amendments in the other body, and I shall refer briefly to them in a moment. But I emphasize that after its careful study, the House of Representatives has placed its firm stamp of approval on the principal provisions of the area redevelopment bill: (a) The establishment of an area redevelopment administration; (b) the extension of assistance to both industrial and rural areas—carefully defined—suffering from chronic unemployment and underemployment; (c) loan programs for the establishment of new or expanded industries or commercial enterprises up to an aggregate of $100 million for industrial areas and $100 million for rural areas; (d) grants not to exceed $75 annually for public facilities that may help attract enterprises to such areas; (e) technical assistance and other general information to assist in redevelopment in such areas; (f) commercial redevelopment in such areas under the urban renewal program; (g) vocational training and retraining under existing programs; (h) a national advisory board; and (i) numerous protective provisions against abuses.

This brief summary is enough to show the high degree of agreement between the two bodies.

The major amendments of the House were as follows:

First, the House in accordance with its general insistence upon keeping the added check of the appropriation procedure upon such financing programs, amended the proposed industrial and rural area loan funds to an authorization for appropriations for funds for such loans;

Second, the House deleted the Senate provision (sec. 7) for a $100 million loan fund for public facilities to aid in attracting private enterprises to these areas;

Third, the House deleted a Senate provision (sec. 17) for the payment of retraining payments to persons not entitled to unemployment compensation, who are receiving training for a new job.

Other changes made by the House included: (a) a prohibition against any public facility grant that would compete with an existing private utility; (b) a requirement that each recipient of assistance keep prescribed records, subject to review by the Commissioner and the Comptroller General; (c) a revision of the wording in the provision in respect to plant relocation; (d) elimination of the Senate limitation of 300 rural redevelopment counties, of the appointment of local redevelopment committees, and of the specific employment of private firms for technical assistance; and (e) minor changes in the urban renewal part of the program.

With the Senate bill, as amended by the other body, now at the desk, we have before us the obvious decision whether to send the bill to conference, or to concur in the House amendments.

I have conferred with the principal sponsors of the bill on the committee, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], as well as the majority leader, who has taken an active interest in this bill from the start, and it is the judgment and recommendation of us all that the Senate would do well to concur in the House amendments.

The principal reasons for this are two: First, as I have already stated, on the major, positive features the two bodies are in agreement; and second, in view of the shortness of time remaining in the session, and the inevitable procedural complexities in arranging a conference, it seems unwise to risk the loss of the very desirable, agreed upon programs in the last minute rush for adjournment.

In most respects I would have preferred the Senate provisions. But I point out that the House would have been very hard to move on the question of loans versus authorizations for appropriations in any event. And some of the House amendments like the requirements for recordkeeping, the prohibition against aiding public facilities that would compete with private utilities, and the revision on plant relocation are probably improvements.

In the eyes of those who have believed that the Senate bill went too far, indeed, the deletion of the $100-million public facilities loan program and of the retraining subsistence payments program may also be welcome changes.

Under all the circumstances, therefore, I hope that the Senate will concur in the House amendments, and that we may send the constructive measure on to the White House with our wholehearted blessing.

SUPPLEMENTAL MEMORANDUM, AUGUST 16, 1958—SUBJECT: REDEVELOPMENT BILL: COMPARISON OF VERSIONS PASSED BY SENATE AND HOUSE

S. 3683, the area redevelopment bill, passed the Senate on May 13, 1958. It was reported by the House Banking and Currency Committee on July 1, 1958. On August 15, 1958, it was passed by the House. A memorandum of August 7, 1958 (a copy of which is attached), contains the changes made by the House Banking and Currency Committee in the Senate version of the bill. All those

changes were adopted by the House. The House made three additional amendments:

I. BORROWING AUTHORITY

Section 9 of the Senate bill contained an authorization to borrow money from the Treasury for the loan programs under the act ($300 million under the Senate bill; $200 million under the House bill). This was changed by the House to an authorization for appropriations, and corresponding amendments made in other sections. (House bill, sec. 8, pp. 17–18, also pp. 9 and 12; see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 15, 1958, p. 17894.)

II. RETRAINING SUBSISTENCE PAYMENTS

Section 17 of the Senate bill authorized the Secretary of Labor to enter into agreements with States to make weekly retraining payments to unemployed persons in redevelopment areas who are not entitled to unemployment compensation, up to a maximum of 13 weeks and up to the amount of average weekly employment compensation payable in that State. This section was deleted by the House. (House bill, sec. 16, pp. 28–29; see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 15, 1958, p. 17896.)

III. RELOCATION OF PLANTS

Section 6 of the Senate bill, which provides for loans for industrial projects in industrial and rural redevelopment areas, contained a restriction on assistance to relocated plans. This provision was amended by the House as follows:

(Matter in brackets deleted; matter in italic inserted.)

"Such financial assistance shall not be extended for working capital, or to assist establishments relocating from one area to another when such assistance will result *to any extent* in [substantial] detriment to the area of original location by increasing unemployment."

A similar amendment was made to the comparable provision in the section relating to urban renewal. (House bill, sec. 6, pp. 7–8; sec. 13, p. 25; see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 15, 1958, p. 17896.)

MEMORANDUM, AUGUST 7, 1958—SUBJECT: AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT: COMPARISON OF VERSIONS PASSED BY SENATE AND REPORTED TO HOUSE

S. 3683, the area redevelopment bill, passed the Senate on May 13, 1958. It was reported by the House Banking and Currency Committee (H. Rept. 2099) on July 1, 1958. This memorandum lists the differences between the bill as it passed the Senate (the Senate bill) and as it was reported to the House (the House bill).

I. RURAL REDEVELOPMENT AREAS

The Senate bill placed a limit of 300 on the number of counties which could be included within designated rural redevelopment areas (sec. 5 (b), pp. 5–6).

The House bill eliminated this limitation (sec. 5 (b), pp. 5–6). (House amendment No. 2.)

II. LOCAL REDEVELOPMENT COMMITTEES

The Senate bill (sec. 6 (c), pp. 11–12) required that a local redevelopment committee be appointed for the purpose of approving applicants under section 6 for financial assistance, in any area where there is no agency or instrumentality of a State or political subdivision qualified to approve applicants for assistance.

The House bill deleted this provision (pp. 11–12). (House amendments Nos. 3, 6, and 7.)

III. LOANS FOR PUBLIC FACILITIES

The Senate bill (sec. 7, pp. 12–14) authorized lending to a State or political subdivision, an Indian tribe or an organization representing a redevelopment area to finance a public facility in the area; $100 million of the $300 million revolving fund (sec. 9, p. 17) was designated for this purpose.

The House bill eliminated the entire section (pp. 12–14) and reduced the revolving fund from $300 million to $200 million (p. 17). Section numbers and cross references were revised accordingly. (House amendments Nos. 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 26–34.)

IV. GRANTS FOR PUBLIC UTILITY FACILITIES

The House bill (sec. 7, p. 17) added to section 7, which authorizes grants for public utilities, a prohibition on such a grant for a public facility which would compete with an existing privately owned public utility subject to State regulation, unless the State regulatory body determines that there is need for an increase in services which the existing utility is not able to meet through its existing facilities or an expansion it is prepared to undertake.

The Senate bill contained no such provision in the section on grants for public facilities (sec. 8, pp. 14–16). (House amendment No. 12.)

V. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

The Senate bill (sec. 11, pp. 18–19) authorized technical assistance for redevelopment areas through members of the agency's staff or through the employment of private individuals, partnerships, firms, corporations or suitable institutions under contract.

The House bill (sec. 10, p. 19) eliminated this provision for employment of private individuals, etc., under contract, but added a cross-reference to the authority to hire experts and consultants by contract or appointment in section 11 (10) at page 23 of the House bill. (House amendment No. 18.)

VI. URBAN RENEWAL

The Senate bill amended title I of the Housing Act of 1949 by authorizing financial assistance under that act for a municipality within an industrial redevelopment area without regard to the predominantly residential requirement of the act (sec. 14, pp. 24–26). The Senate bill also provided that such financial assistance should be included within the 10 percent ceiling on projects in areas not clearly predominantly residential now contained in the act.

The House bill made two changes in this section:

First, the House bill made it clear that this assistance could be given if only a part of a municipality was in an industrial redevelopment area (sec. 13, p. 25). (House amendment No. 23.)

Second, the House bill provides that assistance under this provision is available only from funds authorized for capital grants after June 1, 1958, and only up to 10 percent of such funds, and eliminated the requirement that assistance under this bill must be taken into account in determining the aggregate amount available for the other nonresidential provisions (sec. 13, pp. 26–27). (House amendments Nos. 24 and 25.)

VII. REPORTS AND AUDIT

The House bill (sec. 23, pp. 33–34) requires each recipient of assistance under the loans (sec. 6) and grants (sec. 7) provisions to keep such records as may be prescribed by the Commission, relating to the assistance and the project assisted and provides that the Commissioner and Comptroller General shall have access to all records relating to assistance under sections 6 and 7.

The Senate bill did not contain such provisions. (House amendment No. 35.)

* * * * *

House Report No. 2099 contains at pages 16–17 a discussion of the changes made in the Senate bill by the House Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the Senate concurred in the amendments of the House be reconsidered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which indicates in some detail the attitude in the past of the administration under President Eisenhower toward area redevelopment. I hope this statement will be on the desks of the President's advisers when the President considers whether he should sign the bill, because if the President does not sign the bill at this stage, he will go against the principles which he and his administration have been espousing for some years.

So I hope this statement will be shown to Mr. Sherman Adams and to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and to all the other gentlemen who are assisting in making policy for this country.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT

In connection with the Senate passage of S. 3683, the Area Redevelopment Act, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to, and include in the RECORD, statements indicating President Eisenhower's support for legislation of this type.

Since the bill was first introduced on July 28, 1955, the Economic Report of the President has endorsed similar legislation every year.

Thus, as early as January 24, 1956, in the Economic Report of the President, transmitted to the Congress, the President stated his recommendation that Congress pass legislation to "establish an area assistance program for aiding communities experiencing substantial and persistent unemployment, and make technical assistance more broadly available to aid urban and rural communities in developing balanced and progressive economies."

Again, in the Economic Report of the President transmitted to the Congress dated January 23, 1957, the President again called upon Congress to "establish an Area Assistance Administration * * * and to enlarge the program of Federal aid to include loans and expanded technical assistance for areas of persistent unemployment."

Finally, in this year's Economic Report of the President, transmitted to Congress dated January 20, 1958, the President recommended that Congress "establish an Area Assistance Administration * * * to extend loans, research grants, and technical assistance in areas of persistent unemployment."

Beyond the recommendations contained in the Economic Reports, the President has several times expressed his recognition of the need for area redevelopment legislation in his press conferences and messages to Congress during the past few years. I should like to set forth in the RECORD the press reports of his views.

In a press conference on October 24, 1955, Dr. Arthur F. Burns, speaking for the President, stated that President Eisenhower expected to submit to Congress in January a "home point 4 program designed to help extend good times to those American communities depressed by chronic unemploy-

ment in the midst of general prosperity." I attach hereto copies of the articles appearing in the Washington Star and in the New York Times of October 25, 1955.

[From the New York Times of October 25, 1955]

EISENHOWER BACKS POINT 4 PROJECT FOR PARTS OF UNITED STATES—WILL ASK CONGRESS TO HELP DEPRESSED SECTIONS SHARE IN NATION'S PROSPERITY—GETS ECONOMIC REPORT—PRESIDENT ALSO HEARS LODGE ON U. N. DEVELOPMENTS—AGAIN STANDS UNAIDED

(By Russell Baker)

DENVER, October 24.—President Eisenhower will ask Congress next year for a domestic version of the point 4 technical assistance program to aid the Nation's chronically depressed areas.

The program will be designed to help scattered depressed sections share in the general prosperity through the cooperation of Federal, State, and local governments with private enterprise.

President Eisenhower gave it his strong approval today as a way of extending the good times to every section.

The program was outlined to him in a conference with Dr. Arthur F. Burns, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, and Gabriel Hauge, the President's personal political adviser.

A third visitor today was Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., United States Ambassador to the United Nations.

Mr. Lodge commented that the Soviet Union might accept eventually the President's proposal for an exchange of military blueprints and aerial inspection rights leading toward disarmament.

GOES BEYOND DULLES

The Ambassador said that he was optimistic concerning some real action on the program at this session of the United Nations.

He went slightly beyond John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State. At a news conference here last week, Mr. Dulles said only that he expected the Big Four foreign ministers to clear up misunderstandings about the President's program. The ministers meet at Geneva this week.

Mr. Lodge also reported on United Nations developments, including France's withdrawal from the General Assembly and the talks on disarmament. Part of the meeting took place while the President sat in a wheel chair on the sun deck outside his hospital room.

All the President's visitors today commented in glowing language on his physical appearance.

Medical bulletins from Fitzsimons Army Hospital continued to report progress in the President's recovery from his moderate coronary thrombosis, or clot formation in one of the arteries feeding blood to the heart.

Twice during the morning the President again stood up unassisted. Frequently during the day he sat on the edge of his bed with his legs dangling over the side. He stood yesterday for the first time since entering the hospital, but he has still not taken a step.

Dr. Burns outlined the assistance program in a half-hour hospital conference that included the state of the national economy, the farm-price dilemma and the recent drop in the stock market.

Dr. Burns said that the project would be included in the legislative program sent to Congress in January. It calls for a new Federal agency within one of the major departments.

It is "eminently reasonable," Dr. Burns said, "to assume that the new agency would come under the Department of Labor or the Department of Commerce.

NO MIRACLES EXPECTED

Dr. Burns said that he did not expect miracles from the program. But he said that it represented the Nation's first attempt to come to grips realistically in a practical way with small pockets of depression that persisted in scattered regions.

The Nation's economy is excellent, Dr. Burns reported. Although the stock market drop on the Monday following the President's heart attack was large, he said subsequent gains had made the overall drop in the last month a small one.

The President, according to Dr. Hauge, is intensely interested in measures by the Department of Agriculture to relieve disparity between farm and general income.

On Saturday, Ezra Taft Benson, the Secretary of Agriculture, will confer with the President. He is expected to outline the farm program that the administration will back in Congress.

Mr. Hauge indicated that this would not call for abandoning the flexible price-support program introduced by the administration. He suggested, instead, that the Department had been working on additions. It will not, he said, include any discredited ideas.

At a news conference, Dr. Burns likened the new program for aiding depressed areas to the point 4 program of technical assistance to underdeveloped nations.

It is an attempt to reclaim industrial communities that in spite of the good times we have been having, still have persistent unemployment and depression, he explained.

TYPICAL AREAS NOTED

Typical areas, he said, are several New England textile communities and Pennsylvania and West Virginia areas where the economy is built on coal.

Historically, such pockets of depression have existed even when the country was booming economically, Dr. Burns said. The Federal Government, however, never has attempted before to deal with them on a planned scale, he added.

The agency to be created, Dr. Burns said, will coordinate much aid and relief work now scattered throughout many agencies.

The economist reported that the President had expressed deep interest in this concept of extending the good times to lagging communities.

Dr. Burns noted that he had found the President well informed on the stock market dip and other matters. James C. Hagerty, White House press secretary, had reported a few days ago that the President had not seen a newspaper since he entered the hospital.

Today, however, Mr. Hagerty said that the President had been kept informed on the economic news by Sherman Adams, the assistant to the President.

This afternoon the President saw two visitors. They were L. M. Pexton, president of the Denver Union Stockyards, and B. G. Gordon, Denver contractor.

[From the Washington Star of October 25, 1955]

PRESIDENT TO ASK AID FOR JOBLESS COMMUNITIES

DENVER, October 25.—President Eisenhower plans to submit to Congress in January a home point 4 program designed to help extend good times to those American communities depressed by chronic unemployment in the midst of general prosperity.

The program, as outlined by Dr. Arthur F. Burns, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, calls for Federal loans and technical planning assistance to help stimulate new economic development in such communities.

A new Government agency would be established within an existing department—probably Commerce or Labor—to coordinate the various Federal aid activities.

OUTLINES PROGRAM

Dr. Burns outlined the program to newsmen here yesterday after a conference with Mr. Eisenhower in the Fitzsimons Army Hospital room where he is making uncomplicated progress toward recovery from a heart attack.

Dr. Burns reported that the President not only gave his strong approval to general principles of the new program, but asked that work go forward promptly on some details that still need to be ironed out so that legislation needed to put it in effect can be proposed to Congress in January.

He said the program is designed to aid industrial communities, which still have substantial persistent unemployment in spite of the good times we have been having to help themselves out of depression.

As an example of such communities, he cited some textile towns in New England, hurt by southward movement of the industry, and some coal towns in Pennsylvania and West Virginia.

Dr. Burns said Mr. Eisenhower was keenly interested in trying to extend good times to one-industry communities in such spotty situations.

While he emphasized that "I can't promise too much" for the new program, he said he believes it "comes to grips realistically and in a practical way for the very first time with this problem that has been so recalcitrant in nature across the decades."

Under the principles he outlined, Federal loans would be made on a participating basis with local interests to help finance industrial development projects that have been worked out on a local level and which have won the approval of a State development commission.

Another important function of the proposed new agency, he said, would be to make certain that the chronically depressed communities get the technical assistance they need to develop programs for their own economic development.

Dr. Burns told a reporter he thought it would be fair to describe the proposals as a "home-front point 4 program."

He said it probably would be mentioned briefly in the President's state of the Union message to Congress, with the details to be spelled out in a special message submitted later.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Accordingly, the President did recommend action in his state of the Union message and in his budget message in 1956, and I attach hereto the New York Times report as to the recommendation in the budget message:

AREA REDEVELOPMENT

All of us are greatly concerned because certain chronic labor surplus areas are not sharing in our general prosperity. The primary responsibility for promoting the economic redevelopment of these areas rests with the local community and the States. However, I believe that the Federal Government should give much broader assistance than is possible under present law. Accordingly, the administration is recommending new legislation authorizing Federal loans and grants, in cooperation with the States, to assist communities suffering from substantial and persistent unemployment. Under this program the Secretary of Commerce would take the lead for the Federal Government utilizing also the facilities of the Department of Labor, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and other interested agencies.

The President reaffirmed his support for passage of an area redevelopment

bill in his press conference of June 6, 1956, and I attach hereto the New York Times report of this conference appearing, as published on June 7, 1956:

Edward P. Morgan, of the American Broadcasting Co. Mr. President, another legislative item. Your administration has backed legislation for emergency help to the country's chronic depressed areas. However, that legislation is now still in the committees of both Houses, and it was not included on the White House list of important legislation last week.

Does this mean that you have downgraded the importance of the problem?

Answer. Not at all. I was putting things down that some of them weren't moving very well. Now, this one has been under consideration from a number of different ways, not only the bill itself, but in a—what do you call it? The mobilization—general mobilization bill that Arthur Flemming [Director, Office of Defense Mobilization] administers—through every number of kinds of bills, different bills, there is some help you can give through small-business bills and all the rest of them.

So just to name that one alone is really downgrading my interest in it, because my interest is much more than is contained just in that single bill.

Coming next to January 1957, the New York Times reports the President's recommendation again in his budget message of January 16 for legislation to authorize aids to communities in chronic economic distress. I attach a copy of the article on this budget message:

AREA REDEVELOPMENT—PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Despite continuing high levels of employment and income, pockets of unemployment persist in several areas. Legislation is again recommended to authorize the Secretary of Commerce, with the assistance of other appropriate agencies, to provide loans and other aids to communities which seem to be in chronic economic distress. This aid will help those communities in attempting to solve their basic problems.

The President reiterated his support for this kind of legislation in his most recent budget message, as reported in the New York Times of January 14, 1958:

I repeat my recommendation of last year for the prompt enactment of appropriate authority under which communities with basic problems of persistent unemployment can be assisted in their solution.

He has also informed his Republican supporters of his views in this area. As reported in the March 9, 1958, New York Times, the text of the President's letter to GOP chiefs includes the following:

A number of administration recommendations for new legislation which could be of great help in stimulating the economy are already pending before the Congress. Again I urge Congress to act promptly on such measures as: * * * (c) Special assistance to areas of high and persistent unemployment.

Again, as recently as May 28, 1958, the President reaffirmed his interest in this type of legislation in a press conference. I attach an excerpt from the New York Times article on this conference, as published on May 29:

John Herling, of Editors Syndicate: Mr. President, you will recall, sir, that you regretted the defeat last session of the bill for relief of chronically depressed areas. Now at this session such a bill, a combined operation of Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, and Senator PAYNE, Republican, of Maine, a bipartisan thing, has already passed the Senate, but supporters of the bill are fearful that it may be blocked in the House. Now unless they feel, unless, they say, a strong push comes from the White House in time. Now would you comment on the importance of legislation providing a real program for depressed areas?

Answer. Well, of course, you know this, that time and again I have recommended Congressional action, to this, but I would like to point out, I am pushing a defense bill, I am pushing a foreign trade bill, I am—or reciprocal trade, I am pushing mutual security, I am pushing a lot of other programs, so I don't know whether I could just take time off and push here for a week or so in the one you are talking about. But I will do this. I will ask my people to see whether they want to analyze it or they will analyze it to see whether there is anything in it that would prevent me from doing so. I am in favor of the principle.

I think the foregoing suffices to show that President Eisenhower has had a rather continuous record of expressions of support for legislation to relieve the plight of pockets of persistent and chronic unemployment within our economy. Now that the Congress has seen fit to send to the White House the area redevelopment bill, S. 3683, I trust that this support will lead the President to sign the bill.

INCREASE IN MEMBERSHIP OF BOARD OF APPEALS OF PATENT OFFICE

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 1864.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1864) to authorize an increase in the membership of the Board of Appeals of the Patent Office; to provide increased salaries for certain officers and employees of the Patent Office; and for other purposes, which was, on page 2, line 2, strike out all after "$20,000" down through and including "amended" in line 13.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this bill was introduced in the Senate by the able Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], on behalf of himself and myself.

The bill was passed by the Senate, and went to the House of Representatives. An amendment was adopted by the House; the amendment reduces the salaries provided for some of the officials of the Patent Office.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and I and the other members of the Judiciary Committee are willing to accept that amendment.

Therefore, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

Mr. CURTIS. What subject does the amendment cover? Does it cover only the salaries?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; only the salaries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wyoming that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

MR. AND MRS. CARMEN SCOPPETTUOLO

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to House bill 4059.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4059) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Carmen Scoppettuolo, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. CARROLL, Mr. HENNINGS, and Mr. WATKINS conferees on the part of the Senate.

INCREASE IN DIVERSION OF WATER FROM LAKE MICHIGAN INTO THE ILLINOIS WATERWAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2548, H. R. 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2) to authorize the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test on a 3-year basis the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator from Montana has now moved that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 2. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. WILEY. When can we start with that argument?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have not the slightest idea. I would say in about 15 minutes or a half hour.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3420) to extend and

amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana tell us what is proposed to be done?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, after meeting with the House on four different occasions, the conferees unanimously agreed to the report that I am now presenting to the Senate. The extension, as will be recalled, was for 2 years under the Senate bill, and 1 year under the House bill. The compromise reached was for 1½ years. The amount of money which would be provided under title I by the bill was $3 billion for the 2-year period. Because of the fact that the period of time provided was reduced by a half year, the amount of money provided was reduced in proportion, that is, to $2¼ billion.

Two new uses were provided for foreign currencies by the Senate bill. The first was for the use of some of the funds for educational exchange activities under the Smith-Mundt Act.

The second was for colleges abroad which were built with American capital. That provision will affect such colleges as Roberts College in Baghdad, and American University in Beirut.

The House added three additional new uses for the funds. One of them was to provide additional funds for the erection and acquisition of buildings and lands abroad for the use of our Government. Another provision related to participation in trade fairs and related activities.

The third new use for the funds provided by the House amendment related to the interpretation of foreign technical works. All five of these new uses are included in the conference substitute.

The barter provision which was rejected by the Senate was incorporated almost verbatim in the House bill; but after quite a lot of discussion between the Senate and the House conferees, the conference agreed to a barter provision. I wish to say the barter provision does not materially change the present law. As a matter of fact, the existing law appears entirely adequate and the provision of the conference substitute leaves the authority to barter exactly as it is. It does not make any change in substance at all. So in order to be accommodating to the House, the Senate agreed to, really and truly, in my humble opinion, a reenactment of the present barter provision. It does not broaden it in any manner which I can see. The Senate satisfied the House by accepting it.

Now I wish to say at this point that I strongly favor good hard barter where we dispose of surplus agricultural commodities which we otherwise would not dispose of and get full value in return. Any time that we can reduce our stores of surplus commodities in return for some material which we do not ourselves produce in adequate amounts and which can be stored and maintained in good condition at less cost than the commodities which it replaces, I am for it.

The Secretary of Agriculture has full authority under existing law and under the conference substitute to engage in such a barter program and I, for one, will be watching to see that he carries on an aggressive program to reduce our surpluses through barter wherever the opportunity presents itself. Of course, I am not for any barter transactions which do not reduce our stocks of commodities. I am not for any barter transactions where we could sell for dollars, where the bartered commodity would be shipped out of the United States for dollars in any event and the sole effect of the barter transaction is to put the dollars in the pockets of some one else instead of the Government.

Under the conference substitute the Secretary has complete authority to do everything necessary to reduce our surplus stocks through barter, and full responsibility to see that barter transactions do not simply divert dollars which the Government would have received to others.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There has been considerable discusion about an effort being made to include in the bill provisions which would enable an exchange for diamonds under the barter provision. Has there been any such discussion in committee?

Mr. ELLENDER. There has been such discussion, but there is no prohibition against the Secretary bartering for industrial diamonds right now. The Secretary of Agriculture can do it if that is in the best interests of the United States. The law with respect to that matter has not been changed. It is still up to the Secretary of Agriculture as to whether or not to make exchanges of surplus commodities for minerals and other commodities of value.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Was there any special effort made to procure an amendment which might have been a direction to the Secretary of Agriculture as to a particular type of commodity or material which he might accept under the bartering program?

Mr. ELLENDER. I may say to the distinguished Senator we could not have handled any such matter in conference, because it was not a subject for the consideration of the conferees. We could not have done it had we desired to do it, because the subject matter was not in conference.

Mr. LAUSCHE. However, the law has not been changed at all? The barter provisions remain as they have been?

Mr. ELLENDER. The authority remains as now provided. There has been no substantive change, although the language has been changed somewhat.

There is one provision which we agreed to, relating to something which the Secretary has a right to do now. That is to permit the processing in this country, in our own facilities, of raw materials which come from abroad. However, the Secretary of Agriculture already has that power, I might say to the Senator. The House was desirous of putting new language in the bill, and we agreed to do so.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator.

PERIOD OF EXTENSION

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have covered generally the results of the conference on this bill. I would now like to explain the provisions of the conference substitute in somewhat more detail. The Senate bill provided for a 2-year extension of titles I and II of Public Law 480, 83d Congress, which provide, respectively, for the sale of surplus commodities for foreign currency, and for the donation of such commodities to friendly countries for famine, other urgent relief and other purposes. The House amendment provided for only a 1-year extension. The conferees compromised on 1½-year extension.

AMOUNT AUTHORIZED

Both bills provide additional authorization under title I of $1.5 billion per year. For a 1½-year extension, this would amount to $2¼ billion, and the conference substitute consequently provides for a $2¼ billion authorization.

NEW USES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES

The Senate bill added two new uses for foreign currencies acquired under title I to those now provided by the law. One of these was for educational exchanges under title II of the Smith-Mundt Act. Another was for assistance to American sponsored schools abroad. The House amendment provided for both of these new uses and, in addition, provided for the acquisition of sites and buildings abroad for United States Government use, trade-fair participation and financing the analysis of foreign books and materials. The conference substitute includes all five of these new uses. The provision for trade-fair participation was modified slightly to provide specifically for participation in agricultural and horticultural fairs and related activities. The provision authorizing the use of foreign currencies to acquire sites and buildings includes a parenthetical clause that this is in addition to funds otherwise made available for such purposes. This clause has been included only because of the special provisions which govern expenditures under the Foreign Building Act, and the absence of the clause in any of the other subsections is not to be construed as placing any limitation on the other uses authorized.

APPROPRIATION ACT REQUIREMENT

Each of these new uses for foreign currencies was limited under the House amendment to the amount specified in appropriation acts and the conference substitute adopts this principle of the House amendment. It is not intended, however, that activities which may be carried out under existing provisions of the law would be subjected to this limitation by reason of the fact that they might also be carried out under the new provisions. For example, agricultural trade

fair promotional exhibit activities may be carried out under section 104 (a). These would continue to be financed out of section 104 (a) funds without the necessity of appropriation therefor. On the other hand, new types of activities authorized by section 104 (m) would be subject to the appropriation requirement.

COTTON AND COTTON PRODUCTS

The Senate bill provided that extra-long staple cotton and cotton products should be made available under title I of Public Law 480. The House amendment had no similar provision. The conference substitute contains this provision in a modified form, which limits the financing of the exportation of cotton products under title I to the financing of the estimated portion of the sales price attributable to the raw-cotton content of the product.

BARTER

The House amendment contained a barter provision substantially similar to a provision which the Senate had stricken from the bill. The conference substitute contains a barter provision which makes certain changes in language but no change in substance from existing law. The existing law provides that the Secretary shall enter into barter contracts whenever he has reason to believe that such contracts offer an opportunity to protect the funds and assets of the Commodity Credit Corporation. In lieu of this provision the conference substitute provides that the Secretary shall enter into barter contracts whenever he determines that such action is in the best interest of the United States. The conference substitute is, of course, somewhat broader than the existing provision in that it requires the Secretary not only to protect the assets of the Commodity Credit Corporation, but to protect all other interests of the United States as well. This does not represent a substantive change from the existing law, however, since, of course, as an officer of the United States the Secretary has the obligation in all cases of acting in the best interests of the United States.

The House amendment provided that in carrying out barters or exchanges no restriction should be placed on the countries of the Free World into which surplus agricultural commodities might be sold, except where the Secretary made a specific finding as to a particular transaction that such transaction would replace a cash sale for dollars. This would have imposed upon the Secretary the burden of establishing with respect to each transaction whether or not such transaction would replace a cash sale for dollars. At present the Department requires in the case of certain countries—and in general, these are the countries which normally pay dollars for their purchases—that the barter contractor must present evidence that the barter transaction will not result in the replacement of cash sales for dollars. The conference substitute provides that no restrictions shall be placed on the countries of the Free World into which surplus agricultural commodities may be sold, "except to the extent that the Secretary shall find necessary in order to take reasonable precautions to safeguard usual marketings of the United States and to assure that barters or exchanges under this act will not unduly disrupt world prices of agricultural commodities or replace cash sales for dollars." This language gives the Secretary fully as much authority as he now has to see that barters do not replace cash sales. Before entering into barter contracts providing for shipment of commodities to the so-called dollar countries or, in fact, to any countries, the Secretary may continue to require certificates of additionality or other evidence that such shipments will be in addition to sales which could be made for dollars. It is of no advantage to the Government to barter when the commodities will be exported for dollars in any event and the Secretary should not enter into any barters which are not to the advantage of the United States. On the other hand the Secretary should use barter wherever that action will result in additional exportations and be in the best interest of the United States. The provision of the conference substitute makes it clear that the Congress is interested in good hard barter, and that the Secretary should take whatever action is necessary to accomplish that objective.

The $500 million limitation on barter contained in the House amendment, which was also intended as a goal, is omitted from the conference substitute.

The House amendment specifically provided that barter contracts might be entered into for materials which result from the domestic processing of raw materials of foreign origin, or of domestic origin where the domestic processor agrees to import an equivalent amount of similar foreign material. The conference substitute provides that the Secretary may permit the domestic processing of raw materials of foreign origin. While not specifically stated in the existing law the Secretary now has that authority. This additional language therefore results in no substantive change in the law.

The House amendment struck from the existing law a provision stating that materials acquired through barter by the Commodity Credit Corporation should be considered assets of the Corporation, and that other agencies of the Government in purchasing such materials should purchase them from the Commodity Credit Corporation to the extent available in fulfillment of their requirements. This provision was considered as no longer being of any significance, since section 206 (a) of the Agricultural Act of 1956 provides for the transfer of such materials to the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile unless acquired for other purposes; and section 5 of the Senate bill, which was adopted by the conference substitute, provides that no strategic or critical materials shall be acquired through barter, except for specified purposes or for transfer to such stockpiles. When transferred to such stockpiles, they may be released only under certain specified conditions. The conference substitute therefore adopts the House amendment in this regard.

As just stated, the conference substitute adopted section 5 of the Senate bill with respect to locking materials acquired through barter in the stockpiles.

DONATIONS

The House amendment provided authority for the donation of surplus commodities to trust territories and other areas under the jurisdiction or administration of the United States which are not now covered. The conference substitute adopts the substance of this provision, but has clarified the language and provided, in addition, authority for the Commodity Credit Corporation to purchase fats and oils for donation abroad.

MISCELLANEOUS

The House amendment required the President in negotiating agreements under title I of Public Law 480 to take reasonable precautions not to disrupt normal patterns of commercial trade with friendly countries. That is the present policy and the conference substitute therefore adopts the House language in this regard.

The House amendment contained language concerning grants under sections 104 (d) and (e) of Public Law 480 for cooperative non-self-liquidating projects for the development of human resources and skills. As originally proposed in the House, this provision was intended to exempt such grants from the appropriation process. However, as approved by the House it exempted them from the appropriation process only if appropriated for. The provision therefore had no significance, but put in question the President's authority to waive the necessity of appropriation in such case. This provision is therefore omitted from the conference substitute.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement prepared by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. He happens to be in an Appropriations Committee meeting at this time.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR STENNIS IN SUPPORT OF AGRICULTURAL TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT ACT (PUBLIC LAW 480), AUGUST 22, 1958

Mr. President, the adoption of the conference report extending the Agricultural Trade and Development Act for 1½ years will be another important step in rounding out our agricultural legislation for 1959. This legislation, known as Public Law 480, has led to the exportation of considerable quantities of surplus cotton, rice, dairy products, poultry, and other agricultural products over the last several years. I am especially glad that the Senate and the House conferees have agreed on the basic principles of this bill and hope that the conference report will be adopted and cleared for the President's signature at the earliest possible date.

I have through the years supported Public Law 480, because I believe that it is a desirable program, establishing sound trade relationships which will become even more important in future years.

It is my understanding that through the barter transaction we would acquire materials which would involve minimum loss due to deterioration and would involve minimum storage charges. This program accomplishes the greatest dollar return for our investment, by acquiring critical materials

which cannot be adequately produced domestically. It in effect converts our surplus agricultural commodities into valuable items which may otherwise be in critical shortage in time of emergency.

The new provision requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into bartering agreements where such agreements are clearly in the best interest of the United States is encouraging. Under present law, private trade in effecting bargaining agreements have had to sustain the burden of proof that such agreements would not be disruptive of normal trade channels. This provision has been particularly hard for private agencies and foreign governments to undertake. The new provision would require the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate the situation himself and make this determination. If the Secretary of Agriculture responds to this additional authority—and I am sure he will—he can encourage and strengthen our barter program. This method of trade has always appealed to me as a manner of disposing of our agricultural surpluses as well as increasing our emergency supply of critical materials which cannot be produced domestically.

Mr. President, another project which has had special appeal has been the use of foreign currencies for marketing development projects. A number of foreign countries have entered into this program and have even invested their own funds in carrying out advertising, research, and sales promotion programs. This is certainly a desirable approach to one of our foreign marketing problems, and I hope that greater emphasis will be given to use of these currencies for this and other similar programs.

Mr. President, this program has proved to be most helpful in disposing of surplus agricultural commodities in a sound business way, and I am hopeful that substantial savings of funds now appropriated for our foreign aid program can be realized through implementation of this program.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to concur in the statement of the Senator from Louisiana, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Although there has been some change in the language, the bill as it refers to the bartering of commodities will leave the law almost exactly as it is today. There was a drive put on to greatly broaden the bartering provisions. The Senate was insistent, among other things, that the assets of the United States be protected in any bartering transactions. We also insisted that bartering should not be permitted when such bartering would displace dollar sales. That was what was finally resolved last night.

I feel that in spite of the change in the language, the law will be interpreted exactly as it is now. There are those who feel that the Secretary could have bartered more during the last few months. The Secretary has bartered about $61 million worth of commodities since the 1st of January. There are those who feel the Secretary bartered altogether too much previous to this year, and I think they have some grounds for so believing. I believe the bartering was getting to the point where it was largely displacing dollar sales.

For practical purposes, the law relative to bartering will remain exactly as it is today.

Mr. LAUSCHE and Mr. THYE addressed the Chair.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Ohio, so that he may ask a question of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am glad to hear the comments of the Senator from Vermont. I am sure the Senator from Louisiana feels that there are dangers in the bartering provisions of the bill. There will be many efforts made to eliminate cash sales or dollars sales and convert them into barter deals.

The reason I desire to ask a question is that word has come to me about terrific efforts which are to be made in the way of promoting barter deals in diamonds.

Mr. ELLENDER. Not only in diamonds, but in many metals, including bauxite and aluminum, which we have running out of our ears now.

Mr. AIKEN. Lead and zinc.

Mr. ELLENDER. Lead and zinc, and metals of that kind.

Mr. AIKEN. And many other commodities.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not think the Senate need fear the changes made in the bill will in any manner change the past methods of dealing with the subject.

Mr. AIKEN. The fact is that if it were not required that the assets of the United States be protected, and if the barterers could go into dollar markets and sell at cut rates, they could do a very big business. The law, as we are asking the Senate to approve it, will not permit that to be done.

The Senator from Louisiana and I, as well as the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], are in full accord with the provisions of the bill and the intent of the language.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I want to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Vermont. I am in accord with them.

I wish to commend the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the ranking Republican member of the committee, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], for having fought diligently throughout the winter and into the summer to bring forth a very constructive extension of Public Law 480.

We passed the bill last March. It is unfortunate this should have been a question before the Congress up until now, the 22d of August. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the two senior members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The bill provides primarily what was provided in the previous act, and what passed the Senate. It will continue to serve the purpose for which intended.

Mr. President, the law will continue to serve this Nation, to expand not only our Nation's industrial economy but most certainly the agricultural economy, by moving surpluses off our national markets.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. THYE subsequently said: Mr. President, we have just approved an extension of Public Law 480.

It has been more than 5 months since the Senate originally passed the bill, on March 20, to extend provisions of this surplus disposal law. The bill we passed would have provided for an increase of $500 million in expenditure authorization for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958.

This expenditure authorization was in addition to that provided for during the next 2 years.

The House of Representatives failed to act quickly and decisively.

That failure cost the farmers money. It caused the loss of the opportunity to move $500 million worth of surplus commodities from our national markets before June 30.

Again, let me emphasize that Senate action was taken on March 20—more than 5 months ago. Had the House acted likewise, had the House moved swiftly and efficiently, the farmers could have benefited to the extent of $500 million in April, May, and June.

It is as simple as that. The loss to the farmer can never be regained. Had we moved the $500 million worth of surplus farm products, our national farm markets would have reflected a much firmer tone this summer. This applies especially in the dairy field. We had many applications for surplus products which could not be accepted or approved because there was no money available when it was needed.

We must lay this failure directly before the House of Representatives. The facts bear this out completely, beyond the shadow of a doubt.

Public Law 480 has proven to be of great benefit to agriculture by developing expanded exports of farm products. In turn, the Nation's economy in general has been strengthened.

If we ever are permanently to resolve our economic farm problems, we must broaden the use of agricultural commodities. Our farmers are capable of producing more than we ourselves consume or wear. The new frontier is research and development.

If properly applied and carried through, research and development will lead on to many more uses for agricultural products. The record of the past is clear enough in this respect. Livestock has been improved. Varieties of hybrid seed have increased productivity

of our crops. Better management of soils has vastly increased the per-acre yield. Many acres are producing twice as many bushels of corn today as they produced when the land was first plowed from its virgin state.

All this is due to research and development in the production phase. We must do the same in the field of consumption and utilization of farm products themselves.

Conservation has been provided by the Soil Bank. This, of course, is highly desirable. It also creates an orderly method of laying acres idle, thereby lessening the number harvested. The conservation phase of the Soil Bank is sound. Future generations will have the assurance of productive land to till because of it.

The RECORD will show that I have fought long and hard to obtain for agriculture its rightful share of the Nation's economy. I have always maintained that we will not achieve a solution to our farm economic problems until we develop markets to absorb our surpluses and enact research and development legislation to broaden the use of farm products. Therefore, I have stood against any lowering of supports until this would be achieved.

I remember too clearly my personal experiences after World War I. In 1922, my wife and I obligated ourselves for high-priced machinery and dairy cows and started farming on our own. Then we experienced falling prices. Dairy cows we had paid hundreds of dollars for dropped to as low as $34. There were no acreage allotments then. There were no price supports of any kind. There were no incentive programs.

Yet, even then, we saw surpluses piling up in our Nation's warehouses. We knew of markets breaking daily until the price of oats was so low we could hardly afford to haul them to town. A bushel of corn gave a farmer more heat in the kitchen range than it would purchase in the form of coal or fuel oil. Most farmers were forced to their knees. Many were crushed flat by the depression. They lost everything they had toiled so long and so hard for. Elderly couples saw the work of a lifetime vanish.

Local merchants watched their credit accounts increase and become more delinquent by the day. Local banks were forced by the banking regulations to call their loans and to refuse renewals. Some banks had their doors closed because they were not able to liquidate real estate holdings.

Farm families denied themselves physical needs and comfort. Their eyes and their childrens' eyes were often neglected. The farmer could not afford the simple necessity of glasses. The teeth of both parents were neglected, too. Although it may seem a small matter today, many a father and mother went without dentures in order to pay necessary interest and taxes on their property.

Then Congress acted. The Commissioners' Act was passed in 1933. It appropriated funds for what was termed a commissioners' loan—a second mortgage to the Federal land bank. These were loans to stave off the ever-increasing farm foreclosures and sheriff sales. I lived through those years as a young farmer. My knowledge of that time does not come from reading books. I know from experience that it was a day-to-day existence.

In 1933, I was asked to assist the St. Paul Federal Land Bank in appraising farm loans. Applications were in such volume that their staff was not capable of handling them. In this appraisal work, I came in contact with hundreds of farm families throughout the Midwest. I made a record of their obligations and obtained histories of their struggles and sacrifices. I met them when they were faced with foreclosures.

We were able, through an act of Congress, to renew their hope by granting them loans through consolidating their bills, real-estate mortgages, back interest, and taxes. Oftentimes, the loans or mortgages being foreclosed represented but a small percentage of the true value of the farms. The wave of loan renewals by action of the commissioners' loan saved farms from foreclosure and permitted owners to stay in possession of their property.

Then various farm programs were developed to strengthen the farm economy. Surpluses which had accumulated in our warehouses, once a burden on the farm economy, became a blessing when our Nation was involved in World War II.

I have put forth this very brief history of agriculture legislation so that those who may have been critical of some of my actions will understand why I fought against a lowering of price supports for farm commodities. Price supports had to be maintained until we had provided legislative authorization on programs to absorb our surpluses through market developments on the one hand, and to reduce production of surpluses under the Soil Bank program on the other hand.

The number of acres harvested annually is being reduced under provisions of the long-range program of conservation reserve and under the yearly acreage reserve program. We might possibly make a mistake if we did not continue the acreage reserve part of the Soil Bank program. We should study this question carefully and, if the program is found to be a failure, we should then determine how it might be corrected and improved. We have a tremendous backlog of surplus commodities on hand and therefore it might be wiser to try improving the acreage reserve program than to simply abandon it.

We have taken another wise step in the course of this past year by enactment of S. 4100. This bill will greatly expand research and development in agriculture. It will broaden use of our agricultural products in the industrial field.

Public Law 480 was another administrative authorization that has served agriculture admirably. It afforded this Nation an opportunity to use surplus farm products in the international field. This has won for us friends among nations of the world where food shortages exist.

Many a child who was undernourished has been given a new lease on life because our surplus dairy products, for example, were made available under authorization of Public Law 480. I have had prepared a tabulation showing activities under Public Law 480, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACTIVITIES UNDER PUBLIC LAW 480

The total quantity and value of agricultural commodities contracted for under title I of Public Law 480 from the beginning of the programs through June 30, 1958, amounts to:

Wheat and wheat flour: 616.1 million bushels, valued at $1,732.1 million;

Feed grains: 161.9 million bushels, valued at $335.6 million;

Rice: 28.3 million hundredweight, valued at $288.8 million;

Cotton: 3.2 million bales, valued at $681.4 million;

Meat and dairy products: 353.8 million pounds, valued at $115.1 million;

Tobacco: 202.3 million pounds, valued at $142.3 million;

Fats and oils: 2,436.6 million pounds, valued at $391 million;

Miscellaneous commodities valued at $16.3 million;

For a grand total of $4,004.4 million.

Commodities approved for donation from the beginning of the period to June 30, 1958, are valued at $461.5 million.

Commodities donated include cheese, corn and corn meal, nonfat dry milk, and wheat and wheat flour.

In addition, a total of 813.5 million pounds of these commodities, valued at $110.4 million, were donated under title III of Public Law 480.

Commodities exported under barter contracts in the same period included approximately 210 million bushels of wheat, 232 million bushels of corn and feed grains, about 39 million hundredweight of grain sorghum, 35 million pounds of cottonseed oil, about 12 million pounds of wool, and 1½ million bales of cotton; for a total value of about $922.5 million.

Altogether a total of $5½ billion worth of agricultural commodities have been contracted for under Public Law 480.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, beef and pork prices are firm today because we moved the lard and other fats and oils off national markets through the authorization of Public Law 480. I fought long and hard for legislation that would move our surplus commodities out of our national warehouses and storage bins into world-trade channels. I knew positively that until such time as we demonstrated we were finding a use or market for our surpluses we would be compelled to retain firm floors under our commodities and products in order to stabilize the farm economy. Surpluses will always destroy market prices. This has been demonstrated in the automobile business as well as in every other phase of merchandising.

Yes, Public Law 480 has been one of the most important legislative enactments of benefit to the farmer that Congress has acted on. The act was passed in 1954. It was actually 1955 before it became administratively effective. Up to June 30 of this year we had moved $4,451,500,000 of surplus agricultural commodities.

More than $600 million in applications from foreign countries for surplus farm commodities are now pending in the Department of Agriculture. Failure to carry through authorization of this act

has already caused untold billions of dollars loss to the producers of our Nation.

Had the Congress acted and passed this act at the time the Senate passed it on March 20, more than $1,100,000,000 worth of surplus agricultural commodities would have been moved off the national markets this past summer which, without a question would have strengthened dairy and feed grain prices.

It is deplorable that the American farmer should have to suffer loss of income due to these surpluses left on the national market—surpluses which would have been moved if the Congress had acted early in the year.

President Eisenhower urged the enactment of the renewal of Public Law 480, and I urged such action also.

The Senate acted. The House failed to act.

Mr. President, on August 20, Secretary Benson issued a statement making specific reference to Public Law 480. I should like to read a short excerpt from the statement. Secretary Benson said:

I am much disturbed at the announcement last night by the Senate and House conferees on Public Law 480 that they were unable to reach agreement after a long session.

He continues:

I have earlier pointed out that due to the expiration of this act, we have been holding in abeyance more than $600 million in requests from friendly countries to purchase surplus farm products under Public Law 480. It is impossible to estimate the additional requests which would have been received had not the act expired.

This is a loss not only to our farmers but to the entire Nation.

Should the act not be extended by this Congress or should it be approved by Congress in an unacceptable form, we would certainly do the best we can to move our surpluses with the tools we have. But the magnitude of the loss of Public Law 480 is readily apparent when we consider that in the past 4 years we have programed $4 billion worth of surpluses under title I sales for foreign currencies.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire statement by the Secretary of Agriculture be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE EZRA TAFT BENSON

I am much disturbed at the announcement last night by the Senate and House conferees on Public Law 480 that they were unable to reach agreement after a long session.

This is extremely regrettable in view of the long and costly delay in extending this vital law which expired June 30. It would be most unfortunate if this valuable tool for the disposal of our surplus commodities in foreign markets were to be lost in the current rush to adjournment.

The tragedy of such a failure would be underscored by the fact that there is virtually unanimous agreement in Congress and elsewhere that this act has been most successful in helping to relieve one of our most serious agricultural problems.

We must now face the distinct possibility that in the midst of what appears to be the greatest harvest this Nation has even known we will be further deprived of one of our greatest marketing aids.

I have earlier pointed out that due to the expiration of this act, we have been holding in abeyance more than $600 million in requests from friendly countries to purchase surplus farm products under Public Law 480. It is impossible to estimate the additional requests which would have been received had not the act expired.

This is a loss not only to our farmers but to the entire Nation.

Should the act not be extended by this Congress or should it be approved by Congress in an unacceptable form, we should certainly do the best we can to move our surpluses with the tools we have. But the magnitude of the loss of Public Law 480 is readily apparent when we consider that in the past 4 years we have programed $4 billion worth of surpluses under title I sales for foreign currencies.

It is my understanding that the major point of disagreement among the conferees (and possibly the only point at issue) is the barter provision of the House bill.

This provision is unfortunate. It ignores the basic concept of Commodity Credit Corporation operations to make maximum use of the normal channels of trade. It would cause the CCC to substitute barter for many cash sales and the result would be costly to the taxpayer and to CCC.

The Department is not opposed to barter on a sound basis. We negotiated $61.2 million worth of barter contracts in fiscal 1958. We intend to continue giving favorable consideration to sound barter proposals.

An alternate, simple, and acceptable solution to the present impasse would be a straight extension of 1 or 2 years of the old law.

It is my fervent hope that the conferees will meet and resolve this matter satisfactorily so that the bill may be signed into law and quickly put back into use.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I would not wish Congress to adjourn without calling attention to the valiant service which the senior Senator from Minnesota has given to the farm people, not only of his State, but also of the greater part of the country. I join with him in rejoicing that Congress has finally completed action looking to the extension of Public Law 480. I join him also in deploring the fact that we in Congress have dilly-dallied so long, waiting for action on the part of the other House, and that we have sustained enormous losses in connection with many farm commodities.

I do not know whether we have sustained a loss of a billion dollars, but certainly it has been an enormous amount of American farm products which have been lost since last March, from the standpoint of sales alone, when for all intents and purposes, the money which would have permitted the program to continue was exhausted. Of course there was a small amount remaining until July. Even after July two or three million dollars was left, which is being used to carry out commitments which had been made up to that time.

I wish to point out, too, that the senior Senator from Minnesota has not only been concerned with the extension of Public Law 480, but he has been concerned also with all programs which deal with promoting a prosperous agriculture in this country. I believe he introduced the original bill seeking the eradication of the brucellosis disease among dairy herds. I know he has been one of the early advocates of the school milk program and the use of milk for other purposes, including its use by our armed services.

He is working constantly for soil conservation programs and other programs to protect the soil and water resources which will be the heritage of those who will come after us. He has worked to improve seeds and to control diseases and insects with which our farms have been afflicted. I know he has been active in fields to provide more adequate and better farm credit programs. He has been a great friend of the farm cooperatives of this country, and has always advocated measures which will result in broadening markets for our farm commodities.

The people of the country, particularly the people of the North Central States, have been very fortunate to have a champion like the senior Senator from Minnesota, who is always in the front line fighting for their interests in the Senate.

Mr. THYE. I am indeed grateful to the distinguished Senator from Vermont. He is the senior Republican member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and served as its chairman when the Republicans were in control of the Congress. I am most grateful to him for his remarks, especially because of the high esteem in which the Senator from Vermont is held among agriculturally minded people, particularly those of the Midwest. He has often spoken and has often appeared on our programs out there, and the people of that area have always thought of him as sound and solid in his philosophy as the rocks of New England.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina subsequently said: Mr. President, as a member of the conference committee which worked out the compromises which resulted in this report on the Agricultural Trade and Development Act, I wish to make a statement regarding the compromises we reached in regard to one point of the bill.

In the conference report we have amended section 303 of the law and we have restated that it is the policy of the Congress for the United States to trade surplus agricultural commodities which are expensive to hold and store and which depreciate in value in exchange for foreign strategic and other materials which will be needed by the United States for national security, either in times of emergency or at such time that normal world market supplies become short.

In my opinion this barter section of the bill is one of the most important parts of the legislation. We are not only helping the foreign countries by bolstering their economies and their food supplies, one of the purposes of the bill, but we are also doing something to help our own people at home. In fact, it is the only section of the bill which really contains assistance for our own people. These critical materials which will be imported under the program will be stockpiled in this country after being processed here in the United States. The processing of these materials will give employment to now idle people and the

entire process will give our economy a badly needed help. The storage cost of such a program is small and the value of the commodities on hand will not diminish through the years. In fact, if world shortages should develop they will be of untold value to our Nation, not only in terms of dollars but also in terms of defense.

It should be pointed out that the Secretary of Agriculture and others in the administration brought a halt to the barter program through administrative action. The restating of this program into the law for the next 18 months is now a directive from the Congress that the program be reinstituted and continued.

Only in the event that the importations would be not to the benefit of the United States can the program be halted; and the burden of proof rests on the Secretary of Agriculture.

As a conferee, I supported the barter program for I believe it is in the best interest of this country. Indeed, it is probably more beneficial to us than other provisions of the law.

Mr. President, it should be pointed out that only commodities which meet the President's critical stockpile list approval can be imported through the program for stockpiling; and these stockpiles cannot be used to damage the domestic market in any way.

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, I was absent from the Chamber at the moment when the conference report on Public Law 480 was approved by this body. I had intended to make some comments on the conference committee's deliberations and its understandings relating to this very important piece of legislation.

I am very much pleased with the extension of Public Law 480. As my colleagues know, I submitted the amendment, which the Senate adopted, to make the Public Law 480 program a 2-year program, instead of a 1-year program. The House voted to make it a 1-year program. In the conference committee, we resolved our differences by agreeing on an 18-month agreement. As was pointed out, our efforts to have a $3 billion, 2-year program were likewise compromised at $2,225 million. New uses were provided for the currencies which accumulate as a result of the sale of commodities under the title I provisions of Public Law 480. I am particularly pleased with those new uses, because they make possible a much more effective attack upon some of the great problems which confront mankind throughout the world.

For example, Public Law 480 uses of foreign currency will make possible an effective program against malaria, and also more generous contributions by our Government to the Department of Public Health facilities abroad. Furthermore, our program under Public Law 480 will make it possible for the foreign currencies accumulated to be used for trade fair and for agricultural and horticultural fair participation on the part of our Government. We also have provided for the use of foreign currencies in connection with such matters as the translation of scientific documents and the development of human resources and skills. These are what we call the non-self-liquidating projects, and they are not provided for under section 104 of the act.

Other uses for foreign currencies are outlined; but I highlight these, because I believe they are most important.

Mr. President, I also submitted an amendment which made possible the inclusion of edible vegetable oils under the terms of Public Law 480. That subject is referred to in the report of the managers on the part of the House. In other words, the report includes a new section, section 9, which includes a provision authorizing the Commodity Credit Corporation to purchase products of oilseeds and edible oils, fats and the products thereof, and to donate such commodities abroad.

I hope that the Department of Agriculture will utilize this authority, not only because such use will have a very constructive and healthy effect upon the American domestic market for these commodities, and not only because it will improve the price structure for edible oils and vegetable oils and fats, but also because one of the great food shortages throughout the world is in the field of oils and fats. Particularly is this true of vegetable oils. We shall have large quantities of vegetable oils, as a result of the expanded cotton acreage and soybean acreage. These vegetable oils are helpful to life itself.

So I hope the provisions which I have referred to will be used effectively and aggressively by the Department of Agriculture.

I believe this program is one of the truly good and sound programs of the Government. Public Law 480 not only is of benefit to agriculture—and in the past I have submitted to the Senate information which has revealed that the effect of Public Law 480 sales is to increase the prices of agricultural commodities in the United States—but, as I have also pointed out, this law has improved the sales, and has made possible additional economic assistance to underdeveloped countries.

I believe it is fair to say that in the absence of this program, much of the economic assistance we extend to the countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America would be less effective or, in some cases, totally ineffective, but for the saving grace of the surplus foods we make available today.

A classic example is the free nation of India. The food we send to India is of vital importance to the economic development of that country. It is also of vital importance to the life of the Indian people.

Mr. President, I should like to state, for the RECORD, that I hope our Government will complete its present negotiations with India, both in respect to, first, the sale of wheat and cereal grains; and, second, in respect to barter, because India is perfectly willing to barter substantial quantities of manganese ore for wheat. India has manganese; and we have wheat. All we need is the will to consumate the deal. I hope those arrangements will be completed within the next few weeks. I inquired about this matter of the Department of Agriculture, and also of the Department of State, and was assured, as of yesterday, that the arrangements were in their final stages; that there would be a sale to India of United States surplus foods, under title I—namely, a sale for foreign currencies; and that there would also be a very substantial barter arrangement between the two countries, the exchange being one of manganese for wheat. That is good for India, and it is also good for the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the United States lacks adequate supplies of manganese, for use by our steel industry?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. The Senator from Illinois knows that much of the manganese the United States has obtained in the past has come from the Soviet Union or from Soviet-bloc countries.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Manganese is, of course, absolutely essential to our steel industry; and supplies of manganese which we obtain from India—a neutral country—result in tying closer together the United States and India, a result which certainly is highly desirable.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Illinois is absolutely correct; that exchange is a connecting link, which exists as a result of the availability in the United States of large supplies of food.

The conference report on Public Law 480 involved only one difficulty in the course of the deliberations of the conference committee—namely, over the subject of barter.

One of the provisions of Public Law 480—it is section 303—is known as the barter section. The barter section is not new in our agricultural policy; in fact, it is provided for, among other provisions of law, in the charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation. In other words, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized—and, in fact, is directed—to engage in barter, when that is to the advantage of the United States and when it helps our economy and fulfills our basic national needs.

The report of the managers on the part of the House sets forth the true story of the action of the conference committee on the barter provisions. I should like to quote 1 or 2 sentences, because I subscribe fully to the interpretation which has been made by the House conferees in relation to the barter sections of Public Law 480 extension. The statement of the managers on the part of the House said, in part:

> The committee of conference * * * has reiterated and strengthened the directive of Congress to the Secretary of Agriculture to carry on a meaningful and substantial barter program.

I skip a few lines and quote again:

> In effect, the Congress has felt it necessary to tell the Secretary to carry on a program which is already the law.

The second paragraph reads:

> The language of the conference report (sec. 6 of the report) amends section 303 of Public Law 480 and reiterates the policy of

Congress that it is to the benefit of the United States to exchange surplus agricultural commodities which deteriorate in value and are costly to store for strategic and other materials of a type which will be needed by the United States, either in time of emergency or in its normal economy as world supplies of these materials decrease. There are at least four other provisions of law in which a similar Congressional policy is enunciated.

The managers' statement continues:

In reenacting section 303, the committee has broadened the base from which the President may select in designating those materials which are to be imported in exchange for surplus agricultural commodities. Most of the ore, metals, minerals, or other materials that might be taken will not deteriorate, can be stored at substantially less cost than agricultural commodities and by their presence within the United States will improve its national resources.

Another quotation which I think is highly significant, and I fully subscribe to this as one of the conferees and as one Senator who has held a considerable number of hearings on the whole subject matter of Public Law 480, and I quote now from the statement of the managers on the part of the House:

When Public Law 480 was enacted, the Congress specifically stated in its legislative reports on that legislation that barter was to be a priority method of disposal. Until May 28, 1957, a successful barter program was in operation within the Department, but was brought to a practical stop through regulations issued by the Secretary establishing the so-called additionality requirements, placing upon prospective barter contractors the responsibility of proving that barter transactions would be over and above all possible cash sales.

This particular language, of course, really meant that the Department was putting the stop order upon barter sales.

One of the important changes made in the existing law by the amendment which was adopted in the conference and the agreement which we finally concluded is that it relieves the Secretary of the responsibility of making a finding that barter protections would protect the funds and assets of the Commodity Credit Corporation as a singular or priority requirement.

The Secretary merely has to find that barter is in the best interest of the Government of the United States. In other words, there must be a determination as to whether barter should be engaged in on a much broader basis than that merely the assets of the Commodity Credit Corporation are being properly protected.

The conferees stated very clearly that what we wanted to take place under barter was the kind of action which had taken place prior to May 1957—in other words, an effective, sensible, methodical barter program; not one of excess, but one in which we were moving ahead as a part of the total business of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. President, the conferees specifically stated, in regard to the present requirement for additionality, that no restrictions should be placed on countries of the Free World to which our surplus agricultural commodities may be sold, except under certain conditions, and that was spelled out in the legislation, under which the Secretary must make specific findings.

In other words, under the language of the bill, the burden of proof has been shifted to the Secretary of Agriculture, and in following that authority he is required to follow substantially the same procedures as set out under title I of Public Law 480—procedures to protect normal markets; to see to it there is no dumping of agricultural commodities which will in any way jeopardize world prices; procedures to see that private channels of trade are used.

Mr. President, I want to underscore that Public Law 480 was not designed to involve merely government-to-government activities, but the use of private trade channels was to be emphasized.

I have said a number of times that the Commodity Credit Corporation is not to be a substitute for private business. It is not to supplant private business. The Commodity Credit Corporation was designed to supplement and assist private business, and it ought to limit its activities only to those areas where private business cannot undertake responsible private transactions.

I said earlier, after having read carefully pages 3, 4, and 5 of the statement on the part of the managers of the House, that I concur wholeheartedly in the statement of those managers.

I am hopeful there will be no misinterpretation. I have been assured, as have other Members of this body who were on the conference committee, that the Department of Agriculture is going to proceed with the program of barter. It is also going to proceed with the program of sales under title I. I hope it will proceed with a generous program of donations to the many charitable organizations, both religious and nonsectarian. That is a very important program, in terms of the needs of the people throughout the world, and in terms of our total foreign policy.

I am also hopeful that the market development procedures which are outlined and authorized in Public Law 480 legislation will be used. I am hopeful those market development provisions will be used, not only to develop markets for products which we now have, but for those which may come on the scene. For example, there is a program called Meals For Millions From America. It provides cheap nutrition and fine nutrition from food for people in many areas, emphasizing the use of the soybean. I hope markets will be made available for that kind of program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is another program in regard to providing such nutrition, and that is the economical manufacture of fish flour, which work is being carried on by a distinguished resident of my State, who has a plant not only in Monticello, Ill., but also in New Bedford, Mass. The production of fish flour revolutionizes and improves the diet of people in the rice-eating countries, where there is not sufficient animal food for them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I remember the Senator told us about it in the Senate some time ago. There is no doubt this is the kind of program which could be engaged in and which would be of great help to food deficit areas. Another such program is one which is called the Parboiled Wheat Program, which is a program for turning cereal grain into a product which is usable in areas of the world which are traditionally rice eating. All this is possible in terms of legislation now on our law books.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator believe the bill is a strong direction to the Secretary of Agriculture to restore the excellent program which he killed by his administrative orders and regulations?

Mr. HUMPHREY. On barter?

Mr. DOUGLAS. On barter.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I surely do. The bill says to the Secretary that we want him to proceed, that barter is a type of program authorized by the Congress. Barter is not only authorized, but it is a program formalized in terms of action by the Congress. We want the Secretary to proceed on a constructive basis. No one is asking that the program for barter be other than constructive. We want it to be a part of the total program, and a very significant part of the total program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator think there is any prospect that the Secretary will carry out the law better than he carried out the past law?

Mr. HUMPHREY. One of the reasons we extended the law for 18 months was to review it again at that time. We wanted the entire matter to come before us again for action.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has the Secretary not been sabotaging past acts?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will say, so far as the program other than barter is concerned, it has operated very well.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am referring to the barter part of the program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The barter part has been given most unfair treatment after May 1957.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator think the action we have taken will do away with the requirement that barter must be in addition to all other foreign trade programs?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Barter must be undertaken when it is in the interest of the United States. I am sure in the past barter has actually supplemented cash sales. The record is that as cash sales went up barter sales went up and as barter sales went up cash sales went up. As barter sales came down cash sales came down. This is not an "either/or" proposition; it is a matter of blending together. In some places the barter program is good. In some places the barter program does not work well. When there is a barter program which can work in some areas it ought to be used. When the products can be sold for cash of course we ought to sell for cash. When the products can be sold for soft currencies, we ought to sell them for soft currencies.

The main thing we must keep in mind is that we should do business. I will say, as I said earlier, we have not lost a nickel on barter. In fact, the Commodity Credit Corporation has made millions of dollars.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I can remember the days when the Senator from Minnesota was urging the barter program and the sales of farm products for soft currencies abroad, when the Department of Agriculture and the Department of State were opposing him at every step.

I believe the Senator deserves great credit for the persistence with which he has worked on the program and the degree of success which he has obtained. Certainly it is in the interests of the farmers of the United States to have a market for their products and to reduce the domestic surpluses which would otherwise overhang our markets. This is a fine contribution to good international relations, a process by which hungry people can be fed and by which trade can be put on a basis of self-respect.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator for his generous comments. I happen to believe, as the Senator from Illinois does, in the soundness of this program of using food as an effective instrument for foreign economic policy and as an expression of the concern and compassion of the American people for the less fortunate people around the world.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting several nominations which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see end of Senate proceedings.)

ORDER FOR CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow it be in order to have a call of the calendar, from the beginning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BIPARTISANSHIP IN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "What Is Bipartisanship?" from the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of August 18, 1958.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS BIPARTISANSHIP?

Senator CAPEHART, of Indiana, complained in the Senate the other day about the foreign policy speeches of Senators FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, on the grounds that at this time "it is dangerous to criticize our Nation and the steps our leadership takes."

He was concerned, CAPEHART said, because the Russians repeat to their people and to the world through their government-controlled press, radio and television every criticism our Senators and our Government officials make of our country.

Well, CAPEHART makes a novel approach, at least. What he really says is that we must put the best possible face on our relations with foreign countries—even if they are going badly—so that we don't give the Communists more ammunition for their propaganda machines. Carried to its ultimate, this would mean adhering to outmoded, outworn, and unsuccessful policies—even though they may be carrying us to ultimate defeat—in order to bottle up domestic criticism.

We agree with Senator HUMPHREY'S rebuttal. The Minnesota Senator declared that "it is the patriotic duty of responsible citizens and Senators alike to discuss constructively, thoughtfully, and hopefully what our foreign policy can be and should be.

"In every country in the world, there has been at least some difference of opinion, not only as to our foreign policy but as to their own foreign policy," he continued. "Free people do at times disagree. The right to dissent is a privilege of a free society and at times a moral obligation.

"Bipartisanship does not mean being blind to reality," HUMPHREY went on. "Bipartisan ship does not mean slavish adherence to the folly and the mistakes of those who lead. Bipartisanship means at least constructive thought and contribution in an effort to design policies that are workable and effective, stronger and better."

Well said, Senator HUMPHREY.

As for providing fuel for the Communist propaganda machines, consider this quotation from CAPEHART himself:

"We moved ten or twelve thousand men into Lebanon at the request of the Lebanese Government under a law enacted by the Congress, under what is known as the Eisenhower doctrine. What is so unusual about it? I do not know. Perhaps we are going to establish a permanent base in Lebanon, as we have in England, West Germany, France, and other countries. Maybe we should have a permanent base there. I do not know. Maybe we will have one there * * *"

And this at a time when the administration already had announced we will pull our troops out of Lebanon as soon as the Lebanese Government requests us to do so.

THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, it is my conviction that the Interparliamentary Union, 69-year-old organization of members of the world's parliaments organized with the encouragement of President Grover Cleveland, is performing a very real service in this troubled world. In its conferences, the politicians of various countries who best know the attitudes and the moods of their people get together for discussions which illuminate the changing international scene. I feel that it is very important for the United States to give every support to this Nation's participation. In that connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, two recent editorials which show the interest that is developing in various parts of the country.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Austin (Tex.) Statesman of July 24, 1958]

RIO DE JANEIRO MEETING

With eyes of the Nation focused on developments in the Middle East, little attention has been given to the meeting in Rio de Janeiro of the 69-year-old Interparliamentary Union. Yet this conference of legislators from 54 nations, one from Texas, is certain to witness heated, and possibly influential, debate over the latest international crisis.

This is the view of Senators and Representatives willing to leave Washington during the adjournment rush to attend the meeting. Brazil picked the early date to accommodate the conference in its own Parliament, now in recess.

Eleven United States Congressmen are attending, among them Texas' sole entry, Representative W. R. POAGE, of Waco. Representative HENRY C. TALLE, Iowa Republican, heads the delegation.

This is less than half the number of Congressmen who attended the London conference last September or the 1956 meeting in Bangkok, which came at the height of the Hungarian crisis. Those in Rio expect to have their hands full countering the anticipated attacks from the Soviets on United States-British troop movements in the Middle East.

The Interparliamentary Union is without power, real or assumed. Its annual resolution, this year on foreign investment, atomic weapons tests, establishment of an international police force and other topics, are, like most such expressions of desirable goals, of no binding force or effect. Nonetheless it is a meeting of minds.

A number of United States legislators, including Senator MONRONEY and Representative BOGGS, consider United States participation vitally important in securing the the maximum extension of American influence in world affairs.

Though the meetings have been described as junkets, this is being hotly disputed. They mean a lot of hard work for the delegates.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat of July 26, 1958]

WORLD LAWMAKERS TO RIO

Crowded out of news files by engrossing events of the Middle East, a week-long meeting began yesterday in Rio de Janeiro at which legislators from 54 nations of the world will discuss international problems and, if they can, adopt resolutions of mutual concern. This is a nonofficial gathering, but not without influence to global relations.

The group is the 69-year-old Interparliamentary Union, founded at Paris in 1889, by British and French leaders, with the encouragement of President Grover Cleveland. It has met 46 times since then and is credited with initiating two Hague Conferences. It is a nongovernmental organization of UNESCO.

Headed by Congressman HENRY O. TALLE, of Iowa, the United States delegation numbers 11 Representatives and Senators, including Senator MIKE MONRONEY who has attended most of these sessions since 1948. The union is, of course, without power. Its chief value is for the interchange of ideas, explanation of national roles, a better mutual understanding on parliamentary level among nations.

If the conference does not get bogged in East-West controversy, it may accomplish a good deal in assessing international issues. On its agenda are such resolutions as how best to handle foreign investment, atomic-weapons tests, and the creation of an international police force on a permanent basis.

Some in Washington disparage this annual trek of solons to some foreign capital as just another junket. It can be and often is much more. It would be shortsighted were an American delegation not to attend; Communist representation is always on hand.

Intelligent explanation of United States policy is important on every occasion of international gathering. These delegates are the lawmakers in their respective nations.

The parliaments of the world, at least outside the Red orbit, have enormous influence in their states. Better understanding, mutual help among such men, can have significant value for our role before the world, perhaps for a better peace.

PROPOSED BAN ON NUCLEAR TESTING

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, President Eisenhower is to be commended for his proposal for a 1-year ban on nuclear testing while negotiations for a system of inspection and enforcement are under way. This announcement should give assurance to national leaders and all people around the world who are worried about the effect of radioactive fallout on their children and on future generations. Our interest in the ending of testing and in disarmament is clearly shown. I am very hopeful these negotiations will lead to an inspection and enforcement system so that fear of further testing will be removed and that steps toward disarmament will be taken. Surely mankind, which has had the intelligence to develop weapons of such destructive capacity, can now proceed to an understanding whereby these weapons will not be used, but that our learning will be turned to peaceful pursuits.

SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUAL RETIREMENT BENEFITS

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, recently when the Senate was debating H. R. 8381, providing for internal revenue technical changes, Senator POTTER offered an amendment incorporating the provisions of H. R. 10. As you know, H. R. 10, entitled the "Self-Employed Individual's Retirement Act of 1958," was passed by the House on July 29, 1958. This measure is more commonly known as the Jenkins-Keogh bill. A point of order was raised on the Senate floor and the resultant vote eliminated the Potter amendment as not germane to the bill under discussion. I voted against this point of order and, had I had an opportunity, I would have given my full support and vote in favor of the Potter amendment.

Mr. President, I can well understand the reluctance of many of my colleagues to vote on legislation of this nature which has not been considered by our Finance Committee. Ordinarily, I have the same reluctance, but in this instance we would have been voting on a measure which has been considered by the House Ways and Means Committee for the past several Congresses and which had been reported favorably by that committee on July 24 of this year. Therefore, in this instance I was willing to vote on a measure which had not been considered by our fine Senate Finance Committee, which is chaired by our outstandingly eminent senior Senator from Virginia.

I do not feel that I can improve upon the language in the House report which gives the reason and justification for this legislation. In this respect the report states that the bill "is intended to achieve greater equality of tax treatment between self-employed individuals and employees. Under present law the employees of a business can achieve this postponement of tax on retirement income savings if the employer pays into a qualified pension, profit-sharing, or stock bonus plan what he might otherwise have paid directly to the employees. These amounts can be placed in a tax-exempt pension trust or they can be paid as premiums on an annuity policy with a life-insurance company. In either case the business firm gets immediate deductions for amounts contributed to the plan and the employee is not taxable until he draws down his benefits under the plan. An employee is permitted to defer tax in this manner even though he may have a nonforfeitable right to the employer contribution under the plan.

"This tax deferment for an employee's interest in a pension, profit-sharing, or stock bonus plan has two important advantages. In the first place, it permits the employee to have a larger initial investment in retirement savings upon which more investment earnings may accumulate. In addition, most employees will be in lower tax brackets after retirement than they are during their productive years. The tax deferment under a qualified plan permits some income from the years in which an employee is likely to be subject to higher surtax rates to be taxed in the retirement years when he may be subject to much lower rates or even have unused personal exemptions.

"Your committee believes that it is unreasonable that self-employed persons should be precluded by law from obtaining equivalent tax treatment with respect to retirement savings to that available to employees under a qualified plan. Under present law the employer-proprietor and an employer-partner are precluded, except in very special circumstances, from participating in a qualified plan even though they may establish such a plan for their employees."

Mr. President, as you know, H. R. 10 would permit self-employed individuals to deduct, in computing adjusted gross income, the amount which has been paid as a premium on a restricted retirement policy or as a deposit in a restricted retirement trust fund. This deduction in most cases may not exceed $2,500 in any one taxable year and it may not exceed $50,000 during the lifetime of the self-employed individual.

I strongly feel that this self-employed retirement treatment is a needed and equitable adjunct to our present social security and other retirement programs. As Representative KEOGH has stated, "This amendment is the culmination of many years of hard work by, and on behalf of, an imposing and respectable list of national, State, and local professional parties and organizations of businessmen." Certainly the strong support of this measure is indicated by the following telegram which I received on August 12, 1958:

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD,

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 12, 1958.*

Hon. WILLIAM A. PURTELL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We understand that H. R. 10 (Keogh bill) will be offered as amendment to a pending tax adjustment measure now before the Senate. Your constituents have told us you favor the bill—as does a substantial majority of the Senate.

We urge you to give further support to insure decisive victory for a bill which has been before Congress for nearly 10 years.

American Thrift Assembly for American Angus Association; American Association of Medical Clincs; American Association of Small Business; American Bar Association; American Brahman Breeders Association; American College of Radiology; American Dental Association; American Federation of Labor; American Hereford Association; American Hotel Association; American Institute of Architects; American Institute of Certified Public Accountants; American Institute of Chemists; American Medical Association; American National Cattlemen's Association; American Ophthalmological Society; American Optometric Association; American Patent Law Association; American Podiatry Association; American Society of Industrial Designers; American Society of Internal Medicine; American Veterinary Medical Association; American Woman's Society of C. P. A.'s; American Association of Consulting Chemists and Chemical Engineers, Inc.; Association of Consulting Management Engineers, Inc.; Association of Stock Exchange Firms; Authors League of America; Bureau of Salesmen's National Association; Conference of Actuaries in Public Practice; Engineers Joint Council; Investment Bankers Association of America; Maritime Law Association of the United States; Mobilehome tion of Chiropodists; National Association of Plumbing Contractors; Na- Dealers Association; National Associational Association of Real Estate Boards; National Association of Retail Druggists; National Association of Retail Meat and Food Dealers, Inc.; National Association of Tax Accountants; National Association of Women's and Children's Apparel Salesmen, Inc.; National Association of Women Lawyers; National Automobile Dealers Association; National Council of Salesmen's Organizations, Inc.; National Federation of Independent Business; National Food Brokers Association; National Funeral Directors Association; National Liquor Stores Association, Inc.; National Live Stock Tax Committee; National Medical Veterans Society; National Shorthand Reporters Association; National Society of Professional Engineers; National Society of Public Accountants; National Sugar Brokers Association; National Wholesale Furniture Salesmen's Association; Public Relations Society of America, Inc.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, in conclusion, I express the great hope that both the House and Senate take favorable action on this matter early in the next Congress. It will have my full support.

FIFTY FACTS FOR FARMERS

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, as the second session of the 85th Congress comes to a close, I present 50 facts for the consideration of the farmers of the Nation.

First. Peace has been preserved.

Second. Gross farm income reached a record high thus far in 1958. The $13.8 billion income the first half of 1958 was nearly 5 percent more than the previous record set in the first half of 1952.

Third. Net farm income has jumped nearly one-fourth. Farmers' realized net income of $13.3 billion during the first half of 1958 was 22 percent higher than during the same period the previous year.

Fourth. Income per person on farms is second highest on record. In 1957 it was $967 per person, exceeded only in 1951, during the Korean war.

Fifth. Prices are up. The postwar downtrend in prices which started in 1951 has been reversed. Prices received by farmers in March were 11 percent above those of a year ago and 15 percent above those of 2 years ago. Prices during the first half of 1958 averaged 8 percent above those of a year earlier.

Sixth. The spiraling inflation in farmers' costs is being slowed. During the period of 1939 to 1952, the index of prices paid by farmers—including interest, taxes, and wage rates—increased more than 100 percent. From January 1953, when this administration took office, to June 1958, the index rose only 7 percent.

Seventh. The value of property owned by farmers is at a record high—$187 billion.

Eighth. The net value of property owned by farmers is at a record high—$167 billion, after deducting debts.

Ninth. Farm land values are at a record high. Farmers, exhibiting a confidence in the future of farming, are paying more for land than ever before.

Tenth. Farm ownership is at a record high. Three-fourths of the Nation's farmers own their own farms today.

Eleventh. The farm family continues to dominate agriculture. Ninety-six percent of our farms and ranches are family operations, about the same percentage as 30 years ago.

Twelfth. Total debts of farmers are less than $11 for each $100 of their assets. Seven out of ten farmers have no mortgage debt. Of the mortgaged farms, four-fifths are mortgaged for less than 50 percent of the market value, and half for less than 30 percent.

Thirteenth. Farm foreclosures—near the record low—are extremely rare.

Fourteenth. A national work force of 65 million—near record proportions—and a record high income per worker is increasing the demand for food and fiber produced by farmers.

Fifteenth. Our fast-growing population adds nearly 3 million more American consumers for agricultural products each year.

Sixteenth. Exports of farm products, which set a record high of $4.7 billion during fiscal 1957, continued far above average during fiscal 1958. They totaled $4.1 billion—second highest on record.

Seventeenth. Price-depressing Government surpluses have been sold, where the law permitted program changes. An accumulation in 1954 of 1,186 million pounds of cottonseed oil has been sold. Grass and legume seed stocks have been sold and all Government-owned wool has been sold.

Eighteenth. The level of living on farms is the highest in history. This level is measured by the percentage of farms with electricity, telephones, water systems, central heating, electrical appliances, and automobiles, and the purchasing power of the average value of farm products sold or traded.

Nineteenth. Farms are better equipped and more highly mechanized than ever before. There are over a million more tractors, 40 percent more combines and cornpickers, and 700,000 more trucks owned by farmers than there were in 1950.

Twentieth. A record proportion of farms have electricity. More than 95 percent of all farms now have electricity, compared to 77 percent in 1950. Funds being loaned to REA systems are at record highs—more than $300 million in 1957 and $241 million in fiscal 1958.

Twenty-first. A record high proportion of farms have telephones. More than 55 percent of all farms now have telephones, compared with 38 percent in 1950. Funds being loaned through REA for rural telephones are at a record high—$89 million in fiscal 1958.

Twenty-second. Farm families are now covered by social security. Prior to 1954 the law did not protect them, but farmers past the age of 65 and their survivors now are eligible for old-age protection.

Twenty-third. The Farm Credit System—FCA—is now owned and managed by farmers. A revision in the law in 1954 made this possible, and a large proportion of Federal funds in the system have already been repaid.

Twenty-fourth. The rural development program to aid families on small and low income farms is progressing in 30 States. It is providing more jobs for underemployed farmers and members of farm families, increasing farm incomes, and the general welfare of those who get little or no help from price-support programs.

Twenty-fifth. More farm families are sharing in the benefits of the Nation's expanding economy.

About $1 out of every $3 of the farmers' income now comes from nonfarm sources.

About 30 percent of the farmers work as much as 100 days or more off the farm.

This is nearly double the percentage 15 years ago. Thus, a higher level of living is resulting from increased and diversified income and improved rural living.

Twenty-sixth. Ninety-one percent of the marketed farm products are produced by less than one-half of the farm families—2.1 million farms. These are primarily commercial family farms.

Twenty-seventh. Most of the Government's price-support expenditures for the 6 so-called basic crops go to less than 2 million of the larger and more mechanized farms.

Twenty-eighth. Basic crops (cotton, wheat, corn, tobacco, rice, peanuts) bring farmers about 24 percent of their income from marketings. Present Government price-support investment in basic crops is $6.1 billion. Total investment in inventories and support loans as of May 31, 1958, was $7.2 billion.

Twenty-ninth. Basic crops bring farmers 40 percent or more of their income in 11 States; North Carolina, 67 percent; Mississippi, 57 percent; Arkansas, 54 percent; South Carolina, 53 percent; Kentucky, 49 percent; Montana, 48 percent; Louisiana, 44 percent; Arizona, 45 percent; Texas, 42 percent; Tennessee, 42 percent; Kansas, 40 percent.

Thirtieth. Basic crops bring farmers 10 percent or less of their income in 15 States, and 15 percent or less of their income in 22 States: Up to 1 percent, Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island; 2 to 5 percent, New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey, West Virginia, Nevada, Wisconsin; 6 to 10 percent, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Wyoming, Utah, Florida; 11 to 15 percent, California, Iowa, Michigan, Oregon, Colorado, Minnesota, Connecticut.

Thirty-first. 2.6 million farms—56 percent of all farms—sell only 9 percent of farm marketings. This contrasts with the 2.1 million farms which produce 91 percent of the market products. The 2.6 million farms are principally small-scale and low-income farms. They get little or no help from the multi-billion-dollar price supports for the six basic crops. The rural development program started in 1955 is designed to aid these families with the lowest incomes.

Thirty-second. Price increases have occurred primarily in farm products without price supports and free of controls. Markets for livestock, poultry products, fruits, and vegetables have expanded, and prices have been maintained or risen. In contrast, price-supported products have tended to lose markets, decline in price, and pile up surpluses in Government storage.

Thirty-third. Dairy income during the past year was the highest on record.

Thirty-fourth. Government-owned uncommitted stocks of dairy products have been sharply reduced since 1954:

Butter: From 466 million pounds to 65 million pounds on June 30, 1958.

Cheese: From 436 million pounds to 70 million pounds on June 30, 1958.

Nonfat milk solids: From 599 million pounds to 152 million pounds on June 30, 1958.

Thirty-fifth. Per-capita consumption of such high-protein, protective foods as meat, milk, and eggs, is substantially above prewar levels.

Year	Beef and veal	Pork	Poultry	Total meats and poultry	Eggs	Fluid milk and cream
	Pounds	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Number*	*Pounds*
1940..	62	72	17	157	314	331
1957..	93	62	32	187	358	349

This trend is of major significance because livestock and livestock products account for 55 percent of farm income.

Thirty-sixth. More farmers have been helped to improve their farms or acquire larger ones through the loan programs. Farmers' Home Administration assisted farmers to the extent of $50.3 million in fiscal 1958, compared with $29.7 mil-

lion in the last fiscal year of the preceding administration.

Thirty-seventh. Farmers benefited by the largest tax reduction in history, enacted by the Republican 83d Congress. Relief was received in faster tax write-offs on grain storage facilities and machinery, and deductions for the costs of certain soil-conservation practices.

Thirty-eighth. Completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway in the near future will reduce transportation costs on farm products and items farmers buy. This project has been pushed to completion by the administration after lying dormant for 30 years.

Thirty-ninth. Appropriations for agricultural extension and education increased $29,567,000 in the past 6 years. The increase during the preceding 4 years was only $1,350,000.

Fortieth. Agricultural research funds increased $58,789,000 in the past 6 years. The increase during the preceding 4 years was only $1,984,000.

Forty-first. The years of schooling for rural people has increased. Today's younger generation receives 10.5 years of education, compared to 8.5 years for their parents and 7.5 for their grandparents.

Forty-second. The Great Plains program, developed in 1955, is being pushed vigorously. Land classification in the more hazardous soil areas is being accelerated, and maps will be available to serve as a guide to proper land use. The agricultural conservation program encourages more than ever before proper land use and shares the cost of making needed adjustments.

Forty-third. Soil-conservation assistance and promotion of soil building have been expanded. The 1,750,000 cooperating farmers are making the greatest conservation accomplishments of all times.

Forty-fourth. New and expanded water-management programs have been put into effect. Under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act passed by the Republican 83d Congress, and other legislation, 900 local watershed groups in 47 States have applied to the Department for assistance. The SCS has authorized planning in 366 of these watersheds in 47 States.

Forty-fifth. New alltime highs have been set by timber cut from the national forests—over $115 million per year. At the same time forests have received more protection and are increasing in stands and tree growth for the future.

Forty-sixth. The use of farm products for schoolchildren and for poor and needy people is at a record high level. Children were served 1.9 billion school lunches in 1958, compared to 1 billion in 1951.

Forty-seventh. The use of farm products to aid friendly nations has been greatly expanded. Approximately 60 million people in 80 foreign countries are receiving food donated by the people of the United States. Under Public Law 480, credit and International Cooperation Administration programs, nearly $6 billion of surplus farm products have been moved into use to meet needs of friendly countries and strengthen their economies.

Forty-eighth. In a determined effort to reduce the price-depressing surpluses overhanging farmers' markets, the Eisenhower administration has disposed of recordbreaking amounts of Government-owned commodities:

1953	$520,000,000
1954	1,424,000,000
1955	2,115,000,000
1956	2,723,000,000
1957	4,208,000,000

Forty-ninth. Grain storage capacity owned by Commodity Credit Corporation has been greatly increased during the last several years:

	Bushels
1950	547,000,000
1952	543,000,000
1957	990,000,000

Fiftieth. To assist farmers in making the transition from wartime demands to peacetime markets and conditions, Federal expenditures for programs primarily to stabilize farm prices and income have been the largest ever:

1950	$487,000,000
1951	624,000,000
1952	306,000,000
1953	330,000,000
1954	963,000,000
1955	1,350,000,000
1956	1,936,000,000
1957	3,255,000,000

Overall production and consumption of most farm products are now more nearly in balance than at any time since the height of the Korean war.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 304) to provide for a specific contribution by State governments to the cost of feed or seed furnished to farmers, ranchers, or stockmen in disaster areas, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 469) to protect producers and consumers against misbranding and false advertising of the fiber content of textile fiber products, and for other purposes.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, 85TH CONGRESS

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, at the end of each Congress, it is the practice of the Committee on Foreign Relations to make public a legislative history of the committee. Since the full history of the committee's work during the 85th Congress will not be available until some time after adjournment, I believe it will be useful to Members of the Senate to have now a brief summary of the work of the committee this Congress.

I wish to take this opportunity to record my sincere thanks to all the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations for the fine cooperation they have given me. Without their diligent and conscientious efforts, our heavy workload could not have been carried. I deeply appreciate the contribution the several members have made during consideration of measures pending before the committee and especially the nonpartisan spirit they have shown in their consideration of each important issue faced by the committee.

The Committee on Foreign Relations and its subcommittees met a gross total of 266 times during the 85th Congress. A total of 101 measures, not including treaties, were acted on. Of these, 64 passed the Senate, and the provisions of 21 others were contained in other measures passed by the Senate. On 16 measures, the committee deferred action.

Altogether, 28 bills and joint resolutions were enacted; and 30 Senate or concurrent resolutions were agreed to; and 17 treaties were approved. No treaties were rejected by the Senate.

In almost all instances, the Senate gave its approval to our work by voice votes or by very large majorities. The greatest number of votes cast against any measure reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations was when the Mutual Security Act of 1957 was passed by a vote of 57 for and only 25 against. Sixteen of the seventeen treaties acted on by the Senate were approved by unanimous votes, and the one remaining treaty, the Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency, was approved by a vote of 67 to 19.

As a consequence of Senate action on these 17 treaties and the fact that the President requested the withdrawal of 10 treaties, the Committee on Foreign Relations will begin the 86th Congress with the smallest treaty docket of any postwar year.

The committee's work during the 85th Congress began with consideration of the problems in the Middle East. In March 1957, after 2 months of consideration, the Congress enacted the so-called Middle East doctrine. As the committee's work drew to a close, the situation in the Middle East was again under consideration. The Committee on Foreign Relations, in cooperation with the Department of State, arranged for all Members of the Senate, not only the members of the committee itself, to be briefed daily by officials of the Department of State—a unique procedure to keep Senators abreast of the rapidly changing situation in the Middle East.

During the 85th Congress, the committee also devoted much time to a searching review of the mutual security program. This study began in 1956, when the Senate created a Special Committee To Study the Foreign Aid Program. The information gained during that study and also during a study undertaken by a Subcommittee on Technical Assistance, was available for Members when they considered and approved the Mutual Security Acts of 1957 and 1958.

Among other important measures approved by the committee and the Senate during the 85th Congress were amendments to the act creating the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the authorization of a payment to Denmark for Danish vessels, the amendments to the International Claims Settlement Act, and adjustments in the

United States contributions to various international organizations.

An unusually large number of nominations, totaling 2,908 were referred to the committee during the 85th Congress. Among these were the nominations of 66 Ambassadors and 20 high-ranking officers in the Department of State, and 50 nominations to other positions, such as those involved in our participation in the United Nations and other international organizations. One new committee procedure inaugurated during this Congress was to select by lot a number of the newly appointed Foreign Service officers, in order to examine their qualifications, and thereby to enable the committee to assure itself of the quality of young persons entering the Foreign Service.

Mr. President, in closing, I ask unanimous consent that a listing of the measures considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations during the 85th Congress be printed in the RECORD as part of my report.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TREATIES ACTED ON

1. Protocol to the 1949 International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries (Ex. F, 85–1; Ex. Rept. 1, 85–1): This protocol, between the United States and nine other governments, is designed to make it possible for the Commission, the representative body established under the 1949 convention, to hold its meetings outside North America, if it so desires. Approved May 13, 1957, by a vote of 82 to 0.

2. Protocol to the 1930 Convention for the Protection, Preservation, and Extension of the Sockeye Salmon Fisheries in the Fraser River System (Ex. C, 85–1; Ex. Rept. 2, 85–1): The purpose of this protocol, between the United States and Canada, is the establishment of a program to conserve the pink salmon of the Fraser River system coordinate with the program set up under the 1930 convention for sockeye salmon only. Approved June 6, 1957, by a vote of 85 to 0.

3. Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency (Ex. I, 85–1; Ex. Rept. 3, 85–1): This statute, signed by the United States and 79 other nations, is designed to establish an International Atomic Energy Agency with responsibility for advancing the peaceful uses of atomic energy, and for developing methods for its application to industry, agriculture, and medicine for the benefit and general welfare of mankind. Approved, with an interpretation and understanding, June 18, 1957, by a vote of 67 to 19.

4. Agreement between the United States and Austria regarding certain bonds of Austrian issue denominated in dollars, together with a related protocol (Ex. H, 85–1; Ex. Rept. 4, 85–1): The agreement and protocol create a procedure under which the holders of certain dollar bonds issued prior to World War II by the Republic of Austria and by various municipalities, provinces, and companies in Austria, may establish the validity of their bonds. Approved July 2, 1957, by a vote of 78 to 0.

5. Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Navigation Between the United States and Korea (Ex. D, 85–1; Ex. Rept. 5, 85–1): The objective of this treaty is to protect the personal security, rights, and property of Americans in Korea and to facilitate their travel and business activities. Approved August 8, 1957, by a vote of 86 to 0.

6. Protocol Amending the International Sugar Agreement of 1953 (Ex. L, 85–1; Ex. Rept. 6, 85–1): The protocol revises export quotas on sugar as among exporting countries parties to the agreement of 1953, simplifies the administration of the quotas, and provides greater flexibility in their adjustment to changing market conditions. It also revises the price objectives of the agreement. Approved August 8, 1957, by a vote of 86 to 0.

7. Convention on Inter-American Cultural Relations (Ex. C, 84–2; Ex. Rept. 7, 85–1): This Convention, signed by the United States and all of the other American Republics except Costa Rica, is a revision of the Buenos Aires Convention of 1936. It is intended to promote the exchange of graduate students, teachers, professors, specialists, and other persons of equivalent qualifications among the American Republics, with a view to fostering a greater understanding of the peoples tnd institutions of countries belonging to the Organization of American States. Approved August 8, 1957, by a vote of 86–0.

8. Protocol to the 1946 International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling (Ex. E, 85–1; Ex. Rept. 8, 85–1): The purpose of this protocol is to vest the International Whaling Commission established by the Convention for the regulation of whaling with additional powers so that it may effectively deal with a number of problems not anticipated when the Convention was negotiated. Approved August 8, 1957, by a vote of 86–0.

9. Amendment to the 1949 International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea (Ex. M, 85–1; Ex. Rept. 9, 85–1): The purpose of the amendment is to remove from the Convention a prohibition against the use of inflatable life rafts on merchant and passenger vessels in international carriage. Approved August 8, 1957, by a vote of 86–0.

10. Interim Convention on Conservation of North Pacific Fur Seals (Ex. J, 85–1; Ex. Rept. 10, 85–1): This Convention, an interim agreement effective for a 6-year period, will serve to continue the prohibition now being observed by the four signatory governments (Canada, Japan, the Soviet Union, and the United States) with respect to pelagic sealing, and to provide a joint research program designed to accumulate sufficient factual data to prepare the ground work for a permanent arrangement among the parties to conserve the valuable fur seal herds of the North Pacific Ocean. Approved August 8, 1957, by a vote of 86–0.

11. Income Tax Convention with Austria (Ex. A, 85–1; Ex. Rept. 12, 85–1): This Convention for the avoidance of double taxation with respect to taxes on income follows the pattern of previous double taxation conventions into which the United States has entered. Approved August 8, 1957, by a vote of 86–0.

12. Income Tax Convention with Canada (Ex. B, 85–1; Ex. Rept. 12, 85–1): This Convention introduces certain modifications in the Income Tax Convention and protocol of March 4, 1942, as modified by the supplementary convention of June 12, 1950, between the United States and Canada. Approved August 8, 1957, by a vote of 86–0.

13. Income Tax Protocol with Japan (Ex. K, 85–1; Ex. Rept. 12, 85–1): This protocol, which supplements the convention with Japan of April 16, 1954, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, provides for exemption of the Export-Import Banks of Japan and the United States from taxation on interest received from sources within the country of the other party. Approved August 8, 1957, by a vote of 86–0.

14. Income Tax Convention with Pakistan (Ex. N, 85–1; Ex. Rept. 1, 85–2): This Convention for the avoidance of double taxation with respect to taxes on income follows in simplified form the pattern of previous double taxation conventions in which the United States has entered. Approved July 9, 1958, by a vote of 84–0.

15. Income Tax Convention with Belgium (Ex. B, 85–2; Ex. Rept. 1, 85–2): This Convention which supplements the convention of October 28, 1948, makes certain changes in that convention to facilitate the extension of that convention to the Belgian Congo and Ruanda-Urundi. Approved July 9, 1958, by a vote of 84 to 0.

16. Income Tax Convention with the United Kingdom (Ex. C, 85–2; Ex. Rept. 1, 85–2): This Convention, in the form of a notification, extends the coverage of the 1945 convention with the United Kingdom to 20 British overseas territories. Approved July 9, 1958, by a vote of 84 to 0.

17. Income Tax Convention with the United Kingdom (Ex. A, 85–2; Ex. Rept. 2, 85–2): This Convention amends the 1945 convention with the United Kingdom so as to eliminate double taxation on royalty payments. Approved August 13, 1958, by a vote of 90 to 0.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY BOTH HOUSES

1. Mutual Security Act of 1957 (S. 2130, S. Rept. 417, passed Senate June 14, 1957, by a vote of 57–25; approved August 14, 1957, Public Law 85–141): This act extended the Mutual Security Program for another year and authorized $3.4 billion for various types of foreign aid.

2. Mutual Security Act of 1957 (H. R. 12181, S. Rept. 1627, passed Senate June 6, 1958 by a vote of 51–17; approved June 30, 1958, Public Law 85–477): The act extended the Mutual Security Program for another year and authorized $3,031,400,000 for various types of foreign aid.

3. The Middle East Resolution (H. J. Res. 117, S Rept. 70, passed Senate March 5, 1957, by a vote of 72–19; approved March 9, 1957, Public Law 85–7): This joint resolution authorized the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence.

4. Amendment of act creating Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission (S. 538, S. Rept. 721, passed Senate August 5, 1957, approved August 26, 1957, Public Law 85–179): This act will enable the present Executive Director of the commission to receive, for a period of not to exceed 5 years, retired pay as a retired military officer, and civilian compensation concurrently.

5. St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation (S. 1174 S. Rept. 525; passed Senate June 26, 1957; approved July 17, 1957, Public Law 85–108): This act served to clarify the general powers, increase the borrowings authority, and authorize the deferment of interest payments on borrowing of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

6. Bridge Across the Pigeon River (S. 1361, S. Rept. 522, passed Senate June 26, 1957; approved July 24, 1957, Public Law 85–113): This act revived and reenacted the act of May 29, 1945 authorizing, under certain conditions, the Department of Highways of the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the Pigeon River.

7. Claim of Christoffer Hannevig (S. J. Res. 64, S. Rept. 370, passed Senate June 10, 1957; approved June 27, 1957, Public Law 85–60): This act, in implementation of a 1948 convention between the United States and Norway, confers jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to adjudicate the claim of Christoffer Hannevig, a national of Norway, against the United States based upon the requisition of certain alleged property interests of Mr. Hannevig by agencies of the United States Government during the First World War.

8. Buffalo and Fort Erie Public Bridge Authority (S. J. Res. 95, S. Rept. 720, passed Senate August 5, 1957; approved August 14,

1957, Public Law 85-145): This act granted the consent of Congress to an agreement or compact between the State of New York and the Government of Canada providing for the continued existence of the Buffalo and Fort Erie Public Bridge Authority.

9. Second World Metallurgical Congress (H. J. Res. 404, S. Rept. 863, passed Senate August 20, 1957, approved August 31, 1957, Public Law 85-247): This joint resolution provides for the recognition and endorsement of the Second World Metallurgical Congress, which, under the sponsorship of the American Society for Metals, will be held in Chicago, Ill., on November 2-8, 1957.

10. St. Lawrence Seaway Celebration (H. J. Res. 408, S. Rept. 864, passed Senate August 20, 1957, approved August 30, 1957, Public Law 85-228): This joint resolution authorized the President of the United States to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the St. Lawrence Seaway Celebration to be held in Chicago, Ill., from January 1 to December 31, 1959, inclusive.

11. Conveyance of reversionary interest of United States in certain lands in Texas (H. R. 1983, S. Rept. 369, passed Senate May 22, 1957, approved May 31, 1957, Public Law 85-42): This act authorized the Secretary of State to take the action necessary to make possible an exchange of lands held by two school districts in Texas for other lands more suitable for school purposes.

12. Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission (H. R. 4271, S. Rept. 211, passed Senate April 12, 1957, approved April 20, 1957, Public Law 85-16): This act, in amending the act of August 1, 1956 (70 Stat. 888) added the Delegate from Alaska in the House of Representatives as a member of the Commission.

13. Disposal of certain lands to aliens (H. R. 8929, S. Rept. 862, passed Senate August 20, 1957, approved August 28, 1957, Public Law 85-201): By virtue of this act, the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, is given the same authority as other United States Government agencies to dispose of lands to aliens as well as to citizens of the United States.

14. Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs (S. 1832, S. Rept 223, passed Senate April 12, 1957, approved July 18, 1958, Public Law 85-254): This bill would authorize the appointment of one additional Secretary of State to be designated as the Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs.

15. Danish vessels (S. 2448, S. Rept. 572, passed Senate July 3, 1957, approved June 6, 1958, Public Law 85-450): This bill would authorize payment to the Government of Denmark in connection with the requisitioning in 1941 of 40 Danish vessels by the United States.

16. Interparliamentary Union (S. 2515, S. Rept. 600, passed Senate August 5, 1957, provisions included in H. R. 12181, approved June 30, 1958, Public Law 85-477): This bill would raise the ceiling established by Public Law 409, 80th Congress, on United States contributions to the Interparliamentary Union from $15,000 to $18,000.

17. Contributions to the International Labor Organization (S. J. Res. 73, S. Rept. 526, passed Senate June 27, 1957, provisions included in H. R. 12181, approved June 30, 1958, Public Law 85-477): This measure would increase the ceiling on the United States annual contribution to the International Labor Organization from $1,750,000 to $2 million.

18. Contributions to the International Council of Scientific Unions and its associated unions (S. J. Res. 85, S. Rept. 602, passed Senate August 5, 1957, approved August 14, 1958, Public Law 85-627): This joint resolution would raise the ceiling on United States contributions to the International Council of Scientific Unions from $9,000 annually to $65,000 annually.

19. Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission (S. 2933, S. Rept. 1840, passed Senate July 21, 1958, approved August 8, 1958, Public Law 85-601): This bill would extend the date for filing the report of the Commission and authorize increased appropriations for it.

20. Highway bridge between International Falls, Minn., and Canada (S. 3437, S. Rept. 1752, passed Senate July 21, 1958, approved August 8, 1958, Public Law 85-601): This bill authorized the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge between it and Canada.

21. International Claims Settlement Act Amendment (S. 3557, S. Rept. 1794, passed Senate July 9, 1958, Public Law 85-604): This bill amends the International Claims Settlement Act by adding a new title IV providing a Czechoslovakian Claims Fund out of which to compensate United States citizens whose property was nationalized or otherwise taken subsequent to World War II by the Government of Czechoslovakia.

22. Highway bridge between Lubec, Maine, and Campobello Island, N. B. (S. 3608, S. Rept. 1751, passed Senate July 1, 1958, approved July 28, 1958, Public Law 85-563): This bill revives and enacts the act authorizing the State Highway Commission of Maine to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge between Lubec, Maine, and Campobello Island, N. B.

23. Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission (H. R. 10069, S. Rept. 1807, passed Senate July 11, 1958, approved July 25, 1958, Public Law 85-556): This bill made permanent the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission, increased its authorized appropriations from $100,000 to $200,000 and made other changes in existing law.

24. Bridge across the Rio Grande (H. R. 12632, S. Rept. 2352, passed Senate August 15, 1958): This bill revived and enacted the bill authorizing Gus A. Guerra to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande at Rio Grande City, Tex.

25. Second Annual United States Trade Fair (H. J. Res. 509, S. Rept. 1343, passed Senate March 6, 1958, approved March 28, 1958, Public Law 85-360): This joint resolution authorized the President to invite the States of the United States and foreign countries to participate in the second Annual United States World Trade Fair, held in New York in 1958.

26. World-Science-Pan Pacific Exposition (S. 3680, S. Rept. 1721, passed Senate June 20, 1958): This bill provides for the participation of the United States Government in the World-Science-Pan Pacific Exposition.

27. Foreign Service Annuities (S. 3379, S. Rept. 2232, passed Senate August 11, 1958): This bill would authorize a 10-percent increase in Foreign Service annuities.

28. Foreign Decorations (S. 3195, S. Rept. 1439, passed Senate July 11, 1958): This bill would authorize certain retired personnel of the United States Government to accept and wear decorations, presents, and other things tendered them by certain foreign countries.

SENATE RESOLUTIONS

1. United Nations Emergency Force (S. Res. 15, S. Rept. 613, agreed to by Senate August 8, 1957): This resolution expressed the sense of the Senate that a force similar in character to the United Nations Emergency Force created pursuant to resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly of November 3 and 4, 1946, now operating in the Middle East, should be made a permanent arm of the United Nations.

2. Special Committee to Study the Foreign Aid Program (S. Res. 35, S. Rept. 2, agreed to by Senate January 30, 1957): This resolution extended the special committee until June 30, 1957 and authorized $75,000 for the period February 1 to June 30, 1957. By S. Res. 141 (S. Rept. 435), which was agreed to by the Senate on June 25, 1957, the subcommittee was extended until January 31, 1958 to complete its study.

3. Additional clerical assistance (S. Res. 59, S. Rept. 36, agreed to by Senate January 30, 1957): This resolution authorized the Committee on Foreign Relations to employ two temporary additional clerical assistants.

4. Subcommittee on Technical Assistance Programs (S. Res. 60, S. Rept. 37, agreed to by Senate January 30, 1957): This resolution extended, from January 31 to February 28, 1957, the deadline for transmittal to the Senate of the final report of the subcommittee. A further extension until March 31, 1957 was subsequently made by S. Res. 99, which was agreed to by the Senate on February 20, 1957.

5. Subcommittee on Disarmament (S. Res. 61, S. Rept. 11, agreed to by Senate January 30, 1957): This resolution extended the subcommittee until June 30, 1957, and authorized $30,000 for the period February 1 to June 30, 1957. Further extensions were granted: (1) until August 31, 1957 (S. Res. 151, S. Rept. 524, agreed to by Senate June 26, 1957), with an authorization of $10,000; (2) until January 31, 1958 (S. Res. 192, S. Rept. 1044, agreed to by Senate August 26, 1957), with an authorization of $30,000, and (3) until July 31, 1958 (S. Res. 241, S. Rept. 1179, agreed to by Senate January 29, 1958) with an authorization of $34,000.

6. Additional committee funds (S. Res. 152, agreed to by Senate July 3, 1957): This resolution authorized an additional $10,000 to meet the expenses of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Additional increases were authorized: (1) $10,000 (S. Res. 272, agreed to by Senate March 17, 1958), and (2) $10,000 (S. Res. 326, agreed to by Senate, July 28, 1958).

7. Commonwealth Parliamentary Association (S. Res. 160, S. Rept. 604), agreed to by Senate August 5, 1957, and S. Res. 177, agreed to by Senate August 26, 1957): These resolutions, the latter of which served to amend the first in certain technical respects, authorized the Vice President to appoint 4 Members of the Senate to attend the next general meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association to be held in India, on the invitation of the Indian branch of the association, and $15,000 to meet the expenses incurred by the members of the delegation and its staff.

8. Additional professional and clerical assistance (S. Res. 240, agreed to by Senate, January 29, 1958): This resolution authorized the Committee on Foreign Relations to employ 2 additional professional staff members and 2 additional clerical assistants on a temporary basis.

9. Parliamentary activities (S. Res. 259, S. Rept. 1287, agreed to March 6, 1958): This resolution provided for assistance to Members of the Senate in the discharge of their responsibilities in connection with visiting foreign dignitaries and authorized $5,000 for expenses.

10. Alaskan salmon (S. Res. 263, S. Rept. 1291, agreed to by Senate March 6, 1958): This resolution favored negotiations with the Government of Japan for the protection of the Alaskan red salmon.

11. Printing resolutions (1) (S. Res. 281, agreed to by Senate April 22, 1958): This resolution authorized the printing of the committee print Recruitment and Training for the Foreign Service of the United States as a Senate document; (2) (S. Res. 325, agreed to by Senate July 28, 1958.) This resolution authorized the printing as a Senate document of the legislative history of the Committee on Foreign Relations for the 85th Congress.

12. Loop road linking Glacier Park and Waterton Lakes Park (S. Res. 293, S. Rept. 1750, agreed to by Senate July 1, 1958): This resolution requested that the Secretary of State bring to the attention of the appropriate officials of the Government of Canada

the deep interest of the Senate in the completion of the loop road linking the Glacier National Park in the United States and the Waterton Lakes National Park in Canada.

13. Greetings to Israel (S. Res. 294, agreed to by Senate April 23, 1958): The resolution extended the greetings of the Senate to the State of Israel upon its 10th anniversary.

14. Study of relations with the American Republics (S. Res. 330, S. Rept. 1841, agreed to by Senate July 31, 1958): This resolution directed the Foreign Relations Committee or any duly constituted subcommittee thereof to make a study of United States relations with the American Republics and authorized $150,000 therefor.

15. Study of disarmament (S. Res. 335, S. Rept. 1843, agreed to by Senate July 28, 1958): This resolution authorized the Committee on Foreign Relations to expend not to exceed $35,000 to carry out its responsibilities in the field of disarmament.

16. Foreign policy study (S. Res. 336, S. Rept. 1844, agreed to by Senate July 31, 1958): The resolution instructed the Committee on Foreign Relations to arrange for exhaustive studies to be made of the foreign policy of the United States at a cost of not to exceed $300,000.

17. Discussion between United States and Canadian legislators (S. Res. 359, S. Rept. 2231, agreed to by Senate August 8, 1958): This resolution recommended the establishment of an appropriate subcommittee by the Senate to explore with members of the Canadian Parliament the desirability of increased discussions between the legislators of Canada and the United States.

18. International Health and Medical Research Year (S. Res. 361, S. Rept 2233, agreed to by the Senate August 11, 1958): This resolution requested the President to extend, through the World Health Organization and other agencies, an invitation to the nations of the world to designate representatives to meet and discuss the feasibility of an International Health and Medical Research Year or alternative methods looking toward intensified international cooperation in the field of health.

19. Greetings to Ghana (S. Res. 111, agreed to by the Senate March 5, 1957): This resolution extended the greetings of the Senate to the Legislative Assembly of Ghana.

20. Death of Magsaysay (S. Res. 115, agreed to by the Senate March 18, 1957): This resolution expressed the sorrow of the Senate at the death of President Magsaysay of the Republic of the Philippines.

21. Greetings to Malaya (S. Res. 198, agreed to by the Senate August 30, 1957): The resolution extended the greetings of the Senate to the Legislative Assembly of Malaya.

Concurrent Resolutions

1. Printing of Technical Assistance Report (S. Con. Res. 24, no written report, passed Senate, April 12, 1957): This concurrent resolution authorized the printing of 2,500 additional copies of the final report of the Subcommittee on Technical Assistance Programs.

2. Printing of studies and reports of Special Committee to Study the Foreign Aid Program (S. Con. Res. 30, passed Senate June 5, 1957): This concurrent resolution authorized the printing of these publications as a Senate document with 8,000 for the use of the special committee.

3. Problems of Hungary (S. Con. Res. 35, S. Rept. 523, passed Senate June 26, 1957): This concurrent resolution expressed the sense of the Congress that the Persident, through the United States representatives to the United Nations at the forthcoming special reconvening of the General Assembly of the United Nations, should take every appropriate action toward the immediate consideration and adoption of the report of the United Nations Special Committee on the Problem of Hungary and toward the immediate consideration of other available information on the brutal action of the Soviet Union in Hungary.

4. Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Meeting (S. Con. Res. 36, S. Rept. 604, passed Senate August 5, 1957): This concurrent resolution would authorize the appointment of 4 Members of each House of Congress to attend as guests the meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association to be held in India, which is tentatively scheduled to begin at New Delhi on December 2, 1957, and would provide for the payment of expenses of the delegates.

5. Printing of committee hearings on the mutual security program for fiscal year 1958 (S. Con. Res. 45, no written report, passed Senate August 26, 1957): This concurrent resolution authorized the printing of 1,000 additional copies of these hearings.

6. Admission of Spain to NATO (H. Con. Res. 115, S. Rept. 212, passed Senate April 12 1957): This concurrent resolution expressed the sense of the Congress that the State Department should continue to use its good offices toward the end of achieving participation by Spain in the North Atlantic Treaty and as a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

7. Greetings to the West Indies (S. Con. Res. 77, S. Rept. 1435, passed Senate, April 16, 1958): This concurrent resolution extended the greetings of the Congress to the Federal Legislature of the West Indies.

8. Execution of Hungarian leaders (S. Con. Res. 94, S. Rept. 1797, passed Senate June 19, 1958; H. Con. Res. 343 passed Senate June 24, 1958): This concurrent resolution expressed the indignation of the Congress at the execution of certain leaders of the recent revolt in Hungary.

9. International Health and Medical Research Year (S. Con. Res. 99, S. Rept. 2233, passed Senate August 11, 1958): This concurrent resolution requested the President to extend, through the World Health Organization and other agencies, an invitation to the nations of the world to designate representatives to meet and discuss the feasibility of an International Health and Medical Research Year or alternative methods looking toward intensified international cooperation in the field of health.

10. Discussion between United States and Canadian legislators (S. Con. Res. 108, S. Rept. 2231, passed by Senate August 8, 1958): This resolution recommended the establishment of subcommittees of the Senate Foreign Relations and House Foreign Affairs Committees for the purpose of exploring with members of the Canadian Parliament, the desirability and feasibility of increased systematic discussion between legislators of the two countries on problems of common concern.

11. United Nations Force (S. Con. Res. 109, S. Rept. 1884, passed Senate, July 23, motion to reconsider tabled by Senate July 31, 1958, by a vote of 66–14). This concurrent resolution expressed the sense of the Congress that a force similar in character to the United Nations Emergency Force should be made a permanent arm of the United Nations.

12. Printing of Final Report of Disarmament Subcommittee (S. Con. Res. 111, passed Senate, August 18, 1958): This concurrent resolution authorized the printing of the final report of the Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Committee on Foreign Relations as a Senate document.

Bills and Joint Resolutions Passed by Senate but Not by House

1. Transmission of Executive Agreements to the Senate (S. 603, S. Rept. 521, passed Senate June 25, 1957): This bill in general would require the Secretary of State to transmit to the Senate the text of any international agreement other than a treaty, to which the United States is a party.

2. Amendment of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1959, as amended (S. 979, S. Rept. 612, passed Senate August 5, 1957): This bill would extend the time for filing claims against the Governments of Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, Italy, and the Soviet Union under subchapter III of Public Law 285, 84th Congress, and would provide for the reduction of awards made under title III of Public Law 285 in certain cases where claimants received tax benefits from writing off war losses upon which their awards are based.

3. Implementation of the Geneva Red Cross Conventions (S. 1779, S. Rept. 772, passed Senate August 5, 1957): This bill would give effect to certain obligations which the United States assumed when it ratified the Geneva Conventions of 1949 for the protection of war victims (Exs. D, E, F, and G, 82–1).

4. Waiver of Collection of Certain Financial Assistance Loans (S. 747, S. Rept. 767, passed Senate August 5, 1957): This bill would permit the Secretary of State, with the approval of the Comptroller General of the United States, to evaluate and to cancel, in whole or in part, certain claims of the Government against citizens of the United States growing out of personal loans and other advances made to them in emergency situations abroad.

5. Assistant to the Secretary of State for Cultural Relations (S. 3112, S. Rept. 1932, passed Senate July 28, 1958): This bill would authorize the appointment of an assistant to the Secretary of State to be known as the Assistant for International Cultural Relations.

6. Relief of Mary F. C. Leute (S. 4214, S. Rept. 2352, passed Senate August 18, 1958): This bill provided relief for Mary F. C. Leute by authorizing the Secretary of State to grant her an annuity from the foreign service retirement fund.[1]

7. Highway compact between Minnesota and Manitoba (S. 3944, S. Rept. 2351, passed Senate August 18, 1958): This bill authorized the negotiation of a highway compact between Minnesota and Manitoba for the development of a highway to the northwest angle of Minnesota.[1]

Legislative record

Treaties:	
Held over from previous Congress	18
Submitted during 85th Congress, 1st and 2d sessions	18
Total pending during 85th Congress	36
Advice and consent given	17
Withdrawn	10
Still pending at end of 85th Congress	9
Bills and joint resolutions:	
Referred to the committee	97
Passed Senate	34
Provisions included in other laws	15
Indefinitely postponed	11
Still pending	37
Senate and concurrent resolutions:	
Referred to the committee	79
Passed Senate	30
Provisions included in other legislation	6
Indefinitely postponed	5
Still pending	38
Meetings:	
Full committee:	
Executive	115
Public	69
Total	184

[1] Likely to pass House before adjournment.

Legislative record—Continued

Meetings—Continued	
Subcommittees:	
Executive	44
Public	13
Total	57
Special committee to study the foreign aid program:	
Executive	2
Public	13
Total	15
Conference committees:	
Executive	10
Total meetings	266

Rollcall votes on foreign-policy measures

Protocol to the 1949 International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries	82–0
Protocol to the 1930 Convention for the Protection, Preservation, and Extension of the Sockeye Salmon Fisheries in the Fraser River System	85–0
Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency	67–19
Agreement and Protocol Regarding Certain Bonds of Austrian Issue	78–0
Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Navigation with Korea	86–0
Protocol Amending International Sugar Agreement of 1953	86–0
Convention on Inter-American Cultural Relations	86–0
Protocol to the 1946 International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling	86–0
Amendment to the 1949 International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea	86–0
Interim Convention on Conservation of North Pacific Fur Seals	86–0
Income Tax Convention with Austria	86–0
Income Tax Convention with Canada	86–0
Income Tax Convention with Japan	86–0
Mutual Security Act of 1957	57–25
Middle East Resolution	72–19
Nomination of Scott McLeod to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ireland	60–20
Mutual Security Act of 1958	51–17
Expressing indignation at the execution of certain leaders of the recent revolt in Hungary	91–0
Income Tax Convention with Pakistan	84–0
Income Tax Convention with Belgium	84–0
Supplementary Income Tax Convention with the United Kingdom	84–0
Establishment of the United Nations Force	66–14
Supplementary Income Tax Convention with the United Kingdom	90–0
Nominations confirmed:	
Ambassadors and ministers	66
Department of State (including International Cooperation Administration)	20
NATO	1
United Nations	39
Advisory Commissions	8
Brussels Fair	1
United States Information Agency	1
Foreign Service	2772
Total	2908

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HUMPHREY TO NATIONAL CHRISTIAN EDUCATION CONFERENCE, PURDUE UNIVERSITY, LAFAYETTE, IND.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech I am going to deliver this evening by telephone to some 5,000 young people who are gathered together in the National Christian Education Conference at Purdue University.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR HUMPHREY PROPOSES WORKS FOR PEACE TO DETER GLOBAL WAR; ANNOUNCES TENTATIVE PROGRAM FOR WORLD HEALTH STUDY

(Excerpts from address prepared for delivery by Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY (Democrat of Minnesota) at National Christian Education Conference, Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind., Friday, August 22, 1958—now scheduled for delivery via direct telephone line from District Room in Capitol).

This has been, and rightly so, a working conference.

Your many workshops have enabled you to become better "workers in the Lord's vineyard," better servants of God.

It is the theme of "work" and the "works for peace" which I want to discuss with you tonight.

In 10 days, Americans will be celebrating their annual Labor Day.

The weekend after this, you and your families will be enjoying the relaxation and recreation of the day which has been set aside to honor the laboring men and laboring women of our country.

Tonight, I should like, respectfully, to call you further unto a labor which is the most important in the world today: I call you, my friends, and your Government and mine unto labor to prevent a global Armageddon, unto labor to prevent a Communist-run world.

I call you unto labor which will, instead, speaking positively, makes ours a freer world, a happier world, a better world, a more peaceful world.

GUIDED MISSILES TO MANKIND'S HEARTS

Specifically, I call you yourselves to help create more guided missiles—but not more "Thors" and "Atlases" and "Polarises"—as important as they are to deter war.

I call you to create more guided missiles to the hearts of mankind.

I mean "Christian missiles" of love and friendship, such as you are already creating, but which you must still further increase in number and in effectiveness.

What are these "missiles of peace"?

They are both ancient, and modern devices, which have been used in part for 2,000 years—the weapons against mankind's real enemies.

They are the "weapons" used by the Teacher of Galilee and by His disciples and His followers to "clothe the naked, feed the hungry, heal the sick."

They are the "weapons" of great ideas, the weapons of love and devotion and self-sacrifice which can span vast space and time.

They are "weapons" which must be aimed, principally, among the third of the world which is underdeveloped, but not limited to that area. I mean the "weapons" against pain and suffering, ignorance and superstition and idolatry and illiteracy, hunger and malnutrition, disease and disability.

So, I earnestly call your Government and mine, just as you yourselves have already heard the call, to prove that we Americans are indeed "our brothers' keeper."

THE LAUNCHING PADS OF PEACE

Let us fire our peaceful weapons from the only kind of launching pads we really desire—the peaceful launching pads of our farms and our factories, our divinity schools and our normal schools and our land grant and other colleges and universities.

The moon is 230,000 miles away, and we would like to reach it with a missile, but we would like even more to reach the hearts of peoples in Latin America, in Asia, Africa, the Middle East and in Europe, itself.

We want to overcome misunderstanding, fear, envy, and want. Suffering and privation are vast.

The average life expectancy in south Asia is still only 33 years or so. Infant mortality is 50 percent and higher in much of the underdeveloped world. Per capita income is only $50 per year. To help relieve this enormous need is the challenge facing us.

Why us? Because it is we Americans who have the wherewithal to fulfill mankind's needs.

Because "every one to whom much is given, of him will much be required."

Because "if any man has this world's goods and sees his brother in need, yet closes his heart against him, how does God's love abide in him?"

To meet this challenge is truly the "labor of the Lord."

It is labor which parallels the fine educational work which you, yourselves, are already performing in the churches and church schools across the length and breadth of America.

"GO YE UNTO ALL THE WORLD"

I ask you now, however, to widen still further your scope, so that it encompasses the entire globe.

"Go ye unto all the world"—is now not simply an admonition; it is a dire necessity.

Either we Americans and our friends bring the gospel—the good news—of brotherhood, or our adversaries will bring the bad news, the Communist gospel—of hatred and destruction.

THE GREATEST CHALLENGE IN OUR HISTORY

Why do I say that your mission—all America's mission—is a dire necessity?

It is because this country faces what is, undoubtedly, the severest crisis of its history.

It is not just a crisis involving a military challenge; it involves an economic, a political, and ideological, a spiritual crisis, as well.

For proof of the challenge we face, you need only look at the disturbing headlines on this evening's newspapers. Read the crisis-ridden news dispatches from Beirut and from Amman; from Algeria, and from the Chinese mainland.

Much of this crisis is not even reflected in headlines. For some of the most serious developments in the world are those which are not blared over the radio or television.

I refer, for example, to the ceaselessly mounting stockpile of nuclear weapons and guided missiles in both the United States and Russia. I refer to the continuing buildup—on both sides—of the capability of extinguishing, in the event of an all-out conflict, most of the lives here in continental United States and in the Eurasian land mass of Russia.

What is our answer to this crisis?

Our answer must come, as I have indicated, in the form of deeds of peace, or, as we shall call it tonight, works of peace.

Behind these works there must be ideas—the ideas of inspired men and women who are carrying out God's will for peace.

NO WORDS WITHOUT DEEDS—PROMISE WITHOUT FULFILLMENT

"Works for peace" is not just my phrase. It is a phrase used, among others, by the President of the United States in his state of the Union message on January 9, 1958. His words were eloquent and encouraging when he spoke of cooperation for a better world.

But words without deeds can be barren, just as "faith without works" can be barren.

And the near tragedy has been that while our Chief Executive has spoken of works for peace, America has not sufficiently acted to bring into being these works of peace.

There has been promise, but small fulfillment; great expectations, but few results.

We are all familiar with the old saying, "What you do speaks so loudly that I cannot hear what you say."

Today, many of the peoples of the world might say to us of America: "What you don't do speaks so loudly that we cannot hear what you say."

It is our errors of omission, almost as much as our errors of commission, which serve to limit the effectiveness of what we say to the world.

FOUR TYPES OF PROGRAMS FOR PEACE

Now, let us be more specific.

What solid works of peace can you and I and our government perform?

Let me refer you to four specific works of peace in several areas:

1. Food for peace.
2. Health for peace.
3. Loans for peace.
4. Disarmament for peace.

FOOD FOR PEACE CAN BE A DECISIVE INFLUENCE

One of the most important jobs which we can better perform is to use food for peace.

Fortunately, we in America are blessed with the bounty of a highly productive agricultural economy.

Our vast supply of food is a blessing—a priceless asset to ourselves and to the world.

Yet, far too often, the efficiency of our farmers and the fruitfulness of our soil have been considered as if they represented a "curse."

Yet, it is ridiculous to be anything but grateful to God for the blessing of our crops.

THE GREAT VALUE OF PUBLIC LAW 480

In the year ending June 30, 1958, America exported $4 billion in agricultural products. Twenty-six percent of our exports during the last 4 years have been based on what is known as the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, or Public Law 480, of the 83d Congress.

Under this act, we use constructively for overseas aid purposes our so-called surplus agricultural commodities. Since July of 1954, there has been a grand total of $6.7 billion of programing of surplus agricultural commodities.

During these 4 years, I am glad to say, $1.3 billion have been donated for foreign and domestic relief through nonprofit voluntary agencies—churches and others—together with intergovernmental organizations.

In addition, we have negotiated agreements for the sale of agricultural commodities for foreign currency under what is known as title I of Public Law 480, for a total of $4 billion.

Time is not available to go into detail to describe all of the constructive uses to which these Public Law 480 amounts have been utilized. It is sufficient to say, however, that not only has our food fed the hungry, but it has been used to generate foreign currency and to develop new markets for our commercial foreign exports. It has been used to help create loans to expand local businesses, to exchange students and technicians, and for many other worthy purposes.

You might not think that such a constructive program would experience any difficulties in the Congress. But, unfortunately enough, we have had to battle for the very continuation of this essential program.

This is an ironic contrast which we frequently find in the Congress. For instance, strangely enough, within 1 day's brief session, the Senate unanimously approved a $40 billion defense appropriation bill.

Yet, it takes us far longer and many rollcalls to authorize mere fractions of that sum for constructive peaceful purposes.

IDEAS, NOT MACHINEGUNS, WILL WIN THE WORLD

The reason for that contrast is that the thinking of many people tends to lag behind reality.

The legislative and executive branches have developed the habit of massive overseas arms aid appropriations. Yet, events have long since proven the limitation of mere arms aid alone.

For example, we had armed the Iraqi army, but we had forgotten about the thoughts in the minds of the Iraqi officers and enlisted men. And within a few brief hours, the arms which we had given to help defend the Iraq monarchy had been used to overthrow that government.

We cannot win the battle for men's minds with machineguns and mortars. We can win it basically only with superior ideas.

"Food for Peace" is a superior idea.

Giving food generously represents the real America at work.

If we would win, we must be ourselves.

We must act ourselves.

We must fulfill our true nature.

We are not warmongers. We are not imperialists, as the Soviets picture us.

We are good Samaritans. We believe in helping people to help themselves. This is the soul of America.

STRENGTHENING HEALTH FOR PEACE

There are few fields in which we can perform more constructive works of peace than in the field of health.

During this session of Congress, which is now concluding, it has been my pleasure to help write into the law of the land four pieces of legislation which may contribute, if only in small part, to improving mankind's health.

For example, we wrote into the Mutual Security Act a declaration that the Congress states it to be the policy of our land to help further in the research task of eradicating mankind's diseases. The Congress declared it to be our goal to help find the answers to such major killing and crippling ailments as cancer and heart disease, together with other scourges.

Secondly, we wrote into that same act a new provision whereby the sales of American farm products overseas under Public Law 480 may be utilized henceforth for the purpose of translating scientific works and supporting scientific, including medical, research.

We enacted a separate resolution which took a cue from the current successful International Geophysical Year, in which 60 nations are cooperating in studying the earth, the waters, and the skies.

In this resolution the Senate invited the President to assemble representatives through the World Health Organization, and other means, so as to consider the possibility of setting aside an International Health and Medical Research Year sometime in the future.

PURPOSES OF NEW GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE HEALTH STUDY

And then, on Monday of this week, the Senate approved a resolution under which the Senate Government Operations Committee will make a study of worldwide health activities.

We will look not only at America's health assistance, but at additional medical research work which might be performed overseas. It will be my pleasure to serve as chairman of this study, which will be made by the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations.

It is still too early to describe any detailed plans under this new study.

But, subject to the wishes of the subcommittee members, I may say that I, for one, feel that this subcommittee can serve as a significant stimulus toward better world health.

I, for one, propose to invite the great voluntary organizations of this land to assist us. I mean:

(a) The church groups—with their vital overseas medical aid programs.

(b) The professional groups, such as the American Medical Association, the American Nurses Association, the American Pharmaceutical Association, the American Dietary Association.

(c) The voluntary health groups, such as the American Heart Association, the American Cancer Society, the National Foundation (formerly the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis), the Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation.

(d) Other private foundations, such as the Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Foundation, the Near East Foundation.

We shall ask their best judgment concerning international medical research, assistance, and rehabilitation.

We will probably hold hearings and conferences in Washington, in Bethesda, Md. (the site of the famed National Institutes of Health) and in Geneva, Switzerland (home of the World Health Organization).

We will ask the great private pharmaceutical industry of America to come forth with its ideas and suggestions.

I may say that there are tens of millions of dollars of private drug supplies which are relatively surplus on the American market. Such drugs have been surpassed by newer developments. Yet they are perfectly usable and could be put to invaluable service in relieving foreign distress.

I would like to see a fleet of surplus American ships, carrying surplus American drugs, and with surplus jeeps, and trailers dispatched to the four corners of the world. I would like to see them visit the port cities of underdeveloped areas, with American doctors dispensing these healing medicines and thereafter, proceeding into the interior lands, as well.

This, to me, is a "work of peace."

LOW-INTEREST LOANS FOR PEACE ESSENTIAL

Still another area of "works for peace" is in the form of long-range economic loans to underdeveloped areas.

I need hardly remind you in detail that the Soviets have been making some of their most spectacular progress in the form of trade and aid agreements to underdeveloped areas. In Khrushchev's own words, he challenges us to a war—an economic war. He is determined to win that war.

In Indonesia, for example, Russia has made available $100 million in long-term credits. Our own level of credits have been at the level of $15 million. A similar disparity in aid could be cited in other underdeveloped countries.

Yet, we can ill afford to let the Soviet Union preempt the field of long-term, low-interest loans. It is far more important to us that the underdeveloped countries succeed with their various development programs than it is that we insist on acting like bankers, offering only short-term loans, and at a high interest level.

THE CHALLENGE OF INDIA

The vast subcontinent of India, is a particular case in point. Containing no less than 1 out of every 7 people on the face of this earth, India is now hard pressed trying to achieve even a scaled-down version of its second 5-year plan.

Even if it achieves all of its ambitious objectives under that plan, rising inflation and the increase in population may mean that after 5 years, it will have only about held its own in per-capita income and in job totals. Thus, it is having to race merely in order to stand still. Inevitably, it faces rising discontent among the Indian people.

How do we know there is discontent? The Communists have more than doubled their vote in the second parliamentary elections—reaching a figure of 12 million votes in all. Although the Communists have only 27 of 500 seats in the lower house, they

represent the second strongest political party in India.

Of India's 14 States and 6 territories, the Communists now control 1 state—Kerala—and are the second strongest party in 2 other states—Andhra and West Bengal.

Kerala, I may point out, is, ironically, the state with the highest proportion of Christians in all of India.

But Kerala is ruled by a Communist bloc not because of Christian influence, but despite Christian influence. For Kerala is beset with acute unemployment, especially among intellectuals, together with all the other chronic problems of India.

Then, there is the contrast—Christianity and communism, religion and godlessness.

What do we propose to do about it?

We cannot ignore it. We cannot be indifferent. That would be neither in our Christian tradition nor in our enlightened self-interest.

India needs more aid—from the United States Development Loan Fund and from other means. It needs more power, more schools, more medicines, more of almost everything.

It needs works of peace which will help overcome the unfortunate distrust, which according to public opinion polls, many of her people feel toward us, because of our arms aid to Pakistan.

DISARMAMENT—STEP BY STEP—FOR PEACE

Finally, I should like to mention one other essential work of peace, perhaps the most essential of all.

I refer to the urgency of an imaginative new approach to find some way out of the present alarming deadlock over disarmament. I have consistently urged, as you may know, that we demonstrate more flexibility and resourcefulness in overcoming the present East-West impasse.

I have urged that, instead of rigidly insisting upon the total United States disarmament package and getting nowhere, that we break down that package into feasible units, one step at a time, and agree with the Russians, for example, on joint cessation of nuclear weapon testing with the safeguards of effective and workable inspection.

As in other diplomatic areas of contest, it is essential that we not be so rigid as to defeat our own purposes.

It would be one thing to concede to the Russians some crucial principle, or to give ground on some phase involving our very survival.

It is another thing to compromise on a less essential point which we may well afford to concede in order to secure at least partial agreement.

Let us not get into the Soviet's habit of saying "Nyet."

Too much is at stake for America to be dogmatic to the point of diplomatic futility.

When agreement is reached on one point, the stage is set for subsequent agreement.

Each new demonstration of teamwork makes further demonstrations possible.

CONTRIBUTING TO AN ATMOSPHERE OF PEACE

So, too, each successive work of peace has both a direct and an indirect effect. The direct effect is to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and heal the sick. But the indirect effect is to create a climate of understanding and friendship; and to contribute to an atmosphere of peace.

Nowhere is such a climate and atmosphere more important than in the strained relations between the Untied States and the U. S. S. R.

There is such a wall of suspicion and of misunderstanding between us that anything which can be done to hurdle the wall and have our citizens work side by side with Russian citizens is to the good.

The more Russians and Americans can work fruitfully side by side, on common problems, the more they can increase the likelihood of an overall settlement of peace being achieved.

CONCLUSION

This, then, is my theme of works for peace. One might add to it a great many additional phases, such as schooling for peace.

For widespread illiteracy and the world's hunger for knowledge are two of mankind's greatest needs.

But in whatever the field, let our deeds match our words. Let fulfillment follow promise. Let great works embody great ideas.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I had hoped to be at Purdue University tonight. This group of young people represents what I call the leaders of today and tomorrow. I am going to address on the subject matter of Works for Peace.

A part of the works for peace I shall talk about is the use of American food and fiber, our great abundance of food and fiber, as an instrument of peace for human development.

I am happy tonight that I can open my remarks to the group, as I shall from the Committee Room of the District of Columbia Committee in the Capitol, by long-distance telephone, with a speaker in the great auditorium at Purdue University, by saying that Congress has extended, by our action tonight, Public Law 480 for another 18 months and that we have included new uses for the currencies accumulated, new uses for the money, which will result in relieving people from the terrible liabilities of illiteracy, hunger, and disease. This is a good program. I am happy to be associated with it.

ARMED SERVICES REDUCTION IN FORCE PROGRAM

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, many of us recall with dismay, and considerable distaste, the outstanding military event of last fall when Congressional adjournment signaled the beginning of the infamous reduction in force in the armed services, known as r. i. f.

With virtually no warning, and at the expense of national security, thousands of Reserve officers were discharged from their posts and sent home.

For the privilege of this shattering and disrupting cutback, which brought hardships and injustices to many fine patriots, the armed services squandered some 25 to 50 millions of dollars.

At least this price tag was attached to the r. i. f. operation. But there were additional costs. Morale of all the standing forces was shaken. The confidence in their Government was undermined in the hearts of thousands of military leaders of all ranks. Many young officers changed their minds and decided against a military career. Many retired officers viewed sorrowfully what had been wrought in institutions they loved. Wives and children of dedicated servicemen were disillusioned and embittered.

We all know what happened. We heard about it from the folks back home. We found that the taxpayers of the United States are not so eager to save a few dollars that they were willing to see this thing done to their fighting men. In short, the price in morale, faith, and good judgment was too high. As Bernard Baruch once observed, "we have no ambition to be the richest in the graveyard."

Called before the House Armed Services Committee to defend the r. i. f., the Assistant Secretary of Defense sorrowfully admitted that it did not make much sense.

Even while administration spokesmen explained, defended, or apologized for the r. i. f., which saved some few dollars, with equal vehemence they were asking for more than a half-billion dollars to raise the pay of all those remaining in the military. I supported the pay raise; but, had I been consulted about it, I would have been more eager to have insisted that we keep in the standing forces the trained, experienced Reserve officers who had demonstrated through 10 to 18 years of service their ability to perform in their military assignments.

I recall the tragedy of the r. i. f. at this time because the Congress is nearing adjournment.

With increasing regularity, we now hear reports and rumors that the Defense Department again is preparing to institute a r. i. f.

We had repeated promises, real and implied, that the services had enough of the r. i. f. disaster.

Yet, sad to relate, we know too well how little faith may be placed in such promises.

I was one of the many Members of Congress who, during this session, had looked forward to the opportunity of voting for an anti-r. i. f. bill. I appeared before the House Armed Services Committee last January to urge such legislation. The members of the House committee had intended to produce such legislation.

It is my understanding that such a bill was ready in the House committee at the beginning of this Congress. Dilatory tactics of the Department of Defense in reporting on such legislation precluded any action at this session of the Congress.

It is my understanding that both in the Senate and in the House the Armed Services Committees already are preparing to consider the r. i. f. problem at the very beginning of the next Congress in January. For a fact, I believe both such committees already have rather definite principles to which they will commit such legislative efforts.

In view of these facts, and in the light of the demonstrated folly of the 1957 r. i. f., it is to be hoped that the Department of Defense will defer any substantial reduction program for at least 6 months.

Any less consideration will be, in my opinion, an act of bad faith on the part of those in the administration responsible for such decision.

I believe I know something of the character and ability of the chairman and members of this body's Armed Services Committee. No committee of this Congress works more faithfully, more conscientiously, nor with a greater dedication than does that group of Senators. We all know, too, that this committee

seeks to carry out its duties in a nonpartisan manner, and, for a fact, partisanship has no part of its deliberations.

The members of that committee, from both sides of the aisle, surely will bring their good offices to bear upon the Secretary of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget, so that this Nation will not again witness the shame of this most obnoxious of military defeats—the r. i. f.

INCREASE IN DIVERSION OF WATER FROM LAKE MICHIGAN INTO THE ILLINOIS WATERWAY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2) to authorize the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test on a 3-year basis the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, bills similar to H. R. 2, passed by the House and reported to the Senate by the Committee on Public Works, have twice heretofore been passed by the Congress. On each of those occasions the bill was vetoed by the President of the United States. The bills were vetoed, as set forth in the President's veto message, because of the fact that the legislation had been objected to by our neighbors to the north in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. President, I am happy to report to the Senate that the bill now before this body in its present form, with the limitations contained in it in the form of a statement of program, authorized by the representatives of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and agreed to by the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, whose agreement appears in the record and in the report, is not objected to by the administration. The Committee on Public Works received a communication from the State Department advising us that the bill, on the basis which I have described, was not only not objected to by the State Department but also was not objected to by our neighbor to the north, the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. President, the bill would authorize the temporary diversion of an additional 1,000 cubic feet of water per second from Lake Michigan, to be taken by the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago and diverted into the Illinois River and connecting channels, and thence of course to find its way into the Mississippi River.

The bill authorizes an experiment, an experiment earnestly sought by the people of the State of Illinois, the city of Chicago, and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago.

In the opinion of the committee the authorization is justified on the basis, first, of the great need for this diversion by the metropolitan area of Chicago and its sanitary district, and on the basis that the diversion sought to be authorized under this proposed legislation would do no harm to anyone.

Honorable men have been in violent disagreement as to what would be the result of the diversion of this water. Men of good will and good conscience came before our committee and advised us that the diversion of an additional thousand cubic feet per second of water from Lake Michigan would cause irreparable damage to the Dominion of Canada, to other States adjacent to the Great Lakes, and to States adjacent to the St. Lawrence Waterway.

The committee was not persuaded that such damage would occur. Evidence before the committee by the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army verified that the normal season of rainfall and drought in the watershed of the Great Lakes produced a variance in the water level of the Great Lakes in excess of six feet. In other words, by the operation of the laws of nature, the waters of Lake Michigan, in the duration of the cycle from dry years to wet years, the water level would vary more than six feet in the period of time which represented the normal cycle between the dry years and the wet years. In fact, the evidence showed conclusively that the variance in the water level of the lake would amount to several feet in most usual years.

The further evidence before the committee was—and the report discloses it—that under the operation of the diversion which would be authorized by this legislation there would be no greater variance in the water level than three-eighths or one-half of an inch.

The Senator from Oklahoma probably heard more of the evidence on the proposed legislation than did any other member of the committee. I was astounded beyond my power of expression that men could be so concerned about such a minor operation. When we consider the fact that under the operation of the elements of nature, the water level on Lake Michigan is at times six and a half feet higher than at other times, how in the name of heaven could a change in that water level of three-eighths of an inch or half an inch for a period of 12 months adversely or lastingly affect anyone?

We were told, to begin with, that Canada vigorously opposed this operation; yet we learned that under the terms of an agreement with this country years ago Canada began the diversion of 5,000 acre-feet of water from a watershed north of Lake Superior into Lake Superior, and thence through the waterway to the St. Lawrence River.

We also learned that Lake Michigan is entirely within the jurisdictional area of the United States, that no part of it is within 30 miles or more of the border of the Dominion of Canada.

To cap the climax or, as Sanderson Pratt would have said in the great story by O'Henry, "Cap the vortex"—we learned that the Dominion of Canada had advised our State Department that it had no objection to legislation authorizing the diversion of an additional thousand cubic feet of water per second for a period of 1 year, as contemplated under the terms of the bill.

I invite attention to the fact that the proposed legislation authorizes, in specific language, a diversion for 3 years. However, the evidence before the committee by Mr. E. L. Richardson, Acting Secretary of the Department, set forth the manner in which the program would be operated if authorized under this bill, in language which makes it crystal clear that the extent of the diversion would be for 1 year, not 3 years.

The evidence of the representative of the Department before the committee showed that if H. R. 2 were enacted into law, the following program would be inaugurated and carried out:

The first phase would be a 6-month period of study to develop plans and a method of carrying out the experiment sought to be authorized by the proposed legislation, during which time there would be no additional diversion.

There would be a second phase of 12-month duration, in which the operation of the present diversion of water from the lake, which is limited to 1,500 cubic feet a second, would be carried out. That is, in order to arrive at the proper conclusion on the basis of the experiment herein authorized, after the Department had spent 6 months in making its plans and getting ready for the experiment, it would require 12 months in which to observe the observation of the program as it is now carried on.

Of course, inasmuch as the purpose would be to observe the operation of the present program, there would be no additional diversion under this bill during that 12-month period.

The third phase would involve a 12-month study under the conditions of the increased annual average diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second duration for 1 year. In other words, it would be a year and a half after the bill became law before there would be the diversion of a single cubic foot of water over and above that now being diverted in accordance with law.

Then the diversion would be for a 12-month period, which, added to the 18-month period described, would make 2½ years of the 3-year period authorized under the bill. The witness then advised the committee that the fourth phase would be the 6 months required in which to prepare the final report to Congress, during which time there would be no additional diversion. In other words, if the bill is enacted into law, we have the evidence of the department which would be making the experiment that there would be only a 12-month diversion.

Then we have in the RECORD the obligation and commitment of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago officially agreeing to that method of testing and carrying out the experiment authorized under the bill. Further, there is the report of the committee setting forth that this would be under the supervision of the Department of the Army, and setting forth that the passage of the bill is recommended by the committee with the distinct understanding and official declaration that under the authorization herein granted the diversion would be limited to 12 months of the 3-year period.

As I said a short time ago, the State Department has advised that they have no objection. They have provided us with a communication from the Dominion of Canada telling us that Canada has no objection to it. The Bureau of the Budget advises the committee that the administration has no objection to the program. The committee was convinced that the ends of justice could not be served without this experiment. It would resolve the controversy now raging in terms of speculation on the part of those who oppose the legislation. For that matter, it would either verify or refute the claim of the representatives of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, first, as to what their requirements are, and, second, what the benefits of such a program would be.

As I said a while ago, the program could hurt no one, unless it is held that in wounding men's pride one hurts them.

The opponents say it would cost from $400,000 to $900,000 a year in lost revenue by the creation of the power at Niagara. The evidence is that 60 to 80 thousand cubic feet per second are now bypassed in the electrical generating facility at Niagara because the generating facilities are not there. That is 60,000 to 80,000 cubic feet per second which are not now being used. How could the utilization of 1,000 cubic feet per second, to enable the experiment to be performed, damage anyone? While the fact is that the water now not being diverted is not being used to generate electricity, if diverted, in addition to carrying out the purposes of the experiment, the water would be used to generate electricity.

It is the duty of Congress to legislate for all the people. It has been my privilege, as a Member of the Senate, to help pass the authorization for the St. Lawrence Waterway and its gigantic development. It was done at the expense of all the taxpayers of the country, for the benefit of our country. However, primarily, it was for the benefit of that area of our country. It is a great area and a worthy area, adjacent to and dependent upon the development of the water resources of the St. Lawrence Waterway.

It was my privilege, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors of the Committee on Public Works, to fashion the legislation permitting the great State of New York, through its power authority, to build the Niagara hydroelectric generating project, now under construction. It was my privilege to sit for weeks in hearings and in the work of the committee in fashioning that legislation in order that the inherent right of the people of New York and adjacent areas to the benefit and development of the potentiality of that great hydroelectric power project might become a reality.

We have before us proposed legislation for another great area of our Nation, the metropolitan area of Chicago and the great State of Illinois. There have been times when the distinguished Senators from Illinois were looking elsewhere when Oklahoma needed their help. However, their State is entitled to the proposed legislation. That was the conclusion of the Committee on Public Works after extended hearings. That was the conclusion of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors. Speaking for that committee and for what I believe to be the rights of the people of a great State and of a great metropolitan area, and in the conviction that it can do no harm to any area, I urge the passage of the proposed legislation by the Senate.

There are so many who will be benefited, and are only a few, if any, who can receive any possible damage, from the proposed legislation, that in my judgment the preponderance of the equities calls in ringing terms for the approval of the pending bill by the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to thank the senior Senator from Oklahoma for the very fair-minded treatment he has given to the proposal and for his complete mastery of the issues involved.

I suppose that no two Members of the Senate have clashed more frequently and at times more violently than have the senior Senator from Oklahoma and the senior Senator from Illinois. There was, therefore, no personal reason why the Senator from Oklahoma should support this bill except on the merits of the bill itself. It is at once both a great tribute to the Senator from Oklahoma and real evidence of the solid merit of the proposal, that the Senator from Oklahoma, after hearing evidence in years past and hearing evidence once again this year, has come to such a firm and favorable conclusion, and has analyzed the issues so thoroughly.

Our need in Illinois for this additional water is very real. Chicago up to 1930 diverted 10,000 cubic feet of water per second.

Then by an order of the Supreme Court this diversion was reduced to 1,500 cubic feet. The city of Chicago has fully and religiously obeyed this mandate of the Supreme Court. It has constructed sewage disposal works at a cost of more than $400 million. It has a sewage disposal plant which engineering magazines refer to as one of the seven modern engineering wonders of the world. Chicago has probably the most efficient system of sewage treatment of any city in the world—more efficient, indeed, than that of our beloved city to the north—Milwaukee.

But even the most efficient plant in the world cannot completely dispose of all the sewage which is given to it. We have a process of activating sludge, and we sell the sewage in bags, as the city of Milwaukee does, as fertilizer for lawns. But even in our most efficient systems there is a 10 percent residual which cannot be handled in this way, and which must be disposed of somehow.

The other cities on the Great Lakes have rivers which flow into the Great Lakes. Their residual is deposited in the lakes. Our beloved city to the north, which has an excellent city government, which sends fine Senators and Representatives to Congress, and which has a fine baseball team, deposits its effluvia in Lake Michigan, and we inherit it in Chicago.

But we do not want to return evil for evil. We love Milwaukee so much that we do not choose to deposit all our 10 percent residual in this fashion. We put it into our Illinois River, and the people of Illinois suffer for it. We take the burdens upon ourselves, instead of unloading them on others, which is what our neighbors to the north do.

But with a population of 5½ million, and with industrial waste equivalent to a population of about 3 million more, we really are handling the sewage equivalent of a population of 8½ million.

A 10 percent residual amounts to the equivalent of sewage for a population of 850,000. At present all the water we can have is 1,500 cubic feet a second. That does not provide sufficient oxygen to decompose the nitrogenous effluvia which is the residual from this process. If we could get 1,000 cubic feet in addition, then we would have sufficient oxygen for the process of decomposition to take place. The sanitary hazards to the people of Illinois would be greatly reduced. That is the fundamental reason why we want the extra water.

As the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] has shown, Lake Michigan is purely a domestic waterway. The international boundary line, which is drawn in red on this map, is 30 or 40 miles east of the Straits of Mackinac, which comprise the northeastern limits of Lake Michigan. So Lake Michigan is a purely domestic waterway; and by a treaty with Canada in 1909, domestic waters were exempted from the provisions of that treaty. Secretary of State Elihu Root, in his speech describing that treaty, specifically said that Lake Michigan was exempted from the treaty. So, in fact, Canada really never had any legal case in this matter. But Canada has, in its statement to the Secretary of the Department of the State, declared that it has no objection to this added diversion of 1,000 cubic feet a second. So neither in law nor in fact will we be injuring our relationships with our great neighbor to the north.

I point out that in the past, in a period when the lake levels were rising, we permitted Canada to divert from Hudson Bay to Lake Superior, and hence to the general level of the lake, an additional 5,000 cubic feet a second. So in the exchange thus far, it is Canada which has gained, not we.

I was struck in the hearings by the fact that State after State among the Lake States wept tears for Canada. They spoke of how the additional 1,000 cubic feet a second would injure our relationships with Canada. I never before saw such touching solicitude displayed by any group. But I submit that all this is swept away now by the statement that Canada makes no objection to the added diversion of water.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Will the Senator, at this particular point, permit me to ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD my individual and concurring views which were published in the report

of the Senate Public Works Committee on H. R. 2? The reason I make the request is that the Senator from Illinois has just referred to the fact that Canada has no objection to the proposed diversion of 1,000 cubic feet for 1 year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It was so stated by Assistant Secretary of State Macomber in a letter to Representative YATES.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The letter was also sent to me and is a part of my individual views. It reads, in part, as follows:

> The State Department understands that the Canadian Government has no objection to a 1-year temporary diversion of an additional 1,000 cubic feet of water per second from the Great Lakes system in Chicago.

As the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] knows, we in the Northwest are very much concerned, and I believe properly so, about our relationships with Canada on the great Columbia River, which is one of the principal international waterways of the world. We stated that we would not agree to support the proposed diversion if our friends in Canada, who share with us not only the Great Lakes but also the Columbia River System, objected; and the determining factor in our viewpoint was the letter from Assistant Secretary of State Macomber, to which the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has just referred. That is why I thought it appropriate to set forth at this particular point that part of my individual concurring views which contains the letter that the Assistant Secretary of State wrote not only to Representative SIDNEY R. YATES, but also to me on this particular item.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad the Senator from Oregon has introduced that part of his concurring views, because I know he was sincerely disturbed as to whether the diversion of water from Lake Michigan would imperial the American claim to the use of the waters of the Columbia River, which rises in Canada and which gets a considerable portion of its flow from Canadian glaciers and from tributary streams.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Approximately 35 percent of the water of the Columbia River originates in the mountains of Canada. So the Senator from Illinois can see how profoundly important this matter is when we consider that the Columbia River carries down to the sea a volume of water, second only to "old man river" itself, the Mississippi.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad the Senator realizes the truth of the matter. The Senator from Oregon, at great political risk to himself, has supported power developments on the Columbia River. He has done so because he feels such a development was in the interest of the Nation, and he is not inclined to take a sectional view on that matter.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I trust the enlightened viewpoint of the Senator from Illinois will continue.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is encouraged by the attitude of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to add one further point. The letter from Assistant Secretary of State Macomber was the determining factor, certainly with me, and I believe with other Senators in the Pacific Northwest—although, of course, I cannot speak for them as emphatically as I can for myself.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Oregon is a tenacious battler not only for the national interest but also for the interests of his locality. It is fine to know that this proposal will not hurt the people of Oregon or the rest of the Pacific Northwest in the slightest degree.

I see my friends from the area of the other Great Lakes approaching. I see the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] in the chair. I feel I am encompassed by a crowd of opponents, but I am very glad to yield first to the senior Senator from Wisconsin, whom I see striding toward me with blood in his eye.

Mr. WILEY. I must say that the Senator's manner of handing out what we in the Northwest call "bull" is about the best I have heard in a long time. While the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] may be convinced of what he says is the law, I assume his mind is still open on the facts and the justice and the right.

Mr. NEUBERGER. What are these facts?

Mr. WILEY. I wish to ask one question. In a lawsuit there are facts, equities, and there is the law involved. I presume your letter related simply to that one point of what you think Canada's position is in the matter.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Wisconsin wish to contest Canada's position?

Mr. WILEY. I told the Senator from Illinois at the hearings, and then he clutched at me verbally, so to speak, when I told him I telephoned Canada on this subject, and they told me they did not waive anything.

Mr. NEUBERGER. To whom in Canada did the Senator from Wisconsin talk?

Mr. WILEY. I shall be glad to explain that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is very interesting that the Senator from Wisconsin states he telephoned Canada.

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There are 16 million people in Canada.

Mr. NEUBERGER. There are 17 million.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So I inquired to whom in Canada the Senator from Wisconsin telephoned, and he said he telephoned to a young lady in Ottawa. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILEY. Again the distinguished Senator is using air and force. I said my office telephoned, and talked to the Office of the Secretary of Foreign Affairs, and asked whether they had waived any rights. We also have in writing a statement to the effect that they have not waived any rights under the treaty.

At that point, I had to go to a meeting of the Judiciary Committee.

Then the Secretary's secretary came to the phone, and the question was asked again. She took the question to the Secretary of Foreign Affairs, and brought the answer back, "No."

Be that as it may, let me state that I heard the distinguished Senator from Oregon explain his position, based entirely upon what he thinks Canada's position is. I say we are going to discuss the facts, the equities, the rights and the law, not simply on the basis of Canada's position, but on the basis of American law; and I assume the Senate will pay attention to that, and will not be unduly influenced by the letter the Senator wrote.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I did not write any letter. The letter was written by the Assistant Secretary of State, William B. Macomber, Jr. It is upon the basis of that letter that we are assuming that Canada has no objection. I presume that we are entitled to make that assumption with some degree of accuracy; otherwise, our foreign affairs are in terrible shape. So we presume that when the Assistant Secretary of State writes to a Member of the Senate that Canada has no objection to the proposed diversion, he has some factual basis for making that statement.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator from Oregon wrote a letter to the chairman of the committee, did he not? I have a copy of it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Originally, I wrote to the chairman of the committee a letter in which I said we were concerned if Canada objected, because we did not want to set a precedent which would lead to Canadian diversion of the waters of the Columbia River from installations in Oregon and Washington.

Mr. WILEY. Will the Senator answer my question. Is his mind foreclosed on the facts, the equities, and the law?

Mr. NEUBERGER. My mind is never foreclosed on any issue until the time comes to vote.

Mr. WILEY. That is what I wanted to know. I thank the Senator.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I said that, at least so far as Canada is concerned, we have to rely on the letter from the Department of State.

Mr. WILEY. We shall show the Senator a memoir that has bearing on this issue. But that will come later.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, how ridiculous is the evidence adduced by the senior Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. To call a man ridiculous is no argument, Mr. President.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, how ridiculous is the argument of the senior Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. WILEY. That is not argument, either, it is a professional cliché. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. Well, Mr. President, how extraordinary is the argument, when, after the reading of a letter in which the State Department says Canada has no objection, the Senator from Wisconsin states that he telephoned to Canada, to the secretary to the secretary to the Secretary, who replied to him that their objections had not been withdrawn. Mr. President, if the case of the opponents of this diversion is no better than that, I am sure this measure will receive a unanimous vote of approval.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Illinois made the statement that Lake Michigan is not at all within the boundaries of Canada.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is a domestic waterway. The red line on the map shows the international boundary.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I finish my question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly; I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Illinois stated that at its closest point, Lake Michigan is approximately 30 miles from the Canadian border.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would say 40.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Approximately 40?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, from the Straits of Mackinac.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I understand the Senator from Illinois to mean that since Lake Michigan is within the boundaries of the United States, we can do whatever we please with that water; and that although what we do may transgress on Canadian rights in the Great Lakes basin and along the St. Lawrence Seaway, Canada cannot complain? Do I correctly understand that to be the position of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am simply saying that by the treaty of 1909, Lake Michigan is exempted from the provisions of that treaty; and on that point I have only to read from a declaration by Secretary of State Root, as follows:

> I have carefully guarded the terms of this treaty, in order not to include Lake Michigan.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But if the Senator from Illinois will read the agreement, he will find that any impairment of the level of the water in the Great Lakes Basin or any which causes substantial injury to navigation facilities, comes within the taboo imposed by the Dominion of Canada.

So let us return to the question: Does the Senator from Illinois take the position that the United States is allowed to do whatever it pleases with the rivers and lakes within its boundaries, regardless of the impact on Canadian waters and Canadian users?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me point out that the Chicago River is the only one, with the exception of the St. Lawrence, which flows out of the Great Lakes; all the other rivers feed the Great Lakes. The Chicago River is the only one which reverses the flow.

This matter was specifically guarded in the 1909 treaty. But the United States Supreme Court later reduced the amount to which Chicago was entitled. The Court reduced it from 10,000 cubic feet a second to 1,500 cubic feet a second; and we have loyally obeyed that order.

I say that this is a matter of national legislation. We are requesting from Congress an additional 1,000 cubic feet of water a second, and Canada has not interposed any objection.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then does the Senator from Illinois take the position that the Dominion of Canada is allowed to divert, within Canada, waters which, if permitted to flow in their natural channel, would enter the Columbia River in the State of Washington?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not going to go into that question at all.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is a significant question, because it involves international relations, and is the key to the problem confronting us.

So I wish to ask the question again: Does the Senator from Illinois take the position that Canada is allowed to divert the waters within the boundaries of the Dominion of Canada, and to detour them away from their natural flow into the United States?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is an entirely different issue, and has nothing to do with this one.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If that is the position of the Senator from Illinois, I am willing to take it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may point out that in the late 1930's, Canada diverted 5,000 cubic feet of water a second from Hudson Bay into Lake Superior, and thereby added to the level of the Great Lakes. But the United States did not interpose objection, although at that time the lake level was in the period of the cyclical upswing.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. First, let me say that if I have been unduly harsh upon the Senator from Wisconsin, I apologize.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator from Illinois could not be that way, because when he attempts to get funny, I try to get a little funny; that is the only difference. [Laughter.] When the Senator from Illinois puts on steam, I have a right to act in the same way.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. WILEY. I wish to ask a question: Is it a fact that Congress previously conferred on the Secretary of War authority to regulate the diversion?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Well, subject to control by Congress itself.

Mr. WILEY. The only question I ask at this time is whether Congress in the past delegated to the Secretary of War the right to regulate diversion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Simply to do the technical management and administration of the diversion, through the Corps of Army Engineers. That has been going on for a long time; and the Army Engineers have administered and managed the diversion, and also the cut from 10,000 cubic feet of water a second to 1,500 cubic feet of water a second; and they would administer any increase which the Congress might authorize. But the Corps of Army Engineers does not have legislative authority.

Mr. WILEY. The Congress has conferred authority upon the Secretary of War to regulate the diversion, provided he acts in reasonable relation to the purpose of his delegated authority, and not arbitrarily.

Is it a fact that a case is now pending in court, and that the State of Illinois, or the water district, has not made application to the court for this diversion—or perversion, if one wants to call it that?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I know we were granted authority last December to divert for a temporary period, not an additional 1,000 cubic feet a second, but 8,500 cubic feet a second. That lasted for 6 weeks. The Supreme Court granted it.

I also know the State of Wisconsin and other Lake States asked Chicago to follow their practice of dumping sewage back into the Lake, and the Supreme Court denied their application.

Mr. WILEY. Of course, that is not an answer to my question. That again is a little diversion on the part of the Senator from Illinois. If the Senator will answer the questions, we probably would clear up these issues.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is the question of the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. WILEY. The first question is this: Is it a fact that from 1952 to 1957 Chicago has failed in its removal of solids, and that the percentage has gone from 91.1 to 80.6 percent? In other words, it is not efficient, and is not the whole problem one of getting rid of Chicago's sewage? Is that the whole problem?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, that is not the whole problem. I would like to know what is the authority for the statement of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I shall be glad to put it in the RECORD, because it comes from the metropolitan sanitary district of greater Chicago. It came in today.

Furthermore, the record shows clearly that Chicago has been guilty of failing to comply. The Senator has spoken of Milwaukee. We in Milwaukee remove up to 95 percent of sewage. Instead of putting the sewage back into the lake, we put back liquid that has been purified. Why cannot Chicago do the same thing, instead of taking water that belongs to all the Great Lakes States? That is one of the facts we shall argue in this case. I have in my hands the evidence, and I also have the worksheets, which were sent to me today. There is the evidence right there.

In 1952, the percentage of sewage removal was 91.1. In 1957 it was down to 80.6 percent. So far as concerns the removal of the material we have been talking about, the percentage has decreased from 93.6 to 85.6 percent. In other words, Chicago is not doing the job the Supreme Court told it it should do, in its decision.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have not seen those figures before. In 1956, according to those figures, the percentage of treatment was 88 percent. I think probably 1957 may have witnessed a temporary slump. I also point out that Chicago is spending $150 million additional for sewage treatment. All we are asking for is a trial. I want to emphasize that. Let it be tried for a year.

Mr. WILEY. No; that is not all Chicago is asking for. It is asking the Government of the United States to furnish half of the expense of the experiment. Besides, Chicago is asking the Lake States to furnish their interest in the water. Chicago has a waterfront of

100 miles. The rest of the Lake States combined have a waterfront of about 3,000 miles.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let us see to what degree the lake level would be lowered by the diversion of an additional 1,000 cubic feet a second. The Corps of Engineers studied that question for many years. It arrived at the conclusion, which the Senator from Oklahoma has stated, that if the additional diversion were carried on for 3 years, the lowering of the lake level of Lake Michigan and Lake Huron would be five-eighths of an inch. There would be no lowering of the level of Lake Superior. There would be some lowering of the level of Lake Erie and Lake Ontario by about three-eighths of an inch.

Now, those figures apply to a 3-year diversion. The diversion for 1 year, which is all we are asking for, which has been agreed to by the sanitary district and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, would manifestly reduce the level by only one-third of that amount, or one-eighth of an inch for Lake Erie and Lake Ontario and less than one-quarter of an inch for Lake Michigan and Lake Huron.

Think of it. All these States are up in arms over one-eighth or one-quarter of an inch lowering of the lake level.

As the Senator from Oklahoma pointed out, the lake levels are subject to cyclical ebbs and flows. I have lived on the shores of Lake Michigan for nearly 40 years. I have seen the level of the lake go up, then go down, then go up again. Now it is going down again. The average difference between high water and low water is something like 6 feet 3 inches. Sometimes it is more than that. That normally amounts to 75 inches, up and down. That is what causes the fluctuation. A lowering of only one-eighth of an inch would be caused by the additional diversion; but, nevertheless, the politicians from Wisconsin and the rest of those States will say, when the lake level starts to fall, "It is Chicago that is taking our water and causing the lake to fall." The lake level goes down 75 inches, and they point their finger south to the city of Chicago—to what they call the Wicked City—and say, "You are stealing our water. You are hurting our navigation." It is extraordinary.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. I want to finish.

Thirty years ago we had a mayor in the city of Chicago by the name of William Hale Thompson. He was not of my political party. I never supported him. But he always used to run for mayor. When he ran for mayor, he would run against King George of England. I remember at one of the great political rallies, in which he shouted, "If you elect me mayor of Chicago, I will bust King George on the snoot." That was sure-fire appeal. It got him votes, but it did not do much good for the reputation of the city of Chicago. We have been trying to live down that reputation ever since, with some success, but it still dogs us.

Now, our good friends to the north, when anything goes wrong, blame the city of Chicago. In Wisconsin the politicians run for office, not on a positive program, but against Chicago. [Laughter.] They have a fine mayor in Milwaukee, one of the really great mayors of this country; he is honest as the day is long and he has a fine police department. Their parks are excellent, and their streets are clean. But Milwaukee does not treat its sewage as well as Chicago does. I do not want to criticize mayor Frank Zeidler. I think he is really a fine man. But the mayor of Milwaukee makes speeches continually in which he alleges that Chicago is responsible for all Milwaukee's ills, and even the success of the Milwaukee Braves baseball team cannot assuage his feelings of injured pride. [Laughter.]

This subject has aroused a great deal of passion in Wisconsin. The people of Wisconsin look south, look at the city of Chicago, and say, "There is the source of all of our ills." This means that when a politician runs for office in Wisconsin, he finds it easy, just as William Hale Thompson found it easy to run against King George, to run against Chicago. The politicians point out the speed of that awful lowering of the lake level of one-eighth of an inch, or at most one-quarter of an inch, and how it is going to injure navigation and make it impossible for ships to operate in the harbor of Milwaukee.

This whole thing is really incredible. It is incredible that such fine, intelligent men as those who inhabit the States of Wisconsin and Ohio should be carried away by these delusions; but the truth of the matter is they do not know about this fluctuation in the lake level.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will in a moment. I am in the midst of an oratorical flight, and I want to continue it. [Laughter.]

They forget the 75-inch cyclical fluctuation and concentrate attention on that one-quarter of an inch.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I did not understand the last words of the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I say, they ignore the 75-inch cyclical fluctuation and concentrate on the one-quarter inch. That is truly straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the Senator does not mind, I will get out of the corner he has me in. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. Very well.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator from Illinois state whether it is the honest purpose of the city of Chicago to ask for only a one-year diversion and then to say, "That is the end"?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What does Chicago hope to eventually get?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Chicago wants a test of one year, to be carefully appraised. Then the scientists, engineers, and the Congress can decide whether the program should be continued.

Mr. LAUSCHE. They can decide whether the program should become permanent?

Mr. DOUGLAS. We can decide that later. All we ask is a test. We are not afraid of the truth. We are not afraid of an examination. We are not afraid of a test.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator from Illinois state what is the maximum period of diversion Chicago expects to ask for?

Mr. DOUGLAS. We do not know. We will ask only for what is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. For one year?

Mr. DOUGLAS. In this bill, only one year.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What later, after the bill is put into effect?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Ohio and I have enjoyed each other socially, and I think the Senator knows one of my favorite hymns is the hymn of Cardinal Newman:

Lead, kindly Light, * * *

* * * * *

I do not ask to see
The distant scene, one step enough for me.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator does not want to state what Chicago will ask for in the next bill?

Mr. DOUGLAS. All we ask is that the program be tested for a year and that the results be evaluated. If the results indicate that the experiment is against the interest of the United States and that there should not be any added diversion, we will not ask for it. If it seems to be in the interest of the United States and if there seems to be no real damage to anyone else, we will ask for it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the Senator takes the position that Chicago is asking for only a 1-year diversion——

Mr. DOUGLAS. At this time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator consent to an amendment to the bill which will specifically state that the diversion is for 1 year and not for 3 years, as set forth in the bill?

Mr. DOUGLAS. My good friend from Ohio knows that this is the last night, we hope, of the session. If an amendment is added to the bill, in view of the fact that we will adjourn almost immediately, it means the bill will be killed. I am not going to be mousetrapped by the Senator from Ohio in any such way as that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The fact is that the bill provides for a 3-year diversion, but the Senator is stating a promise to divert only for 1 year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is laid down by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The department says that is the way in which it will administer the legislation. Those terms have been accepted by the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago. This is an agreement which holds solemnly within the terms of the proposed legislation and is not contrary to any part of it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Illinois has had broad experience in the preparation of legislation. May I ask the Senator if he feels it is a sound method of legislating to declare one thing in a bill and then by a private agreement to vary the provisions in the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The agreement is not contrary to the proposed legislation. The agreement will merely provide the basis for the study. As the bill says:

In order to provide a basis for a study of the effect of increased diversion of water from Lake Michigan * * * authority is hereby granted to the State of Illinois and the Met-

ropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of the Army, to withdraw water from Lake Michigan, in addition to all domestic pumpage, at a rate providing a total annual average of not more than 2,500 cubic feet of water per second—

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let us read on. It says:

to flow into the Illinois Waterway during the 3-year period which begins on the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then the bill does give a 3-year right to divert.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, it does not. There is a 3-year test, not a 3-year diversion. The agreement which we have made with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare specifically means the the diversion will occur for only 1 of those 3 years.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the Senator from Illinois feel that if the bill or a future bill provided for a permanent diversion, the Dominion of Canada would consent to it?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That problem can be faced in the future. All we are now asking is a test period of 1 year.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the Senator's position concerning what the position of Canada would be in the event of a permanent diversion?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have not telephoned to any secretary of a secretary of a Secretary, and therefore I am not able to give an expert opinion, but I can say this proposal will not do any injury to Canada. It will do no injury to Canada. Canada has diverted into Lake Superior 5,000 cubic feet per second, which is 5 times as much as we are asking to take out of the Great Lakes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the Senator feel that the inference must be drawn from the letter which was previously read that if the diversion were for more than 1 year Canada would object?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, I do not draw any such inference.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In the opinion of the Senator from Illinois, why did Canada say, according to Mr. Macomber, "'We have no objection to a 1-year diversion"?

Mr. DOUGLAS. They have no objection to a 1-year diversion. They might have no objection now to a 3-year diversion. At one time Canada did have an objection.

The Senator from Oklahoma, like Saul, saw a great light and was converted, and just so has Canada seen a great light and become converted. There is hope even for the Senators from Wisconsin and Ohio on this matter.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There may be some truth in that statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope there is. It is needed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. We may begin calling to our aid divine forces, and we probably would have to if our cause were as weak as the cause of Chicago. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I think we have pursued this subject sufficiently. Unless other Senators wish to ask further questions, I shall be glad to yield the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am always glad to yield to my beloved friend from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator knows that I came into the Chamber late.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to ask a question. Does Chicago need this additional water for drinking purposes?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. It needs the water in order to get added oxygen to handle the nitrogenous residual——

Mr. LANGER. The Senator can stop right there. I know exactly what he means.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to my good friend from Wisconsin, who had the advantage of being brought up in Illinois, but who has gone to that great State to the north. What is our loss is Winconsin's gain and we do not object to this diversion of talent.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I presume the Senator from Illinois has finished his positive presentation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. First, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Illinois if, on the basis of the 758 pages of transcribed hearings, there is any basis for the contention that the diversion would safeguard or improve the health of the people of Chicago?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; I think so.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Has any study been made by the Chicago Board of Health to support this assertion, or has any study been made by any other health agency in Chicago?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Studies have been made by the sanitary district.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am talking about a health organization, a health agency, or a health bureau which has responsibility.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Sanitary District of Chicago includes a number of suburbs. I may say that there is some health hazard for the downstate communities along the Illinois River. Of course, their drinking water is treated.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is there any officer, official, or person in the Chicago Metropolitan Sanitary District, which controls sewage, who has a medical degree of any kind, or who is in any position to make an evaluation of the effect of effluent on health? If so, will the Senator please identify him?

Mr. DOUGLAS. We have the most eminent hydraulic engineer in the world, in the person of Horace Ramey.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I agree that Horace Ramey is a distinguished engineer. But if the distinguished Senator from Illinois were ill would he go to an engineer or to a doctor?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Wisconsin need elaboration on the effect of effluent material on health? We are trying to disguise unpleasant realities with as disinfected verbiage as possible.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I appreciate that reply. I assume, then, that the answer is that no competent health authority has given any testimony to the effect that this diversion would have any influence whatsoever on the health of the people of Chicago. If such testimony has been given, I should be delighted to hear about it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Water contains oxygen. By adding water, including oxygen, we would reduce the amount of solid matter which is now discharged, in an effort to reduce the health hazard to the people of Chicago and the people downstream.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is an explanation, and a complete non sequitur.

The Senator from Illinois has described precisely what happens chemically, but he has given me no evidence whatsoever from any authority that this has any effect on the health of the people of Illinois, except his own assertion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Common sense tells us the answer. It should be obvious even to the Senator.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is not common sense that under those circumstances, with 768 pages of testimony from scores of witnesses, if there were a health hazard the excellent Senators and Representatives from Illinois, who have done such a fine job in presenting this case, would have called at least one qualified person to establish the health hazard?

Mr. DOUGLAS. We felt that is was so obvious that we did not need bacteriological testimony.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Illinois is telling the Senator from Wisconsin that the Illinois State Board of Health, which is responsible for the health of the people of Illinois, has apparently never given any testimony on this subject or taken any position. It has never indicated that the health of the people of Illinois is affected by this practice. If so, when?

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is always a problem in a huge metropolitan center inside a State. We are very proud to be citizens of Illinois, but we do not believe that we must always go to the State for supporting evidence. As a matter of fact, the Illinois Sanitary Water Board does not have jurisdiction over the metropolitan sanitary district and similarly the city of Chicago, being smaller than the sanitary district, does not have jurisdiction over it.

May I point out that the Supreme Court has passed on this issue a number of times, and has held that the added flow was necessary, as it did last December.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is the distinguished Senator from Illinois familiar with the statement of the special master appointed by the Supreme Court in 1941? He stated that there was no health hazard, that there was no health problem. He stated that the biochemical oxygen demand was far lower then, and, though the water was far more polluted, there was no health problem at that time, when the flow was the same.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That was in 1941. Since then the city of Chicago has had a tremendous growth.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Also the city of Chicago has made a considerable improvement in its sanitation facilities, which has greatly reduced the oxygen

deficiency of its water. Since 1941, Chicago has made a great improvement in the efficiency of its sanitation district thereby greatly reducing the oxygen deficiency of its water.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But we have also had an increased population growth, particularly in the suburbs, and that has increased the strain on the system.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct. In fact, the improvement in the factor of pollution was about fourfold between 1941 and 1951, and the oxygen deficiency was reduced correspondingly. The population has increased greatly—possibly by 25, 35, or 40 percent; but on the basis of comparing the figures and facts, it is clear that the problem should have been far greater in 1941, when the efficiency of the sanitation district was so much lower.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Our motto is "Excelsior! Forever Onward." We are always trying to do better.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Neither the Chicago Board of Health, the Illinois State Board of Health, the Public Service Commission, nor any other health agency, nor any group of physicians, nor any single physician, has ever made a finding that there is a health problem as a result of the sewage situation in Chicago.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I point out to my good friend from Wisconsin that we are treating sewage for the equivalent of 8½ million people. We have a 10-percent effluent. That is equivalent to the effluent of 850,000 people. That is equivalent to the effluent of the whole city of Milwaukee. Is the Senator from Wisconsin ignorant of the fact that this creates a health problem?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am not in the least ignorant of the fact. I have a detailed study of the Milwaukee Sanitation District, which I wish to call to the Senator's attention at a later time, which indicates how Milwaukee has been solving the problem. This is a problem facing every city.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Some from Wisconsin would have us solve it by making us dump our sewage into Lake Michigan. We decline to do so because we think too much of our friends from Milwaukee.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The position which the Senator from Illinois takes surprises me, because in my judgment he is the very wisest man I know. I say that without qualification. He is a splendid man, and a man of integrity.

Mr. DOUGLAS. My friend from Wisconsin is also a man of integrity and character, and of greater intelligence.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am overwhelmed by the generosity of my distinguished friend from Illinois. The flattery of the distinguished Senator from Illinois has been so overwhelming that the Senator from Wisconsin has forgotten the point he was about to make, which was undoubtedly the purpose of the Senator from Illinois. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be glad to pause 10 seconds until the Senator from Wisconsin collects his thoughts.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The question I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois is this: In view of his frequent attacks on the Milwaukee practice of dumping into Lake Michigan, is he charging that this is a health menace?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have for years suppressed this skeleton in the closet about Milwaukee. I have refused to mention it because I love Milwaukee so much. It was only after the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] delivered a fiery talk about Chicago and our failure to dispose of our sewage that I felt I had to unlock the closet and let the skeleton be seen.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the Senator will permit——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, I am not going to go into the health hazard. I merely say it is a dirty custom. [Laughter.] We in Chicago do not like it. However, in the interest of comity and out of our respect and affection for Wisconsin we have kept silent. But when we are abused, we have a right after years of silence to bring out the naked and unvarnished truth.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I take it my friend is not talking about the health hazard but the esthetic qualities of certain practices and the superstition that because the effluent is repulsive, it raises certain feelings in the minds of people. He is not discussing the health hazard involved, but is raising the point only because Wisconsin does discharge its effluent into the lake, to the detriment of the sensibilities of the people of Chicago.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We have tried to hush that up so that the people of Chicago would not get angry at the people of Milwaukee. While the people of Milwaukee and Wisconsin have been stirring up false passions against Chicago we have tried to keep the people of Chicago in a friendly frame of mind toward Milwaukee and Wisconsin. We have repeatedly turned the other cheek. But now we have the right to speak.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I should like to say to the Senator that he is 100 percent mistaken. We make milorganite out of the solids, and the liquids are returned 95 percent as water into the lake. We sell the milorganite for fertilizer.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So do we.

Mr. WILEY. I am asking the Senator not to make that kind of statement, because I have now given him the facts. If Chicago will do what Milwaukee has done, build a plant which will take care of the problem, instead of maintaining an inefficient plant, he will have the answer.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Engineering papers refer to the Chicago sewage disposal plant as the seventh engineering wonder of the world.

Mr. WILEY. They said that years ago. That praise is good as far as it goes. However, the Senator comes from a growing area, with more sewerage, and is not building more plants.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Illinois would yield to me so that I might make a motion to bring up the public debt limit bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be glad to do so. I have not tried to hold the floor, but the barbed attacks from Wisconsin and Ohio have been so great——

Mr. WILEY. The Senator loves every minute of it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That I have had to protect the fair name of my State and of my city.

I shall be glad to yield the floor outright.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to bring up the bill I have referred to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be glad to yield the floor.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I wonder if the Senator from Illinois would hold the floor for a few more minutes, so that I might ask him another question or two.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be glad to return later. Lay on, Macduff. [Laughter.]

INCREASE IN PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business may be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2454, H. R. 13580.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill, H. R.13580, to increase the public debt limit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with amendments, on page 1, at the beginning of line 10, to strike out "$285,000,000,000" and insert "$283,000,000,000"; on page 2, after line 4, to strike out:

SEC. 2. During the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this act and ending on June 30, 1960, the public debt limit set forth in the first sentence of section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended by the first section of this act, shall be temporarily increased by $3,000,000,000.

And after line 10, to strike out:

SEC. 3. The act entitled "An act to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit", approved February 26, 1958 (Public Law 85-336; 72 Stat. 27), is hereby repealed.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the bill provides that the existing permanent debt limit be raised from $275 billion to $283 billion. The temporary increase under present law of $5 billion continues through June 30, 1959. Thus, the overall debt limit will be the $288 billion which the Secretary of the Treasury requested, but $5 billion of this will be temporary, as provided by existing law.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one or two questions?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator from Virginia state for the record what the national debt was in 1953?

Mr. BYRD. I do not know exactly. I do not have the figure for 1953. It was very much less than it is today.

Mr. MORSE. Was it either $260 billion or $266 billion?

Mr. BYRD. The national debt limit now is $275 billion.

Mr. MORSE. In 1953, was it $259 billion or $260 billion?

Mr. BYRD. Somewhere in that neighborhood. What year did the Senator say?

Mr. MORSE. Nineteen hundred and fifty-three.

Mr. BYRD. I do not have that figure.

Mr. MORSE. Is it the opinion of the Senator from Virginia that it was in the neighborhood of $260 billion?

Mr. BYRD. It was approximately that.

Mr. MORSE. Would the Senator from Virginia supply the accurate figure for the record?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Virginia have the figure for the national debt as of now, 1958?

Mr. BYRD. The national debt now is about $275 billion, but the debt limit is about $280 billion.

Mr. MORSE. In 1953 it was in the neighborhood of $260 billion, and in 1958 it is in the neighborhood of $275 billion, is that correct?

Mr. BYRD. Yes. I will say to the Senator that there has been an increase in the deficit in the present year of $15 billion. Under the pending bill there would be a total debt limit of $288 billion.

Mr. MORSE. Has the United States been engaged in any major war since 1953?

Mr. BYRD. No. This is the largest debt limit which has ever been requested in peacetime history.

Mr. MORSE. It is the largest debt in the history of the country, is it not?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. Would the Senator say that under the Eisenhower administration our national debt has increased at least $15 billion?

Mr. BYRD. The debt limit has been increased that much if we include the next fiscal year.

Mr. MORSE. We have increased the debt limit in order to take care of the increase in the debt; is that not correct?

Mr. BYRD. I do not believe that the debt itself has increased that much. With the $12 billion deficit we expect in the next fiscal year, it would certainly be $15 billion.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Virginia recall the great soothing sedatives and promises of the Republican candidate in 1952 in regard to the national debt?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator recall the Republican candidate trying to give the American people the impression that if we would put him in the White House, the national debt would be reduced?

Mr. BYRD. I believe that is correct.

Mr. MORSE. I rest my case. [Laughter.]

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum I have prepared.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

The President's second request in 6 months to raise the Federal debt limit should be stern warning of the great fiscal danger confronting us.

The Free World is dependent upon the strength of America, and the strength of America depends upon solvent government and maintaining the value of our dollar.

If confidence in the American dollar is lost, the effect will be calamitous throughout the world. Further impairment of the dollar's value would be a disastrous blow to the international situation.

I have never seen such rapid deterioration in our fiscal affairs as we have experienced since the opening of Congress 7 months ago.

In January, we were told the Federal budget would be virtually balanced in the fiscal year ended June 30, and that there would be a surplus in the current fiscal year which began July 1. Now we are told deficits in both years will total $15 billion.

On February 26, Congress responded to the administration's request for a $5 billion increase in the debt limit temporary to June 30, 1959. Now, in July, there is another request. This is a double-decked request totaling $13 billion—$10 billion in permanent increase and $3 billion temporary until next July 1—bringing the debt limit up to $288 billion.

This is not all the reason for alarm. The Director of the Budget estimates expenditures in fiscal year 1960 will approach, if not exceed, $80 billion. This will mean another deficit next year of at least $10 billion. We have in immediate prospect a Federal debt approaching $300 billion.

Congress has not and should not deny national defense requirements, but failure throughout the Federal Government to plan for military emergencies has been astonishing. In the current situation there is and has been no inclination to eliminate nonessentials. Since 1954 Federal spending for strictly domestic-civilian programs has been increased by 60 percent, or more than $10 billion. This is virtually the equivalent of the estimated deficit in the current year.

We are increasing this category of expenditures in the current session of Congress at an amazing rate. While we are facing an era of continuing heavy deficits, new spending authorizations this year as they stand now exceed the budget requests by more than $5 billion.

Further reduction in the purchasing power of the dollar, which now is 48 cents by the 1939 index, is the certain result of the course we are pursuing.

Taxes are already so burdensome they approach diminishing returns. In certain areas they are practically confiscatory.

Continual increase in the Federal debt limit is the license for further inflation, with all its evil consequences.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, before the bill is read the third time, I should like to state that I am opposed to any increase in the debt limit which is not accompanied by an increase in revenue through the closing of tax loopholes that give preferential treatment to some individuals and groups in our country.

I am sure that every member of this body knows my attitude toward the tax loopholes that leak revenue at a tremendous rate. I have introduced bills and amendments to tax bills to try to close many of them. I have supported the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] in his valiant but so far futile effort to do the same.

My bills and amendments would have scaled down the percentage depletion allowance for oil and gas wells. They would have ended the preferential treatment given to receivers of income from dividends. They would have required the withholding of income tax from dividends and corporation interest. They would have stopped the taking of a deduction as a business expense for gifts and for money spent in an illegal gambling enterprise.

These bills and amendments would have resulted in a revenue gain of some $3 billion. They would have made it unnecessary to raise the debt limit by that amount.

Some time ago I introduced an amendment to the debt-limit bill which lumped these tax-loophole amendments together and reduced the debt limit allowed in the bill by $3 million—approximately what the amendments would recover in lost revenue.

I understand, of course, that the tax-loophole amendments are not germane to the debt-limit bill.

Mr. President, I am not going to argue this; the amendment is not germane in the narrow technical sense of legislative germaneness as it has evolved in the practice of the Senate. For that reason, I am not going to call up my amendment.

But, Mr. President, I have looked up the definition of "germane" in my dictionary. It means what I thought it meant when I introduced the amendment. "Germane" means "closely allied, appropriate, applying to the case in hand." Its synonyms are "relevant" and "pertinent."

It is hard for me to see, Mr. President, what could be more pertinent or relevant, what could be more closely allied with, what could be more applicable to the case in hand, than are revenue measures to an increase in the national debt limit. It is perfectly obvious that what makes it necessary to raise the debt limit is the failure to collect enough revenue to meet the expenditures of Government.

As I have said, I will not call up my amendment and debate its germaneness at this point in the life of the 85th Congress. But what I must do is to register a protest, as strong a protest as I can make, against the raising of the national debt limit the second time in this session of Congress when this body has repeatedly beaten down attempts to increase Government revenue by terminating unfair tax advantages.

More than that, I am deeply concerned about the size of the debt itself. I am concerned because it keeps getting larger, and as it does inflation eats deeper into the economic security of our people.

Since 1941, the debt limit has been raised 7 times and lowered 3 times. From

1941 it rose from $65 billion to $300 billion. After the war the ceiling was set at $275 billion, but it was temporarily increased in 1954, 1955, 1956, and 1958.

It was inevitable, of course, that increasing national debt should add enormously to inflationary pressures. The value of the dollar has shrunk steadily. If the 1938 dollar is considered to be worth 100 cents, the 1958 dollar is worth 48 cents. What it will be worth in 1959 is not certain, but what is sure is that it will be worth less. Since 1946 it has lost value in every single year except 1949 and 1955.

The cost of living has gone up, of course, as the value of the dollar has gone down. Even in recession the cost of living has steadily risen. Consumer prices rose 0.1 percent between May and June this year. The Consumer Price Index for June 1958, was 123.7, taking the period 1947–49 as 100. This was 2.9 percent higher than a year earlier.

Where is the American economy going? The official estimate is that the deficit for fiscal 1959 will be $12 billion. This is the highest peacetime deficit in the history of the Nation. It means, beyond a peradventure of a doubt, more inflation, more insecurity, more economic misery for people on fixed incomes. It means an even more desperate prospect for the unemployed.

Mr. President, there is a tragic process at work in our economy which is revealed, at some point on the circle, by almost any statistic we cite. We have to raise the debt limit because there is a deficit. We have a deficit because revenues are down. We have less revenue because there are many unemployed—5.4 million in June, 6.8 percent of the working force.

It is too late in this Congress to take that decisive action now. It is too late in this Congress to regain revenue for the Government by closing tax loopholes. It is too late, not because those actions would not help now, but because there is no disposition on the part of a majority in either House to take them. That is why I am not calling up my amendment—not because I lack confidence in its rightness but because I am sure that it would not pass.

Mr. President, I am going to vote against the amendment to increase the debt limit. Under the circumstances, I am sure that the debt limit must be increased. I cast my vote against the bill, nevertheless, as a protest against the continuation of tax advantages for our most advantaged people while the Nation swims against a tide of inflation and debt that threatens to engulf it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MALONE obtained the floor.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

REPORT OF AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON COMMUNIST TACTICS, STRATEGY, AND OBJECTIVES

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, a friend in California has supplied me with a copy of the report just filed with the house of delegates of the American Bar Association by that association's special committee on Communist strategy, tactics, and objectives. Senators will recall that this is the outstanding committee which was formerly headed by the former Senator from Maryland and our former colleague, Herbert O'Conor, and which is now headed by Peter Campbell Brown, former Chairman of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

The report is an outstanding piece of work in its field. I believe I may have the first copy to reach Washington. So that I may share it with my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON COMMUNIST TACTICS, STRATEGY, AND OBJECTIVES

PAUL REVERES ARE NOT ALWAYS HEEDED

A Night To Remember tells of the five iceberg warnings sent by wireless to the Titanic. When the sixth message, "Look out for icebergs," came in, the Titanic's operator wired back: "Shut up, I'm busy." Just 35 minutes later, the ship, whose captain had said "God Himself could not sink," was sinking.

The phrase "Remember Pearl Harbor" should remind us that we, people and leaders, were cocksure and complacent before the afternoon of December 7, 1941. The FBI had warned of frequent messages from the Japanese consulate at Hawaii to Tokyo telling of the presence and absence of American warships at Pearl Harbor. Dies committee reports of Japanese espionage by fishing vessels were ridiculed as headline hunting. Capt. Laurance Safford, who was recently awarded $100,000 by a grateful Congress for his World War II coding and decoding inventions, had decoded all the Japanese pre-Pearl Harbor war messages for his superiors. Yet, the attack came as a stunning surprise.

Most persons who are informed on communism think our country is now in greater danger than were the Titanic and Pearl Harbor. The thesis of J. Edgar Hoover's new book, Masters of Deceit, is:

"Communism is the major menace of our time. Today, it threatens the very existence of our western civilization." [1]

In his speech to the 1957 National Convention of the American Legion, Mr. Hoover warned:

"To dismiss lightly the existence of the subversive threat in the United States is to deliberately commit national suicide. In some quarters we are surely doing just that."

On July 6, 1958, Prof. J. Sterling Livingston, a Pentagon consultant stated:

"The doctrine of preemptive war is definitely a part of Soviet strategy. The Russians plan as part of their strategy to strike a forestalling nuclear blow against their enemies." [2]

The lawyer-author of the Gaither report to the President on national security recently told our association:

"Our security is in unprecedented peril. * * * The ultimate objective of international communism is world domination, and the Soviet Union will pursue this objective ruthlessly and relentlessly, employing every possible political, economic, subversive, and military strategem and tactic." [3]

I. COURT DECISIONS ON COMMUNISM

The 1953 midyear report of this committee praised the opinions of Chief Justice Stone in *Schneiderman* v. *United States* [4] and of Mr. Justice Jackson in *American Communications Association* v. *Douds* [5] for their conclusion, based on Communist documents, that the Communist Party, U. S. A. is not a political party but, to quote Mr. Justice Jackson: "Is a conspiratorial and revolutionary junta, organized to reach ends and to use methods which are incompatible with our constitutional system."

Similar statements were made by Chief Justice Hughes when, as Secretary of State, he refused to recognize the Communist Government of Russia, and by Chief Justice Vinson in his scholarly opinion upholding the convictions of the 11 top Communists under the Smith Act.[6]

In the last 2 years, the Supreme Court has decided the following 20 cases:

1. *Communist Party* v. *Subversive Activities Control Board.* The Court refused to uphold or pass on the constitutionality of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, and delayed the effectiveness of the act.

2. *Pennsylvania* v. *Steve Nelson.* The Court held that it was unlawful for Pennsylvania to prosecute a Pennsylvania Communist Party leader under the Pennsylvania Sedition Act, and indicated that the anti-sedition laws of 42 States and of Alaska and Hawaii cannot be enforced.

3. *Yates* v. *United States.* The Court reversed two Federal courts and ruled that teaching and advocating forcible overthrow of our Government, even "with evil intent," was not punishable under the Smith Act as long as it was "divorced from any effort to instigate action to that end," and ordered 5 Communist Party leaders freed and new trials for another 9.

4. *Cole* v. *Young.* The Court reversed two Federal courts and held that, although the Summary Suspension Act of 1950 gave the Federal Government the right to dismiss employees "in the interest of the national security of the United States," it was not in the interest of the national security to dismiss an employee who contributed funds and services to a not-disputed subversive organization, unless that employee was in a "sensitive positions."

5. *Service* v. *Dulles.* The Court reversed two Federal courts which had refused to set aside the discharge of John Stewart Service by the State Department. The FBI had a recording of a conversation between Service and an editor of the pro-Communist magazine Amerasia, in the latter's hotel room in which Service spoke of military plans which were very secret.[7] Earlier the FBI had found

---

[1] P. vi.

[2] St. Louis Post-Dispatch, July 6, 1958.

[3] American Bar Association Journal, May 1958, pp. 425–426.

[4] 320 U. S. 118, 170.

[5] 339 U. S. 382, 424.

[6] *Dennis* v. *United States* (341 U. S. 494.)

[7] United States Senate Committee Hearings on Charges of Disloyalty in the State Department, June 26, 1950, pp. 1391 ff., espec. 1404; cf. *United States* v. *Jaffe*, 98 F. Supp. 191, 194 (1951).

large numbers of secret and confidential State Department documents in the Amerasia office. The lower courts had followed the McCarran amendment which gave the Secretary of State absolute discretion to discharge any employee in the interests of the United States.

6. *Slochower* v. *Board of Education of New York.* The Court reversed the decisions of three New York courts and held it was unconstitutional to automatically discharge a teacher, in accordance with New York law, because he took the fifth amendment when asked about Communist activities. On petition for rehearing, the Court admitted that its opinion was in error in stating that Slochower was not aware that his claim of the fifth amendment would ipso facto result in his discharge; however, the Court denied rehearing.

7. *Sweezy* v. *New Hampshire.* The Court reversed the New Hampshire Supreme Court and held that the attorney general of New Hampshire was without authority to question Professor Sweezy, a lecturer at the State university, concerning a lecture and other suspected subversive activities. Questions which the Court said that Sweezy properly refused to answer included: "Did you advocate Marxism at that time?" and "Do you believe in communism?"

8. *United States* v. *Witkovich.* The Court decided that, under the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, which provides that any alien against whom there is a final order of deportation shall "give information under oath as to his nationality, circumstances, habits, associations, and activities, and such other information, whether or not related to the foregoing, as the Attorney General may deem fit and proper," the Attorney General did not have the right to ask Witkovich: "Since the order of deportation was entered in your case on June 25, 1953, have you attended any meetings of the Communist Party of the U. S. A.?"

9. *Schware* v. *Board of Examiners of New Mexico.* The Court reversed the decisions of the New Mexico Board of Bar Examiners and of the New Mexico Supreme Court which had said: "We believe one who has knowingly given his loyalties to the Communist Party for 6 or 7 years during a period of responsible adulthood is a person of questionable character." The Supreme Court ruled that "membership in the Communist Party during the 1930's cannot be said to raise substantial doubts about his present good moral character."

10. *Konigsberg* v. *State Bar of California.* The Court reversed the decisions of the California Committee of Bar Examiners and of the California Supreme Court and held that it was unconstitutional to deny a license to practice law to an applicant who refused to answer this question put by the bar committee: "Mr. Konigsberg, are you a Communist?" and a series of similar questions.

11. *Jencks* v. *United States.* The Court reversed two Federal courts and held that Jencks, who was convicted of filing a false non-Communist affidavit, must be given the contents of all confidential FBI reports which were made by any Government witness in the case even though Jencks "restricted his motions to a request for production of the reports to the trial judge for the judge's inspection and determination whether and to what extent the reports should be made available."

12. *Watkins* v. *United States.* The Court reversed the Federal District Court and six judges of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, and held that the House Un-American Activities Committee could not require a witness who admitted "I freely cooperated with the Communist Party" to name his Communist associates, even though the witness did not invoke the fifth amendment. The Court said: "We remain unenlightened as to the subject to which the questions asked petitioner were pertinent." The Court did not question "the power of the Congress to inquire into and publicize corruption, maladministration, or inefficiency in agencies of the Government." The Court did question the right of Congress to inquire into and publicize communism and subversion, and suggested that this "involved a broad scale intrusion into the lives and affairs of private citizens."

13. *Raley, Stern, and Brown* v. *Ohio.* The Court reversed the Ohio Supreme Court and lower courts and set aside the conviction of three men who had refused to answer questions about Communist activities put to them by the Ohio Un-American Activities Commission.

14. *Flaxer* v. *United States.* The Court reversed two Federal courts and set aside the conviction of Flaxer of contempt for refusing to produce records of alleged Communist activities subpenaed by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

15. *Sacher* v. *United States.* The Court reversed two Federal courts and set aside the conviction of Sacher of contempt for refusing to tell the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee whether he was "a member of the lawyers' section of the Communist Party." In the second Sacher appeal, the Court again reversed the court of appeals and said that this question was not pertinent to the subcommittee's investigation of Communist witness Matusow's recantation. The Court refused to hear any argument from the Government lawyers representing this Senate subcommittee.

16. *Yates* v. *United States.* In the second Yates appeal, the Court reversed two Federal courts and held that the refusal of Communist Party member Yates "to answer 11 questions about Communist membership of other persons" did not constitute 11 contempts. In the third Yates appeal, the Court reversed 2 Federal courts and held that Yates' contempt sentence of 1 year should be reduced to the 15 days already served for this contempt.

17. *Bonetti* v. *Rogers.* The Court reversed two Federal courts and held that, although the Internal Security Act of 1950 provides that any alien, who "at any time" after entering the United States shall have been a member of the Communist Party, is deportable, Bonetti, an alien who became a Communist after entering the United States, was not deportable because he had reentered after quitting the party. The dissenting judges charged that this construction reads "at any time" out of the act and the word "last" into the statute, and "cripples the effectiveness of the act."

18. *Consul General for Yugoslavia* v. *Andrew Artukovic.* The Court reversed two Federal courts and held that Artukovic, an anti-Communist refugee from Yugoslavia who is living with his wife and children in California, could not claim political asylum in America, but had to submit to an extradition hearing which would be based on Yugoslavia's political charges.

19. *Rockwell Kent* v. *Dulles.* The Court reversed two Federal courts and held that the State Department could not require every applicant for a passport to file a non-Communist affidavit.

20. *Dayton* v. *Dulles.* The Court reversed two Federal courts and held that the State Department had to give a passport to a research physicist whose passport application to accept a job in India had been denied for security reasons. The Secretary of State had found that Dayton had lived for 8 months with a Communist who "was involved in the espionage apparatus of Julius Rosenberg" and that Dayton was going to work in India with another Communist "who recently renounced his American citizenship."

In accordance with the resolution of the house of delegates and authorization of the board of governors, our committee—on the request of the State attorney for its cooperation—applied for and obtained permission to appear as amicus curiae in the appeal pending in the Supreme Court of Florida from the order of dismissal of the disciplinary proceedings against Leo Sheiner. Leo Sheiner had twice previously been ordered disbarred by the circuit court of Florida.

Our committee prepared and submitted a brief to the Supreme Court of Florida stating its views on the duty of the bar and of the courts to cleanse its ranks of an unfit member. The committee further stated its concept of an acceptable standard of fitness for attorneys and of the unfitness of any member of the bar who, in appropriate proceedings persists in refusal to answer pertinent questions concerning his activities in the Communist Party or Communist-dominated fronts on the ground that his answers to such questions concerning his activities might tend to incriminate him. It is inconceivable to us that an attorney and officer of the court may continue in good standing while he pleads self-incrimination in refusing to answer questions relating to subversive activities.

The brief pointed out that, in other walks of life, labor-union officials, teachers, Government employees, and employees of private industry, there had been set a standard under which the individual will be safeguarded in invoking the fifth amendment to inquiries which might tend to incriminate him, but by so doing he forfeits his position of trust and responsibility. The Sheiner case is very important to the bar as other States having such problem attorneys on their rolls have been awaiting the final decision in this matter.

The appeal was argued before the Supreme Court of Florida on February 8, 1958. Julius Applebaum, a member of our committee, argued as amicus curiae for this association. On July 24, 1958, the court issued an order on its own motion requesting further argument on September 5, 1958, and permitting supplemental briefs as to the application of three decisions, *Max Lerner* v. *Hugh J. Casey, et al.; Herman A. Bellan* v. *Board of Public Education, School District of Philadelphia;* and *Milton Knapp* v. *Mitchell D. Schweitzer, et al.*, rendered by the United States Supreme Court on June 30, 1958. Our committee is preparing such supplemental brief in behalf of the association and will participate in the reargument. Our committee is willing to appear in similar cases upon direction of the house of delegates or board of governors.

II. COMMUNIST TACTICS

Communist Russia has been called "a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma." This is true only for those who are ignorant of Communist writings. The Communists have set forth their master plan of world conquest even more forthrightly than did Hitler in Mein Kampf. The Communist manifesto said: "The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims."[8] Communists have never deviated from the theory enunciated by Marx and the strategy devised by Lenin.

For those who want to understand communism, we prescribe, not a 15-day trip to Russia, but 15 days in a library studying the Communist conspiracy. The following quotations from Communist authorities are an accurate summary of Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives.

The Communist master plan for world conquest was stated by Lenin in these words:

"First, we will take Eastern Europe, then the masses of Asia, then we will encircle the United States, which will be the last bastion of capitalism. We will not have to attack. It will fall like an overripe fruit into our hands."[9]

---

[8] United States House Un-American Activities Committee, Strategy and Tactics of World Communism; sec. A, Marxist Classics, May 29, 1956, p. 71.

[9] Collected Works of Lenin, vol. 10, p. 172.

During the last 25 years, the United States has had 3,400 meetings with the Communists, including Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam, Panmunjom, and Geneva. The negotiators spoke 106 million words (700 volumes). All this talk led to 52 major agreements, and Soviet Russia has broken 50 of them. The Communists have followed Lenin's dictum about treaties and agreements:

"Promises are like pie crusts—made to be broken." [10]

During the last 3 years, the United States has met 73 times at Geneva with the Chinese Reds to negotiate the release of 450 American prisoners. Not one American serviceman has been accounted for or released. The Communists have followed Stalin's principle of diplomatic intercourse:

"Words must have no relation to action—otherwise what kind of diplomacy is it? Words are one thing, actions another. Good words are a mask for concealment of bad deeds. Sincere diplomacy is no more possible than dry water or iron wood." [11]

Marx and Engels stated this objective in the Communist manifesto:

"The theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of private property." [12]

Lenin gave this command to Communists:

"We have to use any ruse, dodges, tricks, cunning, unlawful method, concealment, and veiling of the truth." [13]

On another occasion, Lenin added:

"As long as capitalism remains we cannot live in peace. In the end one or the other will triumph—a funeral requiem will be sung over the Soviet Republic or over world capitalism." [14]

On September 17, 1955, Nikita Khrushchev warned us:

"If anyone thinks that our smiles mean the abandonment of the teachings of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, he is deceiving himself cruelly. Those who expect this to happen might just as well wait for a shrimp to learn how to whistle." [15]

Khrushchev made this statement to western diplomats at a Moscow reception on November 18, 1956:

"If you don't like us, don't accept our invitations and don't invite us to come to see you. Whether you like it or not, history is on our side. We will bury you." [16]

Khrushchev appeared on our American television screens on June 2, 1957, and confidently told us:

"Your grandchildren will live under socialism."

William Z. Foster dedicated his book, The Twilight of World Capitalism, to his great-grandson, "who will live in a Communist United States."

The Communist philosophy of negotiation was stated in 1931 to the Lenin School of Political Warfare in Moscow by Dmitri Manuilski, a Soviet official and at one time the presiding officer of the U. N. Security Council:

"War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. To win we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard-of concessions. The capitalistic countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fist." [17]

Georgi Dimitrov advised the Lenin School of Political Warfare how to make use of innocents and dupes in these words:

"As Soviet power grows, there will be a greater aversion to Communist parties everywhere. So we must practice the techniques of withdrawal. Never appear in the foreground; let our friends do the work. We must always remember that one sympathizer is generally worth more than a dozen militant Communists. A university professor, who without being a party member lends himself to the interests of the Soviet Union, is worth more than a hundred men with party cards. A writer of reputation, or a retired general, are worth more than 500 poor devils who don't know any better than to get themselves beaten up by the police. Every man has his value, his merit. The writer who, without being a party member, defends the Soviet Union, the union leader who is outside our ranks but defends Soviet international policy, is worth more than a thousand party members." [18]

The key to Communist tactics is the dialectic. Just as the movements of the planets are predictable by astronomers, so are Communist movements predictable by those who have studied the dialectic. The dialectic is an instrument which gives the Communists complete freedom from normal and logical restraints. According to the dialectic, the Communist objective is never approached in a direct, persistent line. It is not even approached in a circuitous, winding pathway. The dialectic mode of progress consists of a series of advances and retreats. Communists do not wait for an opening; they create it.

Lenin described the dialectic as "one step forward, two steps backward." [19] The Communists go backward and forward to inevitable victory. The operation of the dialectic is like hammering a nail. It is a foolish man who brings down the hammer with a crashing blow and then continues to push. When that blow has spent itself, the entire direction of progress is reversed, and the goal is achieved through a series of backward-forward motions. According to the dialectic, even though heading away from the goal, you are still fulfilling the scientific method of approach; and therefore the reverse movement must be carried out with the same fervor and determination.

The closing of the Daily Worker was a dialectical maneuver. The Communist Party made a dialectical retreat in stopping publication of the leading party organ on January 13, 1958, under the subterfuge that it was in dire financial condition. In so doing, the Communist Party made a two-step advance. First, it strengthened the discipline of the party because, as J. Edgar Hoover has pointed out, the internal struggle for power resulted in a decisive victory for the pro-Soviet faction.[20] Secondly, the ousted editor of the Daily Worker, John Gates, now performs the function of a Tito within the United States. Gates is infinitely more valuable to communism lecturing at American colleges and universities than he ever was while with the Daily Worker. Gatesism promotes the apathy of the intellectuals under the theme: "Communism is dying out." The Communists aim to keep us complacent until the choice is annihilation or surrender, at which time they confidently expect us to submit to a negotiated surrender.

Also during this past year, the Communists went forward with the rocks and garbage grown at Vice President NIXON in South America; backward with the smiles of Menshikov; forward with the executions of Nagy and Maleter; backward by allowing Tito to make a few anti-Soviet statements; forward with the defeats of anti-Communists in Syria and Indonesia—all with the same unity of purpose that makes everything contribute to their plan of world conquest.

The major Communist tactics at the present time include the following:

1. Nullification of the Smith act and other anti-Communist legislation. FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover testified January 16, 1958, at a House hearing made public in May, that 49 of the 108 top Communists convicted by Federal juries under the Smith act have been set free by Supreme Court decisions.[21] Judge Richard H. Chambers of the United States Court of Appeals, in a decision releasing 11 of these top Communists, said that Supreme Court decisions have left the Smith Act, as to any further prosecution under it, a virtual shambles.

J. Edgar Hoover also testified that a top Communist functionary described the decision in the Smith Act case of June 17, 1957, as the greatest victory the Communist Party in America has ever received.[22] The Daily Worker summed up the Yates, Watkins and other cases of that same day in these words: "The curtain is closing on one of our worst periods." [23] The Sunday Worker of May 11, 1958, contains strong opposition to any legislation to overcome the Supreme Court's rulings on internal security.

Other anti-Communist laws which have been targets of the Communist Party and which are now nullified or weakened by the foregoing 20 cases are the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, the antisedition laws of 42 States, Alaska, and Hawaii, key security provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, and the Summary Suspension Act of 1950.

2. Muzzling the FBI and Congressional investigations. For years the Communist Party has poured out its most hysterical language against what the Reds call "the gestapo-like FBI," and Congressional inquisitions and witch hunts. This tactic has been so successful that it is now said that the Communists don't have to tell Congressional committees anything.

Judge Robert Morris, chief counsel for the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee for 6 years, said: "The power of the Congress to learn the underlying facts of the [Communist] conspiracy has been hamstrung" since the decision in the Watkins case.

In the first session of Congress since the Watkins decision the House Un-American Activities Committee conducted only one investigation and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee held only one public hearing. On July 5, 1958, the press reported that Congressional investigations into the Communist conspiracy have reached an all-time low for the last two decades, although committee files are bulging with data on the conspiracy which are crying for exploration.

The experience of France, and particularly Germany, shows the danger of restricting legislative investigations.[24] Bismarck so feared the power of parliamentary investigation that he dissolved the Prussian Parliament when it attempted to assert its right of investigation. Historians agree that the lack of legislative investigation was the great-

[10] Ibid., vol. 9, pp. 290–291.
[11] HUAC, Marxist Classics, op. cit., p. 33.
[12] Ibid., p. 58.
[13] Hoover, Herbert, 40 Key Questions About Our Foreign Policy, Scarsdale, N. Y., Updegraff Press, 1952, p. 33.
[14] Idem.
[15] St. Louis Post-Dispatch, September 18, 1955.
[16] U. S. News & World Report, December 27, 1957, p. 32.
[17] Daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 31, 1955, p. A3764.
[18] HUAC, Annual Report, 1957, p. 2.
[19] HUAC, Marxist Classics, op. cit., p. 187.
[20] U. S. House Appropriations Subcommittee, hearings on the Department of Justice, January 16, 1958, p. 176.
[21] Ibid., p. 173.
[22] Ibid., p. 174.
[23] Editorial, June 19, 1957.
[24] Ehrmann, Henry W., the Duty of Disclosure in Parliamentary Investigations: A Comparative Study, 11 University of Chicago Law Review, 117–153, February 1944.

est single cause for the authorization of Imperial Germany. When the Weimar Republic was created, article 34 of the constitution granted the Reichstag the power "to appoint investigating committees." When the Reichstag attempted to exercise its constitutional right, the German Constitutional Court, in two key cases, narrowed the scope of parliamentary inquiry so considerably that the investigating powers of the Reichstag were inadequate to its tasks. As a result, the Reichstag never exposed the Nazi Party, or Hitler's purges, concentration camps, and secret police. The success of the Nazi conspiracy taught the German Supreme Court a lesson. On August 17, 1956, it handed down a scholarly 375-page opinion which outlawed all activities of the Communist conspiracy in West Germany.

3. Elimination of Federal and State security programs. This tactic has been completely successful in regard to nonsensitive positions, although evidence is abundant that the Communist conspiracy considers nonsensitive positions vitally important. Military security officers have caught Communist janitors collecting the contents of wastebaskets and Communist stenographers making an extra carbon copy of all documents and mailing them to their Communist superiors. The New York Times reported on July 11, 1958, that there are more than 300 Government employees dismissed or suspended as security risks who are due to be reinstated with back pay.

Everyone admits that Government employment is not a right but a privilege. Yet the effect of the Cole, Service, Slochower, and Sweezy decisions is to prevent Federal and State governments from withdrawing this privilege from those who associate with Communists or who are security risks.

On July 9, 1958, the legal chief of the State Department Passport Division testified in Congress that, as a result of the June 1958 decisions in the Kent and Dayton cases, the State Department has had to issue 77 passports to suspected subversives and has another 70 applications pending whose travel abroad will be against the security of the United States. He pleaded for early passage of the legislation submitted by President Eisenhower to overcome these decisions and to give the State Department authority to bar passports from persons whose travel abroad may be deemed injurious to American security.

Joseph Z. Kornfeder, one of the founders of the Communist Party U. S. A., who is now anti-Communist, testified that American passports are essential to Communist spying operations. These Supreme Court decisions, he testified, will save the Soviet Union time and money because it will no longer be necessary to forge American passports.

4. The peace offensive. On April 1, 1951, the House Un-American Activities Committee issued a report called "The Communist Peace Offensive: a Campaign to Disarm and Defeat the United States." This document showed in detail how intellectuals, professors, writers, and others who influence public opinion, were sucked into various Communist peace fronts. This report said: "The most dangerous hoax ever devised by the international Communist conspiracy is the current worldwide 'peace' offensive."

Today, under the slogans "peace" and "peaceful coexistence," we are witnessing a revival of this Communist peace offensive. The Czechs and Hungarians found that coexistence with communism is like getting into a cage with a hungry lion; after the lion has eaten the man, they lie down and coexist in peace. Peaceful coexistence means Communist conquest without war. In his February 1956 report to the 20th congress, Khrushchev asserted in Aesopian language that peaceful coexistence would lead to the victory of world communism.[25]

Dr. Fred C. Schwarz, in his testimony before the House Un-American Activities Committee, has accurately described what the Communists mean by peace: "Every act that contributes to the Communist conquest is a peaceful act. If they take a gun, they take a peaceful gun, containing a peaceful bullet, and kill you peacefully and put you in a peaceful grave. When the Chinese Communists murder millions, it is an act of peace. When the Russian tanks rolled into Budapest to butcher and destroy, it was glorious peace." This is what J. Edgar Hoover calls "semantic sabotage." We cannot negotiate with the Communists because they insist black is white and murder is peaceful coexistence.

5. Summit conferences. Four experts on communism testified before the United States House Un-American Activities Committee on April 30, 1958, that "the Kremlin looks upon a summit conference solely as another weapon in its program of global conquest." Dr. David J. Dallin, Dr. Anthony T. Bouscaren, Dr. James D. Atkinson, and Mr. Francis J. McNamara all declared that "in seeking an international conference, the purpose of the Soviet Union is not to negotiate peace but to disarm the West intellectually and psychologically." All four consultants were in agreement that another summit conference would constitute "a grave setback for the free world."[26] Other experts have said that a summit conference, in Red doubletalk, means a "submit conference."

We must bear in mind that the Communists have the most deplorable record in all history for violation of solemn treaties,[27] and that it is the policy of Communists to promise anything and to perform nothing unless it serves their immediate ends. Just as a confirmed alcoholic is not cured by being invited to have one more drink, so a confirmed treatybreaker is not cured by being invited to sign a new treaty. The President is therefore right in demanding that Communists first demonstrate their good faith by complying with their prior agreements. Without such evidence of good faith, the conference becomes merely a Communist vehicle for propaganda purposes.

6. Cultural exchanges. Nikita Khrushchev's famous report of February 1956 lists cultural and business exchanges as one of those developments which will bring about the growing weakness of the United States and advance world socialism.[28] On June 2, 1957, Khrushchev appeared on American television screens and called for a wider exchange of cultural delegations. On December 22, 1957, the Communist Daily Worker declared that perhaps the best Christmas present Santa Claus will bring America will be the widespread cultural exchange of certain Americans with Soviet agents coming to this country.

On January 27, 1958, the United States signed a 2-year agreement with Soviet Russia for the exchange of persons in the cultural, scientific, technical, and educational fields. Matt Cvetic, former FBI undercover agent who worked with the Communists for 9 years, said: "Every single delegate from Russia or a satellite country with whom I ever came in contact myself, while posing as a Communist for the FBI, was either a member of the Soviet secret police or the Soviet espionage apparatus. The primary activity of every one of Moscow's cultural delegates while in this country is to promote the Communist world revolution." E. H. Cookridge, former British secret service agent and an authority on Soviet espionage, had this to say: "Every Soviet football team, every athlete competing at an international sport event, Soviet scientists attending a congress abroad, the Moscow Ballet performing in a western capital or a group of Soviet artists at a film festival are invariably accompanied by special agents of the Soviet secret police." Judge Robert Morris, who has spent the last 17 years intensively studying the Communist conspiracy, said: "In past years of the exchange, secret police have passed as farmers, ice skaters, clergymen, and scientists for the purpose of conducting espionage operations in this country."

We commend the Veterans of Foreign Wars for their brilliant evaluation of the program of cultural exchanges with Soviet Russia. The VFW said: "The United States is losing and Moscow is gaining through this program as it is now operated. * * * Moscow obviously wants only those exchanges and contacts which give its trusted agents an opportunity to mislead foreigners about the Soviet Union. * * * Moscow has also used the visitor-exchange program as a means of weakening United States security regulations."[29] We also commend AFL-CIO President George Meany for his statement on cultural exchanges: "No believer in the basic principles of free trade unionism could today conceivably desecrate these principles by undertaking to visit a country whose tyrannical leadership has for the 40 years of its existence been the avowed and uncompromising enemy of all human rights."

Cultural interchange with Soviet Russia is a one-way street. When Americans go to Russia, they speak only through interpreters, see only what the Communists want them to see and hear only Communist propaganda. For example, in the Ukraine, the Soviet Government built a children's playground over a mass grave of thousands of anti-Communists. Visitors to Russia, seeing only the surface, come home and report how kind Communists are to their children.

Ivan Pushkar, a Ukrainian imprisoned in slave labor camps in Siberia, testified before the House Select Committee on Communist Aggression[30] how the Russians would "stage these conducted tours for foreigners" with "ruse and fakery and fraud." Henry A. Wallace, in a frank article published in 1952, related that he did not realize during his tour of Soviet Russia how the Communists were making feverish efforts to hoodwink him. Wallace said it was only much later that he learned how a Communist slave labor camp had been transformed into a show city, with prisoners herded out of sight and watchtowers torn down, merely to deceive the American Vice President. Elinor Lipper verifies this in her book, Eleven Years in Soviet Prison Camps. As a prisoner in a slave camp visited by Wallace, she gives an inside account of how American tourists in Russia are deceived.

On the other hand, Communist visitors to the United States have been given access to our industrial and agricultural knowhow, as well as to some of our scientific and military installations. This knowledge has been used to strengthen the Communist dictatorship in areas where it is weakest, such as labor-saving devices and corn-hog production.

7. Recognition of Red China: Diplomatic recognition is essential to Communist subversion. The Communist espionage apparatus needs the diplomatic immunity of its embassies and consulates to set up spy

[25] HUAC, Marxist Classics, op. cit., pp. xxiv–xxv.

[26] What Is Behind the Soviet Proposal for a Summit Conference?

[27] U. S. Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, Soviet Political Agreements and Results, 1956.

[28] HUAC, Marxist Classics, op. cit., pp. xxiii–xxiv.

[29] Veterans of Foreign Wars, Guardpost for Freedom, December 1, 1957, and June 1, 1958.

[30] October 11, 1954.

centers. It needs the unbroken seal of the diplomatic pouch to transmit orders to its spies and couriers and to receive back their reports and microfilmed documents.

How the Red diplomatic apparatus functions is described in detail in the report of the Canadian Royal Commission [31] which investigated code clerk Igor Gouzenko's revelations, in the Report of the Australian Royal Commission [32] which investigated Embassy Secretary Vladimir Petrov's confession, and in the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee investigation of United States Communists working for the U. N.[33] conducted by Senator Herbert O'Conor, past chairman of this committee.

That Red China will model her tactics after the tactics of Soviet Russia is made clear by the statement of Premier Chou En-lai in the Communist magazine International Affairs:

"The great Communist Party of China, organized by progressive elements of the Chinese people, was founded and developed under the influence of the October Revolution, and was modeled on the Communist Party of the Soviet Union." [34]

8. Halt nuclear tests: The current Communist tactic to get an agreement with the West halting nuclear tests is similar to Soviet exploitation of the agreement made at Panmunjom not to rearm the North and South Koreans with jet planes and other modern weapons. The Soviets promptly violated this agreement. Then they violated its inspection clause by refusing to permit the neutral inspection team to inspect North Korean airfields.

Most experts agree that the net results of the suspension of nuclear tests would be that the United States would stop testing but that, within the vast, isolated Soviet land mass, there would be circumvention of the ban on testing.

The National Academy of Sciences, in a report on The Biological Effects of Atomic Radiation, said that the United States population is exposed to radiation from the natural background of cosmic rays, etc., of about 4.3 roentgens, and from medical and dental X-rays of about 3 roentgens. Nuclear weapons tests—if continued at the rate of the past 5 years would give a probable 30-year dose of about 0.1 roentgen. This is less than one would get from a radium dial on a wrist watch. This report was confirmed by a report to Parliament made by the Medical Research Council of Great Britain.[35]

9. East-West trade: Khrushchev's report of February 14, 1956, calls for East-West trade; [36] and this has been part of the Communist line for many years. Foreign trade, to a Communist country, is a means of waging cold war. It is a means of obtaining from the outside world the strategic materials with which it can arm itself for world conquest. Trading with the Communist bloc would be a psychological as well as a military defeat for the United States. The goods we might sell to the Communist bloc will be used against us just as the superb Rolls-Royce jet engines sold to Russia were used to power the Mig–15's against us in Korea.

In May 1958, Khrushchev sent an 8-page letter to President Eisenhower in which he brazenly suggested that the United States grant Soviet Russia long-term dollar credits in order to finance trade with the United States. We would not gain by trading our machinery for Soviet IOU's or even Russia's raw materials. The Senate report on the "Accessibility of Strategic and Critical Materials" issued July 9, 1954, shows that the Western Hemisphere contains all the 77 critical and strategic materials needed for military security. The answer to the propaganda for East-West trade is more North-South trade.

10. Propaganda: Communists are spending $3 billion a year on propaganda which is reaching every city and hamlet in our Nation. In one day, Communist propaganda coming through New York City alone fills three large warehouses, and not a single piece is labeled "Communist propaganda" as required by the Foreign Agents Registration Act. This propaganda comes not only from Russia, but also from Red China, from Iron Curtain countries, and from Western Europe. Much additional Red propaganda is published in the United States by Communist publishers.

The House Un-American Activities Committee recently reported: "Propaganda is part of a global program which ranks as one of the Kremlin's most important instruments of conquest." Henry Loomis, former Director of the Office of Research and Intelligence of the United States Information Agency, estimated that 25 million persons throughout the world are directly engaged in disseminating Communist propaganda.[37]

11. Humiliation: As a dialectical maneuver in between its peace offensive and its drive for a summit conference, the Kremlin uses the tactic of humiliation. This tactic had already been used by the Communists on American prisoners in Korea.

Communists masterminded insulting demonstrations all over South America against Vice President NIXON, which included spitting on him and the throwing of rocks and garbage. On July 18, 1958, a mob of 100,000 Communists gathered in front of the American Embassy in Moscow and threw ink bottles and stones which shattered most of the windows on the first five floors. All spring there was a wave of demonstrations against the American information agencies in various parts of the world, with burnings of the American libraries. This summer, there has been the series of kidnapings of American citizens: 9 United States soldiers held by East Germany, 9 United States airmen shot down in Armenia; and 47 civilians, sailors, and marines kidnaped in Cuba. In addition, there is an untold number of Americans who are being held captive in the Soviet Union. In an interview this summer, John Noble, one of the few captives who have been released, made this statement about American prisoners in Red slave-labor camps: "Every day the Russians taunted us—'If you had a Government in America, they'd get you out.' "

III. HINDSIGHT OR FORESIGHT?

On June 17, 1958, when the Soviet news agency, Tass, announced the executions of former Hungarian Premier Imre Nagy, Gen. Pal Maleter, and two other leaders of the anti-Communist rebellion of 1956, Western leaders expressed shock and dismay. General Maleter, the hero of the rebellion, was seized by the Soviets when he met with them under a flag of truce to negotiate the withdrawal of the Red army from Budapest. Nagy and his associates were executed, although they had received a written guaranty of safe conduct when they left their asylum in the Yugoslav Embassy.

To even the most elementary student of Communist history and tactics, these enormous acts of treachery came as no surprise. In March 1945, 16 top leaders of the Polish Government were invited to Moscow for negotiations and were promised on the word of honor of the Soviet Government, that they would have safe conduct. All 16 were arrested and then vanished. Nothing was heard of any of them until 10 years later, when the wife of General Leopold Okulicki was notified of his death 9 years before in a Soviet prison.[38] The perfect parallel between Soviet betrayal of safe-conduct pledges to the Poles in 1945 and to the Hungarians in 1958 should remind Western leaders of the old Indian maxim: "Pale face cheat red man once, shame on pale face. Pale face cheat red man twice, shame on red man." Since the Katyn Forest Massacre of 1943, it has been obvious that coexistence with communism is a contradiction in terms.

With each succeeding act of Soviet bad faith, many Western spokesmen express surprise. When anti-Communists reply, "You should have expected this," the politically naive make a common rejoinder: "That is mere hindsight; no one could have predicted that the Communists could be that bad." It is appropriate to point out that informed anti-Communists have always known and publicly stated that it is impossible to negotiate with international communism.

It was not hindsight, it was foresight when Secretary of State Bainbridge Colby said on August 10, 1920:

"The existing regime in Russia is based upon the negation of every principle of honor and good faith. * * * The responsible leaders of the regime have frequently and openly boasted that they are willing to sign agreements and undertakings with foreign powers while not having the slightest intention of observing such undertakings or carrying out such agreements. * * * Upon numerous occasions the responsible spokesmen of this power, and its official agencies, have declared that it is their understanding that the very existence of Bolshevism in Russia, the maintenance of their own rule, depends, and must continue to depend, upon the occurrence of revolutions in all other great civilized nations, including the United States, which will overthrow and destroy their governments and set up Bolshevist rule in their stead. They have made it quite plain that they intend to use every means, including, of course, diplomatic agencies, to promote such revolutionary movements in other countries. * * * We cannot recognize, hold official relations with, or give friendly reception to the agents of a government which is determined and bound to conspire against our institutions; whose diplomats will be the agitators of dangerous revolt; whose spokesmen say that they sign agreements with no intention of keeping them." [39]

It was not hindsight, but foresight when Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes stated on March 21, 1923:

"We are just as anxious in this Department and in every branch of the administration as you can possibly be, to promote peace in the world, to get rid of hatred, to have a spirit of mutual understanding, but the world we desire is a world not threatened with the destructive propaganda of the Soviet authorities, and one in which there will be good faith and the recognition of obligations and a sound basis of international intercourse." [40]

It was not hindsight, it was foresight when Robert P. Kelley, Chief of the Division of Eastern European Affairs in the Department of State, wrote in a memorandum dated July 27, 1933:

"The fundamental obstacle in the way of the establishment with Russia of the re-

---

[31] June 27, 1946.
[32] August 22, 1955.
[33] January 2, 1953.
[34] November 1957, p. 20.
[35] U. S. News & World Report, June 7, 1957, pp. 25–27.
[36] HUAC, Marxist Classics, op. cit., pp. xxiii–xxiv.
[37] Annual Report, 1957, p. 33.
[38] Mikolajczyk, Stanislaw, The Rape of Poland, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1948, pp. 111–112.
[39] U. S. Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, Second Report, March 22, 1954, p. 41.
[40] U. S. News & World Report, December 17, 1954, p. 128.

lations usual between nations in diplomatic intercourse is the world revolutionary aims and practices of the rulers of that country. It is obvious that, so long as the Communist regime continues to carry on in other countries activities designed to bring about ultimately the overthrow of the government and institutions of these countries, the establishment of genuine friendly relations between Russia and those countries is out of the question." [41]

It was not hindsight, it was foresight when United States Ambassador to Moscow Laurence Steinhardt reported, on June 17, 1941:

"My observation of the psychology of the individuals who are conducting Soviet foreign policy has long since convinced me that they do not and cannot be induced to respond to the customary amenities, that it is not possible to create 'international good will' with them, that they will always sacrifice the future in favor of an immediate gain, and that they are not affected by ethical or moral considerations nor guided by the relationships which are customary between individuals of culture and breeding. Their psychology recognizes only firmness, power and force, and reflects primitive instincts and reactions entirely devoid of the restraints of civilization. I am of the opinion that they must be dealt with on this basis and on this basis alone." [42]

Former President Herbert Hoover predicted on June 29, 1941:

"The gargantuan jest of all history would be if we should give aid to Stalin in the war. * * * The result would be to spread communism over the world."

IV. CURRENT FALLACIES ABOUT COMMUNISM

So much misinformation is current about communism that it is appropriate to expose some of the major fallacies.

1. "Communism in the United States is dwindling in power because the party is dwindling in numbers." This popular belief shows a complete misunderstanding of Leninism. Lenin's great contribution to communism was his principle of the dedicated few. He coined the expression "the fewer, the better." He originated the party of professional revoluntionaries subject to military discipline. He rejected the idea of a popular party, and enunciated the principle that no one should be given party membership unless he was under discipline. This is how Lenin was able to establish communism with only 17 supporters and to take over Russia with only 40,000.

It is just as false to measure the strength of communism in the United States by comparing the small number of party members with the large number of non-Communists, as it would be to measure the seaworthiness of a ship by comparing the area of its holes with the area of its hull. A few strategically placed holes can sink the largest ship.

The real strength of communism in the United States is the number of non-Communist organizations and individuals who will collaborate with the Communists. For every Communist Party member, there may be 100 non-Communists who will do the work of the Communists.

The Communists now have 600 fronts. In addition they have "fronts in front of the fronts." Making use of their fellow travelers and dupes, plus their "united front tactic," the Communists boast they can have 50,000 letters on any issue sent to Capitol Hill or the White House inside of 72 hours.

2. "The Communist Party is just another political party." It has been indisputably established by the hearings of the Subversive Activities Control Board in 1951 and 1952, by 20 years of investigation by Congressional committees, and by the prior decisions of the Supreme Court in *Dennis* v. *United States* [43] and in *American Communications Association* v. *Douds*,[44] that the Communist Party U. S. A. is not just a minor political party like the Prohibition Party. In the Dennis case, Chief Justice Vinson rightly described the Communist Party as "a highly organized conspiracy, with rigidly disciplined members subject to call when the leaders, these petitioners, felt that the time had come for action."

Like an iceberg, eight-ninths of the Communist Party has always been underground. The crypto-Communists who carry no cards, and whose names appear on no party records, are the most dangerous Communists. Top Communist agents such as Klaus Fuchs, Guy Burgess, and Donald Maclean never marched in a May Day parade, never carried a hammer and sickle banner, never raised a clenched fist at a Red rally. They were effective agents because they were always underground conspirators, and never aboveground.

3. "Poverty breeds communism." This is the false "stomach" theory of communism. Communism is not a disease caused by an empty stomach; it is a disease of the mind and soul. Communism does not originate with the poor, the uneducated, the exploited, or the working class. Every major world Communist figure who became a Communist in a non-Communist country did so as a student intellectual, materialistic in philosophy and atheistic in faith. The list of important Communist agents who were well-fed student intellectuals includes Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, Chou En-lai, Chou Teh, Mao Tse-tung, Ho Chi-minh, Alger Hiss, Harry Dexter White, Klaus Fuchs, Julius Rosenberg, Guy Burgess, and Donald Maclean. The Communist government of Kerala, democratically elected after the Hungarian revolt was crushed by Soviet troops, has 11 members; 9 are the sons of Indian aristocrats or intellectuals.

4. "The only alternative to peaceful coexistence is world war III with nuclear destruction of our cities." The Communists do not want to destroy us or our cities. A dead man is useless as a slave laborer. They want to take our cities intact as they captured Prague and the giant Skoda munitions works. They plan to capture America with native Communists, just as they took Czechoslovakia with Czechs, China with Chinese, Indochina with Indochinese, South Korea with Koreans, and almost took Spain with Spaniards.

The only alternative is not world war III. Another alternative is a declaration of independence for the satellites and oppressed peoples of Russia. The Kremlin would not embark upon a foreign war if it had or was threatened with a strong independence movement behind the Iron Curtain. The Kremlin remembers that communism came to power only because the Czar, and then the Kerensky government, insisted on forcing the people to fight a foreign war. The Kremlin remembers that in 1941 the Germans were welcomed as liberators, and were hard fought only after they failed to act as liberators.

V. SAFEGUARDING OUR REPUBLIC

1. Remedial legislation: In his testimony before a House Appropriations Subcommittee on January 16, 1958, J. Edgar Hoover said:

"Crime and subversion have become critical challenges due to the mounting success of criminal and subversive elements in employing loopholes, technicalities, and delays in the law to defeat the interests of justice." [45]

Hoover quoted a Federal judge who warned against "an unfortunate trend of judicial decisions * * * which strain and stretch to give the guilty not the same but vastly more protection than the law-abiding citizen." [46] In his speech to the national convention of the American Legion last fall, Hoover warned us:

"It would be the worst kind of folly to allow the spy and subversive immunity through technical rather than logical interpretation of the law, while they plot the destruction of our democratic form of government."

We urge that careful consideration be given to Congressional legislation or judicial construction which will:

1. Restore to Congressional committees the right to determine whether the questions asked of pro-Communist witnesses are pertinent.

2. Restore to Congressional committees the same freedom to investigate Communists and pro-Communists that these committees have always had to investigate businessmen and labor leaders.

3. Restore to the States the right to enforce their own antisubversive laws.

4. Restore to the Smith Act the provision which makes it a crime to teach or advocate the violent overthrow of the Government.

5. Restore to the Smith Act the meaning of "organize" which includes organizational work done after 1945, so that Communist organizers cannot hide behind the statute of limitations.

6. Restore to the executive branch the right to determine and to dismiss security risks in both sensitive and nonsensitive positions of the Government.

7. Restore to the States the right to set standards high enough to exclude from public employment and education those who refuse to testify about their Communist activities and associates.

8. Restore to the executive branch the right to question aliens awaiting deportation about subversive associates and contacts, and the right to deport aliens who are Communists at any time after entering the United States.

9. Restore to the executive branch the right to deny passports to those who refuse to sign a non-Communist affidavit.

10. Restore to the States the right to exclude from the practice of law those who have been members of the Communist conspiracy or who refuse to testify about Communist activities.

Although 8 years have elapsed since the passage of the Internal Security Act, the Communists have succeeded in preventing its enforcement and in blocking a final judicial determination of its constitutionality. The April 20, 1953, order of the Subversive Activities Control Board, issued after exhaustive hearings and backed by scholarly documentation, that the Communist Party, U. S. A., must comply with said act still awaits enforcement. We reassert the views stated in the brief we filed in the United States Supreme Court in support of this important legislation. If any part of this act violates the Constitution, the courts should so hold and Congress should pass new legislation or amend the old act to conform to constitutional requirements. If it is constitutional, the Communist Party and members should not have immunity from its security provisions during many years of protracted litigation.[47]

2. Reevaluate the policy of recognition of Soviet Russia and its satellites: How diplomatic recognition can be used as a weapon in the cold war was well stated by House Majority Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK on July 13, 1958, when he called for "a severance of diplomatic relations with Russia."

---

[41] Ibid., p. 130.
[42] Ibid., July 4, 1958, p. 72.
[43] 341 U. S. 494.
[44] 339 U. S. 382.
[45] Hearings on the Department of Justice, p. 174.
[46] Idem.
[47] Subversive Activities Control Board, Report, S. Doc. No. 41, 83d Cong., 1st sess., April 23, 1953.

Four American presidents refused to recognize the Communist Government of Russia, and it remained weak and ineffective so long as it was unrecognized. Communism began to spread through the world as soon as the United States extended diplomatic recognition in 1933, because, in violation of all international morality and even of the executive agreement by which recognition was extended, Soviet Russia used her embassies and consulates as centers of espionage, subversion, and propaganda.

In describing the recent case involving the Communist spy, Rudolf Ivanovich Abel, J. Edgar Hoover testified:

"I mention this case particularly, Mr. Chairman, because there are some people who think that the matter of Soviet espionage is a thing of the past and no longer exists in view of the theme of peaceful coexistence the Soviets continue to expound. Many of the incidents in the Abel case occurred in 1957." [48]

We must all realize that Communist governments use blackmail, counterfeiting, forgery, kidnaping, lying, mass murder, slavery, subversion, theft, and treaty-breaking as part of their official state policy. It is a matter of historical record that the Kremlin blackmailed the Allies into concessions during World War II by threatening to sign a separate peace with Hitler; that Communist governments have counterfeited American money and forged American passports; kidnaped American citizens and held them for ransom; kidnaped 28,000 Greek children in the cruelest mass abduction in modern history; murdered 11,000 Polish officers at Katyn Forest,[49] 6,112 American soldiers whom they captured in Korea,[50] and thousands of boys and girls in Hungary, forced millions of Polish, Latvian, Lithuanian, Estonian, Czech, Hungarian, and Ukrainian citizens to work as slave laborers in Siberia; stole 600 tons of gold bars worth $700 million from the Government of Spain in 1936; [51] destroyed by subversion the postwar Republics of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland; and violated 50 of their last 52 treaties.

Nothing would slow down the Communist line more definitely than if the United States were to recognize the necessity of treating Soviet Russia as an outlaw and putting its Red agents in the same category. It would dry up the channels by which Soviet Russia spreads its propaganda, directs its espionage, and enforces its discipline on our citizens.

We invite serious attention to the speech of Richard L. Roudebush, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, to the national encampment of the VFW on August 30, 1957, in which he called on our Government to sever diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union.[52] Twenty-two State conventions of the American Legion have also endorsed withdrawal of recognition from Soviet Russia.

It has been claimed that our embassies in Communists countries have value as listening posts. Evidence is abundant that our embassies provide listening posts only for the Communists and not for Americans. American diplomats discovered a microphone had been hidden for years only a few feet from where our Ambassador to Moscow Joseph E. Davies dictated his top-secret reports to Washington. In the American legation in Communist Hungary, a microphone was discovered in the fireplace of the room where Cardinal Mindszenty resides. The Communists had a wire recorder on the legation roof.

We should, of course, continue to refuse recognition to Red China, and we should continue to press for the return of or a satisfactory accounting for the 450 American prisoners of war still held by Red China in violation of the Korean armistice agreement, as called for by House Resolution 292, unanimously passed by the House of Representatives on July 9, 1957.

3. Be prepared with a plan of action: One of the several lessons we learned from the Hungarian rebellion in October 1956, was that the West has no plan of action. The Voice of America, Radio Free Europe and promises of "liberation" by responsible American officials had kept alive the hope for freedom. But when the major breakthrough came in Hungary, we had no plan to help the freedom fighters. This aid did not need to be military, but it did need to be prompt. The Rev. Daniel A. Poling, editor of the Christian Herald, said in June 1958:

"There were 4 days when in the opinion [even] of Tito, recognition by the United States of the Nagy government would have saved the revolution. Nothing more than this was required. Red Russia waited until she knew we would not act—and then she came."

Similar lost opportunities to administer a fatal or crippling blow to world communism were the occasions of Stalin's death, and the Poznam and the East German rebellions. Each opportunity was muffed by the West because we had no plan.

Had our leaders understood the Communist dialectic, they would have known that we could have intervened to aid the Hungarian freedom fighters without running any risk of war with Russia. It would have been un-Marxian, an antidialectical for Soviet Russia to have fought the United States over the issue of freedom for Hungary. On the other hand, it was a dialectical advance for Soviet Russia to fight little Hungary, because—while going backward in world opinion over Hungary itself, it went forward in proving that the West will not heed anti-Communist pleas for help, and that Communist nations aid each other, but anti-Communists must fight alone.

4. Study communism: In 1937, Pope Pius XI asked a searching question about communism:

"How is it possible that such a system, long since rejected scientifically and now proved erroneous by experience, how is it, we ask, that such a system could spread so rapidly in all parts of the world?"

He answered his own question in these words: "The explanation lies in the fact that too few have been able to grasp the nature of communism."

Twenty-one years later, an additional 750 million human beings have been swept behind the Iron Curtain. But it is unfortunately still true that all too few people understand what communism is. Last year, our committee reported:

"The greatest asset the Communists have at the present time is not the hydrogen bomb, certainly not Soviet satellites, but world ignorance of their tactics, strategy and objectives."

When our enemy was Nazi Germany, our Government and military leaders studied every detail of the enemy and his strategy. One of the great generals of the European campaign was George S. Patton. Early in World War II, when the Germans were advancing, General Patton was asked one day if he wasn't discouraged. His answer was precise:

"I have studied the German for 40 years. I have read the memoirs of his great men. I have studied every detail of all his military campaigns. I have attended some of his staff courses. I know exactly how he will react under any given set of circumstances. He does not know what I will do. For this reason, when the time comes, I shall beat the hell out of him."

And this, he did.

We can no more save our Republic from communism merely by saying we are against communism, than parents can save their children from polio by fervently being against polio. To conquer any disease requires intelligent study to isolate the germ and discover the vaccine. As the number one killer in the world today, communism is a disease which merits our urgent study.

APPENDIX—RECOMMENDED READING

Books play a vitally important part in the history of government and economics. One need only mention Das Kapital, The Wealth of Nations, Uncle Tom's Cabin, and the Federalist Papers to be reminded that books have started wars, changed the economy of great nations, and established new governments.

A number of books published during the past year by some of the world's top experts on communism testify to the overriding importance of the Communist issue, and to the unhappy reality that the United States is losing the battle against international communism. A study of the following books and reports could halt the rising tide of world communism.

1. Congressional committee hearings and reports: For 20 years the House Un-American Activities Committee has been patiently investigating the Communist conspiracy. The reports of its hearings, and those of its Senate counterpart, the Internal Security Subcommittee, are an encyclopedia of information on this continuing conspiracy. The abuse which has been heaped upon these committees by the Communists and their fronts is itself an attestation of the value of these reports.

2. Masters of deceit: The Story of Communism in America and How To Fight It, by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover (Henry Holt and Co., New York, 1958, $5). Mr. Hoover's preeminence as an authority on communism is unchallenged. This book provides us with a valuable primer on communism in the United States: its history, strategy, membership and future. He describes the day-to-day operations of the Communist Party, what goes on underground, and how discipline is enforced. He shatters many anti-anti-Communist arguments and shows why this is no time for complacency regarding internal subversion.

3. No Wonder We Are Losing, by Judge Robert Morris (The Bookmailer, New York, 1958, $2.50). Judge Morris has put into this book his personal record of 17 years' investigation of communism on behalf of the New York State Legislature, Naval Intelligence, and as chief counsel for the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. Particularly important chapters concern the famous hearings on the Institute of Pacific Relations, communism's reach into education, and methods and rules of Congressional committees.

4. I Was a Slave in Russia, by John H. Noble (Devin-Adair Co., New York, 1958, $3.75). The author, an American citizen, was captured by the Russians just after V–E Day in 1945 and held prisoner for 9 years. In this book, he tells of his shocking experiences as a slave laborer in Siberia; of other Americans who are still there; and of the millions of political prisoners and how they are treated. This book is especially useful for those who believe in summit conferences and cultural exchanges with the Communists.

5. Communits Psychological Warfare: Consultation with Edward Hunter, by the United States House Un-American Activities Committee (U. S. Government Printing Office,

---

[48] Hearings on the Department of Justice, op cit., p. 178.

[49] U. S. House Katyn Forest Committee, Final Report, December 22, 1952.

[50] U. S. Senate Committee on Government Operations, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, Korean War Atrocities, January 11, 1954.

[51] National Republic, February 1958, p. 3.

[52] VFW, Guardpost for Freedom, October 1, 1957.

March 13, 1958). In 25 pages of testimony under questioning by Staff Director Richard Arens, Edward Hunter gives a brilliant analysis of current Communist strategy and how it follows here the pattern so successful in Asia. A distinguished journalist, author, and expert on communism in the Far East, Mr. Hunter is the originator of the term "brainwashing." In this report, he warns that Communist psychological warfare is now winning such extensive victories in the United States that the Red bloc will not need to employ direct military force against us in order to win the total war which they are waging.

6. International Communism: Consultation with Dr. Fred C. Schwarz by the United States House Un-American Activities Committee (U. S. Government Printing Office, May 29, 1957). Dr. Schwarz is an Australian psychiatrist who is one of the world's top authorities on communism, particularly on the Communist mind. In this testimony, Dr. Schwarz gives his expert diagnosis, prognosis, and recommended treatment for the disease of communism. He shows how the first step in the Communist conquest of every country is the ideological conquest of the student mind.

7. A Guide to Anti-Communist Action, by Dr. Anthony T. Bouscaren (Henry Regnery Co., Chicago, 1958, $4). Dr. Bouscaren is the author of a number of authoritative works in the field of international Communist operations. He is a professor of political science at Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis., and is currently teaching at the National War College, in Washington, D. C. This book provides specific answers to the question of how individual Americans can combat communism with knowledge and facts.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, as we approach the close of the 2d session of the 85th Congress it is fitting to pay honor to those Senators who are retiring from this body.

I may be rightly accused of making the understatement of the year when I say there have been differences of opinion among the Members of the Senate. There have been differences of opinion between the Senator I rise to honor today and various other Members of the Senate. But I believe that practically all the Members of this body are of one opinion about the Senator of whom I speak today.

And that joint opinion is that BILL KNOWLAND is a man of moral soundness, honesty, and uprightness—in a word, he is a man of integrity.

That word integrity was used by nearly every speaker to describe BILL KNOWLAND when he announced last year his intention to retire from the Senate at the end of his term. It was used again by nearly every speaker on the occasion of BILL KNOWLAND's 50th birthday anniversary last June 26. Indeed, as the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] said at that time, BILL KNOWLAND "may be called today Mr. Integrity."

INTEGRITY COUPLED WITH COURAGE AND VISION

In BILL KNOWLAND integrity is coupled with courage and vision. His intelligence enables him to grasp problems and find their solutions. His vision enables him to choose the solution which goes to the heart of the problem. Mere surface treatment is not enough for BILL KNOWLAND. His vision has deep roots. He has been a keen student of Government ever since he was a boy.

BILL KNOWLAND's integrity, and the courage he has shown to assert his convictions, not infrequently have placed him in conflict with the convictions of others. These conflicts have shown him to be a hard and outspoken fighter who placed the importance of the issue at conflict above any fear of unpopularity. This is the real test of courage in politics.

Some have said that BILL KNOWLAND has stood up to this test too well for his own good.

I do not subscribe to this.

I believe the American people admire men of such unselfish convictions.

I believe the American people need more men of such unselfish convictions.

I believe the American people will continue to reward such men.

I admit that there is a great danger for such men of outspoken and unselfish conviction in today's trend away from individual interest in politics in favor of organized pressure in politics. But I am convinced that in every individual American there is a deep respect for men like BILL KNOWLAND who will face such pressures unafraid, and who place the cause of individual freedom above any fear of political consequences. And I believe this respect from many individual Americans for individual leaders like BILL KNOWLAND will make itself known where it counts and to their mutual benefit.

A DEDICATED MAN

BILL KNOWLAND is leaving this body, but he is not leaving the cause of good government. He is constitutionally unable to do so. His dedication to the common good will not let him do so.

This dedication is the driving force in BILL KNOWLAND. From it comes his earnestness, his seriousness, his great capacity for work. This dedication has been evident throughout his 25 years of robust service to his State and country.

It was evident in his first elective office after his election as a member of the California State Assembly in 1933.

It was evident in 1934 when he went on to a 4-year term in California's Senate.

It was evident in 1938 when he became Republican national committeeman, and 2 years later when he became head of the committee's executive committee.

It was evident when he entered the Army as a private soon after the start of World War II, and when he won a commission the hard way, and wound up with a forward echelon in Normandy in July 1944.

FROM BATTLEFIELD TO FLOOR OF UNITED STATES SENATE

His ability and his sense of dedication won for him his appointment from the battlefield to the United States Senate in the summer of 1945. The story is well known how he learned of his appointment by reading a copy of Stars and Stripes. In 1953, he was elected majority leader and became minority leader in 1955.

Through all this service to his State and to his country, BILL KNOWLAND has shown his dedication to the common good. The rewards which have come to him and the honor paid him have been incidental, though I am sure they have been deeply appreciated by him.

I am sure that this dedication to the common good will continue to be evident throughout BILL KNOWLAND's life.

I am sure he will continue to be an energetic force for good government in whatever roles of service lie ahead for him.

In these future roles, I wish him success—for his sake, and for the sake of the people of California and of the whole Nation.

I shall miss BILL KNOWLAND's presence here. Mrs. Bridges and I extend our sincere wishes for a long and happy life.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR IRVING M. IVES, OF NEW YORK

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, as adjournment nears, I know that all of us regret the necessity for IRVING IVES' decision not to seek reelection. For each of us will sorely miss the companionship, the counse', and the understanding of our good friend, the senior Senator from New York. I speak from personal knowledge as a colleague for 12 years. I know of his conformity for work, his sincerity and intelligence.

SIXTEEN YEARS IN NEW YORK STATE ASSEMBLY

His 16 years of experience in the New York State Assembly, followed by the 12 fruitful years he has spent here in Washington, gave him a knowledge and appreciation of the legislation process which made him one of the most effective and able Members of this body.

His career in the Senate began with important work in shaping legislation in the field of labor-management relations, a field in which he is acknowledged to be one of our Nation's leading students. As a freshman Senator in 1947, he played an extraordinary and important role in helping to shape the Taft-Hartley Act.

And in the present session of the Congress, his years of investigative activity have borne fruit in many ways, not the least of which has been his service as the able vice chairman of the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field.

BACKGROUND IN HIS HOME STATE

Senator IVES was already an expert on labor legislation when he came to Washington. He played a key role at Albany in the enactment of many of New York State's labor laws. As chairman of the joint legislative committee on industrial and labor conditions of the New York State Legislature, he was the author and sponsor of legislation creating the New York State Department of Commerce and the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations at Cornell University. He was appointed as the first dean of the School of Industrial and Labor Relations of Cornell University in 1945, serving in that capacity until he began his career here in the Senate.

He was also a pioneer in the field of civil-rights legislation. The enactment in 1945 of the Ives-Quinn law in New York State brought into existence the first legislation by any State to prohibit discrimination in employment because of

race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry. And all of us here in the Senate are well aware of how his interest in civil rights has continued here in Washington. IRVING IVES has ever been in the forefront of the battle for such legislation on the national scene.

WORLD WAR I VETERAN

A veteran of World War I, Senator IVES has been a banker, insurance man, and educator—but first and foremost, he is a legislator, a man of conviction, honesty, and courage. He has served the citizens of New York most ably in the Senate. For example, passage of the Niagara power legislation last year was a landmark in that service.

Political experts have told me that he could have been reelected, but his health would not permit him to make the sort of campaign he would have wanted to make. And this is a source of real sorrow for all of us. I bid him and his charming wife well in their return to private life.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR RALPH E. FLANDERS, OF VERMONT

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, it is with mixed feelings that I address myself to a subject which I know is of interest to every Member of this body—the retirement this November of Senator RALPH E. FLANDERS, of Vermont.

I say my feelings are somewhat mixed because, on the one hand, I regret that he will be no longer associated with us in the Senate, and on the other hand, I envy his return to one of the loveliest sections in America.

RALPH E. FLANDERS was born in Barnet, Vt. His father came of a family so poor that he had to be "bound out" as a boy for a year at a time to farmers in need of help who were willing to support him.

But this distinguished Senator, who went to school 8 years and never attended any college, has been awarded 8 honorary degrees from leading American universities.

CONNECTION WITH NASHUA, N. H.

Senator FLANDERS spent his twenties in short periods of employment to gain experience under different conditions. The one which he looks back on with particular pleasure was a year and a half connection with a Canadian-French inventor which resulted in the design of a automatic paper-box machine which is still being made and still going strong in the city of Nashua, N. H. He soon wrote one book on gearing and became a national and even international authority on the subject.

At this attracted the attention of the Fellows Gear Shaper Co., in Springfield, Vt., which offered the future Senator a job which he gladly accepted.

After 2 years, an opening occurred in the Jones & Lamson Machine Co., in Springfield, and an unsuccessful machine which appeared to have great possibilities was turned over to RALPH FLANDERS for developing. This task engaged his attention for the next 4 or 5 years. He completely redesigned the machine, enlarged its field of usefulness, took out a number of patents on his improvements, and began its development as a main product of the company. At this time he was made manager of the company as a whole and, in 1939, succeeded to its presidency, which position he held until he went to Boston in 1944.

During World War II, RALPH FLANDERS was called to Washington to administer machine tool priorities, a job which he continued until it was well organized. Other Government assignments continued, including industry adviser to wartime OPA; special adviser to the Navy on the acceleration of torpedo production; and most important, membership in the Economic Stabilization Board.

PRESIDENT OF FEDERAL RESERVE BANK

In May 1944, Senator FLANDERS was honored by being elected to the presidency of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston. His 2 years in this post gave him the opportunity to render a major service to all New England.

He was appointed United States Senator in November 1946, to fill the unexpired term of Senator Warren Austin. He was subsequently elected for the full term and was reelected in 1952.

Since joining this body he has served on numerous Senate committees, including the Banking and Currency, Rules, Post Office and Civil Service, Armed Services, Finance and the Joint Economic Committee.

He has sponsored, or cosponsored, nationally important legislation on such vital subjects as housing, labor relations, voluntary health insurance, United Nations emergency force, and disarmament resolutions.

I know I speak for every Member of the Senate when I express my sincere wish to RALPH and Mrs. Flanders that they enjoy to the utmost a happy retirement in the State which he loves.

Mr. President, I have previously expressed myself relative to the retirement from the Senate of the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] yield 2 or 3 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina, with the understanding that the Senator from Nevada will not lose the floor? The Senator from South Carolina was seeking recognition before the quorum call.

Mr. MALONE. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

INCREASE IN PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13580) to increase the public debt limit.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I desire to go on record against the increase in the debt limit. In the spring of this year, Congress increased the debt limit from $275 billion to $280 billion. Now it is proposed to increase the debt limit $8 billion more, which will make the total $288 billion.

It is my firm opinion that if the United States is to remain a free country, we must remain strong militarily and strong economically. We cannot remain strong economically by continually increasing the debt.

It is my firm conviction that the administration must discontinue recommending programs which will plunge the Federal Government further into business in competition with private business and encourage greater spending on the part of the Federal Government.

I firmly believe that Congress must discontinue launching new programs of the kind which we launched here today for education, as to which the Federal Government has no jurisdiction under the Constitution, and also the foreign-aid programs involving the giving away or spending of several billion dollars. There are other such unnecessary programs which I could mention.

I think we must call a halt, and now is the time to do it. The only way we will stop spending is to stop increasing the debt limit. If we do not raise the debt limit, then we will be prohibited from going any further with our spending.

It is for these reasons that I wish to be recorded in opposition to any increase in the debt limit.

FREE LABOR AND ENLIGHTENED MANAGEMENT—NEW APPROACH TO OUR LATIN AMERICAN RELATIONSHIPS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] may yield to me for the purpose of my making a brief statement, with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MALONE. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, during the past 3 weeks, when I was preparing this speech, I did not know it would perform the function it is about to perform, namely, of providing a breath-catching period following forensic gestures in the Lake Michigan diversion debate. But after listening to that delightful debate, I see now that my speech will serve more than its original purpose.

I prepared this speech as chairman of the Latin America Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee; it is the subcommittee which has been entrusted by the Senate with a study of Latin American relations. Copies of the speech have been in the press gallery for many hours. It is a major speech by me, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Problems. The title of the speech is "Free Labor and Enlightened Management—A New Approach to Our Latin American Relationships."

THE RUDE AWAKENING

Mr. President, now that the initial shock has passed, we can begin to develop some perspective on the trip to South America made by the Vice President of the United States.

We know that the incidents which marred that journey probably were started by, and certainly were exploited

by Communists. Spitting upon a woman is a tactic fully in character with the executioners of Hungary.

But we also can begin to recognize that communism is not the whole story. It took the shock of the Nixon journey to stimulate more realistic and purposeful thought about Latin America in this country.

STRONG FRIENDSHIP WITH LATIN AMERICA ESSENTIAL TO UNITED STATES SECURITY

In our confidence that we and Latin America were "good neighbors," we allowed ourselves to become preoccupied with other areas and other problems. Certainly, we need not have ignored the significance of the fact that the Soviet bloc presses in upon Western Europe or the fact that the Middle and Far East are in a most turbulent state of political turmoil. Certainly, these facts are of critical importance to us. Nevertheless, we had only to refer to World War II to remind ourselves that Latin America also is critical to the United States in time of emergency. Within 1 year of Pearl Harbor, 11 of the Latin American countries declared war on our enemies. During the war, the United States imported from Latin American countries about 80 percent of their total copper output, 100 percent of their oil, and 75 percent of their lead and other strategic war materials.

Now, as then, Latin America is an area essential to the security of the United States whether we are aware of the region or forgetful of it. If peace is urgent for the United States, then it is essential to have "area policies" for peace. Latin America is one of the areas in which we require these policies. It is within this scope that the Subcommittee on American Republic Affairs will examine United States Government policies toward Latin America. These policies are based on many complex factors and it is not my purpose now to go into matters which the subcommittee, over the coming months, will study in great detail. What I should like to suggest today is that some of the most important factors in United States-Latin American relations may be primarily outside the scope of official United States Government action.

UNITED STATES CITIZENS IN LATIN AMERICA—EMISSARIES OF GOOD WILL AND UNDERSTANDING

To North Americans and Latin Americans alike, the word "neighbor" suggests a personal and not an official relationship. A neighbor is a friend, not an official envoy from some distant power. Who, then, is the average Latin American likely to use as his measure of United States good neighborliness—the occasional United States diplomat confined by necessity and custom to political circles in the capitol or the ever-present United States businessman and engineer who is everywhere that commerce is—in the remote oil fields, on the plantation, and at the mines? It is these men—the businessmen and the technicians who are physically the Latin's neighbor and in many cases his employer. Statistics alone indicate the importance of the nonofficial groups of our citizens in Latin America. There are only about 1,000 United States diplomats in Latin America as compared to 112,815 private United States citizens living in these countries. The opportunity and responsibility of the private citizen to contribute to his country's stature, therefore, is obviously very great.

I speak here not of personal diplomacy in social relations, important though this may be, but of the heavier responsibility that comes with the conduct of business relations. For it is in the world of business that the United States has its largest, most frequent, and most widespread contact with Latin America. Although the total number of United States companies operating in Latin America has never been officially estimated, investments in Latin America today run over $7.5 billion. This investment has increased 12.1 percent since 1950. These investments, moreover, are in industries that are crucial to the economic well-being of many a Latin American company. That is true, for example, of the oil industry in Venezuela, the copper industry in Peru, and the plantation industries of Central America.

BUSINESSMEN SYMBOLIZE THE UNITED STATES TO LATIN AMERICANS

Hence, the United States businessman, whether he wishes so or not, is the prime focus of Latin American eyes. His policies, most of which are beyond the scope of formal government-to-government relations, are in fact a major criterion by which the United States is measured. By way of an illustrative parallel, let us imagine, for a moment, that the United States steel and automobile industries were managed by foreign businessmen. We should then recognize how sensitive our politicians, our press, our labor leaders, our business leaders, our intellectuals, and students would be to every move and every policy of that management. Would we be any less quick than Latin America to see "exploitation" in that management? Would we be any less ready to listen to charges of "imperialism" raised by the extremists among us? Certainly the polices of that foreign management would be for millions of American workers a more real, personal, and tangible measure of that foreign government than anything done by its ambassador in Washington.

GROWTH OF THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT IN LATIN AMERICA

In his role as employer, then, the United States businessman is a most real and personal representative of the United States to the single largest group of Latin Americans—the working people. The number of these people who are organized is growing daily.

Ten years ago, Latin American trade union membership was 3,765,000; today that figure is 12,019,000, an increase of 319 percent. The increase for some of the more highly industrialized countries is even more impressive. During this period the percentage increase in trade union membership in Argentina was 84 percent; for Brazil over 500 percent; and for Uruguay 432 percent.

The actual figures showing the increases over the 10-year period are these:

Argentina	500,000	4,200,000
Brazil	500,000	2,536,000
Uruguay	75,000	183,000

Even in Central America—the most agriculturally dependent area—the past 2 years has seen the formation of national unions in all countries.

THE POLITICAL IMPORTANCE OF THE LABOR MOVEMENT IN LATIN AMERICA

Because of this growth in numbers and in organization, the workers of Latin America are far more than just an economic group and their attitudes are far more than just a business problem. They must be regarded as a major force, in certain countries, the decisive force, in determining national political destinies.

In Argentina, in 1946, it was the workers who brought Peron to power. In Bolivia in 1952 it was the workers who by force of arms installed the present government. In 1958, a few months ago, it was the workers who were a powerful factor in overturning the dictators of Venezuela and Columbia.

This political potential of the worker to be manipulated in the quest for power has, of course, been of fundamental concern to the Communists since 1948 when Marx first issued his manifesto to the proletariat. Today in 1958 this Communist interest in labor is no less persistent.

GRAVE THREAT OF COMMUNIST DOMINATION OF SOUTH AMERICAN LABOR UNIONS

In Ecuador, the Communists control the national labor movement. In Uruguay and Chile the Communist-controlled unions outnumber those of the free trade union groups. In Argentina, Brazil, Peru, and many other Latin American countries Communist labor elements in certain key sectors of the economy are strong. If this were not enough—and we know that partial control is never enough for the Communists—their training of Latin American labor leaders is going on at a disturbing and almost incredible rate.

Latin American attendance at Communist-sponsored schools and gatherings held behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains is indicated by the following: During the single year of 1957 a total of 168 persons representing 18 different delegations attended these various meetings, rallies, and schools. This constituted a sizable increase over 1956 when only 11 delegations representing 80 persons attended such labor gatherings behind the Iron Curtain. Those individuals who attend these labor gatherings and schools receive a thorough grounding in Communist principles, tactics, and action programs. Upon return to their respective countries their progress is closely followed through correspondence, visits from officials of the Communist international labor organizations, and regional meetings held under the auspices of the Latin American arm of the World Federation of Trade Unions, the Confederation de Trabajadores de America Latina.

Labor gatherings, rallies, and schools constitute only a part of the total Communist program. The World Conference of Teachers which was held in Warsaw during August of last year was attended by 10 country delegations from Latin America. This conference was sponsored by the Communist teachers organization. Even larger than these Communist mechanisms are the cultural, professional and front delegations, which do not fail to include Latin American representation. Perhaps it was recognition of these facts, the growth of the political potential of Latin American labor and of Communist interest therein, that brought Vice President NIXON to the conclusion that we in the United States "must take more of an interest in Latin American labor."

FREE UNITED STATES LABOR—MODEL FOR LATIN AMERICAN LABOR

For many years the American labor movement has taken a substantial interest in the trade unions of Latin America. Their programs are conducted through the various international labor organizations, some of which have been in existence 60 years, and are paid for by the dues of the 15 million trade unionists in the United States together with trade unionists from other areas of the world.

The purpose of these activities, as has been stated by President George Meany, of the AFL–CIO, is to "help our trade-union colleagues in other lands in their efforts to build free unions. We think it is absolutely essential for the freedom and economic health of these lands that they have strong free trade-union movements with full opportunity for genuine collective bargaining and decent working conditions."[1]

In Latin America these private labor activities go back to the 1920's. They were intensified in the post-war era and in 1948 it was largely under the leadership of the United States labor that the free trade unions of the Western Hemisphere split from the Communist international labor organizations and formed a new and democratic group of their own—the Inter-American Confederation of Workers. This organization was followed by the present Inter-American National Organization of Workers—ORIT—which was founded in January, 1951 as the Western Hemisphere branch of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions—ICFTU. I think trade unionists everywhere may take justifiable pride in the fact that this hemispheric labor organization that they helped to found and support, today outnumbers the Communist international organization by 5,881,000 to 204,207, a ration of 29 to 1.

Other activities of United States Labor in Latin America have been educational and developmental in nature. For instance, in the case of Guatemala, the Communists dominated the labor movement until 1954, when the Communists were forced out of power. Until that time, there was an almost complete vacuum of leadership in trade union ranks. It was the United States unions, working through the hemispheric organizations, which sponsored the program to restore Guatemalan trade unionism under democratic leadership.

UNITED STATES LABOR STRENGTHENS BONDS OF FRIENDSHIP BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND LATIN AMERICA

One major effect of these programs has been to create a substantial bond of understanding and friendship between the Latin American and United States unions. It is an almost ironic coincidence that at the very time last April and May when the Vice President was in Latin America, an international labor delegation, including United States unionists, was also visiting the area. Instead of the hostile demonstrations that greeted the official representative of the United States, the labor delegation was warmly welcomed at the same airports by hundreds of Latin American workers. There is a lesson here, I think, in the meaning and effectiveness of people-to-people relationships. While these activities are undertaken by labor for labor's sake, they are also a substantial factor in building in Latin America a more complete and accurate picture of what we mean by the United States.

UNITED STATES BUSINESSMEN SHOULD DIRECT THEIR ACTIVITIES TOWARD BUILDING FRIENDSHIP WITH LATIN AMERICA

However much United States labor continues to build and expand its activities in Latin America, the fact remains that the greater opportunity and responsibility for creating good relations with Latin America lies with United States business. In its industrial relations, business wields much greater and more immediate economic power. The record of United States business in Latin America is, unfortunately, a mixed one.

There is no doubt that United States employers, generally speaking, pay better wages and create better working conditions than domestic employers in the countries to the south. According to the publication the National Association of Importers and Exporters of the Mexican Republic — in the June–July 1956 issue—for example, United States employers pay in the top 10 percent of the wage scale. In this respect United States business is in the vanguard of enlightened Latin American management.

However, the fact remains that some United States businessmen in Latin America still follow labor relations policies which are as outmoded and dangerous as the stereotyped thinking that classifies Latin America as the "banana republic" region or as a "backward area." These stereotypes, if they were ever true, gave rise to a form of paternalism in labor relations that is still too prevalent today. Some companies, even though they do pay good wages and create good working conditions, do so through the medium of a company union. They are surprised and injured to find that this device—a dying institution in the United States—is resented in the same fashion by ever-growing numbers of 20th-century Latin American labor leaders. Other companies, living in an even more distant and unreal era, are fighting a bitter, rear-guard action against all unionism. They treat all labor leaders, whether trained in Moscow or under the auspices of free and democratic labor groups, as subversive elements.

The important fact is that the leaders of genuine free labor organizations in Latin America are just as devoted to their countries and to the interests of working people as are their counterparts in the United States. Like them, however, they are determined to overthrow the era of paternalism in Latin America, as we began to do in this country in the 19th century.

SHORTSIGHTED BUSINESS PRACTICES HURT OUR LATIN AMERICAN RELATIONS

My purpose here is not to raise a specific labor dispute or to question a specific employer, whose central headquarters probably may not even be aware of the actions of its local manager. Rather, it is to raise the general question: Who wins by vicious, outdated antilabor tactics? Obviously, it is not the Latin American worker. He is aware, if some management is not, that the era of paternalism is past. If responsible unions do not lead him to victory over paternalism, he will seek elsewhere for the leadership to destroy this evil the next time.

It is not the companies that will win, since at best they can reckon only a short-term gain in outmoded labor practices preserved, a gain maintained in many cases at the very high money cost attached to union-busting tactics. Even if these companies succeed in breaking democratic unions, they will face the prospect of dealing across the bargaining table with some of the alumni of the Moscow trade-union schools whose course in economics is very simple: Since all United States business is "exploitation" and "imperialism" it must belong to the state. In such negotiations the issue at stake will not be only the manager's labor practices but perhaps his business itself.

Certainly, neither the Latin American or United States Government has anything to win by hollow victories over free-trade unions except crises. Too often, government is called upon, like the fire department, to intervene in the blaze of misunderstanding and ill will which stems from a breakdown in industrial relations, a breakdown which, in turn, spreads its evil until a major issue exists between nations.

The responsibility for a breakdown is, of course, not one sided. As in any joint effort, responsibility is required on all sides. The unions cannot make demands which go beyond the capacity of Latin American industry to sustain. Latin America is in a fierce and sometimes desperate competition with other areas of the world to sell its products at competitive prices. It is one of the hard facts of the open market that if the price is too high or does not produce a reasonable profit, the product will go unsold, the factory, mine, or plantation will close, and the workers' jobs will disappear.

FREE AND DEMOCRATIC LABOR UNIONS—A STABILIZING INFLUENCE IN LATIN AMERICA

Certain countries of Latin America, especially those with inflation, are also beset by an equally fierce and desperate competition between the cost-of-living and the income of its workers. Wage

[1] From a talk delivered by George Meany, October 17, 1957, in San Francisco, Calif.

levels and living standards in certain countries are incredibly low, as anyone familiar with the Latin American scene knows only too well. Can one question the urgent human need that impels workers to seek a living wage? Can one dispute that a most urgent effort is needed, however complex this may be, to raise living standards in these countries? Can we not see where the quick, easy slogans of the extremist may be more appealing to desperate men and women who are compelled to work for a pittance than the realities of the industrial age or the financial complexities of the international market?

I believe there is encouraging evidence that the democratic labor leaders of Latin America are learning and accepting the difficult and responsible role which they must play. They must press for the legitimate and urgent needs of their members without resorting to the extremism which would bring their economic house down about their heads. In this respect they are following and indeed, as we have seen, learning from the American labor movement which for more than half a century has developed the techniques of modern trade unionism in the largest industrial society in the world.

As a case in point, I should like to call attention to a document that was written only 2 months ago by a group of 170 Latin American trade union leaders from 8 South American countries who attended a training seminar conducted by the free international labor organizations in Montevideo, Uruguay. This document expresses the conclusions of these Latin Americans as to what a trade union is and discusses at length the various technical aspects of bargaining, negotiation, and other matters of importance in labor relations. From the section which explains the various provisions of a model collective contract I should like to quote the following excerpts:

> One of the first clauses of the collective contract should establish that the employer recognizes the union as the representative of the workers and thereby recognizes the union demands as being those of the workers which they wish established in a collective contract.
>
> Another clause of the agreement is that which provides for the rights of the employer, since the workers already have rights and duties. What the employer desires principally is the high morale of his employees, continuous production during the term of the collective agreement, and the economic stability of his company which the workers should encourage in order to obtain more advantageous conditions in a new collective agreement.
>
> For this reason, mention is made in many collective agreements of the rights of the employer in addition to the rights of the worker, such as his management of the company, increased production by acquiring new machinery, the dismissal of workers who do not fulfill their obligations as described in the contract, and also the expectation of union cooperation in maintaining efficiency in the company which will eventually help both management and workers maintain their prosperity.

I think that such a contract is a model not only of aggressive trade unionism but of mature economic responsibility.

It is with this type of democratic trade union leader that United States management in Latin America can and must deal. It can deal with him because there is a responsibility on both sides, such as we have long been accustomed to in the United States. It must deal with him because if it does not, other are waiting to lead; others, who, as I have previously noted, may well have been schooled in a hostile country and in a hostile doctrine.

For too many years we have had too much misunderstanding with Latin America, as the Vice President's trip so painfully brought home. We, as well as the vast numbers of responsible Latin Americans, have heard too much of "exploitation" and "imperialism." Some of these attacks against the United States business are made by angry men simply because the United States is a large and powerful and foreign target, even though far more deserving objects of their anger can be found among the ranks of their native employers. But we must also recognize that there have been, and still are, too many cases where actions by shortsighted elements of United States business have provoked the charges against us.

I use the word "us" advisedly since the charges are not made against this particular company or that corporation, but against the United States as a whole. There may have been simpler days when it was possible to operate in Latin America solely on the thesis "business is business." But these simple days, all of us know, have long since fled before the specter of cold and hot wars. A businessman of any experience in Latin America must know that he and his company, whether they wish it or not, are taken to represent the United States; that international business is part and parcel of international politics, and that in addition to his responsibility to his company and its stockholders he carries an equally heavy responsibility to the Nation.

IMPROVEMENT OF OUR LATIN-AMERICAN RELATIONSHIPS THROUGH ENLIGHTENED INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

I would suggest United States business use the initiative it applies in other matters to set its record straight with the Latin Americans. Those companies who do have modern industrial relations policies should be more aggressive in making these facts clearly and widely known. Truth is by far the most effective answer to the cries of "exploitation" and "imperialism."

Mr. President, in the last analysis, if American businessmen who are in South America set a good example of the operation of a free economy, in accordance with the principles of the free economy in the United States, that is the best answer to the Communists, because when American businessmen go to South America and really put into practice the system of free enterprise in the United States—including the inherent part of it which deals with collective bargaining—they give the best answer to the Communists in South America.

Those companies which cannot with equal candor expose their present industrial relations policies to searching public review should, as the first and essential step, change these policies to conform to the realities of modern industrial society. The Latin American public does search and does review these policies whether the companies like it or not, and the enemies of the United States make the most of the shortcomings they find.

There is, then, a need to interpret the rules of a "modern industrial society"—and for an interpretation which clearly, and unequivocally sets forth the guidelines within which American firms will conduct industrial relations in Latin America. These rules can, of course, only be general guidelines since labor legislation, customs, and economic and social conditions vary in Latin America from country to country. Nevertheless, guidelines can do much to eliminate the type of confusion which is evident today. I want to stress that I believe action on this front ought to be prompt because our Nation is damaged to the extent that we fail to act abroad in general accord with the progressive principles of industrial relations which we apply in the United States.

One thing is certain—just as the era of paternalism is passing, so has the era of intervention in Latin America already passed. While the United States Government will continue to give proper protection to its citizens and their interests abroad, this is not the 19th century. The United States Marines are an arm of the United States Government and not of the industrial relations departments of United States business in foreign lands. If United States management follows enlightened policies abroad, I believe that it will have no need for the Marines. On the contrary, it will have the cooperation of host countries in performing management's unique and truly creative role, that of expanding and improving a country's economy while insuring for itself an equitable and just return on its investment. But if short-sighted labor policies are pursued—given the explosive temper of the times—United States business management will bring down a torrent of hatred not only upon itself but upon all of us.

Both we and the Latin American countries alike have had enough of crises. We need durable policies which will build a true and lasting understanding between our peoples. While official policies are of great importance in this regard, there are many equally important areas of United States-Latin American relations that are in the hands of private citizens. I have spoken today at some length about one such area, that of industrial relations. I have done so because I believe that history will record as one of the major events of this era the emergence of industrial society in Latin America. In such an emergence, the conduct of United States business abroad can be crucial, both for Latin America and ourselves, since it has such a tremendous potential for leadership and an equally great potential to produce crises.

There are, of course, many other important areas where our private citizens can help to bring about a real understanding between the United States and Latin America. The field of education,

as evidenced by the activities of the Latin students during Mr. NIXON's trip, is an obvious and important one. The fields of medicine and agriculture, in which our private foundations as well as our Government has been very active, are among many others. Since I consider these areas of private cooperation and understanding to be of the greatest effectiveness and importance, I hope that the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs will review most carefully how our official Government programs can properly assist and supplement these efforts.

Whatever Government programs and activities are undertaken abroad, they cannot do the whole job or take the place of the much larger efforts of thousands of our private citizens. In their individual fields—management, labor, education, medicine, agriculture and many others—these citizens are daily painting in the details of the portrait of the United States in Latin America. Since understanding of the United States is and must remain a prime national objective if there is to be a lasting peace, the responsibilities of these citizens, and their opportunities are very great. I hope and believe that they will be equal to the test.

Mr. President, I close with a plea that American businessmen, American investors, American engineers, American technicians—all Americans who live in South American or in Latin American countries—recognize that they are the most important ambassadors the people of the United States have in that part of the world. They have the responsibility and the obligation to carry into Latin America the American way of life. And any business practice, any labor practice, any economic practice that cannot be squared with the American way of life is a disservice to the American people in our relations with South America and Latin America.

Therefore, as my committee proceeds with a study, during the next 2-year period, of Latin American and American relations, I want to make it very clear tonight that, as chairman of the committee, I intend to be very much interested in seeing what kind of ambassadorial job American representatives and citizens, investors, businessmen, and technicians living in South America are doing for the American people, because I have a feeling we shall find much evidence of a need for a great improvement on the part of American businessmen in respect to their business practices in South America, if we are really to develop a good neighbor policy with our friends to the south of us.

APPLICABILITY OF POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN'S RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY AMENDMENTS OF 1957 TO CERTAIN RETIRED POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN, AND THEIR WIDOWS, WIDOWERS, AND CHILDREN

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on H. R. 7450.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7450) to make the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act Amendments of 1957 applicable to retired former members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police force, the White House Police force, and the United States Secret Service; and to their widows, widowers, and children, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BIBLE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BIBLE, Mr. PROXMIRE, and Mr. BEALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

INCREASE IN PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13580) to increase the public debt limit.

THE DEBT LIMIT RISE—AND INFLATION ONE PART OF A PINCERS MOVEMENT TO DESTROY THIS NATION

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I opposed an increase in the debt limit ceiling in the Senate Finance Committee last year, and again early this year. When I asked that my vote be recorded I said to the committee, "This is only the beginning. Before the year is over they will be back for another debt limit rise." I did it for the reason that we are trying to support the world and trying to dominate the world.

We are going to send troops into any little buffer nation that is in trouble. We are going to give that country money. In this country we have come to believe that money is the end and the answer to every problem confronting the United States. Some day we shall run out of money. When we do, we shall look around, and nobody will be in sight. Taxes will have bled our own people white and the stamina of our Nation will be destroyed.

TWO POLITICAL PARTIES TODAY IDENTICAL

The people themselves cannot even know what the Congress of the United States and the executive branch have done to them in 24 years. Until lately they refused to believe it. It used to be that when a certain party was in power and something happened to the people, they voted against that party and put the other party in power. What is the use now of voting for the other party? The parties are exactly alike. There is not one iota of difference.

POLICIES THAT BUILT NATION REVERSED IN 1934

When did that change come about? It was in 1934 that the great change came over this Nation.

For 150 years, Mr. President, we built the standards of living in this country to a higher level than existed in any nation on earth. How? By imposing a duty, or a tariff, whichever one wishes to call it. Article I, section 8, calls it a duty—an excise. To do what? To make up the difference between the standard of living and wages in a foreign country and that in this country, on a product which is competitive. That is how we raised the standard of living of this country.

INFLATION PRICES UNITED STATES PRODUCTS OUT OF WORLD MARKET

As a result, this country became well established. We were running on our own power, when along came the change in policy in 1934. In 1933 we went off the gold standard. In a very short time, through inflation, we priced ourselves out of every market in the world. The only way a manufacturer in this country can sell his product is by having a tariff imposed to make up the difference between the cost of production in this country and the world price of any product.

FIRST CONGRESS IN 1789 ENACTED PROTECTIVE TARIFF

So in 1934 the whole policy of this Nation was changed. The first Tariff Act, which was enacted in 1789, was a protective tariff to make up the difference between the cost of doing business in this country and in the chief competing country, on a competitive product. Sometimes the tariff was adjusted awkwardly. Sometimes it was adjusted too high, sometimes too low; but the objective was always the same. When they missed the objective, the officials concerned lost their jobs, because an investment in this country was lost as a result.

TARIFFS BASED ON FAIR AND REASONABLE COMPETITORS UNTIL 1934

The best tariff law was enacted in 1930, when the Tariff Commission was established, as a agent of the Congress, to adjust flexible tariffs and flexible duties. To adjust them on what basis? On the basis of fair and reasonable competition, under section 336, relating to adjustment of costs.

The Tariff Commission adjusted the tariff on a flexible basis, to make up the difference between the wages paid and the cost of doing business in a foreign country and those in this country on each competitive product.

Every 10 days, or every year, or every 10 years, whenever the Tariff Commission had reason to believe that there was a change in the living standards of a nation, the Commission could consider readjusting a tariff on its own motion, at the request of the President or at the request of Congress. It could adjust the tariff to make up the difference. What did that mean? It meant taking the profit out of sweatshop labor throughout the world at the water's edge.

AMERICAN MARKET DIVIDED BY FOREIGN GATT MEMBERS SINCE 1947

Mr. President, this is the only market in the world that amounts to anything. It is the only market in the world that amounts to anything at Geneva. In 1947 the President of the United States put authority in the hands of the representatives of 36 other nations, this Nation making the 37th, sitting at Geneva, to complete the job of dividing the mar-

kets of America. We have no American markets. We are down on the ground. We are living on a war economy, Mr. President—$40 billion last year, $60 billion this coming year. The country is afraid to quit.

WAR ECONOMY CONTINUED TO HOLD UP STANDARD OF LIVING

We are afraid to quit, because when we do the people of this country will be unemployed and the investments will be gone. That is the way we are holding up the standard of living.

So what does the Congress do? The pincers movement can destroy this country. It contains several economic factors and political factors, but only one is presented to the Congress at a time. First we go off the gold standard and start inflation, deliberately. Next we have free trade, free imports with low-cost labor. We try to compete with foreign labor, although in America more is paid for industrial insurance and social security than is paid for wages in the foreign countries. We cannot compete. We know we cannot. Why does Congress vote for that? I do not know. Some day we will find out. That is the second thing.

FOREIGN AID PROGRAM LAUNCHED BEFORE START OF WORLD WAR II

Then, not content, we started even before World War II what we called lend-lease. Then we later called it the Marshall plan. First there was a $3¾ billion loan to England. That was to be the last. That was to settle everything. Then the great Marshall plan was to settle everything.

BRITAIN SET COST OF MARSHALL PLAN

What was the Marshall plan? General Marshall did not know. Marshall made a speech at Harvard, which had a little paragraph in it that we should help other nations get on their feet. I doubt if he knew the paragraph was in his speech, but it was known in London. The Prime Minister told us within 30 days how much it would cost. We were told it would cost $17 billion in 5 years. That is what it was to cost. That was to be the end of it. Everything was fine.

SENATOR PREDICTED IN 1948 GIVE-AWAY PROGRAM TO BE PERMANENT

Mr. President, I stood on the floor of the Senate in 1948 and said that once we started it would become permanent. That is in the RECORD. Of course the program has become permanent. The Secretary of State has said it must be permanent.

The present Secretary of State is not the first Secretary of State to say that. Mr. Acheson in 1948—and I will correct the RECORD if necessary—and his assistant, Mr. Willard Thorpe, said it. Mr. Acheson first said, in general purport, "It has become impossible to separate the regulation of the national economy and foreign trade."

ACHESON PROGRAM RUBBERSTAMPED BY DULLES

Then Willard Thorpe testified before the House Ways and Means Committee. What did he say? He testified to a 3-point program. First was the loan, the Marshall plan. Second was the statement that we should develop these countries, to hold them up until we could make free trade permanent. That was the 1934 trade agreements—reciprocal trade—which was the second point. Then there was the International Trade Organization. If Congress had passed that the program would have been permanent. Mr. Thorpe said, "They are inseparable."

FREE TRADE PROGRAM COPIED FROM KARL MARX

Mr. Dulles sat here as a Senator for a year and voted for everything Mr. Acheson brought in. When he failed of election as a Senator from New York he went to work for Acheson. He is the one who wrote the treaty with Japan, which is destroying the textile industry in this country, and everything that it touches.

Mr. Dulles has carried out every iota of the program Mr. Acheson and Mr. Thorpe advocated. Where did it come from? That came from the Marxist plan.

KARL MARX ADVOCATED FREE TRADE TO HASTEN REVOLUTION

Mr. Marx was not such a dumb fellow. He said, "I am for free trade." He said it in his speech in 1848 at Brussels, Belgium. As a coincidence, it was at a democratic meeting. He said, "I am for free trade, because it hastens the revolution." And on that basis, he said, "I am for free trade."

HISS, HARRY DEXTER WHITE, V. FRANK COE, SPEEDED PROGRAM

So we hear his successors in this country. Mr. Frank Coe—they spell it C-o-e—can be looked up. He is one of the finest traitors this country ever developed. Then along came Mr. Alger Hiss. Then along came Harry Dexter White. There were 5 or 6 of them. Harry Dexter White organized the International Monetary Fund. The International Monetary Fund was going to cure everything. It turned out that this group was about the finest group of traitors this country ever produced.

So what? So the Congress of the United States is following the plan of free imports, inflation, and billions to Europe and Asia. Is it not wonderful, Mr. President, that we can follow those men—now dead or discredited.

COLONIALISM DEFINED

So we are carrying on a program in Europe and Asia. We might call it "colonialism" under a different name. Colonialism died in World War II, when the airplane dominated the British fleet. The British fleet held colonialism for England, France, Belgium and the other smaller nations for 300 years, but when the airplane dominated the British fleet, colonialism died. Colonialism has ridden on its momentum since then.

I stood on the Senate floor in 1948, 11 years ago, and said, "Colonialism is dead. The people of the colonial nations are on the move. There will never be any more profit made from the colonial nations, because it will cost more to hold them in subjection than can be made from the trade they can provide."

There were 300 years of colonialism. What is colonialism? Colonialism is the domination by a stronger nation of the markets of a weaker nation. That is what we had, under England, but we declared our independence in 1776. We declared our independence from the interminable trade wars of old Europe.

Trade wars had been going on for a thousand years.

BIGGEST TRADE WAR IN HISTORY NOW THREATENED

The biggest trade war in the history of the world is threatened now. So we send Marines over. That is like sending a 10-year-old boy into a slum area to stop a fight. Nobody wants a fight, so they do not find any fight. Now the Marines are coming home, after being laughed at by the Middle East and by Russia.

RUSSIA SEEKING WARM-WATER PORTS TO BOTH MAJOR OCEANS

Why should Russia want a war? All Russia has wanted for 500 years is a warm water port in both oceans, and Russia has them. Have we forgotten that? The British fleet kept them from getting it for 300 years, but the fleet is gone. The fleet does not dare leave the harbor. Our fleet dares to leave, because we do not know any better, but if a fight started in the Mediterranean or on Formosa, the fleet would be on the bottom in 30 minutes, if it meant anything, if it were in the way—but it probably does not mean anything.

SENATOR RECALLS SERVICE IN TWO WARS

It was my good fortune, if one wishes to call it that, to see a couple of wars. I took a battery of field artillery to France in 1917 and 1918. The French .75 was a pretty good gun then, It is not good now.

In 1942, the Japs hit Dutch Harbor. I am the one the Senate Military Affairs Committee, now the Senate Armed Services Committee, sent in to make a report on Alaska, as their consultant. I made a report on Alaska. It was not pretty, Mr. President.

HOW MAC ARTHUR FOUGHT IN PACIFIC

In 1943 I was sent to the South Seas, with MacArthur. Do Senators know what MacArthur used to do with people like the Marines we sent over there? Japan had those islands barricaded and fortified until they were impenetrable. They were impenetrable by any land force. What did MacArthur do? He mapped out a program. I used to see him stand on the porch of his cabin at New Guinea and look toward the Philippines—just standing there looking like a statue—impatient, hardly able to wait. So when one of these little islands which was so fortified that we could not do anything with it was in the regular way, what did he do? He bypassed it, and let the defenders starve to death. That is what they did. Little wars.

LITTLE WARS BRING DEATH TO SOLDIERS WITHOUT VICTORY

What is a little war good for? A little war murders our soldiers. We murdered our soldiers in Korea. We would not let them win and we would not let them lose. We ran them up and down the snowy hillsides, and left them with their guts shot out.

ATOMIC SUBMARINES CAN SAFEGUARD NATION

Anyone who would do that should be impeached. What are we going to do in

these little wars? Are we going to get down to fighting with pocketknives because we are afraid to use what we have? Only 10 days ago we knew what was going to happen. We have known it for 2 or 3 years. One of our atomic submarines went under the North Pole. Then a second crossed the Pole under the Arctic ice. It traveled 5,000 miles under water and stopped only because it had reached its destination. It did not stop because it ran out of fuel. It did not stop because it was tired, or for any other reason than that it had reached its destination. Build 100 of them, 50, or 25 of them, or whatever we need, and leave them under the Arctic ice. All they would have to do would be to surface every 2 or 3 years and let the boys reenlist.

America could be destroyed by 30 or 40 submarines which do not have to stop for 2 years. We could destroy the nation which destroyed us; and the submarines would never have to come home. So let us build them.

FUTURE WARS TO BE FOUGHT IN THE AIR AND UNDER SEAS

The next war will be fought under the sea and in the air. I have been saying this for 10 or 12 years. I still believe it. It will not be fought with marines out on an island. It will not be fought with field artillery such as I had in France in 1917 and 1918. It will not be fought with flattops. A flattop can be sunk like a canoe by a submarine.

We need the Navy, but it must change. It will have a different duty. It must hunt submarines off the coast, at a distance of 1,000 to 1,500 miles. That is not done with jets. It is done with slow planes. There is a place for everyone, but times have changed.

MARCHING ARMIES NOW OBSOLETE

A foot army will be just as obsolete as a Civil War musket in the next war. There will be foot soldiers, but they will be trained parachute troops who can be set down anywhere and left for 2 hours, 2 weeks, or 2 years, and picked up when they have completed their mission. They will be commando trained.

The home guards will be commando-trained to protect defense installations and public utilities, but there will be no foot soldiers fooling around over the world. They are being laughed at. Thank God, we are bringing them home before we are laughed out of the country.

WORLD INSPECTION OF FOREIGN INDUSTRIES

When I first came here, I thought that I had to see all our star boarders, so I visited every nation in the world. It took me 8 years. I visited their industries. I watched them at work. I watched what they ate, what they wore, and how they got along.

An engineer is a dangerous man, because if he is allowed into a plant he may not know much about that particular industry, but he will soon know whether or not the man who operates the plant knows anything about it. He will know whether the workmen are satisfied. He will know what they eat and what they wear. He will know how long the plant is going to last, because his is the business of industrial reporting. He knows how to do it.

After I had visited all the star boarders in Asia and Europe I went behind the Iron Curtain and stayed for 2½ months. I know Khrushchev and Bulganin as well as one can know anyone he associates with for a few months. They are tough. Mr. Khrushchev is as tough as a boot; and he knows what he is doing.

SOVIET SATELLITES UNDER FOREIGN DOMINATION FOR CENTURIES

The State Department was continually saying, "They are not getting enough to eat. They cannot live. There will be a revolution." Therefore, in 1955, when I got ready to leave, this is what I said—let Senators put it down in their books. I said three things—in the first place, that Russia could make any area under her control, such as the Balkans, self-sufficient in everything necessary for war or peace, in a very reasonable time. I said there would be no successful revolt. Why? Because the Balkans have been between Turkey and Russia and Germany for a thousand years. They have never been truly free. They have always been dominated by some other country.

In the Socialist Republic where Stalin was born, the Georgian Republic, I saw the first women wearing lipstick. It is a little warmer in Georgia and the Armenian Republic. One must listen to those people to know what they are thinking about. One asks, "How are you getting along?" They grin and walk away. Finally they began to talk. They said, "Turkey is not going to attack us any more." That statement did not mean much until I looked into the situation. Turkey has overrun the Georgian Republic forty or fifty times in 100 years.

So perhaps the Georgians do not like Russia too well, but they know that if Turkey attacks them, Russia will destroy Turkey in 30 minutes. Turkey is not going into that area.

FORTY-YEAR TRADE WAR DESTROYED NATION HOLDING RUSSIA IN CHECK

We took care of Germany. In 1917, we entered a 40-year trade war between England and Germany, on England's side, and utterly destroyed the only nation that could hold Russia in check. We have done that twice. Now we wonder what we are going to do with Russia.

Let Germany grow enough, and she will tell us what to do with Russia. She will grow if we allow her to do so. The Germans are a peculiar race. They will fight and they will work. They are about the only nation left in Europe which will do that. Think that over. All we have to do is to let them alone for 3 or 4 years, and they will be able to whip any nation in Europe. England and France are never going to leave Germany, so they keep us there. They are afraid of her.

TREASURY SECRETARY ANDERSON LAUDED

Several witnesses appeared before the Senate Finance Committee, but the only one I paid very much attention to was Mr. Anderson, our Secretary of the Treasury, one of the finest men it has ever been my pleasure to know. I knew him almost intimately when he was Secretary of the Navy. He had more horse sense than anyone who has been Secretary of the Navy while I have been in the Senate, a period of 12 years.

He is the one who said, "There will be no more new defense industries on the Pacific coast. We are going to put them behind the secondary defense area—the Sierra Nevada Mountains."

SECONDARY DEFENSE AREA MECCA FOR NEW DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

That made considerable sense. We placed the Navy munitions stores behind the Sierra Nevada Mountains in 1928. At that time I was State engineer of Nevada. Senator Pittman and I, together with the then Governor of Nevada, thought of that idea. We said, "This is the secondary defense area. It is harder to get at than the area on the Pacific slope." So the munitions stores were placed behind the Sierra Nevada Mountains.

Those mountains range all the way from Canada to old Mexico. That is still a secondary defense area.

After Mr. Anderson had been Secretary of the Navy for 2 or 3 years, he was the cause of the announcement from the Armed Services Committee, to the effect that there will be no more new defense industries along the Pacific coast, where they can be destroyed by a well-placed shot fired from a submarine out in the Pacific.

COAST UNIVERSITIES GAINED EARLY LEAD IN ATOMIC ENERGY FIELD

In the University of Southern California and in Cal-Tech and at Stanford they are doing wonderful things. They have taken the lead in the atomic energy field since 1938. I remember that when I was making an industrial report on the 11 States, Alaska, Hawaii, and the Philippines I had a branch office in San Francisco, and I worked with those wonderful California people. That was as early as 1938. That is only 20 years ago. Those people have been in the vanguard of this development.

NEVADA UNIVERSITY PROGRAM OFFERS GREATER SAFEGUARD IN EVENT OF ENEMY COASTAL ATTACK

Recently we have been allocated a subcritical reactor for the University of Nevada. It will be located behind the Sierra Nevada Mountains. At the University of Nevada scientists are studying nuclear chemistry and nuclear physics, and they will build laboratories and machine shops, so that if there is ever a real threat on the Pacific coast, some of those brains can move back there. Perhaps that is not far enough back from the coast.

RAISE IN DEBT LIMIT ASKED ANNUALLY TO BOLSTER FOREIGN AID

At least it is a secondary defense area. The things we are doing in the name of national defense and spending billions of dollars for are the silliest things on earth today. We have sent over $70 billion to Europe and Asia since the close of World War II. There is not that much real money in the whole world. Every year, however, the bureaus come to us and say, "We are all making

money." Every little while they come to us and ask for more money. Once a year, on the average, they ask for a raise in the debt limit. If a private business said it was making money, and the presiding officer was a member of the board of directors, about the second time they came for additional money, the presiding officer, I am sure, would ask, "Where is this money you are making?"

The answer is they are not making any money. If the American people ever wake up and are ever furnished the information as to what is being done with the money that is spent for mutual security—first it was called the Marshall plan, then ECA, and the name has been changed since then every year or two, and, of course, no information is available on it so far as the American taxpayers are concerned as to what is being done with all that money—if the American people ever wake up as to what is actually being done with all that money, they will move on Washington, and will not even wait for an election.

SECRETARY OF STATE PLAYING SANTA CLAUS TO WORLD WITH TAXPAYERS' MONEY

I believe that Mr. Anderson, the Secretary of the Treasury, is one of the finest men who has ever held a position in Government. He is honest and he has integrity. He is telling Congress the truth. What is the truth? We have a Secretary of State who is running all over the world promising money to everybody. Now we are proposing to dig water wells all over the Sahara Desert. What we do is buy the consent of these nations to sign treaties which they never intend to keep if the money stops coming.

What did the Secretary of the Treasury tell us. He said, "I am only a middleman. When the President asks for it and decides to spend it, and when Congress appropriates it, I must pay it out; that is all. All I am is a middleman."

I love him for it. I would do anything for him. We must stop this business somewhere. We cannot spend money all over the world. I believe there is only one way in which it will ever be stopped, and that is by the taxpayers when they finally catch up with us.

Mr. Brundage is a distinguished young man in charge of the budget. He is in the same position. All he can do is what he has told us. He said that he, too, was a hired hand. We are working with hired hands.

MILLIONS PROMISED TO MAKE SAHARA BLOOM LIKE ROSE, WHILE OUR OWN WEST FILLED WITH ARID WASTES

I said before that the man we ought to have testify before the Committee on Finance is Mr. Dulles. He is the man who is traveling all over the world. Every time he steps out of an airplane he promises several hundred million dollars to somebody.

Now we propose to solve the water problem in the Middle East. I am an engineer. I have been in the engineering business and was in it before I came to the Senate. I know something about water. At least I used to be paid for my knowledge. I have been all over the Middle East. I have seen the whole area. By the time we get enough water in the Sahara Desert to make the desert bloom like a rose—that is what we have promised to do—some of the taxpayers will say, "Why don't you get a little water for us in some of the arid areas in the United States?"

AMERICAN DROUGHT AREAS STARVE FOR FUNDS WHILE MILLIONS SPENT ON FOREIGN IRRIGATION

Arkansas would like to come under the Bureau of Reclamation, because a month or two of dry weather out there destroys the crops. However, it is said we cannot do it, because we do not have the money. We do not have money for projects like that. We do not have money for flood control in this country.

A bureau here in Washington, as to which not a Senator knows what its job is or what it is doing, can say that we will build a project in the Middle East, or a project in any other country, or a project in Asia or anywhere else. We do not even know what is being done. All we do is appropriate the money, and then raise the debt limit.

SENATOR'S INQUIRY OF SECRETARY ANDERSON REPRINTED

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point my cross-examination of the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Anderson, so that the taxpayers will have the information as to what this situation is all about.

That is from page 30 of the hearing before the Committee on Finance on H. R. 13580, an act to increase the public debt limit, dated August 15, 1958, to page 39, as indicated.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator MALONE. Mr. Secretary, I do not have to state again in the record my high regard for you, and that you are being used as a middleman. The things that happen and cost money, about all the say you have in it is as one member of the Cabinet; is that not true?

Secretary ANDERSON. Yes, I would say that is true.

Senator MALONE. If you are overruled or whatever the ruling of the Cabinet or the President on policy that costs money, then your sole job is to pay the bills, is it not?

Secretary ANDERSON. Certainly the responsibility of the Treasury to meet the obligations of the Government exists.

Senator MALONE. Well, isn't that what you are for?

Secretary ANDERSON. Yes.

Senator MALONE. Therefore, you have very little to do with the policy that spends the money but when it—after it is committed, Congress appropriates it—then you just have to tell them how to get it, that is about it; is that correct?

Secretary ANDERSON. That is correct, sir.

Senator MALONE. So far as the people are concerned, I have been in many States in the last few months, the people are stunned, they are beyond reaction. It has been going on now 24 years, and they do not know what to do. I think the election, though, is going to be a very great disappointment to many of us. There are more than 250 depressed areas in the United States accounting for around 6 million unemployed.

There is a bill in the House to help depressed areas. If it passes it will cost you a little more money. We bring about these depressed areas ourselves.

The State Department has advocated this bill for 15 years, that we remake the industrial map of the United States and the depressed areas as a result of our imports, low-cost labor, then we have the money, the Government money to train workers for other jobs, these working men, and ship them somewhere else, and then make up as near as we can, maybe some help to the stockholders and to the people that we break with the policies.

That is just something that is coming up.

Didn't our inflation start about 1933 and 1934? Didn't it really become accelerated——

Secretary ANDERSON. Senator, my recollection of the movement of the level of costs, prices during that era, is not sufficiently clear to be responsive.

Senator MALONE. Would you supply for the record some kind of a chart as to when this inflation of the dollar, the cheapening of the dollar, really became accelerated for the first time?

Secretary ANDERSON. We will certainly furnish what we have available to the Senator.

Senator MALONE. If you do not have it available, who do you think would have it?

Secretary ANDERSON. I am sure we have all the figures, Senator.

Senator MALONE. I am sure you do, too.

How much inflation has there been in the last 12 to 18 months, say, 2 years, to make it easy?

Secretary ANDERSON. According to our calculations, beginning January 1956, the purchasing power of the dollar, equated to the period 1947–49, I mean 1939, is equal to 100, I beg your pardon——

Senator ANDERSON. Say that again.

Secretary ANDERSON. 1939 equaled 100. The purchasing power of the dollar on January 1956, would be 51.8. On January 1957, it would be 50.3. On January 1958, it would be 48.6.

Senator MALONE. 48.6?

Secretary ANDERSON. In June of 1958, on the same basis, it would be 48.0.

Senator ANDERSON. Forty-eight what?

Secretary ANDERSON. 48.0.

Senator MALONE. Then even according to your figures there is a steadily increasing inflation?

Secretary ANDERSON. There has been a steady decline in purchasing power during this period.

Senator MALONE. Do you have any figures compared to 1933—the 1933 dollar compared to the 1939 dollar?

Secretary ANDERSON. I do not have them with me. I would be glad to get them for the Senator.

Senator MALONE. If you will, I would appreciate it.

(The information referred to is as follows:)

Consumer Price Index and purchasing power of the dollar

	Consumer Price Index (1947–49=100)	Purchasing power of the dollar [1] (calendar year 1939=100)
Year:		
1933	55.3	107.4
1939	59.4	100.0
1940	59.9	99.2
1941	62.9	94.4
1942	69.7	85.2
1943	74.0	80.3
1944	75.2	79.0
1945	76.9	77.2
1946	83.4	71.2
1947	95.5	62.2
1948	102.8	57.8
1949	101.8	58.3
1950	102.8	57.8
1951	111.0	53.5
1952	113.5	52.3
1953	114.4	51.9
1954	114.8	51.7
1955	114.5	51.9
1956	116.2	51.1
1957	120.2	49.4

[1] As measured by the BLS Consumer Price Index.

Consumer Price Index and purchasing power of the dollar—Continued

	Consumer Price Index (1947–49=100)	Purchasing power of the dollar (calendar year 1939=100)
Recent months:		
1956—January	114.6	51.8
April	114.9	51.7
July	117.0	50.8
October	117.7	50.5
1957—January	118.2	50.3
April	119.3	49.8
July	120.8	49.2
August	121.0	49.1
September	121.1	49.1
October	121.1	49.1
November	121.6	48.8
December	121.6	48.8
1958—January	122.3	48.6
February	122.5	48.5
March	123.3	48.2
April	123.5	48.1
May	123.6	48.1
June	123.7	48.0

Senator MALONE. Now, it depresses me to read the papers, and I brought them with me this morning on my way up and I took a little look at them. Who is it who makes these commitments all over the world that Congress then receives legislation to fulfill, and then you have the responsibility to get the money? Who is making these commitments all over the world, moneywise?

Secretary ANDERSON. Senator, I would assume that there are some commitments made by a variety of departments.

Senator MALONE. By what?

Secretary ANDERSON. By a variety of the departments of the Government, primarily in the——

Senator MALONE. Who are the principal ones?

Secretary ANDERSON. Primarily the State Department and the Defense Department.

Senator MALONE. The State Department is a spearhead. I think Mr. Dulles testified that he was the one who carried out the policy, discussed it with other members of the Cabinet, and then he was the one who went into the nations and promised the money and all. Who is it that promises these trade concessions; is that the Department of Commerce, or who is that?

Secretary ANDERSON. I think the State Department is the American representative, Senator.

Senator MALONE. I notice in the paper this morning, that "United States Aid Assures Canada on Trade."

"Chief of foreign commerce predicts easier customs in Toronto talk," and goes on to say, "The imposition of import limitations on Canadian oil, Mr. Macy said," Loring K. Macy. I crossed his trail once before on another matter. I think it was Mr. Loring K. Macy when we got a man by the name of Lee who was one of the finest traders we were able to find out of the Department of Commerce about 1948, and we had him up as a witness, but Mr. Macy said that they need not worry about this. It would not hurt Canada, our limitations on Canadian oil, he went on to say. The purport of the article is they need not worry, we would take care of everything.

We have in the Wall Street Journal, that great journal of New York, the bible, you know, the bible of economy, "United States Allies Ease Curbs on Trade with Red Nations.

"Weeks Doesn't Spell Out Items; Machine Tools, Oil Tankers Probably on List."

In my visit to Russia in 1955, I traveled 14,000 miles there in each of the Socialist Republics, as they call them, I found a good deal of machinery from Cincinnati and various places, but they were making a play then that they were limited to certain items. I had the list, I got it in Paris, but of course those items are reaching Russia and Communist China at the same time. Now they are coming out into the open, and I just thought it might be of interest to the committee that the nation that we are building up to fight us—that probably they need that machinery. If we are going to fight them, we will want to make it as fair as we can. We don't want to pick on any cripples.

What effect does it have, when the Federal Reserve Board raises the discount rate to 2 percent from 1¾ percent? What is the effect?

Secretary ANDERSON. Well, of course the effect will be that the area where it is applicable, which is the San Francisco area, that commercial banks borrowing from the Federal Reserve Bank will pay a quarter of 1 percent more interest.

Senator MALONE. What is the effect on the customer? I mean the ordinary guy out there in Wellington, Nev., or up in Vermont, who does not know anything about the Federal Reserve Board. He just wants to finance his business.

Secretary ANDERSON. It would be difficult for me to give an answer as to how quickly or whether the banks will transfer it.

Senator MALONE. What has it done for him? What is the effect of it?

Secretary ANDERSON. Well, obviously it is done with the idea of placing some measure of restraint upon borrowings as represented by the increase in the rediscount rate.

Senator MALONE. They have the ability to do that. How much of a leeway does the Federal Reserve Board have on the discount rate? How low could they go and how high could they go?

Secretary ANDERSON. There may be a limit as to how high they can go. I frankly am unaware of any limitation.

Senator MALONE. Could you furnish that for the record? You couldn't remember all about it.

Secretary ANDERSON. Yes.

(The information referred to is as follows:)

"The Federal Reserve Act provides that any Federal Reserve bank may establish from time to time, subject to review and determination by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, rates of discount to be charged by the Federal Reserve bank for each class of paper, which shall be fixed with a view of accommodating commerce and business. No mention is made of how high the rates could be set, but the rates are set with the view of accommodating commerce and business."

Secretary ANDERSON. The process, as the Senator knows, is normally for the board of directors of the respective banks in the Federal Reserve districts to make a recommendation to the Federal Reserve Board in Washington that the rate be increased, and the Board itself then——

Senator MALONE. As a restraint, then, on business.

Secretary ANDERSON. Well, as some restraint on the borrowings by commercial banks from the central banks.

Senator MALONE. Of course that means the customers, it is handed on to the customer.

Secretary ANDERSON. Ultimately it would have that effect.

Senator MALONE. Isn't that what it is for?

If they are extending too much credit in the bay area and they want to slacken that up or they think they can stand that much interest, then they regulate it, isn't that the purpose of it?

Secretary ANDERSON. Yes. But I would say this is more of a signal, when the increase is up a quarter of 1 percent, that there is a belief on the part of the Board of Directors of the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco that there should be an added restraint on borrowings.

Senator MALONE. Yes.

Now then, a business that goes into business and they can pay 1 percent or whatever the discount rate is at the moment, or pay 2 percent, whatever it is, and they go into business on that basis and have to refinance on a higher rate, what effect does that have on a business?

Secretary ANDERSON. Well, I would assume that the Senator is meaning if you went into a business and calculated your return on one rate of interest——

Senator MALONE. Yes.

Secretary ANDERSON. And thereafter you were required to refinance at a higher rate of interest, that there would be a diminution of profit.

Senator MALONE. And maybe a disappearance of profit.

Secretary ANDERSON. Yes; I think——

Senator MALONE. And maybe a failure of business.

Secretary ANDERSON. I think one must keep in mind these interest payments are tax deductible and therefore the measure of the effect of it would be the necessary cost after taxes.

Senator MALONE. Which is very little these days at best, is that about right?

Secretary ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Senator MALONE. Now, then, I see that the "U. S. Offers Prospects of Easing Water Lack if Arabs Accept Aid Plan. Officials Privately Talk of Help From the Atom, Scientists and American Capital."

American capital is what interests me. Who made that commitment?

Secretary ANDERSON. Senator, the only thing I can say on that subject is to refer the Senator to the speech the President made at the General Assembly, and other than that, I would not be in position to know any details about it.

Senator MALONE. Anyway, if they send this aid over there, all you have to do is pay the bill. You do not know anything about it; anyway, you are not responsible for it. You just pay the bill.

Secretary ANDERSON. Well, all the commitments or charges that are made by any of the Departments of Government ultimately find their way to the Treasury and we have to pay them.

Senator MALONE. You are ultimately the fall guy. You have to come up here and face the music. That is why we feel the way we do about you this morning. I have been in Arabia, been in a private plane, and flew all over in 1947. That is a pretty big order, to ease the water supply in Arabia. It sounds good on paper; a good deal like building the dam for Nasser on the Nile. I have been up the Nile, too. I suppose you have.

I see Mr. Dulles, according to the Wall Street Journal of August 15, that is today, "Dulles Battles at U. N. To Save Mid-East Program; Arabs Are Skeptical of Aid Plan," of furnishing water, I suppose. We used to fly a hundred miles there and just see a camel and a goat and a man and woman and a little boy or something, you know. We would be up there 700 feet high, and 50 or 60 miles further you would see another little unit. They milk the goat and make cheese out of it, they told me is how they live, and some dried dates. If you had a well every little bit, I suppose that is what they have in mind. The Arabs live there and they are skeptical.

These headlines bother me.

On curbing inflation——

Secretary ANDERSON. As I indicated before, Senator, this particular move of the Federal Reserve System is a signal toward a restraint on borrowing.

Senator MALONE. They think if they borrow to much money it might be more inflation?

Secretary ANDERSON. I think it should be said so far as I know there is very little borrowing at this moment by the commercial banks from the Federal Reserve. The free reserves have been relatively high in the country.

Senator MALONE. But in any case it is going to cost them a quarter percent more today than it did yesterday.

Secretary ANDERSON. When they borrow.

Senator MALONE. I see, too, "Tunisia Will Get United States, British Arms." Tunisia, is that the place which has been a colony of France for a good many years, where they have all that trouble in there?

Secretary ANDERSON. I think probably the Senator refers perhaps to Algeria.

Senator MALONE. Tunisia, it says. "Move To Strengthen Nation Against Algerian Rebels Approved by French."

Secretary ANDERSON. Tunisia, of course, is the country of which Mr. Bourguiba is President, and I think the Senator is probably referring in his question relative to France to the Algerian situation.

Senator MALONE. We have already given them the arms and the newspapers carried the story pretty liberally that the sidearms and arms they are using on the Algerians we have already furnished the French; that is true, is it not?

Now, we are furnishing arms to Tunisia to fight off the Algerians.

Secretary ANDERSON. I have not had the privilege of reading the article.

Senator MALONE. I understand that. You have to read them every morning to get as mad as I get.

I see that "Paris Sets Rules for Algeria Vote." They are going to vote on something that the French will let them have and they set the rules. That sounded very interesting.

The New York Times has an editorial this morning, "A New Hemispheric Policy."

"The announcement in Washington on Tuesday that the United States is now willing to join an Inter-American Development Institution has great significance for the hemisphere. Moreover, it is startling news, for it represents a basic change in thinking in the executive branch of the Government.

"This is one more important result of the shock administered to the Government by Vice President NIXON's South American trip last May. Since then the President's brother, Milton Eisenhower, has made his swing around Central America and Secretary Dulles has visited Rio de Janeiro. Both returned with reports that seem to have reinforced the deductions from Mr. NIXON's experience."

The upshot of the editorial is that we have a new bank coming up, is that right?

Secretary ANDERSON. The United States has indicated its willingness to engage in the establishment of an Inter-American financing institution.

Senator MALONE. What does that mean from our standpoint, who puts up the money?

Secretary ANDERSON. Well, certainly this country would be a participant.

Senator MALONE. Will put up the money?

Secretary ANDERSON. Would be a participant.

Senator MALONE. About like 1 horse and 1 rabbit.

Secretary ANDERSON. Senator, I do not know.

Senator MALONE. I do not want to force an answer because you are only one member of that Cabinet.

I see by the Washington Post that "Curbs Eased On Red Trade," and it goes on to say that "The United States yesterday announced changes in its export policy allowing substantially more United States goods to go to Iron Curtain countries," which of course is very interesting. It has been going there ever since World War II. The committee here of Congress, of the Senate, uncovered the fact that they had been sending copper to Russia here during World War II, or in Korea, during Korea.

Wasn't Britain the first to recognize Red China? At least it led the way.

Secretary ANDERSON. You mean of the Western Powers? I do not know, my memory is not such that I can give it.

Senator MALONE. I will supply it for the record. It was. In my opinion, I said on the Senate floor at that time we had promised to follow them but we raised so much trouble over here they didn't do it at once.

Then the Post also says, "British, United States To Let Tunis Have Arms," and then, "Ike's Plan Stirs Ire in Mideast; Nehru Is Critical." Mr. Nehru, that great capitalist in New Delhi. I visited him about 4½ hours.

We got along fine because there was nothing that I told him that he had heard before.

Now, Mr. Secretary, I want to say to the chairman of our committee, the distinguished Senator from Virginia, I think we have the wrong man here this morning. I think I have read the headlines of only one morning, and every morning it will just scare every American who is asked to read the papers, either Dulles or somebody has promised more money or another bank we are going to finance or more free trade, I think we ought to have Mr. Dulles here before we pass on this thing just to find out what basis he is doing this on because our Secretary of the Treasury and we all agree I am sure, I am not telling anybody a thing, that we consider him one of the finest men in the Cabinet, all they do, it just filters down to him and down to him to take the rap and he is such a fine man he generally gets what he asks for and if we could get to the bottom of this and if we are getting Mr. Dulles, we are getting pretty close to it.

We did have another man doing this sort of thing at random and that was—who was the fellow who tried to take over Pennsylvania—Mr. Stassen. He was running wild 4 or 5 years. At least we have got it cut down to only one man now in all this business.

Mr. Stassen is a fine man, according to his lights, and has more energy than any human being I ever saw, but at least we have got it cut down to one man.

Don't you think, Mr. Secretary, it would be a good idea for this committee to hear Mr. Dulles to see just about how far we are going in the red?

Secretary ANDERSON. Frankly, Senator, I think that it would not add anything at this time to the calculations which we have made; any commitments that would be made would have to be made under existing appropriations or else they would have to be submitted to the Congress next year.

Senator MALONE. As our distinguished chairman has said, you have $70 billion as a backlog there. He can call on that, can't he?

Secretary ANDERSON. Yes, but the calculations which we have made take into consideration what we judge to be the expenditures.

Senator MALONE. Where is Mr. Dulles today?

Secretary ANDERSON. I do not know, sir, but I would assume in New York.

Senator MALONE. Is there anybody there that he could promise money to?

Secretary ANDERSON. I beg your pardon?

Senator MALONE. Is there anybody there meeting him that he could promise money to? Maybe we do not have the whole story yet.

Secretary ANDERSON. I am sure, sir, that the calculations with which we are concerned are those that take into account the reasonable expenditures which we expect out of existing appropriations between now and next June and I would think any other ones would have to be brought before the Congress.

Senator MALONE. If he promises more money between now and next June and he could take it out of that $70 billion, couldn't he, if he could get the debt limit raised high enough?

Secretary ANDERSON. It could only come out if it were appropriated for the purpose.

Senator MALONE. Well, I do not think—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask you a question about this: We have a new slant on that $70 billion. I think you have been under the impression, at least I have gathered that, and I depend a lot on your statistics, that this $70 billion is there, as a backlog, it has really been authorized, it is really available any time the Appropriations Committee sets it up, would it not?

The CHAIRMAN. It is appropriated.

Senator MALONE. It is appropriated, and you do not have to do anything. All you have to do is spend it.

Secretary ANDERSON. Yes, that is correct, sir, but what we do in making the estimates which we submitted to the committee is determined from each of the departments of the Government their best judgment as to the rate at which the money is going to be spent.

Senator MALONE. That is true. But Mr. Dulles is unpredictable. All this in the last few days has been promised that I read you, it is in the current papers this morning. Now Mr. Dulles is the fellow who is doing this.

We got rid of Stassen under some condition, I do not remember why he quit, some reason, though, that he quit, and then he went to Pennsylvania, and they wouldn't turn the Treasury over to him so I guess he is going to work.

It is kind of hard on him to do that now. But Mr. Dulles has not gone to work yet. He is spending money. He is committing it all over the world, and when he goes into a place he has two things to buy these agreements with, and, Mr. Secretary, I have to tell you I have been in all these nations and I do not say I know all about them, but I know some of the people and they will sign anything as long as we pay for it with no idea of keeping it at all and I do not blame them.

So when he has the taxpayers' money, within the billions, to say to the Arabs, "Now if you will just keep quiet another year, and not cause us too much trouble, we will furnish the water for the Sahara Desert," that is quite a promise, but they might keep quiet for a year, if you show them a billion or two dollars. He has promised that.

Then he can also make further trade agreements and give more of the lifeblood of this Nation to buy agreements. All this was debated on the floor, all of it was asked Mr. Dulles and he said "Yes" to every one of them.

Senator DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman——

Senator MALONE. I am going to finish, if you don't mind, and I do not interrupt you.

Senator DOUGLAS. I beg your pardon.

Senator MALONE. What I am getting at, Mr. Chairman, we just have the wrong man here. You know Congress is not going to turn this man down, he is just too fine a fellow for that, because he has come up here and said, "Now here are the commitments that the Secretary has made." He didn't mention it to the Secretary. But he is the fellow who is making them, "And I have got to meet the bills," and he is showing you unmistakable evidence he cannot match them, he cannot meet them unless you do this. So far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, it could be we could cancel Mr. Dulles' passport by Congressional act, and just not give him this $10 billion, and the first thing you know he would be doing this diplomacy on his own account instead of paying for it, and I am in favor of that, and I am not in favor of raising the debt limit.

The CHAIRMAN. I say the Judiciary Committee would have to cancel his passport.

Senator MALONE. That is all right. We might suggest it. We are acquainted with them.

I just want to make this further suggestion: We do not have the money, and it is just like the water in the sink, the more we appropriate to do this thing with and buy them, the less it is worth, and inflation is keeping pretty close tab on the appropriations above the amounts you collect, and you are bleeding the American public white. Our people in Nevada, you are getting over a hundred million dollars—a hundred million dollars from the State of Nevada, around a hundred million dollars in taxes, and there are only 300,000 people there, counting everybody. And they just cannot go much further. The mines are shut down on account of imports, titanium factories are shutting down on account of imports from Japan; 700 men laid off the other day, last 6 months, 1,400 of them in copper at Ely. Lincoln has about 1,500 men working in the whole county in mines, because we are a great tungsten and lead county; Humboldt County, 40 percent of taxable property wiped out. By what? By Mr. Dulles' making all these trips around and promising them to the Arabs and to the European countries, Asiatic countries, and giving it to them in order for them to sign his agreements which no one intends to keep.

When the tug is tightened, Europe is going to be neutral. I have said all I am going to say. I am going to vote against it, and I just love the Secretary of the Treasury, I just think he is one of the finest men I ever knew. It is not his fault. Some way, or another he has got to say "No," and he can say it if he doesn't have any money.

PINCERS PLAN DESTROYING NATION ECONOMICALLY AND POLITICALLY

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I stated earlier that there is a preconceived plan—I called it a pincers movement—to destroy this country economically and politically. There are several parts to the pincers plan, but only one part at a time is put before the United States Senate in a separate bill, and no mention is made of all of them.

So we argued in the committee, and then on the floor. Finally it is said, "The administration wants it. Perhaps it will not hurt us very much." So we pass it. But we do not realize that it fits into the entire pincers movement, with the pincers closing on the United States.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN'S WORDS OF WARNING NOTED

Abraham Lincoln had something to say about this at one time. This is what he said, in referring to what he regarded as a preconceived plan:

> We cannot absolutely know that all these exact adaptations are the result of preconcert. But when we see a lot of framed timbers, different portions of which we know have been gotten out at different times and places and by different workmen, and when we see these timbers joined together, and see they exactly make the frame of a house or a mill, all the tenons and mortises exactly adapted to their respective places, and not a piece too many or too few—in such a case, we find it impossible not to believe that all worked upon a common plan or draft drawn up before the first blow was struck.

STATUS OF FORCES TREATY DENOUNCED

So we have inflation, preconceived free imports, preconceived billions of dollars to Europe, Asia, and nations in every other part of the world. Everything has been preconceived. We have a preconceived political plan; a preconceived Status of Forces Treaty, under which we utterly desert an American soldier when he leaves these shores. Whenever he commits a crime—and many soldiers do unknowingly, or because of the pressure—then he is tried under the laws of the nation in which the crime was committed.

For example, in the Middle East, where we plan to cure the drought, the water holes are several hundred miles apart. We are sending our soldiers over there. When one of them commits a crime, such as stealing a loaf of bread, under the laws of the foreign country his hand can be cut off.

"Oh, no," it is said, "they would not do that."

WHITE HOUSE DOMINATING LEGISLATIVE BRANCH IN DEFIANCE OF CONSTITUTION

Mr. President, this is a preconceived plan, a preconceived pincers movement, which Congress does not see, because only one thing at a time is put in front of us. For example, tonight, because we want to get home, we will vote for anything in order to get home. We have been treated here for 3 or 4 weeks like a bunch of schoolboys, sitting 12 to 14 hours a day. We have had no time to answer our mail. We have had no time to consider anything. But we must vote this way; we must vote that way. Why? The White House wants it.

I have never read anything in the Constitution of the United States which said that the White House—the executive department—was to run the legislative branch. When I went to school, in the grades, I memorized the Constitution of the United States. But I still do not remember anything in it which said that one branch of the Government was to dominate another. I was always taught that the Constitution provided for a separation of powers.

CREATORS OF CONSTITUTION PURPOSELY SEPARATED POWERS

What did those old hedgehogs, Washington, Franklin, Madison, and Hamilton, who wrote the Constitution, say about it? They had been pushed around by experts—kings, queens, and dictators—who attempted to regulate both the national economy and the foreign policy. They said to themselves, "That is not for us. It will never happen here." So they separated the powers. That was what they thought.

That policy was good for 150 years. But suddenly, in 1934, Congress joined together the regulation of the national economy and the fixing of foreign policy, and placed both in the hands of the executive, notwithstanding the fact that article I, section 8, of the Constitution says specifically—and it does not stutter—that Congress—the legislative branch—shall regulate the national economy and shall regulate foreign trade and shall adjust the duties, imposts, and excises which we now call tariffs.

CONGRESS, FLOUTING CONSTITUTION, TRANSFERRED POWERS TO EXECUTIVE

So Congress blithely transferred those powers to the Executive. Congress amended the Constitution without referring the question to the people.

What did George Washington say about such a practice. I will tell Senators what he said. These are not his exact words, but in substance this is what he said. He said if, in fact, the separation of powers is in any way wrong, amend the Constitution in the way set forth in that document. Do not evade it, because while in one case it might be for the good, it is the customary method by which free governments are destroyed.

That is what is being done to us tonight. The United States Government is being destroyed.

PLAN TO DIVIDE UNITED STATES MARKETS, WEALTH, WITH NATIONS OF WORLD PRECONCEIVED

Mr. President, speaking of the preconceived plan, there is little doubt that there is a preconceived plan to divide the wealth, the markets, and the cash of this Nation among the nations of the world, and to make us dependent upon foreign nations across major oceans for the critical minerals and materials without which we cannot fight a war or live in peace. Congress yesterday rejected a mineral bill which would have let the mines survive. That is all it would have done. No special legislation would have been needed if the Constitution of the United States had been let alone. But that was not done.

CONGRESS YIELDS TO PRESIDENT POWER TO REGULATE ECONOMY FOR 4 MORE YEARS

A few weeks ago we rushed madly to extend foreign aid for 4 years. For what? What did we extend? The power to regulate foreign trade and to set the duties, imposts, and excises, in effect to regulate the national economy. We gave that power to the President of the United States for another 4 years. He does not have to consider anybody. He does not have to consider or consult with a Representative or a Senator. He does not have to ask anybody about it.

When the agent of Congress, the Tariff Commission, is asked to determine what is the danger to an industry of the lowering of a tariff, the President of the United States can bypass the Commission without asking anybody.

Oh, yes; there is a provision that two-thirds of each House of Congress can stop the President from acting. But Senators know how much chance we have to get two-thirds of either House to stop the President from doing anything. Members of Congress are afraid the President might be against them in a reelection contest or something of that nature.

POOR AND RICH ALIKE TAXED TO BUY WORTHLESS TREATIES WITH FAITHLESS FOREIGN POWERS

Mr. President, we have tied everything together and have turned it over to the President of the United States. But that is only one part of the pincer movement. That is all it is. That is the Marxist angle. It is one part of the movement to divide the wealth of the United States. Through that act, there will be a division not only of the markets, but also of the capital of the United States. We are taxing the last little stenographer in San Diego until she is bled white. To do what? To buy a treaty with some foreign nation in Asia

or Europe, a nation which has no more intention of keeping faith with the treaty than the man in the moon. They will give us lipservice so long as we give them money. How are we going to get out of debt? For 24 years we have been giving them money.

We will give Mr. Tito, of Yugoslavia, $3 million. He is a little short of "dough." He is nodding in our direction for a little while, until after he gets the money.

FOREIGN-AID FUNDS FINANCING FOREIGN COLONIALISM

We buy arms, and then give money and arms to France to enable France to try to hold large parts of North Africa in colonial subjugation. Mr. President, I have said 50 times on the floor of the Senate that I have no objection to having any nation do whatever it may wish to do—whether it be France, England, or Belgium—even if it wishes to dominate another nation. That is its business. But when we are sending our funds and arms to those countries, we have a right to examine the situation and to see where it is headed.

I have stated where I think it is headed. I have said before that colonialism is dead; it cannot be continued.

In connection with this situation, Russia has the advantage, because Russia is opposed to colonialism for the other nations than herself. As a result, the little nations that want independence are friendly to Russia.

We have control of the oil in the Middle East. However, I wish to point out that it matters not how colonialism is exercised; it is still colonialism. So, Mr. President, as a result of that situation, we are being hurt.

MILITARY COSTS CUMULATIVE

The United States is living on a war economy. As I have previously stated, the Congress has voted appropriations in excess of $40 billion for military purposes for the current fiscal year; and, in the next fiscal year, no doubt the Congress will vote an additional $60 billion for the same purpose.

In that respect, we are like a "two-bottle man." Finally, he gets up to consuming two bottles a day. Then, some morning, he feels a little worse, so he takes an extra pint, to carry him over the next 24 hours.

That is similar to what we are doing; we are living off our economy, we are eating it up; and Congress does not have the guts to stop it.

INFLATION SEEDS SOWN IN 1933

In 1933, the United States followed Britain off the gold standard, and adopted a managed currency, which could only result in inflation and in pricing the United States industries and manufacturing companies out of the world markets.

Mr. President, do you know what the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board told the Senate Finance Committee, which has under investigation the economy of the Nation? Incidentally, let me say that I hope the committee continues the investigation; I think it will be the biggest thing ever done in this country.

Under my questioning, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board said he could fix the margin for payments on purchases of securities on the stock exchange at 100 percent or 1 percent or nothing; and today he is doing that very thing. What effect does that have? It determines the flow of purchases of stock on the stock exchange.

FLOW OF PRINTED MONEY TURNED ON AND OFF LIKE WATER TAP

He testified—and his testimony is in the record, although I do not expect anyone else ever to read it—that he thinks business in the United States needs more money in circulation, either next year or 12 years from now, or if he thinks the country needs less money in circulation, he can arrange that; he has the power either to have more money printed, so to speak, or to reduce the amount of money in circulation. That is what he testified.

So, Mr. President, the stock exchange transactions no longer mean anything. In times past, if the stock exchange was permitted to operate without governmental control—whether the margin was 50 percent or 75 percent or 10 percent or 1 percent—at least it was a gage of the economy of the Nation, a gage as to who wished to buy what stock.

But it is a different situation when one man, the head of a board of 7 members, can say, "You must put up 1 percent margin or 75 percent margin". A short time ago he changed the margin requirement to 75 percent; and the result was that the stock market went down. Of course it did, because not many persons who wanted to buy stock could put up that much money.

MANAGED ECONOMY RUSE LIKE BLOWING ON THERMOMETER

It is like blowing on a thermometer. When the temperature outdoors is 10° below zero, if a person stands beside a thermometer, outdoors, and blows on the thermometer, soon the thermometer will register close to 80°, and then he will say, "Why, it is warm out here." The trouble is, Mr. President, he freezes to death while he is blowing on the thermometer.

So the economy of the Nation is being destroyed while those in Washington are self-satisfied and well fed.

WASHINGTON A SMALL BUT DIFFERENT AND DANGEROUS WORLD

Mr. President, the people of the United States are waking up—unfortunately for many persons. On the Potomac River there is a sound barrier, through which no public sentiment ever penetrates. If a Member of Congress is in Washington for 60 days and, during that period, does not return home, where the boys are working with their hands, and are bleeding them white, all in the effort to pay their taxes and be able to feed thir families; if a Member of Congress does not listen to them, he thinks that what he hears in Washington constitutes public sentiment. That is what happens to Members of Congress, who are entertained by ambassadors and many other fine, well-to-do people. All those people have plenty to eat and plenty to wear. It is a different world in Washington, and it is a dangerous world.

MULTI-BILLION-DOLLAR INCREASE IN DEBT LIMIT FOREBUNNER OF OTHER HIKES TO COME

The proposal before the Senate tonight will undoubtedly be passed by acclamation, for Senators are tired, and they are in a hurry to return home. Those who are weary and anxious to return home find it easy to ask, "What does another $8 billion increase in the debt ceiling amount to? After all, by spring the administration will be asking for still another increase in the debt limit."

All this request means, Mr. President, is that, once the requested authority is provided by Congress, it will be necessary to raise wages, pensions, and social security payments.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FOUR DOLLAR SHRINKS TO 33 CENTS AND STILL GOING DOWN

We should consider the value of the dollar in 1934. At that time it was worth 100 cents. But by 1948, it was worth only 48 cents. And in 1958, it is worth approximately 33 cents. So a man who was making $5 a day in 1934 must make $15 a day today, in order to be able to eat and to provide food for his family and to be able to send his children to school.

Now the Senate, by acclamation, is about to raise the ceiling on the debt limit by $8 billion; and undoubtedly that will be done without a record vote.

Mr. President, in the Senate Finance Committee, the only vote that is recorded is mine; but I assure Senators that mine is recorded. It was recorded there last spring, too; and I am proud of it.

All I say is that when what I predict occurs, I want my recorded vote to be examined.

Mr. President, I do not know how to keep Congress from spending this money, or how to prevent Mr. Dulles from spending $300 million every time his plane touches the ground—except to make it impossible for him to touch any money. [Laughter.]

PRESIDENT CAN NOW TRADE AWAY ANY INDUSTRY IN NATION TO FURTHER HIS FOREIGN POLICY

Never before in the history of the United States did the Government give the Secretary of State the right to buy the signature of a foreign country to a treaty. But today the President can trade a part or all of any industry, in order to further his foreign policy; and he does not have to ask Members of Congress who represent the 48 sovereign States; he does not have to ask Senators; he does not have to ask Members of the House of Representatives; he does not have to ask anyone. He can ignore the findings of the Tariff Commission, which determines what should be the tariff or duty, on the basis of fair and reasonable competition—in other words, on the difference between the factory wages and the cost of doing business and the taxes paid in this country and the comparable costs in each foreign country, in the case of each product. The latter is the system our country followed for 150 years. But today all that is utterly ignored.

CONGRESS BUYING BANKRUPTCY, NOT PEACE

So the Members of Congress tell their constituents, "We are buying peace." But, Mr. President, far from that, what we are actually buying is bankruptcy. A country that is bankrupt cannot whip anyone. The destruction of the United States economically will be the most dangerous kind of destruction; and the Members of Congress are voting for it every day.

UNITED STATES BEING "SOLD DOWN THE RIVER" THROUGH GATT

Mr. President, what do we have in Geneva today? In 1947 the President—not satisfied with having, entirely at his own choice and discretion, traded the United States down the river—doing so by means of his negotiations with foreign nations, in order to obtain their signatures to a treaty which no country except the United States intends to keep—organized what is called the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Thirty-seven nations are signatories to that organization and to that method of doing business. The United States has but 1 vote among the total of 37. Thirty-six other nations, the foreign competitors of the United States, have their representatives sitting at Geneva, where they divide among themselves the remainder of our markets; and all that is done under laws passed by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States.

"RECIPROCAL TRADE" A MYTH AS OTHER NATIONS BAR UNITED STATES GOODS

I cannot believe they understand what they are doing. Why this method of reciprocity? The two words "reciprocal trade" never occurred in the act in the beginning, and they are not there now. Of course, it is not reciprocal. Every other nation in the world has tariffs. Other nations have import permits. They have exchange permits. It is impossible to import into a foreign country a product which that country itself manufactures.

Do Senators have any idea what it costs to get an automobile into England—that great sponsor of free trade? It costs 55 percent of the cost of the automobile. Foreign companies cannot import automobiles into England. So American corporations own the companies which are making small cars. This may not be the time to go into that subject. It is a subject for another discussion.

TAXPAYERS' MONEY USED TO MAKE UP DIFFERENCE BETWEEN UNITED STATES COSTS AND WORLD PRICE

Mr. President, do you know what the whole plan spells? It means inflation. It means pricing ourselves out of every market in the world. We use the taxpayers' money to make up the difference between the cost of manufacturing a product in this country and the world price of that product. Free imports result in putting the American workingman and the American investor in direct competition with the low-cost, sweatshop labor of the world, where often the cost of wages paid in those countries does not amount to the cost of industrial insurance and social-security taxes paid in this country.

Our American corporations are going abroad in droves. Since World War II more than $50 billion have been invested in foreign countries. American corporations are going into those nations and establishing plants to furnish the market there, because it is the only way their products can be sold in those countries. Such a policy would result in putting American laboring men out of work and on the streets, except for the fact that we are operating on a war economy.

SQUANDERING OF TAXPAYERS' MONEY ON FOREIGN COUNTRIES UNCONSTITUTIONAL

The money of the American taxpayers is distributed all over the world. Nobody knows where it goes or what is done with the money. The officials who handle such money do not know, either.

So what have we done, Mr. President? We have departed entirely from the Constitution of the United States. Of course, it is in violation of the Constitution to distribute the money of American taxpayers all over the world. It is alleged that we are buying peace. Take a look at what we have bought in the past few months. That is all one has to look at. As time goes on there will be more evidence of what we are buying. We are buying bankruptcy.

NATION'S NEED IS STATESMEN TO STAND UP FOR AMERICA

We are headed toward a world government so fast that it should scare one to death. There is propaganda for it all over the United States. The question is asked, "What is Khrushchev going to do?" Khrushchev has this. Khrushchev has that. What is Khrushchev going to do? Who gives a damn what Khrushchev is going to do? Let us protect the United States of America. Let us keep ourselves in such a posture that we do not have to care what anybody else does. But we are not doing it. Khrushchev is as tough as a boot. I know him. He is for Russia. That is what Dulles does not understand. He does not understand how anybody can be for his own country. Mr. Khrushchev is for Russia, and Mr. Churchill is for England. What we need is to develop a few people who are for the United States of America—and quickly, too.

This country in the present century has gone to war three different times. Why? For two reasons. I remember the little old war I took a small part in, in which we used French 75's and a few other weapons. President Wilson stated that if Germany controlled Europe, we would be lost. He also stated that, of course, we had to protect nations across major oceans so that we would be able to get materials, without which we were helpless, and that we had no other place to get them. Both of those statements are as phony as a $3 bill.

When I used to get an opportunity to go to bed during that war, which was not often, but when we would settle down for a day or two, I used to wonder why the Germans were so dangerous to us across the ocean when they could not get across the English Channel. That was a pretty awkward question. It would take a pretty big bite to believe that allegation.

UNITED STATES CAN BE SELF-SUFFICIENT IN CRITICAL STRATEGIC MATERIALS

I did not know whether President Wilson was right about his statement relating to strategic and critical materials. I had to come to the United States Senate to find out. I made an industrial report on 11 Western States, Alaska, Hawaii, and the Philippine Islands, showing how we could be self-sufficient in strategic and critical materials.

I used to think that Congress was looking for the facts. I had to come to Congress to find out that is not so. But there are two reports I have made since I have been a Member of Congress. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee made those reports. I recommend a reading of them to Senators and Representatives. One is a report on the accessibility of critical materials to the United States in wartime. The other report is a breakdown of the economy of each government, so it can be plainly seen how those countries trade, and how they manipulate the value of their currency in terms of the dollar. These reports are free.

SENATE REPORTS REFUTE THEORY MUST CROSS OCEANS TO OBTAIN DEFENSE MATERIALS

Only recently Dr. Eisenhower discovered South America, and the Vice President discovered South America. I recommend those two reports for study. The study repudiates the statements made by Mr. Wilson, Mr. Roosevelt, and Mr. Truman. It was said we had to protect nations across major oceans in order to get strategic and critical materials, without which we could not fight a war or live in peace. But that simply is not true.

The report was handed to some top officials in 1954, in the 83d Congress. No one has denied the proof of the document, and I will discredit anybody on the Senate floor who denies it. We do not have to have anything for war or peace that has to come through the Suez Canal. No longer is it said we have to have those materials for ourselves; now it is said we have to protect the supply of oil for Europe. It has come to that.

I first came to the Senate in 1947. As soon as I became a Member of Congress, I took off for Europe. I went into the Ruhr, where the coal mines and the steel mills are, and to Frankfurt, where the chemical industry is. I was earnest. My heart showed in my face. I just wanted to find out. I found out, all right.

EUROPEAN COAL OPERATIONS DESCRIBED

In 1947, if Senators will read the record, they will find it was said it wanted to increase production. I am here to tell Senators that they wanted to cut down production. And they did so. The coal mines are 2,000 feet down, with 4 shafts, with very fast lifts. About 1,500 or 2,000 feet back from the shaft was an automatic loader, with a 3½-ton truck, that I saw. It loaded automatically. Nobody touched it. It would go out, would go up, would dump and come back, and nobody would touch it.

The German workman was with me. He talked a little broken English. There the coal seam has about a 3- or 4-foot depth. The seams are not like ours, which are 7 or 8 feet.

A few yards away from where we were the loader had a 10- or 12-foot ceiling. I said, "Show me one of the new faces where you are mining." So we followed the mine shaft out to the new part of the mine. We got down on our knees, where it was finally 3 or 4 feet high. It was a wet mine. There was about an inch of water in it. We were crawling in the water. We got over to the place where he showed me a new 6-foot coal cutter, cutting the coal out. I had never seen a coal cutter before. We had no coal in our part of the country.

The coal was going down on a steel conveyor shaft. It was a shaker conveyor. The conveyor belts were 30 or 40 feet in length. The conveyor belt took the coal over to the next level and out to where the self-loader was. Nobody ever touched it. I said to this German worker, "I do not see anything wrong with your system. Out in Nevada, in the West, when we want to increase mining production we open up new faces, if we have them. You have them here. Why do you not open them up?" In his broken way he said, "We would like to, but the only factory in Germany that makes coal cutters is on the reparations list."

SENATOR PREDICTS ENGLAND AND FRANCE TO REMAIN IN OCCUPIED ZONES IN GERMANY

Senators can put that together. Take it one thing at a time. It is like a watch factory. We want to cut only 10 percent, but in the 10 percent we cut out the thing without which the watch will not work.

I could tell Senators much more about this subject. It does not sound good, but that is it.

I say to Senators that England and France will never move out of Germany. They are afraid of Germany politically, tradewise, and militarily. They are correct, too. They should be afraid, because the Germans will fight and they will work. We keep them down on the ground. We utterly destroyed them twice in our lifetime. It is the only nation which could hold Russia in check, and we will not let the Germans up.

REVIVED GERMANY WOULD CHECK RUSSIA

We hear that we are building up Germany. We are not building up Germany; we are holding Germany down. If we built her up for 3 years and turned them loose we could forget about Russia.

The plan we are following—the 3 or 4 things I have mentioned—constitutes what? It constitutes international socialism at its worst. I do not think there is a Socialist on the Senate floor, but we are voting for this plan. We are reducing the standard of living in America. One cannot live and pay the wages necessary without a war economy today.

If Mr. Khrushchev is half as smart as I think he is, it will not be long before somebody invites him over here. As I told Senators before, he is tough as a boot, and, believe me, he is for Russia. That is what kills us. We cannot understand anybody who is for his own country.

COEXISTENCE WITH RUSSIA WOULD BE FATAL TO ECONOMY

Khrushchev will walk up to our President and shake hands with him, if he is half as smart as I think he is, and he will say, "Mr. President, there is only one nation in the Western Hemisphere that can fight its way out of a paper bag; that is your Nation. There is only one nation in the Eastern Hemisphere that can fight its way out of a paper bag, and that is ours. Let us stop all this foolishness. You come over and take a look at our country and we will come over and take a look at yours. And we will quit this foolishness."

We could not accept that. We would be broke in 60 days. We would be economically destroyed. But Khrushchev would not be. Economic destruction is final in this business.

Let me tell Senators something further. If we have a severe depression now—and we are riding for one; do not make any mistake about it, since we are living on a war economy—we shall be in trouble. We have given all of our markets away and priced ourselves out of the world market. If we have a serious economic dip we shall see what will happen.

LOSS OF AMERICAN MARKET TO AMERICANS AMONG GRAVEST DANGERS

Let the workingmen and the American investors look around, and if they see they have lost the American market we shall be in trouble. We had that market for 150 years. Whenever we needed anything, it came in at our level of living standard. We had the American market. The American businessmen competed for the American market on an even basis. The Americans took the depressions in stride, because they had the American market. That is the only market in the world which amounts to anything.

If we let the workingmen and the businessmen wake up to a depression, with 10 million or 15 million on the street instead of 6 million, with 269 depressed areas, such as there are today, and if they look around to find they do not have the American market and have been priced out of the world market, do Senators know what might happen? We could easily wake up with the kind of government we think we are fighting. It would not take long.

AMERICAN CURRENCY NO LONGER STABLE

Mr. President, what do we have? We have no stable currency. We have no bottom to the currency. We have no top to the currency. We are simply printing currency whenever we need it. We are going to print $8 billion more because we say we need it.

We have divided up the American markets with the nations of the world. Soon we shall have nothing. We are taking the taxpayers' money every day of the year to spend throughout the world. If we handled a private business for 60 days as we have handled this business for 24 years the business would be destroyed. In a private business a private individual will go broke when his bank quits him, and the bank will quit him pretty quickly if he acts as we are acting in treating this Government. But a government is not broke until the money it prints has no value. We are riding for such a fall as fast as God Almighty will let us.

UNITED STATES GOLD SUPPLY DISAPPEARING

Mr. President, it might be well to mention tonight that we started in 1934 with more than $22 billion in the vaults which belonged to the United States. Tonight we have less than $5.7 billion to call our own. How did we get in that condition? The money we gave to the foreign nations, in greenbacks, can be used to buy gold. They can use that money for credit in the gold reserves, and they are doing it.

FOREIGN CLAIMS ON UNITED STATES GOLD PERIL RESERVES

When we work we earn a little old greenback, and we are not permitted to buy gold. We are not trusted with gold.

The previous Secretary of the Treasury, of whom I was very fond—I am now fond of him, too, for I think he is a good lawyer and a good businessman and is smart—was asked about this matter. I asked him about it. I said, "George, I am very fond of you. This thing is bigger than GEORGE MALONE or George Humphrey. Let us make a record." We took 3 days at it. He became a little impatient at times, and so did I. I said, "You can either answer or we can stay here until midnight; it is all right with me." So he answered.

Then Mr. Martin, who is the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, was asked about the subject. I asked him about it.

I said, "Mr. Martin, what would happen if all of these credits to foreign nations, some held by individuals, were transferred to foreign balances, as could easily be done, and they were demanded? What would happen?"

DEPRESSION WARNING CITED

He said, "Payment could be refused if it became dangerous."

I said, "That is very interesting, but, Mr. Chairman, what would happen if we violated our long-established policy of paying trade balances in gold, if we suddenly said, 'We cannot do that.'? What would happen to the dollar on the international exchange?"

He said, "It would be very depressing."

I said, "What would happen to our economy?"

He said, "It could cause a very serious depression."

So we could refuse to do it and we would have a depression. The dollar would be depressed all over the world.

What is the answer? The answer is that if we continue to do it, within another 2 or 3 years we shall not have any gold at all that we can call our own.

RUSSIAN GOLD CIRCULATING IN EUROPE

The Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey, testified to the same effect. He said, "They will not demand gold." I forget just the phrase he used. But, of course, that would not happen.

I have news for him. Russia is mining gold. It does not cost Russia $35 an ounce to mine gold. I saw some of

their gold mines. I had a map of the places I wanted to see in Russia. I remember the first 5-year plan they had in the late 1920's. I could have gone there myself then, but I was building a firm of engineers in Nevada and I could not go. Some of my friends did go. I know where the Russians built dams and mined gold. Finally, they let me go and see it.

Russia is putting its gold out through Europe, I do not think it is news to any Senator that England and the nations of Europe are trading with Russia and China, led by England. Almost every one of them recognizes Communist China. They expected us to follow, too. Trouble was caused here, and we did not do it. They are building us up, however, to recognize Red China.

UNITED STATES FOREIGN AID BUILDING PLANTS TO SUPPLY RUSSIA, RED CHINA

The point is the European nations are trading with Russia and with China. We have our heads in the clouds in this country. We are too "holier than thou" to do anything. All we do is to give them the money to build their plants. We give them our taxpayers' money to do a job. We raise our debt limit. If we pass the pending bill we will have raised the limit twice this year. Generally, it is only once a year. But when the Treasury representatives came before the Senate Finance Committee last spring we said, "Mr. Secretary, you are coming again before the Congress. Keep it up. That is all you have to do, and you will come again next spring for another debt limit rise."

Three or four organizations are encouraging investments abroad. They are the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and the International Finance Corporation. Now we are talking about organizing another bank. Every time one turns around there is another outlet for American money, encouraging American capital to move into Europe and to move into Asia. Why? For a long time it has been said we want to raise the standard of living of the workingmen all over the world.

FOREIGN INVESTMENT BUBBLE WILL BURST WHEN REASONABLE TARIFF RESUMES

I have news for the workingmen of America. If they want to raise the standard of living of those people, let them go back to the Constitution of the United States, and let the tariff represent the difference. Very quickly American corporations in these nations and the nations themselves will say to themselves, "The party is over. We cannot make any money on this low-cost labor because America has extended the tariff." We have the only market they want. So they will let their own wages go up and create a market at home. That is the way to help them. Then as they raise their standard of living the tariff will go down.

FREE TRADE HOLDS DOWN FOREIGN WAGES AND INCREASES FOREIGN PROFITS

We would have reverted to the 1930 act this year if we had not extended the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. So long as foreign countries can operate under practically free trade conditions, they will hold wages down. They will take what the traffic will bear, and that will represent the profit. No wages will be raised in foreign countries when they can profit under the present tariff, because that would reduce the profit. We have the shoe on the wrong foot, Mr. President.

If we want to know what some of the States think about what we are doing, last year the President called a conference in Salt Lake City of the representatives of 10 Western States, thinking, of course, that everything we were doing in Washington would be approved. But at that regional conference, a Republican regional conference of representatives from 10 Western States, on May 3 and 4, 1957, what did they do? They passed a resolution asking that the 1934 trade agreement, which they laughingly called "reciprocal trade," be allowed to expire. We never heard anything more about the conference. That conference included the States of Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming, and they unanimously passed a resolution urging the Congress of the United States to allow the 1934 Trade Agreements Act to expire in 1958, this year.

WESTERN REPUBLICANS DENOUNCE GATT TRADE ACT

Mr. President, on the 15th of May, I put the following resolution into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

FOREIGN TRADE AND THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

Whereas 34 foreign, competitive nations are sitting in Geneva, Switzerland, regulating our foreign trade through multilateral trade agreements under the auspices of the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade; and

Whereas this distribution of our foreign trade between such foreign competitive nations is being carried on under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, as extended (so-called reciprocal trade); and

Whereas, under this act more than $30 billion of American capital has been invested in such foreign low wage standard of living nations to compete in American labor and investors in the textile, livestock, mining, crockery, glass, precision instrument, machine tool, chemical and electrochemical, and several hundred other fields: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 10 State Republican regional conference, including the States of Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming urge the Congress to resume its constitutional responsibility of regulating foreign trade and the national economy through the adjustment of the duties, imposts, and excises (art. I, sec. 8) through its agent, the Tariff Commission, and allow the 1934 Trade Agreements Act to expire in June 1958.

YOUNG REPUBLICANS DEMAND TARIFF LEGISLATION REVIEW

Mr. President, the Young Republican National Federation for 1957 and 1958 declared in a resolution:

IMMEDIATE REVIEW OF TARIFF LEGISLATION

We know that behind the shield of our collective defense arrangement, there must be growth and development or that shield will be a paper one. We support the administration in its advocacy of trade policies which promote the interchange of goods to mutual advantage. Under no condition, however, should such an interchange of goods be to the detriment of our American industrial, mining, processing and developing segments of the economy, ending with a resultant loss in operation and income to both employer and employee. Furthermore, we call for an immediate review of tariff legislation to bring relief to hard-hit American industries.

CONGRESS TO RETAIN CONTROL

We believe effective control over foreign trade and the trade agreements program should be retained in the Congress.

That is an expression from two organizations which should be heeded.

GEORGE WASHINGTON'S ADVICE ON FOREIGN FAVORS

I wish to quote from some prominent people who have had a part in the writing of our Constitution. George Washington was one of them. He said:

It is folly for one nation to look for disinterested favors from another. It must pay with a portion of its independence whatever it may accept under that character. It may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more.

He said, further:

There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation.

He also said:

Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice. It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world.

PROTECTION OF AMERICA WILL DISPEL FEAR OF RUSSIA

George Washington never said we should not have allies in a fight. Every Senator on the floor knows that when a fight starts the people whose interests are common with ours will be allied with us, and the people whose interests are not common will be against us, no matter how much money we put up. We hear a great deal of propaganda about what Khrushchev is going to do. We are asked, "What is he going to do next?"

People are scared to death, at least theoretically. Who cares what Khrushchev is going to do? Let us get ready to take care of the United States of America.

Unless we have the guts to protect our own country and keep it free, the time becomes limited. Fear is being built up in the United States. We can make this hemisphere self-sufficient and produce all the things we need to fight a war or remain at peace. How long we will be able to do it, is something else.

AMERICA MUST MEET AIR AND UNDERSEAS CHALLENGE

We have been reading a great deal in the paper lately about Admiral Rickover. I have known Admiral Rickover for a great many years. I have visited his office. I visited him when he was designing the *Nautilus*. I went to Connecticut 4 years ago to see the launching of that submarine, when it was

launched without an engine. That is the submarine that went under the North Pole.

How will we fight the next war? Will we fight it with Marines or with the Navy? We will fight the next war in the air and under the sea. That is how we are going to fight the next war. I do not care what plans are made. If we are not ready to meet the challenge, we will be whipped. That is what they are laying the groundwork for.

There is a great deal of subtle propaganda being put out to the effect that we must join Europe for our own protection, that we must accept a modification of our sovereignty and join a world government, for our own protection. No nation in Europe would be able to fight a war if we did not furnish the weapons. The Nevada Air Corps could whip any one of them.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What air corps did the Senator say?

Mr. MALONE. The Nevada Air Corps. Does the Senator wish to debate the issue? I should be happy to do so.

FOREIGN AID PACTS DESIGNED TO PRESERVE COLONIAL SYSTEM

Some people say that the next war will be fought with foot soldiers, and that we will protect the colonial system with foot soldiers. Mr. President, those people will never submit. Those people are on the move. In 1948 I said on the floor of the Senate that those people would never submit. We debated the Atlantic Pact on the floor of the Senate, and I debated it with Senator Vandenberg. I said to him, "Senator, if we sign that Atlantic Pact, we are guaranteeing the integrity of the colonial system throughout the world."

He said, "Oh, no."

I said, "I will explain it to you."

We are guaranteeing to go to war if any of these nations go to war. How are they going to go to war? To preserve colonialism. Every man, woman and child in America knows it now.

RUSSIANS BUILDING OWN COLONIAL SYSTEM, OPPOSE THOSE OF OTHER NATIONS

That is how they got into war, so that we could rescue them, to protect their colonial system. We cannot protect it. That is why Russia is ahead of us. The Russians are laughing at us. We are trying to hold the colonial system together. The Russians are against anyone else holding a colonial system, even though they may have one of their own. They are against anyone else holding a colonial system, however. We are weakening ourselves economically and militarily in every way.

A prominent member of the military—I forget his name, and although it could be easily found, perhaps it should be forgotten—wrote an article for the Saturday Evening Post about what a great thing the foot soldiers were going to do in the next war. Someone asked me about it. He asked me what I thought about it. I said, "If he was paid for it, it is all right. However, you had better look out, when a great magazine will publish a thing like that. A man like that is supposed to know better."

We send our troops into Lebanon. That is like Russia putting its marines in Cuba. Mr. Bulganin asked me when I visited him in his office, "What would you do if we built an air base in Cuba?" I said to him, "We would bomb the hell out of it," and I grinned.

Of course, I do not know whether, with our present State Department, we would do anything like that.

GEORGE WASHINGTON'S VIEW ON FOREIGN SOURCES OF SUPPLY

Mr. President, George Washington further said:

> Ought our country to remain dependent on foreign supply, precarious because liable to be interrupted? If the necessary article should in this mode cost more in time of peace, will not the security and independence thence form ample compensation?

Meaning, Mr. President, that the material can be gotten cheaper with labor which is paid 20 cents an hour or 50 cents a day, but we have a standard of living to maintain, and there are people who will say that the consumer is entitled to the lower price, meaning that wages should go down and the living standard should go down in this country to meet it.

CONSUMER GETS NO PERMANENT ADVANTAGE FROM LOW-COST IMPORTS

But I have news for those people. The consumer does not get the advantage of the lower price. When production in this country is destroyed, the price charged will be what the traffic will bear. The consumer will not get the advantage. Far from getting the advantage of any lower wages, they will pay whatever the traffic will bear.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The United Press International today carried a dispatch listing 43 Republicans in the House and 6 in the Senate who did not support the President's program for the so-called foreign aid and the misnamed reciprocal trade program. The senior Senator from Nevada is listed as one of the six Republican Senators who probably will not receive the active support of the President, because the Senator from Nevada is not in the some political camp as the distinguished President of the United States.

I ask the Senator from Nevada whether he feels that when he took his oath of office, he had the determination, the courage, and the perseverance to reflect the views of his constituency in Nevada, or whether he thought he was obligated to heed the commands or suggestions of the Chief Executive?

LEGISLATURE NOT SUBORDINATE TO EXECUTIVE OR VICE VERSA

Mr. MALONE. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Idaho that I am very fond of the President of the United States. I consider him to be a personal friend of mine. If he were running for reelection tomorrow, I would be for him.

But nowhere in the Constitution of the United States do I find that after the President has been elected, and after I have been elected, or after the Senate Membership has been elected, or after the Membership of the House has been elected, the President must follow the lead of Congress, or vice versa.

I might relate something about what happened in 1956. I have had the habit of calling the White House about every 2 or 3 months. I have reason to believe I am welcome there, because apparently the next open date is mine, and I go down and talk to the President like a Dutch uncle. I know other persons, like Paul Hoffman, come in and rub me out. But that is all right. I do not hold that against anybody. The President is elected, as I am, and we have our own convictions.

However, in 1956, the President was running for office, but I was not running. One does not often quote what he says to the President of the United States, or what the President says in return. But this happened so long ago—in 1956—that I do not think I am breaching any confidences.

I said, after we had visited for awhile, "Mr. President, this is not the time to take up our differences in foreign trade and our billions to Europe, because if we do not get you reelected, how am I going to continue to argue with you?"

CONSCIENCE DICTATES VOTE

When we are elected to the office of Senator, which is the next highest office to the President of the United States, in my opinion, we think of the office, as the distinguished Senator from Idaho has suggested. We also have a conscience. If we believe something is not good for the United States, we do not vote for it.

If we do, we are not worthy of our oath of office.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The senior Senator from Nevada, throughout his service in the Senate, has demonstrated his independence and his determination to reflect the thinking of the people whom he represents, in part, in this body. I ask the Senator whether there is any dominant sentiment in his State to continue a program which during the past decade has resulted in the channeling abroad of $70 billion of the American taxpayers' dollars, dollars which originally were intended to create good will and to create a bulwark for the economies of the free nations of the world.

The record today shows that the United States has fewer friends throughout the world because we have been showing discrimination in the distribution of our largesse. Actually, many nations in South America and elsewhere, which do not need this financial help, are critical of the United States. They point out that our dollars are being given to nations everywhere, while many of the friendly nations in South America are not receiving handouts.

Does the Senator believe the people of his State want a continuation of programs which are destroying the economic structure of the United States, and which obviously are not strengthening the free nations of the world?

Does the Senator from Nevada bow in subservience to the policies which obviously are not proving to be successful, or does he intend to keep faith with the people who elected him to the Senate by trying to build up the national defense and the preparedness of the United States to withstand Communist aggression, infiltration, and subversion?

Mr. MALONE. I think the United States should withstand aggression from any country, whether it is Russia, England, or any other nation.

LONDON DOMINATING UNITED STATES ECONOMIC FOREIGN POLICY

The United States now, economically and in political direction, is being dominated from London, which represents the colonial theory.

Mr. President, these are the closing hours of the 85th Congress.

In these closing hours, the Senate is being pressed to enact two closely and dangerously related bills.

One would appropriate $3,518,092,000 more taxpayers' dollars to hand over to foreign countries.

The other would increase our permanent debt limit by $3 billion to $283 billion, and add another $5 billion to that to set a so-called temporary debt limit of $288 billion.

Mr. President, in the opinion of the senior Senator from Nevada these two bills are part of a sinister pincers movement.

The purpose of this pincers is to squeeze the lifeblood out of the American economy and to further enslave the American taxpayer.

One arm of the pincers is foreign aid.

The other arm is interest-bearing Federal debt.

The taxpayer is caught between both.

The two arms are connected so that they work together.

The foreign-aid appropriations make it necessary to increase the Federal debt.

The higher the Federal debt, the greater the interest that the Federal Government must pay on it.

The taxpayer must pay out of his pocket every dollar that our Government gives to foreign nations.

The taxpayer must pay out of his pocket every dollar that goes to pay interest on the public debt.

The international WPA that we call foreign aid began in 1947.

It has now cost the American taxpayers $75,598,000,000.

These are direct costs.

During this same period we have been financing the world, the interest alone on the public debt has totaled $73,629,015,000.

This, too, must be paid by the American taxpayer.

Who gets the interest?

It is the big banks and corporations that can afford to invest in interest-bearing Government securities.

Who pays the interest?

The general taxpaying public.

The more billions the Government hands out in foreign aid the more money it has to borrow.

The more money it has to borrow the more it has to pay in interest, and the higher Congress must raise the debt limit.

The higher the debt limit and the higher the interest charges the less possibility is there of ever obtaining any reduction in corporate or individual income taxes.

The American taxpayer is forever caught between the pincers if Congress continues to vote for higher debt limits and foreign aid.

Today our Federal debt is greater than that of all the nations in the world that we are aiding with our dollars put together.

Last year during this debate I included a table showing the government debt of all the important nations this side of the Iron Curtain—27 of them including the United States.

The United States debt was then $280,800,000,000, about what it is now. The debt of all the other nations combined totaled only $153,738,000,000.

The United Kingdom which we have given $7,090,000,000 since the war, had a total debt of $74,200,000,000, or approximately one-fourth of ours.

France, which we have given $5,453,000,000 has a debt of only $16,229,000,000.

Germany, which we have given $3,887,000,000, has a debt of $5,024,000,000.

Italy, which we have given $2,874,000,000, had a debt of $7,233,000,000.

Japan, which we have given $2,502,000,000, had a debt of only $2,601,000,000.

Thailand, which we have given $117 million had a debt of only $353 million.

Burma has only received $23 million in foreign aid but then her total debt was only $140 million.

Pakistan has received $370 million in foreign aid; her total debt was $681 million.

The United States Federal debt, I repeat, is $280 billion and yet we are continually urged to contribute more and more billions each year to countries whose public debt is only a fraction of our own.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD this list which was prepared last year by the New York Daily News of the debts of the leading nations of the non-Communist world, and regret that it has not been brought up to date. However, regardless of how extravagent or wasteful these nations might have been in the last 12 months, it would be impossible for any of them to approach the enormous Federal debt inflicted on our own taxpayers who are being required year after year to support them, as our star boarders.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Debts of the important nations of the world as translated into American dollars and presented in millions:

United States	280,800
Australia	2,930
Belgium-Luxembourg	6,378
Brazil	1,037
Burma	140
Canada	14,546
Chile	74
Colombia	281
Denmark	1,306
France	16,229
Germany	5,024
Greece	295
India	6,408
Israel	506
Italy	7,233
Japan	2,601
Mexico	300
Netherlands	5,423
Norway	1,726
Pakistan	681
Philippines	452
Portugal	486
Sweden	2,803
Thailand	353
Turkey	1,158
United Kingdom	74,200
Venezuela	10

This total does not include those minor nations of the world whose trivial debts (in current money talk) are in the millions—not billions.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the interest alone on our present United States public debt is more than twice as great as the total debt itself in any year prior to 1918.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD a table showing the public debt of the United States for each year of its history, and the per capita debt for each year in which such data is available, which includes that for each year subsequent to 1850.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Public debt of the United States, 1791 to 1958

Year	Amount	Per capita	Interest
1791	$75,463,000		$2,349,437
1792	77,228,000		3,201,628
1793	80,359,000		2,722,242
1794	78,427,000		3,490,288
1795	80,748,000		3,189,151
1796	83,762,000		3,195,055
1797	82,064,000		3,300,043
1798	79,229,000		3,053,281
1799	78,409,000		3,186,288
1800	82,976,000	$15.63	3,374,705
1801	83,038,000		4,412,913
1802	80,713,000		4,125,039
1803	77,055,000		3,848,828
1804	86,427,000		4,266,563
1805	82,312,000		4,148,999
1806	75,723,000		3,723,408
1807	69,218,000		3,369,578
1808	65,196,000		3,428,153
1809	57,023,000		2,866,075
1810	53,173,000	7.24	2,845,428
1811	48,006,000		2,465,733
1812	45,210,000		2,451,273
1813	55,963,000		3,599,455
1814	81,488,000		4,593,239
1815	99,834,000		5,745,569
1816	127,335,000		7,213,259
1817	123,492,000		6,388,210
1818	103,467,000		6,016,447
1819	95,530,000		5,163,536
1820	91,016,000	9.44	5,126,097
1821	89,987,000		5,087,274
1822	93,547,000		5,172,578
1823	90,876,000		4,922,685
1824	90,270,000		4,996,562
1825	83,788,000		4,366,769
1826	81,054,000		3,973,481
1827	73,987,000		3,486,073
1828	67,475,000		3,098,801
1829	58,421,000		2,542,843
1830	48,565,000	3.77	1,913,533
1831	39,123,000		1,383,583
1832	24,322,000		772,562
1833	7,022,000		303,797
1834	4,760,000		202,153
1835	38,000		57,803
1836	38,000		
1837	337,000		
1838	3,308,000		14,997
1839	10,434,000		399,834
1840	3,573,000	.21	174,598
1841	5,251,000		284,978
1842	13,594,000		773,560
1843	32,743,000		523,595
1844	23,462,000		1,833,867
1845	15,925,000		1,040,032
1846	15,550,000		842,723
1847	38,827,000		1,119,215
1848	47,045,000		2,390,825
1849	63,062,000		3,565,578
1850	63,453,000	2.74	3,782,331
1851	68,305,000	2.85	3,696,721

Public debt of the United States, 1791 to 1958—Continued

Year	Amount	Per capita	Interest
1852	$66,199,000	$2.67	$4,000,298
1853	59,805,000	2.32	3,665,833
1854	42,244,000	1.59	3,071,017
1855	35,588,000	1.30	2,314,375
1856	31,974,000	1.13	1,953,822
1857	28,701,000	.99	1,678,265
1858	44,913,000	1.50	1,567,056
1859	58,498,000	1.91	2,638,464
1860	64,844,000	2.06	3,177,315
1861	90,582,000	2.80	4,000,174
1862	524,178,000	15.79	13,190,325
1863	1,119,774,000	32.91	24,729,847
1864	1,815,831,000	52.08	53,685,422
1865	2,677,929,000	75.01	77,397,712
1866	2,755,764,000	75.42	133,067,742
1867	2,650,168,000	70.91	143,781,592
1868	2,583,446,000	67.61	140,424,046
1869	2,545,111,000	65.17	130,694,243
1870	2,436,453,000	61.06	129,235,498
1871	2,322,052,000	56.72	125,576,566
1872	2,209,991,000	52.65	117,357,840
1873	2,151,210,000	50.02	104,750,688
1874	2,159,933,000	49.05	107,119,815
1875	2,156,277,000	47.84	103,093,545
1876	2,130,846,000	46.22	100,243,271
1877	2,107,760,000	44.71	97,124,512
1878	2,159,418,000	44.82	102,500,875
1879	2,298,913,000	46.72	105,327,949
1880	2,090,909,000	41.60	95,757,575
1881	2,019,286,000	39.18	82,508,741
1882	1,856,916,000	35.16	71,077,207
1883	1,721,959,000	31.83	59,160,131
1884	1,625,307,000	29.35	54,578,379
1885	1,578,551,000	27.86	51,386,256
1886	1,555,669,000	26.85	50,580,146
1887	1,465,485,000	24.75	47,741,577
1888	1,384,632,000	22.89	44,715,007
1889	1,249,471,000	20.23	41,001,484
1890	1,122,297,000	17.80	36,099,284
1891	1,005,807,000	15.63	37,547,135
1892	968,219,000	14.74	23,378,116
1893	961,432,000	14.36	27,264,392
1894	1,016,898,000	14.89	27,841,406
1895	1,096,913,000	15.76	30,978,030
1896	1,222,729,000	17.25	35,385,029
1897	1,226,794,000	16.99	37,791,110
1898	1,232,743,000	16.77	37,585,925
1899	1,436,701,000	19.21	39,896,925
1900	1,263,417,000	16.60	40,160,333
1901	1,221,572,000	15.74	32,342,979
1902	1,178,031,000	14.88	29,108,045
1903	1,159,406,000	14.28	28,556,340
1904	1,136,259,000	13.83	24,646,490
1905	1,132,357,000	13.51	24,590,944
1906	1,142,523,000	13.37	24,308,576
1907	1,147,178,000	13.19	24,481,158
1908	1,177,690,000	13.28	21,426,138
1909	1,148,315,000	12.69	21,803,836
1910	1,146,940,000	12.41	21,342,944
1911	1,153,985,000	12.29	21,311,334
1912	1,193,839,000	12.52	22,616,300
1913	1,193,048,000	12.27	22,899,106
1914	1,188,235,000	11.99	22,863,836
1915	1,191,264,000	11.85	22,902,897
1916	1,225,146,000	12.02	22,900,869
1917	2,975,619,000	28.77	24,742,702
1918	12,243,629,000	117.11	189,743,277
1919	25,482,034,000	242.54	619,215,569
1920	24,299,321,000	228.23	1,020,251,622
1921	23,977,451,000	220.91	999,144,731
1922	22,963,382,000	208.65	991,000,759
1923	22,349,707,000	199.64	1,055,923,690
1924	21,250,813,000	186.23	940,602,913
1925	20,516,194,000	177.12	881,806,662
1926	19,643,216,000	167.32	831,937,700
1927	18,511,907,000	155.51	787,019,578
1928	17,604,293,000	146.09	731,764,476
1929	16,931,088,000	139.04	678,330,400
1930	16,185,310,000	131.51	659,347,613
1931	16,801,281,000	135.45	611,559,704
1932	19,487,002,000	156.10	599,276,631
1933	22,538,673,000	179.48	689,365,106
1934	27,053,141,000	214.07	756,617,127
1935	28,700,893,000	225.55	820,926,353
1936	33,778,543,000	263.79	749,396,802
1937	36,424,614,000	282.75	866,384,331
1938	37,164,740,000	286.27	926,290,714
1939	40,439,532,000	308.98	940,539,764
1940	42,967,531,000	325.62	1,040,935,697
1941	48,961,444,000	367.97	1,110,602,812
1942	72,422,445,000	541.39	1,260,085,336
1943	136,696,090,000	1,020.38	1,808,160,306
1944	201,003,387,000	1,455.67	2,608,970,806
1945	258,682,187,000	1,852.74	3,616,686,048
1946	269,422,000,000	1,905.42	4,721,958,000
1947	258,256,000,000	1,792.05	4,957,922,000
1948	252,292,000,000	1,720.71	5,211,102,000
1949	252,770,000,000	1,694.75	5,339,396,000
1950	257,357,000,000	1,696.68	5,749,913,000
1951	255,222,000,000	1,653.42	5,612,655,000
1952	259,105,000,000	1,650.06	5,859,263,000
1953	266,071,000,000	1,666.74	6,503,580,000
1954	271,260,000,000	1,670.14	6,382,486,000
1955	274,374,000,000	1,660.15	6,370,362,000
1956	272,651,000,000	1,622.64	6,786,599,000
1957	270,634,309,846	1,580.55	7,244,193,486
1958	276,444,438,345	1,587.63	7,611,544,091

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the above table is significant. It is worthy of study.

It will be noted that each war has increased the public debt during the war and also during a brief reconstruction period of 2 or 3 years following. This is the natural consequence of war.

Since our constitutional government was formed we have had seven wars. They were:

The War of 1812: from 1812 to 1815.
The Mexican War: from 1846 to 1848.
The Civil War: from 1861 to 1865.
The Spanish-American War: in 1898.
World War I: 1917 and 1918.
World War II: 1941 to 1945.
And the Korean war: 1950 to 1953.

The War of 1812 increased the public debt to $127,335,000, but after 1816 our Government wisely began to reduce the debt by economical and judicious administration and an increase in customs duties, then a principal source of revenue.

In 20 years they had the debt down to a mere token sum of $38,000 on which there was no interest charge of a sufficient amount to be noted in the records.

The Mexican War tripled the public debt from $15½ million in 1846 to $47,045,000 in 1848 and for 4 years after that war the public debt was between $63 million and $68 million. But it then declined annually to 1857 when the per capita debt was only 99 cents or less than a dollar.

The Civil War, with the second highest number of casualties in our history cost our Government less than the interest on our public debt tody, and after 1866 there was a continuous decline in the debt and in the interest charges until 1893, almost on the eve of the Spanish American War, which only increased the national debt by $200 million.

These were American wars fought in American interests.

Our international wars began in 1917 and for the first time in history our national debt zoomed to $3 billion. It reached approximately twelve and a quarter billion in 1918, and twenty-five billion in 1919. Many of these billions represented money borrowed from our taxpayers and given to our allies, but which our allies never paid back.

However, beginning in 1921, the debt was progressively reduced until the great depression. In 1930 it was only $16,185,000,000, and the interest charge was less than one-tenth what the interest on our public debt is today. The per capita debt was $131.50.

The national debt began to rise when the New Deal came in but even in 1941, when our preparedness program already was well underway, it had not yet reached $50 billion. In 1945 it was $258 billion; in 1946, $269 billion. Much of that debt, some $50 billion of it, was represented in the costs of financing our allies.

In 1947 and 1948 our public debt began to taper off in accordance with our historic pattern, but foreign aid expenditures of billions a year reversed that principle and tradition, and in consequence our debt now is the highest it has ever been in history and $22 billion higher than it was at the close of the war. The interest charges alone would have financed the Civil War.

This is an enormous debt. It represents, as the table shows, a debt of nearly $1,600 owed by every man, woman and child in the United States.

The Government of the United States has mortgaged not only our children but our children's children.

Why?

Primarily to bring security to foreign governments at the risk of losing our own security.

Many of these foreign governments are run by dictators, and several by Communist dictators; many others are run by Socialists and self-proclaimed neutrals who always side with the Communists in a showdown. Some of them are kingdoms? Some are sheikdoms, whatever that is. And scarcely any of them are republics or democracies.

Yet we are financing them at taxpayers' expense, increasing the national debt to do so, and burdening future American generations with oppressive taxation.

Not one of these countries, as the table I introduced early in my remarks shows, has a public debt remotely comparable to our own.

All of them put together do not have a public debt that comes within a hundred billion dollars of being what our own debt is.

Only three nations in the world have a public debt as large as the interest alone that we are paying on our own national debt.

And yet we have administration spokesmen weeping and moaning to us here on Capitol Hill because they only want to give away 3½ billion to these almost debt-free nations in the coming year.

Out of one side of their mouths they plead for us to give away more billions to foreigners.

Out of the other side of their mouths they plead with us to raise the debt limit so we can incur more debt to give more billions to foreigners.

Mr. President, on June 30, 1958, the council of State chambers of commerce issued a bulletin, headed: "What Price Foreign Aid in 1959."

Page 1 of that bulletin includes a table.

I ask unanimous consent that this table be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Foreign aid funds paid out during the postwar period from July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1957, and foreign aid funds available from July 1, 1957, to date [1]

	Million
Grants paid out July 1, 1945 to June 30, 1957	$50,981
Grants unexpended as of June 30, 1957	6,200
Funds provided for fiscal 1958:	
Grant appropriations	2,300
Farm commodities for relief purposes	300
Total grants	59,781

[1] Source: Office of Business Economics, U. S. Department of Commerce.

Foreign aid funds paid out during the post-war period from July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1957, and foreign aid funds available from July 1, 1957, to date—Continued

	Million
Less: Returns on grants to June 30, 1957	$1,724
Net aid in grants	58,057
Loans paid out July 1, 1945 to June 30, 1957	13,023
Grants converted to loans	2,257
Unexpended loan authority June 30, 1957	3,800
Funds provided for fiscal 1958:	
Loan appropriations	400
Foreign currencies from sale of farm commodities	600
Expanded loan authority of Export-Import Bank	2,000
Total loans	22,080
Less: Principal collected on loans to June 30, 1957	4,539
Net aid in loans	17,541
Total net aid	75,598

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the council of State chambers of commerce also prepared a table showing the net funds provided by the taxpayers of each State of the Union for foreign aid during the period of July 1, 1945 to June 30, 1958.

I ask unanimous consent that this table be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

State-by-State breakdown of post-World War II foreign-aid costs

	Federal tax burden, percentage	Net funds provided, July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1958
Alabama	0.93	$703,061,400
Arizona	.50	377,990,000
Arkansas	.44	332,631,200
California	10.51	7,945,349,800
Colorado	.89	672,822,200
Connecticut	2.25	1,700,955,000
Delaware	.61	461,147,800
Florida	2.08	1,572,438,400
Georgia	1.30	982,774,000
Idaho	.24	181,435,200
Illinois	7.11	5,375,017,800
Indiana	2.36	1,784,112,900
Iowa	1.11	839,137,800
Kansas	.94	710,621,200
Kentucky	1.08	816,458,400
Louisiana	1.17	884,496,600
Maine	.41	309,951,800
Maryland	1.90	1,436,362,000
Massachusetts	3.66	2,766,886,800
Michigan	5.01	3,787,459,800
Minnesota	1.62	1,224,687,600
Mississippi	.41	309,951,800
Missouri	2.39	1,806,792,200
Montana	.30	226,794,000
Nebraska	.60	453,588,000
Nevada	.20	151,196,000
New Hampshire	.32	241,913,600
New Jersey	4.20	3,175,116,000
New Mexico	.32	241,913,600
New York	13.93	10,530,801,400
North Carolina	1.36	1,028,132,800
North Dakota	.19	143,636,200
Ohio	6.18	4,671,956,400
Oklahoma	.91	687,941,800
Oregon	.91	687,941,800
Pennsylvania	7.14	5,397,697,200
Rhode Island	.58	438,468,400
South Carolina	.61	461,147,800
South Dakota	.20	151,196,000
Tennessee	1.13	854,257,400
Texas	4.23	3,197,795,400
Utah	.33	249,473,400
Vermont	.18	136,076,400
Virginia	1.68	1,270,046,400
Washington	1.53	1,156,649,400
West Virginia	.73	$551,865,400
Wisconsin	2.05	1,549,759,000
Wyoming	.16	120,956,800
Alaska	.10	75,598,000
District of Columbia	.72	544,306,600
Hawaii	.29	219,234,200
Total	100.00	75,598,000,000

State-by-State breakdown of post-World War II foreign-aid costs—Continued

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, 400 years ago the greatest and potentially the richest nation in the world was Spain.

Its monarchs possessed all of South and Central America, the southwestern portion of the United States, the southern half of Italy, Sicily, and Sardinia, the areas that now comprise the Netherlands and Belgium, and even Austria. Most of the world's gold supply and silver supply was in her hands. Then she collapsed.

A great English economist in 1698, Charles D'Avenant, wrote what is perhaps Spain's most appropriate obituary, as follows:

> Spain is a sufficient instance, what a weight of old debts are upon any country, and how they render present administration difficult and impotent. The chief branches of that kingdom's revenue are employed in payment of interest for money borrowed a hundred years ago; and that nourishment which should support the body politick, being diverted in another way, it becomes weak, and unable to resist accidents. When a people so involved come to be engaged in a foreign war 'tis quickly evident to their enemies that they are not much to be feared for their power, and to their friends, that they are not to be depended on for any help.
>
> These large anticipations which began in 1588, and were continued from year to year, without any measures thought on to lessen the debt, have more contributed to sink the Spanish monarchy than all their other bad councils put together. And this has been all along the case of Spain, whose crown revenue is near as large as that of France, but so clogged and anticipated that upon any emergency, for want of money, they can neither find fleets or armies for their kingdom's defense.

Mr. President, foreign aid is nothing new. It has been extended to one or more of the empire-minded powers of Europe since 1914. It has helped hurl us into two foreign wars. It contributed in large measure to the 1929 depression. It has never brought us returns in either peace or friendship.

During World War I the United States financed 19 allies. Nine of these quondam allies are now behind the Iron Curtain controlled by Communists.

Before the entry of the United States into World War I the war in Europe was financed in large measure by New York banks. After America's entry the war was financed by the United States taxpayers and the loans made to these powers were ample to pay off the debts owing to the banks.

In World War I, prior to America's entry on April 6, 1917, great Britain's direct borrowings in the United States totaled $1,065,000,000. J. P. Morgan & Co. were the American bankers for the British Government.

France made her first war loan in the United States in September 1914, for $10 million, arranged through the National City Bank of New York.

In March 1915, a syndicate headed by J. P. Morgan & Co., placed a loan of $50 million in New York for the French Government.

France next obtained $250 million from a loan placed in New York in October 1915, by a syndicate headed by J. P. Morgan & Co.

In May 1916 France obtained a loan of $100 million in New York handled by an American foreign securities company which had a paid-in capital of only $10 million but sold $94,500,000 in 5-percent bonds.

In April 1917 France obtained a loan of $100 million through J. P. Morgan & Co.

France also arranged industrial or export credits in the sum of $45 million arranged by the Brown Bros. & Co., and $110 million arranged by Bonbright & Co., individually and in connection with the Guaranty Trust Co. and Bankers Trust Co.

In October 1916 the city of Paris arranged a loan of $50 million in New York. In November of the same year the city of Marseilles arranged a loan of $12 million, as did also the city of Lyons and the city of Bordeaux. All city loans were negotiated by Kuhn, Loeb & Co.

Russia, on September 1, 1917, owed the United States $279 million. She also owed Britain $2,766,000,000; France $762 million; Japan, $152 million, and Italy, $10 million.

Credits in behalf of Russia prior to American entry into the war included: $5 million, October 1914, National City Bank; $10 million, April 1915, National City Bank; $50 million, June 16, 1916, syndicate headed by the National City Bank, and $25 million, November 1916, handled by the same syndicate.

During World War I the United States financed allies and other nations in the sum of $10,578,509,000, principal only, exclusive of interest, in addition to financing its own military operations which entailed an increase in the national debt from $1,282,000,000 to $24,298,000,000. These loans were financed by proceeds from Liberty Loan sales.

The Liberty Loan Act provided that the Secretary of the Treasury was permitted to make loans only to foreign governments engaged in war with the enemies of the United States, and such authority was to cease upon the termination of the war between the United States and the Imperial German Government.

Loans were made to Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Esthonia, Finland, France, Great Britain, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Liberia, Lithuania, Nicaragua, Poland, Rumania, Russia, and Yugoslavia.

In direct contravention to the express wording of the Liberty Loan Act loans

were made after the war had ended. The total of these postwar loans was $2,170,000,000, and included indirect loans to Germany via other governments who supplied Germany with products purchased with loans from the United States. Austria, also a former enemy, was also a beneficiary of this largesse.

The war debts were never paid. Principal plus interest owed the United States by foreign governments on indebtedness growing out of World War I, now approximates $18 billion.

Despite the fact that these debtor countries did not pay their debts to the United States for money obtained from American Liberty bond purchasers, United States banks throughout the period between World War I and World War II continued to make loans to these and other foreign governments.

Samuel Crowther in America Self-Contained lists the new loans to foreign countries from the years 1922 through 1931, as follows:

1922	$763,627,000
1923	420,597,000
1924	969,224,000
1925	1,076,466,000
1926	1,314,481,000
1927	1,574,225,000
1928	1,578,951,000
1929	948,230,000
1930	1,107,333,000
1931	419,835,000

Crowther observes:

> The foreign loans * * * did not help trade. The foreign loans were not made in order to help trade. They were not made to rehabilitate foreign nations. They were made, for the most part, simply so that the bankers might have a stock of quick moving goods.

Mr. President, the time came when the foreign countries which had welched on their debts to the United States Government began to welch also on their debts to the New York banks. That was the beginning of the great depression.

DEFENSE OF UNITED STATES MUST BE BASED IN NORTH AMERICA

Mr. President, if, 30 years ago, someone had said we would be afraid of any nation, that we would be afraid of our own shadow, that we would be divesting our own markets of the lifeblood of the American people, and would be dividing our markets among the other nations of the world, that person would have been put into an insane asylum.

Mr. President, principles do not change. It is true that we have to keep up with the rest of the world. But the principle of defense never has changed.

I have said before that the next war will be fought under the sea or in the air, but not on the ground, where I and many of my colleagues fought the First World War.

We must keep control of this situation; and we can do so. We can defend this hemisphere from North America, and can make it self-sufficient in case of war—just as Russia can do, so far as her part of the world is concerned.

NUCLEAR-POWERED SUBMARINES TO CHANGE COURSE OF WARFARE

Today, and everyone in this country will know it within 6 months, if we construct enough nuclear-powered submarines, such as the *Nautilus*, which recently went under the North Pole—and let me point out that I said, facetiously, 5 or 6 years ago, that such a submarine has to surface only every 2 or 3 years, just long enough to let the crew reenlist [laughter]—the method of war in the world will be changed. I do not know how many submarines of that type we need; but if we had any gumption, we would make a great many more of them. Once such submarines submerge, they cannot be located, for they do not use the old type of engine. Instead, they are run by nuclear fuels. In a matter of minutes—not hours—such submarine can surface and can throw bombs into Moscow or anywhere else their commanders wish.

If we had as many of those submarines as we need—and we should let those at the top of our national defense determine how many of them we need—then, if we had a certain number of them under the Arctic ice, they could destroy any nation that attempted to destroy us. Under those circumstances, if a potential attacker knew that was possible, he would never attack us.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Nevada reads the newspaper press accounts of the President's press conferences and the statements released by the press-relations bureau of the White House. Does not the Senator from Nevada fear that whereas we should have solidarity within the United States, in order to face the threats that come from behind the Iron Curtain these inept statements from the White House probably will cause dissension and friction within the Nation, and actually will weaken the defense of our country? Although we have reliance upon missiles, planes, and nuclear-powered submarines, and although we have confidence that we are building up military defenses to reserve the security of the Nation, if there is lack of harmony or unity within the Nation, is not the responsibility for that in the White House, where these inept public-relations policies are initiated?

GOVERNMENT LACKING FORTITUDE

Mr. MALONE. I do not believe the responsibility is solely in the White House. Instead, it is right here in the Congress—in the Senate and in the House of Reresentatives. The Members of Congress are the ones who must develop the guts to stand on their feet and say what they believe. I have told the Senate what I believe, and within 6 months everyone will know it.

But, instead, our officials become frightened when Khrushchev and others make threats.

Furthermore, the United States has become the laughing stock of the world. Our Government does not even have the guts to insist upon the freeing of American citizens who are captured—for instance, when Americans were captured by Castro, and were kept in captivity in the mountains of Cuba. Mr. President, do you know what I would have done if I had been President at that time? I would have sent a radio message to Castro, "My friend, tomorrow morning, at 9 a. m., a passenger plane will land at the airport nearest your base. It will pick up our men whom you have made captive—either that, or, if you do not see that they are put aboard that plane, it will be followed by a fleet of our planes; and that will be the last anyone will ever hear of you."

Then those American citizens would have been freed at once.

But, instead, the policy our Government follows is a disgrace to the American people. Our Government does not have the guts that God gives to geese.

Mr. President, tonight I am saying things which everyone in the United States should know. I should not have to say them. All Members of Congress know them. All we need to do is stop and think. But no one stops to think, any more; we just follow, like a bunch of cattle.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will my friend yield to me?

Mr. MALONE. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I had hoped the Senate would be able to take a yea-and-nay vote, tonight, on the pending bill. However, if the Senator from Nevada does not feel that he can join us in our desire to have the yeas and nays ordered, and to have that vote taken tonight, I wonder whether he will yield to me, in order to permit me to make a motion that the Senate adjourn. In that event, it would be impossible for us to conclude the session this week. However, I do not believe we should ask Senators to remain much longer this evening.

Mr. MALONE. I am very happy to yield for that purpose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the Senator from Nevada permit a vote to be taken tonight on the debt-limit-increase bill—with the understanding that consideration of the mutual security bill will not be resumed until tomorrow? Also, I should like to request the ordering of the yeas and nays, while most of the Members are in the Chamber. If we are able to dispose tonight of the bill to raise the debt ceiling, then the Senate could resume its consideration of the mutual security bill; and, on tomorrow, the Senator from Nevada could be recognized.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, it is impossible for me to turn down the request the Senator from Texas has made, because he has been so fine in his dealings with me during the entire session—in fact, during the entire time he has been the majority leader.

I must admit that I am just so aggravated and so angry—in fact, I was so angry that was one reason I ran for election to the Senate in 1946, the only job I ever ran for. But I am more angry now, because now the Republican organization is doing exactly what the Democratic organization has been doing for the last 25 years.

So, Mr. President, I promise to yield in 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me now, long enough to permit me to request the yeas-and-nays on the question of the final vote on the debt-limit-increase bill—so that all Members may know what sort of vote will be taken on that question?

Mr. MALONE. Very well.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on the question of the final passage of the bill, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Obviously there is a sufficient number; and the yeas and nays are ordered.

WASHINGTON QUOTED

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I wish to quote further from George Washington. He said:

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities. * * * It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world.

Mr. President, George Washington never said our country should not have allies. Certainly, Mr. President, when any trouble develops, we shall have allies who are friendly to our point of view. But we do not need allies under a treaty which binds us to do things that our allies never will do—things in which they, themselves, do not believe.

JEFFERSON ADVOCATED ECONOMIC INDEPENDENCE

Mr. President, Thomas Jefferson said:

To be independent for the comforts of life we must fabricate them ourselves. The grand inquiry now is, shall we make our own comforts or go without them at the will of a foreign nation?

JAMES MADISON PLEDGES TO "BUY PEACE OF NONE"

James Madison said, in a message to the Bey of Algiers in August 1816:

The United States, whilst they wish for war with no one, will buy peace of none. It is a principle incorporated into the settled policy of America, that as peace is better than war, war is better than tribute.

JAMES MONROE'S VIEWS ON NATIONAL SELF SUFFICIENCY

James Monroe said:

It cannot be doubted that the more complete our internal resources and the less dependent we are on foreign powers for every national as well as domestic purpose the greater and more stable will be the public felicity.

James Monroe also said:

Possessing as we do all the raw materials, the fruit of our own soil and industry, we ought not to depend in the degree we have done on supplies from other countries. While we are thus dependent, the sudden event of war, unsought and unexpected, can not fail to plunge us into the most serious difficulties. It is important, too, that the capital which nourishes our manufacturers should be domestic, as its influence in that case instead of exhausting, as it may do in foreign hands, would be felt advantageously on agriculture and every other branch of industry. Equally important is it to provide at home a market for our raw materials, as by extending the competition it will enhance the price and protect the cultivator against the casualties incident to foreign markets.

"FEED OUR OWN," SAID ANDREW JACKSON

Andrew Jackson said:

We have been too long subject to the policy of the British merchants. It is time we should become a little more Americanized, and instead of feeding the paupers and laborers of England, feed our own, or else in a short time, by continuing our present policy, we shall all be rendered paupers ourselves.

Henry Clay said:

Let us no longer watch the nod of any European politician. Let us be real and true Americans and place ourselves at the head of the American system.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN'S ESTIMATE OF FOREIGN DANGERS

Abraham Lincoln said:

At what point, then, is the danger to be expected? I answer, if it ever reaches us, it must spring up among us. It cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen, we must live through all time or die by suicide.

Daniel Webster said:

Away then, once and forever, with the miserable policy which would bring the condition of the laborer in the United States to that of a laborer in Russia, or Sweden, in France or Germany, in Italy or Corsica. Instead of following these examples, let us hold up all our own, which all nations may well envy, and which, unhappily, in most parts of the earth, it is easier to envy than to imitate.

WORLD WAR I A TRADE WAR, SAID WOODROW WILSON

Woodrow Wilson said, in a speech on September 5, 1919:

The real reason that the war we have just finished took place was that Germany was afraid her commercial rivals were going to get the better of her, and the reason some nations went into the war against Germany was that they thought Germany would get the advantage of them. The seed of jealousy, the seed of deep-seated hatred, was hot, successful commercial and industrial rivalry. This war in its inception was a commercial and industrial war. It was not a political war.

HERBERT HOOVER'S SOUND ADVICE ON FOREIGN AND MILITARY POLICY

Herbert Hoover said:

The foundation of our national policies must be to preserve for the world this Western Hemisphere Gibraltar of western civilization. We can, without any measure of doubt, with our own air and naval forces, hold the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. With one frontier on Britain (if she wishes to cooperate); the other on Japan, Formosa, and the Philippines, we could, after initial outlays for more Air and Navy equipment, greatly reduce our expenditures, balance our budget, and free ourselves from the dangers of inflation and economic degeneration.

Mr. Hoover also said:

We are not blind to the need to preserve western civilization on the Continent of Europe or to our cultural and religious ties to it. But the prime obligation of western continental Europe rests upon the nations of Europe. The test is whether they have the spiritual force, the will and acceptance of unity among them by their own volition. America cannot create their spiritual forces: We cannot buy them with money.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement with respect to the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEBT LIMIT

UNDER PRESENT LAW

As the law stands now the permanent statutory ceiling is $275 billion and, under an act signed last February 26, the limit was temporarily raised $5 billion until June 30, 1959.

In other words, under present law the limit is temporarily $280 billion until next June 30, and at that time it would revert to the permanent $275 billion ceiling.

UNDER HOUSE BILL

As this bill was passed by the House of Representatives, the present temporary $5 billion increase in effect is repealed; the permanent limit would be raised by $10 billion from $275 billion to $285 billion; and in addition there would be another $3 billion temporary increase expiring June 30, 1960.

In other words the limit would be $288 billion until June 30, 1960, and at that time it would come down to a new permanent limit of $285 billion.

UNDER SENATE BILL

Under the bill as reported by the Senate Finance Committee, and as it is now pending before the Senate, the permanent limit would be raised $8 billion from $275 billion to $283 billion, and the $5 billion temporary increase enacted last February would be unchanged, to remain effective until June 30, 1959.

In other words, under the bill now before the Senate with Finance Committee approval, the limit would be $288 billion until the end of this fiscal year, and at that time it would revert to a new permanent ceiling of $283 billion.

LEEWAY UNDER BILL

Requirement for the debt limit is measured principally by the operating leeway afforded. Leeway is provided by the combined amount of unused borrowing authority under the limit, and cash balances on hand at any given time.

On the basis of figures presented to the Finance Committee by the Secretary of the Treasury, and the outlook as he outlined it, provisions in the Senate bill would be ample. Members of Congress, and the public generally, need have no fear to the contrary.

The official estimates clearly show that under provisions of this bill the Federal Government can pay all of its bills on time, and in no period will it be operating on a leeway of less than $4.7 billion.

In fact, under the pending bill, there will be times during the current fiscal year when the leeway will be as high as $15.9 billion.

The semimonthly estimates of the leeway situation in fiscal year 1959, based on official

figures submitted by the United States Treasury Department, are as follows:

Estimated leeway under proposed $288 billion statutory debt limit

[In billions]

Fiscal year 1959	Proposed $288 billion statutory debt limit	Estimated debt outstanding (subject to limit)	Leeway under $288 billion debt limit		
			Unused borrowing authority	Estimated operating cash balances	Total
1958					
Aug. 15	$288	$277.8	$10.2	$5.2	$15.4
Aug. 31	288	278.5	9.5	5.6	15.1
Sept. 15	288	276.3	11.7	2.2	13.9
Sept. 30	288	276.1	11.9	4.0	15.9
Oct. 15	288	280.2	7.8	5.5	13.3
Oct. 31	288	279.9	8.1	4.1	12.2
Nov. 15	288	279.6	8.4	3.0	11.4
Nov. 30	288	279.7	8.3	2.8	11.1
Dec. 15	288	282.0	6.0	2.9	8.9
Dec. 31	288	281.9	6.1	3.9	10.0
1959					
Jan. 15	288	285.1	2.9	5.7	8.6
Jan. 31	288	284.9	3.1	5.5	8.6
Feb. 15	288	283.7	4.3	3.4	7.7
Feb. 28	288	284.1	3.9	4.6	8.5
Mar. 15	288	283.7	4.3	2.8	7.1
Mar. 31	288	280.5	7.5	2.9	10.4
Apr. 15	288	283.7	4.3	4.2	8.5
Apr. 30	288	283.6	4.4	3.0	7.4
May 15	288	284.8	3.2	3.8	7.0
May 31	288	285.8	2.2	4.5	6.7
June 15	288	285.5	2.5	2.2	4.7
June 30	288	283.3	4.7	4.2	8.9

REQUIREMENT FOR REVIEW

In short, the administration requested a $288 billion limit until June 30, 1960, and the committee bill would grant the $288 billion limit until June 30, 1959.

The semimonthly leeway estimates clearly show the $288 billion is enough for the current fiscal year ending June 30, 1959.

The Treasury has not supplied figures on which we can base an estimate of the requirement for fiscal year 1960.

Congress will be back in session during the first few days in January 1959. That is only 4 months from now. At that time the new budget for fiscal year 1960 will be ready for presentation. There will be something by which to measure the requirements for debt limit requirements in that year, and there will be sufficient time for a more adequate estimate of the debt a year hence. The situation can and should be reviewed at that time.

RESTRAINT ON SPENDING

As the Senate knows, the present Secretary of the Treasury, as well as his predecessors of more recent years, are on record as to the advisability of a reasonably tight debt limit. Current expenditure authorization procedure is the reason for that.

Under this procedure we finance multiyear Federal programs and projects far in advance. As a result we have built up tremendous balances in prior year authorizations—appropriations, authority to spend out of debt receipts, contract authorization, etc., over which there is little annual expenditure control except debt limitation. In the current year total spending authorizations will be at least $150 billion.

In this connection, the people of this country are reassured that there is no more responsible committee in Congress than the Senate Finance Committee.

So long as it is fiscally possible, the committee will report legislation to protect the integrity of the Federal Government of the United States. And, so long as the money can be raised within our system, the Government's valid bills and debts will be paid—and on time. It is the committee's job to see to that, as difficult as it is in these times.

The committee has determined that, under existing conditions, a reasonably tight debt ceiling properly administered by executive agencies, is the most constructive and effective remaining restraint on excessive Federal spending.

I cannot overlook this opportunity to compliment responsible officials of the Government for their action in this respect a year ago. Unfortunately their efforts were disgracefully misrepresented by some low-grade Federal officers and their associates. The principal offenders were in the Defense Department area working through friends and contractors.

SITUATION IS SERIOUS

Special interests—vested and otherwise—can no longer be tolerated. Every current indication and every word of new testimony is now building up a preponderance of evidence as to the seriousness of the situation confronting us.

When Congress convened in January we were told by the administration that the Federal budget would be virtually balanced in the last fiscal year and that there would be a surplus in this fiscal year.

Actually, there was a $2.8 billion deficit in the last fiscal year, ending June 30, and another deficit of $12 billion is anticipated in the present fiscal year.

The administration has asked for two debt ceiling increases in a period of 6 months, aggregating $13 billion, making the total debt limit $288 billion.

This unprecedented deterioration of our fiscal condition in a brief space of 6 months should shock every American into a realization of the perils that confront us.

The Budget Director anticipates an $80 billion expenditure budget this fiscal year. And this will continue: so that in 5 years it is predicted we will spend $400 billion. On the basis of the present revenue, there would be an accumulated deficit of $65 billion in the next 5-year period. The debt would then approach $350 billion.

It is evident that we have a runaway budget and little effort is being made by either the administration or Congress to control it.

The Secretary of the Treasury has intimated that he may have to ask for another debt ceiling increase when Congress convenes in January.

DEFICIT-DEBT-INFLATION

Over the past year the Senate Finance Committee has made a special study of the financial condition of the United States. Every competent witness has testified that continual Federal deficits and growing national debt are the principal factors in inflation.

The contention that inflation will balance the budget by increasing income which may be taxed is fallacious. Increased cost of goods and services purchased by the Government will consume most of the increase in revenue resulting from inflated income.

Deficit spending will promote serious inflation and, if continued, it will destroy more of the purchasing power of our present 48-cent dollar.

Unless we change our course, we are going to be in serious fiscal and economic trouble. When the American dollar goes down, the currency of the world will collapse. Drastic action will be necessary to prevent real disaster.

The security of the Free World—and that includes us—depends upon the strength of the United States, and the strength of the United States depends upon solvent government and maintaining the value of our money.

On the basis of constant 1939 index measurement, since that year the value of the American dollar has dropped from 100 cents to 48 cents. This year it dropped every month, January through June. There are indications that it dropped in July. And in August we already have the rise in the price of steel and aluminum.

Raising the debt limit formally licenses further inflation. We have been forced by Federal spending into raising the limit on a temporary basis since 1954. Now we are asked to do it both permanently and temporarily.

We are spending ourselves into the inevitable corner. By law we have ordered expenditures far beyond our income. The gun is at our heads. Under the circumstance, how can continuing deficits and mounting debt be avoided?

NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

We need no crystal ball to see the budgetary shape of things to come. We need only to look at the nature and magnitude of the legislation we have been passing in this session of Congress.

To mention only some of it as passed by the Senate:

We have approved the $666 million temporary unemployment compensation act, the $125 million superliner construction bill, the $500 million transportation loan guaranty authority, and $1.5 billion in Federal pay raises.

We have approved legislation for an additional $2 billion in Export-Import Bank lending authority, $350 million for small business, and in the Senate we have passed 4 bills for housing and related projects authorizing a total of $26 billion in Federal cash and public credit.

Then, there were the $1.5 billion (Public Law 480) Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act amendments, the $1.5 billion school bill, the $500 million highway bill (in addition to the trust fund), and two resolutions for acceleration of public works which, in the kind of spending atmosphere we have generated, could run for $50 billion.

These certainly are not all, but they are samples of the kind of legislation we have been passing. New spending authorizations in this session of Congress, in their present status, exceed the President's request by upward of $10 billion.

It should be noted that much of this new spending authorization is outside of appropriation control. It should be noted also that the greater part of it is in strictly domestic-civilian categories.

Please note too that I have been speaking of new spending authorizations, much of which will be spent in future years. Only part of it will be spent in the current fiscal year.

The Senate may be surprised at the areas in which spending will be increased this year. In the hearing on this bill last Friday, Mr. Maurice Stans, Director of the Budget testified that:

1. The budget submitted in January estimated total spending at $73.9 billion; this is now revised to $79 billion, an increase of $5.1 billion.

2. The January spending estimates for national security, including military, stockpile, defense production, and atomic energy, totaled $42.8 billion; this is now revised to upward of $43.5 billion, an increase of about $700 million.

3. The January spending estimates for foreign aid and international affairs, including military assistance and economic aid, totaled $4.4 billion; this is now revised to $4.1 billion, a reduction of $300 million.

4. The January spending estimates for the remaining areas of Federal activity, which I choose to call domestic civilian, totaled

$26.8 billion; this is now revised to $31.6 billion, an increase of nearly $5 billion, or approximately 20 percent.

In short, more than 90 percent of the increased spending this year which has occasioned revision of estimates since January is for domestic-civilian programs and projects.

I submit that while some of this increased spending may be necessary and even urgent, most of it is excessive and nonessential, slipped in by the spenders under cover of sputnik and recession hysteria. Here is the spawning ground for the new inflation.

It is astonishing to note the number of honorable men in and out of Government who brush inflation lightly aside. But, I think in our conscience we know the evil we are doing.

The evils of inflation are endless. They are insidious. They have tremendous effects on the life of every individual. Ultimately they wreck business and Government. History is full of the fatalities of inflation.

I hope and believe the American public will awaken to—

What is stealing our savings;

What is robbing those on fixed incomes;

What is penalizing prudent people who believe in honest, sound financing;

What is reducing the purchasing power of our money;

What is eating away at our national security; and

What is the real threat to freedom in the world.

When this awakening occurs the Nation will be stirred to its depths and rise up against the evil in our traditional fashion. This cannot happen too soon.

This is the reason for the Finance Committee amendments to this bill, assuring as best we can a review of the situation again within the year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORTON in the chair). The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? The yeas and nays have been ordered——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Shall the bill pass? The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], would each vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOBLITZELL], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOBLITZELL], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 20, as follows:

YEAS—57

Aiken	Gore	McNamara
Anderson	Hayden	Monroney
Barrett	Hennings	Morton
Beall	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bennett	Hill	Neuberger
Bible	Humphrey	Pastore
Bush	Jackson	Potter
Capehart	Javits	Purtell
Carroll	Johnson, Tex.	Revercomb
Case, N. J.	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Smathers
Chavez	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Church	Knowland	Sparkman
Clark	Kuchel	Stennis
Cooper	Long	Thye
Cotton	Magnuson	Watkins
Curtis	Mansfield	Wiley
Dirksen	Martin, Iowa	Yarborough
Douglas	McClellan	Young

NAYS—20

Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Dworshak	Jordan	Russell
Ellender	Langer	Schoeppel
Ervin	Lausche	Talmadge
Frear	Malone	Thurmond
Goldwater	Morse	Williams
Green	Proxmire	

NOT VOTING—19

Allott	Fulbright	Murray
Bricker	Hoblitzell	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Holland	Payne
Butler	Hruska	Smith, N. J.
Carlson	Ives	Symington
Eastland	Jenner	
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	

So the bill (H. R. 13580) was passed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from California to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to make a very brief statement that I had hoped to be able to make before the vote was taken as to why I voted in the negative on the pending bill. I realize the vital necessity of maintaining the credit of the United States, but those of us who have sought to keep expenditures within reason are confronted with a very grave dilemma in connection with this bill. If a majority of the Members of the Senate had voted as had the Senator from Georgia, there would have been no necessity for this bill. Instead of voting to increase the debt limit there would have been a reduction in the public debt, and I voted in the negative merely to express my protest against continually permitting Federal spending on so many useless projects, and particularly in the area of foreign aid.

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2258, H. R. 13192, making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAYDEN and Mr. DOUGLAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I object, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is not in order. A motion has been presented. There has been no vote.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I receive recognition?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognized the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. The Chair will be happy to recognize the Senator from Illinois later.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the mutual security appropriation bill which is now before the Senate appropriates $3,518,092,500 for assistance to countries receiving aid under this program. This is an increase of $440 million over the amount passed by the House of Representatives. The committee bill is $157,500,000 under the authorization act for mutual security and is $432 million less than the amount recommended for this program by the President in his original submission to the Congress last April.

The $440 million which has been added to the House bill in the committee consists of $280 million for the Development Loan Fund, $90 million for defense support, $55 million for the contingency fund, and $15 million for special assistance.

With the additional $280 million the development loan fund will have a total of $580 million for fiscal year 1959.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table on page 2 of the

committee report, which details the amount of the appropriation last year, the budget estimate for this year, and the amounts in the Senate and House bills, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mutual security appropriations, 1959

Item	Appropriations, 1958	Estimates, 1959	Authorization acts	Recommended in House bill, 1959	Senate Committee bill, 1959	Increase (+) or decrease (−), Senate bill compared with—			
						Appropriations, 1958	Estimates, 1959	Authorization acts	House bill, 1959
Military assistance	$1,878,800,000	$1,800,000,000	$1,605,000,000	$1,515,000,000	$1,515,000,000	−$363,800,000	−$285,000,000	−$90,000,000	
Defense support	725,000,000	835,000,000	810,000,000	700,000,000	700,000,000	+65,000,000	−45,000,000	−20,000,000	+$90,000,000
Development Loan Fund	300,000,000	625,000,000	625,000,000	300,000,000	580,000,000	+280,000,000	−45,000,000	−45,000,000	+280,000,000
Technical cooperation	142,000,000	171,500,000	171,500,000	171,500,000	171,500,000	+29,500,000			
Special assistance	225,000,000	212,000,000	202,500,000	185,000,000	200,000,000	−25,000,000	−12,000,000	−2,500,000	+15,000,000
Contingency fund		200,000,000	155,000,000	100,000,000	155,000,000	+155,000,000	−45,000,000		+55,000,000
Other programs	165,010,000	106,592,500	106,592,500	106,592,500	106,592,500	−58,417,500			
Total mutual security:									
Appropriation	2,768,760,000	3,950,092,500	3,675,592,500	3,078,092,500	3,518,092,500	+749,332,500	−432,000,000	−157,500,000	+440,000,000
Unobligated balance	667,050,000	[1]		[1 2]		−667,050,000			
Total	3,435,810,000	3,950,092,500	3,675,592,500	3,078,092,500	3,518,092,500	+82,282,500	−432,000,000	−157,500,000	+440,000,000

[1] Entire unobligated balance of President's fund for Asian economic development (no amount specified) to remain available through June 30, 1959.

[2] Entire unobligated balance of United Nations Relief and Works Agency (no amount specified) made available through June 30, 1959.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the amount of the executive branch presentation by country is in many instances classified, and for that reason it is not possible to include in the committee report the amount of aid requested for each individual country. I have at my desk the presentation books prepared by the administration, and any Senator may examine the classified figures if he desires to do so.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments to the bill be agreed to en bloc, that the bill as thus amended be regarded for the purpose of amendment as original text, provided that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by reason of agreement to this order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion before the Senate is to take up H. R. 13192. The Senate has not yet acted on that motion. The Senator from Illinois has requested recognition.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the motion is agreed to, H. R. 2 would be laid aside in favor of the mutual-security bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. That is the motion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I know the majority leader made this motion in perfectly good faith, but once the mutual-security appropriation bill is before the Senate and passed, there is great danger of filibustering H. R. 2 to death. As I look around, I pick out various Members from adjoining States who are athletic opponents of H. R. 2. I see piles of documents on their desks. I am very fearful that if H. R. 2 is once laid aside in favor of mutual security, it will be dead. I trust our majority leader will keep the Senate in session until we get a vote one way or the other on H. R. 2.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That will depend entirely on the Senate.

The only vote I wish to get now is a vote on the mutual security appropriation bill. The reason I want to get a vote on the bill as early as possible is that the independent offices appropriation bill will also come before the Senate shortly, and both bills will probably have to go to conference. I intend to bring up the diversion bill by motion. How long the Senate will debate it I do not know. It will depend on the pleasure of the Senate. Therefore, I cannot assure the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, once H. R. 2 is laid aside and the Senate takes up the appropriation bill, our athletic friends will talk H. R. 2 to death. I am trying to protect H. R. 2. I do not want to have it subjected to that fate, not believing in the filibuster.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the bill is talked to death it will be for the good of the country. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. The statement of the Senator from Ohio indicates his frame of mind. It confirms my suspicion. I wonder if our able and distinguished majority leader would be willing to permit the Senate to come to a vote on this matter?

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe that if our friends knew that the mutual security bill was outstanding, their oratorical onslaughts would be somewhat diminished.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas to proceed to consider H. R. 13192, making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes (putting the question).

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, H. R. 13192, making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield first to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and then to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask the Presiding Officer whether my request for unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc was agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair asks the Senator from Arizona to restate his request.

Mr. HAYDEN. The request is to adopt all the committee amendments en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to agreeing to the committee amendments en bloc?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if the amendments are agreed to en bloc, will the bill be open to further amendment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a parliamentary inquiry pending. The Senator from New York has addressed a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair, which has not yet been answered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I understood that the Senator from Arizona asked that the amendments of the Committee on Appropriations be considered and agreed to en bloc, with the understanding that the bill be considered de novo and subject to amendment, and that no points of order are waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Arizona restate his request?

Mr. HAYDEN. I shall repeat it. I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments to the bill be agreed to en bloc and that the bill as thus amended be regarded for the purpose of amendment as original text, provided that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by reason of agreement to this order.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the order is entered, does it mean that we cannot then offer any amendment to the bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that if the request of the Senator from Arizona is agreed to, any amendment which any Senator desires to offer may be offered to the bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Any amendment which would be within the rules of the Senate.

RAISING THE DEBT LIMIT

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to state my position in respect to the vote I cast on raising the debt ceiling. I feel I have done everything possible to keep the debt down. I voted against what I believe to be unnecessary expenditures and unjustified invasion by the Federal Government of private enterprise, and to the assumption of functions by the Federal Government which have always been performed by local or State governments.

I voted for all the measures mentioned by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] to close leaks in the collection of taxes. It is for that reason that I voted against lifting the debt ceiling.

I do not subscribe to the idea of fixing a ceiling and then disregarding it and lifting it and spending far above it, and then with great indifference making the ceiling conform to extravagant spending.

Mr. President, I now turn to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has the floor.

THE OMNIBUS HOUSING BILL

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to withdraw my objection to the second reading of the omnibus housing bill. Previously I raised objection to it. I desire to withdraw it at this time.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, due to the fact that the Senator from Ohio has withdrawn his objection to the second reading of the new housing bill, I object to the second reading of the housing bill.

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1959

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13192) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments en bloc, with the limitations proposed by the Senator from Arizona.

Without objection, the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 2, line 2, after the word "of", to strike out "title I, chapter 1" and insert "chapter I."

On page 2, line 8, after "131 (b)", to strike out "$700,000,000" and insert "$790,000,000: *Provided,* That not less than $50,000,000 thereof, shall be available for Spain exclusive of technical cooperation."

On page 2, line 12, after "section 203," to strike out "$300,000,000" and insert "$580,000,000."

On page 2, line 23, after "section 400 (a)," to strike out "$185,000,000" and insert "$200,000,000."

On page 4, line 4, after "section 451 (b)," to strike out "$100,000,000" and insert "$155,000,000."

On page 5, line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,250,000."

At the top of page 7, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 106. The appropriations and authority with respect thereto in this act shall be available from July 1, 1958, for the purposes provided in such appropriations and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1958, and the date of enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms hereof.

On page 7, after line 7, to insert the following new section:

SEC. 107. None of the funds provided by this act nor any of the counterpart funds generated as a result of assistance under this act or any prior act shall be used to pay pensions, annuities, retirement pay, or adjusted service compensation for any persons heretofore or hereafter serving in the armed forces of any recipient country.

On page 7, after line 13, to insert the following new section:

SEC. 108. Not to exceed 50 percent of the foreign currencies heretofore generated in any country under section 402 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, may, notwithstanding prior provisions of law, hereafter be used in accordance with the provisions of that section: *Provided,* That quarterly reports of the use of foreign currencies pursuant to this section shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

RAISING THE DEBT LIMIT

Mr. GOLDWATER. I should like to explain my vote against raising the debt ceiling. I have been in business all my life, at least until I came to the Senate. When the credit of a business gets bad, it cannot get a bank to lend it any money. The United States Government is getting into the position where its credit is getting into bad shape. I believe the only way we can stop the ridiculous spending spree that Congress has entered upon is to say to the Federal Government, "There will be no more money for you. Start cutting your suit to fit the cloth." There will have to be an end to the wild, reckless, and ridiculous Federal spending, or there will be an end to the Federal Government.

I have voted consistently, since I have come to the Senate, to cut the budget by means of economizing, and I intend, as long as I am in the Senate, to continue that kind of voting.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement with regard to my vote against raising the debt ceiling, although my reasons may be different from those stated by other Senators.

I am not greatly concerned about an increase in the debt, if the increase is for purposes of eventually increasing the wealth of America.

We have been confronted by an administration which has opposed great self-liquidating and wealth-creating projects. We have been confronted with an administration which has been opposed, for example, to the building of great multipurpose dams which would repay to the Treasury many times their cost, and would conserve the natural resources of the country, and would in the long run increase the wealth of the country far beyond the construction costs of those particular projects.

I have no objection to increasing the debt of this country if it is for purposes which will promote the general welfare of the people of this country.

We are confronted with an administration which has taken a very reactionary line with regard to most pieces of general welfare and social welfare legislation which would accrue to the benefit of the American people.

We have been confronted with an administration which has participated in a handout program to wealthy and vested interests in the country. The administration has favored great corporations with tax loopholes. It has not followed a policy which would save for the American people on those expenditures in respect to which savings should be made. The administration promised in its campaign of 1952 that it would bring about great savings and reductions in the national debt. Year after year the administration has increased the national debt and increased the cost of living along with it.

Mr. President, I opposed increasing the national debt also because as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations I have warned the Senate for several years of the great waste by the administration in the administration of the foreign aid program, particularly in the field of military aid. We have wasted hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars in the life of this administration, which have totaled several billion dollars in this field, particularly with respect to military aid. We have an administration which in my judgment has given us an example of further waste, a waste of many millions of dollars, as the final accounting will show, occasioned by the sending of marines into Lebanon, where not a single marine should have been sent.

We have seen our country in recent days go through a face-saving process on behalf of the United States, when it is known that behind the scenes at the United Nations most of the members of the United Nations were against the policies we have followed in Lebanon by way of sending troops into that country.

Mr. President, we cannot make those mistakes without a cost of millions and millions of dollars. I do not propose to vote tonight to increase the debt ceiling for an administration which has wasted

huge sums of American taxpayers' dollars during its life. It is about time for us to say to this administration, "We will give you no more."

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1959

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13192) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated 8-28-58-C and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 6, it is proposed to strike out "$1,515,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,415,000,000."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I understand that there will be no further votes tonight, and that this amendment will be the pending question for tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Alabama is correct.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tonight, it adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PROPOSED NATIONAL STANDARDS FOR STATE BILLBOARD REGULATION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, my office continues to receive many inquiries about the progress toward carrying out the billboard-regulation provisions which were added by Congress this spring to the law authorizing our great new National System of Interstate Highways. The wide public interest in this question will undoubtedly be focused, in the weeks and months immediately ahead, on the proposed national standards which have been prepared by the Department of Commerce, and on the progress of plans in the different States for seeking State participation in the program and acceptance of these national standards.

To make available to the many interested persons some recent materials on this whole subject, I would like to place a series of items in the RECORD today. I shall not include the actual text of the national standards as proposed by the Department of Commerce, because I understand that they will appear in the Federal Register next Monday, August 25, and that the Department will welcome comments and suggestions thereon during the following 30 days, before the national standards will become official in their final form.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, first, an exchange of correspondence between myself and Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks on August 12, 1958, bearing upon testimony given by Secretary Weeks before the Senate Subcommittee on Public Roads on that date; a letter of August 18, 1958, from Secretary Weeks to me, transmitting the draft of the proposed national standards; press reports on these national standards from U. S. News & World Report for August 2, 1958, and Washington Daily News of August 22, 1958; a letter to the Secretary signed by the able junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and me—as the Senate sponsors of the legislation finally adopted—in which we have made certain comments with respect to the provisions in the draft national standards governing "signs in the specific interest of the traveling public," which may be permitted by the States under the terms of the act.

Finally, I ask unanimous consent also to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an interesting editorial from the Portland Oregonian of August 17, 1958, commenting on the role which the issue of signboard regulation along our spectacular new Interstate Highway System—and the sterling leadership which the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Public Roads, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], gave in this issue—apparently played in the recent primary election contest in the State which the chairman of the subcommittee does—and will—so ably help to represent in this body.

There being no objection, the correspondence, article, and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE OF PUBLIC WORKS,
August 12, 1958.

Hon. SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I regret that an executive session of another committee on which I serve made it impossible for me to attend the meeting of the Senate Subcommittee on Public roads this morning, at which you and the General Counsel of your Department, Mr. Frederick C. Nash, discussed the outlines of your forthcoming set of national standards for the regulation of roadside signboards along the new Interstate Highway System. However, I have reviewed some of the discussion which took place between you and Mr. Nash and members of the committee. As the original sponsor of this legislation, I have a number of questions which I would like to present to you in an effort to clarify some of the issues raised since I was unable to ask them in person at this morning's meeting.

First, I would like to express my appreciation for the obviously thoughtful and conscientious work which has been done by the responsible personnel of your Department, seeking to work out effective national standards under this new legislation. I am particularly pleased that you have apparently decided to accept the suggestion which I made in my Senate speech on May 13, for the installation by the States of informational boards for pedestrian-sized advertising on the safety rest areas along the interstate highways.

The following aspects of the program appear to require additional clarification:

(1) Questions were raised about the applicability of national standards within municipal areas and other areas zoned for industrial or commercial use under State law. If a municipality or other local governmental unit, in the exercise of its own zoning or police powers, chooses to impose regulations on signboards which meets or exceeds the national standards, is there any question but what an area so regulated may be included by the State within the mileage which may be covered by its statewide agreement with the Department of Commerce?

(2) Obviously, if State legislation exceeds the national standards to be promulgated by you, in imposing even more stringent regulations or even complete prohibition of billboards along interstate highways, that State would qualify for the Federal assistance provided under the new law. Will this fact be spelled out clearly in the statement of standards to be published by your department?

(3) The legislative debate on the bill explains that the mere local sale of brand-name national products—i. e., toothpaste or automobiles—by local dealers is not a local activity permitted advertising within 12 miles of the particular retail outlet. Will this fact be clearly stated in the national standards?

(4) While the law is fairly explicit about the types of signs to be covered by the standards and about their geographic coverage, it states little about the other necessary terms of the agreements. Upon careful analysis, is there any real question but that these agreements may legally contain provisions for the recovery of the Federal bonus payments, should the State at some future date decide to change its policies, and to abandon billboard regulations consistent with the national standards?

(5) I would like information on two additional matters which do not relate to the national standards but about which I have received repeated inquiries. In view of the remarks of President Eisenhower in signing the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958, to the effect that present billboard control provisions have certain shortcomings, does the administration contemplate asking for corrective amendatory legislation at the beginning of the next session of Congress? And what information can you give me about the nature of State legislation which may have been adopted or which may have been drafted for introduction in coming State legislative sessions?

Finally, let me express my approval of your statement that you intend to limit the size of permissible signs to something in the neighborhood of 50 or 60 square feet, rather than to permit the common 24-sheet billboards.

I shall look forward to having the answers to the questions I have asked as early as may be at all possible for you or your associates to provide them.

With good wishes,

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D. C., August 12, 1958.

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: This is in reply to your letter of August 12, 1958, raising certain questions with regard to section 12 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958.

(1) The answer to this question is: No, an area regulated as you have described may be included by the State within the mileage which may be covered by its statewide agreement with the Department of Commerce. It could not be excluded from the application

of the national standards unless the State applied for the exclusion.

(2) It is our present feeling that if the State imposes more stringent regulations or even complete prohibition of billboards along the interstate highways, that State would qualify for the Federal assistance provided under the new law. However, we do not feel that the statute requires or even authorizes us to spell this fact out in the standards to be promulgated by the Secretary of Commerce. Accordingly, it is not our present plan to include anything in the standards on this subject.

(3) We are considering the insertion of the standards of something along the line you mention. This was discussed at the committee meeting this morning.

(4) We do not think that the law is specific on this subject. We are giving the matter careful study but have not reached any final decision yet as to exactly what the rights of the Federal Government would be under these circumstances. It does not seem to us that this subject is one that should properly be covered in the standards.

(5) The administration has not yet decided what, if any, corrective amendatory legislation should be requested at the beginning of the next session of Congress.

I really do not have much information to give you on the subject of State legislation. We believe that preparation of this legislation is largely dependent upon the promulgation of the national standards.

I appreciate very much your remarks concerning the work of the Department on this very difficult subject.

Sincerely yours,

SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary of Commerce.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D. C., August 18, 1958.

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: In accordance with the commitment I made during my appearance before the Senate Subcommittee on Public Roads on August 13, I enclose copy of national standards for the regulation of outdoor advertising signs, displays, and devices adjacent to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways.

These proposed standards will be filed with the Federal Register on Monday, August 25. The procedure after publication in the Register involves a waiting period of 30 days during which interested parties will have an opportunity in writing to make known their views to the Secretary of Commerce.

If you have any comments either prior to filing with the Register or during the 30-day waiting period after publication, I should be very happy to have them and shall, of course, accord them every possible consideration consistent with the statutory responsibility imposed upon the Secretary of Commerce to set the standards.

Sincerely yours,

SINCLAIR WEEKS.

[From the U. S. News & World Report of August 22, 1958]

LITTLE BILLBOARDS FOR BIG HIGHWAYS—HERE'S THE PLAN

New Federal highways will not become "billboard alleys" if regulations by the Commerce Department are followed.

Ads will be restricted as to location, size, and number.

The restrictions apply to new sections of the Interstate Highway System.

States don't have to enforce the new rules. But they are offered a bonus if they do.

Billboards along thousands of miles of new highways across the country will be restricted by official rules soon to be issued by the Government. It is possible now to tell you what those rules will be.

The idea is to permit enough advertising to serve the motorist's convenience, but to avoid making the new highways "billboard alleys." States that comply with the regulations will be offered bonuses in Federal money toward the cost of building the interstate highways.

On a road where the rules are in effect, most of the advertising signs will be confined to spots called informational sites or rest stops. In each of these places, which will be within 12 miles of the next city or town, there will be one or more large panels, 13 by 25 feet, for advertising signs. On each panel there will be room for about 2 dozen signs, measuring about 3 by 4 feet, for the ads of local business such as motels, hotels, restaurants, and filling stations.

That is to be the rule for advertisers in cities and towns. Different rules will apply in areas where there are not enough advertisers to justify an "informational site." There, places of business within 12 miles of the highway will be permitted to put up signs adjacent to the right-of-way, but under these limitations:

No billboard may be placed within a scenic area or closer than 2 miles to an interchange—a connection with another highway or a town.

In a stretch between 2 miles and 5 miles from an interchange as many as 6 signs may be put up.

Farther than 5 miles from an interchange signs must be at least a mile apart.

All these signs will be much smaller than the standard highway billboard.

Then there will be general rules, applicable to all signs:

No flashing lights will be permitted.

No brand name will be allowed on a sign unless it is part of the name of the dealer's business. One exception: A filling station will be permitted to show its brand of gasoline so the motorist will know whether he can use his credit card.

There will be some important exemptions from the rules:

No restrictions on billboards will apply in sections of the interstate highways that follow the old, established rights-of-way where billboards previously have been permitted.

The rules will not cover portions of interstate roads that are within the corporate limits of cities and towns or areas adjacent to the highway that have been zoned for industrial or commercial use.

Nor will there be restrictions on signs advertising historical sites operated by nonprofit organizations.

Owners of property adjacent to interstate highways will be permitted to put up for sale or for lease signs.

Also, the regulations will apply only to roads in the Interstate Highway System. Along these highways the restrictions apply to adjacent land for a distance of 660 feet beyond the edge of the right-of-way on either side.

This, in general terms, is what the new rules, as now drafted by the Commerce Department, will provide. Changes in the completed draft, if any, probably will be minor. In the next few days the proposed regulations will be published in the Federal Register. After that, interested persons will have 30 days to offer proposed changes before the rules become final.

By complying with the billboard regulations the States will be entitled to an extra one-half of 1 percent in the Federal contribution toward the cost of new interstate highways. In time it is expected that the rules will be in force along vast stretches of the 41,000 miles of interstate roads.

[From the Washington Daily News of August 22, 1958]

TOUGH BILLBOARD RULES SET

(By Lowell Bridwell)

Fairly tough standards to control outdoor advertising along the Nation's 41,000-mile Interstate Highway System will be published next week.

Commerce Secretary Sinclair Weeks will allow 30 days for suggestions and comments. Soon afterward the standards will be adopted officially and the antibillboard program will be in business.

UP TO STATES

States can accept or reject the Federal standards. If they accept, they get a bonus of one-half of 1 percent of what it costs to build the interstate roads in their States. To most States, that's a tidy sum.

The standards call for construction of informational sites—little roadside parks built away from the main-traveled roadway. Motorists could get to these sign parks by access roads.

If there is a wide gap between informational sites, billboards can be erected along the road, but they must be within 12 miles of the business doing the advertising. They can't be closer to an interchange than 2 miles.

SIX SIGNS ONLY

There can't be more than 6 signs in the section 2 to 5 miles from an interchange, and there can't be more than an average of a sign a mile for the next 7 miles. No signs are permitted farther than 12 miles from an interchange.

Billboards erected outside informational sites can't be higher than 10 feet and no bigger than 60 square feet.

Neither moving parts nor flashing lights will be permitted on any billboards. Brand names can't be advertised unless they are part of the names of the outfits doing business, or unless they are of specific interest to the traveling public.

The signs erected within the informational sites can be only 12 square feet in size, and the whole collection of signs on any one billboard must be limited to 1 big sign 13 by 25 feet. They must be kept clean and in good repair.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
August 21, 1958.

Hon. SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary of Commerce,
Department of Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Thank you for your letter of August 18, transmitting the draft of national standards of billboard regulation to members of the Committee on Public Works for study. We very much appreciate this opportunity to submit comments on the proposed standards prior to their publication in the Federal Register next Monday.

As sponsors for the final version of the amendment in the Senate Committee on Public Works which became section 122 of the law, we want to congratulate the draftsmen on your staff on the conscientious and careful manner in which they have dealt with the many difficult problems inherent in the law. No doubt, the proposed draft will attract suggestions for additions or changes, many of them mutually contradictory. We find ourselves in general agreement with most of the decisions which have been reached by you in preparing these standards, especially with the functional approach of providing "informational sites." Today, we are submitting only 2 suggestions with respect to 1 phase of the proposed standards. We are continuing to study other questions, about which we may comment later, before the standards become final.

(1) With respect to class 4 signs "in the specific interest of the traveling public" as defined on page 7 of your draft, we suggest that "outdoor sports, camping and recreational facilities" might be added as permissible information after "lodging" and "eating."

(2) Further, with respect to the same paragraph, we believe that the second sentence needs to express more strongly and

precisely the distinction between brand or trade-name "advertising" which is not contemplated within the terms of class 4, and the information about access to services and products, including trade-name products, which class 4 does contemplate as being in the specific interest of travelers.

As background to this point, it is helpful to recall the policy considerations which brought this standard of class 4 into law.

The overall policy premise of the legislation is, of course, to keep to a minimum, signs whose major justification lies not in their value to the highway user, but in their commercial advertising value to the user of the sign. It is plain that the four classes of permissible signs are stated as carefully circumscribed exceptions from a general rule. Under this major premise, brand name and trademark product advertising as such was not to be permitted by the national standards. Brand names and marks would be permissible only to the extent that the availability of the identified product might be a significant part of the information which might be in the specific interest of highway users.

In the light of this policy background, it is obviously important that the standard for class 4 signs not open the back door to national brand-name advertising campaigns under the guise of giving the traveler information about a local outlet for the product or service in question. The present draft seems to us to contain that danger. It could be interpreted to permit, for instance, a standard national signboard prominently featuring the name of a brand of gasoline, tires, or other automotive products, with relatively little space given on the sign for a list of places within a 30-mile radius where the product may be obtained—whether or not information about the place or places so listed can impress themselves on the traveler's consciousness. The same brand-name sign could, apparently, be repeated again within a relatively short distance with a different list of outlets.

The final sentences of your draft section 5, on pages 7 and 8, need to be tightened so as to assure that class 4 signs will, in fact, be information rather than advertising, as those words are used in the statute. While the brand or trade name of a product—e. g., of the make of car the traveler is driving—may be one item of significant information for a driver looking for service, the name and location of the place offering that service is surely of at least equal significance. The standards should assure that class 4 signs give this equal significance to the information about the place in question as they do to identifying the product or service offered there.

While we prefer to leave to your expert draftsmen the phrasing of this requirement, 1 possible suggestion indicating our ideas would be to strike the last 2 words on page 7 and thereafter, and to substitute therefor "* * * unless, and only to the extent that, it may appear as one item of information contained in a sign for such a place, in order to identify or characterize the place itself or to identify the vehicle service, parts, accessories, fuels, oils, or lubricants offered at such a place."

As additional questions come to our attention concerning the proposed standards after their publication in the Federal Register, we shall be pleased to take advantage of the opportunity to submit further comments during the following 30-day period. In the meantime, we appreciate your attention to the above suggestions.

Sincerely,

THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
United States Senator.
RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

CIV——1207

[From the Portland Oregonian of August 17, 1958]

BILLBOARD ALLEY SETBACK

The decisive victory of Senator ALBERT GORE in Tennessee against the formidable opposition of the traditionalist wing of the Democratic Party was more than just a victory over racial intolerance. The Washington Post and Times Herald reports that Senator GORE's opponent, a three-time governor of the State, Prentice Cooper, had the support of the billboard industry to the tune of $300,000 worth of free roadside political advertising.

The billboard people, of course, were peeved because Senator GORE had led the fight to achieve reasonable regulation of outdoor advertising along the routes of the projected Interstate Highway System.

It is reasonable, therefore, to interpret Senator GORE's triumph as a victory, too, at least in part, for the idea that American motorists have a right to some esthetic return for the billions they will spend on the new freeways.

THE MALLORY CASE DECISION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, an editorial in the Washington Post entitled "Mallory Bill in Reverse," correctly states the proper view in this matter, a view which I strongly stated in my individual and minority views to the Mallory bill.

The editorial commented on the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, Mr. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, in his question, "Why should any bill be passed if there is no difference between reasonable delay and without unnecessary delay?"

The distinguished Senator from Kentucky joined me and a few other distinguished Senators trying to create a record on the floor of the Senate showing that the Senate version of the Mallory bill was entirely unnecessary and in fact may lead to further confusion.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial in the Washington Post be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MALLORY BILL IN REVERSE?

The Senate has put itself into the strange posture of legislating to save the Supreme Court from distortion of its opinions by the lower courts. The Senate Judiciary Committee's amended version of the Mallory bill was broadly commended by its sponsors as a means of upholding the Supreme Court's decision in the Mallory case last year. In the House the bill had been passed as a means of reversing the Court's Mallory ruling.

The Court had set Mallory free from a rape conviction because the police had detained him to extract a confession instead of arraigning him "without unnecessary delay," as commanded by the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. The House said in its bill that hereafter a confession otherwise valid shall not be thrown out simply because of delay in arraigning the accused. By a vote of 41 to 39 the Senate changed this to require that a confession otherwise valid shall not be held inadmissible because of "reasonable" delay in the arraignment—contending that this is what the Supreme Court meant in its Mallory ruling.

Senator COOPER asked, with unassailable logic, why, in that event, should any bill be passed? Sponsors of the measure replied that there is much confusion among lower Federal courts as to what the Mallory ruling means and a widespread feeling that "something should be done." This is far from being convincing. The Supreme Court has a way of straightening out lower courts which do not faithfully interpret its decisions, and even if it fails to do so promptly, Congress can hardly expect to reduce the confusion by a vague legislative declaration setting forth what it thinks the Supreme Court intended.

In these circumstances it is not surprising that the Senate and House conferees seem to be hopelessly deadlocked on the bill. We hope the Senate will stand fast against the House version to the last ditch. If this means failure of both bills, so much the better. The courts will then be free to iron out the problem, preferably through a new study of rule 5 (a) by a Supreme Court advisory committee.

TURTLE MOUNTAIN, N. DAK., CHOKECHERRY INDUSTRY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article published in the Minot Daily News, Minot, N. Dak., of August 16, 1958, relating to Turtle Mountain chokecherries industry be printed in the RECORD. This new industry will be of benefit to the Indians and non-Indians of that area according to Hon. John Hart, North Dakota Indians Affairs Commissioner, and Hon. Pat Gourneau, chairman of the Council of the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation in North Dakota.

Mr. President, such new industries are consistent with the plan suggested by my bill S. 809, which is pending before the Senate. I will reintroduce this bill next year with the hope that the Indian Affairs Subcommittee will favorably report it to the Senate. Twenty distinguished Senators joined me on this important bill that will bring jobs to the Indians on Indian reservations through new industries being located in those areas. The entire community will be aided by the new influx of money through the new jobs created.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRYOUT FOR NEW INDUSTRY

(By Merrill Schalow)

A harvest of Turtle Mountain chokecherries is well advanced in the Dunseith and Belcourt areas, the first step in an experiment of Paul-Mark, Inc., of Fargo to develop a new North Dakota industry.

Should the experiment prove successful, it will mean a new source of income for people living in the Turtle Mountains.

Eli Dobervich, who heads the Fargo firm, believes he can find a market for chokecherry products if they can be produced on a competitive scale, and this particular fruit can be found in abundance in the Turtle Mountains each summer.

The hope of the company is to produce chokecherry preserves cheaply enough so that they can be placed side by side with other fruit preserves on the grocer's shelf at a price which will appeal to the consumer.

It is necessary to experiment with a batch of berries in order to find out if this is possible, and if present plans are carried out, the company will need an experimental batch of 2,000 gallons. If the juice is high enough, additional purchases will probably run as high as 10,000 gallons.

Success of the experiment can very well turn out to be a big item in the future economy of the region, Patrick Gourneau, chairman of the Turtle Mountain advisory committee, said.

Should the experimental batch come through with flying colors, there is every reason to believe that a steady market for the berries in the future is assured, Gourneau stated.

Two chokecherry receiving stations have been established in the area, one in Belcourt, the other in Dunseith. The company is paying 25 cents a gallon for the batch of experimental berries. If the venture is a success, there will very likely be an increase in the price next year, Gourneau said.

To insure the maximum return of juice per gallon to the company, the berries must be picked at the proper stage of ripeness. Dobervich was in the area to instruct the people when they should start picking.

Berries must also be picked clean and taken to market in the shortest possible time, and when it is necessary to hold berries over a day, they must be stored in a cool place.

To accomodate pickers, the receiving stations have designated 3 days of each week as purchasing days, and 4-gallon capacity picking containers are furnished free by the company and are available at the receiving stations.

People without land wishing to pick berries should get permission of the landowner before commencing the chore, Gourneau advised.

That the Turtle Mountain region is "loaded" with the fruit was proved last weekend when the Julius Peltier family of Dunseith picked 24 cans or 96 gallons.

In summing up the idea behind the venture, Gourneau said, "The berries bought here will be transported to Fargo. There they will be put through a pitting machine and the juice extracted. The juice in turn will be converted into jams and jellies and placed on the market. The company is confident that a waiting market can be found. The whole question hinges on the amount of juice a gallon of berries will produce. If results are satisfactory, we are in business every summer. If results are unsatisfactory, we can still chalk up the venture as a noble experiment.

"Again, if results are satisfactory, we can look forward to a bright future for native fruit. We have other fruit besides chokecherries. Experiments are also planned this year for cranberries and plums. If everything turns out well and we come to realize that native fruit is a resource worth preserving, we will surely lose the urge to set fires each spring which are so destructive not only to native wild fruit, but to wildlife as well."

FEDERAL SCHOLARSHIP AND LOAN BILL

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, because the Senate has today approved the conference report on the Federal scholarship and loan bill, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a thoughtful article by A. Robert Smith in the Pendleton East-Oregonian of August 15, 1958, which describes some of the benefits that will accrue to educational institutions in the State of Oregon under this legislation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME FEDERAL AID FOR EDUCATION IS ASSURED

(By A. Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—Oregon's State and private institutions of higher learning would be eligible for about $500,000 to $700,000 annually in Federal funds to offer students in the form of loans, under legislation which passed the House last week and is pending in the Senate, Representative EDITH GREEN, Democrat, of Oregon, said she was informed.

The House and Senate bills are similar in most respects, except that the House ruled out giving scholarships to needy students and put the scholarship funds into the bill's student loan provisions.

Oregon colleges and universities would administer the loan funds pretty much as they see fit, determining who qualifies, as long as the students are needy and do satisfactory work. Each institution would be able to receive no more than $250,000 each year from the Government for loans. The institution itself would be required to provide matching funds so that the total loan fund would contain no more than 75 percent Federal funds, no less than 25 percent local funds.

The student who borrows money from the loan fund could obtain no more than $1,000 each year, no more than $5,000 for all his years in school. He would be required to repay the loan over a period of 11 years following graduation. While in school he would pay interest on the loan at 2 percent but need not pay any principle during that period. Following graduation, there would be a year of grace. Then for the next 10 years, the rate of interest would be 4 percent.

Each State's allotment under the amount authorized by the bill would be determined by the United States Office of Education by comparing the number of students enrolled in institutions of higher learning in the State compared to the number enrolled nationally.

The Senate version contains $40 million for this program the first year, which would give Oregon about $489,000 that year. The House, by lumping scholarship funds into the loan program, increased this first year figure to $47.5 million.

Then for the next 3 years, the Senate version calls for $60 million annually for loans. Oregon's share each year would be about $600,000 of that amount. But the House has increased the second-year figure to $75 million, of which Oregon would get close to $700,000, the Office of Education told Congresswoman GREEN.

The Senate is expected to pass the bill and retain the scholarship grants for needy students, which will throw the bill into a conference for some sort of compromise. The House knocked the scholarship authorization out by a standing vote, 109 to 78, on a motion by Representative WALTER JUDD, Republican, of Minnesota.

The Senate bill provides for $17.5 million in scholarships annually for 4 years. Needy students could obtain up to $500 annually in these grants, and the institution the student is attending could add up to $500 annually in addition to each student's scholarship.

The House-passed bill also contains authorization for 1,000 fellowships of $2,000 each to train college teachers; $60 million in grants to States for scientific teaching equipment, of which Oregon would be eligible for $619,000 a year; $15 million in grants to improve testing and guidance programs; $6 million for teacher-training institutes in the guidance field, among other things.

Mrs. GREEN, who was on the House Education Committee that drafted the bill, opposed deletion of the scholarship program but felt the resulting measure is a very good bill. It represented real progress, because this is the first time the House has ever passed a general education bill.

She said she thought the scholarship program was important because it would be a Congressional indication of the value we place on educational achievement. The scholarship would serve as sort of a prize. It would get students to work just a little bit harder. The scholarship is recognition of scholastic achievement. A loan is just recognition of financial need.

Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, Democrat, of Oregon, took the other position—that loans were more desirable than scholarships.

"I don't regard the prize aspect as very strong," said PORTER. "The student ought to be glad to get a loan. It's an investment in his future. After getting a degree, he will probably have a better job and be able to repay it. And this will mean that the money can then be used by someone else. It will also save the Government a lot of money."

When the Federal aid to education bill comes up in the Senate, an attempt may be made to add an amendment providing for a public school construction program. But Mrs. GREEN said, regretfully, that such a proposal would not gain House approval at this time, hence could not become law.

The Eisenhower administration has made no request for a school construction program this year. The administration has asked for a scholarship program, but of less than half the proportions provided by the Senate bill.

While details remain to be worked out between the two versions emerging from either Chamber, it appears almost certain that Federal aid will this year be launched for the benefit of college students and teachers, if not for teachers and buildings in the elementary and secondary school field of education.

INCREASE IN DEBT LIMIT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate much longer, but there seems to be some misapprehension about the reason for the deficit of $15 billion in fiscal 1958–59, and the second request by the administration for an increase in the debt limit.

If the hearings before the Committee on Finance are read, it will be found that I questioned the Secretary of the Treasury very closely on the reason for the deficit. These are the facts. The deficit of approximately $3 billion for 1957–58 is due entirely to the failure of revenues to come up to expectations. There was a decline of $3 billion in revenue below the amount which was budgeted in January. The Secretary of the Treasury, upon being questioned, admitted that the fall in revenues was due to the recession. So the recession caused the deficit of $3 billion for the current year.

Five billion dollars of the projected deficit of $12 billion for the fiscal year 1958–59 is due to an increase in expenditures above the amount contemplated in the budget. But $7 billion of the projected deficit is due to the belief that revenues will fall below expectations; that the revenues will amount to $67 billion instead of $74 billion, as budgeted.

This means that of the deficit of $15 billion, $10 billion will be due to a fall in revenues, not to an increase in expenditures. The Secretary of the Treasury admitted that this fall in revenue was due to the recession. In other words, it is the recession which has primarily caused the deficit, which in turn has forced the Government to increase the debt limit.

I think that is very important to realize, because all the talk a few minutes ago was to the effect that it was an increase in expenditures which had caused the increase in the debt limit.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I think that what the Senator from Illinois has said about the loss of revenue being caused by the recession is true. However, is it not also true that some of the fiscal policies which have been followed by the Government have not been conducive to creating a strong economy?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I quite agree.

Mr. MORSE. In the reasons which I gave, I tried to point out the kind of wasteful policy which has been followed in connection with some of the foreign-aid programs, and the wasteful policy which has been followed in connection with some of the tax loopholes which have accrued to the benefit of some of the vested interests in this country, which have not taken the tax savings and plowed them back into industry at all, but have frozen them and have stopped working them. This, in turn, has had a bad effect on the economy, and has produced less revenue for the economy, and has thus created, in part, the deficit.

Therefore, those who have been fighting for wealth-creating projects and fighting for the abolition of certain types of wasteful military expenditures, have tried to make a fight to strengthen the producing features of our economy.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Oregon is correct.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

ADDITIONAL REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following additional reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

S. J. Res. 179. Joint resolution to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by the Dickinson Dam in the State of North Dakota as "Edward Arthur Patterson Lake" (Rept. No. 2494).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H. R. 13856. A bill making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2495).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

S. 4129. A bill to amend title 32 of the United States Code to permit the appointment of the Adjutant General of Puerto Rico as provided by the laws of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico (Rept. No. 2496).

ADDITIONAL BILLS INTRODUCED

The following additional bills were introduced:

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. FULBRIGHT):

S. 4323. A bill to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the renewal of urban communities, and for other purposes; read the first time by its title, and ordered to lie on the table.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 4324. A bill to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Winnemucca Colony, Humboldt County, Nev., and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes; read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER (for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. MORTON, and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 4325. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces commemorating the establishment of the Cumberland Gap National Historical Park; read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT TO INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES (for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS) submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of Rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 13856), an act making appropriations for sundry executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely, at the end of the bill, add the following new section:

"SEC. —. The Congress hereby requests the President, from time to time during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, to review the expenditures programed by the executive branch for such fiscal year and to issue such directives to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and other officials in the executive branch of the Government as may be necessary to achieve the maximum reduction in the expenditures of the executive branch during such fiscal year consistent with the objectives of maintaining essential Government services, providing adequately for the common defense, and fostering a healthy national economy; all with a view toward achieving an aggregate, of at least 2 percent on defense appropriations and at least 4 percent on other appropriations but not more than 10 percent on any one item, reduction in the expenditures programed by the executive branch as of July 1, 1958, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to authorize executive action to decrease expenditures for interest on the public debt, veterans compensation, or pensions, Federal, and State cooperative benefit programs and expenditures from trust funds. A report of action taken under this chapter shall be contained in the 1960 budget."

Mr. BRIDGES (for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS) also submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 13856, making appropriations for sundry executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

APPOINTMENTS TO SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO PRESERVE HISTORIC SENATE DOCUMENTS, ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). The Chair has been requested by the Vice President to announce the appointment by him, pursuant to Senate Resolution 318 of this Congress, of the following Senators to the special committee to study the feasibility and desirability of preserving selected documents, records, and memorabilia of the United States Senate having historical significance or value:

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico.

Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, of Utah.

Senator FRANCIS CASE of South Dakota.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana.

Senator HERMAN E. TALMADGE, of Georgia.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, August 22, 1958, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 607) to provide retirement, clerical assistance, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Saturday, August 23, 1958, at 10 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 22, 1958:

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Byron H. Hanlon, United States Navy, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of vice admiral under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Rear Adm. George C. Towner, United States Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him to have the grade, rank, pay and allowances of vice admiral while so serving.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 22, 1958:

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

Raymond L. Rhodes, of New Jersey, to be comptroller of customs with headquarters at New York, N. Y.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Philip A. Hoghaug, of North Dakota, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 34, with headquarters at Pembina, N. Dak.

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

To be representatives of the United States of America to the 10th session of the general conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization

Maxwell M. Rabb, of Massachusetts.
John W. Hanes, Jr., of Virginia.
Robert H. Hamlin, of Massachusetts.
George N. Shuster, of Connecticut.

To be alternate representatives of the United States of America to the 10th session of the general conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization

Anna L. Rose Hawkes, of Vermont.
Justus B. L. Lawrence, of New York.
William Albert Noyes, Jr., of New York.
John R. Richards, of Oregon.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Carlton G. Beall, of Maryland, to be United States marshal for the District of Columbia for a term of 4 years.

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Brig. Gen. Robert G. MacDonnell, United States Army (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), to be president and senior member of the California Debris Commission.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Leon P. Miller, of West Virginia, to be United States attorney for the Virgin Islands for a term of 4 years.

Howard W. Babcock, of Nevada, to be United States attorney for the district of Nevada for a term of 4 years.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Russel R. Bell, of West Virginia, to be United States marshal for the southern district of West Virginia for a term of 4 years.

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

Bernard C. Werner, Clarksville.
Vernard R. Kerlin, Lockesburg.

CALIFORNIA

Agnes C. Richmond, Beverly Hills.

GEORGIA

John C. Cagle, Jasper.
Wiley K. Lindler, Sylvester.

ILLINOIS

William M. Toland, Browning.
Roy Guy Yates, Flora.
William C. Newton, Golconda.
Paul K. Koontz, Loraine.
Eugene S. McKee, Monmouth.
Carl J. L. Wessel, Rock Island.
Albert J. Rule, Thornton.
Walter W. Dimmick, West Frankfort.

INDIANA

Theodore P. Cordes, Sr., Seymour.

KENTUCKY

D. Hess Vest, Walton.

LOUISIANA

Hugh D. Wagner, Cameron.
Marie L. Haley, Luling.
John B. Richard, Scott.

MAINE

Stanley P. Dennett, Dixfield.

MARYLAND

John Landon Reeve, Monkton.

MASSACHUSETTS

Ephraim Martin, Boston.

MISSOURI

Louis Walter Meier, New Madrid.
Lawrence L. Poleski, St. Ann.

NORTH CAROLINA

Lexine G. McCarson, Balfour.
Earl W. Miller, Jr., Council.
Charles A. Brown, Efland.
Lala C. Shell, Elk Park.
Audrey H. Cashatt, Randleman.

PENNSYLVANIA

Clare F. Connell, Coraopolis.
Claude R. Coons, Covington.
Michael Richard O'Mahony, Mercer.

TENNESSEE

Keith L. Patterson, Friendsville.

TEXAS

Olen C. Thomas, Ralls.
William H. Summers, Trenton.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, AUGUST 22, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

I Kings 22: 43: *He turned not aside from doing that which was right in the eyes of the Lord.*

O Thou who art the source of all our blessings, we are pausing at this noon hour to turn our minds and hearts unto Thee in praise and petition.

May we now give ourselves in dedication and devotion to Thy holy will for this is the only return we can make for the many manifestations of Thy bountiful providence.

Grant that in these days of world crisis and confusion we may have the grace to pray even for our enemies who, in their blindness and brutality, are filling human life with so much fear and foreboding.

Show us how we may have a larger part in lifting men and nations into that higher spiritual unity where all antipathies and antagonisms are supplanted by friendship and fraternity.

Hear us in the name of the Captain of our salvation. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 3276. An act for the relief of Carl Ebert and his wife, Gertrude Ebert; and

S. 3818. An act for the relief of Vicenta Garcia y Puente.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3368) entitled "An act to amend section 1870 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the district courts to allow additional peremptory challenges in civil cases to multiple plaintiffs as well as multiple defendants."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6282) entitled "An act for the relief of the former shareholders and debenture noteholders of the Goshen Veneer Co., an Indiana corporation."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7710) entitled "An act to provide for the lump-sum payment of all accumulated and current accrued annual leave of deceased employees."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7785) entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of an additional judge for the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13450) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36 to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) entitled "Joint resolution providing for the construction by the Department of the Interior of demonstration plants for the production, from saline or brackish waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses."

LEGISLATIVE PROCEDURE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at any time during the remainder of the week it may be in order for the Speaker to declare recesses subject to the call of the Chair; to consider conference reports the same day reported, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXVIII; and that reports from the Committee on Rules may be considered at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 22 of rule XI.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not know that I would object to all features of the request made by the gentleman, but I do not know of any reason why unanimous consent should be given for the consideration of all conference reports on the same day on which they are reported. If the gentleman will exclude that, we might get somewhere.

Mr. ALBERT. Of course, it is the standard provision. We are making this request only to expedite the business of the House.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that, but it can be overly expedited, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. It has been agreed to by the minority leader.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1959

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 13856) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes (Report No. 2689), which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. VURSELL reserved all points of order on the bill.

FAIR AND WARMER NOW—BUT IN 500 GENERATIONS GLACIAL AGE?

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in an article entitled "Fair and Warmer" the auther suggests that if the climatic curves of the past are extrapolated into the future, there is a better than 50–50 chance that we are still in a warm interglacial stage heading toward another glacial stage perhaps 10,000 to 15,000 years from now; the winters are actually getting cooler again, and should continued to average colder until about 1965; despite minor colder cycles, the general warming up should continue for at least 200 or 300 years in most of the lowland regions of the Northern Hemisphere.

Thus, for the United States, it is predicted that the next centuries are going tropical. Then comes ice with a glacial coat in 500 to 700 generations which is in 10,000 to 15,000 years. Perhaps by then man will have mastered the elements to his convenience, and even the globe.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include the article Fair and Warmer as it appeared in the May 2, 1958, issue of the Princeton Alumni Weekly.

In order that man may live to usher in other ages the challenge to life that confronts the generations ahead would appear to make our wise use of the nuclear age imperative. Such is a conclusion that one can draw from the article that follows:

FAIR AND WARMER

(By Erling Dorf)

Are the winters actually getting colder? Is it true that we are really still in a warm spell of a glacial age? Is the present trend toward generally fair and warmer or cloudy and colder? The answers to questions such as these can perhaps best be approached by getting a proper perspective through an understanding of the long-range climatic changes of the geologic past. Then into these broader patterns we may be able to fit the present short-range trends.

Most of us are quite accustomed to changeable weather. Daily, monthly, and seasonal weather changes belong to the short-term cycles in earth history. We are less apt, however, to be aware of the longer term cycles which we refer to as climatic changes rather than weather changes. Last winter's abnormally cold weather over most of the country was, paradoxically, quite normal in the swing of longer term climatic cycles. We are living, in fact, and again paradoxically, in a short cold spell which is part of a longer warm episode, which in turn is part of a still longer colder period. And what's more, this longer cold period extends into the past for perhaps as much as a million years.

With respect to the geologic past one might well ask how it is possible to reconstruct climates of remote ages extending back many millions of years. In principle the methods are quite simple. Using the present as the key to the past, the geologist applies the knowledge that in the modern world the great majority of plants, as well as many land animals, are rather narrowly restricted to definite climatic zones. This is particularly true of plants, which are more sensitive to climatic conditions than land animals and cannot migrate southward or burrow underground during the unfavorable season. There are no palms or breadfruit trees in the parks of New York City, Chicago, or St. Louis simply because the climate is too cold, or more specifically, the winters in these cities are too cold for these plants. They are at home only in the tropics and the subtropics. By inference, when plants such as these are found as fossils, they are indicators of warmer climates in the past. For the best climatic indicators, we may rely on such forms as palms, figs, breadfruit, peppers, acacias, and laurels to indicate warm subtropical to tropical conditions. On the other hand, an assemblage of poplars, maples, oaks, elms, and sycamores is typical of temperate climates. Further, vegetation dominated by Canadian spruce, larch, alpine fir, and birch would be indicative of colder, subarctic conditions. Assemblages such as these are widely known in rocks originally formed as muds, silts, and volcanic ash deposits of ancient lake bottoms and stream valleys. In addition to such specific climatic indicators, geologists may use the overall aspect of an assemblage of fossil plants in an ancient deposit to reconstruct past conditions. This is an even safer method than using climatic indicators alone. Individual plant species may give false impressions because of their occasional tolerance to conditions outside of the normal range of the group to which they belong. The magnolias, for example, extend northward as far as southern New York and Massachusetts, considerably north of the normal tropical habitat of this family; also the well known persimmon ranges north of its normally tropical family as far as northern New Jersey and Connecticut. Such anomalous forms if used alone would obviously give a false impression of the climatic conditions. In basing conclusions on the total assemblage, however, such species are easily recognized as being out of place and therefore not climatically significant.

In the use of fossil plants as clues to ancient climates we also find it possible to judge on the basis of certain anatomical features which vary according to the conditions of growth. Large, rounded, smooth-margined leaves dominate the forests of tropical and subtropical climates, for example, whereas smaller, lobed or toothed leaves are more characteristic of temperate climates. Thick-skinned leaves are typical of colder climates, whereas thinskinned leaves are typical of warmer climates. Since these features can also be observed in fossil plants, they have often served as confirmation of the conclusions based on climatic indicators or total assemblages.

It is further possible to use the fossil remains of climatically-sensitive animals in the rocks to help determine ancient climates. Corals, for example, more especially reef corals, are typical only of the warm, clear seas of the tropics and the subtropics. The microscopic foraminifers, which live in the oceans by the millions, are also reliable indicators of temperature conditions below sea level. Of large animals such forms as alligators, manatees, and tapirs indicate warmer climates, whereas reindeer, musk oxen, and walruses are more characteristic of colder climates.

In recent years another quite independent method of recognizing ancient climatic changes has been based on the discovery that in marine seashells oxygen isotopes occur in a proportion which is controlled by the temperature of the sea water. Thus in ancient fossilized shells the proportion of oxygen–18 to oxygen–16 can give us a clear indication of the temperature of the waters in which the shellfish lived.

Even the rocks themselves may give reliable clues regarding the climatic conditions under which they were formed. Certain types of lowland gravels, for example, are easily recognized as glacial deposits resulting from the extensive ice sheets which develop during episodes of intensely cold climates. Such cold glacial ages are now known to have occurred at least 3 times during the last 700 million years of the earth's history. Rocks of reddish color, on the other hand, are usually derived from red soils which originate only under the warm, humid conditions of the tropics or subtropics. Furthermore, peat and coal deposits point to humid, subtropical to warm temperate conditions during the past, even in such unlikely regions as Antarctica and Spitsbergen.

MAGNOLIAS IN ALASKA

What are some of the major conclusions based upon the researches on ancient climates? In the first place it seems clear that our present world climate is rather unusual and is basically a cold, glacial climate. It is further apparent that during more than two-thirds of the last 500 million years the earth's climates have been considerably warmer and more uniform than they are today. The last episode of this warm, nonglacial climate is believed to have occurred in the so-called Eocene epoch, roughly 40 to 50 million years ago. In the rocks of this age we find the fossilized remains of subtropical types of plants, including palms, cycads, and magnolias as far north as southeastern Alaska, western Oregon, and northern Wyoming. Central Alaska supported typically temperate forests, including oaks, hickories, elms, maples, and beeches. South American and West Indian types of tropical plants flourished in the Gulf States as far north as Tennessee, and warm-water alligators ranged as far north as Wyoming. During the same epoch forests of tropical Indo-Malayan aspect extended as far north as southern England. At this time there was apparently no icecap on Greenland, which instead supported a vegetation much like the modern forests of New Jersey and Pennsylvania. Fossils of this age from Grennell Land, only 8° from the North Pole, include pines, birches, spruce, and hazel—clearly a cold temperate assemblage quite different from the treeless Arctic tundra of the region today. There is no evidence that the equatorial regions, on the other hand, were any warmer during the Eocene epoch than they are today.

During the successive geologic epochs following the Eocene the fossil evidence in the Northern Hemisphere indicates a slowly cooling climate which forced the tropical and subtropical forests southward, replacing them gradually by temperate forests. The end result of this long period of cooling was what is known as the glacial age, which

began about a million years ago. By this time it had become so cold that the summers of Greenland, Labrador, and central Canada were no longer warm enough to melt away the winter snows. This eventually led to the development of thick lowland ice sheets which slowly spread to areas as far south as our northern United States. At this time forests which included the northern spruce, larch, and fir were driven as far south as Louisiana, south-central Texas, and northern Florida. Arctic musk oxen are known to have ranged as far south as California, Texas, and Mississippi. Walruses extended southward as far as Georgia, over a thousand miles south of their present home waters. Subarctic shellfish occur as far south as the center of the Gulf of Mexico and southern California. There were apparently four such glacial episodes separated by warmer interglacial stages during which the climate, as judged by both fossil plants and animals, became at least as warm as the climate of today.

THE LITTLE ICE AGE

At the present time we appear still to be in such an interglacial stage, about two-thirds of the way toward another glacial stage. Since the melting away of the last ice sheet from the North American mainland, the climate has varied from warmer to colder and back again with the last protracted warm spell occurring between A. D. 1000 and 1200. At this time the climate was somewhat warmer than today, enabling the Norsemen to grow crops and raise cattle and sheep in southwestern Greenland. It is also known that at about this time productive vineyards were common in southern England. Beginning in about 1600, however, the climate began to turn much colder so that glaciers advanced and even destroyed some of the villages in the valleys of the Alps. This cold episode, called the little ice age, lasted from about 1650 to about 1850, since which time there has been a generally warming trend.

What can be said of our present climatic trend? The records show that since 1900 the annual mean temperature of the entire United States has risen about 2½° F. Philadelphia's temperature has risen about 3° F. since 1880, and New Haven's about 2½° F. since 1870. Records from St, Louis, Kansas City, and Omaha indicate that the Middle West has also experienced a warming trend during the past 50 to 80 years. Aside from the land areas it is apparent that the oceanic realms have also been getting warmer, especially the Atlantic and the Arctic. In the Arctic regions, in fact, both the land and sea areas have been warming up more than the temperate areas. In Spitsbergen, for example, winter temperatures have moved up about 16° F. since 1910; this increase has changed the period of ice-free ports from roughly 3 months in 1910 to about 7 months in 1950.

Has this warming trend been uniform and worldwide? Here the answer is no. In most of the United States there seem to have been rather regular cyclic fluctuations from warmer to colder spells, each lasting a decade or so. At the present time we are in a decade somewhat colder than the last one which ended in 1955. The records also show that certain regions of the world have actually experienced a cooling trend during the time that the rest of the world was warming up. These regions include the west coast regions of North America and the Hudson Bay area.

The effects of the generally warming climate of the past century have been widespread and varied. Throughout the colder parts of the world, the great majority of existing glaciers and icecaps have been melting away at an increasingly rapid rate, especially since the midtwenties. As a consequence the rate of sea level rise has also been increasing, amounting to as much as a 6-inch rise during the last 25 years along the Atlantic coast of America. On land the tree line has slowly moved upward into the mountain uplands and poleward into the Arctic tundra, and the crop line in the Canadian prairies has moved northward between 50 and 100 miles as the result of the addition of as much as 10 days to the growing season. The warmer summers have even begun to kill off the birch trees over large areas in northern New England. Many kinds of birds, including the cardinal, the turkey vulture, and the blue-winged warbler, have extended their normal ranges farther northward in our Northern States. Even the warmth-loving opossum has been slowly moving farther north. Should the warming trend continue, there seems little doubt that both the physical and economic welfare of large parts of the world's population will be affected.

There is, of course, no sure way of forecasting whether or not the warming up will continue, despite the words of Byron that "The best prophet of the future is the past." Unfortunately predictions based on past performance of either weather or climate are notoriously even less reliable than predicting the future actions of people, race horses, or Princeton football teams. One can express an opinion on the probabilities, however, if the climatic curves are extrapolated into the future. These suggest to me that there is a better than 50–50 chance that: we are still in a warm interglacial stage heading toward another glacial stage perhaps ten to fifteen thousand years from now; the winters are actually getting colder again, and should continue to average colder until about 1965; despite minor colder cycles, the general warming up should continue for at least 200 or 300 years in most of the lowland regions of the Northern Hemisphere.

ADDITIONAL JUDGE, JUVENILE COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 7785) to provide for the appointment of an additional judge for the juvenile court of the District of Columbia:

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2690)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7785) to provide for the appointment of an additional judge for the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5).

THOS. G. ABERNETHY,
JOHN DOWDY,
JOS. G. O'HARA,
JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr.,
Managers on the Part of the House.
JOSEPH S. CLARK,
ALAN BIBLE,
J. K. JAVITS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7785) to provide for the appointment of an additional judge for the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House bill provided for the appointment of an additional judge for the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, and permitted the court to appoint its clerk and deputy clerk who would serve at the pleasure of the court.

The Senate amendments dealt with the residence requirements for the additional judge, the appointment of the court clerk and deputy clerk, and a requirement of quarterly reporting in the operation of the court.

The Senate recedes from its amendments.

THOS. G. ABERNETHY,
JOHN DOWDY,
JOS. G. O'HARA,
JOHN J. ALLEN, Jr.,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, the close of the session is always regarded with mixed emotions. This is, however, I think an unusual and I would say a most pleasant opportunity that I have because today marks the birthday of my good friend and colleague from Indiana, CHARLIE HALLECK. The Speaker has graciously permitted us to take this brief time in which to congratulate CHARLIE not only on his birthday but on his many years of fine service in this body.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. I want to join the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] in congratulating CHARLIE HALLECK on his birthday. He has been one of our outstanding legislators, he has made a great record of accomplishments and we all wish him health and success.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I, too, want to join with other Members in congratulating CHARLIE HALLECK on his birthday. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] is a warm and close friend of mine, a friendship developed over the years since 1935 when we both came to the House of Representatives. As Jack Benny says, we all get to be 39, but regardless of our age, age it seems to me is largely a matter of how we are thinking and the interest we take in what we are doing. With the blessing of the good Lord through good health, which CHARLIE enjoys, I know he will, in the years ahead, continue to do the splendid work he is so capable of performing.

He has been a party stalwart and has contributed a great deal to our deliberations.

I hope we shortly adjourn so he will have the opportunity to catch some of the uncaught fish which he so loves to do.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. It is a pleasure to join in these friendly words of congratulation to our colleague from Indiana. We Hoosiers are proud of CHARLIE HALLECK and the record he has made. During the years I have been privileged to serve in the Congress CHARLIE has always been most helpful and cooperative. He has shown the ability to grasp quickly and accurately the content of legislative proposals. We certainly wish him many, many more years of public service.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRAY. I think this is a fine precedent that we are setting here. Usually we do not say anything nice about a person here in Congress, that is, in the way of eulogies, until he is either retiring or dead. In this case CHARLIE HALLECK is neither retiring nor is he dead. In fact, we look forward to many more years of usefulness for CHARLIE here in this body.

I believe one reason we of the Indiana delegation have gotten on as well as we have and have been as friendly to each other as we have has been because of the fine leadership of CHARLIE HALLECK. I have known him since we were at the University of Indiana some years ago. I do not believe any person on either side of the aisle is a finer legislator, or more honest, conscientious, and capable in regard to those things in which he believes than CHARLIE HALLECK.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I want to join wholeheartedly in this tribute to CHARLIE HALLECK. I know of no Member of this body more deserving of these kudos than the distinguished gentleman from Indiana.

Through thick and thin, of course, CHARLIE HALLECK has always stood out as a beaconlight, a leader, a planner, and a parliamentarian in the Republican cause. But his unquestioned party loyalty has never blinded him to the needs of the Nation and the welfare of all the American people. He has performed ably and well in the cause of a strong, safe, secure, and peaceful America.

I look forward to many more years of service with CHARLIE. I hope to be here to celebrate his 80th birthday, in fact, and feel sure—from the looks of things now—that he will be here with us on that occasion.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. In behalf of the Republican Conference of the House of Representatives, I want to join in the tributes being paid to our very good friend CHARLIE HALLECK. We congratulate him on his birthday and wish him the best of everything in the years that lie ahead.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I desire to join the gentleman from Indiana in paying tribute to an outstanding Hoosier and one of the great Members of this House. I know I speak the sentiments of every Member of the Congress on this side of the aisle as well as on the Republican side when I say that we all wish him many happy returns of the day and long years of the distinguished type of service he has given this body and the country for so many years in the past. CHARLIE HALLECK is one of the most able and devoted men in public life today. An outstanding debater, a skillful legislator and great former majority leader, he is truly a distinguished and valuable Member of this House.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I want to be permitted to take this opportunity to join the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] and friends on the other side of the aisle in paying due tribute to a distinguished American, a fine gentleman and one whom I greatly admire for his real ability and leadership, Mr. HALLECK. I do hope he enjoys many more happy birthdays, and for years continues his distinguished service in the Congress.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to say a few words about our very distinguished and lovable friend, CHARLIE HALLECK. Through the years we have all learned to love and admire CHARLIE. As a matter of fact, CHARLIE is pretty flexible at times with us over here. If we want a little help from the other side, we can always go to CHARLIE and CHARLIE usually responds and vice versa. Seriously, Mr. Speaker, CHARLIE is greatly admired and respected on both sides of the aisle. We wish nothing but the best for him and many, many more years of happiness.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in paying deserving and appropriate tribute to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] I think the expressions of regard and friendship of the Members of the House here today are an indication of the respect and appreciation for him as a man and as a colleague and as a public servant.

I am glad to join with the Indiana delegation and others today in wishing him many, many more years of valuable service in this body in the interest of the American people.

He is not only a distinguished American and a valuable and effective public servant, but a friend with a warm heart, accommodating, humble, and always willing to assist a colleague in any possible way.

I am glad to count him as my personal friend and, CHARLIE, I wish you many returns of this day and good hunting in Stuttgart, this fall.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the rest of my colleagues in paying tribute to one of our distinguished Members, the gentleman from Indiana, CHARLIE HALLECK. Through the years that I have served in this body, CHARLIE has been a great help to me. He was one of the first men when I come here to give me advice and assistance. I want to join with the others in saying he is a great American, a great legislator, and he is certainly a great asset to this legislative body. I wish CHARLIE and his delightful family many more years of happiness together with many more years of service to our great country.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield ?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in behalf of the distaff side of the House, I am happy to join with the Indiana delegation on this somewhat unusual occasion. We do not do this very often and I am particularly happy that it is for CHARLIE HALLECK that we are making this splendid exception. We, women, respect him. We honor him. We know what a hard worker he is, Mr. Speaker. As an ordinary Member of the House, I, too, want to join with all the rest of you wishing him many, many years more of the constructive, fine, and loyal work that he has done with such integrity and such honor.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying that a man is usually well thought of everywhere except in his own community. This is one saying that does not apply to my good friend, CHARLIE HALLECK. I know of no man in political life in Indiana who is better loved today than CHARLIE HALLECK. It was a pleasure a few years ago to speak in one of his local communities for his reelection. There I saw the outpouring of admiration there is in his District for his fine, outstanding qualities as a person and as a leader.

CHARLIE is one who through the years has not lost the zest for new approaches to the problems of America and the world. This constant youthfulness is one of his outstanding characteristics. CHARLIE will never see 40 again, but you would never know it from talking to him.

I join with all of my colleagues in the House in wishing him not only a happy birthday today, but also to extend my best wishes for many more happy birthdays with us here in the House.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I have probably known CHARLIE HALLECK, longer than anyone in this body and while I have never agreed with him politically, I recognize him as a very able legislator and a good friend. I want to wish him many happy returns on his birthday.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in this tribute to CHARLIE HALLECK. I was one of those who was fortunate enough to go to his District and make a speech for him during his last campaign. There in his District, in walking with and talking to his constituents, I found that he is loved by them as a great legislator, as a man of integrity and above all as a good family man, and you could see the warmth of the feeling and the high esteem in which CHARLIE HALLECK's constituents hold him. Happy birthday.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to say anything about CHARLIE HALLECK. If there were any danger of losing him, I would be quite voluble, but knowing that CHARLIE like the rest of the poor is going to be with us always and agreeing with everyone who has spoken here today that he is absolutely indispensable, I will not consume any further time on CHARLIE except to say that it has been a great pleasure and privilege to work with him here all these years, under his domination, because he has dominated not only that side of the House but he has dominated this side of the House as well.

But, Mr. Speaker, I do want to express my deep personal regret at the retirement of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE]. I do not think we have had a finer man or more efficient legislator than Mr. LECOMPTE, since I have been here and I am sorry indeed that he is leaving us.

He is my near neighbor, he in southern Iowa and I in northern Missouri. There is only a State line between us, and he and I do not recognize even that faint line of demarcation. It has been a pleasure to work with him. He is a good neighbor, personally and officially, and I feel that we suffer an irreparable loss in his retirement from the House.

I wish him the vacation to which he is so richly entitled; and I join with his other colleagues in the House in wishing him Godspeed.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I join very heartily in this tribute to my good friend from Indiana, with whom I have served in the House for over 20 years. I have voted with him in support of much legislation in the House, and I have opposed him in many instances. No one can be associated with CHARLEY HALLECK, whether for him or against him, over a long period without coming to have a deep respect for his ability, his integrity, and his fearless support of those principles in which he believes.

I am proud to call him my good personal friend and congratulate him on his birthday.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 legislative days in which to extend their remarks regarding our colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I promised CHARLIE I would not tell how old he is. I will only say that he is a little older than I.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, it gives me real pleasure to join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in expressing congratulations and best wishes to our friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] on this important day in his public life. It has been my good luck to know CHARLIE well, and I value his friendship highly. There is no tougher legislative fighter for a cause to which he is committed than the gentleman from Indiana, but he fights fair, and I honor him both for his fighting qualities and his fairness.

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure and a privilege to join in paying tribute to one of America's great citizens—CHARLIE HALLECK, of Indiana. For nearly a quarter of a century in this body, CHARLIE HALLECK has fought hard and effectively for America and for the principles of Government which make our country unique in the world.

CHARLIE, a happy birthday to you today, along with my good wishes, not only for many, many more such days, but for many, many more years of effective, honorable service to our country.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with my colleagues in extending congratulations to our distinguished friend, CHARLIE HALLECK, on his birthday. We all admire, esteem, and respect the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. I was privileged to serve with him for several years as a member of the House Small Business Committee. Some years ago I was privileged to visit his District—the Wabash District—with members of a subcommittee of the House, and while there I learned at firsthand of the esteem and effection that the people of his constituency hold for him. So, Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish for Congressman HALLECK a very happy birthday and many more years of useful service.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join the friends of CHARLIE HALLECK on congratulating him on another birthday. It has been a great pleasure to serve in the House of Representatives with Mr. HALLECK throughout many years. I have found him cooperative, intelligent, and one who is devoted to the service of his country. His fine personality and his friendly ways have endeared him to every Member of the House. I wish for him many, many years of happy, useful life.

Mr. NIMTZ. Mr. Speaker, as the junior and youngest member of the Indiana delegation, I join the fellow members of the delegation and my colleagues here in saying happy birthday to the dean of the Indiana delegation.

As a student at Indiana University school of law in the late 1930's, I heard about CHARLES A. HALLECK, who was one of her distinguished graduates then serving here in the House. From those student days as the years rolled along, it came my privilege to know CHARLIE HALLECK. It is an honor to be a member of this State delegation, of which he is the senior. He is respected and admired everywhere.

It is Indiana's privilege to share him with the entire country, for his service here is not confined in his thinking and his actions to Indiana. His thoughts, his words, his actions are motivated here by what is best for the entire country.

I wish him a happy birthday and many, many more years of service here in this great representative body.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have served in this body for 18 consecutive years. CHARLIE HALLECK then was a mere youngster of 40 years of age when I came here.

He had been in the Congress several years then, and I regarded him as a man of whom the State of Indiana could be proud.

The years since then have proved that I was right. I have watched CHARLIE all that time, and I have admired the manner in which he faced issues and sought to keep our country on an even keel. Never have I been disappointed in him. Never have I felt disillusioned.

Today, on his 58th birthday, we pay tribute to him. He deserves it. He has been as fine a Congressman as this body ever had. He has been loyal to his party, to his friends, to his State, and to his country.

In Indiana we are very proud of CHARLIE HALLECK. We salute him on this anniversary. We want him to have many, many more of such anniversaries—and we hope he observes them in the capacity of a public servant, for the country needs men like him in public office always.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, it is my wish to join with all of my colleagues in congratulating Congressman CHARLIE HALLECK on his birthday. His service in the Congress has been of the greatest value to the country.

I do not know of a more dynamic and persuasive speaker than he is whenever called upon to either support a bill in which he believes or to oppose one which he considers to be inimical to the best interests of the country. I may add that he was the first Member of Congress to visit my District and make one of his outstanding speeches.

It is my hope that he will enjoy many years of fine health, happiness, and prosperity.

INTERIM POWERS TO THE SPEAKER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request made earlier today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at any time during the remainder of the week it may be in order for the Speaker to declare recesses subject to the call of the Chair; to consider conference reports the same day reported, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXVIII; and that reports from the Committee on Rules may be considered at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 22 of rule XI.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1959

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 13856) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection a second is considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Independent Offices brings back to the floor for the consideration of the membership the Independent Offices appropriation bill.

As you recall, the President vetoed the first bill and gave as his reason for doing so an item which the bill carried of $589 million for the civil service retirement fund. He objected to it because there was no budget estimate for it.

The law clearly requires the Civil Service Commission to submit that estimate each year, and they did; but the Bureau of the Budget, I think, gave them some bad advice. They disallowed it.

There was, of course, a continuing resolution that kept all agencies going until September 1, so there was an umbrella for the President to sit under until September 1. I hope that next year if we pass these continuing resolutions, as we do, that we will not invite an item veto by giving them an umbrella to stand under. We will just say: Until the specific appropriation bill is passed by the Senate and House and sent to the Executive, or until the Executive vetoes it.

So, Mr. Speaker, we bring back to you the identically same bill. Whatever the membership had in that bill it has in this bill, with the exception of two items. Let me repeat, what was in that bill before it was vetoed is in there now. In other words, all of your projects are in there with the exception of two items. One, we took out the figure of $589 million that the President objected to for the civil service retirement fund, and we put another item in there because it was within the jurisdiction of the committee in reference to the General Services Administration to be in conformity with your recent enactment covering a retirement fund for ex-Presidents, and so forth, of $100,000.

With that in there I humbly submit it to the membership, and ask them to suspend the rules and pass it. You have already passed it twice, and I do not see any occasion for speeches at this time.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, at the bottom of page 1 of the report there is this statement:

> The effect of statements of Congressional action on items contained in House Report No. 1543, Senate Report No. 1656, House Conference Report No. 2237, and other legislative history of H. R. 11574, are therefore equally applicable to the items contained in this bill.

I take it that this means that this bill incorporates the appropriations agreed upon by the House and Senate conferees and approved by the House and Senate in the Independent Offices appropriations bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, prior to the President's veto; is that right?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. YATES. Item 15 of the conference report in that bill recommended an appropriation of $39,915,000 for sites and planning expenses of public buildings projects. Among the projects approved in that item were the proposed Federal buildings and courthouse in Chicago, Ill. That project is carried over and included under that item in this bill; is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. YATES. And those buildings, that is, the proposed Federal buildings and courthouse in Chicago, Ill., are included among the projects for which the sum of $39,915,000 is appropriated in the sites and planning item on page 10 in this bill?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. YATES. I thank the chairman of the committee.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is not possible or advisable to amend this bill in any way, I presume, but may I say that the Veterans' Administration is going to be short of money in order to operate until January or February of next year. I think it was through a misunderstanding on both sides that the cut in this appropriation was made, but they will be obliged to dismiss administrative personnel and some in the field offices.

Mr. THOMAS. There was no official—and I use the word "official" as meaning there has been no request of the committee from the Bureau of the Budget or from the Veterans' Administration. I am not questioning the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts, because I think she knows perhaps more about veterans' affairs than the remainder of us put together. But if there is any shortage, we will be glad to look into the matter in January.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am afraid January will be too late. I think it was through misunderstanding that the money was not made available.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, this bill, as the gentleman from Texas told you, was passed by the House 2 or 3 times. I think that the $589 million that is being left out of this bill at the request of the President, and with the other $100,000 that is being added to implement the legislation that was passed here, this week, ought to meet the hearty approval of all of the Members. We have to be realistic about this matter. And I hope that the bill will be passed with a minimum of debate so that the matter at this late day in the session may be expedited.

This reduction of $589 million will ease the budget situation for fiscal 1959 by over one-half billion dollars and reduce the pressure national debt ceiling. It is good legislation.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I just want to bring a problem to the attention of the House that concerns important programs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of Labor. Since the last supplemental appropriation bill passed this House, the decision was made that no more such appropriations would be initiated by the House, and that any additional needs would have to be provided for in the bills still left for Senate action.

Since the House acted on the last supplemental bill we have passed legislation which requires appropriations, and under the rules it is impossible for me to offer these amendments to this bill, because this bill is being brought up under suspension of the rules. But, I will try to bring to the attention of House and the conferees who will serve either on this bill or the foreign-aid bill, depending on which bill the Senate prefers to attach some of these budget requests, the amounts necessary to carry out the vitally important legislation that we have passed.

I have in mind such bills as the recently enacted unemployment compensation bill for ex-servicemen. This provides that men discharged from the military service shall be entitled to unemployment compensation under State rules and regulations and enjoy the same types of benefits that the civilian employees both in private industry and the Federal Government now enjoy. I certainly hope we do not pass up making an appropriation for the men, many of whom give their lives in the course of the performance of their duty to our Nation. We should certainly appropriate what the President has requested for this program which is $66 million for payments and $4,410,000 for operating expenses.

Another piece of legislation is that amending the Longshoremen and Harbor Workers' Act which is designed to reduce the number of accidents and encourage safe working practices for employees of stevedoring, ship repair and related employments. This legislation would give the Secretary of Labor added responsibility and authority for reducing accidents in the highest accident frequency rate industry in the country. Again we ignore our responsibility if we do not provide, as a bare minimum, $225,000 so that this program can operate until next February when we can act on additional appropriations to provide for the rest of the fiscal year.

Another piece of legislation, one which has been the subject of much discussion, relates to the filing of plans and reports covering health, welfare, and pension plans. We have done much talking about employers and labor in the administration of such plans and we have spent a great deal of time and money

obtaining data and information to inform Congress of the need for this legislation which we have passed. To me it would be ridiculous not to appropriate the funds necessary to administer this legislation. A bare minimum, in my opinion, would be $75,000 to $100,000 which again would just be enough to cover expenses for about 6 months at which time the new Congress can provide funds for the rest of the fiscal year.

Another item about which there has been a great deal of confusion and which I would like to call to your attention is the manner in which the appropriation for the grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration has been made. The distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] and I discussed this at some length here in the House last Wednesday. This confusion, and undue restriction on the use of these funds, can be clarified very easily by the inclusion of language in an appropriation bill, or in the reports accompanying such a bill, which would not call for an additional dollar to be appropriated by this Congress but would establish, at a more realistic level, the point at which the contingency fund, included in appropriations already made, can become available.

These are some of the amendments for the Department of Labor which I would offer today if parliamentary procedure did not prevent it.

Then there are several very important programs in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that are in the same category. For instance, as things stand now there is not one cent in any appropriation bill to implement the National Defense Education Act.

The education bill, as reported by the conferees, authorizes appropriations in the first year, fiscal year 1959, of $182,800,000. The President has submitted a request for funds for grants and payments in the amount of $117,200,000. Since the conference report on the education bill contains provisions which are not covered by the President's request, the revised minimum requirements for the current fiscal year are estimated to be $133,700,000. This results from the fact that area vocational schools have been added to the program and the amounts for grants and loans for improving science, mathematics, and foreign language instruction have been increased in the bill as reported by the conferees. This amount, along with $2,100,000 for salaries and expenses would be sufficient to cover only the interim requirements for this program in order to make a beginning during the first crucial months following enactment. The full requirements of the program for this fiscal year can then be assessed when the 86th Congress convenes in January. At that time we can consider the supplemental needs of the Office of Education for the remainder of fiscal year 1959. Certainly the least we should do is to appropriate these amounts before this Congress adjourns.

H. R. 9822, which I introduced at the first of this session, provides for a White House conference on aging. This conference and similar conferences to be held by the States, will draw nationwide attention to the 35 million persons aged 45 to 64 and the 15 million persons who are 65 and over, many of whom have problems of employment discrimination and compulsory retirement, of inadequate incomes, ill health, poor housing, and severely limited opportunities to live lives of dignity, usefulness, and contentment.

This bill, which has now passed both Houses of Congress unanimously, will bring together older citizens and professionals concerned with their varied problems in conferences throughout the country for the purpose of formulating recommendations for action. An immediate appropriation of $270,000 will provide the authorized minimum of $5,000 to each State so that it can begin immediately to assign staff to work out preliminary plans for studies and for initiating conferences in a number of communities. This sum will not permit most States to complete the necessary preparations for the White House conference and to defray expenses of their delegates but will permit discussions to begin in communities far enough in advance so that wide participation and thorough deliberation by thousands of citizens groups can precede the State and national conferences.

The appropriation of $100,000 for salaries and expenses of administration will enable staff in HEW in the next 6 months to provide information and assistance to State officials in relation to the objectives of the conference, the mechanics of operations, the methods of organizing for this task at State and community levels. It will permit a first meeting of the advisory committee of professional and public members required in the legislation. The theme and general topics of the conferences can be agreed upon in these early months and the preparation of studies can be initiated which will supply basic data bearing on these problems. Again this is the minimum necessary just to carry out the intent of Congress until the 86th Congress can appropriate the funds necessary to carry out this legislation for the full year.

The last item I will discuss is grants for expansion of teaching in the education of mentally retarded children. This is authorized by a bill I introduced and which I am sure has the support of practically every Member of this Congress.

There are approximately 1 million mentally retarded children of school age in the country, all of whom need special education and training in special classrooms under teachers with particular training for this type of work. Only about 15 percent of these children are now so served. A shortage of trained special teachers and a shortage of facilities for training these teachers are considered to be the two most important obstacles to expansion of educational services for mentally retarded children. It is estimated that there are needed approximately 50,000 qualified teachers. A large number of the 10,000 teachers now teaching these special classes for the retarded are incompletely prepared for their tasks and are seeking additional college training in this specialty. Expansion of teaching training facilities depends on utilizing and increasing the small reservoir of well-qualified leadership presently available to staff our college and university programs of training teachers for this service. Because of the specialized nature of this personnel training, much of which is carried on at the graduate level, the States cannot expect to be entirely self-sufficient in meeting needs for special teachers. It is anticipated that as a result of this program all States will be benefited.

A deplorable situation exists now and it is unthinkable that the Congress, after authorizing this program which will go far in correcting this situation, would fail to carry it out promptly just because of technicalities in the parliamentary procedure.

The procedure of taking this bill up under suspension of the rules forecloses amendments to take care of these programs. However, as I mentioned earlier, it is still possible for the Senate to amend this bill to include the appropriations I have discussed. Such action, and subsequent concurrence by the House is, in my opinion, of utmost importance. These programs, which are all vital to our national welfare, will be delayed almost a full year and much ground will have been lost despite the splendid efforts of the Congress in passing this legislation. We have made commitments to the people of the country; we must not let them down by failing to make the necessary appropriations.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENSION OF EMPLOYMENT OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1411) to amend the act of August 26, 1950, relating to the suspension of employment of civilian personnel of the United States in the interest of national security, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2687)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1411) to amend the Act of August 26, 1950, relating to the suspension of employment of civilian personnel of the United States

in the interest of national security, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That the Act of August 26, 1950 (64 Stat. 476), is hereby amended to read as follows: 'That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the Act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), as amended (5 U. S. C. 652), or the provisions of any other law, the head of any department or agency of the United States Government may, in his absolute discretion and when deemed necessary in the interest of national security, suspend, without pay, any civilian officer or employee of the Government. To the extent that such agency head determines that the interests of the national safety and security permit, the employee concerned shall be notified of the reasons for his suspension and within thirty days after such notification any such person shall have an opportunity to submit any statements or affidavits to the official designated by the head of the agency concerned to show why he should be reinstated or restored to duty. The agency head concerned may, following such investigation and review as he deems necessary, terminate the employment of such suspended civilian officer or employee whenever he shall determine such termination necessary or advisable in the interest of the national security of the United States: *Provided*, That any employee having a permanent or indefinite appointment, and having completed his probationary or trial period, who is a citizen of the United States whose employment is suspended under the authority of this Act, shall be given after his suspension and before his employment is terminated under the authority of this Act, (1) a written statement within thirty days after his suspension of the charges against him, which shall be subject to amendment within thirty days thereafter and which shall be stated as specifically as security considerations permit; (2) an opportunity within thirty days thereafter (plus an additional thirty days if the charges are amended) to answer such charges and to submit affidavits; (3) a hearing, at the employee's request, by a duly constituted agency authority for this purpose; (4) a review of his case by the agency head, or some official designated by him, before a decision adverse to the employee is made final; and (5) a written statement of the decision of the agency head: *Provided further*, That any person whose employment is so suspended or terminated under the authority of this Act may, in the discretion of the agency head concerned, be reinstated or restored to duty, and if reinstated or restored, by action of the agency head under this proviso or pursuant to determination and decision of the Civil Service Commission under section 4, shall be allowed compensation for all or any part of the period of such suspension or termination in an amount not to exceed the difference between the amount such person would normally have earned during the period of such suspension or termination, at the rate he was receiving on the date of suspension or termination, as appropriate, and the interim net earnings of such person: *Provided further*, That nothing contained in this Act shall be deemed to require the suspension of any civilian officer or employee prior to hearing or termination: *Provided further*, That to the extent consistent with the interest of the national security in the light of the facts and circumstances of the particular case, the department or agency head concerned shall utilize, in lieu of other provisions of this Act or any Executive order issued under this Act, the provisions of section 6 of the Act of August 24, 1912 (Public Law 628, Eighty-third Congress), and section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 in connection with the suspension or termination of employment of any civilian officer or employee.

"'SEC. 2. Nothing contained in this Act shall impair the powers vested in the Atomic Energy Commission by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 or the requirements of section 161 of such Act that adequate provision be made for administrative review of any determination to dismiss any employee of such Commission.

"'SEC. 3. As used in this Act, "national security" means all governmental activities of the United States Government involving the national safety and security, including but not limited to activities concerned with the protection of the United States from internal subversion or foreign aggression. All employees of any department or agency of the United States Government are deemed to be employed in an activity of the Government involving national security.

"'SEC. 4. It shall be the duty of the United States Civil Service Commission, upon the request of any employee, to review the decision, under this Act and under any Executive order issued pursuant to this Act, of the agency head concerned in the case of such employee with respect to the validity, truth, and merits of the charges made and with respect to the procedures followed. The Commission shall prepare a written opinion and decision in each such case containing its recommendations with respect to the decision of the agency head. The Commission shall transmit its opinion and decision to the agency head concerned for action in accordance therewith. The determination by the Commission of any question or other matter connected with such review shall be final and conclusive. If any member of the Commission does not concur in such opinion and decision, he may file a dissenting opinion.'

"SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act to the Act of August 26, 1950, shall be effective with respect to any action or proceeding for suspension or termination of employment commenced prior to July 1, 1959, except that the provisions of section 4 of such Act of August 26, 1950, as contained in such amendment, shall not be effective with respect to any case in which any such termination of employment was effected prior to the date of enactment of this Act. Such Act of August 26, 1950, as in effect immediately prior to such date of enactment, shall be held and considered to remain in effect with respect to proceedings for suspension or termination of employment commenced subsequent to June 30, 1959."

And the House agree to the same.

TOM MURRAY,
JAMES H. MORRISON,
JAMES C. DAVIS,
EDWARD H. REES,
ROBERT J. CORBETT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
THOS. E. MARTIN,
THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1411) to amend the Act of August 26, 1950, relating to the suspension of employment of civilian personnel of the United States in the interest of national security, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute text.

The committee of conference recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment which is a substitute for both the text of the Senate bill and the text provided by the House amendment and that the House agree to the same.

The Senate bill proposed a change in the provisions of the Act of August 26, 1950, which now require that the officer or employee concerned must be suspended without pay before he may receive a hearing, by providing, in effect, that in cases arising under such Act the officer or employee need not necessarily be suspended without pay pending a hearing but may be retained, in the discretion of the department or agency head, in the same or another position pending a hearing of his case.

The House amendment continued this provision of the Senate bill and, in addition, reenacted the existing provisions of the Act of August 26, 1950, so as to clarify its application to activities of the Federal Government and provide additional safeguards for the protection of officers and employees from arbitrary actions thereunder.

The conference substitute is the same as the House amendment except for the following change:

The conference substitute makes it clear that the provisions of the revised Act of August 26, 1950, as contained in the amendment made by the first section of the conference substitute will be effective with respect to any action or proceeding for suspension or termination of employment commenced prior to July 1, 1959, but that the provisions of section 4 of such act as contained in such amendment will not be effective with respect to any case in which any such termination of employment was effected prior to the date of enactment of the conference substitute. Section 2 of the conference substitute also provides that the Act of August 26, 1950, as in effect immediately prior to the date of enactment of the conference substitute, shall be held and considered to remain in effect with respect to proceedings for suspension or termination of employment commenced after June 30, 1959.

Under section 2 of the conference substitute it is intended that a Government department or agency may reopen any case disposed of under existing law, regardless of the outcome of such case, or may institute new proceedings in any such case. Any such reopened or new proceedings would be governed by the provisions of the Act of August 26, 1950, as contained in the conference substitute. However, it is not intended that proceedings heretofore completed under existing law and resulting in the termination of employment of the employees involved may be reopened by such employees for the purpose of having their cases disposed of under the new provisions.

This limitation on the effective period of this legislation is established with the understanding on the part of the committee of conference that this legislation as so limited will provide a statutory basis for the Government employee security programs pending the development of a permanent Government employee security program subsequent to the study and report of the Commission on Government Security (Sen. Doc. No. 64, 85th Cong., 1st sess.).

TOM MURRAY,
JAMES H. MORRISON,
JAMES C. DAVIS,
EDWARD H. REES,
ROBERT J. CORBETT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, the legislation as it is presented in the conference report is the same as legislation which was passed by the House on July 10, 1958, except that the conference report limits the period for which the amendments to Public Law 733 made by this legislation will remain in effect. This limitation is until June 30, 1959. It is hoped that by that time legislation will have been submitted by the administration covering recommendations of the Wright Commission dealing with security problems as they relate to Federal employee security matters.

Public Law 733, which this legislation amends, will of course continue after June 30, 1959, the same as it is today unless amended by law. Public Law 733 is the basic legislation used as the authority for the present Federal Employee Security Program.

The amendments to this law are made necessary by a Supreme Court decision in the case of Cole against Young. This decision determined that Public Law 733 under Executive Order 10450 applied only to sensitive positions and that employees could not be separated as security risks in nonsensitive positions. This action by the Court in the view of one of its Justices, Justice Clark, and I quote "has stricken down the most effective weapon against subversive activity available to the Government." As a result of this Cole decision nearly 100 individuals have been restored to the rolls and been given back salary payments approximating one-half million dollars.

As I have indicated there is no basic change in the legislation as it passed the House except as to the limitation as to time. Although there were no changes in the basic principles of the bill as approved by the House a quick review of its provisions may be in order.

The bill provides that any suspended employee with a permanent or indefinite appointment, before his termination, shall be entitled to the following: First, a written statement of the charges against him; second, a reasonable opportunity to answer such charges; third, a hearing, at the employee's request, by a duly constituted agency authority; fourth, a review of the case by the agency head; and fifth, a written statement of the decision of the agency head.

As used in this legislation, "national security" means all governmental activities of the United States Government involving the national safety and security, including but not limited to activities concerned with the protection of the United States from internal subversion or foreign aggression. The bill further provides that all employees of any department or agency of the Government are deemed to be employed in an activity of the Government involving national security.

The bill provides that any person who is reinstated or restored to duty following a wrongful suspension or removal shall be allowed compensation for the period of time such person was not on the payroll in an amount not to exceed the difference between the pay such person would have earned had he remained in his position and the interim net earnings of such person.

The bill also provides for an appeal to the Civil Service Commission by any employee adversely affected under the legislation or under any Executive order issued pursuant thereto. The Commission, in considering such appeal shall review the validity and truth of the charges made and the procedures followed by the department or agency. Following a review of the appeal, the Commission shall prepare a written opinion and decision. The decision of the Commission shall be final and the agency head shall comply with such written opinion and decision.

I would like to commend the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], who through the years, has worked unceasingly for the adoption of legislation such as this conference agreement presents, whereby for the first time we are saying in legislation that there is no room for Communists and fellow-travelers on the Federal payroll in any capacity.

I would like also to commend the Honorable FRANCIS WALTER, chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee. It was his bill, H. R. 981, which formed the basic language of this legislation and which, together with amendments sponsored by Mr. REES, presents the bill in the form in which it is now before the House—that is, except for the time limitation of June 30, 1959.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I want to inquire of the gentleman from Tennessee, is this the same bill that was passed putting all Federal employees under the so-called security program?

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct.

Mr. WIER. That is the bill S. 1614?

Mr. MURRAY. No, sir; it is S. 1411.

Mr. WIER. Are there any changes made?

Mr. MURRAY. There were no changes made in the bill as it passed the House except the conferees agreed that this would expire June 30 of next year instead of making it permanent.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I want to raise my voice in opposition, anyway.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I hardly expect any words of mine at this hour of the 85th Congress to change a majority of the House with respect to S. 1411. However, I do want the record clear. This is a bad bill. It will not strengthen the security program of the Federal Government. There is no crying need for it, no emergency, no urgency. The administration does not want it enacted. It had no hearings at all in the other body. Why put this on the statute books? Why not wait until comprehensive hearings can be held next year and then enact a program?

If enacted, this bill will mean that our intelligence agencies will have to investigate millions of persons in nonsecurity positions. This will decrease their ability to investigate where investigation is really needed.

It will mean that each of the 65 agency heads becomes a law unto himself. He can use anything as the basis for dismissal on security grounds. He can throw everybody out and start again. Due process of law is not required. There are no standards, no criteria, no fair procedures. This being true, how can any effective review be made? And what does the Civil Service Commission know about appellate procedures and does it have time for this duty? It was my amendment adopted in committee that made the Civil Service Commission decision mandatory instead of merely advisory, a small improvement in that it allows us to hold the Civil Service Commission responsible for the final decision in each case appealed.

However, very few will appeal. What is the use? If the agency head calls you a security risk, you have had it, brother. Make no mistake about it. If you resist, you call attention to the charge and that would not help you when you try to make a living outside Government service. A person's reputation for loyalty or security deserves the protection of fair procedures, whether he works in or outside of the Government. This bill needlessly and recklessly denies Government workers that protection. The conference report should be rejected.

Mr. DENNISON. Mr. Speaker, as the Members know, I have had serious doubts as to the need for this measure, S. 1411. The hearings on this bill and the debate on the floor show that my interest has always been to secure full hearings before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee as soon as possible so that a proper study can be made of all existing loyalty-security law, as well as of all proposed changes. When, several weeks ago, during the course of the general debate on this bill, the distinguished Chairman of the Committee, Mr. MURRAY, stated on the floor that this was stop-gap legislation and promised to hold hearings after the first of the year on the Wright Commission recommendations, I withdrew my objections and reluctantly lent my support to the measure. Of course the additional relief by way of appeal to persons subject to the law gave added virtue to the bill. I am pleased, therefore, that the conferees have agreed on a termination date of June 30, 1959 for the amendments contained in the bill and that the Chairman on the floor today has reiterated his pledge to hold hearings on a Government security program soon. This augurs well for a reconsideration of this entire field in the 86th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope that when hearings do begin next year that full consideration will be given to a review of the entire loyalty security program and that reasonable and fair measures for the protection of our country can be adopted without sacrificing the legitimate and historical rights and privileges of private citizens who serve their Nation as Federal employees.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD

and that any other Members who desire to do so may have the same privilege.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EFFECTIVE DATES OF COMPENSATION INCREASES FOR WAGE BOARD EMPLOYEES

Mr. MURRAY submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 25) relating to effective dates of increases in compensation granted to wage board employees.

LUMP-SUM PAYMENT OF ANNUAL LEAVE OF DECEASED EMPLOYEES AND OTHER MATTERS

Mr. MURRAY submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 7710) to provide for the lump-sum payment of all accumulated and current accrued annual leave of deceased employees.

EFFECTIVE DATES OF COMPENSATION INCREASES FOR WAGE BOARD EMPLOYEES

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 25) relating to effective dates of increases in compensation granted to wage board employees, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2691)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 25) entitled "An Act relating to effective dates of increases in compensation granted to wage board employees", having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with the following changes: On page 2, lines 1 and 2 of the House engrossed amendment, strike out "formal collection of data for such wage survey is begun" and insert in lieu thereof "such wage survey was ordered to be made"; and

On page 4, lines 7 and 8 of the House engrossed amendment, strike out "for which the formal collection of data is begun prior to September 1, 1958" and insert in lieu thereof "which was ordered, prior to September 1, 1958, to be made".

And the House agree to the same.

TOM MURRAY,
JAMES H. MORRISON,
JAMES C. DAVIS,
EDWARD H. REES,
ROBERT J. CORBETT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
DICK NEUBERGER,
RALPH YARBOROUGH,
THOS. E. MARTIN,
THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 25) entitled "An Act relating to effective dates of increases in compensation granted to wage board employees," submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute text.

The committee of conference recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment which makes two changes in the House amendment which are discussed below and that the House agree to the same.

The two changes are as follows:

First, the conference agreement provides that the effective date for an increase in compensation pursuant to a wage survey is the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the forty-fifth day, excluding Saturdays and Sundays, following the date on which the wage survey was ordered to be made (rather than the date on which formal collection of data for the wage survey is begun, as provided by the House amendment).

In making this change with respect to the effective date of an increase in compensation pursuant to a wage survey, it is the intent of the committee of conference that the words "the date on which such wage survey was ordered to be made" mean that date on which the appropriate authority specifically authorizes or orders that the collection of data for wage determination purposes be commenced. It is not the intent of the committee that the above-quoted words be construed to mean, or to include in any way, any date on which those administrative functions, activities, preliminary work, or other preparatory steps, which are preliminary or necessary to the issuance of such authorization or order, are being carried on or are authorized or ordered to be carried on. Further, it is not the intent of the committee that the above-quoted words shall be construed to mean, or to include in any way, any date on which it is authorized or ordered that a wage survey or surveys is or are generally necessary.

Second, the conference substitute makes a change in section 4, pertaining to the applicability of the provisions of the conference substitute, in conformity with the first change made by the conference substitute.

It should be noted that, in connection with supplemental surveys, it is the intention of the committee of conference that, when a department or agency uses incomplete wage data collected in the normal course of business by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Bureau of Census, or other duly constituted and authorized data collecting agency of the Federal Government, and supplements such incomplete data with a wage survey of its own in a determination of wage adjustments, the provisions of paragraph (1) of the first section of the conference substitute shall apply.

TOM MURRAY,
JAMES H. MORRISON,
JAMES C. DAVIS,
EDWARD H. REES,
ROBERT J. CORBETT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, the provisions of bill S. 25 as presented in the conference report are the same as the provisions which were passed by the House except that the conference agreed to a minor change in the date on which the 45 days allowed for conducting a survey and issuing a new schedule of wage rates begins. The House version provided that this period begin on the date on which the actual data collection was commenced. The conference agreement provides that this date is the date on which a responsible official of the department or agency either authorizes or orders the collection of data.

The effective date provided by the House was also changed so as to bring it into conformity with this first change.

While there were no changes in the basic principles of the bill as approved by the House, a summary of the provisions may be in order for the purpose of refreshing the minds of the Members.

Under previous procedures and operations, a period of from 3 to 6 months was involved in the collection of data, the analysis of data, and the establishment of a new wage scale under wage board procedures. This unreasonable length of time resulted in the some 750,000 wage board employees receiving wage increases some 8 to 10 months after similar increases were granted to private industry. Bill S. 25 sets an effective date for the wage increases so as to eliminate this undue delay.

The bill provides that when an agency conducts its own wage surveys, any increases resulting therefrom shall be effective not more than 45 days after the collection of the necessary wage data is authorized or ordered. When the agency uses data collected by another department or agency, such increases are to be effective 20 days after the agency receives the necessary data. Testimony in hearings and discussions with officials of the executive branch indicate that these 45- and 20-day periods are reasonable and can be met if operations are well planned and effectively carried on.

The bill also provides that retroactive increases shall be granted only to the employees on the payroll on the effective date of the increase or to those employees who have retired during any retroactive period and to the estate of those employees who died during such retroactive period. This provision is comparable to the provisions which the Congress wrote into the recently enacted pay raise legislation.

The bill also provides that any change in the face value of the Federal group life insurance policies resulting from wage increases shall be effective on the date of issuance of the order granting such increases or the effective date of such increase, whichever occurs later.

This provision is also similar to the provision written into recently enacted pay legislation and prevents undue administrative difficulties which would result from a retroactive reevaluation of the policies.

The bill provides that it shall not apply to any increases in rates granted pursuant to a wage survey, the data collection for which was ordered prior to September 1, 1958.

I sincerely believe that the provisions of the bill as reported by the committee of conference are reasonable, workable, and to the interest of both the Government and the employees.

LUMP-SUM PAYMENT OF ANNUAL LEAVE OF DECEASED EMPLOYEES AND OTHER MATTERS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 7710) to provide for the lump-sum payment of all accumulated and current accrued annual leave of deceased employees, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman take some time to explain this bill.

Mr. MURRAY. I shall be glad to.

Mr. Speaker, the House-passed bill authorized lump-sum payment for accumulated annual leave up to 45 days for overseas employees. These employees presently may accumulate 45 days of annual leave, but in event of death or resignation lump sum payments for unused leave are limited to 30 days.

The second Senate amendment adds a section 3 to the bill, providing that an employee who transfers from the legislative branch to the postal field service may receive compensation at any step-rate in the appropriate postal field service salary level which is not higher than his highest legislative employee salary. This will place transfers from the legislative branch to the postal field service on an equal basis with provisions, already made by law, relating to salary rates payable to employees who transfer from the legislative branch to the classified service, employees who transfer from the postal to the classified service, and employees who transfer between positions in the classified service or who are reinstated in the classified service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2692)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7710) entitled "An act to provide for the lump-sum payment of all accumulated and current accrued annual leave of deceased employees", having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 1: That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 1.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In Senate amendment numbered 2 as set forth in the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "Sec. 3." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 2.".

And the Senate agree to the same.

TOM MURRAY,
JAMES H. MORRISON,
EDWARD H. REES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
DICK NEUBERGER,
RALPH YARBOROUGH,
THOS. E. MARTIN,
THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7710) entitled "An Act to provide for the lump-sum payment of all accumulated and current accrued annual leave of deceased employees", submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: This amendment postponed to May 1, 1959, the effective date of the increased "odd-size" penalty rate on mailings provided by the Postal Rate Increase Act, 1958, in order to prevent undue financial hardship on certain businesses, particularly the seed and nursery businesses which had previously received or ordered large supplies of "odd-size" catalogs. This amendment is eliminated for the reason that this matter is covered by other legislation. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 2: This amendment provides that any employee in the legislative branch of the Federal Government, whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives and who has completed two or more years of service as an employee of the type described above, may, upon his appointment to a position to which the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 applies, have his initial rate of compensation fixed at the minimum rate of the appropriate level of the applicable basic salary schedule or at any step of that level which does not exceed the highest previous rate of compensation received by him during service as a legislative employee as described above. This amendment corrects an omission in a similar provision contained in section 4 of the Act of May 29, 1958 (72 Stat. 151; Public Law 85-432) by covering those cases involving the appointment of certain legislative employees to positions in the postal field service. The House recedes with a technical amendment which redesignates a section number.

TOM MURRAY,
JAMES H. MORRISON,
EDWARD H. REES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3335) to provide for a National Cultural Center which will be constructed, with funds raised by voluntary contributions, on a site made available in the District of Columbia, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "National Cultural Center Act."

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established in the Smithsonian Institution a bureau, which shall be directed by a board to be known as the Trustees of the National Cultural Center (hereafter in this act referred to as the "Board"), whose duty it shall be to maintain and administer the National Cultural Center and site thereof and to execute such other functions as are vested in the Board by this act. The board shall be composed as follows: The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Librarian of Congress, the Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, the Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts, the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Chairman of the District of Columbia Recreation Board, the Director of the National Park Service, the Commissioner of the United States Office of Education, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, 3 Members of the Senate appointed by the President of the Senate and 3 Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives ex officio; and 15 general trustees, who shall be citizens of the United States, to be chosen as hereinafter provided.

(b) The general trustees shall be appointed by the President of the United States and the members of the first Board shall have terms expiring 3 at the end of 2 years, 3 at the end of 4 years, 3 at the end of 6 years, 3 at the end of 8 years, and 3 at the end of 10 years, after the date of enactment of this act. The term of office of each member of the Board subsequently appointed shall be 10 years except that a successor appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of such term shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term.

(c) There shall be an Advisory Committee on the Arts composed of such members as the President may designate, to serve at the pleasure of the President. Persons appointed to the Advisory Committee on the Arts, including officers or employees of the United States, shall be persons who are recognized for their knowledge of, or experience or interest in, one or more of the arts in the fields covered by the National Cultural Center. The President shall designate the Chairman of the Advisory Committee on the Arts. In making such appointments the President shall give consideration to such recommendations as may from time to time be submitted to him by leading national organizations in the appropriate art fields. The Advisory Committee on the Arts shall advise and consult with the Board and make recommendations to the Board regarding existing and prospective cultural activities to be carried on in the National Cultural Center. The Advisory Committee on the Arts shall assist the Board in carrying out section 5 (a) of this act. Members of the Advisory Committee on the Arts shall serve without compensation, but each member of such Committee shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in connection with the work of such Committee.

NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER

SEC. 3. The Board shall construct for the Smithsonian Institution, with funds raised by voluntary contributions, a building to be designated as the National Cultural Center on a site in the District of Columbia bounded by the Inner Loop Freeway on the east, the Theodore Roosevelt Bridge approaches on the south, Rock Creek Parkway

on the west, New Hampshire Avenue and F Street on the north, which shall be selected for such purpose by the National Capital Planning Commission. The National Capital Planning Commission shall acquire by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, lands necessary to provide for the National Cultural Center and related facilities. Such building shall be in accordance with plans and specifications approved by the Commission of Fine Arts.

DUTIES OF THE BOARD

SEC. 4. The Board shall—

(1) present classical and contemporary music, opera, drama, dance, and poetry from this and other countries,

(2) present lectures and other programs,

(3) develop programs for children and youth and the elderly (and for other age groups as well) in such arts designed specifically for their participation, education, and recreation, and

(4) provide facilities for other civic activities at the Cultural Center.

POWERS OF THE BOARD

SEC. 5. (a) The Board is authorized to solicit and accept for the Smithsonian Institution and to hold and administer gifts, bequests, or devises of money, securities, or other property of whatsoever character for the benefit of the National Cultural Center. Unless otherwise restricted by the terms of the gift, bequest, or devise, the Board is authorized to sell or exchange and to invest or reinvest in such investments as it may determine from time to time the moneys, securities, or other property composing trust funds given, bequeathed, or devised to or for the benefit of the National Cultural Center. The income as and when collected shall be placed in such depositaries as the Board shall determine and shall be subject to expenditure by the Board.

(b) The Board shall appoint and fix the compensation and duties of a director, an assistant director, and a secretary of the National Cultural Center and of such other officers and employees of the National Cultural Center as may be necessary for the efficient administration of the functions of the Board. The director, assistant director, and secretary shall be well qualified by experience and training to perform the duties of their office.

(c) The actions of the Board, including any payment made or directed to be made by it from any trust funds, shall not be subject to review by any officer or agency other than a court of law.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 6. (a) The Board is authorized to adopt an official seal which shall be judicially noticed and to make such bylaws, rules, and regulations, as it deems necessary for the administration of its functions under this act, including, among other matters, bylaws, rules, and regulations relating to the administration of its trust funds and the organization and procedure of the Board. The Board may function notwithstanding vacancies, and eight members of the Board shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

(b) The Board shall have all the usual powers and obligations of a trustee in respect of all trust funds administered by it.

(c) The Board shall submit to the Smithsonian Institution an annual report of its operations under this act, including a detailed statement of all public and private moneys received and disbursed by it.

TERMINATION

SEC. 7. (a) This act shall cease to be effective, and all offices created by this act and all appointments made under this act shall terminate, if the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution does not find that sufficient funds to construct the National Cultural Center have been received by the Trustees of the National Cultural Center within 5 years after the date of enactment of this act.

(b) If the offices of Trustees of the National Cultural Center terminate under the provisions of subsection (a), all funds and property (real and personal) accepted by the Trustees of the National Cultural Center under section 5 (a), and income therefrom, shall vest in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution and shall be used by the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to carry out the purposes of the act entitled "An act to provide for the transfer of the Civil Service Commission Building in the District of Columbia to the Smithsonian Institution to house certain art collections of the Smithsonian Institution," approved March 28, 1958, and for the acquisition of works of art to be housed in the building referred to in such act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 190]

Anfuso	Frelinghuysen	McCulloch
Ashley	Friedel	Macdonald
Avery	George	Mason
Barden	Glenn	Miller, Calif.
Baring	Gordon	Miller, N. Y.
Bass, N. H.	Gregory	Mitchell
Baumhart	Griffiths	Morrison
Beamer	Hale	Moulder
Belcher	Hardy	Mumma
Bentley	Harrison, Nebr.	Osmers
Berry	Hays, Ark.	Philbin
Blitch	Healey	Pilcher
Boykin	Hébert	Powell
Brooks, La.	Henderson	Preston
Brownson	Herlong	Prouty
Buckley	Hess	Radwan
Burdick	Hill	Rivers
Christopher	Hillings	Robeson, Va.
Clevenger	Hoffman	Roosevelt
Coffin	Horan	Santangelo
Collier	Hosmer	Saylor
Colmer	Ikard	Scherer
Coudert	James	Scott, Pa.
Cunningham, Nebr.	Jenkins	Sheehan
	Jensen	Shuford
Davis, Tenn.	Johnson	Spence
Derounian	Jones, Mo.	Taylor
Dies	Kean	Teague, Tex.
Diggs	Kearney	Thompson, La.
Dixon	Kilburn	Van Zandt
Doyle	Krueger	Wainwright
Durham	Landrum	Williams, N. Y.
Eberharter	Latham	Winstead
Engle	LeCompte	Young
Farbstein	McCormack	Zelenko

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOLAND in the chair). On this rollcall 321 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, enactment of the bill S. 3335 during this session of Congress has been specifically requested by the President of the United States. The bill has been endorsed by the Department of Interior, the Bureau of the Budget, the Board of Commissioners for the District of Columbia and the Commission on Fine Arts. It was passed in the other body by an overwhelming vote. Your House Committee on Public Works, after open hearings and committee discussion, recommends the bill to you with an amendment which is acceptable to its sponsors.

This legislation is designed to fill a long-felt deficiency in our Capital City. As President Eisenhower pointed out in his letter of August 1 to Chairman BUCKLEY:

> There has long been a need for more adequate facilities in the Nation's Capital for the presentation of the performing arts. An auditorium and other facilities such as are provided for in (this) pending legislation, established and supported by contributions from the public, would be a center of which the entire Nation could be proud. I hope that the Congress will complete action on this legislation during this session.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes, I will gladly yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I just wonder why there should be opposition to this bill. It does not cost the Government any money. They are going to have a magnificent structure here. The money is going to be raised by voluntary contribution and they will have a magnificent building here for the performing arts. It is very badly needed, and we get it free, and the only reason I can see why anybody would object to this bill is because is does not cost the Government any money.

Mr. WRIGHT. I certainly concur in what my colleague has said.

The bill would permit the construction, here in Washington, of a national cultural center. It would be financed—not by the Government—but by private funds donated by the public. The site would be provided by the United States, and this would be the only Federal expense involved. The committee amendment which we are recommending would require that, if sufficient funds for the erection of this center shall not have been raised from the public and received by the trustees within 5 years after enactment of this law, the act shall cease to be effective and the land be returned to the United States.

Alone among the major capitals of the world, Washington has no facilities suitable for the presentation of grand opera. There is no building in Washington which can accommodate the requirements of the more elaborate theatrical, ballet, and orchestral presentations which have enriched the lives and expanded the cultural horizons of the citizens of many much smaller cities both here in the United States and the world over. American musical and theatrical

companies play to enthusiastic overflow audiences in capitals throughout the world. Yet neither these American companies nor their counterparts from other lands can be invited to perform in Washington because we have here no appropriate accommodation for them.

This bill would establish within the Smithsonian Institution a Board of Trustees for the National Cultural Center. The Board would be composed of 15 specified Federal officials and 15 general trustees appointed by the President. It would be the duty of the Board to supervise and oversee the construction of the center with privately donated funds, to maintain and administer it, and to present programs of the performing arts—opera, popular musicals, ballet, and folk dancing, plays, lectures, and public meetings of all sorts. There also would be established an Advisory Committee on the Arts, selected by the President, to advise and consult with the Board and recommend appropriate activities to be conducted in the center.

The site proposed for the building is in what is known as Foggy Bottom almost due north of the Lincoln Memorial, in an area bounded by Rock Creek Parkway, New Hampshire Avenue, the Proposed Inner Loop Freeway and the authorized Theodore Roosevelt Bridge. This is the location which, after an exhaustive study of all possible sites, has been recommended by the Department of the Interior and the National Capital Planning Commission.

The reason, of course, why Congress must concern itself with meeting this critical need is that Congress serves as the governing body for this great city. In the typical American city, the local municipal government would handle a matter of this kind—and indeed many have. By the most recent accounting, there are some 382 other American cities which already enjoy such facilities as are proposed here. By our inaction, were we to turn a deaf ear to the President's request, we would be denying the residents of the Washington area the opportunity to have a resource they greatly desire and one to which the size and stature of this metropolitan area otherwise would certainly seem to entitle them.

But we probably would be doing more than that. For this is our National Capital. This city belongs to all Americans. When George Washington in 1789 commissioned Maj. Pierre L'Enfant to plan the Federal City he directed that it be planned as a cultural and civic center for the new United States. Our Capital City is in many respects a magnificent showpiece of our way of life. It is the window through which much of the world sees the United States. I am proud of its grandeur and its spacious beauty, its gracious buildings and monuments, its unsurpassed libraries and its splendid art galleries.

Yet here is one deficiency which is broadly acknowledged. The authorities agree that Washington needs a center for the performing arts. The public seems anxious to correct that deficiency by popular donation and by their continuing patronage. Many impressive figures in the financial and theatrical worlds have pledged their backing. The American Institute of Architects has offered its wholehearted cooperation without fee in designing the structures. The President has asked that we permit this planning to get underway without further delay by acting before this Congress adjourns. The other body has acted. They are waiting now only for the "green light" from us. Your committee recommends that we give it to them by suspending the rules and passing this bill today.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does that include tap-dancing, toe dancing and can-can dancing?

Mr. WRIGHT. I presume it would include any of those performing arts. Perhaps even the Grand Ole Opry.

Let me say this in all sincerity, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is important. I suppose that I have done my share of demagoging. All of us like to portray ourselves as real, sure enough corn-fed, homegrown, log cabin boys. All of us have been just a bit guilty of that. In striking such a pose, it is always kind of easy to ridicule and poke fun at things of a cultural nature. I plead guilty to having done my share of it, but I think, Mr. Speaker, that we have reached a state of maturity in this Nation when that kind of attitude no longer becomes us. Sooner or later, we have to grow up and stop poking fun at things intellectual and cultural.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR].

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to concur in the statements made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] and especially those of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. I honestly cannot see what is wrong with this bill—some feel it is in error—unless it is the fact that it is not costing the taxpayers of the United States a single penny. It is rather amusing to me that certain Members of Congress and certain members of our committee and other committees are opposing this legislation, and when we check their record we find they have voted consistently for foreign aid, or to build stadiums or cathedrals, and everything else, in foreign countries. Yet when we come back to the United States and have the opportunity to give the people of the United States the privilege of making a contribution toward a cultural center, they are prohibited.

The point is going to be raised, as it was in the committee, that we have no definite plans. I am hoping that every member of the committee has taken the time to read the plans which are headed, "A National Civic Auditorium and Cultural Center for the Citizens of the United States." It covers 95 pages. I have been in Congress only for the short period of 20 years, but I have never seen anyone submit to a committee of Congress of which I have been a member a specific plan any more elaborate, any more detailed than this one.

So I repeat, seemingly there is something wrong, according to the view of some there is something in error with this legislation, and that something is that it is not costing the American taxpayers a single penny.

I sincerely hope that we will give the opportunity to the people of the United States to contribute to this cultural center and that we shall pass this bill in this Congress, at least one bill that will not cost the taxpayers anything.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, as one of the cosponsors of this legislation I rise in strong support of this bill for a national cultural center. It has been said that this will not cost the Government any money. No, it will not.

The people of the country should be pleased that the civic minded citizens of Washington, D. C. and of this country are taking on themselves the civic obligation to provide this cultural center for this great and growing city. There are such centers in many of our United States cities, and many more in every country of Europe. We in Pittsburgh are doing the same job at public expense. We are building an auditorium to take care of events of this type which we believe are necessary to our culture and civic growth.

This resolution is drawn in a manner similar to the Taft resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 44 of the 84th Congress, first session, under which 60 Senators sponsored such a bill for a Taft Memorial. The same type of provisions are generally in this bill as were in the Taft resolution. As you know, the Taft Foundation was given a year, when they came in with the plans for the very fine bell tower that is now just being finished over on the Senate side of the Capitol grounds. Those funds, too, were raised by voluntary contributions from people who had faith in the ideals of Senator Taft.

The fine, generous, and civic-minded citizens who have backed and sponsored this legislation have faith in the cultural ideals of this good country. I believe this Congress will give the good people of Washington, D. C., so many of whom are behind this legislation, the go ahead and the challenge to come up with the fine building that this will be. I heartily endorse this legislation and urge my friends in Congress to take this immense civic step forward for Washington, D. C., the Capital City of the United States.

There are some very instructive parallels between the legislation establishing the Taft Memorial Foundation and S. 3335 as amended providing for the National Cultural Center.

The Taft Memorial Act authorized the erection on the Capitol Grounds and the presentation to the Congress of the United States a memorial bell tower of appropriate design.

The land was clearly provided in this case, just as the legislation for the National Cultural Center provides that the Federal Government provide the land. My own resolution, cosponsored with Senator EDWARD MARTIN of Pennsylvania, provided the land for the fine Mellon

Memorial Fountain for Washington, D. C., at the intersection of Pennsylvania Avenue and Constitution Avenue, and the fountain was donated to the Capital by voluntary subscriptions at no cost to the United States Government. I look back with pride on the work and accomplishment in adding to the beauty of this wonderful friendly city to which I owe so much, and to my many local friends who are working so hard in this cause.

Section 2 of the Taft Memorial Act provides that the design and plans for the memorial shall be subject to the approval of the Architect of the Capitol with the advice of the Commission on Fine Arts.

The National Cultural Center legislation provides that the building shall be in accordance with plans and specifications approved by the Commission of Fine Arts.

Section 2 further provides—in the Taft Memorial Act, that "such memorial shall be erected without expense to the United States."

Section 3 of the National Cultural Center Act provides that the Board of Trustees "shall construct for the Smithsonian Institution, with funds raised by voluntary contributions, a building to be designated as the National Cultural Center."

So this is another exact parallel between the two measures.

There was a discussion in the committee and elsewhere about the plans for the National Cultural Center not being prepared and definite to the last degree.

Let us see what the Taft Memorial Act provides—in section 3 there is this language:

> The authority granted by the first section of this act shall cease to exist unless (a) within 1 year after the passage of this concurrent resolution the plans for such memorial have been presented for the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, and within 3 years after such approval the erection of such memorial has commenced, and (b) the Architect of the Capitol finds that, prior to the commencement of the erection of such memorial, sufficient funds are available to insure its completion.

Now, it seems to me that we have to be absolutely fair in these matters. We cannot give permission to the Taft Memorial Foundation to come in a year after passage of that act with plans for the memorial—and at the same time demand from the National Cultural Center sponsors that they have their plans spelled out to the *n*th degree before we will consider giving them a site.

We have to be consistent in these matters.

I need hardly say it is my personal conviction that the National Cultural Center is important from any point of view.

The National Cultural Center was amended in committee to provide that the money must be raised in 5 years. This is a strengthening feature, and again there is the parallel with the Taft Memorial Act.

Section 4 of the Taft Memorial Act reads as follows:

> SEC 4. After the completion of the memorial according to the approved plans and specifications, it shall be accepted on behalf of the people of the United States by the Congress and thereafter shall be maintained by the Congress as part of the Capitol Grounds.

The President of the United States in his letter, and I call your attention to the text which appears on page 4 of the report of the Committee on Public Works says this:

> An auditorium and other facilities such as are provided for in pending legislation, established and supported by contributions from the public, would be a center of which the entire Nation could be proud.

The National Cultural Center is expected to be self-supporting and undoubtedly will be self-supporting.

But in any event, I see no reason why the District of Columbia should not make a contribution to the National Cultural Center just as it does in the case of the National Zoo. Just as other cities contribute to their cultural activities.

But, finally, for the future I cannot see how we can in this body make a clear case against a Federal contribution when we have provided in the Taft Memorial Act that it shall be "maintained by the Congress as part of the Capitol Grounds."

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT].

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill. It is very simple. It provides that the Supreme Court of the United States, in reviewing a final judgment or decree of a State court, cannot take any action which would invalidate a State statute on the grounds of it being repugnant to the Constitution except by a unanimous decision of all of the Supreme Court Justices participating in the review.

In other words, the decision of the Supreme Court must be concurred in by all of the Justices before their decision is to be binding and a reversal of the State court.

I am alarmed at the recent great number of decisions by the Supreme Court declaring State statutes and State constitutional provisions unconstitutional by a 5 to 4 decision. Twenty-nine of these cases have been decided by the Supreme Court since 1950. In a little over 7 years, the Supreme Court has knocked down and held unconstitutional, by a sharply divided Court, State statutes or State constitutional provisions in 29 instances.

Apparently the majority of the High Court cares nothing about precedent but is foisting upon our people their own whims and ideas about social justice.

The day before yesterday, Wednesday, August 20, the chief justices of 10 States charged the United States Supreme Court with unrestrained policymaking. They voiced a strong plea for States rights in their report submitted to the Conference of Chief Justices. The 10 justices represented States both North and South and accused the Court of adopting the role of policymaker without proper judicial restraint.

The report pointed out that a number of the decisions by the Court, which wiped out and obliterated the rights of the States and the privileges of our people, were decisions of a divided Court, in most instances on a 5-to-4 division. Not only that, but this same committee of 10 chief justices of the supreme courts of the States called upon the Supreme Court of the United States to exercise one of the greatest of all judicial powers—the power of judicial self-restraint in differentiating between constitutional rights and powers on the one hand and local self-government on the other.

Surely, justice has come to a pretty pass in this country—here in a democracy—when a committee of State chief justices has to call upon the Supreme Court of the land to exercise restraint in rendering its decision. Never before in the history of a republican form of government has the judicial branch arrogated unto itself dictatorial power to declare policy, to amend the Constitution, and to enact laws.

If we are to survive, we must curb this dictatorial Court before they wreck our way of life and take from us the freedoms and liberties that have meant so much to the progress and growth of our great Nation.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ].

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, the National Confederation of American Ethnic Groups recently conducted a nationwide poll. Its purpose was to give affiliated groups the opportunity to name the issues the ethnic groups wish to support or oppose. Participating in the drive to find out what the ethnic groups think and want were 67 national organizations with chapters in the 48 States and a combined membership of more than 18 million.

Poll results indicate an awakening of the ethnic groups, with a strong tendency to strengthen and unify local, State, and nationwide ethnic organizations and to establish common goals within the framework of the national confederation.

Noteworthy, also, is the eagerness of the ethnic groups to engage in unified, concerted action in support of NCAEG objectives, thus enabling the groups to grow in service to themselves and the Nation.

The National Confederation of American Ethnic Groups is headed by Judge Blair F. Gunther, of the Pennsylvania Superior Appellate Court and board chairman of the Polish National Alliance. Paul M. Deac, veteran Washington newsman, is its executive vice president and director of activities. The broad base of NCAEG is reflected in the many nationwide groups of some 40 different nationality and religious backgrounds who have joined NCAEG from its inception here a year ago. Confederation national headquarters are located at 1761 R Street NW., Washington, D. C.

The issues listed in the poll questionnaire which I submit here along with poll results, have since been adopted as the national confederation's program of action.

PART 1.—*Questionnaire*

Question	Abstain	Yes	No
1. Both major parties soft-pedaled the issue of communism in the last presidential elections and presumably will continue to do so in this year's elections, despite the fact that the threat of communism has never been greater and the need to stop Communist imperialism and aggression more acute.			
Do you or members of your organization approve of such policies?	2	------	65
Would you vote for candidates who do not regard communism as a major issue?	1	------	66
2. Information and propaganda:			
Do you feel we need an effective counterpropaganda arm to combat and offset Soviet propaganda?	------	67	------
Do you believe the United States Information Agency and Voice of America are doing an effective job in combating Soviet lies and making friends for America abroad?	------	------	67
Do you believe a joint Congressional committee should be created to look into the effectiveness, personnel competency, and present policies of the United States Information Agency and Voice of America?	------	67	------
3. Do you believe the nationality groups should have a voice in the formulation of our country's national and foreign policies, meaning full and fair representation in the higher courts, in Congress, and on all policymaking bodies of Government?	3	63	1
4. Do you approve of the present administration's domestic and foreign policies? If you disapprove, please briefly state why	11	1	55
5. Do you believe men and women after 40 are too old to work?	1	1	65
If you do not think so, do you favor NCAEG support of legislation barring discrimination in hiring of men and women over 40?	2	59	6
6. Do you consider current unemployment compensation sufficient?	6	20	41
If not, do you favor NCAEG action to help restore jobless pay to adequate standards?	8	45	14
7. Would you vote for candidates at local, county, State and national levels who disregard or oppose the legitimate aspirations of nationality groups to assert themselves and thereby correct some of the injustices and abuses of which the nationality groups have been victim in the past?	2	3	62
8. Do you favor action to insure charity income tax deductibility on gift parcels, especially those destined to the needy behind the Iron or Bamboo Curtains?	5	53	9
9. Kennan proposals:			
Are you in favor of abandoning our position of strength in free Europe?	1	1	65
Are you in favor of a neutralized Germany?	5	1	61
10. Yugoslavia:			
Are you in favor of military aid to Yugoslavia?	5	7	55
Are you in favor of economic aid to Yugoslavia?	6	12	49
Are you in favor of discontinuing all aid to Yugoslavia?	7	48	12
11. Are you in favor of continuing aid to neutral countries?	5	37	25
12. Are you in favor of further appeasement and concession to the Soviet Union?	------	------	67
13. Do you favor withdrawing recognition of Chiang Kai-shek and recognizing Communist China?	------	------	67
14. Do you believe we as a nation should support the ideals of freedom and self-determination for all enslaved people?	1	66	------
15. Do you favor adoption by United States of a strong and farsighted liberation policy?	1	65	1

PART 2.—*Tentative issues*

Issue	Abstain	Yes	No
1. Revise Immigration Act	2	58	7
Introduce in Congress an omnibus immigration and naturalization bill designed to wipe out iniquities of the McCarran-Walter Act, namely:			
a. Eliminate discriminatory and racist aspects of present quota system which favors Nordic peoples. Harsh, unfair aspects are exemplified in the yearly immigration quotas:			
Britain 65,361 — France 3,069 — Czechoslovakia 2,859			
Hungary 865 — Greece 308 — Yugoslavia 933			
Romania 289 — Poland 6,488 — Japan 92			
Germany 25,814 — Norway 2,364 — China 100			
Ireland 17,756 — Italy 5,645			
b. Abolish second class citizenship—wipe out all distinction between native-born and naturalized citizens.			
c. Eliminate harsh penalties, e. g., deportation, for minor offenses committed 20 to 30 years ago or more.			
d. Apply unused Nordic quota numbers to desirable non-Nordic immigrants, mostly kin, irrespective of birthplace.			
2. Fight unemployment	5	57	5
Seek adoption by administration and Congress of measures to effectively combat the current recession which has reached alarming proportions:			
a. Introduction of measures guaranteeing adequate unemployment compensation.			
b. Institution of public-works projects in localities hard hit by unemployment.			
c. Reduction of personal income taxes.			
3. Foreign aid	1	66	------
Reappraise all foreign aid, particularly as concerns aid to Communist dominated and neutral countries, with a view to eliminating waste and misuse of United States aid. (Up to date, only a fraction of such aid has reached the people. As a result, the rich have become richer and the poor poorer, thus defeating the basic humanitarian aim of United States aid.)			
4. Aid to Yugoslavia	2	51	14
Reappraise United States policy toward Yugoslavia and other so-called National-Communist states.			
5. Fourth dimensional warfare	------	67	------
Urge United States adoption of fourth dimensional strategic warfare—weakening the Soviet empire from within.			
"Peaceful coexistence" in Communist dialectics means "conquest by subversion" and eventual absorption of the Free World in a world Communist state.			
Fourth dimensional warfare would enable United States to beat Soviets at their own game by turning peaceful coexistence into a two-way affair, namely, competitive subversion—thus weakening the Soviet empire from within.			
To accomplish this, the following prerequisites must be met:			
a. Mobilize American public opinion in full support of fourth dimentional warfare.			
b. Bring about abrogation of Yalta agreement. Reaffirmation of Atlantic Charter principles.			
c. Adopt a genuine and vigorous liberation policy covering not only the satellite nations, but all people enslaved by Communist tyranny and dictatorship, including Russia itself.			
6. Cold war	1	66	------
Demand study of United States psychological warfare and information programs by joint Congressional committee or NCAEG components to determine causes for repeated United States failures in cold war.			
7. Nationality groups and cold-war effort	1	66	------
Oppose abuse and discrimination practiced by United States Information Agency—Voice of America and other Government officials against professionally qualified nationality group candidates for Government jobs and demand that these objectionable practices be promptly and completely eliminated.			
8. Recognition in Government	3	64	------
Urge appointment of qualified nationality group representatives to the higher courts, and to high-level Government advisory and policymaking bodies.			
9. Kennan proposals	1	65	1
Condemn Kennan proposals, i. e., to abandon our position of strength in free Europe and to neutralize Germany.			
10. Gaither report	6	46	15
Demand full publication of Gaither report concerning the state of our national defense and security.			
11. Foreign-language scholarships	2	60	5
Ask for diversion of a percentage of multimillion science scholarship fund voted by Congress to creation of scholarships for study of foreign languages other than those usually taught in United States high schools and colleges.			
Present United States position as the top world power coupled with growing needs of national security and psychological warfare make this a must.			
12. Foreign-language specialists	1	65	1
Seek employment of competent linguists—writers, translators, interpreters and proofreaders—in various Government agencies where such help is needed.			

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished author of the bill, the gentleman who has done so very, very much by his legislative skill to bring this bill to the House today, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I should like to pay tribute to those Members of this body and of the other House who have worked long and hard for this great project of a National Cultural Center.

To my colleague from Pennsylvania, CARROLL D. KEARNS, who has worked longer for this program than any Member of this House, I pay a special tribute. The gentleman from Pennsylvania introduced and cosponsored legislation for similar purposes with my predecessor Charles R. Howell, who shared this same great vision.

To the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who had the courage to join me in this venture, and the drive and imagination to enlist the sympathetic support of his colleagues, Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, and Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, as cosponsors, and the rest of his colleagues on June 20, 1958, when this measure passed the Senate unanimously, a special debt is owed by the citizens of our country. His contribution is, indeed, an historic one. This legislation is, I am confident, a further and important addition to Senator FULBRIGHT's contributions to cultural matters which began with the historic Fulbright Act of 1944.

I want to say how grateful I am for the bipartisan spirit which has supported this legislation and worked hard and faithfully for it at every step in the House.

I want the Members of this House to know that the ranking minority member of the House Public Works Committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR] not only sponsored this legislation but has been one of its most valuable and consistent supporters. Without his help, given generously and without stint to the chairman of the Public Buildings Subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], this legislation would not have had a chance of adoption.

There are enough and more honors for those who have contributed of their time and strength to this fight.

I would like to mention the other sponsors this afternoon, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], each of whom deserve the enthusiastic support of their countrymen today, tomorrow, and at the voting booths in November.

There is the historic phrase in connection with the first telegraphed message, asked by Mr. Morse, "What hath God wrought?"

My dear friends and colleagues from both sides of this House, I feel impelled to ask this same question this afternoon, "What hath God wrought?" for this is an historic occasion which will grow in importance as time goes on.

I know all of us will look back to this moment, and be proud that we have contributed to the growth of our country in cultural matters.

No one has worked harder for this on the Democratic side of the aisle than the chairman of the Public Buildings Subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] and no one has shown a greater grasp of the vast potential of this measure than the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] whose magnificent statement we have just heard.

If this legislation proves anything, it is that Members of both parties can work together in harmony for the advancement of our country. The fine arts and education reflect the true status of our Nation, and make our civilization endure and flourish.

There is a rare unanimity of opinion in support of the National Cultural Center, extending from President Eisenhower and Vice President NIXON, the Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, all the Federal and District Agencies, the Board of Trade, the General Federation of Women's Club, the National Federation of Music Clubs to the AFL–CIO.

We have the President's fine statement in the printed Report of the Committee on Public Works and referred to by our distinguished colleague, Mr. WRIGHT of Texas.

Some months ago, Vice President NIXON wrote me as follows:

> As you know, for some time I have been in favor of the development of such a center here in Washington. It would not only provide a much needed facility for the residents of this area, but more important, it would also serve as a symbol of the interest of our Nation and Government in the rich cultural traditions and experience of America.

The Wall Street Journal in a front-page story on May 15, 1958, declared that while Vice President NIXON and his entourage were running into angry mobs the New York Philharmonic Symphony on its South American tour at the same time was everywhere greeted with warmth and affection by cheering symphony fans.

It is important to note that upon his return the Vice President recommended that we send cultural groups to South America where the New York Philharmonic Symphony was received with such great ovations at the very time the Vice President was being abused and his life endangered. This is not art for art's sake, but a question of survival against a ruthless enemy which uses art as propaganda.

The legislation today calls for the Federal government to contribute some little-used land it owns in a public park area where no office buildings will be built. The Government to contribute the land just as it did to the Bell-Tower Memorial to Senator Taft.

The District of Columbia Board of Commissioners have offered to contribute an acre that is in private ownership, by the only device open to them—that is, that the land be purchased by the National Capital Planning Commission with Capper-Crampton funds, which the District will repay through ad valorem taxes raised in the District of Columbia.

Since the taxpayers here pay some $170 million in local, not Federal taxes—more than several states—and this tax money is allocated by the Congress it seems eminently fair that the District be allowed, as provided in S. 3335, to add its contribution to this National Cultural Center.

Compared to the $40 billions we appropriate each year for Defense and Government's contribution of six acres of land, acquired through the years at a cost of about $900,000 seems little enough for the contribution to the arts of peace.

Certainly, the arts of peace must be cultivated, too.

We fail to get our message of peace across, and we have failed in this very badly. Yet the cost of the arts of peace are infinitesimal compared to the cost of the arts of war.

Unfortunately, as many keen observers have pointed out, we are inclined to rely altogether too much on propaganda handouts, and informational media which fail to get across the story of our peaceful intentions. They will fail to get our story across as long as we fail to pay attention to the arts of peace at home—the arts, in other words, which other peoples regard as the very soul of a nation and a people.

COSTS OF OPERATION AND POSSIBLE REVENUE

I have had some figures developed as to costs of operation and possible revenue, which will be of interest to this body.

Pereira & Luckman, the coordinating architects, advise me, in a letter of August 9, 1958, that they checked the operating expenses in conjunction with a typical Broadway theater operation and have developed a figure of approximately $4,000 per week.

With a theater such as the National Theater in Washington, seating 1,800, and tickets averaging $3—experience showing that the prices which are normally higher than this are offset by those which are normally lower—there is realizable revenue of $43,200 at full or capacity houses. And try to get a ticket at any successful play in New York—you will find that you have to arrange for it months or weeks ahead.

I have been given figures by Wallace Harrison, architect of New York's Lincoln Center and many other great buildings, including the Rockefeller Center in New York City, both as to the Metropolitan Opera Co. and as adjusted to the proposed Lincoln Center. These are extremely enlightening and informative.

These are the richest and most plush music and theater operations in the entire world—much richer than those of any European state-supported theater and opera house. As a sponsor of this measure I can assure this House that nothing as rich and plush as the Metropolitan Opera House is contemplated in Washington, D. C.

The Metropolitan Opera House had a net deficit for the fiscal year ended May 31, 1955, of $214,005. As adjusted to the Lincoln Square Center with its more efficient operations there would be a net surplus of $156,751.

I am confident that the National Cultural Center can be managed so that it would be continuously in the black. I hope that the President will appoint the kind of men who can assure that it would be so run—men from the world of business, finance, labor, and industry, who can use their great experience to advantage.

But in this connection it may be as enlightening to Members of this body as it was to me to see what one of our most distinguished Members has to say on the matter of deficits in connection with the National Cultural Center.

I have here a photostat of a letter written by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS] to Mr. Gerson Nordlinger, Jr., a leading official of the National Symphony Orchestra, the Washington Opera Society, and the Washington Ballet.

The gentleman from New Jersey, a member of the Committee on Public Works, has this to say:

> I am in favor of an appropriation amounting to as much as $200,000 in the District of Columbia budget in order to meet any operating deficit which might occur. Furthermore, I am convinced from experience that the gift money which is expected to be received for the construction of the center would be more easily obtained if such a prospectus were worked out.

Following are typical letters of support—from all sections of this great Nation—and Mr. AUCHINCLOSS' letter.

There also follows an estimate of the costs of operation of the National Cultural Center based upon a carefully drawn estimate—and compared with the expenses of the Metropolitan Opera Association—expenses which far exceed those expected in Washington.

I include also an explanation of the operation of the Capper-Cramton Act as it relates to this proposal:

IOWA FEDERATION OF MUSIC CLUBS,
Cedar Rapids, Iowa, July 7, 1958.

The Honorable W. R. HULL, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Iowa Federation of Music Clubs wishes to express their approval for the need of a National Cultural Center and we urge that the House Public Works Committee report out without change, the bipartisan bill S. 3335 and the companion bill H. R. 13017 for the Natural Cultural Center, which was passed unanimously by the Senate.

I have the honor to remain,
Very truly yours,
Mrs. MARGARET J. HEINRICH,
Chairman of Legislation,
Iowa Federation of Music Clubs.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF MUSIC CLUBS,
Beloit, Wis., August 22, 1958.

Memo for Representative THOMPSON:

Subject: National Cultural Center.

In light of the gigantic appropriations for defense of our Nation, the cost of a National Cultural Center is negligible.

Peace will come to the world only through most effective communication and a true understanding of world needs and world problems.

Music and the arts are common denominators of emotions and should be promoted in every way possible so that they in turn will promote mutual understanding. A National Cultural Center, the first for our great Nation, would be a significant step in the right direction.

It is the opinion of the 600,000 members of the National Federation of Music Clubs that a National Cultural Center is an absolute must.

The membership of the federation has faith that the Members of the House will take the same fine, positive action as did the Senate June 20, and pass the Fulbright-Thompson proposal today, unanimously.

MARIE A. HURLEY,
National Legislation Chairman,
National Federation of Music Clubs.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 8, 1958.

Mr. GERSON NORDLINGER, Jr.,
Apartment 307 Woodley Park Towers,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. NORDLINGER: I appreciate more than I can say your thoughtful and friendly letter of August 6 which I have just received and I am very pleased that you recognize my sincere desire to be of help in the project for establishing a Cultural Center in Washington.

Having had some experience in promotions of this kind, I am forced to the conclusion that under the present set-up this proposal is headed for trouble because it is not based on a sound businesslike foundation. A fair appraisal of not only the income to be derived from such a venture but also the expenses involved should be made and from such an appraisal it will be determined to a certain extent whether it will be profitable or not. I am in favor of an appropriation amounting to as much as $200,000 in the District of Columbia budget in order to meet any operating deficit which might occur. Furthermore I am convinced from experience that the gift money which is expected to be received for the construction of the center would be more easily obtained if such a prospectus were worked out. I am frank to say that I look with skepticism on the plan as proposed at present and hope that the proponents of this venture will proceed along more businesslike lines than they are now doing.

Thank you again for taking the time out to write such an encouraging letter and I assure you that I have always considered it a privilege to be of service to the people of Washington who have no vote but who are as fine citizens as can be found anywhere.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely yours,
JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
Member of Congress.

Gross annual revenue and expenses (estimated) of the National Cultural Center

Income from facility rentals:	
The Auditorium-Music Hall:	
Opera, touring	$28,500
Opera, resident	12,960
Ballet	37,800
Musicals, professional	162,000
Musicals, amateur	2,500
National Symphony	15,000
Touring Symphony	6,000
Recitals, professional	5,000
Festivals	2,500
Patriotic and religious	2,500
Conventions	12,500
Total revenue	298,510
The Theater:	
Plays, amateur	1,500
Recitals, professional	13,500
Recitals, amateur	3,750
Festivals	1,500
Forums and lectures	750
Civic group meetings	1,500
Conventions	11,250
Total revenue	33,750
Operating expenses:	
Stage department material	73,000
Repairs and maintenance	16,000
Electricity	7,000
Insurance	41,000
Contingencies	7,000
Total expenses	144,000

CAPPER-CRAMTON ACT OF JULY 29, 1930

1. Under the terms of the Capper-Cramton Act of July 29, 1930, the National Capital Planning Commission, for many years, has been acquiring the lands for the park, parkway and playground system of the District of Columbia. That act authorized appropriations totaling $16 million for these purposes, which funds are to be reimbursed by the District of Columbia as acquisitions are completed.

This operates as a loan, in fact, and the District of Columbia reimburses the National Capital Planning Commission out of the taxes paid by citizens of the District of Columbia. This amounts to nearly $180 million each year. There is no expense to the Federal Government for lands bought by the National Capital Planning Commission in the District of Columbia—and this is the case with the Foggy Bottom site planned for the National Cultural Center.

The Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, and the Recreation Board also have approved the use of funds appropriated to the National Capital Planning Commission for the purpose of the National Cultural Center. If the lands in question are acquired by the Planning Commission, they immediately will become a part of the parkway system in the District of Columbia and under existing legislation can be made available for the purposes of the Cultural Center. (As explained to Public Buildings Subcommittee at hearings on August 5 by William E. Finley, director, National Capital Planning Commission.)

2. Mr. MCGREGOR. To reiterate your statement, the District will have to reimburse the Federal Government for land acquisition.

Mr. FINLEY. That is correct, sir.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Have you any money available for that purpose now?

Mr. FINLEY. Sir, the District Government sets aside a certain amount of money in its annual budget each year to reimburse the United States Government for lands purchased by our Commission for parks, parkways, and playgrounds. They have been setting it aside each year for almost 30 years.

3. There is 6.5 acres owned by Government. Additional land will be obtained by street closures, at no cost.

4. There is about 1 acre still in private ownership to be obtained by National Capital Planning Commission with use of Capper-Cramton Act funds.

Metropolitan Opera Association, Inc., statement of net surplus or (deficit) for the fiscal year ended May 31, 1955, adjusted to indicate effect of conducting same operations at proposed center and further adjusted to reflect 1956 operating conditions and wage and price levels

	Fiscal year ended May 31, 1955	Adjustments to indicate effect of conducting some operations at proposed center—1954–55 wage and price levels	As adjusted	Adjustments to indicate effect of 1956 conditions and wage and price levels on some operations	As adjusted
Income:					
Ticket sales	$2,816,795	$510,200	$3,326,995		$3,326,995
Broadcasting fees	165,000		165,000		165,000
Store and studio rents	133,417	(133,417)			
Auditorium rental	87,447	(87,447)			
Recording royalties	14,077		14,077	$56,000	70,077
Ballet school tuition (net)	15,764		15,764		15,764
Piano	18,000		18,000		18,000
Sherry catering	24,467	(24,467)			
Program	13,750		13,750		13,750
Libretto	8,680		8,680		8,680
Royalties, M. Lawrence picture	20,000		20,000		20,000
Other royalty income	1,399		1,399		1,399
Television	398		398		398
Checkroom	15,760	(15,760)			
Miscellaneous	1,042		1,042		1,042
Total income	3,335,996	249,109	3,585,105	56,000	3,641,105
Expenses:					
Salaries and wages:					
Singing artists, conductors, etc	767,766		767,766	38,800	806,566
Assistant conductors and orchestra	506,955		506,955	25,300	532,255
Chorus, ballet, and supers	391,331		391,331	20,200	411,531
Stagehands	298,195	(62,800)	235,395	9,800	245,195
Electrical department	131,992	(19,800)	112,192	9,500	121,692
Property department	115,260	(17,600)	97,660	11,700	109,360
Other stage departments	233,858		233,858	12,000	245,858
Superintendents, engineers, porters, matrons, etc	150,858	(150,858)			
Front of house	85,169	(85,169)			
Studios	31,479	(31,479)			
Stage department	12,421	(12,421)			
Box office	49,306		49,306		49,306
Executive and clerical	244,818		244,818	44,200	289,018
Total salaries and wages	3,019,408	(380,127)	2,639,281	171,500	2,810,781
Other operating expenses:					
Stage department material and expenses	218,482		218,482	80,500	298,982
Repairs and maintenance:					
Theater and storehouses	50,457	($50,457)			
Stage department	7,466	(7,466)			
Studio	10,515	(10,515)			
Electricity	21,884	(21,884)			
Transfer and cartage	137,157	(108,600)	28,557		28,557
Administrative and general	242,550		242,550	62,100	304,650
Insurance	41,995	(22,600)	19,395	8,000	27,395
Taxes	128,135	(33,200)	94,935		94,935
Interest	42,198	(42,198)			
Depreciation	59,405	(25,000)	34,405		34,405
Contingencies and special expenses	7,515		7,515		7,515
Rental charges, new center		263,300	263,300		263,300
Total other operating expenses	967,759	(58,620)	909,139	150,600	1,059,739
Total expenses	3,987,167	(438,747)	3,548,420	322,100	3,870,520
Profit or (loss) from New York operations	(651,171)	687,856	36,685	(266,100)	(229,415)
Net profit from tour	116,092		116,092	(51,000)	65,092
Net profit or (loss) from operations	(535,079)	687,856	152,777	(317,100)	(164,323)
Contributions:					
Metropolitan Opera Guild	78,491		78,491		78,491
National council	52,458		52,458		52,458
Special Arabella commitment	52,737		52,737		52,737
Fund drive	62,052		62,052		62,052
Berlioz concert	4,085		4,085		4,085
Appropriations from employees welfare fund	8,066		8,066		8,066
Annual giving (net)	57,231		57,231		57,231
Other contributions	5,954		5,954		5,954
Total contributions	321,074		321,074		321,074
Net surplus or (deficit)	(214,005)	687,856	473,851	(317,100)	156,751

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of Sunday, August 17, 1958]

STILL SOME HURDLES, BUT LOWER ONES

(By Robert C. Albrook)

Congress works in mysterious ways its wonders to perform. Just when things seem hopelessly entangled in conflicts, conferences and confusion, the waters are miraculously calmed and a storm-tossed piece of legislation sails smoothly into harbor.

This, last week, was the case with the District Cultural Center project. Already approved by the Senate, it will come before the House with a strong endorsement from a seemingly enthusiastic Public Works Committee. Although a two-thirds vote will be needed for passage under suspension of the rules (a customary procedure this late in the session), sponsors are optimistic.

The chief credit probably should go to Representative FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., of New Jersey, the bill's sponsor, and his indefatigable aide, George Frain, who has worked assiduously on behalf of the District's art and music facilities for many years.

But their labors would have been in vain except for the support of President Eisenhower, Senator FULBRIGHT, who put the project through on his side of the Capitol, and Representatives JONES, MCGREGOR, MACK, DOOLEY, AUCHINCLOSS, and other members of the House Public Works Committee who have pushed the legislation along or indicated broad sympathy with its objectives.

AUCHINCLOSS, a veteran in District affairs on the Hill and the real father of the post-war home-rule movement, has some reservations about procedure. He would like to be assured that this privately financed project, to be built on publicly owned land in Foggy Bottom, will indeed be able to stand on its own feet, as its sponsors believe it will.

AUCHINCLOSS explained his position to fellow subcommittee members this way:

"I think the committee ought to go into this thing with its eyes open. I am not against culture. I think it is an excellent thing for the District of Columbia to have. I do think we ought to have some assurance, if they are to construct some kind of building, that we can have a look-see at it and have some kind of prospectus which will show whether they will be able to operate it at a profit without the necessity of coming to the local government, which is hard pressed for funds anyway, or to Uncle Sam."

But AUCHINCLOSS did not vote against the bill in committee, recording himself instead as present. And he went on to say: "I do not want to be in the role of trying to be in opposition in any way to the advancement of this kind of center. I think it is necessary and I think it a good thing for the community."

Representative MCGREGOR, however, was impressed—and so, apparently, were a majority of the committee—with the prospectus for the center worked up by the District Auditorium Commission, under a Congressional mandate, and presented to Congress in January 1957.

This $95,000 study appeared, a year ago, to have been wasted, and the project doomed, after Congress refused to endow the Commission with authority to select and acquire a site for the proposed center. The Commission wanted to buy a site in Foggy Bottom, parts of which were earmarked for other public and private projects.

But early this year, THOMPSON and FULBRIGHT proposed the new legislation, now before the House, which settles the site question by authorizing use of land, already mostly federally owned, also in Foggy Bottom but south of the tract favored by the Commission.

The new legislation also would provide for appointment of a new commission and for general supervision of the project by the Smithsonian Institution, all along the lines of the Mellon Gallery's creation.

The old Commission's report convinced the House committee, however, that all the advance planning that could reasonably be expected had been done and that this effort ought not to go down the drain. Said MCGREGOR of the Commission's prospectus: "I have never seen a prospectus as nearly complete as the one which has been presented in behalf of this legislation."

Representative DOOLEY seemed to bespeak general committee sentiment in noting: "I think there is so much public interest over the Nation in this cultural center that no doubt it will be a success financially. I used to be in that business, and I know money is available."

If the House approves the bill this week, the big job of raising $15 to $50 million and settling on detailed plans will be the next order of business, once a new commission is named.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the concept otherwise is the same. The need for the people of the United States, in their very own Capital City, to have such a facility is so evident, that any repetition would be unnecessary.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate our colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, on the splendid work that he has done in bringing this plan to fruition. It is something that has long been needed in our Nation's Capital. I think we all owe the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] a debt of gratitude for the splendid work he has done in this matter, and I am sure today the House will show its appreciation by overwhelmingly voting for this fine piece of legislation.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I want to make clear two points. First, this is not going to cost the taxpayers a cent; is that correct?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Not one cent, that is correct.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. In the second place, this will provide a cultural center not only for those living in this area, but it will provide a cultural center for Americans everywhere; is that not true?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. It will, indeed, this being the Capital City for 170 million people.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I certainly congratulate the gentleman for bringing this legislation before us.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. I wish to congratulate the gentleman from New Jersey. One of the first things I did when I came to the Congress in 1951 was to introduce a bill to provide for a cultural center in the Nation's Capital. Is it not true that most countries overseas subsidize projects of this kind to improve their cultural attainments?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. It is, indeed, true. In this hemisphere the Government of Canada has undertaken a $50 million program. This is going to be a voluntary program just as in the case of the Taft Memorial and just as in the case of so many other great monuments to our people here.

Mr. MORANO. Is it not true that one of the reasons we do not attract the National Symphony Orchestra and the Metropolitan Opera Co. here in the Nation's Capital is because we do not have the accommodations to take care of them?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. There are no suitable facilities. The gentleman is quite correct.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. PELLY. I think this is a very meritorious project and I am very glad to support it.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I compliment the gentleman on the work he has done in connection with this cultural center and I associate myself with his efforts and urge that the House give as nearly unanimous support as it can to this legislation which is long overdue and highly desirable for the Nation's Capital.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, as an example of the almost unanimous support for this cultural center, I would like to read and put into the RECORD a letter addressed to the Honorable WILLIAM HULL, of Missouri, from the Iowa Federation of Women's Clubs:

The Iowa Federation of Women's Clubs wishes to express their approval of the need for a cultural center.

That is what it says among other things. The National Federation of Women's Clubs which has more than 600,000 members is in favor of this, as are many other organizations. I would like in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, to express my profound gratification and appreciation on behalf of all who have worked so long on this matter, to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], and to the full Committee on Public Works and those who have made this possible.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. YATES. Did I understand the gentleman correctly to say that the Iowa Federation of Women's Clubs are approving this bill?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. You understood the gentleman correctly, and the letter is signed by Mrs. Margaret J. Heinrich of the State of Iowa.

Mr. YATES. Are there other clubs in Iowa that approve the bill?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I think one or two from Iowa did not approve, but the overwhelming concensus is in favor of the bill.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my deep appreciation to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey for the work done in this whole matter and also to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee as well as to the members of the full committee. Some indication of the enthusiasm which a National Cultural Center in our Capital City would generate across the country can be seen from what has happened here in Washington since President Eisenhower's letter of endorsement was released.

S. 3335 was passed in the Senate without a dissenting vote. After long and considered hearings, the bill had been approved by the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds, by the National Capital Planning Commission, the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Washington Board of Trade, the Bureau of the Budget and many other agencies and individuals, who testified before the Senate committee.

Along with many other beauty-loving Americans, I have long been aware of

our lack of cultural facilities here in our National Capital.

In addition, my work on the Foreign Affairs Committee has brought me an increased realization of the importance of the arts in our foreign relations, and of the use other countries make of these in their foreign relations. I have asked myself and others the question: "Why is it that Washington should lack the needed facilities for the performing arts?"

The District of Columbia Auditorium Commission, headed by Mrs. Eugene Meyer, and which included a number of Members of Congress from both Houses, found that 382 American cities have cultural facilities. Americans as well as foreigners visiting Washington find it difficult to understand why our Capital City has no center for the arts, especially when they know that we have helped a number of European cities restore their great theaters and opera houses.

Feeling a definite sense of responsibility to my own people I joined with other Members in introducing a companion measure, H. R. 13193. It would seem exceedingly timely for us to demonstrate our recognition of the fact that beauty in all its phases is a vital human need.

Only recently the Congress passed, and the President signed, a bill for a second stadium to seat 50,000. Surely the need of an art center is one that cannot be gainsaid.

It is my earnest hope that this bill do pass.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, I shall close my remarks with a tribute to the person who has worked longer and harder for this legislation than anyone else. Earlier, I said that the idea is not new; it originated, in fact, with George Washington, this Nation's first President. In his first inaugural message, General Washington called to the attention of the Congress the need for recognition of music and the arts. Since Washington's day the cultural center has been advocated by Jefferson, Madison, Truman, and, as Mr. WRIGHT stated, Eisenhower. The great amount of work necessary to bring us here today, however, was done by my able and devoted legislative assistant, George Frain. Mr. Frain has worked night and day for years, literally, to see the culmination of this great project. Words cannot express my appreciation and admiration of his work. My cosponsor in the other body, the great Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], has often paid similar tribute to George Frain. The art and music lovers of this Nation are indebted to Mr. Frain, as are all of us here today.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in enthusiastic support of the bill to establish a National Cultural Center in the Nation's Capital. The establishment of such a center is long overdue in this Nation. We have been negligent in proper recognition of the cultural arts; it is my hope that the House will give this bill a unanimous vote of approval. This is a fine example of the realization of social goals through private initiative. This project is being paid for by the voluntary subscriptions of the citizens of this country; we cannot deny them the benefit and joy of a National Cultural Center.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 3335.

The most remarkable thing about this bill which came before the Public Works Committee is the fact that this group of people who are interested in providing a National Capital Cultural Center are willing to actually assume the burden of raising the funds to finance it. That is quite a distinctive approach to those of us in Congress who have been working on many projects involving the construction of buildings. It seems to me when people have the demonstrated initiative such as there is in this case to assume voluntarily the cost of construction of the National Cultural Center that we should respond to that initiative and encourage it and do everything we can to cooperate with them in bringing this building to a reality. This building will add to the beauty, the attractiveness, and the greatness of this Nation's Capital. We should pass this bill as presented to us.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may use to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON].

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, the need for this cultural center is apparent. It is in the national interest.

I join in supporting this measure and to warmly endorse the site which has been selected for the cultural center. Not only should the center itself afford adequate facilities for any fine arts performance but the site from every viewpoint offers the best advantages of accessibility, esthetic beauty, proximity to residential, business areas and hotels, good public transportation, restaurants, and parking facilities. My support is also based and conditioned on the provisions for financing through donations solicited for that purpose with the provision that if such funds are not forthcoming, the amount collected would go to the Smithsonian Institution.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express gratification at the commendation that has been extended to my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] for the effort he has put forth in this matter. It is well deserved. I am strongly in favor of this bill.

The bill is most worthy. It would fill a longfelt want in our National Capital. Cultural centers exist in practically every European capital. We have none. This Nation that leads in so many worthwhile activities is terribly delinquent in failing to provide a cultural center in this the greatest Capital in all the world. We should no longer delay in providing such a center.

A center of this kind will enable us to have presentations in cultural subjects such as music, art, drama, and all the other activities of a cultural character. The failure to have such a center, in my opinion, detracts from our national prestige.

Furthermore, it should not be overlooked that a cultural center, where representatives of foreign nations will participate in performances can be helpful in building understanding and good will between ourselves and the people of other nations.

I repeat the bill has a most worthy objective and should have the support of the House. And, in concluding, I would like to bring to the attention of the House that the establishment of the center, as provided for in this bill, will be at no cost to the Federal Government. The cost is to be met by voluntary contributions.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS].

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, 12 years ago when I came to Congress we were about to build a monument in honor of the soldiers of World War II. That was before the Korean war. I suggested at that time that we had enough monuments around Washington for pigeons to roost upon, and I thought it would be very good to do something along a different line, perhaps a living memorial to members of our Armed Forces. I see my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], on the floor. He had a bill for this purpose pending in Congress before I was privileged to be a Member of this body.

We decided to build a cathedral of the arts, an opera house. I do not believe that any other Member of Congress has had the privilege I have had of conducting the United States Air Force Symphonic Band and Orchestra in many parts of the world. A year ago today I was in Tokyo, at the height of the Girard case, conducting before 50,000 people there. There was no incident even though a Member of the United States Congress was conducting—because music is an international language.

I want to give great credit to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], also to his predecessor, former Congressman Charles Howell, and the others who have been working on this project for a long time.

The Capital of the Nation, Washington, D. C., should have a cultural center. It should be the cultural center of the United States of America; and, furthermore, I would like to see the greatest school system in the country functioning here in our Nation's Capital.

Let us make this Nation's Capital a world capital today, a cultural center, an educational center. The bill before us

today, if passed, will be a great step in that direction and I believe the people of the world will rise and say: "Well done, United States of America."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNS. I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. CELLER. It is true you can never say anything mean in music, and it is good to have a music center in Washington where, I may say as a fellow musician, we can have grand opera, or opera comique, something we have lacked all these years.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, is not a melody always sweet?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. While these kudos are being passed around about this fine piece of legislation, I would like to express my gratitude and that of my colleagues for the fine work done by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS] to make this cultural center possible. We are glad to follow his leadership.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, my friend, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS], ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings, stayed here hour after hour all of this week for an opportunity to demand a second on this suspension. He wanted to explain this bill to the House and state why he opposes it. Mr. AUCHINCLOSS is unavoidably absent. He asked me to demand a second and to make this presentation to the House.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS], as most of you know, is a very substantial and successful businessman. He has had great experience in business affairs. He has raised large sums of money for charitable and benevolent enterprises. Mr. AUCHINCLOSS has examined this legislation. He says there is not a bit of good business judgment in it. He [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS] is in favor of a cultural center, as am I, but this bill has been hastily drawn and contains provisions that will hinder, in our opinion, the establishment of a cultural center in the city of Washington rather than help it.

I ask unanimous consent to insert Mr. AUCHINCLOSS' statement in the RECORD immediately after my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us proposes to establish a National Cultural Center in the Nation's Capital for the promotion and advancement of drama, poetry, music, opera, the dance and other performing arts. Sponsors of this legislation estimate that the cost not figuring the cost of the site, will be $15 million to $50 million plus. The word "plus," of course, means the sky is the limit.

The bill authorizes Congress to present as a gift to the cultural center 8.2 acres of land, now owned by the Federal Government. This land is estimated to have a present day value of $4 million to $5 million. In addition, the Federal Government will add $650,000 to the national debt and turn over this money to the Cultural Center Board to acquire by condemnation or otherwise an additional 1.2 acres of land.

I am not opposed to establishing a cultural center in the Capital or even to the Federal Government providing some funds for its accomplishment. However, before doing so I do think Congress should have some definite information as to what is being proposed. That information we do not have now.

Proponents of this legislation know definitely that 9.4 acres are required as a site. They say they do not know how many buildings or the nature of the buildings that will be required. They gave the committee no estimates as to whether the operation of the project, including the use of domestic artists and the importation of foreign artists for presentation in the center, would be a paying or a losing venture.

Proponents of the bill provided the committee no information as to anticipated expenditures for maintenance and operation and they did not provide the committee any estimate of expected revenues. No one, as far as I can ascertain, knows whether this will be a break even or a losing venture financially.

They did present an elaborate report on a previous study but said this is not the kind of project that is now wanted which would make the figures in it pretty much valueless.

If the project should prove financially and economically a money-losing venture who will pay the bill? The Federal Government will pay it, of course.

This bill in one of its provisions says the actions of the Board, which this legislation will create, will not be subject to review by any officers or agency of the Government except the courts. Proponents of this legislation say it will not cost the Federal Government a cent, that all the money is to be raised by donations.

The bill, however, provides that the Federal Government is to donate to the enterprise land valued at about $5 million and in addition loan the cultural center $650,000 of additional money. The loan is to be paid back at some future indefinite time.

Furthermore, the Federal Government is creating this new agency. It is giving it broad powers that are not subject to review by anyone except the courts. It can buy land, presumably contract debts and perhaps even float revenue bond issues to augment the monetary gifts it received. No one except the courts can review its actions.

The Cultural Center Board will be an agency created by Congress. If the venture loses money it will be the moral obligation of the Federal Government to make good any deficits.

I do not think the Congress should grant to any agency such broad powers without more careful study than this bill has had.

The members of our committee were refused an opportunity to suggest or offer any amendments to this bill. The Members of the House on the floor now are being denied an opportunity to offer any amendments to put safeguards into this legislation to protect the interests of the taxpayers.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], says the idea of a cultural center in the Nation's Capital has been under consideration ever since the George Washington administration. It has been proposed then off and on for 160 years.

We are told that creation of this cutural center is a great national emergency and that legislation creating it must be rushed through Congress without amendment and with only 40 minutes of debate. It is implied that it is now or never on this legislation. We are told that unless this bill is enacted speedily our Nation and the world will return to the dark ages. I do not believe this legislation is so desperate an emergency as it is painted.

All Mr. AUCHINCLOSS and I say is that this bill has not been adequately considered. We say there should be opportunity to put safeguards in it to protect the American taxpayer. We ask that action on this bill be deferred until January which is only 4 months away. If this is done I am certain we can obtain a far better bill than the one being rushed through Congress today in the expiring hours of this session.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I arise in opposition to this bill not because I oppose the establishment of a cultural center here in the District of Columbia but because the plans as set forth in the hearings and the so-called prospectus are far from complete and entirely theoretical. There is nothing businesslike about them. May I enumerate:

First. There is disagreement about what kind of building or buildings shall be erected. The written prospectus calls for a building which includes a large hall seating 4,000 people; an opera house; a theater; and various small rooms for meetings and so forth. The proponents of the bill testifying before the committee stated their opposition to a large hall and the various proposed smaller rooms.

Second. There is no definite estimate about the cost of the buildings. Figures were suggested in the hearings of from fifteen million to fifty million dollars plus. I might observe that with inflation upon us, this cost estimate will probably increase considerably.

Third. There is no definite plan as to how this money is to be raised. It is stated that popular subscriptions will be secured but common sense dictates that contributions of any size will not be forthcoming unless it is decided what kind of a building will be required and more definitely what the program will be.

Fourth. In the prospectus the income is generously estimated to be $437,376 and this includes an income of $83,500 from the use of a great hall which is opposed by many. But no estimate of operating costs is submitted. Perhaps

this is because it is unknown just what sort of a project is being promoted. Furnishings and operating costs such as management, maintenance, insurance, gas, electricity, and water, are constant expenses, not to mention printing, publicity, and other inevitable costs. How can substantial contributions be expected unless an estimated balance sheet showing the expense of operating is submitted?

Fifth. There is no doubt in my mind that because of the way this proposition is being handled the District of Columbia and/or the Federal Government will be called upon to make an annual contribution to meet a deficit in operations. I would not object too much to that if an estimate were submitted as to how much such a contribution might be. That is the straightforward way of doing business.

Sixth. I object to the claim made by the proponents of this measure that this project does not cost the Government a cent. The facts are that appropriations amounting to $150,000 have already been made and spent in the study of this proposal and the Government is asked to donate land valued at something like $2 million on which to build the center. I don't object to either of these facts but I do object to the creation of the idea that this is of no expense to the Federal Government. Let us keep the record straight.

Mr. Speaker, I believe for the benefit of the proponents of this plan and in the interest of sound business principles that this project should be referred back for further study and consideration, so it may be determined what the eventual cost, if any, may be to the Federal Government.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, many visitors from Europe come to my office here in the Capitol each year. Almost invariably, they speak of their admiration for Washington as one of the most beautiful cities of the world. Then they go on to express their amazement that it contains no cultural center for the performance of opera, ballet, music, and drama. Every provincial city, every grand ducal seat of France and Germany has its beautifully appointed home for the performing arts. I refuse to believe, Mr. Speaker, that what a Louis Napoleon or a Frederick the Great could do, the free people of the United States, by their own initiative, cannot do.

I hope that S. 3335 will overwhelmingly pass, and that the National Cultural Center will become a reality.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I support this bill. Many, if not most, of the great capitals of the world have theaters built by the government and subsidize the drama, the opera, music, and the ballet. I do not feel we should follow this practice. On the other hand, I regret the lack of these cultural activities in our great Capital. This bill meets this situation in a truly American way, by making it possible for private citizens, for the people of the country, to create a cultural center on Government premises. I congratulate the sponsors of this legislation in Congress and in Washington; I particularly want to mention Mrs. Virginia Lorve Bacon, a great civic leader and widow of a distinguished American who served in this House. This bill provides the right way to go ahead with a national cultural center, the right place to locate it. Now is the right time to act on it.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay my compliments to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama. He has done an excellent job, and I hope he clears up somewhat of an error that seems to have gone around, emanating from my distinguished friend from Washington, that this is going to cost the Federal Government a considerable sum of money. I hope he will show us that the contributions that are going to be collected will pay $693,000 for the land that is now owned by the Federal Government.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the gentleman personally as chairman of this committee that has given great deliberations to this problem, and I hope that this legislation will be passed unanimously. I would like to pay tribute, also, to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR], on our side.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that I have to ask the indulgence of the House to take time to explain the purpose of S. 3335. I thought that its intent was clear to all the Members. However, in view of some of the statements that have been previously made, I feel that it is incumbent on me to clarify just what the bill does.

First let me say to the Members of the House that the entire tract of land on which the cultural center will be built will occupy approximately 7½ acres. Government-owned land now totals approximately 6½ acres, leaving a balance of an acre to be acquired at an approximate cost of $625,000; $625,000 to acquire the remaining acre will come from funds available under the Capper-Cramton Act of 1930, under which the National Capitol Planning Commission has been acquiring lands in the District of Columbia. The Federal Government will be reimbursed by the District of Columbia for money used under the Capper-Cramton Act from District funds raised by ad valorem taxes.

If this measure fails today, the National Capital Planning Commission intends to acquire the site for a park. Thus you will not save anything by refusing to vote for this bill. Further, whether acquired for a park or a cultural site, this will not cost the Federal Government a cent—since the District of Columbia, as I have said, reimburses the United States for all funds used by it under the Capper-Cramton Act.

The committee believes that there is in the bill the most proven way of administering the affairs of a program such as this. The Smithsonian Institution, through its Board of Regents, has been most successful through the years in its operation. This Board will have supervisory control over the board of trustees set up under S. 3335. This bill has been carefully drawn and in the best legal manner possible. The President of the United States forwarded a letter to the chairman of the Public Works Committee urging approval of this project under the terms and conditions set forth in the bill before you today.

The committee felt it would be a wise policy to set a limitation on the period of time under which the board of trustees could exist and make solicitations. The commission is given 5 years in which to raise the amount of money necessary to construct this building. In the event that, at the expiration of 5 years, in the opinion of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, there are not sufficient funds on hand to construct the center, the funds raised will be turned over to the Smithsonian Institution for use in its art collection.

I know of no better way to insure the success of a program of this type than the way we have provided for in this legislation. This is a bill that will not cost the Fedral taxpayers one red penny and which will provide a center that is badly needed to show to the world the American culture of which we are all so justly proud.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Is it not a fact that the precedent for such an amendment was established in the memorial to the late great Senator from Ohio, Senator Taft, when that act provided, without their having any plans, 1 year in which to provide plans and 3 years in which to construct the memorial?

I might point out to the House that following the completion of that magnificent structure, the Bell Tower, it shall be accepted, according to the bill, on behalf of the people of the United States, by the Congress, and thereafter maintained by the Congress. This bill provides no maintenance by the Congress.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That is exactly right.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, somebody mentioned earlier in this debate the Iowa Federation of Music Clubs, and their support of this measure. I am going to be very much interested to see how many thousands of dollars that organization contributes to the construction of this cultural center in Washington.

I am amazed to hear certain gentlemen say that this proposition is not costing the taxpayers anything. In the first place, it starts out by costing them 8 or 9 acres of valuable Government- and taxpayer-owned land in the District of Columbia. Do not forget that only a week or so ago Members voted to spend—I did not—$600,000 plus for about half a square of land adjacent to the new Senate Office Building. This was necessary, it was said, to add to the environment and atmosphere of the new Senate Office Building. If you do not think that land costs money around here, just go back and review that little transaction, and keep in mind that if this Government-owned land is given away for a cultural center it will not be available for the location of future Government buildings.

Now, why this cultural center? I read from the report of the committee:

> All Americans are proud of their National Capital, yet its cultural facilities are inferior to all leading European capitals, and numerous smaller European cities. * * * This lack of an adequate center for the arts in Washington detracts from our international prestige.

So apparently this legislation is designed to try to keep up with the bankrupt international Joneses. A Member of Congress was quoted in the local newspapers the other day as saying we were being criticized by inhabitants of the 80-some embassies in Washington because there is no so-called cultural center. My answer is that if these people do not like our culture, they know what to do about it. I would further say that if we had just a few of the billions of dollars that we have given to foreign free-loaders over the years we could build a cultural center every 15 feet in the District of Columbia, and have enough left over to take care of those 1,300 school children in the District of Columbia who are not going to get a chance at culture because they do not have the shoes to go to school regularly.

You talk about culture.

Then we find a provision in this bill that is very interesting. I do not believe I have seen it in any other bill of this nature that has come before Congress. It says this:

> The actions of the board, including any payment made or directed to be made by it to any trust funds, shall not be subject to review by any officer or agency other than a court of law.

What do you have to hide in this proposition, that only a court of law can review the expenditures?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, briefly. The gentleman did not yield to me, if he remembers, but I will yield to him.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I did not even notice the gentleman, or I would have yielded to him.

Nobody is trying to hide anything. No. 1: This is standard language. No. 2: They are trustees, and fiduciaries are under the control of the laws of the Federal Government, as are any other trustees.

Mr. GROSS. This provision ought to be amended. That is one of the troubles of bringing bills of this nature before the House under suspension of the rules which prohibits amendments by the Members.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman and compliment him for his statement in opposition to this bill.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The gentleman from Ohio said the opponents of this legislation had been voting vast sums of money to build cultural centers and similar structures overseas. Has the gentleman from Iowa voted for those programs?

Mr. GROSS. No, and the gentleman from Washington has not voted for those programs.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? The gentleman mentioned my name.

Mr. GROSS. I did not mention the gentleman's name.

Mr. McGREGOR. I wonder if the gentleman from Washington will not admit that he has been voting for foreign aid to build coliseums and racetracks and almost everything else in foreign countries, but now he is not willing to give the people of America the opportunity to have a cultural center.

Mr. MACK of Washington. My votes in this Congress have consistently been against foreign aid, as have the votes of the gentleman from Iowa and also the votes of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GROSS. That is exactly right.

Make no mistake about it, this is a legislative blank check. It is on a par with the $24 million Freedom Shrine that the House very wisely turned down not so long ago. I do not think any Member of this House would want to stake his reputation on the statement here and now that all the money for the construction of this 25 to 50 million dollar cultural center is going to be raised from philanthropic sources.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I would stake my reputation on it, for the record.

Mr. GROSS. I will be glad to remind the gentleman a few years from now of the fact that you came to Congress for help. In the first place, the Government is donating the land. You are getting a 5 to 6 million dollar contribution from the Government right now.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. I assume the gentleman is familiar with the committee amendment we have included which provides that if the money is not raised in 5 years the act will be null and void.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, and I know how Congress operates. I know how some people come in with simple legislation that calls for contributions or matching funds, and if the money is not raised in full the cry goes up: "We have the project started now and we must have Federal funds to finish it." You have heard that refrain over and over again, and so have I.

No, this is a legislative blank check, and it ought to be turned down. I do not care how many cultural centers the people of Washington want to build on land they buy and with their own money. I want them to get off the backs of my taxpayers.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of this bill and note the justification for it is to be found in the widespread support found throughout the Washington community. This bill has the endorsement of individuals and organizations from all walks of life, and I believe that the site itself is most suitable for the purposes for which selected. I would like to note in this connection the fine work done by the Washington Board of Trade in urging not only the passage of the bill but the selection of the site which is provided in the bill.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, during the rollcall on S. 3335, to provide for a National Capital Center of the Performing Arts, I will be unavoidably absent. Were I going to be present, I naturally would vote in favor of this meritorious legislation because I have long recognized the need of our Capital City for these facilities.

It has been obvious that Washington, which annually attracts thousands of visitors from all of our States and from abroad, has been under a serious handicap in not being able to provide a cultural center of this kind for the benefit of its own citizens and the visiting public. There is no question that the American public will gain from the good that such a center can bring about by developing and advancing the artistic, creative, and cultural talents of our people.

I am happy that the House in voting for S. 3335 will make it possible for the Nation's Capital to proceed with the establishment of such a badly needed public facility.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, the project authorized by this legislation, S. 3335, is one of the finest and most desirable programs ever proposed for the Nation's Capital.

The program is not only desirable but should have the enthusiastic and overwhelming support of the membership of this House.

It should not be controversial even though I can appreciate the concern of some Members regarding the possible cost to the taxpayers of the Nation, however, this legislation should not cost the taxpayers 1 cent.

The question of cost was the single item that made this legislation controversial last year, at which time I spoke in opposition to it, and it was defeated by this House by an overwhelming majority.

Last year the legislation provided that the Federal Government would purchase several acres of land at a cost of several million dollars. This would not only have been costly to the taxpayers of the Nation but would have taken much valuable property off the tax rolls of the District of Columbia.

The legislation this year has eliminated this costly provision and is therefore in the form of a compromise from that which was originally proposed.

Since the cost factor has been eliminated and the fact that our Nation's Capital is the only principal city in the world without such a cultural center, I hope that this bill, S. 3335, will be overwhelmingly approved.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, erection of the National Cultural Center will have national significance, since it will serve as a mecca and magnet for people from all over the country who visit the Nation's Capital.

There should be no question about the need for this building and about the soundness of the method under which it is to be constructed. Careful thought and planning has gone into all aspects of this project, and I commend all concerned for having worked out such a reasonable solution to the complex questions involved.

It should be noted that the land to be occupied by this structure is not now being used for any significant purposes, that the center will not be subsidized by the Federal Government, and that it will be self-supporting. We have a precedent for this project in the National Gallery of Art, which now houses a world famous collection of priceless works of art. Yet no Federal money was expended to construct that building.

We in the United States are justly proud of the accomplishments of our writers, actors, and related performers. We have a great history of achievement and success in these fields which is certain to be enhanced in the years ahead. One sure means for stimulating this growth in the performing arts is to provide proper places in which they can be performed. All over the country, drives and projects are going forward with this exact object in mind.

It is only fitting that the Nation's Capital should house a structure worthy of the great performing arts of the United States. That is exactly what will be provided by this legislation.

Special commendation is due to my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS], and his dedicated coworkers in and out of Congress, who have worked so long and so hard to make the National Cultural Center a reality. Mrs. Robert Low Bacon and other tireless civic leaders have provided uncounted hours of hard work and planning to make this legislation possible. I congratulate all of them for a job well done, and urge every Member of this body to give their efforts an overwhelming vote of approval.

The SPEAKER. The question is: Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended?

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules are suspended and the bill is passed.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] A quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant-at-Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 261, nays 55, not voting 113, as follows:

[Roll No. 191]

YEAS—261

Abbitt	Fino	Miller, Md.
Adair	Fisher	Mills
Addonizio	Flood	Minshall
Albert	Fogarty	Montoya
Alexander	Forand	Morano
Allen, Calif.	Forrester	Morgan
Anderson, Mont.	Fountain	Morris
	Frazier	Moss
Arends	Fulton	Multer
Aspinall	Garmatz	Murray
Ayres	Gary	Natcher
Baldwin	Gathings	Nimtz
Barrett	Gavin	Nix
Bass, Tenn.	Granahan	Norrell
Bates	Gray	O'Brien, Ill.
Becker	Green, Oreg.	O'Brien, N. Y.
Beckworth	Green, Pa.	O'Hara, Ill.
Bennett, Fla.	Griffin	O'Hara, Minn.
Bennett, Mich.	Gwinn	Ostertag
Betts	Hagen	Patman
Blatnik	Halleck	Patterson
Boggs	Harden	Pelly
Boland	Harris	Perkins
Bolling	Harrison, Va.	Pfost
Bolton	Harvey	Pillion
Bonner	Haskell	Poage
Boyle	Hays, Ohio	Poff
Bray	Heselton	Polk
Breeding	Hoeven	Porter
Broomfield	Holland	Price
Brown, Ga.	Holmes	Quie
Brown, Mo.	Holt	Rabaut
Brown, Ohio	Horan	Rains
Broyhill	Huddleston	Ray
Burleson	Hull	Reece, Tenn.
Byrd	Hyde	Rees, Kans.
Byrne, Ill.	Jackson	Reuss
Byrne, Pa.	Jarman	Rhodes, Ariz.
Canfield	Jennings	Rhodes, Pa.
Carnahan	Jonas	Riehlman
Carrigg	Jones, Ala.	Roberts
Celler	Judd	Robison, N. Y.
Chamberlain	Karsten	Robsion, Ky.
Chelf	Kearns	Rodino
Chenoweth	Keating	Rogers, Colo.
Chiperfield	Kee	Rogers, Fla.
Christopher	Kelly, N. Y.	Rogers, Mass.
Church	Kilday	Rogers, Tex.
Clark	Kilgore	Rooney
Coad	King	Rutherford
Cooley	Kirwan	Sadlak
Corbett	Kluczynski	St. George
Cramer	Knox	Saund
Cretella	Knutson	Schenck
Cunningham, Iowa	Krueger	Seely-Brown
	Lafore	Selden
Curtin	Lane	Sieminski
Curtis, Mass.	Lankford	Sikes
Curtis, Mo.	Lennon	Simpson, Ill.
Dague	Lesinski	Simpson, Pa.
Dawson, Ill.	Libonati	Sisk
Delaney	Loser	Smith, Miss.
Dellay	McCarthy	Smith, Va.
Dennison	McDonough	Springer
Dent	McFall	Staggers
Denton	McGovern	Stauffer
Devereux	McGregor	Steed
Dingell	McMillan	Sullivan
Dixon	Machrowicz	Talle
Donohue	Mack, Ill.	Teague, Calif.
Dooley	Madden	Teller
Dorn, N. Y.	Magnuson	Tewes
Dwyer	Mahon	Thomas
Eberharter	Mailliard	Thompson, N. J.
Edmondson	Marshall	Thomson, Wyo.
Elliott	Martin	Thornberry
Everett	Matthews	Tollefson
Evins	May	Trimble
Fallon	Meader	Tuck
Fascell	Merrow	Udall
Feighan	Metcalf	Ullman
Fenton	Michel	Vinson
Vorys	Wier	Wolverton
Walter	Wigglesworth	Wright
Watts	Willis	Yates
Westland	Wilson, Calif.	Younger
Whitener	Wilson, Ind.	Zablocki
Widnall	Withrow	

NAYS—55

Abernethy	Dowdy	O'Konski
Alger	Flynt	Passman
Allen, Ill.	Ford	Reed
Andersen, H. Carl	Grant	Riley
	Gross	Schwengel
Andrews	Gubser	Scott, N. C.
Ashmore	Haley	Scrivner
Baker	Hemphill	Scudder
Bosch	Hiestand	Siler
Bow	Johansen	Smith, Calif.
Brooks, Tex.	Kitchin	Smith, Kans.
Budge	Laird	Taber
Bush	Lipscomb	Utt
Byrnes, Wis.	McIntosh	Van Pelt
Cannon	Mack, Wash.	Weaver
Cederberg	Miller, Nebr.	Wharton
Davis, Ga.	Moore	Whitten
Dawson, Utah	Nicholson	Williams, Miss.
Dorn, S. C.	Norblad	

NOT VOTING—113

Anfuso	Glenn	Miller, N. Y.
Ashley	Gordon	Mitchell
Auchincloss	Gregory	Morrison
Avery	Griffiths	Moulder
Bailey	Hale	Mumma
Barden	Hardy	Neal
Baring	Harrison, Nebr.	O'Neill
Bass, N. H.	Hays, Ark.	Osmers
Baumhart	Healey	Philbin
Beamer	Hébert	Pilcher
Belcher	Henderson	Powell
Bentley	Herlong	Preston
Berry	Hess	Prouty
Blitch	Hill	Radwan
Boykin	Hillings	Rivers
Brooks, La.	Hoffman	Robeson, Va.
Brownson	Holifield	Roosevelt
Buckley	Holtzman	Santangelo
Burdick	Hosmer	Saylor
Clevenger	Ikard	Scherer
Coffin	James	Scott, Pa.
Collier	Jenkins	Sheehan
Colmer	Jensen	Shelley
Coudert	Johnson	Sheppard
Cunningham, Nebr.	Jones, Mo.	Shuford
	Kean	Spence
Davis, Tenn.	Kearney	Taylor
Derounian	Keogh	Teague, Tex.
Dies	Kilburn	Thompson, La.
Diggs	Landrum	Thompson, Tex.
Dollinger	Latham	Vanik
Doyle	LeCompte	Van Zandt
Durham	McCormack	Vursell
Engle	McCulloch	Wainwright
Farbstein	McIntire	Williams, N. Y.
Frelinghuysen	Macdonald	Winstead
Friedel	Mason	Young
George	Miller, Calif.	Zelenko

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Glenn.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Baumhart.

Mr. Morrison of Louisiana with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Brooks of Louisiana with Mr. Clevenger.

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Henderson.

Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Van Zandt.

Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. Healey with Mr. Auchincloss.

Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Kean.

Mr. Santangelo with Mr. Beamer.

Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Collier.

Mr. Friedel with Mr. Derounian.

Mrs. Blitch with Mr. George.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Hess.

Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Sheehan.

Mr. Preston with Mr. Scherer.

Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Scott of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Cunningham of Nebraska.

Mr. Engle with Mr. Brownson.

Mr. Doyle with Mr. Avery.

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Bentley.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Vanik with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.
Mr. Coffin with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. McIntire.
Mr. Winstead with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Harrison of Nebraska.
Mr. Bailey with Mr. Hillings.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Robeson of Virginia with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Prouty.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. James.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. O'Neill with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Mumma.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Neal.
Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Radwan.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Holtzman with Mr. Wainwright.
Mr. Johnson with Mr. Jensen.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Hale.
Mr. Young with Mr. Hill.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Williams of New York.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Vursell.
Mr. Gordon with Mr. LeCompte.
Mr. Durham with Mr. Jenkins.
Mr. Gregory with Mr. Burdick.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks on the bill just passed, S. 3335.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FOR THE RELIEF OF CERTAIN DISTRESSED ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3942) for the relief of certain aliens distressed as the result of natural calamity in the Azores Islands, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, there are hereby authorized to be issued (A) 1,500 special nonquota immigrant visas to aliens, specified in section 2 of this act, and (B) a number of special nonquota immigrant visas not to exceed the annual quota allocated under the Immigration and Nationality Act to the quota area of the Netherlands to aliens specified in section 3 of this act seeking to enter the United States as immigrants. The spouse of any such alien and his unmarried sons or daughters under 21 years of age, including stepsons or stepdaughters, and sons or daughters adopted prior to July 1, 1958, if accompanying them, may be issued special nonquota immigrant visas notwithstanding the numerical limitations herein provided.

SEC. 2. Visas authorized to be issued under clause (A) of section 1 of this act shall be issued only to nationals or citizens of Portugal who, because of natural calamity in the Azores Islands subsequent to September 1, 1957, are out of their usual place of abode in such islands and unable to return thereto, and who are in urgent need of assistance for the essentials of life.

SEC. 3. Visas authorized to be issued under clause (B) of section 1 of this act shall be issued only to nationals or citizens of the Netherlands who have been displaced from their usual place of abode in the Republic of Indonesia subsequent to January 1, 1949, and who were residing in continental Netherlands on the enactment date of this act.

SEC. 4. Visas authorized to be issued under this act may be issued by consular officers as defined in the Immigration and Nationality Act in accordance with the provisions of section 221 of that act: *Provided,* That each such alien is found to be eligible to be issued an immigrant visa and to be admitted to the United States under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act: *Provided further,* That a quota number is not available to such alien at the time of his application for a visa.

SEC. 5. Aliens receiving visas under clause (A) of section 1 of this act shall be exempt from paying the fees prescribed in paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 281 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

SEC. 6. Except as otherwise specifically provided in this act, the definitions contained in section 101 (a) and (b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall apply in the administration of this act.

SEC. 7. No special nonquota immigrant visa shall be issued under this act after June 30, 1960.

Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of certain distressed aliens."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation under consideration is designed to meet two emergency situations that exist in the world today and require action based on humanitarian grounds. One was caused by a series of earthquakes in the Azores Islands where 25,000 people lost their homes and their belongings. They were taken to adjacent islands when the island on which they lived sustained great damage, or—in one instance—sunk in the sea. It is proposed under the first clause of this bill to make possible the immigration to the United States of 1,500 of these 25,000 homeless people and their immediate families.

The second clause of the bill provides for the admission of Dutch expellees who were driven out from Indonesia to the Netherlands. Since 1945 approximately 290,000 Dutch citizens have returned, or have been forced to go to the Netherlands from what used to be the Dutch East Indies.

The importance of this legislation lies in the fact that its enactment will enable your representatives at the next meeting of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration to point out to the rest of the world that the United States is willing to make an attempt to find settlement possibilities for these people without disturbing the economy of the United States. By being able to make these representations to the other 26 member nations of ICEM, I am certain we will obtain their participation in the efforts being made in order to find larger settlement opportunities for people affected by these emergencies.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, this provides for the immigration of 3,100 foreigners, Dutch and Portuguese. Is that correct?

Mr. WALTER. Portuguese natives and Dutch nationals.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman have any idea how many adults there are covered in this bill?

Mr. WALTER. The total number of heads of families, who of course are adults, is stated in the bill. May I point out to the gentleman from Iowa that the total number of aliens authorized to be admitted annually under the quotas set forth in the Walter-McCarran Act will in no wise be reached through the enactment of this legislation.

Mr. GROSS. What does this bill do to the labor market in this country?

Mr. WALTER. It could not do anything to the labor market. May I point out to the gentleman that these people will be easily absorbed. Let me speak now of those formerly living in the Azores. These people are for the most part relatives of people in this country, and they will go to some of the New England States and to California. Their number cannot affect the labor market in the United States and they would not be given admission unless it were guaranteed that they will not become public charges. As to the Dutch people, I can assure the gentleman that this country will gain some of the finest, sturdiest, most loyal, and highly skilled immigrants.

Mr. GROSS. I am a little perplexed at some of the things we do here. We are now taking in some Dutch nationals. I am not opposed to that, particularly, or to the Portuguese. But I noted in the paper, I think it was yesterday morning, that we are now not only giving arms to Sukarno in Indonesia but flying the arms down there with Air Force planes. If I remember correctly, it was Sukarno who drove the Dutch out of Indonesia.

Mr. WALTER. I was disturbed by that news, too, because I am thoroughly convinced that Mr. Sukarno has been flirting with the Communist Chinese and the Russians so long that if any more of these Dutch people remain in the Dutch East Indies they may not be able to leave at all. The people we are talking about now are the victims of those very people to whom the gentleman has just referred.

Mr. GROSS. It seems a little incongruous that we should be giving arms to the people, Sukarno in this instance, who are driving the Dutch out of the East Indies, and then turn around and taking these displaced persons in.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, S. 3942, as introduced and as it was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, provided for the issuance of 1,500 special nonquota immigrant visas to Portugese nationals and citizens left homeless by the terrible earthquakes and volcanic eruptions that shook the Azores in September 1957.

The committee amended the bill so as to extend a helping and friendly hand

to another group of fine people forced to flee their homes in the face of political and economic tyranny. The amendment would grant visas to 3,136 citizens and nationals of the Netherlands, and their dependents, who have been driven out of their homes of long standing in Indonesia and are now living under crowded conditions in Holland.

The new Government of the Republic of Indonesia has expelled indirectly almost 220,000 people of Dutch nationality. They have been forced to leave behind all their money and all their possessions. These people have had to search for a place to live and work in the small but valiant nation of Holland.

America has always been a haven of refuge for those who have suffered calamities, as have these brave Dutch and Portugese. Enactment of this bill will be in keeping with our tradition of willing, generous, and friendly assistance to those who are not as fortunate as we. And our Nation stands to gain by the eventual acquisition of over 5,000 upstanding and loyal American citizens.

I urge every Member to lend his support to this act of friendship and assistance.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I for one am grateful that the committee has taken care of a few people from the Azores. They do not carry arms, they are not fighting with anybody. They make excellent citizens, particularly in my State, anyway, and I think my State probably has more of these Portugese than any other State in the Union.

They are a credit to America. Here is an opportunity to take care of some of these people.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts. I know of his interest in this legislation over a long period of time.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, during the present year, one of the Azores Islands, the island of Fayal, has been visited by recurring earthquakes and volcanic activity. Hundreds of homes have been destroyed. More than 5,000 people have been evacuated from the island. Most of its 25,000 people have flocked to Horta, Fayal's principal seaport, desperately seeking means of escape to other islands.

These islands are a part of Portugal, which is one of the closest friends of the United States in the family of free nations. The islands are strategically located and are an essential part of our own national defenses. We have airbases in the Azores and have always enjoyed excellent relations with her people.

The bill we have before us would admit to America 1,500 of these stricken people who have been left homeless and impoverished by the natural disasters which have struck them this year. Many of these unfortunate people are close relatives of American citizens of Portuguese extraction, who would welcome them to our shores and aid them after their arrival. I strongly urge the passage of this bill. It is a humane action in the interest of one of our country's closest overseas friends. Enactment of the bill will strengthen the close ties and the bonds of friendship which exist between the United States and Portugal. It will also be another demonstration to the world that the great heart of America is ready and willing to assist the people of a nation which has earned our friendship and help.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a worthy piece of legislation. Coming from an area, as I do, where we have a great many good, fine Portuguese people, I want to say right here and now that they certainly have made wonderful citizens and have made a great many contributions not only to our community but to the entire manufacturing industry of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I can well sympathize with the victims of the earthquake and volcanic eruptions which took place in the Azores Islands in 1957 and 1958. The people in my Congressional District in Connecticut suffered terribly from two successive devastating floods in 1955. The havoc wrought by these disasters cost the lives of 77 people and property damage of $200 million in my District. Our sympathy goes out to all who have suffered from natural calamities, and I think it would be a great humanitarian act on the part of this Congress to offer shelter in the land of plenty to the destitute victims of the earthquake and volcanic eruptions in the Azores Islands. I urge the enactment of the pending measure providing immigration relief to the natural disaster victims and also those seeking political refuge.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support S. 3942. This is a good bill. It is a humanitarian measure designed to relieve suffering and hardship. It provides for the issuance of 1,500 special nonquota immigrant visas to Portuguese nationals, as well as 3,136 nonquota visas to Dutch nationals who were displaced from Indonesia.

The Portuguese nationals were made homeless by the tragic earthquakes and volcanic eruptions in the Azores in 1957. I favor this legislation, Mr. Speaker, because it carries out the traditional position of the United States to aid and welcome distressed peoples, and, at the same time, permit relatives of the Portuguese and Dutch nationals here in the United States to sponsor and provide for them to come to the United States.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, like the other gentlemen from Massachusetts, I have many Portuguese people in my District. They are good citizens. They are God-fearing, church-going individuals who are a credit to any community. I want to commend the committee for bringing forth such a meritorious piece of legislation.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a member of the great Judiciary Committee which reported out favorably S. 3942, for the relief of certain distressed aliens, which is applicable to the Portuguese inhabitants of the Azores Islands, as well as others from the Republic of Indonesia.

Many of these people have been driven from their homes on the island of Fayal in the Azores because of the tragedy which has struck them by continuous earthquakes. They have no place to go and I think it is a humanitarian act on our part to welcome these proud people to our shores under this bill.

The chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration and its members worked diligently and sympathetically to bring this bill to the floor and they are to be commended. Certainly in times of distress and fear it is our duty to open our shores to those of foreign lands in situations such as the Portuguese have experienced. I support this legislation and hope that it passes overwhelmingly. There are many Portuguese in my District, and I know this legislation will aid them in bringing their families together.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the Judiciary Committee and especially the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] for his expeditious handling of S. 3942. This is a humanitarian measure and truly indicates the generosity of the American people to open their doors to sincere people seeking a new home. The people from the Azores have come to this country from time to time over a period of a great many years and have made outstanding citizens and contributed greatly to the economic and cultural well-being of our country. The same can be said, Mr. Speaker, for the Dutch and the Indonesians, who will be permitted to come to this country under this legislation. I wholeheartedly support it and hope the bill will be overwhelmingly passed.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 3942, which would provide nonquota visas for Portuguese refugees of the island of Fayal in the Azores, who were made homeless by the recent volcanic eruption on that island.

In the District which I represent in California are a great many families of Portuguese extraction. These people have earned the reputation as fine, law-abiding, hard-working citizens, who contribute a great deal to the economy of the District, as well as being good neighbors of which we all can be proud.

Many of these refugees from the Azores have relatives living in this country. A number in the 11th District of California have expressed their willingness and desire to assist these unfortunate people in their time of need.

I can well understand their deep concern for their overseas brethren. I am exceedingly anxious to help alleviate the unfortunate conditions which now afflict

them due to the loss of their homes and lifelong possessions.

This Nation has acted in previous instances to assist persons similarly afflicted. Only recently we passed laws allowing admission to the United States of Hungarian refugees, who had been crushed and driven from their homes by ruthless Soviet tyranny.

This legislation would authorize the issuance of 1,500 special nonquota immigrant visas to Portuguese aliens, their wives and unmarried sons and daughters under 21 years of age, including stepsons or stepdaughters, if accompanying them to this country.

Such visas would be issued only to nationals or citizens of Portugal who, because of the natural calamity in the Azores Islands, are out of their usual places of abode, unable to return to their homes, and who are in urgent need of assistance for the essentials of life.

It is by no means a blanket authority for immigration to this country.

The bill would permit United States consular officers abroad to issue visas to these people when found eligible under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

I urge this body to exercise compassion and good judgment in adopting this legislation, which has already won the approval of the Senate.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, aside from being a humanitarian proposition, these Dutch are good people. They are of a type that we should and do welcome here in the United States. They are our kind of folks and they make excellent citizens. In other words, these folks are skilled specialists of the type that are needed here.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] who is the author of one of the original bills on this subject.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, since I have already addressed the House in behalf of this meritorious bill, I will be brief in my remarks.

This bill was passed by the other body and for that reason, in order to expedite action in the House, was reported out of the committee rather than my companion bill, H. R. 13627, or Mr. FOGARTY'S bill, H. R. 13124, Mr. FORAND'S bill, H. R. 12796, or Mr. HAGEN'S bill, H. R. 13315, all of which were pending before the committee.

The desperate need for this legislation arises from a recent great, destructive, natural disaster caused by long-continued, severe earthquakes accompanying the sustained eruption of the volcano of Pico Gorda, which for a long period belched forth smoke, fumes, ashes, and lava upon the homes of more than 5,000 helpless victims on the island of Fayal in the Azores.

The stricken area had to be evacuated by these thousands of people fleeing from the fury of the poisonous fumes, suffocating smoke, and molten lava spreading over the countryside.

Most of the population of Fayal poured into Horta, the main seaport, seeking means of escape to other islands. The Portuguese Navy and hundreds of small fishing boats carried thousands of women, children, and aged and helpless people to adjacent islands in the vicinity where they might take temporary refuge from the natural holocaust.

This tragic event was the occasion for great suffering and hardship for these bewildered, unfortunate people, who were compelled to flee their homes, leaving their meager belongings behind them, and who are now homeless and dependent on charitable assistance, support, food, clothing, and shelter from relief agencies.

These people are thus displaced from their homes and native hearths, are escapees from a great disaster and refugees in other places where they are unable to support themselves and cannot find any means of providing livelihood for their families.

This bill permits admission to this country of a small, limited number of these afflicted people. There are precedents for this action, and these people are especially deserving, not only because they are pitiable victims of natural tragedy, but also because they are a good, loyal, God-fearing people whose kinsfolk and relatives in this country are among our very best citizens.

I have many Portuguese people in my District, and there are many of them who are residing in my great State. These people are of highest quality as loyal citizens. They are a noble component of our great American amalgam of citizenship—devoted, industrious, and patriotic in war and peace.

In the name of humanity, and in the interests of justice and equity, I ask compassion and help for this afflicted group and most earnestly urge my esteemed colleagues to pass this worthy bill.

This bill contains ample safeguards controlling the screening of the proposed refugees, and we may be assured that no unworthy persons will be admitted under its provisions and operation.

I can testify from my own experience that the Congress will never regret, but will always be proud, that it authorized the admission of these outstanding, loyal people to the United States. When encouragement, humane assistance, and opportunity take the place of a trembling earth and a searing lava covering their lands and homes, extinguishing their life's work and humble possessions, these people, like their fellow countrymen before them, will embrace their adopted country with love, devotion, and unswerving loyalty. Let us pass this bill by a smashing, and emphatic vote.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the chairman of the subcommittee who has so expeditiously and efficiently produced the bill before you. I am the author of a House bill which is identical with S. 3942, to permit the nonquota entry into the United States of a maximum of 1,500 families from the Azores Islands who are distressed by reason of a series of natural calamities.

The calamities I refer to are the volcanic eruptions near the island of Fayal in the Azores which commenced on September 27, 1957, accompanied by earthquakes. Subsequent repetitions occurred on November 4, 6, and 18, and December 18, 1957, and March 18, 1958. Following introduction of my bill a further eruption of Capelinhos volcano occurred on August 18, 1958. These eruptions and earthquakes were accompanied by extensive property damage on the nearly island which destroyed the livelihood of numerous residents of such island and created the necessity for this legislation. One thousand five hundred is estimated to be a reasonable number to afford relief. It should be noted that the Azores Islands are extremely beautiful islands, but they are definitely overpopulated in terms of the resources available compared to the number of persons resident thereon. I am advised that they fall within the Portuguese quota and that that quota only amounts to 428 persons annually.

This country's immigration policy contemplates overquota admissions where it can be demonstrated that first, an emergency need for such relief exists; second, the aliens affected are, as a group, of an assimilable and compatible character; third, their admission into the United States will not jeopardize internal security and may prospectively enhance the national interest and national welfare; and fourth, such temporary immigration programs will be beneficial to the conduct of this Nation's foreign relations.

It would be my considered judgment that the Portuguese admissions provided for by this bill meet all of these tests in a superlative fashion. As I have indicated, the disaster has occurred and the first criterion is therefore met. The meeting of the other criteria involves the character of our relationships with the Portuguese Government and the quality of the people who will be admitted.

We have enjoyed extremely friendly relationships with the Portuguese Government. During World War II and since that time they have permitted us the use of the Azores Islands as an intermediate point in the long air journey across the Atlantic. The quality of the Portuguese people is beyond question. I can attest personally to this fact because I have large numbers of people in my District who are either immigrants from the Azores Islands or the descendants of such immigrants. Almost without exception they are persons of extremely good character and accomplishment. They subscribe to the principles of our Government and economic institutions. They are industrious. They have a love of learning. They conform generally to all of the ideals of our society. I know that this act of humanity which we are about to undertake will be well received not only in those areas of this country which have an interest in matters of this kind but also in the Republic of Portugal.

Parenthetically, I should state that the natural disaster which occasions this aspect of this legislation was extremely well-reported in a recent issue of the National Geographic Magazine.

I am certain that the same considerations apply with respect to the admissions of Dutch people from the Indonesian area referred to in section 3 of the Senate bill as amended by the House Committee of the Judiciary. I will leave discussion of this aspect of the bill to persons more qualified than I to deal with such distress situation which is outside the scope of the bill, H. R. 13315, which I introduced. I would respectfully urge immediate passage of this legislation without any substantial argument or dissent.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I support and will vote for this bill sponsored by the distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island, Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, and the distinguished junior Senator from my State of Massachusetts, Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY. This legislation will make available 1,500 special nonquota immigrant visas for issuance to certain distressed aliens in the Azores Islands.

These people of Portuguese descent were made homeless when the volcano of Pico Gorda erupted on the island of Fayal in the Azores and caused almost continuous earthquakes and destruction.

Many of these tragedy victims have relatives in New England communities who can assist them and offer them new hope in starting life over again in America. These New Englanders of Portuguese extraction have been good and loyal citizens of the United States and have contributed greatly to American culture. Their Portuguese relatives who have suffered so much since their homes were destroyed in the Azores will make equal contributions to our great country if we pass this bill and allow them to come to our shores.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately this is the only bill that will come before us in this session of Congress to allow immigrants to enter the United States. I had hoped that in this 2d session of the 85th Congress that the Immigration and Nationality Act would be amended. Bills which were filed by myself, H. R. 93 and H. R. 4086, and bills filed by many other Members of this House and Members of the Senate provided for a much more realistic approach to the present problem. For instance, under the present act only 438 quota immigrants can be admitted annually to the United States from Portugal, only 308 from Greece, only 5,645 from Italy, and only 6,488 from Poland. Why? Because the quotas are based on the 1920 census. Section 201 (a) of Public Law 414, 82d Congress, authorizes one-sixth of 1 percent of the 1920 census of Americans of foreign extraction as the basis for the issuance of immigrant visas. The lowest quota is 100, but southern European countries such as Portugal, Italy, and Greece have very low quotas because there were very few Americans in 1920, comparatively speaking, who were descendants of the Portuguese, the Italians, and the Greeks.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the 86th Congress will face the immigration problem realistically. The act needs to be amended and the national quotas must be based on the 1950 census, not the 1920 census.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. I supported it in the Committee on the Judiciary, and I am hopeful that it will be approved by the House without any undue delay.

The purpose of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to authorize the issuance of 1,500 special nonquota immigrant visas to certain citizens of Portugal who have been displaced from their homes in the Azores Islands as a result of earthquakes and volcanic eruptions, which have occurred on several occasions this year. These acts of nature have destroyed hundreds of homes and more than 5,000 people have been evacuated from the islands. These people are desperately seeking means of escape to other islands, and the number amounts to almost 25,000 people. As we know them, they are good, kindly, sincere, and upstanding people, many of whom have their relations in our United States and are our best citizens.

Under the provisions of this bill, out of these thousands that have been made homeless through no fault of their own and with no haven of refuge, we will admit 1,500 hoping that other countries will take a selfsame interest and admit the rest of these immigrants to their countries.

I am satisfied in my own mind that the admission of 1,500 of these special nonquota immigrants will not interfere in the least bit in the economy of this country, since I know that their countless relations and friends will provide homes and adequately support them. I sincerely hope that the opportunity will be presented to allow them to establish themselves here in the United States since they deserve a helping hand from the people of this Nation.

As I stated previously, as a member of the House Committee on the Judiciary, I favored this legislation, and I join with my colleagues on the committee with the hope that the House will support this legislation.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, it is most gratifying to see that the Congress of the United States has acted promptly on the legislation under which a helping hand will be extended to a sizable group of the people of the Azores Islands who have suffered fear and destruction of their property caused by the series of volcanic eruptions that took place in the Azores Islands between September 1957 and March 1958.

Congress has once more taken humanitarian action where such action was most needed. But, the Congress has actually done more than to open the doors to the United States for a hardy group of Portuguese islanders. In acting on the immigration bill permitting the entry of 1,500 families from the Azores Islands, the Congress has actually recognized the exceptionally high qualities of character, the resourcefulness, patriotism, and civic qualities of the Americans of Portuguese descent, many of whom live in the States of Rhode Island and Massachusetts.

The immigration program authorized by the Congress will extend until June 30, 1960, and it is, therefore, of prime importance that friends and relatives of the immigrants from the Azores Islands whose entry has now been authorized, endeavor without delay to find for the new arrivals suitable places to live so that they will quickly become a part and parcel of the splendid community of the Americans of Portuguese descent in this country.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Fayal Islands, in the Azores, have been seriously affected by a series of earthquakes that have taken many lives, left thousands homeless, separated families, and scattered the members of these families to various parts of Portugal in search of shelter.

Many are homeless and penniless. Their future is a most discouraging one.

Many of these displaced persons have relatives and friends in my home State of Rhode Island who are not only willing, but anxious, to provide them with a home and a future.

I am glad that, despite the fact that President Eisenhower has turned down my request that he use his emergency powers to permit some of these people to come to the United States, Congress is taking steps by the enactment of this bill to allow 1,500 of these people to come here to join their loved ones.

I introduced in the House early last June, a bill, H. R. 12796, but as the Senate has acted on Senator PASTORE's bill first, I am glad to support this bill and urge all my colleagues to vote for it.

Enactment of this legislation will not only show to the world that we in America are ever ready and willing to help people in need, but it is, above all, a humanitarian act.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title of the bill was amended to read: "A bill for the relief of certain distressed aliens."

GRANTS FOR SUPPORT OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 4039) to authorize the expenditure of funds through grants for support of scientific research, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the head of each agency of the Federal Government, authorized to enter into contracts for basic scientific research at nonprofit institutions of higher education, or at nonprofit organizations whose primary purpose is the conduct of scientific research, is hereby authorized, where it is deemed to be in furtherance of the objectives of the agency, to make grants to such institutions or organizations for the support of such basic scientific research.

SEC. 2. Authority to make grants or contracts for the conduct of basic or applied scientific research at nonprofit institutions of higher education, or at nonprofit organizations whose primary purpose is the conduct of scientific research, shall include discretionary authority, where it is deemed to be in furtherance of the objectives of the agency, to vest in such institutions or organizations, without further obligation to the Government, or on such other terms and conditions as the agency deems appropriate, title to equipment purchased with such grant or contract funds.

SEC. 3. Each agency or department of the Federal Government exercising authority granted by this act shall make an annual report on or before June 30th of each year to the appropriate committees of both Houses of Congress. Such report shall set forth therein, for the preceding year, the number of grants made pursuant to the authority provided in the first section of this act, the dollar amount of such grants, and the institutions in which title to equipment was vested pursuant to section 2 of this act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? If not, the Chair will put the question.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to authorize any Federal agency, which is now authorized to enter into contracts for the conduct of basic research, to make grants for these same purposes. Thus, the agencies could proceed in their discretion by contract or grant to meet the needs of individual situations. Grants or contracts would be made for basic scientific research at nonprofit institutions of higher education or to nonprofit organizations whose primary purpose is the conduct of scientific research.

In addition, the legislation would authorize these agencies to vest in such institutions or organizations, on such terms or conditions as the agency deems appropriate, title to equipment purchased with such grant or contract funds.

The Subcommittee on Health and Science held hearings on this legislation, in the course of which testimony was received from Departments of Defense and Agriculture, the National Science Foundation, and the Atomic Energy Commission. It was pointed out that in many instances grants for the purpose of scientific research are more appropriate than contracts and that the equipment purchased with grant or contract funds is frequently so specialized that it is of no value to the Federal Government, but could fill a very useful function if left with the research institutions or organizations. It was stressed that the cost of bookkeeping to the Federal Government in many instances exceeded the value of such property to the Federal Government. Each of the agency witnesses testifying stressed that this authority would be used only where transfer of title to the equipment would not involve any additional cost to the Government and under these circumstances the committee feels that this legislation would further scientific research programs in which the Federal Government and educational institutions are interested.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PATENT OFFICE BOARD OF APPEALS

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1864) to authorize an increase in the membership of the Board of Appeals of the Patent Office; to provide increased salaries for certain officers and employees of the Patent Office; and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the first sentence of the first paragraph of section 3 of title 35 of the United States Code is amended by striking out the word "nine" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "not more than fifteen."

(b) Such section is amended by inserting therein, immediately after the first paragraph thereof, the following new paragraph:

"The annual rate of compensation of the Commissioner shall be $20,000."

SEC. 2. Section 7 of title 35 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Such designated examiners-in-chief may be compensated at the established rate for the positions in which they are temporarily serving: *Provided,* That at the end of the period for which designated their rate of compensation shall be adjusted to what it would have been had such designation not been made."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes an increase from "nine" to "not more than fifteen" in the membership of the Board of Appeals of the Patent Office. It also provides a salary increase for the Commissioner of Patents.

The Patent Office, of course, is one of the real business offices of the Government. In that office there are some 1,000 examiners of patents who process as much as 7,000 patents per year.

This bill would increase the membership of the Board of Appeals to "not more than fifteen" in order that they may be enabled more expeditiously to examine and pass upon the patents channeled to them by these thousand examiners.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand this bill is not approved by the Department of Commerce?

Mr. WILLIS. Initially there was some frowning on it, but it has been cleared.

Mr. GROSS. Does it provide any supergrade jobs?

Mr. WILLIS. No. The bill as amended deletes that. I might say it satisfies the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, S. 1864 will give much-needed relief to the Board of Appeals of the Patent Office. At the present time this Board is laboring under a backlog of over 7,000 pending cases. The result is that in some instances it requires several years to process patent applications. This period of delay is inexcusable and must be alleviated.

There is no evidence that this delay is due to inefficiency on the part of the present members of the Board of Appeals or the Commissioner of Patents. On the contrary, the statistics show that they have labored hard to dispose of a steadily increasing number of appeals. In the last fiscal year, for example, they disposed of almost 1,000 more cases than were disposed of in fiscal 1950. Even so, the backlog continues to mount.

S. 1864 would increase the number of members on the Board of Appeals from 9 to not more than 15. It would also increase the compensation of the Commissioner to $20,000 per year.

This bill has the strong support of the Secretary of Commerce, the Commissioner of Patents and the entire patent bar. I know of no opposition to it from any responsible source.

I am satisfied with the bill in its present form and urge its favorable consideration by the House.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, this legislation (S. 1864) provides for an increase in the membership of the Board of Appeals of the Patent Office and an increase in salaries for certain officers and employees.

The witnesses in support of this legislation gave pertinent testimony as to the necessity of these changes—Robert C. Watson, United States Commissioner of Patents; Leo P. McCann, Chairman, United States Board of Patent Appeals; and Sam W. Kinsley, Personnel Director, United States Patent Office. These expert witnesses averred that the legis-

lation would be beneficial both to business and industry and would result in speeding the final determination of the matters on the appeal calendar. A substantial increase in the salary features will attract competent and experienced personnel—as well as interest candidates to the lesser classifications for the pursuit of a career. The loss of trained personnel on raids by industry and law firms have resulted from low salaries in the upper bracket positions.

The freedom of selection of top experts by the Director will be the direct result of these increases.

The increase of the Board from 9 to 15 members will facilitate the work to the point that the present backlog of cases, appeals pending, amount to 2,000 workload and at the current end 5,000 case workload—either awaiting hearing or decisions. There are 2,000 other cases which are not ready for hearing or decision. Thus nearly 8,000 cases presently represent workload. So we can realize the great importance of the Bureau of Patents as a functioning unit of government. There were 77,000 applications for patents this year. These applications are assigned to one of the 67 examining divisions, consisting of a principal examiner, an assistant and a considerable number of examiner assistants who study the nature of disclosure of the applications, making searches to ascertain whether or not the applicant's contribution to arts is sufficiently important to warrant the issue of a patent.

The issues resulting between the applicant and the examiner through a series of hearings and attempts by amendments to satisfy the objections or determinations of the examiner. Upon his final rejection of the application—an appellate procedure has been provided.

An appeal may be taken to the Board of Appeals. It is the only appellant tribunal of the entire Patent Office upon the question of patentability of inventions.

The examiners and assistant examiners are ex officio members of the Board but seldom function to decide cases—although in important cases they do.

The Commissioner appoints the members of the Board of Appeals when vacancies occur (he actually recommends the individual to the Secretary of Commerce). The Secretary of Commerce recommends to the President in the usual manner. The President issues a certificate to the permanent members of the Board of Appeals, (now number 9 members) as his appointees. As well as the Commissioner and Assistant Commissioner.

The designated members as referred to in this bill are those of primary grade or higher who are assigned to the Board for duty from time to time as needed. There are 10 such designated presently, who are sitting with the 9 regular members to handle the heavy influx of appeals.

The 8,000 appeals now pending are a real challenge.

Members, three in number, sit as a panel, hearing both oral and written argument. The panel studies the brief and arguments, rendering its decision. No more than one designated member can sit on a panel. One writes the decision—speaks with the second, then submits to the third person on the panel. This takes a great deal of time with much detail and extended delays. They have the last word—appeals are then taken to the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals and by suit de nova can be taken to the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia.

This is a difficult work and the reputation of the Board must enjoy the highest reputation for personal integrity and judicial honesty in an office of first importance in the economy of the Nation. It enjoys the highest kind of confidences and secrets. The finest legal minds of international reputation practice before this tribunal.

Delay of final decision generally for 4 years, holds up plans for the building up of a new industry or the expansion of facilities for added production—meaning new employment not only to those in the parent industry but the related trades—including building industries, raw material and transportation expansion for added services.

The correspondence that I received from outstanding lawyers specializing in this field of law have been most revealing as to the need of this legislation. Listed strongly for this legislation were the law firm of Attorneys Merriam, Lorch & Smith, of Chicago Ill.; the Patent Law Association of Chicago, John A. Marzall, president; also attorneys, firm of Olson, Mecklenburger, von Holst, Pendleton & Neuman, of the Chicago bar.

The present determination of Appeals Board decisions averages 3,000 cases per year. Some appeals are withdrawn or the appellant and the examiner arrive at a decision, not requiring a decision.

In 1957, 2,500 cases were dismissed and 2,800 were decided. In 1956, 3,400 were dismissed and 2,300 were decided.

If each group of 3 panels determine about 500 case appeals per year, an average 1,000 cases would be decided by the increase of 2 panels—increase from 9 to 15.

These men require a high degree of administrative, legal, scientific—that is, engineering—ability and skill. These attributes must be combined in the talents of one individual. The salaries are important, especially in a system where the individual has reached the high position as member of the Board. These salaries are fixed in accordance with the Position Classification Act of 1949, a salary bill which covers the normal career in civil service salary—not an executive employee's salary. This bill will give prestige and security to those in the system to seek a career in the Patent Office. It will alleviate the problems of employment caused by applicants who accept employment with the specific intention of leaving after a period of training.

This bill gives the opportunity in the Patent Office to men, well trained, to remain in the service of the Government, aspiring to a career of honor with justice, with opportunity for his family to live with dignity and a feeling of enjoying a position of security.

Now—after training them—we lose them, but these higher salaries under the Classification Act will now be under the Commissioner to fix the annual rates of basic compensation for examiners in chief, subject to the approval of the Department of Commerce and of the Civil Service Commission.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR CONTINUING CONSTRUCTION OF THE RAMA ROAD IN NICARAGUA

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3712) to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of the Rama Road in Nicaragua.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State, in addition to the sums heretofore authorized, the sum of $4 million, to be available until expended, for discharging the United States obligations under the applicable agreement with the Government of Nicaragua: *Provided*, That the survey and construction work shall be under the general supervision of the Secretary of Commerce: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated pursuant to this authorization shall not be available for expenditure except under the conditions set forth in section 5 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 160), with respect to the authorization contained in that section.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes an additional $4 million for the completion of the Rama Road which is being constructed from San Bonita to Rama. Under executive agreement, this work was started back in 1944, but due to the increased cost of materials and construction, it will cost $16 million instead of the estimated $12 million. There is remaining to be completed 40 miles, of which out of the prior authorizations they have the necessary funds to complete 20, and the $4 million that is requested here today will complete the remaining 20 miles and construct a large bridge.

We had before the Committee on Public Works representatives of the Bureau of Roads who informed us of the necessity for the $4 million to complete the road due to the additional cost of material and labor. The committee also had representatives of the Department of State who told us of the necessity to complete this road so that we live up to an agreement we made with Nicaragua. They also pointed out that at this time it is necessary that we keep the agreement because of the good will that is so

necessary with our neighbors to the south.

Mr. Speaker, it was thought by the members of the committee that this legislation is necessary at this time and will do a very big job in public relations and good will.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] a question or two.

Was this bill reported unanimously by the gentleman's committee?

Mr. FALLON. There was 1 vote recorded against it. I think the vote was 30 to 1.

Mr. GROSS. Have we not had a similar bill before us year after year, and in amounts of $4 million or $5 million, and has it not been stated on the floor each time that would be the end of this request?

Mr. FALLON. I do not think in this case, I will say to the gentleman. The estimated cost at the beginning was in the neighborhood of $12 million. What we have done is to give it to them piecemeal over a period of years. Now we are at a stage where it can be completed within the next 2 years. But, it is necessary, due to the increased cost of materials and labor, to get the additional money.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman please state again what this road has cost us so far?

Mr. FALLON. So far there has been authorized $12 million, of which I think $11 million has been expended for work under contract.

Mr. GROSS. Does that include the $4 million here authorized?

Mr. FALLON. No. The $4 million would be additional, making the total completion cost $16 million.

Mr. GROSS. What does the gentleman think this road is going to cost in the end?

Mr. FALLON. As far as I am concerned, $16 million.

Mr. GROSS. That will be the end? This authorization of $4 million will be the end?

Mr. FALLON. So far as I am concerned, yes.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think that will be the position of his committee; the majority of his committee?

Mr. FALLON. I think, according to the testimony before our committee, this will be the final cost to the United States.

Mr. GROSS. One more question. Where does this road begin and where does it end?

Mr. FALLON. It begins at San Benito and runs to Rama, 156 miles.

Mr. GROSS. Does it serve any real, useful purpose?

Mr. FALLON. It does to the country of Nicaragua.

Mr. GROSS. Well, how much of an area of Nicaragua does it serve?

Mr. FALLON. Well, it serves a large portion of Nicaragua.

Mr. GROSS. Does it connect with any other road?

Mr. FALLON. It connects with the harbor and also the Inter-American Highway which comes to Managua, just a few short miles away.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I think we should make it plain on the RECORD here that it is the intention of this House to complete this Rama Road so that if anything unexpected comes up it will be taken into consideration by the gentleman from Maryland in the coming years, is not that the case?

Mr. FALLON. That is the case.

Mr. FULTON. They are making adequate progress, and it is not only for the benefit of Nacaragua but for the security and the safety of the United States to have this country opened up and become a part of the whole North American Continent. At the present time you cannot even get access to the east from these areas, is that not correct?

Mr. FALLON. Yes.

Mr. FULTON. So that with a connection with the Pan-American Highway as well as the sea, it gives us an opportunity, through our security forces, to make transportation available where it is not now available and to have greater security for the American people, does it not?

Mr. FALLON. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. It would be just fine if we could build a road in every country in the world, I am sure, but I just do not think that the Treasury is going to stand that kind of a drain eternally and forever.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN]

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, this matter came before the House Committee on Public Works, and we listened carefully to the testimony that was given before us. Originally diplomatic commitments were made during World War II by this Government to the Government of Nicaragua that this road would be built by the United States. The road is now built to about three-quarters of the total distance. If it were left at this point, it would have no significance. If it is completed, then it will be a connection between tidewater on the Caribbean Sea and the capital through the completion of the Rama Road and the Inter-American Highway, which will provide a basic cross continental route through Nicaragua by road. If we believe in complying with our diplomatic commitments, we have no alternative except to complete it, and for that reason the Committee on Public Works was nearly unanimous in feeling that we must complete this road and therefore comply with our commitments. From the evidence developed in the last 6 months in South and Central America, this is no time for the United States to fall down on its commitments to those countries.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this bill takes my mind back 60 years ago when, as a boy in Nicaragua, I was told, and it was believed, that on the eastern coast of Nicaragua was tremendous wealth in mines, in timbers, and other resources. And, in all that time, from Rama and Bluefields and that region on the eastern coast of the country there has been no transportation except in recent years by air.

The opening up of this road from Rama will provide a new and rich future for Nicaragua and for all Central America. I can imagine no greater contribution we could make to the warming and intensifying of our relations with the Latin Americans than the quick completion of the Rama Road.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3379) to provide for adjustments in the annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the annuity of each retired officer who on August 1, 1958, is receiving or entitled to receive an annuity from the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund, based on service which terminated on or before January 31, 1958, shall be increased by 10 percent.

(b) The annuity otherwise payable from the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund to—

(1) each survivor annuitant who, on August 1, 1958, is receiving or entitled to receive an annuity based on service which terminated on or before January 31, 1958, and

(2) each person granted an annuity in accordance with section 5 of the act of May 1, 1956 (70 Stat. 125), shall be increased by 10 percent.

(c) The increases provided by subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall become effective on the first day of the second calendar month following enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. The annuity of each retired officer who, on or after August 1, 1958, is receiving or entitled to receive an annuity from the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund, based on service which terminated on or after February 1, 1958, shall be increased effective on the first day of the second calendar month following enactment of this act or on the commencing date of annuity, whichever is later, in accordance with the following schedule:

If annuity commences between:	*Annuity increase (percent)*
Feb. 1, 1958, and June 30, 1959	8
July 1, 1959, and June 30, 1960	6
July 1, 1960, and June 30, 1961	4
July 1, 1961, and June 30, 1962	2

SEC. 3. The annuity of any survivor annuitant who, on or after August 1, 1958, is receiving or entitled to receive an annuity from the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund, based on service which terminated on or after February 1, 1958, shall be increased effective on the first day of the second calendar month following enactment of this act or on the commencing date of an-

nuity, whichever is later, in accordance with the following schedule:

	Annuity increase (percent)
If annuity commences between:	
Feb. 1, 1958, and June 30, 1959	8
July 1, 1959, and June 30, 1960	6
July 1, 1960, and June 30, 1961	4
July 1, 1961, and June 30, 1962	2

SEC. 4. No increase provided by this act shall be computed on any additional annuity purchased with voluntary contributions pursuant to the provisions of section 881 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended.

SEC. 5. No annuity of a retired officer shall be increased under any section of this act in an amount in excess of $500 per annum. No annuity of a survivor annuitant shall be increased under any section of this act in an amount in excess of $250 per annum.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H. R. 13715 is to do for retired Foreign Service officers and their widows what Congress did earlier this year for retired civil servants. When the bill to increase civil service annuities was before the House, the report accompanying that bill stated that its provisions were "moderate, fair, and reasonable" and that the increase provided by the legislation would give some benefit to those "whose incomes in many instances are inadequate to maintain the decent standard of living which retired employees of the Government are entitled." I cannot think of any more compelling arguments for this bill than those offered by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Foreign Service officers are covered by a separate retirement system and are not included in the provisions voted earlier by the Congress.

When the Foreign Service annuity increase bill came to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, it contained no limitation on the annuity increase. The committee has amended the bill to include limitations in annuity increases identical to those set for the civil servants, namely, a maximum of $500 for retired officers and for a widow a maximum of $250 per annum.

There are additional and compelling factors in the case of Foreign Service personnel that warrant our consideration. Most of the officers have spent their working life abroad. Many of the posts in which they serve were, and still are, hardship posts. Often the climate is unhealthful and health standards are minimal and educational facilities are lacking or deficient. Until 2 years ago the officer had to bear the heavy costs of education for his children that, in this country, are available in every community.

I could mention other problems faced by our Foreign Service personnel. But I think I have said enough to indicate that members of the Foreign Service have unusual expenses. Although Congress in recent years has improved the conditions of employment, the individuals who will benefit from the provisions of this bill served at a time when these improvements were lacking and salaries very small. Hence they have had little opportunity to save up for their declining days.

Section I covers 540 officers and widows. The cost is estimated at slightly more than $200,000 a year and, of course, will drop as these individuals die. For the next 5 years individuals who move from the active rolls to the retired rolls will receive a percentage increase that diminishes progressively. This is because the longer they stay in an active status, the more they will benefit from the 10-percent-salary increase voted earlier this year.

The money to pay the increased cost will come from the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund to which active officers pay a percentage of their salary. The latest report available to the committee shows that the fund had $22.5 million in June 1957. The increases voted by this bill will not add an undue drain on the fund.

I hope the Congress will give these people the small measure of consideration they so well deserve.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I join our chairman in support of this bill. I regret that our colleague, the author of the bill, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY], himself a former Foreign Service officer, is unable to be present, but he has left here remarks which I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at the conclusion of my own remarks.

These retired Foreign Service officers are in a precarious condition because of the same rise in the cost of living which has affected our retired civil-service employees.

However, we felt that the cost of living affected these two groups equally and, therefore, we put in similar limitations on the amounts to those placed in the civil-service retirement bill. These Foreign Service people have served our country well overseas, they have not had a chance to acquire homes here and to make money here in preparation for retirement. So they are a class that is particularly deserving of consideration and I hope this bill will be passed promptly.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, this is a simple bill. Its purpose is to give to retired Foreign Service officers and their widows—all of whom were drawing annuities on or before January 31, 1958—a 10-percent increase in those annuities, provided, however, that the increase for retired officers does not exceed $500 and, for widows, $250. The percentage of the increase and the ceiling limiting the dollar amount of the increase are identical to the provisions of Public Law 85-465, the recently enacted law covering civil-service annuitants.

The law dealing with retired civil servants also included a provision that the increases voted would not be payable after July 1, 1960, unless Congress appropriated money to the civil-service retirement fund to cover the increases.

My bill does not contain this provision. In the first place, the estimated cost of the Foreign Service annuity increase is about $200,000. This sum can be borne by the Foreign Service retirement fund. That fund is in relatively better condition than is the civil-service retirement fund. Second, proposed changes in the Foreign Service Act which the Congress will consider next year will increase the employee's contribution from 5 to 6½ percent. Therefore, I see no reason for a limitation similar to that in the recent civil-service annuity increase law.

Some may argue that Foreign Service salaries are high. I will admit that today they are quite good, and so are allowances. But those who will benefit from this bill are individuals who served when salaries were inadequate and allowances were either inadequate or nonexistent. The opportunity to set aside any savings for retirement was small indeed. This bill will provide a small measure of relief without an undue strain on the Treasury or the retirement fund.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALTER). The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 3379, as amended?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 13715) was laid on the table.

WORLD SCIENCE-PAN PACIFIC EXPOSITION

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3680) to provide for participation of the United States in the World Science-Pan Pacific Exposition to be held at Seattle, Wash., in 1961, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President, through an executive department or independent agency designated by him, shall cooperate with the Washington State World Fair Commission with respect to, and determine the extent to which the United States shall be a participant and an exhibitor at, the World Science-Pan Pacific Exposition (hereafter in this act referred to as the "exposition") which is being held at Seattle, Wash., in 1961. The purpose of such exposition are to—

(1) commemorate the centennial of the physical fixing of the boundary line between the United States of America and Canada,

(2) depict the role of science in modern civilization, and

(3) exhibit the varied cultures of the Nations of the Pacific Rim.

The President is authorized, by proclamation or in such other manner as he may deem proper, to invite the several States of the Union and foreign countries to take part in the exposition: *Provided*, That no Communist de facto government holding any people

of the Pacific Rim in subjugation be invited to participate.

SEC. 2. There shall be in the designated department or independent agency a Commissioner for the exposition who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall receive compensation at the rate of $17,500 per annum. The head of the designated department or independent agency shall prescribe the duties of the Commissioner and may delegate such powers and duties to him as are deemed advisable in order to carry out this act.

SEC. 3. In carrying out the provisions of this act, the head of the designated department or independent agency may—

(1) appoint, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, such persons as he deems to be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, except that no person appointed under this paragraph shall receive compensation from the United States at a rate in excess of that received by persons under the Classification Act of 1949 for performing comparable duties;

(2) enter into such contracts as may be necessary to provide for United States participation in the exposition;

(3) erect such buildings and other structures as may be necessary for United States participation in the exposition, on land owned by the State of Washington or by any local government of such State or any political subdivision or instrumentality of either: *Provided*, That all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of work on such buildings and other structures shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Bacon-Davis Act, as amended (40 U. S. C., sec. 276a–276a–5);

(4) purchase books of reference, newspapers, and periodicals;

(5) incur such other expenses as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act; and

(6) accept any gifts, loans, donations, or devices to be used in carrying out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 4. The head of each department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government is authorized—

(1) to cooperate with the head of the designated department or independent agency with respect to United States participation in the exposition, and

(2) to make available to the head of the designated department or independent agency, from time to time, on a reimbursable basis, such personnel as may be necessary to assist the designated department or independent agency in carrying out its functions under this act.

SEC. 5. (a) The President shall report to the Congress during the first regular session of Congress which begins after the date of enactment of this act with respect to (1) the most effective manner of representation of the United States at the exposition, taking into account the avoidance of undue competition among governments, and (2) the amount of appropriations which are necessary to accomplish such representation.

(b) The President shall report to the Congress within 6 months after the date of the official close of the exposition on the activities of the Federal Government pursuant to this act, including a detailed statement of expenditures. Upon transmission of such report to the Congress, all appointments made under this act shall terminate.

SEC. 6. After the close of the exposition, all property purchased or erected with funds provided pursuant to this act shall be disposed of in accordance with the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, and other applicable Federal laws relating to the disposition of excess and surplus property.

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $125,000 to carry out the provisions of this act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second in order that we may have a discussion of this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], one of the authors of the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, this is a relatively simple bill, a Senate bill, as you know. It was introduced in this body by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] and by me.

The bill provides basically for a study of the extent to which the Federal Government should participate in the World Fair, otherwise known as the World Science-Pan Pacific Exposition, which will be held at Seattle beginning in 1961.

The State of Washington and the city of Seattle already have put up $15 million. To let you know we are serious about this World Fair, we have set aside 76 acres, most of them in the downtown area of Seattle, in which to hold the fair.

There is great interest in the scientific world in this country in an exposition of this type. Many of the scientists, and I may say the top scientists of this country, have been feeling for some time that there should be an exposition in which the advances in science could be portrayed. It was decided that the Seattle World Fair would lay emphasis on this along with emphasis on the bond between this country and the other countries around the Pacific rim.

When the San Francisco and New York World Fairs were held a Federal commission was appointed of several members to make a study exactly such as we suggest here. This bill is not quite so ambitious as that. We are asking only for the appointment of a single commissioner at a salary of $17,500 a year, to serve for this relatively brief period until the fair. He will work under one of the established agencies of the Government, probably the Department of Commerce.

The function of this Commissioner will be to make a study to determine the extent to which the Federal Government should participate in the Seattle World Fair and, I may say, participate in the fair in the way of exhibiting at the fair, and perhaps to some small extent to participate financially.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Can the gentleman assure the House that there is no intention on behalf of the gentleman's State or any other agency, or the Federal Government to invite to participate in this fair any de facto governments not recognized by the United States of America, such as Red China, northern Korea or northern Vietnam, or any other government on the Pacific rim that is a Communist government holding subject peoples under control?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Committee on Foreign Affairs, as the gentleman knows, wrote into the bill a prohibition against inviting exhibits by any of these de facto Communist governments.

Mr. FULTON. That was my amendment which put a limitation on the power of the President to invite these governments. My question goes further. There is no intention by the gentleman's home State or any other agency to invite such countries; is there?

Mr. MAGNUSON. There is not. I have discussed the amendment with the management of the fair and they have said there is no objection to the amendment and no intention of issuing invitations to such countries.

Mr. FULTON. I thank the gentleman very much. I will support the bill then.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, just one further word in explanation of this bill. This carries an authorization of $125,000 to cover the cost of this survey which will be made before the next Congress adjourns and a report will be made back to the next Congress. I hope the bill will be approved. It is very important to us and we are very proud of our plan to have this world's fair.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week the House adopted the motion of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] to permit the United States Information Agency to construct facilities for broadcasting messages behind the Iron Curtain and into the Soviet Union, Africa, and the Middle East.

By the same token, the purpose of a World Science-Pan Pacific Exposition to be held in Seattle in 1961 is to send messages all over the world with the truth about the United States.

As the gentleman from California [Mr. SAUND] pointed out so eloquently during debate on the Bow motion, what this Nation needs in the world now is to use some of our supersalesmanship. American gold will not buy friends abroad; but America can do a good public-relations job with other nations free of artificial propaganda by exchanging information and ideas. Washington State's World Fair in 1961 is timed to demonstrate world cooperation in peaceful scientific research through reporting on the Geophysical Year and creating closer cultural, economic, and social ties with other nations. Also it would commemorate 100 years of peace with a 3,200-mile border between the United States and Canada—underscoring the absence of any unfriendly curtain.

At this fair, foreign and domestic exhibitors will be displaying accomplishments in the peaceful fields for better living and utilization of resources. When they come to America, visitors from foreign lands will have an opportunity to see power and reclamation projects of the Pacific Northwest where arid deserts were transformed into rich, fertile food-

producing acres capable of feeding hundreds of thousands of hungry people.

The original Senate bill had provisions which followed the precedents of past fairs such as the San Francisco Fair and the one in New York. However, the House Foreign Affairs Committee, as I understand, thought that before any Federal commitments were made a survey should be undertaken. Therefore the House committee reported a bill authorizing a study at a cost not exceeding $125,000. The printed report, let me emphasize, makes it absolutely clear that there is no "open-end" authorization. Any further funds would have to be authorized after evaluating the report provided for in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, most strongly I call for the passage of this bill. Fifteen million dollars have been provided by Washington State and the local authorities for this fair. Seventy acres close to downtown Seattle are in process of being acquired under condemnation. Those responsible for putting on the fair are proceeding in a most thorough way. After the study provided by this measure is completed, however, Congress can decide about United States participation and if it is in the best interests of the country. I am confident it will so decide.

After all, estimates indicate the Federal Government would receive back $800,000 in admission taxes alone. But that question must be decided later. Now the point is, shall we invest $125,000 in an endeavor for peace and plenty in the world? I urge an "aye" vote.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the splendid statement made by the gentleman from Washington, and also by Congressman MAGNUSON of our State.

The Federal Government historically has taken part in expositions all over the world and should in the planned Seattle one. Most of the cost of the capital investment in this world exposition is being made by the citizens of Seattle and of Washington State. They have shown their good faith in promotion of the exposition dedicated to the advancement of science. It seems to me most proper that the Federal Government should spend the small sum provided in this bill to make a study as to what extent the National Government will participate in this fine educational and inspirational event.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, or someone interested in this bill, how much this is likely to cost the Federal Government over and above the $125,000 authorized in the bill?

Mr. MORGAN. The total cost, of course, cannot be determined until the full study is made, but I imagine it would be a substantial amount.

Mr. GROSS. Substantial, did the gentleman say?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes; that is right.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. PELLY. I think the idea can best be explained by the fact that this fair is to be patterned on the San Francisco Fair and the New York Fair, that is, providing for the participation by the Federal Government; but certainly there is no commitment here except $125,000. Any further participation by the Government would have to be determined by the Congress itself.

Mr. GROSS. But the bill provides for buildings and other structures.

Mr. PELLY. I may say that the report clearly indicates that there is no intent to commit the Federal Government. The report is very clear that the authorization is limited to $125,000 and any further participation would have to be authorized by the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. I believe the gentleman mentioned certain payments, that the Government would be repaid from admissions.

Mr. PELLY. It would certainly receive the excise taxes on admissions. That would represent a substantial recovery to the Government.

Mr. GROSS. I thought the Government was going to get some direct cut on admissions that would be applied against the expense of the Government, but the gentleman is talking in terms of tax on admissions.

Mr. PELLY. The existing tax on admissions would go into the Treasury. But it is not on that basis certainly that I would recommend the bill to the gentleman or that they would get their money's worth back. I think the greatest return the Government could receive would be the good will of other nations throughout the world which would participate. The Federal Government should be invited to participate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I would like to say to the gentleman that it is impossible at this point to make any intelligent estimate of the cost to the Federal Government. The purpose of the survey which is authorized by this bill is to determine how far the Government wishes to participate in this fair. The Commissioner will come back with a report and the Congress will decide on the basis of that report how extensively it wants the Federal Government to participate in the way of exhibits or in the matter perhaps of a building in which to house the Federal exhibits, or any other financial contribution the Commissioner might recommend.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman expect that the Federal Government will be asked to erect a building or buildings?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The bill contains authorization for the erection of Federal buildings.

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentleman say that some $15 million has already been raised?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. The State of Washington has appropriated $7,500,000 and the city of Seattle has appropriated $7,500,000 for the purpose of acquiring a site and making preparations for this world fair.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to know there is in this project an immediate sense of fiscal responsibility. The House has just passed a bill authorizing the building of a cultural center here in Washington and not a dime has been raised in preparation for it.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I would like to make it clear that the Federal Government is given no authority in this legislation to make commitments for anything beyond $125,000.

Mr. GROSS. I understand, but that is a good deal like some other things that get started, they just grow, and grow, and grow.

Mr. JUDD. I realize it is always possible to take a second step after you have taken a first one, and a third one after that; it is also possible not to take those steps. My point at this time is that this bill does not give any permission to promise to erect any building or incur any obligation beyond $125,000.

Mr. GROSS. It is a good deal like the start of the foreign aid program, if you remember that, do you?

Mr. JUDD. Yes, I certainly do.

Mr. GROSS. And you know what it is today, do you not?

Mr. JUDD. Yes, I believe it has been the most successful expenditure of money of a comparable amount that we have ever made from the standpoint of ensuring the survival of this country and the peace of the world.

Mr. GROSS. I could not disagree with the gentleman from Minnesota more than in that statement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, the World Science Pan-Pacific Exposition is going to be held in Seattle, Wash., in 1961. It will be a large exposition and the State of Washington and the city of Seattle have already put up $15 million to finance it. The administration of the exposition is in the hands of the Washington State World Fair Commission.

The Washington State World Fair Commission desires that the Federal Government participate in this important exposition which is to be held 3 years from now. In the judgment of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and of the executive branch of the Government it is desirable that the Federal Government should participate in the Seattle fair. A fair of this magnitude and nature should be effective in promoting good will and understanding among peoples. This is particularly true because the nations of the Pacific rim are expected to participate and our relations with the countries in this part of the world are

of direct importance to us in the United States.

I want to make clear that this resolution does not relate to whether or not there shall be an international fair in Seattle in 1961 nor does it provide that the United States shall direct or administer such fair. All that is involved in this resolution is authority for the United States to participate in the exposition, the control of which and most of the financing of which will rest with the State of Washington and the city of Seattle.

The ultimate decision as to the nature of Federal participation in the Seattle fair and the amount of money to be spent by the Federal Government for such participation will be made by the United States Congress. Action on this bill does not involve the final decision on these matters. The purpose of this bill is to make it possible for the proper Federal officials to work with the Washington State World Fair Commission in preparing a plan for United States participation in the Seattle fair and, on the basis of this planning, to submit recommendations to the next sesssion of Congress. The recommendation as to what the United States should do in connection with the exposition and how much expenditure of Federal funds should be made will be submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for its consideration and the Congress will have the final say in the matter.

The Bureau of the Budget raised a number of rather important objections to S. 3680 as it passed the Senate. The bill in the form in which it was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs provided for a commission of 16 members, a majority of whom were either members of the Cabinet or major independent agencies of the Government. It authorized the appointment of a commissioner at a salary of $20,000 per year and of two deputies at salaries of $17,500 each.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs was inclined to agree with the Bureau of the Budget that the bill in this form provided a larger and more expensive administrative structure than was necessary. We sought the advice of the Bureau of the Budget as to how the bill should be modified so as to provide the necessary authority and personnel so that the Federal Government could work with the Washington State World Fair Commission but at the same time without being larger or more costly than necessary. The bill reported by the Foreign Affairs Committee has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget and, I am informed, is satisfactory to the Seattle exposition authorities. The bill authorizes an appropriation of $125,000 and it is the understanding of the committee that such funds as are appropriated subject to this authorization will be used only to pay expenses necessary for the commissioner to operate and for the various Federal agencies to cooperate in preparing plans and recommendations for submission to the next session of Congress.

It seems to me that it is desirable that this bill be passed so that such planning can go forward. The determination as to the extent of Federal participation in the Seattle exposition or the amount of money to be appropriated should be made after plans and recommendations have been formulated and submitted to the Congress. It is my understanding that there will be an exposition in Seattle whether Congress takes favorable action on this bill or not. Congress should not decide against United States participation until it has had an opportunity to judge intelligently just what advantages such participation may bring to the United States as well as what the cost may be. At the next session of the Congress we will have an opportunity to make the necessary evaluation and take final action. I hope that the bill as amended and reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs will pass.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill S. 3680 as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INVESTIGATION AND ERADICATION OF THE PREDATORY DOGFISH SHARK

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2719) to provide for the payment of bounties on dogfish sharks to control the depredations of this species on the fisheries of the Pacific coast.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to prosecute, for a period of not to exceed 4 years from the date of approval of this act, investigations of the abundance and distribution of dogfish sharks, experiments to develop control measures, and a vigorous program for the elimination and eradication or development of economic uses of dogfish shark populations.

SEC. 2. In carrying out the foregoing purposes and objectives the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to cooperate with the official conservation agencies of the States bordering on the Pacific coast, with the commercial fishing industry, and with other governmental or private agencies, organizations, or individuals having jurisdiction over or an interest in the fisheries of the Pacific coast.

SEC. 3. There is authorized to be appropriated from time to time, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary not to exceed $95,000 per annum to carry out the purposes and objectives of this act.

Amend the title so as to read: "An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and eradicate the predatory dogfish sharks to control the depredations of this species on the fisheries of the Pacific coast, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALTER). Is a second demanded?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might require.

Mr. Speaker, this bill carries a Senate number and also carries a Senate title; however, when the bill came to our committee we struck out all of the provisions of the Senate bill and rewrote it.

The Senate bill provided for bounties as a means of doing away with the dogfish shark which are infesting the waters of the Pacific Coast, particularly the north Pacific waters. In testimony before our committee the Fish and Wildlife people opposed the idea of bounties as being unworkable from an administrative point of view and pointed to an experience that had been had by the Canadian Government some years ago. The Canadians tried the bounty sytsem for a year and found it did not work from an administrative point of view. So the House committee, following the suggestion of the Fish and Wildlife Bureau, rewrote the bill and provided that the Department of the Interior conduct for a 4-year period a research program designed to do away with and eradicate the dogfish shark. The bill limits the amount of funds that may be expended for this purpose to $95,000 per year.

Mr. Speaker, the dogfish shark has increased in terrific numbers in recent years to the point where the fishermen seeking to catch other species of fish, particularly salmon, are unable to do so by reason of the dogfish sharks. When the fishermen go to known grounds and cast out their nets, instead of getting salmon or other species, they get large numbers of the dogfish shark. For instance, one fisherman dropped his nets into the water and pulled in 30,000 pounds of dogfish sharks.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is essential for the preservation of other species of fish. Something must be done to eliminate the dogfish shark.

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. CRETELLA. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee or someone on the committee a question. We on the east coast are bothered terrifically by the starfish which have been destroying the oysters on the east coast. There was a report furnished by the Department of Commerce suggesting some legislation, and it was my understanding that this starfish bill was also going to be considered by the Senate in connection with the dogfish shark bill.

Can anyone on the committee tell the House what has happened to the legislation dealing with starfish eradication on the east coast?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I may say to the gentleman that as far as the committee is concerned, it was simply a matter of time. I may further say to the gentleman that I was one of those who favored and supported the starfish bill. I understand that the starfish creates a terrible

problem in the New England area. The only reason the committee did not take the matter up was not because of opposition to the bill but due to lack of time.

Mr. CRETELLA. A report was filed by the Department of Commerce some time ago. I wrote to the committee and asked for consideration of my bill. Legislation was introduced by other Members as well as myself from the east coast.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I appreciate that fact, and, again, all I can say is that our schedule was terrifically heavy the past few months, and we did not get to it, as well as other pending measures. May I say further to the gentleman, in talking to those Members who spoke to me about the starfish problem, I said I would do everything I personally could to get favorable action on the measure should it be introduced in the next Congress.

Mr. CRETELLA. And that applies to the other members of the committee as well?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I do not know of any member of the committee that is opposed to it. If they are, they have not said anything to me. But, I do not want to commit individual members.

Mr. CRETELLA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND].

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I support S. 2719 which in its original form was similar to the bill I introduced, H. R. 13612 and which provided payment of bounties on dogfish. Although I support this bill, I regret that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries changed the legislation so that these bounties will not be paid.

The bill as reported by the committee is a step toward control of this predator, but it is not the positive approach that I asked for. If in 4 years the Department of Interior can find a commercial use for dogfish shark, the intent of my legislation will be accomplished.

Dogfish shark is a serious problem for the commercial fishermen and sports fishermen of my District in the State of Washington. In fact, this predator affects the fishing industry from as far away as California and Alaska. I offered my bill because I believed it was a practical method of controlling this shark which consumes up to 20 times its own weight annually.

My bill would have encouraged fishermen to take dogfish commercially, thus the balance of nature that once existed would be reestablished. This legislation also would have authorized the Secretary of Interior to pay a bounty of $10 a ton for unlivered dogfish or 10 cents a pound for dogfish shark livers.

A conservative estimate of the total weight of these fish exceeds 1 million tons. This means that our fishing industry stands to lose as much as 20 million tons of salmon, bottom fish, and crab each year to this predator. This seems to me a situation that could eventually lead to even more severe losses than have been noted in the past. Now is the time to take positive steps to end this menace.

Before 1949, as much as 135 million pounds of dogfish were landed annually by fishermen who sold them for their liver, a source of vitamin A. This catch held these fish in check, but in 1950 the market for dogfish livers became virtually nonexistent because of low-priced synthetic vitamin A compounds. Since then the dogfish population has greatly increased in numbers.

Commercial fishermen report they have lost their costly gear because of the difficulty of hauling overloaded nets filled with dogfish into their boats. Even in cases where the nets were taken aboard, there is much damage because of the abrasive nature of the skin of dogfish.

This pest also affects the sports fishing industry of my District. Thousands of fishermen visit the area annually to troll and mooch for salmon. Hundreds of boathouse and resort owners owe their livelihood to sports fishermen who depend on them for bait, accommodations, boats, food, and tackle. These fishermen will not return to areas where dogfish shark have depleted the salmon run.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope this body will cast a favorable vote for S. 2719 which is a start toward positive action in the best interest of our commercial and sports fishermen and will pave the way toward saving one of our most valuable national assets, the salmon runs of the Pacific.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. NORBLAD].

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, I am very much in favor of this legislation and hope it passes. It had been my hope that the original bill providing for bounties might have been approved by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, but since that was not the case, I in turn favor this substitute measure.

Dogfish sharks are very definitely a menace to fisheries along the Pacific Coast. Many fishermen have told me of catching dogfish sharks and finding that there were actually pieces of salmon or other fish in their stomachs, so it is obvious that they have been damaging our commercial fisheries.

Prior to the war, these sharks were caught in large numbers and the liver used to make vitamins but synthetics were discovered and, since fishery of the dogfish shark has ceased, that has caused them to multiply in great numbers. I feel that this research program will be an answer to exactly what should be done in the future to control them.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say that there are times when only the Federal Government can help. The Great Lakes were infested with lamprey eels. We did what we could but lost all our trout. Thanks to Federal assistance and a newly developed chemical the lampreys are being eradicated. The success of these efforts makes it possible for us to start redeveloping our trout. I trust this legislation will be passed and that the investigation will be made.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I thank the gentlewoman. The authorization for that program came out of our committee, and I am happy that the program is working.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this is needed legislation and legislation that will repay manyfold the money invested in it.

Dogfish shark have increased enormously in the waters of the north Pacific along the Oregon and Washington coast. These sharks live upon young salmon, other fish, and upon young crab. Each shark eats many times its own weight in fish each year.

If the numbers of these dogshark can be decreased, food fish weighing millions of pounds will be preserved for taking by sports and commercial fishermen.

This bill merely asks for $95,000 each year for 3 years for scientific study of ways and means for destroying dogfish shark. Studies like this have been made in other fields and resulted in beneficial methods of destroying predators. I hope the bill will be approved by the House.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take the full 5 minutes, but I think that everyone should understand that dogfish sharks apparently infest and are propagated in every sea in the world; that there is probably no place where dogfish shark are not to be found. This bill will provide for the expenditure of $380,000, which is not exactly lettuce, over the next 4 years for the purpose of research.

It is my belief that dogfish shark have already been researched sufficiently. There is one of the finest institutes of fisheries at the Washington State University; they have researched these dogfish; they have been researched backward and forward. I am sure the only way we will ever get rid of dogfish shark is not by spending money for research but hire trawlers to take them out. I do not think the passage of this bill with an expenditure of $380,000 is going to accomplish any real purpose except to add people to the payroll.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, when this bill first came to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries it was a bounty or subsidy bill for the eradication of these dogfish shark. The Members of the House will notice the amendment written by the committee is just what the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] was discussing. We took the bounty off and inserted language on page 2 that it should be a control measure, a control program. It is similar to the program that the gentlewoman from Ohio was discussing on the Great Lakes with respect to the lamprey eel. We passed a bill to control the lamprey eel, and there has been successful development along that line.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The lamprey eel is found in the Great Lakes—it may be found in certain other places—but these dogfish shark are found in every ocean and every sea in the world. It is a far different problem.

Mr. BONNER. That is true, but there is a greater infestation of them in this area than elsewhere.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my marks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, for a long time I have been active in seeking some solution to the problem of dogfish. Frankly I had introduced legislation to offer a bounty of $10 a ton for dogfish carcasses and 10 cents a pound for livers, but the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, I regret to say, felt a research bill would be better. The bounty idea was a temporary stopgap measure to reduce the number of these pests of the sea until research could come up with some better solution. However, the Fish and Wildlife Service prefers research and if we cannot have the bounty measure, I certainly believe this research bill has merit and strongly support it.

Many persons familiar with my interest in eliminating this predator have asked for information about the dogfish. The Seattle Times of August 17, 1958, carried an informative article on this major fisheries headache written by Donald H. Clark. Let me quote from it:

The one fish in Puget Sound without a single friend in the world—above or below water—is the dogfish. Scientists call the species squalus acanthias; others know it as grayfish or mud shark. Fishermen have a number of not-so-polite names for dogfish.

This underwater marauder, enemy of all marine life, grabs lures intended for game fish, swallow fish hooks, snarls lines, breaks nets, eats herring and other valuable bait fish, gobbles young crabs, and makes a hobby of being a first-class villain.

Because the dogfish hasn't been fished commercially for some 14 or 15 years, the species is multiplying dangerously, both in Puget Sound and in the coastal waters of Washington State.

Dogfish are torpedo shaped. They have large mouths, muddy complexions, rasplike hides, nasty dispositions, and quite a few equally obnoxious relatives.

Male dogfish grow to a maximum length of about 4 feet and to a weight of 8 pounds. Females, more deadly and disagreeable than the males, attain lengths up to 5 feet and weights up to 20 pounds.

Dogfish eat herring, hake, salmon, cod, anchovies, ratfish, flatfish, and rockfish. They eat shad, sculpin, sand lances, porgy, krill, crab, shrimp, octopus, and squid. They eat clams, snails, worms, jellyfish, and sea anemones. They also eat various marine plants and quite a lot of mud. Dogfish don't eat whales, but they would if they could.

One hundred and sixteen of these insatiable pests recently were taken from one herring trap in Quilcene Bay. Several dogfish that got into a herring trap in British Columbia, ate herring until they actually floated and couldn't submerge.

Squalus is no Johnny-come-lately in Puget Sound. He was here when the first pioneers arrived, and probably had been around for centuries before. He will be here for many more centuries unless drastic control measures are devised. Although they now are worthless, dogfish were of considerable value to Indians before white men came to this area.

The newspaper article also explains the basic cause of the problem:

When a vitamin craze swept the country shortly before the Second World War, chemists found that dogfish livers were loaded with vitamin A. Thousands of fishermen went after dogfish with otter trawls and setlines.

Production of dogfish livers reached 320,000 pounds in 1940, jumped to 2,350,000 pounds in 1941, slacked off slightly the following year, and reached a peak of 2,794,000 pounds in 1943. In that year, the dogfish catch netted Puget Sound fishermen $1,290,000. Prices topped 54 cents a pound for livers.

The boom subsided abruptly when two industrial chemists, one in Switzerland and one in Holland, discovered methods of manufacturing vitamin A by synthesis. The discovery killed Puget Sound's fish-liver business. Prices collapsed and dogfish roamed the saltchuck undisturbed.

Year by year since synthetic vitamins took over, the dogfish population has expanded, to the consternation of fishermen and sportsmen.

George Walker, of Seattle, recently gave up salmon fishing when he caught 37 dogfish in 1 hour but no salmon. Other sports fishermen go from place to place, hoping to find a bit of Puget Sound which is not infested with dogfish.

Wear and tear on nets by worthless dogfish plague commercial fishermen. An optimistic fish merchant who tried to sell dogfish to the public as "grayfish," found no takers.

As I said earlier I favor the bounty plan to reduce the number of these predators, but since we cannot obtain that means of solution, I urge passage of this bill for research. This is a problem of Federal waters and the Federal Government has responsibility, so let us pass this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2719) as amended?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and eradicate the predatory dogfish sharks to control the depredations of this species on the fisheries of the Pacific coast, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FISHERIES LOAN FUND

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the list of suspensions has been completed, the bill S. 3295 may be added to that list.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us what that bill is.

Mr. BONNER. It is a bill that was on the list of suspensions. It was taken off but it has now been cleared. It is a bill to add $10 million to the loan fund for fisheries. There has been no money lost in this program. The present amount expires in about October. The program has been successful, and there are now about $4 million in applications. The moneys will run out unless the bill is passed in this session of Congress.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I understand this has been cleared on this side, that it is agreeable to have the bill reinstated. It was through an error that it was stricken from the list, and the Members on this side are perfectly willing to have it reinstated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF BOARD OF PAROLE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 4096), to amend section 4201 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the annual rate of compensation of members of the Board of Parole.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4201 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by deleting the second sentence thereof and substituting in lieu thereof the following sentence: The annual rate of basic compensation of each member of the Board shall be $17,500.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill recommended by the Department of Justice with the concurrence of the Bureau of the Budget to increase the compensation of the members of the United States Board of Parole.

The Board of Parole is a quasi-judicial administrative agency within the Justice Department. It has 8 members appointed by the President for 6-year terms. Appointees to the Board, in order to qualify, must be specially trained and experienced in such fields as medicine, law, penology, sociology, and psychology.

Members of the Board are called upon to assume the heavy responsibility of passing on the parole status of around 24,000 Federal offenders in 29 Federal prisons. Each year members conduct more than 11,000 hearings on applications for parole. In addition, the Board performs various reviewing and supervisory functions.

At the present the most any member is paid in salary is $13,970. Commensurate with his duties and responsibilities, and in comparison with the compensation paid members of comparable

boards and commissions, this amount is clearly inadequate.

For this reason the Justice Department has recommended an annual basic salary of $19,000. The other body reduced that figure to $17,500, and that is the figure agreed to by the House Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, the members of the Board of Parole have proved that they are deserving of this increase in salary to bring them in line with other Government servants rendering comparable services, and I therefore urge the enactment of this measure.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been recommended by the Department of Justice and the Bureau of the Budget. There is no objection from any source. It was the unanimous opinion of the members of the committee that it should be adopted. I hope it will be.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York answer a question or two? I have heard a report that because the increase in salary was reduced from $19,000 to $17,500 we might expect a bill here next year to increase the salary to $20,000. Has the gentleman heard that report? Would the gentleman be in favor of another increase for these people next year to $20,000?

Mr. KEATING. I would always try to review every situation on its merits. I have not heard any such rumor. The gentleman must recognize that rumors fly thick and fast at this time of the session.

Mr. GROSS. I do.

Mr. KEATING. I have heard of no indication that it is intended to ask for a further increase beyond this.

Mr. GROSS. I would hope that these people would not be back next year for another increase, in view of the fact that this increase in the annual salary is well above $3,000. This bill does not provide for any supergrades in this agency?

Mr. KEATING. No. I would not expect they would be back next year, but, of course, I have no control over that.

Mr. GROSS. I think the legislation is all right. I think these people are entitled to an increase in pay to bring them more nearly in line with the salaries paid other commissioners.

Mr. KEATING. I commend the gentleman on his attitude.

Mr. CELLER. Mr Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this bill that was thoroughly considered by our Committee on the Judiciary. This bill increases the salaries of the members of the Board of Parole from $13,970 to $17,500. This is in keeping with the program of Congress for modernization of Federal salary schedules for Federal Boards and Commissions.

In 1956 Congress passed the Federal Executive Pay Act providing substantial salary increases for some 21 boards and commissions of the Federal Government. The Board of Parole was not included in that act and therefore received no salary increase at that time. This bill will reduce the inequity in the existing salary differential between the Board and comparable Federal agencies.

The jurisdiction of the Board of Parole, consisting of 8 members, extends to the 29 Federal penal institutions throughout the United States. The members spend approximately 35 percent of their time in travel and personally conduct over 11,000 hearings per year on applications for parole. Including short term cases of less than a year, reconsiderations of cases on institutional progress reports as well as conducting review hearings on petitions from attorneys, relatives, and others, the Board makes over 20,000 decisions a year. It has approximately 7,000 parolees and releasees residing in their home communities under its jurisdiction.

This legislation was sponsored by the Department of Justice and has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

I hope that this bill will have the unanimous approval of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1959

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the bill H. R. 13489, the Military Construction Appropriation bill for 1959.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2114) to amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), as amended, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to acquire land for field sites, to undertake construction and improvement of buildings, and for other activities.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to establish the National Bureau of Standards," approved March 3, 1901, as amended, is amended by adding the following sections:

"SEC. 13. To the extent that funds are specifically appropriated therefor, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to acquire land for such field sites as are necessary for the proper and efficient conduct of the activities authorized herein.

"SEC. 14. Within the limits of funds which are appropriated for the National Bureau of Standards, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to undertake such construction of buildings and other facilities and to make such improvements to existing buildings, grounds, and other facilities occupied or used by the National Bureau of Standards as are necessary for the proper and efficient conduct of the activities authorized herein: *Provided*, That no improvement shall be made nor shall any building be constructed under this authority at a cost in excess of $40,000 unless specific provision is made therefor in the appropriation concerned.

"SEC. 15. In the performance of the functions of the National Bureau of Standards the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to undertake the following activities: (a) The purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards; (b) the repair and alteration of buildings and other plant facilities; (c) the rental of field sites and laboratory, office, and warehouse space; (d) the purchase of reprints from technical journals or other periodicals and the payment of page charges for the publication of research papers and reports in such journals; (e) the furnishing of food and shelter without repayment therefor to employees of the Government at Arctic and Antarctic stations; (f) for the conduct of observations on radio propagation phenomena in the Arctic or Antarctic regions, the appointment of employees at base rates established by the Secretary of Commerce which shall not exceed such maximum rates as may be specified from time to time in the appropriation concerned, and without regard to the civil service and classification laws and titles II and III of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945; and (g) the erection on leased property of specialized facilities and working and living quarters when the Secretary of Commerce determines that this will best serve the interests of the Government."

SEC. 2. Such act is further amended in section 11, paragraph (a) by striking out the word "therein" and substituting therefor the word "herein."

SEC. 3. The act entitled "An act to provide authority for certain functions and activities in the Department of Commerce and for other purposes" approved July 21, 1950, is hereby repealed in its entirety.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, S. 2114 would amend the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards so as to authorize the National Bureau of Standards to acquire land for field sites to be used in connection with its radio propagation research programs. The Bureau would have to request specific appropriations for such purchases. Another purpose of the bill is to increase from $25,000 to $40,000 the present limitation on the construction of facilities without having to obtain specific appropriation therefor. Other provisions of the bill are: To incorporate the provisions of Public Law 618, 81st Congress into the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards; authorize certain construction on leased properties; and to correct a minor error in a recently enacted amendment to the organic act. This legislation does not expand the functions of the National Bureau of Standards. A more detailed statement on this bill is set forth in House report 2635 to accompany S. 2114.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

If not, the question is, will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BONDS OF UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1438) to amend section 544 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the bonds of United States marshals.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsections (a) and (b) of section 544 of title 28, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

(a) Every United States marshal, including any marshal appointed to serve during a vacancy, shall be bonded in the sum of $20,000 for the faithful performance of duty by himself and his deputies during his continuance in office and by his deputies after his death until his successor is appointed and qualifies.

(b) The Attorney General may require the United States marshal for the southern district of New York to be bonded in a sum not exceeding $75,000 and any other United States marshal to be bonded in a sum not exceeding $40,000.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple bill. It is the result of an executive communication received from the Department of Justice. In a word, it provides for the filing of a single bond by the Government to cover all marshals at a substantial saving of money instead of having a separate bond for each marshal in each district court throughout the Nation. It is as simple as that. Considerable moneys will be saved and it has been recommended that we adopt this amendment to the code by the Department of Justice.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it will be refreshing to the Members to know that this is an economy measure.

S. 1438 would eliminate the requirement imposed by section 544 of title 28, United States Code, that bonds of United States marshals be approved by a judge of the district court for which the marshal is appointed, and filed and recorded in the office of the clerk. That section also requires that before he enters the duties of his office a bond be posted for the faithful performance of the marshal's duty.

There is no longer any need for the approval of the marshal's bond by the district judge, since rather than posting personal collateral, corporate surety bonds are now furnished instead. Under present law it is impossible to include marshals' bonds in group purchase plans authorized by the act of August 9, 1955, which provided for blanket bonds covering various Federal officials. Enactment of S. 1438 would make it possible to purchase a single bond to cover all United States marshals. This would result in substantial savings to the Government which now pays the premium on all individual bonds covering these officers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that this measure, which has the approval and recommendation of the Department of Justice, receive the support of every Member of this body.

The SPEAKER. The question is: Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL AIR MUSEUM

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1985) to authorize the preparation of plans and specifications for the construction of a building for a National Air Museum for the Smithsonian Institution, and all other work incidental thereto.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution are hereby authorized and directed to prepare plans, including drawings and specifications for the construction of a suitable building for a National Air Museum (with requisite equipment, approaches, architectural landscape treatment of the grounds, and connections with public utilities and the Federal heating system) for the use of the Smithsonian Institution, to be located on that part of reservation which is bounded by Fourth Street Southwest on the east, Seventh Street Southwest on the west, Independence Avenue on the south, and Jefferson Drive on the north, title to which is in the United States.

SEC. 2. That the exact location of the building on the site shall be approved by the National Capital Planning Commission, and the design shall be approved by the Commission of Fine Arts.

SEC. 3. That the preparation of said drawings and specifications, and all work incidental thereto shall be under the supervision of the administrator of the General Services Administration in accordance with provisions of the Public Buildings Act of May 25, 1926, as amended.

SEC. 4. That there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That appropriations for this purpose, except such part as may be necessary for the incidental expenses of the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution in connection with this project, shall be transferred to the General Services Administration for the performance of the work.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to authorize and direct the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to prepare plans and specifications under the supervision of the Administrator of the General Services Administration for the construction of a suitable building and all necessary appurtenances for the use of the Smithsonian Institution as a National Air Museum. This bill, Mr. Speaker, was reported out of the Committee on Public Works unanimously. The bill is in keeping with Public Law 722, approved August 12, 1946, which authorizes the establishment of a National Air Museum within the Smithsonian Institution and which created an advisory board to the Board of Regents and the procurement and display of objects of interest to aviation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. How much is this going to cost?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. There is not going to be any additional cost. This is merely to authorize a plan and study of a building to be specifically constructed for the purpose of displaying articles that have been given to the Smithsonian such as the airplane, the *Spirit of St. Louis*, and other items of great interest to the aviation world and to the public generally.

Mr. GROSS. This is comparable to the cultural center in Foggy Bottom and we will get the bill for that at some later time?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. No, this is going to be at the cost of the Federal Government. The project discussed earlier today is being carried on at the cost of the subscribers or the patrons of that project.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I appear in opposition to this bill.

I am not opposed to the establishment of an air museum. I do submit however, that an air museum can better be established and set up at a considerable savings in cost to the taxpayers.

I have introduced a bill which provided for the Air Museum to be placed in what is known as the old Pension Office Building here in Washington. Those of us who sponsored the use of that building for the purpose of an air museum submit, as I have suggested, that we can save the Government the sum of $40 million by using an already adequate building for this purpose.

It has the added advantage of preserving one of Washington's most notable buildings, and of completing the renovation of Judiciary Square here in the District of Columbia.

This old Pension Office Building, as many of you perhaps know, was the scene of many of the inaugural balls in years past. It is a building with a great tradition and history here in the Nation's Capital. Some object that it is not a beautiful building; others disagree. It is an adequate building by virtue of the nature of its construction, adequate for an air museum.

Then the proposal to use the Pension Office Building instead of spending some forty-odd million for a new one has the added advantage of preserving the Mall site upon which this Air Museum will be built under the pending proposal. This site is opposite the present Mellon Gallery. My proposal would save this site for uses more in keeping with the character of the Mall.

There are a great many people in the Nation's Capital who are seriously concerned with the building on the Mall opposite the Mellon Art Gallery of the structure for the purpose of an air museum. As a matter of fact, as was pointed out by Mr. David Finley, Chairman of the Fine Arts Commission, the site upon which they propose to put this Air Museum is the last site available for an air museum on the Mall, which many people who are interested in this subject feel is more in keeping with the character of the location than the Air Museum would be.

So, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, and others in this area for whom I speak, we are not opposing an air museum; we are heartily in accord with the necessity and the wisdom of establishing an adequate air museum. Our opposition simply is based on two grounds: First, we can save money by using the already available and adequate building for that purpose; and those of you who are familiar with the Pension Office Building will know that the inside height of the building is such that it can adequately accommodate the planes they wish to store in an air museum. Second, and probably just as important to those who are concerned with the cultural aspects of the Nation's Capital, it will preserve the Mall site property for purposes more in keeping with the area.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I would like to associate myself with the views of the gentleman from Maryland and ask him, if he has not already stated the figure, whether he give us an estimate of the difference between the cost of converting the Pension Office Building and the cost of the new building.

Mr. HYDE. Those who have talked to me about this project have estimated that by using the Pension Office Building for this purpose instead of erecting a new building on the Mall, the saving would be in excess of $40 million.

Mr. JOHANSEN. If the gentleman will yield further, that is a more substantial saving than was claimed for the bill just passed, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Have we plans now for another big building on the Mall to take care of the things that we have buried and lost?

Mr. HYDE. I do not know of any present or existing plans for any building on the Mall other than for the purposes here indicated in this museum bill now before us. As I said a moment ago, the chairman of the Fine Arts Commission says this particular site is the last available one for an art museum in that area.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Two or 3 years ago we passed a bill here authorizing a building to take care of all the things that cannot be put on exhibition now.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR].

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I am certainly in accord with the statement made by the gentleman from Alabama, chairman of our subcommittee. We had hearings on this particular bill, and my distinguished friend from Maryland was the only one who appeared in opposition to the legislation. He was not opposed to the principle of the bill but he was opposed to the legislation and the location. I certainly pay my respects to him for taking care of his great State and his district which he represents so well, but some of the rest of us have to look after the balance of the United States.

I call your attention to the fact that there was not a single person appearing in opposition to the location of this particular museum. Dr. Carmichael—I am sure we all have a high regard for him—appeared in behalf of the present location; G. E. Graf, Acting Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, appeared on behalf of the location; the General Services Administration, by Franklin G. Floete, appeared in behalf of the particular location; David E. Finley, Chairman, Fine Arts Commission, appeared before our committee in behalf of the particular location; James H. Douglas, Department of the Air Force, Office of the Secretary, appeared in behalf of the particular location; Harland Bartholomew, Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission, appeared on behalf of this particular location.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it would be grand if we could satisfy everyone, but with all the witnesses who appeared before our committee, we had only one objection to the location.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HYDE. Can the gentleman tell me from the committee records to whom notices were sent of this hearing?

Mr. McGREGOR. I cannot. The gentleman knows that I do not have the committee records before me, but I am certain the gentleman from Maryland received a notice, because he was at the committee meeting.

Mr. HYDE. The gentleman from Maryland happened to be at the committee meeting on another bill and did not know this particular bill was before the committee at the time. It was by luck and happenstance that I was there.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am sure the gentleman from Maryland knows I am a member of the minority side and we do not get notices when the meetings are held. But I do know, and I challenge the gentleman from Maryland to dispute this fact, that he was the only one who appeared in opposition to this location.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute. The fact that only a certain number of people appeared before the committee is no indication that there is no opposition to it if those who are opposed to it do not get notice of the hearing. I do not know what the gentleman is attempting to prove by that statement.

Mr. McGREGOR. I am of the opinion that when the Smithsonian Institution is represented, the General Services Administration is represented, the Commission of Fine Arts is represented, the Department of the Air Force is represented, and the National Capital Planning Commission is represented, and they were all in accord with this location, that that is a rather important fact.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman will recall the question was propounded to Dr. Carmichael, secretary of the Board of Regents, whether or not this bill would be suitable for a building for the display of airplanes, and he said it would be totally and completely inadequate.

Mr. McGREGOR. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a word briefly in behalf of this legislation. The United States has a great history in aviation, and I think it is a crying shame that such famous airplanes as the *Spirit of St. Louis* and the early Wright brothers flier are so inadequately displayed down at the Smithsonian. I know that there are dozens of other airplanes with a background of history that are tucked away in garages and hangars around the country. I think the country owes it to the aviation industry to adequately display these relics of our past and as indications of our future in aviation, and I urge a vote on this legislation.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LANKFORD].

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I, like my colleague from Maryland, am completely in accord with the idea behind this legislation. Unfortunately, it is brought up under suspension of the rules and we have no opportunity to amend it.

Mr. Speaker, the only thing in this bill I object to is the site. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR], has made much of the fact that only one person appeared in opposition to the site. I would like to remind the gentleman that I introduced a bill proposing another site, and I had not the slightest idea that any hearings were ever being held on it. I would also like to point out to the gentleman from Ohio that Mr. Finley, chairman of the Commission on Fine Arts, qualified his endorsement of this bill to a certain extent, saying that there should be further study. And, if the gentleman

from Ohio will read the report put out by the committee, he will find that letter in there.

I am only objecting to the site. My colleague from Maryland has covered the objectionable points quite thoroughly in his objection to the bill, and I shall not go into that. I feel that there are many sites that should be considered and which have not been considered that would be much more apropos for this type of building. I earnestly suggest, inasumch as it has been authorized for some 10 or 12 years, that there is no great hurry to pass this bill now, but let us give it some more study.

I am strongly in favor of the establishment of an air museum and have introduced legislation calling for the location of the museum at College Park Airport. The College Park Field has often been termed the Cradle of Aviation. Founded in 1908, it was the location of the first military airbase in the world and the first airmail service in the United States originated from there. I am not opposed to S. 1985 purely because College Park was not selected as the site. I was not, however, given an opportunity to testify on behalf of my bill, and it is my understanding that the committee accepted the statement by the Smithsonian Institution that over 20 other sites were considered in detail by the Board of Regents of the Institution. I strongly doubt that any other site was given detailed consideration. From the very beginning, I have heard only one site proposed by the Smithsonian and other interested agencies and that site is the one on the Mall.

The suggestion made by my colleague the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE] that consideration be given to the utilization of the Pension Building as an air museum is certainly entitled to serious consideration. I have been unable to determine what the estimated costs are for the erection of this museum and I note that S. 1985 contains no ceiling limitation. There is no question that if the Pension Building were suitable, the saving to the taxpayers would run into the millions.

In the near future, many of the activities of the Bolling Air Force Base will be transferred to Andrews. This is still another site that could well lend itself to the erection of a National Air Museum. It is my understanding that if the museum is erected on the Mall that it will be impossible to build a structure adequate in size for the showing of our present aviation collection, not to mention a display of vehicles of space which are making news today and will assuredly be making news tomorrow. Are we here in Congress to be asked to appropriate money for an additional building? There is nothing urgent about the matter today. Not only should the subject of suitable sites be explored more fully but careful consideration should be given to the ultimate cost of the museum and we should attempt to establish a structure that will not only be adequate for today's needs but for the needs of the future.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, my interest in this measure is threefold. In the first place, I am a Regent of the Smithsonian Institution, and it is the Congress that gave the Smithsonian Institution the responsibility for planning the location and erection of an air museum.

Second, I am an early Navy aviator, No. 73. Third, I was Ohio's first director of aeronautics back 29 years ago, and I am interested in the great gift of Ohio's Wright brothers to civilization, the airplane, and to see its history properly preserved and presented. Now, I understand that there has been a suggestion made by people in Maryland that we put this thing out in College Park in Maryland. The Smithsonian Board of Regents, the various commissions and committees involved considered all these various sites before they decided on this site on the Mall. When this suggestion of the Pension Building came up in committee, one member—I shall not give his name, but he was thoroughly familiar with the building and the city—said "I would not wish that building on my worst enemy for a purpose like this." What we want to do, what the Congress wants to do, is to provide a location for this great historic contribution to the culture and the civilization of the world down on the Mall; that is where it is put by this bill; where millions of children can go through it while they are going through the great series of Smithsonian museums and institutions which the Congress has located along the Mall. This building should be erected where the National Planning Commission, after considering all of these other suggestions, wants it to be placed. I hope the bill will be passed.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. Who is going to have the responsibility as to the type of building that is to be built? Will it be in conformity with other buildings on the Mall or one of these modern things?

Mr. VORYS. The Smithsonian Institution Board of Regents will, no doubt, make recommendations to the Congress, and they will, no doubt, create a building commission similar to the one that is building the Smithsonian building for which the first shovelful of dirt down on 12th Street and Constitution was dug today. I can assure my colleague that the architecture will conform appropriately with the other buildings on the Mall.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to direct a question to the gentleman in charge of the bill. First, am I correct in my understanding that if this legislation is passed, it starts the inevitable chain of events that leads to the construction of this building?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That is the hope of the authors of the bill. If it were not expected to build it, there would be no need for this legislation.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Has there been opportunity given either to the Board of Trade or the Federal City Council to express their sentiments on this proposal as to the site?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I have not heard any objection nor has there been any communication to the Committee on Public Works in disagreement with the site, except that of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. JOHANSEN. May I say to the gentleman that his answer is not completely responsive to my question. Have their views at any time been solicited?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that there was wide notoriety or notice given to the fact that the Committee on Public Works was going to hold hearings and that the bill was scheduled for consideration. I do not know how diligent some Members have been or are in ascertaining whether or not hearings are going to be held on bills before a committee.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Am I correct—and I am not saying this critically—that the answer to my question is that their views on this proposed legislation have not been specifically solicited?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I would say they have not been specifically solicited. There are a great number of organizations in the District of Columbia, and by their very nature people from those organizations testify before committees on bills in which they are interested. The Board of Regents has proven throughout the years that it could deal satisfactorily with this problem.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Can the gentleman say how soon it is hoped to start construction?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. This bill does not authorize construction. It only authorizes the preparation of plans and specifications for construction. So I could not begin to tell the gentleman when this building would be started.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. If anybody thinks that this is the start of the Air Museum idea he is all wrong. The Air Museum was created by legislation years ago and responsibility for carrying forward the planning was given to the Smithsonian Institution.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATION FOR PAN AMERICAN GAMES IN CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 13343), to authorize the appropriation of $500,000 to be spent for the purpose of the Pan American games to be held in Chicago, Ill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $500,000 for the Third Pan American games (1959). The said appropriation shall be available for the purpose of promoting and insuring the success of the Pan American games to be held at Chicago, Ill., and shall be expended in the discretion of the organization sponsoring said games, subject to such audit as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the author of the bill, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill which will promote friendly relations with our neighbors and our friends in Canada, and in South and Central America. These are not the first Pan American games to be held. These will be the third.

The first Pan American games were held in Buenos Aires in 1951. The second games were held in Mexico City in 1955. We participated in each of those events, together with our other neighbors on this hemisphere. There were more than 18,000 athletes who participated in each of those celebrations. It is anticipated that there will be more than 2,000 who will participate in the games to be held in the city of Chicago in August of 1959.

I need not tell this House the necessity of promoting good relations with our neighbors in Central and South America. The recent visit of the Vice President to South America bears eloquent testimony to that need. The more recent visit of the President's brother, Milton Eisenhower, to Central America and his report upon his return that our relations needed bettering among the countries of this hemisphere is ample proof to that effect, again.

Then I read from a newspaper article which appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times of August 11 by the eminent columnist, William S. White, on the Latin-American summit. He says:

Our relationship with Latin America is no longer merely unsatisfactory. It is now highly dangerous. And at a time when we may be driven back to a dependence on this hemisphere, a situation we have never known before.

Such unpleasant factors as these underlie the hurried arrangements being made for a so-called summit conference of the 21 American presidents.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Are these games that are now scheduled at Chicago a postponement of the games that were originally scheduled for Cleveland, Ohio?

Mr. YATES. These are the same games that were originally scheduled for Cleveland, Ohio, and from which the city of Cleveland withdrew 2 years ago.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. What is the amount involved in this bill?

Mr. YATES. Where the city of Cleveland requested $5 million for the purpose of constructing a permanent installation, the amount requested in this bill is one-tenth of that amount, $500,000, for the purpose of carrying on some of the expenses of the games.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman will recall that the legislation for Cleveland, if my memory serves me correctly, passed the Senate but was defeated in the House and had the opposition of the Ohio delegation in the House because of the feeling on the part of the Ohio delegation that we should not spend $5 million of the money of the American people for the holding of these games; instead, that the financing of these games should be, as all of our other games have been financed, by popular subscription from the people themselves rather than from the taxpayers.

Mr. YATES. I would agree with the gentleman that this is a most desirable objective if it can be attained. We in the United States of course raise the amount of money with which we send our athletes to the Olympic games, by popular subscription. I do not know whether or not that practice is pursued in all the other countries of the world, but I do know that the purpose of the appropriation which is requested in this bill is as follows: Part of it will be used for the purpose of transporting the personnel, such as the athletes, who cannot afford to come here and whose countries cannot afford to raise the money for their transportation. Another part of the appropriation will be used to house and to feed the athletes while they are in Chicago. The countries themselves will raise a part of that money.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does not the gentleman think it would be more effective as far as making friends in South America is concerned if the American people themselves furnish the money by voluntary contributions to meet these expenses than if the money were taken from the Treasury of the United States? I would be perfectly willing to contribute to such a fund, but I hesitate to vote for a bill that would say to my taxpaying public back home, "You have to pay for a thing that should be done by voluntary contribution."

Mr. YATES. I respect the gentleman's opinions and I would join him in making a contribution myself for this purpose because I think this is a highly desirable celebration. There need be no argument to any Member of this House nor to any other American of the value of athletic competition in stimulating friendship and in promoting good will.

This is a going institution at the present time. The city of Chicago, I may say to the gentleman, already has started and is going to raise more than $2 million in furtherance of this objective. Our schools, our stadiums, our baseball parks, our amphitheaters all will be thrown open for the purpose of holding these games.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is the money in Chicago being raised by public subscription or through taxation?

Mr. YATES. I would say both, by both public subscription and by local taxation. The city of Chicago is going to do its utmost to make this an unforgettable event for our visitors from other countries in the hemisphere.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It just seems to me, sir, that we do not get much credit in foreign countries for that which we give to them out of our Federal Treasury; or at least I will say we do not get the sort of credit that it seems to me normally should be given when we make these gifts of our own volition in order to help the people of other countries and to show our good will toward them.

Mr. YATES. I may say to the gentleman that the past has proved his statement to be correct. But, I would say further, with respect to athletic competition for athletes who cannot come here because of inability to raise funds, I think the American taxpayers would be willing to contribute a portion of what they have paid in taxes to help to make this occasion a most memorable one. I may say, too, that the authorization in this bill is a first step in this respect. The amount requested will go to the Committee on Appropriations and while this is the outside or the maximum amount which may be the subject of appropriation, it may very well be substantially less. The Committee on Appropriations will go over the amount requested at its meetings next year.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Are you fearful that this may establish a precedent which will haunt us in the future?

Mr. YATES. May I say to the gentleman that a precedent has already been established in connection with the Olympic games in California where the Congress voted $4 million, or $3½ million for a permanent installation and $500,000 for the operating expenses of those games.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, just to keep the record straight, I opposed the appropriation for the Pan American games that were scheduled to have been held in Cleveland. I opposed the $4 million or $5 million appropriation for the Winter Olympic games in California, and I am opposed to this digging into the Treasury for more money for this purpose. I am convinced that there is a bottom to the Treasury of the United States. We are dealing here as we were in those other instances with the taxpayers' money. There is no money in the Treasury of the United States that does not come from the taxpayers. This is not our money; it is the taxpayers' money that you are playing with and there ought to be an end to this sort of thing. The distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] talks about

how necessary this is to our relations with the Central American countries and so on and so forth. He mentioned the fact that Mr. Milton Eisenhower had been down to the Central American countries. Sure, he went there and he was accompanied by the checkbooks of every so-called lending agency that we have. I do not know what the bill is going to be for that and I am sure the gentleman does not know either.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me we have already been very liberal in the matter of handing out money to a lot of these foreign countries, and it is time to call a halt.

This bill will provide half a million dollars for the Pan-American games in Chicago, and it is my understanding that about $300,000 of this amount will be used to pay the transportation and other expenses of bringing these foreign athletes to Chicago and taking care of their upkeep while there. If those governments, those countries cannot pick up the small amount of money to send their athletes to the United States, then I think we can do without them. I know no reason why we should pay their transportation and upkeep. I think we have done enough when we provide the facilities for them to compete when they get here.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. YATES. They will pay part of their transportation. The athletes of many of the countries will probably have their way completely paid. I assume, for example, that the athletes representing the Dominion of Canada in these games will have their way completely paid. But many of the countries that are going to participate in these games are small countries such as Trinidad, the Dutch West Indies, and other small places, who might find it difficult to pay all the expenses of sending their athletes to these Pan-American games. I think it is very important that we extend the hand of friendship at this time and make it possible for all to compete.

Mr. GROSS. The House just passed a bill providing another $4 million for the Rama Road down in Nicaragua, running the total for that purpose up to $16 million.

We are called upon time after time at each session of the Congress to appropriate money for the benefit of foreign countries on the grounds that we must encourage friendly feeling on their part toward us.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Certainly I yield, if the gentleman can provide a reason for this kind of expenditure.

Mr. YATES. Does not the gentleman agree with me that this is one of the best ways to build good relations with our neighbors to the north and with our neighbors to the south who are closest to us? If we are to have any kind of defense posture in this hemisphere it must be a hemispheric defense, and how better can that be solidified than by such acts of friendship?

Mr. GROSS. Why not a little reciprocity once in a while?

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I wonder if the gentleman would not agree that we had better be concerned with building up some good will toward ourselves, the Members of Congress, on the part of the American taxpayers?

Mr. GROSS. I certainly agree with the gentleman.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I would like to take this moment to tell this body that I am very much in opposition to this bill, because I think this is a bad precedent. In our country sports have been self-supporting. We do not support any of the national games by Government subsidies, football or baseball. I think the bill rests on a bad base. I oppose the bill.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. I would like very much to say just a word about the whole position of the United States relative to the Pan American games. I did know very intimately the whole message of these particular Pan American games, and I was very disappointed that Ohio was unable to take the attitude we all felt she should take in the matter. Now Chicago has taken that attitude and has asked for $500,000 for what to me is one of the very important things that we can do in a small matter. When anyone says this is not for ourselves, it is so much for ourselves that it really is a shame to oppose it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. I am very anxious that the membership should understand the deep meaning that there is in these games. This provides an opportunity for the youth of the north and the south to come in contact with each other. This is a wonderful way to build friendships. We are going to find that without friends we will be in a very bad way.

There is no better way to do this, and I certainly hope the House will pass the pending bill.

Mr. GROSS. I must respectfully and regretfully disagree with the gentlewoman from Ohio when she minimizes $500,000.

Mrs. BOLTON. I did not minimize it. I think it is the best expenditure we can make.

Mr. GROSS. The gentlewoman referred to it as only $500,000.

Mrs. BOLTON. The gentleman referred to $4 million.

Mr. GROSS. I was not for the four or five million dollars, and I do not minimize a half million dollars. That is still a lot of money out where I come from.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Does the gentleman not agree that interchange of peoples in this type of legislation is the best people-to-people diplomacy we can get?

Mr. GROSS. No, I do not agree with that. I just cannot figure out where this sort of thing is going to end. I mentioned yesterday that the United States Treasury is confronted, as of now—today—with the refinancing of approximately $120 billion of securities that will be due or become payable in the next 12 months. Within the next 5 years the United States Treasury will be called upon to refinance all but $58 billion, or approximately that, of the total of $277 billion of national debt presently outstanding, a herculean refinancing job.

The people are not rushing out to buy Government bonds today. Where does the Government propose to sell these bonds and what rate of interest will it have to pay to get the people back into the Government securities market? Yet, you come in here with spending measure after spending measure, totally oblivious of the condition of the United States Treasury. When Secretary Humphrey resigned he made a public statement in which he said he inherited a "mess" and he was leaving a "mess."

Somewhere along the line somebody is going to have to give some evidence of fiscal sanity in this country, and I do not know of any better place to start than now.

Mr. YATES. May I repeat to the gentleman that this $500,000 is merely an authorization. The amount that will be spent will actually be checked by the Committee on Appropriations and justification for the expenditures will have to be made. For all that I know at the present time the budget has not been clearly made up and it may not amount to nearly that sum.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON]. No one in Congress feels more for the peoples of the world than does the gentlewoman from Ohio. She has expressed eloquently, I think, the sentiment of all of us who serve as members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

What we are attempting to do or planning to do next year is to bring in all the athletes of Latin America to Chicago, the singers, the writers, the people who have the best brains and the culture. We plan to have in Chicago next summer all of our Latin-American neighbors. This is a service for all the Americas, and I think it will result in bringing closer to us than ever before in the minds and the hearts of the people of Latin America the people of our own United States, and I want to commend the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] for taking the position she does.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I would like to point out to the House that support for this measure was unanimous and completely bipartisan in our Foreign Affairs Committee. I want to say that it is not very often that Chicago comes in and asks for cooperation of this kind, and I sometimes wonder whether the moderateness of this request has not perhaps in itself tended to provoke more discussion than if we had come in and asked for $5 million. We ask for only $500,000 to bring to the great Midwest—the heart of America, the home of happy and great Americans whose roots are to be found all over the world—athletes and other representatives from Latin America in order that we may exchange knowledge of each other and of each other's ways, and to produce the kind of understanding that is envisioned in this bill. This is a very small amount to ask, and Chicago will proudly carry the major load. I would point out to the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Iowa that I also always guard the Federal purse strings tightly, and rightly so.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois and wish to remark that under the leadership of TOM O'BRIEN and of Mrs. CHURCH, the Chicago delegation has marched in a true spirit of bipartisanship in dealing with the problems of the Middle West.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORANO].

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] and the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH]. This is the best way, in my mind, to develop a good neighborly policy. It is the best way to develop a people-to-people neighborliness that will result in making friends for the United States. Certainly, the trip to South America by the Vice President demonstrated that we need friends in that area. Now, bringing some athletes into the city of Chicago will do more, in my opinion, than trips by very prominent officials of this Government going into South America. By bringing athletes from those countries, who are well known in those countries, to Chicago will, in my opinion, do more than sending prominent officials from the United States to Latin America. This is only $500,000. This is only an authorization. It has to be examined again by the Committee on Appropriations. If it cannot be justified, the Committee on Appropriations can cut it and allow only that money that can be justified.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes an appropriation of $500,000 to meet a small part of the costs which will be incurred in bringing to Chicago 2,000 young athletes from the countries of this hemisphere to take part in the Pan American games a year from now.

It seems to me that there can be no question but that it will be a great thing for the United States to have 2,000 young men and women from nearly all of the countries to the south of us come to Chicago where they can become better acquainted with us and where we will have an opportunity to get to know them better. Certainly a gathering of this kind will make a worthwhile contribution to our foreign policy.

There are those who say that the United States is not known or understood by the average citizen in Central and South America. I am certain that there are many people in all of the countries of these areas to whom the United States is a land with motives and actions which are difficult to understand. It has been demonstrated many times that athletic ability is exceedingly democratic in its incidence. Certainly no class, race or political party has any preeminence in this field.

Two thousand young athletes of both sexes selected only upon their demonstrated preeminence in competitive sport would assure that a most representative cross section of background and opinion would come here. Certainly, the impressions that they carry back home would be most informative. I am sure all of us believe that if our neighbors could know the truth about us, this would be more effective than any propaganda which could be devised.

I believe that for the modest expenditure which this resolution authorizes the benefits will be very great. I hope that the resolution will be passed by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, a couple of days ago we were expressing our disappointment over the failures, in some respects, of our information program around the world. It is equally appropriate at this time to speak of our successes. There is nothing that America can do more to make friends and influence people around the world, nothing that will bring more good returns, than to demonstrate in our own land the codes of good sportsmanship. Effective democratic government depends most not on the ability to win; it depends most on the ability to try one's level best to win, and then if one loses, to accept defeat without bitterness against the person who beats you, and to cooperate in the decision of the majority, working together for the good of the country—until the next contest, the next race.

A major reason why some peoples have failed at democracy is because they have not learned how to lose and still play ball. When someone loses, he feels he has to organize a coup or another party or a splinter group. Nothing America can do more to win people to the real fundamentals of democracy than to show the kind of good sportsmanship that participation in these games in Chicago will demonstrate. We ought to approve this resolution.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BYRNE].

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as one who was born, raised, and educated in the city of Chicago, I would like to associate myself with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] and the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH] in the remarks they have made.

Also, I have confidence in my native city, in her ability to raise funds and to act as host to any big sporting event.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I say that we do a great job in all sports. Chicago is the only city in the United States of America with two major league ball clubs.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill?

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that in his opinion two-thirds had voted in favor thereof.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 244, nays 64, not voting 122, as follows:

[Roll No. 192]

YEAS—244

Abbitt	Christopher	Harrison, Va.
Abernethy	Church	Harvey
Adair	Clark	Haskell
Addonizio	Coad	Hays, Ohio
Albert	Cooley	Hoeven
Allen, Calif.	Corbett	Holifield
Allen, Ill.	Cramer	Holland
Andersen, H. Carl	Cretella	Holmes
	Cunningham, Iowa	Holt
Anderson, Mont.	Curtin	Horan
Andrews	Dague	Huddleston
Arends	Dawson, Ill.	Hull
Aspinall	Dawson, Utah	Hyde
Ayres	Delaney	Jarman
Bailey	Dent	Jennings
Baker	Denton	Jones, Ala.
Baldwin	Devereux	Judd
Barrett	Dingell	Karsten
Bass, Tenn.	Dixon	Kearns
Bates	Donohue	Keating
Beckworth	Dooley	Kee
Bennett, Fla.	Dorn, N. Y.	Kelley, N. Y.
Bennett, Mich.	Dorn, S. C.	Kilday
Blatnik	Dwyer	Kilgore
Boggs	Eberharter	King
Boland	Edmondson	Kirwan
Bolling	Elliott	Kitchin
Bolton	Everett	Kluczynski
Bonner	Evins	Lafore
Bosch	Fallon	Lane
Boyle	Fascell	Lankford
Breeding	Feighan	Lesinski
Brooks, Tex.	Fenton	Libonati
Broomfield	Fino	Loser
Brown, Ga.	Flood	McCarthy
Brown, Mo.	Fogarty	McDonough
Broyhill	Forand	McFall
Burleson	Forrester	McGovern
Bush	Frazier	McMillan
Byrd	Fulton	Machrowicz
Byrne, Ill.	Garmatz	Mack, Ill.
Byrne, Pa.	Gary	Mack, Wash.
Canfield	Gathings	Madden
Cannon	Gavin	Magnuson
Carnahan	Granahan	Mahon
Carrigg	Gray	Mailliard
Celler	Green, Oreg.	Marshall
Chamberlain	Green, Pa.	Martin
Chelf	Gubser	Matthews
Chenoweth	Hagen	May
Chiperfield	Harris	Meader
		Merrow

Metcalf	Price	Staggers
Miller, Md.	Quie	Steed
Mills	Rabaut	Sullivan
Montoya	Rains	Talle
Morano	Reece, Tenn.	Teague, Calif.
Morgan	Reuss	Teller
Morris	Rhodes, Ariz.	Tewes
Moss	Rhodes, Pa.	Thomas
Multer	Riley	Thompson, N. J.
Murray	Roberts	Thompson, Tex.
Natcher	Robsion, Ky.	Thornberry
Nicholson	Rodino	Trimble
Nimtz	Rogers, Colo.	Tuck
Nix	Rogers, Fla.	Udall
Norblad	Rogers, Mass.	Ullman
Norrell	Rogers, Tex.	Vinson
O'Brien, Ill.	Rooney	Vorys
O'Brien, N. Y.	Rutherford	Walter
O'Hara, Ill.	Sadlak	Whitener
O'Hara, Minn.	Saund	Wier
Ostertag	Saylor	Wigglesworth
Passman	Scudder	Williams, Miss.
Patman	Seely-Brown	Wilson, Calif.
Patterson	Selden	Withrow
Pelly	Shuford	Wolverton
Perkins	Sieminski	Wright
Pfost	Simpson, Ill.	Yates
Philbin	Sisk	Younger
Poff	Smith, Miss.	Zablocki
Polk	Smith, Va.	
Porter	Springer	

NAYS—64

Alexander	Harden	Riehlman
Alger	Hemphill	Robison, N. Y.
Ashmore	Heselton	St. George
Betts	Hiestand	Schenck
Bow	Jackson	Schwengel
Bray	Johansen	Scott, N. C.
Brown, Ohio	Jonas	Scrivner
Budge	Knox	Siler
Byrnes, Wis.	Krueger	Smith, Calif.
Cederberg	Laird	Smith, Kans.
Curtis, Mass.	Lipscombe	Stauffer
Curtis, Mo.	McGregor	Taber
Davis, Ga.	McIntosh	Thomson, Wyo.
Dennison	Miller, Nebr.	Tollefson
Dowdy	Minshall	Utt
Flynt	Moore	Van Pelt
Ford	O'Konski	Weaver
Fountain	Pillion	Westland
Grant	Poage	Wharton
Griffin	Ray	Wilson, Ind.
Gross	Reed	
Haley	Rees, Kans.	

NOT VOTING—122

Anfuso	Gordon	Miller, N. Y.
Ashley	Gregory	Mitchell
Auchincloss	Griffiths	Morrison
Avery	Gwinn	Moulder
Barden	Hale	Mumma
Baring	Halleck	Neal
Bass, N. H.	Hardy	O'Neill
Baumhart	Harrison, Nebr.	Osmers
Beamer	Hays, Ark.	Pilcher
Becker	Healey	Powell
Belcher	Hébert	Preston
Bentley	Henderson	Prouty
Berry	Herlong	Radwan
Blitch	Hess	Rivers
Boykin	Hill	Robeson, Va.
Brooks, La.	Hillings	Roosevelt
Brownson	Hoffman	Santangelo
Buckley	Holtzman	Scherer
Burdick	Hosmer	Scott, Pa.
Clevenger	Ikard	Sheehan
Coffin	James	Shelley
Collier	Jenkins	Sheppard
Colmer	Jensen	Sikes
Coudert	Johnson	Simpson, Pa.
Cunningham, Nebr.	Jones, Mo.	Spence
	Kean	Taylor
Davis, Tenn.	Kearney	Teague, Tex.
Dellay	Keogh	Thompson, La.
Derounian	Kilburn	Vanik
Dies	Knutson	Van Zandt
Diggs	Landrum	Vursell
Dollinger	Latham	Wainwright
Doyle	LeCompte	Watts
Durham	Lennon	Whitten
Engle	McCormack	Widnall
Farbstein	McCulloch	Williams, N. Y.
Fisher	McIntire	Willis
Frelinghuysen	Macdonald	Winstead
Friedel	Mason	Young
George	Michel	Zelenko
Glenn	Miller, Calif.	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Glenn.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Baumhart.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Brooks of Louisiana with Mr. Clevenger.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Henderson.
Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Holtzman with Mr. Van Zandt.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Auchincloss.
Mr. Healey with Mr. Kean.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Beamer.
Mr. Santangelo with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Derounian.
Mr. Friedel with Mr. George.
Mrs. Blitch with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Sheehan.
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Scherer.
Mr. Preston with Mr. Scott of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Cunningham of Nebraska.
Mr. Engle with Mr. Brownson.
Mr. Doyle with Mr. Avery.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Bentley.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Vanik with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.
Mr. Coffin with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. McIntire.
Mr. Winstead with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Harrison of Nebraska.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Hillings.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Robeson of Virginia with Mr. Prouty.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. James.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Wainwright.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Williams of New York.
Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Neal.
Mr. Johnson of Wisconsin with Mr. Mumma.
Mrs. Knutson with Mr. LeCompte.
Mr. Young with Mr. Radwan.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Hill.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Dies with Mr. James.
Mr. Gordon with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Durham with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Gregory with Mr. Hale.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Jenkins.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Vursell.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Dellay with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Jensen.

Mr. McMILLAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDING FISH AND WILDLIFE ACT OF 1956 TO INCREASE AUTHORIZATION FOR FISHERIES LOAN FUND

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3295) to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 in order to increase the authorization for the fisheries loan fund established under such act.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (c) of section 4 of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 1121) is amended by striking out "$10,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$20,000,000."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? If not, the question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the bill just passed at this point in the RECORD; and also that such other Members as may be interested in the bill may have the privilege of extending their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to authorize an increase in the present fisheries loan fund from $10 million to $20 million. The present fund was authorized in 1957 as a source of loans for fishermen who could not otherwise obtain them. To date it has made over $6 million in loans and has pending applications for an additional $6,600,000. At the present rate of processing of loans it is anticipated that the present fund will be exhausted by the beginning of October.

Experience to date has been favorable, with $377,000 in default, of which it is expected that $250,000 will be collected shortly. It is believed that in order to maintain a revolving fund the full amount of $20 million will be required and that the fund will then be on a self-sustaining basis. The use of this money has enabled a number of fishermen to remain in business who would have otherwise been forced out, and the poor credit rating of the industry makes imperative a source of money other than commercial credit. Experience to date indicates that with the fund increased pursuant to this bill, possible losses will be more than offset by interest accretions and that the original fund can be kept intact.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill which has already passed the Senate and which is endorsed by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.

The experience under this program has been excellent. The interest accruing to the funds from outstanding loans is considerably in excess of defaults. Within the next 30 days the loans to be processed will exceed the obligational authority.

On many occasions I have brought to the attention of the House and the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee the unfortunate plight of this distressed industry. It is my intention during the early days of the next session to introduce legislation which will tend to offset the effects of present legislation which is detrimental to the fishing industry of the United States.

I am grateful for the action which the committee has taken on this measure. In line with the suggestion of the President that root solutions be provided for the ground fish industry, I trust that speedy and effective action will be taken by the committee on the new bill in January.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, first I wish to congratulate the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries for reporting this bill to the House so that we may have an opportunity to vote on this important bill that seeks to increase the authorization for the fisheries loan fund. As stated by the chairman of the committee, Mr. BONNER, this bill will increase the loan fund from that amount set in 1957, which was $10 million, to $20 million, since it is anticipated that the fund will be exhausted in October of this year. From the experience in this program so far there is a great deal of interest on the part of the fishermen for these loans, due to the fact that new capital is mandatory and for the reason that these borrowers have encountered difficulty obtaining financial assistance through commercial channels. Mr. Speaker, this is not a grant, it is no giveaway, it is merely an authorization to increase the loan fund that will be lent to those fishermen that may qualify under the rules and regulations. This industry needs our help, these men who risk their lives on these fishing boats in our coastal waters are sincere, conscientious, industrious, and hard-working people.

They merely ask for a loan to tide them over the rough and slow periods of business. The money will be repaid, no doubt, with interest, and your Government will lose nothing. In my opinion the establishment of the Fisheries Loan Fund was one of the finest pieces of legislation passed by the Congress, because it reaches out a helping hand to fishermen in this industry that have been hurt severely due for the most part to our reciprocal trade program. I, too, wish to join with my colleagues that are supporting this measure with the hope that this bill will have the unanimous support of the House today.

ATOMIC ICEBREAKER: PRESIDENTIAL VETO OF H. R. 9196

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, on August 12, 1958, the President vetoed H. R. 9196, to authorize the construction of a nuclear-powered icebreaking vessel for operation by the United States Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

Immediately after the objections of the President were spread at large upon the Journal, a motion was made and agreed to that the bill and the message be referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and ordered to be printed.

This legislation was the subject of the fullest and most careful consideration by the committee during extensive hearings held earlier this year.

The Defense Department initially submitted a written report recommending against enactment. Upon analysis, the testimony of the Department of Defense witnesses refuted the original negative report, particularly when the committee agreed that it was not intended that this project interfere with or impede naval projects having higher priority. Moreover, while the Commandant of the Coast Guard testified that existing specific missions of the Coast Guard do not show a current need for additional icebreakers, he believed that the testimony before the committee disclosed an overall present national need for an atomic icebreaker.

In my opinion, the hearings conclusively established the desirability of this authorizing legislation and that the need for such a vessel transcends the individual requirements of the Navy and the Coast Guard and their specific missions as presently prescribed. The existence of such a ship, specially designed and fitted out as a laboratory, would enable this country to overcome its present great disadvantage in regard to the strategic and commercial potentialities of the Arctic and Antarctic. Failure to recognize the importance of matching Russian capabilities in the scientific fields in the polar seas is myopic to say the least.

Moreover, the hearings also strongly indicated that the use of atomic icebreakers in support of governmental polar projects, particularly in the Antarctic, would result in net savings—not additional costs—because of their greater efficiency and flexibility under the special conditions in those areas. Even if it were true that such a vessel were not needed at this time, no one who has any knowledge of the subject can deny that such a project must be undertaken and need will exist, if not now, then certainly in the very near future. This is a project that will take a minimum of 3 years from the time the initial appropriation is approved. Delay now will mean greater eventual cost in money, and no one knows how much more in precious time.

The veto message states that "placing the construction of an icebreaker arbitrarily ahead of high priority projects in the Coast Guard program would be most unwise." There is nothing in the bill, nor was there any intent expressed in the hearings or in the report, that this matter be placed ahead of any projects, in the Coast Guard or elsewhere, having higher priority. Unfortunately, there are no high priority projects in the Coast Guard program. But in my opinion, based upon years of intimate knowledge of Coast Guard affairs, its problems and its needs, this project is the highest priority of many important projects which should be in the Coast Guard's program. This important agency has been suffering continuing neglect in recent years and is failing to keep abreast of current developments due in large part to inadequate or obsolescent equipment handed down from the other services.

The construction of other types of nuclear powered vessels, particularly submarines, certainly generates a requirement for a nuclear powered icebreaker. The operation of submarines under the Arctic ice, as exemplified by the recent magnificent feats of the *Nautilus* and the *Skate*, has proven successful to a degree that future use of this avenue of traffic will require fully capable surface support in war or peace. None of our aging existing fleet of icebreakers has the required degree of capability.

I think it is well at this point to call to mind the cost in money and lives resulting in World War II from our failure to heed the warning and advice of those who with foresight and knowledge urged such projects as the fortification of Guam and the charting of the Aleutians. Their opponents felt that the areas were too remote and the projects too expensive.

For these and other reasons fully set out in our report to the House, I am deeply disappointed that this authorization measure should have been vetoed with apparent disregard of the hearings and the committee report. While I might not quarrel with an Executive decision to withhold a request for funds because of fiscal stress, I strongly take exception to the action taken in this veto and the accompanying message as applied to this carefully considered authorization measure, which was overwhelmingly approved by both Houses.

In the stress and pressure of these closing days of Congress, the committee chose not to attempt to override the President's veto even though I believe that the great majority of the committee was as disappointed as I.

There follow the principal findings and conclusions upon which the committee urged the enactment of this legislation.

First. Since World War II the United States has increasing interests and commitments in both the Arctic and Antarctic regions of a military, commercial, and scientific nature. For example, the vast distant early warning system was built and supplied in large part through the employment of surface vessels with icebreaker escort. The new multimillion dollar ballistic missiles early warning system must be built and supplied in the same way. Large mineral deposits have been discovered and are being exploited in Labrador and other areas. Oceanographic and environmental studies of the frozen seas are being conducted in the Antarctic as well as the Arctic.

Second. Existing law requires the Coast Guard to develop, establish, maintain, and operate, with due regard to the requirements of national defense, aids to maritime navigation, icebreaking facilities, and rescue facilities for the promotion of safety on and over the high seas and waters subject to the jurisdiction of the United States. Modern icebreakers are needed to carry out the Coast Guard's responsibilities in the Great Lakes and many port areas of the country, and to maintain itself in a state of readiness to function as a specialized service in the Navy in time of war.

Third. The Department of Defense advised that since 1954 there have been insufficient United States icebreakers to

carry out all tasks desired. No reduction in the need for icebreakers is foreseen. There is no substitute for the performance of the functions of an icebreaker.

Fourth. Of the 9 specially designed icebreaking vessels in the United States operated by the Navy and the Coast Guard, only 1 is of postwar design, built with bipolar characteristics, that is, with capability of operating in both the Antarctic and Arctic areas. The other 8 were designed prior to World War II, and their average age is about 14 years. They are, thus, not only inadequate in number, but obsolescent in design and condition.

Fifth. Despite our need for additional icebreakers and the obsolescence of our existing vessels, it will take at least 3 years, and probably more, from the time appropriations are made available to the time a new prototype can be constructed and delivered.

Sixth. The limited endurance of conventionally powered icebreakers greatly reduces their efficiency and effectiveness for prolonged operations in the polar areas. This defect can be overcome with a modern icebreaker powered by atomic energy.

Seventh. The design of an atomic-powered icebreaker will give it not only practically unlimited cruising range and endurance, but enable it to be used to carry cargo, such as fuel, to supply, without the aid of other vessels, land or ice bases otherwise difficult to reach.

Eighth. Such a ship, fitted out as a laboratory, could serve as a base of operations for extended scientific studies, especially of an oceanographic and environmental nature. Testimony and recent reports disclose that the United States is far behind in scientific research and development in the Arctic and Antarctic.

Ninth. The advanced state of Arctic research and scientific knowledge by the Russians and the fact that they have an atomic icebreaker nearly ready to go into operation in the Arctic cannot be minimized. As one expert testified:

> We now realize in our thinking that the U. S. S. R. does not lie either to the east or to the west of North America. It lies to the north of North America.

Tenth. In view of the trend toward the application of atomic power to merchant ships and the responsibilities of the Coast Guard relative to design and construction standards of merchant ships, it is important that the Coast Guard gain practical working knowledge of atomic propulsion as quickly and as thoroughly as possible.

Eleventh. Recent developments indicate expanded commercial shipping operations in the Arctic in the near future, with consequent need for effective and adequate icebreaker support. An atomic-powered icebreaker would be capable of greatly lengthening the navigation season and assuring greater efficiency and safety of such commercial operations.

Twelfth. Depending upon the exact characteristics to be built into the proposed vessel, it is estimated that a fully modern, atomic-powered, icebreaker with multipurpose capability and having bipolar characteristics would cost between $40 and $60 million. The great advantages of the application of atomic energy to an icebreaker offsets the cost differential over a conventionally powered vessel more than in any other type of noncombatant vessel in the present state of development of this source of power. In fact, when all factors are taken into account the support of operations such as those required in the Antarctic by an atomic icebreaker would result in net savings against support by conventionally powered vessels.

Thirteenth. The Atomic Energy Commission recommended favorable consideration of the bill because of (a) the greater endurance and efficiency of an atomic-powered icebreaker, (b) the material contribution such a project would make to the advancement of reactor technology and (c) the fact that the utilization of a nuclear-power plant would afford an excellent opportunity to demonstrate a peaceful use of atomic energy in a practical application.

Fourteenth. According to the Atomic Energy Commission, neither the provisions of the bill as reported, nor the carrying out of the project, will impair or interfere with other high priority atomic programs.

Fifteenth. In view of the multipurpose uses which can be made of the proposed vessel for noncombatant operation and the historic mission of the Coast Guard in peace and war, that agency is the appropriate one to operate the vessel.

Sixteenth. The Navy and the Coast Guard work together very closely, and the vessel would be readily available to the Navy for high priority tasks requiring its use.

Seventeenth. The testimony fully supported the need for the earliest possible construction of the icebreaker which would be authorized by this bill.

AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

Mr. COOLEY submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 3420) to extend and amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2694)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3420) to extend and amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, with a recommendation that it do pass, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That section 101 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (Public Law 480, 83rd Cong.), is amended by striking out the semicolon at the end of paragraph (a) thereof and adding 'or normal patterns of commercial trade with friendly countries;'.

"SEC. 2. Section 103 (b) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) Agreements shall not be entered into under this title during the period beginning July 1, 1958, and ending December 31, 1959, which will call for appropriations to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation, pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, in amounts in excess of $2,250,000,000, plus any amount by which agreements entered into in prior fiscal years have called or will call for appropriations to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation in amounts less than authorized for such prior fiscal years by this Act as in effect during such fiscal years.'

"SEC. 3. (a) Section 104 of such Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence of paragraph (h) thereof the following: 'and for the financing in such amounts as may be specified from time to time in appropriation acts of programs for the interchange of persons under title II of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1446)'.

"(b) Section 104 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, is further amended by substituting a semicolon for the period at the end of paragraph (k) and adding the following new paragraphs:

"'(l) For the acquisition by purchase, lease, rental or otherwise, of sites and buildings and grounds abroad, for United States Government use including offices, residence quarters, community and other facilities, and for construction, repair, alteration and furnishing of such buildings and facilities: *Provided*, That foreign currencies shall be available for the purposes of this subsection (in addition to funds otherwise made available for such purposes) in such amounts as may be specified from time to time in appropriation acts;

"'(m) For financing in such amounts as may be specified from time to time in appropriation acts (A) trade fair participation and related activities authorized by section 3 of the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956 (22 U. S. C. 1992), and (B) agricultural and horticultural fair participation and related activities;

"'(n) For financing under the direction of the Librarian of Congress, in consultation with the National Science Foundation and other interested agencies, in such amounts as may be specified from time to time in appropriation acts, (1) programs outside the United States for the analysis and evaluation of foreign books, periodicals, and other materials to determine whether they would provide information of technical or scientific significance in the United States and whether such books, periodicals, and other materials are of cultural or educational significance; (2) the registry, indexing, binding, reproduction, cataloging, abstracting, translating, and dissemination of books, periodicals, and related materials determined to have such significance; and (3) the acquisition of such books, periodicals, and other materials and the deposit thereof in libraries and research centers in the United States specializing in the areas to which they relate;

"'(o) For providing assistance, in such amounts as may be specified from time to time in appropriation acts, by grant or otherwise, in the expansion or operation in foreign countries of established schools, colleges, or universities founded or sponsored by citizens of the United States, for the purpose of enabling such educational institutions to carry on programs of vocational, professional, scientific, technological, or general education; and in the supporting of workshops in American studies or American educational techniques, and supporting chairs in American studies:'."

"SEC. 4. Section 109 of such Act is amended by striking out 'June 30, 1958' and inserting in lieu thereof 'December 31, 1959.'

"SEC. 5. Section 204 of such Act is amended by striking out 'June 30, 1958' and inserting in lieu thereof 'December 31, 1959.'

"SEC. 6. Section 303 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 303. The Secretary shall, whenever he determines that such action is in the best interest of the United States, and to the maximum extent practicable, barter or exchange agricultural commodities owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation for (a) such strategic or other materials of which the United States does not domestically produce its requirements and which entail less risk of loss through deterioration or substantially less storage charges as the President may designate, or (b) materials, goods, or equipment required in connection with foreign economic and military aid and assistance programs, or (c) materials or equipment required in substantial quantities for offshore construction programs. He is hereby directed to use every practicable means, in cooperation with other Government agencies, to arrange and make, through private channels, such barters or exchanges or to utilize the authority conferred on him by section 4 (h) of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, as amended, to make such barters or exchanges. In carrying out barters or exchanges authorized by this section, no restrictions shall be placed on the countries of the Free World into which surplus agricultural commodities may be sold, except to the extent that the Secretary shall find necessary in order to take reasonable precautions to safeguard usual marketings of the United States and to assure that barters or exchanges under this act will not unduly disrupt world prices of agricultural commodities or replace cash sales for dollars. The Secretary may permit the domestic processing of raw materials of foreign origin. The Secretary shall endeavor to cooperate with other exporting countries in preserving normal patterns of commercial trade with respect to commodities covered by formal multilateral international marketing agreements to which the United States is a party. Agencies of the United States Government procuring such materials, goods, or equipment are hereby directed to cooperate with the Secretary in the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities by means of barter or exchange. The Secretary is also directed to assist, through such means as are available to him, farmers' cooperatives in effecting exchange of agricultural commodities in their possession for strategic materials.'

"SEC. 7. Section 206 (a) of the Agricultural Act of 1956 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following: 'but no strategic or critical material shall be acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation as a result of such barter or exchange except for such national stockpile, for such supplemental stockpile, for foreign economic or military aid or assistance programs, or for offshore construction programs'.

"SEC. 8. In carrying out the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, extra long staple cotton shall be made available for sale pursuant to the provisions of title I of the Act in the same manner as upland cotton or any other surplus agricultural commodity is made available, and products manufactured from upland or long staple cotton shall be made available for sale pursuant to the provisions of title I of the Act as long as cotton is in surplus supply, and no discriminatory or other conditions shall be imposed which will prevent or tend to interfere with their sale or availability for sale under the Act: *Provided*, That that portion of the sales price of such products which is financed as a sale for foreign currency under title I of the Act shall be limited to the estimated portion of the sales price of such products attributable to the raw cotton content of such products.

"SEC. 9. Notwithstanding any other provision of law (1) those areas under the jurisdiction or administration of the United States are authorized to receive from the Department of Agriculture for distribution on the same basis as domestic distribution in any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, without exchange of funds, such surplus commodities as may be available pursuant to clause (2) of Section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, as amended (7 U. S. C. 612c), and Section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1431); and (2) the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to purchase products of oil seeds, and edible oils and fats and the products thereof in such form as may be needed for donation abroad as provided in the following sentence. Any such commodities or products if purchased shall be donated to nonprofit voluntary agencies registered with the Department of State, other appropriate agencies of the Federal Government or international organizations for use in the assistance of needy persons outside the United States. Commodity Credit Corporation may incur such additional costs with respect to such oil as it is authorized to incur with respect to food commodities disposed of under Section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949."

And the House agree to the same.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
WILLIAM S. HILL,
CHARLES B. HOEVEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
EDWARD J. THYE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3420) to extend and amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and substituted language which was basically title I of H. R. 12954 as reported by the committee. The House amendment was much more comprehensive than the Senate bill and contained numerous provisions, including several authorizing additional uses of foreign currencies and a provision with respect to augmented barter, which were not included in the Senate bill.

In general, the substitute amendment agreed on by the conferees follows the provisions of the House amendment. Except for minor and clarifying amendments, the differences between the House amendment and the substitute agreed upon by the conferees are as follows:

PERIOD OF EXTENSION

The Senate bill extended titles I and II of the act for 2 years. The House bill extended these titles for 1 year. The conference amendment reported herewith extends titles I and II of the act for 1½ years, until December 31, 1959. Both House and Senate bills provided for operations under title I at the rate of not more than $1.5 billion per year, and this rate of operation is retained in the conference report.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

Section 5 of the Senate bill (sec. 7 of the conference report) was not in the House bill. It prohibits the acquisition of strategic or critical material by barter or exchange except for the national stockpile, the supplemental stockpile, for foreign economic or military aid or assistance programs, or for offshore construction programs.

LONG-STAPLE COTTON AND COTTON PRODUCTS

Section 6 of the Senate bill (sec. 8 of the conference report) was not in the House amendment. As agreed to by the conferees, it provides that extra-long-staple cotton shall be made available for sale under title I of the act in the same manner as upland cotton or any other surplus agricultural commodity and that products manufactured from upland or long-staple cotton shall be made available for sale under title I but that only that portion of the sales price of such products which is attributable to the raw cotton content of the product shall be eligible for financing under title I as a sale for foreign currency.

ADDITIONAL USES OF FOREIGN CURRENCY

Sections 3, 4, 5, and 8 of the House amendment, providing additional uses of foreign currencies accruing from sales under title I, have been retained without substantive change as section 3 of the conference substitute. The provision authorizing use of foreign currencies for trade fair participation has been slightly amended to make clear that the authorization covers also agricultural and horticultural fair participation and related activities. These provisions retain the language requiring appropriation of foreign currencies for these additional uses, which appeared in the House amendment.

RELIEF PROGRAMS

Section 6 of the House amendment, authorizing the President to extend relief and related programs to any area under the jurisdiction or administration of the United States, such as the Pacific Trust Islands or the Ryukyus, has been amended by the adoption of alternative language suggested by the Department of Agriculture. It is the understanding of the committee that title I now applies to these areas. The substance of the provision remains the same. This section, appearing as section 9 in the conference report, also includes a provision authorizing the Commodity Credit Corporation to purchase products of oilseeds and edible oils and fats and the products thereof and to donate such commodities abroad.

MALARIA ERADICATION, PUBLIC HEALTH, AND RELATED USES

Section 7 of the House amendment has been eliminated from the conference report for technical reasons and because the committee on conference understands that the authority for use of foreign currencies which was spelled out in that amendment already exists. The committee of conference was in complete agreement, however, on the objectives of this section and emphasizes its view that more liberal use should be made of the authority now existing in section 104 of the act for financing nonself-liquidating projects for the development of human resources and skills. Experience has demonstrated that many such constructive projects, for example, in education, malaria eradication, and public health, are not suitable for financing on a loan basis. We are convinced that there are frequently cases of this sort where use of foreign currency sales proceeds on a grant basis can serve a higher priority development need than would be possible through their use on a loan basis. The conference committee deemed the application

of section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953, to grants in such instances to be inappropriate and urges the President to make more liberal use of his authorities under this act than has been the case in the past.

BARTER

The committee of conference, in including in the conference report a provision with respect to barter, has reiterated and strengthened the directive of Congress to the Secretary of Agriculture to carry on a meaningful and substantial barter program. There was no provision with respect to barter in the Senate bill. The Department of Agriculture vigorously opposed the inclusion of any provision relating to barter either in the House amendment or in the conference report. The fact that such a provision is included in the conference report, therefore, is a clear indication of the dissatisfaction of the House and of the conference committee with the manner in which the Secretary has executed his responsibilities to conduct a barter program during the past 15 months. In effect, the Congress has felt it necessary to tell the Secretary to carry on a program which is already the law.

The language of the conference report (sec. 6 of the report) amends section 303 of Public Law 480 and reiterates the policy of Congress that it is to the benefit of the United States to exchange surplus agricultural commodities which deteriorate in value and are costly to store for strategic and other materials of a type which will be needed by the United States, either in time of emergency or in its normal economy as world supplies of these materials decrease. There are at least four other provisions of law in which a similar Congressional policy is enunciated.

In reenacting section 303, the committee has broadened the base from which the President may select in designating those materials which are to be imported in exchange for surplus agricultural commodities. Most of the ore, metals, minerals, or other materials that might be taken will not deteriorate, can be stored at substantially less cost than agricultural commodities and by their presence within the United States will improve its national resources.

When Public Law 480 was enacted, the Congress specifically stated in its legislative reports on that legislation that barter was to be a priority method of disposal. Until May 28, 1957, a successful barter program was in operation within the Department, but was brought to a practical stop through regulations issued by the Secretary establishing the so-called "additionality requirements," placing upon prospective barter contractors the responsibility of proving that barter transactions would be over and above all possible cash sales.

The effect of this action was to give sales for foreign currency under title I of the act priority over disposal of surpluses by barter. During the fiscal year just passed, the Secretary has made agreements to sell surpluses for foreign currencies to at least 12 countries into which he refuses to let surplus commodities move under barter transactions without proof of "additionality," although he is required by section 101 (a) of this act to determine that sales under title I will be in addition to usual marketings of the United States before approving any such sale.

The details of the barter provisions included in this conference report are relatively unimportant. Congress is not so much concerned with the administrative details of the Secretary's operations as that he should carry on an aggressive and effective barter program. Had he been doing so, there would have been no need for any barter legislation in this bill.

One of the important changes made in existing law by the amendment reported herewith is that it relieves the Secretary of the responsibility of making a finding that barter transactions would protect the funds and assets of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Instead, the Congress has made the policy decision that barter is in the best interests of the country as a whole and intends and directs that the barter program be carried out substantially as it was prior to May 1957.

Prior to that time the Secretary had properly interpreted the language of the existing statute that barter as directed by Congress does protect the funds and assets of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Under that interpretation, approximately $350 million of surplus commodities were exchanged annually for strategic and other valuable materials. Having determined to bring that highly successful program to a halt, the Secretary suddenly decided that the language in the statute directed him to make a determination as to whether or not barter did protect the funds and assets of the Corporation. It was on the basis of this legalistic maneuver that the Secretary brought the program to a halt in May 1957.

The language of the amendment reported herewith eliminates the provision which has given the Secretary this trouble and replaces it with a directive that he shall conduct barter operations "to the maximum extent practicable" and "whenever he determines that such action is in the best interest of the United States." We would remind the Secretary that Congress has on several occasions and in several different statutes indicated that the exchange of surplus agricultural commodities for strategic and other materials of permanent value is in the best interests of the United States and indicates by its reenactment and amendment of section 303 of Public Law 480 that it does not consider a program such as he has been carrying out since May 1957 to be a satisfactory expression of that policy.

The deletion of the language pertaining to the protection of assets was specifically designed to remove the legal base which permitted the Secretary to require so-called certificates of additionality to be furnished by contractors to establish that any sale through barter would be in addition to normal cash sales. Nor is anything in this bill to be construed to permit the requiring of such certificates of additionality.

The conferees were well aware of the testimony given before the committees of both Houses of Congress by the Department of Agriculture designed to show that their assets were not being protected because of the alleged replacement of cash sales by barter sales. At no time was competent evidence given to support these statements. Representative grain and cotton exporters testified that barter transactions do not displace dollar transactions, in fact, in normal trade practice they were handled in precisely the same way, and that barter transactions had many times made possible the sale of additional commodities for cash.

The conferees were also aware of the fact that the data furnished the Congress by the Department of Agriculture showed that as barter transactions increased so did cash sales, and that as barter transactions decreased, there was a resulting decrease in cash sales.

The House amendment contained a limitation of $500 million on the amount of barter the Secretary could engage in in any 1 year. This has been removed from the bill agreed to by the conferees. This is a clear indication on the part of the conference committee that it did not want any such dollar limitation on the authority of the Secretary to exchange essentially valueless surpluses for materials of lasting value.

The conferees also took notice of the fact that under existing law some of the Federal agencies had not cooperated to the fullest extent with the Commodity Credit Corporation in arranging barters. It therefore restated the requirement in the law that other governmental agencies cooperate with the Secretary in arranging, through private channels, barters or exchanges. However, this language does not mean that the Secretary may restrict the barter program in order to protect or conform with other programs of other Government agencies.

The conferees specifically stated in regard to the present requirements for additionality that no restrictions should be placed on the countries of the Free World into which surplus agricultural commodities may be sold excepting under certain conditions, spelled out in the legislation, where the Secretary must make specific findings.

In the past the burden of proof as to additionality has been on the contractors in relation to each contract proposed by them. Under the language of the bill, that burden of proof has been shifted to the Secretary and, in exercising that authority, he is required to follow substantially the same procedures as are followed in title I of Public Law 480. However, it should be noted that the safeguarding of usual marketings is limited to the safeguarding of usual marketings of the United States. It is not intended that the usual marketings of other nations shall be a basis of consideration in the approval of a barter transaction.

Furthermore, in the exceptions granted to the Secretary, he is required to assure that a particular barter transaction will not unduly disturb world prices of agricultural commodities. The conferees were aware that prior to May 28, 1957, barter contractors were offering nominal discounts in order to dispose of the commodities abroad. These discounts normally were around 1 to 2 percent. Following the May 28 directive, the requirements of the additionality program were so stringent and the movement of commodities so difficult that discounts of from 8 to 10 percent were reported. This bill contemplates that a discount of a few percent will not unduly disturb the world prices and not be the basis for establishing restrictions. If a discount is reported above this reasonable rate, the Secretary should take appropriate precautions and action to guard against the disturbing effect of such a large discount.

The Secretary was also directed to assure that a barter sale does not replace a cash sale for American dollars. The burden of proof is on the Secretary to establish that the barter deal does in fact replace a cash sale for American dollars. If such a finding is made, it is the intention of the conferees that the particular barter transaction should be rejected.

The conferees are also aware of the problem having to do with the exporting of wheat from Canada and other friendly nations. Accordingly, it has directed the Secretary to endeavor to cooperate with these countries with respect to commodities governed by formal, multilateral international marketing agreements to which the United States is a party. As a practical thing, the international wheat agreements are the only ones affected by this language and even though it might temporarily reduce by some 40 percent the ability of the United States to dispose of wheat through barter, it was the sense of the conferees that mutually agreeable plans should be worked out with Canada and other signatories of appropriate agreements.

Furthermore, the conferees have recognized the economic and security factors in accepting domestically processed materials in lieu of ore. While the present law is silent on the subject, for a long time barter contracts were made for domestically processed materials. For some reason this program was stopped. It was the sense of the conferees that American labor and management should be permitted to participate in the barter program. Accordingly the bill specifically au-

thorizes the Secretary to permit the processing of foreign ores by domestic processors. The House provision that alloys produced from domestic ores could be taken was eliminated from the bill.

As we have stated above, the substantive changes in the law, while significant, are not nearly as significant as the fundamental fact that the Congress has felt it necessary to enact legislation to require performance of a program which it has previously established by law. This bill is designed to reinstate a barter program of at least the magnitude followed prior to the restrictive regulations issued by the Secretary of Agriculture. Not only will the assets and resources of our country be improved through this program, but there will be substantial savings in storage and depreciation costs, and the value of the materials taken in exchange for the commodities will increase as world supplies diminish.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
WILLIAM S. HILL,
CHARLES B. HOEVEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (S. 3420) to extend and amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, in considering the conference report on S. 3420 dealing with the operations of Public Law 480, I feel it necessary to call the attention of the House to certain problems which this bill was designed to correct. In most conferences in which I have participated over my years in the Congress, Members have genuinely tried to reach reasonable agreements on the matters in conference. In this case, however, the spirit of compromise was lacking and the House conferees found themselves dealing indirectly with representatives of the Secretary of Agriculture, who arrogantly and continuously opposed any language which would require the Secretary to carry out the many laws enacted concerning the so-called barter of surplus agricultural commodities. Threats of a veto, innuendo, and many unusual tactics were used throughout the conference.

I firmly believe but for the fact that the bill contained certain items involving title I which were desired by the Secretary, no agreement would ever have been reached. Finally, however, the House position that new and stronger law was required prevailed and the modified version I have submitted to you was the result. It requires the Secretary to reinstate a barter program similar to the one in operation prior to the decision of the Secretary to change the law by his administrative action. It eliminates the principle of additionality which was the device used to practically kill the program and, excepting for certain leeway involving Canada, it stops the practice of protecting the exports of other countries at the expense of our own exports.

However, in view of the past record of the Secretary in ignoring the law on this subject and because I suspect he will endeavor to find loopholes in this law, I am taking certain steps designed to assure that the law will be followed. I have directed the committee staff to establish a system which will enable us to be kept advised of progress under the laws dealing with barter. I have also directed our Subcommittee on Foreign Agricultural Operations to conduct hearings and studies under our responsibility for legislative oversight. Mr. POAGE, the subcommittee chairman, has already started such hearings.

This program of exchanging costly to store and deteriorating agricultural commodities for needed strategic or other materials that are cheaper to store and do not deteriorate is an excellent one for our country. It is also the law. The personal desires of a few in the executive branch of our Government will not be permitted to retard or destroy it.

There is one other matter, Mr. Speaker, which I think may not have been covered adequately in the conference report. The conferees approved the House provision authorizing use of foreign currencies generated under title I for financing United States participation in trade fair and related activities, but amended it to make it clear that the definition of fairs is to include agricultural and horticultural fairs and related activities. This authority is different from and in addition to any authority which the law now contains for participation in trade fairs and similar activities as a part of agricultural market development activities of the Department of Agriculture under section 104 (a) of the act, and the restrictions as to use of funds applicable to the new provision included in the conference report are not applicable to operations under section 104 (a).

DISASTER AREA RELIEF

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 304) to provide for a specific contribution by State governments to the cost of feed or seed furnished to farmers, ranchers, or stockmen in disaster areas, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving th right to object, will the gentleman from North Carolina please explain the bill and the amendment?

Mr. COOLEY. Well, I will give a very brief explanation of the bill. The bill provides for State participation in relief, for such temporary relief as may be provided in the event of disasters in the country. The Senate bill provided that the States' participation would be to the extent of not less than 25 percent or more than 50 percent, and the House amendment provides that the participation shall be not in excess of 10 per centum, as the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine to be equitable of that part of the cost, including transportation of such feed or seed which is not paid by the recipients thereof.

Mr. HOEVEN. It is my understanding that this bill is now acceptable to the Committee on Agriculture of the House and it will be acceptable to the other body.

Mr. COOLEY. I will say to the House that we have informally conferred with the members of the Senate Agriculture Committee, and we have every reason to believe that if this bill passes today it will be acceptable to the Senate and will be enacted.

Mr. HOEVEN. May I say further that this is a bill that is desired by the administration and there is no objection on our side.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, no feed for livestock or seed for planting shall be furnished to farmers, ranchers, or stockmen pursuant to Public Law 875, 81st Congress (42 U. S. C. 1955 and the following); Public Law 115, 83d Congress, 1st session; Public Law 357, 83d Congress, 2d session; Public Law 480, 83d Congress, 2d session; or pursuant to any other law as a disaster relief measure, unless, in addition to such administrative costs as may be assumed by the State, the State in which such feed or seed is furnished agrees to contribute such percentage, not less than 25 nor more than 50, as the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine to be equitable of that part of the cost, including transportation, of such feed or seed which is not paid for by the recipients thereof.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, after the comma, insert "after June 30, 1959."

Page 2, line 4, strike out "not less than 25 nor more than 50," and insert "not in excess of 10 per centum."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PEREMPTORY CHALLENGES

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3368) to amend section 1870 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the District Courts to allow additional peremptory challenges in civil cases to multiple

plaintiffs as well as multiple defendants, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2678)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3368) to amend section 1870 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the district courts to allow additional peremptory challenges in civil cases to multiple plaintiffs as well as multiple defendants, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. (a) The first section of the Act entitled 'An Act to expedite the construction of public buildings and works outside of the District of Columbia by enabling possession and title of sites to be taken in advance of final judgment in proceedings for the acquisition thereof under the power of eminent domain', approved February 26, 1931 (46 Stat. 1421; 40 U. S. C. 258a), is amended by adding at the end of the second paragraph the following new paragraphs:

" 'If, upon application of any party in interest made within 30 days of the filing of the declaration of taking or within 30 days from the date of the enactment of this Act, the judge finds the action of the acquiring authority in arriving at the amount of the estimated compensation to have been fraudulent, or not in good faith, the judge shall fix the estimated value of the just compensation for the land taken and require the acquiring authority to deposit with the court the amount of compensation so determined.

" 'Whenever the judge finds the action of the acquiring authority in arriving at the amount of the estimated compensation to have been fraudulent or not in good faith, the acquiring authority shall not be entitled to the rents, issues and profits of the land during the period between the filing of the declaration of taking and the deposit with the court of the just compensation fixed by the judge of the court.

" 'The declaration of taking, the amount of the deposit, and any other matters arising out of the proceedings herein involved shall not be admissible in evidence in any case.

" '(b) The amendment made by this section shall be applicable with respect to any condemnation proceedings under which final adjudication of just compensation has not been made on the date of enactment of this Act.' "

And agree to the same.

EMANUEL CELLER,
FRANCIS E. WALTER,
LESTER HOLTZMAN,
KENNETH B. KEATING,
WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
ESTES KEFAUVER,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to bill (H. R. 3368) to amend section 1870 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the district courts to allow additional peremptory challenges in civil cases to multiple plaintiffs as well as multiple defendants, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

This amendment, as agreed to by the conferees of both Houses, is to require, under the Declaration of Taking Act, that the administrative estimate of just compensation be in good faith, fair, and honest. It will permit a Federal judge, in instances where the judge finds the declaration of taking was not made in good faith, to fix the estimated value himself, and require the acquiring authority to deposit with the court the estimated compensation as determined by the court.

In addition, where the court finds that the action of the acquiring authority, in arriving at the amount of the estimated compensation to have been fraudulent or not in good faith, the acquiring authority will not be entitled to the rents, issues, and profits of the land during the period between the filing of the declaration of taking and the deposit with the court of the just compensation fixed by the court.

The amendment further provides that the proceedings herein involved shall not be admissible in evidence in any case. This includes the case brought for the purpose of assessing the value of the land involved in the condemnation proceedings.

This act applies to future condemnation proceedings as well as to proceedings presently pending which have not reached final adjudication and it sets up a 30-day limitation with respect to both future and pending cases for the purposes of petitioning to the court by the party in interest to test the question of fraudulency and good faith.

Simply stated, the amendment permits a judicial review of the good faith of the Government estimate of just compensation for the land summarily acquired under the Declaration of Taking Act. It is believed elementary that the Government in all of its dealings should act with the most scrupulous good faith and that the good-faith requirement is of special importance whenever the Government exercises its sovereign power of eminent domain.

It is also the intention of the conferees that this amendment will in no way affect the Government's power in quick taking of property under the Declaration of Taking Act for the Government will in no way be divested or be required to divest itself of title.

EMANUEL CELLER,
FRANCIS E. WALTER,
LESTER HOLTZMAN,
KENNETH B. KEATING,
WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, as I understand this amendment it simply permits a judicial review of the good faith of the Government estimate of just compensation for the land summarily acquired under the Declaration of Taking Act. It is believed elementary that the Government in all of its dealing should act with the most scrupulous good faith and that the good faith requirement is of special importance whenever the Government exercises its sovereign power of eminent domain.

It is recognized that each such case must of necessity be judged on its own merits, and that no single standard can be equitably applied to all cases. For example, in cases where the Government through its sovereign power of eminent domain seizes property designed and constructed by agreement for Government use, normal appraisals based on the price a prudent buyer would pay cannot be used. The costs to the Government of similar property openly and competitively procured at the time of taking, as well as the value to the Government of the property condemned, is manifestly the fairest measure of just compensation, both to the Government and the owner.

Whereas, this measure is equitable in such cases, normal appraisals may be more equitable in other types of cases. It should never be the function of the Department of Justice or any other branch of Government to exercise the great power of eminent domain to obtain property at confiscatory prices. Rather, a bona fide effort should be made by all branches of Government concerned to fairly ascertain just compensation and protect equally the rights of the taxpayer and property owner, as well as the Government. The nature of the determinations of estimates filed under this statute renders the judicial review thereof vital for the protection of the constitutional rights of the citizens of the Untied States.

TEXTILE FIBER PRODUCTS IDENTIFICATION ACT

Mr. HARRIS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 469) to protect producers and consumers against misbranding and false advertising of the fiber content of textile fiber products, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2695)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 469) to protect producers and consumers against misbranding and false advertising of the fiber content of textile fiber products, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 12, and 15.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 5, 7, 13, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree

to the same with amendments as follows: On page 2, line 14, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "(f)" and insert "(g)."

On page 2, line 17, of the Senate engrossed amendments, after the word "product" where it appears the second time insert a comma.

On page 2, line 19, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out the comma after "animal"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: On page 3, line 4, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "(g)" and insert "(h)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: On page 3, line 15, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "4 (g);" and insert "4 (h)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following "furniture, mattresses, and box springs"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: On page 3, line 21, of the Senate engrossed amendments, after "under" insert a comma; and the Senate agree to the same.

OREN HARRIS,
JOHN BELL WILLIAMS,
PETER F. MACK, JR.,
CHAS. A. WOLVERTON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
MIKE MONRONEY,
ALAN BIBLE,
ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL,
JOHN M. BUTLER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 469) to protect producers and consumers against misbranding and false advertising of the fiber content of textile fiber products, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate receded from its amendments Nos. 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 12, and 15.

The following Senate amendments are technical, clarifying, and conforming changes: Nos. 13, 14, 17, and 20. The House recedes with respect to these amendments.

Amendment No. 4: Section 3 (d) of the bill as it passed the House provided, in paragraph (5), that section 3 should not apply to any textile fiber product until such product had been "produced in the form intended for sale or delivery to, or for use by, the ultimate consumer." This Senate amendment inserted the words "by the manufacturer or processor" after the word "produced". This change recognizes the fact that the manufacturer or processor of the article is normally the person who will produce the article in the form intended for sale or delivery to, or for use by, the ultimate consumer. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 5: Section 4 (b) of the bill as it passed the House provided that a textile fiber product shall be misbranded unless stamped, tagged, or labeled so as to show certain information. Paragraph (1) of subsection (b) required the inclusion of information as to the constituent fiber or combination of fibers in the product, designating with equal prominence each natural or manufactured fiber in the product by its generic name in the order of predominance by the weight thereof if the weight of such fiber is 5 percent or more of the total fiber weight of the product. This Senate amendment added a proviso that (exclusive of permissible ornamentation) any fiber or group of fibers present in an amount of 5 percent or less by weight of the total fiber content shall not be designated by the generic name or the trademark of such fiber or fibers but shall be designated only as "other fiber" or "other fibers," as the case may be. In actual legal effect the Senate provision appeared to add nothing to what was already provided by paragraph (2) of subsection (b), but certain persons or classes of persons affected by the provision were interested in having it included at this point. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 7: Section 4 (c) of the bill as it passed the House provided that a textile fiber product shall be considered to be falsely or deceptively advertised if any disclosure or implication of fiber content is made in any written advertisement used in connection with the sale of such product, unless such advertisement contains certain specified information. This Senate amendment modified that part of the subsection dealing with the information which the advertisement would have to contain. While the language is different from the language of the bill as the House passed it, there appears to be no difference in substance. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 10: This Senate amendment provides that a textile fiber product shall be considered to be falsely or deceptively advertised if the name or symbol of any fur-bearing animal is used in the advertisement of such product, unless such product or the part thereof in connection with which the name or symbol of a fur-bearing animal is used is a fur or fur product within the meaning of the Fur Products Labeling Act. If the textile fiber product contains the hair or fiber of a fur-bearing animal, the name of such animal, in conjunction with the word "fiber," "hair," or "blend" may be used. The House recedes with certain necessary technical changes.

Amendment No. 11: This Senate amendment provided that a textile fiber product shall be misbranded if it is used as stuffing in any upholstered product, mattress, or cushion after having been previously used as stuffing in any other upholstered product, mattress, or cushion, unless the upholstered product, mattress, or cushion, containing the reused stuffing is labeled indicating that it contains reused stuffing. The House recedes with a technical amendment.

Amendments Nos. 16, 18, 19, 21, and 22 amend section 12 (a) of the act, which enumerates the textile fiber products not subject to the provisions of the act.

Amendments Nos. 15, 16, and 17: These amendments were made to the House provision exempting "outer coverings of furniture" from the act. As modified by the Senate the provision would have exempted "upholsteries and outer coverings of mattresses and box springs." As a result of the action of the committee of conference the exemption will embrace "outer coverings of furniture, mattresses, and box springs."

Amendment No. 18: This Senate amendment provided for the exemption of paddings or cushions to be used under floor coverings. The House recedes with a technical amendment.

Amendment No. 19: This Senate amendment provided for the exemption of handicraft threads. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 21: This Senate amendment provided for the exemption of textile fiber products which are subject to the labeling requirements of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938, as amended. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 22: This Senate amendment provided for the exemption of catamenial devices, adhesive tapes and adhesive sheets, cleaning cloths impregnated with chemicals, and diapers. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 23: The bill as passed by the House provided in section 12 (a) that certain of the exemptions listed should not be applicable if any representation as to fiber content of the article is made in any advertisement, label, or other means of identification. One class of article to which this limitation applied was sewing thread. This Senate amendment made the limitation inapplicable in the case of sewing thread. The House recedes.

OREN HARRIS,
JOHN BELL WILLIAMS,
PETER F. MACK, JR.,
CHAS. A. WOLVERTON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 469) to protect producers and consumers against misbranding and false advertising of the fiber content of textile fiber products, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GOSHEN VENEER CO.

Mr. LANE submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6282) for the relief of the former shareholders and debenture noteholders of the Goshen Veneer Co., an Indiana corporation.

HIPOLITO C. DE BACA

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 10473) for the relief of Hipolito C. DeBaca, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 3, after "act" insert "No benefits, except hospital and medical expenses actually incurred, shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act for any period prior to the date of its enactment."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman state the nature of the amendment?

Mr. LANE. This is a bill that waives the statute of limitations against a former employee of the Rehabilitation Agency in Las Vegas, N. Mex., to file a claim with the Employees Compensation Commission. This amendment

merely states that there will be no benefit accrual by reason of the enactment of this act for any period prior to the date of its enactment except for medical and hospital expenses.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDUCATION OF MENTALLY RETARDED CHILDREN

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 13840) to encourage expansion of teaching in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. HOLT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. FOGARTY. Bills identical with this bill were introduced by several Members of the House a couple of years ago. It passed the Senate unanimously in April or May of this year. There were some objections to the Senate bill by the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the gentlemen from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN]. Those objections have been met in this bill. I talked with him by telephone this morning and told him of the pending action, and he assented. I have talked to the ranking member of the committee on the gentleman's side, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN], and to other Members on this side.

The bill provides for grants up to $1 million a year to be made to public institutions for the training of teachers to teach mentally retarded children. There are about 1 million mentally retarded children of school age and only about 15 percent of them are getting the schooling they need at this time. This bill would help these institutions to give the teachers of these mentally retarded children the specialized training and the teaching facilities that are needed now.

Mr. HOLT. I thank the gentleman. It is my hope that the bill will be improved next year. I voted against it in the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, while this bill carries my name, there is no one Member who can claim full credit for this legislation. Time is not sufficient to give individual recognition to all who have helped. However, I certainly could not in good conscience offer this bill to the House today without giving recognition to the basic work and continued efforts of the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN] in getting his companion bill through the committee, and also the very effective work of the influential gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MAY] with the leadership. If it were not for their efforts it would not have been possible to bring this bill before the House today.

For a good many years I have had a deep interest in programs which would improve the health, welfare, and education of those persons in the Nation who are handicapped. A few years ago my attention was drawn to the serious problem of those with mental retardation. Many such individuals are themselves neglected and their families are in distress because of lack of understanding of their problem, and because of inadequate facilities to help them. Yet it is known that large numbers of mentally retarded individuals could become contributing citizens and well-adjusted members of their families and communities if care and education are given to them at the right time.

Within the last few years the Congress has repeatedly taken action to aid in developing and strengthening in the Nation a balanced program for the mentally retarded, including services in health, welfare, rehabilitation, and education. As you know, I have strongly supported such action in the belief that it would encourage and stimulate the development of well-rounded services and hasten the acceptance of the mentally retarded into the community.

Today I would like to point to a gap in our program of aid. I refer to the serious problem of inadequate personnel to conduct programs of special education for the Nation's approximately 1 million school-age children with varying degrees of mental retardation.

It is my understanding that the goals of a good educational program for exceptional children or for special education include at least the following three major parts: First, the search for knowledge through research which will form a basis for improving special education programs; second, the need for extending and improving the schools and classes in local communities; and third, the development of more and better qualified teaching personnel.

The conduct of research and extension of school programs are both dependent upon the availability of well-qualified educators with specialization in the field of mental retardation, and yet, according to the Office of Education, only about 10,000 or 15,000 teachers would be needed if all of the mentally retarded children were to have suitable specialized educational opportunity.

The Congress recognized the need for research in education on such basic matters as the characteristics of mentally retarded school-age children, methods of teaching them, and factors in the school program which make for adjustment in the family and community.

In 1957, as you will recall, I took the initiative in the Appropriations Committee to request that $675,000 in the Office of Education appropriation for cooperative research be set aside for mental retardation. Many of you know that leaders in the education of exceptional children in colleges and universities and State education agencies had already identified urgent problems needing research, and that request was very promptly made for the funds. As a result, the Office of Education made a beginning by entering into contracts with State educational agencies, and colleges and universities widely spread throughout the Nation for 42 studies during the fiscal year 1957. Since that time 11 others have been brought under contract. Judging from the reports, the stimulating effect of this new program has already been felt throughout the country.

While the research studies under the provisions of Public Law 531 explore a wide range of topics, in general they cover, first, definition and identification of the mentally retarded; second, learning characteristics and responses of mentally retarded children; third, language and communication difficulties and certain physical limitations as they relate to the learning of children classified as mentally retarded; fourth, teaching methods and procedures; fifth, effects of different types of school organizations; sixth, miscellaneous other problems, such as the rural isolated child or the effect of the school program on the postschool adjustment of the mentally retarded child.

This legislation will aid in preparing highly qualified leadership personnel at the doctoral and master's levels in the education of the metally retarded. Persons prepared under the provisions of this legislation would qualify to, first, direct college and university programs for the preparation of teachers of the mentally retarded; two, direct and supervise programs for mentally retarded children in local school systems, and in State departments of education; and three, conduct research in the education of the mentally retarded. This proposed legislation would supplement the provisions of Public Law 531, 83d Congress, and in no way overlap with the provisions of that law.

According to data collected by the Office of Education, there may be as many as 15 colleges and universities with some facilities to immediately conduct doctoral programs in the education of the mentally retarded. All of these need strengthening either by additional staff or facilities in order to accommodate as many candidates for advanced degrees as are needed for the Nation's educational program. It would also make it possible to develop some new centers in colleges and universities in regions where opportunities do not exist for advanced training in the education of the mentally retarded.

According to an Office of Education study, in 1953–54 there were 40 colleges in the Nation offering some opportunities for the preparation of teachers of the mentally retarded. However, the same 40 colleges reported only 28 instructors devoting full time to the preparation of teachers of the mentally retarded; 64 staff members were also giving "part time" to instruction of this program. Relatively few of the colleges and universities—perhaps 15 appeared to have

the facilities to conduct doctoral programs in this field. Many of the others seemed to be inadequately staffed and otherwise ill equipped even for the training of undergraduate students in this area. The same colleges reported—in 1953—the granting of only 4 doctoral degrees and 130 master's degrees in the field of mental retardation. While the situation has improved somewhat since the Office of Education study was made, additional information from a more limited survey revealed the situation is currently almost as critical as it was in 1953–54.

It appears that there is need for the development of some new centers. Of the 15 colleges and universities which now seem to be prepared to initiate or expand doctoral programs, 11 are in either the Northeast or the Middle West. There are 2 in the South, 1 in the Southwest, and 1 to serve the Rocky Mountain States and the Northwest.

The ultimate goal of all our efforts is to give education and care to children and youth so they will be as well prepared for adult life as possible. The basic objective of this legislation is to provide traineeships at the graduate level which would be financially adequate to attract promising individuals who would then become the directors of college and university programs, of local school programs, and of research studies. It appears that this is the best contribution the Federal Government could make to alleviate the shortage of manpower in the education of the mentally retarded.

This legislation will hasten the time, in my judgment, when the State and local school systems and the institutions of higher learning will be in a position to provide the teachers needed by these children.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. R. 13840, a bill to encourage expansion of teaching in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State agencies.

In the years I have been privileged to serve in this great body, Congress has enacted many worthwhile measures. However, few, if any, have been more worthwhile than the pending proposal. I urge the House to approve it overwhelmingly.

The bill authorizes the expenditure of up to $1 million annually to train teachers to teach mentally retarded children. Teaching these children requires specialized training, as anyone can understand. There is so much that can and needs to be done in this field that we ought not hesitate for a moment to do it. In every community in our country there are these children who need our help. Let us give it to them.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, as the author of this legislation designed to assist America's mentally retarded children, I am most pleased that the House has agreed to its passage. I have believed for a long time that the one group most entitled to assistance from the Government is that which includes our handicapped and practically helpless children who, through no fault of their own, have a mental deficiency.

Approximately 1 million of these little children live in the United States. Only a small fraction of them are now given the kind of specialized educational training that they so desperately need.

This bill will help break the bottlenecks that stand in the road of a truly effective program for mentally retarded children. It will do so by strengthening the teaching facilities of our institutions of higher learning, and by offering fellowships to those persons desiring to prepare themselves for work in this vitally important field.

I know that mothers and fathers, as well as interested persons all over this Nation, will rejoice in the wise action of the Congress in putting this modest program into action.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, having had a companion bill in on this legislation for some time, plus my great interest in improving the scope of teaching of mentally retarded children, I support this bill 100 percent.

The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and myself have worked quite diligently in a true bipartisan way during the past few weeks to promote Mentally Retarded Children's Week, and in the past 3 days specifically to get approval of this bill. We have received excellent cooperation from both sides of the aisle, from the leadership and others so that this vital legislation could pass unanimously.

May I add also that my distinguished colleague from Connecticut, Senator PURTELL has cooperated since passing a similar measure in the other body. Senator PURTELL should be greatly commended for his leadership in this vital field.

I merely want to conclude that this bill be passed at once.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] in urging the unanimous approval of the House in the passage of H. R. 13840, the bill to encourage expansion of teaching in the education of mentally retarded children. I congratulate the gentleman for once again finding an effective way to pioneer new ground in social welfare legislation.

Mr. FOGARTY has accomplished such great things for the health and welfare of the American people as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Departments of Labor and of Health, Education and Welfare that every American is, and always will be, in his debt. He deserves the further thanks now of all who are interested in the welfare of handicapped children, for, as a result of his skill in working out the difficult parliamentary machinery for getting this bill before the House today, we will finally have the opportunity, I hope, to enact legislation in this field after years of unsuccessful effort.

THOUSANDS OF TEACHERS NEEDED

The legislation before us will make possible the training of many additional teachers with the necessary temperament and ability to help the hundreds of thousands of mentally retarded children in our country to live useful lives. According to information prepared for me last year by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, about 2 percent of all school age children are probably in the mentally retarded category. Although many colleges and universities now offer specialized courses for teachers in this field, an estimated 42,000 more teachers are needed just in this one specialized field alone.

So this bill, providing for grants to nonprofit institutions of higher education to set up courses in this field, or expand them, and also providing for fellowships and traineeships for teachers or supervisors of teachers of the mentally retarded, will be most helpful. Of course, the $1 million a year for 10 years authorized by the measure will not go too far, but it is, at least, a start.

Mr. Speaker, ever since the original bill on this subject was introduced in the Senate some years ago, I have been intensely interested in the objective of this legislation. As a matter of fact, correspondence which I have received over the last 3 or 4 years on the mentally retarded bill—similar to the one we are now passing—stimulated my interest in the whole range of problems in connection with the education of all categories of exceptional children—gifted and handicapped alike. This interest resulted in my introduction on the last day of the first session of this Congress of the bill H. R. 9591, which has received widespread support among educators in the field of exceptional children.

NO ACTION ON H. R. 9591

I want to use this opportunity today, Mr. Speaker, to explain why no action of any kind has been taken on H. R. 9591 in this session. This is an appropriate point for such a report, since H. R. 9591, the Exceptional Children Education Assistance Act, would have provided under its terms for all types of exceptional children the type of benefits which are made available in the field of mentally retarded children by this bill now before us.

I discussed this proposal at great length under a special order in the House on August 28, 1957, and the extensive reference material compiled for me by the Legislative Reference Service is all included—about 20 pages of material appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which was published September 19, 1957. I know that researchers in the field of special education who will be reading the proceedings on the passage of the bill before us today will also be interested in the voluminous background material on all phases of the problem of special education for exceptional children which I placed in the RECORD a year ago.

ROCKY ROAD FOR EDUCATION BILLS

Now as to why nothing was done this year on H. R. 9591. I think a quick review of the fate of all the educational bills in this session gives us the key to the answer. In addition, however, some groups in the educational field, particularly those interested in the problem of doing something for mentally retarded children, asked me not to press forward on H. R. 9591 this year for fear it might in some way interfere with or handicap the passage of the kind of legislation we are considering right now.

That by itself would not have deterred me from discussing H. R. 9591 with the appropriate committee of the House or urging incorporation of this bill into H. R. 9591. I think that when Congress is asked to pioneer in a new area, it does not do much good from a strategic standpoint to be timid about it. If there is opposition to a concept, it will continue no matter how the details of its proposed operation are weakened by offers to compromise. So I do not think it would have hurt this bill on the mentally retarded.

No, Mr. Speaker; what deterred me from pressing for action this year on H. R. 9591 was the on-again, off-again, up-the-hill-and-down-the-hill course of all bills in this session involving Federal aid to education. I know of no legislative issue which has run as rocky a course this year.

Fresh after the sputniks, we were going to have all sorts of elaborate educational assistance programs to catch up with the Soviets, to turn out engineers, scientists, teachers of science, and so forth. We have now passed a much-weakened education bill—one which will help many needy students to finance their education on a loan basis and will encourage many, perhaps, to go into teaching. And the colleges will get some help from it. But it is by no means the kind of bill we were talking last January about passing—one which would have had a tremendous scholarship program as part of it.

NO ADMINISTRATION LEADERSHIP OR DRIVE

I blame no one for this, least of all the committees of Congress which had jurisdiction in this field. It has been a most confusing session in many respects, and the confusion which has marked our consideration of education bills is not too much different from that which marked legislation on defense, foreign aid, the recession, housing, to name just a few. National leadership has been so badly lacking that Congress has had to do the planning as well as the legislating—has had to try to think out and develop national policy. This, of course, is primarily the job of the President and his advisers.

But because of the controversy and infighting and the administration's backing and filling on educational issues generally, I know that it took all of the time and effort of the Subcommittees on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor just to work out the details of the one big educational assistance bill. No hearings were scheduled or held on any of the bills such as mine dealing with specialized education for exceptional children. To seek such hearings this year under the atmosphere which prevailed would have been less than useless.

MENTALLY RETARDED BILL ONLY A START

But now, on the last few days of this session, we are making a tiny bit of headway, at least, in this field by the consideration under unanimous consent of the bill introduced only yesterday by Mr. FOGARTY dealing with the problem of educating teachers for the mentally retarded. These are most remarkable circumstances under which the bill is brought before us, and, as I said, it is a tribute to the parliamentary skill of Mr. FOGARTY that we are getting this opportunity today to consider it. I hope that we can still achieve Senate agreement in the remaining hours of the session on this much-modified bill. Since the Senate has twice passed much stronger bills in this same area, I am sure that we can get concurrence.

But, Mr. Speaker, the point I am anxious to make is that this bill to help train teachers for mentally retarded children is and must be regarded as only a start in this field. There is such a great need for teachers for all categories of exceptional children—the crippled, the speech handicapped, the deaf, the hard-of-hearing, the blind, the children with serious visual defects, children who have serious health problems due to heart disease, epilepsy, or other debilitating conditions, those who are maladjusted or seriously disturbed including the institutionalized delinquent—the whole range of handicapped youngsters who need specialized educational help, plus, at the other extreme, the outstandingly gifted children who also need specialized teaching in order to realize their potentials.

H. R. 9591 TO BE REINTRODUCED

Because all of these children need educational help similar to the kind we are beginning to provide for mentally retarded children under this bill now before us, I intend, Mr. Speaker, to reintroduce H. R. 9591 with appropriate revisions next year and to press for action early in the new Congress. The first ground has been cleared for such legislation. The trail has been blazed. Now we must press forward to do what must be done for millions of American children who need—who must have—specialized educational opportunities.

Mr. FOGARTY, in his remarks, noted that some 40 colleges in 1953–54 were offering courses in the teaching of the mentally retarded but that only 28 instructors in all were devoting full time to this work, while perhaps only 15 colleges appeared to have facilities to conduct doctoral programs in this field. A similar situation prevails in connection with the special courses necessary to train teachers of other categories of exceptional children.

COLLEGES HAVE ALREADY DONE MUCH

On the other hand, a great deal has been done and is being done by the colleges in this field, as shown by the compilation made for me by the Legislative Reference Service of the colleges and universities on a State-by-State basis having programs for the preparation of teachers of exceptional children. The compilation, for the academic year 1954, showing the areas of exceptionality covered by each school, is as follows:

Colleges and universities having programs for the preparation of teachers of exceptional children, academic year 1954

State	Institution	Special education program
Alabama	University of Alabama	Speech correction.
	Birmingham, Southern College.	Speech and hearing.
Arizona	University of Arizona	Speech correction, speech and hearing.
Arkansas	University of Arkansas	Speech correction.
	Arkansas State College	Deaf.
California	Chico State College	Speech correction, speech and hearing.
	College of the Pacific	Speech correction, speech and hearing, socially maladjusted.
	Fresno State College	Speech correction.
	Los Angeles State College	Deaf, mentally retarded, speech correction, speech and hearing.
	Occidental College	Speech correction.
	San Diego State College	Mentally retarded, speech correction.
	San Francisco State College.	Blind, crippled, deaf, hard of hearing, mentally retarded, partially seeing, socially maladjusted, speech correction, blind and partially seeing, deaf and hard of hearing, and others.
	San Jose State College	Speech correction, speech and hearing.
	Stanford University	Do.
	University of California at Berkeley.	Mentally retarded, socially maladjusted, mentally retarded and socially maladjusted.
	University of California at Los Angeles.	Speech correction.
	University of California at Santa Barbara.	Do.
	University of Southern California.	Deaf, hard of hearing, speech correction.
	Whittier College	Speech correction.
Colorado	University of Denver	Mentally retarded, speech correction, speech and hearing.
Florida	Florida State University	Mentally retarded, speech correction, speech and hearing, overall.
	University of Florida	Mentally retarded, speech correction, speech correction and hearing, overall.
	University of Miami	Speech correction.
Georgia	University of Georgia	Do.
Illinois	Bradley University	Do.
	College of St. Francis	Do.
	Eastern Illinois State College.	Do.
	Elmhurst College	Do.
	Illinois State Normal University.	Crippled, deaf, hard-of-hearing, mentally retarded, partially seeing, socially maladjusted, special health problem, speech correction, overall.
	Northern Illinois State Teachers College.	Speech correction.
	Northwestern University	Speech correction, hearing.
	Rockford College	Do.
	Southern Illinois	Mentally retarded, speech correction, hearing.
	University of Chicago	Socially maladjusted, speech correction.
	University of Illinois	Deaf, mentally retarded, speech correction.
Indiana	Ball State Teachers College.	Speech correction, hearing.
	Indiana State Teachers College.	Mentally retarded, speech correction, hearing.
	Indiana University	Speech correction, hearing.
	Purdue University	Do.

Colleges and universities having programs for the preparation of teachers of exceptional children, academic year 1954—Continued

State	Institution	Special education program
Iowa	Grinnell College	Speech correction.
	State University of Iowa	Crippled, speech correction, hearing.
Kansas	Fort Hays Kansas State College.	Speech correction.
	Kansas State Teachers College.	Mentally retarded, socially maladjusted, speech correction.
	Municipal University of Wichita.	Speech correction, hearing, deaf, crippled, hard-of-hearing.
	University of Kansas	Deaf, hard-of-hearing, mentally retarded, socially maladjusted, speech correction.
Kentucky	University of Kentucky	Speech correction, hearing.
Louisiana	Louisiana State University.	Speech correction.
Maryland	University of Maryland	Speech correction, hearing.
Massachusetts	Boston University	Blind, speech correction, hearing.
	Emerson University	Speech correction, hearing.
	Smith College	Deaf.
Michigan	Michigan State Normal College.	Crippled, deaf, mentally retarded, partially seeing, speech correction.
	Wayne University	Crippled, deaf, hard-of-hearing, mentally retarded, partially seeing, socially maladjusted, special health problem, speech correction, others.
	Western Michigan College of Education.	Speech correction, hearing.
Minnesota	University of Minnesota	Crippled, mentally retarded, speech correction, hearing, others.
Mississippi	Mississippi Southern College.	Do.
	University of Mississippi	Speech correction, hearing.
Missouri	Central Missouri College	Speech correction.
	St. Louis University	Do.
	Southwest Missouri College.	Do.
	University of Missouri	Speech correction, crippled.
	Washington University	Deaf, hard-of-hearing, speech correction.
Nebraska	University of Nebraska	Speech correction, hearing.
New Jersey	New Jersey State Teachers College.	Mentally retarded, speech correction, hearing, others.
New York	Brooklyn College	Mentally retarded, speech correction.
	City College of the City of New York.	Mentally retarded.
	Hunter College of the City of New York.	Blind, crippled, deaf, gifted, partially seeing, special health problems, others.
	New York University	Mentally retarded.
	Queens College of the City of New York.	Speech correction, hearing.
	State University of New York College for Teachers at Buffalo.	Crippled, mentally retarded, speech correction, partially seeing, others.
	State University of New York Teachers College at Geneseo	Mentally retarded, speech correction.
	Syracuse University	Crippled, deaf, mentally retarded, partially seeing, speech correction, hearing, others.
	Teachers College of Columbia University.	Deaf, hard-of-hearing, mentally retarded, partially seeing, crippled, special health problems, others.
North Carolina	Eastern Carolina College	Speech correction.
North Dakota	State Teachers College	Do.
	University of North Dakota.	Speech correction, hearing.
Ohio	Bowling Green State University.	Do.
	Kent State University	Mentally retarded, speech correction, deaf, hard-of-hearing.
	Ohio State University	Mentally retarded, speech correction, hearing, others.
	Ohio University	Speech correction, hearing.
	Western Reserve University.	Speech correction, deaf, hard-of-hearing.
Oklahoma	University of Oklahoma	Mentally retarded.
	University of Tulsa	Speech correction, hearing.
	Oklahoma College for Women.	Deaf.
Pennsylvania	Franklin and Marshall College.	Speech correction, hearing.
	Marywood College	Mentally retarded.
	Mount Mercy College	Speech correction.
	Pennsylvania State University.	Gifted, mentally retarded, speech correction, hearing.
	State Teachers College, Bloomsburg.	Mentally retarded, speech correction, hearing.
	State Teachers College, California.	Mentally retarded, speech correction.
	Temple University	Speech correction.
	University of Pittsburgh	Deaf, mentally retarded, speech correction, hearing.
South Dakota	University of South Dakota.	Speech correction, hearing, others.
Tennessee	George Peabody College for Teachers.	Mentally retarded, speech correction, hearing, others.
	University of Tennessee	Deaf, others.
	Vanderbilt University	Speech correction, hearing.
Texas	North Texas State College.	Speech correction.
	Southern Methodist University.	Do.
	Southwest Texas State Teachers College.	Crippled, mentally retarded, speech correction.
	Texas State College for Women.	Speech correction.
	University of Houston	Mentally retarded, speech correction, hearing.
	University of Texas	Mentally retarded, speech correction, hearing, others.
Utah	University of Utah	Speech correction, deaf, hard-of-hearing.
Virginia	University of Virginia	Speech correction, hearing.
Washington	University of Washington	Do.
Wisconsin	Marquette University	Speech correction.
	University of Wisconsin	Do.
	Wisconsin State College	Mentally retarded, speech correction, deaf, hard-of-hearing, others.
Wyoming	University of Wyoming	Speech correction.
District of Columbia.	Catholic University of America.	Do.
	Gallaudet College	Deaf.
	George Washington University.	Speech correction.

TEXT AND OUTLINE OF H. R. 9591

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this is the only time in this session that I have discussed H. R. 9591 in the House—for the reasons I outlined above—and in view of the widespread interest this bill has generated in the educational field, I know many Members have received letters about H. R. 9591 from educators in their districts, I submit at this point an outline of H. R. 9591 made at the time I introduced the bill on Friday, August 30, 1957. I also include a press release based on an address which I made on this bill last year before the National Association for Retarded Children meeting at the time in St. Louis.

The remarks which I made a year ago in introducing H. R. 9591, including the bill's text, are as follows:

H. R. 9591, BY MRS. SULLIVAN—THE EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT

(Extension of remarks of Hon. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, of Missouri, in the House of Representatives, Friday, August 30, 1957)

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, several days ago, in a special order during proceedings of the House, I outlined a bill which I was preparing to introduce before adjournment designed to stimulate and assist the training of urgently needed teachers for instructing so-called exceptional children; that is, the gifted and also those children with physical, mental, or emotional handicaps. I have today introduced the bill, and it is numbered H. R. 9591.

H. R. 9591, as its title states, is a bill to provide for the establishment of a special $18,500,000 7-year program of Federal scholarship and fellowship grants to individuals, and a $2,500,000 program of grants to public and nonprofit institutions of higher education, to encourage and expand the training of teachers for the education of exceptional children.

The preamble of the bill states:

"The Congress believes that the American promise of equality of opportunity extends to every child within our country, no matter what his gifts, his capacity, or his handicaps, whether he is handicapped by defects of speech, of sight, or of hearing, or crippling disease or condition, whether his adjustment to society is made difficult by emotional or mental disorders, or whether, on the other hand, he is endowed with outstandingly brilliant gifts of mind and of spirit. All such exceptional children require special educational guidance for development of their total educational potential.

"The Congress finds that the educational problems presented by such exceptional children are of national concern, and that there is an acute national shortage of, and urgent national need for, individuals professionally qualified to teach such children, to supervise the teachers of such children, to train such teachers and supervisors, and to conduct research into the problems relating to the education of exceptional children.

"While the Congress recognizes that the primary responsibility for meeting these problems lies with the States and local communities, national interest in the training of self-reliant and useful citizens demands that the Federal Government assist and encourage and stimulate the initiation of adequate programs in the States to meet these problems.

"Therefore, this act provides, on a temporary, 7-year basis, a program to further the training of teachers, supervisors of teachers, and researchers in special education for exceptional children, and to encourage and assist public and nonprofit institutions of higher education to expand their training work in these fields."

DEFINITION OF "EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN"

Mr. Speaker, among the definitions carried in H. R. 9591, covering various phases of the program this bill would authorize, is the definition of the children it is specifically

intended to help—"exceptional children"—as follows:

"The term 'exceptional children' means those children determined in accordance with regulations issued by the Commissioner (United States Commissioner of Education) to present special educational problems, such as (a) children who are unusually intelligent or gifted; (b) children who are mentally retarded; (c) children who are deaf or hard of hearing; (d) children who are blind or have serious visual impairments; (e) children who have serious health problems due to heart disease, epilepsy, or other debilitating conditions; (f) children who suffer from speech impediments; (g) children who are crippled (including those who have cerebral palsy); and (h) children who are maladjusted emotionally and socially, including the institutional delinquent."

Under the bill, Mr. Speaker, fellowships or scholarships would be authorized, with such stipends as the Commissioner should determine, totaling $500,000 for the remainder of this current fiscal year ending next June 30; $1,500,000 for the 1959 fiscal year; $2,500,000 for the 1960 fiscal year; and then $3,500,000 a year for fiscal years 1961, 1962, 1963, and 1964, when the temporary 7-year grant program would end. Thus, $18,500,000 would go to individuals for tuition, other scholastic expenses, living expenses and such other stipends as the Commissioner should provide. The idea, as I said in outlining the plan originally, is to make it worthwhile for experienced teachers to go back to college to take this advanced training, without feeling they were making a difficult financial sacrifice.

SECTION ON GRANTS

In addition to the grants to individuals, $2,500,000 would be authorized altogether—not a year, but over the 7 years—for grants to public and nonprofit institutions, making a total of $21 million for the entire program.

The language of this section of the bill on grants, section 5, is as follows:

"GRANTS BY THE COMMISSIONER

"SEC. 5. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to award scholarships and fellowships, with such stipends as he may determine, to individuals for the purpose of taking advanced training, at institutions selected by the recipients, for stated periods of time, in order to engage in employment as teachers of exceptional children, or to train or supervise teachers in this field, or engage in research in the teaching of exceptional children: *Provided*, That, in his discretion, the Commissioner, in order to accomplish the objectives of this act, may also make these awards for study at the undergraduate level.

"(b) The Commissioner is also authorized to make grants to public and nonprofit institutions of higher education to construct, install, improve, or expand specialized facilities and equipment in connection with courses of instruction for persons preparing to engage in employment as teachers of exceptional children, or to train such teachers, or to supervise such teachers, or to engage in research in special education for exceptional children: *Provided*, That the Commissioner, in his discretion, may also make grants to establish specialized courses in this field in such institutions.

"(c) The amount of scholarship and fellowship grants made in any fiscal year to residents of a State under section 5 (a) shall not exceed, in the aggregate, an amount which bears the same ratio to the total funds appropriated under authority of section 4 (a) for such fiscal year as the school-age population of such State bears to the total school-age population of all the States.

"(d) Payments of grants pursuant to this act may be made by the Commissioner from time to time, on such conditions as the Commissioner may determine, including conditions requiring public and other nonprofit institutions to make such reports, in such form, and containing such information as the Commissioner may from time to time reasonably require to carry out his functions under this act, and conditions requiring compliance with such provisions as the Commissioner may from time to time find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(e) The Commissioner shall consult with an advisory committee as described in section 6 (a) which shall assist him in determining the areas and priorities of need in the award of these grants, and in setting the standards for the granting of such fellowships, scholarships, and grants."

TEXT OF BILL

Mr. Speaker, the full text of H. R. 9591 is as follows:

"[85th Cong., 1st sess., in the House of Representatives, August 30, 1957, Mrs. SULLIVAN introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor]

"H. R. 9591

"A bill to provide for the establishment of a special $18,500,000 7-year program of Federal scholarship and fellowship grants to individuals, and a $2,500,000 program of grants to public and nonprofit institutions of higher education, to encourage and expand the training of teachers for the education of exceptional children

"*Be it enacted, etc.*—

"SHORT TITLE

"This act may be cited as the 'Exceptional Children Educational Assistance Act.'

"FINDINGS AND PURPOSE OF ACT

"SEC. 2. The Congress believes that the American promise of equality of opportunity extends to every child within our country, no matter what his gifts, his capacity or his handicaps, whether he is handicapped by defects of speech, of sight, or of hearing, or crippling disease or condition, whether his adjustment to society is made difficult by emotional or mental disorders, or whether, on the other hand, he is endowed with outstandingly brilliant gifts of mind and of spirit. All such exceptional children require special educational guidance for development of their total educational potential.

"The Congress finds that the educational problems presented by such exceptional children are of national concern, and that there is an acute national shortage of, and urgent national need for, individuals professionally qualified to teach such children, to supervise the teachers of such children, to train such teachers and supervisors, and to conduct research into the problems relating to the education of exceptional children.

"While the Congress recognizes that the primary responsibility for meeting these problems lies with the States and local communities, national interest in the training of self-reliant and useful citizens demands that the Federal Government assist and encourage and stimulate the initiation of adequate programs in the States to meet these problems.

"Therefore, this act provides, on a temporary, 7-year basis, a program to further the training of teachers, supervisors of teachers, and researchers in special education for exceptional children and to encourage and assist public and nonprofit institutions of higher education to expand their training work in these fields.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 3. As used in this act—

"(1) The term 'State' means a State, Alaska, Hawaii, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;

"(2) The term 'Commissioner' means the United States Commissioner of Education;

"(3) The term 'school-age population' means that part of the population which is between the ages of 5 and 17, both inclusive, determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the population between such ages for the most recent year for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce;

"(4) The term 'State educational agency' means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools in a State, or, if there is no such agency or officer, an agency or officer designated by the governor or by State law;

"(5) The term 'nonprofit institution' means an institution owned and operated by one or more corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual; and

"(6) The term 'exceptional children' means those children determined in accordance with regulations issued by the Commissioner to present special educational problems, such as (a) children who are unusually intelligent or gifted; (b) children who are mentally retarded; (c) children who are deaf or hard of hearing; (d) children who are blind or have serious visual impairments; (e) children who have serious health problems due to heart disease, epilepsy, or other debilitating conditions; (f) children who suffer from speech impediments; (g) children who are crippled (including those who have cerebral palsy); and (h) children who are maladjusted emotionally and socially, including the institutionalized delinquent.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 4. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958; $1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959; $2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960; $3,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961; $3,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962; $3,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963; and $3,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964; for grants to individuals for scholarships and fellowships in accordance with the provisions of section 5 (a) of this act.

"(b) There is also authorized the sum of $2,500,000 to be expended during the existence of this program in the form of grants to public and nonprofit institutions in accordance with the provisions of section 5 (b) of this act.

"GRANTS BY THE COMMISSIONER

"SEC. 5. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to award scholarships and fellowships, with such stipends as he may determine, to individuals for the purpose of taking advanced training at institutions selected by the recipients, for stated periods of time, in order to engage in employment as teachers of exceptional children, or to train or supervise teachers in this field, or engage in research in the teaching of exceptional children: *Provided*, That, in his discretion, the Commissioner, in order to accomplish the objectives of this act, may also make these awards for study at the undergraduate level.

"(b) The Commissioner is also authorized to make grants to public and nonprofit institutions of higher education to construct, install, improve, or expand specialized facilities and equipment in connection with courses of instruction for persons preparing to engage in employment as teachers of exceptional children, or to train such teachers, or to supervise such teachers, or to engage in research in special education for exceptional children: *Provided*, That the Commissioner, in his discretion, may also make grants to establish specialized courses in this field in such institutions.

"(c) The amount of scholarship and fellowship grants made in any fiscal year to residents of a State under section 5 (a) shall not exceed, in the aggregate, an amount which bears the same ratio to the total funds appropriated under authority of section 4 (a) for such fiscal year as the school age population of such State bears to the total school age population of all the States.

"(d) Payments of grants pursuant to this act may be made by the Commissioner from time to time, on such conditions as the Commissioner may determine, including conditions requiring public and other nonprofit institutions to make such reports, in such form, and containing such information as the Commissioner may from time to time reasonably require to carry out his functions under this act, and conditions requiring compliance with such provisions as the Commissioner may from time to time find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(e) The Commissioner shall consult with an advisory committee as described in section 6 (a) which shall assist him in determining the areas and priorities of need in the award of these grants, and in setting the standards for the granting of such fellowships, scholarships, and grants.

"ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND ADVISORY PANELS

"SEC. 6. (a) The Commissioner shall appoint an advisory committee of not more than eight persons who shall be conversant with the overall educational needs of exceptional children and who shall assist the Commissioner in developing general policies under this act. The Commissioner shall be ex officio a member of this committee and shall act as chairman thereof.

"(b) The Commissioner is also authorized from time to time to establish advisory panels of specialists in special education for any of the categories of exceptional children enumerated in this act. Each such panel shall consist of not less than five persons, who shall meet at the call of the Commissioner.

"DELEGATION OF FUNCTIONS

"SEC. 7. The Commissioner may delegate to any officer or employee of the Office of Education any of his functions under this act except the making of regulations.

"PUBLICIZING AVAILABILITY OF GRANTS

"SEC. 8. The Commissioner shall take such steps as are practicable to publicize to the fullest extent possible the availability of fellowships, scholarships, and grants under this act among teachers and prospective teachers, and among all colleges and universities offering accredited courses of study leading to advanced degrees in nursery, kindergarten, elementary, or secondary education.

"COOPERATION WITH STATES

"SEC. 9. In the administration of this act, the Commissioner shall consult and advise with the various State educational agencies to determine the extent of need for teachers of exceptional children in the respective States and to keep the State educational agencies fully informed of all developments under this program in order to encourage them to establish special programs or special classes for exceptional children. In this connection, the Commissioner shall advise the State educational agencies of the names and home addresses of all individuals from their respective States who have received fellowships, scholarships, or grants for training in the field of education of exceptional children, and the particular field of study each is pursuing, so that the respective State educational agencies can then take appropriate steps to seek to attract such persons to positions in their home States in order to utilize the advanced education and skills which they have acquired under this program: *Provided*, That no individual receiving a scholarship, fellowship, or grant for advanced study under this act shall be required, as a condition of such scholarship or fellowship or grant, to promise to take employment subsequently in any State."

The press release referred to, Mr. Speaker, now follows:

CONGRESSWOMAN SULLIVAN CITES URGENT NEED FOR 75,000 SPECIALLY TRAINED TEACHERS FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

ST. LOUIS, October 12.—United States Representative LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, Democrat, of Missouri, said tonight the Nation urgently needs at least 4 times as many teachers for exceptional children as the estimated 25,000 professionally trained persons now serving in this specialized field. She wants the Federal Government to pioneer the way to help the States and universities meet this need.

Mrs. SULLIVAN is the author of a bill (H. R. 9591) to establish a 7-year Federal program of fellowships and grants totaling $21 million to encourage experienced teachers to take—and more universities to offer—advanced professional training in teaching exceptional children. Educators include in the term "exceptional" mentally gifted children and also the mentally retarded, the physically handicapped, and the emotionally maladjusted.

Speaking at the concluding dinner meeting of a 4-day convention of the National Association for Retarded Children in the Coronado Hotel here, the St. Louis Congresswoman reported there were perhaps 6 million American children of school age in the exceptional categories, "each having a serious educational problem not being reached and not being met in the average school."

While exceptional children do not in all cases need special classes, they do need specialized teaching techniques, she declared, and such help is not generally available because of the extreme shortage of qualified, professionally trained teachers in these fields.

EXCEPTIONAL CHILD LOST IN AVERAGE CLASSROOM

As a consequence, Mrs. SULLIVAN added, these children "are not receiving and are not enjoying their educational birthright." Many handicapped children are not in any school, and most of the other exceptional children, including the gifted, are lost souls in the average classroom, she said, calling this a tragic waste of human resources.

Noting that most of the persons in her audience were concerned with this issue primarily from the standpoint of the needs of mentally retarded children, Mrs. SULLIVAN pointed out that the basic problem in training and educating the retarded child—the shortage of qualified teachers and specialized facilities—is shared by all of the millions of children of school age "with visual defects or speech impediments or hearing impairment, the emotionally maladjusted, the undervitalized, the crippled, the whole group of exceptional children, including the gifted child, too."

The best chance of helping the retarded child, therefore, she added, is through a unified approach which will enlist the support of all of the groups working with various types of exceptional children, since all share many of the same educational problems.

ATTRACTING MORE TEACHERS TO FIELD

Reporting on the current need for at least 100,000 specially trained teachers in a field where only about 25,000 are now serving, Congresswoman SULLIVAN said:

"The best teachers of exceptional children are those who are, first of all, good teachers; then, secondly, who are trained in the special skills of teaching the exceptional child. So we must get the outstanding, experienced teacher to go back and take the special training she needs in this work. And the way to achieve that is to make it worth her while through fellowships which are generous enough so that she is not called upon to make a great financial sacrifice."

Mrs. SULLIVAN'S bill, which she introduced in the final hours of the last session of Congress as a basis for discussion among interested groups prior to the start of the new session next January, provides for a total of $18,500,000 in direct grants to individual teachers or prospective teachers over the next 7 years to enable them to take special training—primarily at the graduate level—in the education of exceptional children. An additional $2,500,000 could be allocated during that 7-year period to colleges and universities for equipment, facilities, or other expenses in expanding or initiating specialized courses in methods of teaching such children.

FELLOWSHIPS AWARDED ON STATE POPULATION BASIS

The awards to individuals would be allocated among applicants on a strict State-by-State formula based on school-age populations. This restriction would not apply, however, on grants to colleges and universities. The teachers receiving the fellowships or scholarships, furthermore, would be free to study at any college or university offering accredited courses in these fields, and would not be required to go back to their home States to teach afterward, but their own States would be urged to seek to attract these teachers back home to teach or serve as supervisors.

The actual amounts of the awards to individuals and institutions and the successful applicants would be determined by the United States Commissioner of Education with the help of an advisory committee of eight persons conversant with the educational needs of exceptional children.

Acknowledging that with the limited Federal funds it provides her bill could not by itself "solve the teacher shortage in this field," Mrs. SULLIVAN nevertheless added:

"But I think it could pioneer the way, stir up professional interest among teachers in going into this field, encourage more of the States to establish special teaching arrangements and facilities for exceptional children, and—most important of all—train those who in turn can establish the necessary courses in our colleges and universities so that every school of education eventually offers good courses in teaching exceptional children."

MANY COLLEGES NOW OFFER SPECIAL COURSES

According to figures inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Mrs. SULLIVAN at the time she introduced her bill, about 133 American colleges and universities were offering specialized courses in 1954 in one or more fields of exceptionality, mostly in techniques of teaching children with speech or hearing defects, but including 2 schools offering courses in teaching the gifted, a dozen or so in each category offering courses in teaching blind or partially seeing, maladjusted, or crippled children, and about 40 offering courses in teaching the retarded.

Now serving her third term in Congress, Mrs. SULLIVAN is best known in the House for her work on consumer issues and those affecting the average urban family. She took the lead in passage by Congress this year of the new law to require for the first time compulsory Federal inspection of poultry for wholesomeness; she is cosponsor with Congressman JAMES J. DELANEY, of New York, of the leading bills now pending in the House to revise and drastically tighten Federal controls over the use of insufficiently tested chemical additives in food and cosmetics; she was the "angry voice" in the House 3 years which precipitated the Federal Trade Commission inquiry into the "fake shortage" of coffee which had sent prices doubling; and she has been continuously active and vocal in fighting increases in living costs.

Mrs. SULLIVAN has also been the leading Congressional advocate of a food-stamp plan

for distribution of surplus food to needy Americans and nearly succeeded this year in writing it into the agriculture bill by amendment from the House floor despite bitter opposition from the Secretary of Agriculture. Among her committee assignments is membership on the Housing Subcommitee of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 9591 BASED ON YEAR'S STUDY

Her bill for fellowships for teachers and grants to universities in the exceptional children field grew out of a year's study on the problem beginning with correspondence from some of her constituents who are parents of retarded children, followed by discussions with educators in this and other fields of exceptional children, plus extensive research work by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. Much of this background and research material was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Mrs. SULLIVAN at the close of the recent session.

At that time, too, she pointed to the precedents for this type of Federal educational assistance, outlining the work of the United States Government's National Science Foundation in granting fellowships to scientists for advanced study, and to high school science and mathematics teachers; the United States Public Health Service program in providing traineeships to graduate nurses for advanced training, and to physicians and medical technicians and others for advanced work in physical rehabilitation skills.

In her talk before the National Association for Retarded Children, Mrs. SULLIVAN discussed the various federally aided research programs now under way through the United States Office of Education, the Public Health Service, and the Children's Bureau of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare into the problems of training or educating retarded children. She also cited the work of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation of the same Department in helping mentally retarded individuals at or near the age of employability learn specialized occupational skills.

"But the urgent need is to do more—much, much more—to help these people at the nursery school, kindergarten, and elementary school levels," Mrs. SULLIVAN told the convention audience. "As you all know, the biggest need is for trained teachers—dedicated, devoted, warmhearted, but above all skilled teachers—who can reach the retarded child, or the cerebral palsied, or the crippled, or all of these exceptional children needing specialized educational techniques to bring out their full potential—teachers who can reach such a child and help him find the way to a good life."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Education is authorized to make grants to public or other nonprofit institutions of higher learning to assist them in providing training of professional personnel to conduct training of teachers in fields related to education of mentally retarded children. Such grants may be used by such institutions to assist in covering the cost of courses of training or study for such personnel and for establishing and maintaining fellowships, with such stipends as may be determined by the Commissioner of Education.

SEC. 2. The Commissioner of Education is also authorized to make grants to State educational agencies to assist them in establishing and maintaining, directly or through grants to public or other nonprofit institutions of higher learning, fellowships or traineeships for training personnel engaged or preparing to engage in employment as teachers of mentally retarded children or as supervisors of such teachers.

SEC. 3. Payments of grants pursuant to this act may be made by the Commissioner of Education from time to time, in advance or by way of reimbursement, on such conditions as the Commissioner may determine. Such payments shall not exceed $1 million for any one fiscal year.

SEC. 4. Each State educational agency and each public or other nonprofit institution of higher education which receives a grant under this act during a fiscal year shall after the end of such fiscal year submit a report to the Commissioner of Education. Such report shall contain a detailed financial statement showing the purposes for which the funds granted under this act were expended.

SEC. 5. For purposes of this act—

(a) The term "nonprofit institution" means an institution owned and operated by one or more corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

(b) The term "State educational agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools in the State.

SEC. 6. The Commissioner of Education is authorized to delegate any of his functions under this act, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

SEC. 7. This act shall continue in effect until a date 10 years after the date of the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be allowed to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

SALINE WATER PROGRAM

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution—Senate Concurrent Resolution 121—authorizing a change in the enrollment of the joint resolution—Senate Joint Resolution 135—providing for the construction by the Department of the Interior of demonstration plants for the production, from saline or brackish waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, in the enrollment of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) providing for the construction by the Department of the Interior of demonstration plants for the production, from saline or brackish waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, to strike out, in the language agreed to by the conferees on House amendment numbered 15, in the second sentence beginning with the word "Unobligated", the numeral "1956" and in lieu thereof insert "1952."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ATTACHMENT AND GARNISHMENT OF WAGES, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1913) to amend the Code of Law for the District of Columbia by modifying the provisions relating to the attachment and garnishment of wages, salaries, and commissions of judgment debtors, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill so the House can be acquainted with the rather drastic change in the debtor situation in the District of Columbia?

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, under existing law in the District of Columbia a judgment creditor may issue an attachment of a debtor's wages called a garnishment, which garnishment requires that the employer withhold all of the debtor's wages until it can be judicially determined how much of the attached wages should be turned over to the creditor.

Under existing law if an exemption is claimed the debtor is required to file a written claim of exemption which claim is set down for a hearing in open court at which the debtor must be present. During the time this hearing is pending the entire wages are still held up.

The exemption provided for under present law is unworkable and economically unsound in that the majority of defendants never take advantage of it and it promotes a coercive influence on defendants due to the holdup of the defendant's salary until the litigation is determined.

There are approximately 3,500 cases of garnishment heard before the municipal court of the District of Columbia every month.

The purpose of H. R. 7035 is to provide a 10 percent lien and continuing levy upon the gross wages due or to become due to the judgment debtor. This percentage attachment is to continue as a lien against the wages of an employee until the judgment, interest, and costs are fully paid. In the event more than 1 attachment is filed against the same employer for money due to the same employee, the writs so filed will take priority as of the time they are received by the United States marshal and only 1 levy can be made at any one time until the attachment having priority is satisfied.

The bill also provides a penalty to an employer in that he would be liable to a judgment if he willfully failed to pay the creditor the percentage provided for in this act. Such liability is limited to the amount of the wages due the employee upon a pay period, and provides that the employer would be liable to a judgment of 10 percent of the gross wages due if he inadvertently or otherwise not willfully failed to pay the judgment creditor the percent prescribed. This loss cannot be passed on to the employee.

The provisions of this bill shall be effective as to wages, salaries, and commissions of an employee-judgment debtor on or after the date of the enactment of this act.

A subcommittee of the House District Committee held hearings on H. R. 7035 on May 13, 1957, and May 27, 1957. At the time the hearings were held the chief judge of the municipal court of the District of Columbia appeared, and other judges of the municipal court, the Corporation Counsel for the District of Columbia, the president of the District of Columbia Bar Association, and many other interested public citizens who testified in favor of this bill. There were a number of individuals who appeared and testified in opposition to H. R. 7035 or any other bill which would amend the law relating to attachment or garnishment on wages, salaries, and commissions in the District of Columbia. It might be well to point out that all of these persons who testified against amending the present law were all representatives of various businesses who have extended credit in a reckless manner to the very individuals who were always brought into court with these proceedings.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the District of Columbia law affecting garnishees, that is attachment of wages for the payment of debt, is obsolete and it has long been in need of modernization.

The bill as passed by the other body, S. 1913, and called up in the House today, is an improvement on the existing statute.

After careful comparison thereof, however, with H. R. 7035, I am convinced that the House version more nearly accomplishes the aims and intent of the Congress than does the Senate version. Either version is a tremendous improvement upon existing law. I do hope, however, that the House version will prevail, and that, when the 86th Congress convenes, the District Committee will again conduct hearings with reference to this important matter and further improve the statute.

A good summary of the situation was written by the Honorable Milton S. Kronheim, Jr., who has been a municipal court judge for the District of Columbia since 1949. His remarks were printed in the spring 1958 issue of the Personal Finance Law Quarterly Report. I set it forth in full as follows:

A JUDGE TAKES A CRITICAL LOOK AT THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GARNISHMENT LAW

(By Judge Milton S. Kronheim, Jr.)

I have been asked to discuss garnishments. It seems to me that the subject divides itself into three questions:

1. Are garnishments a problem?

2. If so, whose problem?

3. What can or should be done?

Now frequently when we are listening to some speaker, or reading the words of some writer, the thought occurs, Who is this fellow? How did he get that way? So I think I should say that from 1934 to 1947 I was the credit manager of a medium-sized wholesale concern—and that I was the claims attorney for the Dun & Bradstreet agency from 1938 to 1942.

That was the background I took with me to the bench in 1949. I found on the docket tens of thousands of cases revolving around credit. It was impossible not to notice that most defendants had no capital, very little income, and in many cases a poor past credit record. And the necessarily implied question is, "How did these people get credit?"

ONE THOUSAND A WEEK

It seems to me that the answer to this question is that an average of 1,000 garnishments a week issue from our court each week. Under our statute, an employer cannot pay the employee when he receives a garnishment. This is very harsh indeed; not a week goes by that I do not receive an anguished communication from some wage earner whose pay is held up (I refer such a person to Legal Aid). Of course we have exemptions—but these must be claimed subject to a hearing, and during the delay, the defendant's wages are still held.

Without belaboring the point, in my opinion, there is a problem.

My second question is, whose problem is it?

Well, I must confess, I am impressed by the wretched condition of some of these debtors. The court has them, in every condition of poverty—wrapped in burlap, or blind, or a father cooking over a hot plate for five children while the mother is in a mental institution. This is no mere rhetoric, but a factual report greatly diminished. But in spite of this judicial aspect, I do not think the cure, if there is one, is a court problem. It arises in the course of doing business under the law; the only function of the courts is to find the facts and apply the law.

LEGISLATIVE PROBLEM, TOO

It is a business problem; and it is a legislative problem. Now as to the legislature, I have said as much in public hearings. The people most affected are poor, naive moneywise, and in the District of Columbia they have no vote. It's easy to see why Congress, which legislates for the District, is not under any pressure to give this garnishment situation the attention which I think is demanded. The only group remaining is the business community; and I think the credit grantor is the most involved. It seems to me that it is their problem.

So, 1. We have a problem.

2. It is a business problem.

The third question is what can be done? What should be done?

Well, again it seems to me that something can be done. In the other branches of the court we deal with sin, or incapacity—things arising out of the moral code or the nature of man. In the granting of credit, or in the execution of garnishments, we're dealing merely with a recent business and legal creation. I feel that creditors cannot ignore the plain challenge to do their clear duty.

I suggest to your committee four avenues of approach for further suggestion to the Congress:

1. A lawsuit should not be available to collect on credit not given in accordance with ordinary business standards.

Now I'm talking to lawyers and businessmen: I don't have to point out that every day millions of people are given credit on the time-honored basis of cash, character, or capacity. Where none of these are present credit is not given in good faith. It's that simple.

Recently a friend of mine (I have two friends) who runs an automobile agency told me of having received a garnishment on one of his people who is paid $45 a week. The garnishment was for $874. When my friend asked the judgment creditor how a $45-a-week man with a family could be given that much credit, the answer was, "That's my business."

I submit that is an accurate answer—and it carries with it another question—Should the law court collect on his business?

So much for good faith—it was introduced in 1949 as a bill and again in 1950, and 1956—but while considered briefly by some legislators, has died, although I should say for the sake of accuracy that the latest bill is still technically pending.

2. My second suggestion would be to investigate the New York law which provides that only one garnishment is good at a time—and that only to the extent of 10% of the debtor's income. This has worked in New York. It also is presently pending as legislation.

3. My third suggestion is that garnishments be abolished. There are four States presently in which no wage garnishment is allowed; one of these is Texas. Has this affected the Texas economy? I suggest that creditors calculate how much of their accounts are collected by this misery spreading process. I dare say that the sum percentagewise is negligible. This, too, is pending legislation.

4. My fourth suggestion would call for a real contribution on the part of credit grantors—a real step forward. How much credit is reasonable? If it is obviously unreasonable to credit a $35 domestic with a $476 television, and it is reasonable to sell her a $19 radio then people who are in business should be able to tell where reasonableness begins and ends.

My final suggestion is that of the municipal court of appeals of the District of Columbia. In the McIver case they said, "distressing cases of overcharging and overselling are often encountered, but we know of no remedy under existing law except that of education of the buying public."

If that is the only feasible solution—and I have been told forcibly that it is—then I hope credit grantors will forgive me if I tell them that it is their task to do it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted etc.—That the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1901, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 1104 thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 1104A. ATTACHMENT OF WAGES.—(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, where an attachment is levied upon wages due a judgment debtor from an employer-garnishee, such attachment shall become a lien and a continuing levy upon the gross wages due or to become due to the judgment debtor for the amount specified in the attachment to the extent of (1) 10 percent of so much of the gross wages as does not exceed $500 due or to become due to the judgment debtor from the employer-garnishee for the pay period or periods ending in any calendar month, plus (2) 50 percent of so much of the gross wages as exceeds $500 due or to become due to the judgment debtor from the employer-garnishee for the pay period or periods ending in any calendar month. Such levy shall be a continuing levy until the judgment, interest, and costs thereof are fully satisfied and

paid, but in no event shall the payments in satisfaction of such execution reduce the amount payable to the judgment debtor to less than $50 per week and in no event shall moneys be withheld, by the employer-garnishee from the judgment debtor, in amounts greater than those prescribed by this section. Only one attachment upon the wages of a judgment debtor shall be satisfied at one time. Where more than one attachment is issued upon the wages of the same judgment debtor and served upon the same employer-garnishee, the attachment first delivered to the marshal shall have priority, and all subsequent attachments shall be satisfied in the order of priority set forth in section 452 of this act.

"(b) It shall be the duty and responsibility of any employer upon whom an attachment is served, and who at such time is indebted for wages to an employee who is the judgment debtor named in such attachment, or who becomes so indebted to such judgment debtor in the future and while such attachment remains a lien upon such indebtedness, to withhold and pay over to the judgment creditor, or his legal representative, within 15 days after the close of the last pay period of the judgment debtor ending in each calendar month, that percentage of the gross wages payable to the judgment debtor for the pay period or periods ending in such calendar month to which the judgment creditor is entitled under the terms of this section until such attachment is wholly satisfied. Any payments made by an employer-garnishee in conformity with this subsection shall be a discharge of the liability of the employer to the judgment debtor to the extent of such payments. Not more than 10 percent of the gross wages payable to the judgment debtor for any pay period ending in any calendar months shall be withheld and paid over by the employer-garnishee under this subsection until the total amount of gross wages paid or payable to the judgment debtor for all pay periods ending in such calendar month equals $500.

"(c) It shall be the duty and responsibility of the judgment creditor (1) to file with the clerk of the court, every 3 months after the serving of an attachment, a receipt showing the amount received and the balance due under the attachment as of the date of filing, and (2) to file a final accounting with the court and to obtain a vacation of the attachment within 20 days after the attachment has been satisfied. If the judgment creditor fails to file any of the receipts or the final accounting prescribed in this subsection, any interested party may move the court to compel the defaulting judgment creditor to appear in court and make an accounting forthwith. The court may, in its discretion, enter judgment for any damages suffered by, and tax costs in favor of, the party filing the motion to compel the accounting.

"(d) If the employer-garnishee willfully fails to pay to the judgment creditor the percentage prescribed in this section of the wages which become payable to the judgment debtor for any pay period, judgment shall be entered against him for the whole amount of the judgment creditor's judgment and costs, and execution shall be had thereon, except that in no event shall judgment be entered against the employer-garnishee in an amount greater than the gross wages which became payable to the judgment debtor for the pay period or periods with respect to which the employer-garnishee willfully failed to pay to the judgment creditor the percentage prescribed in this section. If the employer-garnishee fails, but not willfully, to pay to the judgment creditor the percentage prescribed in this section of the wages which become payable to the judgment debtor for any pay period, judgment shall be entered against him for an amount equal to the percentage with respect to which such failure occurs. The judgment debtor shall not be liable to the employer-garnishee for any amount for which judgment is entered against the employer-garnishee under this subsection.

"(e) If a judgment debtor resigns or is dismissed from his employment while an attachment upon his wages is wholly or partly unsatisfied, and he is subsequent reinstated or reemployed by the same employer, such attachment shall lapse and no further deduction shall be made thereon unless such reinstatement or reemployment occurs within 90 days after such resignation or dismissal.

"(f) For purposes of this section, the term 'wages' means—

"(1) wages, salary, commissions, or other remuneration for services performed by an employee for his employer, including any such remuneration measured partly or wholly by percentages or share of profits, or by other sums based upon work done or results produced, whether or not the employee is given a drawing account, and

"(2) any drawing account made available to an employee by his employer.

Such term does not include any amount paid or payable to an employee who is not a resident of the District of Columbia as remuneration for services performed within the District of Columbia, if the period for which the employee is engaged by the employer to perform such services within the District of Columbia is less than 15 consecutive days duration; and any such amount shall be subject to attachment without regard to this section.

"(g) The percent limitations prescribed by subsection (a) of this section shall not apply in the case of execution upon a judgment, order, or decree of any court of the District of Columbia for the payment of any sum for the support or maintenance of a person's wife, or former wife, or children, and any such execution, judgment, order, or decree shall, in the discretion of the court, have priority over any other execution which is subject to the provisions of this section.

"(h) No attachment issued by the municipal court for the District of Columbia upon a judgment of such court duly docketed in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and levied within 6 years from the date of such judgment upon the wages due or to become due to the judgment debtor from the employer-garnishee, shall lapse or become invalid prior to complete satisfaction solely by reason of the expiration of the period of limitation set forth in section 4 (c) of the act of April 1, 1942 (56 Stat. 193; D. C. Code 11–755)."

SEC. 2. Subsection (b) of section 1069 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D. C. Code 15–304), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "This subsection shall not apply with respect to an attachment upon wages to which section 1104A of this act applies."

SEC. 3. Section 1098 of such act, as amended (D. C. Code 15–312), is amended by striking out "If" and inserting in lieu thereof "Subject to the provisions of section 1104A of this act, if."

SEC. 4. Section 1107 of such act, as amended (D. C. Code 15–403), is amended—

(a) by striking out "earnings, salary" each place it appears in subsection (a) and (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "earnings (other than wages, as defined in section 1104A)"; and

(b) by striking out "salaries," in the proviso in subsection (a).

SEC. 5. (a) Section 456 of such act, as amended (D. C. Code 16–312), is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(c) In any case in which the cause of action arises in the District of Columbia or in which judgment is sought in the District of Columbia on a judgment secured outside of the District of Columbia, an attachment which is issued under section 445 of this act solely on the ground that the defendant is not a resident of the District, and which is levied upon the wages (as defined in sec. 1104A (f)) due to or become due to the defendant from his employer, shall be subject to the provisions of section 1104A of this act, except that the employer-garnishee shall pay over the wages withheld pursuant to such section only pursuant to the order of the court which has jurisdiction of the case. In applying the provisions of such section to any such attachment, the term 'judgment debtor' as used in such section shall be considered to refer to the defendant in the case in which such attachment is issued; and the term 'judgment creditor' shall be considered to refer to the plaintiff in such case."

(b) Subsection (b) of such section 456 is amended by striking out "wages" and inserting in lieu thereof "earnings."

SEC. 6. The amendments made by this act shall apply only with respect to attachments upon wages (as defined in section 1104A (f) of this act) which are issued on or after 60 days from the date of the enactment of this act.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McMILLAN: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of the bill H. R. 7035, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 456 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D. C. Code 16–312) is amended by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c), and by inserting after subsection (a) a new subsection as follows:

"(b) (1) Where an attachment is levied upon wages, salary, or commissions due a judgment debtor from the employer-garnishee, such attachment shall become a lien and a continuing levy upon the gross wages, salary, or commissions due or to become due to the judgment debtor for the amount specified in the attachment, to the extent of 10 percent of the gross wages, salary, or commissions for each pay period. Such levy shall be a continuing levy until the judgment, interest, and costs thereof are fully satisfied and paid. Only one attachment upon the wages, salary, or commissions of a judgment debtor shall be satisfied at one time. Where more than one attachment is issued upon the wages, salary, or commissions of the same judgment debtor and served upon the same employer-garnishee, they shall be satisfied in the order of priority set forth in section 452 of this act.

"(2) It shall be the duty of any employer upon whom an attachment is served, and who at such time is indebted to an employee who is the judgment debtor named in such attachment for wages, salary, or commissions, or who becomes so indebted to such judgment debtor in the future and while such attachment remains a lien upon such indebtedness, to pay over to the judgment creditor, or his legal representative, once each calendar month, that percentage of the gross wages, salary, or commissions payable to the judgment debtor during such calendar month to which the judgment creditor is entitled under the terms of this subsection until such attachment is wholly satisfied. Any payments so made by an employer-garnishee hereunder shall be a discharge of the liability of the employer to the employee-judgment debtor to the extent of such payments.

"(3) If the employer-garnishee willfully fails to pay to the judgment creditor the

percentage described in this subsection, judgment shall be entered against him for the whole amount of the judgment creditor's judgment, and costs, and execution shall be had thereon, except that in no event shall judgment be entered against the employer-garnishee in an amount greater than the gross wages, salary, or commissions that became payable to the employee-judgment debtor for the pay period or periods with respect to which the employer-garnishee willfully failed to pay to the judgment creditor the percentage prescribed in this subsection.

"(4) If a judgment debtor resigns or is dismissed from his employment while an attachment upon his wages, salary, or commissions is wholly or partly unsatisfied, and he is subsequently reinstated or reemployed by the same employer, such attachment shall lapse and no further deduction shall be made thereon unless such reinstatement or reemployment occurs within 90 days after such resignation or dismissal.

"(5) Wages, salary, and commissions payable to an employee-judgment debtor shall include any compensation measured partly or wholly by percentages or share of profits or by other sums based upon work done or results produced, whether or not the employee-judgment debtor is given a drawing account; and, for the purposes of this subsection, such compensation and any such drawing account shall be deemed to be wages."

(b) Subsection (c) of such section 456 (as redesignated by subsection (a) of this section) is amended by striking out "wages" and inserting in lieu thereof "earnings."

SEC. 2. Subsection (b) of section 1089 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D. C. Code 15–304), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "This subsection shall not apply with respect to an attachment upon the wages, salary, or commissions of an employee-judgment debtor to which subsection (b) of section 456 of this act applies."

SEC. 3. Section 1098 of such act, as amended (D. C. Code 15–312), is amended by striking out "If" and inserting in lieu thereof "Subject to the provisions of subsection (b) of section 456 of this act, if."

SEC. 4. Section 1107 of such act, as amended (D. C. Code 15–403), is amended—

(a) by striking out "earnings, salary" each place it appears in subsections (a) and (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "earnings (other than wages, salary, and commissions)"; and

(b) by striking out "salaries," in the proviso in subsection (a).

SEC. 5. The amendments made by this act shall apply with respect to attachments upon the wages, salary, and commissions of an employee-judgment debtor which are issued on or after the date of the enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 7035) was laid on the table.

MAKING POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN'S RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY ACT AMENDMENT OF 1957 APPLICABLE TO RETIRED FORMER MEMBERS OF METROPOLITAN POLICE FORCE, ET AL.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7450) an act to make the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act Amendments of 1957 applicable to retired former members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police force, the White House Police force, and the United States Secret Service; and to their widows, widowers, and children, with amendments of the Senate thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object; was this not reported out of the committee unanimously?

Mr. McMILLAN. That is correct. It was passed by the House a year ago and the other body has just passed the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? (After a pause.) The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. McMILLAN, DAVIS of Georgia, and BROYHILL.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FURTHER PROTECTION AGAINST THE INTRODUCTION AND DISSEMINATION OF LIVESTOCK DISEASES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 12126) an act to provide further protection against the introduction and dissemination of livestock diseases, and for other purposes, together with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Line 7, after "amended" insert "(1)."

Line 9, after "animals," " insert "; and (2) by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: *'Provided*, That wild ruminants or swine may be imported from any such country upon such conditions, including post entry conditions, to be prescribed in import permits or in regulations, as the Secretary may impose for the purpose of preventing the dissemination of said diseases into or within the United States: *And provided further*, That the subsequent distribution, maintenance, and exhibition of such animals in the United States shall be limited to zoological parks approved by said Secretary as meeting such standards as he may by regulation prescribe for the purpose of preventing the dissemination of said diseases into or within the United States. The Secretary may at any time seize and dispose of any such animals which are not handled in accordance with the conditions imposed by him or which are distributed to or maintained or exhibited at any place in the United States which is not then an approved zoological park, in such manner as he deems necessary for said purpose.'"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE CONSENT CALENDAR AND PRIVATE CALENDAR TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow it may be in order for the Speaker to direct the call of the Consent Calendar and the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ACCEPTING STATUE OF DR. FLORENCE RENA SABIN

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution—Senate Concurrent Resolution 102—accepting the statue of Dr. Florence Rena Sabin, to be placed in the Statuary Hall collection, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the statue of Dr. Florence Rena Sabin, presented by the State of Colorado, to be placed in the Statuary Hall collection, is accepted in the name of the United States, and that the thanks of the Congress be tendered such State for the contribution of the statue of one of its most eminent citizens, illustrious for her work in the field of medicine; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions, suitably engrossed and duly authenticated, be transmitted to the Governor of Colorado.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CEREMONIES IN ROTUNDA—DR. FLORENCE RENA SABIN

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution—Senate Concurrent Resolution 103—to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of the late Dr. Florence Rena Sabin and authorizing ceremonies on such occasion, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, the State of Colorado is hereby authorized to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of the late Dr. Florence Rena Sabin, of Colorado, and to hold ceremonies in the rotunda on such occasion; and the Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized to make the necessary arrangements therefor.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPEALING CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF LAW RELATING TO MESSENGERS FOR COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 13861) a bill to repeal certain provisions of law relating to messengers for the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the provisions of House Resolution 42 of the 80th Congress relating to messengers for the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives which were made permanent law by section 105 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1948, are hereby repealed.

(b) The provisions of House Resolution 45 of the 81st Congress relating to messengers for the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives which were made permanent law by section 105 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1950, are hereby repealed.

(c) The provisions of House Resolution 118 and House Resolution 486 of the 83d Congress relating to messengers for the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives which were made permanent law by section 103 of the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1955, are hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FAVORING CONGRESSIONAL RECOGNITION OF BASEBALL HALL OF FAME

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution—Senate Concurrent Resolution 37— favoring Congressional recognition of the Baseball Hall of Fame, located at Cooperstown, N. Y.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object; is this Senate resolution the same as the House Concurrent Resolution 213 which was introduced by our distinguished colleage from New York [Mr. KEARNEY].

Mr. BURLESON. That is correct.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution as follows:

Whereas baseball is universally recognized as the American national sport, a sport that in the more than 100 years of its existence has captured the imagination and zeal of most of our youth and has spread to other lands; and

Whereas millions of Americans have participated either as players or spectators in countless school, college, community, or professional leagues since Abner Doubleday conceived the first game of "town ball" in 1839 in Cooperstown, N. Y.; and

Whereas modern American baseball teams have achieved wide acclaim in exhibition tours in foreign lands and have been generally accepted as among our finest good will ambassadors abroad; and

Whereas baseball epitomizes our highest ideals of sportsmanship and fair play; and

Whereas there was established in 1938 at Cooperstown, near the site of the first game, the Baseball Hall of Fame; and

Whereas the Baseball Hall of Fame is the shrine of the game's immortals whose exploits are there preserved for the inspiration of future generations: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress hereby recognizes the Baseball Hall of Fame at Cooperstown, N. Y., as a memorial to individuals who have made outstanding contributions to the sport of baseball and as a fitting and valuable institution for the collection and preservation of famous tokens and other evidences and data relating to our national game.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING ACT OF MAY 17, 1954 (68 STAT. 98)

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the Senate bill (S. 4085) to amend the act of May 17, 1954 (68 Stat. 98), providing for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of old St. Louis, Mo., and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of May 17, 1954 (68 Stat. 98), entitled "An act to provide for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of old St. Louis, Mo., in general accordance with the plan approved by the United States Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission, and for other purposes" is hereby amended by striking sections 4 and 5 therefrom and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $17,250,000 to carry out the purposes of this act: *Provided*, That funds authorized to be appropriated by this act shall be expended by the United States for construction of the memorial in the ratio of $3 of Federal funds for each $1 of money contributed hereafter by the city of St. Louis or other non-Federal source for purposes of the memorial, and for such purposes the Secretary is authorized to accept from the said city or other non-Federal sources, and to utilize for purposes of this act, any money so contributed: *Provided further*, That the value of any land hereafter contributed by the city of St. Louis shall be excluded from the computation of the city's share."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF FINAL REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT OF SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution (S. Con. Res. 111) to print the final report of the Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Committee on Foreign Relations as a Senate document, with additional copies, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the final report of the Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Committee on Foreign Relations, under authority of S. Res. 241, agreed to January 29, 1958, shall be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and that 2,000 additional copies shall be printed for use of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COMPILATION OF SOCIAL SECURITY LAWS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up the resolution (H. Res. 693) providing for printing as a House document the Compilation of Social Security Laws and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the compilation of social security laws, prepared by the Social Security Administration for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means, be printed as a House document; and that 4,000 additional copies be printed, of which 3,000 shall be for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means, 300 copies shall be for the use of the Senate Committee on Finance, and 700 copies shall be for the use of the House document room.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF COMMITTEE ACTIVITY REPORTS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the printing of committee activity reports for the session, I wish to remind the chairmen of all committees that the Joint Committee on Printing has very properly ruled that the printing of such reports both as committee prints and in the RECORD is duplication, the cost of which cannot be justified.

It is requested that committee chairmen decide whether they wish these reports printed as committee prints or in the RECORD since the Government Printing Office will be directed not to print them both ways.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 13678. An act to provide in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for a loan service of captioned films for the deaf.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 12728. An act to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, with respect to the payment of compensation in cases where third persons are liable.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 469) entitled "An act to protect producers and consumers against misbranding and false advertising of the fiber content of textile fiber products, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13247) entitled "An act to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs, and for other purposes."

JOHN W. McCABE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, 39 years ago last June 1; that is, June 1, 1919, a young fellow came here to the House of Representatives as an employee. He was brought here by a great Member of this body who represented a considerable part of the district which it is now a privilege to represent, the Honorable Will R. Wood, who was chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

The person to whom I refer is John W. McCabe. John has served here through these years capably and efficiently, helpful to all of us, one of the finest persons it has ever been my privilege to know.

NOW HE IS RETIRING

On May 24, 1956, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], who represents now the First District which at that time was part of the district I now represent, and the home town area of John McCabe, and I spoke of his service and his great work here in the House of Representatives.

So, Mr. Speaker, without taking further time at this point I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to include in my remarks the observations I made at that time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from the great First District of Indiana for the splendid and well-deserved things he has said in commendation of Johnny McCabe. I know I speak for myself, and I am sure I speak for every Member on our side of the aisle, when I say to Johnny that we have appreciated through the years the splendid service he has given us, always of assistance, always ready and willing to be helpful not only to the Members on our side of the aisle but to Members on the other side of the aisle.

The gentleman from Indiana referred to the great Will R. Wood, who was my predecessor here in the House. Since coming here I have found many of the tracks of Will R. Wood. He did many things that were helpful to the Congress and to the country. I am absolutely sure one of the finer things he did was to bring John McCabe down here.

I was elected first to the Congress when there were not very many Republicans serving in the House. I came down here on February 5, 1935, to be sworn in after a special election. To say that I was a pretty green hand is probably the understatement of the year. But I found one person around here who knew enough about what was going on and about the operations of the House of Representatives to be of real assistance to me. That person was John McCabe. So I am happy on this occasion to say that of him, in his presence among those of us who have been so happy to have him here with us.

No employee has demonstrated a greater sense of pride in the privilege of serving his Government and none has been more loyal or more faithful in the discharge of his duties.

Although John is a native and resident of the First District of Indiana I know that he counts many friends among the folks of the Second District.

As he approaches this milestone of service, certainly we wish him the best of everything in the years to come and express the fond hope that he shall continue to be with us here on the floor for a long, long time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. MADDEN. As the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] stated, 2 years ago several Members paid tribute to Johnny McCabe when he commemorated his 37th year as an employee of the House. At that time I told the Members of the great record that Johnny McCabe has made through the years as a citizen of Whiting in the Calumet region of Indiana.

Years ago Johnny McCabe was the assistant to John Killigrew, the Republican county chairman in my District. I am certainly happy that Johnny is not back there now as an assistant county Republican chairman, as our party would not want to compete against his political strategy. I hope Johnnie enjoys many years of good health and happiness in his retirement. With all his friends and reputation, I hope that he does not decide to run for Congress on the Republican ticket if he becomes bored with the life of a retired gentleman.

Johnnie was a delegate or a convention official at all Republican national conventions since 1912. Speaker RAYBURN, CARL VINSON, and DAN REED are the only Members remaining who were here when Johnny started to work in the House of Representatives.

Everybody who knows Johnny McCabe back over almost half a century of political activity in my District honors him and realizes that he has done a great work for his district and country as an employee in the House of Representatives. I know that every Member of this House joins with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and myself in paying tribute to Johnny upon his retirement.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman from Indiana. I should have stated at the outset that Johnny is retiring at the end of this year, hence this occasion to speak of him.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, when Congress assembles next January one of our beloved figures will be missing. In 39 years he has been a faithful and devoted House employee, cheering all with his pleasant smile and faithful service. He served efficiently at my Republican National Convention where he was a popular figure. We all will miss Johnny and wish him well for the future.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks at this point in the RECORD on Johnny McCabe.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. NIMTZ. Mr. Speaker, I join the dean of the Indiana delegation and the other Members of the House in paying tribute to one of Indiana's distinguished citizens, John W. McCabe, upon his retirement as an employee of this body. Although I have known Johnny, as he is so affectionately called, only since my arrival here in January 1957, it is my understanding that he has served faithfully the membership of this House since 1919.

I can easily understand why he is so highly regarded by all who serve here. He is friendly, he is loyal, and he is always on the job. If you want something done, you do not have to look for Johnny, because you know he is always on the floor. Also, he is reliable, if you ask Johnny to do something, you know it will be done.

I, too, wish my good friend, John McCabe, many years of health and happiness. We shall be happy to have him back home again in Indiana.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], in paying tribute to the long and faithful service of Johnny McCabe. I have never known a more sincere and courteous person. He has been cooperative with and helpful to me ever since I have been a Member of this House. I admire him greatly. I shall miss him in this Chamber. I wish him many years of happiness in his retirement.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I join in paying a well-deserved tribute to Johnny McCabe who has so well served the Republican minority—the House of Representatives, for the past 39 years. Now that he has decided to retire I wish for him the best of everything in the years that lie ahead. I am personally grateful to him for the many acts of kindness

he has performed in my behalf throughout my service as a Member of the House. May the Lord richly bless him always.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I have learned with regret that Johnny McCabe has decided, because of his health, to retire from the service of this House.

For 39 years Johnny, as he has been known to all the Members, has served faithfully and well. Always obliging. No task was ever too irksome. His one desire was to be helpful. His disposition was always pleasant and shedding sunshine and happiness to all about him. I wish for him many more years of happiness.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to hear the very fine things said today about Johnny McCabe.

He has been a most loyal and helpful public servant—always willing to assist, to extend a favor and to procure information whenever asked. His attention to duty by being on the job is not surpassed by any staff member that it has been my pleasure to work with.

I trust that you, Johnny, have a most enjoyable retirement and that you live many, many years to enjoy the fruits of your labors. May you enjoy good health and reap a rich harvest for the sincere devotion that you have given to your job.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the other members who have spoken about Johnny McCabe. Johnny told me some time ago that he intended to retire at the end of this Congress, and I was indeed sorry to learn of his plans to leave the House, where he has served so faithfully for so many years.

I have great affection for Johnny McCabe and he has been a real friend over the years I have served in the House. He has given me every possible assistance, and has extended courtesies far too numerous to mention. I have tried to thank him for what he has done, but I am indeed happy to have this opportunity to again express my sincere gratitude and appreciation. His friendship has meant a great deal to me and the House will never be the same without him.

I hope Johnny enjoys the retirement which he so richly deserves. I want to wish him good health and much happiness for many years to come. It has been a privilege to know you, Johnny, and I have greatly enjoyed my association with you.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, Johnnie McCabe has been a faithful and efficient member of the House staff. He has been courteous and kind, and we will miss him very much.

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in the tribute to Johnnie McCabe. It has been a privilege and a pleasure for me to have known Johnnie and I wish him many happy years of retirement. Thirty-nine years of service to this House is a record few have equalled and certainly few have exceeded. Yet that is the period of service which Johnnie McCabe has given to this body, and given cheerfully and well.

As a fellow Hoosier, I wish him happiness, good health, and a long life. We shall all miss him.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in paying homage to Johnnie McCabe who is retiring after a long tenure of service here. Johnnie has always been a real help to me. And, I feel it should not go unmentioned that I appreciated his sharing his daily Washington News with me as well as many other Members. Every good wish to Johnnie for happiness and well-being in his retirement.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the other Members of Congress in paying respect to one of those who is nearly a permanent fixture of this legislative hall.

I am referring to Johnny McCabe. I join with his many friends in wishing him Godspeed in the years ahead. I wish him the fullest enjoyment of all the pleasures that he so richly deserves for his many years of service.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in this tribute to Johnnie McCabe because, believe it or not, we have been personal friends since 1912 when we were both pages in the Republican National Convention of that year. Of course, Johnnie is much older than I, more experienced and more able.

I do join with the Indiana delegation, and with the full membership of this House, in wishing him Godspeed in the years ahead. We hope he will enjoy health, happiness, contentment, and prosperity for the rest of his days.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding to me.

I have known John McCabe for a number of years, as a matter of fact since 1938, when I was a small boy. He was then Chief Page on the minority side. It is due to his great help and his guidance that I came to learn a good deal of what I know today about the Congress of the United States.

I would like to join in paying tribute to Johnnie McCabe, who is one of the finest individuals we have in this country. He is a small man physically, but his heart, his courage, his integrity, and his generosity are as large as the Capitol Building itself. I am proud to have known him. I wish him well. I say on behalf of myself and on behalf of all the young men he helped to train, to bring up in this world, that he has been a wonderful influence over the years. We will miss the Chief.

May God bless you, Johnnie, and may you have many, many years of happiness and may your friends always be able to come to you for good advice.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, there is one phase of Johnnie's life I know very few Members of this body are aware of. During the Korean war in 1952 he went over there with our Committee on Armed Services and spent a week on the front when General Van Fleet was there. He had a fatigue suit on and he did everything every Member of Congress did, walking up and down the hills, but he was always Johnnie as we know him on the floor.

God bless you from here on in.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED. Johnnie McCabe and I entered the Congress at the same time, which will give you some idea of his age. He has been a marvelous public servant, he has been a true friend to me and very helpful in many ways.

I wish him well as he retires from this body, and I hope he will return frequently to see us.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am certain that I express the sincere sentiments of the Members of this House when I say to Johnnie that all of us wish that the future will bring you contentment, happiness and good health.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, 24 years ago when I came to this Congress I wanted to know who every Member was and who every employee was. I asked, "Who is Johnnie McCabe?" They said, "He is the fellow that does something for everybody and for every person who asks him to do something."

He was the jack of all trades, so to speak, but a man who was a friend to each and every Member who came to this Congress. I shall never forget the many, many things he did to help me when I started in my service to the people of this country.

Johnnie, we wish you the best of luck, peace and contentment as you go on through life. And come back and see us. You are always welcome.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity the gentleman from Indiana is giving to us today. As for Johnny McCabe, although a native of Indiana, we in California have something in common with him because he lived in California for a number of years, and the first thing he told me when I came here was he thought a great deal of California, which endeared him very much to me. He was always available for any information or any service that we might request of him. We are going to miss him around here, and we hope he will enjoy many years of health and happiness.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Johnny McCabe is one of the

finest characters I have ever known. No task has ever been too great for him, and no task has ever been too small. He regards every Member as a person that should be helped. I always have liked the word "service." He always gave service on every activity in the Capitol. He kept his mind on every piece of legislation. He watched every departmental matter affecting the Congress of the United States. I wish him the greatest happiness in his retirement. We will all be thinking of him and wishing him good luck, and many, many thanks to him for work superbly done.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

RETIREMENT OF JOSEPH P. O'HARA

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure we all want to join in wishing our colleague, the Honorable JOSEPH O'HARA, from the Second District of Minnesota, the best of everything as he goes into retirement from the Congress at the end of this year.

I do so with mixed emotions. Naturally, I am pleased that he goes into voluntary and not involuntary retirement. So often we are denied expressions of regard as many of our beloved colleagues are taken from us by death, or political defeat after the Congress has adjourned and consequently we do not have the opportunity to tell them personally how much we have enjoyed their company, and how much they will be missed in the Halls of Congress.

JOE O'HARA came to Washington in the 77th Congress during my second term in office. I knew and respected him as a man of unquestioned integrity and unusual ability from his very first days here, and his reputation has become enhanced during the entire period of his service.

In our State they often refer to people of Scandinavian descent as "Minnesota Irish." Here, in the person of JOSEPH PATRICK O'HARA, we have an all-American Irishman, who does honor to his American citizenship and his national heritage.

His Congressional District adjoins mine and I naturally know many of his constituents. On occasion, I have campaigned some of his neighbors who had strayed across the District line. In addition, I am honored to count among my own constituents one of his fine sons and his splendid family. From my years of association with his neighbors I can bear witness to the fact that I have never heard one word of criticism relative to his personal or official conduct. His constituents and mine respect and admire Mr. O'HARA.

JOE O'HARA has been an outstanding Congressman. The House of Representatives, with its time-honored traditions and history of great men, has been honored by his distinguished presence. He has dedicated himself as completely to the service of his people and his Nation as any man I have known. He has demonstrated over and over again his understanding of the problems of others and his readiness to be helpful. He has shown by deed and by example the depth of his Christian principles and beliefs. He has chalked high his mark of devotion to duty, and only men of great stature can hope to equal the record he has left.

I am in my 20th year of service in the Congress, Mr. Speaker, and I recall no voluntary retirement in recent years with the exception of Clifford Hope of Kansas which has been more deeply regretted by me personally. I shall miss greatly my good friend JOE O'HARA and his lovely wife. My office staff asked me to join them in this expression and also to say how much we shall miss the fine people in his office. The cooperation between our two offices has left nothing to be desired.

As our distinguished colleague from the Second District of Minnesota prepares for retirement and returns to the practice of law, I am privileged to be among those here today in wishing him the best of everything. I hope he will come back often to visit with us.

I now yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day for all in this House, and especially those of us from Minnesota, who have known and loved JOE O'HARA all these years, to have him retire. It is a sad day for the Congress and for the country. Because JOSEPH O'HARA, in my opinion, after working closely with him here for 16 years, is one of the most valuable public servants in this body. Certainly he is one of the ablest; certainly he is one of the hardest working and conscientious. And certainly he has another quality which many people who are able and hard working do not have in so superlative a degree; he is second to none in political courage. It is relatively easy to stand up with physical courage against machineguns on the battlefield; but all of us here know that it is a great deal harder to have the courage of one's convictions in the face of political pressures from powerful organized groups to which we may ourselves belong, or from dear friends who sincerely believe that we are wrong.

In all the years I have been here I have never heard one person among those, either here or at home in Minnesota, who disagreed with him on various issues, ever speak of him except in terms of highest respect for his honesty, his integrity, and his courage. They admire him all the more because no one ever heard him utter an unkind or a demogogic word or make a bid for votes by concealing or departing from his point of view.

JOE O'HARA is a man who is solid, strong, and steady in physical makeup. His mental, emotional, and moral makeup are of the same type—solid, steady, deliberate, and dependable. Not only is this true of his work as a Congressman, but of his character as a man and as a friend.

The greatest tribute that can ever be paid to anybody is the tribute paid by those who know him best. Those who have known JOE longest and best, perhaps even better than we do, are the people of his District. And I want to point out this fact, because I think it is unique. JOE is an Irishman in a District that is overwhelmingly Scandinavian and German. He is an active, devout Roman Catholic, in a District and in a State that are predominantly Protestant. And yet, for nine terms, the people of the Second District of Minnesota have returned him to Congress, always with large majorities. They would do it again if he would let them. That is the finest possible tribute I think that could be paid to any man—and a tribute to the quality of the people who have given it.

Mr. Speaker, we are sorry to lose him from the Congress, of course. But we are consoled by the knowledge that he and Mrs. O'Hara will be freed from at least the strains and stresses of this public position and can have some time for themselves and the families of their three fine sons. We know that JOE will always be available for his country's service if it should need his advice, his experience, and his help.

We shall miss the O'Haras sorely, but we extend to them our good wishes and ask God's blessing on them wherever they may be in a long and happy retirement.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished minority leader, Mr. MARTIN.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, may I join the gentleman from Minnesota and his colleagues in expressing my deep personal regret at the termination of the service of JOE O'HARA. He has served very nearly 20 years. He has served with credit and distinction. He has been one of the really solid Members of the House, a rugged American with only one purpose in mind, and that was to serve his country and his State to the best of his ability and according to the dictates of his own conscience.

We shall miss JOE O'HARA. We always miss a big man and a good man. I wish for him and his family all happiness in the future.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, JOSEPH P. O'HARA, has chosen not to return to the Congress. It has been a real privilege to serve with JOE in the House of Representatives. As a member of the Minnesota delegation, I have conferred with him many times. He has always given me his honest opinion as a friend.

I have always found JOE to be fair. Whenever we have discussed issues he has respected my viewpoint as well as his own and has weighed his answers. He is not given to snap judgments, but once his decision is made the path is clear.

We have cast our votes differently on a number of occasions. For my part, I have never questioned that JOE voted

his honest convictions as his conscience dictated. It has been said many times in this Chamber that honest men may have differences of opinion. This is part of the greatness of our country and the very basis on which our legislative process rests.

JOE O'HARA will be remembered in the Congress not only for his legislative efforts but for the esteem in which he is held by his colleagues. Minnesota is indeed losing a faithful spokesman and a real public servant in his departure from the Washington scene.

Those of us who want to return his friendship hope for him the best of everything. We hope that he and his family, of which he is immensely proud, enjoy the years ahead. We know that he will now have more time to spend in my District where fishing is good and relaxation is easy. Who can tell, JOE may want to indulge in a little politicking since this is an interest that cannot be denied. We want you to know, JOE, that you are always welcome in our District. Knowing, however, your loyalty to the Republican Party, we may have difficulty in making a convert.

I sincerely hope that the gentleman from Minnesota will continue his active interest in community affairs and in the political arena. He will always be welcome as both a friend and adversary because we know that he will always be both friendly and fair in political debate. JOE O'HARA is a great Minnesotan and a great American and in every sense, a real gentleman. Minnesotans of all political faiths are proud of him and join in saying thanks for a task well done.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, had Mr. O'HARA chosen to remain in the House he would next year have been the ranking member of the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I now yield to the chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

JOSEPH PATRICK O'HARA

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, to know JOE O'HARA is to respect and love him. I suppose I have been as closely associated with JOE in 18 years of our service in the Congress as any other Member on either side of the aisle. He is my friend. We are devoted friends from our association and years of service in this Congress.

So it is with mixed feelings, Mr. Speaker, that I come to the end of this session of the Congress and suddenly realize that the service of someone we have worked with so closely and understood and who understood us in the important matters we are called upon to consider in the Congress of the United States will be terminated and we will no longer have the privilege of the association.

I am going to miss JOE personally. We came here together in 1941. As I said at a little luncheon our committee had for JOE and Mr. WOLVERTON, a few days ago, JOE O'HARA is going to be missed in this Congress as much as any other Member who is leaving us.

The rugged individualism in JOE makes one respect him. He is frank, honest, sincere, and unafraid, fearless in every move. The country as well as his own District in the great State of Minnesota has benefited by his service during all of these years. We can ill afford to lose such a man of conviction as JOE O'HARA.

When JOE told me he had decided to retire, it was just after the Easter recess, he said he had tried to contact me and advise me about it before he made the announcement. I told him had I had the opportunity I would have protested, and I would, seriously. I know, however, that he and Mrs. O'Hara, and his fine children and grandchildren, are going to enjoy some relaxation from the problems, troubles, and tribulations we wrestle with here every day and that we wrestle with back home when we are not in session.

JOE, I am personally going to miss you. From the depths of my heart, I regret to see you go. No one has had more and tougher arguments with you than I, but you have always been the foursquare sharpshooter that stands up face to face and battles out the issues.

So it is, Mr. Speaker, I arise to pay tribute to JOSEPH PATRICK O'HARA and to join the host of his many friends in expressing regret in his decision not to seek reelection and the loss which this means to the House of his helpful and constructive leadership in the passage of worthwhile legislation.

It is from a personal affection with which I speak as well as from the associations which I have had with JOE O'HARA during these years in the House. He and I both came to Washington with the 77th Congress. He and I both started our service as members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee with the 78th Congress. He and I both have served for many years as members of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

During this period, accordingly, I have been in a peculiar position to observe his pride in participating in, and in authorship of, legislation on behalf of the public welfare. JOE O'HARA has been the author of much legislation relating to the District of Columbia which has become law, including the Corporation Code and laws pertaining to the courts. He has been the author of many bills in the fields of transportation, public health, and interstate commerce including significant legislation in the fields of fur labeling and the labeling and regulation of foods and drugs.

During the years I have served with him on these committees I have come to a high appreciation of his trustworthy service on behalf of the public and of his calm approach to matters of vital concern to our people. He has always exhibited a commendable zealousness in protecting our constitutional safeguards and the right of individuals to be heard or seek redress through our judicial processes. The legislation which has emanated from our committees, accordingly, and from the Congress, is the better for his having participated so attentively and exactingly in its consideration.

We have heard about the so-called Minnesota Irish, who usually trace their ancestry to one of the Scandinavian countries. But in JOE O'HARA we have a real Irishman from Minnesota. He has the warm personality, the ready wit, and the sparkling good humor we expect in the Irish. As befits a good Irishman, he is a man of deep religious convictions. He loves his family. He has the steadfast integrity and the uprightness of character needed to make a good family man.

JOE O'HARA is a man who makes friends easily. He does not treat friendship lightly. To be his friend is a great honor and a distinct privilege. He is a man who will meet you more than half way. You can depend on him.

As he has confided to his friends, in leaving Congress he is going back to his first love, the practice of law. To that first love, he will take the great ability and unbounded energy he has shown as a Member of this House and in his committee work. We are going to miss him, but we all wish him the best of luck and know that he will serve his first love well, as he has served us and the country well.

So, again, it is with mixed feeling I cannot help, JOE, that since we have been so closely associated on the 2 committees during the past 18 years, coming up together each on our own side to the top of the committee, and with it the greater responsibilities of such a position—I cannot help but feel that I am going to miss you tremendously. But to you and Mrs. O'Hara and to the rest of the family go my good wishes and Godspeed.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Thank you, OREN, for the splendid tribute to my colleague.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it was with the most sincere and deepest regret that I learned JOE O'HARA had decided to retire from this body. I am quite sure he would be with us here for a long, long time if he wanted to be here.

I served for years on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and possibly by reason of that fact I had a little closer association with JOE than some Members, although I am very sure there is not one of us who has not been closely associated with him. I came to know him and respect him.

As I have served in his body, I have thought time and again about the attributes that make for greatness in this body—what are the characteristics that we look for in the man or woman who serves here and who comes to the top in what certainly is a great reservoir of manpower? Many have spoken already of the attributes we know JOE O'HARA possesses and has used through the years, his integrity, his honesty, his knowledge of the things that have come before us, his willingness to work. Many others could be mentioned, and many of them have been. But, from my experience with him, I think one attribute stands out, and it certainly is a very worthwhile thing here in service in this body, and that is JOE O'HARA's courage. I have not always agreed with him—generally, I have, on the problems that have been before us. But JOE O'HARA had the courage to stand for his convictions when he believed he was right. Yet, with all of that,

he was willing to play on the team to do his part when team play was advisable. I want to comend him for that and to say to him, particularly have I appreciated that willingness on his part when from time to time I have had some of the responsibility for the management of affairs in the House of Representatives. So, JOE, good luck and best wishes, and we hope to be seeing you right along.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Thank you, CHARLIE.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to our colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN].

Mr. MCMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I certainly cannot let this occasion go by without saying a few words about our good friend, JOE O'HARA. He came to the Congress in the same year that I did. We have served on the same committee since that time. I do not know of any man in the Congress who has given of his time more generously to any worthwhile problem that has come up in this Congress for the benefit of the District of Columbia in the committee on which we serve together.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my tribute to one whom I consider to be the finest gentleman I have had the opportunity to serve with in the Congress. As one of the younger men here, I hope in the coming years if I reach the time when I desire to retire, that I can leave the kind of record behind me that JOE O'HARA is leaving today—a record of real statesmanship—the record of a real gentleman and one who has treated his colleagues with fairness in every way.

You know, JOE represents a lot of good old Scandinavian Swedes, and I happen to be a Swede. I not only want to pay tribute to JOE O'HARA, but I also want to pay tribute to the Swedes of Minnesota who over these years have had the sound judgment to send this great Irishman to Washington. I would like to say to him that I think he should change his name to "O'Harris."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that if I were as sure of reelection to Congress as Mr. O'HARA would be this year had he chosen to remain, I would feel considerably more at ease today than I do facing the general election date.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, many have said that they view JOE'S leaving Congress with regret. I view it with sadness, not particularly regret, because JOE O'HARA has deserved by his record of service in this Congress the right to these days of retirement that are coming to him and the happiness we hope he may receive from them.

The sadness comes to me because we will not see JOE O'HARA here every day. All of us will miss him in his retirement. Since I have been in Congress he has been of great help to me in many matters, although he and I have not always seen eye to eye, as was the case with Mr. HALLECK, but I have always admired the things he stood for and his solid principles and convictions. He is one of God's great noblemen. We shall all miss him, but we wish him well in his retirement that is so well deserved from his service to the Nation.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Might I say just this one word further before I yield to other Members? Were it not for the assistance which the wife of our esteemed colleague has given him throughout the years in her encouragement and in her efforts toward helping him, JOE O'HARA would never have attained the high position he holds today. I, for one, not only will miss JOE but will also miss his fine wife and family when they leave this city of Washington.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the closing days of the Congress are always sad days to me, because they bring with them the retirement of so many old friends and so many fine Members of the House of Representatives in retirement from public service.

I had the pleasure of serving with JOE O'HARA on the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for a great many years. There I learned not only to respect him but also to admire him for the qualities of mind and character which he displayed.

As has been said here today, he has been a legislator not only of ability but also of great courage. He has stood for those things in which he believed. He has voted his convictions on the floor of this House. He has represented his people honestly, honorably, and well.

Each and every one of us I am sure joins with his other friends in Minnesota and elsewhere in extending to him our best wishes for a long life and a satisfying one as he leaves us.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the minority whip, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join our colleagues from Minnesota in their expression of regret over the decision of our friend, JOSEPH P. O'HARA, to retire from Congress.

Several years ago I served with JOE O'HARA on the Select Committee To Investigate Lobbying Activities. I learned then that he was a man of courage, composure, and keen judgment. The pressures that beset those who served on that committee did not divert JOE O'HARA from his steadfast course. JOE is a kind, friendly, and courteous person. Yet he is a fighter, but a fighter who fights fair.

JOE has truly been one of the rocks of the House—a great and valuable Member. We can ill afford to lose him. We wish him health, happiness, and Godspeed in the years ahead.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to take this opportunity to wish my old friend, JOE O'HARA, the very best in the years ahead for him during his retirement.

When I first came to Congress JOE O'HARA was one of the first Members I met. I can well remember the wonderful speeches that he delivered on St. Patrick's Day. I was really impressed on first meeting Mr. O'HARA, and certainly when I delved into his record and found out he was a great attorney before coming to this wonderful body, I knew then why he was such a good legislator while serving here.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to say not only to JOE O'HARA but to this entire body that we are losing a great friend, the State of Minnesota is certainly losing one of her greatest legislators; but as time goes on, I am sure that the State of Minnesota will receive some of his advice and counsel as a seasoned legislator in this body.

So, to JOE O'HARA and his very wonderful wife, I extend the best wishes of the people of the Fifth Congressional District of Connecticut.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I want to pay my respects to a great American. I concur in all the good things that have been said about JOE O'HARA. I served with him on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for about 7 years, and I regard him as a high type, wholesome man. I feel, and firmly believe, that America is losing a great statesman. I have not always agreed with him, but I am certain that he has always voted his convictions in this Congress.

JOE, I say to you, may fortune be kind to you, may the face of God shine on you and travel with you for the rest of your life.

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the others who have paid tribute to one of the great Members of this body.

The thing that I admired most about JOE O'HARA in my association with him was his legal mind. I think as a Representative in this body he was a man of great capacity insofar as the law is concerned. I never consulted him on any subject that he did not have a logical answer to, an answer to the problem I was seeking. We are going to miss him. As a matter of fact, I do not consider this ceremony the end of anything as far as JOE O'HARA is concerned. I think it is just the beginning of a period in his life when he is going to enjoy the freedom, the independence, and liberty he has been denied as a public servant. He will become a private citizen and then have the opportunity to write to his Congressman and complain about the way the Government is running. He

will be able to go here and there wherever he pleases without the thought of his constituents worrying about where he is going.

I wish him well and trust that he may have many years of health and happiness to enjoy his retirement.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE].

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, a good many years ago when I met JOSEPH P. O'HARA, I was introduced to him by the late Representative Harold Knutson, of Minnesota. I remember what Representative Knutson said that day: "You are now making the acquaintance of one of the ablest lawyers in the North Star State, and he will distinguish himself as a Congressman." That firm prophecy has indeed come true.

It has been a joy for me to sit side by side with JOE O'HARA in one of the committees of the Congress. I have learned that what Members who have spoken ahead of me have said is most certainly true about his legal and legislative ability. In addition, some members of my immediate family are his constituents, and as relatives will, we talk about political matters. Every report I have had about Congressman O'HARA from members of my own family and other people as well has been favorable.

So, at this time I want to say that Mrs. Talle, other members of my immediate family, and the people of my District join with me in expressing gratitude to Mr. O'HARA for his distinguished service and wish for him and his family great joy and happiness. I do that also in the name of the State of Iowa where he was born.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, it was a pleasure to serve with a man of the type and character of JOE O'HARA. He has been honest, farseeing, and has had a passion for serving his country. We will miss him greatly and wish for him many, many years of good life and service to his community and his country.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it has been a pleasure and a privilege to have been an associate of JOSEPH O'HARA, a distinguished Representative from the great State of Minnesota.

He has rendered a high quality of service to the Congressional District he has so long represented and to the people of the entire country.

He is a man of strong and sterling character. Always conscientious in the performance of his duty, he could never be swerved from what he considered right no matter what influences were brought to bear.

His work on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been outstanding. His judgment has been sound and always helpful. He will be greatly missed by his colleagues on the committee and in the House.

I extend to him and his wife my best wishes for an enjoyable retirement that he has decided upon voluntarily. I trust they will have many, many more years of happiness.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, it is nice to attend and hear the fine compliments that have been bestowed upon my good friend and colleague, JOE O'HARA.

JOE was one of the first men I met when I came to Congress and on many occasions I have consulted with him on important legislation emanating from his committee. Socially, JOE is one of the most likable and genial men I have ever met. I have always been a great believer that every man should be the master of his soul and know when to get in and when to get out of positions of great responsibility. I wish for you, JOE, a most pleasurable and satisfactory retirement knowing that you will always have keen remembrances and the affections of your many associations here in the Congress of the United States. I extend to you every good wish for a full and happy retirement.

During the trying times of the last few years, we have had a most stalwart and effective leader on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in the person of CHARLES A. WOLVERTON. He has followed closely the work of this most important committee, and his speeches regarding the hearings and his recommendations as to the proper procedure for Congress to take has been a light of leadership which many of his colleagues have followed. His great insight has caused him to make sound recommendations for the welfare and benefit of our national economy. I have appreciated his guidance, and I wish for you, CHARLIE, good health, continued good friends, and a good retirement.

The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is losing another hard-working member in the person of JOHN HESELTON. He has been a conscientious and diligent member of the committee, formulating his opinions on the legislation being considered after thorough and unbiased study of all phases of the subject matter. His colleagues will miss his inquiring mind and his constituents will miss a man who has consistently worked for their welfare and best interests. My best wishes go to you, JOHN, for good health and happiness in your retirement and future endeavors.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, with so many of my colleagues I join in expressing real regret that the Honorable JOSEPH O'HARA has decided not to seek reelection.

When I first came to Congress in 1949, I quickly came to know and admire JOE O'HARA as a man of rare courage. Once he determined his position on a legislative matter he was immovable. This is not to say that he could not give and take in the spirit of fair compromise. It is to say that he did not yield to blandishment or political expediency.

I shall miss this Minnesota neighbor, and wish for him many years of health and happiness in his retirement.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in the 2 years that I served on the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I had the great pleasure and privilege of working with the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

We get to know each other best in working together in committees. In my 10 years in the House I learned to know and respect JOE for his deep and sincere convictions and for his gentlemanly conduct in his work as a Member of Congress.

As a member of the Commerce Committee I more fully recognized his ability, knowledge, charm, and good character. His leaving will be a big loss to the committee and to the Nation. I join with my colleagues in paying my personal tribute to the gentleman from Minnesota and wishing him well in his retirement. May he enjoy good health and a long and happy retired life.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking minority member of the District of Columbia Committee, I wish to state that I personally regret the voluntary retirement of JOE O'HARA very much. If those living within the confines of the District do not have similar regrets, I think they should.

JOE served as the ranking minority member of two subcommittees: Judiciary and Fiscal Affairs. Both very important. He gave his time and energy to these two committees. He gave time when he should have been looking after his health instead. He served in a thankless task, but which must be done by someone.

Again, I say those living in the District should appreciate his services, which, in my opinion, were always the best.

Mr. Speaker, this is a cold league. When a Member retires, is defeated, or called by death, he is very quickly forgotten. This possibly is as it should be, the House having had probably 10,000 Members.

A Member of this body for any reason wishing to retire, and return to a normal life with his family, should be commended for so doing. Only time will tell whether a person belongs to the ages.

JOE and Mrs. O'Hara are entitled to all the good and fine things this life can offer. They deserve it. They have, I would say, slaved for it. JOE O'HARA has been an outstanding veteran of World War I. He has been an outstanding family man and proud of it. For 18 years he has been a fine Member of Congress, and even longer than that a fine public servant without a blemish.

He and Mrs. O'Hara are now entitled to go south in the winter and a little further north in Minnesota in the summer. I hope he catches so many Minnesota fish that the State will be compelled to restock the lakes and streams. What greater wish could be bestowed, under this regrettable situation of JOSEPH PATRICK O'HARA's retiring. Even his alma mater, Notre Dame, will regret his retirement. The Inns of Court, London, England, should take due notice.

Joe and Mrs. O'Hara, along with the other Members of this body, I wish you to enjoy life to the fullest extent, play as hard as you worked. If you find retirement and loafing overdone, come back. Come back as a lobbyist, registered or

otherwise. I am certain you will be listened to.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, JOE O'HARA is my Congressional neighbor. His District—Minnesota and mine—Iowa, partly adjoin each other and therefore we have had much in common. I regret that JOE is retiring from the Congress. He has been a very valuable Member of the House and the least I can say is that he has served well his day and generation as a faithful public servant. May the Lord's richest blessings be with him in the years that lie ahead.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, after having served the Ninth Minnesota District for 18 years, I understand that my good friend and colleague, the Honorable JOSEPH P. O'HARA, is to retire voluntarily at the end of the 85th Congress. During most of that time I have had the honor and pleasure of serving with him.

We in the Congress who know him and served with him will miss his presence a great deal. As for me, I received a great deal of benefit from his advice and counsel.

He has always been devoted to our country and its free institutions and has always manifested deep concern for the happiness and welfare of the people. In serving in this honorable body, he has shown an exceptional ability, a real knowledge of human nature, of generosity, of courage, and above all loyalty to his family and friends.

The time that I have served in Congress has been made easier for me by reason of my acquaintance with JOSEPH P. O'HARA. His friends, and there are many of them, wish him many years of the happiness he so richly deserves. I am pleased that he is enjoying the best of health.

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have this opportunity to join with the Minnesota delegation, as well as our colleagues, in paying tribute to JOE O'HARA. I came to know our friend, JOE, as he is so commonly called by his host of friends, when I came to Congress 8 years ago.

I have had a deep appreciation for the work that he has done in the House of Representatives and have often found the opportunity to seek his counsel.

In a lighter vein, I have been associated socially with our colleague and his family, and while we will miss him here in the House of Representatives, I can only wish for Mrs. O'Hara and him many pleasant days ahead and will look forward to having him visit us frequently here in the House.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the record of public service of JOE O'HARA, of Minnesota.

His work on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and District of Columbia Committee has been outstanding. He is diligent and forceful and has applied sound principles of good government in advocating or opposing legislation.

His retirement from the House of Representatives will deprive us of his valuable legislative services in the fields in which he has become an expert. But even more, we will miss JOE as a friend. His joviality and his sense of humor have won the affection of his colleagues, and I know we all wish him every success in his future endeavors.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I became acquainted with JOE O'HARA shortly after I came to Congress in 1951. I learned to respect him very early, and that respect has grown throughout the years. I consulted him often on matters. I have learned to place a very high value on his judgment. JOE O'HARA is one of those rare individuals that has strong views, yet he was always kind and tolerant of the views of those with whom he disagreed. He was always unwavering and steadfast in his beliefs in the dignity of the individual as opposed to Government regimentation.

JOE O'HARA has been a great legislator; if he had turned to the judiciary instead of legislative, he would have been one of our Nation's greatest judges. We will miss him in Congress, as he is the type of man that is most difficult to replace. JOE, we wish to say that you have done a great job in Washington. We trust that your future life will be full of success and happiness.

Mr. MCMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest things that has happened to me since I have been a Member of Congress is that I have had the pleasure of serving with a man like JOE O'HARA. The Congress can ill afford to lose many good men of JOE's caliber. I believe that JOE comes as near voting his own convictions on every piece of legislation that comes to the floor of the House for consideration as any man that has ever served as a Member of this great legislative body.

I sincerely regret to learn that JOE has decided to retire as a Member of the United States Congress, however, I hope that he will now be able to do some of the things that he has been denied during the past 20 years.

JOE and I were freshmen here together and we have joined hands in fighting some rather tough battles during World War II and the readjustment years since the war. I know that it will be difficult for the State of Minnesota or any other State to send a man here who could fill JOE O'HARA's shoes; and, even though we are from different political parties, we certainly see eye to eye on at least 90 percent of the problems facing this country at the present time and all legislation that has been considered on the floor of the Housing during the past 20 years.

I wish for JOE and his family good health and happiness and trust they will visit my State and my District when he decides to do some traveling.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, JOE O'HARA is an American of the highest order and a public servant of great ability, integrity, and fidelity.

His life and illustrous career are replete with outstanding achievements and patriotic contributions. From famous Notre Dame, where he was an all-American football star, to the Halls of Congress, he has demonstrated those attributes of character, ability, and determination that mark him indelibly as a noble Christian gentleman and a leading American statesman.

JOE O'HARA is made of stern stuff. He cannot be swerved from his chosen course; he will never surrender his deep convictions; he always strives, and is willing to fight, for what he believes in conscience to be right and just and in the public interest.

An accomplished and penetrating legal mind, this great son of Notre Dame and the splendid State of Minnesota has admirably and effectively contributed time and time again to the deliberations and accomplishments of the Congress.

Ready of wit, precise, forceful, and apt of speech, strong and convincing in his argumentation, JOE O'HARA is an extremely valuable Member of the House, respected, admired, and loved by all his colleagues, and universally esteemed for his strict adherence to principle and conviction.

He is not committed to dogmatism, however, and his mind is broad, flexible, logical, and fair.

In his veins courses the warm, pulsating blood of the Celt, and his heart responds instantly and generously to the human and humane facets of any question or problem before him for decision.

Truly, he deeply believes in and practices in his daily life and tasks the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

The Congress cannot afford to lose men possessed of the strength, zeal, and Americanism of JOE O'HARA. His service here has been magnificent, and I deeply regret his voluntary departure from his high place in our ranks.

But he will long remain in our hearts, and his people and the Nation will long remember with grateful appreciation his unselfish contributions to the common good of the Nation.

To him and his family I tender hearty congratulations upon his outstanding Congressional service, and I wish for him and them in the years ahead good health, good fortune, and good blessings of peace and happiness in all their endeavors. May happy tidings always attend JOE O'HARA and his family.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I got to know and appreciate JOE O'HARA, the gentleman from Minnesota, through our mutual service on the District of Columbia Committee. Blunt and to the point, he went to the heart of any question under consideration, and he never tolerated specious argument or demagoguery. His heart is a heart of gold, big and sympathetic, and he has the capacity of making warm friends. The Congress needs men of his capabilities and unfortunately they do not appear often on the scene.

I wish him good health, prosperity, and happiness in the days to come, and I hope his friends may see something of him from time to time.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, along with my colleagues, I want to be on record as one of those who loved JOE O'HARA. No more solid, no more honest, no more devoted, no more pleasant man ever served in this Congress. Many things have been said about JOE O'HARA, who was a friend of all of us, and I just want

to add my best wishes for every happiness in the future for JOE and his lovely wife.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I join in this tribute to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, Hon. JOSEPH P. O'HARA, who is voluntarily retiring from Congress at the end of this session. I would like to associate myself with all of the fine things which have been said about him and to express, within the capacity of words to do so, the feelings of respect, admiration, and friendship which I hold for him.

During my service in Congress, I have served with him on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and in addition I have served with him on two subcommittees. I have come to know him intimately and well; and, the better I have come to know him, the more I have admired and respected him, because I learned of his devotion to duty and his dedication to public service.

His services as a Member of the House of Representatives will be missed, because he has rendered truly valuable service not only to the people of his District but to the people of our Nation as well. He is a man of great courage, of great ability, and has proven himself to be an honorable and able Member of Congress.

While we regret that he decided to leave Congress and reenter private life, we respect his decision. We wish for him many more years of good health and happiness, and we extend to him and to his family our very best wishes in the years which lie ahead.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, along with my colleagues, I want to participate in an expression of appreciation for my colleague, JOSEPH P. O'HARA.

When a man has served in nine consecutive Congresses, his contemporaries in both Houses have had ample opportunity to assess his true worth. If there is one man in this Chamber—or, for that matter, in that at the other end of the Capitol—of whom it is eminently safe to assert that he represents the very highest type of legislator, that man is JOSEPH PATRICK O'HARA. In the 18 years since he has lived and worked in our midst, he has been a lesson to us all in his selfless and conscientious devotion to duty and the discharge of the responsibilities of his high office. It gives me peculiar pride to offer him tribute here, for he was born in Tipton, Iowa, situated in the District I have the honor to represent. So that I have, as it were, a certain family pride in him, both as a man and as a legislator. The splendid record he leaves behind him here is, after all, the most eloquent testimony which could be adduced in praise of his long and brilliant public career.

It is no disparagement of his merits as a great public servant that his educational background so eminently fitted him to become a Member of this body. His legal education, which was pursued at the Inns of Court in London and at Notre Dame University in this country, constituted a magnificent preparation for a parliamentary career to which was added a long and arduous practical application in trial work. Admitted to practice in the Federal courts of Minnesota and North Dakota, he served as county attorney for McLeod County, Minn., from 1935–38, and was admitted to practice before the United States Supreme Court. He served for 27 months in World War I, including duty in the AEF. He was elected to the 77th Congress and has been with us ever since. He was described here the other day by his Minnesota colleague, Mr. JUDD, as "a man who is solid, strong, and steady in physical makeup. His mental, emotional, and moral makeup are of the same type—solid, steady, deliberate, and dependable."

Not only—

As Mr. JUDD rightly observed—

is this true of his work as a Congressman but of his character as a man and as a friend.

I think that observation by my friend from Minnesota is profoundly true, and I make haste to associate myself with it.

Long will Mr. O'HARA be remembered for his solid and constructive work in framing legislation and in arduous committee investigations. To cite a few examples, his labors in the fields of transportation, public health, and interstate and foreign commerce have long been preeminent and have brought him national and international fame. The District of Columbia has him to thank for much wise and constructive legislation. He is the author of the District Corporation Code and measures pertaining to District laws.

What a pity such a man should feel it necessary to lay down the burdens of a public career. Speaking of laws, one is tempted to add that there should be a law against that. We may take some comfort, however, albeit vicarious, in that his own State and community can henceforth enjoy the benefit of his sage and varied experience as a lawyer and a national legislator. It will be a rich field to reap from.

May many long and sunny years stretch before our old and esteemed friend and colleague as he retires from the ardors of public service in the full and proud consciousness of work well and truly performed.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in paying respect to the Honorable JOSEPH P. O'HARA, of Minnesota, who is voluntarily retiring from this great legislative Hall.

JOE, as he is affectionately known, and I have been personal friends for many years. He has a great record as a gentleman and a public official. His family has every right to be proud of his accomplishments. JOE has been most sincere in his endeavor to be of service, not only to his constituency but to his country as well.

So, JOE O'HARA, to you and yours, go my best wishes and may you have many years to enjoy the privileges which should be yours.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to the Honorable JOSEPH P. O'HARA, of Minnesota, who has chosen to retire voluntarily from the House of Representatives and return to the private practice of law. I am sure I express the sentiments of his colleagues, both Republican and Democratic, when I say that he will be greatly missed.

Congressman O'HARA's service has been outstanding, especially in the field of interstate and foreign commerce. He has served long and arduously as a member of the important Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and he will be hard to replace.

Since coming to Washington as a Member of the 77th Congress, Congressman O'HARA's record of achievements has overwhelmingly inspired the voters of his District to return him to each succeeding Congress. His record is an enviable one, and he will be missed when the Congress convenes in January of 1959.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, at this stage it is very hard to say anything that has not already been said. But, as an honorary member of the Order of the North Star, I have a great feeling of kinship for Minnesotans and certainly for my friend, JOE O'HARA. I have served with him on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now for 8 years, and I have never found JOE O'HARA to be anything but upright and honest and determined in his position. I have never found him to be unfair. I think that when he leaves this Congress Minnesota will sustain a great loss; not only will Minnesota sustain a great loss, but the Nation as well. I wish for him and his lovely wife and many grandchildren many, many years of happiness and joy.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, as a Representative from the neighboring State of Wisconsin, we in the Midwest have many meetings together. As a new Member of Congress, the Member that impressed me the most in our first Midwest delegation meeting was JOE O'HARA and the statement he made at that meeting. His advice to me as a young Member of the Congress 6 years ago was indeed most helpful. He is a Congressman with good judgment, with great courage, and with the highest integrity. JOE O'HARA is a real friend and a true gentleman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORANO].

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, since I have become a Member of Congress I have known JOE O'HARA. I have great respect and admiration and love for him. The high praise that has been heaped upon him by his colleagues here, not only from the State of Minnesota but other Members of the House, is fully merited, fully deserved. In addition to knowing JOE O'HARA as a legislator I have come to know the O'Haras socially. His lovely wife and Mrs. Morano have become fast friends. So we both are going to miss them. But as a Member of Congress from the great and beautiful State of Connecticut, I hereby extend an invitation to Mrs. O'Hara and JOE to come to Connecticut and spend

some time with us. Mrs. Morano joins me in this invitation.

In the meantime, our prayers go with them for good health and happiness and a well-deserved retirement in Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, for quite a few years now there have been two O'Haras in the House of Representatives, and I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I owe a very deep debt to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA]. When I came to the Congress mine was an easy path because JOE O'HARA in his service here had made the name "O'HARA" an honored one. If I were in any difficulty I had only to remark that I was Congressman O'HARA and every door was opened to me because they thought there was only one Congressman O'HARA and that it must have been the gentleman from Minnesota.

He has been so close to me, he has been so dear to me. Having the same name, some of his telephone messages would come to me. I remember once they were waiting for me at the White House. It was a very important conference and I said, "I guess you want JOE O'HARA," and they said, "Of course, we do."

So I have sort of lived in the reflection of the reputation of JOE O'HARA, and I have come to love him in a very, very large measure.

I say to JOE that we had a common ancestor, that old Milesian king back in Ireland, thousands and thousands of years ago. And I say further to you, you are the noblest and finest of his descendants.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. And one further comment; these two gentlemen named O'HARA own the two strongest, the two most stentorian voices in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I yield at this time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK].

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to become a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce 6 years ago. I have greatly enjoyed that service and have been very grateful for the opportunity to serve on that committee.

We are particularly unfortunate this year in that three of our very valuable members on our side of the committee are retiring voluntarily, Mr. WOLVERTON, Mr. O'HARA, and Mr. HESELTON.

I have come to know JOE O'HARA and to respect him greatly, because he has always been ready to give me help, advice, and information, which I have often needed. JOE O'HARA is completely objective in his thinking. He never looks at issues from a selfish viewpoint. He retains his objectivity to a most unusual degree. I shall miss JOE O'HARA. We had some fun together as fellow patients at the Bethesda hospital for a little while. JOE had a major operation, and mine was not so serious.

We have enjoyed our work together, and I wish him and Mrs. O'Hara every good thing in the years ahead.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I could not sit here at a time when the Members of Congress were trying to express their appreciation of Mr. O'HARA without adding a word about the personal sadness I shall feel when the roll is called next year. Mr. O'HARA is one of those who, when I first came here, met with me in the office of Lawrence Smith together with a goodly group of those who knew what they stood for and who never failed to say so.

When I heard hat he would no longer be back, I thought to myself that when measures would come up which to our minds were basically unsound, such as surely too large an appropriation, or measures going in directions for which this country has not seemed to Mr. O'HARA historically to stand, at such times I would miss that strong, firm, quiet "No." It never failed to come from the gentleman from Minnesota.

I hope that in that respect at least his District will have the courage and the good judgment to send someone who will share his courage and his convictions.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY].

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to my fellow Minnesotan, JOE O'HARA.

I have often disagreed with the gentleman's position on political issues, but never questioned his integrity or courage, nor doubted that he had given careful and thorough study to the questions in dispute. JOE O'HARA was consistent. He disagreed with Democrats, he disagreed with Republicans.

Abraham Lincoln's statement that a political party or a politician who advocates one year what he opposed the year before, or who opposes one year what he advocated the year before cannot command respect, has no application to JOE O'HARA. Unless there was significant change in forces and factors JOE O'HARA was consistent. He stood firm.

My best wishes go to him and to his wife and family for many happy years together.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a special personal reason for wanting to join in this tribute to JOSEPH O'HARA. Very early in the 4-year period I was privileged to be associated with my distinguished predecessor, Congressman Paul Shafer, I first became acquainted with Mr. O'HARA. He was 1 of 3 or 4 Members of the House that I met at that early time. One of them, of course, was the incomparable Dewey Short, one was the late Congressman Frank Fellows, and another was our friend from the other side of the aisle, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

From the outset of my acquaintance with Mr. O'HARA I regarded him as exemplifying the finest qualities of a Member of Congress and of a devoted public servant. The impression that I formed of him before my own service in Congress began has been confirmed many times over in the 4 years I have been privileged to serve in this House. He combines the qualities of great ability, of courage, of independence, and a kindliness and respect for his colleagues, that are most admirable.

If I may resort again to a phrase that I used in the course of discussion of a controversial issue yesterday, I do congratulate JOE O'HARA on the fact that, as Benjamin Franklin said, having served so long and ably in the ranks of the servants he has now elected to restore himself to the ranks of the rulers. I wish to Mr. O'HARA and Mrs. O'Hara every good thing in life.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to join with all these fine colleagues of our good friend, Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota, in paying tribute to the man, and certainly well deserved tributes. As all of you know, it is very dangerous for a man in this Congress to undertake to speak for the entire delegation of his State without first clearing it with every Member, and certainly that would be true of Texas. But, when you say nice things about a fellow like JOE O'HARA, I have no qualms or quibbleations about speaking for the entire delegation of Texas in paying tribute to a great man and a great American and in saying ditto to the many nice things that have been said about this great fellow. I realize they are only a few of the things that ought to be said about him and his great contribution to our country and to our way of life.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to one of my best friends, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota. Like my colleagues, I deeply regret his leaving the Congress because certainly it will be a loss to the House of Representatives and to the District which he has represented so well for so many years. It has been my privilege to serve with him on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for the last 12 years. During that time his kindly and friendly advice and his words of wisdom have always been helpful to me. I have not always agreed with him, but in retrospect I am sure he has been right more often than I. To say that JOE has the courage of his convictions is a gross understatement. Time after time on issues before our committee he has stood alone. He would do so on the House floor if the question involved was basic and fundamental from his point of view. The course of least resistance is to be with the majority. That philosophy never appealed to JOE O'HARA. I think the most pleasurable moments of his entire Congressional career were the times that he stood with the minority.

If I were to sum up his sterling qualities in one short sentence I would do it in this way. "Beneath a gruff exterior lies one of the biggest hearts and the most genial and kindly personality ever given to any man."

I want to join with my colleagues in wishing him the best of luck and good health in the years ahead and the same to his sweet, gracious, and charming wife.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately in the use of the English language after you have used a superlative, you cannot go any higher. But in speaking about JOE, you can use all of the superlatives without your tongue in cheek.

We shall miss him on the committee; I shall personally miss his advice, his counsel, his wisdom in the deliberations of our committee, and in addition his genial spirit in a social way.

Although I am not sure of it, I feel rather confident that JOE will be around these parts for probably some time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, one of the incalculable and immeasurable compensations that accrued to me as a result of my service in this House is the privilege of working with and being a friend to JOE O'HARA.

I am sure every Member of this body who knows JOE will agree with me when I say that he is the embodiment of all the qualities of statesmanship.

It has been my privilege to work rather closely with Mr. O'HARA as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and more recently and perhaps more closely in recent months as a member of the much publicized Committee on Legislative Oversight. Not once in the many years I have worked with Mr. O'HARA have I seen him raise a party or a partisan question. He has a record of diligence, energy, and ability, and he is a very valued member of those committees.

JOE O'HARA's departure from this body will create a void that will never be quite filled. We shall always remember him for his courage, his ability, and his integrity, and a great devotion to the ideals of the American system of government.

I hope JOE will return to visit us often, and that my office, so long as I am in Congress, will always be on his list to visit.

We wish JOE O'HARA and his family the very best of health and happiness for many years to come.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I shall not try to add to the list of good qualities which have been testified to here this afternoon, but I do want to carry my testimonial some years back of the dates that have been mentioned.

After World War I, three of us youngsters started a law office in Minneapolis. Two or 3 years later JOE O'HARA, just out of law school, came to our office and became the first clerk that we had. Of course he had no compensation at that time, but we quickly learned the qualities of JOE O'HARA.

It gave me a good deal of pleasure after election to this body in 1952, to reverse that field, and call on JOE, I being the freshman and he having some experience behind him, for advice and counsel in this field which was new to me.

I know that he is going to be successful in whatever he does. I want to add my congratulations and best wishes to him and to his family.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, as one of the comparatively new Members of this body it gives me a mixed feeling in joining in this expression of regret that JOE O'HARA has decided to retire.

No Member of this body was a greater help to me when I first came here. JOE's kindness and thoughtfulness are such that endear him to everyone with whom he comes in contact. Of course, I suppose I have a special soft spot for the Irish, having married one.

I understand JOE is contemplating remaining in this area and becoming a member of the local bar association, of which I have the honor to be a member.

If JOE decides to do that and carries through that idea, may I be the first member of the bar to welcome him and say that Minnesota's loss will be the Nation's Capital's gain.

So I pay this tribute to JOE with mixed feeling, and may I say to him and to his lovely wife, may the best of God's blessings be with you in the years to come.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, there is always a certain sadness when any class begins to break up, whether it be college, high school or in this honorable body. I have that feeling today when JOE O'HARA is retiring.

We came to Congress together as members of the 77th class. With the retirement of JOE O'HARA and BILL HILL at the end of this session, that class will be badly broken up.

I feel his leaving us very keenly. I well recall my first day as a Member of this body. I attended a reception given by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, Mrs. ROGERS. There I met JOE O'HARA for the first time. I have loved him ever since. I found him to be friendly and kindly that evening, and since that time I have found that he is a man of ability as well as at all times a kindly, friendly, and generous individual.

During the 18 years he has gained in stature like the pines of the State of Minnesota, and has always been as sturdy.

We will miss him very much as he leaves us. JOE, may you have the best of everything in your retirement, and then some.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has mentioned something unusual about our colleague. That is Mr. O'HARA's determination and his courageous stand on many issues. I want to say that we people of Danish ancestry are supposed to be stubborn, but I will have to yield in this instance to my good friend, JOE O'HARA.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, like the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, who just spoke, I was also a member of the 77th class. I came to the House with JOE O'HARA, and we took our oaths of office together on January 3, 1941. I liked Joe the first time I saw him. Over the years I have formed a great respect and admiration for his integrity and ability. JOE is a delightful person to know, and our friendship has meant a great deal to me.

One of my first recollections of JOE O'HARA was a reception he and our former colleague, Dick Gale, also from Minnesota, gave in JOE's office for the Members of the 77th Congress. JOE was anxious to establish closer bonds of fellowship among our group. His affable personality enables him to make friends and keep them.

I am sorry to see JOE leave Congress. Certainly we need men like him in public life today. JOE is independent and fearless, and never hesitates to do what he thinks is right, and for the best interests of the country. JOE is going to be missed by his many friends, and we wish him well in whatever he does.

I had the great pleasure of serving on the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee with JOE. I know of his vast knowledge of the matters coming before that important committee, and the respect which he commands from every witness who appears before the committee.

I consider JOE O'HARA one of the most able Members of this House.

When JOE came to the Congress he was first assigned to the House Judiciary Committee. His outstanding reputation as a leader of the bar was immediately recognized. It is my opinion that JOE is one of the most able lawyers of the country, and I am sure there will be a great demand for his services if he should return to the practice of law.

JOE has added further luster to his brilliant career by his service in this body. I personally feel that his voluntary retirement is an irreparable loss, not alone to his District and to the State of Minnesota, but to the entire Nation.

I want to wish JOE O'HARA much happiness, good health and continued success for many years to come.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, to conclude this tribute to my

colleague from Minnesota, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] at this time.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, as we have listened this afternoon to the tributes that the colleagues of Congressman JOE O'HARA paid him, we realize the respect that his colleagues have for him, the great work that he has done, and the great service he has rendered to the people of the Second District of Minnesota. This great respect that his colleagues have for him is felt very deeply by the people of the Second District of Minnesota. These people love and admire Congressman O'HARA.

They admired him because he has always spoken out forthrightly for what he believes. He has shown leadership, and he has told them unequivocally for what he stood. He led the way, and usually their opinions coincided with his. They listened to him because they knew he had given the matter great thought and would give an opinion based on sound reason. But, the main reason they loved and respected him so much is this: He loved the people himself. I have not known Congressman O'HARA very long, but I do know this about him, that when he is back in his District, he knows these people, knows them by name, and have sincere consideration for their well-being. He was able to talk to them and talk about exactly what affected them, and they knew that he had been thinking of them and serving them well here in the Congress. Whether of his political philosophy or of the opposite political philosophy, they still loved and respected him. This feeling spread out from his District into my District. When I was running for election this last winter, many times the question would come up "Well, what would you do on this issue" and "What would you do on that issue" and "What would be your stand on this," and many people who knew him in the First District said, "Well, when you get down there to Washington, just contact JOE O'HARA and get his advice on that." And, it finally got to be that when people asked me, I said, "Well, I will contact JOE O'HARA when I get down there and find out what it is all about."

I think another reason why the people of the first District learned to love and respect Congressman O'HARA, just like they do in the Second District, is because my predecessor, Congressman Andresen, was a close and dear friend of Congressman O'HARA. During the many years they served together here in the Congress, they shared their experiences and opinions and came many times to the common decision of what was the best for the country.

And, as we look at the work he has done and the stand he has taken, we can just listen to him when he answered the rollcall here, and know that he is a man of conviction. You can tell by the sound of his "aye" or his "no" that here is a man who knows what he is doing and votes with forthright conviction.

So, as we bid Congressman JOSEPH P. O'HARA farewell, as he retires from Congress, we hope he will come back and visit us often, and give us advice on tough questions that he has studied for years. This is a Congressman who will truly be missed next year.

With that, the people of the First District and myself pay tribute to Congressman O'HARA, and we only hope that the Congress can carry on as he has in the past, believing in the well being of the people and in as sound a philosophy as he does for what is the best thing for the country.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS BY COMMITTEES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the chairmen of all committees of the House may at any time between now and the last issue of the RECORD extend their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD explaining the activities of their respective committees during the 85th Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR MAJORITY LEADER TO EXTEND HIS REMARKS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, Mr. MCCORMACK, that he may extend his remarks at any time until the last issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of this session of the Congress on the activities and the accomplishments of the 85th Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

S. 3754—GRAZING BILL

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I had previously asked that S. 3754 be passed over. The reason for my request was that the bill had a provision in subsection 1 (g) compensating owners of grazing permits on public land for the termination of their permits.

The law has consistently been that grazing permits are the barest kind of licenses and constitute no possessory interest in the Federal domain whatsoever. I have withdrawn my objections to this bill upon the express acknowledgment of proponents of the bill that subsection 1 (g) of S. 3754, now before us, does not constitute a recognition that grazing permits on public land are a possessory interest but rather are mere licenses terminable at the will of the Government. Because of the special circumstances involved in S. 3754 I feel it is equitable that provision should be made for a small compensation to holders of these grazing permits in the McCracken Mesa area.

Grazing upon public lands is a privilege given to individuals or groups through a permit, license, or lease. Grazing, as a privilege, is distinguished from a right, title, interest, or estate.

Grazing permittees, licensees, or lessees should recognize that any investments they make in the manner of improvements on public lands is without thought of compensation should the privilege be terminated.

While withdrawing opposition to this measure as worded, due to unusual and peculiar circumstances involved in the proposed land transfer and Indian claims therein, conservationists hold to the principle that grazing is a privilege rather than a right and trust nothing in subsection (g) of S. 3754 can be construed as meaning otherwise.

My views are prompted by a letter which I received from the United States Department of Interior over the signature of Mr. Hatfield Chilson, Under Secretary of the Interior, setting forth substantially the same view and pointing out that S. 3754 does not constitute a general policy of compensating grazers on public land devoted to use not consistent with the previous grazing activity. I ask unanimous consent that the letter referred to be incorporated into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

There being no objection the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., August 21, 1958.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: You have requested our comments regarding a question raised with respect to subsection 1 (g) of S. 3754, a Senate amendment to the bill as introduced which relates to compensation to the holders of grazing permits whose activities are displaced by the transfer to the Navaho Tribe of Indians of the lands involved. The question raised, we are advised, is whether the Department regards subsection 1 (g) as comprehending a general policy of compensating grazers when public land is devoted to another use not consistent with grazing activity.

As you are aware, the United States is seeking to acquire title to lands of the Navaho Indians that will be inundated when waters are impounded behind the Glen Canyon Dam, now under construction. The Indian lands involved comprise the dam site and a substantial portion of the reservoir area of the Glen Canyon development. S. 3754 would provide for exchange of the Navaho Indian lands for other lands in the McCracken Mesa area which are now utilized for grazing purposes.

Ordinarily, the Government would not acquire dam site and reservoir lands by an exchange process. It would acquire those lands directly from the owner by a negotiated sale or by condemnation proceedings, or, if the lands to be inundated are public lands it would, under the authority of the Federal reclamation laws, withdraw the lands from entry and thus—as is provided under the Taylor Grazing Act—terminate any outstanding grazing permits. The process of acquiring reservoir lands in the instant case by exchange is therefore an unusual one and comes about because of the Indian ownership of the lands required for the Glen Canyon project.

The Department wishes to make it entirely clear that, should the Congress adopt the language contained in subsection 1 (g) of S. 3754, now pending in the House, such action would be regarded as dealing only with the special circumstances existing in the case at hand, and that it does not regard the provision as establishing a general policy or precedent. In this connection, it should be noted that in our report on S. 3754 to the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, we stated:

"On the other hand, while the displacement is, relatively speaking, small, nevertheless, the Congress may wish to consider the possibility of extending to the stockmen directly affected the principle of compensation now embodied in the provisions of title 43, United States Code, section 315q. While, as is well known, a grazing permit confers no right, title, interest, or estate in the public lands (43 U. S. C., sec. 315b), special equities justifying compensation might be thought to exist where, as here, the parties affected had no reason to anticipate they were establishing their activities in an area that would be affected by a reservoir project. Such action would place the burden of cost upon the reservoir project which will benefit from the exchange rather than upon the individuals now operating in the McCracken Mesa area."

As we have noted above, by the exchange process proposed in S. 3754, the McCracken Mesa lands, which are not physically affected by the Glen Canyon project would in effect be devoted to reservoir purposes, a possibility which no user of the mesa area could have anticipated when establishing his use. This peculiar situation was considered as distinguishing the instant case from the usual circumstances in which public lands devoted to grazing purposes are—under the express terms of the Taylor Grazing Act—made subject to reclassification and devotion to any higher use for which those lands may be suited.

For the foregoing reasons, the Department of the Interior would regard adoption by the Congress of subsection 1 (g) as reflecting only the fact that the Congress in this instance considers special equities to exist by reason of the lack of physical relationship of the McCracken Mesa area to the Glen Canyon Reservoir. Such action would, in our view, be consistent with the principle of compensation embodied in the act of July 9, 1942 (56 Stat. 654; 43 U. S. C., sec 315q) referred to in the quoted paragraph above.

Sincerely,

HATFIELD CHILSON,
Under Secretary of the Interior.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN VIRGINIA

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Governor of Virginia, the Honorable J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., in his usual courageous manner, declared again the policy of Virginia to resist usurpation of authority and to operate public schools of Virginia in accordance with the laws and constitution of Virginia.

The Governor declared in a forthright manner that there would be no integration in Virginia's schools nor will Virginians tolerate the patrolling of the schools of Virginia by Federal paratroopers with fixed bayonets. I stand foursquare with the Governor and commend him for his determination to preserve the rights and privileges of our people and to resist with all the power at his command the dictatorial, arbitrary, unconstitutional attempt by the Chief Executive and the Supreme Court to wipe out the States and to take over the operation of the schools.

We in Virginia will not sit idly by and voluntarily give up our constitutional rights. We are going to see this thing through. We are going to operate our schools in the future as we have in the past.

I notice from the press that in one of the counties that is now under the gun they have formed a committee with the so-called purpose of keeping the public schools open. The officials of that organization are apparently trying to get the Governor and the local school board to keep the schools open regardless of what might happen about integration. Whether intentional or otherwise, they are contacting and conferring with the wrong people. The Governor is not going to close the schools. The school board is not going to close the schools. If the schools are closed, they will be closed by the NAACP and the Federal courts. If this so-called keep-the-schools-open organization really wanted to keep the schools open they would be consulting with and talking to the NAACP and the Negro parents who apparently are intent upon having the schools integrated. I say their efforts are directed in the wrong direction and if they really want to keep the schools open they should about-face and pursue and put their efforts in the right channel.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include the news release dealing with the Honorable J. Lindsay Almond's press conference in Richmond on yesterday, Thursday, August 21, 1958.

NO ENFORCED INTEGRATION IN VIRGINIA, ALMOND SAYS

Governor Almond yesterday declared bluntly "there will be no enforced integration" in Virginia public schools.

The Governor's statement at his regular press conference was made as Virginia faces what could be a critical showdown on its policy of "massive resistance" to integrated schools.

Public-school systems in Norfolk, Arlington, and Charlottesville have been ordered by Federal courts to desegregate next month.

Speaking in sharply precise terms, Almond said he was "convinced that mixing races in the public schools will destroy the process of education."

ASKS PUBLIC SUPPORT

He called on the public to support him and the General Assembly in a policy of no integration in the public schools.

Almond's remarks were prompted by a news-conference question concerning President Eisenhower's statement Wednesday that it was the solemn duty of all Americans to comply with the decisions of the Supreme Court.

The Governor spoke in serious and measured tones almost without pause for several minutes.

"I've read the account of the President's statement," he said, "and saw him on television. The matter is exactly where it was before it got started.

"It is a State matter * * * it is our responsibility to work it out to the best of our ability.

"I am convinced that the mixing of races in the public schools will destroy the process of education—we've already seen that in other areas."

ACUTE SITUATION

The situation in Virginia, the Governor said, is even more acute than in many areas, and "our concern is the preservation of education so that all the children of Virginia will have the best educational facilities and opportunities the State can afford.

"This cannot be done through the mixing of the races in the schools, and there will be no enforced integration in Virginia," the Governor said.

Obviously, referring to the use of Federal troops to enforce Federal court integration orders at Little Rock, Ark., and President Eisenhower's statement implying that troops may be used again, Almond said that if troops are sent into Virginia they will patrol empty schoolhouses.

GOVERNMENT BY CONSTITUTION

The State's massive resistance laws automatically close schools where pupils of more than one race are enrolled. At another point in the statement Almond said:

"The problem can't be solved in an atmosphere of troop patrols and pressure under this drive * * * this urge for forcing down the throats of the people what they can not and will not accept because they feel that it is unconstitutional."

The Governor said, "The Court's usurpation of the functions of the Constitution has caused people to realize they themselves must insist on Government as ordained by the Constitution, and not by what some Swedish sociologist has written * * * who knew nothing of our customs, traditions and way of life, and who openly expressed his contempt for the Constitution of the United States."

His reference apparently was to a study of the Negro in America entitled "An American Dilemma," by Gunnar Myrdal. The study was cited in the Supreme Court's desegregation decree.

Virginia's position, Almond said, was not defiance of the Federal courts, but dedication to the Constitution.

"I have no spirit of defiance," he said, "but the obligation to uphold the United States Constitution is of just as much concern to the governor of a sovereign State as it is to the President.

"It is my deep conviction," the Governor said, "that the Supreme Court's desegregation decision is in violation of the Constitution * * * my obligation is just as strong as it ever was. My obligation to uphold law and order is a matter on my conscience, a matter that I will diligently observe."

NO MEETING PLANNED

In response to another question concerning suggestions that he meet with President Eisenhower to discuss the State's integration problems, Almond indicated he would not welcome such a meeting.

"I do not invite the suggestion and no one has made such a suggestion that I recall," he said.

"This is a State matter as far as I'm concerned * * * a matter for me to work out as best I can under laws passed by the General Assembly * * * I know of no agency that can change those laws with the exception of the General Assembly in response to the will of the people of Virginia.

"I call on the people of Virginia to stand with the Governor of Virginia and with the General Assembly to preserve (Virginia's) right to function as a sovereign State. It is my conviction that is the only course for Virginia to pursue," he said.

"The State of Virginia and the localities of Virginia cannot operate mixed schools and will not operate mixed schools."

Almond stressed that he intended no disrespect to President Eisenhower or to the

Federal courts, but there was no other course for Virginia to follow.

"We have our problem * * * a problem which entails sacrifice," he said. "It's just a question of whether the people are willing to stand up to it."

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD'S COMMENTS ON THE PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT ON CESSATION OF THE NUCLEAR BOMB TESTING

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased with the President's statement today in regard to the conclusion of the Geneva experts who have declared that it is scientifically and technically possible to detect nuclear weapons tests providing the Nations involved in testing are willing to cooperate in the establishment of properly manned and equipped detection stations placed on all the major land masses of the world.

I further approve of the President's statement that the United States is prepared to withhold further testing, on its part, of atomic and hydrogen weapons for a period of 1 year from the beginning of negotiations, unless testing is resumed by the Soviet Union.

The agreement is contingent upon two major factors:

First. The system of detection stations is installed and works effectively; and

Second. Satisfactory progress is being made in reaching agreement on implementing major and substantial arms control measures such as the United States has long sought.

The further factor, of secondary importance, is the requirement that the agreement would also deal with the problems of detonating—for peaceful purposes as distinct from weapons tests detonations. The President states that we will be ready to start negotiations by October 31 of this year. I wish to consider these 2 major factors and 1 minor factor separately.

In reference to the first factor, I believe that if the nuclear nations cooperate in good faith, we could install most of the stations which it is necessary to install for detection purposes, within 1 to 2 years. This could only be done, however, by a completely coordinated and cooperative effort of the nuclear nations working on the basis of utmost urgency. It would contemplate, in my opinion, a minimum of 200 detection stations, with a possible maximum of 600 stations. The difference in numbers would depend upon the floor of detection as represented by the size of the weapons detonated. In other words, the smaller the weapon to be detected, the more stations we would need with shorter distances between stations.

Any lack of good faith, any type of political obstruction, any period of undue delay in negotiation as to terms and conditions of implementation, or any failure to realize the urgency of starting immediate location and construction of detection stations could, in my opinion, jeopardize the consummation of an agreement and would destroy the hopes of humanity for the establishment of a realistic program of test cessation.

Now I wish to direct my remarks toward the second factor. I am gravely troubled by the inclusion of the principle stated in the second factor. In the first place, the statement is unclear and is susceptible of different interpretations. If the principle stated in the first factor is made contingent upon the satisfaction of the all-embracive principle referred to in first factor, then I have little hope for the completion of a nuclear testing cessation agreement.

While the principle stated in the second factor is important and represents the reaching of an agreement on complete disarmament measures for both nuclear and conventional weapons of war, we know how difficult the achievement of this goal may be. It is a goal which certainly should be pursued and negotiations should run concurrently with the negotiations for nuclear bomb test cessation. But, the principle outlined in the first factor should not be jeopardized in the future, as it has been in the past, by the inclusion of what seems to be, at this time at least, an unobtainable goal.

The problem of nuclear detonation for peaceful purposes, as distinct from weapons tests, is a relatively simple problem to solve. The utilization of nuclear material to create harbors, or to blast passageways through the earth and mountains, could be accomplished by full and honest international participation and observation by accredited scientists and engineers from both the Communist and the Free World. If such frank and honest cooperation and participation was carried out, no accusation of selfish gain to either side could be made. Unless such an honest arrangement is made, either side could charge the other side with cheating and claim that the tests were made for testing weapon principles and not for peaceful purposes.

It is only natural that the U. S. S. R. and the United States, with its ally, Great Britain, will be approaching these negotiations with suspicion of each side's motives. Any attempt—on the part of either side—to obtain propaganda advantage or clandestine advancement in nuclear weapon technology will doom the negotiations to failure.

Any attempt to delay unduly the negotiation process will be dangerous for time is the essence of either a moratorium or a negotiating period. Extensive delay in the negotiation process, or in starting the construction of scientific detection and inspection stations with a complement of scientific and engineering personnel satisfactory to both sides will doom the whole program to failure.

Both sides have scientists and engineers that are highly qualified in the field the Geneva experts studied. Neither side can outsmart the other. The first retreat from honest and urgent negotiations and action will, in itself, bring the program of weapon test cessation to an immediate stop.

There is no problem facing mankind today so important as the problem of survival in this age of nuclear weapons. There is no mission more important for man to perform. There is no challenge greater to the spirit and the brain of man than the challenge to insure the lives of the world's people. It is to be hoped that in this hour, when statesmanship is so grievously needed, that men will rise in the U. S. S. R., the United States, and Great Britain, who can solve the problem, who can perform the mission and who can meet this great challenge which faces humanity, if it is to survive.

TRAGIC DULLES POLICY NULLIFIES PROGRESS IN NUCLEAR WEAPONS TEST CESSATION

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, today, August 22, 1958, the President issued an important statement regarding the willingness of our Nation to start negotiations on October 31, 1958, with Soviet and British representatives to obtain a cessation of nuclear weapons tests.

The President makes, in general, what appears to be a frank and open statement, looking toward an international agreement. A close study, however, of his statement raises some doubts as to the clearness of its meaning. I refer specifically to (b). Parenthesis b places as a condition of the annual determination to suspend the testing of nuclear weapons, what has been heretofore called the one package disarmament requirement. Before nuclear testing can be suspended satisfactory progress is being made in reaching agreement on and implementing major and substantial arms control measures such as the United States has long sought. If this does not include the whole field of conventional arms, men, and materiel, as well as the tie-in of continued plutonium and uranium 235 production, then I do not understand the language. If it does include this wide field of disarmament controversy, then it foredooms to failure any chance of taking the first step outlined in parenthesis a.

I regret that I must state that the inclusion of the "one package" requirement as a contingency for nuclear weapon test cessation on a step-by-step basis casts a reflection on the sincerity of the President's statement. It seems to be a tragic continuation of the futile and abortive Dulles philosophy which has failed to establish, in world opinion, our sincerity in the search for world peace.

It is this fatal lack of vision, this holding back, this being dragged into the future which is killing our influence throughout the world.

When, in the name of God and the preservation of humanity from nuclear suicide, will we ever learn to lead instead of reluctantly follow world opinion?

When will we punch instead of timidly counterpunch?

When will we be wise enough to propose a wise and realistic program and follow through with wide open eyes which see and meet each danger as we advance into the future step by step?

I do not ask nor advocate naive trust of Soviet promises. I do not advocate any reliance on promises or trust of written agreements. I advocate agreements which proceed step by step, resting on proven, tested guaranties of compliance.

If we proceed in this manner there is no risk to us. Failure of compliance by any party to the agreement would constitute an immediate notice of abrogation of the agreement. Such a failure in compliance would demonstrate to the world the sincerity or duplicity of the offending party.

Just as long as we fail to lead with bravery and honesty in the field of international policy, just that long will we fail to meet the challenge of Soviet intransigence and duplicity. Just that long will we continue to lose our influence in the United Nations.

Two years ago, on October 29, 1956, Adlai Stevenson proposed to stop the explosion of big hydrogen bombs. He excluded small weapons. He made his proposal contingent upon Soviet concurrent cessation and the installation of scientific detection stations. The President and the Vice President took to the airwaves and TV broadcasts and berated Mr. Stevenson in violent language. They cast aspersions on his intelligence and his patriotism.

But, 2 years later they have caught up with the Stevenson vision. They now reluctantly are being forced by world opinion to accept the principle of nuclear weapon test cessation.

The position which Adlai Stevenson took on the dangers of radio active fallout from weapon testing has now been sustained by the world's scientists. Reports from the House and Senate Special Committee on Radioactive Fallout—Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—reports from the National Academy of Science, reports from the International Commission on Radiological Protection and reports of the British Academy of Science all sustain his fears and prophecies and the world opinion now demands that the United States retreat from the rigid position of Adm. Lewis Strauss, Dr. Edward Teller, President Eisenhower, Secretary of State Dulles, and Vice President Richard Nixon.

Mr. Speaker, in order that the reader may know today the text of Adlai Stevenson's speech of October 29, 1956, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed as an appendix to my remarks.

H-BOMB MEMORANDUM

(By Adlai E. Stevenson)

The President issued several memorandums in support of his statement calling for the continuance of exploding large H-bombs.

I will take up the major points included in these memorandums in some detail.

The administration has attached to the President's statement a chronology of disarmament negotiations since the Second World War. In his statement, the President refers to the fact that in the past 2 years alone, the Soviet Union has rejected no less than 14 American proposals on disarmament.

The reason that the administration's efforts to obtain general disarmament have all foundered has been the Soviet rejection of a system of adequate inspection. Yet, as this record shows, the administration has repeatedly refused the opportunity to take a concrete step toward disarmament in the one area where inspection is automatic—the explosion of large nuclear weapons.

Moreover, this chronology omits the fact that on September 6, 1955, the President's Special Assistant for Disarmament informed the United Nations Disarmament Subcommittee that the United States would offer no alternative arms-control program other than the so-called open-skies formula—a plan originally proposed by the Truman administration. Thus no progress whatever has been made toward disarmament by the Eisenhower administration. Indeed, the President reported to Congress on July 15, 1955, that no one has been able to devise a better plan than the Baruch plan of 1946.

We are thus stalled on dead center by the rigidity of the Eisenhower administration's approach to the problem of disarmament.

Nevertheless, the President remains, as he says, "hopeful that * * * the reality of significant disarmament will come to pass." That hope is, of course, shared by all Americans.

But no one who knows the facts is very hopeful that the Soviet Union will agree to a system of adequate on-the-spot inspection within the foreseeable future. For any system of on-the-spot inspection would require a repudiation of that secrecy which is indispensable to the Communist tyranny that governs the Soviet Union.

The President, it appears, offers no solution to the disarmament stalemate. For so long as this stalemate persists, what can we expect of the future?

With no restrictions upon the testing of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons, the atomic monopoly is now possessed by three nations—the United States, the Soviet Union, and Great Britain.

Mr. Stassen, President Eisenhower's disarmament advisor, said 5 months ago that within a year the secret of making the hydrogen bomb would spread all around the world.

Once this occurs, once other industrialized nations—such as France, Japan, Argentina, Czechoslovakia, Eastern Germany, India, or even Communist China—begin to make and explode nuclear and thermonuclear bombs, the threat to peace will be immensely multiplied. So long as the H-bomb remains a monopoly of the three nations which now possess it, a continued military standoff may insure a long period in which such bombs are not used as instruments of war. But once the possession of these bombs spreads to other countries, which is unlikely for technical reasons if testing is prohibited, the danger of their aggressive utilization will have increased many fold. When that day comes, an irresponsible dictator, a maniac, another Hitler, might well detonate the world.

Once the bomb is possessed by countries in addition to the present three, the problem of its control will have become infinitely more difficult. Few nations will willingly remain have-not atomic nations when their neighbors possess the means to destroy them. And once the bomb is in the possession of a number of nations all wantonly shooting poison into the atmosphere, the danger of impairing or destroying human life through bomb explosions is enormously increased.

With a sense of urgency impelled by these considerations, I proposed a halt to the tests of large hydrogen weapons. Under that proposal, the stopping of these tests would have the following results:

1. It would greatly delay if not render it impossible for any nation not now producing bombs to make such bombs. This point the President's statement wholly ignores.

2. It would end or greatly diminish the rate of cumulative pollution of the atmosphere that is a real and present danger to the health of men, women and children now living—as well as to future generations.

3. It would break the disarmament stalemate that now exists. It would be a concrete step toward ending the arms race in the one area where headway can be made because we can detect violations at once.

The administration's statement either ignores or distorts these propositions.

It completely ignores the practical certainty that if testing is not stopped the atomic "have not" nations will possess the bomb within a short time. It denies categorically that H-bomb testing presents perils to the health of humanity.

It implies that for the United States to enter into an agreement for the discontinuance of H-bomb tests would jeopardize our superiority in these weapons and would endanger our national security.

To support its position, the administration marshals a confusion of omissions and misstatements, as the following point-by-point analysis of the key points of the white paper makes clear.

ANALYSIS

President's memorandum: "Three: In the light of these facts, your Government has kept enlarging its stockpile of nuclear weapons, and has continued development and testing of the most advanced nuclear weapons. The power of these weapons to deter aggression and to guard world peace could be lost if we failed to hold our superiority in these weapons."

The President's memorandum is misleading in implying that we must necessarily continue to explode nuclear weapons in order to maintain our superiority in those weapons. To the extent the United States, by agreeing to stop large H-bomb explosions, would affect its progress in the development of nuclear weapons, the Soviet Union would also affect its own progress. To the extent that the Soviet Union could continue the research and development of all such weapons short of testing, the United States would also continue such research and development. To the extent that we have superiority—or as it is expressed elsewhere in the President's statement, a commanding lead—we would safeguard that superiority, that lead, by reducing the charges of a Russian technical breakthrough that might assist them to close the gap.

I repeat again that an agreement to end explosions of large H-bombs should not apply to the testing of smaller nuclear weapons; the United States, as well as other powers, would be free to go forward with such tests.

President's memorandum: "Four: The continuance of the present rate of H-bomb testing—by the most sober and responsible scientific judgment—does not imperil the health of humanity. On the amount of radioactive fallout, including strontium 90, resulting from tests, the most authoritative judgment is that of the independent National Academy of Sciences. It reported last June, following a study of 150 scientists of the first rank, that the radiation exposures from all weapons tests to date—and from continuing tests at the same rate—is, and would be, only a small fraction of the exposure that individuals receive from natural sources and from medical X-rays during their lives."

Many outstanding scientists vigorously disagree. Scientists emphasize that no one knows with certainty whether the present rate of H-bomb testing will or will not produce significant damage to millions of people alive today. This is true especially of children; as they mature the calcium that goes into building up their bones will be contaminated with the fallout of strontium 90 from H-bomb tests.

On this subject, the National Academy of Science reported in June 1956: "How much radiation will produce a given result, how much can be done to counteract the deleterious effects, these are largely unsolved problems."

Thomas E. Murray, a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, has stated: "We know that there is a limit to the amount of this strontium that the human body can absorb without harmful effects. Beyond that limit, danger lies, and even death."

The problem has been to fix the limit. It is still an unsolved problem.

The International Commission on Radiological Protection and the British Medical Council warn that the danger level for radioactive strontium should be set not at the level used by the Atomic Energy Commission but at one-tenth that level.

Obviously, the President's statement greatly exaggerates the degree of certainty that is possible on the basis of present scientific knowledge. In addition, in relating its comments to the present rate of H-bomb testing, it gives a wholly false picture of the danger from strontium 90 fallout. The report of the National Academy's Committee on pathological effects of atomic radiation, which is the basis for the National Academy's comments on this subject, was prepared in January of this year and its findings are already out of date. Since that time the nuclear monopoly enjoyed by the United States and the Soviet Union is now shared with the United Kingdom—and, as has been earlier pointed out, there is every prospect that within a relatively short time other nations will be producing nuclear weapons.

The Federation of American Scientists Radiation Hazard Committee declared on October 25, "Certain areas of the world may have already passed the danger point in strontium 90 saturation." The committee said Atomic Energy Commissioner Willard F. Libby, official AEC spokesman on fallout hazards, has been "very optimistic" in his estimates of the danger to mankind from radioactive fallout.

On Thursday of last week, members of the AEC research project at the University of Rochester Medical Center in New York declared President Eisenhower's defense of further H-bomb tests was confused and represented an oversimplification of the facts of life on the fallout.

Nineteen scientists, including William F. Meuman, top researcher of the AEC's project at the University Medical Center, specifically took issue with the fallout references President Eisenhower made last Tuesday night in his defense of further H-bomb tests.

The President said the National Academy of Sciences' June radiation report declares: "That the radiation exposure from all weapons tests to date—and from continuing tests at the same rate—is, and would be, only a small fraction of the exposure that individuals receive from natural sources and from medical X-rays during their lives."

Actually, the Rochester scientists declared: "The National Academy of Sciences' report does not say that the levels likely to be reached, if bomb testing continues, are safe • • • there is good reason to fear that they may not be safe." The FAS Radiation Hazards Committee report, issued in Boston, declared: "It may well be true that in certain areas of the world, the strontium 90 hazard has already passed the danger point, to say nothing of the additional production of this material in further tests." The report said strontium 90, which seeps into the human bone, produces blood changes and can lead to cancer, has been steadily descending upon the earth since the H-bomb test began. The scientists said the strontium 90 concentration is greatest in the soil where calcium is scarcest and the human system, instead of absorbing calcium into the bones, then absorbs the strontium 90.

The FAS group cited Commissioner Libby's own speech in illustrating that certain areas in Wales have strontium 90 concentrations 50 times greater than the worldwide average. It reasoned that Libby's maximum permissible level of strontium 90 intake while still safe for people in other parts of the world, might be exceedingly critical for low-calcium soil areas like Wales. The scientists also criticized Dr. Libby for basing his standards for permissible dosage on occupational exposure, as in the case of an X-ray technician, rather than the prolonged exposure, which people suffer in having radiation in the soil all around them. The FAS group further said that fallout safety levels are being based on the limited experience of humans with radium poisoning and a comparison of this with strontium 90 effects on experimental animals. The scientists pointed to a report by the British Medical Council declaring children's growing tissues are particularly radiosensitive and so could not tolerate the same maximum permissible dose level Libby has allotted to humans in general.

The FAS committee also said recent administration references to a National Academy of Sciences report on radiation have persistently referred to the genetics section of the report and glossed over the report's pathological section. It is the pathological section which warns against the strontium 90 hazard caused by H-bomb tests.

And in Pasadena, A. H. Sturtevant, California Institute of Technology geneticist, and one of the scientists who had signed the National Academy of Sciences report on genetic effects from radiation declared: "The danger from radioactive strontium in fallout is greater than the information available to the committee led us to suppose." Sturtevant recommended that his committee's conclusions on fallout dangers be revised upward.

Under these circumstances, to issue reassuring statements on the dangers of strontium 90 on the assumption of a continuance of the present rate of H-bomb testing is irresponsible. It is tantamount to a public health officer stating that the population of a city need take no precautions against a smallpox epidemic since, for the moment, no more than three cases had appeared, when there was a practical certainty that, if precautions were not promptly taken, the disease would spread to many times that number. And, as a distinguished newspaper columnist pointed out the other day, it casts the United States in a suspicious light by its neighbors. It is like adding a little arsenic to your neighbor's coffee each day, but assuring him that it isn't enough to kill him.

But apart from the fact that the rate of testing will certainly increase, the administration's optimism is misleading for another reason—the supposition that strontium 90 is absorbed uniformly among human beings. This is not true. From the Atomic Energy Commission's own measurements, the people of certain areas where the soil is low in calcium are absorbing a concentration of strontium 90 that is 5 times above the average. Even if further tests were discontinued people in those areas would be subjected to radiation from strontium 90 that would exceed by several times their absorption from natural sources.

I repeat that the President's memorandum fails entirely to point out that when it compares the dangers of radioactive fallout from H-bomb tests to the exposure from medical X-rays or from natural sources, it is basing its assertion exclusively on a report of the National Academy's Committee on Genetic Effects of Atomic Radiation. This has nothing to do with the really serious danger—the pathological damage from strontium 90 fallout. The President's memorandum leaves out the most important point: pathological damage.

Scientists agree that the genetic damage from bomb-tests is of relatively minor concern compared with the pathological damage from strontium 90, which, as has been previously pointed out, is assimilated into the bones, particularly of children, and which can produce blood changes and cause blood cancer.

In attempting to minimize the hazards of the effects of radioactive fallout by comparing them to an individual's exposure to medical X-rays, the author of the report even neglects to mention that the National Academy regards the extent of X-ray exposure as itself a possible danger, in fact, in the same chapter of its report, the Committee on Genetic Effects makes specific recommendations for reducing the medical use of X-rays.

The President's memorandum: "Six: There is radioactive fallout, including strontium 90, from the testing of all nuclear weapons, of whatever size • • • thus, the idea that we can stop sending this dangerous material into the air—by concentrating upon small fission weapons—is based upon apparent unwareness of the facts."

This statement is completely irrelevant. It can be regarded only as a deliberate effort to mislead. The fact is that the amount of radioactive fallout from a single large explosion has been and can be as much as that from 1,000 smaller bombs of the Hiroshima size. Essentially all the strontium 90 in the stratosphere comes from H-bombs.

President's memorandum: "Seven: With reference to the Soviet Union: Its sympathy with the idea of stopping H-bomb tests is indisputable. This idea merely reflects the Soviet Union's repeated insistence, ever since discussion of the Baruch plan in 1946, that all plans for disarmament be based on simply voluntary agreements. Now, as always, this formula allows for no safeguards, no control, no inspection." As to the assertion that an agreement to stop H-bomb tests would allow for no safeguards, no control, no inspection the President again disregards the key fact that violations of such an agreement can no more be hidden than an earthquake.

President's memorandum: "Eight: A simple agreement to stop H-bomb tests cannot be regarded as automatically self-enforcing on the unverified assumption that such tests can instantly and surely be detected."

This statement is amplified as follows in paragraph 22 of the memorandum that accompanies the white paper: "While the system of long-range detection or monitoring is believed to be as effective as it can be made in the present state of scientific knowledge, it cannot insure the detection of every test irrespective of size, location or type and composition of the weapon tested."

I repeat again for the dozenth time that I have never proposed the prohibition of tests of other than large H-bombs. President Eisenhower himself stated categorically on October 5: "Tests of large weapons by any nation, may be detected when they occur." The President repeated this statement in substance in his October 23 paper. Therefore, there is no difference of view as to the detectability of the kind of bomb included in my proposal.

We will know if the Russians explode a big H-bomb, and the world will know it too.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many of you in the House or how many in the other body knew that in the bill, that contained money for the civil service retirement fund and as a result of which the bill was vetoed by the President, there was a cut which was agreed to apparently by both the Senate and the House. I do not know how reluctantly it was agreed to, but anyway it was agreed to. It would put a freeze on some positions in the Veterans' Administration here in Washington and in the field offices.

Mr. Speaker, it seems an outrageous thing with all we are doing in every direction, the avalanche of money that is pouring out of the Congress these recent weeks, not to give greater consideration to the veterans who have kept and are keeping our country free.

THANKS TO MEN AND WOMEN OF ALL SERVICES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to give my thanks to the brave crew of the *Nautilus* that took that dangerous trip under ice at the North Pole. Those men stayed submerged for hours and hours and hours and indeed had a very dangerous assignment.

Then I would give my deep thanks to the marines who went into Lebanon. I saw Chet Huntley's very fine description of their work. On Comment I saw his very fine television presentation and heard his very fine description of the carrier *Essex* which covered our men as they went into Lebanon. You can see the danger the pilots were under as they took off and landed on the deck of that carrier.

I want to pay tribute also to our paratroopers who did such wonderful work in the operations in Lebanon and in that eastern area.

There were three men from my own District in these various activities. I give thanks to them and give thanks again and again and again to the men of all services who are working for us all the time, many of them giving their health and strength and many of them putting their lives in jeopardy, because their operations are dangerous, in fact, extremely dangerous.

REAR ADM. CARL F. ESPE, UNITED STATES NAVY

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that we are to have the privilege of the leadership of Rear Adm. Carl F. Espe, United States Navy, as commander of the 1st Naval District. He and his lovely wife are delightful. I want the House to know of his remarkable record during his service in the United States Navy.

A native of Pittsburgh, Pa., Carl Frederick Espe graduated from the Naval Academy with the class of 1922. He subsequently had service afloat until the summer of 1929 in the battleships *Pennsylvania* and *Mississippi* and the destroyers *Mervine* and *Chase*. After duty as an instructor in seamanship and mathematics at the Naval Academy, he joined the cruiser *Detroit* in June 1931 and 2 years later was assigned his first command, the minesweeper *Bobolink*.

Returning to the Naval Academy in 1934, he had a year's assignment in the executive department, followed by 3 months' service as aide and flag lieutenant to commander, Cruiser Division 6, and further staff duty as aide and flag secretary to commander, aircraft, base force. After duty as executive officer of the newly commissioned destroyer *Perkins*, he had instruction at the Army Industrial College, Washington, D. C., and in 1939 was assigned to the Washington Navy Yard. He put the destroyer *O'Brien* in commission the next year and commanded her until December 13, 1941, shortly after the United States entered World War II.

His war service included duty as navigator of the U. S. S. *Ranger*, as aide to the Vice Chief of Naval Operations, Navy Department, and as Commander, Destroyer Squadron 46 and Destroyer Division 91. For outstanding service in the Southwest Pacific area, including the Philippine Islands, he was awarded the Silver Star Medal, the Legion of Merit and Gold Star in lieu of a second similar award with combat "V," and the Bronze Star Medal also with "V." For exceptionally meritorious service in the planning department of the staff of the Commander in Chief, United States Pacific Fleet, January–December 1945, he received a Gold Star in lieu of the third Legion of Merit.

Following the cessation of hostilities his duties ashore included service in the Naval Intelligence organization as head of the Operational Intelligence Branch; Assistant Director of the Naval Intelligence Division and Director of that Division and as a student at the Naval War College. These assignments were interspersed with duty afloat in command of Destroyer Flotilla 1, Amphibious Groups 3 and 1—the latter operating in the Korean area of hostilities—and Amphibious Force, Pacific Fleet. In January 1958 he was designated commandant of the First Naval District with headquarters in Boston, Mass. He assumed command as commandant, First Naval District, on May 12, 1958.

Admiral and Mrs. Espe will reside at Quarters "G," Boston Naval Shipyard.

I include the following information with my remarks:

ADM. CARL FREDERICK ESPE, UNITED STATES NAVY

PERSONAL DATA

Born: April 15, 1900, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Parents: Charles and Susan Espe, both now deceased.

Wife's maiden name and date of marriage: Hilda Saunder Crowley of Baltimore, Md., June 17, 1947.

Children: None.

Official home address: In care of Mrs. Hugh L. Porter, 8518 Perry Highway, Pittsburgh 37, Pa.

Education: Allegheny High School, Allegheny County, Pa.; United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md. (bachelor of science, 1922); Army Industrial College, Washington, D. C. (1938–1939); Naval War College, Newport, R. I. (advanced course, 1949).

PROMOTIONS

Appointed midshipman, July 11, 1918.

Commissioned ensign, United States Navy, June 3, 1922.

Lieutenant (junior grade), United States Navy, June 3, 1925.

Lieutenant, United States Navy, July 3, 1928.

Lieutenant commander, United States Navy, August 1, 1937.

Commander, United States Navy, January 2, 1942.

Captain, United States Navy, August 7, 1947.

Rear admiral, United States Navy, April 1, 1949.

Vice admiral, United States Navy, (T) from April 13, 1956, to April 11, 1958.

MEDALS AND AWARDS

Silver Star Medal.

Legion of Merit with Combat "V."

Gold Star in lieu of Second Legion of Merit with Combat "V."

Gold Star in lieu of Third Legion of Merit.

Bronze Star Medal with Combat "V."

Victory Medal (World War I).

American Defense Service Medal, Fleet Clasp.

American Campaign Medal.

World War II Victory Medal.

Navy Occupation Service Medal, Asia Clasp.

National Defense Service Medal.

Korean Service Medal.

United Nations Service Medal.

Philippine Liberation Ribbon.

Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal.

CITATIONS

Silver Star Medal: "For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity as commander destroyer sound screen of a carrier task group in action against enemy Japanese forces during the assault on Makin, Tarawa, and Apamama in the Gilbert Islands, from November 10 to 27, 1943. Through his exceptional directive ability and his comprehensive understanding of each tactical situation, Captain Espe effectively deployed ships of the sound screen to provide protection for the task group operating in enemy submarine-infested waters. By his personal valor, inspiring leadership, and daring initiative, Captain Espe contributed materially to the success of our assault forces in that vital theater of war."

Legion of Merit: "For exceptionally meritorious conduct * * * as commander of a destroyer squadron during action against enemy Japanese forces on Truk, February 16 and 17, 1944, and during raids on the Saipan-Tinian area on February 21 and 22, 1944. With the units of his squadron subjected to

continuous day and night torpedo and bombing attacks, Captain Espe directed the ships under his command in assisting in the destruction of two hostile planes and, maintaining a protective position for the carriers, enabled the task group to proceed to the initial launching point and carry out a damaging air attack against enemy shipping, aircraft, and shore installations on these strategically important islands."

Gold Star in lieu of a second Legion of Merit: "For exceptionally meritorious conduct * * * as commanding officer of Destroyer Squadron 46, and as screen commander of Task Group 38.1, during operations against enemy Japanese forces in the Pacific war area, from August 24 to October 30, 1944. Skillfully maneuvering the screen throughout the attacks on Palau, Formosa, and the Philippine Islands, Captain Espe contributed greatly to the protection of the task group while operating in enemy waters under heavy aerial attack and constant submarine threat and, by prompt decisive action, rendered effective service many times in the rescue of pilots."

Gold Star in lieu of the third Legion of Merit: "For * * * outstanding service * * * as a member of a planning board in the plans division of the staff of the commander in chief, United States Pacific Fleet and Pacific Ocean areas, in connection with operations against enemy Japanese forces from January 13 to September 1, 1945. Utilizing his thorough knowledge of naval and military operations, Captain Espe assisted in preparing plans for the capture and occupation of the Japanese Empire and adjacent locations for the opening and maintenance of a sea route for allied vessels and for operations subsequent to the surrender of the Japanese. By his professional ability and devotion to duty, he contributed materially to the success of our Armed Forces in the Pacific war area."

Bronze Star Medal: "For meritorious achievement as commander, Destroyer Squadron 46, attached to Task Group 58.1, in action against enemy Japanese forces in the Western Pacific area, from June 6 to August 8, 1944. After the Japanese carrier airpower was destroyed and the Japanese Fleet heavily damaged and driven to home waters, Captain Espe led his ships in rescuing personnel from a large number of carrier planes which had been forced to land in the water. Later he participated in the bombardments of Iwo Jima, Guam, and Chichi Jima, destroying hostile installations and on the night of August 4, assisted in intercepting the remnants of a Japanese convoy by demolishing on AK and a DD."

CHRONOLOGICAL TRANSCRIPT OF NAVAL SERVICE

July 1922–August 1922, U. S. S. *Argonne*.

September 1922, receiving ship, San Francisco, Calif.

September 1922–July 1924, U. S. S. *Pennsylvania*.

July 1924–August 1924, U. S. S. *Mervine*.

August 1924–April 1927, U. S. S. *Chase*.

April 1927–May 1929, U. S. S. *Mississippi*.

May 1929–May 1931, Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md. (instructor).

May 1931–June 1933, U. S. S. *Detroit*.

June 1933–June 1934, U. S. S. *Bobolink* (commanding officer).

June 1934–March 1935, Naval Academy, Annapolis (executive department).

March 1955–June 1935, staff, commander cruiser division 6 (aide and flag lieutenant).

June 1935–June 1936, staff, commander aircraft, base force (aide and flag secretary).

June 1936–September 1936, Puget Sound (Wash.) Navy Yard for fitting out duty in the U. S. S. *Perkins*.

September 1936–July 1938, U. S. S. *Perkins* (executive officer).

July 1938–September 1938, Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.

September 1938–June 1939, Army Industrial College, Washington, D. C. (instructor).

June 1939–December 1939, Navy Yard, Washington, D. C.

December 1939–March 1940, Boston (Mass.) Navy Yard for fitting out the U. S. S. *O'Brien*.

March 1940–December 1941, U. S. S. *O'Brien* (commanding officer).

December 1941–April 1942, U. S. S. *Ranger* (navigator).

April 1942–June 1943, aide Vice Chief of Naval Operations, Navy Department.

June 1943–December 1944, commander, destroyer squadron 46, additional duty as commander, destroyer division 91.

December 1944–December 1945, staff, Commander in Chief, United States Pacific Fleet.

December 1945–July 1948, Office of Chief of Naval Operations, Navy Department (head, Operational Intelligence Branch).

July 1948–January 1949, commander, destroyer flotilla 1.

January 1949–June 1949, Naval War College, Newport, R. I. (instruction).

June 1949–August 1951, Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, Navy Department (Deputy Director of Naval Intelligence—title changed to Assistant Director of Naval Intelligence).

August 1951–October 1951, commander, amphibious group 3.

October 1951–October 1952, commander, amphibious group 1.

October 1952–May 1956, Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, Navy Department (Director of Naval Intelligence—title changed to Assistant Chief of Naval Operations, Intelligence and Director of Naval Intelligence).

July 1956–May 1958, commander, amphibious force, United States, Pacific.

May 12, 1958, commandant, First Naval District, with headquarters in Boston, Mass.

THE HONORABLE GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate a great hero, the gentleman from Missouri, a great statesman, a great Member of Congress, Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Today he is walking with an artificial prosthetic appliance. He lost his leg some little time ago, but he is walking again. I congratulate him.

We are lucky to have in the House such a fine individual and I know full well what I am saying because I serve with him as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. More power and good luck to him.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

HON. DAVID B. WILLIAMS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Judge David B. Williams was born in Boston, Mass., January 7, 1919. He attended the elementary schools there and was graduated from high school at Newburyport, Mass. His educational training was furthered at Harvard College, where he received his bachelor of arts degree. He received his bachelor of laws degree from Boston University Law School.

He saw service in the Armed Forces of the United States from April 1942 to March 1946 as a member of the United States Air Force, where he was the recipient of the Air Force Commendation Ribbon.

Back in public life he served as clerk of the courts, city solicitor, legislator, Governor's councilor, and was appointed to the judiciary in 1954, where he now serves.

Judge Williams resides in Concord, Mass., with his wife, Gloria, and two children, Deborah and Gregory. He is a member of the Elks, Lions, Masons, Odd Fellows, and numerous other civic and professional organizations.

He is life member of Minute Man Chapter, which he organized. He has served as chapter adjutant and treasurer, department commander of the DAV in Massachusetts, and in 1956 at the DAV national convention in San Antonio, Tex., was elected fourth national junior vice commander. He is now serving as chairman of the national finance committee and imperial bench rat, NOTR.

His warm and engaging personality, his unquestioned integrity and ability, is enhanced by an active interest in the DAV and a sincere concern for his fellow veteran. These attributes are among those which make Judge David B. Williams a natural choice for national commander of the Disabled American Veterans.

DELEGATE BARTLETT AND ALASKAN STATEHOOD

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, all of us who did our bit to bring about statehood for Alaska are proud that it is about to be accomplished. No doubt the people of Alaska will ratify statehood by an overwhelming vote in the forthcoming referendum, and Alaska will become in fact our 49th State by Presidential proclamation before the end of the year.

I am concerned, however, over the lack of credit that has been given to the man whose tireless persistence and dedication, over a period of many years, contributed so materially to achieving the support for statehood in the House of Representatives that made the admission of Alaska possible.

I refer to the distinguished Delegate from Alaska, the Honorable E. L. "BOB" BARTLETT, who is now serving his seventh term here with us.

I believe that no Member of this House will dispute my statement that had it not been for Mr. BARTLETT's sterling work—his total dedication to the cause of statehood—his refusal to acknowledge defeat even when prospects seemed darkest—Alaska statehood still would be far in the future.

Delegate BARTLETT never sought publicity for himself. He sought it for Alaska, and had remarkable success in obtaining it. His characteristic personal modesty, which we in this House know so well, perhaps has made it easier for certain late arrivals in the statehood movement in behalf of Alaska to claim credit that we know rightfully belongs to Delegate BARTLETT. Some of the articles I have read in magazines and newspapers recently concerning Alaska statehood undertake to glamorize other individuals in the Alaska picture to such a degree that an uninformed reader might well be left unaware of Mr. BARTLETT'S great contribution.

Members of this body are well aware of the marvels of the press agentry in these times. We see strange and wonderful manifestations of that art, but I think others here share my bewilderment at reading that statehood for Alaska was brought about by this or that individual, when many of us who cast the votes that admitted Alaska had not even met those referred to, much less having been persuaded by them.

Of course many people in the Congress and outside it helped to bring about statehood for Alaska. The author of the bill, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN], was an outstandingly able and effective advocate for the cause to which he so unselfishly dedicated his time and efforts, and justly has earned a place in history. But I know he would be the first to acknowledge that his task would have been almost impossible but for the reservoir of good will toward Alaska and the solid support for statehood that Delegate BARTLETT'S own efforts had achieved over a period of many years in this House.

Delegate BARTLETT is indeed the father of Alaska statehood. It shall be a monument to him for all time to come. We who have served with him here shall never forget his dedication to the cause in which he so deeply believed. We congratulate him on its accomplishment and wish him all success in his future service to his beloved State and the Nation.

U. S. S. "ENTERPRISE"

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. BOGGS]. Under previous order of the House the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today, the United States of America is placing a gallant fighting ship on a scrap pile. This is comparable to placing one of our national heroes in potter's field. There will be no people around mourning the fate of this once proud mistress of the sea. There will only be the hissing sound of the acetylene torches and the thumping of the scrap metal presses tearing her asunder—a feat which the sea and air power of the Japanese failed to accomplish. This is a glaring example of the stunted memory of the American people. This symbol of naval air power that performed so gallantly in turning defeat into victory should have been preserved as a national monument.

There never was a ship the Japanese tried harder to sink than the U. S. S. *Enterprise*. Six times the wishful Nipponese announced she had been sunk and six times the *Enterprise* suffered structural damage from enemy hits and near misses during World War II, but she still sailed on.

Only 22 years ago, on October 3, 1936, she was launched. To those who loved the *Enterprise* and served on her, it is hard to see her headed for the scrap heap.

Words quoted as the ship slid down the ways into the water were prophetic. A line from Othello has been fulfilled in her career:

> May she also say with just pride: "I have done the State some service."

Indeed it is hard to measure the worth of the *Enterprise*. Statistics are cold. They tell little of the drive for victory, the fighting hearts of the men who ran the ship and flew the airplanes, the triumphs over near disasters.

Winner of 20 battle stars during World War II in the Pacific, the *Enterprise* shot down 911 Japanese planes, sank 71 ships, and damaged 192 more. She steamed more than 275,000 miles during the war. Her magnificent record included participation in every major battle of the Pacific except the Battle of the Coral Sea.

Commissioned May 12, 1938, CV–6 was the seventh Navy ship to bear the name *Enterprise*. The CV–6 was a giant in contrast to her predecessors. The aircraft carrier had a displacement of almost 20,000 tons, a length of 825 feet, and a maximum breadth of 109 feet. She had been built at an approximate cost of $19 million.

By the time America was plunged into World War II, the *Enterprise* was part of the Pacific Fleet. On November 28, 1941, as flagship of Task Force 8 the *Enterprise* left Pearl Harbor. In addition to Air Group 6, she carried 12 VMF–211 aircraft for delivery to the new airfield on Wake Island. The same day the commanding officer issued battle order No. 1, the first sentence of which read:

> The *Enterprise* is now operating under war conditions.

On December 4, the planes were launched at a point about 175 miles north of Wake to fly to the island, and the task force retired toward Pearl Harbor.

The *Enterprise* was originally scheduled to arrive on December 6, but heavy weather forced the task force commander to slacken speed, and revise his ETA to December 7. At dawn on December 7, the force was some 200 miles from the island of Oahu. A small group of Dauntless scout-bombers from VS–6 were launched for the flight to Pearl.

Shortly afterward one of the pilots of these planes was heard to exclaim over the radio:

> Please don't shoot, this is an American plane.

Then another pilot radioed to the ship:

> Pearl Harbor is being attacked by enemy planes. Maybe Jap planes.

From fleet headquarters came confirmation from Adm. P. N. L. Bellinger: Air raid, Pearl Harbor. This is no drill.

The *Enterprise* hoisted her battle flag and launched aircraft to seek out the carriers from which the Japanese planes had taken off. The results of this search were negative, but on December 10, she sank the Japanese submarine I–170 that had scouted the Hawaiian Islands in connection with the Pearl Harbor attack. It was the first Japanese combatant ship sunk by United States forces. First blood for the *Enterprise*.

Less than 2 months later, on February 1, the *Enterprise* and her sister ship, the *Yorktown*, constituted the carrier striking power in the force that launched the first American offensive operations in the Pacific.

The *Enterprise*, Admiral Halsey's flagship, was the core of a task force which made an attack on Wake on February 24, and one on Marcus on March 4. To hit Marcus, the *Enterprise* was within 1,000 miles of Japan.

In April the *Enterprise* and several other screening ships acted as escorts for the U. S. S. *Hornet* in company with TF–16 to effect the first American offensive against the Japanese homeland. On the flight deck of the *Hornet* were 16 B–25's of the 17th AAF Air Group under the command of Lt. Col. James H. Doolittle. On April 18, 1942, these aircraft gave Tokyo its first aerial attack of the war.

At the Battle of Midway, June 4–6, 1942, the United States Navy airpower aboard the *Enterprise*, the *Hornet*, and the *Yorktown* and based ashore at Midway, and United States Marine Corps and United States Army airpower also based at Midway inflicted a telling defeat upon the enemy force. Japanese forces went down for a count of 4 carriers, 1 heavy cruiser, and 258 aircraft. All ships were sunk by carrier aircraft of the United States Navy.

Misled by position reports, the first carrier strikes had difficulty locating the Japanese carriers. In this predicament, Commander Air Group 6 of the *Enterprise*, estimating that the enemy might have reversed course, decided to turn north. According to Commander in Chief, Pacific, this was one of the most important decisions of the battle and one that had decisive results. Commander Air Group 6 found the enemy just as its carriers were about to launch an all-out attack against Midway and the United States task force. Those Japanese planes never left the deck of their carriers.

The *Enterprise* planes were in at the kill of all four carriers and the heavy cruiser sunk at Midway. The American victory in this action wrested the initiative from the Japanese and was one of the decisive battles of the entire war.

In the invasion of the Solomons and in repelling recapture the *Enterprise* played a prominent and effective role. Despite tremendous poundings, the "Big E" came through again and again. She supported the landings, August 7–9, participated in the Battle of the Eastern Solomons, August 23–25, and took part

in the Battle of Santa Cruz Islands, October 26–27. She fought in the Battle for Guadalcanal, November 12-15, in which she assisted in sinking 89,000 tons of war and cargo ships—2 battleships, 1 heavy cruiser, 3 destroyers, and 11 cargo ships. The last Guadalcanal engagement occurred January 29–30, 1943, the Battle of Rennell Island, and the *Enterprise* was there.

During the first part of 1943, the *Enterprise* continued its battle career as flagship of Commander Task Force 16. When the big carrier reached Pearl Harbor May 8, it was honored as the only carrier to fight through the entire first year of the war. Four United States carriers had been sunk in action: The *Lexington* in the Coral Sea, the *Wasp* in the South Pacific, the *Yorktown* at Midway, and the *Hornet* in the Battle of Santa Cruz. The *Enterprise* stood a long vigil as the only carrier in the South Pacific since the *Saratoga* was under repair and the *Ranger* was operating in the Atlantic. She became the first aircraft carrier to win the Presidential unit citation.

From July 20 to October 31, 1943, the "Big E" was back at Bremerton for needed repairs. But before the year was out she was with Task Force 50 ready to participate in the Gilbert Island occupation November 18–24.

When the Japanese, finding that their bombers were no match for a Hellcat screen, began sending in medium bombers after dark, the *Enterprise* met the challenge. On the night of November 26, a team of two Hellcats and one Avenger, led by Lt. Comdr. E. H.—"Butch" O'Hare went into action. It was the first aerial battle of its type, and it so disrupted enemy attack that it was credited with saving the task group from damage. The *Enterprise* at once put fighter operations on a round-the-clock basis.

The *Enterprise* participated in the Marshalls campaign January 29–February 22, 1944. In the raid on Truk, February 17–18, VT–10 of the *Enterprise* made the first night bombing attack in the history of the United States Navy. Pilots made 25 runs, scored 13 direct hits, 3 near misses, and 2 hits on islets mistaken for ships. Naval Historian S. E. Morison says:

> This night bombing run resulted in about one-third of the total damage to shipping effected by the entire carrier force.

Total tonnage sunk in the 2-day attack was about 200,000 tons.

In March, the *Enterprise* provided air cover for the occupation of Emirau, and on March 30–April 1, as part of Task Force 58, made strikes on the western Carolines. The "Big E" also supported landings of southwest Pacific forces at Hollandia.

Early June found the *Enterprise* engaged in the Mariana Islands. On June 11, she launched her planes against Saipan. The *Enterprise's* share in the destruction of enemy forces included 3 ships sunk, 2 damaged, and 39 planes destroyed.

In support of the occupation of Palau, the *Enterprise* and her task force operated in the Volcano and Bonin Islands August 31–September 1, then moved south to make preliminary strikes on Palau, Yap, and Ulithi on September 10, and remained to support the landings on Peleliu September 15 and operations ashore until the 18th.

From then on action was taken in support of the Leyte landings in which the carrier conducted preliminary strikes on Formosa, the Ryukyus, and northern Luzon—October 10–15. She supported the landing—October 20—participated in the battle for Leyte Gulf—October 24–26—and continued support of the Leyte occupation throughout October and November.

The *Enterprise* had the distinction of being the only carrier in action against all three of the widely scattered Japanese forces in this operation. "Big E" planes hit the southern, central, and northern forces in succession.

Early the first morning, her planes delivered an attack on the Japanese force in the Sulu Sea, damaging two battleships and a heavy cruiser. That afternoon her bombers blasted the battleship *Musashi*, one of the world's largest battleships, in the Sibuyan Sea. She was sunk by aerial attack alone. The next day, October 25, the *Enterprise* participated in an all-day battle against a Japanese carrier force, assisting in the sinking of 4 carriers, 1 light cruiser, and 2 DD's.

As 1945 operations opened, the *Enterprise* was a night carrier. With the U. S. S. *Independence*, she made up the first night carrier division in the United States Navy. Operations of the task force were in support of the landings at Lingayen Gulf and were marked by operations in the South China Sea from January 10 to 19. The force ranged south to attack shipping and various other targets as far down as Saigon.

In February, the *Enterprise* participated in the first carrier strikes on Tokyo after which she moved southward to support the assault and capture of Iwo Jima from February 19 to March 8. Ten days later she went back to Japan with Task Force 58 attacking targets on Kyushu as a preliminary to the Okinawa campaign. The next day she joined Task Group 58.2 covering the severely damaged *Franklin's* return to Ulithi.

The *Enterprise* returned to Okinawa support on April 8 and was hit by two kamikazes on April 11. She retired to Ulithi, but returned on May 11 to the fray. On May 14 she was hit again by suicide planes and retired. This was the last action for the U. S. S. *Enterprise*.

The Navy has not forgotten the *Enterprise*. Her name will be perpetuated by the magnificent nuclear carrier now under construction. This aircraft carrier will join others which are now protecting the interests of free people throughout the world. It is important to note that nothing in modern warfare has changed to lessen the importance of the aircraft carrier since the *Enterprise* was fighting in World War II. We need the flexible airpower of these mobile airfields. They can support our land forces and allies anywhere in the world, just as they supported the landing in Lebanon. There are many areas in the world where land-based aircraft cannot accomplish this mission. We must therefore maintain strong modern naval air striking power in both oceans at all times. We must not permit this power to deteriorate.

HONORABLE KARL M. LECOMPTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, when I asked for this special order the other day I did not know the plan of another colleague from Iowa to do the same thing. Because he is my senior and is a very able and popular Member, and probably more qualified because of his acquaintance with the man to whom I propose to pay tribute, I yield to him at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE].

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this special order so that members of the Iowa delegation and other Members, too, might have opportunity to pay tribute to a distinguished legislator, who is retiring voluntarily from service in the Congress. The gentleman is KARL M. LECOMPTE, of Corydon, Iowa, who for 20 years has served in the House of Representatives from my State.

Mr. LECOMPTE and I came here as freshmen 20 years ago.

As every Member of this Chamber knows, there is no finer endorsement than for the people of a Congressional District to reaffirm their confidences in a man for 10 consecutive terms. Congressman LECOMPTE has served his constituents ably and loyally during these 20 years. His contributions to the people of his District, the State of Iowa, and the Nation have been many and great. His reward should be commensurate.

He is not retiring to inactivity. He is returning to his hometown of Corydon to what he likes to call his "first love"—his newspaper. He will continue to exert leadership through his work in this field.

KARL LECOMPTE has many friends. He is kind and generous—thoughtful and considerate. One gets to know a colleague intimately through 20 years of close association. I can say that I know him to be a man of his word—a man who cherishes his friends—and a man of honor.

I know that others are eager to pay tribute to Mr. LECOMPTE, therefore, Mr. Speaker, before yielding time, I ask unanimous consent that Members may have opportunity to extend their remarks in line with the purpose of this special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, now I yield, and you understand why, first to the members of my own delegation. I yield

to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, my heart is sad to think that KARL LECOMPTE is quitting Congress. It will be a great loss to the Nation and to this body not to have him here. He has been a tower of strength throughout the years. I first became acquainted with KARL in 1933 when I was a freshman member of the Iowa Legislature. Some of the senior members or previous members of that body were honored by the then membership. KARL LECOMPTE was at that meeting. I liked him upon first meeting him and I have never forgotten the friendly attitude that he displayed at that gathering. I next met him here on this floor when I came to this body 2 years after KARL did. Throughout the years of our service together in this body, he was always a great help to me. Many, many times I went to him for advice. It was always freely and gladly given. Also it was advice that was valuable to me as a Member. He was a man who could always be depended upon. He was always the same, just as the gentleman who was honored a little while ago, Mr. O'HARA, was always the same. It seems to me together they grew in stature in this body. They became strong and could not be shaken, either one of them, by any whim and certainly KARL LECOMPTE could not be swayed from his purpose. I liked his attitude and his approach to legislative matters. We often sat together in this Chamber and talked about legislation. Although frequently we did not agree, he was always friendly and never held anything personally against anyone for differing with him.

But, I especially liked KARL LECOMPTE'S attitude in that he was progressive; he was always for the regular order. He believed in going forward. I well recall many times he said to me when in doubt about a bill, "Well, PAUL, I have discovered it is well to follow the committee if you are not otherwise well informed on a piece of legislation." He said, "The members of these committees know what they are doing. They have studied the background of this piece of legislation and you are safe in following the committee because the committees are constructive. They know more about it than anyone else." That piece of advice given to me by KARL many times during our services together has been of great value to me. I think of KARL as a progressive American, one who believes in going forward and being with the majority and being constructive. He never said a destructive word to my knowledge about any piece of legislation. He was that kind of an individual. If he was a member of an organization, he was for the organization and he so carried his work forward here in this body in that attitude. In addition to that, he was kindly and friendly at all times. He was a man of ability. He studied hard and he was interested in his people. I think of KARL as being a man in love with his wife and two organizations. First, comes the love that he has for his wife. Then, the love for the people of his own State and District; and then his love for this body and every Member of it. I can pay no greater tribute to anyone than to say that of him. In KARL'S retirement I wish him and his lovely wife, Dorothy, the best of everything. I know we will see them again frequently. They will be with us in our thoughts. His ideas and his thoughts will never leave this Chamber because he has been a true legislator, a true American, and a true citizen of the State of Iowa.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALLE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, KARL LECOMPTE is one of several fine outstanding Members of this body who have chosen this year to retire.

Those of us who have known KARL and worked with him here will miss him greatly. I shall miss him particularly because of my association with him on the Committee on House Administration. I have served there with him for a number of years. I know how conscientious he has been in the performance of his duties which have had to do quite closely with the affairs of the House of Representatives.

I think I might, without undertaking to add too many words, say this of KARL LECOMPTE: He was a strong, courageous person, standing by his convictions, ready to take a stand, a gentle person who could be strong in competition, but, with it all, he never hurt anyone. To my mind that is a tribute of which anyone can be proud; and certainly I can say as much of my good friend, KARL LECOMPTE. I am just sorry that he will not continue to be among us.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALLE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is with high personal regard for a personal friend and colleague that I wish to join with my colleagues to pay tribute to a distinguished and able Member of this House, the Honorable KARL LECOMPTE, who has announced his retirement from public office at the conclusion of the 85th Congress. While it has been my privilege to serve with this distinguished Member for only 4 years, I have learned to respect him as much or more as any Member of this House. I should like to note also, that even though it was not my privilege to be here during the major portion of his service, I knew of his distinguished record and service through the news channels and through a personal association of many of his friends who always spoke so highly of him. When I was first elected, many of my friends reminded me of the great opportunity I would have of serving with an outstanding State delegation. And almost without exception my friends told me that I would enjoy serving with KARL LECOMPTE, that he would be helpful to me in getting acquainted with my new opportunity of service, that he would stand ready to counsel and advise me on problems that would confront me and that I could rely on his judgment.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to say publicly today that I have not been disappointed in any way. He has, so far as my relationship with him is concerned, measured up even better than my friends predicted.

Because of my high regard and deep appreciation for the many courtesies he has extended to me personally, and for the many ways in which he has gone out of his way to be helpful to every Member of Congress when he had the opportunity, that I take this opportunity to pay tribute to him today.

KARL LECOMPTE was elected to the United States House of Representatives in November 1938, from what was then the Fifth Congressional District of Iowa—now the Fourth. There is no test of a man's ability in any department of public life more severe than service in the National House of Representatives What a man gains in this Chamber he gains by sheer force of his own integrity, ability, and devotion to duty, and if he loses and falls back he must expect no mercy. It is an area in which the strongest survive. KARL LECOMPTE has stood the test through 20 years of service to his fellow Iowans. He has been reelected in nine successive elections.

A native of Corydon, Iowa, Congressman LECOMPTE was born May 25, 1887, son of Charles Francis and Hannah Miles LeCompte. He attended public schools and graduated from the Corydon High School. He then entered the State University of Iowa, from which he was graduated with the degree of bachelor of arts in 1909. He served his country in World War I.

KARL'S father, Charles F. LeCompte, had come to Iowa in 1865 and was instrumental in establishing the Corydon Times-Republican in Wayne County, Iowa. Charles LeCompte was in the newspaper business in Iowa for more than half a century. It was from this background of family interest in Iowa journalism that KARL began his career of public service after college graduation in Corydon with the Times-Republican. He served as publisher and editor of this newspaper for many, many years. I believe I am correct in stating that the Times-Republican is the oldest newspaper in Wayne County, Iowa.

KARL LECOMPTE was never a candidate for public office until 1916, when he ran for the Iowa State Senate. He was elected to the 37th and 38th general assemblies. It is reported he was the youngest member in the Iowa Senate during the 37th general assembly.

KARL'S vital interest in his native Iowa prompted his activity as a member of the Iowa Territorial Centennial Committee. During his service in Washington, D. C., Iowa's centennial, celebrated in 1946, received KARL'S able support and active attention. He sponsored legislation in Congress to authorize the coinage of 100,000 50-cent pieces commemorating the Iowa centennial.

When the members of the Iowa delegation spoke on the floor of this House concerning the achievements of the State, during the centennial celebration, Mr. LECOMPTE mentioned particularly the history of the schools and churches of our State. I should like to quote for you several paragraphs from this speech,

which I believe will remind you once again of the sterling qualities that are possessed by KARL LECOMPTE. I quote as follows:

Bringing Bibles and schoolbooks along with their plows and axes, pioneers of the great State of Iowa might glory in a job well begun if they could know, as we celebrate today the first 100 years of statehood, of the high place Iowa has achieved in the educational and spiritual progress of this Nation.

Iowa takes great pride in her well-earned reputation as a great agricultural State; however, her greatest pride is her children, for whose character, health, and education she has given much time, thought, and attention.

In the century of Iowa's statehood, Iowa has maintained the spiritual and educational ideals of her pioneer forefathers—upholding freedom of speech and press, freedom of religion, the right to work and save, and the peaceful pursuits of happiness. The State continues as a place where the humble as well as the proud, the poor as well as the rich meet on common ground; this democratic ideal is well expressed in the motto of this State: "Our liberties we prize and our rights we will maintain."

Yes, Iowa men and women of the past 100 years have written glorious chapters in the history of this Republic; and in this next century of its continued progress, the fight will go on for the finer things of life in the devotion of its citizens to the ideal good.

Representative LECOMPTE has devoted his life to the fight for the finer things of life. He has been devoted to the welfare of all the people of Iowa. For all he has done, the people of Iowa, the Iowa delegation, Congress, and the people of the United States, owe him a great debt of gratitude.

It is not always easy for a Member from a State somewhat removed from our Nation's Capital to sit at his desk on the Hill and keep thoroughly in mind what is best for all the people of his District. KARL LECOMPTE has never failed to keep the welfare of his constituents in the forefront in his Congressional activities.

At the same time, he has shown sympathetic understanding of the problems which confront Members from other States. He has been and will always be a friend to all.

Because of his fine personal virtues, his ability to get along with his colleagues, his generous and considerate attitude toward the other fellow, his tolerance and high respect for the other man's viewpoint, his friendly and engaging personality and his complete devotion to public welfare, I should like to dub him, "A Congressman's Congressman." He has, in my opinion, earned that title as much or more than any man I have ever known that has served in this great body.

KARL has been a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee since 1953 and served on two subcommittees of that committee: International Organizations and Movements and the Subcommittee on Europe. Members of the committee have indicated to me that he has always taken a leading part in shaping the key legislation that came before that committee. He was completely devoted to the idea of keeping the affairs of this committee out of partisan politics, having uppermost in his mind what was best for his country and for human kind. The work of this committee necessitated having a number of official study missions. The record shows that he served with great distinction on those missions and made a special contribution on the study mission to the Australian Commonwealth Jubilee. While by comparison to his long service in Congress, he was a comparatively new member of this committee, yet he carried a special place of high respect on the committee because of his long years of service in Congress. His colleagues respected him highly. He never lost his temper, was always completely objective in his approach to any propositions that presented themselves to the committee. Members of the committee and the staff have told me that he will be greatly missed and that it will be very difficult to find anyone to fill adequately the vacancy caused by his decision to not be a candidate for reelection.

The testimony of members of the House Administration Committee, of which he was a very able member, would be almost a duplication of what those who served on the Foreign Affairs Committee have given, to which I have already referred, except that much more could be said because his service there has been over a much longer period. Because the work of this committee concerns the welfare of each of our offices each Member should be and I am sure is very grateful for the sympathetic interest he has given to those things that make it possible for our offices to serve our constituency more effectively.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps no one can speak for Congressmen any better than those who work for him. In the case of this distinguished Member we are eulogizing, it happens that an employee has worked for him during his entire service in Congress and this morning when I talked to Margaret Welch, his secretary for 20 years, and told her about my plans to pay tribute to her Congressman today, she made substantially this statement to me:

In most instances the old saying that no man is a hero to his valet would apply as well in the case of his secretary, but an exception to the rule is Representative LECOMPTE, who is admired and respected by every member of his staff.

One gets to know a Member of Congress extremely well working with and for him 8 hours a day for 20 years, and in the case of Mr. LECOMPTE, it can truly be said that he is an ideal employer, devoted to public service.

Mr. LECOMPTE has so many attributes it would be difficult to name all of them, but perhaps his consideration for others would head the list, and he is just as thoughtful of those working for him as he is of his many good friends and constituents.

His greatest enjoyment is helping his constituents; yet he is so self-effacing that when he is praised for some accomplishment he invariably deprecates his own efforts in the matter and insists that the credit should go to a member of his staff.

He is 71 years of age, but his optimism and faith in our American form of government have kept him young.

What a fine tribute from one who knows him so well.

Mr. Speaker, his vital interest in the history of Iowa led to his election to the Iowa Historical Society. He also holds membership in Sigma Delta Kappa, the Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, and the Knights of Pythias.

The people of Iowa, the Congress, and our country will miss that fine spirit of cooperation which quietly but effectively helped us make progress as a nation in so many ways.

To the Republican Party KARL LECOMPTE has given his unfailing loyalty. He possesses the sterling qualities of a true American first, and a loyal party man second.

I am sure that every Member of this House will join me also in extending best wishes to his loving and devoted wife, Dorothy LeCompte, who in her charming manner made a host of friends in Washington who will miss her greatly. Her tireless work for and with the many charitable organizations in this community is indicative of her unselfish and devoted interest in the finer things of life. She was always very active in the affairs of the Congressional Club, where she will be missed indeed, and everyone, I am sure, joins me in the hope that she, with her honorable and distinguished husband will return periodically and join us in some of the festive activities in the future.

All who knew these fine people, I am sure, will want to join me to extend best wishes for good health and many years of happiness as they retire to their home in Corydon. Let us remember this fact—we can always learn something from the other fellow's experience. And as we thing of KARL LECOMPTE, we must be reminded that we cannot hope to accomplish much in this forum unless we have the confidence and respect of our colleagues.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my deep regret upon the retirement from the Congress of the Honorable KARL LECOMPTE. It has been my privilege to serve for 4 years with him on the Committee on House Administration where he has been the ranking minority member. In addition, I have had the honor of twice serving with him as a delegate to the NATO Parliamentary Conference. KARL LECOMPTE has been an outstanding Representative, devoted to the best interests of his country, acting freely without regard to political consequences.

Let me express the hope that in his retirement, Mr. LECOMPTE and his lovely wife will always find the best in life.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALLE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for this opportunity to rise and pay tribute to a fellow colleague from Iowa, the Honorable KARL M. LECOMPTE. I did not know KARL before coming to this House 2 years ago except by reputation. Since my coming to this body I have come to know KARL and have felt that he was truly a friend even though we are not of the same political faith. KARL LECOMPTE is an American who has attemped to serve his country to the best

of his ability. He is noted in Iowa for being resourceful in observing the needs of the people he represents—and this is always important in serving in this high office. KARL rose, during his tenure in this House, to become the chairman of the great House Committee on Administration. In many ways Mr. LECOMPTE will have made his mark upon the pages of the annals of the history of this Nation. I will miss KARL in this House as will all who knew him well and who served with him. But I also wish for KARL and Mrs. LeCompte everything good as they leave the Washington scene to return to their native State to reenter the newspaper business. This is for them to be a retirement but it is obvious that it will be an active one. Again I say, I wish them well and Godspeed.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALLE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON].

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, for 12 years I have had the pleasure and privilege of serving with KARL LECOMPTE on the House Administration Committee. In addition, I serve with him on the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

KARL was chairman of the House Administration Committee when I came to Congress. He was kind and considerate of me when I was a freshman Congressman, and through these years has been a devoted friend.

We have worked together very closely. When I was the ranking minority member of our committee in the 83d Congress, KARL LECOMPTE always advised and conferred with me in all things concerning the activities of our committee. Likewise, when I was honored with the chairman's position beginning with the 84th and to the present, he has been most helpful and wholly cooperative. His advice has been sought and valued. Not only that, his record previously made, was an inspiration and a challenge to follow.

KARL LECOMPTE is a gentleman and a friend whom I hold in fondest esteem; and a devoted public servant. I wish for him and his lovely wife Dorothy, the best of all good things—happiness, health, and contentment.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALLE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, we regret that our distinguished colleague, KARL LECOMPTE, is leaving this body after 20 years of service.

He has served with great distinction as chairman of the House Administration Committee in the 80th and 83d Congresses. His role as ranking minority leader on the same committee has been equally distinctive.

KARL LECOMPTE has been a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for the past 6 years, and a member of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements. As a committee member he has diligently served in the best interests of the Nation. His service in Congress has been more than a job, it has been a responsibility of the highest order.

Before joining the Committee on Foreign Affairs, KARL and I were delegates on a special mission to Australia to attend the Australian Commonwealth Jubilee in Canberra, Australia. It was on this trip that I got to know KARL as an amiable traveling companion and friend.

KARL LECOMPTE has a great wealth of understanding and tolerance and a pleasant sense of humor. All these attributes are serviceable here. For, despite all the pressures and hectic activity on the Hill, he always maintains a sound perspective on the overall requirements and responsibilities of the Congress.

We are going to miss the friendly companionship, the good commonsense, and the inspiration for better service which KARL LECOMPTE provides. We are especially going to miss his wise counsel around the table of the Foreign Affairs Committee. Our very best wishes and sincere affection go with him. We hope he will continue to have a very fruitful and rewarding life among the friends and neighbors whom he represented in such outstanding fashion in Congress for all of these years.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to the Congress KARL LECOMPTE was among the first Members I met. Having been born in the State of Nebraska, bordering Iowa on the west, and representing a District in Minnesota bordering Iowa on the north, naturally we from the same part of the country had much in common and were brought together frequently. I always admired and had warm personal regard for KARL. But in part because he is a very unassuming person and does not push himself forward as the cartoonists would have you think all politicians do, I did not get to know him real well until he joined the Committee on Foreign Affairs 6 years ago. During these years I have had the privilege of sitting two seats from him through the many weeks and months of that committee's deliberations. He was always faithful in attendance, always participating actively in the discussions. You find KARL LECOMPTE is a stronger man, an abler man, a more dedicated man, the more you get to know him. He has a great capacity to give himself in loyal friendship to all with whom he is associated. He has an unusual degree of affection and loyalty to the State of Iowa and to the people of his District. He has that same sort of affectionate loyalty to his alma mater, Grinnell College, in his District. He never missed an opportunity to call to our attention the achievements of some fellow alumnus. And like all persons who give themselves generously, he calls out a like response from others. The more you see KARL LECOMPTE at work, quiet, studious, thorough, kindly, helpful, completely dependable, the greater your own regard and affection for him. He is a genial individual. He enjoys life and people. I know he has greatly enjoyed all his years here. He enjoyed the trips abroad, such as the gentleman from Missouri has spoken of. He made friends everywhere.

We shall miss him very greatly in the Congress. And, he will miss the Congress. But we know he goes back to Iowa to the people he loves, and we wish for him and his lovely and devoted wife, Mrs. LeCompte, many years of useful, a bit more relaxed and a very happy retirement.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, too many of our experienced Members are leaving this great body this year. We on the Committee on Foreign Affairs are going to miss KARL LECOMPTE keenly. Quiet but deeply interested, he played a real part in our deliberations. I am happy to have this opportunity to wish him and his charming wife much joy and constructive living in the years to come.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I say amen to all that has been said about my colleague and my next door neighbor for many years on the seventh floor of the New House Office Building, Mr. LECOMPTE of Iowa. While visiting there, I often met his lovely wife; a wonderful individual. He was very fine and she was very fine. We will miss them terribly.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it was not only my privilege and honor to serve with my colleague, Mr. LECOMPTE, here in the House, one of the most distinguished Members of this body, but it was also the good fortune of Mrs. Younger and myself to be associated with Mr. and Mrs. LeCompte socially. We appreciated both of them immensely. We have never met a couple that we admired more, a couple that we will miss more after retiring from this body than the LeComptes. Both have earned retirement because of their wonderful service to the people, not only of Iowa, but the people of the United States. May they live long and enjoy the fruits of their labors.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to meet KARL LECOMPTE when I first came here 10 years ago, because I was assigned to the Committee on House Administration of which he was the ranking minority member. I do not think I have ever known a more helpful or more kindly person in my life. I have served on that committee when he was chairman of it. He served on the NATO parliamentary committee, of which I have been chairman since its inception, so that I have served with him both as chairman and when he was chairman of the committee.

In both instances I found that he would go out of his way to be helpful. On the NATO committee he was always present at the delegation meetings, at the plenary sessions, at the committee sessions, and was extremely helpful to those of us on the American delegation.

In addition, I have had the privilege of being invited to his home, and he and Mrs. LeCompte have come to our home. My wife and I think they are the kind of people it has been a privilege for us to know. We shall certainly miss them when they go back to Iowa.

I join their many friends and colleagues in wishing for them the best of everything, and a long, happy, and useful retirement.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, for the past 20 years our distinguished colleague, KARL LECOMPTE, has served his country and his District as a devoted public servant.

He was first elected to the 76th Congress in 1938. In 1953 he joined the Committee on Foreign Affairs and has served with great distinction. In the work in the committee he devoted himself vigorously to the task of solving some of the most pressing problems confronting the Nation.

KARL LECOMPTE is a man of the highest integrity who has stood firmly by his principles. He is consistent in his views and has won the respect, admiration, and affection of all who know him. His sincerity of purpose and friendliness of nature compel deep respect and enduring affection.

The people of Iowa are rightfully proud of his achievements in the past 20 years as a Member of this body. His sincere friendliness and cheerfulness will be missed by many of the Members.

The Foreign Affairs Committee is losing one of its most valuable members. His diligence, wisdom, and leadership will be missed. We are sorry to see him leave, but I am sure he carries with him the best wishes of every member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and of the House of Representatives.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAUND. I have had the privilege to serve with Congressman KARL LECOMPTE on the Committee on Foreign Affairs. My service on the committee was made more pleasant because of the association with KARL. He has been a kind friend and good counselor with me. I shall miss him keenly. I shall always know him as a beloved friend.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. and Mrs. LeCompte were among the first people I met when I came to Washington several years ago. My wife and I were fortunate to enjoy their company many times.

In Congress I was fortunate to serve on the Committee on Foreign Affairs with KARL LECOMPTE. It was during this period that I learned why our colleague has had such a long and outstanding public career.

He is patient and understanding; he is always cheerful in attitude and cooperative. He is firm in his convictions, conscientious in his work and reflects a strong sense of responsibility for the people he so ably represented.

We shall miss him very much. I am happy to join in this well deserved tribute and to extend to him and his wife every best wish.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, my very good friend and colleague from Iowa, Hon. KARL M. LECOMPTE, is voluntarily retiring from Congress at the end of this year.

KARL is completing 20 years of distinguished service in the House of Representatives. He was chairman of the Committee on House Administration in 80th and 83d Congresses. In addition, he was a valuable member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He has represented the Iowa Republican Members of the House on the important Committee on Committees for many years. He has also served on the important Republican policy committee.

KARL is a man of wide experience, having been a newspaper publisher for many years and also a member of the Iowa State Senate for 4 years. Always attentive to his legislative duties, KARL has consistently voted for the best interests of his constituents. His reelection to the Congress for 10 consecutive terms by the people of his District is the best evidence of that fact.

It has been a real privilege and a genuine pleasure to have been so closely associated with Congressman LECOMPTE throughout the years. I have welcomed his wise counsel and advice. Being from the same State, we of course had much in common, and I shall always consider him to be one of my closest and devoted friends. I wish him the best of everything as he returns to his home town of Corydon, Iowa, where he and his lovely wife, Dorothy, have built a new home. KARL will continue with his newspaper work, and I am sure that his editorials will reflect his usual sound thinking and Americanism at all times. Mrs. Hoeven and I wish the LeComptes the best of everything as they leave Washington for good old Iowa.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN].

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, as a result of the decision of our colleague, KARL LECOMPTE, to retire at the end of his present term, the Congress is losing one of its most able Members, and the people of the State of Iowa are losing an outstanding Representative.

For the past 4 years I have had the privilege of serving with KARL LECOMPTE on the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I can say without hesitation that he will be sorely missed by the membership of that committee.

I join KARL LECOMPTE's host of friends and admirers in wishing him and his lovely wife many future years of happiness and good health.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed emotions that I join my colleagues in expressing my regrets on the voluntary retirement from Congress of our distinguished friend and colleague from Iowa, the Honorable KARL M. LECOMPTE.

It was a pleasure and privilege to serve with Mr. LECOMPTE on the Foreign Affairs Committee and to have the opportunity of working closely with him. Even before that time, I long admired Mr. LECOMPTE and greatly respected him for his integrity, soundness of judgment, and devotion to legislative work. Needless to say, Mr. LECOMPTE, the Foreign Affairs Committee will intensely miss your sound and sage counsel. The committee can ill afford to lose you at the very time five other members of the committee have also decided to retire: namely, Chairman GORDON, Mr. BYRD, Mr. VORYS, Mr. RADWAN, and Mr. PROUTY.

May you and Mrs. LeCompte, together with your family and friends enjoy a long and happy future. May God's choicest blessings be showered upon you and yours.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I greatly regret that our colleague, the Honorable KARL M. LECOMPTE has elected to retire from Congress. I shall miss his companionship and the opportunity to discuss many of the issues with which we are confronted.

On the other hand, I know that he will find great happiness and relaxation in a return to the publication of his newspaper and in the new home which has just been completed.

Mrs. Gross joins me in the sincere hope that KARL and his good wife, Dorothy, as they embark upon their retirement may have many years of health and happiness which they so well deserve.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in honoring the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE].

As former chairman and ranking Republican member of the House Administration Committee, he has rendered many years of able and valuable service.

It was a privilege to serve with him on that committee for the past 2 years. It gave me the pleasure and the opportunity to get to know KARL better. My association with him has been most pleasant. He is indeed a man of great ability, courage, and integrity.

His courtesy, friendliness, and cooperative spirit have endeared him to me as I know it has to all who have had the pleasure of knowing and working with him.

To KARL and his wife I extend sincere wishes for good health and good fortune and many years of a most pleasant and happy retired life.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, before I was elected to represent the Sixth District of Florida, I knew Congressman KARL M. LECOMPTE and his lovely wife, Dorothy. He was a valued friend of my father, Dwight L. Rogers. They not only lived in the same hotel here in Washington, but served in the Congress together. Although it has not been my privilege to have been here during the major portion of his service in the Congress, I do count it an honor to have at least been here during part of the time he has served. I have found

his advice and counsel helpful at all times, and I feel it has been a privilege for me to have continued the warm friendship between the Rogers and the LeComptes.

I extend my best wishes for continued happiness to Congressman LECOMPTE and his fine family.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I heartily concur in all the compliments that have been paid to our colleague, the gentleman from Iowa, KARL LECOMPTE, who was elected to the Congress on the same day in 1938 as was I.

To know KARL as I know him is to respect him, and admire his high qualities, not only as a statesman of the highest order, but also as a gentleman; honest in all his dealings with his fellow man, and a true friend and patriot.

KARL told me how very difficult he found it not to be a candidate again, but finally he decided to retire after his long service of 20 years here in the Congress. Congressman LECOMPTE served his people well and with great distinction, always doing that which in his heart he felt was best for them and their children, not only for today but for the future. We can ill afford to lose such a man in the Halls of Congress.

However, he leaves his duties here with the very best wishes of his multitude of friends. All that is enjoyable and pleasing and good in life is my personal wish for those dear friends, Karl and Dorothy LeCompte.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, even though our party affiliation has placed us on opposite sides of the aisle in the House of Representatives, I would like to join my colleagues in wishing the Honorable KARL M. LECOMPTE, of Iowa, much happiness and success upon his retirement.

Congressman LECOMPTE will be long remembered for his fine service as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, House Administration Committee, Joint Committee on Printing, and Joint Committee of the Library. His keen ability and his knowledge of Government fitted him admirably to serve on the above-named committees.

KARL LECOMPTE served in the Senate of the State of Iowa from 1917 to 1921 and came to Washington as a member of the 76th Congress. His outstanding record of accomplishments will always be a guiding light to future Representatives of Iowa's Fourth District.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my good friends from the great Iowa delegation in paying tribute to one of its members, the Honorable KARL M. LECOMPTE. KARL is voluntarily retiring, and he and his gracious wife have every reason to be proud of his fine record.

He has done an excellent job and our best wishes go out to both him and his wife in their retirement.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Iowa Republican delegation in the House, I want to express appreciation to everyone who has participated in paying these fine tributes to my dear friend, KARL LECOMPTE. I know that he and his lovely wife will be deeply touched by the sentiments expressed here today.

VOICE OF THE VETERAN

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, from North Dakota, in 1937, there came to Washington a World War I veteran. His trip was for the purpose of completing a change of station. He was leaving a successful period of employment as veterans service commissioner in his native State. He was moving to Washington to become associated with the national rehabilitation program of the American Legion as a claims worker.

The veteran making the trip was T. O. Kraabel. In his new station he repeated the successful experience of previous years in serving the veterans of North Dakota. The group to be dealt with was national, rather than statewide, in scope; but the responsibility was basically unchanged. Torger O. Kraabel, "T. O." to countless friends, proved, by his consecrated service to veterans, that he had the capacity to deal with the American Legion's national rehabilitation program, and so he became its director in 1941.

In 1958, "T. O." has reached the chronological age which calls for his retirement as director of that program. Actually, those who know him, hold to the belief that retirement for "T. O." is a fiction. In mind, in body, and certainly in spirit this is a period in "T. O.'s" life when he will be able to use his fine capacity and great experience in continuing to help others.

It is interesting to note the background of this man who was honored in February 1958 at the annual national conference of the American Legion's National Rehabilitation Commission and American Legion service officers from all over the Nation. At that time, he was presented with a book of letters expressing the thanks and good wishes of many who recalled their experiences in their association with him and his work; he was praised by those who introduced him to the conference banquet guests; he was given a formal expression of thanks in a beautiful silver set; and he received a gift of cash.

Luther College, in Decorah, Iowa, where he received his bachelor of arts degree in 1915, recognized his standing as an alumnus, and granted an honorary doctor of humanities in 1954. It is perhaps significant that in service in the American expeditionary force in World War I, he was one of that select few who were chosen to serve as official couriers, and that in such service he was assigned to the American Peace Commission. For "T. O." is essentially a peaceful man, given to exercising his talents with a tolerance that has become one of his hallmarks.

From the millions of World War II and Korean conflict veterans who were helped by the benefits provided by the GI bill of rights, there has come no formal expression of thanks to "T. O." for his work in securing adoption of that monumental piece of veterans legislation; but his persevering labors to plan, to secure passage of that legislation, and to see that it was properly administered, are indelibly stamped in the record. As the wartime director of the national rehabilitation program, in a period when the American Legion was operating under the manpower shortages then known in many areas, his was the coordinating mind which channeled American Legion efforts to a successful conclusion.

In family life, "T. O." has been happy. He and his wife, Charlotte, and their daughter, Elizabeth, now grown to young womanhood, have moved pleasantly and quietly among a small group of friends in their social activities. His devotion to the religion of his Norwegian ancestors is shown by his activity in Grace Evangelical Lutheran Church in Washington. He was treasurer of that congregation in 1949.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF T. O. KRAABEL, CONSULTANT TO THE DIRECTOR, NATIONAL REHABILITATION COMMISSION, THE AMERCIAN LEGION

Army number 2162289; registrant, Traill County, N. Dak.; born Clifford, N. Dak., August 27, 1893, of Norwegian-American parents; occupation, student; inducted at Hillsboro, N. Dak., on September 6, 1917. Sent to Camp Dodge, Iowa. Served in Company I, 352d Infantry, to October 2, 1918; Army Candidates School, Langres, France, to November 17, 1918; personnel office, 331st Infantry, to December 14, 1918; Company I, 352d Infantry, to discharge. Grades, Private, first class, January 8, 1918; corporal, February 26, 1918; sergeant, May 20, 1918; overseas from August 3, 1918, to August 17, 1919. Discharged on April 4, 1919, to accept commission; commissioned second lieutenant infantry, on April 5, 1919; assigned to postal express, AEF, to April 6, 1919; attached to the American Peace Commission as official courier. In this capacity, served in Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, Italy, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Germany. Discharged at Camp Dodge, Iowa, August 23, 1919, as a second lieutenant.

Education: Public schools, Clifford, N. Dak.; Bruflat Academy, Portland, N. Dak.; Luther College, Decorah, Iowa, bachelor of arts, 1915; University of North Dakota Law School, 1916–17; doctor of laws, Luther College, June 1950.

Occupation: Cashier, Farmers State Bank, Security State Bank, Lawton, N. Dak., February 1920 to December. Finance officer, veterans' bureau, Fargo, N. Dak., January 1915 to April 1927. Veterans' service commissioner, State of North Dakota, April 1927 to June 1937. Claims representative, national rehabilitation committee, the American Legion, Washington, D. C., July 1937 to December 1958. Executive secretary, national rehabilitation commission, the American Legion, January 1939 to April 1941. Acting director, national rehabilitation commission, April 1941 to September 1941. Director, October 1941 to January 6, 1958.

Organizations: Member, Gilbert C. Grafton Post 2, the American Legion, Fargo, N. Dak. Voiture 240, 40 & 8, N. Dak. Life member, Sigma Nu fraternity. Army-Navy Club, Washington, D. C. Area D vice chairman, national rehabilitation committee, the American Legion, 1934–36. National vice chairman, National Rehabilitation Committee, 1936–37. Grace Evangelical Lutheran Church, Washington, D. C., financial secretary, 1940–41 and 1957; member church council, 1940–43, 1946–49, and 1956–57; treasurer, 1949.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 9020. An act to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9262. An act for the relief of the estate of A. A. Alexander;

H. R. 13475. An act to authorize an exchange of lands at the Rochester Fish-Cultural Station, Ind.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 11749. An act to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 6 months, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD, Mr. KERR, Mr. FREAR, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, and Mr. WILLIAMS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 4059) entitled: "An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Carmen Scoppettuolo," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CARROLL, Mr. HENNINGS, and Mr. WATKINS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1864. An act to authorize an increase in the membership of the Board of Appeals of the Patent Office; to provide increased salaries for certain officers and employees of the Patent Office; and for other purposes;

S. 1903. An act to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, relating to travel expenses of civilian officers and employees assigned to duty posts outside the continental United States;

S. 3335. An act to provide for a National Cultural Center which will be constructed, with funds raised by voluntary contributions, on a site made available in the District of Columbia;

S. 3379. An act to provide for adjustments in the annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system;

S. 3942. An act for the relief of certain aliens distressed as the result of natural calamity in the Azores Islands, and for other purposes;

S. 4039. An act to authorize the expenditure of funds through grants for support of scientific research, and for other purposes; and

S. Con. Res. 109. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress on the establishment of the United Nations force.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to Senate amendments to the bill (H. R. 9700) entitled "An act to consolidate into one act all of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12226) entitled "An act to amend the Virgin Islands Corporation Act (63 Stat. 350), and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 25) entitled "An act relating to effective dates of increases in compensation granted to wage board employees."

ISSUING OF PASSPORTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to discuss pending legislation that I believe is extremely important to the security of the United States.

The United States Supreme Court on June 16, 1958, handed down the decisions of Kent against Dulles and Dayton against Dulles, Docket Nos. 481 and 621, which held in effect that there is no law in being at the present time which authorizes the Secretary of State to deny passports to Communists or Communist supporters. As a result of those decisions, there are no means available to the Secretary of State to deny passports to persons wishing to go overseas to engage in activities harmful to the United States, such as espionage, subversion of foreign governments, and propaganda.

H. R. 13760, which I introduced, is intended to fill the gap that has resulted from the Supreme Court's decisions of June 16.

Section 5 of the bill clearly sets forth a Congressional finding that the international Communist movement is dedicated to weakening and ultimately dominating the United States; that it constitutes a clear, present, and continuing danger to the security of the United States; and that its agents and supporters use passports to promote the objectives of international communism. For these reasons the bill provides that passports may be denied, and I repeat, may be denied, by the Secretary of State to three categories of persons:

First. A member or former member of the Communist Party.

Second. An individual who is affiliated with the Communist Party.

Third. An individual who knowingly engages or has engaged since 1948 in activities intended to further the international Communist movement.

In all three categories, however, the Secretary of State must make an affirmative showing that the activities or presence of the person abroad would be harmful to the security of the United States.

Despite what you have heard or what you may hear, the rights of the individual are safeguarded under the terms of this legislation. There is clear provision in section 8 for an administrative hearing. Similarly, there is a provision for judicial review in the district courts of the United States. These provisions are intended to insure that no Secretary of State arbitrarily infringes on the rights of citizens and to insure that the requirements of due process of law shall be met.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs gave careful and detailed consideration to this legislation. No less than 10 different bills were on the committee calendar. Furthermore, the bill which we reported underwent a thorough and searching analysis which resulted in the amendments adopted by the committee.

I think I should point out here that H. R. 13760 was reported by the committee without a dissenting vote.

President Eisenhower has urged the passage of legislation that would effectively plug the loophole left by the Supreme Court's decisions of June 16, 1958. In his message of July 7 of this year to the Congress the President said:

I wish to emphasize the urgency of the legislation I have recommended. Each day and week that passes without it exposes us to great danger. I hope the Congress will move promptly toward its enactment.

Since the President's message of July 7, the number of applicants who the State Department believes would fall into the category covered by this legislation has increased from 60 to 386. Should this measure fail to pass before Congress adjourns, there are indications that the number of applicants will continue to increase and that it will be necessary, under the Court's decisions of June 16, for the Department of State to issue passports to those persons before Congress reconvenes in January.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I want to join with the gentleman in his expressions as to the urgency of this matter. As the gentleman and others know, I am retiring from the Congress this year and I had looked forward, after finishing the big bills in our committee, to coasting down the home stretch. But, then I read that Presidential message, which the gentleman has just quoted and which I want to repeat, in which the President said:

I wish to emphasize the urgency of the legislation I have recommended. Each day and week that passes without it exposes us to great danger.

When I read that I urged our committee at least to look into the matter to find out whether there were grounds for such a statement. At a hearing over a month ago in our committee, we were then told that there were over 60 applications pending on which the files contained information of Communist activities when the Supreme Court decided this case on June 16 and that the State Department had no grounds any more for denying passports to such persons. We were told over a month ago that 70 new applications of the same kind had come in. As the gentleman has said, we were told last

week that that 70 has jumped to 386 such applications that have come in. Here are the names of some of those 60 that immediately had to receive their passports because they were pending at the time of the court's decision: Paul Robeson, Anna Louis Strong, both recent visitors to Moscow; Anita and Henry Wilcox, and Harry Bridges.

Our committee was presented with a very long and elaborate bill, dealing with a great many passport problems—problems which still persist. It occurred to me that the time situation was such that there would be no chance to act on such a bill. So I determined to see whether we could not get up a short bill that would put the finger in the dike, that would at least plug this one place so that those who are active in the Communist movement could be prevented from going abroad. I worked with my friend, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN], who is now addressing us, and with officials of the Department and with other Members of the Congress, and we tried the thing in a series of bills. Now this is said to be a highly controversial matter. I think the gentleman will agree that when our committee started on this in the first of its 5 or 6 hearings on the bill, the committee was certainly not of one mind. But, to me, a thing that should be considered by this House is that that committee brought out this bill without a dissenting vote and there are expressions in the committee report from those who have filed supplemental views with which I could join and with which the gentleman could join. So that we have reduced this to the bare minimum that will enable our Government to prevent these people, and not merely Communists, because the fact that a person is a Communist does not mean that he will not get a passport, but prevent those persons tied into the Communist movement whose presence abroad would be harmful to our security, from receiving passports. This bill merely prevents such people from going abroad, but surrounds all applicants with safeguards to prevent arbitrary action by our Government.

I think it should be pointed out that travel by American Communists abroad is essential to the furtherance of their conspiracy to overthrow our Government. Personal contact among international Communist leaders is vital to their activities. Strategy plans, subversive activities, and arrangements for the flow of cash and information in support of the Communist conspiracy are obviously facilitated by personal contact. Written messages, whether by open mail or diplomatic pouch, are no substitute for secret personal meetings.

Under the Walter-McCarran Act, the entry of alien Communists into the United States was prevented. Enactment of this bill would block the other end of this two-way street by helping to prevent the departure of American Communists operators from the United States.

If this bill were enacted, the fact that passports are not presently required by American law for travel to other Western Hemisphere countries would not destroy this Government's power to impede the travel of Communists within the Western Hemisphere because almost all of South America and much of Central America cannot be visited without a passport, owing to the legel requirements in those areas. Moreover, American Communists who legally can go to Mexico without a passport but who then take off from there for Prague would be subject to criminal prosecution unless they apply for and obtain a United States passport.

The fact that the travel of Communists to Mexico and Canada cannot presently be prevented through passport controls is no argument for not attempting to prevent their travel to other and more important foreign areas.

And late as the hour is today and late as the hour is in this session, because of the extreme urgency of this situation as pointed out by our President and as agreed to by those devoted members of our committee who have studied this problem so carefully, I still have great hope that action can be taken. It is almost unbelievable that any one person would take the awful responsibility of blocking consideration of this bill.

I want to say one more thing in conclusion considering the original divergence of views in our committee, in view of the fact that there were many on that committee who are anxious to preserve the right of travel, just as anxious as is the Supreme Court, it is to me a tribute to the statesmanship of our committee that we were able to work out this bill without a dissenting vote. It seems to me that this should be impressive with our colleagues, the fact that it was done without a dissenting vote, the fact that it was done at all; therefore, I hope that this will not have proven to be on my part and on the committee's part a lost labor of love, but that it may prove an effective labor, even though the time is short, by enacting this bill into law.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SELDEN. I thank the gentleman from Ohio who did yeoman work in perfecting and bringing this legislation before the committee. I, too, hope that his efforts will not be just a lost labor of love.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. I would like to emphasize the fact that here we are in the closing days of the last session of this Congress and are presented with a rather unusual procedure in handling what I think everyone will agree is a vital piece of legislation.

All of us would rather see it handled in the ordinary normal course of business. Obviously at this time that is impossible. We would like to take the opportunity to hammer out here, as we did in committee, all possible ideas in connection with the legislation. Obviously, that is not now possible.

I think the record ought to be clear, however, that the situation that gave rise to this problem occurred as late as June 16 of this year; that the President's message came down on July 7; that it was after that date that a bill was first introduced and that immediately, as the gentleman from Ohio said, a great deal of effort and work went into trying to reconcile the various differences of opinion and ideas on trying to do something on this issue. As a result we find ourselves finally at this point with a bill which came out of the Foreign Affairs Committee unanimously.

There are those who will disagree with what has been done and would rather have something else done. I think, however, that basically and fundamentally all ideas on this subject were presented to our committee or were brought up in the committee at one time or another during the consideration of this bill. I think the gentleman will agree with that statement.

There are those who would impose absolutely no restrictions or limitations whatsoever on the issuance of a passport by the United States of America. To those people this legislation cannot possibly be an answer, nor can there be a compromise which would suit them. If they feel constrained, therefore, at this point to take the position that this legislation is unreasonable, that is a philosophy or position to which they are personally entitled.

In my view, the restriction upon this right as presented in this bill is as reasonable, as justifiable, as logic and reason can make it.

There are those who would want to write with great particularity into the legislation the procedure by which an individual who would be involved in this shall protect his rights. Perhaps that can be done, I do not know. Every possible avenue certainly has been explored and discussed, and I, for one, have not seen the language which would prescribe with particularity the things that some folks are talking about. I believe the language in the bill at this late date to meet the emergency which confronts us, through no one's fault in particular, is as reasonable and logical as this committee and this Congress can make it at this time.

I join with the gentleman and urge the passage of the legislation and hope that under the procedure by which it will be considered this House will have an opportunity to consider and pass upon the legislation, recognizing full well that there are those who might not agree in all particulars on all four squares with the legislation. In the hope, however, of plugging the gap, we ought to pass the legislation.

Mr. SELDEN. I thank the gentleman from Florida who has worked tirelessly and effectively in securing committee approval of H. R. 13760.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I think it should be made clear that this legislation is not intended to reverse the Supreme Court. The legislation is intended to fill the gap that the Supreme Court found was lacking in our law. The Supreme Court definitely found that Congress had not acted in this field. They held that existing law was not sufficient.

What we are doing is not to get around the Supreme Court but to propose a law that will fill the gap the Supreme Court said was lacking; that is, give statutory authority to the Secretary of State to bar these individuals.

We talk about the right to travel freely as being a part of our liberty. Well, our right to travel freely is regulated and denied here in the United States every day, not by the Secretary of State, not even by a policeman, but by an electric traffic light. If you run through that red light and do not stop when it says "Stop," you may go to jail. We have various traffic devices, we have regulations as to drivers' licenses, enacted for what purpose? To interfere with an individual's right to travel, in the interest of the public safety. That is what this bill proposes in this deadly struggle we are having with worldwide communism: individuals, where the necessary findings have been made, can have their travel abroad interfered with, in the interest of the safety of the rest of us. A passport has been described by the Court as "carrying the implication of extending the bearer diplomatic protection." We are not going to give them that kind of protection in travel when the public safety, when the security of the United States is endangered by their travel.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Alabama and also the other members of the committee, including particularly the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], who have labored so long and I think productively in this very difficult field with its admittedly unclear borderlines. We ought to make it plain that the bill does not deny to any American citizen the right to travel; rather, it recognizes that while the citizen has such a right, he does not have in exercising that right, any right to require that this Government assist him in that travel if it can demonstrate in hearings and in the courts that the travel will be harmful to the very security of the Nation.

The right to travel does not give any right to have the Government endanger its own survival by issuing him a passport that will give him special assistance, protection, and privileges around the world. We have no business to be facilitating anything that we can demonstrate is injurious to our country.

Another point ought to be made with respect to this legislation. Some people fear that citizens may be denied passports because of their views or associations. This legislation very carefully steers clear of that. The key word in it on this point is activities, the passport can be denied by the Secretary of State only if it can be demonstrated that the individual has—

knowingly engaged since 1948 in activities intended to further the international Communist movement—

Or that his—

activities or presence abroad would be harmful to the security of the United States.

This does not interfere with anybody's views or anybodys' right to associate with whom he pleases. It does not convict anybody of guilt by association. It merely says that where the individual's presence or activities abroad would be harmful, the Government may in its own defense deny him a passport—after hearings and with the right to appeal.

The bill, as was pointed out by the gentleman from Florida, is not complete or perfect. It cannot possibly stop all these individuals from getting passports; but it will stop many. The very fact that since the Supreme Court's decision in June, so many of them have emerged from wherever they have been, and suddenly applied for passports, knowing the Secretary cannot now refuse, indicates that a lot have been stopped from applying by the previous interpretation that the Secretary of State had the authority to deny. Once it is established by this legislation that he has the necessary authority, under these very careful safeguards, I think you will find that many of the most dangerous among them will not be pressing for passports, because that would lead to revelation of the activities in which they have been engaged.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that the Congress wants to go home with our Government stripped bare of any authority in law to defend itself against these dangerous agents and couriers of a conspiracy that is resourceful and tireless in its efforts to destroy this republic. I join in hoping that even at this late date a means will be found to take action upon this genuinely vital measure.

Mr. SELDEN. I thank my collegue from Minnesota.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman agrees that the matter of this legislation was considered not in any sense of fear but in a sense of urgency based on the realities which this country faces in the international Communist conspiracy.

Mr. SELDEN. The gentleman is quite correct.

Mr. FASCELL. Would not the gentleman further agree with me that what we should emphasize, is the fact that this is permissive authority?

Mr. SELDEN. That is correct. The Secretary of State is authorized but not required under the terms of H. R. 13760.

Mr. FASCELL. To be exercised in the sound discretion of the Secretary of State at times and in such manners as he thinks will be in the best interest of the United States within the framework prescribed by the legislation.

Mr. SELDEN. It is very definitely permissive legislation and is limited to the several specific categories that I listed earlier.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, is it not also obvious that the Secretary of State is not going to withhold a passport from any citizen unless he is very sure that he has a case that will stand up when it is tested in the courts? Therefore it is certain that there will not be reckless use of this permissive authority, because the courts would upset him and that would redound to his discredit rather than to the benefit of the country?

Mr. FASCELL. Is it not correct that a person must knowingly engage in Communist activities under the terms of H. R. 13760?

Mr. SELDEN. That is correct. It is stated very definitely in the bill that a person must knowingly engage in activities intended to further the international Communist movement.

Mr. FASCELL. And which are found to be against the best interests of the United States; is that correct?

Mr. SELDEN. The bill states:

As to whom it is determined that his or her activities or presence abroad would under the findings made in section 5 be harmful to the security of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to point out that H. R. 13760, the bill the committee has reported, is much more restricted than the legislation that was originally requested by the administration. Yet, it grants the necessary authority to the Secretary of State and, at the same time, provides adequate safeguards to the rights of the individual.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize the extreme difficulty that the leadership encounters during the closing days of a Congress in deciding upon the legislation that must be considered before adjournment. At the same time, I am hopeful that Congress will not adjourn before H. R. 13760 has been carefully considered.

APPEALS COUNCIL OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, this morning I appeared before the Appeals Council of the Social Security Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, on behalf of a constituent appealing an unfavorable decision on her total disability pension claim.

I had an opportunity to learn firsthand the difficult job the members of the Appeals Council have in determining equitable adjudications in disability cases. I came away convinced more than ever that the language "substantial gainful activity" must be more clearly defined.

The Chairman of the Appeals Council, Mr. Joseph E. McElvain, and the other members present, Mr. Bernard D. Levinson and Mr. Henry W. Sullivan, were most courteous, understanding, sympathetic, and sincere. These gentlemen, as well as the district managers and the regional referees who handle these cases have to judge them on the basis of the

data and facts presented to them—which, very often, are misleading or do not give the true picture of the situation. There is no doubt in my mind that these officials are trying to do a conscientious job, but I fear that at times worthy cases receive unfavorable consideration, and there is prolonged delay before a decision is reached. These delays are no doubt caused by the difficulties encountered in interpreting the meaning of the law, and by the shortage of adequate help.

I would like at this time to call to the attention of my colleagues the case of Miss Charlotte Winewski, of Milwaukee, better entitled "How Dead Must You Be?" It may seem like a melodrama script and a tear jerker. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted I included the entire file on this case, including correspondence from Miss Winewski and reports from the Social Security Administration. I am sure my colleagues will find this case history not only interesting reading, but will also find that it stresses the necessity for Congress and the Social Security Administration to define just what is meant by "substantial gainful activity."

HOW DEAD MUST YOU BE?

Miss Charlotte Winewski was born in 1907 and was employed as a head bookkeeper until 1945, when she became unable to work any longer because of rheumatoid arthritis. She was taken ill in 1938, when she was bedridden for 6 months. She recovered partly and was able to work most of the time until 1945. Then both legs gave way, and since then she has been getting steadily worse.

On September 19, 1955, Miss Winewski filed an application for disability benefits with the Social Security Administration. The application was denied.

Miss Winewski first contacted me on October 21, 1957. Her rheumatoid arthritis condition at that time was placed by her physician at 90 percent disabling. She was and is in terrific pain at all times. Every joint in her body has been affected except the right elbow. Both hands are deformed and there are two fingers on each hand which cannot be used because there is no strength in them. She is a much typist but she is reduced to pecking out her work with one finger of each hand, because her wrists are useless. The back of her head and the shoulders are also affected.

Miss Winewski has been doing a small amount of bookkeeping at her home for a business concern or individuals who bring the material to her house and call for it. Most of what she earns is used to pay for the expensive medicines she has to have. These have been costing her from $400 to $800 every year since 1948. I was amazed to learn that she managed to perform seasonal employment at an average annual salary of $1,400 in spite of her condition. I felt that Miss Winewski's case was a worthy one and urged that an appeal should be made from the decision by the Social Security Administration which denied her disability benefits.

On October 23, I wrote as follows:

OCTOBER 23, 1957.

Re Miss Charlotte Winewski, 387-10-1910, File No. 14: DO: RC.

Mr. R. W. HUGHES,
District Manager, Social Security Administration, 2609 West Oklahoma Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.

DEAR MR. HUGHES: My attention has recently been called to the above-named person's claim for disability benefits which was apparently disapproved by your Administration.

From the information submitted to me, it appears that Miss Winewski has been severely disabled with rheumatoid arthritis which has prevented her from following steady, gainful employment. She has been working periodically, on a seasonable basis, as a bookkeeper and accountant. Her recent earnings, however, are completely inadequate to provide for her needs.

In view of the circumstances of this case, I would appreciate your cooperation in reviewing this file to see what further consideration may be given to Miss Winewski's claim. It would appear to me that this lady has been unable to pursue "substantial gainful employment" within the meaning of the law, inasmuch as she has been reportedly unable to do a substantial amount of work and earn a fair and decent living.

With best wishes, I am

Yours sincerely,

CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
Member of Congress.

A similar letter was written to the Director of the Social Security Administration. The replies received follow:

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *October 25, 1957.*

Re Charlotte Winewski, 387-10-1910.

Hon. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ZABLOCKI: Miss Winewski filed an application for the disability freeze on September 19, 1955 and at that time we obtained detailed information regarding the extent of services she performed in connection with her business. Her claim was denied and she submitted additional medical evidence together with a request for reconsideration. Upon reconsideration it was determined that the original determination was in accordance with the provisions of the law and a period of disability could not be established for her.

To qualify for a period of disability, the impairment must so severely affect her overall ability that she is prevented from doing, not only her usual work, but also any other type of substantial gainful activity. A decision was made that the evidence of record indicates that Miss Winewski is able to engage in substantial gainful activity in spite of her arthritic condition.

If Miss Winewski does not agree with our determination, she can request that a hearing be held on her application. She was advised of this procedure, but to date has not contacted us.

Thank you for your interest in this case.

Sincerely yours,

R. W. HUGHES,
District Manager.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,

Hon. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ZABLOCKI: Your letter of October 23, 1957, requests further consideration of a claim filed by Miss Charlotte Winewski, 3477 South 13th Street, Milwaukee, Wis.

We have reexamined Miss Winewski's records and affirmed the denial of her application for disability insurance benefits because we find that the work she has done since at least 1951, despite an arthritic condition, demonstrated an ability to do substantial gainful work. This finding is supported by her own statements of services which are reasonably commensurate with her previous experience and annual earnings.

To qualify for benefits under the disability provisions of the Social Security Act, an individual must be unable to engage in any substantial gainful activity because of a severe impairment which can be expected to be of long-continued and indefinite duration. The impairment must prevent her from doing not only her usual work but also any other type of substantial gainful work.

The phrase "substantial gainful activity" as taken from the law relates to the individual's ability to perform work with some regularity in employment or self-employment for remuneratoin or profit. The controlling factor is the individual's capacity for gainful work. In determining whether an individual has the capacity, we examine her educational background and her experience and training, to discover the work potential and adaptability which may remain even after impairment.

In reporting self-employment since 1951, Miss Winewski's earnings averaged approximately $1,400 a year as compared to a previously reported 8-year average of $1,578 as wages received for bookkeeping work. The major part of her income since 1951 was earned during the seasonal income-tax period when she completed income-tax returns. The remainder was earned for a limited but steady amount of bookkeeping work she has done and is continuing. It appears that her small earnings during the later part of each year are due to lack of such suitable work. She has otherwise demonstrated in the early part of each year her ability and capacity to do a substantial amount of work, when it is available.

Miss Winewski has been advised that the denial of her application has been affirmed on reconsideration. She has also been informed of her right to request a hearing before a referee of the Social Security Administration. If she has any questions in this regard, the representatives in the district office at 2609 West Oklahoma Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis., will glad to help her if she will call or write to that office.

Sincerely yours,

VICTOR CHRISTGAU, *Director.*

On October 31, Miss Winewski wrote to me as follows:

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *October 31, 1957.*

The Honorable CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
Milwaukee, Wis.

DEAR SIR: I have your letter of October 23, 1957, and wish to thank you for all the help you are giving me in trying to establish my claim for disability benefits under the Social Security Act.

With the help of Mr. Hughes, of the South Side office of the Social Security Board, I filed a request for a hearing to be held on my application on the grounds that after payment of my medical expenses, the balance of my earnings were not enough to comprise substantial gainful activity.

My application for a freeze of my account was made over 2 years ago and all this time it's been kicked around, back and forth, and each letter I received seemed to raise some new point of objection. Now I am told that it might be a year before I am granted a hearing and, no doubt, another year before a decision is reached. Mr. ZABLOCKI, I need these benefits now, not when I'm dead and buried. You would almost think I was asking for charity. I'm asking for something

that I feel I am rightfully entitled to inasmuch as I contributed to the fund from the very first day the social security law was enforced back in 1936 to the present time. My condition is steadily getting worse and from all indications I may not even be able to do that tax work.

Mr. ZABLOCKI, is there anything at all you can do to help me get this hearing as soon as possible?

Whatever you can do on my behalf will be sincerely appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

CHARLOTTE WINEWSKI.

I immediately contacted the Social Security Administration authorities advising them that I had personally interviewed the claimant and believed her case warranted expeditious consideration. I pointed out that Miss Winewski is seriously afflicted with arthritis and that after payment of her medical expenses the balance of her earnings were not enough to comprise substantial gainful activity.

On November 9, I received the following letter from the social security district office:

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *November 9, 1957.*

Re Charlotte Winewski, 387–10–1910.

Hon. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ZABLOCKI: Early last week we had a very nice talk with Miss Winewski concerning the denial of her application for the disability freeze. At that time we also assisted her in applying for cash disability benefits which would be potentially payable beginning with December 1957 when she attains age 50. We also prepared her request for a hearing before a referee of the Social Security Administration.

The case will first be reviewed in our Division of Disability Operations at Baltimore to see if a decision in her favor might now be justified. If the denial is sustained she would then be scheduled for a hearing before a referee. She expressed a desire to appear in person before the referee and we believe that this was a wise decision on her part.

Miss Winewski is certainly deserving of sympathy and from all indications has struggled against her handicap with exceptional fortitude and determination. We feel, as you do, that an early date for the hearing would be quite desirable. However, the schedule is completely out of our control here in the district office and would depend on the backlog of similar requests with which the referee might be confronted. It's our understanding that referees generally have been facing a very heavy backlog of disability hearing requests, so it's rather difficult to be encouraging about the likelihood of her case being heard in the very near future. We did the best we could to give a complete account of our observations concerning the effect of her crippling arthritic condition and would hope that the information recently submitted would improve her prospects for a favorable decision.

In order that our Division of Disability Operations and the referee may be fully informed of your concern, we have forwarded your letter of November 6 to be associated with the request for hearing.

Your interest in the case of Miss Winewski is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

R. W. HUGHES,
District Manager.

On December 9, Miss Winewski wrote:

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *December 9, 1957.*

Hon. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ZABLOCKI: I wish to acknowledge your letters of November 8 and 12 and December 2, 1957, and wish to extend my sincere thanks and express my deep gratitude for the help you are giving me in trying to obtain social security disability benefits. I know you are a very busy person and faced with problems graver and of much more importance than mine; therefore, I am doubly appreciative of the time and effort you spend on my behalf.

From present indications, unless, of course, the medical profession comes up with a new miracle wonder drug very soon, I won't be able to continue doing the income-tax work as the pain in my hands, wrists, arms, and back of my neck and head is so severe and continuous that I just can't concentrate on what I'm doing.

I hope the hearing is granted very soon and thank you again for trying to obtain it for me as quickly as possible.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLOTTE WINEWSKI.

I continued in my efforts to obtain an early hearing on her case and finally the hearing was held on April 29, 1958, in Milwaukee. The referee's decision follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

REFEREE'S DECISION

In the case of Charlotte Winewski, 387–10–1910, case No. C–3165, claim for period of disability.

The above-entitled matter is before the undersigned referee because of a request for hearing filed by Charlotte Winewski, the applicant herein, who disagrees with a determination of the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, Social Security Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, that she is not entitled to the establishmeint of a period of disability under the provisions of title II of the Social Security Act. The hearing was held on April 29, 1958, in Milwaukee, Wis., and the applicant appeared in her own behalf.

On September 19, 1955, the applicant filed an application to establish a period of disability beginning June 23, 1945, alleging that since that time she has been unable to engage in substantial work because of rheumatoid arthritis. The Bureau, however, denied her application on the ground that she had not met all the requirements of the act to establish a period of disability, and so notified the applicant by letter dated October 22, 1956. Upon reconsideration the Bureau affirmed its initial determination and notified the applicant by letter dated October 16, 1957, that in spite of her arthritic condition her earnings demonstrated her ability to engage in substantial gainful activity.

The Social Security Act authorizes the establishment of a period of disability, upon application, if certain conditions have been fulfilled. The disability must have begun before age 65 and must have lasted continuously for at least 6 full calendar months. The disability must have begun at a time when the individual met certain insured-status requirements, that is, when 20 of the 40 last quarters and 6 of the last 13 quarters were quarters of coverage, and must still be in existence at the time of filing application. The term "disability" is defined in section 216 (i) to mean inability to engage in any substantial gainful activity by reason of a medically determinable physical or mental impairment which could be expected to be of long-continued and indefinite duration (or result in death), or blindness. Section 216 (i) also provides than an individual shall not be considered to be under a disability unless he furnishes such proof of the existence thereof as may be required.

The applicant, who was born in 1907 and who has had a high-school education as well as certain business courses in addition, was employed as a head bookkeeper until 1945, when she states that she became unable to work any longer because of rheumatoid arthritis. Her wage record shows regular earnings up to the middle of 1945, rising from $1,252 in 1938 to $2,351 in 1944.

The applicant testified that she was first taken ill in 1938, when she was bedridden for 6 months. After that she came out of it partly and was able to work most of the time until 1945. Then both legs gave way, and since then she has been getting steadily worse. She states that there is terrific pain at all times and she has to take 6 to 8 aspirins a day as well as metacortin. Every joint in the body is affected except the right elbow. In her legs, it affects her toes, her ankles, her knees and her thighs, formerly her hips also. Both hands are deformed and there are two fingers on each hand which cannot be used because there is no strength in them. She is a touch typist but she is reduced to pecking out her work with one finger of each hand, because her wrists are useless. The back of the head and the shoulders are also affected. She lists the various remedies she has tried as follows:

Chiropractor, 8 months; curative workshop; St. Lukes, therapy; blood transfusions; short wave; cosmic wave; gold; cortisone; metacortin; aralen; iron; vitamins; nutralite; juices; teas; baths every day; hot towel applications; butazolidin; terramycin.

A representative of the Bureau reported in September 1955 that when he saw her in her home she moved about very slowly and apparently painfully, using a cane. She did not walk erect but was noticeably bent over. Her condition now, as observable at the hearing, was at least as bad as this, and probably worse. She was unable to walk alone the few steps from her seat at the hearing table to the elevator, and had to be assisted by a friend who accompanied her. It took the assistance of two people to get her out of her chair.

The applicant further testified that she never leaves the house. She came to the hearing in a taxicab with the help of the friend, and she says that on New Year's Day she was carried by some friends to their house, but otherwise she has not been out. She lives alone and looks after her own needs, but when she moves about she has to lean on things and she is able to do very little. However, she has refused to take to a wheelchair because she feels she would have to stay there and would get stiffer and if a remedy for her disease were discovered she might not be able to take advantage of it.

She has been doing a small amount of bookkeeping at home for a business concern or individual who brings the material to her house and calls for it. Except during the period from the first of the year until income tax returns are due, this occupies only about 7 hours a month, and she receives from $15 to $25 a month for it. (From June 1956 until early in 1957 she had three of these accounts and was paid $40 a month, but both together only required about 9 hours in a month. Since then, the two remaining have been paying her $27 a month.) She says that in 1946 and 1947 she must have earned less than $600, because she did not file an income tax return. Her records

show that she has earned the following amounts since then:

Year	Total	January–March
1948	$709.00	(1)
1949	759.00	(1)
1950	869.75	(1)
1951	1,236.00	(1)
1952	1,356.00	$1,131
1953	1,423.00	1,198
1954	1,333.00	1,333
		January–April
1955	1,488.00	$1,253
1956	[2] 1,007.00	852
1957	[3] 829.00	(1)

[1] Not shown.
[2] 1st 8 months.
[3] 1st 10 months.

In her testimony she stated that her net earnings for 1957 were $1,076.

All of this except the small monthly payments from the regular clients mentioned is earned from income-tax work. However, in 1957 she says she turned down a good portion of the tax work because she was too sick to answer the door, and in 1958 she did not do any. She says that she does this work because she has to pay for the expensive medicines she has to use—cortisone formerly and now metacortin. These have been costing her from $400 to $800 every year since 1948. She claims that what she has earned is only 20 percent or 25 percent of what she could have earned if she were in a normal condition—that she would make $800 a month, since such work averages about $6 an hour and even more in the last year or two.

As to her method of working the applicant states:

"It is impossible for me to estimate the number of hours spent on these earnings. These earnings were for filing of income-tax work I did. I probably spent 12 hours working 1 day, probably none the next and 1 or 2 hours the third day. There are days, due to my illness that my hands and wrists are in such pain that I cannot use them, so, therefore, I do as much as I can on the days that the pain isn't so great."

An attorney who has known the applicant since the early 1950's testified that he knows of people who have given her bookkeeping work whether they needed it or not in order to supply her with a means of living, and that he himself has given her translations to do from Polish. People also take her papers to be notarized. The attorney states that she was crippled and showing signs of advanced arthritis when he first knew her, though probably not as bad as now.

In October 1945 the applicant was referred to the Curative Workshop of Milwaukee by her physician (Dr. Regan), who had prescribed parafin baths to both knees. Since then she has had other treatments, but the only clinical reports in evidence are from the arthritis specialist who has been treating her ever since December 1948 for rheumatoid arthritis. He states that she was bedridden for 6 months in 1938 and then became ambulatory, but that in June 1945 she became unable to work. His report (exhibit 16) continues:

"At the present time she is scarcely able to walk, having to use a support in order to ambulate. There is not only involvment of the hips, knees, ankles, and toes, but all the joints of the upper extremities as well. She has been under my care in the past, at Columbia Hospital, and has also spent 2 years in the out-patient department of St. Luke's Hospital in Milwaukee under care of Dr. Welch on a rehabilitation program.

"In the past 10 years she has had all of the usual methods of treatment of rheumatoid disease, including hospital rest, all forms of physiotherapy, rehabilitation, gold injections, vitamin, iron, butazolodin, terramycin, aralen, cortisone which was discontinued because of depression, replaced by meticorten, salicylates, deep-heat therapy, and transfusions.

"She has shown throughout a tenacity and determination to remain independent and has carried out all medical suggestions conscientiously. There are few patients with rheumatoid disease as advanced and extensive as that which Miss Winewski has, who would not be confined to the wheelchair and bed at the present time."

In his report (exhibit 6) made in September 1955 this doctor states that there is impairment of all peripheral joints in both upper and lower extremities as well as the shoulders and hips; that the sedimentation rate is 97 in 1 hour; that X-rays show loss of joint space, bone erosion and demineralization. His diagnosis is rheumatoid arthritis, stage IV, active. In a later report in June 1957 (exhibit 7) he states that X-rays show joint destruction and demineralization, and a typical diffuse rheumatoid involvement except in the right elbow, with contractures, visible deformities, and muscle atrophies about the involved joints.

One look at the applicant would convince anybody that she is completely disabled—hopelessly crippled—at the present time. Dr. Borman's reports confirm from a medical viewpoint that this is so. She has had the disease since 1938 and as long ago as that it was so bad that she was bedridden for 6 months. Almost every joint is affected, and the result is almost complete limitation of motion. In 1945 she had to quit her employment entirely by reason of her malady and she has never been able to return to it.

If this were all, it would not be difficult to conclude that from 1945 on she was unable to engage in any substantial gainful activity. In 1946, however, she begins to do bookkeeping work at home, on a limited scale, with the surprising result that from 1951 to 1955 she is able to earn from $1,300 to $1,500 every year, and over $1,000 right up to this year.

What does this mean? That she has recovered, or that she was never disabled—or does it mean something else? The referee believes that according to any reasonable standard and within the meaning of the disability provisions of the Social Security Act she was still and has been at all time in fact unable to engage in any substantial gainful activity and that 9 people out of 10 in her condition would have given up the struggle. By heroic effort, however, she has managed to perform from 7 to 9 hours of work every month and in the first 3 months of the year to force herself to a burst of exertion for this limited time sufficient to earn the necessary money to supply herself with medicine for the rest of the year. The referee feels with regret that his words would be inadequate to convey to others the impression he received and has retained of this courageous woman. He can only say that he is convinced that if the worse came to the worst she would still go down fighting.

It is true that the total sum derived from this effort has been about as much as she was earning by regular employment back in 1938. But obviously this means that her real earnings are only half what they were then, and she has testified that she could earn $6 or more an hour if she were well. Certainly the $25 or $27 a month which she earns regularly is not substantial. If she could go on throughout the year earning as much as she does in the first 3 or 4 months it might be necessary to hold that in spite of her impairment she had proved that she was not completely disabled. But from what she has testified and from what he saw of her the referee does not believe that she could undertake to do what she does in the first months of the year if it were not for the rest that she knows is coming after the hectic income tax period exertion is over. What she does do must be at a terrific cost to herself because she testified that if she uses the fingers for a quarter or half an hour the pain expands and is so bad she has to stop. For that reason she is never able to guarantee when she will get work out.

The referee finds that the applicant's inability to engage in substantial gainful activity by reason of her physical impairment began in June 1945 when she was forced to stop working. Accordingly, it is the decision of the referee that the applicant is entitled to the establishment of a period of disability based upon her application filed on September 19, 1955.

TENCH T. MARYO,
Referee.

Mr. Speaker, the referee decided the applicant was entitled to the establishment of a period of disability based upon her application filed on September 19, 1955. Miss Winewski was naturally pleased, and wrote:

I am very happy and relieved now that the whole thing is settled and have you to thank for having this taken care of so well and fast, and will always be grateful to you for all your help. These benefits will surely be of great help, but, believe me, Mr. ZABLOCKI, I would gladly exchange them for good health.

But that was not the conclusion of this case. On August 12, Miss Winewski wrote to me again, as follows:

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *August 12, 1958.*
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
New House Office Building, Room 1512, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ZABLOCKI: Here I thought my claim was finally settled and I had been waiting for a statement showing computation of my benefits, etc., and instead I got the enclosed letter informing me that the appeals council has decided to review Mr. Maryo's decision.

Mr. ZABLOCKI, I can't take much more of this. I filed application for a disability freeze September 19, 1955, and since then it's been one thing after another, objection upon objection, correspondence upon correspondence, favorable and unfavorable. How much longer will this go on?

Even though I am tempted to, I just can't give up now. I have too much at stake right now to take any chances of having Mr. Maryo's decision reversed. In a desperate attempt to prevent this from happening, I have written a letter to the appeals council which I am herewith sending you. Would you please read this letter and make whatever necessary changes or additions you feel that are required and return it to me. I am holding up the mailing of this letter until I hear from you, as at this point I can't afford to make any costly blunders.

This whole thing has been so vague and confusing. I feel as if I'm fighting a duel with the Government, only the Government refuses to give me a weapon with which to defend myself.

In the letter to the appeals council you will notice I stated I would ask you to appear for me at the review. Is this possible? I know you are a very busy man and engaged in matters of much more importance than mine, but I thought I would just ask anyway. If this is impossible, is there someone you know in Washington, an attorney, perhaps, who would be willing to represent me? It would make me feel better if I knew I would be represented at the review.

I don't know if you have a copy of Mr. Maryo's decision so, in order to save time, I am enclosing same. This, together with the enclosed copy of the letter to the ap-

peals council, I believe, would cover all the vital facts pertaining to my claim.

Please let me hear from you as soon as possible.

Sincere thanks for all your help and advice and with best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

CHARLOTTE WINEWSKI.

I then immediately contacted the chairman of the appeals council and the correspondence follows:

AUGUST 14, 1958.

Re Miss Charlotte Winewski, 387-10-1910, case C-3165.

Mr. JOSEPH E. MCELVAIN,
Chairman, Office of Appeals Council, Social Security Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MCELVAIN: This is with reference to our conversation yesterday concerning the case of Miss Charlotte Winewski.

I want to express my appreciation to you for responding to my call and for coming to the office to discuss this case, despite your oral advice to my Secretary that an interview between us at this time would serve no good purpose, because the decision is up to the panel. Further, I realize that it would be imposition upon your duties, if you responded to all of the calls of Members of Congress who have been contacted by claimants appealing their cases.

However, when a Representative feels that there has been a miscarriage of justice, or there appears to be a lack of understanding in a particular case, I am sure you will agree that it is his prerogative to consult you for his own benefit, and for that of the Social Security Administration, in order to clarify the questions in his mind.

Since our discussion, I have had an opportunity to review Miss Winewski's correspondence, and I find that she had not sent a letter to the appeals council in reply to the notice of August 6—but that she contemplated a reply—which you will undoubtedly receive in the near future.

I will appreciate receiving from you the information which you advised you would forward to me, that is, the memorandum containing the reasons for the appeals council's decision to review the referee's decision on Miss Winewski's claim. With this information, I will be in a better position to obtain the necessary data to present her case to the appeals council.

Thanking you again for your courtesy and cooperation in this matter, and with best wishes, I am,

Yours sincerely,

CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION AND WELFARE,
Washington, D. C., August 14, 1958.

Re Miss Charlotte Winewski, account No. 387-10-1910.

Hon. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ZABLOCKI: Pursuant to your oral request of August 13, 1958, for further explanation of the reason for the action of the appeals council in deciding to review the referee's decision in the case of Miss Charlotte Winewski of Milwaukee, Wis., I submit the following:

We decided to review the referee's decision because of (1) the lack of substantial medical evidence as to her condition on March 31, 1947, when she last met the earnings test and (2) her earnings record in self-employment in the 1951–56 period which raises a question as to her having a sufficiently severe impairment on March 31, 1947.

In order to qualify for a period of disability under the provisions of section 216 (i) of the Social Security Act, as amended, it is necessary that a claimant be unable to engage in any substantial gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental impairment which can be expected to result in death or to be of long continued and indefinite duration, provided that at the date she becomes so disabled, she meets the earnings requirements as set forth in the act.

Miss Winewski met the earnings requirements through the quarter ending March 31, 1947. Thereafter, the records of this department show no further earnings reported until 1951.

Although Miss Winewski alleged that she first became unable to work because of her impairment in June 1945, and the history in the case shows that she was suffering from rheumatoid arthritis at that time, there is no evidence of record to show the degree of involvement, deformity, or limitation of motion of the joints at that time. The earliest medical evidence of record was furnished by a physician who first treated Miss Winewski on December 17, 1948. In a report dated September 23, 1955, he says that her condition has gradually worsened.

Miss Winewski's work experience includes many years as a bookkeeper, and although the referee's decision held that she was unable to follow any substantial gainful activity after 1945, her earnings record shows substantial earnings in self-employment for the years 1951, 1952, 1954, 1955, and 1956. This would, of course, be indicative of the ability to engage in substantial gainful activity.

It appears that Miss Winewski's condition has deteriorated to a point where a period of disability can be established as beginning at a date subsequent to the date she alleged, and if she meets the earnings requirements at such date by reason of her self-employment in the 1951–56 period, favorable action may still be taken on her claim. You may be assured that this possibility will not be overlooked in our review of this case.

Your interest in this matter is appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH E. MCELVAIN, *Chairman.*

This brings me to date. This morning I represented Miss Winewski at the hearing, because I knew it was physically impossible for her to appear on her own behalf. The board members were most cooperative and understanding—and we are anxiously awaiting the final determination on this case. But in the meantime, I am sure all my colleagues will agree that the Congress and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social Security Division, should define "substantial gainful activity." I was advised that the Department in the very near future will issue a memorandum containing information and possible definition of the term "substantial gainful activity." This action should tend to promote uniformity of interpretation.

But I cannot help wonder whether it will still give the answer to the question: How dead must you be?

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Nebraska (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for Friday and Saturday this week, on account of official business.

To Mr. VINSON, for an indefinite period of time, on account of official business.

To Mr. BARING (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program, and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SELDEN, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. MARTIN (at the request of Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts), for 60 minutes, on tomorrow.

Mr. ZABLOCKI, for 10 minutes, today, and to include certain letters.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ROGERS of Texas in two instances.

Mr. HALEY.

Mr. EVINS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MOORE (at the request of Mr. QUIE) in six instances and to include extraneous matter.

(At the request of Mr. BALDWIN, the following Members and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. UTT.

Mr. SAYLOR.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. COAD) and to include extraneous matter.

(At the request of Mr. ALBERT, the following, and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. EDMONDSON.

Mr. MACDONALD.

Mr. MULTER.

Mr. FLYNT.

Mr. BURLESON in two instances.

Mr. AYRES.

Mr. MORGAN.

Mr. MILLS.

Mr. BONNER.

Mr. SPENCE.

Mr. ENGLE.

Mr. CELLER.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 8381. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to correct unintended benefits and hardships and to make technical amendments, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7720. An act for the relief of Viola Belger;

H. R. 9147. An act to provide for the disposal of certain Federal property in the Boulder City area, to provide assistance in the establishment of a municipality incorporated under the laws of Nevada, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11009. An act to provide for the establishment of Grand Portage National Monument in the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12207. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Alto Ross and children and for E. B. Ard and his daughter, Mrs. Joan Ard Nichols;

H. R. 12216. An act to designate the dam and reservoir to be constructed on the Cumberland River, near Carthage, Tenn., as the

Cordell Hull Dam and Reservoir, and to establish the United States Study Commission on the Neches, Trinity, Brazos, Colorado, Guadalupe-San Antonio, Nueces, and San Jacinto River Basins, and intervening areas;

H. R. 12303. An act to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands;

H. R. 12670. An act to provide for additional payments to the Indians of the Crow Creek Sioux Reservation, S. Dak., whose lands have been acquired for the Fort Randall Dam and Reservoir project, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12883. An act to provide for certain improvements relating to the Capitol Power Plant and its distribution systems;

H. R. 13549. An act to increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve the actuarial status of the Trust Funds of such System, and otherwise improve such System; to amend the public assistance and maternal and child health and welfare provisions of the Social Security Act; and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 653. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 659. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 607. An act to provide retirement, clerical assistance, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 3276. An act for the relief of Carl Ebert and his wife, Gertrude Ebert;

S. 3287. An act for the relief of Vivian D. Giesey;

S. 3818. An act for the relief of Vicenta Garcia y Fuente;

S. 4249. An act to authorize a program for the conservation, restoration, and management of the rare Hawaiian nene goose; and

S. J. Res. 135. Joint resolution providing for the construction of demonstration plants for the production from saline or brackish waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House, of the following titles:

H. R. 1493. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Charles A. Holshouser;

H. R. 2265. An act for the relief of Clifford Oesterlei;

H. R. 2269. An act for the relief of Truck and Axle Manufacturing Co.;

H. R. 4991. An act for the relief of Waldo Miller;

H. R. 5497. An act to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act;

H. R. 5584. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maude L. Smith;

H. R. 6238. An act to amend section 1292 of title 28 of the United States Code relating to appeals from interlocutory orders;

H. R. 6595. An act for the relief of Markus H. Teitel;

H. R. 7178. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph D. Metzger;

H. R. 7337. An act for the relief of James McGuire;

H. R. 7374. An act for the relief of Angelo Sardo;

H. R. 7499. An act for the relief of the Cooper Tire and Rubber Co.;

H. R. 7685. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eldrey L. Whaley;

H. R. 8014. An act for the relief of Miss Edith Dorn;

H. R. 8184. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Robert B. Hall;

H. R. 8735. An act to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the District of Columbia teachers retirement and annuity fund, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9407. An act to provide additional opportunity for certain Government employees to obtain career-conditional and career appointments in the competitive civil service;

H. R. 9500. An act to permit certain sales and exchanges of public lands of the Territory of Hawaii to certain persons who suffered a substantial loss of real property by reason of the tidal wave of March 9, 1957;

H. R. 9822. An act to provide for holding a White House Conference on Aging to be called by the President of the United States in January 1961, to be planned and conducted by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare with the assistance and cooperation of other departments and agencies represented on the Federal Council on Aging; to assist the several States in conducting similar conferences on aging prior to the White House Conference on Aging, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9833. An act to amend section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920;

H. R. 10587. An act for the relief of Homer G. Preston;

H. R. 10733. An act for the relief of Magnolia Airport, Inc.;

H. R. 10813. An act for the relief of Maj. Anthony R. Parrish;

H. R. 10993. An act for the relief of Kiiko Nemoto;

H. R. 11078. An act to promote boating safety on the navigable waters of the United States, its Territories, and the District of Columbia; to provide coordination and cooperation with the States in the interest of uniformity of boating laws; and for other purposes;

H. R. 11156. An act for the relief of Duncan Moore and his wife, Marjorie Moore;

H. R. 11200. An act for the relief of the estate of L. L. McCandless, deceased;

H. R. 11239. An act for the relief of James F. Moran;

H. R. 11299. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Tarsi Priori;

H. R. 12144. An act for the relief of Paul E. Nolan;

H. R. 12154. An act for the relief of Ernest T. Stephens;

H. R. 12365. An act for the relief of the estate of Suck Pil Ra;

H. R. 12632. An act authorizing Gus A. Guerra, his heirs, legal representatives and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.;

H. R. 12655. An act for the relief of S. Jackson & Son, Inc.;

H. R. 12662. An act to provide for the acquisition of lands by the United States required for the reservoir created by the construction of Oahe Dam on the Missouri River and for rehabilitation of the Indians of the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation in South Dakota and North Dakota, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12663. An act to provide for additional payments to the Indians of the Lower Brule Sioux Reservation, S. Dak., whose lands have been acquired for the Fort Randall Dam and Reservoir project, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12867. An act for the relief of Clayton T. Wells;

H. R. 12906. An act for the relief of Anneliese Ottolenghi;

H. R. 13132. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955;

H. R. 13406. An act to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended;

H. R. 13437. An act for the relief of Bernard H. English and John E. Hayden;

H. R. 13500. An act to provide for the disposal of federally owned property of the Hanson, Company, and Houma Canals, La., and for other purposes;

H. R. 13559. An act to amend the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act of 1956 to permit the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make payments with respect to special restorative training, or specialized courses of vocational training, for younger persons than those with respect to whom the Administrator may now make such payments, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 557. An act to amend the act of September 7, 1957 (71 Stat. 626), providing for the establishment of a Civil War Centennial Commission;

H. J. Res. 630. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to use certain real property in the District of Columbia for the proposed Southwest Freeway and for the redevelopment of the Southwest area in the District of Columbia;

H. J. Res. 654. An act requiring the Secretary of Commerce to submit certain recommendations for legislation for the purpose of assisting Congress to determine whether or not to reimburse States for certain highways on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; and

H. J. Res. 661. An act to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, August 23, 1958, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2256. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, relative to stating that an adequate soil survey and land classification of the land in the Paonia project, Colorado, has been completed as a part of the investigation required in the formulation of a definite plan for project development, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2257. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report of the Secretary of Agriculture on the orderly liquidation of commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation and on programs to expand agricultural markets, pursuant to Public Law 540, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMAS: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 13856. A bill making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year end-

ing June 30, 1959, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2689). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: Committee of conference. H. R. 7785. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional judge for the juvenile court of the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 2690). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MURRAY: Committee of conference. S. 25. An act relating to effective dates of increases in compensation granted to wage board employees (Rept. No. 2691). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MURRAY: Committee of conference. H. R. 7710. A bill to provide for the lump-sum payment of all accumulated and current accrued annual leave of deceased employees (Rept. No. 2692). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MOSS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 4305. A bill to recognize the Ryan-Hemet Airport as a public airport for the purposes of the Federal Airport Act, and to provide for reimbursement for damage to such airport in accordance with such act; with amendment (Rept. No. 2693). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee of conference. S. 3420. An act to extend and amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Rept. No. 2694). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee of conference. H. R. 469. A bill to protect producers and consumers against misbranding and false advertising of the fiber content of textile fiber products, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2695). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LANE: Committee of conference. H. R. 6282. A bill for the relief of the former shareholders and debenture noteholders of the Goshen Veneer Co., an Indiana corporation (Rept. No. 2696). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 102. Concurrent resolution accepting the statue of Dr. Florence Rena Sabin, to be placed in the Statuary Hall collection; without amendment (Rept. No. 2697). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 103. Concurrent resolution to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of the late Dr. Florence Rena Sabin and authorizing ceremonies on such occasion; without amendment (Rept. No. 2698). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SHEPPARD: Committee of conference. H. R. 13489. A bill making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2699). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 13856. A bill making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 13857. A bill to provide that the Supreme Court may invalidate a State statute only by unanimous decision of the Justices participating; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana:

H. R. 13858. A bill to authorize the rehabilitation of the Sherburne Lake Dam and outlet works, Milk River project, Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 13859. A bill to provide for promotion of economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 13860. A bill to provide for an averaging taxable income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. R. 13861. A bill to repeal certain provisions of law relating to messengers for the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 13862. A bill to establish an additional naval district, consisting of eastern Texas, Arkansas, and northern Louisiana; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:

H. R. 13863. A bill to provide for promotion of economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 694. Resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the committee print entitled "How To Obtain Financing Under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958," and providing for additional copies; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 13864. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Marrone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 13865. A bill for the relief of Alice K. Rush; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 13866. A bill for the relief of Maria Jesualda Reis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

735. Mr. CARNAHAN presented a resolution adopted by the Missouri Department of the Veterans of World War I, United States of America, at its State convention May 17 and 18, 1958, held in West Plains, Mo., that the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested and urged to promptly grant an age pension to the Veterans of World War I, by passing H. R. 2201 at this session of Congress, which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Imports of Japanese Textiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 22, 1958

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, some time ago when we were debating the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, a great many Members of the House raised serious questions about increasing textile imports from Japan. I particularly raised the question of velveteen imports, because one of the largest velveteen manufacturing plants in the United States was located in my District and had to cease operations of its velveteen production because it could not compete with similar velveteen being produced in Japan by labor which received an average of 17 cents per hour wages.

When we raised these questions and referred to what had already happened and then wondered what would continue to happen, we were assured by the administration spokesmen and by other advocates of the bill then before the House that Japan had imposed upon itself a voluntary quota restriction system which would keep Japanese textile imports to the United States at a moderate figure.

Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I read a news item in the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer, issue of August 19, 1958, which reads as follows:

JAP GOODS REACH UNITED STATES VIA AFRICA

WASHINGTON.—Secretary of Commerce Weeks said Monday 86,000 yards of Japanese velveteens were brought to this country recently on a South African ship.

He informed Representative WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, Democrat, of South Carolina, the shipment, valued at $56,000 was placed in a bonded warehouse August 1. DORN had asked Weeks to investigate reported shipments of Japanese goods by way of South Africa.

"The goods in question have not entered the economy of the United States," Weeks wrote. "Goods entered into a bonded warehouse may be withdrawn for reexport or may be entered for consumption into the United States at a later time. * * *

"As matters now stand, since these cotton goods have not been entered for consumption, we are not in a position to say that this case involves an unauthorized transshipment from Japan or a violation of the Japanese voluntary program."

There is no denial that the 86,000 yards of Japanese velveteen mentioned in this item were imported to the United States. The statement by the Secretary of Commerce that "The goods in question have not entered the economy of the United States" is both ridiculous and absurd. One cannot believe that the Secretary of Commerce is so naive as to believe that this shipment of velveteens will be brought into the United States, stored in a bonded warehouse and then reshipped or reexported to another country.

Some of us wonder if the purpose is not to bring it into the United States,

store it temporarily and then withdraw it after the Congress adjourns. In fact, if the Congress had adjourned at the normally expected time, around August 1, these goods might have been placed on the open market for sale, distribution, and consumption in the United States without ever being stored and bonded.

I am taking the Secretary of Commerce at his word that the goods in question have not entered the economy of the United States. I am also assuming that he is dealing in whole truths and not half-truths by leaving the inference that these goods will not enter the economy of the United States in violation of the voluntary agreement concerning Japanese textile imports.

I, therefore, have written the Secretary of Commerce making additional inquiry on this 86,000-yard lot of Japanese velveteens, and on the 15th day of each month from now on I expect to write him and ask him the status of this shipment.

I sincerely hope that he has not resorted to attempted deception and that he will see to it that these goods do not enter the economy of the United States and that they are promptly transshipped from this country to their "original" destination.

Changing Imports Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OMAR BURLESON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 22, 1958

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, some administration officials have made it clear they have no intention of heeding Congressional advice to make changes in the voluntary import program. Calling the program remarkably successful, Assistant Commerce Secretary Frederick H. Mueller said:

> One of the things we should feel comfortable about is that we have a voluntary program that can be changed overnight, instead of a mandatory legislative program. This is particularly good in this time of unrest in the Middle East.

That statement is particularly disquieting in the face of recommendations from some quarters that the voluntary program be scrapped altogether if the new Middle East crisis materializes.

Presumably these people believe that denial of Middle East oil would create the need for importing more crude oil into the United States—exactly what happened during the Suez debacle.

One of the arguments used for long-term extension of the Trade Agreements Act is that stability is necessary in planning imports. Yet the voluntary program for oil imports is commended because it can be changed overnight.

Mueller concedes the voluntary program has no ready answer for requests of some 54 newcomers asking import rights for about 363,000 barrels a day of crude oil into districts XI–IV.

He expresses as a personal belief that some weight should be given to the people who have invested in foreign oil. Meanwhile he saw fit to attack in rather bitter terms the IPAA history of opposing unrestrained oil imports, saying they have cried wolf too often to be taken seriously.

If the administration officials don't take heed of the new Congressional mandate—

Said one independent—

it looks like we are headed for Government control over oil similar to that of FPC control over gas. This voluntary guise is a farce, of course, which can only serve to vest Federal officials with more and more powers to decide day-to-day issues, like who gets a quota and how much. As long as the thing works exactly the opposite of what it should, penalizing not the importers of excessive oil but rather those who can't have imports, the backlog of requests is going to grow—and with it Federal bureaus regulating our business. Yet because they call it voluntary that is supposed to be preferable to a positive system for regulating imports.

Tobacco Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 22, 1958

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter written to Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS from James P. Richards, the president and executive director of the Tobacco Institute, Barr Building, Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TOBACCO INSTITUTE, INC.,
Washington, D. C., August 19, 1958.

The Honorable PAUL A. DOUGLAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: On page 274 of the printed hearings before the Committee on Finance, on H. R. 7125, you are quoted as follows:

"Senator DOUGLAS. I think the Senator from Indiana raised a very important question yesterday when he asked why you could not have the tax at the time of sale, rather than prior to the time of sale or any stated period.

"I have checked with the staff, and subject to their check, I think that all of the manufacturers' excise taxes that I know of, at least, are levied at the time of sale. That is true of automobiles, true of tires which we heard about yesterday, of durable consumer goods, and of tobacco.

"Why is not this a sound principle for distilled spirits as well?"

When H. R. 7125 was before the Senate for consideration on August 11, 1958, the following colloquy took place between you and Senator LONG (p. 16861):

"Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

"Mr. LONG. I yield.

"Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not important in this connection to compare the excise taxes on whisky with the excise taxes of other manufactured products? We collect about $11 billion a year in all excise taxes. Is it not true that with the single exception of whisky, those taxes are levied when the manufacturer, or in 1 or 2 cases the retailer, actually sells the product?

"Mr. LONG. The Senator is entirely correct.

"Mr. DOUGLAS. That is, the taxes are not collected in advance of the sale. That is true of tobacco. It is true of beer. It is true of a wide variety of products. But is it not also true that with respect to whisky, the tax is levied at the time it is taken out of the bonded warehouse? If it is less than 8 years old, it is levied, irrespective of how long it has been kept in the warehouse, once it leaves the warehouse. If the American distiller produces whisky which is 10, 12, or 14 years old and he keeps it in the warehouse, he has to pay the tax at the end of 8 years, even though he does not sell it for 2, 4, or 6 years later? Is that not true?

"Mr. LONG. Yes.

"Mr. DOUGLAS. He has to carry the interest charges and the factory's loss, and so forth, during this time.

"Mr. LONG. The Senator is entirely correct.

"Mr. DOUGLAS. The present provision is really intended to put the taxation of whisky on parallel terms with the taxation of all other manufacturers' excise taxes; namely, that the tax is collected at the time of sale and not at some artificial cutoff date."

Knowing that you will welcome clarification of a possible misunderstanding, I am taking the liberty of pointing out that the payment of Federal excise taxes on tobacco products actually occurs prior to manufacture, which, in many cases, is as much as 45 days prior to the actual sale of the products.

Although the Internal Revenue regulations governing the payment of the tax provide for the incidence of the tax liability upon removal from the bonded premises, the tax stamps, which in most cases serve as a closure for tobacco packages, are purchased prior to manufacture and are affixed at the time of packaging.

This old-fashioned method of collecting the tax, i. e., through the sale of stamps, has resulted in an ever-increasing burden to our industry. It is estimated that tobacco manufacturers have, at all times, in excess of $150 million tied up in tax prepayment, which makes necessary the borrowing of funds or use of their resources to purchase the required Federal tax stamps before the taxed merchandise is sold. Payers of excise taxes imposed subsequent to the levy on tobacco products have been provided more modern and efficient business procedures of tax accounting by return, without the use of stamps. Unlike tobacco manufacturers, these payers of excise taxes are permitted to make tax payment on the last day of the month following the month in which tax liability is incurred and to file a quarterly return.

By the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, Congress sought to end this discrimination against the tobacco manufacturers by provision in section 5703 (a), subchapter A, chapter 52, for the payment of tobacco excise taxes by return, as other excise taxes are paid. You will recall, I am sure, that the act gave the Secretary of the Treasury power to promulgate regulations to carry out the intent of Congress so expressed. To date, no such regulations have been promulgated by the Secretary and thus the intent of the act to establish the return system for the tobacco industry has not been effected.

In H. R. 7125, which you and your colleagues on the Senate Finance Committee recently had under consideration, there was a provision directing the Secretary of the Treasury to provide a 7-day return period for the payment of tobacco excise taxes. Because such a short period as 7 days would provide little real relief for manufacturers

of cigarettes, the Tobacco Institute, Inc., submitted to the Senate Finance Committee a statement in support of an amendment to H. R. 7125 which would afford more equitable treatment to tobacco manufacturers by placing them on the same basis as most other payers of excise taxes.

Although the conferees on the part of the House and the Senate agreed to strike out the 7-day provision from the bill, we look forward to more favorable consideration by the 86th Congress and we respectfully seek your support of our efforts in behalf of more equitable treatment in the payment of tobacco excise taxes at that time.

I remember very pleasantly our association from time to time when I was a Member of the House and I hope that our paths will soon cross again.

With best personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

JAMES P. RICHARDS,
President and Executive Director.

Farm Outlook—Best in Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 22, 1958

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I have been carefully following the rise and fall of the price quotations for farm products, and it is with satisfaction that I note the outlook for our Nation's farmers this harvest time is the best in years. Not only are the prices for farm commodities better in most instances, but most of the huge surpluses have been reduced and thus lessen any threat to the profits which our farmers can expect to reap for their toil in tilling the fertile soil of our great country.

This is most heartwarming to me, because I have long been an admirer of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, and have supported his recommendations by voting for the sound farm programs which he has proposed to Congress. The Benson philosophy of freeing the farmers from Government regulation and returning to a sound agricultural policy where prices are dictated in the market place and not by Federal bureaucrats has certainly paid dividends. Those who formerly scoffed at Benson and asked for his scalp are now singing his praises and he is the most sought after for speaking engagements of any member of the President's Cabinet.

Although my farming experience is somewhat limited, I have always had a profound respect for our farmers. Because of the nature of the terrain in the First District of West Virginia, we do not have any farms, and the principal sources of income are derived from mining and manufacturing.

The number of farms in the First District is rather small, but our farmers are aggressive and obtain the maximum production from the limited acreage which they have. Dairy production and livestock is the major source of farm income in this area, but we also produce some of the finest apples and other orchard crops found in the Nation.

During my tenure in office, I have come to rely very strongly on the recommendations of the American Farm Bureau as to the agricultural program which is best suited to meet the needs of the people of our State and the Nation as a whole. I confer and correspond regularly with officials of the Farm Bureau here in Washington, and at both the State and local levels in West Virginia. I can certainly commend this organization for the realistic approach which they have taken to the farm problems, and the zeal with which they encourage the farmers of America to learn to provide for their own needs rather than depending upon Government subsidies as a cure-all. The job of a Congressman would be lightened tremendously if other so-called lobbying and pressure groups in Washington had as sound a program and asked for as little Federal help as that advocated by representatives and members of the American Farm Bureau.

During this past session, my office has been responsible for helping and assisting a number of our farmers in obtaining loans for the purchase of homes and farms under the program administered by the Farm Home Administration. I have also personally helped farmers in applying for soil conservation assistance and in connection with placing lands under the Soil Bank conservation reserve program. We have also been able to supply the farmers in the First Congressional District with copies of the annual Agriculture Yearbook and have mailed a great number of farm bulletins to both farmers and housewives.

The 1958 Agriculture Yearbook entitled "Land" will be available for distribution about October 1 and I will be happy to send a copy to any farmer or agricultural student as long as my limited supply lasts. Also, I will forward on request a complete list of all farm bulletins which are available for free distribution, and will furnish general information regarding any of the programs administered by the Agriculture Department or other agencies of Government which might affect the farmers and livestock men in my District. These services are available to all simply by addressing a letter or postcard to my office.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial taken from the August 23, 1958 issue of the Wheeling Intelligencer, Wheeling, W. Va. This editorial, entitled "Out of the Doghouse," is a resounding tribute to Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, and I wholeheartedly subscribe to the thoughts expressed therein.

The editorial follows:

OUT OF THE DOGHOUSE

Capitulation of the once-powerful farm bloc on the issue of price supports furnishes further evidence of the growing stature of Agriculture Secretary Benson. And this, in turn, is in large measure a reflection of improved conditions on the farm.

As finally accepted by the Senate and sent to the White House, this new farm legislation, which heads off drastic cutbacks in acreage allotments for cotton and rice and removes planting controls for corn, also lowers price support floors for major crops from 75 to 65 percent of parity. Farm bloc representatives wanted the acreage revisions, but sought higher rather than lower price supports.

Thus Mr. Benson forges another step ahead in his objective of removing the Government gradually from the field of farm management, of returning American agriculture to an enterprise producing for the market rather than for storage. That the resistance he received was little more than token and that the men who do the farming showed little interest in high price guaranties should have occasioned no surprise. The American farmer is enjoying greater prosperity today than has been the case for a long time and just as they once blamed Benson for all of their ills, farmers are beginning to credit him with at least partial responsibility for their current blessings. The Department of Agriculture's July report shows that these blessings are many. The overall farm net income, this report discloses, was at the rate of $13.3 billion during the first half of 1958, a 22-percent gain over the like period last year. Moreover, farm assets are at an all-time high, $188 billion, farmers have less than $11 in debts for each $100 of assets, farm ownership is at a record high, only 1 farm in 3 has a mortgage, the standard of living on American farms is the highest on record and 96 percent of our farms and ranches still are family owned.

One other statistic is worthy of note. The buildup of farm surpluses has been reversed, Government investment in farm products acquired in the price-support program having dropped 20 percent during the past year and a half.

So it would appear that a farm program fought every inch of the way by farm bloc politicians has resulted both in reversing the surplus buildup and bringing greater prosperity to American agriculture, a development which has transformed a man once considered the Republican Party's worst liability into one of its most valuable assets.

S. B. (Bess) Owens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 22, 1958

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to perform my sad duty in advising the Congress of the recent passing of my good friend and counselor, S. B.—Bess—Owens of Wellington, Tex. The city of Wellington, the county of Collingsworth, and indeed all of Texas mourns the passing of this great American.

Few communities in the world have the good fortune of such men as was Bess Owens and it is impossible to think of Wellington without thinking of him. He was a moving factor in the area and the surrounding territory and contributed so very much to the development and progress of that section of the State.

Bess Owens was a farmer, a native Texan, and had lived in Collingsworth County some 40 years. His service to all persons who came in contact with him were many and his lifetime was a wonderful example of helpfulness to others. Perhaps his greatest professional gift was his interest and service to the lifeblood of the area, agriculture, in which his vision and perception were excellent.

The finest gift he possessed, however, was the capacity to give of himself for others and he exercised it in full measure. He was truly an outstanding man among outstanding people. His greatness will become more apparent each day and his contributions to mankind will live forever. His friendship, which was my good fortune, will always be one of my most cherished treasures.

I feel sure that all the Members will want to join me in tendering deep sympathy to Mrs. Owens and to the host of friends who, with me, mourn his passing.

Multiple Sclerosis Hope Chest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 22, 1958

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement of mine concerning the 1958 multiple sclerosis hope chest.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BEALL

Worthy endeavors have been made in the Nation's Capital recently in behalf of the 1958 multiple sclerosis hope chest. The Washington, D. C., area chapter of the National Multiple Sclerosis Society has performed a needed and important community service in spearheading a drive to aid victims of multiple sclerosis, a progressive crippling disease of the central nervous system which strikes at random through our population and is no respecter of sex, occupation, or previous state of health.

Under direction of Vice Adm. H. R. Thurber, United States Navy (ret.), the annual fund-raising campaign was assisted by 12,000 marchers who generously agreed to canvass their neighborhoods throughout metropolitan Washington. Many constructive efforts were lent to this cause, not the least of which was the special benefit sponsored by Mrs. Ethel M. Fistere, president of the Connecticut Avenue Association and director of the Arthur Murray studios in this area. Mrs. Fistere organized a ball which was televised from the Shoreham Hotel on the evening of June 15, a highlight of which was the award made to Mr. Jack Cooke as national multiple sclerosis father of the year. Support was rallied to help find the cause of multiple sclerosis which affects over a quarter of a million young adults in this country and which, I understand, currently afflicts some 2,600 patients and suspected cases in this community. Those who are interested in receiving information about multiple sclerosis may contact the local office of the Multiple Sclerosis Society at the LaSalle Apartment Hotel, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

It has been of interest to me to note that Mrs. Fistere was in the forefront of this humanitarian endeavor. She is not a stranger to worthy causes. As a past president of the local Soroptomist International, Mrs. Fistere provided leadership for many of that organization's charitable activities. This year she is serving as the first woman president of the Connecticut Avenue Association, a group composed of nearly 100 shops, banks, churches, and various business establishments. The association has received acclaim for its outstanding civic contributions to the Red Cross blood donor campaigns, the United Givers Fund, the Hungarian Relief drive, the Round-the-World Children's Christmas Party it has sponsored, and many others.

Vice Admiral Thurber and his many dedicated helpers in the hope chest campaign are striving earnestly to find the cause and cure of a dread disease.

Senate Passes, House Committee Acts, but Rules Committee Blocks TVA Self-Financing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 22, 1958

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, with all the actions taken by the Congress, which is soon to adjourn, one of the bills which the Congress failed to enact is the measure to permit the Tennessee Valley Authority to issue revenue bonds to provide for financing needed facilities to this great Government agency.

As the Members are aware, the Senate passed such a measure by a bipartisan vote of 61 for and 20 against. The House Public Works Committee favorably reported two bills in this area, one identical with the Senate-passed measure. However, the Rules Committee failed to grant a rule for the consideration of the bill and the House was thus denied an opportunity to work its will on this legislation.

This is a good bill and should be enacted early in the next session of the Congress.

The simple facts are that such a bill will; First, do away with the need for Federal appropriations to finance normal TVA growth needs. Second. The measure would also require the TVA to make large cash payments into the United States Treasury—larger than now called for. Third. This legislation would maintain Congressional control over TVA and place definite restrictions upon TVA service area—the measure would reduce and not increase the area which could now receive TVA power. Fourth. The bill, which the House was not permitted to act upon, puts a reasonable ceiling on the amount of bonds which could be issued and gives the Congress power to disapprove new projects. I repeat, the legislation is needed. It is a good bill and a fair bill which should have been considered and enacted into law.

By failing to act, the Congress was denied consideration of legislation in this field affecting future power needs of six million people who live in the area. With no appropriations being provided, certainly the Congress should let these six million people have an opportunity to vote bonds. I should add, the bonds would be "gilded edge," paid off, and liquidated. This too is not a novel or new proposition, as TVA has issued bonds in the past and they have all been paid off and liquidated.

The failure to act on this legislation is one of the shortcomings of an otherwise great, constructive and productive session of the Congress.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have included with my remarks a statement by our distinguished Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, which appeared recently in the Nashville Tennessean.

The article follows:

TVA OFFICIALS FAIL IN SELF-FINANCE PLEA

KNOXVILLE.—TVA board members have returned to Knoxville from a weekend visit to Washington with no hopes for self-financing bill action this year.

The board members could not be reached for comment yesterday but it was learned they were unsuccessful in their efforts to see President Eisenhower to make a final plea for the bill.

All three of the board members, Gen. Herbert D. Vogel, Arnold R. Jones, and Dr. Frank Welch, were appointed by the President.

All had endorsed the House Public Works Committee's version of the self-financing bill, which remains locked in the house rules committee.

At Washington Monday, Representative CLIFFORD DAVIS, of Memphis, chief strategist of the House TVA bloc, said he will resign from Congress if the bill does not pass at the next session.

DAVIS, whose chairmanship of the Rivers and Harbor Subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee led to his selection as chief sponsor of the bill, said the drive for the bill will begin early in the next session.

Speaker SAM RAYBURN, Democrat of Texas, told reporters in his daily news conference yesterday he hopes to get the bill passed early in the next Congress.

"I am hoping to get it up early next year," he said. "It is a good bill and I am strong for it."

"I think that CLIFF DAVIS (Representative CLIFFORD DAVIS, Tennessee Democrat) did a fine job in getting the bill out of the Public Works Committee. I hope he reports the same bill next year, and that we pass it," RAYBURN said.

DAVIS said:

"If we don't pass it next time, I'll resign from the House," according to a Chattanooga Times report.

The opinion of TVA directors that the bill is dead for the present session was supported yesterday by Clyde Ellis, executive secretary of the National Rural Electric Cooperatives Association.

Ellis, one of the national leaders in the drive for the TVA bill, said he probably will discuss his ideas of strategy for the next session when he makes a speech in Tennessee, Thursday night.

Fair Trade Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 22, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on July 21 I appeared before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in behalf of S. 3850, the fair

trade bill, which I have the honor to cosponsor with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. On the same day, I received unanimous consent to have my statement to the committee printed in the RECORD. Before the committee, I submitted two tables in evidence of my contention that it is possible to have fair margins for retailers, fair prices for consumers, and also flexible pricing with fair trade enforcement. These tables were made a part of the committee's record, but were not available at the time my statement was printed in the RECORD. In order to make this record complete, I ask unanimous consent that these tables be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE I.—*House brand gasoline prices by quarters*

[In cents]

Date	Newark, N. J.			Philadelphia, Pa.			Wilmington, Del.			Baltimore, Md.			55-city average		
	Dealer price	Dealer margin	Retail price excluding tax	Dealer price	Dealer margin	Retail price excluding tax	Dealer price	Dealer margin	Retail price excluding tax	Dealer price	Dealer margin	Retail price excluding tax	Dealer price	Dealer margin	Retail price excluding tax
1953—July 1	15.9	5.3	21.2	16.1	4.8	20.9	16.1	5.9	22.0	15.8	5.7	21.5	16.55	5.52	22.07
Oct. 1	15.9	5.8	21.7	16.1	4.8	20.9	16.1	5.9	22.0	15.8	5.6	21.4	16.54	5.47	22.01
1954—Jan. 1	14.4	5.5	19.9	15.6	6.3	21.9	15.6	6.4	22.0	15.3	6.3	21.5	16.35	5.62	21.97
Apr. 1	13.65	2.25	15.9	15.4	6.5	21.9	15.4	6.6	22.0	14.6	6.9	21.5	16.24	5.36	21.60
July 1	13.9	3.0	16.9	15.4	5.5	20.9	15.4	6.6	22.0	14.6	6.9	21.5	16.05	5.53	21.58
Oct. 1	13.9	3.0	16.9	15.3	4.3	19.9	15.7	6.8	22.5	15.4	6.4	21.8	16.20	5.12	21.32
1955—Jan. 1	14.9	2.0	16.9	14.9	5.0	19.9	15.7	6.8	22.5	15.4	6.3	21.7	15.91	5.35	21.26
Apr. 1	14.9	3.0	17.9	15.3	4.6	19.9	15.7	6.8	22.5	14.9	6.8	21.7	16.24	5.18	21.42
July 1	11.4	3.5	14.9	12.9	4.0	16.9	15.7	6.8	22.5	14.6	7.7	21.7	16.33	5.11	21.44
Oct. 1	15.0	1.9	16.9	14.5	2.4	16.9	15.9	6.0	21.9	15.4	4.5	19.9	16.26	5.17	21.43
1956—Jan. 1	14.5	2.4	16.9	15.0	4.9	19.9	15.9	6.0	21.9	15.4	4.5	19.9	16.32	5.32	21.64
Apr. 1 [1]	13.5	3.4	16.9	14.5	3.4	17.9	15.9	6.0	21.9	15.4	6.1	21.5	16.42	5.01	21.43
July 1	14.9	5.0	19.9	15.3	4.6	19.9	16.1	5.8	21.9	15.7	6.5	22.2	16.34	5.44	21.78
Oct. 1	14.9	5.0	19.9	14.6	4.3	18.9	16.1	4.8	20.9	15.7	6.5	22.2	16.40	5.34	21.74
1957—Jan. 1	14.9	5.0	19.9	15.3	4.6	19.9	15.6	5.3	20.9	15.7	6.5	22.2	16.21	5.28	21.49
Apr. 1	15.9	5.0	20.9	14.6	5.3	19.9	16.6	4.3	20.9	16.7	6.5	23.2	16.63	5.32	21.95
July 1	16.1	5.8	21.9	14.0	3.9	17.9	14.7	5.2	19.9	16.9	6.3	23.2	16.65	5.54	22.19
Oct. 1	15.9	5.0	20.9	14.6	4.3	18.9	14.5	4.4	18.9	16.3	6.1	22.4	16.21	5.21	21.42
1958—Jan. 1	14.4	4.5	18.9	12.9	4.0	16.9	13.4	4.5	17.9	16.0	5.9	21.9	16.55	5.16	21.71
Apr. 1	15.2	4.7	19.9	15.2	4.7	19.9	15.2	4.7	19.9	15.3	5.6	20.9	16.39	5.19	21.58
June 1	14.2	4.7	18.9	15.2	4.7	19.9	15.7	4.2	19.9	15.3	5.6	20.9	16.07	5.36	21.43

[1] Esso established fair trade prices Apr. 30, 1956.

NOTE.—This table shows how fair trade laws can promote low prices while preventing unfair competition.

Source: Before July 1, 1956: Department of Statistics, American Petroleum Institute. Starting July 1, 1956: National Petroleum News.

TABLE II.—*New Jersey gasoline price changes during fair trade (excluding 7¢ tax)*

[In cents]

After fair trade	Tankwagon price to dealer	Service station price
Apr. 30, 1956	14.9	19.9
Jan. 10, 1957	15.9	20.9
June 26, 1957	16.1	21.1
July 30, 1957	15.9	20.9
Oct. 2, 1957	14.9	19.9
Dec. 6, 1957	[1] 14.9	18.9
Mar. 1, 1958	15.2	19.9
May 8, 1958	14.2	18.9
June 20, 1958	13.2	17.9

[1] Less ½ cent voluntary.

NOTE.—This table shows how fair-trade laws can promote price flexibility while preventing unfair competition.

Hon. Al Ullman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. HALEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 22, 1958

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee that has handled the Klamath Indian termination problem, I want to pay tribute to a Congressman who has quietly and effectively rendered a great service to his State and the Nation.

Congressman AL ULLMAN, of Oregon, who joined this committee as a freshman in this Congress, is the man who is responsible more than anyone else in the Congress of the United States for the successful conclusion of the important Klamath Indian legislation that was passed last week and is now before the President for signature. The bill that was enacted was introduced at Congressman ULLMAN's request last January. It had few friends and was given virtually no chance of enactment. Yet, due to Congressman ULLMAN's diligent efforts, his persistence and personal influence, the impossible was accomplished and the bill passed not only the committee, but was overwhelmingly approved in the House of Representatives. Many of us who are very much opposed to Federal acquisition of additional lands have gone along with this program because we have been convinced that there is no other immediate equitable solution.

Congressman ULLMAN has never sought the spotlight on this problem. He is not the kind of man that seeks headlines or publicity. It is for this reason that I want the people of his Second Congressional District in Oregon to know that without his dedicated efforts there would be no solution to the Klamath problem today.

It was my privilege to visit Congressman ULLMAN's Congressional District last fall and stop at the Klamath Indian Reservation. Congressman ULLMAN, Congressman SHUFORD, and I spent 2 days there. We made an intensive trip through the reservation—we discussed the problems with community leaders and with others intimately familiar with the problems. This has been one of the most difficult and perplexing matters to come before the committee for many years. The fact that we have arrived at an equitable solution to the problem is a great tribute to a fine Congressman. It is my hope that the citizens of Oregon's Second District will give AL ULLMAN the credit that is due him and will keep him here in Congress where he is rendering such important service to his District and the Nation.

Today in Congress, by Joseph McCaffrey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 22, 1958

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, every day during this session a distinguished radio commentator, Joseph McCaffrey, has been heard in Washington covering the workings of Congress. This program entitled "Today in Congress" was sponsored as a public service by the Independent Airlines Association and I should like to emphasize that it really was an outstanding public service. Mr. McCaffrey's reporting and presentation was of the most accurate and outstanding order in the tradition of the finest journalism to which the public is entitled.

Mr. McCaffrey's program was particularly distinguished by its fairness and impartiality. In covering a body whose lifeblood is controversy every side of the issue was scrupulously reported without prejudice and, what is more, in a lively, and interesting manner.

What made the McCaffrey program outstanding was the fact that it not only dealt with the major headline events

but really covered the workings of the Congress and gave time to many vital and constructive efforts here on the Hill even though they were not of the sensational and headline catching variety. This made for a sort of oral CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from which you could get a comprehensive picture of the workings of the House and Senate, the committees, the personalities, the human interests and the humor which only an observer and commentator of the greatest talent could capture and compress into a 15-minute broadcast.

I know that I do not speak just for myself when I say that the program was a most valuable service and that I certainly hope it will be back on the air just as soon as the Congress reconvenes.

The So-Called States Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 22, 1958

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter which I have today dispatched to Mr. Tom J. Hitch, president of the Tennessee Farm Bureau Federation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. TOM J. HITCH,
President, Tennessee Farm Bureau,
Columbia, Tenn.

DEAR TOM: I thank you for your telegram regarding the so-called States rights bill. Though other pending bills could be described by the term "States rights," I take it that you refer to H. R. 3, since it is the most publicized of the several States rights bills.

It appears to me basically sound for Congress to proceed to protect its legislative prerogatives from undue encroachment by the judiciary through court construction of legislative intent, if general application is confined to future legislation. This is particularly true with respect to the doctrine of preemption. I am prepared to support the substance of H. R. 3 with respect to legislation enacted hereafter. This was the recommendation of the United States Senate Judiciary Committee.

The retroactive provision of H. R. 3 appears unsound. The more this provision and its effect were analyzed and debated, the more unsound it appeared, and the less support it had in the Senate. I think it would be quite unwise and unsettling to pass a seemingly simple bill which deals retroactively with all existing law.

Evidence has been presented to show, for instance, that H. R. 3 would unsettle existing law in such diverse fields as interstate commerce, the marketing of farm products, the inspection of food products, drugs and chemicals under Federal and State pure food and drug laws, and the like. The Attorney General of the United States has strongly recommended against H. R. 3, stating it would raise many legal questions. Other eminent authorities have suggested that the retroactive provision of this bill, if enacted, would create more problems than it would settle.

Yesterday, I voted against recommittal of the Bridges bill. This, too, was a so-called States rights bill. I supported it because it dealt specifically and carefully with the doctrine of preemption on the question of sedition.

I did not wish to see this sound measure recommitted and killed because an unsound amendment to it had been proposed but not adopted. With further consideration, it may even have been possible to amend the amendment into acceptable form.

I am prepared, as I have said, to support a general rule of construction, such as proposed by H. R. 3, with respect to future legislation, but cannot at this time vote to apply it retroactively when the consequences are entirely uncertain but surely far reaching. This would be like leaping backward in the dark.

I appreciate having the benefit of your views on this and other subjects.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT GORE.

The Federal Trade Commission Does Not Have and Will Not Request the Necessary Funds To Act Against the Gigantic Fraud of Fictitious Pricing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 22, 1958

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Trade Commission is now participating in the false advertising it is supposed to prosecute. I refer specifically to the press release of the Federal Trade Commission on August 22, 1958, in which it announced the Commission intends to act against the gigantic fraud of fictitious pricing. It proposes to adopt an 8-point advertising guide to eliminate fraudulent pricing on an industrywide basis. This is so much window-dressing. The Commission knows, the Congress knows, and the public should know, that the guides cannot be enforced because there is no money for their enforcement. The plain truth is that the Commission does not have and will not request of Congress or the Bureau of the Budget the money to enforce the guides for the benefit of the public.

The real deception is that the announcement lulls the purchaser into restful submission to shameless lying by industry concerning the value of offered products, "Regular $50 value, now only $25," when in truth the product has never sold for $50 and many times has not sold for more than $17.50. Under these circumstances, the Commission announcement is another license to dishonest advertisers to continue defrauding the working man, the pensioner, and social-security client, and the poor in desperate need of honest bargains.

I raised this matter once before in an attempt to stir action to protect the buying public. I mentioned then, and I repeat, that the best hope of preventing these practices is the Trade Commission's Bureau of Consultation. It was pointed out then that an additional $100,000 should be added to the pending appropriation in order that advertising guides could be used to eliminate fictitious pricing. If this money is provided, the voluntary and industry-cooperation methods of the Bureau of Consultation, supported by prosecution of violators, could be used to stamp out this cheating. Instead of accenting the industrywide approach to the problem, the Commission now proposes to launch a piecemeal attack on individual violators without adequate administration or policing of industry guides.

The Commission's present effectiveness in the battle of fictitious pricing can be deduced from its own press release. It alleges that 30 percent, or approximately 71 cases, of its 235 issued orders in the past year dealt with fictitious prices. You can find that many comparative pricing claims in any Sunday edition of the newspapers in Washington, D. C., without looking to advertising in such States as New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Illinois, California, or Ohio.

Congress should look again at the operation of the Federal Trade Commission with respect to its efficacy in protecting the buying public. Minus an interference in its normal processes by another branch of the Government, the Commission is doing a creditable job within a limited sphere. But the limitation is self-imposed and its power is not fully used to protect the ultimate consumers of goods.

There is little or no effort being made to mobilize the honest advertisers and the voluntary business organizations, such as the better business bureaus and the Advertising Federation of America, behind a nationwide concerted drive against fraudulent pricing. What has been done constructively so far has been done by the Bureau of Consultation. That bureau's effectiveness has been limited by reluctance to provide it with adequate funds for administration of voluntary clean-up programs and advertising guides for entire industries.

The press release also states that it will make no difference whether advertising guides are issued to the Commission staff or to industry, the effect will be the same. It seems obvious that unless all members of an industry are bound by an industry guide, no member will consider himself bound. Individual violators will be subjected to prosecution while their competitors continue fraudulent pricing practices. The eventual benefit sought for the working man, the social-security pensioner, the small-income family, will be lost and forgotten in the shuffling papers of the Trade Commission.

I am thoroughly in favor of the advertising guides. I am in favor of their use to protect the ultimate consumer. But I am deeply concerned by the Commission's reluctance to adopt adequate measures for administration and enforcement of the guides. There must be a proper presentation of the facts to Congress and the public on the damaging effects of fictitious pricing, and there must be an allocation of sufficient funds and personnel for effective administration of the guides. Until this is done, the Federal Trade Commission is substituting words for action and is falsely representing its services to the public.

Congressman Moore To Tour District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 22, 1958

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, as this session of Congress draws to a close, we all are looking forward to an opportunity to return to our respective States and visit and talk with the people whom we have the honor to represent here in the Congress.

Inasmuch as the First Congressional District of West Virginia is only an hour's time from Washington by modern air travel, I have made every effort to spend as much time as possible, in my district, even while the Congress was in session. This has permitted me to better help and assist the people in my district and has given me a better-than-average knowledge of conditions in West Virginia and how the folks back home feel on particular legislative issues. Also, throughout the session, I have maintained an office in the district to better serve my constituents, and I have made a great many personal appearances and speeches in the seven counties which I represent.

However, the limited time which I have been able to spend in my district has not permitted me to travel about as much as I would like, and to talk with persons who have problems on which I, as their Congressman, might be of assistance. Consequently, I am looking forward to adjournment as a time when I might visit each community and hold regular office hours during which time persons might drop in to say hello or to sit down and discuss specific problems.

In preparation for these annual visits in each community, I have made arrangements for office space in various courthouses, post offices, and other civic buildings where it will be convenient to meet and privately discuss problems with individuals, who might want to see me. The following schedule has been arranged and in each instance the time shown is local time in the particular community:

Monday, September 22, Hancock County: 10 a. m. to 12 noon, City Building, Chester; 1:30 to 4:30 p. m., courthouse, New Cumberland.

Wednesday, September 24, Hancock County: 9:30 a. m. to 4:30 p. m., post office building, Weirton.

Thursday, September 25, Brooke County: 9:30 a. m. to 4:30 p. m., courthouse, Wellsburg.

Friday, September 26, Ohio County: 9:30 a. m. to 4:30 p. m., post office building, Wheeling.

Monday, September 29, Marshall County: 9:30 a. m. to 5 p. m., courthouse, Moundsville.

Wednesday, October 1, Taylor County: 9:30 a. m. to 4:30 p. m., post office building, Grafton.

Thursday, October 2, Marion County: 9:30 a. m. to 5 p. m., courthouse, Fairmount.

Tuesday, October 7, Wetzel County: 9:30 a. m. to 12 noon, courthouse, New Martinsville; 1:30 to 4:30 p. m., city hall, Pine Grove.

Wednesday, October 8, Wetzel and Marshall Counties: 9:30 a. m. to 12 noon, city hall, Cameron; 1 to 4 p. m., city hall, Hundred.

Thursday, October 9, Marion County: 9:30 a. m. to 12 noon, post office, Farmington; 1:30 to 4:30 p. m., city hall, Rivesville.

These visits in the various cities and towns are as informal as we can possibly make them, and workers, businessmen, and housewives are urged to drop by for a chat. No appointments are necessary and all persons are welcome to come as "they are"' to see and visit with their Congressman. I hope the tour this year will be as successful as it was last year when we had several hundred people each day stop by our "mobile" office to let me know their feelings on various matters.

In addition, I would like to mention that my District office, located in the Mercantile Bank Building in Moundsville, is open 6 days a week to serve the residents of the First Congressional District. When I am out of the office on official business, there is always a competent member of my staff available to answer questions or assist persons with their problems. I always welcome having my friends call upon me whenever my services might be of particular assistance.

Charles A. Fisk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 22, 1958

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is with sorrow I advise this honorable body of the passing of my good friend, Mr. Charles A. Fisk, of Amarillo, Tex. Many Members of the Congress were personally acquainted with Charlie Fisk who was one of the giants of Texas and indeed, of America. His contribution to the progress, growth, and development of Amarillo and the Panhandle of Texas is unequalled and his magnificent influence and guiding hand was evident for more than a half century.

Mr. Fisk's occupation will be noted in history books as a banker, in which profession he was instrumental in establishing the Amarillo Bank & Trust Co., where he served as an officer for 29 years. His great contribution will be remembered and evidenced forever, however, as a builder of institutions which serve the welfare of the community for generations. The account of his worthwhile civic and philanthropic contributions to Amarillo, the Panhandle, the State of Texas, and to the Nation is unending. More, he was a builder of men and his life, and those he touched, magnified the fundamental principles which go to make for greatness. Considerable of his success has been attributed to his love for people and the fact that he possessed an avid memory for names, faces, and incidents. He enjoyed a rare sense of humor and always had time to swap jokes with visitors to his home or office.

Along with untold others, I count his friendship my good fortune and rich experience. I mourn his passing today but I rejoice always in the example of his life and the indelible stamp he made for posterity in the Panhandle of Texas. To his widow, his daughter, and his son, I extend my sincere sympathy in which I know this body joins me.

Voluntary Program "Enforcement"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 22, 1958

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, does the "buy American" directive really have any teeth, as a means of assuring importing-company compliance with the voluntary imports program?

The brief filed by Government lawyers in answer to the complaint of Eastern States Petroleum and Chemical Corp., against the "buy American" provision and the whole voluntary program, points out that (1) a noncomplying importer is forbidden to sell to the United States Government only those products made from crude oil imported in excess of the company's quota, (2) the company is barred from selling these products only in the United States, and (3) the company may obtain in-quota crude from any other importer and sell products made therefrom to the Government. As the brief points out, products made from crude in excess of the quota also can freely be sold to non-Government purchasers.

Said the Government brief:

> Plaintiff * * * is free to import as much oil as it chooses. It is free to sell any such oil to any non-Government purchaser. It is free to make contracts for the sale of petroleum products to the Government, and is free to deliver thereunder any products except those made in whole or in part from crude which appellant itself or others have imported in noncompliance with this program. Thus, plaintiff can obtain crude from any other complying producer or importer and deliver to the Government products made therefrom. Furthermore, since the Executive order applies only to purchases within the United States, plaintiff can sell its products made from its noncomplying crude to Government installations abroad.

Meanwhile, some small refiners and other importers who do not sell products to the Government, and are thereby not affected even remotely by the so-called enforcement machinery, are watching what happens to Delta Refining Co. of Memphis. That company, according to Administrator Carson, is importing crude without a quota. It not only began importing before its quota became effective, but is reportedly exceeding that quota by a hundred percent.

If the Eastern States suit does not knock out the enforcement machinery altogether, and nothing is done to change the voluntary program, a number of other importers are expected to begin disregarding the quota, since there is no penalty attached for those who are not trying to sell the product to the military.

Robert E. Howe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 22, 1958

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in addition to his constituents, a Congressman meets thousands of people each year, and many of them he comes to know well. Of all the people I have come to know during my 9 years in Congress one of them stands out clearly in my mind as one of the finest men I have ever known. He is Bob Howe, director of Labor's Nonpartisan League.

Bob Howe is one of those rare individuals who inspires confidence in the people that meet and get to know him. He has a warm, rich sense of humor and a deep understanding of people and their problems. He goes about his business in a quiet but confident manner and leaves with everyone a feeling of warm affection, as well as respect. He knows what he is talking about, means what he says, and his word is always as good as gold. Bob has fine, genuine friendly qualities that people sense when they meet him, and come to know without any question of doubt as time goes on.

Robert E. Howe was born in What Cheer, Iowa, in 1894, into an English mining family—his father came to the United States as a boy—but spent most of his boyhood years in mining camps and towns in Montana and Illinois. In 1910 he joined the UMWA as a summertime trapper at the Oak Ridge mine near Johnston City, Ill.

Leaving high school after 2 years, he attended business college for a year and then, in 1914, went to work as a flagger in Old Ben Coal Corp.'s No. 8 mine at West Frankfort, Ill. His father, who belonged to the United Mine Workers' Association until he became a mule boss, was motor boss for many years at Old Ben No. 8 and, Bob recalls, this circumstance was not always conducive to family harmony during working hours. He spent 25 years at the No. 8 mine during which time he became a motorman, acquired mine examiner papers—but never worked at it—and served in practically the whole gamut of offices in local 959, from toolkeeper to pit committeeman and president.

In 1939, Hugh White, then vice president and now president of district 12, delegated Bob Howe for a special legislative mission in Washington to work for the passage of a mine safety bill under Earl Houck, United Mine Workers' Association legal director. Bob had no previous lobbying experience, but he knew something about mine safety and he had a persuasive manner. His baptismal experience in the Congressional arena was disquieting and at times unnerving, but he did not lose any Senators in this initial try. The safety bill passed the Senate but failed in the House. Bob went back to the mine after Congress adjourned and was recalled to Washington several times during the next year or two to work on other legislative matters, including the Guffey coal bill. The mine safety bill, setting up the Federal inspection system, finally passed in 1941.

In 1940 John T. Jones was made director of the reorganized Labor's Nonpartisan League and Howe became a full-time staff member.

Upon the death of John T. Jones in 1955, the international executive board of the United Mine Workers Association appointed Bob Howe to succeed him as director of Labor's Nonpartisan League, and he is doing a fine job.

Bob Howe has never lost touch with the men that he worked with for so many years in the mines and whose troubles and pains as well as joys and happiness he shared. His basic concern is, and I am sure always will be, for those men and their families. I consider it a privilege and an honor to have known and worked with him. I know that hundreds of my colleagues here on Capitol Hill, as well as thousands of people out in the coal mine areas, join me in this expression of deep affection and genuine respect for Bob.

A Change of Policy for the Better

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 22, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, since I have not hesitated to call the Federal Reserve Board to task when they were doing something which I thought was wrong, I think it is appropriate that I give them a pat on the back when they do something which I think is right.

On June 30, 1958, I wrote the Chairman of the Board a letter as follows:

JUNE 30, 1958.

Hon. WILLIAM MCC. MARTIN, JR.,
Chairman, Board of Governors,
Federal Reserve System,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: During the course of the hearings on the problems of small-business financing in April of this year, Chairman PATMAN raised the question about the occupancy of a part of Federal Reserve bank premises by the American Bankers Association.

I am now advised that the New York State Bankers Association occupies a portion of the Federal Reserve bank premises at 33 Liberty Street, New York City, and the Maryland State Bankers Association occupies a portion of the premises of the Federal Reserve bank building in Baltimore, Md.

It is also my understanding that the letterheads of these various associations carry the name of the association and under it, as the address of the association, the address "Federal Reserve Bank Building."

I will appreciate your advising me whether or not the Federal Reserve Board intends to discontinue this practice of renting space to bankers' associations and, if so, when the policy will be implemented.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely,

ABRAHAM J. MULTER.

I am pleased to direct our colleagues' attention to the fact that on August 14, 1958, the Chairman of the Board wrote me as follows:

AUGUST 14, 1958.

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MULTER: This is in further reference to your letter of June 30 regarding rental of space in Federal Reserve bank buildings to bankers associations. As you were advised in my letter of July 8, the Board's views would be communicated to you as soon as a review of the matter had been completed.

The facts are these. The New York State Bankers Association has been a tenant of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York since 1930. The association was accepted as a tenant because the Reserve bank felt that discussion of matters of mutual interest to the Reserve bank and commercial banks would be facilitated by such an arrangement.

The Board recognizes the reasons which prompted the Federal Reserve bank to enter into the arrangement, but after review has come to the conclusion that it should be discontinued.

The situation at the Baltimore branch is quiet different. The use of space there arises solely from the fact that the present executive manager of the Baltimore Clearinghouse also serves as secretary of the Maryland Bankers Association and is permitted by the clearinghouse to perform his bankers association duties in the quarters which the clearinghouse rents from the Baltimore branch. The branch has no lease or other direct arrangement with the bankers association.

In this case also, the Board has come to the conclusion that the arrangement whereby the bankers association occupies space in the Federal Reserve branch building should be discontinued.

Accordingly, the Board has initiated steps to terminate the arrangements as soon as that can reasonably be done.

Sincerely yours,

WM. MCC. MARTIN, JR.

I think it was a mistake in the first instance to permit private banking associations to occupy space in Government buildings. It is particularly bad when the associations' letterheads made it appear that they were part of the Federal Reserve System, a wholly Government-owned institution.

I congratulate the Federal Reserve Board for having changed its policy as indicated by its Chairman's letter.

Gustavus Vasa Fox

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 22, 1958

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, Alaska has waited patiently for many years to become a member of our family

of States. On July 7, 1958, President Eisenhower signed Public Law 85–508 which permitted Alaska to become the 49th State of the United States of America. People throughout the world have heralded this act of granting statehood for Alaska as dramatic proof of the dynamic characteristics of democracy in America.

It would be impossible to enumerate all the persons who assisted in the passage of this legislation. But I think it would be a mistake, indeed, if I did not call attention to a man who did as much as anyone, at least, in laying the groundwork for this historic event.

I refer to Gustavus Vasa Fox, Assistant Secretary of the Navy during the Civil War years, who was born on June 13, 1821, in Saugus, Mass., which I am privileged to represent here in Congress. The son of Dr. Jesse and Olivia (Flint) Fox, he received his academic training at Phillips Academy in Andover, where I was pleased to follow in his footsteps. He received an appointment to the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, and graduated in 1841. Fox served as an officer in the United States Navy for the next 15 years. He served in the Mediterranean area, and with the Coast Guard for a time, and had special assignments of commanding the United States mail steamships, *Ohio* and *George Law*. During the Mexican War, Fox was busy transporting troops to Vera Cruz. In 1852, Midshipman Fox was promoted to the rank of lieutenant, and in 1856 he resigned his commission in favor of entering the business world. Shortly after resigning, he married Virginia Woodbury, the daughter of Judge Levi Woodbury of New Hampshire, and became affiliated with the Bay State Mills in Lawrence, Mass.

Immediately preceding the outbreak of the Civil War, General Winifield Scott was anxious to send provisions and relief to Fort Sumter in the Charleston Harbor. Montgomery Blair, the Postmaster General, and a relative of Fox by marriage, recommended that Scott confer with Fox about the matter. Summoned to Washington in February 1861, Fox unveiled his elaborate plan to provide Fort Sumter with supplies and relief. President Buchanan rejected the plan but in March, shortly after his inauguration, President Lincoln authorized Fox to initiate his plan which the President hoped would bring relief to the garrison in time. Fox, a volunteer with no military status in the United States Navy at this particular time, set out from New York on April 9 with an impressive naval squadron, composed of 4 battleships, 3 steam tugs, and the steamer *Baltic* which he commanded. He arrived at the Charleston Harbor 3 days later, on the morning of April 12, and witnessed the bombardment of Fort Sumter. His plan, through no fault of his own, was turned from almost complete success into heartbreaking defeat. Having been forced to evacuate the garrison, Major Anderson, the commanding officer, and 70 men were taken on board the *Baltic* by Fox and brought back to New York. President Abraham Lincoln, writing personally to Fox concerning the failure of his mission, commented:

> I most cheerfuly and truly declare that the failure of the undertaking has not lowered you a particle, while the qualities you developed in the effort have greatly heightened you in my estimation.
>
> For a daring and dangerous enterprise of a similar character you would today be the man of all my acquaintances whom I would select.

In May 1861, Fox was appointed Chief Clerk of the Department of the Navy, under Secretary Gideon Welles, and a few months later, in August, he was appointed Assistant Secretary of the Navy when that position was created.

Serving as the right-hand man of Secretary Welles, Fox applied much diligence and exerted all the energy at his command to improve the efficiency and fighting power of the Navy. For his many labors and efforts, Fox has been given credit for his contribution to the naval strategy which evolved during the Civil War. When Fox resigned from the Department after the great conflict, Secretary Welles had the following to say:

> I regret to lose him from the Department, where, notwithstanding some peculiarities which have caused dissatisfaction with a few, he is of almost unvaluable service, and he has in him a great amount of labor. He has a combination of nautical intelligence and commonsense such as can hardly be found in another, and we have worked together with entire harmony, never in a single instance having had a misunderstanding. I have usually found his opinions sensible and sound. When I have had occasion to overrule his opinions, he has acquiesced with a readiness and deference which won my regard. His place I cannot make good in some respects.

In April 1866, an attempted assassination on Czar Alexander II of Russia occurred which prompted the adoption of a Congressional resolution expressing the sentiment that the American people were happy that the Czar's life had been spared. President Johnson on this occasion selected Gustavus Fox to deliver this public expression to the Czar.

Fox left the United States in May 1866, taking passage on a monitor, the *Miantonomoh*, to demonstrate that this type of vessel was a seaworthy carrier. The Fox entourage on reaching Russia was received with great cordiality by the Czar and his court. Many gifts and memorials commemorating the occasion were presented to Fox and the members of his party. The mementos given the American envoy now form the Fox collection in the United States National Museum; they were presented to the museum by Mrs. Fox.

Fox returned to the United States in December 1866, after touring Europe, and settled in Lowell, Mass., where he became an executive with the Middlesex Mills. While living in Lowell, he was visited in 1871 by the Grand Duke Alexis, third son of the Emperor. A few years later, Fox became affiliated with the firm of R. Mudge, Sawter & Co., in Boston. He died shortly thereafter, on October 29, 1883, in New York City.

It should be pointed out that in his obituary the Boston Evening Transcript of October 30, 1883, reported that:

> Captain Fox might have obtained from the United States Government an admiral's commission, had he not declined to ask for it, but accepted the special mission to Russia as the sole reward for his valuable services. One result of his visit to Russia was the purchase of the Territory of Alaska by the United States Government. In the negotiations concerning this purchase Mr. Fox took an active interest after his return from Russia.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to be able to call to the attention of my colleagues, the life and characteristics of a man, who, I like to think, is typical of the District I am privileged to represent.

Coal and Manpower—West Virginia's Most Precious Assets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 22, 1958

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, ofttimes various Congressmen are accused, or credited as the case might be, of championing a particular cause. If there has been any cause which I have boosted to the exclusion of others during my tenure in Congress, it has been that of coal and those who mine it, because it is the lifeblood of my District and our great State of West Virginia. I have had a particular interest in the coal miners and the coal production of the Mountain State for a great many years. Members of my immediate family have long been connected with the coal fields of our State. As a youth, I can recall many discussions about the conditions in the coal mines because it was a barometer as to whether a number of my friends would eat beans or steak. The individual prosperity of every family in West Virginia can be fairly well gaged by the rise or fall in the price of coal and the number of tons produced in a particular year. Coal is to West Virginia, what corn and wheat is to the Plains States, and as cotton is to the Southern States. We live and breathe and literally eat or starve according to the fluctuations in the coal market.

Why is coal production so important to West Virginia? One need look no further than the statistics of the annual production of bituminous coal in the United States to gain the answer to this question. In 1957, the latest year for which statistics are available, West Virginia produced nearly a third of the entire coal mined in this country, the exact figure being 31.63 percent, or 155 million tons out of a total of 490 million tons of coal produced in the Nation. There were 228,163 men employed in the bituminous coal industry in the United States last year, and of these workers, 71,996 were West Virginians.

Consequently, as the Congressman from the First Congressional District, I

have determinedly battled for legislation and governmental policies which will be beneficial and helpful to the coal miners and producers not only in West Virginia, but throughout the Nation. During this past session of Congress, I have introduced and supported several bills which would restrict and control the amount of residual fuel oil permitted to enter the United States from abroad and which over the years has consistently cut into the markets for West Virginia coal and caused unemployment in our State. I have also introduced a bill encouraging research to find new and additional uses and markets for the coal which we produce.

On the other hand, I have vigorously opposed public-power bills such as that which would permit further expansion of the Tennessee Valley Authority which has cost the American taxpayers billions of dollars and destroyed markets for West Virginia coal and robbed us of many industries which would have located in our State except for the cheap power of TVA. These industries would have burned West Virginia coal if they had located in our State. In addition, I have encouraged Government agencies and private industries to utilize more coal for heating and production, and have devoted considerable attention to the West Virginia coal-by-wire theme, which has created a unique partnership between our coal producers and private power companies which utilize coal to produce electric power for our homes and industries.

During this session of Congress, I have actively supported bills which would benefit West Virginia miners. I also took a leading role in helping to enact legislation extending unemployment compensation benefits received by idled coal workers from 26 to 39 weeks. Along with other Congressmen, I helped to defeat the antilabor Kennedy-Ives bill which was rightfully and vigorously opposed by union leaders such as John L. Lewis and by the membership of the United Mine Workers, which has done such a magnificent job in improving the working conditions, wages, and employment opportunities for the coal miners of West Virginia and throughout the Nation. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pause here and pay my deep respect to the leader of this great union, John L. Lewis. He has and is doing a tremendous job for the coal miners of my District and State. He has, by example, set a pattern I would like other labor leaders to follow.

Through personal negotiation and letter writing, I have encouraged and urged the State Department and the International Cooperation Administration to help seek new foreign outlets for coal produced in West Virginia, and have insisted that the "buy American" clause be inserted in all legislation or contracts which might in any way affect the mining and purchase of coal produced in the United States. I have helped to block several bills and some international bartering agreements which would have adversely caused harm to our domestic economy.

My experiences as the Congressman from the First Congressional District of West Virginia has at times been frustrating, but I have never laid down the gantlet insofar as the battle for serving the best interests of the people of West Virginia is concerned. I have especially felt rewarded in regard to my efforts to assist the coal miners and coal producers of the Mountain State. Nothing warms the heart of a Congressman so much as a letter of appreciation and I have received my share of thank-you notes from grateful coal miners and other citizens, all of whom are interested in seeing the coal economy of West Virginia continue to prosper in the years ahead.

I can assure the people in my District that I will continue to lend my best efforts to serve their needs and to help the coal industry prosper and thrive, so long as I have the honor to act as their Representative in the Congress of the United States.

Trinity Project Power Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 22, 1958

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, the majority of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs have taken action on the Trinity partnership in spite of the obstacles thrown in their paths by the chairman of the committee.

Seventeen of the 31 members of the committee have signed a statement which has been sent to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Bureau of the Budget and to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

In this statement the majority of the committee urged "that the Secretary of the Interior not request funds, and the Appropriations Committees not approve funds for the Trinity project power facilities until such time as the Congress has had ample opportunity to carefully consider and act on this legislation."

This action was necessary because the chairman of the committee simply refused to let Trinity partnership legislation be acted on by the committee—this in spite of the promises which he made to other members and to me.

When Congress authorized the Trinity project, it specifically directed the Secretary of the Interior to study the proposition of selling the Trinity falling water to a non-Federal agency and let this agency build the Trinity power facilities—and advise Congress of the results of his studies and his recommendations.

The Secretary did what Congress directed him to do. He invited the non-Federal agencies in California to come up with proposals to buy Trinity falling water. Only the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. submitted a proposal. The Secretary studied this proposal and submitted his recommendations to the Congress.

On June 9, 1955, when the Trinity authorization bill was being considered on the House floor, the chairman promised to "hear" the partnership proposal on its "merits." He also referred to the almost unanimous endorsement of the project. The chairman knew at the time that without the provision directing the Secretary to report on a partnership proposal this support would not have been present and without it Trinity project authorization would not have been approved by his committee or passed by the Congress.

So the chairman did what suited his purpose at the time. But when it came time to deliver on his promises he resorted to various tactics to prevent a committee vote on the partnership proposal.

Assuming that the chairman intended to make good on his promises of June 1955 and subsequently, I announced that I intended to ask for a vote to make the partnership bill the pending order of business before the committee. But before I could do so the chairman began to maneuver. He let it be known that through additional hearings and other delaying tactics he intended to keep the bill before the committee indefinitely and thereby bar action by the committee on any other pending bills during this session.

He was thus willing to bottle up all other legislation pending before the committee including the saline water conversion bill—a bill in which he professed much interest. I decided to defer action on the partnership bill in order to expedite passage of other important bills, some of which had already passed the Senate.

Hearings on the partnership legislation were completed last February. If the chairman had any intentions of keeping faith with his prior commitments he would have himself called up the bill for committee action. He didn't have the votes to kill it so he resorted to these tactics.

I and other members of the committee have bent over backward to accommodate the chairman. He pleaded with me and other members of the committee to please not call up the bill for action until after the June primary, even though he should have disposed of the matter long before that. In order to accommodate him and be eminently fair we agreed on condition that he agree to a definite date for action.

Faced with this and because it suited his purposes for the moment, he agreed to consider the bill June 11.

Then what happened? The Democratic leadership of the House called the House into session at 10 the morning of June 11 and as a result the committee did not meet that morning. But did the chairman act in good faith and set another date? He did not and he has not to this date, but instead has resorted to all sorts of parliamentary maneuvers to prevent committee action.

But if he and other Federal power advocates think they are going to win by default and force Federal construction of Trinity power facilities by delaying tactics—I can say they are mistaken. The majority of the committee want an opportunity to act on this proposal which they themselves directed the Secretary to submit.

But then the majority of the committee are not dictated to by the Federal-or-nothing policy of certain Sacramento interests who want more below-cost power for the Sacramento Municipal Utility District. They want more cheap power to the few at the expense of the many. Apparently to them the customers of this free-loading district represent all the people. Well they do not to me. I want the benefits of Trinity partnership to flow to all the electric consumers; all the water users and all the taxpayers. But then, I am not a stooge of the Federal-or-nothing Sacramento interests.

Testimony before our committee revealed that the Sacramento Municipal Utility District—SMUD—now has a 40-year contract with the Department of Interior for the purchase of over two-thirds of the firm power capacity of the entire Central Valley project. Congress has already appropriated over $800 million for this project. When Congress authorized the Central Valley project, it specifically provided that power revenues were to be used to financially aid and assist the water features of the Central Valley project. Trinity is now an integral part of the Central Valley project. If the Federal Government constructs the power facilities at Trinity, power revenues will be used to financially aid and assist the Sacramento Municipal District. They cannot aid and assist the water features as required by law simply because the power would be sold to SMUD at less than its cost of production.

Testimony before the committee revealed that power from Federal Trinity plants would cost between 7.3 and 8.9 mills per kilowatt-hour to produce. Yet the great bulk of the power would go to SMUD at less than 5 mills per kilowatt-hour. SMUD uses about 1 billion kilowatt-hours per year and the difference between 5 mills and 8 mills is 3 mills, so 3 mills times 1 billion kilowatt-hours is $3 million which the water users of Central Valley project, the Federal taxpayers and all other Americans are going to have to put up so that SMUD can have another block of the low-cost power.

Contrast this with the results of partnership development which is embodied in my bill and similar bills by Congressmen HUBERT SCUDDER and CHARLES GUBSER, both from California.

If the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., instead of the Federal Government, builds the power facilities, the company, not the Federal taxpayer, will put up the $60 million cost. Under partnership the Trinity power facilities will not be a drain on the water users and the taxpayers for the benefit of SMUD but instead a surplus of over $175 million over the repayment period will accrue which can be used to financially aid and assist the water features of Central Valley project as required in the authorization act. Further, Federal tax payments of over $80 million would be paid by the company which could be used for other needed water development and reclamation projects in California and elsewhere in the Nation. In addition, State and local governments would receive some $60 million in taxes from partnership—nothing from all Federal.

So you have $60 million saving in capital cost plus $175 million surplus available to water features plus $80 million in Federal tax payments, plus $60 million in State and local tax payments, which add up to $375 million advantage of partnership over all-Federal Trinity. This is more than the cost of the San Luis project. We should consider this when San Luis comes before the committee next year.

Yet even in the face of all of these facts, the chairman has seen fit to bottle up this legislation in the House Interior Committee. We have his own words for this. He was quoted in the California press: "It (the partnership proposal) is still before a subcommittee—in the basement, that is—and I am going to try to keep it there."

Faced as we are with a $12 billion deficit and the necessity of again increasing our national debt ceiling, it seems to me that it behooves the Congress and its committees to act wherever and whenever possible to hold down all Federal costs and Federal appropriations of taxpayers' money.

Certainly we should not be advocating the expenditure of Federal dollars when a non-Federal agency is willing to undertake a task such as Trinity partnership and under proper Government controls and regulations.

Mr. Speaker, I am appending hereto a copy of the petition to the Secretary of Interior as follows:

We, the undersigned, representing the majority of the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives, have carefully considered the testimony on H. R. 6997, H. R. 7407, and H. R. 10005, which are identical bills to provide for the joint development of the water-power resources of the Trinity River division, Central Valley project, California, by the United States and Pacific Gas & Electric Co., to reduce expenditures of the United States, to increase revenues of the United States, to encourage the most widespread use of the power generated at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles, and for other purposes.

The Congress, when it passed the Trinity Authorization Act (Public Law 386, 84th Cong., 1st sess.), directed the Secretary of the Interior to report to Congress the results of his studies and his recommendations with respect to joint development of the Trinity power facilities. The results of the Secretary's studies and his recommendations are embodied in these bills.

Since there does not remain sufficient time in this, the 2d session of the 85th Congress, to further consider and act on this legislation, we urge that the Secretary of the Interior not request funds, and the Appropriations Committees not approve funds for the Trinity project power facilities until such time as the Congress has had ample opportunity to carefully consider and act on this legislation.

A copy of this statement is being forwarded to the Secretary of the Interior and to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

A. L. MILLER, JOHN P. SAYLOR, JOHN R. PILLION, CRAIG HOSMER, J. ERNEST WHARTON, WILLIAM A. DAWSON, E. Y. BERRY, JOHN J. RHODES, JAMES B. UTT, KEITH THOMSON, JACK WESTLAND, PHIL WEAVER, HAROLD R. COLLIER, J. EDGAR CHENOWETH, WALTER S. BARING, JAMES A. HALEY, GEORGE A. SHUFORD.

Statement Concerning the Activities of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives, 85th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 22, 1958

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, once again I report with a great deal of pleasure and pride the accomplishments of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries as this Congress comes to an end. The privilege of serving in the chairmanship of this important committee for consecutive terms has made possible the highest degree of continuity of policy and programing. I feel that our record has been a most constructive one. It has been a period of accomplishment that equals any in the history of the committee.

During the first session there were a total of 92 meetings of the full committee and its subcommittees. Forty-nine pieces of legislation considered by the committe became law.

During the second session, there were 90 meetings of the full committee and its subcommittees, and, 31 measures reported from the committee in the second session have been approved by the President.

Major legislation reported by the committee during this Congress included authorization of two superliner passenger vessels for operation in the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans; the Federal Boating Act of 1958; the Maritime Academy Act of 1958, relating to the State maritime academies; several bills amending and strengthening title XI of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 governing mortgage insurance on privately financed loans for the construction of vessels; temporary extension of the use of dual-rate systems by steamship conferences; bills designed to improve the safety of navigation in the Great Lakes in anticipation of the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway, and others providing needed clarification in the navigation rules generally; amendment to the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act to assure an adequate minimum of wildlife lands under public control to meet the requirements of the ever growing army of sportsmen of the country for hunting areas; the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act providing for more effective integration of a fish and wildlife conservation program with Federal water resources developments; implementation of the 1955 treaty with the Republic of Panama; and licensing of ocean freight forwarders.

In one most important matter I was greatly surprised and deeply disappointed that a bill to authorize the construction of an atomic-powered ice-breaking vessel for operation by the Coast Guard was vetoed in the closing days of the session, after having overwhelmingly passed both Houses of the Congress, on the basis of exhaustive

hearings demonstrating an immediate overall national need for such a vessel for use in the Arctic and the Antarctic.

During the two sessions of this Congress the committee has launched and carried through a number of important inquiries pursuant to special investigative authority or in accordance with section 135 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

In this Congress, as in the 84th, we decided that great value could be rendered to the committee by starting off our program with a series of hearings concerning the functions and workings of the several administrative agencies under the committee's jurisdiction.

Following the organization of the committee, extensive hearings were held in Washington studying the operations of: First, the Maritime Administration and merchant marine problems generally; second, Fish and Wildlife Service, with particular regard to a report on the progress of the Fish and Wildlife Reorganization Act; and third, current problems of the United States Coast Guard.

This type of general review has been found to be most helpful in the orientation of the Members to the important work of the committee. In these cases, we were involved with review of the operation of existing legislation or the activities of the agencies, but not with any new legislation. Such hearings were strictly informative in nature, and provided much useful background for the Members to enable them better to appraise legislation concerning the agencies involved. Moreover, we were able to determine the effectiveness of the administration of recently passed legislation.

Four standing subcommittees were established: They are: First, Subcommittee on Merchant Marine, HERBERT C. BONNER, of North Carolina, chairman; second, Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation, FRANK W. BOYKIN, of Alabama, chairman; third, Subcommittee on Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey and Navigation, EDWARD A. GARMATZ, of Maryland, chairman; and fourth, Subcommittee on the Panama Canal, LEONOR K. (Mrs. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN, of Missouri, chairman.

In large part, these subcommittees handled the work of the committee in its four principal phases. In view of the general interest, however, in a number of cases hearings were held by the full committee, irrespective of the subject.

In the following analysis, legislation and investigations are set forth in terms of the four major categories of the committee's jurisdiction, rather than by the work of the individual subcommittees.

Speaking generally, many matters considered from initial stage during the first session were carried through to enactment into public law. On the other hand, there were others of complexity and broad interest that were started in the first session of the 85th Congress, but not carried to final action until the second session.

MERCHANT MARINE

During the past Congress, it became apparent that special study and inquiry should be made into various aspects of the exercise of policies relating to our maritime laws. Early in this Congress it was announced that full investigation and hearings would be made into policies relative to maintenance and management of the national-defense reserve fleet, approval of transfers of American ships to foreign registry, and the trade-in of vessels to the Government for allowance of credit toward new construction. These subjects are intimately related to each other and to our national maritime policy as laid down in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, which calls for the development and maintenance of an adequate and well-balanced American-flag merchant marine for the dual purpose of serving our waterborne commerce and our defense. Accordingly, during March, April, and May of 1957, an extensive series of hearings was held to determine whether existing administrative policies were consistent with the intent of Congress in regard to the merchant marine and whether need existed for additional legislation.

Concern over whether or not our merchant marine is being maintained at levels sufficient to meet mobilization requirements has been highlighted in recent years by requests for legislation to help build up a reserve of older usable tankers for national defense, as well as to encourage the construction of newer, larger, and faster tankers for American-flag operation. Although legislation was enacted to make special provisions for allowance of credit toward newly constructed tankers in return for trade-in of older ones, it apparently did not accomplish its intended purpose, for we still found ourselves with no standby reserve of tankers. The trade-in questions are not confined to tankers, but are also closely related to the problems of replacement of the dry-cargo segment of our fleet, which should be accomplished over the next 10 years in order to keep it up to date. We were interested in the operation of a so-called trade-out-and-build policy adopted by the Maritime Administration, whereunder a large number of usable vessels, particularly tankers, had been approved for transfer to foreign registry, subject to certain specific conditions relative to the flag to which transfer was made, and agreement by the transferring owner to build new tonnage in American shipyards. This very policy, which seemed to hold promise by putting much-needed work in the shipyards, appeared inconsistent with other policies relative to the reserve fleets, whereby obsolete or badly damaged vessels, vastly inferior to many of those being transferred, were required to be maintained for eventual mobilization use. In at least one case specific charges of violations of the law, or, at least, very careless administration, were alleged.

After very full hearings on these subjects, with extensive testimony taken from high officials of the Department of Commerce, Federal Maritime Administration, and Department of Defense, the committee found itself still uncertain as to the present thinking at the top level of Government concerning merchant marine policy in defense planning and the problems of coordination of policy between the Department of Commerce and the Department of Defense.

In an attempt to clarify these matters, the committee called on the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of Commerce to appear in person to resolve the doubts and confusion created by the testimony of officials of their respective departments. In their testimony, the departmental Secretaries assured the committee that the need for a merchant marine for defense purposes, in the light of current strategic concepts, was under full and careful review by the highest councils of Government, including the National Security Council. Subsequently, we were advised that after study the Defense Mobilization Board had concluded that an adequate merchant marine is essential for defense purposes, and that a continuing need for a modern, adequate, and well-balanced United States merchant marine fleet has been affirmed as the policy of the administration.

As to the more detailed aspects of Maritime Administration implementation of its programs and policies, the hearings disclosed the need for continuing surveillance in order to be sure that the law continues to be adequate to meet the complex problems of modern ocean transportation. Much study was given to transactions under the so-called trade-out-and-build program involving a group of companies generally referred to as the Onassis interests. The committee's inquiry into the details of these transactions disclosed weaknesses in the Government's contractual position. After these weaknesses had been brought out in the hearings, the Maritime Administration took further steps to protect the Government's interests in the event of default in the construction of new vessels for American-flag operation, in return for approval of transfer to foreign registry of older vessels.

Notwithstanding assurances by the Maritime Administration that the proposed new vessels would definitely be built in accordance with agreements entered into pursuant to the trade-out-and-build program, serious doubts and weaknesses began to appear during the first half of this year. The contractors announced that they were going to default on their agreements to build some 190,000 tons of new tankers, in return for approval of foreign transfer of some 14 existing vessels. Investigation by a special subcommittee disclosed deplorable administrative deficiencies within the Maritime Administration, and in the opinion of the committee, in the Department of Justice as well. As a result of this investigation Maritime Administration has indicated that it is tightening up on its requirements in cases where trade-out agreements are to be made.

Another matter of considerable importance arose early in the first session of the Congress when, despite the dangerously low level of activity in American shipyards and the great need for new construction to overcome mobilization deficiencies in all types of vessels, the shipbuilding industry was confronted by a serious shortage of shipbuilding steel.

Extensive staff investigation was carried out in preparation for hearings, but, happily, the situation eased, and it became apparent that the problem would soon be resolved. Accordingly, no further committee action was taken on the matter.

During World War II, there was a tremendous buildup of Government-owned port facilities in the United States. Following the war, the Department of Defense continued to operate the military terminals on a large-scale basis for the handling of the many varieties of Government cargoes being shipped overseas in support of foreign bases and our occupation forces. When the shipment of military cargoes leveled off, subsequent to the Korean war, commercial facilities were experiencing a serious loss of business in certain areas as the result of competition from Government terminal operations. As a result of complaints by commercial terminal operators, legislation was introduced in the first session to require that all Government agencies transship unclassified equipment, materials, and commodities over publicly or privately owned commercial marine terminal facilities so as to insure a fair and reasonable participation of such facilities in the handling of Government cargoes by geographic areas.

The problem was recognized as being a serious one, and full hearings were held in the spring of 1957. However, in view of the difficulties and dangers involved in the enactment of legislation which might be unduly inflexible to the detriment of essential military missions, hearings were recessed and final action deferred for further review of the situation in the second session, in the hopes that it might be satisfactorily settled in the interim. On June 25, 1958, the committee adopted an interim report recommending to the Secretary of Defense that the Government practices and procedures be further reviewed and modified with the objective of shipping all cargo possible through commercial terminal facilities. In taking this action our intent was to make it clear that we consider the subject as still open, with legislation in prospect, if the Department of Defense fails to comply with the general administration policy and its own directives regarding Government competition with private enterprise.

Other merchant marine matters of significance in the first session were passage of a bill to permit Great Lakes shipyards to compete on an equal basis with those on the east, gulf, and west coasts for new construction under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936; and a bill to extend the time limit of an act approved in the 84th Congress for the sale of certain war-built vessels for operation on essential trade routes 3 and 4 from the Atlantic coast to Cuba and Mexico.

In this Congress, as for several terms in the past, it has been necessary to report legislation to make exception to our traditional coastwise laws to permit Canadian vessels to serve certain areas in Alaska not served by American-flag vessels.

Following the tragic and disastrous collision of the two popular trans-Atlantic passenger liners, the motor vessel *Stockholm* and the steamship *Andrea Doria* on July 26, 1956, the committee was authorized and directed in the 84th Congress to investigate and report on matters relating to safety of life at sea in the light of this great maritime casualty. As previously reported, a staff of the best available experts made a report, with recommendations, at the end of that Congress with regard to future courses of action which appeared necessary or desirable to prevent such occurrences in the future. Our committee has felt a continuing responsibility in this field and, therefore, held hearings in both sessions of this Congress to ascertain progress made by the appropriate administrative agencies to prepare for an international conference at the earliest practicable date to discuss the problems disclosed in the investigation.

On the basis of these very helpful hearings, it appears that our cognizant Federal agencies are, for the most part, proceeding with all reasonable dispatch, except in the field of communications.

The departmental agencies and the industry are well along toward agreement on an agenda and on the United States' position on the many complex matters which must be considered if we are to develop safety standards consistent with the increasing traffic and higher-speed ships on the seas. The committee intends to continue to follow this important subject closely.

About a month prior to the opening of the second session, the Federal Maritime Administrator advised of proposals to sell the four reserve shipyards and the Maritime Training Station in laid-up status at Alameda, Calif., which had been maintained in standby status since World War II. Inasmuch as the reserve shipyards at Vancouver, Wash.; at both Richmond and Alameda, Calif.; and also the training station at Alameda had been inspected by ranking committee members during the recess, the Administrator was requested to withhold final action in these matters until a hearing could be held after the Congress reconvened. On the basis of hearings, the committee did not feel that an adequate case was made for disposing of the reserve shipbuilding facilities. On the other hand, the committee concurred in the Administrator's proposal with regard to declaring the Alameda training station excess to the Government's needs, and so advised him.

In the case of matters such as the reserve shipyards, involving vast investment of Government funds and serious questions of mobilization readiness, as well as impact on existing commercial facilities, it is hoped that the Administrator will continue his past practice of giving advance notice of major actions.

Beyond question, the most important and urgently needed single piece of legislation considered by the committee affecting the American merchant marine and its role in our national security was the bill—H. R. 11451—to authorize the construction and sale by the Federal Maritime Board of a superliner passenger vessel equivalent to the *United States* and a superliner passenger vessel for operation in the Pacific Ocean.

In the past several years the United States has been suffering from a serious deficiency in its mobilization base due to the lack of large, safe, modern passenger vessels for immediate conversion to troopships in time of emergency. There is also a great and growing demand for an increase in the passenger-carrying segment of the American merchant marine. Construction of these ships under the law enacted in this Congress will enable this country to meet deficiencies in shipping services which are presently inadequately served by American-flag ships.

The Atlantic superliner will replace the aging steamship *America* and provide additional capacity for the North Atlantic with a sister ship to the steamship *United States*, and the Pacific ship will augment the trans-Pacific service rendered by the steamships *President Wilson* and *Cleveland* in a trade which is rapidly growing. The bill was found necessary because the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 is not entirely adequate to assure the construction of vessels in the superliner category, involving highly complex questions of construction-subsidy determination, differentiation between commercial and defense features, American versus foreign construction and safety standards, determination of special governmental assistance received by competing foreign passenger ships and other matters of opinion subject to a wide variation of viewpoints. Failure of the former Maritime Commission to recognize the inadequacy of existing law resulted in lengthy controversy over the contracts for the construction of the steamship *United States* and two other superliners after World War II.

The 1936 act anticipated the need for superliners, but did not attempt to prescribe the precise legislative provisions necessary to assure their construction. Accordingly, after full study and lengthy hearings, it was found that, in order to make it possible for an American operator to secure an economic return in accordance with the parity principle of the act, it was necessary that the imponderables and ambiguities encounted when the steamships *United States*, *Constitution*, and *Independence* were constructed be resolved through special legislation. This bill, by establishing special pricing provisions based upon the special characteristics of each of the ships authorized, clarifies those matters that were the source of the previous controversy, and at the same time fully protects the interest of the Government.

The implementation of this essential legislation is urgent, and it is regrettable that funds were not made available in this session so as to advance as far as possible these major projects which of necessity will require several years to complete.

The need for large surface vessels for defense purposes and the growing demand by the public for water transportation over the ocean points to the importance of continued study of passenger shipping. Proposals calling for large, fast, one-class, or tourist-class vessels have been made, and will merit careful analysis in the future, if supported by

reliable traffic estimates and other elements of economic feasibility.

This Congress saw the enactment of an important change in the 1936 act which should aid materially both the American subsidized operator and the Government. By permitting operators to invest up to 50 percent of their statutory reserve funds in common stocks and other "growth" securities, such funds will have a chance to appreciate with the inflationary forces that have contributed to the greatly increased costs of shipbuilding. The existing law which requires reserve funds for replacement purposes to be deposited in interest-bearing securities, such as Government bonds, has been found to be unrealistic in recent years. Under the new law investments will be made through approved trustees in a manner similar to that followed by colleges, universities, pension funds, and so forth.

Further to aid in financing of ship construction, a most important measure was considered, which would implement the so-called "pledge of faith" clause in the Mortgage Insurance Act, so that in the event of default by a mortgagor, the Government will be able to immediately make good under its guaranty. While the record has been excellent with regard to both direct loans by the Government and Government-guaranteed loans, private lenders point to the possibility that in the event of a default a long and costly wait for repayment is possible under present law. They say that enactment of this legislation will make it possible for ship operators to finance new construction through private channels at costs approximating the costs of direct Government financing. Under these circumstances a greater portion of the investing public will develop confidence in our merchant marine program.

Another instance of legislation to perfect title XI of the 1936 act, in the interest of reducing financing costs and encouraging the use of guaranteed private financing, passed the House too late to be enacted into law this year. This bill would allow operators with replacement obligations the opportunity to finance a given ship without a mortgage with the right to place a mortgage, guaranteed by the Government, at a later date to finance a subsequent ship in its program. The additional flexibility created by this change in the law would allow an operator to take advantage of fluctuations in the money market which could result in very significant savings. The bill will undoubtedly be reconsidered in the next Congress.

Another meritorious bill, to include floating drydocks within the coverage of the guaranteed mortgage insurance law, passed the House but did not become law in this session. It is desirable that we provide for the availability of drydock and ship repair facilities adequate to service the very large new tankers and ore carriers that are becoming so important both to our economy and our defense. The subject should receive further careful consideration.

The problems and needs of domestic shipping impel us to realize that aid to, and preservation of, this segment of our merchant marine is of great significance. Moreover, changes in economic development urge reconsideration or modification of traditional concepts.

In this connection, a bill to permit foreign-flag vessels to transport lumber from Savannah, Ga. to Puerto Rico was carefully considered by the committee, even though it was not reported to the House. But the questions raised by the problems of that one important southeastern port, suffering from the discontinuance of American-flag service in the noncontiguous trade, raises many others equally applicable to other ports in similar trade. The Maritime Administrator was urged to make a special study of the situation and report back to the committee in the next Congress with his suggestions as to possible courses of corrective action.

Other bills affecting the domestic trade would: First, H. R. 9833, allow foreign controlled American corporations limited rights with regard to the ownership and operations of nonpropelled barges and self-propelled vessels of not more than 500 gross tons; and second, H. R. 12125, authorize intercoastal carriers to modernize their administrative procedures by allowing the use of short-form bills of lading and other shipping documents in lieu of the present cumbersome and inefficient long-form documents.

As the result of a recent Supreme Court decision, which cast grave doubts on certain aspects of the longstanding international steamship conference system, the committee favorably considered interim legislation to provide a reasonable time for thorough study of the operation of such conferences and their practices, the first in 44 years. Although temporary in nature, this is most important legislation. In many quarters it is generally felt that the dual-rate contract arrangement used by many steamship conferences is the basis for stability in overseas shipping, an industry subject to great fluctuations of supply and demand. The committee's study on this and other aspects of the conference system is already under way. The termination date of the legislation, June 30, 1960, will make possible a comprehensive review of the regulatory aspects of our international ocean trade in the light of today's conditions.

Maritime education was the subject of several bills. One, providing for more effective Government participation in assistance to State maritime academies, has become law. Others, providing in one case for civilian status for personnel at Kings Point, the Merchant Marine Academy, and in another case to establish and maintain the United States Maritime Service as a uniformed service, were heard, but in view of the conflicts involved were not acted upon by the committee in this session.

Matters involved in these instances point to the need of special study of maritime education, not only at Kings Point, but the State academies and the Coast Guard Academy as well.

Following upon its comprehensive investigation of ocean freight forwarders in the 84th Congress, legislation to provide for regulation of this important segment of the merchant marine was reported to and passed by the House in the 2d session.

FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE CONSERVATION

Within the sphere of its jurisdiction over fisheries—commercial and sport—and wildlife conservation, the activities of the committee ranged from consideration and action upon bills affecting control over the salmon and related fisheries in the Northwest United States and the Territory of Alaska, to protection of the rights of fishermen in the Caribbean Sea and Pacific Ocean involved in international conflicts concerning the seaward boundaries of countries in those areas. These particular matters were amendments to or developments of legislation previously enacted.

In the 84th Congress, legislation was enacted to effect a reorganization of the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to establish an Assistant Secretaryship within the Department and to separate the commercial fisheries jurisdiction from that of sport fisheries and wildlife.

It seems that departmental reorganization plans sometimes afford vistas of expansion to some who are charged with their effectuation. Accordingly, the committee conducted its own independent survey of the Washington and regional offices to observe whether or not the reorganization was being carried out in the most efficient manner possible. The new Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fisheries and Wildlife was fully cooperative. I, personally, want to take this opportunity to compliment Assistant Secretary Ross A. Leffler for the conscientious and efficient manner in which this difficult change of organization was accomplished, despite considerable pressure from other sources.

A measure which had been introduced in previous Congresses to prevent the extinction of the Key deer, a vanishing species inhabiting the Florida Keys, was considered anew. In the light of improvements made in the former proposals regarding the establishment of refuge and sanctuary areas, the new bill was favorably reported by the committee and passed by the Congress.

In view of the demands made in recent years by different localities for fish hatcheries for commercial and game fish, your committee considered the problem of national planning in a hearing with the Fish and Wildlife Service represented.

The major effort of the committee in the field of wildlife legislation involved the perennial problem of means of acquiring fast vanishing lands suitable for use as migratory bird refuges. With the relentless advance of civilization, the marshy areas adjacent to waterways have been progressively converted to industrial use. There is little reason to believe that the trend will be reversed.

In view of the fact that the hunting of waterfowl is a sport in which millions of our citizens participate, and upon the continuance of which another large number make their livelihood in sup-

plying the needs of the hunters, the danger of a decline in the numbers of birds because of decreased living space presents a disturbing prospect.

As early as 1934 it was recognized that increased efforts were needed to provide habitat, and in that year there was enacted legislation requiring those hunting migratory birds to purchase a so-called duck stamp to affix to their hunting licenses. Although the law permitted the use of funds thus collected to be used for purposes other than acquisition of wildlife land, the hunters were led to believe that the fund would be devoted to that purpose. Again, in 1949, when the price of the stamp was increased from $1 to $2, the hunters were assured that the money was needed for refuges. Over the years by far the greater part of the fund has been used for purposes other than land acquisition, and the problem of securing sufficient land has become more acute.

During the present Congress, bills were introduced to increase the stamp price to $3, with the hope that the increased revenue would permit acceleration of the purchase program. Assistant Secretary of the Interior Leffler, recognizing the need, proposed legislation that would earmark virtually all of the duck-stamp money for land acquisition, and the committee and the Congress, with the enthusiastic support of all sportsmen's organizations, proceeded to enact this proposal into law.

Of great importance to the sportsmen of America was the amendment of the Coordination Act, whereby fish and wildlife needs must be considered in connection with flood-control projects of the Army engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Department of Agriculture. Heretofore, the Fish and Wildlife Service has not been required to be consulted with respect to ameliorating the effect of manmade changes on the face of nature upon wildlife values. Consequently, its efforts probably were not as successful as they might otherwise have been in this field. Now, as a result of this legislation, the experience and knowledge of the Fish and Wildlife Service must be considered while projects are in the planning state. In the future, greater protection can be afforded fish and wildlife, together with a probable saving in expense.

Other legislation gave recognition to the dangers to fish and wildlife inherent in the use of more lethal insecticides and pesticides as adjuncts to agriculture. During the past several years, there have come from the laboratories of the country many toxic compounds which have proven their great effectiveness in controlling the pests that damage crops, but which have also appeared to have as great a damaging effect on wildlife. Too little is known of their immediate and long-range effect, and much research will be required to learn. The bill enacted into law during this Congress authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to make a start on acquiring that knowledge.

The constantly increasing population of the world with the increasing pressure upon available food supply makes necessary the constant acquisition of knowledge of means of augmenting available sources so that they can be utilized if need arises. As a part of the program, the committee held hearings on a proposal to utilize ricefields in the South, during the period of time when they must be flooded, for the production of a crop of edible fish. As a result of the hearings, the committee reported out a bill, which is now law, to conduct studies with a view to securing knowledge that would not only provide a new source of essential foods, but would also augment the productivity of a considerable area of land in the ricegrowing region.

The committee also considered and acted upon a number of other proposals concerning the fisheries and wildlife, involving problems of the commercial fisheries, predator control, and conservation of wildlife.

COAST GUARD, COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY AND NAVIGATION

A good part of the committee's most important and significant activity was in the area covered by this heading.

Foremost among the subjects relating to Coast Guard jurisdiction was the report of the committee's comprehensive study of recreational boating safety—House Report No. 378—filed in the House April 18, 1957. The report analyzed the complete record of the nationwide hearings held on all phases of this subject during the 2d session of the 84th Congress. The report, containing recommendations for (a) Federal legislation, (b) administrative action by the Secretary of the Treasury, and (c) cooperative action by the States, was followed by proposed legislation reflecting the majority opinion of boating enthusiasts testifying to the need for additional boating regulation in the interest of safety and common sense in this fastest growing of all American sports.

A preliminary hearing was had on this bill in July 1957, with testimony limited to the views of the Coast Guard so all interested could be fully prepared to testify with such views in mind when the bill was further considered in the second session. At the conclusion of this preliminary hearing, the committee took the unprecedented step of urging that the Council of State Governments review the proposed legislation and make recommendations and suggestions for its amendment so as to effectuate the fullest possible cooperation between the States and the Federal Government in a field of growing concern and responsibility to both. Throughout the recess following the end of the first session members of the staff of the committee and officers of the Coast Guard worked closely with a special subcommittee of the Council of State Governments in a thorough review of the committee bill and the drafting of a model State law intended to fit in with the proposed Federal revision of the boating laws. In my opinion, this unusual exercise in Federal-State cooperation has been highly successful. The problem received further intensive consideration by the Congress in the second session when revised legislation, conforming closely to the views of the Council of State Governments and the suggestions of the Coast Guard, was introduced.

After due notice to all interested parties, full hearings were held on the clean bill, H. R. 11078, on March 18, 20, and 21, 1958.

Notwithstanding the thorough study and extensive hearings conducted by the committee during the preceding 2 years, small but vocal opposition manifested itself after the bill had been reported to the House. Although delayed by parliamentary maneuvers of the opposition, the bill passed the House with minor amendments, and only 29 votes against. Subsequently, the House concurred in a Senate amendment and the bill has since been enacted into law.

Of a different character, but of outstanding importance in the national interest, was a bill to authorize the construction of a nuclear-powered icebreaking vessel for operation by the United States Coast Guard. Although not in the program of either the Department of the Navy or the Coast Guard, the thorough hearings held by the committee conclusively established the desirability of this authorizing legislation and demonstrated that the urgent need for such a vessel transcends the individual requirements of the Navy and the Coast Guard and their specific missions as presently prescribed. The existence of such a ship, specially designed and fitted out as a laboratory, would enable this country to overcome its present great disadvantage in regard to the strategic and commercial potentialities of the Arctic and Antarctic. Therefore, I was deeply disappointed that this authorizing measure should have been vetoed with apparent disregard of the hearings and the committee report. The increasing emphasis on the need for polar capabilities in the scientific and transportation fields, as highlighted by the dramatic exploits of the nuclear submarines *Nautilus* and *Skate*, makes it imperative that legislation of this type be again introduced in the new Congress.

Legislation that was considered and became law in the first session included an increase in the authorization—enacted in the preceding Congress—for the construction of two sorely needed surveying ships for the Coast and Geodetic Survey; amendments to laws relating to the retirement pay and status of members of the former Lighthouse Service, and Coast Guard Reserve, and Coast Guard warrant officers; and a bill to modernize the laws relating to the endorsement of masters on vessel documents.

The regulations proposed by the Coast Guard to implement Public Law 519, 84th Congress, providing for the inspection and certification of certain small vessels carrying more than six passengers for hire, came under heavy attack from many quarters. Accordingly, after careful consideration, the law was amended to delay its effective date for an additional 6 months to allow more time for operators to comply with its requirements and suggest reasonable changes in the regulations.

A problem of increasing importance, as the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway to deep-draft overseas shipping becomes imminent, is the matter of compulsory pilotage. Under present law, American and Canadian ships operating within the lakes are required to have officers qualified to navigate the lakes. On the other hand, there is no requirement whatsoever applicable to foreign-flag vessels, or even American-flag ships navigating United States waters under registry. The number of foreign vessels navigating the Great Lakes is increasing. Collisions have occurred involving foreign vessels, and upon completion of the Seaway there will be a substantial increase in the number of both foreign and United States registered vessels navigating the Great Lakes. In view of the imperative need that qualified pilots on such vessels be required by law, the committee considered legislation to this end, and it passed the House as reported. Inasmuch as it did not clear the Senate in this Congress, this is a subject that should be given high priority for reconsideration in the next Congress.

Other important legislation of a more localized nature included amendments to the navigation and inspection laws which would (a) except from the vessel-inspection requirements for a limited period of time certain small vessels providing essential service to small outports in southeastern Alaska; (b) amend the vessel-admeasurement laws relating to water-ballast spaces to meet a special problem among the small vessels serving the offshore drilling rigs in the Gulf of Mexico; (c) clarify the application of navigation rules for the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters; (d) amend and bring into conformity the statutes and rules governing lights for vessels towing or being overtaken; and (e) authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to prescribe day signals for certain vessels.

PANAMA CANAL

In the field of activity touching the Panama Canal, its operations, and administration, the committee was confronted with the necessity of acting on legislation to implement the new treaty made with the Republic of Panama in 1955 covering the transfer of some $24 million of land and buildings to the Republic. Authorization of the transfer was favorably acted upon.

Present calculations indicate that the canal is reaching a probable saturation point within the next 12 to 15 years. In view of the time required to locate, plan, and construct improvements on the existing canal or additional trans-isthmian facilities, the committee recruited a special technical staff to serve as a Broad of Consultants, expert in engineering and transportation, to evaluate existing data to determine the proper location, type, and extent of additional means for transit between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans in the region of Central America. The Board's work commenced at the end of the year 1957 and is expected to continue throughout the greater part of next year.

As a part of the continuing effort to keep the canal abreast of traffic and ship size requirements, the Panama Canal Company has initiated a program of short-range improvements involving widening and deepening parts of the canal and installation of lighting to permit night operation. The committee's staff of experts examined the Company's proposals on the ground, and have submitted to the committee a report on their observations concerning the program. Their work is continuing and on the completion of their study of the available engineering data, and possible further field examination, it is anticipated that definitive recommendations will be forthcoming concerning future development of trans-isthmian transit facilities.

The standing subcommittee on the Panama Canal concluded 1957 with a visit to the canal and a first-hand observation of the facilities and current problems.

This Congress has seen substantial continued development in our merchant marine and other fields under the committee's jurisdiction. I pledge my continued and full support to carry out and advance all of the objectives of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

In closing, I would like to take this opportunity to express my heartfelt thanks to all of the members of the committee and its staff who have labored hard and devotedly to bring about the substantial and constructive achievements of this Congress.

Post Office Legislation and Benefits for Postal Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 22, 1958

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the 85th Congress, I want to take a moment to thank and pay my respects to the many postal workers in my District who have so faithfully performed their duties over the years, even though, in many instances, their salaries were far below that being paid to workers with less responsible positions in private industry.

It is with a sense of satisfaction that after a long, hard battle, we were able to enact legislation granting a long-overdue pay increase to these devoted public servants. I am happy to have been in the forefront of the battle to obtain this salary raise and was one of the first to introduce such legislation during the 1st session of the 85th Congress, and to sign the discharge petition to get the bill out of committee. It was most unfortunate that the President saw fit to veto the first postal pay bill passed by Congress. But, in the second bill, we were able to make the salary raise retroactive to last January, and this certainly helped to soften the blow of the veto.

The 85th Congress was the most productive in many years insofar as legislation benefiting postal employees was concerned. In addition to the salary-increase bill, there were several other major bills which will have a long-range effect upon the Post Office Department and its more than one-half million employees. A major victory was achieved when the postal rate-increase bill was finally enacted. This measure will help to place the Post Office Department upon a more financially secure basis and make each class of mail pay a fair share of the cost of operating the United States mail system.

Another important measure enacted by Congress, and of which I was a joint sponsor, was the bill which increased by 10 percent the benefits paid to the more than 300,000 civil service and postal retirees and survivors. Certainly those who have to live on pensions and fixed incomes in these days of high prices know and appreciate how much this increase in benefits means to our senior civil servants, and the dependents of those who died while in the civil service of our country.

Rural carriers also obtained additional benefits under Public Law 85-399. This law increased the equipment maintenance allowance for rural carriers from 9 to 10 cents per mile, or a minimum of $3.50 per day, whichever is greater. It also authorized the payment of an additional allowance not in excess of $2.50 per day to carriers serving heavily patronized routes.

Every postal clerk or carrier who has received a complaint from a patron concerning the receipt of obscene mail should be pleased with Public Law 85-796, which strengthens the penalties and prosecution procedures for use against persons who mail obscene and crime-inciting matter. This bill was reported out of the House Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member, and it gave me a great deal of satisfaction to have helped enact this legislation which will eliminate much of the filth and hate mail that today flows through our Nation's post offices.

There were a great many other minor bills enacted which will inure to the benefit of postal employees. These bills dealt with such diverse subjects as fees for undeliverable mail; establishment of postal stations at military bases and other locations; withdrawal of contributions from the civil service retirement fund; sureties and disbursing procedures; and technical changes in connection with promotions to prevent inequities.

I will be happy to furnish postal workers with copies of the above laws or with an analysis as to how these new legislative acts may affect them personally. It is my hope that I will be able to again personally meet many of my friends in the postal service when I make a complete tour of the District after adjournment. In a number of the communities, I will be holding office hours in the Post Office Building for the purpose of discussing problems with persons who may need my assistance in connection with some Federal matter. Consequently, I hope to obtain the personal reaction of the post office employees as to the effectiveness with which this past Congress

has dealt with the problems of this agency of our Government.

One other observation which I would like to make, deals with what can be expected next session of Congress regarding post office employees. I predict that the yearly battle for pay raises will soon become a thing of the past, and that Federal employees can shortly look forward to having their salaries pegged to the cost of living index which has worked satisfactorily for so many industrial employees. A Presidential study has just been completed by a steering committee headed by Labor Under Secretary James T. O'Connell, and this report recommends that salaries of postal employees be geared to comparable industrial rates and that regular annual adjustments be provided without necessity for Congressional legislation. I'll be interested in hearing the reaction of our postal employees to this plan which would seem to present a much more sensible approach to the ever existing problem of the wage-price spiral.

Work of the Committee on Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 22, 1958

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, customarily at the end of each session of Congress the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs submits for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a stewardship report on the committee's work. The purpose is to make available a digest of the principal measures which have come before the committee. Last year the report was submitted by the chairman, Hon. THOMAS S. GORDON. The ill health that is forcing Congressman GORDON to relinquish his Congressional seat this fall has also compelled him during the past months to forego his work as chairman. This is a matter of deep regret to all of us who have served with him. We shall miss the kind and gentle qualities that have been among his characteristics. In addition to our chairman, the committee is also losing the services of five other members. JOHN VORYS is ending 20 years of service that has been marked by devotion and distinction. He has always presented his views with vigor and clarity. Personally I shall miss him. Our colleagues, the gentlemen from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] are seeking another office. The experience they gained on the committee should serve them well in their new offices. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE] is bringing to a close a long and distinguished service in the House. The gentleman from New York [Mr. RADWAN] has decided to withdraw from public office to recover his health. To each of them I express my appreciation for their cooperation in my task as acting chairman and add my good wishes for their personal happiness.

The 85th Congress has been one of the busiest for the committee and its subcommittees. The full committee had a total of 158 meetings. More significant were the increased activities of the 8 subcommittees which held 123 meetings. I am aware that the Committee on Foreign Affairs is sometimes accused of secrecy in its work. Any fairminded person will recognize, I am sure, that the committee must receive much material of a highly classified nature if its judgments and decisions are to be based upon facts. At the same time, Chairman GORDON and I have constantly pressed upon the executive branch the importance of declassifying as much of this material as possible in order that the public could have as much information as is consistent with national security. The result of this pressure is reflected in the increased number of pages of printed hearings produced by the committee in this Congress. Final figures show that 7,013 pages of printed hearings have come from our committee the last 2 years. Almost half of these, 3,318 pages to be exact, cover the mutual security program hearings held in 1957 and in 1958. A perusal of the 1958 hearings will show that security deletions are relatively few and that there is a considerable body of information on the extent, the strength, and the weakness of our foreign-aid program. The committee believes that this approach has resulted in a much better understanding of the program, not only in the Congress but throughout the country.

Almost 200 bills and joint resolutions have been referred to the committee of which nearly half were duplicates. The committee considered 60 of these measures. Of 33 bills and joint resolutions reported out by the committee, 28 have been enacted into law. In addition, 14 resolutions on various subjects received Congressional approval.

The crisis in the Middle East that led to the landing of our troops in Lebanon was of grave concern, not only to the committee but to the entire membership of the House. To keep the House as fully informed as possible, arrangements were made with the Department of State to provide daily briefings. These meetings were open only to Members of the House. It was understood by those attending that the information they received would be treated as classified information. After a ranking officer of the Department gave a résumé of the latest developments, Members of the House interrogated the witness. At several meetings, more than 40 Members of the House appeared. So far as I can gather Members of the House welcomed the opportunity to get a firsthand account of a very critical and fast-moving situation. From the point of view of the Department, it was possible to gather quickly Congressional reaction to these serious events. In retrospect I think this has been a very worthwhile project which I hope will be repeated if the occasion again warrants it.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 103, part 12, page 16859, Chairman GORDON gave the House a digest of the measures handled by the committee during the 1st session of the 85th Congress. At this point I would like to insert a digest of the measures handled during the second session.

MEASURES ENACTED INTO LAW

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1958

This act extended the Mutual Security Act of 1954 for another year. The executive branch had requested an authorization of $3,297,900,000. The committee recommended $2,958,900,000, an amount which the House authorized. The authorization enacted into law was for $3,031,400,000, a sum $72,500,000 above the House authorization and $72,500,000 below the Senate figure.

The committee initiated significant changes in the title headings of the act in order to place military assistance in a separate chapter and defense support under the economic chapter. These changes were intended to make clear that defense support, although necessary for military needs, was, nevertheless, economic assistance. Special assistance and the contingency fund were put into a new chapter because each could include both military and economic assistance. The House accepted the committee's changes. The Senate also accepted the change with one modification. Special assistance was removed from the same chapter as the contingency fund and put into the chapter headed "Economic Assistance." This change conforms to the executive branch definition that special assistance is regarded as economic assistance necessary to achieve political, economic, or other objectives in countries where no assistance is provided in support of significant military forces, or in situations where assistance cannot be appropriately rendered as technical assistance or from the Development Loan Fund. The contingency fund, unlike special assistance, may be used for both military and nonmilitary assistance; approved June 30, 1958, Public 85–477.

PAYMENT TO THE GOVERNMENT OF DENMARK

This bill authorizes an appropriation of $5,296,302 to the $35,432,350 already paid to the Danish shipowners for the 40 Danish ships that were requisitioned by the United States in 1941.

The additional payment is necessitated by the fact that the procedures followed when the ships were first requisitioned established a legal situation under which the owners of the vessels could not receive full compensation in the terms of the original understanding between the Danish Ambassador and the Department of State; approved June 6, 1958, Public Law 85–450.

APPOINTMENT OF AN ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR AFRICAN AFFAIRS

The bill amends the act of May 26, 1949, as amended, by increasing the number of Assistant Secretaries of State from 10 to 11. It also increases the number of such Assistant Secretaries in the Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956.

The additional Assistant Secretary will permit the establishment of a Bureau of African Affairs headed by an Assistant Secretary. This new post is intended to enable the Department of State to give adequate recognition to the growing importance of our relations with Africa.

The salary authorized in the Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956 for an Assistant Secretary is $20,000. A request for the position is included in the Department's fiscal year 1959 appropriation request; approved July 18, 1958, Public Law 85–524.

AMENDMENT TO THE INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1949 (CZECHOSLOVAKIAN CLAIMS)

This bill amends the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, by providing for the payment of claims by American citizens against Czechoslovakia, based upon

the nationalization or other taking of American-owned property in Czechoslovakia on or after January 1, 1945. Authority to administer the claims provided for is given to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. Payment in full would be made on all claims of $1,000 or less. Those in excess of $1,000 would receive payment of $1,000 on account, with the balance to be prorated equally among all award holders; approved August 8, 1958, Public Law 85–604.

AUTHORIZING CERTAIN RETIRED PERSONNEL OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT TO ACCEPT AND WEAR DECORATIONS, PRESENTS, AND OTHER THINGS TENDERED THEM BY FOREIGN COUNTRIES

The bill authorizes certain retired personnel of the United States Government to accept and wear such decorations, orders, medals, emblems, presents, and other things as have been tendered them by certain foreign countries which are being held for such individuals by the Department of State; approved August 27, 1958, Private Law 85–704.

FOREIGN SERVICE ANNUITIES

The bill provides a 10-percent increase in annuities to retired Foreign Service personnel and to their widows. In the case of retired officers the increase is limited to a maximum of $500 per annum and, in the case of widows, to $250 per annum. This would confer on those individuals who come under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system the same increase as was given retired civil-service annuitants under Public Law 85–465 approved June 25, 1958. The entire cost of all the annuity increases will be paid from the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund; approved September 2, 1958, Public Law 85–882.

PARTICIPATION IN THE WORLD SCIENCE-PAN PACIFIC EXPOSITION

This bill provides for participation of the United States in the World Science-Pan Pacific Exposition to be held at Seattle, Wash., in 1961. The bill further authorizes the President to cooperate with the Washington State World Fair Commission and to determine the extent to which the United States shall be a participant and exhibitor at the exposition. Although the bill authorizes an appropriation of not to exceed $125,000, it is anticipated that United States participation in the exposition will require additional authorizations and appropriations.

The bill requires that the President report to the Congress during its first regular session after the enactment of this legislation with respect to the most effective manner of representation of the United States and the amount of appropriations which will be necessary to accomplish such representation; approved September 2, 1958, Public Law 85–880.

HIGHWAY COMPACT BETWEEN MINNESOTA AND MANITOBA, CANADA

The bill authorizes the negotiation of a compact between the State of Minnesota and the Province of Manitoba, Canada, for the construction of a highway through the northwest angle of Minnesota. This area is separated from the rest of the State by the Lake of the Woods and the construction of this highway will provide access to the area through Manitoba. No expenditure of Federal funds is anticipated; however, it is possible that Federal highway funds may be used within the State of Minnesota for this purpose; approved September 2, 1958, Public Law 85–887.

CORREGIDOR BATAAN MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The bill amends the act of August 5, 1953, creating the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission by making clear that the Commission is not limited to a life span of 4 years; rather that the individual commissioners, of whom there are 9, are appointed for 4-year terms. The bill also amends existing law by deleting the authorization for $100,000 and substitutes the sum of $200,000. The increased authorization, against which the Commission intends to request an appropriation of $46,000 for next year, will be sufficient for the Commission to continue its operations for another 2 years; approved July 25, 1958, Public Law 85–556.

RELIEF OF MARY F. C. LEUTE

The bill is for the relief of the widow of an American, Joseph Henry Leute, who was serving in the consular service at the time of his death abroad in 1909. There was no law under which his widow could receive any benefits. The bill provides that Mr. Leute shall be deemed to have been a participant under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system, thereby making his widow eligible for consideration for benefits. This bill in itself will not give her any money, but will make it possible for the Secretary of State to consider her financial situation in order to determine whether she is in actual need and without other adequate means of support. If the Secretary so determines, he may then extend to her a maximum of $100 per month payable from the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund; approved September 2, 1958, Private Law 85–784.

UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF SCIENTIFIC UNIONS

This resolution authorizes an increase in United States contributions to the International Council of Scientific Unions and its associated unions from $9,000 to $65,000 annually. The funds made available under this authorization are to pay the dues assessed against the United States as a result of its membership. Appropriations under this authorization are included each year in the appropriation for the Department of State; approved August 14, 1958, Public Law 85–627.

INVITATION TO INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION TO HOLD THE 12TH SESSION OF ITS ASSEMBLY IN THE UNITED STATES

The resolution authorizes an appropriation of $200,000 to enable the United States to extend an invitation to the International Civil Aviation Organization to hold the 12th session of its assembly in the United States in 1959. The appropriation made pursuant to this authorization will be used to defray costs over and above those which are ordinarily incurred in holding a session at the Organization's headquarters and which are shared on a pro rata basis by all the member nations; approved June 4, 1958, Public Law 85–448.

PARTICIPATION IN THE SECOND ANNUAL UNITED STATES WORLD TRADE FAIR

This resolution authorizes the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the Second Annual United States World Trade Fair to be held in New York City from May 7 to 17, 1958; approved March 28, 1958, Public Law 85–360.

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL AUTOMATION CONGRESS AND EXPOSITION

The resolution authorizes the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the Fourth International Automation Congress and Exposition to be held in New York City from June 9 to 13, 1958; approved April 11, 1958, Public Law 85–374.

PARTICIPATION IN THE CALIFORNIA INTERNATIONAL TRADE FAIR AND INDUSTRIAL EXPOSITION

This resolution authorizes and requests the President to invite by proclamation, or in such other manner as he may deem proper, the countries of the Free World to participate in the California International Trade Fair and Industrial Exposition to be held in Los Angeles, Calif., from April 1 to 12, 1959; approved September 2, 1958, Public Law 85–924.

CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGES ACROSS INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARIES

The following are authorizations for the construction, maintenance, and operation of bridges over the rivers and the places specified, to supply facilities needed for the flow of international transportation. No expenditure of funds by the United States is involved:

Bridge across the Rainy River at International Falls, Minn.; approved July 28, 1958, Public Law 85–566.

Bridge between Lubec, Maine, and Campobello Island, New Brunswick, Canada; approved July 28, 1958, Public Law 85–563.

Bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.; approved August 28, 1958, Public Law 85–841.

CONCURRENT AND HOUSE RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED

ESTABLISHMENT OF PLANS FOR THE PEACEFUL EXPLORATION OF OUTER SPACE, HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 332

The resolution requests the President to enter into international agreements concerning the joint exploration of outer space, the advancement of scientific development relating thereto, and declares the support of the Congress for the prohibition of the use of outer space for military purposes.

Passed House June 2, 1958, under suspension of the rules; passed Senate July 23, 1958, by voice vote.

EXPRESSING INDIGNATION AT THE EXECUTION OF CERTAIN LEADERS OF THE REVOLT IN HUNGARY, HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 343

This resolution expresses the sense of Congress that the President express through the organs of the United Nations and through all other appropriate channels, the deep sense of indignation of the United States at the act of barbarism and perfidy of the Government of the Soviet Union and its instrument for the suppression of the independence of Hungary, the Hungarian Communist regime, and expresses the sense of the Congress that the President express the sympathy of the people of the United States for the people of Hunugary on the occasion of this new expression of their ordeal of political oppression and terror.

Passed House June 19, 1958; unanimous-consent proceedings; passed Senate June 24, 1958, by voice vote.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A UNITED NATIONS FORCE, SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 109

The resolution expresses the sense of the Congress that consideration should immediately be given by the General Assembly of the United Nations to the development, within its permanent structure, of such organization and procedures as will enable the United Nations promptly to employ suitable United Nations forces for such purposes as observation and patrol in situations that threaten international peace and security.

Passed Senate July 23, 1958; passed House, amended, August 21, 1958, under suspension of the rules, by vote of 299 yeas to 20 nays; Senate concurred in House amendments, August 22, 1958.

EXTENDING GREETINGS TO THE FEDERAL LEGISLATURE OF THE WEST INDIES, SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 77

This resolution conveys the greetings of Congress to the Federal Legislature of the West Indies on the occasion of the inauguration of the first Federal Legislature and reaffirms the friendship of the United States for the people of the West Indies.

Passed Senate April 16, 1958; passed House April 17, 1958, unanimous-consent proceedings.

PAN AMERICAN DAY CELEBRATION, HOUSE RESOLUTION 528

The resolution designates April 14, 1958, for the celebration of Pan American Day and extends most cordial greetings of the House

of Representatives to the representative bodies of each of the other American Republics on this occasion.

Passed House April 15, 1958, unanimous-consent proceedings, without reference to committee.

EXTENDING CONGRATULATIONS TO THE STATE OF ISRAEL ON THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF ITS ESTABLISHMENT, HOUSE RESOLUTION 546

This resolution extends to the people of Israel the congratulations and good wishes of the House of Representatives on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the establishment of the State of Israel and the best wishes of the House of Representatives for continued progress and success.

Passed House, April 23, 1958, unanimous consent proceedings, without reference to committee.

MEASURES PASSED BY HOUSE BUT NOT FINALLY ACTED UPON IN SENATE

DENIAL OF PASSPORTS, H. R. 13760

The bill is to protect the security of the United States by authorizing the Secretary of State to deny passports to persons who are members of the Communist Party or affiliates of the Communist Party and to persons who, since 1948, have knowingly engaged in activities intended to further the international Communist movement, provided that it is shown that their activities or presence abroad would be harmful to the United States under the Congressional findings of fact contained in section 5 of the bill, which section finds that the international Communist movement is dedicated to the ultimate domination of the United States; that it is a clear, present, and continuing danger to the United States; and that, in view of its use of passports as a means to promote the conspiracy, the issuance of passports to supporters of the international Communist movement should be denied.

Passed House, amended, August 23, 1958, unanimous consent proceedings, by voice vote.

PAN AMERICAN GAMES TO BE HELD IN CHICAGO, ILL., H. R. 13343

The bill authorizes an appropriation of $500,000 for the purpose of promoting and insuring the success of the Pan American Games to be held at Chicago, Ill., August 27 through September 7, 1959.

Passed House August 22, 1958, under suspension of the rules, by vote of 244 yeas to 64 nays.

MEASURES REPORTED BUT NOT FAVORABLY ACTED UPON IN HOUSE

EVALUATION AND WAIVER OF WARTIME LOANS TO CERTAIN AMERICAN CITIZENS, H. R. 10568

The bill authorizes the Secretary of State to evaluate in dollars certain financial assistance loans expressed in foreign currencies arising as a result of World War II. When World War II started in the Far East the Department of State used a fund made available to it for emergencies in the Diplomatic and Consular Service to assist Americans who found themselves in a difficult financial position. Through the availability of this special fund repatriation expenses of some Americans were advanced. In setting up this fund, Congress had made clear that advances from it were to be treated as loans for which the recipient would sign a non-interest-bearing promissory note. There are approximately 20,000 promissory notes outstanding in 2,000 different accounts for loans made in foreign currency. The bill would authorize the Department of State to convert these fiat currencies into realistic dollar values, and if the Department cannot collect the converted amounts it will turn the account over to the General Accounting Office to attempt collection. Should it be determined that a debt is uncollectible, the Secretary of State, at the discretion of the Comptroller General, can waive collection of all or part of the money owed the Government.

Reported to House, July 17, 1958.

GRANTING THE CONSENT OF CONGRESS TO A GREAT LAKES BASIN COMPACT, S. 1416

The purpose of the bill is to grant the consent of Congress, with certain limiting qualifications, to the creation of a Great Lakes Commission by the States of Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin. The Commission's powers include the gathering and publication of information; making recommendations with respect to the orderly and balanced development, use, and conservation of the water resources of the Great Lakes Basin; considering the means of improving fisheries and navigation; recommending legislation to the States; and cooperating with the United States Government and other public bodies. The only cost to the Federal Government would be that of the salary of the Federal representative to the Commission, which shall not exceed $15,000 per annum.

Reported to House, August 13, 1958.

New Aid for Business and Professional Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 22, 1958

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, too often in our haste to please and enact legislation which is beneficial to the labor element in our country, we forget there would be no jobs for the great masses of our people, were it not for the genius and capital provided by the business and professional men in our great Nation. I make this statement in no way to belittle or to take away one whit of credit from the skilled laboring men who through their toil have made our standard of living the greatest on the earth, and our productive capacity the envy of every other nation. These remarks are made out of respect for the basic principles on which our free-economy system is founded, and in deference to those men, whose farreaching vision and courage to invest their lives and resources, has created a better world for all of us who must toil for our daily bread.

Here in these Halls of Congress, and more often in the many bureaus and agencies of Government, we come close to strangling the very life out of the goose that lays the golden egg—the business and professional men of America. Through endless, and often senseless, laws and regulations we hamper and impede the productive capacity of our industries and businesses. If you have talked to a small-business man lately, then you will be familiar with the story which I hear repeatedly in my travels throughout my District. The average man engaged in business has to spend far too much of his time rendering reports and supplying countless statistical data and information to Federal, State, and local regulatory agencies. If these reports do not overwhelm him, the filing and payment of the ever-increasing myriad of corporation, partnership, and personal taxes, may often cause him to wonder why he ever went into business for himself.

Fortunately, I believe Congress has awakened to the reality of the situation and is taking action to lift part of this burden off the backs of our business people. Likewise, I hope measures might be taken by the various agencies of Government to simplify and wherever possible eliminate unnecessary reports and regulations which hamper and burden the small businesses throughout the Nation.

I am happy that I have had an opportunity to serve as a member of the House Select Committee on Small Business during this past session of Congress. It has given me a better opportunity to study and gain a firsthand knowledge of the problems which exist in the field of business and finance. It has provided me with a keener appreciation for the businessmen I know and meet and helps me to better discuss their problems. It has impelled me to introduce and support legislation which will help alleviate the problems which exist and to improve the economic climate so that more businesses may thrive and flourish.

CHANGES EFFECTED BY THIS CONGRESS

Several important legislative steps were taken by the 85th Congress to help lighten the load on business. I was a joint sponsor of a bill which has now become Public Law 85–866, that reduces some of the tax burden on small businesses. This legislation contains four major provisions:

First. Faster tax writeoffs on new equipment in the first year after its purchase.

Second. Extension from 2 to 3 years of the time for which a loss may be applied against previous income to gain a retroactive tax refund.

Third. Ten years instead of 15 months in which to pay estate taxes on a business held by a few persons.

Fourth. An increase from $60,000 to $100,000 on the amount of earnings that may be retained for expansion instead of being distributed, and thus lessening the tax burden.

Public Law 85–536, established the Small Business Administration as a permanent Government agency and increased the lending authority to better help small businesses obtain badly needed equity capital. This law increases the ceiling on individual loans which the Small Business Administration may grant from $250,000 to $350,000 and reduces the interest rate charged on such loans from 6 to 5½ percent.

Another legislative measure which should prove beneficial to small business is Public Law 85–699. This law authorizes the appropriation of $250 million to SBA for the purpose of furnishing long-term equity capital to small business. These funds will not go directly to individual business concerns but will be allocated to small-business investment companies which in turn must lend such funds only to small businesses which can qualify. In effect, this law creates special lending institutions tailored to meet the needs of small businesses which have not

been able to obtain adequate financing through present banking and loan companies.

Still another Congressional act which should aid many small businesses, especially those who produce goods for sale, is Public Law 85–800. This law revises the Federal purchasing and procurement procedures to insure that small-business concerns in our country get a larger share of the contracts made by the United States Government for the purchase of goods and services.

Taken as a whole, this Congress has made considerable progress in recognizing the problems of small-business men and professional people, but there is still much room for improvement. For instance, one very important measure enacted by the House, died in the Senate in the rush for adjournment. This was H. R. 10, commonly referred to as the Jenkins-Keogh bill, which would have granted some special tax relief to professional men and other self-employed persons who presently are not adequately covered by social security. This legislation, if approved, would have permitted self-employed persons who qualified to take a tax deduction up to 10 percent of their income, but not in excess of $2,500 in any one taxable year, provided such funds were invested in special retirement funds or annuities. I am hopeful the 86th Congress will take early action to approve this bill so that the retirement needs of many of our small-business men and professional people may be provided for in a better manner.

Any business or professional man who would like additional information on any of the new laws which I have briefly discussed, may obtain a complete analysis of such legislation by writing to my Washington office. Likewise anyone interested in obtaining assistance in connection with loans or Government contracts may obtain such information either from my office or by contacting the Small Business Administration branch offices which serve the First Congressional District. For those businessmen located in the northern Panhandle of West Virginia, the SBA branch office in the Fulton Building, 107 Sixth Street, Pittsburgh, Pa., is the nearest. There is also a branch office of the SBA located in the Embleton Building, 922 Quarrier Street, Charleston, to serve the needs of small business located in other areas of West Virginia.

Report of the Committee on House Administration for the 85th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OMAR BURLESON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 22, 1958

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I submit herewith a résumé of the activities of the Committee on House Administration during the 85th Congress. The committee has been very active throughout the Congress, and I feel that a great deal has been accomplished in the field over which the committee has jurisdiction.

A breakdown of the activities of the committee is furnished according to regular and special subcommittees. I believe this is the most understandable method of setting forth the activities of the Committee on House Administration.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS

Subsequent to the action of the House in authorizing certain studies and investigations to be conducted by various committees, the Subcommittee on Accounts held hearings on all resolutions providing funds for this purpose. In each case the amount recommended by the Committee on House Administration was approved by the House. The list of committees, showing the amounts requested and the amounts approved, is as follows:

Committee	Amount requested	Amount approved
Agriculture	$50,000	$50,000
Armed Services	250,000	225,000
Banking and Currency	205,000	190,000
Campaign Expenditures (select committee)	30,000	30,000
District of Columbia	10,000	7,000
Education and Labor	150,000	125,000
Foreign Affairs	75,000	75,000
Government Operations	1,352,000	1,175,000
House Administration	170,000	170,000
Interior and Insular Affairs	60,000	57,500
Interstate and Foreign Commerce	410,000	410,000
Judiciary	425,000	365,000
Merchant Marine and Fisheries	75,000	75,000
Outer Space (select committee)	225,000	185,000
Post Office and Civil Service	50,000	50,000
Public Works	160,000	160,000
Small Business (select committee)	493,000	443,000
Un-American Activities	635,000	632,000
Veterans' Affairs	110,000	110,000
Ways and Means	250,000	250,000
Total	5,185,000	4,784,500

In the 2d session of the 85th Congress the Committee on House Administration sent a questionnaire to each Member of the House of Representatives, inviting comments and opinions on many items of proposed legislation directly affecting the efficient administration of Members' offices. Responses to the questionnaire proved valuable to the committee in considering and reporting legislation. Some of the more important subjects on which Members' opinions were sought are as follows:

First. Allowances: (a) Stationery, (b) postage, (c) telephone and telegraph, (d) electrical and mechanical office equipment, (e) mileage, (f) District office expense, (g) District office rent.

Second. Congressional employees: (a) Maximum number of employees in Members' offices, (b) need for administrative assistants, (c) salaries of employees, (d) computation of basic and gross salaries, (e) dual salaries, (f) mileage for Congressional employees.

Third. Vouchers: (a) Should expenditure of counterpart funds be publicized? (b) per diem for Members and employees, (c) per diem for witnesses.

Fourth. Administrative services: (a) Folding room, (b) document room, (c) central mimeographing room and service, (d) pages, (e) personnel office.

Fifth. Parking.

Sixth. Printing.

Seventh. Cafeteria and restaurants.

Eighth. Moving sidewalk or conveyor belt between Capitol and House Office Buildings.

The following legislation, considered and reported by the Committee on House Administration, is intended to make more efficient the administration of the offices of Members of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE EXPENSES

H. R. 790—Public Law 85–54—authorizes Members of the House of Representatives to be reimbursed for official office expenses incurred not only in their Congressional Districts, but also those incurred any place outside the District of Columbia.

RENTAL OF OFFICE SPACE

H. R. 9282—Public Law 85–301—authorizes each Member to have not to exceed two offices in his district, the total rental for which shall not exceed $1,200 per annum.

POSTAGE ALLOWANCE

House Resolution 399, approved August 22, 1957, increased the Members' allowance for air mail and special delivery postage to $300 per annum, effective at the beginning of the fiscal year, July 1, 1957.

H. R. 13688—Public Law 85–778—increased the postage allowance to $400 per annum, effective at the beginning of the 1st session of the 86th Congress; and amended the existing law to provide that the allowance become available at the beginning of each regular session of Congress, commencing with the 86th Congress—the effective date had previously been the beginning of each fiscal year, July 1.

TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE ALLOWANCE

H. R. 9406—Public Law 85–289—authorized that each Member's allowance for telephone and telegraph service be computed on a biennial rather than an annual basis, thus enabling a Member to utilize any unused portion of his allowance during the second session of any Congress—6,000 minutes allowed for a 2-year period instead of 3,000 minutes for each year.

A resolution was considered by the committee on August 6, 1958, but was not reported to the House, providing an additional 600 minutes for long-distance telephone service for the remainder of the 85th Congress.

STATIONERY ALLOWANCE

House Resolution 628 authorized an additional stationery allowance of $600 for each Member of the House of Representatives for the 2d session of the 85th Congress.

By administrative action of the Committee on House Administration, Members of the House were notified on August 13, 1958, that they would be permitted to charge to their stationery allowance any expense incurred in printing services performed by the majority and minority printing clerks under rules and regulations agreed upon by the Committee on House Administration and the Clerk of the House.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT

H. R. 12601, approved by the committee on May 28, 1958, and reported to the House June 5, 1958, provided for an ad-

ministrative assistant to each Member of the House. The bill remained on the House Calendar when Congress adjourned, the Rules Committee having failed to grant a rule for its consideration.

INSURING FUNDS OF SERGEANT AT ARMS

House Resolution 144 authorized the Sergeant at Arms of the House to protect the funds of his office by purchasing insurance in the amount necessary to protect such funds against loss.

WITHHOLDING FUNDS FROM EMPLOYEES' SALARIES

H. R. 12521—Public Law 85-492—authorized the Clerk to withhold certain amounts from employees' salaries when such employees are indebted to the House of Representatives.

PAGES

Hearings were held on May 6, 1957, on the following bills which would provide a method for the appointment, housing, education, and supervision of Congressional pages: House Resolution 19, House Resolution 62, H. R. 4612, H. R. 9120, H. R. 10698, and H. R. 11046.

BOND PROGRAM—PAYROLL DEDUCTION

As the result of an excellent response to a letter addressed to all employees of the House by the Committee on House Administration, the committee authorized the House Disbursing Office to proceed with a United States savings bond payroll deduction plan, effective July 1, 1958, under certain regulations approved by the committee.

LEGISLATION ADJUSTING SALARIES AND PERSONNEL

The committee reported favorably to the House 15 resolutions increasing either salaries or personnel in committees and offices of the House.

Of 107 items of legislation referred to the Subcommittee on Accounts, definite action was taken on 74. Of those on which the committee did not act, 12 were providing funds for studies or investigations which had not been authorized by the House.

COUNTERPART FUNDS

In accordance with the provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1943, as amended, the Committee on House Administration receives reports from all committees of the House on the use of counterpart funds. At regular intervals the chairman of the Committee on House Administration has released to the press the total amount of expenditure of counterpart funds of each committee of the House.

GROUP HOSPITALIZATION

Since the 82d Congress the Committee on House Administration, through its staff, has handled the quarterly collection of premiums for approximately 1,500 Members and employees of the House of Representatives.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS, HON. ROBERT T. ASHMORE, CHAIRMAN

The principal activity of the Subcommittee on Elections in the 85th Congress consisted of contested election cases. In the first session, 5 committee meetings were held and in the second session, 30 meetings were held, making a total of 35 committee meetings on contested election cases—for the study and investigation of the Hatch Act, pursuant to House Resolution 406, 85th Congress, 1st session, see Special Subcommittee To Study Restrictions on Political Activity.

In the contested election case of James I. Dolliver against Merwin Coad, Sixth Congressional District of Iowa, the subcommittee conducted three meetings, one of which was to hear the oral arguments of the parties concerned. House Document No. 53, dated January 16, 1957, a petition filed by Mr. Coad, was considered in committee and it was determined that no contest existed by virtue of the fact that no valid notice of intention to contest has been filed as contemplated by the Revised Statutes of the United States, title II, chapter 8, section 105, governing contested election cases. This decision of the subcommittee was approved by the full Committee on House Administration and, subsequently the chairman submitted a resolution for action by the House of Representatives. House Resolution 230—Report No. 343—was agreed to by the House April 11, 1957, 85th Congress, 1st session.

In the contested election case of Steven V. Carter against Karl M. LeCompte, Fourth Congressional District of Iowa, the Subcommittee on Elections held 9 meetings—2 during the first session and 7 during the second session. The committee considered House Document No. 153, dated April 17, 1957, relative to three motions, contained in the document, submitted by the attorney for the contestant. The subcommittee denied the three motions contained in the document; it was agreed that a request be made to each of the county auditors in the Fourth Congressional District of Iowa, to hold the ballots and election material intact until the case was finally resolved by the Congress. Two full-day sessions were held, hearing both the principals and the attorneys of the interested parties in oral argument. Subcommittee met with the full Committee on House Administration, referring the action taken which was that Karl M. LeCompte was duly elected as Representative from the Fourth Congressional District of Iowa. The chairman submitted a resolution for action by the House of Representatives. The committee report was filed and approved by the House on April 22, 1958. House Resolution 533—Report No. 1626—was agreed to by the House on June 17, 1958.

In connection with the special election held to fill a vacancy in the First Congressional District of Minnesota, two meetings were held. Eugene P. Foley, Democratic candidate, requested the Subcommittee on Elections to recount the votes, alleging numerous errors in the counting of the ballots. The unofficial tabulation of the vote was 87,965—Mr. Foley receiving 43,655 and the Republican candidate, Albert Quie receiving 44,310—a total plurality of 655. This plurality was less than three-fourths of 1 percent of the total vote cast; and under the laws of Minnesota, there is no provision for a recount of an election for Members of Congress. The subcommittee met on this matter and concluded that the chairman and two members should make an on-the-spot investigation. The investigation was made in the First Congressional District of Minnesota, and upon its completion, the three-man committee reported to the subcommittee that there was no need for a recount because of insufficient evidence to justify a recount and that the application for a recount be denied. The subcommittee concurred in the findings, and since the decision was a negative one, no report to the full committee or to the House was required, and hence no formal report was made.

The contested election case of James C. Oliver against Robert Hale, First Congressional District of Maine, involved 21 meetings. This case was before the committee on the basis of a plurality of 29 votes in favor of the contestee, Mr. Hale. The total number of votes was 116,027—Mr. Hale receiving 58,028 and Mr. Oliver receiving 57,999. The subcommittee heard the oral arguments of the parties concerned, and had before it for consideration the evidence submitted in the record of testimony and the prepared briefs of the contestant and contestee. Upon completion of the examination of the disputed ballots, the subcommittee concluded that Robert Hale won the election by a plurality of 111 votes and that he was duly elected as Representative from the First Congressional District of Maine. The subcommittee submitted its decision and final report to the full Committee on House Administration which unanimously confirmed the subcommittee's action. The Chairman, Mr. ASHMORE, submitted a resolution, declaring Mr. Hale was entitled to his seat, to the House for final action. House Resolution No. 676—Report No. 2482—was agreed to by the House on August 6, 1958.

Oral arguments of the parties on each contested election case, heard before the Subcommittee on Elections, are on record in printed form and are available for distribution.

Fourteen identical or similar bills making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers were referred to the subcommittee but no formal action was had.

Nineteen other items of legislation referred to the subcommittee, but on which no formal action was had, pertained to amending certain provisions of the laws relating to the prevention of pernicious political activities, amending the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, establishing preferential primary elections for the nomination of candidates for the office of President, and other bills relating to elections and voting.

Two hearings were held pursuant to H. R. 1167 and 433, identical bills, establishing a Commission to study certain aspects of the restrictions on political activities imposed under sections 9, 12, and 15 of the act commonly referred to as the Hatch Political Activities Act. Following the hearings, a resolution—House Resolution 406— was introduced by the chairman, ROBERT T. ASHMORE, which was agreed to by the House on

August 22, 1957, authorized the Committee on House Administration, or any subcommittee thereof, to make an investigation and study of the operations and enforcement of the Act to Prevent Pernicious Political Activities, the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, and other Federal elections laws. Pursuant thereto, the Subcommittee on Elections met in committee, establishing a Special Subcommittee to Study Restriction on Political Activity in order to carry out the provisions of the resolution.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRINTING

Most of the activity in the Subcommittee on Printing during the 85th Congress was concerned with the printing of various studies and documents of general interest to the public.

There were 75 House resolutions referred to the subcommittee. Of the 75 resolutions, 59 were approved and 2 withdrawn.

There were 18 Senate resolutions referred to the Printing Subcommittee, all of which were approved by the committee and reported to the House of Representatives by the full committee.

It is expected that the publication entitled "Our Capitol," which was authorized to be reprinted during the 2d session of the 85th Congress, will be available for distribution to Members of the House before the end of this year.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LIBRARY, DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS AND ENROLLED BILLS

During the 85th Congress, a total of 86 bills and resolutions were referred to the subcommittee and a total of 4 hearings were held on separate items of legislation; namely House Joint Resolutions 233, 465, H. R. 2575 and 7813.

House Joint Resolution 233, dated February 14, 1957, encouraging and fostering the cooperation of private and State historical commissions in preserving important documents was considered in a committee hearing on June 5, 1957. A similar bill, Senate Concurrent Resolution 31, was referred to the committee, and was approved in lieu of House Joint Resolution 233. This resolution passed the House August 22, 1957.

A meeting on April 8, 1957, was held to consider H. R. 2574, providing for the erection of a suitable memorial in Newport News to honor certain individuals who have served in the United States Armed Forces. This legislation failed to win subcommittee approval and, therefore, was not reported.

In connection with H. R. 7813, which was referred to the subcommittee, May 28, 1957, the subcommittee heard witnesses on the subject to organize and microfilm the papers of the Presidents of the United States, the principal witness being former President Harry S Truman. This legislation was reported out of committee to the House of Representatives for action. It passed both Houses and became Public Law 85–147.

Legislation designating the rose as the United States national floral emblem, House Joint Resolution 465, was referred on February 26, 1958, and was considered by the subcommittee on June 30, 1958. The committee did not act upon this legislation, hence no formal report was made.

Hearings on House Joint Resolution 233, House Joint Resolution 465, and H. R. 7813 have been printed and are available for distribution.

House Joint Resolution 677, introduced by the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK on August 15, 1958, to reserve a site in the District of Columbia for a memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt, was referred to the subcommittee, but was not brought before the committee for consideration during this session due to the inability to obtain appropriate departmental reports prior to adjournment of the second session of Congress.

Legislation referred to the Committee on House Administration for disposition under the subcommittee, reported out of committee and passed by the House is as follows:

House Joint Resolution 23—Public Law 85–8—appointing Arthur Compton as Smithsonian regent.

House Joint Resolution 202—Public Law 85–9—appointing J. N. Brown as Smithsonian regent.

House Joint Resolution 279—Public Law 85–20—authorizing the procurement of an oil portrait and marble bust of the late Chief Justice Fred M. Vinson.

House Joint Resolution 345—Public Law 85–20—authorizing the erection of a memorial to the dead of the Second Infantry Division, World War II and the Korean conflict on public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C.

House Joint Resolution 451—Public Law 85–403—authorizing the 101st Airborne Division Association to erect a memorial in the District of Columbia.

H. R. 7234—Public Law 85–53—fixing the responsibilities of certifying officers and disbursing officer of the Library of Congress.

H. R. 7813—Public Law 85–147—organizing and microfilming the papers of Presidents of the United States in the collections of the Library of Congress.

Four other House bills were referred to the committee for which Senate bills on the same subject were considered in lieu thereof; namely, House Joint Resolution 233—Senate Concurrent Resolution 31, passed August 22, 1957; H. R. 4002—S. 1984 passed Senate March 20, 1958, now Public Law 85–357; H. R. 9145—S. 1984, passed Senate March 20, 1958, now Public Law 85–357; and H. R. 8228—S. 2434, passed Senate August 22, 1957, now Public Law 85–308.

Twelve Senate bills and Senate concurrent resolutions or Senate joint resolutions referred to the subcommittee were reported out of the subcommittee to the House for action, that is, Senate Concurrent Resolutions 31, 37, 64, 65, 80, 81, 102, 103; Senate Joint Resolution 103; and S. 2434, S. 1984, S. 4085. These bills and resolutions passed both Houses, with the exception of Senate Joint Resolution 103 which was not passed by the House.

Relative to the function of the subcommittee devoted to the processing of the disposal of executive papers, the Archivist of the United States submitted 32 reports for consideration. The subcommittee reviewed the reports and approved the 32 reports as submitted.

There were 1,096 bills originating in the House of Representatives and ultimately passed the Senate, examined for accurate enrollment, and presented to the President. The chairman, Hon. OMAR BURLESON, Committee on House Administration notified the House of such presentation.

During the first session, the members of the Library Subcommittee, who are also members of the Joint Committee on the Library, met on July 18, 1957, with the joint committee to hear testimony from the Librarian of Congress, Mr. L. Quincy Mumford, and other Library officials, on the matter of codifying the many statutes affecting the Library of Congress.

The Librarian, Mr. Mumford, and Dr. Ernest Griffith, Director of the Legislative Reference Service, also appeared before the committee during the second session of the 85th Congress. Dr. Griffith presented in memorandum form his personal suggestions and recommendations concerning the administration and operations of the Legislative Reference Service.

This memorandum, entitled "A Memorandum on Its Achievements, Problems, and Potential, With Recommendations for Its Improvement," has been printed and is available for distribution as a committee print.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELECTRICAL AND MECHANICAL OFFICE EQUIPMENT

The equipment program for the House of Representatives has become well stabilized which required little activity on the part of this subcommittee during the 85th Congress. There were two principal changes in the list of equipment approved for purchase on Capitol Hill: First, the addition of several models of photo-duplication machines, and second, the addition of several models of portable dictation machines.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE TO STUDY FEDERAL PRINTING AND PAPERWORK, HON. WAYNE L. HAYS, CHAIRMAN

The Subcommittee To Study Federal Printing and Paperwork, of the Committee on House Administration, authorized pursuant to House Resolution 128 of the 85th Congress, continued its work in a number of phases of the overall study, with emphasis on the following:

Revision of laws relating to depository libraries: Based on the views expressed by outstanding library authorities in the United States which were developed by subcommittee hearings held in key cities, namely: Chicago, San Francisco, New Orleans, and Boston in October 1957 on the bill H. R. 9186, a new bill—H. R. 11042—was introduced by Chairman WAYNE L. HAYS on February 27, 1958. Thereafter, on the basis of views expressed by 21 Government departments and agencies, which were supplemented by hearings held in Washington, D. C., a clean bill—H. R. 13140—was introduced by Chairman HAYS, which was reported to the House by the committee as House Report No. 2136, on July 9, 1958, and passed without opposition on July 21, 1958. The chairman and Members of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, to which the bill was subsequently referred, acknowledged its merits and importance but expressed regret that it was received too late for

Senate action to be taken in the 85th Congress.

Procurement and supply of paper: Information developed through a staff study of the procurement and supply of paper and hearings on this subject, which were conducted during the first session of the 85th Congress, was carefully analyzed. This data, together with related information developed during the second session of the 85th Congress, convinced members of the subcommittee that there is unwarranted overlapping activity and unnecessary expense in the procurement and supply of paper. The report which the subcommittee will file subsequent to adjournment will set forth proposals for the correction of these conditions.

Forms management: Information was obtained from the Bureau of the Budget as to what administrative measures had been taken by that agency to reduce the paperwork burden represented by approximately 150 specific targets enumerated in the Hoover Commission Task Force Report on Paperwork Management. The information which has been received is in process of evaluation to determine what, if any, legislative action is indicated to be necessary to attain further reductions in paperwork.

Report on United States Government printing facilities: Much information and data have been developed and analyzed for use in connection with the report on United States Government printing facilities, including duplicating and reproduction, which will be filed subsequent to adjournment in accordance with authority given on August 6, 1958. The chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing cooperated with the work of the subcommittee by making records and reports in that office available to provide supplemental information. This comprehensive report will include a detailed analysis of findings and recommendations for improvement of those conditions which do not appear to best serve present day conditions and consequently result in needless expense and duplication.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE TO STUDY RESTRICTIONS ON POLITICAL ACTIVITY, HON. ROBERT T. ASHMORE, CHAIRMAN

In the preliminary stages on the study and investigation of the Hatch Act, basic materials were accumulated, such as, former public laws, Executive orders, and civil-service rules and regulations administered by the Civil Service Commission, and other data on the legislative history of the Hatch Act. Letters were prepared and forwarded to budget officers or comptroller offices under the governor of each State, requesting information on State and local employees, paid in part from Federal grants who would be subject to section 12 of the Hach Act. Letters were also sent to each secretary of state of the 48 States requesting their views and opinions as to whether or not they felt that the Federal Government should by legislation, such as section 12, regulate the conduct of State and local employees and whether his State has a so-called little Hatch Act. An edition of their State election laws was also requested. A letter, enclosing a questionnaire and a prepared pamphlet explaining section 9 and the amendment of the 1940 Hatch Act, section 12, was sent to some 3,000 mayors and city managers of cities with a population of 5,000 to 10,000.

In addition to the hearings held on H. R. 1167 and H. R. 433 during the 1st session of the 85th Congress, two hearings on political restrictions of the Hatch Act were held during the 2d session.

Hearings on H. R. 1167 and H. R. 433 and the hearings held on political restrictions have been printed and are available for distribution.

During the course of the study and investigation of the Hatch Act, the subcommittee heard various persons informally and answered numerous inquiries concerning the political restrictions imposed on both Federal and State employees, including employees of the District of Columbia government.

The special subcommittee will complete its study and investigation on the restrictions of political activities by the end of the 85th Congress, and a report will be filed with the Office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives, as authorized by House Resolution 406.

Record of the Activities of the Committee on the Judiciary, 85th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 22, 1958

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a review of activities of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, 85th Congress, reveals the major role which the committee has played in the legislative history of this Congress. This is evidenced not only by the number of legislative proposals considered by the committee, but by the very nature of the legislative proposals themselves. Major legislation enacted into law which was considered by this committee includes, among others, the first civil rights legislation enacted in almost 80 years; the first revision of the Immigration and Nationality Act since 1952; a number of public laws dealing with Federal judicial practice and procedures, both civil and criminal.

Out of the total of 14,013 measures introduced in the House of Representatives during the 85th Congress, 5,577 were referred to the Judiciary Committee, thus the Judiciary Committee handled 39.8 percent of the legislative work of the House of Representatives. Of the legislation processed by this committee, 96 legislative proposals were enacted into public law. This was accomplished through the work of the 5 regular subcommittees and 4 special subcommittees. During the course of the Congress the full committee held 59 executive sessions.

This committee, in addition to the public legislation, handled approximately 4,802 private bills. These private bills included 3,739 immigration matters, and 1,063 claims against the Government. Thus thousands of persons were the beneficiaries of the private legislation enacted into law.

In addition to the processing of legislative proposals, the committee issued several special reports covering the operations of the various subcommittees. A list of these reports is attached to the individual reports of the subcommittees which are herein set forth.

Throughout the Congress this committee received the utmost cooperation and devotion of the individual members, together with its staff. It was the teamwork of this combination that has made possible this outstanding legislative record.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1—ACTIVITIES IN THE 85TH CONGRESS

Subcommittee No. 1 (general jurisdiction over judiciary bills as assigned; special jurisdiction over immigration and nationality) had 107 public bills referred to it for action, and held 53 meetings.

During the first session of the 85th Congress, extensive studies and inquiries conducted in the United States and abroad led to the preparation of public legislation incorporated in H. R. 8123 and S. 2792, which were enacted in law on September 11, 1958 (Public Law 85-316). This legislation contains several amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act, as well as related provisions affecting the entry of highly skilled aliens, relatives of United States citizens and aliens lawfully residing in the United States, and the entry of a defined class of refugees. An interim report on the administration of Public Law 85-316 was prepared by Subcommittee No. 1 and inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, dated August 21, 1958 (pp. 18996-18997).

Public hearings were held by Subcommittee No. 1 on May 23, 1957, on the bills: H. R. 1011, by Representative WILSON of California and H. R. 44552, by Representative SAUND—both bills proposing the curtailment of the crossing of international borders by juveniles. Subcommittee No. 1 decided not to take action on this legislation.

On January 27 and January 30, 1958, hearings were held by Subcommittee No. 1 on 7 bills: H. R. 2542, H. R. 3033, H. R. 3498, H. R. 3663, H. R. 6239, H. R. 7829, and H. R. 10353, proposing to amend title 18 of the United States Code relating to the mailing of obscene or crime-inciting matter, venue, and related purposes. The bill, H. R. 6239, was reported to the House with amendments and it passed the House on May 19, 1958. After a conference on amendments proposed by the Senate, that legislation was enacted into law on August 28, 1958 (Public Law 85-796).

Subcommittee No. 1 concluded during the 85th Congress its work on legislation proposing the establishment of a commission to study problems in the field of international legal practices and procedures. In the 84th Congress, this legislation passed the House but was not acted upon by the Senate prior to adjournment. A similar bill introduced in the 85th Congress, H. R. 4642, was again acted upon by the House, passed the Senate, and was enacted into law on September 2, 1958 (Public Law 85-906).

Studies and investigations relating to the admission of the refugees from the Hungarian revolution conducted by Subcommittee No. 1 since November 17, 1956, have culminated in the enactment on July 25, 1958, of Public Law 85-559 (H. R. 11033), under which the Attorney General of the United States is authorized to adjust the status of the Hungarian refugees admitted under parole pursuant to section 212 (d) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. The adjustment of status to that of an immigrant

admitted for permanent residence extends, under that law, retroactively to the date of the refugee's arrival in the United States.

On July 10, 1958, Subcommittee No. 1 held hearings on H. R. 13311, a bill amending the Immigration and Nationality Act by the addition of provisions regulating the judicial review of orders of deportation and exclusion of aliens. The bill, amended by Subcommittee No. 1, passed the House on August 12, 1958, under suspension of rules, but the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate did not report this legislation prior to adjournment.

The bill, H. R. 11874, under which the Attorney General of the United States is authorized to create the record of lawful admission for permanent residence in the case of aliens who had their residence in the United States continuously since their entry prior to June 28, 1940, was enacted into law on August 8, 1958 (Public Law 85–616). That statute exempts from its benefits certain aliens inadmissible to the United States under parts of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act insofar as they relate to highly undesirable persons.

The bill, H. R. 13378, proposing to facilitate the naturalization of alien spouses and children of a defined class of clergymen and missionaries, was enacted into law on August 20, 1958 (Public Law 85–697), bringing the naturalization privileges of the class of aliens therein defined in accord with such privileges granted alien spouses and children of foreign-service personnel, American businessmen residing abroad, etc.

H. R. 13451, a bill to amend section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act and for other purposes, was enacted into law on August 21, 1958 (Public Law 85–700). Under this legislation, the Attorney General of the United States is authorized to adjust the status of an alien temporarily in the United States, pursuant to a lawful admission, to that of an immigrant admitted for permanent residence without the necessity of such applicant leaving the United States and returning in order to make an additional entry.

Public Law 85–700 also grants nonquota status to a limited number of highly skilled immigrants, in whose behalf petitions for first preference status under the respective quota, were approved by the Attorney General of the United States prior to July 1, 1958.

Subcommittee No. 1 recommended favorably to the House the enactment of S. 3942, with amendments, designed to admit to the United States a specified number of Portuguese and Dutch nationals displaced from their permanent place of abode following a national calamity in the former instance and political and economic pressures in the latter. This legislation was enacted on September 2, 1958 (Public Law 85–892).

Continuing its permanent supervision of laws within its jurisdiction, Subcommittee No. 1 has published the following reports containing findings and recommendations arrived at pursuant to the investigations: House Report 67, Spanish sheepherders; House Report 203, ICEM and land resettlement; House Report 780, Japanese agricultural workers; House Report 1368, immigration problems on the southeastern sea border.

Action by Subcommittee No. 1 in the field of private legislation is reflected in the following table:

House bills:	
Private laws:	
Individual bills	63
House bills incorporated in 58 House joint resolutions which became private law	557
Pending in Senate:	
Individual bills	5
Bills incorporated in one House joint resolution	8
House bills—Continued	
Adverse action by Senate:	
Individual bills	1
Bills deleted from House joint resolutions	51
Recommitted	1
Tabled	770
Tabled, Senate bills passed in lieu	50
Deferred	48
Pending	1,589
Total	3,143
House joint resolutions:	
Private laws (joint resolutions—referred to above—incorporating individual bills)	58
Private laws (joint resolutions granting relief to 205 persons who were not subjects of individual bills)	3
Pending in Senate	1
Not acted upon	2
Total	64
House concurrent resolutions:	
Confirming the findings of the Attorney General in cases submitted to the Congress under the provisions of sec. 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (of the 1,905 applications considered by the committee, 1,521 were included in 3 concurrent resolutions, 26 were withdrawn, 346 were not approved, 9 were approved on resolutions in the 84th Congress, and relief was granted in 3 cases under other provisions of law)	3
Confirming the findings of the Attorney General in cases submitted to the Congress under the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (92 applications considered—79 included in the concurrent resolution—3 withdrawn by the Attorney General and 5 held for further investigation)	1
Not considered	1
Total	5
Private laws	302
Included in one bill by House Amendment	3
Recommitted	4
Tabled	117
Deferred	74
Pending	18
Total	518
Senate concurrent resolutions:	
Confirming the findings of the Attorney General under the provisions of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, and under the provisions of section 244 (a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (of the 647 applications considered, 611 were included in the above resolutions. Five were withdrawn by the Attorney General, fourteen were not approved, and seventeen were held for further investigation)	6
Withdrawing suspension of deportation cases (pursuant to section 246 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act)	3
Total	9

85TH CONGRESS, SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2, GENERAL JURISDICTION OVER JUDICIARY BILLS, AS ASSIGNED SPECIAL JURISDICTION OVER CLAIMS

During the 85th Congress the subcommittee conducted hearings on 46 different days. These covered public as well as private claims measures.

Consideration was given to a total of 639 bills and resolutions.

The subcommittee considered two bills, H. R. 105 and H. R. 8439, which concerned the problem of the forfeiture of bonds posted by refugees who originally entered the United States as nonimmigrants and then adjusted their status to that of immigrants admitted for permanent residence. A hearing was held on H. R. 105 in the first session of the 85th Congress, and based on the testimony adduced at that hearing, H. R. 8439 was introduced as a substitute bill. H. R. 8439 provided authority for the Attorney General to cancel any departure bond posted pursuant to the applicable immigration law in behalf of any refugee who entered as a nonimmigrant after May 6, 1945, and prior to July 1, 1953, and subsequently had his immigration status adjusted to that of an alien admitted for permanent residence. The bill further provided for a refund in those instances where the proceeds of the bond had already been paid into the Treasury. The bill passed both Houses of Congress, and became Public Law 85–727.

The subcommittee considered several bills relating to statutory provisions concerning claims handled by the Armed Forces. Two of the bills recommended by the Treasury Department and approved by the subcommittee, H. R. 3820 and H. R. 4370, provided for an amendment to title 14 of the United States Code relating to the Coast Guard. H. R. 3820 provided for the amendment of section 490 so that the Secretary of the Treasury would have the same authority to settle claims of the military and civilian personnel of the Coast Guard as is now possessed by the Secretaries of the military departments with respect to their personnel. H. R. 4370 would have amended section 645 of the same title so that its provisions would conform to those of section 2733 of title 10 of the United States Code relating to similar claims for damage to property, personal injury, or death which are asserted against the Army, Navy, or Air Force. These two bills were reported by the committee and passed the House. In the Senate the two bills were combined in that H. R. 3820 was amended to include the provisions of H. R. 4370. H. R. 3820 passed the Senate in that form, and the House agreed to the Senate amendments. The bill became Public Law 85–738.

Another bill concerning claims handled by the military departments, H. R. 1061, would have granted additional power to the Secretaries of those departments to settle certain claims. That bill passed the House and Senate, but was the subject of a pocket veto.

H. R. 9022 provided for an increase in the authority of the Secretaries of the military departments to settle claims based on the noncombatant activities of the services, as set forth in section 2733 of title 10 of the United States Code, from $1,000 to $5,000. The section was further amended to permit the payment of the amount limited in that section in partial payment of meritorious claims in those cases where the amount of the claim exceeds the amount so payable. This bill became Public Law 85–729.

H. R. 10425 had as its purpose the amendment of section 2734 of title 10 of the United States Code so that the Secretary of the Treasury would have the same authority to settle claims arising in foreign countries incident to noncombatant activities of the Coast Guard as is now possessed by the Secretaries of the military departments incident to noncombatant activities under their jurisdiction. This bill was reported by the committee and passed the House, but no action was taken by the Senate prior to adjournment.

H. R. 9371 and H. R. 12212 concerned the validation of certain payments made by the military departments. H. R. 9371 had as its purpose the validation of payments by the Army and Air Force to the Military Sea Transport Service for the transportation of

household goods of servicemen to Hawaii in connection with the change of station to an area where dependents were not permitted to accompany such members of the services. That bill became Public Law 85–814. H. R. 12212 granted employees assigned to the Golcuk Navy Yard, Ismet, Turkey, in the period from November 23, 1955, to April 30, 1957, a release from any liability to refund any erroneous overpayments of per diem resulting from administrative error, and provided for the payment of any funds withheld because of such overpayments. This bill became Public Law 85–907.

A number of bills granting relief to States or political subdivisions within States were referred to the subcommittee. Among the bills recommended favorably was H. R. 7636, authorizing the conveyance of a site of land to Florida for a State road department shortwave radio tower upon the payment of a fair value for the land conveyed. This bill became Public Law 85–293. H. R. 1942 provided for the payment of the amount due the Sergeant Bluff Consolidated School District of Iowa for the tuition of children of Air Force personnel, and became Public Law 85–140. S. 807, providing for the payment of $193,392 to the Jackson School Township of Indiana in exchange for the conveyance of the school building and land which was necessitated by proximity of the school to an airfield, became Public Law 85–291. H. R. 4804 provided for the payment of $73,248 to the Newington School District of Newington, N. H., in full satisfaction of its claims against the United States for costs to be incurred in relocating an elementary school because of the noise and danger of aircraft using the Pease Air Force Base. The payment was conditioned on the transfer of the school property to the Government. That bill became Public Law 85–727. H. R. 3261, providing for the payment of $6,028 to the Oceanside-Libby Union School District, San Diego County, Calif., in settlement of the district's claims against the Government for the refund of an equal amount which it paid in order to obtain the consent of the United States to a grant of an easement by the school district to California for highway purposes, became Public Law 85–555. H. R. 7384, which became Public Law 85–248, authorized the payment of $12,000 to the town of Medicine Lake, Mont., in settlement of its claims for damages to its municipal water supply as the result of the activities of the Fish and Wildlife Service. Payment to the State of New York in settlement of its claims for a refund of employment tax erroneously made under the Federal Contributions Act in connection with the operation of a housing project was provided for in H. R. 7738, which became Public Law 85–809.

A bill providing for the payment of $581,721.91 to the State of Washington for the replacement of a road previously located on land taken for use by the United States, H. R. 2224, was considered and passed by the Congress, but was the subject of a pocket veto.

Public Law 85–255 authorized the payment of amounts due certain commissioned officers during the years 1932, 1933, and 1934 for advancement in rank which were not paid because of the application of the Economy Act of 1932. That law resulted from the enactment of H. R. 293, originally considered by the subcommittee.

H. R. 3366 had the effect of validating the receipt of the compensation, including meals and living quarters in kind, received by individuals who were placed in an active duty status while serving as interns or resident physicians in non-Federal hospitals. This bill was reported by the committee, passed both Houses, and became Public Law 85–869.

The Secretary of the Army recommended a bill which was introduced as H. R. 5810, which provided for the reimbursement to the tribal council of the Cheyenne River Sioux Reservation for expenses incurred in negotiations relating to an agreement between the United States and the tribal council. Payment as provided for in the bill was in accordance with the provisions of the agreement set out in the act of September 3, 1954 (68 Stat. 1191). The bill became Public Law 85–274.

House Joint Resolution 185 authorized the reference to the Court of Claims of a claim asserted against the United States by Norway. This reference was in line with an agreement previously entered into between the two countries, and the bill became Public Law 85–60.

The settlement of a group of claims arising as the result of the crash of an airplane at Worcester, Mass., on July 18, 1957, was provided for in H. R. 8868. The bill passed both Houses of Congress and became Public Law 85–760.

H. R. 11406, which had as its purpose the removal of the statutory limitation of $1,000 in section 2733 of title 10 of the code so as to permit the settlement of claims arising from the accidental release of a bomb near Mars Bluff, S. C., was reported by the committee and passed the House, but no action was taken in the Senate prior to adjournment.

The Secretary of the Army reported to the Congress the amounts equitably due claimants who filed claims pursuant to the act of August 13, 1954, relating to flooding and damage from fluctuations of the water level of the Lake of the Woods. H. R. 10805 authorized the payment of the amounts so reported, and the bill became Public Law 85–621.

The subcommittee considered a bill (H. R. 10874) which authorized the payment of $137,997.64 and interest fixed as provided in the bill to the city of Fort Myers, Fla., and a payment of $209,538.99 and interest to Lee County, Fla., in reimbursement of valid expenditures made in connection with the contemplated establishment of an Air Force weapons center. The committee reported the bill providing for payments in those amounts, and at the time of floor consideration an identical Senate bill (S. 3314) was substituted. The latter bill became Public Law 85–546.

The subcommittee favorably recommended H. R. 13571 to the full committee. This bill would provide for the payment of $12,828.35 to the city of Madeira Beach, Fla., in settlement of the city's claims against the United States for the construction of concrete groins for erosion control of 500 feet of property principally on land adjacent to the beach house of the Veterans' Administration. The bill was reported and passed the House, but no action was taken in the Senate prior to adjournment.

The subcommittee held an extensive hearing on H. R. 6681, a bill to make the Federal tort claims provisions of title 28 of the United States Code the exclusive remedy for persons injured or damaged in accidents involving Government drivers. This bill remained pending in the subcommittee at the end of the Congress.

The following tabulation indicates the workload of this subcommittee in connection with claims against the Government:

Referred to subcommittee:	
Private, House bills	973
Private, House joint resolutions	3
Private, House resolutions	17
Private, Senate bills	70
Total	1,063
Public, House bills	69
Public, House joint resolutions	1
Public, House resolutions	2
Public, Senate bills	4
Total	76
Total	1,139
Reported to committee:	
Private, House bills	436
Private, House resolutions	14
Private, Senate bills	54
Total	504
Public, House bills	24
Public, House joint resolutions	1
Public, House resolutions	1
Public, Senate bills	3
Total	29
Total	533
Reported to House:	
Private, House bills	427
Private, House resolutions	14
Private, Senate bills	52
Total	493
Public, House bills	23
Public, House joint resolutions	1
Public, House resolutions	1
Public, Senate bills	3
Total	28
Total	521
Passed House:	
Private, House bills	425
Private, House resolutions	14
Private, Senate bills	55
Total	494
Public, House bills	22
Public, House joint resolutions	1
Public, House resolutions	1
Public, Senate bills	4
Total	28
Total	522
Private House bills, adversely reported	81
Private, Senate bills, adversely reported	3
Public, House bills, adversely reported	11
Public, Senate bills, adversely reported	1
Total	96
Pending in Senate:	
Private, House bills	117
Public, House bills	3
Total	120
Private laws enacted	239
Public laws enacted	23
Bills vetoed:	
Private	34
Public	1
Total	35
Claims settled administratively	16

In addition to the public bills relating to claims referred to the subcommittee by reason of its special jurisdiction over claims, 22 public bills of a general nature were referred to the subcommittee. These bills concerned such subjects as the War Contractors Relief Act, a Commission on the Office of the President, and a proposed extension of the bonding requirements of contractors with the Government to cover contractor obligations to States resulting from public-works contracts. The subcommittee heard testimony on H. R. 6609, a bill to amend the War Contractors Relief Act and adversely reported it to the full committee. A hearing was held on two bills, H. R. 8808 and H. R. 9374, proposing an extension of the bond requirements now existing as to

contractors with the Government for public-works projects. These bills proposed that the contractors be required to furnish bonds to insure the payment of State obligations arising from the performance of the Federal contracts. The subcommittee made an adverse recommendation to the full committee, and the bills were tabled by the full committee.

Number of general public bills referred to the subcommittee	22
Number of hearings held	2
Number of general public bills reported to the full committee	3

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 3—GENERAL JURISDICTION OVER JUDICIARY BILLS AS ASSIGNED—SPECIAL JURISDICTION OVER PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, COPYRIGHTS, AND REVISION OF THE LAWS—GENERAL STATEMENT

The work of this subcommittee is divided generally into three channels. It processes all general legislation bills assigned to it; it handles all legislation relating to patent, trademarks, and copyright laws and in addition it has jurisdiction over the revision of the laws, classifiying all laws of a general and permanent nature as they are enacted into the 50 titles which comprise the United States Code.

In all, 146 bills were referred for processing. Ninety-nine bills were handled in the first session of the 85th Congress and are not discussed here, since they are covered in an earlier report made at the end of the first session of this Congress. During the second session, in addition to handling bills carried over from the first session, the subcommittee processed 43 new bills. These include such subjects as diversity of citizenship, appellate procedure, Patent Office fees, interstate compacts, Federal sentencing procedures, disclosure of Government information, habeas corpus, and Patent Office matters.

The following statement points up the functions of the subcommittee and highlights some of the legislation processed by it.

GENERAL LEGISLATION

In order to reduce the current heavy workload of the Federal courts and to help in eliminating the great backlog of cases now pending on the court calendars, the subcommittee acted upon H. R. 11102, which increases from $3,000 to $10,000 the monetary jurisdiction of the Federal courts and which restricts the use of the Federal courts to corporations by declaring them citizens of those States where they have their principal places of business. This legislation became Public Law 85–554 and should have widespread effect in reducing our congested Federal court calendars.

Important legislation upon which the subcommittee took favorable action relates to abbreviated records on appeals, H. R. 6788. This bill will permit the several courts of appeals to adopt rules authorizing the abbreviation of the transcript and other parts of the record made before Federal agencies when the orders of those agencies are reviewed by the courts of appeals. In many instances much of the record before such agencies is not relevant to the questions actually raised on appeal. This legislation (Public Law 85–791), in permitting an abbreviated record to be transmitted, should result in substantial savings of time and money to the Government without interfering with appellate rights.

A bill which became law in the last session of Congress but bears mentioning is H. R. 7915 (S. 2377, Public Law 85–269) which authorizes Federal courts, after a witness has testified, to require the Government to submit prior statements and records of the witness in its possession for the court's inspection for the purpose of turning relevant material over to defendants who seek to impeach the credibility of the witness. This legislation, popularly referred to as "preserving the FBI and other Government files" resulted from the Supreme Court decision in the case of *Jencks* v. *U. S.* (353 U. S. 657).

The subcommittee, after exhaustive study, approved a bill on Federal sentencing procedures, House Joint Resolution 424 (Public Law 85–752), which sets up additional procedures for judges to use in the sentencing of prisoners convicted of Federal crimes. In addition the bill provides for the development of a policy on uniform sentencing by authorizing meetings of judges, prosecutors, etc., from time to time to discuss the present wide disparity in Federal sentences. It is felt that this legislation, containing flexible sentencing procedures, will greatly advance the rehabilitation of prisoners generally.

Recent bombings of schools, synagogues, and public buildings in Southern States and in certain other sections of the country caused the subcommittee to study the possibility of Federal legislation making it a Federal offense to import, transport, possess, or use explosives in order that the FBI and other Government law-enforcement agencies can be brought in immediately to investigate these outrageous occurrences. Because it was late in the Congress, the subcommittee decided to take no action at this time. Two bills were introduced as a result of the hearings, H. R. 13797 and H. R. 13813, containing modifications of the earlier bills. It was decided to obtain the views of the Attorney General and interested agencies on these latter bills in order that action could be secured early in the next Congress.

The subcommittee handles interstate compact legislation, and considered and approved H. R. 7153 which gives the consent of Congress to a compact between the States of Oregon and Washington, establishing a boundary between those States (Public Law 85–575).

In addition, the subcommittee approved other bills, one relating to venue in tax refund suits by corporations, Public Law 85–920, legislation affecting the interest of Indians with respect to civil and criminal jurisdiction over Indian country in Alaska, Public Law 85–615, legislation making the Federal Probation Act applicable to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, Public Law 85–643, another bill to preserve markers and to punish trespassing on Indian reservations, H. R. 7240, legislation affecting split sentences, Public Law 85–741, lis pendens, Public Law 85–689, interlocutory appeals, Public Law 85–919, a bill providing for the design of the United States flag in view of the probable addition of new States, H. R. 13552, legislation affecting the annual rate of compensation of members of the Board of Parole, Public Law 85–928, bills which would permit district courts to allow additional peremptory challenges in civil cases to multiple plaintiffs as well as multiple defendants (vetoed September 2, 1958), and a bill which would authorize the use of certified mail in summoning jurors, Public Law 85–259, among other proposals.

PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, AND COPYRIGHTS

The subcommittee considered S. 1864 which should go a long way toward reducing the tremendous backlog of cases in the Patent Office and makes possible salary increases for certain of its employees. The Patent Office recently increased the number of assistant examiners from 640 to over a thousand. To handle the annual appeals (between 6 and 7 thousand) its Board of Appeals is in urgent need of an increase in its membership. This legislation, which became Public Law 85–933, authorizes an increase of 6 members to the present Board of 9.

Like the Patent Office, the Trademark Office is in great need of appelate procedures to properly take care of trademark applications. The instant legislation, Public Law 85–609, authorizes a Trademark Trial and Appeal Board which will greatly facilitate the processing of applications and free the Assistant Commissioner from much of this burdensome task for other much-needed administrative work.

The subcommittee also reaffirmed its favorable position on and reported H. R. 7151 which raises generally patent and trademark fees. It is estimated that these fees will offset the Patent Office expenses by 70 percent. The subcommittee also approved H. R. 8419 which relates to actions for infringements of copyrights by the United States.

REVISION OF THE LAWS—CLASSIFICATIONS OF LAWS TO CODES

The primary function of the subcommittee with respect to revision of the laws—the classification of the public laws to appropriate titles of the United States Code and District of Columbia Code—has been carried on since the beginning of the Congress. There have been 936 public laws, comprising almost 2,500 pages in the Statutes at Large, that have to be examined carefully for this purpose. At the time of adjournment sine die on August 24, 1958, there were more than 200 bills awaiting approval by the President, and which will be classified during the recess.

The laws of the first session were incorporated in supplement V of the United States Code, consisting of 3 volumes, aggregating 4,224 pages, and in supplement VI of the District of Columbia Code, consisting of 2 volumes, aggregating 690 pages. The laws of the second session will be incorporated in a new edition of the United States Code and in a seventh supplement of the District of Columbia Code. Also, with respect to the District of Columbia Code, all the decisions of the Federal courts involving provisions of that code have been studied and annotations have been prepared for insertion in appropriate places in the code. This has required the study of 5 volumes of the United States Reports, 11 volumes of the Federal Reports, 11 volumes of the Federal Supplement, and 11 volumes of the Atlantic Reports.

PREPARATION OF CODE SUPPLEMENTS AND NEW EDITION

The preparation of printer's copy for supplement V of the United States Code required about 6,200 sheets and 13,000 cards. The Government Printing Office furnished about 4,400 galleys of proof, which had to be read and corrected, as well as final proofs consisting of more than 4,200 pages.

At the beginning of the second session work was commenced in preparing printer's copy for a new edition of the United States Code. At the time of adjournment sine die more than 10,000 sheets and 17,000 cards, comprising the first 28 titles of the code, had been delivered to the Government Printing Office and 5,400 galleys of proof have been received. As soon as the balance of the laws are classified delivery of copy to the Printing Office will be resumed. It is expected that the new edition will comprise 9 volumes.

In all the work on the new edition and supplements of the United States Code the committee has had the benefit of the excellent services of the West Publishing Co. and the Edward Thompson Co., lawbook publishers.

The preparation of printer's copy for supplement VI of the District of Columbia Code required about 2,000 sheets and 2,800 cards, and work is progressing on the copy for supplement VII.

In editing new editions and supplements the entire code is studied carefully with the view of making improvements and useful notes and tables.

ENACTMENT OF TITLES INTO LAW

In its program of making the codes more useful the subcommittee has continued its attention to the preparation of bills to enact

into law particular titles. At the beginning of this Congress thirteen titles of the United States Code had been enacted into law as part of this program. Two of those titles—title 10, armed services, and title 32, National Guard—which were enacted at the end of the 84th Congress, had been pending for more than a year after having been reported to the House by this committee. As a result they did not contain the pertinent laws that were enacted during that period. Early in this Congress a bill that had been prepared through the joint efforts of the Department of Defense and this subcommittee was introduced to bring up to date those two titles. The bill was reported favorably by this Committee on July 30, 1957, and finally became Public Law 85–861 on September 2, 1958. The bill and report were both extremely voluminous—the slip law itself aggregating more than 130 pages.

Several years ago the subcommittee prepared a bill to enact into law Title 23, Highways. This bill was not acted upon because of the consideration of the Federal Highway program involving numerous substantive changes in law. During the second session of this Congress, however, the House Committee on Public Works was prepared to report a bill consolidating all the highway laws. By cooperation between that committee and this subcommittee the consolidation bill was redrafted as an enactment of title 23, and became Public Law 85–767. Similarly, the subcommittee's early draft of a bill to enact into law title 38, pensions and veterans' benefits, was not acted upon, and during the second session of this Congress, through cooperation between this subcommittee and the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Senate Committee on Finance a bill consolidating the veterans' laws was redrafted as an enactment of title 38, and became Public Law 85–857.

As a result, there are now 15 titles of the United States Code enacted into law.

A bill to enact into law title 39, the postal service, was drafted in conjunction with the office of the General Counsel of the Post Office Department. It was reported by this committee and passed the House but was not acted upon in the Senate.

For the past 2 years the subcommittee has been cooperating with the Office of General Counsel of the Civil Service Commission in drafting a bill to enact into law title 5, relating to government affairs and employees. It is hoped that a bill will be ready for introduction before the end of the first session of the 86th Congress.

Bills to enact into law other titles of the code are in varying stages of development.

With respect to the District of Columbia Codes, 2 bills have been drafted to enact into law part II, civil procedure, comprising titles 11–17, and part IV, criminal law and procedure, comprising titles 22–24. It is hoped that these bills will be ready for introduction early in the next Congress.

COOPERATION WITH OTHER COMMITTEES AND AGENCIES

Throughout the year the subcommittee's law-revision counsel maintains a system of cooperating with other committees of the Congress and with the other two branches of Government. Innumerable inquiries regarding the proposed classification of laws are answered and assistance given in connection with the drafting of bills, particularly those affecting titles of the code that have been enacted into law.

Bills referred	146
Bills on which hearings were held	86
Bills favorably reported to full committee	46
Bills reported to House	44
Bills passed House	40
Senate bills processed	5
Bills pending in Senate	9
Bills which became public law	21
Bills vetoed	1

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4—GENERAL JURISDICTION OVER JUDICIARY BILLS AS ASSIGNED—SPECIAL JURISDICTION OVER BANKRUPTCY AND REORGANIZATION

During the 85th Congress, Subcommittee No. 4 held hearings and reported a number of bills improving the substance and administration of the bankruptcy law. Five of these bills were enacted into public law. These include H. R. 13, which provides for certain technical changes in proceedings under chapter XI, Arrangements, and H. R. 5811, which eliminates one of the notices now required in straight bankruptcy proceedings and thereby results in a substantial saving of money.

In the area of railroad reorganization, the subcommittee favorably reported two bills which have both become law. The first of these is H. R. 982, which provides that a former lessor whose properties are being operated under section 77 (c) (6) of the Bankruptcy Act would have the same right as other carriers to receive a division of revenue accruing from operations over its lines in accordance with the criteria fixed by section 15 (6) of the Interstate Commerce Act. The second is H. R. 12217, which authorizes the Interstate Commerce Commission to order compliance with certain lawful orders of State regulatory bodies where the reorganization court or the trustees have not complied with those orders. The purpose of this law is to prevent an impasse in reorganization from adversely affecting public convenience and safety.

Impelled by the reequipment financing problems of the airlines, the subcommittee favorably reported H. R. 7671, making chapter X proceedings inapplicable insofar as they affect title and the right to repossess aircraft and aircraft equipment.

In addition to these bills, Subcommittee No. 4 acted favorably upon several other bankruptcy bills. H. R. 106 would give bankruptcy courts jurisdiction to determine the effect of a discharge. At present, with some exceptions, bankruptcy courts are determining only the right to a discharge. H. R. 12802 would limit the priority and nondischargeability of taxes to 3 years preceding bankruptcy. Under present law, both priority and nondischargeability are unlimited. H. R. 12115 would amend chapter XIII—Wage Earners Plans—by removing the present $5,000 limitation on eligibility. These bills passed the House but were not acted upon by the Senate.

The subcommittee also held comprehensive hearings on H. R. 5195, dealing with the difficult problem of circuity of liens embodied in section 67 (c) of the Bankruptcy Act. However, the full committee took no action on the subcommittee's recommendation relating to this bill.

The subcommittee considered a number of bills concerning the administration of the judicial system. Two of these were enacted into public law. They are H. R. 10154, which authorizes the judicial conference of the United States to participate in the rulemaking process in an advisory capacity. The second was H. R. 3370, which increases mileage and subsistence allowances of grand and petit jurors. Two other bills, H. R. 3046, providing for the transfer of cases between district courts and the Court of Claims, and H. R. 3816, relating to the appointment of secretaries and law clerks by district judges, were favorably reported by the subcommittee and passed the House but were not acted upon in the Senate. The subcommittee also considered H. R. 3365, providing for jury commissions in United States district courts, and H. R. 3815, relating to bailiffs in the district courts. The subcommittee adversely reported the latter and took no action on the former.

Subcommittee No. 4 held hearings on a number of bills which would amend the Federal Criminal Code. Among them were bills extending Federal criminal jurisdiction to assaults and homicides on certain Federal officers and employees not presently covered. The subcommittee ordered these bills adversely reported. A hearing was also held on a bill providing criminal penalties and an injunctive remedy for certain false advertising or misuse of names indicating the various exchange services of the Armed Forces. No action was taken on this bill by the subcommittee. A bill to define the place at which certain offenses against the income tax laws take place was acted upon favorably by the subcommittee and has become law.

A variety of other bills were also acted upon. Legislation providing war risk hazard and workmen's compensation benefits for employees of Federal contractors and for direct-hire Federal employees at overseas installations which had previously been temporary was enacted into permanent law. Similarly, the authority which had been granted by annual extensions of title II of the First War Powers Act relating to amendments and modifications of defense contracts was also enacted into permanent law effective during periods of national emergency.

In addition to the legislation already discussed, a very large number of holiday, celebration, and incorporation bills were referred to Subcommittee No. 4. Most significant of the actions relating to these bills was the establishment of a Civil War Centennial Commemoration Commission, a Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission, and a Hudson-Champlain Celebration Commission.

In respect to incorporations, the subcommittee favorably reported five incorporation bills, all of which subsequently became law. These were the Veterans of World War I, the Military Order of the Purple Heart, the Congressional Medal of Honor Society, the National Memorial of the Jewish War Veterans, and the Blinded Veterans' Association.

A number of bills to authorize a specific version of the Star Spangled Banner were referred to the subcommittee. Extensive hearings were held on each of these proposals but the committee decided to take no action at this time.

Number of public bills referred to subcommittee	289
Number of public bills on which hearings were held	92
Number of public bills reported to full committee	205
Number of reports filed	39
Number of public bills passed House	44
Number of public bills pending in the Senate	5
Number of Senate bills disposed of	7
Number of public bills approved by the President	34

At the beginning of the 85th Congress, Subcommittee No. 4 was composed of Messrs. James B. Frazier, Jr., chairman, and Robert T. Ashmore, John Dowdy, John M. Robsion, Jr., F. Jay Nimtz, and Russell W. Keeney. Subsequently, Mr. H. Allen Smith, of California, succeeded Mr. Keeney upon the latter's death. Mr. E. L. Forrester succeeded Mr. Frazier as chairman upon Mr. Frazier's transfer to the Ways and Means Committee. Mr. Whitener succeeded Mr. Ashmore upon Mr. Ashmore's transfer to Subcommittee No. 2 of this committee.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5—GENERAL JURISDICTION OVER JUDICIARY BILLS AS ASSIGNED—SPECIAL JURISDICTION OVER ANTITRUST MATTERS

This subcommittee exercised jurisdiction over a variety of subjects with specialization over bills concerning antitrust problems and the Federal judicial system. Under its general jurisdiction, the subcommittee considered several bills relating to the improvement of the Federal judicial system. Approximately 75 bills were introduced creating new Federal judgeships, both district and circuit,

as well as providing for new judicial districts and new judicial divisions. After hearings on all of these bills, the subcommittee reported an omnibus judgeship bill, which bill was pending before the Rules Committee at the adjournment of this Congress.

However, other bills relating to the administration of the Federal judicial system were enacted into law. Among these bills were bills providing for a roster of senior judges; providing for membership by district judges in the Judicial Conference of the United States; a bill to provide for the appointment of a temporary judge when a disabled judge eligible to retire fails to do so; for the retirement of chief judges of circuit and district courts, as chief judges, upon reaching the age of 70; a bill declaring the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals to be a constitutional court; and a bill providing for a new system of bonding United States marshals. Another bill providing for an increase of subsistence allowances of Federal judges passed the House, but failed of enactment in the Senate.

This subcommittee also devoted considerable time to the consideration of over 70 bills relating to various civil-rights proposals. During the first session, it conducted several days of hearings on these bills, which constituted over 1,000 printed pages. As a result of its consideration and deliberation of the civil-rights question, the bill H. R. 6127 was enacted into law. During the second session, the subcommittee again considered several bills dealing with the question of civil rights. It conducted 2 days of hearings, but no further action was taken during that session.

During the 85th Congress, the subcommittee had referred to it 264 bills and conducted hearings on 184 measures. It disposed of a total of 156 bills, of which 14 were reported to the House by the full committee, 10 of which were enacted into public law.

Number of bills referred to Subcommittee No. 5	264
Hearings conducted	184
Number of bills reported to full committee	156
Number of bills reported to House	14
Number of bills enacted into public law	10

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5—RECORD OF ACTIVITIES, 2D SESSION, 85TH CONGRESS, ANTITRUST JURISDICTION-LEGISLATIVE

In May the Judiciary Committee completed it consideration of the professional team sports bill, H. R. 10378, which the Antitrust Subcommittee had recommended to clarify contradictory Supreme Court decisions on the applicability of the antitrust laws to the business of organized professional team sports' exhibitions. In its bill, the subcommittee had recommended that only those activities reasonably necessary for continuation of organized professional team sports of baseball, football, basketball, and hockey, be granted an exemption from the antitrust laws.

The Judiciary Committee amended H. R. 10378 so as to include a specific provision to permit reasonably necessary regulation of broadcasts and telecasts of sports events, and, on May 13, 1958, reported the bill with the recommendation that it be passed—House Report No. 1720. During the debate, on June 24, the House eliminated the reasonably necessary test by substituting a new bill for the bill that had been recommended by the Judiciary Committee. In the Senate, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, after hearings, voted on August 1, 1958 to table all organized professional team sports bills.

On July 16 and 17 the Antitrust Subcommittee held hearings on a series of identical bills which would amend section 2 (a) of the Clayton Act so as to provide for mandatory functional discounts—H. R. 10304, H. R. 10305, H. R. 10644, H. R. 10999, and H. R. 11409. These bills would make it unlawful for a seller to fail to grant to true wholesalers a discount from the prices the seller charged on sales to any other type of customer.

During the hearings the subcommittee received testimony from the sponsors of the bills, representatives of the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice, spokesmen for the National Association of Tobacco Distributors, National Candy Wholesalers Association, Inc., National Frozen Food Distributors Association, and the National Oil Jobbers Council, as well as a number of proprietors of small business establishments.

On August 6, 1958 the subcommittee held hearings on H. R. 10243, H. R. 10251 and H. R. 13357. These bills would amend the Clayton Act so as to provide that section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act shall be an antitrust law as that term is defined in the Clayton Act.

These bills resulted from an opinion on January 20, 1958 of the United States Supreme Court in two private antitrust cases, *Nashville Milk Company* v. *Carnation Milk Company* and *Safeway Stores, Inc.* v. *Vance*. In those cases the Supreme Court ruled that private treble damage actions under the antitrust laws could not be maintained to collect damages for violations of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act. The Supreme Court based its decision on the conclusion that Congress, in enacting the Robinson-Patman Act, did not intend to make section 3 of that act an antitrust law.

ANTITRUST JURISDICTION—INVESTIGATIONS

During the second session the subcommittee completed public hearings in its investigation of the consent decree program of the Department of Justice that had commenced on April 3, 1957. In its investigation, the subcommittee sought to ascertain how effective the disposition of civil antitrust cases by consent decree has been in antitrust enforcement, to eliminate the conditions that caused the Government to institute antitrust proceedings in the first instance, and to restore competition to the industries concerned.

For the consent decree investigation, the Department of Justice prepared and submitted to the subcommittee extensive information about general problems involved in consent settlements. In the hearings, in addition, the subcommittee received testimony from representatives of the Department of Justice with respect to the scope of the Antitrust Division's consent settlement program, the procedures used when decrees are negotiated, and the policy considerations that are involved in the determination to accept a decree.

To supplement this general survey of the Antitrust Division's program, the subcommittee examined two particular consent decrees in detail. For these case studies, the subcommittee selected the decrees entered in the oil pipeline industry, *United States* v. *The Atlantic Refining Company* (Civil Action No. 14060, District of Columbia, December 23, 1941), and the telephone industry, *United States* v. *Western Electric Company and American Telephone and Telegraph Company*, district court, New Jersey, January 24, 1956. The A. T. & T. decree afforded the subcommittee an opportunity for a detailed examination of the procedures and policy considerations involved in negotiating a consent decree in major antitrust litigation. The oil pipeline decree, which had been in effect 16 years, in addition to negotiation problems, delineated the Antitrust Division's procedures and enforcement problems that arise when a consent decree's provisions become the standard for an entire industry.

OIL PIPELINE DECREE

The oil pipeline consent decree was a settlement of the general antitrust program in the oil industry, started in 1940 to eliminate at one time all of the restraints that affected oil industry, from the producer to the ultimate consumer. The Antitrust Division's general oil industry program was contained in four separate proceedings instituted on September 30, 1940. One of these cases, brought under the Sherman Act, was popularly called the Mother Hubbard case and encompassed every phase of operations in the petroleum industry. The other three companion cases were under the Elkins and Interstate Commerce Acts and were concerned with the transportation issues that were involved in the Mother Hubbard case.

The violations of the Elkins Act and the Interstate Commerce Act were alleged to be elements of an unlawful conspiracy among the major oil companies to secure control over the domestic petroleum industry. Control by the major oil companies over common-carrier pipelines allegedly was an essential element in the majors' monopolization of the oil industry.

The alleged violations of the Elkins Act and Interstate Commerce Act involved rebates from common-carrier pipelines, in the form of dividend payments, to the major oil companies that owned and used the pipelines. The dividends paid by the pipeline, in part, were derived from the transportation tariffs paid to the pipeline by the major oil company, its shipper-owner. The Department of Justice contended in its complaints that these rebates, which varied from a low of 34 percent annual return on capital stock investment to, in one instance, a 6,200 percent average annual rate of return * * * amounted to exorbitant returns upon the capital stock in the common-carrier pipelines.

None of the cases involved in the Department of Justice's 1940 general program in the oil industry came to trial. As a result of the crises which preceded World War II, the Government decided military requirements necessitated a pipeline from the Texas fields to the east coast. Counsel for the pipelines testified before the subcommittee that the major oil companies would not agree to cooperate in the construction of such a pipeline unless the Government, in a consent decree, would declare that those activities which were attacked in its antitrust program in the oil industry did not violate the antitrust laws. This condition, insisted upon by the industry as a requirement for construction of the national defense pipeline, contributed to the Justice Department's agreement to the pipeline consent decree on December 23, 1941, in settlement of the pipeline rebate issues.

The pipeline consent decree permits the shipper-owner of a common-carrier pipeline to receive dividends or payments from the pipelines which do not exceed 7 percent of the value of the pipeline's property. According to the Justice Department, the purpose of the consent decree was to insure that the oil companies, that at the same time were owners and shippers on common-carrier pipelines, did not receive dividends derived from transportation charges that would amount to more than a 7-percent return on their investments in the pipeline company. The decree, however, provides that the basis for the 7-percent return would be the valuation of a common carrier's property as made by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

In essence, the pipeline consent decree prohibits 52 oil pipeline common carriers from paying back to their major oil company owners, in the guise of earnings and in violation of the rebate provisions of the Interstate Commerce and Elkins Acts, transportation charges which the oil company shipper-owners have paid to the pipelines.

Hearings on the oil pipeline consent decree were held during the recess, on October 21, 22, 23, and 24, 1957, during which 14 witnesses testified. The subcommittee heard testimony from representatives of the Justice Department Antitrust Division, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Amer-

ican Petroleum Institute, and Service Pipe Line Co. The subcommittee also heard the testimony of the Secretary, in 1941, for the industry committee that negotiated the decree.

The subcommittee's investigation of this consent decree disclosed that the Antitrust Division's record of enforcement was such that in the 16 years that had elapsed between entry of the decree and the start of the subcommittee's investigation, no court proceeding had been instituted to clarify or enforce the decree's provisions.

After the subcommittee announced its public hearings on September 19, 1957, however, the Department of Justice, on October 11, 1957, brought four cases under the decree.

During the hearings, representatives of the Antitrust Division testified that from the very beginning the Department had notice that there had been repeated violations of the decree but took no action. As early as February 22, 1944, the Attorney General advised Congress that a number of the defendant companies had violated the decree's provisions, and that he was preparing to take appropriate action. The subcommittee's investigation also disclosed that at least three full-scale FBI investigations had been conducted to ascertain compliance with the provisions of the decree. Each of these FBI investigations had disclosed activities which were the basis of Antitrust Division staff recommendations for court orders to enforce the decree.

The four cases filed on October 11, 1957, demonstrate the wide range of questionable activities under this decree. One case involves the practice of a number of oil companies to compute dividends to the shipper-owner on the basis of property that is obtained by loans from outside parties. Throughout the history of the decree the Antitrust Division had advised the oil industry that inclusion of debt owed to outsiders in the valuation base was not permissible under the decree.

Inclusion in the valuation base of debts owed by the pipelines to outside parties permits the oil companies to inflate the dividends allowable to the parent company. In the case of the Arapahoe Pipe Line Co., for instance, this practice enabled the shipper-owner to realize a 72.7-percent return in 1956 on its capital stock investments.

The subcommittee's investigation disclosed a number of other questionable activities under the decree. The Department of Justice testified that these activities include: false reports to the Attorney General; failure to adhere to accounting practices required by the decree; failure to file reports; and the maintenance of separate records and accounts for reports to the stockholders as distinguished from reports to the Attorney General.

The subcommittee ascertained that these practices, coupled with an absence of court clarification of the decree, had the result that in 1956 the shipper-owners' return on their investments in oil pipelines still remained exorbitant. For example, in 1956 Service Pipe Line paid to its parent, Standard Oil Company of Indiana, dividends which amounted to a 41.3 percent return on its capital stock investment; Texas Pipe Line Co. paid dividends to the Texas Co. that amounted to a 69.2 percent return; and the Great Lakes Pipe Line paid to its shipper-owners dividends that amounted to a 300 percent return on their capital stock investment.

Efforts of the Department of Justice to enforce this decree are now in litigation.

A. T. & T. DECREE

The consent decree in the A. T. & T. case was signed on January 24, 1956, and terminated litigation that had commenced on January 14, 1949. The Government's complaint charged that Western Electric Co. and American Telephone & Telegraph Co., in violation of the Sherman Act, had monopolized the manufacture, distribution, and sale of telephones, telephone apparatus, equipment, material, and supplies. This monopolization resulted from the fact that A. T. & T.'s wholly owned subsidiary, Western Electric, manufactured and sold more than 90 percent of all telephones and telephone equipment sold in the United States, and that a substantial part of the remaining 10 percent was produced under the direct control of Western Electric.

According to the complaint, Western owned and operated more than 98 percent of the facilities used in United States long-distance telephone service, and owned or controlled operating companies which furnished approximately 85 percent of all local service in the United States. The operating companies, as well as the long lines department purchased substantially all of their equipment from Western Electric.

The Government alleged in its complaint that the situation created by the closed market in the Bell System operating companies bought, as well as the closed market in which the Western Electric Co. sold, had been used by A. T. & T. to delay the introduction into the Bell System of improvements in the art of telephony in order that maximum rates might be secured from existing equipment, even though less expensive and more efficient equipment was available.

When he instituted the case, the Attorney General announced that its chief purpose was to restore competition in the manufacture and sale of telephone equipment. This purpose was to be achieved by separating Western from A. T. & T. and dissolving Western into three competing manufacturing concerns. Additional relief would have required A. T. & T. and its operating companies to buy telephone equipment only under competitive bidding, and Western Electric to dispose of its 50 percent stock ownership in Bell Telephone Laboratories.

The relief obtained in the consent decree fell far short of the relief requested in the Government's complaint. Under the decree Western Electric continues to be a wholly owned subsidiary of A. T. & T. and continues to own 50 percent stock ownership in the Bell Laboratories. Nor, under the decree, are A. T. & T. and its operating companies required to buy telephone equipment on the basis of competitive bidding.

As a result of the decree, A. T. & T. continues to own and operate more than 98 percent of the facilities used in long-distance telephone service in the United States and owns and controls operating companies furnishing approximately 85 percent of all local telephone service in the United States. Western continues its relationship with the Bell System and is in a position to sell more than 90 percent of all telephones, telephone apparatus, and equipment sold in the United States.

The consent decree is based on the theory that it is legal under the antitrust laws for Western's manufacturing activities to remain a part of the Bell System and for Western to manufacture the equipment the system uses in furnishing communications services that are subject to Federal and State regulation. Western's manufacturing activities are permitted to remain as part of the Bell System on the ground that Western is indirectly subject to regulation.

The primary relief obtained by the Government in the decree relates to A. T. & T. and Western's patents. The decree requires that licenses be granted to any applicant for all existing and future patents of the Bell System. Patents issued prior to the date of the decree are required to be licensed royalty-free. Patents issued subsequent to the date of the decree are to be licensed at reasonable royalties.

In order to obtain a license under the Bell System patents, however, the decree provides that the applicant, if requested by A. T. & T., must grant back to A. T. & T. or Western licenses, at reasonable royalties, for any of its own patents that cover equipment useful in furnishing common-carrier communications services. The decree, however, has no provision that requires the Bell System to open its markets to any manufacturer that may be licensed under its patents. The decree assures to Western unfettered control to the markets that comprise the Bell System.

The subcommittee sought to ascertain the reasons for the wide disparity between the relief asked for in the Government's complaint and the relief it obtained in the consent decree.

The subcommittee held 17 days of hearings in its investigation of the negotiations and the effects of the A. T. & T. consent decree. The 20 witnesses who testified included representatives of the Departments of Justice and Defense, Federal Communications Commission, former employees of the Department of Justice familiar with the litigation, and representatives from A. T. & T., Western Electric, and Bell Telephone Laboratories.

During the hearings, the subcommittee probed deeply into all of the transactions between the Government and the defendants relating to the attempts to settle this major antitrust case by consent.

During the hearings, the former general counsel for A. T. & T. testified that he met with Attorney General Brownell, for example, in June 1953 at White Sulphur Springs. During this meeting methods for disposition of the A. T. &.T. case were discussed. In the course of the discussion, Mr. Brownell suggested that A. T. & T. could examine into the Bell System's current business practices in order to see what could be enjoined without damage to the system. Such practices could then be submitted to the Antitrust Division as a basis for a consent decree. Following this conversation with Mr. Brownell, the A. T. & T. organization initiated negotiations looking toward a consent disposition of the case rather than disposition by the Government's dismissal of its complaint.

The subcommittee's investigation underscored A. T. & T.'s influence on the relationship of the Department of Defense to the Department of Justice with respect to this antitrust litigation. At the request of Secretary of Defense Wilson, for example, A. T. & T.'s executives prepared the memorandum and reports which developed the decisions of the Department of Defense. A. T. & T. executives on duty in the Department of Defense prepared some of the communications from the Secretary of Defense to the Department of Justice with regard to the case. In addition, the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, Mr. Brucker, accepted representations made to him by representatives of A. T. & T. without challenge, and with no independent investigation urged Assistant Attorney General Barnes to act in this litigation in a manner proposed by A. T. & T.

A report on the subcommittee's consent decree investigation is now in preparation.

TIEKEN INVESTIGATION

In addition to antitrust problems, the subcommittee was delegated authority to examine into a matter that involved several other aspects of the Judiciary Committee's jurisdiction; namely, the administration of the Department of Justice, conflicts-of-interest legislation, and impeachment of Federal officials. Pursuant to this authority, the subcommittee conducted an investigation into the operations of the office of the United States Attorney for the northern district of Illinois, Mr. Robert Tieken.

Early in the session the subcommittee had received complaints that Mr. Tieken had abused the powers of his office and had failed to comply with regulations of the Department of Justice that establish the procedures for the Attorney General's supervision of United States attorneys' activities.

In addition, these complaints indicated that Mr. Tieken, in the conduct of his office, may have violated the Canons of Ethics and possibly the conflict-of-interest statutes.

In view of the gravity of these allegations, the subcommittee first heard Mr. Tieken in executive session on March 20, 1958. At the conclusion of this executive session the subcommittee decided further investigation was warranted. As a result, the subcommittee, on April 21, 1958, prepared and submitted an investigative report to the Attorney General.

When it became apparent that the Department of Justice was not going to act upon the subcommittee's April 21 recommendations, public hearings were scheduled and held on June 11, 12, 13, 16, and 17, 18, 19, and 23, 1958.

During the hearings, the subcommittee developed all the facts surrounding Mr. Tieken's alleged misconduct. Particular attention was given to the circumstances involved in Mr. Tieken's issuance of Federal grand jury subpenas for four Illinois State officials who were involved in condemnation suits over his property. In addition to the circumstances involved in Mr. Tieken's condemnation cases, the subcommittee also inquired fully into Mr. Tieken's conduct involved in (1) publication of pending matters, (2) use of grand juries to conduct "fishing expeditions," (3) the conduct of investigations without prior authority from the Attorney General, and (4) his failure to disqualify himself from matters in which he had a personal interest.

The subcommittee's report, dated August 7, 1958, on its investigation of Mr. Tieken was released on August 27, 1958.

STAFF REPORTS

During this session the subcommittee published two reports prepared by the subcommittee staff. Early in the first session, the subcommittee had directed the staff to undertake a comprehensive analysis of the Federal conflict of interest legislation, as well as an analysis of the rules and regulations promulgated by the departments and agencies to implement these ethical standards. This study will be the basis for comprehensive legislative proposals designed to eliminate the criticisms that have developed as to the application and enforcement of the conflict of interest laws.

Parts I and II of the staff report entitled "Federal Conflict of Interest Legislation," was published on March 1, 1958. Part I reviews six existing conflict of interest enactments, and exemptions therefrom, and presents a proposed revision and consolidation. Part II presents proposed revisions of certain related sections of existing law dealing with bribery.

The balance of the staff study, which consists of five parts in all, is now under preparation. The additional sections will include the following: Part III, proposals for further legislation in the area of Federal Government employment ethics; part IV, analysis of individual agency regulations that are designed to implement employment ethics; and part V, a proposed overall code of Government employment ethics.

The second report of the staff consists of a revision of the Subcommittee's 1950 publication entitled "The Antitrust Laws: A Basis for Economic Freedom." This revision will collate to date all of the amendments to the basic antitrust legislation, and will include all related statutes.

Since 1950, the subcommittee has had a constant demand for copies of this publication from educational institutions and business organizations. The up-to-date compilation of these laws in the subcommittee's document will be of material assistance to the Congress in its consideration of antitrust matters in addition to its recognized value to students, educational institutions, and business organizations.

PUBLICATIONS, 85TH CONGRESS

Reports: The Television Broadcasting Industry, June 24, 1957, House Report No. 607; Airlines, February 4, 1958, House Report No. 1328; Federal Conflict of Interest Legislation, March 1, 1958; Organized Professional Team Sports, May 13, 1958, House Report No. 1720; Premerger Notification, May 28, 1957, House Report No. 486; Conduct in Office of Robert Tieken, August 7, 1958.

Hearings: Premerger Notification, serial No. 2, 1957, H. R. 264, H. R. 2143, and H. R. 7698; Organized Professional Team Sports, serial No. 8, 1957, H. R. 5307, H. R. 5319, H. R. 5383, H. R. 6877, H. R. 8023, H. R. 8124, and H. R. 10378; Consent Decree Program of the Department of Justice: Oil Pipelines, serial No. 9, part I, two volumes, 1958; A. T. & T., serial No. 9, part II, three volumes, 1958; Functional Discounts, serial No. 21; Joint Meat Packers Hearings, 1957.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE

Twelve bills were referred to the Special Subcommittee on Administrative Procedure. These cover problems such as pay for hearing examiners, legal career service, admission to practice before Federal agencies, etc. Several comprehensive bills, notably H. R. 3350, dealing with all of these topics were referred to the subcommittee and information and departmental reports were compiled and analyzed. The subcommittee is composed of FRANCIS E. WALTER, chairman; ROBERT T. ASHMORE; DEWITT S. HYDE; F. JAY NIMTZ, and JOSEPH MONTOYA.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE TO STUDY SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

This subcommittee was established by the Judiciary Committee and was authorized to conduct an inquiry and make findings and recommendations, legislative or otherwise, with reference to those questions raised by certain decisions of the Supreme Court, rendered during the October term 1956, which affect powers of Congress to investigate Federal laws relating to subversive activities and the enforcement of Federal criminal laws. The subcommittee was originally composed of Messrs. Edwin E. Willis, chairman, Byron G. Rogers, Earl Chudoff, William C. Cramer, and Arch A. Moore, Jr. Upon the resignation of Mr. Chudoff from the Congress at the end of the first session, Mr. Lester Holtzman was designated to succeed the vacancy on this subcommittee. The subcommittee selected the following decisions for its consideration and study: *Andrew R. Mallory, Petitioner* v. *United States of America; Clinton E. Jencks, Petitioner* v. *United States of America; Shirley Kremen, Samuel Irving Coleman, and Sidney Steinberg, Petitioners* v. *United States of America; Oleta O'Connor Yates, Henry Steinberg, Loretta Starvus Stack, et al., Petitioners* v. *United States of America; William Schneiderman, Petitioner* v. *United States of America; Al Richmond and Philip Marshall Connelly, Petitioners* v. *United States of America; John T. Watkins, Petitioner* v. *United States of America; Paul M. Sweezy, Appellant* v. *State of New Hampshire, by Louis C. Wyman, Attorney General; Raphael Konigsberg, Petitioner* v. *the State Bar of California and the Committee of Bar Examiners of the State Bar of California; Delvaille H. Theard, Petitioner* v. *United States of America; Rudolph Schware, Petitioner* v. *Board of Bar Examiners of the State of New Mexico.*

The subcommittee initiated hearings during the first session of the 85th Congress which continued during the second session of the Congress on the decision rendered by the Supreme Court in the case of *Andrew R. Mallory* v. *United States of America.* During these hearings, witnesses who represented Federal and local law-enforcement authorities, as well as representatives of bar associations, were heard.

Upon completion of the hearings, the subcommittee recommended to the full committee a legislative proposal designed to overrule the decision of the Supreme Court in the Mallory case. Thereafter the full committee approved the recommendation of the subcommittee and directed the subcommittee chairman to introduce a bill embodying the legislative proposal of the subcommittee. That bill, H. R. 11477, was subsequently ordered reported by the full committee and passed the House of Representatives. It passed the Senate in an amended version and became the subject of a conference. The House adopted the conference report but that report failed Senate passage on a point of order.

The subcommittee also took up one phase of the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of *Oleta O'Connor Yates, et al* v. *United States of America.* The particular phase with which the committee was concerned was the definition of the term "organize" as contained in the Smith Act and as interpreted by the Court in this particular decision. After a hearing on this subject, the subcommittee recommended to the full committee a legislative proposal designed to redefine the word "organize" as used in the Smith Act. This recommendation was embodied in the bill, H. R. 13272, which the committee ordered favorably reported to the House of Representatives. It passed the House of Representatives but there was no Senate action on the matter.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON STUDY OF PRESIDENTIAL INABILITY

The Special Subcommittee on the Study of Presidential Inability is composed of Messrs. EMANUEL CELLER, chairman, FRANCIS E. WALTER, JACK B. BROOKS, KENNETH B. KEATING, and WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH. This subcommittee was originally formed in the 84th Congress. Since that time it has conducted an exhaustive study of this subject including hearings in which the views of eminent political scientists and leading constitutional lawyers were presented. In addition to those hearings, the subcommittee published a document setting forth replies to a detailed questionnaire on the problem which had been circulated throughout the country to experts in this particular field.

During the first session of the 85th Congress an additional hearing was held by the subcommittee, at which time the Attorney General testified. In addition, the subcommittee published a document which was an analysis of the replies to the questionnaire and hearings held on the subject during the 84th Congress.

A number of bills were introduced concerning this problem, all of which were referred to the subcommittee. After considerable deliberation and consideration, the subcommittee reported four bills to the full committee. These proposals were considered by the full committee which recommended that they be referred back to the subcommittee for further study and consideration. These matters were still pending before the subcommittee on the adjournment of the 85th Congress.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE OPERATION OF SUBMERGED LANDS LEGISLATION

The Special Subcommittee on the Operation of Submerged Lands Legislation was instituted under the authority granted to the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations, including the operation and administration of the Submerged Lands Act and the Outer Continental Shelf Act. The subcommittee is composed of Messrs. EDWIN E. WILLIS, chairman; WILLIAM M. TUCK; JAMES B. FRAZIER, JR.; KENNETH B. KEATING; and PATRICK J. HILLINGS. When Mr. JAMES B. FRAZIER, Jr., resigned from the Judiciary Committee, he was succeeded as a member of this special subcommittee by Mr. ROBERT T. ASHMORE.

The purpose of the special subcommittee is to conduct a study and analysis of the problems arising from the operation and administration of those laws. The need for such a study was predicated upon a preliminary survey conducted by the staff of the Committee on the Judiciary as well as other studies conducted by agencies outside of the Government. Such preliminary studies have pointed up many and varied problems arising out of the operation and administration of the existing law. Examples of such problems are the question of double jeopardy in criminal law over violations committed in the area of the outer Continental Shelf; the peculiar problem of contract law resulting from the drilling and building operations in the same area. Also, there are serious questions of workmen's compensation as well as problems in the field of insurance such as the type of underwriters and of policies. Of course, there are many others.

Therefore, the special subcommittee undertook the task of gathering sufficient facts and knowledge from the time and experience of operation under the existing laws in order that a conclusion might be reached as to what, if anything, should be done in the way of amendatory legislation to the existing law. It is believed that sufficient time has passed in which to garner experience in the administration and operation of these laws so that whatever improvements may be necessary will be in the best interests of all the parties involved, including the Government of the United States.

Following the adjournment of the first session of the 85th Congress the subcommittee conducted a field inspection in the Gulf of Mexico of actual off-shore drilling operations. The members of the subcommittee and its staff visited both the on-shore and off-shore installations which included interviews with the working personnel in the field. The entire off-shore drilling operation was studied. Following this field inspection, the subcommittee then conducted 3 full days of hearings in New Orleans, La. During these hearings experts in every phase of the operation conducted in off-shore drilling were heard.

During the second session of the 85th Congress the subcommittee was able to recommend to other standing committees of the Congress certain amendments to pending legislation affecting the submerged lands operation. In both instances the subcommittee's recommendations were accepted by the other standing committees and embodied in the legislative proposals then under consideration by those committees.

Accomplishments of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs During the 85th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, my service as chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee will end with the present Congress. It has been a great honor and experience for me to have served as chairman of this committee in the 84th and 85th Congresses and to have been associated and worked with the membership of this committee on both sides, not only during my 4 years as chairman but during the 15 years I have been a member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and its predecessor, the Public Lands Committee. And so, as the active portion of this session comes to a close, I want to express my sincere appreciation and thanks to the members of the committee and to its staff for their cooperation and assistance and for their conscientious, diligent attention to the committee's work and activities. It has been the cooperation and diligence of all Members that has made the 84th and 85th Congresses productive in the fields of responsibility of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

As Members are aware, the broad responsibility of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs involves considering, reporting on, and helping to secure enactment of legislative measures providing for the maximum utilization, management, and conservation of the natural resources—and, in a very real sense, important segments of the human resources—of the United States, its Territories, and possessions; legislative matters involving the Government and administration of our Territories and other offshore areas; and legislation affecting the Indians, Indian tribes, trust lands, and claims of the Indians, Aleuts, and Eskimos of the United States and Alaska.

I especially want to pay tribute to the subcommittee chairmen and to the ranking minority member of the committee, all of whom served with me both in the 84th and 85th Congresses. But for the energy and leadership of Chairman WAYNE N. ASPINALL, Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee; Chairman LEO W. O'BRIEN, Territorial and Insular Affairs Subcommittee; Chairman WALTER ROGERS, Mines and Mining Subcommittee; Chairman GRACIE PFOST, Public Lands Subcommittee; and Chairman JAMES A. HALEY, Indian Affairs Subcommittee, and the continuing cooperation and counsel of Dr. A. L. MILLER, of Nebraska, our committee would have been unable to perform its mission.

I want also to express my appreciation to the committee's professional and clerical staff. The members of the staff set a high standard of performance in committee activities and service to Members during all the 4 years I served as chairman. Without their help the committee's legislative and administrative workload could not have been met.

Now, with respect to the committee's performance during the 85th Congress, I am summarizing the committee's major accomplishments. The bare statistics do not tell the qualitative story but they do help to show in convenient form the quantity of work that was given the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee to do, the immense amount of time that it and its members spent on these matters, and the amount of its output. The story that lies behind these figures is told somewhat more fully by the summary of the major measures that were considered which I will give a little later and will be told still more fully in the committee print on the accomplishments of the committee that is being prepared and will be available for all to read who will.

Our full committee held 66 meetings during the 85th Congress—31 during the 1st session and 35 during the 2d. The Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation held 76 meetings in Washington and special subcommittees held 2 days of field hearings at El Centro, Calif., and Devils Lake, N. Dak., on matters of concern to the regular subcommittee. The Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs had 47 meetings in Washington. The Subcommittee on Mines and Mining met 18 times in Washington and a special Subcommittee on Coal Research sat 8 days in Pennsylvania, Virginia, Oklahoma, Colorado, and Washington, D. C. The Public Lands Subcommittee met 51 times in Washington and special subcommittees on the administration of the Small Tracts Act, on forest fire control, and on Everglades National Park met 6 times for hearings in the field. And the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs met 46 times in Washington, with 7 days of field hearings by special subcommittees at Palm Springs and Blythe, Calif., Fort Hall, Idaho, and the Crow Indian Reservation in Montana. We have had, in short, a grand total of 329 committee and subcommittee meetings, not counting other days spent in the field by these bodies, by individual members, and by members of the staff on official business viewing premises and interviewing persons on problems of concern to the committee.

A total of 865 measures were referred to the committee. These were introduced by 196 Members of Congress, the Delegates from Alaska and Hawaii, and the Resident Commissioner for Puerto Rico. Some were of nationwide or broad regional significance; others were of concern to one or another of 50 distinct jurisdictions—44 States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam.

Of the 865 measures referred to the committee, 218—representing a total of 420 out of those so referred—were reported to the House, 193—representing a total of 353 out of those so referred—became law, and 2 were concurrent resolutions which received the approval of both Houses. Eleven were pending on the floor of the House when the 2d session of the 85th Congress ended, 9 were then pending in the Senate, and 1 was in conference. Two were vetoed by the President, 1 was defeated on the floor of the House, and 1 was ordered recommitted by the House.

The distribution among the subcommittees of the bills referred to the committee and of those reported and enacted is as follows:

Subcommittee	Referred	Reported [1]	Enacted [1]
Irrigation	166	35 (77)	33 (68)
Territories	137	51 (77)	42 (59)
Mines	99	11 (38)	8 (18)
Public Lands	301	75 (151)	[2] 68 (135)
Indian Affairs	162	46 (77)	42 (73)

[1] The figures in parentheses indicate the total number of bills referred which are represented by those reported or enacted, as the case may be.

[2] Includes 2 concurrent resolutions adopted by both Houses.

I cannot single out for special mention all of the important bills which our committee handled and which were enacted.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Certainly, though, there is little room for disagreement about the significance of the Alaska Statehood Act, Public Law 85–508; the Military Public Lands Withdrawal Act, Public Law 85–337; the act creating a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, Public Law 85–470; the act extending the Federal saline water conversion program to include the building of demonstration plants, Public Law 85–883; the act settling the boundaries of Everglades National Park, Public Law 85–482; the modification of the Klamath Indian Termination Act to assure the maintenance of the Klamath Forest on a basis which will yield a continuous supply of timber in perpetuity, Public Law 85–731; the act authorizing annual payments under reclamation repayment contracts to be adjusted to changing economic conditions, Public Law 85–611; and the act permitting the public land States to select, in certain instances, mineral lands in lieu of the school lands granted to them, Public Law 85–771. These and many others are described below.

There were other important bills which we handled but which did not become law, some because of lack of time, others because of their controversial nature. The time spent in hearing and considering these measures was not wasted either on the part of the committee or on the part of the witnesses who appeared before it. The record that was made will be valuable if, as seems likely, the subjects are taken up again next Congress, and this is so whether the committee's or the Congress' reaction to the testimony presented was generally favorable or otherwise. I refer to such bills as those to authorize the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, to admit Hawaii to statehood, to create a Coal Research and Development Commission, to provide relief for the depressed minerals industry, to provide Federal assistance in the construction of the Nebraska midstate reclamation project, to create the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park, to authorize the Fryingpan-Arkansas reclamation project, and to create a national wilderness system within our forests, parks, and Indian reservations.

Before turning to the details of our work, I must add that the committee did not confine itself to legislation alone. Its investigation of the Federal water rights claims made in the Santa Margarita suit, pending in the Federal courts in southern California, and its special hearings and reports on the conduct of the saline water research program, on Indian relocation and industrial programs, on forest-fire control in southern California, on the problems of the coal industry, and the importance of a coal research and development program, and on illegal diversions from the Colorado River and the related problem of squatters on Federal lands in that area, are all worth mentioning. So, too, is the preparation of a two-volume compilation of Central Valley project documents—the first of which has already been printed and the second of which will appear shortly—under the editorship of the chairman of the committee assisted by, successively, Mr. Eugene Eaton and Mr. Phil Dickinson. Finally, the committee handled a number of reports made by the Department of the Interior to the Congress under the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 and the Rehabilitation and Betterment Act of 1949.

Let me now turn to a more detailed description of the jurisdiction of, and the work accomplished by, our committee, taking these matters up subcommittee by subcommittee:

IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

The Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee has jurisdiction over legislation relating to the Federal reclamation program which operates principally in the 17 Western States, legislation relating to multiple-purpose development of the Nation's water resources, and legislation involving the Nation's water and power policies and the saline water research program. The Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee also is responsible for examining and recommending committee action on proposals admitted under the Small Reclamation Projects Act and Rehabilitation and Betterment Act.

Most of the matters with which the subcommittee dealt during the 85th Congress fall into one or another of the following categories: First, legislation supplementing and amending general reclamation law, including the establishment of new policies; second, legislation to authorize new reclamation projects and to modify presently authorized projects; third, legislation pertaining to problems specific to individual existing projects or irrigation districts; fourth, legislation relating to compacts on interstate streams; fifth, legislation relating to the saline water research program; sixth, proposals under the Small Projects Act and Rehabilitation and Betterment Act.

As noted above, 166 bills and resolutions were referred to the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee. Of this number, 35 were reported by the subcommittee and the full Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and 33 were enacted. The subcommittee and the full committee also approved 6 small projects and the findings of the Department of the Interior on 7 rehabilitation and betterment projects.

GENERAL RECLAMATION LAW

Four measures were enacted amending and supplementing general reclamation law:

An amendment to the Small Reclamation Projects Act permitted the small projects program to get under way—Public Law 85–47. The amendment modified the authorizing procedure for small projects to meet objections of the President to certain language in the original act.

Another measure enacted extends for 3 years the time during which the Secretary of the Interior may enter into amendatory repayment contracts under the Federal reclamation laws and grant deferments of construction charge payments in special hardship cases—Public Law 85–156.

The Reclamation Project Act of 1939 was amended to permit the Secretary of the Interior to include a variable repayment plan in existing and proposed repayment contracts under the Federal reclamation law, including contracts under the Water Conservation and Utilization Act and contracts for the storage of water and for the use of stored water made pursuant to the Flood Control Act of 1944—Public Law 85–611. The new act permits the use of variable formulas based on economic factors and tailored to individual project requirements whereby the annual payments required of water users will reflect more completely than is now possible their ability to pay.

The fourth measure authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to reimburse landowners and tenants for expenses, losses, or damages incurred in moving themselves, their families, and their possessions, when such moves are occasioned by the acquisition of land for developments under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior—Public Law 85–433.

PROJECT AUTHORIZATION

Seven measures were enacted authorizing new reclamation projects or modifying, presently authorized projects:

The San Angelo reclamation project, Texas, is a $32.2 million multiple-purpose project for irrigation, municipal and industrial water supply, flood control, protection and enhancement of fish and wildlife, and recreation—Public Law 85–152.

The $9.7 million greater Wenatchee division of the Chief Joseph project, Washington, provides for the irrigation of about 8,660 acres of land lying along the Columbia River in Chelan and Douglas Counties—Public Law 85–393.

The Mercedes division of the lower Rio Grande River rehabilitation project, Texas, is a $10.1 million project for rehabilitation of the irrigation works of the Hidalgo and Cameron Counties Water Control and Improvement District No. 9, serving an area of 68,000 acres—Public Law 85–370.

The $2.75 million Pecos River Basin water conservation project in Texas and New Mexico, will salvage an annual average of 26,500 acre-feet of water now being consumed nonbeneficially and will provide salinity alleviation works to eliminate considerable inflow of mineralized water into the Pecos River—Public Law 85–333.

The modified plan for the Washoe project, Nevada and California, calls for development of a reservoir site on Prosser Creek for fish and wildlife and flood control at an additional cost of about $3 million—Public Law 85–706.

The modified plan of development for the Glendo unit of the Missouri River Basin project calls for inclusion of the $700,000 Gray Reef Dam and Reservoir on the North Platte River to regulate the water releases from Alcova Dam in Wyoming—Public Law 85–695.

Legislation relating to the Red Willow unit of the Missouri River Basin project approves the feasibility report of the Secretary of the Interior on that unit in Nebraska and thereby permits the initiation of construction subject to the appropriation of funds therefor—Public Law 85–783.

SPECIFIC PROJECT PROBLEMS

Seventeen measures were enacted of concern to individual irrigation districts or affecting individual existing projects:

The Coulee Dam Community Act provides for disposal of certain Federal property in the Coulee Dam and Grand Coulee areas and provides assistance in the establishment of Coulee Dam as a municipality incorporated under the laws of the State of Washington—Public Law 85–240. The Boulder City Community Act serves the same purpose with respect to that Federal municipality in Nevada—Public Law 85–900.

Five acts relating to repayment by irrigation districts authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter repayment contracts or amendatory repayment contracts with the Northport Irrigation District, Nebraska—Public Law 85–123; the Mirage Flats Irrigation District, Nebraska—Public Law 85–160; the Heart Mountain Irrigation District, Wyoming—Public Law 85–33 and Public Law 85–889; the Arch-Hurley Conservancy District, New Mexico—Public Law 85–663; and the Casper-Alcova Irrigation District, Wyoming—Public Law 85–283.

The Columbia Basin Project Act was amended by raising the limits on the amount of land owned by an individual or a family to which water may be delivered to 1 or more farm units comprising not more than 160 acres in the case of an individual or 320 acres for a family—Public Law 85–264.

Two other measures relating to the excess land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws permit the establishment of irrigated farms on the East Bench unit of the Missouri River Basin project and the Seedskadee project, Wyoming, that will be of a size sufficient to provide an adequate family living—Public Law 85–112 and Public Law 85–797. In the case of the East Bench unit the new acreage limitation is in terms of 160 acres or the equivalent of 130 acres of class 1 land, whichever is larger. In the case of the Seedskadee project the limitation is in terms of the equivalent of 160 acres of class 1 land.

In addition to the above, laws were enacted directing the Secretary to conduct detailed studies and render a report on possible water service from the Central Valley project to Santa Clara, San Benito, Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties, California—Public Law 85–784; authorizing the construction of certain drainage works for the benefit of the Yuma Irrigation District, Ariz.—Public Law 85–389; declaring Hungry Horse Dam, Mont., to be a Federal reclamation project—Public Law 85–428; authorizing credit in lieu of cash to be given the Salt River Valley Water Users' Association and the Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District in return for property owned by them in Phoenix, Ariz., and needed by the Government for a new Federal building—Public Law 85–437; and providing for the naming of a structure and a reservoir of the Solano project, California—Public Law 85–481 and Public Law 85–485.

INTERSTATE COMPACTS

Four measures were enacted relating to interstate compacts. Two of these give Congressional consent to the Klamath River compact between the States of California and Oregon—Public Law 85–222 and to the Bear River compact entered into by the States of Idaho, Utah, and Wyoming—Public Law 85–348. Another gives Congressional consent to the negotiation of a Little Missouri River compact by the States of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming—Public Law 85–184. The last amends a previous act granting the consent of Congress to the negotiation of compacts by the States of the Niobrara River Basin by granting a 3-year extension for the negotiations—Public Law 85–427.

SALINE WATER PROGRAM

Legislation was enacted authorizing the construction of not less than five experimental demonstration plants for the conversion of sea water and brackish water to water suitable for municipal, industrial, agricultural, and other beneficial uses—Public Law 85–883. Three of the five required demonstration plants will be designed for the conversion of sea water and two for the treatment of brackish water. The sea water conversion plants will be located on the west coast, east coast, and gulf coast. One of the brackish water treatment plants will be located in the Northern Great Plains area and one in the arid regions of the Southwest.

A special hearing was also held during the first session on progress being made by the Department of the Interior under the Saline Water Act of 1952.

SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS AND REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT PROJECTS

The committee adopted resolutions approving the loan applications under the Small Reclamation Projects Act of the Cameron County Water Improvement District of Harlingen, Tex.; the South Davis County Water Improvement District, Utah; the Bountiful Water Subconservancy District, Utah; the Walker River Irrigation District, Nevada; the Goleta County Water District, California; and the Roosevelt Water Conservation District, Arizona.

The committee also approved the Secretary's findings with respect to repayment on seven rehabilitation and betterment projects.

OTHER LEGISLATION CONSIDERED

Bills to authorize the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado, and the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, were favorably reported by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee but were not enacted.

In addition, there were eight measures or groups of measures which the committee gave consideration to or held hearings on but did not report. One of these, the Hells Canyon legislation, was defeated in committee. Committee consideration and action on three other measures relating to new Federal reclamation projects—Burns Creek, Idaho; Spokane Valley, Wash.; and Garrison diversion unit, North Dakota—was never completed. Another measure on which there were hearings but no final action provided for a loan and grant covering the construction of the midstate reclamation project in Nebraska. The others related to joint development of the power facilities of the Trinity River division, Central Valley project, California; a study of the best means of eliminating hazards connected with the Klamath project, Oregon; and the transfer to local districts of title to irrigation distribution systems.

MISCELLANEOUS

In addition to the above, hearings were held on the Federal suit against the Fallbrook Public Utility District, California, and others. The principal purpose of the hearings was to ascertain what water-rights claims are being advanced on behalf of the United States and the necessity for joinder in the suit of thousands of defendants.

TERRITORIAL AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs extends to Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and other insular possessions of the United States.

One hundred and thirty-seven measures were referred to the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs during the 85th Congress. Of these, 51 were reported and 42 became law.

ALASKA

By all odds the most important piece of legislation reported by the subcommittee and the full committee was the Alaska statehood bill—Public Law 85–508.

In addition to the statehood bill, 15 measures relating to Alaska became law:

Title to lands beneath tidal waters offshore of surveyed townsites was granted to Alaska by Public Law 85–303, which also extended the Submerged Lands Act of 1953 to lands lying seaward of these lands.

The Legislature of Alaska was given general authority to utilize 90 percent of the proceeds from Government coal mines in Alaska, and the share of the proceeds from local operations under the Mineral Leasing Act which Alaska is entitled to receive was increased from 37½ percent to 90 percent—Public Law 85–88. Another act provided for the leasing by the Secretary of the Interior of lands beneath nontidal navigable lakes and streams in Alaska under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920—Public Law 85–505.

Earlier laws were amended to permit the public lands in Alaska containing coal, oil, or gas to be entered and utilized for homesites, headquarters sites, or trade and manufacturing purposes, with a reservation to the United States of all rights to the minerals—Public Law 85–725.

Two laws concerning mining in the Chilkat River area were enacted. The first added 320 acres to the Klukwan Reservation and authorized the Chilkat Indian village, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior to lease the lands of the enlarged reservation for mining purposes—Public Law 85–271. The second enlarges an earlier statute to permit mining of all metals—not only precious metals as previously provided—in certain parts of the Chilkat River—Public Law 85–662.

Four acts provided for the conveyance of small tracts of land to Alaska—Public Law 85–11; the city of Anchorage—Public Law 85–265; the city of Ketchikan—

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Public Law 85–753; and removed a cloud on title to certain other land—Private Law 85–287.

An amendment to the Alaska Public Works Act of 1949 clarified the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to convey federally owned land utilized in construction of public works—Public Law 85–233.

The act of May 5, 1956, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct campground, parking areas, and other public recreational facilities in Alaska, was amended to provide specific authority for him to convey the lands and facilities in question to the Territory and its subdivisions—Public Law 85–225.

Earlier law relating to the refunding operations of municipalities and public utility districts was amended to apply to school districts, to cover outstanding general obligation bonds, to permit the issuance of revenue bonds for refunding purposes, and to permit the proceeds of refunding operations to be used to pay redemption premiums—Public Law 85–675.

Public Law 85–16 provides that the Delegate from Alaska shall be 1 of the 13 members of the Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission. Public Law 85–601 extends the life of the Commission to March 1, 1960, increases its authorized appropriations from $75,000 to $300,000, and adds officials of the Province of Alberta to those with whom the Commission may cooperate.

HAWAII

Eighteen bills concerning the Territory of Hawaii were enacted:

Four of these have to do with general governmental matters. One provides for an annual meeting of the Territorial legislature—Public Law 85–690. One repeals a requirement that the President be furnished semiannually with copies of the legislature's executive proceedings—Public Law 85–714. Two others concern the Hawaii civil service—Public Law 85–650—and election of employee representatives to the board of trustees of the retirement system—Public Law 85–793.

Nine bills were enacted dealing with such varied land matters as the permissible period for leasing public lands—Public Law 85–803; the interest rate on right-of-purchase leases—Public Law 85–711; removal of restrictions on patented lands—Public Law 85–694; land exchanges—Public Law 85–713 and Public Law 85–718; transfer of lands to the University of Hawaii—Public Law 85–719; the granting of fee patents to lands held under certificates of occupation—Public Law 85–720; the sale of lands to and their exchange with tidal wave sufferers—Public Law 85–834; and the status of certain offshore reef lands—Public Law 85–677.

Three measures amended provisions of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, relating to the utilization of the home-loan fund—Public Law 85–708; the period of tax exemption—Public Law 85–710; and the use of Homes Commission land for post offices and other public improvements—Public Law 85–733.

The computation of the permissible indebtedness of the Territory was changed by excluding therefrom bonds issued to finance veterans' home and farm mortgages—Public Law 85–691.

Foundation was laid for development of a joint civil-military airfield complex at Honolulu by the provisions of Public Law 85–534.

VIRGIN ISLANDS

Five laws concerning the Virgin Islands were enacted, as follows:

The 1954 Organic Act was revised to provide that no political or religious test shall be required for holding a Territorial office; to extend the Territorial legislature's jurisdiction to all rightful subjects of legislation instead of all subjects of local application; to modify the salary of the Comptroller of the Virgin Islands, and to provide for appeals from his decisions and for payment of his and of his assistants' salaries by the United States; to provide that criminal cases should be tried by jury if demanded either by the defendant or by the Government; and to permit revenue bonds to be issued by the Territory for projects, authorized by an act of the legislature, which will, in the legislature's judgment, promote the public interest by economic development of the Virgin Islands—Public Law 85–851.

The organic act was also revised to provide that members of any board, authority, or commission established by the laws of the Virgin Islands and having quasi-judicial functions shall be appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the legislature if local legislation so requires—Public Law 85–224.

The life of the Virgin Islands Corporation charter was extended to June 30, 1969, and its authorized activities were enlarged to include construction of facilities for producing potable water from salt or brackish water—Public Law 85–913. The same act also provided for transfer to the Corporation of the Navy Department's power-generating facilities at St. Thomas.

Legislation was enacted directing the Virgin Islands Corporation to convey two tracts of land no longer needed by it to the Government of the Virgin Islands—Public Law 85–712.

Public Law 85–404 removed the limitations on the amounts authorized to be appropriated for capital improvements and administration of the Virgin Islands National Park which were written into the original legislation.

GUAM

Two public laws affecting Guam were enacted:

The first concerns the collection of income taxes on Guam. It reiterates and enlarges on the previous text of section 31 of the Organic Act of Guam, declares that the income taxes imposed by virtue of the act shall be deemed to be a Territorial income tax, provides for the administration of the tax by the Governor of Guam, and ratifies and confirms income-tax assessments and collections made between 1951 and the date of the act—Public Law 85–688.

The second amends the Organic Act of Guam to increase the salary of the judge of the district court of Guam, to lengthen the term of his office, to extend the jurisdiction of the court to cover all causes arising under the Federal Constitution, laws, and treaties, to set up a three-judge appellate division in the district court, and to provide for the temporary assignment to the district court of judges from other Federal courts—Public Law 85–444.

MISCELLANEOUS

Legislation extending the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to carry on in Antarctica and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands the same geological and biological surveys, mapping, and similar activities that he is authorized to carry on in the United States and its Territories was enacted—Public Law 85–743.

OTHER LEGISLATION CONSIDERED

Chief among the Territorial bills considered but not enacted were those to grant statehood to Hawaii. Others included bills to provide for the construction of a geophysical institute at the University of Hawaii, to increase the compensation fo members of the legislature, to lower the voting age of its citizens to 20, to govern interim appointments by the Governor of Hawaii, to provide for the granting of corporate charters by the Alaska Legislature, to provide for land grants to Alaska—three separate measures—to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to acquire certain lands on Guam, and to create an Antarctic Commission.

MINES AND MINING

The Subcommittee on Mines and Mining has jurisdiction over mining interests generally, mineral resources of the public lands, mineral land laws, mining schools and experimental stations, and conservation of petroleum on the public lands and of the United States radium supply.

Of the 99 measures referred to the subcommittee, 11 were reported and 8 were enacted. In addition, hearings were held on several other matters of concern to the mining industry. A special Subcommittee on Coal Research concluded a coal study which commenced in the 84th Congress.

ENACTED LEGISLATION

An act directing the Secretary of the Interior to establish and maintain a program to encourage the long-range exploration of mineral deposits in the United States, its Territories, and possessions by private enterprise became law—Public Law 85–701. The program contemplated will be similar to the one heretofore administered by the Defense Minerals Exploration Administration and financed under the Defense Production Act. This earlier program ended on June 30, 1958.

Two amendments to the Mineral Leasing Act were adopted.

The act was amended by removing the State acreage limitation—5,120 acres—on phosphate leases, thus permitting the leasing of 10,420 acres of Federal phosphate-bearing lands without regard to State boundaries—Public Law 85–122.

The land which any person or group may hold under Federal coal leases or permits within any one State was increased from 5,120 acres to 10,240, with

provision for the granting of cancelable leases or permits for an additional 5,120 acres in certain cases—Public Law 85–698.

Three changes were made in the mining claim laws:

Geological, geochemical, and geophysical surveys may now be used for the fulfillment of annual assessment work requirements, subject to certain conditions and limitations—Public Law 85–876.

The end of the period for performing annual assessment work on unpatented mining claims was changed from July 1 to September 1—Public Law 85–736.

The time during which annual assessment work may be performed on unpatented mining claims the locations of which were based upon the discovery of uraniferous lignite was extended for 1 year—that is, until July 1, 1958—Public Law 85–68.

Two minor measures relating to individual oil and gas leases were also enacted—Public Law 85–618 and Private Law 85–165.

OTHER LEGISLATION CONSIDERED

A bill providing for a 1-year extension that is, through 1959, of the domestic fluorspar and asbestos purchase programs established under the act of July 19, 1956, was vetoed by the President on the ground that it would defeat the objectives of the stabilization program for acid-grade fluorspar contained in the general mineral stabilization legislation then before the Congress.

The latter legislation, represented by 21 bills, provided for the purchase of 150,000 tons of domestic copper over a 1-year period, stabilization payments over a 5-year period to domestic producers of lead, zinc, acid-grade fluorspar, and tungsten, and incentive payments over a 5-year period to domestic producers of chromite, beryl, and columbium-tantalum. The legislation was drafted and offered by the administration as the only acceptable means for alleviating the acute distress of certain domestic mining industries, for preserving productive capacity expected to be needed in the future, and for assistance in the development of competitive domestic mining industries in chromite, beryl, and columbium-tantalum. The total possible cost of the program was estimated to be $458 million. The bill reported was defeated in the House.

A bill, 1 of 14 on the subject, providing for the establishment of a 3-member Coal Research and Development Commission as an independent agency, was reported by the committee. The purpose of the legislation was to provide a means whereby a substantial improvement in the economic position of the coal industry could be achieved. The basic provisions of the legislation were similar to those recommended by the special Subcommittee on Coal Research. This subcommittee, under the chairmanship of the Honorable ED EDMONDSON, continued during the 1st session the series of hearings it began in the 84th Congress and concluded its study on the need and possibilities of a research and development program for the coal industry of the United States. The findings and recommendations of the subcommittee are contained in House Report No. 1263.

MISCELLANEOUS

The Subcommittee on Mines and Mining held hearings in 1957 on the administration and operation of the multiple-use mining law, which relates, among other things, to title uncertainties and surface rights on unpatented mining claims.

PUBLIC LANDS

The Public Lands Subcommittee has responsibility for measures relating to the utilization, conservation, and development of more than 459 million acres of public lands in the United States and Alaska, more than 24 million acres embraced within some 180 units of the national park system, and nearly 160 million acres of land within national forests created from the public domain.

A total of 301 measures were referred to this subcommittee during the 85th Congress, of which 75 were reported and 66 were enacted. In addition, two concurrent resolutions were adopted by both Houses of Congress. The measures enacted or adopted are summarized below under three principal headings: (a) public lands and related matters, (b) recreation, parks, and cemeteries, and (c) national forests.

PUBLIC LANDS AND RELATED MATTERS

Four bills of general application were enacted:

The Military Land Withdrawals Act accomplishes two principal purposes: (a) it provides that no area or areas embracing more than 5,000 acres of public-domain land shall be set aside for the exclusive use of any single defense project or facility unless the withdrawal, reservation, or restriction of the land has been approved by an act of Congress; (b) it makes applicable within any military reservation in the United States, Alaska, and Hawaii the hunting and fishing laws of the State or Territory in which the reservation is located—Public Law 85–337.

As a supplement to the committee's action on this measure, the chairman of the committee sent letters to the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture calling attention to the overall problems of large-scale withdrawals of lands from use and development under the public land laws and requesting that such withdrawals or reservations not covered by the bill be reported to the committee and that approval thereof be withheld pending committee study and advice.

Two sections of the Revised Statutes were amended to permit the States, when selecting public-domain lands in lieu of the school lands granted to them at the time of their admission to the Union but later found to be unavailable, to choose mineral lands if the lands originally granted are of that character—Public Law 85–771. If the lands selected are on the known structure of an oil or gas field, they may be acquired only if the original lands are on such a structure. And if the lands selected are subject to a mineral lease or permit, they may be acquired only if all the lands subject to the lease or permit are acquired and if none of the lands are in a producing or producible status.

A third act permits desert-land entries to be made on disconnected tracts of public lands which, though they are not contiguous, are sufficiently close to each other to be managed as a single farm unit—Public Law 85–641.

Permissible uses of land grants made to the States for erection of public buildings and of the proceeds derived from such grants were extended to the reconstruction, improvement, and equipment of such buildings and to debt service on bonds issued for these purposes—Public Law 85–411. Before the enactment of this act, special legislation had been enacted covering substantially the same subject with respect to North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington—Public Law 85–6; Idaho—Public Law 85–84; and Wyoming—Public Law 85–97.

Nine bills relating to conveyances of land to specific States and municipalities were enacted: Arizona—Public Law 85–812; Council Bluffs, Iowa—Public Law 85–304; Kentucky—Public Law 85–676; Nevada—Public Law 85–193 and Public Law 85–339; Henderson, Nev.—Public Law 85–776; Salem, Oreg.—Public Law 85–528; Spearfish, S. Dak.—Public Law 85–35; and Utah—Public Law 85–631.

Another eight measures provided for conveyances to private parties, usually at fair market value, or for clearing up title defects in prior transactions.

In the railroad right-of-way field, there were five enactments. The most important declared forfeited all of the right-of-way in California granted to the Atlantic & Pacific Railroad Co. in 1866 but not presently occupied by railroad facilities—Public Law 85–571. The other four validated conveyances by railroads of small tracts of land within their rights-of-way.

Two other enacted bills cleared title to certain lands in Montana which were devised to the United States subject to conditions precluding acceptance of the devise—Public Law 85–36; and deleted from the New Mexico-Arizona Enabling Act certain provisions which operated to restrict the degree of discretion those States may exercise in the handling of funds derived from the lands granted to them—Public Law 85–180.

RECREATION, PARKS, AND CEMETERIES

Two bills of general applicability in this field were enacted:

Establishment of a 15-man bipartisan Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission to study the amount, kind, quality, and location of the outdoor recreation resources which the American people will need by 1976 and 2000 and to recommend the measures that should be taken to meet these requirements was provided for—Public Law 85–470. The act also provides for the appointment by the Commission of a 25-member advisory council representing State agencies, industrial interests, local governments, and the like, plus additional members from Federal agencies with a direct interest in the outdoor recreation field. The Commission is to make its final report and recommendations by September 1, 1961. The act authorizes the appropriation of $2,500,000 to carry out its purposes.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The maximum period for which concessionaires' leases may be granted in the national parks was increased from 20 years to 30—Public Law 85–434. It is expected that this increase will assist the concessionaires in obtaining from institutional investors the long-term credit they need to improve and expand their facilities for public accommodation and recreation in the parks.

Five measures providing for the creation, enlargement, or improvement of national parks and monuments were enacted:

Modification of the boundaries of Everglades National Park, Fla., to include approximately 197,000 acres of land and water which are not now owned by the United States and to exclude about 65,000 acres which the Government already owns was provided for—Public Law 85–482. The area to be included is valuable for its mangrove swamps and is important for the protection of both resident and migratory birds and of the fisheries off the Florida coast. The acquisition will also be useful for the development of a western entrance to the park. The act authorizes an appropriation of $2 million to carry out its purposes.

Fort Clatsop, the most important site on the Pacific coast associated with the Lewis and Clark expedition, was established as a national memorial—Public Law 85–435. It will contain not more than 125 acres and a donated replica of the fort. Land acquisition is estimated to cost $30,000 and development and repairs $255,000.

The Secretary of the Interior was authorized to accept Grant's Tomb in New York City as a gift and to administer it as a national memorial—Public Law 85–659.

Provision was made for the establishment of a national monument of about 700 acres within the Grand Portage Indian Reservation—Public Law 85–910. The Grand Portage—a 9-mile trail—was highly important in the fur trade of early American history, in the exploration and colonization of the Northwest, and in relations with Canada. This land, plus an area known as the Northwest Company site and the site of Fort Charlotte, will be included in the monument. Approximately 400 acres of Indian tribal lands will be donated to the Government. The remainder of the necessary lands will be acquired at an estimated cost of about $15,000. Development costs for the monument are estimated at $300,000.

The Petrified Forest National Monument, established in 1906 and since enlarged to include the Rainbow Forest area and the Painted Desert, will become a national park after certain inholdings are eliminated—Public Law 85–358). The park will include about 240 acres more than the monument.

Two measures were enacted relating to Independence National Park, Philadelphia, establishment of which was authorized in 1948. The first authorizes the appropriation of $7,250,000 to be expended by June 30, 1963, for its development and improvement—Public Law 85–764). This act also authorizes the acquisition of properties adjacent to Christ Church and their inclusion in the park. The second act provides for the acquisition of a narrow strip of land adjacent to the Deshler-Morris House in the park—Public Law 85–702.

Land acquisitions in connection with existing national parks and monuments were provided for in seven more acts: The most important was the authorization for acquisition of approximately 1,200 acres at or near El Portal, just outside the Arch Rock entrance to Yosemite National Park, to be used as an administrative site for the park and related purposes—Public Law 85–922. The cost will be in the neighborhood of $300,000. The new site is not made a part of the park but will be under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior. The other six relate to Cowpens National Battlefield site, South Carolina—Public Law 85–547—1 acre; Fort Frederica National Monument, Ga.—Public Law 85–401—150 acres including the Bloody Marsh Battle area and two buffer tracts within the monument; Gloria Dei—Old Swedes—Church National Historic Site, Pennsylvania—Public Law 85–709—7 acres; Isle Royale National Park, Mich.—Public Law 85–647—3 acres in Houghton, Mich., to be added to administrative site; Montana National Bison Range—Public Law 85–622—400 acres for a display pasture; and Whitman National Monument, Wash.—Public Law 85–388—50 acres.

Eight bills providing for land exchanges in or adjacent to established national parks, monuments, and cemeteries became law. These relate to Death Valley National Monument, Calif.—Public Law 85–495; Great Smoky Mountains National Park, N. C., and Tenn.—Public Law 85–407; Gunnison National Monument, Colo.—Public Law 85–391; Hot Springs National Park, Ark.—Public Law 85–679; Natchez Trace Parkway, Miss.—Public Law 85–746; Olympic National Park, Wash.—Public Law 85–455; Shiloh National Military Park, Tenn.—Public Law 85–406; and Vicksburg National Military Park, Miss.—Public Law 85–667. Of these, that relating to the Natchez Trace Parkway is the most interesting. It provides for relocation of portions of the parkway at the expense of Pearl River Water Supply District and exchange of parkway lands and roadway for new lands of approximately equal value. The Shiloh National Military Park Act is also interesting in that it is intended to facilitate the relocation of two public roads that now cross the park to the edge of the park.

MISCELLANEOUS

A number of miscellaneous subjects were covered by another eight measures within the present category. They are, in brief House Concurrent Resolution 91, declaring it to be the sense of Congress that the Altar of the Nation, in the Cathedral of the Pines, Rindge, N. H., "has been dedicated to the glory of God as a memorial to all American war dead;" Public Law 85–343, retroceding to the State of Montana concurrent police jurisdiction over the Blackfeet Highway; Public Law 85–5 and Public Law 85–499, extending the time for completion by the Boston National Historic Sites Commission of its work under the joint resolution of June 16, 1955; Public Law 85–828, increasing by $200,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated to assist in completion of the International Peace Garden, United States-Canada; Public Law 85–658, amending the act of August 11, 1955, to permit use of funds donated and appropriated thereunder for development of certain properties in New York City; Senate Concurrent Resolution 32, recognizing the National Cowboy Hall of Fame and Museum, Oklahoma City, "as a memorial to individuals who have made outstanding contributions in the opening and development of the West;" and Public Law 85–41, permitting the use of a certain portion of the Springfield Confederate Cemetery, Springfield, Mo., as a part of the Springfield National Cemetery.

NATIONAL FORESTS

Bills relating to the national forests were enacted as follows:

Approximately 15,700 acres of Palisades reclamation project land were transferred to the Caribou and Targhee National Forests without prejudice to continued use of such of the lands as are needed for the reclamation project—Public Law 85–651. The transfer will facilitate development of the recreational potentialities at and near Palisades Reservoir.

Deduction of 10 acres from the Sequoia National Park and their addition to the Sequoia National Game Refuge of the Sequoia National Forest was authorized—Public Law 25–648. A land exchange between Sequoia National Forest and Kings Canyon National Park was also provided for—Public Law 85–666.

The period for effecting an exchange of private timber rights held by the McCloud River Lumber Co. in Shasta National Forest for national forest timber of equal value was extended by 2 years—Public Law 85–116. The lands to be acquired by the Government by the exchange arrangement are valuable for recreation.

The boundaries of the Siskiyou National Forest were extended to include a strip of land along the Rogue and Illinois Rivers—Public Law 85–833. Somewhat over 20,000 acres are involved. The land which will be added to the forest pursuant to this act is reported to have unique scenic and recreational values.

OTHER LEGISLATION CONSIDERED

In addition to the above, consideration was given by the Subcommittee on Public Lands to 16 other measures and their companions which failed to become law. Extended hearings were held on a series of bills designed to create a National Wilderness Preservation System within the national forests, parks, and wildlife refuges, and on Indian reservations. In these bills, a wilderness is defined as an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man, where man himself is a member of the natural community who visits but does not remain and whose travels leave only trails. Extended hearings were also held on bills to establish the Chesapeake and Ohio National Historical Park in Maryland

containing not more than 15,000 acres. These latter bills were reported to the full committee.

A bill to permit the National Freedom Shrine Commission to erect a monument near Washington, D. C., to freedom of speech, religion, the press, assembly, and petition was reported to the House but recommitted. Another bill to authorize acquisition of the site of Fort Pemberton, Miss., and to provide for its administration as a facility of the Vicksburg National Historic Park passed both Houses but was pocket vetoed by the President.

Other matters considered were bills to quitclaim the United States interest in certain lands in California—hearings; to validate conveyance of a strip of railroad right-of-way in California—ordered reported; to convey certain Federal lands on the University of Maryland campus to the State—passed House; to provide for burial in Gettysburg National Military Park of the last survivors of the Union and Confederate Armies—tabled; to create a national cemetery in De Soto County, Fla—hearings; to authorize the burial of Mrs. Frank O. Taafel in the Zachary Taylor National Cemetery—tabled; to provide for the establishment of Fort Jackson, Ala., as a national monument—hearings; to provide for acquisition with appropriated funds of land at the Antietam battlefield site, Maryland—referred to subcommittee after having been reported to full committee; to designate St. Ann's Churchyard, New York City, as a national historic site—passed House; to request completion by the Secretary of the Interior of his report on the potential Point Reyes national seashore recreational area, California—reported to House; to direct investigation of the Wheeler Peak-Lehman Caves area, Nevada, as possible national park—reported to House; and to provide that owners of private property within Federal areas may be taxed by State and local bodies—hearings.

MISCELLANEOUS

Hearings were held by special subcommittees on administration of the Small Tracts Act, on forest-fire control in southern California, and on problems of squatters on public lands along the lower Colorado River and illegal diversions of water therefrom.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs includes the relations between the United States and Indian tribes, the care, education, and management of Indians, claims payable out of Indian funds, and the care and allotment of Indian lands. Its responsibility extends to the approximately 434,000 Indians, Aleuts, and Eskimos of the United States and Alaska and to Indian landholdings and reservations which are subject to varying degrees of Federal control and total approximately 52 million acres in 28 States and Alaska.

One hundred and sixty-two measures were referred to the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs during the 85th Congress. Of these, 46 were reported and 42 were enacted.

GENERAL

Seven measures not confined to any one tribe or group of Indians were enacted:

A portion of section 2103 of the Revised Statutes requiring that contracts with Indian tribes be executed before a judge of a court of record was repealed—Public Law 85–770.

The prohibition contained in title 18, United States Code, section 1157, against disposition of livestock purchased for Indians by the United States without the consent of the local superintendent was repealed—Public Law 85–86. The earlier law no longer served a useful purpose since few outstanding loans are not protected by adequate mortgage security.

An earlier law authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey lands no longer needed for Federal Indian school purposes to local governmental agencies was amended to provide that, upon continuing breach of the conditions of the conveyance and failure of the Secretary of the Interior to declare forfeiture, the Indians affected may petition the local Federal district court to do so—Public Law 85–31.

Teachers in Indian Bureau schools are now given 30 working days' leave each calendar year for attendance at educational meetings—Public Law 85–89.

The General Services Administration was authorized to transfer surplus Federal property in the vicinity of the McNary Dam townsite, Oregon, and Pickstown, S. Dak., to Indian tribes for industrial purposes—Public Law 85–186.

The Secretary of the Interior was directed to convey 70 acres of land to the State of North Dakota for the use and benefit of the North Dakota State School of Science. In return the School of Science will provide tuition to 10 Indian students each year for 10 years—Public Law 85–205.

Public Law 85–420 restores to tribal ownership 70,200 acres of lands on 5 Indian reservations, viz, Klamath River, Calif.; Coeur d'Alene, Idaho; Crow, Mont.; Fort Peck, Mont.; and Spokane, Wash. The restored acreages are undisposed-of remnants that were ceded to the United States by the listed tribes.

TERMINATION PROBLEMS

Implementation of the program for terminating Federal control over various Indian tribes and the solution of problems arising from previous legislation along these lines involved five measures that were enacted:

Indian rancherias in California were the subject of two enactments. One provides for the distribution of lands, minerals, water rights, and improvements on 41 such rancherias—Public Law 85–671. The principal groups involved are of Pomo, Maidu, Me-wok, and Mono stock. The act affects 1,390 Indians residing on 7,617 acres of trust lands. Each of the 41 rancherias involved adopted and filed a resolution with Congress requesting that legislation to terminate Federal control over the lands be enacted. Indian water rights will continue for 15 years unaffected by the termination of Federal supervision; thereafter they will be within the jurisdiction of the State of California with a priority, however, dating from the time when they were established.

The other act provides for the transfer of approximately 100 acres of land of the Coyote Valley Indian Rancheria to the Secretary of the Army for use in connection with the Coyote Valley Dam—Public Law 85–91. Acquisition of this land by the Corps of Engineers terminates Federal supervision over the rancheria and over those Indians who were living there and do not also have restricted holdings elsewhere.

The Klamath Termination Act was amended in a number of respects by Public Law 85–132. Those of greatest importance are (a) authorization for appropriation of $550,000 to assist the tribe in preparing for termination of Federal supervision; (b) deferment of the final termination date for 18 months; (c) provision that sales of tribal property should not be made before adjournment of the 85th Congress; and (d) clarification and modification of the procedure to be followed in handling guardianship and competency cases. The Termination Act was further modified by Public Law 85–731 which provides for a review of the appraisals of the real property assets of the Klamath Tribe theretofore made under the Termination Act, requires private purchasers of the various forest units which are to be sold to agree to manage them in perpetuity "as far as practicable according to sustained-yield procedures so as to furnish a continuous supply of timber," provides for Federal acquisition of such of the Klamath Forest units as are not retained by the tribe or purchased by private parties, provides for Federal acquisition of the Klamath marsh as a wildlife refuge, and extends the final termination date to August 13, 1961.

The Menominee Termination Act of 1954 was amended by postponing the final termination date to Decembre 31, 1960—Public Law 85–488. This act also authorized the appropriation of Federal funds equal to expenses incurred for the termination program prior to the date of enactment and, in addition, one-half of such expenses incurred thereafter, or the sum of $275,000, whichever is the less.

RESERVOIR LAND ACQUISITIONS

Five measures were enacted providing for payments to the tribes concerned—the Crows of Montana, the Navahos of Arizona and Utah, and the Sioux of North and South Dakota—for lands taken or needed by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation for reservoir and allied purposes:

Payment of $2½ million to the Crow Tribe for the transfer to the United States of the Indian tribal interest in the Yellowtail damsite and in a portion of the right-of-way for Yellowtail Reservoir on the Crow Indian Reservation in Montana is provided for in Public Law 85–523. This law also provides that the tribe may bring suit within 3 years for additional compensation if it believes $2,500,000 to be too little.

Acquisition of title to 53,000 acres of Navaho land needed for the Glen Canyon Dam and Reservoir project, including its

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

permanent operating headquarters at Page, Ariz., is provided for in Public Law 85–868. In exchange for these lands the Navaho Tribe will receive trust title to an area of equal acreage of land in southern Utah abutting the reservation.

The Standing Rock Sioux Indians will be paid $1,952,040 as just compensation for lands taken for Oahe Reservoir on the Missouri River in South Dakota—Public Law 85–915. This act also authorizes the payment of $3,299,153 for all other claims of the tribe and individual Indians connected with the same taking and $6,960,000 for a rehabilitation program. The act contains a number of other provisions of benefit to the Standing Rock Sioux.

The Lower Brule Sioux Tribe will be paid $967,523 in final settlement of all claims arising out of the construction of Fort Randall Dam and Reservoir on the Missouri River in South Dakota—Public Law 85–923. The dam gates were closed on July 21, 1952, and the land in question has been flooded for several years. The act contains a number of other provisions of benefit to the tribe and its members.

Payment of $1,395,812 to the Crow Creek Sioux Tribe of South Dakota in final settlement of all claims arising out of the construction of Fort Randall Dam and Reservoir was authorized—Public Law 85–916. As noted above, the gates of Fort Randall Dam were closed on July 21, 1952, and the land in question has been flooded for several years. This act contains a number of other provisions of benefit to the tribe and its members.

INDIAN PUBLIC WORKS

Construction by the United States of an irrigation distribution system and drainage works for 11,000 acres of restricted lands on the Torres-Martinez, Augustine, and Cabazon Reservations in the Coachella Valley, Calif., is authorized by Public Law 85–801. This project will entail an expenditure of $2 million in reimbursable Federal funds. Operation and maintenance will be undertaken by the Coachella Valley Water Users' Association, within the boundaries of which the Indian lands lie.

The Navajo-Hopi Rehabilitation Act of 1950 was amended to provide an additional $20 million for construction and improvement of roads on the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations—Public Law 85–740. This additional sum will be used to bring some 1,000 miles of road on the mineral-rich areas of the reservations up to secondary road standards.

INDIAN LAND MATTERS

A number of measures, in addition to those mentioned above under the heading "Payment for Reservoir Sites," deal with various aspects of Indian lands. The most important of these provides for judicial determination of the respective rights and interests of the Hopis and Navajos in lands set aside by the Executive order of December 16, 1882—Public Law 85–547. Following the court decision the boundary between the two reservations will be readjusted. The law also provides that each tribe may sell, buy, or exchange any lands within its reservation with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

Three others provide for disposition of 49 acres of tribal land on the Catawba Indian Reservation, S. C.—Public Law 85–34; for the transfer of 32,000 acres of public and Chippewa Indian lands to the State of Minnesota at their appraised value, less liens assessed against the land under the act of May 20, 1908—Public Law 85–387; for the conveyance of about 1 acre of land in Wisconsin held in trust for the Lac du Flambeau Band of Chippewas to the diocese of Superior for church purposes and about 22 acres to the town of Flambeau for cemetery purposes—Public Law 85–396; and for the leasing by the Papago Tribe, Arizona, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, of approximately 2,400 acres of land to the National Science Foundation for an astronomical observatory—Public Law 85–816.

Another 3 acts authorize the conveyance of 2 acres of land, together with the improvements located thereon, to the Lummi Tribe of Washington for use as a community recreation center—Public Law 85–612; provide for the exchange of 2 tracts of land—about 15 acres each—on or near the Makah Reservation, Wash., between the United States and the local school district—Public Law 85–188; and convey 3 acres of land and certain improvements to the Makah Tribe—Public Law 85–758.

All rights, except mineral rights, which the Crow Tribe has in 4,900 acres of land within the Huntley reclamation project, Montana, were terminated by Public Law 85–628. This act also provides for transferring to the credit of the Crow Tribe a sum equal to the net revenues collected by the United States from leases on the ceded lands between 1904 and 1958 with interest thereon and for the future administration of the surface rights by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with public land and reclamation laws and of the subsurface rights under the laws applicable to Indian trust lands.

Public Law 85–780 restores to the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation, Wyo., title to the minerals, including oil and gas, which was extinguished by law in 1953 and provides for future administration under the Tribal Mineral Leasing Act of 1938.

MISCELLANEOUS

Other Indian subjects covered by 85th Congress legislation were as follows: preparation of a roll of members of the Otoe and Missouria Tribe, Oklahoma, and per capita distribution of approximately $1,150,000 awarded to members of the tribe by the Indian Claims Commission—Public Law 85–395; revision of the roll of the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians of North Carolina—Public Law 85–154; extension of the law providing for the tribal government of the Osage Indians of Oklahoma to January 1, 1984—Public Law 85–192; clarification of the status of land added to the Rocky Boy's Reservation in Montana in 1947 by explicitly limiting it to Chippewa Crees—Public Law 85–773; authorization of a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians, Minnesota, from proceeds from the sale of their timber, provision for future per capita payments without further Congressional authorization, and repeal of an existing law which provides that the Secretary may employ personnel for the timber operations only with the consent of the tribal council—Public Law 85–794; amendment of earlier legislation concerning allotment of lands on the Fort Belknap Reservation in Montana to make homestead lands explicitly subject to alienation by the allottees—Public Law 85–605; provision that an earlier act requiring a reduction in Federal payments to the Klamath County School Board for the education of Indian children as a means of recouping Federal expenditures for the construction and improvement of school facilities is no longer effective—Public Law 85–72; naming 30 Pine Ridge Sioux Indians to whom payments—$3,500 in each case except 2—are to be made for loss of land and incidental expenses resulting from the establishment of the Pine Ridge aerial gunnery range, S. Dak., in 1942—Public Law 85–878; transferring to the Crow Creek Sioux Tribe, without compensation, title to a number of buildings on the site of the old Fort Thompson, S. Dak., Indian agency acquired by the Corps of Engineers during the construction of Fort Randall Dam and Reservoir and reimbursing the tribe for payments it made for certain of the improvements—Public Law 85–860; removal of the bar of an earlier statute of limitations to permit payment of claims amounting to $11,934 to be made to 169 Sioux Indians for losses incurred during wars with the United States over 80 years ago—Public Law 85–195; and changes in the law governing the handling of trust funds of the Shoshone and Arapaho Indians of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming in various respects, including directions that a $7,500 grant be made from the Shoshone trust funds for emergency and educational loans, that 85 percent of the trust fund receipts be paid per capita in monthly installments, and that per capita payments be not subject to ordinary liens or claims—Public Law 85–610.

OTHER LEGISLATION CONSIDERED

At the close of the 2d session of the 85th Congress, a bill providing for the elimination of 3,900 acres of land from the Cheyenne and Arapaho subagency reservation, Oklahoma, was in conference between the two Houses. Three others—one relating to the conveyance of certain ceded lands on the Huntley reclamation project, Montana, to the Huntley School District; another providing for the addition of lands to the Summit Lake Reservation, Nev.; and the third dealing with mineral rights on the Crow Reservation, Mont.—had passed the Senate and been reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, but no action was taken on them by the House.

Hearings had been held on 5 other bills—1 ratifying conveyance of Crow Tribe allotted lands in violation of acreage restrictions; another providing for the transfer to irrigation districts of the operation and maintenance of Indian irrigation and power project works;

a third authorizing compromise of debts of Indians and their tribal organizations; a fourth repealing a 1946 act providing for preparation of a roll of the Yakima Indian Reservation; and a fifth extending the period during which the Secretary of the Interior may lease Colorado Indian reservation lands. No further action was taken on these five bills.

SPECIAL STUDIES

Special subcommittees held hearings on the Fort Hall Reservation, Idaho, on problems relating to land use and economic conditions there and at Palm Springs, Calif., on equalization of land allotments on the Agua Caliente Reservation. A committee report entitled "Indian Relocation and Industrial Development Programs" was prepared and printed on the basis of field investigations by members of the committee and its staff.

Summary of Legislation Considered by the Committee on Banking and Currency, 85th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRENT SPENCE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 22, 1958

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, during the 85th Congress the House Banking and Currency Committee acted on a number of bills of vital importance to the national economy. One of these bills established a new program to provide new sources of long-term credit for small-business concerns, by encouraging the formation of privately owned small business investment companies. In the field of housing, bills were enacted to stimulate production of housing generally and to extend and improve existing programs for slum clearance and urban renewal, farm housing, college housing, military housing, and low-rent public housing. Another of the committee's bills completely rewrote the Small Business Act to make the Small Business Administration a permanent agency and strengthen its powers to assist small business. The committee also acted to expand or extend existing programs to maintain production essential for national defense, to help finance exports of the products of American industries and farms, and to maintain controls needed to regulate exports of materials in short supply and trade with Iron Curtain countries. These and other bills considered by the committee are described more fully below.

LAWS ENACTED, FIRST SESSION

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK EXTENSION, PUBLIC LAW 85-85—HOUSE REPORT 221, H. R. 4136

Following a precedent established in 1945 and continued in 1951, the committee acted early in the 85th Congress to extend the life of the Export-Import Bank for 5 years, through June 30, 1963. This extension was provided for in H. R. 4136, reported by the committee on March 25. The bill passed the House on April 9 and the Senate on June 5, and became law on June 17.

The Export-Import Bank is an agency of the United States established in 1934 to assist in the financing of exports and imports between the United States and foreign countries. Most credits of the bank finance the export of United States manufactured or agricultural products, or services. To a limited extent imports into the United States are also financed, but generally financing from commercial banks and other private sources is available for this purpose. A provision of the charter of the bank expresses the intent of Congress that the bank should encourage and not compete with private capital and throughout the years the relationship between the bank and private lenders has been most harmonious.

Many of the development projects abroad for which the bank assists in financing exports of American goods and services require considerable time for completion. In order that the development of projects of this type may proceed on an even-flow basis the committee has deemed it wise to act well in advance of the scheduled expiration date of the bank's lending authority. The 5-year extensions of the agency allow operations to proceed without interruption but at the same time automatically bring the agency up for review by the committee at periodic intervals.

INTERIM AUTHORIZATION FOR FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION, PUBLIC LAW 85-10—HOUSE REPORT 51, HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 209

As the mortgage market tightened in late 1956, offerings of FHA and VA mortgages for purchase by FNMA under its secondary market operations sharply increased, with the result that FNMA had neared the limt of its funds in early 1957. In response to urgent requests for action to permit FNMA to borrow more funds for its secondary market operations, the committee on February 7 reported out a joint resolution increasing this authority by $500 million. This was a stopgap measure, designed to meet FNMA's immediate needs, pending more deliberate consideration of long-term needs. It became law on March 27, 1957.

As enacted, the measure included, in additon to the $500 million increase for secondary market operations, an increase of $50 million for FNMA's special assistance purchases of cooperative housing mortgages and a technical amendment concerning limits of FHA-insured mortgages on multifamily projects in urban renewal areas.

Under FNMA's Charter Act, it may borrow up to 10 times its capital and surplus to obtain funds for its secondary market operations; in early 1957, this worked out at about $1.1 billion. The resolution increased FNMA's capital stock held by the Treasury by $50 million; under the 10-to-1 formula this resulted in an increase of $500 million in borrowing authority, raising the limit to $1.7 billion. While most of FNMA's borrowing takes the form of obligations sold to the general public, it also has authority—subject to the overall 10-to-1 limit—to borrow from the Treasury; an increase of $350 million—to $1,350 million—was made in this authority. In return for the stock it received in FNMA, Treasury canceled $50 million of FNMA notes it held. These amounts were raised again later in the session by the Housing Act of 1957, discussed below.

Section 305 (e) of the National Housing Act authorizes FNMA to purchase cooperative housing mortgages insured by FHA under section 213 of that act. Public Law 85-10 raised the maximum amount of these mortgages which FNMA may hold under section 203 (e) by $50 million—from $50 million to $100 million—and correspondingly increased the limit per State from $5 million to $10 million. These amounts were raised again later in the session by the Housing Act of 1957, discussed below.

Section 3 of Public Law 85-10 makes a technical change in the method of computing the maximum amounts for FHA-insured mortgages on multifamily housing projects in urban renewal areas under section 220 of the National Housing Act. Under section 220, FHA may increase the mortgage limit by $1,000 per room in high-cost areas; the technical amendment makes it clear that this increase is allowable for projects which average less than 4 rooms per family unit.

EXTENSION OF VOLUNTARY HOME MORTGAGE CREDIT PROGRAM, PUBLIC LAW 85-66—NO HOUSE REPORT, SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 115

The general housing bill (H. R. 6659, discussed below) as reported by the committee contained a provision extending the life of the voluntary home mortgage credit program, which was due to expire June 30, 1957. This program facilitates the flow of private funds for housing credit into remote areas and small communities. Requests for home loans are referred by VHMCP personnel to those lenders considered most able and willing to approve such loans. When it became apparent that action on H. R. 6659 could not be completed by June 30, the Senate and House on June 27 passed Senate Joint Resolution 115, extending the program through August 15, 1957. The measure was signed by the President on June 29.

HOUSING ACT OF 1957, PUBLIC LAW 85-104—HOUSE REPORTS 313 AND 659, H. R. 6659

The Housing Act of 1957, enacted on July 12, 1957, was designed to assist recovery from a serious slump in housing; restore a sound home-building industry; and achieve other important housing objectives. It contained six titles.

Title I dealt with FHA insurance programs.

Title II related to the operations of the Federal National Mortgage Association.

Title III concerned the slum clearance and urban renewal programs.

Title IV dealt with the low-rent public housing program and provided for the disposition of several federally owned war housing projects.

Title V extended and amended the military housing program and also amended the purchase price formula used in the acquisition of Wherry projects through negotiation.

Title VI continued and expanded the college-housing program, continued the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

voluntary home mortgage credit program, established a new 2-year program of farm housing research, provided for the exchange of data with foreign nations relating to housing and urban planning and development, directed the FHA Commissioner and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to set reasonable ceilings on discounts permitted in connection with Government-insured or guaranteed loans, and expanded the authority of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to make urban planning grants.

TITLE I. FHA INSURANCE PROGRAMS

The act increased the permissible maximum loan-to-value ratios on mortgages insured by FHA under its regular sales housing program, thereby permitting lower downpayments for home buyers. It raised the maximum amount of a mortgage which may be insured by FHA under section 203 to 97 percent of the first $10,000 of appraised value of property, plus 85 percent of the next $6,000 of appraised value, and 70 percent of such value in excess of $16,000. Existing dollar ceilings—for example, $20,000 in the case of a 1- or 2-family home—were unchanged. The maximum loan-to-value ratio was increased again by the Emergency Housing Act of 1958, discussed below.

Prior to the 1957 amendment the maximum loan-to-value ratios were 95 percent of the first $9,000 of value and 75 percent of the appraised value in excess of $9,000—except that the President could increase the figure of $9,000 to $10,000.

Where the mortgagor is not the occupant of section 203 housing—as in the case of a builder-mortgagor—the mortgage continues to be limited to a maximum of 85 percent of the mortgage amount available for owner-occupants.

The act also lowered downpayments for section 203 (i), which is designed to encourage low-cost housing in suburban and outlying areas. The minimum downpayment was reduced from 5 to 3 percent.

The law also increased the permissible maximum mortgage under section 203 (i) from $6,650 to $8,000.

The law also lowered the downpayments for urban renewal sales housing under section 220, to conform to the minimum downpayments permitted under the section 203 program.

The section 222 servicemen's mortgage insurance program was also modified so as to permit downpayments lower than 5 percent wherever such lower downpayments would be permitted under the revised downpayment schedule for FHA's section 203 program.

The law required the FHA Commissioner, before putting the lower downpayments into effect, to make a finding that such action was in the public interest, taking into consideration possible effects on the economy and also the availability or lack of credit for GI loans guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration. On August 6, 1957, the lower downpayments permitted by the act for the various FHA programs were made effective by regulation.

Others provisions relating to the FHA insurance programs: The act amended the FHA title I home improvement loan program to make payments of loss to the lender incontestable after 2 years from the date the claim was certified for payment, in the absence of fraud or misrepresentation, unless the Government demands repayment within the 2-year period.

The section 207 rental housing program was amended to permit a high cost area allowance of $1,000 per room regardless of the number of rooms per unit.

The program for rental housing for elderly persons under section 207 was amended to permit a maximum mortgage of up to $8,400 per unit for elevator-type projects. The act also made it clear that units in section 207 projects for the elderly can be designed for and occupied by single elderly persons.

The act also amended the National Housing Act to require that in cases where replacement cost instead of value is used as a basis for mortgage insurance, the FHA shall furnish the applicant with its estimate of replacement cost instead of the estimate of value which it furnishes to the buyer in other cases.

Title I also contained a number of technical provisions relating to debentures, insurance premiums, transfer of moneys among FHA insurance funds, and other phases of FHA operations. It also repealed two obsolete provisions.

TITLE II. FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION—SECONDARY MARKET OPERATIONS

The law amended the provision governing the amount of FNMA stock which a mortgage seller must purchase under FNMA's regular secondary market operations. Under prior law FNMA could increase without limit the amount of the required stock purchase, the only restriction being that it could not be less than 1 percent of the mortgage amount. The 1957 act established the maximum stock purchase requirement at 2 percent and retained the minimum of 1 percent.

The act provided additional funds for FNMA's regular secondary market operation. By increasing FNMA's capitalization by $65 million, FNMA's borrowing authority was increased by $650 million, since under the law FNMA may borrow up to 10 times its capital and surplus. The increased borrowing authority brought FNMA's total mortgage purchase authority to approximately $2.4 billion. A corresponding increase was made in the amount of FNMA obligations which may be purchased by the United States Treasury.

FNMA special assistance functions: Under its special assistance program FNMA provides financing support on favorable terms for especially deserving FHA programs such as military housing, urban renewal housing, and cooperative housing.

The act required that until August 8, 1958, FNMA purchases of mortgages under its special assistance functions must be at par. Under prior law FNMA was required to purchase at 99 or more.

With respect to the fees and charges which FNMA may make in connection with special assistance mortgages, the act placed a limit of 1½ percent of the unpaid principal amount. Not more than half of such fees and charges may be collected at the time of commitment. Previous law contained no limit on such fees and charges.

The act increased the authorization for FNMA purchases of mortgages designated by the President for special assistance. The new authorization of $450 million for the purchase of whole mortgages supplanted the previous authorizations of: First, $200 million for the purchase of whole mortgages, and second, $100 million for the purchase of 20 percent immediate participations in mortgages. The President has designated as eligible for special assistance, mortgages covering disaster housing, housing in Guam and Alaska, Wherry military housing, housing for the elderly, and urban renewal housing.

Additional FNMA support for cooperative housing was provided by an increase from $100 million to $200 million in the authority of FNMA to purchase FHA section 213 cooperative housing mortgages under its special assistance functions. The former $10 million limitation on outstanding purchases per State was increased to $20 million. Under the amendment $50 million of the total authorization was reserved for cooperatives certified by the Federal Housing Commissioner to be consumer cooperatives. Of the commitments in any one State, not more than $15 million may be outstanding at any time for cooperatives which are not consumer cooperatives.

The authorizations for FNMA purchases of FHA title VIII military housing mortgages was increased from $200 million to $450 million, of which 7.5 percent was reserved for purchases of mortgages insured under section 809. Section 809 mortgages finance sales of housing for essential civilians at military research and development centers.

The authorizations for FNMA purchases under its special assistance programs were raised again by the Emergency Housing Act of 1958, discussed below.

TITLE III. SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN RENEWAL

The authority of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to make capital grants under the title I program for slum clearance and urban renewal was increased by $350 million. Under this program the Federal Government makes grants to local communities up to two-thirds of the cost of slum-clearance and urban-renewal projects.

The act also provided an alternative formula for calculating the Federal capital grants, the use of which is optional with the community. In place of the two-thirds Federal to one-third local grant formula for a project, the local public agency can have, if it so elects, the benefit of a three-fourths Federal to one-fourth local grant formula, if the community bears all expenses of planning, surveys, legal services, and administrative costs. In effect, under the alternative formula, the Federal Government pays a higher percentage of a reduced project cost. The purpose of the alternative formula was to make it possible to

eliminate review and discussion at the Federal level of survey and planning costs and project administrative costs.

The act also increased from 10 percent to 12½ percent the proportion of the capital grant authorization available to any one State.

In order to relieve both the local public agencies and the Federal Government of a considerable burden of paperwork, the act authorized the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to permit local public agencies to make relocation payments in fixed amounts—not exceeding the present $100 limit—to individuals and families without the necessity of investigating the actual costs incurred in each case.

The maximum allowance for paying the relocation expenses of individual businesses displaced by slum-clearance operations was raised from $2,000 to $2,500.

The definition of "urban renewal plan" was amended to permit a local community to indicate in a submission separate from the urban renewal plan, the relationship between the urban renewal plan and the overall local planning objectives. The previous definition required that this relationship be indicated in the urban renewal plan itself.

Another amendment extended to slum-clearance projects under the 1949 act a provision—previously applicable only to urban renewal projects under the 1954 act—whereby the estimated costs of facilities offered as noncash grants-in-aid can be deemed actual costs for certain purposes. This avoided delay and resulting expense in winding up an urban renewal project where the facilities offered as noncash grants-in-aid are still under construction and the actual costs thereof cannot be known until completion.

The act also provided that, where the local housing agency is also acting as the local public agency for the purposes of slum clearance and urban renewal, the local housing agency may include in its administration building sufficient facilities for the administration of its slum clearance and urban renewal functions. In such cases an economic rent shall be charged for such facilities as are used for urban renewal functions. The rent shall be paid from funds derived from sources other than low-rent public housing projects administered by the local housing agency.

TITLE IV. PUBLIC HOUSING

Low-rent housing: The act permitted certain exemptions from income for the purpose of determining eligibility for both initial and continued occupancy. The amendment permitted families seeking admission to public housing an exemption from their annual income of $100 for each minor (other than the head of the family and his spouse) and each adult dependent member of the family with no income, and up to $600 of the income of each member of the family other than the principal wage earner. For continued occupancy, exemptions were permitted of either $100 or all or part of the income of each minor in the family—other than the head of the family and his spouse—and $100 for each adult dependent member having no income, and up to $600 of the income of any other member of the family other than the principal wage earner. Exemptions under prior law were—for admission, $100 for each minor; and for continued occupancy, $100 for each minor or all or any part of the income of each minor.

The permissible cost limits of low-rent public housing were raised from $1,750 to $2,000 per room for regular units, and from $2,250 to $2,500 per room for units for elderly persons.

Another amendment required that every contract for Federal assistance to low-rent public housing projects shall require that the plans, drawings, and specifications follow the principle of modular measure in every case deemed feasible by the local housing agency.

Disposition of war housing projects: The act contained the following provisions affecting the disposition of war housing projects: First, it extended until December 1, 1957, the time in which war housing project Conn-6029 may be sold to the Housing Authority of Wethersfield, Conn., pursuant to the provisions of the Housing Act of 1954; Second, it directed the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to dispose of housing project Nev-26021, to the Housing Authority of Las Vegas, Nev.; Third, it directed the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to convey two Lanham war housing projects—La-16011 and La-16012—to the State of Louisiana; Fourth, it directed the Administrator to sell to the city of Layton, Utah, a war housing project known as Verdeland Park—Utah-42015.

TITLE V. MILITARY HOUSING

The title VIII military housing program was extended by the act for 1 additional year, through June 30, 1959.

The act made the statutory maximum average of $16,500 per family unit for housing under the title VIII program applicable to each project rather than each mortgage. Since financing for a large project generally requires separate mortgages for the various areas of the project, and the mortgages in some of these areas may range somewhat higher than the $16,500 family-unit average limitation—although the family-unit average of all project mortgages does not exceed that limit—this section permits greater flexibility in project planning and financing.

The act changed the formula used in determining the purchase price of Wherry Act housing acquired by the military services through negotiation. It substituted for the allowance for physical depreciation, previously included in determining such price, an allowance representing the estimated cost of repairs and replacements necessary to restore the property to sound physical condition.

TITLE VI. MISCELLANEOUS

College housing loan program: The act increased the college housing loan authorization by $175 million—from $750 million to $925 million.

Eligibility under the program was extended to include: First, any public or nonprofit hospital operating a school of nursing beyond the level of high school, or approved for internships by recognized authority, and, second, any agency, public authority or other instrumentality of any State established to provide or finance housing or other educational facilities for students or faculty of any nonprofit public educational institution offering at least a 2-year program acceptable for full credit toward a baccalaureate degree.

A $25 million ceiling was placed on the amount of loans which may be outstanding to hospitals for housing for nurses and interns.

Voluntary home mortgage credit program: The voluntary home mortgage credit program was extended by the act until July 31, 1959. Under previous law the program would have expired on August 15, 1957.

Farm housing research: The act authorized a new program of farm housing research designed to assist in the improvement of farm housing by developing data and information on, first, the adequacy of existing farm housing, second, farm housing needs, third, problems in purchasing, constructing, or improving farm housing, fourth, the interrelation of farm housing problems and problems of urban and suburban housing, and fifth, any other matters bearing upon adequate farm housing.

The research, study, and analysis must be conducted by land-grant colleges financed with grants made to them by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

The Administrator's authority to make grants to land-grant colleges expires June 30, 1959, and the total amount of such grants cannot exceed $300,000 during either of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1958, or June 30, 1959. Appropriations were authorized to be made to carry out the program.

Exchange of data: The Housing and Home Finance Administrator was directed to exchange data relating to housing and urban planning and development with other nations where the exchange is deemed by him to be beneficial to the programs of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Discount control: Under the act the Federal Housing Commissioner and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs were directed to fix reasonable limits on the charges, fees, and discounts imposed upon the builder, seller, or purchaser, in connection with the financing of the construction or sale of housing covered by an FHA or VA mortgage. This provision was repealed by the Emergency Housing Act of 1958, discussed below.

Urban planning grants: The act extended eligibility for section 701 planning grants to, first, official governmental planning agencies for areas threatened with rapid urbanization as a result of the establishment or rapid and substantial expansion of a Federal installation, and second, State planning agencies, to be used for the provision of planning assistance to such areas.

SALE OF PROJECTS IN ALEXANDRIA, LA., HOUSE REPORT 220, H. R. 5603

This bill, providing for the conveyance of two Lanham Act projects to the State

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

of Louisiana, was reported by the committee on March 25, and passed the House on April 1. The Senate did not act on this bill, but it did include substantially the same provisions as an amendment to the general housing bill, and the proposal was enacted into law as section 402 (c) of the Housing Act of 1957, discussed above.

SALE OF PROJECTS IN DECATUR, ILL., PUBLIC LAW 85-234—NO HOUSE REPORT, S. 2460

This act provides for the conveyance of two Lanham Act projects in Decatur, Ill., to the city of Decatur or its housing authority, for $260,000, on condition that the projects will be demolished within 5 years. The bill passed the Senate on August 21; passed the House August 23; and was approved by the President on August 30, 1957.

INCREASE IN SBA LOAN AUTHORITY, PUBLIC LAW 85-4—HOUSE REPORT 3, S. 637

The first hearing of the committee during 1957 was held January 23, on legislation to increase the Small Business Administration's authority to make loans to small businesses. At the close of 1956, SBA's outstanding business loans and commitments had reached $137 million, just $13 million short of the statutory limit of $150 million then in effect. Since applications for such loans were being approved at the rate of about $13 million a month, prompt action was required to prevent a sudden interruption in SBA's lending program. Accordingly, the committee on January 28 reported out H. R. 3109, which provided for an increase of $80 million in the business loan authorization; this was the amount estimated to be sufficient to permit operations through July 31, 1957, the expiration date then provided in the statute. On January 29 the Senate passed S. 637, providing for an increase of $65 million. On January 31, the House passed S. 637, with an amendment substituting the provisions of H. R. 3109. The Senate agreed to the House amendment the following day, and on February 11 the bill became Public Law 85-4. As enacted, it raised SBA's business loan authority by $80 million, from $150 million to $230 million.

REVISION OF SMALL BUSINESS ACT, HOUSE REPORT 555, H. R. 7963

Under the Small Business Act of 1953, as in effect at the beginning of the 85th Congress, the Small Business Administration was scheduled to expire on July 31, 1957. On May 14, 1957, the committee began hearings on legislation to extend this expiration date and revise the Small Business Act, as a result of which the committee on June 13 reported to the House a bill, H. R. 7963, which completely rewrites the Small Business Act, making various changes in the interest of promoting a more vigorous and efficient program of assistance to small business. The bill passed the House on June 25, 1957, but it did not become law until the second session of the Congress. See the discussion of the bill below, under Laws Enacted, Second Session.

EXTENSION OF SMALL BUSINESS ACT, PUBLIC LAW 85-120—NO HOUSE REPORT, S. 2504

When it became apparent that the Senate could not act on H. R. 7963—discussed above—in the first session, the Senate passed S. 2504, a bill extending the Small Business Act for 1 year, through July 31, 1958, and increasing its authority to make loans to small business by $75 million, to $305 million. The House passed the bill on August 2, and it became law on August 3—effective retroactively, as of July 31.

LAWS ENACTED, SECOND SESSION

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT EXTENSION, PUBLIC LAW 85-471—HOUSE REPORT 1873, H. R. 10969

This act extends for 2 additional years, through June 30, 1960, the remaining powers of the President under the Defense Production Act of 1950. These include power to establish priorities for defense contracts, limited power to allocate materials for defense purposes; authority to guarantee loans made in connection with defense contracts; authority to make loans and purchases to build up our defense capacity and assure adequate supplies of defense materials; authority for businessmen to cooperate voluntarily in meeting defense needs without violating antitrust laws; and provision for establishment of a reserve of trained executives to fill Government positions in time of mobilization.

The maintenance of a strong and flexible defense program requires that current military and atomic-energy programs proceed without interruption and that a broad and diversified mobilization base be established which will reflect new requirements resulting from changes in technology and strategy. The authorities provided in the Defense Production Act are essential to meet those objectives. Some of these powers are needed now to maintain production schedules on missiles and other defense contracts; others are needed for longer range preparedness programs; and other powers must be maintained in readiness for possible future emergencies.

The extension legislation passed the House on June 16, and the Senate on June 23. It was approved by the President on June 28, 1958.

EXPORT CONTROL ACT EXTENSION, PUBLIC LAW 85-466—HOUSE REPORT 1467, S. 3093

This act extends the Export Control Act of 1949 for a further period of 2 years to June 30, 1960. That act, which is administered by the Secretary of Commerce, authorizes the regulation of exports to the extent necessary, first, to protect the domestic economy from excessive drain of scarce commodities, second, to safeguard the national security insofar as it might be adversely affected by exports of strategic commodities, and, third, to further our foreign policy. The need to control exports in the interest of national security will probably continue for the foreseeable future. It is clear that this country must continue to take special precautions to see that United States goods of strategic significance do not go unchecked to the troubled spots of the world.

Noting that the Commerce Department's Supplemental Report on Iron and Steel Scrap of February 21, 1958, predicted that withdrawals of heavy melting grades from the scrap reservoir would exceed the additions to the reservoir during the next decade, the committee, in its report on this legislation, urged the Department to continue to exercise surveillance over the rate of withdrawal of the heavy melting grades from the scrap reserve.

This act passed the Senate on April 22; passed the House on June 16; and was approved June 25, 1958.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK; INCREASE IN LENDING AUTHORITY, PUBLIC LAW 85-424—HOUSE REPORT 1450, S. 3149

This act, approved May 22, 1958, increases the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington from $5 billion to $7 billion and also provides an increase of the same amount in the authority of the bank to borrow funds from the Secretary of the Treasury. If the limitations on lending and borrowing authorities of the bank had not been increased it would have been compelled to restrict its activities sharply with a consequent adverse effect upon the export of American products to the Free World.

The bank, which began operations in 1934, assists in financing and facilitating trade between the United States and foreign countries.

Loans authorized during the bank's history total approximately $9 billion, through the end of 1957. Of this sum $1.5 billion have been partially provided by private sources or have been canceled as a result of sales being made for cash or due to the failure of the American manufacturers or contractors to obtain the desired contracts.

The bank actually paid out over $6 billion in this same period.

Of the $6 billion actually disbursed, an even 50 percent, or $3 billion have been repaid. This represents loans paid in full plus semiannual payments received on outstanding loans.

The bank has received total income of $867 million. Over 40 percent of the income went back to the United States Treasury in two ways: Interest paid on all loans from the Treasury; and dividends paid to the Treasury on capital stock at an annual rate of $22.5 million.

The Export-Import Bank has had a highly successful record of operations, has played a vital role in assisting our friends in the Free World on a mutually profitable basis and has made a substantial contribution to our domestic economy. Its loans are used to pay for orders placed in the United States in such fields as electrical equipment, railroads, mining, farm products, and manufacturing machinery. Based on the bank's past record, this extension of its borrowing and lending authority will result in profit for the Government as well as profits and jobs for our domestic economy.

EMERGENCY HOUSING ACT, PUBLIC LAW 85-364—NO HOUSE REPORT, S. 3418

This act, effective April 1, 1958, was enacted as part of the antirecession legislative program. In the spring the Nation was experiencing a serious economic decline and the number of unemployed climbed above 5 million. The act was designed to encourage and expedite the construction and financing of a substantial number of new housing units.

Primary emphasis was placed on expanding and amending existing pro-

grams which could best provide immediate economic relief. To achieve this objective, the act substantially reduced the required downpayments under the FHA program, added $1.5 billion to the special assistance program of the Federal National Mortgage Association, provided additional funds for the VA direct loan program, provided for an increase in the interest rate on GI loans and title VIII military housing loans, and removed the discount controls which had been placed upon GI and FHA mortgages in the Housing Act of 1957.

The act reduced the required downpayments under section 203 and section 220 of the National Housing Act. Under prior law, FHA-insured sales housing mortgages could not exceed 97 percent of the first $10,000 of FHA-appraised value—or of replacement cost in the case of certain programs—85 percent of the next $6,000; and 70 percent of the remaining appraised value. Under the act, the 97 percent ratio now applies to the first $13,500 of appraised value—or replacement cost—rather than to the first $10,000, and the 85 percent ratio is applied to the next $2,500, rather than to the next $6,000. This increase in the maximum mortgage ratio has the corresponding effect of decreasing minimum downpayment. Existing dollar ceilings on these mortgages—for example, $20,000 for a 1- or 2-family home—were unchanged.

The law increases from $450 million to $950 million the Federal National Mortgage Association's special assistance fund made available to the President for the purchase of home mortgages which are not otherwise marketable, and for the purchase of home mortgages generally as a means of aiding and maintaining the stability of a high level national economy.

The law provided a special $1 billion fund under FNMA's special assistance program for commitments and purchases of FHA and GI mortgages on new homes where the loan does not exceed $13,500 in original principal amount.

An additional $25 million was provided for the purchase by FNMA of military rental housing mortgages insured by FHA under section 803 and $25 million for the purchase of section 809 sales housing mortgages at military research and development centers. The same section also increases the permissive interest rate ceiling on FHA section 803 military housing mortgages from 4 percent to 4½ percent.

The act amended the GI loan program, administered by the Veterans' Administration with the following provisions:

First. The maximum interest rate for both guaranteed and direct loans was increased from 4½ percent to 4¾ percent, with the proviso, however, that the rate established must be at least one-half percent below the rate established by the FHA Commissioner for FHA loans under section 203 (b) (5) of the National Housing Act.

Second. The GI loan program (both for guaranteed and direct loans) was extended for World War II veterans for 2 years until July 25, 1960.

Third. An additional $150 million was provided for the direct loan program during each of the fiscal years 1959 and 1960, and $50 million for the final quarter of fiscal year 1958.

Fourth. The maximum loan permitted under the direct loan program was increased from $10,000 to $13,500.

Fifth. The VA was authorized to reserve direct loan funds for 3 months under commitments to builders for a 2-percent fee. The VA may make construction advances up to an amount equal to cost of land, plus 80 percent of the value of improvements.

Sixth. The VA was required to adopt procedures to speed up the processing of direct loan applications.

The final section of the act repealed section 605 of the Housing Act of 1957 which required the Commissioner of the FHA and the Administrator of the VA to regulate discounts on FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed loans.

INCREASE IN FHA MORTGAGE INSURANCE AUTHORIZATION, PUBLIC LAW 85-442—HOUSE REPORT 1767, SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 171

This act, effective June 4, 1958, increased by $4 billion the amount of mortgages the FHA is authorized to insure under section 217 of the National Housing Act. Section 217 contains the mortgage insurance authorization for all FHA programs, except the title I home repair and improvement program and the title VIII armed services housing program. The latter two programs have separate authorizations.

Because of the stimulating effects of the Emergency Housing Act signed into law on April 1, 1958, and because of a general improvement in the flow of mortgage funds into the housing market, FHA mortgage insurance activity jumped spectacularly with the onset of the spring building season.

As a result it became clear that FHA would reach its maximum authorization by the end of May, and would be forced to stop issuing commitments, unless its insurance authority was increased.

The bill as reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency would have povided an emergency $1 billion increase in FHA's insurance authority, since it was contemplated that whatever further authorization was necessary would be included in the general housing bill to be considered later in the session. However, the resolution passed by the Senate called for a $4 billion increase, and that figure was adopted by the House.

PROJECT IN JUNEAU, ALASKA, PUBLIC LAW 85-359—HOUSE REPORT NO. 1441, S. 2042

This act, approved March 28, 1958, authorized the conveyance of a fee simple title to the lands underlying war housing project Alaska-5003, at Juneau, Alaska. The legislation was needed to facilitate the sale of the project under provisions of the Lanham Act.

PROJECT IN HOONAH, ALASKA, PUBLIC LAW 85-806—HOUSE REPORT NO. 2348, S. 2594

This act, approved August 28, 1958, transferred property rights and powers with respect to a housing project at Hoonah, Alaska, from the Housing and Home Finance Agency to the Department of the Interior, so as to permit the Bureau of Indian Affairs to work out a solution to various problems that have arisen in connection with the sale of the project to the Hoonah Indian Association.

RICKOVER MEDAL, PUBLIC LAW 85-826—NO HOUSE REPORT, SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 201

This resolution, approved August 28, 1958, would authorize the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, on behalf of the Congress, to present to Rear Adm. Hyman George Rickover, United States Navy, an appropriate gold medal. This medal is to be conferred on Admiral Rickover for his achievements in successfully directing the development and construction of the world's first nuclear-power reactor devoted exclusively to the production of electricity.

The resolution also directs the Secretary of the Treasury to have duplicates in bronze of such medal to be coined and sold. The proceeds of such sales will be used to reimburse the Treasury for the cost of coining and selling the duplicates.

SBA DISASTER LOANS IN AREAS SUFFERING FROM EXCESSIVE RAINFALL, PUBLIC LAW 85-335—HOUSE REPORT 1333, S. 2920

This act broadened the disaster loan authority of SBA to permit SBA to make disaster loans to small business in areas affected by excessive rainfall. Previously a 1955 amendment to the SBA Act gave the Administrator authority to make a disaster loan to small-business concerns in an area "where a drought is occurring." The 1958 amendment also modified that authority so that disaster loan eligibility will not have to cease at the moment the drought is broken. As modified the SBA law now provides that a disaster loan may be made to a small-business concern in an area "affected by a drought or excessive rainfall." The law, of course, requires that appropriate determination be made by the Administrator and the President or the Secretary of Agriculture to insure that the liberal assistance provided is made available only in areas which may properly be considered as suffering major hardships from these conditions.

Disaster loans bear a maximum interest rate of 3 percent—for the Administration's share of a loan—and can have terms up to 20 years. Since a disaster loan is intended as a rehabilitation measure, more liberal credit standards are applied to their consideration than would be prudent for the agency's business loans. This act was approved February 22, 1958.

SMALL BUSINESS ACT, PUBLIC LAW 85-536—HOUSE REPORTS 555 AND 2135, H. R. 7963

This act, approved July 18, 1958, completely rewrites the Small Business Act of 1953, making various changes in the interest of promoting a more vigorous and efficient program of assistance to small-business concerns. The principal changes embodied in the act are first, to make the Small Business Administration a permanent agency, second, to increase the revolving fund authorization for loans to small business from $305 million to $500 million, third, to increase the maximum amount of the SBA share of a business loan from $250,000 to

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

$350,000 and fourth, to reduce the maximum interest rate from 6 percent to 5½ percent on direct SBA business loans and on SBA's share of such loans made in participation with private lenders and to eliminate the ceiling on the interest rate on the private lenders' share.

The act also makes several important changes concerning SBA's assistance in obtaining a fair share of Government procurement contracts for small-business concerns. It requires that SBA's definition of "small business" for procurement purposes, as well as for loan purposes, take into proper account differing characteristics of various industries to the extent the definition is based on number of employees. The act also makes clear that the policy of insuring that a fair proportion of Government purchases being placed with small-business concerns applies to all types of Government contracts. In addition, it requires that any dispute between SBA and a contracting agency as to the propriety of awards to small-business concerns shall be submitted to the head of the department or agency concerned.

The provisions of the act relating to procurement contracts are also extended to cover sales of Government property, so that small-business concerns may be assured a fair proportion of awards when the Government is selling property, as well as when it is purchasing goods or services.

Two changes are made in the "pool loan" program, under which a group of small-business concerns may form a corporation and obtain a loan from SBA up to $250,000 times the number of concerns in the group. Before its revision, the act authorized such loans where the corporation is formed to establish facilities "to produce or secure raw materials or supplies." Under the new act, such loans may be made to obtain raw materials, equipment, inventories, or supplies for the concerns in the pool, as well as to establish facilities for that purpose, and such loans may also be made to finance research and development for the members of the pool.

Another new provision of the act will assist small-business concerns in obtaining Government contracts for research and development and in obtaining the benefits of research and development performed by larger firms under Government contracts or at Government expense.

SBA's disaster loan program was strengthened by new provisions authorizing SBA to pay transportation expenses of personnel hired on a temporary basis to deal with the disaster, and to accept gratuitous services and facilities from public and private agencies and groups in connection with disaster loans, and another new provision exempting disaster loans made by national banks in participation with SBA from the restrictions that normally apply to real-estate loans by such banks.

The new act also makes SBA's security interest in property subordinate to State and local tax liens on such property in any case where this result would follow under State law if the interest were held by a party other than the United States.

Finally, a number of new provisions are included to facilitate the administration of the act, such as provisions permitting SBA to use services of other Government agencies on a nonreimbursable basis, to hire employees on a temporary or intermittent basis, and to require other Government agencies to cooperate and consult with SBA in formulating policies affecting small business.

The bill passed the House June 25, 1957; passed the Senate with amendments on July 1, 1958; and became law on July 18, 1958.

SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT OF 1958, PUBLIC LAW 85–699—HOUSE REPORTS 2060 AND 2492, S. 3651

The Small Business Investment Act establishes a new program to provide equity and long-term loan funds to small-business concerns through the mediums of privately owned and operated small-business investment companies and State and local development companies.

The act establishes a Small Business Investment Administration within the Small Business Administration, to be headed by a Deputy Administrator. The powers conferred by the act upon the Small Business Administrator will be exercised through the new Deputy Administrator.

Appropriations of not to exceed $250 million are authorized for loans by SBA under the act. These include SBA purchases of subordinated debentures of small-business investment companies, as well as other SBA loans to such companies, and SBA loans under title V of the act to State and local development companies.

The new small-business investment companies will be chartered by the States, except in those States where such companies cannot be chartered under State law and operate in accordance with the purpose of the act. In such a State, SBA is authorized to charter small-business investment companies until July 1, 1961. Provision is also made for converting State-chartered investment companies and State development companies into SBA chartered small-business investment companies in such States. To obtain the benefits of the act, a State-chartered company must be chartered expressly for the purpose of operating under the act, and must be approved by SBA. In granting such approval, as well as in issuing charters, SBA will consider the need for small-business financing in the proposed area of operation, the character of the management of the company, the number of small-business investment companies previously organized, and the volume of their operations.

The act requires that each small-business investment company have not less than $300,000 of paid-in capital and surplus. SBA can provide half of this in the form of subordinated debentures. The Administration can also lend additional funds up to 50 percent of the company's capital and surplus under such terms as it fixes. In addition such companies may borrow additional funds from private sources under regulations prescribed by SBA.

Small-business investment companies operating under the act may provide equity-type capital to small-business concerns through the purchase of convertible debentures with terms and interest rates fixed by the companies with SBA approval. Whenever an investment company provides capital to a small-business concern through the purchase of convertible debentures, the concern is required to purchase stock in the investment company in an amount equaling from 2 to 5 percent of the amount of the capital provided; the exact percentage will be established by SBA regulation. Small-business investment companies may also make loans for terms up to 20 years to small-business concerns, and may extend the maturity of any such loan for an additional 10 years for orderly liquidation purposes. Without SBA approval, the aggregate securities and obligations of a small-business concern held by an investment company cannot exceed 20 percent of the latter's capital and surplus. Small-business investment companies operating under the act are exempt from the provision in the Investment Company Act of 1940 which limits borrowings to one-third of assets; and they are eligible for discretionary exemptions for their securities under the Securities Act of 1933 and Trust Indenture Act of 1939.

The act also provides authority for SBA to make loans to State development companies to stimulate and supplement the flow of private equity capital and long-term loan funds to small-business concerns. Funds so advanced cannot exceed the company's borrowings from other sources. SBA may also make loans to State and local development companies, to assist identifiable small-business concerns in connection with plant construction, conversion, or expansion, up to $250,000 for each concern. The authority to make such loans to local development companies expires June 30, 1961.

The act repeals section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act—which authorized working-capital loans to business concerns by Federal Reserve banks—and provides that amounts repaid to the United States by those banks as a result of such repeal shall be used to finance a new program of grants for studies, research, and counseling for small businesses under the Small Business Act. Under this program, grants would be limited to $40,000, and not more than one grant could be made in any one State in any one year.

Although not included in this act, tax provisions which should prove most helpful in increasing the amount of private funds available to the investment companies operating under this act have been included in Public Law 85–866, Technical Amendments Act of 1958. These tax incentives allow investors in small-business investment companies an ordinary, rather than capital deduction for any losses resulting from such investment. They will also allow investment companies to receive a similar tax deduction for any loss on the convertible debentures or stock of small-business concerns they may acquire; plus a 100 percent dividends received deduction.

The act passed the Senate on June 9, 1958; passed the House with amendments on July 23; and was approved by the President and became law on August 21, 1958.

TREASURY SALES OF SECURITIES TO FEDERAL RESERVE, PUBLIC LAW 85-476—HOUSE REPORT 1880, H. R. 12586

This act extends until June 30, 1960, the authority of the Federal Reserve banks to purchase securities directly from the Treasury in amounts totaling not more than $5 billion outstanding at any one time.

Prior to 1935 Federal Reserve banks could purchase Government obligations either in the market or directly from the Treasury. The Banking Act of 1935, however, required that all purchases of Government securities by Federal Reserve banks be made in the open market. In 1942 the authority of the Federal Reserve banks to purchase securities directly from the Treasury was restored, but a limit of $5 billion was placed on the amount outstanding at any one time. The $5 billion authority was granted initially only through 1944, but the Congress has extended it from time to time so as to provide continuous limited direct borrowing authority ever since.

The primary purpose of this direct borrowing authority is to help the Treasury and the Federal Reserve System work together in minimizing the disturbing effects on the economy of short-run peaks in Treasury cash receipts and disbursements, particularly around the time of quarterly income-tax payments. This act was approved June 30, 1958.

BILLS REPORTED BUT NOT ENACTED

SAVINGS AND LOAN HOLDING COMPANIES, HOUSE REPORT 178, H. R. 4135

Passed the House March 21, 1957, but was not acted on by the Senate, although similar provisions were included in S. 1451 as passed the Senate.

In 1955 the committee reported out a bill, H. R. 6627, designed to regulate holding companies in the field of commercial banking. It was subsequently enacted into law and became the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956. Shortly after the committee had reported that bill, a new holding company was formed in the savings and loan field. In view of the potential problems that could develop from a holding company movement in the savings and loan field the committee decided to take action before these problems assumed the complex status that had been encountered in dealing with the holding company problem in the commercial banking field. Accordingly, the committee on March 1, 1957, reported H. R. 4135, to protect against the encroachment of holding companies in the savings and loan field.

H. R. 4135 as reported by the committee and passed by the House prohibits any holding company from acquiring control of two or more savings and loan associations if the savings accounts in the associations are insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. The bill also denies FSLIC insurance to any uninsured savings and loan association if it is controlled by a holding company which also controls an insured savings and loan association. The bill prohibits any insured savings and loan association controlled by a holding company from making any loan to the holding company or any of its subsidiaries. The bill does not have any retroactive effect as it would not require an existing holding company—and there are only a few—to divest itself of an insured association it now controls. However, it does prohibit an existing holding company from acquiring control of any additional insured association after enactment of the act.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES, HOUSE REPORT 1859, S. 3497

Passed the Senate April 16, 1958; House defeated rule for its consideration August 1, 1958.

During the latter part of 1957, it became apparent that the tempo of our economy was slackening; by the spring of 1958 more than 5 million people were unemployed. S. 3497 was passed by the Senate and favorably reported to the House by the Banking and Currency Committee with the objective of reducing the ranks of the unemployed while helping local communities provide needed waterworks, sewage systems, and other facilities.

The bill would have broadened the existing public facility loan program, which was established in 1955. Under the present program, the Federal Government makes loans to communities of 50,000 population and under, to finance public-works projects, if financing is not otherwise available on reasonable terms. A $100 million revolving fund is provided for these loans. The interest rates are fixed by the administration and vary from time to time; the current rate for 30-year obligations is 4 percent for general obligation bonds and 4⅜ percent for revenue bonds.

S. 3497, as reported to the House, would have expanded this program by making $2 billion—of which $400 million would have been a revolving fund—available for such loans to all communities regardless of population, and would have reduced the interest rate by making it conform to the average rate paid by the Government on all outstanding obligations—this would have worked out at 2⅝ percent at the time the bill was reported. The bill would also have extended such loans to cover nonprofit hospitals and lengthened the maximum term to 50 years; and would have made Federal loans available if not otherwise available on "equally favorable" terms—as compared with "reasonable" terms, which is the requirement of the law now.

The bill also would have authorized an additional $50 million for planning advances under section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954. The section 702 program was established to provide a shelf of planned public works which could be placed under construction quickly.

The bill passed the Senate April 16, 1958, and was reported to the House June 6. On August 1, 1958, a resolution providing for consideration of the bill was defeated in the House by a rollcall vote of 187 to 173.

THE HOUSING ACT OF 1958, HOUSE REPORT 2359, S. 4035

The bill was called up under suspension of the rules on August 18, 1958, but failed to obtain the necessary two-thirds, the vote being 251 for and 134 against.

As reported by the committee, S. 4035 was a general housing bill with several important objectives. One prime purpose was to stimulate additional construction activity to combat the recession. A second major objective was to achieve better housing generally, improve present programs designed to combat slums and blight, and provide special assistance to meritorious housing programs such as military housing, college housing, cooperative housing, and the veterans' home loan program.

Title I would have broadened FHA programs. The regular FHA section 203 sales program would have been changed to reduce required down payments and lengthen loan maturities; facilitate trade-in financing; and broaden the section 203 (i) program to encourage low-cost housing outside of built-up areas. Other FHA programs would have been changed to encourage more rental housing construction and cooperative housing construction to alleviate the acute shortage of such housing in urban centers. The section 221 relocation housing program—a vital part of urban renewal and slum clearance—would have been strengthened by raising the mortgage ceiling to make the sales program more workable in many areas, and by establishing a new section 221 rental housing program. The section 222 program for servicemen would have been changed by increasing the mortgage ceiling and extending the program to cover low-cost sales housing in outlying areas under section 203 (i). The bill would also have set up a new FHA program to insure mortgages on proprietary—that is profit-run—nursing homes.

Title II would have established a program of Federal loans to permit nonprofit corporations to build housing for the elderly. These loans would have carried an interest rate of 3¼ percent under present conditions, with maturities up to 50 years. Appropriations of $100 million would have been authorized for such loans.

Title III related to the Federal National Mortgage Association. It would have extended through August 7, 1959, the requirement that FNMA pay par for mortgages it buys under its special assistance program; reduced FNMA's commitment and purchase fees for such mortgages; authorized the President to make $500 million additional available for FNMA purchases of FHA and VA loans up to $13,500 under the antirecession authority provided in the Emergency Housing Act; extended the so-called standby commitment to cover existing homes; authorized FNMA to make loans on pledged FHA and VA mortgages; and increased from $15,000 to $17,500 the limit that generally applies to FNMA mortgage purchases.

Title IV would have authorized capital grants of $500 million a year for 2 years for slum clearance and urban renewal, and would have made a number of

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

changes in the urban renewal program. These would have broadened eligibility for relocation payments, increased the amounts of such payments, made an increased portion of urban renewal grants available for redeveloping industrial and commercial areas, and made other changes to achieve more efficient operation.

Title V would have provided $400 million additional for college housing loans, of which $50 million would have been reserved for "other educational facilities" such as cafeterias and student centers and $50 million would have been reserved for housing for nurses and interns. The bill would have provided a new program of loans to educational institutions for the construction or rehabilitation of classrooms, laboratories, and related fixed facilities and initial utilities necessary or appropriate for the instruction of students, the administration of the institutions, or the conduct of varied research activities. Appropriations of $250 million would have been authorized for such loans. A further amendment would have made nonprofit student housing cooperatives eligible under the college housing program.

Title VI would have extended the armed services housing mortgage insurance program for 1 additional year—June 30, 1959, to June 30, 1960. It also contained provisions to facilitate the acquisition by the military of Wherry housing, and also section 207 rental housing projects, under certain conditions. A further amendment would have required that time and a half be paid for overtime on projects financed under section 803. Another amendment would have made it clear that under the Wherry acquisition program the Secretary of Defense could assume the existing mortgage when acquiring the property or acquire the property subject to the mortgage.

Title VII of the bill would have established a new mortgage-insurance program to encourage lower downpayment loans outside of the FHA and VA programs. It would have created a Home Mortgage Guarantee Corporation, under the jurisdiction of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, to write this insurance. The insurance would have covered the top 20 percent of the loan, subject to a requirement that the lender bear 10 percent of any loss. Loans of up to 90 percent of the value of the home, but not more than $25,000 would have been eligible for insurance. The initial capital for the new corporation would have been provided by the 11 Federal Home Loan Banks, through a $20 million stock subscription. The Corporation would have charged premiums for the insurance to cover expenses and build up reserves.

Title VIII would have given discretionary authority to the FHA Commissioner to help prevent foreclosure in cases where the borrower becomes unemployed. One amendment would have permitted defaulted interest payments to be included in the FHA debentures instead of in the certificate of claim as under present procedure. Another provision would have authorized the Commissioner to acquire the mortgage in return for debentures paid to the lender to prevent foreclosure in cases where the lender would be unwilling or unable to exercise forebearance.

Title IX related to veterans' housing. It would have provided an additional $150 million for direct home loans to veterans. It would also have removed the requirement that the maximum interest rate on VA-guaranteed and direct loans shall be one-half of 1 percent below the maximum interest rate on FHA section 203 loans.

Another provision would have added to the list of supervised lenders whose loans are guaranteed by VA on an automatic basis all certified agents of any Federal agency which are acceptable to the Veterans' Administration. The bill also provided that downpayments or deposits made by veterans on purchases of homes in a project of five or more units shall be placed in a special trust fund until the date of settlement, and authorized the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to suspend from participation in the veterans' loan-guaranty program any builder, owner, or sponsor who has been similarly suspended from participation in an FHA program.

Title X would have provided a new program under title V of the Housing Act of 1949 for the insurance of loans to provide housing for migratory farm labor. Another amendment would have extended existing authorizations for low-rent public housing for 1 additional year. Another amendment would have extended the farm housing research program for 3 additional years and authorized appropriations of $100,000 a year during such additional period. Other amendments concerned the sale of housing financed under title IX of the National Housing Act which had been acquired by FHA, funds for surveys of public works planning, hospital construction under the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, and the disposal of additional war housing projects.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT, H. R. 2099, S. 3683

This bill passed the Senate on May 13, 1958, and passed the House with amendments on August 22. When the President refused to sign it, it failed to become law.

The Area Redevelopment Act would have established a new program to help build new employment opportunities in industrial areas suffering from chronic unemployment, and in rural areas with heavy concentrations of low-income farm families.

The act provides for an Area Redevelopment Administration, headed by an area redevelopment commissioner, as a constituent agency of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The Commissioner would be responsible for designating the areas to be assisted under the act. These would be designated as industrial redevelopment areas or rural redevelopment areas. He would be required to designate as an industrial redevelopment area any area which has suffered from unemployment of 6 percent or more for 18 of the preceding 24 months, or 9 percent or more for 15 of the preceding 18 months, or 12 percent or more for the preceding 12 months. He would have discretionary authority to designate as an industrial area any area which has suffered 15 percent unemployment for the preceding 6 months, if the cause is not temporary, or any other area which has suffered substantial and persistent unemployment for an extended period of time. The areas eligible for designation as rural redevelopment areas would be those with the largest number and percentage of low-income families, plus substantial and persistent unemployment or underemployment.

Appropriations of $200 million would be authorized for revolving funds for redevelopment loans; $100 million for industrial redevelopment areas and $100 million for rural redevelopment areas. These loans would be to help finance industrial plants. They could cover the purchase or development of land and facilities—inculding machinery and equipment—construction of new buildings, rehabilitation of empty buildings, or alteration of existing buildings. Applicants for such loans would have to be approved by a State or local agency directly concerned with the economic development of the locality, and the project would have to conform with an overall program for the economic development of the area. The Federal loan could not exceed 65 percent of the project cost, and there would have to be reasonable assurance of repayment. The maximum term would be 40 years—with a possible extension of 10 years—and the interest rate would be fixed under a formula which adds one-fourth of 1 percent to the current average yield on longterm marketable Government obligations—this worked out at 3⅜ percent when the bill was passed.

The act also would authorize appropriations of $75 million annually for grants to provide public facilities in redevelopment areas. Such a grant would be authorized only if it will fill a pressing need in the area and there is little probability the project can be undertaken without the grant. The applicant must contribute to the cost in proportion to its ability to do so. In addition, the Commissioner must find that the project will provide more than a temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment and will tend to improve the opportunities for successfully establishing or expanding industrial or commercial plants or facilities in the area.

The Commissioner could provide technical assistance to redevelopment areas to help them evaluate their needs and develop their potentialities for growth. Appropriations of $4,500,000 annually would be authorized for this purpose. The Commissioner would also be required to furnish such areas with any information or advice obtainable from the various Government agencies which may help provide greater employment opportunities, and to furnish the Government procurement offices with a list of firms in redevelopment areas that desire Government contracts.

For industrial redevelopment areas, the act would waive certain of the normal requirements of the slum clearance and

urban renewal program, so that financial assistance may be extended under this program to clear sites in these areas for industrial and commercial development. Up to 10 percent of the funds authorized for the slum clearance and urban renewal program after June 1, 1958, would be available for this purpose.

The act also would amend section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 to make planning grants under that section available to counties and municipalities located in industrial redevelopment areas, even though they exceed the 25,000 population limit that normally applies. These grants are for surveys, land-use studies, and other planning work—excluding plans for specific public works.

The act also provides that the Secretary of Labor shall determine the vocational training needs of unemployed individuals in redevelopment areas, and cooperate with Federal, State, and local officials in charge of existing vocational training programs to make sure their facilities and services are fully available to such individuals. If the Secretary of Labor finds a need for additional facilities or services and so advises the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, additional Federal assistance for this purpose would be authorized, including financial assistance, to be furnished through the Commissioner of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The act contains safeguards against pirating of industries. Section 6 (a) provides that no redevelopment loan shall be made to assist establishments relocating from one area to another when such assistance will result to any extent in detriment to the area of original location by increasing unemployment. The same provision is included in section 13, with respect to the use of financial assistance under the slum clearance and urban renewal program.

Summary of the Record and Accomplishments of the Committee on Ways and Means During the 85th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 22, 1958

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with established custom and also in specific response to the letter of August 4, of our distinguished majority leader, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, I am pleased to take this means and opportunity to set forth a brief summary report on the record and accomplishments of the Committee on Ways and Means during the 85th Congress.

The Committee on Ways and Means has just completed one of the most active, intensive and productive periods of work in its entire history. The committee has thoroughly considered the extremely large volume of legislation referred to it and has taken action on both major and minor bills in each and every field of its broad jurisdiction. The legislation which has been accorded favorable consideration by the committee is sound, responsible, and beneficial to the American people. While members of the committee individually, including myself, may have differed over particular bills on occasion, every member of the committee has applied himself with great diligence and conscientiousness to the extraordinarily heavy workload confronting us with the result that I can truthfully and with sincerity say that the record of the Committee on Ways and Means for the 85th Congress was not only an outstanding one but I believe will compare favorably with the record of any of this committee's predecessors. At a later point in this summary I will present not only a brief digest of the legislative measures which have received favorable consideration by the committee during this Congress but I shall also present detailed statistics on the work and activity of the committee which I believe Members of this body and the public generally will find both interesting and highly revealing. However, before doing so, I wish to express a personal comment at this point relative to the high degree of cooperation which I have received as chairman of the committee.

As Members of the House know, a very difficult task devolved upon me with the unfortunate passing of our late esteemed colleague and chairman of the committee, the Honorable Jere Cooper, just before the opening of this session of the Congress. As the new chairman of the committee, this task was made much easier for me by the exceptionally fine cooperation which I have received from my colleagues on the committee and I wish to express to them my sincere and grateful appreciation for their assistance and helpfulness. The normally very heavy workload of the committee during the session now drawing to a close was enhanced by the fact that consideration of certain major legislative measures had been deferred until this session, other measures relating to termination dates had to be brought to completion and acted upon during this session, and by the further fact that the other body did not act on several major matters until very late in this session. My colleagues on the committee have pursued their heavy responsibilities with energy and with great ability, with the result that the record of this committee is truly an enviable one.

In this connection, it is worth emphasizing here that the nature of the measures falling within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means is such that this committee must always proceed with the utmost caution, responsibility, and prudence. Taxes, tariffs, social security, and fiscal legislation are matters which intimately and personally affect the lives of every American, and in all these areas our committee must act with the highest degree of responsibility bearing in mind that these are sensitive and vital areas of action. Also, in each of these areas the committee must always bear in mind not only the immediate effect of measures upon which it may take favorable action but it must also consider the long-term effect and impact of the measure and the relationship which the precedent which it will set will have to other proposals which will be made in the future.

As is clear from the table which I shall set forth below, and as will be even more fully demonstrated from the legislative digests later on, the committee has taken action in every field of its jurisdiction on a broad front during this Congress. A bird's-eye view of some of the major measures acted upon by your committee is indicative of the diligence and conscientiousness with which the committee has approached its heavy responsibilities. The committee favorably reported, the House and Senate passed, and the President signed, the Excise Tax Technical Changes Act of 1958, a bill of over 430 pages, which is the first technical revision of our excise tax structure since 1932, when many of our present excise taxes were first adopted; it has favorably reported the Technical Amendments Act of 1958, a bill of some 270 pages, and over 100 sections, which passed both the House and the Senate and is now public law, the purpose of which is to correct unintended benefits and hardships and thus close many actual and potential loopholes in our income and estate tax laws; it has favorably reported, and there has been signed into law, the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, a major legislative enactment which extends the President's authority in the vital field of international trade for an additional 4 years; it has favorably acted upon, and there has been signed into law, the first revision of the Antidumping Act for many years; it favorably reported, the House and Senate passed and the President signed, the Social Security Act Amendments of 1958, a major social security bill, which strengthens the financial basis of the social security system, provides increased benefits for all social security recipients, strengthens and improves the benefit structure, and improves other titles of the act; it has twice favorably reported and there have been signed into law, at the request of the administration, measures to extend the so-called Korean corporate and excise taxes for an additional temporary period of time; it favorably reported, and there has been signed into law, a bill to provide for an emergency extension of Federal unemployment compensation benefits; it favorably reported a bill which was signed into law to make it possible for our citizens to receive a higher interest rate on their investments in United States savings bonds; it favorably reported a bill which has become public law to extend for an additional period of time the provisions of the Renegotiation Act; it has acted to empower the Government to further control the manufacture of narcotic drugs; it has acted on bills, at the request of the administration, to increase the public debt limit so as to protect the fiscal integrity of the Government; and it has acted upon a very broad variety of measures of lesser importance in all fields of its jurisdiction.

As was pointed out in the report which summarized the activities of the committee during the first session of this

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Congress, the subcommittees of the Committee on Ways and Means undertook and completed a series of studies during the first session which laid the groundwork for a considerable amount of the action taken by the full committee during the second session of this Congress. These subcommittees, which were established at the beginning of this Congress are three in number and operated in the three major fields of the committee's jurisdiction.

The membership of the subcommittees is as follows:

Subcommittee on Foreign Trade Policy: Hon. HALE BOGGS, chairman; Hon. CECIL R. KING; Hon. BURR P. HARRISON; Hon. EUGENE J. MCCARTHY; Hon. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ; Hon. DANIEL A. REED; Hon. JOHN W. BYRNES; Hon. ANTONI N. SADLAK; Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS.

Subcommittee on Excise Taxes: Hon. AIME J. FORAND, chairman; Hon. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER; Hon. EUGENE J. KEOGH; Hon. FRANK M. KARSTEN; Hon. A. S. HERLONG, JR.; Hon. THOMAS A. JENKINS; Hon. NOAH M. MASON; Hon. HAL HOLMES.

Subcommittee on Internal Revenue Taxation: Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS, chairman; Hon. NOBLE J. GREGORY; Hon. THOMAS J. O'BRIEN; Hon. FRANK IKARD; Hon. RICHARD M. SIMPSON; Hon. ROBERT W. KEAN; Hon. HOWARD H. BAKER.

These subcommittees are to be commended on the meritorious activities and studies which were undertaken and completed by them which was of material assistance to the full committee during the session of this Congress now drawing to a close.

I. STATISTICS ON COMMITTEE ACTIVITY

To indicate the intense activity of the committee from January 1957 to date, there have been some 200 meetings of the full Committee on Ways and Means, and 48 meetings of the 3 subcommittees, for a total of 248 meetings during the 85th Congress. The full committee met 61 times in executive session during the first session, and 62 times in executive session during the session just completed, in addition to the meetings of the subcommittees and meetings concerning public hearings. The hearings of the full committee and the subcommittees are contained in some 16 volumes covering over 10,000 pages of testimony. These hearings also contain, in addition to the testimony of some 1,057 witnesses who personally appeared before the committee, the statements and expressions of views of hundreds of additional individuals and organizations on the subjects under consideration. Included among the major hearings during this Congress were extensive hearings on general revenue revision, extension of the President's authority under the reciprocal trade agreements legislation, hearings on all titles of the Social Security Act, hearings specifically on unemployment compensation, on the Antidumping Act, and on a series of other subjects within the jurisdiction of the committee.

There follows a complete table which shows all the subjects upon which public hearings were conducted by the committee, along with the number of witnesses who actually appeared personally before the committee and the number of days devoted to each such hearing:

TABLE I.—*Public hearings, Committee on Ways and Means and subcommittees thereof, 85th Cong.*

Subject	Date	Total number of witnesses	Total number of pages	Days
Tax Extension Act	Feb. 6, 1957	2	31	1
Interest rate of United States savings bonds	Feb. 21, 1957	4	40	1
Antidumping Act	July 29–31, 1957	9	430	3
Import excise tax on lead and zinc	Aug. 1–2, 1957	70	355	2
Withholding of city taxes	Aug. 27, 1957	14	82	1
General revenue revision	Jan. 7–Feb. 7, 1958	355	3,588	24
Public debt limit	Jan. 17, 1958	3	56	1
Reciprocal trade agreements	Feb. 17–Mar. 25, 1958	282	2,935	27
Import of newsprint	Mar. 27, 1958	3	20	1
Unemployment compensation	Mar. 28–Apr. 1, 1958	52	389	3
Social security	June 16–30, 1958	192	1,205	11
Renegotiation Act extension	July 29, 1958	13	240	1
Public debt limit	July 30, 1958	3	49	1
Total		1,002	9,420	77
Subcommittee on Internal Revenue Taxation: Changeover of depreciation method.	Mar. 12, 1957	5	50	1
Subcommittee on Foreign Trade Policy: Panel Discussion.	Dec. 2–13, 1957	50	865	10
Grand total		1,057	10,335	88

There were referred to the committee during the 85th Congress a total of 2,078 bills and resolutions, by far the largest number which have been referred to the committee in its entire history. Despite this extraordinary heavy volume of legislation referred to the committee, as further indicative of the committee's intense work, the committee favorably reported to the House a total of 105 bills and resolutions, of which 98 have passed the House of Representatives, 71 have passed the Senate, and 71 were signed into public law. These reported measures cover all fields and facets of the committee's jurisdiction. During the course of this Congress the committee has considered practically every bill which has been referred to it, either specifically or in terms of the subject matter covered by the bill. I have had a check made and find that more bills were reported by the committee during this Congress than in any Congress during the past 20 years.

There follow tables showing the above and also showing the status, by major category of subject matter, of legislation referred to the committee and legislation upon which favorable action was taken:

TABLE II.—*Legislation referred to Committee on Ways and Means, 85th Cong. (Jan. 3, 1957, through Aug. 22, 1958)*

Total number of bills referred to the Committee on Ways and Means 1st and 2d sess. through Aug. 22, 1958	2,059
Total number of House joint resolutions referred	17
Total number of House concurrent resolutions referred	5
Total number of House resolutions referred	4
Total number of Senate bills referred	2
Total	2,078

	Total number of tax bills	Total number of tariff bills	Total number of social security bills	Total number of miscellaneous bills	Grand total
House bills	1,170	346	511	23	2,050
House joint resolutions	12	3		2	17
House concurrent resolutions	4			1	5
House resolutions	1	3			4
Senate bills	2				2
Total	1,189	352	511	26	2,078

TABLE III.—*Status of legislation, Committee on Ways and Means, 85th Cong.*

	House bills	House joint resolutions	Senate bills	Total
Reported by Ways and Means	101	3	1	105
Passed House	94	3	1	98
Reported in Senate	68	3	1	72
Passed by Senate	67	3	1	71
Public law	67	3	1	71

	Tax bills	Tariff bills	Social security bills	Miscellaneous bills	Total
Reported by Ways and Means	41	42	18	4	105
Passed House	36	41	17	4	98
Reported in Senate	19	36	14	3	72
Passed Senate	19	35	14	3	71
Public law	19	35	14	3	71

TABLE IV.—*Number of bills and resolutions reported by the Committee on Ways and Means from the 75th through the 85th Congs., 1937 through 1958*

Congress:	
75th, 1937–38	33
76th, 1939–40	25
77th, 1941–42	35
78th, 1943–44	29
79th, 1945–46	27
80th, 1947–48	62
81st, 1949–50	55
82d, 1951–52	65
83d, 1953–54	52
84th, 1955–56	99
85th, 1957–58	105

II. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF LEGISLATION ON WHICH FAVORABLE ACTION WAS TAKEN

A. TAX LEGISLATION

1. MAJOR TAX BILLS

Before summarizing the tax legislation favorably reported during this Congress by the Committee on Ways and Means, it would be useful to comment briefly on the response of our existing ability-to-pay tax system to the sharp recession which was felt in the first part of 1958. When the magnitude of this recession was realized, there were numerous recommendations for general tax reduction legislation. While only the future can actually tell us whether or not these recommendations were wise, it is worthwhile to point out that our tax system itself showed a very considerable flexibility in the face of the business decline. The President's budget document in January which was developed without consideration of the recession situation, anticipated Federal revenues for fiscal year 1960 in the neighborhood of $74½ billion. At the present time the Treasury is anticipating budget receipts in fiscal year 1960 of $67 billion. This decline of $7½ billion means that this much more money will be left in the hands of the public. It will be available for private expenditure, and it will be one factor in whatever recovery we may experience over the next 12 months. The decline in tax revenues is to a very small extent the result of specific legislation enacted during the current year. It is primarily the response of a tax system based on ability to pay to a sudden decline in that ability. I simply want to take note of this situation at the same time that the fact is recorded that the committee did not recommend for enactment any of the proposals for general tax reduction that were advanced during the early months of 1958.

During the 85th Congress the Committee on Ways and Means favorably reported 7 pieces of major tax legislation. Two of these were the Tax Rate Extension Act and the Excise Tax Technical Changes Act which passed the House during the first session. The remaining 5 major tax bills were passed by the House during the 2d session of the 85th Congress, although 1 had been reported by the Committee on Ways and Means during the 1st session. Of the 7 bills, 6, in substance, have been enacted into law. These include the Korean rate extension bills in both the first and second sessions, a bill dealing with the temporary formula for taxing life insurance companies, the excise tax revision bill, the income tax revision bill, and the small business tax adjustment bill, which was included in the income tax revision bill. The remaining major bill dealing with the treatment of retirement programs for the self-employed has been passed by the House and is awaiting action by the Senate.

Including both major and minor tax legislation, the Committee on Ways and Means during the 85th Congress took favorable action on 41 bills designed to amend the tax laws in various respects. Of the 34 bills not included in the category of major legislation above, 14 have been signed into public law and 29 have passed the House.

A brief description of the major bills in the tax field follows:

EXCISE TAX TECHNICAL CHANGES ACT OF 1958

The Excise Tax Technical Changes Act of 1958, H. R. 7125, was a comprehensive technical revision bill in the excise tax field. The conference report on this bill was accepted by the Senate on August 15 of this year. The bill was approved by the President on September 2, 1958, and is Public Law 85–859. This bill represents the culmination of 3 years' work. The major part of this work was done by the Subcommittee on Excise Taxation. The full Committee on Ways and Means took action on the bill in the spring of 1957. The bill passed the House on June 20, 1957.

The bill as finally passed deals for the most part with technical and administrative problems in the excise-tax field. Generally it is designed to reduce complexity of administration and competitive inequalities. Title 2 of the bill, for example, involves a very extensive revision of the sections of the Internal Revenue Code dealing with the taxes on distilled spirits, wines, beer, tobacco products, and firearms. Since the objective of many of these provisions is regulatory, it is highly desirable that they should operate in a way to protect the revenue and at the same time involve a minimum of unnecessary compliance problems for manufacturers, retailers, and wholesalers. Another feature of the bill is a general revision of the rules defining the tax base for the manufacturers sales tax where the manufacturer also makes sales at retail. Unless the tax base here is defined as the manufacturer's price component of the final price, this manufacturer would be at a competitive disadvantage. Illustrative of the other technical provisions of the bill were revisions of the reporting requirements with respect to various tax-free sales and a rather comprehensive revision of the rules dealing with the documentary stamp tax on property transfers. In a large number of areas, the bill defines more precisely than present law what is a taxable article. Revisions of this nature were made in connection with the retail taxes on jewelry and luggage and various manufacturers excise taxes.

The bill was not designed primarily to reduce excise taxes but several tax reductions provided in the final bill should be noted. The present exemption from the admissions tax of tickets selling at 90 cents or less was revised to avoid the notch problem of the suddenly high tax on tickets just over 90 cents. The new provision allows an exemption from tax for the first $1 paid for any admission. Another significant reduction was the granting of exemption from a large number of manufacturers and retail excise taxes for nonprofit educational organizations. This will eliminate the discrimination in the present law whereby public schools are able to buy various articles and services tax free while private schools must pay the tax. An additional tax exemption is the removal of the tax on club dues for certain nonprofit community swimming pools and skating rinks.

TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1958

A second major tax bill reported by the Committee on Ways and Means was H. R. 8381, the Technical Amendments Act of 1958. This bill was reported by the Committee on Ways and Means on July 9, 1957, passed the House in January 1958, the conference report on this bill was accepted by the House and Senate on August 15 of this year. The bill was approved by the President on September 2, 1958, and is Public Law 85–866. This bill was concerned primarily with correcting unintended tax benefits and hardships in income, estate, and gift taxes, some of which arose as a result of the major tax revision enacted in 1954, as well as those carried over unchanged from the 1939 code. This bill was the culmination of several years of work, first by the Subcommittee on Internal Revenue Taxation and then by the full committee.

For the most part the various provisions of the Internal Revenue Code represent a definite policy of the Congress on the question of how various business transactions should be treated. The bill, H. R. 8381, dealt with unintended benefits and hardships in the sense that it did not represent to any great extent a revision of the general policy or philosophy of the Congress with respect to the treatment of various kinds of transactions. It was concerned with situations where the language of the statute gave rise in practice to results that were not intended in the original policy. In certain areas, for example, the Congress had provided specified exceptions to loophole-closing provisions in order to accommodate ordinary business practices. It turned out in practice that some of these ordinary practices could be utilized in achieving a purpose that the Congress had sought to prevent. It became necessary then to redefine the dividing line between tax avoidance devices to be prevented and ordinary business practices that should not be encumbered with complicated tax requirements. This was the nature of provisions included in the bill dealing with such things as the depreciation of improvements on leased property, amortization of bond premium by dealers in tax-exempt securities, and the taxation of "call" proceeds on bonds originally issued at a discount.

In other respects it turned out in operation that detailed provisions of our tax laws have involved the application of some penalty provision in the case of legitimate business transactions. For this reason the bill provides new rules with respect to such things as collapsible

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

corporations, reinvestment of proceeds from the seizure or condemnation of property, and the investments of funds of pension trusts, designed to facilitate legitimate business operations.

In still other respects the bill revises the operation of the tax law in areas where it was unnecessarily complicated such as in the definition of property for purposes of computing the depletion allowances.

SMALL BUSINESS TAX ADJUSTMENT

A particularly important piece of legislation reported by the Ways and Means Committee this year was H. R. 13382, providing certain tax changes that were of importance to small business. The language of this bill, slightly modified by the Senate Finance Committee, was added on the floor of the Senate to the technical amendments bill, H. R. 8381, and was finally passed by the Congress in that form—Public Law 85–866. Two provisions of the technical amendments bill itself were of particular importance to small business so it will be useful to discuss the small business provisions en bloc.

The small business tax revision bill contained five principal provisions designed to assist small business.

First, the bill provided ordinary loss treatment—up to $25,000 or $50,000 a year in the case of a husband and wife filing a joint return—where the original holder of small-business stock sells it at a loss, subject to the qualifying conditions contained in the bill.

Second, the 2-year net operating loss carryback is extended under the bill to a 3-year carryback. The carryback of losses to the third prior year should result in refunds of taxes in the year of the loss when the taxpayer most needs the funds, rather than in a subsequent profit year.

Third, the bill permits businesses to write off 20 percent of the cost of their depreciable, tangible personal property—both new and used—in the year of acquisition, subject to the conditions contained in the bill.

Fourth, the bill increases from $60,000 to $100,000 the minimum accumulated earnings credit representing amounts which a business can accumulate over a period of years without the possibility of imposition of accumulated earnings tax.

Finally, the bill provides that where the estate of a decedent consists largely of an interest in a closely held business, the estate is to have up to 10 years for payment of the Federal estate tax.

The small-business provisions that were part of the technical amendments bill included permission for certain small corporations to be taxed in a manner similar to the taxation of partnerships and certain tax advantages for small business investment companies.

KOREAN TAX RATE EXTENSIONS—REPEAL OF TAX ON TRANSPORTATION OF PROPERTY

In both the 1st and 2d sessions of the 85th Congress, at the request of the administration, the Committee on Ways and Means took steps to extend for another year the 52-percent corporate income tax rate and certain excise tax rates on automobiles, distilled spirits, cigarettes, wine and beer, known as the Korean tax rates.

In the rate extension bill in the 2d session of the 85th Congress, there was included a provision repealing the tax on the transportation of freight including the special taxes on the transportation of coal and the transportation of oil by pipeline—Public Law 85–475. This particular excise tax on the transportation of property has been more widely criticized than any excise tax since it discriminated against areas of the country removed from the centers of population, and against companies too small to afford their own truck fleets, and it was generally regressive in its impact. This repeal involved a revenue loss in the fiscal year 1960 of approximately $450 million.

MISCELLANEOUS

In January of 1958 the Ways and Means Committee reported, and the House passed, H. R. 10021, that would extend for another year the system of taxing the income of life-insurance companies that was provided in 1955—Public Law 85–345. Hearings on the subject of life insurance company taxation beginning November 17 will be held by the Subcommittee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

H. R. 10, a bill to provide that self-employed individuals may exclude from taxable income amounts set aside in certain approved investment plans, in trusts or in insurance polices for the purpose of providing retirement income was reported and passed by the House. No action has been taken by the Senate on this bill.

H. R. 5551, as reported by the committee, would have permitted the deduction from gross income of a limited amount of railroad retirement tax paid by railroad employees. The bill was not reached on the House schedule prior to adjournment.

2. MINOR TAX BILLS

In addition to the major tax bills discussed above, there were a number of less comprehensive but important bills reported by the Committee on Ways and Means during the 85th Congress amending the tax laws, which are summarized below:

H. R. 17, by Mr. FORAND; passed House August 5, 1957: As amended by the committee in reporting this bill favorably to the House, it would reduce from 20 to 10 percent the tax imposed with respect to roof gardens, cabarets, and similar establishments. Testimony and statistics presented to the committee indicated that the discriminatorily high rate of the cabaret tax—almost all other ad valorem excise taxes do not exceed the rate of 10 percent—is a significant contributing factor to the existing serious decline in the level of employment of musicians and other entertainers. An estimated revenue loss of $21 million is anticipated from enactment of this legislation. The bill passed the House as reported by the committee.

H. R. 232, by Mr. IKARD; Public Law 85–165, signed August 26, 1957: This bill provides that a taxpayer who receives or accrues an award in a civil action for breach of contract, or breach of fiduciary duty, and so forth, may spread the amount of the award over the period during which it would have been received, except for the breach, if this results in a lesser tax than would result from including the entire award in gross income of the current year. Under existing law, averaging of certain receipts, such as those from back pay, and so forth, is permitted, but in the case of a breach of contract, and so forth, the injured party may receive a judicial award for the loss of income which would ordinarily be received over a period of years but is required to include the amount of the total award in gross income for the year in which the award is received. It follows that this frequently results in a substantially higher tax than would be imposed if the taxpayer had received the equivalent income spread over the period in which the breach occurred. Provision is also made for the allowance of all credits or deductions the taxpayer would have received had he received the income in the absence of a breach of contract or fiduciary relationship, and so forth. The Senate amended the bill by adding a provision which severely restricts the authority of the Office of Defense Mobilization to issue certificates for rapid amortization of emergency facilities. Under the provisions of the amendment, certificates for 5-year amortization can be issued after August 22, 1957, only for new or specialized defense facilities, as therein defined, and for research and development facilities for defense. The authority to issue these certificates is terminated completely after December 31, 1959.

H. R. 731, by Mr. KEOGH; passed House August 15, 1958: This bill provides relief in the case of amounts left by an estate to United States charities where there is a foreign or State death tax imposed upon the transfer to charity. This is accomplished by allowing a deduction for estate-tax purposes for foreign death taxes imposed and paid on charitable bequests if, first, the property on which the tax is imposed is situated in the foreign country and included in the gross estate of a citizen or resident of the United States, and, second, if the decrease in estate tax resulting from the deduction inures solely to the benefit of public, charitable, or religious transferees or if the entire Federal estate tax is to be equitably apportioned among all of the transferees of the decedent which received property included in the gross estate. Where this deduction is allowed, no credit against the estate tax is to be available for the foreign taxes which are deducted. The provision is effective with respect to the estates of decedents dying after the date of enactment.

H. R. 2391, by Mr. BAKER; passed House August 16, 1957: This bill would allow a deduction to taxpayers for percentage depletion on income from sand and gravel extracted from navigable waters, if the taxpayer extracts the sand and gravel under a permit from or with the permission of the United States. The deduction is to be available for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1956. Under present law, there is a 5-percent allowance for depletion of sand and gravel deposits, but the Internal Revenue

Service has ruled that this deduction is not available to taxpayers who dredge sand and gravel from the bed of a navigable river under a permit from the Federal Government on the basis that such taxpayers do not have an economic interest in the deposit.

H. R. 4952, by Mr. SIMPSON; passed House August 16, 1957: This bill amends the foreign tax credit provisions of both the 1939 and the 1954 code by providing that a United States recipient of a royalty for the use of copyrights, patents, and other similar properties derived from sources within the United Kingdom is to be deemed, for foreign tax credit purposes, to have paid any income, war profits, or excess-profits taxes paid to the United Kingdom with respect to such royalty, provided the recipient elects to include in its gross income the amount of such United Kingdom tax. Under the tax laws of the United Kingdom, royalties and dividends paid by British corporations are treated as advance payments of the tax of the shareholder or royalty recipient. Where recipients of such dividends or royalties are subject to the income taxes imposed by the United Kingdom, they are taxed on the gross amounts of the dividends or royalties and are considered to have paid the tax on the dividends or royalties previously collected from the payer of the dividend, and so forth. The United States Supreme Court did not accept this concept as to who was the taxpayer of this British tax where the United States citizens or residents were involved. To prevent double taxation, a tax convention was entered into with the United Kingdom for taxable years beginning on or after January 1, 1945, which provides that British corporate taxes on dividends paid to United States shareholders are considered to have been paid by the shareholder. This convention overcomes the effect of the United States Supreme Court decisions and allows a foreign tax credit for the taxes paid. The same convention provides that royalties paid by a British corporation to a United States recipient are not subject to the British corporate tax unless the recipient has a permanent business establishment in the United Kingdom. However, where a United States royalty recipient has a permanent business establishment in the United Kingdom, no relief from double taxation is available under the income-tax convention and, as a result, royalties are reduced by British corporate taxes and the royalty recipient is not entitled to a foreign tax credit as a result of the United States Supreme Court decisions. This bill gives United States royalty recipients who have permanent business establishments in the United Kingdom the same relief accorded to dividend recipients under the income-tax convention.

The provisions of this bill are embodied in section 111 of H. R. 8381—Public Law 85-866.

H. R. 5520, by Mr. COOPER; Public Law 85-17, signed April 20, 1957: This bill, as passed by the House, increases the maximum permissible interest rate on savings bonds and certificates held to maturity from 3 percent to 3½ percent a year. It also authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to increase the yield on savings bonds and certificates with an issue date of February 1, 1957, or later, as well authorizing him to increase the maximum interest rate on series E savings bonds maturing on February 1, 1957, or later, which the holder retains for an extension period of not more than 10 years beyond maturity, with certain restrictions. The need for this legislation was based on the fact that since May 1, 1952, when the Treasury Department raised the investment yield on savings bonds held to maturity to the maximum permitted by statute, this rate has necessarily remained stationary. However, the rates of return on most other forms of investment had risen sharply since that time placing savings bonds in a relatively unfavorable position. Thus, the effect of this bill was to permit the Treasury Department to restore the competitive position of savings bonds with other comparable forms of saving without causing any significant change in the present distribution of investments. The Senate amended the bill so as to reduce the maximum permissible interest rate from 3½ percent contained in the House-passed bill to 3.26 percent and it is this rate which became public law. This legislation was introduced at the request of the administration.

H. R. 5551, by Mr. MCCARTHY; reported to House July 30, 1958: This bill, as introduced, would exclude from taxable income, taxes imposed upon employees under the social-security, railroad retirement, and civil-service retirement systems. The bill, as reported to the House by the committee, was amended so as to permit the deduction from gross income, for Federal income-tax purposes, of a limited amount of railroad retirement tax paid by railroad employees. The amount of the deduction would be limited to an amount by which the railroad retirement tax exceeds 3 percent but may not exceed in any case $200 per year. The deduction is only allowable with respect to wages paid to railroad employees after June 30, 1959, for services after that date. The maximum tax benefit to a railroad employee who earns at least $4,200 at the first bracket income-tax rate of 20 percent would be $27.30 per year.

H. R. 5658, by Mr. FORAND; passed House July 31, 1957: This bill removes aromatic cachous from the application of the 10-percent excise tax on toilet preparations. The committee believed that aromatic cachous should not be taxed as toilet preparations since they are more nearly like mouthwashes and candied mints than like the externally applied toilet preparations to which the tax applies. The tax also places them at a competitive disadvantage with nontaxed articles purchased for similar use. In addition, they are usually sold in candy stores, and so forth, and other shops which do not handle other articles subject to the toilet-preparations tax.

H. R. 5804, by Mr. BENTLEY; passed House August 15, 1958: This bill extends 2 years after 1954 a provision of the 1939 code relating to persons who have been mentally incompetent since September 30, 1947, and who remain so until the date of their death. The bill also provides that any powers such persons have at the date of their death to change beneficiaries of a certain type of trust they have created are not to result in such property being included in their gross estate for estate-tax purposes. Under existing law, a decedent's gross estate includes all trust property in which he has a discretionary power even if the decedent was mentally incompetent 3 months or more before December 31, 1947, and continued to be so to the date of his death, so long as the date of his death is after August 16, 1954.

H. R. 5938, by Mr. KING; Public Law 85-318, signed February 11, 1958: This bill deals with the application of the marital deduction in the case of decedents who were adjudged incompetent before April 2, 1948, and were not restored to competency before their death. Under the provisions of the 1939 code, a marital deduction is provided for estate-tax purposes with respect to interests in property passing to a surviving husband or wife, but where the spouse's interest is terminable or may fail to pass to the spouse, the marital deduction is available only if the termination of the interest or the failure of the interest to pass occurs within the 6 months immediately after the decedent's death, or as the result of a common disaster resulting in the death of both husband and wife. This bill adds another exception in the case of terminable interests passing to a surviving spouse where the event which could terminate the interest becomes impossible of occurrence within 6 months of the decedent's death. This exception is available only in the case of decedents adjudged incompetent before April 2, 1948, who were not restored to competency before their death. April 2, 1948, represents the effective date of the act originally providing the marital deduction.

H. R. 6745, by Mr. EBERHARTER; reported to the House February 13, 1958: This bill provides for the withholding by the Federal Government from wages of Federal employees of income taxes imposed by certain municipalities if the municipality has a population according to the most recent decennial census of 75,000 or more. Existing law provides for the withholding by the Federal Government of State or Territorial taxes collected through withholding. This bill represents a further extension of that provision since, like the State and Territorial governments, the cities have cooperated with the Federal Government with respect to fiscal matters generally and also withhold Federal income taxes from compensation paid their employees. The bill restricts this withholding to cities with populations of 75,000 or more in order to limit the administrative burden being assumed by the Federal Government.

H. R. 7628, by Mr. MASON; reported to the House August 29, 1957: This bill provides for the extension of involuntary conversion tax treatment to property which is disposed of as a result of civil antitrust proceedings instituted by the Attorney General under the Sherman

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Act or the Clayton Act where none of the defendants in the civil action have been named as defendants in criminal proceedings because of the acts complained of in the civil action. As in the case of other involuntary conversions, any proceeds received from the property sold or otherwise disposed of solely as a result of certain specified antitrust proceedings are not to result in taxable gain to the extent the taxpayer replaces the property converted with other property similar or related in service or use to the property so converted, or purchases stock in the acquisition or control of a corporation owning such other property. The newly acquired property, however, must be a type of reinvestment which is in accord with the terms of the consent agreement or court decree.

H. R. 7670, by Mr. EBERHARTER; passed House August 15, 1958: This bill provides that income-tax exemption is not to be denied a social club simply because it is also a benevolent life-insurance association of a purely local character—which are themselves tax exempt. It had been brought to the attention of the committee that there are some organizations which carry on the activities of both a social club and a benevolent life-insurance association. In such cases, present law prohibits tax exemption of the organization as a social club. The bill provides that no part of the income of the club which is attributable to its operations as a benevolent life-insurance association can be used for the recreational, pleasure, or other nonprofitable purposes for which the club is also organized. It also provides that no club dues tax will be assessed with respect to amounts paid by the members which are attributable to its activities as a benevolent life-insurance association.

H. R. 7762, by Mr. JONAS; Public Law 85–319, approved February 11, 1958: As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill, which became law without further amendment, makes applicable to taxable years ending in 1954 a rule dealing with personal holding company income. The rule, which provides that personal holding company income does not include rents for the use of property of a corporation where the lessee uses the property in the operation of a bona fide commercial, industrial, or mining enterprise, was made applicable to years beginning after December 31, 1953, and ending after August 16, 1954, in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and equivalent treatment provided in the 1939 code was extended by Public Law 370 of the 84th Congress to taxable years ending before January 1, 1954. Through an oversight, this law was not made applicable to years ending after December 31, 1953, which were not covered by the 1954 code. The bill H. R. 7762 was designed to correct this oversight.

H. R. 7954, by Mr. COOPER; Public Law 85–74, approved June 29, 1957: This bill amended section 4263 (e) of the Internal Revenue Code to set the mileage rate limit at 2.5 cents per mile on fares eligible for the exemption from tax on transportation of persons provided for service personnel traveling in uniform of the United States at their own expense while on official leave. The legislation was made necessary by the increase in rail tariffs which became effective July 1, 1957, and would have rendered the existing exemption from tax for such travel ineffectual if the mileage rate limit were not raised. The committee felt the continuance of this tax relief to be highly desirable. The bill became law without amendment.

H. R. 8102, by Mr. CURTIS of Missouri; reported to House July 31, 1957: As reported by the committee, this bill would provide substantially the same tax treatment for real estate investment trusts as present law provides for regulated investment companies, with the tax treatment provided being limited to what are clearly passive real estate investments—as contrasted to active operation of businesses involving real estate. This would have the effect of eliminating the corporate tax on certain real estate investment trusts which distribute substantially all of their earnings to shareholders, the distributed earnings thus being taxed only to the shareholders. The committee was of the opinion that equality of tax treatment between the beneficiaries of real estate investment trusts and the shareholders of regulated investment companies is desirable, since in both cases the methods of investment constitute pooling arrangements whereby small investors can secure advantages normally available only to those with larger resources. It was also believed desirable to remove, as much as possible, taxation as a factor in determining the size of investments in stocks and securities on the one hand and real estate equities on the other, particularly at a time when there is a nationwide shortage of private capital and mortgage money for individual homes, office buildings, factories, and so forth. Although the provisions of this bill were adopted as an amendment to another bill in the Senate, H. R. 8381, the provision was deleted in conference.

H. R. 8216, by Mr. COOPER; Public Law 85–323, approved February 11, 1958: This bill provided that refunds of alcohol and tobacco taxes cannot be made to persons who have not borne the burden of the tax or cannot show that they have paid the refund over to the person who has borne the ultimate burden of the tax. These provisions already existed in most cases with regard to manufacturers and retailers excise taxes. Until recently there appeared to be no special need for these restrictions in the case of alcohol and tobacco taxes, but recent developments have made desirable their enactment in order to prevent the unjust enrichment of taxpayers who have shifted the burden of the tax to someone else. Adoption of this legislation was urged by the Treasury Department. Amendments were adopted in the Senate relating to the effective date.

H. R. 8268, by Mr. MCCORMACK; Public Law 85–367, signed April 7, 1958: This bill redefines the term "unrelated business taxable income" contained in the 1954 code so as to accord the same tax treatment for income distributed with respect to limited partnership interests held by certain testamentary charitable trusts as is presently accorded income derived from dividends received by such trusts. The bill, as amended by the committee, excludes from the definition of unrelated business taxable income the income derived from a limited partnership interest only to the extent that the income attributable to such interest is actually distributed. The bill provides limitations which assure that the new exclusion will apply only to passive income derived from a limited partnership interest and then only to the extent that such income is distributed by the trust to charitable organizations. Additional limitations are provided to assure that the exclusion will be reduced to the extent that the charitable trust makes a capital distribution to the partnership from amounts distributed to the trust by the partnership.

H. R. 8560, by Mr. MCCARTHY; passed House July 31, 1957: This bill would remove the manufacturers' excise tax on children's phonograph records selling for 25 cents or less. At the present time the tax on phonograph records applies to all such records, regardless of price or purpose for which sold. The committee was advised that records selling for 25 cents or less are primarily designed for children. It has already been provided by law that the excise tax on sporting goods shall not apply to specific sizes or types or articles used predominantly by children, and the committee concluded that a similar provision should apply in the case of phonograph records. The anticipated revenue loss was estimated to be negligible.

H. R. 8628, Mr. SADLAK; passed House July 31, 1957: The purpose of this bill is to permit a taxpayer to make appropriate adjustment in his last-in and first-out LIFO inventories for abnormal conditions induced by wartime shortages without requiring such taxpayer to take such adjustments into account with respect to his Korean war excess-profits tax liability. The amendment proposed by this bill is necessitated by the interrelationship between the section of the 1954 code relating to involuntary liquidations of last-in first-out LIFO inventories and a section of the 1939 code relating to an excess-profits tax base for the 1950 excess profits tax, which may operate to deprive taxpayers of the relief which was intended to be afforded to them upon the replacement of an involuntarily liquidated LIFO inventory or to deny them the use of the special average base period net income provided by the 1950 Excess-Profits Tax Act. Thus by the provisions of this bill the average base period net income of companies preserving defense capacity and increasing capacity for manufacturing peacetime products from certain strategic and critical metals would not be reduced because of subsequent expenses for the replacement of liquidated inventory.

H. R. 8794, by Mr. CURTIS of Missouri; Public Law 85–380, approved April 16, 1958: This bill exempted from the excise tax on admissions certain musical performances conducted by nonprofit civic or community associations. This is accomplished by substituting the words "musical performances" for the word

"concerts" in the language of the already existing law providing exemptions from admissions tax for performances by symphony orchestras, bands, and so forth, thus making possible the exemption from tax of musical comedies and reviews conducted by such nonprofit associations. The committee felt there was no justification in exempting, for example, a light opera but subjecting to tax a musical comedy or review presented by the same organization at its next performance. This bill was amended in the Senate to: First, provide an exemption from admissions tax in the case of athletic games or exhibitions between school teams where the proceeds are divided between the educational institutions involved and hospitals for crippled children; and, second, provide an exemption for such games or exhibitions where the proceeds inure to tax-exempt organizations operated for the purpose of benefiting retarded children. The House accepted the Senate amendments.

H. R. 8865, by Mr. COOPER; Public Law 85-321, approved February 11, 1958: This bill was designed to secure greater compliance with present law on the part of employers and others in paying over to the Government trust fund withheld tax moneys such as income, social security and retailers taxes. It provides, in general, for penalties to insure that employers who withhold income or social security taxes or who collect excise taxes shall pay such moneys into the Treasury. The committee was advised that as of December 31, 1956, the delinquent withheld income and social security taxes alone amounted to $279 million. This legislation was designed to prevent further occurrence of this kind of delinquency. The bill became law as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 8881, by Mr. REED; passed House August 16, 1957: This bill amends the marital deduction provisions of the 1939 code to conform them with the more realistic rules of the 1954 code with respect to certain property left in a life estate with a power of appointment between 1948 and 1954. The provisions of both the 1939 code and the 1954 code provide a marital deduction in computing the gross estate of a decedent if the decedent's surviving spouse has a right to the income of the property forming the basis of the gift for life, with a general power of appointment. Unlike the 1954 code, the 1939 code required that in such cases the property be placed in trust. Because of doubt as to what constituted a trust under the laws of the various States, it was not clear that a legal life estate qualifies as a trust in all jurisdictions. It was also not clear when, where property was placed in trust and the surviving spouse given an interest in and power of appointment over part of the property, the interest given constituted a transfer in trust qualifying for the marital deduction. For these reasons, a section was incorporated in the 1954 code to provide that property in a legal life estate, as well as property in trust, qualifies for the marital deduction, and also that a right to income coupled with a general power of appointment over a part of the property forming the basis of the gift, qualifies for the marital deduction. The rules provided in the 1954 code are, by the provisions of this bill, incorporated in the 1939 code.

A provision similar to H. R. 8881 is embodied in section 99 of H. R. 8381—Public Law 85-866.

H. R. 8887, by Mr. FORAND; passed House September 16, 1957: Under the provisions of the 1939 code a deduction is provided in computing estate tax, as distinguished from a credit, for the value of property left to a decedent within 5 years of his death if such property had been taxed as a part of the estate of the donor-decedent or had been subject to gift tax. Because of difficulties presented by the interrelationship of certain sections of the 1939 code no deduction for prior-taxed property was allowed to the extent that property in question exceeded 50 percent of the decedent's estate and had been acquired from the decedent's spouse. As a result, double taxation resulted where more than 50 percent of the decedent's estate was acquired from his spouse, because no marital deduction had been allowed to the extent of the excess over 50 percent. To eliminate this double taxation, a section of the 1954 code provided a credit, which was later extended to estates of decedents dying after December 31, 1951, and before August 16, 1954, by Public Law 417, 84th Congress. This bill would extend the treatment provided by Public Law 417 to the estates of decedents dying after December 31, 1949, by making the credit available where the deaths of the husband and wife occurred within 3 years of each other but after December 31, 1947, and by providing that, where the deaths of the husband and wife occurred more than 2 years apart, the credit for prior estate taxes would be 80 percent instead of 100 percent.

H. R. 8960, by Mr. KEOGH; passed House August 16, 1957: This bill would exclude from the definition of personal holding income for tax purposes the income from certain music royalties received by publishing corporations. The exclusion would be available only where other personal holding company income does not constitute more than 5 percent of the gross income of the company, and only if the copyright royalties constitute 50 percent or more of the gross income. Recent trends have shifted the source of income of music publishing companies from the sale of sheet music to royalty income. Substantial expenses for advertising and promotion are usually necessary in order to secure the success of musical compositions. In general, the publishing companies are operating companies, rather than passive in nature, and should not be subject to the personal holding company tax because of this shift in source of income. The bill contains safeguarding provisions.

H. R. 9035, by Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania; Public Law 85-320, signed February 11, 1958: This bill amends the 1954 code so as to provide substantially the same treatment for stock options held by an employee at the time of his death as was previously provided in the case of stock options exercised by the employee prior to his death. Generally, the bill provides that where an option is held by an employee at the time of his death, it will receive a stepped-up basis for determining gain or loss for purposes of the income tax. The new basis of the option provided by this measure will reflect the spread between the option price and the value of the stock at the date of the death of the employee or the optional valuation date. The law prior to the enactment of this bill failed to provide such a stepped-up basis for options held and unexercised at the date of the employee's death. This legislation removed this inequity.

H. R. 9049, by Mr. BOGGS; passed House August 16, 1957: This bill permits pension trusts under certain conditions to purchase unsecured debentures of the employer. The provisions of existing law denied income tax exemption to employee pension, profit-sharing, and stock-bonus trusts—among other tax-exempt organizations—unless any loans made to employers are adequately secured. This limitation worked a hardship on unincorporated stock brokerage firms, which are prohibited under other provisions of law from pledging any of their registered securities as collateral for employee-trust loans. In many cases the assets of the brokerage firm consist almost entirely of assets falling in these restricted categories. Thus these firms find it difficult to borrow funds from their employees' pension, profit-sharing and stock-bonus trusts, even though this is advantageous to the employees' trusts. This legislation was designed, with adequate safeguarding provisions, to rectify this discrimination. The provisions of this bill were incorporated, in substance, in the Technical Amendments Act of 1958—H. R. 8381, Public Law 85-866—in the Senate and were in that bill as it was approved by the President.

H. R. 9057, by Mr. HERLONG; reported to House August 21, 1957: This bill, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, would provide 5-year amortization treatment for housing facilities constructed for migrant farmworkers. The committee decided upon this action because of the serious shortage of existing housing facilities for such farmworkers and their families, as well as the inadequacy of the facilities that are in existence, and because it is believed preferable that this shortage be made up by construction by private industry rather than by the Government. Similar treatment has been accorded in the past for the construction of other types of facilities where shortages existed.

H. R. 10239, by Mr. KEOGH; passed House August 15, 1958: As reported by the committee, this bill would suspend through June 30, 1960, the 3 cents per pound tax imposed on the first domestic processing of palm oil, palm kernel oil, and fatty acids or salts derived therefrom. This action was taken to restore the competitive balance between these oils and coconut and babassu oils, the first domestic processing tax on coconut oil having been suspended by Public Law 85-235—approved August 30, 1957—and no processing tax being imposed on babassu oil. Palm oil and palm kernel

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

oil are used for the same general purposes as coconut and babassu oils and the action of last year placed them at a competitive disadvantage.

H. R. 13130, by Mr. MILLS; Public Law 85–517, approved July 11, 1958: This bill extended for 2 years, to July 11, 1960, the existing authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to authorize transfers of distilled spirits between plants and warehouses where it is deemed desirable for national defense. The committee was advised that termination of these provisions would have a disrupting effect upon industry operations and create administrative problems for the Government; moreover, while part of the authority under this provision is not being used at the present time, need for such authority could arise on short notice in the case of a national defense emergency. This legislation, which was enacted into law without amendment, was approved by the Treasury Department.

H. R. 13173, by Mr. MCCORMACK; passed House August 8, 1958: As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill provides that the period of limitations for filing a claim for credit or refund of overpayment of taxes where a net operating loss carryback results from the elimination of excessive profits by renegotiation is not to expire before the 12th month after the month in which the agreement or order for the elimination of the excessive profits becomes final. The committee was advised that, while the period for filing a claim in most cases provides adequate time, there is a type of case where the taxpayer may not be in a position to know that he is eligible for a credit or refund before the expiration of the period of limitations. In such cases, this has the result of the Government, through renegotiation, taking money away from the taxpayer on one hand, and even though this decreases his tax liability, denying him an opportunity to obtain a credit or refund. The committee believed this to be unfair and unintended. As reported by the committee, the bill would apply only in cases where it was the renegotiation which made the renegotiated year a loss year.

B. GENERAL FISCAL, AND OTHER LEGISLATION

1. DEBT LIMIT

In the field of general fiscal legislation, the Committee on Ways and Means twice during 1958, at the request of the administration, raised the debt limit of the United States. In January of 1958 the committee reported the bill, H. R. 9955, which provided that the permanent $275 billion debt ceiling would be raised temporarily by $5 billion—to $280 billion, effective through July 1959. This action was taken on the basis of the administration's estimates in the January budget that the budget would be approximately balanced in fiscal years 1958 and 1959. The purpose of the debt ceiling increase enacted at that time was to assure the Treasury of an adequate margin of working balance to deal with the irregular flow of revenues into the Treasury during the year and to provide additional borrowing capacity for flexible debt management. At the time this temporary increase in the debt ceiling was enacted, the Treasury was within $1 billion of the permanent debt ceiling and was operating with an imprudently low cash balance.

The sharp turndown of tax collections and the increase of expenditures in the first half of 1958 made it clear that instead of a balanced budget for the fiscal year 1959 there would be a very substantial deficit which has been estimated close to $12 billion. In view of this situation, the committee reported H. R. 13580, which further raised the debt ceiling. As reported by the committee, this bill raised the permanent debt ceiling from $275 billion to $285 billion, and in addition provided that until June 1960 the debt ceiling would be temporarily increased by $3 billion, $288 billion. The bill, as acted on in the Senate, provided that the existing permanent debt limit be raised from $275 billion to $283 billion. The temporary increase under present law of $5 billion continues through June 30, 1959. The House concurred in the Senate amendments. The bill was approved by the President on September 2, 1958 and is Public Law 85–912.

2. RENEGOTIATION ACT

The committee reported H. R. 11749, to extend the renegotiation authority under the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for a 6-month period, to June 30, 1959, as well as to provide 2 substantive amendments to the renegotiation law which were recommended by the administration. The President has requested, and the Department of Defense has recommended, the extension of renegotiation. Defense expenditures are greater in amount than ever before in peacetime history, and past production and cost experience in the manufacture of new and experimental weapons in the aircraft, missile, and space fields are not necessarily satisfactory for setting proper prices and avoiding excessive profits. These factors make the continuation of renegotiations expedient. The committee limited the continuation to 6 months because it intends to undertake a broad review of the entire subject of renegotiation early in the next Congress. The two substantive amendments provide for, first, the addition of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to the departments whose contracts are subject to the provisions of the renegotiation law; and second, the judicial review of decisions of the Tax Court in renegotiation cases in the court of appeals. This second amendment was stricken from the bill by the Senate Finance Committee. The House concurred in the Senate amendments. The bill was approved by the President on September 6, 1958, and is Public Law 85–930.

3. INTEREST RATE ON SAVINGS BONDS

During the first session, the committee favorably reported H. R. 5520, which was designed to increase the maximum permissible interest rate on savings bonds and savings certificates. The Secretary of the Treasury, under the bill, was given discretionary authority to raise the interest rate on series E savings bonds, maturing on February 1, 1957, or later which the holder retained for an extension period of not more than 10 years beyond their maturity dates, from 3 percent to 3.26 percent. This bill was approved by the President on April 20, 1957, and as a consequence the interest rate on savings bonds has been increased. This legislation was and is quite important to the millions of individuals who purchase and hold series E savings bonds and will permit our individual citizens to continue to participate in this vitally important savings program at a rate of interest commensurate with that which is paid on other forms of similar investments.

C. CUSTOMS AND TARIFF LEGISLATION

1. MAJOR BILLS

During the 2d session of the 85th Congress the Committee on Ways and Means considered and took action on a number of bills relating to customs and tariff matters. The principal measure in this area was H. R. 12591, the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958. The Trade Agreements Act has, since 1934, been the principal instrument of United States foreign trade policy and the measure under which the tariff system of the United States has been modified in consideration of elimination of certain trade barriers of foreign countries. The last extension of the trade agreements legislation took place in 1955 and was for a period of 3 years. The extension this year was the 11th one in the history of the trade-agreements program and is regarded as the most critical extension thus far. Because of the immense responsibility imposed upon the Committee on Ways and Means in connection with this legislation the committee held extensive hearings which provided an opportunity for all interested individuals and organizations who desired to be heard to appear before the committee. In addition the committee spent several consecutive weeks in a study of the legislation and its perfection in executive session. As a result the legislation was approved by the House by a vote of 317 to 98. The bill as passed by the House was modified by the Senate and the difference between the two versions were resolved in conference. The conference report was agreed to by both Houses. As approved by the Congress the legislation contains the following important provisions:

First. It provides for an extension until July 1, 1962, of the President's authority to enter into trade agreements. This is the longest extension in the history of the trade-agreements program. The extension for a 4-year period was designed to make possible the negotiation of a trade agreement with the European Common Market and free trade area countries.

Second. The President was authorized to negotiate reductions in duties by 1 of 3 alternatives: (a) a reduction by 20 percent; (b) reduction by 2 percentage points; and (c) a reduction to a rate of 50 percent ad valorem. The legislation specified that any of the reductions made must go into effect in stages and within a 4-year period immediately after the expiration of the 4-year period within which the President may negotiate trade

agreements. The authority provided under this extension was greater than that provided for in the 1955 extension act.

Third. The national security provisions were completely rewritten by the committee to define the standards that should apply in its application and to provide procedures. Additional standards and procedural refinements were added by the Senate and incorporated in the bill.

Fourth. The escape clause provisions in the existing legislation were modified in several respects. A procedure was established whereby the Congress can, by the adoption of a concurrent resolution requiring a two-thirds vote of both Houses, under privileged status, override Presidential disapproval of the Tariff Commission's recommendation. In addition the period of time within which the Commission is obliged to complete its escape clause investigations was reduced from 9 months to 6 months. Another modification of the escape clause provision provided that with respect to items bound on the free list and which have been the subject of a successful escape clause application, the President may impose a duty not to exceed 50 percent ad valorem.

Fifth. The peril point provision was also modified in several respects. The time allotted to the Tariff Commission to make its peril point investigations was increased from 120 days to 6 months. The peril point procedure was also modified to provide that in those instances in which the Commission finds under the peril point that an existing rate of duty is inadequate to prevent serious injury, an escape clause investigation should be instituted without delay.

The above are the principal provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958. They provide for an effective continuation of the trade agreements program while at the same time perfecting the safeguarding provisions of the law in a manner consistent with the basic principles of the trade agreements program.

The bill amending the Antidumping Act of 1921 as amended, H. R. 6006, which passed the House in the 1st session of the 85th Congress, and which was more fully described in the report of activities of the 1st session, was passed by the Senate during the 2d session. The Senate adopted two amedments relating to the determination of injury by the Tariff Commission and the House concurred in one of these amendments which provides that if the Tariff Commission is evenly divided as to whether its determination as to injury shall be in the affirmative or in the negative, that that shall constitute an affirmative determination. The bill so modified was approved by both Houses.

The Subcommittee on Foreign Trade Policy of the committee, under the chairmanship of the Honorable HALE BOGGS, continued its studies during the adjournment period of the 1st session and into the 2d session. The subcommittee collected and published a 1,157-page compendium of papers contributed by approximately 60 experts in the field of foreign trade policy, and covering a wide range of issues. In December 1957 the subcommittee held 2 weeks of panel discussions on the subject matter of the compendium and published the record of these deliberations.

2. MINOR BILLS

In addition to foregoing major measures, the committee favorably reported a number of bills on customs and tariff matters, which, while for the most part of a relatively minor nature, all will contribute to the fostering of good will and in varying degrees will be of assistance to the citizenry of our country and to our domestic industries.

First, there were several bills reported by the committee, most of which were enacted into law, which provide for the exemption from or suspension, either temporary or permanent, of duties on the importation of various types and categories of materials. These included:

H. R. 38, by Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin; Public Law 85-257, approved September 2, 1957:

This bill, which was enacted into law without amendment, provides for the temporary free importation—until March 31, 1960—of casein or lactarene, and mixtures of which either is the component material of chief value. Useful as a raw material to the domestic coated-paper industry, and to the domestic building-supply industry in the production of water-resistant glue, the various executive departments brought out evidence indicating that the elimination of duty on this item probably would result in a reduction in price of imported casein to the domestic consumer without injury to the domestic production industry—which consists almost entirely of edible casein whereas imports consist almost entirely of inedible casein—and in the long run would be of general economic benefit as well as eventual benefit to the domestic industry.

H. R. 274, by Mr. KEATING; passed House August 15, 1958: This bill was reported unanimously to the House on August 8, 1958, and provides for the temporary free entry of religious sceneramas and other articles imported for exhibition by religious societies or institutions. Under the bill, articles so entered would have to be exported or destroyed under customs supervision within a maximum period of 3 years, or the importer would be liable to liquidated damages under the terms of his bond.

H. R. 776, by Mr. MACHROWICZ; Public Law 85-379, approved April 16, 1958: As it became public law, this bill provides for the temporary free importation of automobiles and parts of automobiles when intended solely for show purposes. Section 308 of the Tariff Act provides for the free importation of various categories of articles not intended for sale or for sale on approval, under bond conditioned upon their exportation within certain time limitations. As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, automobiles and automobile parts would have been included in this section of the Tariff Act under the same safeguarding provisions applicable to the other categories already contained therein; however, as the Senate Finance Committee amended the bill and as it became public law, a time limit of 6 months on any one shipment is provided, and the privilege is also conditioned upon substantially reciprocal privileges being allowed by the exporting country in respect of similar imports to such country from the United States.

H. R. 1126, by Mr. FASCELL; Public Law 85-410, approved May 16, 1958: This bill, which became public law in the form in which it was reported by the committee, was designed to eliminate the difficulty previously encountered with regard to the dutiable status of imported old and obsolete revolvers and muzzle-loading pistols. The bill included on the duty-free list all firearms of obsolete ignition, incapable of using a fixed cartridge or fixed shotgun shell. The committee was advised that all types of obsolete firearms are equally sought by gun collectors as a hobby and for their historical significance, and it appeared to be inconsistent that some should be imported duty free while others were subjected to duty. The committee was also advised that the subject articles would not be competitive with current models.

H. R. 2151, by Mr. HARRISON of Virginia; Public Law 85-418, approved May 19, 1958: This bill, as reported by the committee, would have suspended the import duties on certain coarse wools imported under bond for use in the manufacture of rugs and carpets, and certain other products, for a period of 3 years. The committee was advised that this legislation was needed in order to enable the domestic carpet industry to obtain added supplies of imported coarse wools at competitive world prices so it could compete more successfully with foreign producers of carpets in the American market. The Senate Finance Committee, however, amended the bill to provide that the suspension of duties would end at the close of June 30, 1960, a period of slightly over 2 years. The Senate committee also amended the bill to provide an extension of time to January 1, 1958—from March 1, 1958—for the submission of the report of the United States Tariff Commission on its comprehensive study of tariff classification laws pursuant to section 101 of the Customs Simplification Act of 1954, as amended. This extension of time has been requested by the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission. The House accepted the amendments of the Senate.

H. R. 2783, by Mr. BENTLEY; reported in Senate April 28, 1958: The committee bill would have transferred amorphous graphite or plumbago, crude or refined from the dutiable list to the free list, for tariff purposes. The committee was advised that the United States has long been dependent on imports for nearly all of its requirements of natural amorphous graphite and that it is among the materials listed as strategic and critical for stockpiling purposes by the Federal Government. The Senate Finance Committee amended the bill to provide a temporary period of free importation—to June 30, 1960—in reporting the bill to the Senate.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

H. R. 2842, by Mr. VAN PELT; Public Law 85–235, approved August 30, 1957: As reported by the committee, this bill provided for a 3-year suspension of duty on imports of tanning material extracts. The Senate Finance Committee reported the House bill without amendment, but a provision was added on the Senate floor which suspended to June 30, 1960, the 3-cent processing tax on coconut oil. The Senate amendment was accepted by the House.

H. R. 4686, by Mr. MCCARTHY; Public Law 85–87, approved April 25, 1957; and H. R. 10015, by Mr. MCCARTHY; Public Law 85–453, approved June 11, 1958: These two bills were enacted to continue temporarily the suspension of duties on metal scrap, the first to June 30, 1958, the second to June 30, 1959. The exclusions from the application of the suspension of duties already existing in the law were continued in both bills, and the Senate Finance Committee added a further provision to H. R. 10015—which the House accepted—that primary or virgin nonferrous metal in pig, ingot, or billet form, would not be included in the duty-free provisions of the bill. The committee was informed by the executive branch that the types of metal scrap affected by this legislation are in short supply, and in some cases imports of metal scrap represent important sources of the metals involved.

H. R. 5005, by Mr. BOGGS; Public Law 85–378, approved April 16, 1958: As this bill became law, it provides for a 2-year suspension of duties on the importation of crude chicory and a 2-year reduction in duty on ground or otherwise prepared chickory to 2 cents per pound. The House bill would have provided a permanent rate of 2 cents per pound on ground or otherwise prepared chicory. The Committee on Ways and Means was advised that this legislation would be of material assistance to domestic producers of ground chicory, as well as being of benefit to American consumers of chicory.

H. R. 5208, by Mr. PATMAN; Public Law 85–417, approved May 16, 1958: As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, and as it became public law, this bill provides that harpsichords and clavichords and parts thereof shall be dutiable at the rate applicable to pianos or parts thereof, on a permanent basis. The committee was advised, in favorable and informative departmental reports on this legislation, that domestic production of these instruments is limited and that while information is lacking as to the extent of imports, such imports are very small, and that enactment of this legislation would provide a means of making it easier for larger numbers of persons in the United States to obtain them.

H. R. 5924, by Mr. COOPER; Public Law 85–211, approved August 28, 1957: This bill, which became law without amendment, was designed to provide for the importation of advertising materials, samples, and advertising films so as to implement an international convention. The convention was dated at Geneva, November 7, 1952, signed on behalf of the United States May 28, 1953, and was ratified in the Senate on February 22, 1956. While enactment of this legislation did not involve important changes in the tariff treatment of the imports involved, it was necessary to bring such tariff treatment precisely into accord with that contemplated by the convention.

H. R. 5944, by Mr. MAGNUSON; passed House August 15, 1958: This bill provides for the addition to the free list of tourist literature issued by certain groups, relating chiefly to places or travel facilities outside the United States. The purpose and effect of the legislation is to simplify the tariff treatment of tourist literature and to extend the present duty-free treatment to a broader class of such literature. Safeguarding provisions against abuse are provided for by law.

H. R. 6304, by Mr. COOPER; Public Law 85–30, approved May 14, 1957: As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill, which was introduced at the request of the Department of Defense, would have made permanent the existing temporary privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad. This privilege has been provided continuously since 1942, through periodic renewals, and is limited to shipments of bona fide gifts not exceeding $50 in value. The committee was advised that there is a very definite morale factor embodied in this legislation, and that it is most important to servicemen on duty overseas to be able to send small gifts and souvenirs to their families and friends at home; subjecting such gifts to duty would hamper this practice. Adequate safeguarding provisions exist in the law and through appropriate administrative regulations. The Senate Finance Committee amended the bill to provide a temporary extension of this privilege for 2 years, to July 1, 1959. The House agreed to the Senate amendments, and in this form it became public law.

H. R. 6894, by Mr. KARSTEN; Public Law 85–808, approved August 28, 1958: As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill would amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide a rate of duty of 4 cents per pound on all unmanufactured mica and would transfer to the free list mica films and splittings not cut or stamped to dimensions. The committee was advised that the changes contemplated by this legislation would have no adverse effects on the domestic mining industry. This bill was amended in the Senate Finance Committee, but was later recommitted to that committee and reported back to the Senate without amendment.

H. R. 7004, by Mr. JENKINS; Public Law 85–696, approved August 20, 1958: This bill, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, provides that imported handles, wholly or in chief value of wood, to be used in the manufacture of paint rollers, will be dutiable at the rate applicable to paintbrush handles of wood. The committee was advised that the Department of Commerce knew of no commercial reason for the existing disparity of tariff treatment between paintbrush handles of wood and paint-roller handles, although they are used for the same purpose, and, further, that there is no information to indicate that putting them both on the same duty level would be detrimental to domestic wood manufacturers.

H. R. 7096, by Mr. JENKINS; Public Law 85–284, approved September 4, 1957: As reported to the House, this bill would have transferred dressed or manufactured istle or tampico from the dutiable to the free list of the Tariff Act of 1930, placing it in the same category as istle or tampico fiber not dressed or manufactured in any manner. The committee was informed that there is no significant domestic production of dressed fiber, that such fibers are in short supply, and that prices have been rising with resulting increases in cost of production and price of finished product. This legislation, therefore, would reduce the burden on domestic users. The bill was amended in the Senate to limit the free importation privilege to 3 years, as a testing period and without prejudice in case future extensions are deemed advisable. A provision was also adopted in the Senate to permit the free importation of a beta-ray spectrometer for the use of Stanford University in the field of research. A further amendment was adopted in the Senate to place certain wool yarns on the free list. The Senate amendments were accepted by the House.

H. R. 7363, by Mr. HÉBERT; passed House March 20, 1958: As reported by the committee, this bill reduces to 5 cents per pound the import duty on eviscerated pigeons. This legislation would place imports of such pigeons on a duty level with eviscerated chickens.

H. R. 7454, by Mr. EBERHARTER; Public Law 85–458, approved June 13, 1958: As this bill was reported by the committee, it provides for the free importation by colleges and universities of sound recordings and film to be used by them in certain nonprofit radio and television broadcasts. The Senate Finance Committee removed from the bill the limitation that the society or institution making the broadcasts must own or operate the radio or television station involved, but retained the restriction on exposed or developed picture film and added a limitation on that item of 2 years as the period of free importation. These amendments were accepted by the House.

H. R. 7516, by Mr. BURDICK; Public Law 85–408, approved May 16, 1958: This bill amended the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to permit the importation free of duty of religious vestments and regalia for presentation without charge to a church or to certain religious educational or charitable organizations. The law already provided for the free importation of such articles when ordered by the institutions themselves; this bill merely extended the privilege so as to make possible the free importation of such articles when ordered for presentation to these institutions as gifts.

H. R. 8933, by Mr. SADLAK; reported to House August 13, 1957: This bill would transfer from the dutiable to the free list handmade and machine handmade paper. The committee was advised that there is presently no domestic commer-

cial production of this type of product, the annual consumption in the United States being satisfied entirely by imports. The recent increases in costs of manufacture have threatened to reduce the already specialized and dispersed market; elimination of the tariff would help to ease the burden of increasing cost and prices.

H. R. 9509, by Mr. McCarthy; passed House February 27, 1958: This bill, as amended by the committee, would add iconostases to the list of religious articles for which free entry is already provided in paragraph 1774 of the Tariff Act, and would extend the application of this paragraph to cemeteries, schools, orphanages, and similar nonprofit activities operated by associations organized for religious purposes, as well as providing that parts, appurtenances or adjuncts of any of the articles for which free entry is already provided, whether physically joined thereto or not, may be entered free of duty.

H. R. 9917, by Mr. King: Public Law 85–415, approved May 16, 1958: This legislation continued for 2 years, to July 16, 1960, the suspension of duties on, first, alumina when imported for use in producing aluminum; second, crude bauxite; and third, calcined bauxite. The executive departments reported favorably on this legislation, and the committee was advised that reimposition of a duty would put United States producers of aluminum at a competitive disadvantage.

H. R. 10112, by Mr. Forand; Public Law 85–397, approved May 9, 1958: This bill was enacted to make permanent the existing temporary duty-free treatment of guar seed. The committee concluded that guar seed should be placed permanently on the free list because it is not produced in any quantity in the United States and because this action would be of assistance to those industries which must import the product for their use.

H. R. 10277, by Mr. Ikard; Public Law 85–645, approved August 14, 1958: As reported by the committee, this bill provided for a reduction in the minimum width specification for standard newsprint paper in rolls from 15 to 13 inches. This legislation was considered desirable because of the changed requirements of newspapers in the United States, there being a trend toward the use of narrower width paper, and in view of the traditional disposition under the Tariff Act to accord duty-free treatment to newsprint paper. The bill was reported after consideration of testimony received during public hearings held on the subject. The Senate Finance Committee amended the bill by adding two provisions, one clarifying and establishing as law the present Bureau of Customs classifications of rayon and other synthetic textiles, and the other providing for the temporary free importation of certain extracts of eucalyptus whether or not used chiefly for tanning purposes. Present law provided for the temporary free entry of such extracts for tanning purposes. These amendments were accepted by the House.

H. R. 10792, by Mr. Reed; Public Law 85–416, approved May 16, 1958: This legislation continues for 2 years, to August 7, 1960, the suspension of duty on copying lathes used for making rough or finished shoe lasts. This is a highly specialized and expensive type of machinery used by the shoe-manufacturing industry which can only be obtained from foreign sources. The bill became law without amendment.

H. R. 11407, by Mr. Mills; Public Law 85–398, approved May 9, 1958: This bill, which became law without amendment, was reported by the committee to extend for 2 years, to July 1, 1960, the existing provisions of law relating to the free importation of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders. Enactment of this legislation, which has been extended from time to time over a period of years, makes possible the avoidance of undue administrative burdens upon persons evacuated to the United States, and constitutes an important morale factor and inducement to overseas service. Safeguarding provisions against abuse of this privilege are provided by law.

H. R. 13076, by Mr. Ostertag; passed House August 13, 1958: This bill provides for the free entry of certain chapel bells imported for the use of the Abelard Reynolds School No. 42 in Rochester, N. Y. The committee was advised that these bells are not manufactured in the United States, would be used for the musical training and appreciation of students at the school, and would remain the property of the school.

TRADE-FAIR BILLS

Following the long-established policy of Congress to facilitate participation of foreign countries in international expositions held in the United States by permitting articles intended for display at such expositions to be entered free of import duties and charges, the following bills were favorably reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and enacted into law during the 85th Congress to permit articles imported into this country for the purpose of exhibition at such fairs and expositions to be admitted without payment of tariff, subject to the usual safeguarding regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury:

H. R. 4803, by Mr. Mason: The Chicagoland Commerce and Industry Exposition, June 28–July 14, 1957.

H. R. 8705, by Mr. O'Brien of Illinois: The St. Lawrence seaway celebration, January 1–December 31, 1959.

H. R. 9655, by Mrs. Green of Oregon: The Oregon State Centennial Exposition and International Trade Fair, June 10–September 20, 1959.

H. R. 10242, by Mr. O'Brien of Illinois: The Chicago International Fair and Exposition, July 1959.

H. R. 11019, by Mr. Robsion of Kentucky: The Kentucky State Fair, September 4–13, 1958, and—Senate amendment—the International Trade Exhibition at St. Paul, Minn., May 7–18, 1958.

H. R. 11889, by Mr. McCarthy: The Minnesota State Fair and Centennial Exposition, August 23–September 1, 1958. This bill was amended by the Senate Finance Committee adding a provision to permit residents of the United States to bring into the United States for temporary periods automobiles rented abroad without being required to pay duty or to post a bond. The Senate amendment was accepted by the House.

House Joint Resolution 126, by Mr. Pelly: The Washington State Sixth International Trade Fair, May 17–26, 1957.

House Joint Resolution 439, by Mr. Pelly: The Washington State Seventh International Trade Fair, April 11–20, 1958.

House Joint Resolution 556, by Mr. McDonough: The California International Trade Fair and Industrial Exposition, April 1–12, 1959.

In addition to the bills listed above in the general field of foreign trade and tariff legislation, there were other bills reported by the Committee on Ways and Means during the 85th Congress, of a minor nature or of limited application, to clarify, simplify, or strengthen the customs and tariff provisions of law. These were:

H. R. 9291, by Mr. Sadlak; Public Law 85–454, approved June 11, 1958: This bill was designed to close certain loopholes in the existing tariff structure regarding rubber-soled footwear. The legislation was considered necessary because of the possibility, under the existing law, of avoidance of the import duty, which was imposed specifically for the protection of the domestic rubber-soled footwear industry, by foreign producers through manipulation of products. The effective date was changed in the Senate to September 1, 1958, and the House accepted this amendment.

H. R. 9919, by Mr. Machrowicz; Public Law 85–673, approved August 18, 1958: This bill amends the customs drawback law by extending the privilege of substitution to all classes of merchandise used in the manufacture or production of articles for exportation. The Department of State strongly endorsed this legislation as one of a number of desirable measures to simplify United States customs procedures. The privilege extended was already applicable to sugar, metal, and various other items, and in favorable reports from other Departments on this legislation, it was pointed out that these provisions have been successful in those cases.

H. R. 9923, by Mr. Pelly; Public Law 85–414, approved May 16, 1958: This legislation, which became law as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, amended the Tariff Act so as to allow the temporary free exportation under bond for exportation of articles to be repaired, altered or otherwise processed. Safeguarding provisions and certain limitations are provided. The committee was advised by the Department of Commerce that the proposed legislation, without changing the tariff position, would eliminate the existing tieup of money and delays involved in these procedures.

D. SOCIAL SECURITY LEGISLATION

1. MAJOR SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS

The major action taken by the Committee on Ways and Means during the 85th Congress in the broad field of social security was drafting and favorably reporting of H. R. 13549, the Social Security Amendments of 1958—Public Law

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

85–840, approved August 28, 1959. While a number of minor, but nonetheless important, social security bills were acted upon by the committee during the 85th Congress, H. R. 13549 was a major undertaking and involved substantial and extensive changes in the Social Security Act. This bill followed over 2 weeks of public hearings on all titles of the Social Security Act, and approximately 2 weeks of consideration in executive session of the proposals made during the course of the public hearings.

The Social Security Amendments of 1958, in general, accomplished several major objectives. First, this legislation will substantially improve the financial soundness of the social security system; second, it provides for an increase in social security benefits by 7 percent, with a minimum of $3; third, it makes significant improvements in the benefit structure by extending and improving the protection of the program and facilitating the program administration; and, finally, it removes certain inequities in the old-age and survivors insurance program, and provides a new and improved formula for grants-in-aid to the States for public assistance to the aged, disabled, and blind needy individuals, as well as aid to dependent children.

Among the more important changes made by the bill were: An increase in the tax rates on employers and employees of one-fourth of 1 percent effective January 1, 1959, and a stepped-up schedule on the tax-rate increases already contained in the law, so that the full statutory rate will now become effective by 1969 instead of by 1975; an increase in the wage base from $4,200 to $4,800; an increase in benefits, as indicated above, of 7 percent with a minimum of $3; removal of the so-called offset provision concerning disability benefits; provision of benefits for dependents of totally disabled individuals, paralleling the benefits now available to dependents of OASI benefits; extension of coverage to certain additional groups of individuals; improvement of and liberalizing of certain of the qualifying provisions concerning specific categories, such as, adopted children, widows, employees of nonprofit organizations, State and local groups, and, finally, a new variable formula for use with respect to public assistance titles of the Social Security Act, in addition to the creation of two advisory councils—child welfare services and public assistance financing—to make recommendations and submit reports to the Congress.

2. OTHER SOCIAL SECURITY BILLS

In addition to the Social Security Amendments of 1958, H. R. 13549, there were numerous bills reported by the committee which constituted revisions of the social security law, some major revisions relating to the unemployment compensation laws and others, relating to the old-age and survivors and disability insurance as well as the public assistance titles, of perhaps a minor nature, but nonetheless important to the groups affected.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

H. R. 8888, by Mr. KEAN; passed House August 16, 1957: This bill would extend the protection of the unemployment insurance system to certain groups of workers to whom it is not now available. These groups include employees of certain Federal instrumentalities neither wholly nor partially owned by the United States, now exempted by reason of a general tax exemption; employees on American aircraft while outside the United States, or of organizations operated primarily for carrying on a trade or business for profit even though all the profits are payable to certain nonprofit organizations, and it extends the program of unemployment compensation for Federal employees to employees of partially owned Federal instrumentalities.

H. R. 11630, by Mr. MILLS; Public Law 85–848, approved August 28, 1958: Enactment of this legislation will provide a permanent unemployment compensation program for ex-servicemen similar to that now existing for civilian employees of the Federal Government. Benefits would be paid in accordance with State unemployment insurance law provisions, and financed by Federal appropriations. The benefits provided by the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 will cease for everyone at the end of January 1960, under present law, and in any case they are available only to individuals who entered military service before February 1, 1955. The administration recommended this approach as a permanent program for meeting the post-service unemployment compensation needs of ex-servicemen. The bill passed the House and Senate without amendment.

H. R. 11908, by Mr. FORAND; passed House August 8, 1958: The effect of this bill would be to provide that in determining the eligibility of Federal employees for unemployment compensation their accrued annual leave shall be treated in accordance with State laws. Under present law, no compensation may be paid to a Federal employee during a period subsequent to separation from Federal service when he is being paid for accrued annual leave. The committee was of the opinion that there is no inconsistency in the payment of both unemployment compensation and a sum for accrued annual leave to the same person for the same period of time, as the concept of insurance, unemployment, and maintenance of purchasing power are not involved with respect to the matter of annual leave. The bill would place the Federal worker in the position of being treated in exactly the same manner as workers in private industry who receive similar annual leave payments upon separation, by making the award of unemployment compensation depend upon the provisions of the appropriate State law.

H. R. 12065, by Mr. MILLS; Public law 85–441, approved June 4, 1958: This bill was reported favorably by the committee on April 23, 1958, at a time when unemployment was abnormally high and unemployment insurance benefit rights were being exhausted at a rapid rate. The bill as reported provided authorization for temporary unemployment benefits for individuals whose benefits rights become exhausted, and for individuals who had been in employment not covered under unemployment insurance. These benefits, under the committee bill, would have been financed by a grant from the general funds of the Federal Treasury. The bill, however, was amended on the floor of the House to delete the provisions for payment of benefits to workers who were in employment not covered under existing State laws, and further to provide that the benefits paid would ultimately be restored to the Treasury. As the bill became law, the States are given an option to accept or reject its provisions, and the amount of additional temporary unemployment compensation to an unemployed individual equals 50 percent of the total amount payable to him under the State law pursuant to which he exhausted his benefits. The bill as passed by the House was recommended by the administration.

OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS AND DISABILITY INSURANCE

H. R. 1944, by Mr. KEAN; Public Law 85–238, approved August 30, 1957: As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill permits social-security benefits to be paid to the alien survivors, residing outside the United States, of members of the uniformed services who die as the result of service-connected disabilities. There are approximately 20,000 aliens enlisted in the Armed Forces, many of whose families reside outside the United States, the largest single group consisting of Philippine nationals. Although they enlisted with the understanding that they would be entitled to all the rights and benefits that accrue to members of the Armed Forces, and although they have no alternative but to make contributions to the social-security system, a large proportion of their alien survivors living outside the United States were prohibited by the operation of a provision in the 1956 social-security amendments from receiving survivor benefits. The Defense Department urged enactment of this legislation, to keep faith with these aliens serving in the Armed Forces. The provision was made retroactive to January 1, 1957, the date members of the uniformed services were brought under social security on a contributory basis. An amendment to the bill was adopted on the Senate floor which amended the provisions relating to the "living-with" requirements for purposes of widows, widowers, wives, and husbands benefits under OASI. The amendment was accepted by the House.

H. R. 4770, by Mr. EBERHARTER; Union Calendar; failed of passage August 5, 1957: As this bill was reported by the committee, it would amend title II of the Social Security Act to make possible the coverage under OASI of policemen and firemen in positions covered by retirement systems in all States, under the same provisions existing in present law for policemen and firemen in the States which already have such coverage. As in the case of all other State and local employees who are members of a retirement system, such coverage could be obtained only through agreements between

the States and the Department of HEW, and would be conditioned upon a favorable referendum vote by the retirement-system group.

H. R. 5411 by Mr. KEAN; Public Law 85–798, approved August 28, 1958: As reported to the House, this bill would reinstate rights to mother's insurance benefits that were terminated by remarriage in the case of a widow or former wife divorced whose new husband dies before she can qualify as his widow for OASI purposes. The 1956 social security amendments made a provision for reinstatement to widows' benefits rights in similar situations, but did not provide similar protection in the case of mothers' benefits. The Senate Finance Committee amended the bill to add a provision permitting any instrumentality of two or more States to obtain social security coverage, under its agreement, for those of its employees who are in policemen's or firemen's positions covered by a retirement system and who desire coverage. The Committee on Ways and Means had approved a similar provision as a part of the Social Security Amendments of 1958—H. R. 13549. The bill was further amended on the Senate floor to provide that the State of Washington be added to the list of States permitted to obtain social security coverage for policemen and firemen in positions covered by a retirement system. The amendments of the Senate were accepted by the House.

H. R. 6191, by Mr. COOPER; Public Law 85–109, approved July 17, 1957: As reported to the House, this bill provided, first, for a 1-year—to July 1, 1958—extension of the period within which application may be filed to establish a period of disability without being subject to the limitation that a period of disability cannot begin more than a year before the application is filed; and, second, that social-security benefits will not be reduced on account of disability compensation received from Veterans' Administration as a result of service-connected disability. The committee also requested, in its report on this bill, that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare report back to it by March 1, 1958, on the extent to which individuals filing applications for disability-insurance benefits after December of 1957 may have lost benefits by reason of not having applied earlier. Although the Senate Finance Committee removed the second provision from the bill, it was restored on the Senate floor and became law as passed by the House.

H. R. 7570, by Mr. KEAN; Public Law 85–785, approved August 27, 1958: This legislation provides coverage for certain employees of tax-exempt organizations which erroneously, but in good faith, failed to file the required waiver certificate in time to provide such coverage. The Senate Finance Committee made certain technical amendments to the bill which were recommended by the Department of HEW to more adequately meet the objective of the bill. The Senate amendments were accepted by the House.

H. R. 8599, by Mr. KEAN; Public Law 85–786, approved August 28, 1958: The purpose of this legislation is to provide a more satisfactory method of dealing with sick-leave payments to public employees who are past retirement age. This is accomplished by providing that the exception from wages made by section 209 (l) of the Social Security Act is not applicable to payments to State or local employees for periods after the employee reaches retirement age in which he renders no services. At the recommendation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Senate Finance Committee narrowed somewhat the language of the bill in order to make it apply only to State and local government sick-leave payments, which is the effect required to meet the problem. The House accepted the Senate amendments.

H. R. 8753, by Mr. COOPER; Public Law 85–227, approved August 30, 1957: As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill would have amended title II of the Social Security Act to include the States of California, Connecticut, and Rhode Island under the existing provisions of law permitting certain specified States to divide a retirement system into two parts and provide social-security coverage for the part consisting of the positions of those employees who desire such coverage. The committee recognized that legislation applying only to certain States has disadvantages, but believes that the provision should, for the time being at least, be extended only to those States expressly requesting it. The Senate Finance Committee amended the bill to also include Minnesota in the States to which such provisions would be applicable, and also amended the bill to provide that the coverage agreements or modifications entered into prior to 1960—rather than 1959 as in the House bill—could be made effective with respect to services performed any time after December 31, 1955. The bill became law as amended by the Senate.

H. R. 8755, by Mr. COOPER; Public Law 85–226, approved August 30, 1957: As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill amended title II of the Social Security Act to permit any instrumentality of two or more States to obtain social-security coverage under its agreement separately for those of its employees who are covered by a retirement system and who desire such coverage. The bill was amended in the Senate substituting a retroactive coverage provision of more general application, and adding Alabama, Georgia, Maryland, New York, Tennessee, and the Territory of Hawaii to the list of States which may obtain social-security coverage for policemen and firemen in positions covered by a retirement system. The Senate amendments were accepted by the House.

H. R. 8821, by Mr. EBERHARTER; Public Law 85–229, approved August 30, 1957: This legislation was enacted to facilitate the provision of OASI coverage for State and local employees under certain retirement systems. Under the law before enactment of this bill, after a retirement system—in those States where provision for division has been made—has been divided between those members who desire coverage and those who do not, a referendum was required among those indicating a desire for coverage before such coverage could be effected. This bill made possible their coverage without the necessity of a subsequent referendum, provided certain safeguards are followed in the process of dividing the system into two parts. The committee bill was enacted without amendment.

H. R. 8892, by Mr. HARRISON of Virginia; Public Law 85–239, approved August 30, 1957: The Committee reported this bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to extend the time within which a minister may elect coverage as a self-employed individual for social security purposes. The extension provided was for 2 years, in general through April 15, 1959. The bill also provided, for tax purposes as well as for OASI benefit purposes, that remuneration paid in 1955 and 1956 to ministers, erroneously though in good faith reported as wages by certain nonprofit organizations, should be treated as remuneration for employment instead of net earnings from self-employment. A provision was added to the bill in the Senate providing that a minister, in computing his earnings from his ministry for social security purposes—but not for income tax purposes—shall include the value of the meals and lodging furnished to him for the convenience of his employer, and the rental value of the parsonage furnished to him. This applies both in determining the amount of social security contributions to be made and eligibility for and amount of benefits to be paid. The House agreed to the Senate amendments.

H. R. 9829, by Mr. PATMAN; passed House August 8, 1958: This legislation was reported by the committee to provide an additional period of time within which certain State agreements under section 218 of the Social Security Act may be modified to secure coverage for nonprofessional school-district employees. The 1956 amendments provided for the coverage under OASI for certain of such employees in eight specified States and the Territory of Hawaii without a referendum and as a group separate from the professional employees who are in positions under the same retirement system. The provision, however, was not in effect long enough for at least some of the States to secure the desired coverage before it expired. In order that the objectives of the legislation may be accomplished, this legislation was approved by the committee to provide an additional period, to January 1, 1960, for this coverage to be obtained.

H. R. 11346, by Mr. MCCORMACK; Public Law 85–787, approved August 27, 1958: As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill added Massachusetts to the States permitted to divide a retirement system into two parts and provide social-security coverage for the part consisting of the positions of those employees who desire such coverage. The bill was amended in the Senate to also include the State of Vermont in this group of States. A further amendment was adopted in the Senate making provision for those persons who did not

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

choose coverage under a divided retirement system to be given an additional opportunity to elect such coverage. A similar provision had been included by the Ways and Means Committee in the social security amendments of 1958—H. R. 13549—and the Senate amendments to H. R. 11346 were accepted by the House.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

H. R. 3035, by Mr. EBERHARTER; Public Law 85–26, approved April 25, 1957: This bill, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, provided for an extension from June 30, 1957, to June 30, 1959, of the provisions contained in the Social Security Act amendments of 1950 relating to the approval by the Secretary of HEW of certain State plans for aid to the blind. Although the provisions are applicable to any State, in actuality only the States of Missouri and Pennsylvania are involved. These States continue to require this legislation if they are to continue to receive Federal funds for their aid to the blind programs, even in those instances where there is full conformity to the Federal requirements for eligibility for such funds. This is due to the type of dual program for aid to the blind in existence in these States, and enactment of this legislation afforded additional time for the Department of HEW and the States involved to study this situation.

H. R. 7238, by Mr. MCCORMACK; Public Law 85–110, approved July 17, 1957: As reported to the House by the committee, this bill amended the public-assistance provisions of the Social Security Act so as to provide for a more effective distribution of Federal funds for medical and other remedial care. The legislation was designed to correct an unintended result stemming from the public-assistance medical care provisions of the 1956 amendments to the Social Security Act. Amendments were adopted in the Senate which provided a different approach to the problem, and the Senate Finance Committee in its report stated that the amended bill would accomplish the desired result at less expense. The bill was further amended on the Senate floor to add Alabama to the list of States which may secure social-security coverage for policemen and firemen in positions covered by a retirement system. In conference, the House receded.

E. NARCOTICS LEGISLATION

The Committee on Ways and Means also took favorable action during the first session of the Congress on a bill, H. R. 9028, covering another important area of the committee's jurisdiction, namely, the field of control of narcotic drugs. While this legislation was technically tax legislation, or constituted an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code, from a substantive point of view it appropriately can be considered to be an additional different field of jurisdiction. This legislation was designed to give full effect to treaty obligations of the United States to limit exclusively to medical and scientific purposes the manufacture of narcotic drugs and to require that such manufacture be restricted to persons and premises that have been licensed for the purpose. It was also designed to amend the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act to bring the regulation of exports in conformity with current treaty obligations, and to permit the importation and exportation of certain narcotic drugs for scientific research purposes. This action of the committee during the first session thus further supplemented the important action taken by the committee and the Congress during the last Congress with regard to control of the illicit trafficking in drugs and the prevention of insidious and heinous crimes resulting from the use of such drugs. This legislation is considered, therefore, to be quite important in protecting the welfare of our citizens and in promoting the general interest.

F. MISCELLANEOUS

There were several bills reported by the committee during this Congress which do not fall within the field of taxes, social security, or foreign trade and tariffs. Among these are:

H. R. 12489, by Mr. MILLS; Public Law 85–823, approved August 28, 1958: This legislation, which was enacted into law without amendment, amends the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 to extend the time to January 3, 1961, for submission by the Secretary of Commerce of the final report on the highway cost allocation study. Interim progress reports are required under the bill on March 1, 1959, and March 1, 1960. This legislation was requested by the Commerce Department. It was pointed out that the test-road project in connection with the highway program will not be completed until late in 1958, and results of the test studies would not be available in time for the final report unless the date for its submission were postponed.

S. 2006, by Senator HILL; Public Law 85–881, approved September 2, 1958: This legislation, which was recommended by the Department of Defense, relieves the Surgeons General of the Army and Navy of certain duties imposed on them by the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the regulatory taxes on adulterated butter and filled cheese, and by the Public Health Service Act with respect to the licensing of establishments in the preparation of certain biological products. These provisions are obsolete, and the committee was advised that no justification exists for their continuation. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is in a position to adequately safeguard the interest of the public in these respects, and it appears to be inappropriate for the military departments to be charged with this responsibility.

H. R. 9028, by Mr. KARSTEN; passed House August 22, 1957: As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, this legislation was designed to give full effect to treaty obligations of the United States to limit exclusively to medical and scientific purposes the manufacture of narcotic drugs and to require that such manufacture be restricted to persons and premises that have been licensed for the purpose. It also amends the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act to bring the regulation of exports in conformity with current treaty obligations, and to permit the importation and exportation of certain narcotic drugs for scientific research purposes.

A Report on Veterans' Legislation and Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 22, 1958

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, as a combat-wounded veteran of World War II, I have always taken a keen interest in the problems of our former servicemen, and have actively supported legislation which is beneficial to the veterans of our Nation. Letters received from individual veterans or from veterans' organizations always receive priority treatment in my Congressional office. It is my belief that men who have fought and bled for the preservation of our national ideals, and the wives and dependents of those who gave their lives in the service of our country, should be accorded the best possible representation. Therefore, although not a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I have introduced several bills and actively supported legislation introduced by other Members which would protect and increase the benefits of those who have served their Nation in time of war.

During this past week, I was advised that the Secretary of Defense has recommended the favorable consideration of H. R. 12783, a bill which I introduced to authorize the military services to provide Congressional Medal of Honor holders with appropriate uniforms and insignia. The lateness of this session will prevent approval of this bill by the 85th Congress, but I am hopeful the Armed Services Committee will report this bill early next January.

There is no present authority for furnishing uniforms to Congressional Medal of Honor holders who are no longer members of the armed services. These outstanding individuals are often called upon to address private and public groups and appear in various ceremonies where they represent the services of which they are a part. An excellent example of this is the recent interment of the unknowns of World War II and the Korean conflict at Arlington National Cemetery. Providing uniforms to these honored veterans would help pay the country's debt of gratitude for outstanding service and preclude embarrassment to the individuals and to the United States Government when an appearance in uniform is requested.

Many worthy bills of interest and benefit to veterans were enacted during this past session. Following is a brief résumé of these bills which have now become public laws:

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

Public Law 85–168, effective October 1, 1957, increased rates of compensation for service-connected disabilities by a minimum of 10 percent and up to 24 percent for total disability.

Public Law 85-425, effective July 1, 1958, increased the pensions for widows of Spanish-American War Veterans from $54.18 to $65; and if they were married at the time the veteran was in service, the pension was increased from $67.73 to $75. Widows of veterans of the Mexican War, Indian Wars, and the Civil War also received increased pensions. Widows of Confederate soldiers of the Civil War were for the first time made eligible for pensions.

Public Law 85-840 amended the Social Security Act in one very important respect concerning veterans now receiving non-service-connected pensions. Previously, under the social security law, veterans having non-service-connected disabilities could not draw full benefits from both social security and the Veterans' Administration. For instance, if a veteran under 65 years of age was drawing $66.15 for a non-service-connected disability, and also was eligible for $90 social security benefits because of total disability, then the social security payment was reduced by the $66.15 so that he could not receive more than a total of $90 from these two Government agencies. I am happy to report this inequity has now been eliminated and non-service-connected veterans who are totally disabled may now draw complete benefits from both the Veterans' Administration and the Social Security Administration. I urged and fought hard to have this discrimination eliminated.

VETERANS' HOUSING

Public Law 85-364 authorized $150 million for direct GI loans for each of the fiscal years 1959 and 1960. It also increased the maximum amount of such loans from $10,000 to $13,500.

Veterans' legislation has been very effective in the past in providing better housing for our ex-servicemen. But in recent years, due to administrative difficulties and tight-money policies, it has been difficult to obtain a GI loan from local lending institutions which can obtain higher interest rates on conventional loans. There is a definite need for more money to provide direct loans to worthy veterans who want and need more adequate housing.

HOSPITALIZATION AND HEALTH BENEFITS

Public Law 85-468 was a general appropriations bill and provided $5 billion for the various veterans programs, of which $717.2 million will be used to provide hospitalization. Although this may seem like a huge sum, there are still many veterans who are denied hospitalization because of lack of sufficient bed space, and this is especially true in connection with nonservice mental cases.

Public Law 85-678 amends the National Service Life Insurance Act to provide increased disability-income protection.

Public Law 85-782 increases by $150 a month compensation paid to severely disabled service-connected veterans who require an aide or attendant while they are not hospitalized at Government expense.

Public Law 85-674 increases the burial allowance from $150 to $250.

EDUCATION AND INSURANCE BENEFITS

Public Law 85-871 authorizes the Veterans' Administration to provide certain specialized vocational training for retarded children who are eligible for training under the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act.

Public Law 85-807 extends GI educational benefits to servicemen who have received less-than-honorable discharges which were later corrected to honorable conditions.

Public Law 85-896 extends three new options to section 621 policyholders—insurance issued between April 25, 1951, and December 31, 1956.

OTHER VETERANS' LEGISLATION

In addition to the bills enumerated above, there were several miscellaneous bills and resolutions approved relating to minor or administrative and technical changes in veterans' benefits. There were also 10 bills which were approved by the House but which were not acted upon by the Senate prior to adjournment.

Shortly after the adjournment of Congress, I will have available for distribution a complete analysis and summary of all veterans' legislation reported and acted upon by the 85th Congress. I will be happy to send a copy of this publication to anyone desiring this information as long as the limited supply lasts. In the meantime, I will welcome letters and suggestions from the veterans in my District, and will continue to render prompt and efficient service on any case referred to my office for assistance.

SENATE

SATURDAY, AUGUST 23, 1958

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in this shrine of each patriot's devotion, for toiling months the few out of the millions have been allowed by Thee to be servants of the Nation in a tense and tortured time when the earth has been plowed with violence, when brave fighters for freedom have been met and subdued by the bayonets of tyrants, and when wars and rumors of war have vexed the world.

In such a day, Thou hast summoned us to strengthen the bulwarks of liberty and to mobilize the might of freedom against malignant, rampant evil bent on enslaving all peoples.

Now that the sands of this session of deliberations have almost run out, we acknowledge that at best we have been but unprofitable servants.

Now unto Thy holy keeping we commit ourselves and the Nation, as on the last page of another national volume is about to be inscribed, "What we have written, we have written."

Wilt Thou bless and strengthen all that here has been worthily done, as the Members of this body have followed flickering lights in these dark and confusing times? Pardon and overrule what has been done unworthily, left undone, or done amiss.

And in Thy great mercy, grant us peace—peace in our own hearts, peace in this dear land, and peace in all the earth, now and evermore. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, August 22, 1958, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 13840. An act to encourage expansion of teaching in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies; and

H. R. 13861. An act to repeal certain provisions of law relating to messengers for the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Joseph C. Satterthwaite, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

BOARD OF PAROLE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Edward J. Donovan, of New York, to be a member of the Board of Parole for the term expiring September 30, 1962.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Paul Kearney, of Oregon, to be United States marshal for the district of Oregon for a term of 4 years.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John Nichol Irwin II, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Hugh M. Milton II, of New Mexico, to be Under Secretary of the Army.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

OFFICE OF DEFENSE AND CIVILIAN MOBILIZATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of J. Roy Price, of New York, to be an Assistant Director of the Office of Defense and Civilian Mobilization.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Kenneth T. Downs, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Director of the Office of Defense and Civilian Mobilization.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

THE MARINE CORPS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMY, AIR FORCE, NAVY, AND MARINE CORPS, PLACED ON THE VICE PRESIDENT'S DESK

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, which previously had been placed on the Vice President's desk.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified immediately of the confirmation of all these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements made during the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, AND PROPOSED PROVISION FOR TREASURY DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. No. 119)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation in the amount of $500,000 for the Department of Labor, and a proposed provision for the Treasury Department, for the fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON LIQUIDATION OF COMMODITIES HELD BY COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law a report on orderly liquidation of stocks of agricultural commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation and the expansion of markets for surplus agricultural commodities, dated August 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

CERTIFICATION OF ADEQUATE SOIL SURVEY AND LAND CLASSIFICATION, PAONIA PROJECT, COLORADO

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Paonia Project, Colorado, and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON CLAIMS FOR DAMAGE CAUSED BY NAVAL VESSELS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Financial Management), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on claims for damage caused by naval vessels, during fiscal year 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Fourth Guam Legislature; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Resolution 6

"Resolution relative to respectfully requesting Congress of the United States to amend the Organic Act of Guam so as to provide that the legislature may override with finality the veto of the Governor of Guam

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Guam—

"Whereas under section 19 of the Organic Act of Guam, Public Law 630, 81st Congress, chapter 512, the Legislature of Guam is empowered to override the veto of the Governor of Guam on any bill presented to him only in limited fashion because of the provision contained in such section that upon such override by the legislature the bill is transmitted to the President of the United States, who is empowered to uphold the veto of the Governor, the wishes of the legislature to the contrary notwithstanding; and

"Whereas in the history of the Territory of Guam since the date of said Organic Act there has never been an occasion when the President of the United States has refused to uphold the veto of the Governor of Guam, thereby in effect nullifying the power of the legislature to override the veto of the Governor; and

"Whereas the prerogative of legislative bodies to override the veto of the chief executive officer is within the traditional power of almost all legislative bodies within the American framework of representative government; and

"Whereas the local autonomy granted by virtue of said Organic Act is narrowly limited if, as the history of Guam indicates, the veto of an appointed governor cannot be overridden by the elected representatives of the people of Guam: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully requested and memorialized to amend the Organic Act of Guam to permit the legislature to effectively override the veto of the Governor of Guam; and be it further

"Resolved, That in considering such amendment, the Congress bear in mind that the Legislature of Guam is willing to accept a very limited right to so override executive vetoes, even to the extent of requiring a three-fourths or even four-fifths vote by the legislature, since it is the desire of the people of Guam to override the veto of their appointed Governor only when the opinion of their elected representatives is practically unanimous on the desirability of such action; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Speaker certify to and the legislative secretary attest the adoption hereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairmen of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the Senate and House, and to the Governor of Guam."

A resolution adopted by the National Medical and Dental Association and the National Advocates Society, at Chicago, Ill., reaffirming their loyalty to the country and its democratic principles, and so forth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ENTITLED "OPERATION OF ARTICLE VII, NATO STATUS OF FORCES TREATY" (S. REPT. NO. 2497)

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, I submit a report of the Subcommittee on the Operation of Article VII of the Status of Forces Agreement, which report of the subcommittee has been fully approved by the full committee. I ask that the report be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from North Carolina.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 4326. A bill to amend the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 to provide for a budget which will more clearly reflect the financial condition of the Government by distinguishing between capital and noncapital type expenditures; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 4327. A bill to prohibit certain acts involving the importation, transportation, possession, or use of explosives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KENNEDY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 4328. A bill to repeal the withholding of income tax at source on wages; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. MALONE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. POTTER:

S. J. Res. 202. Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Gen. John J. Pershing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF BUDGET AND ACCOUNTING ACT OF 1921

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 to provide for a budget which will more clearly reflect the financial condition of the Government by distinguishing between capital and noncapital type expenditures, and request that the bill be appropriately referred. In connection with the introduction of the bill, I desire to speak, in order to explain this measure. I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may proceed for 5 minutes to present my explanation of the bill, which I am introducing in the closing hours of the session, not for the purpose of having the bill passed at this session, but in order that both the bill and the speech which I shall make on it today will be available for consideration at the next session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

The bill (S. 4326) to amend the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 to provide for a budget which will more clearly reflect the financial condition of the Government by distinguishing between capital and noncapital type expenditures, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, for many years, I have expressed on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere my interest in capital budgeting. Briefly, capital budgeting would list separately the capital investments and the operating expenses of the Federal Government.

I think there is much confusion in the country—and in Congress, too—when the budget is under consideration as to just what the money is going for; there is confusion as to how much of it goes to finance projects that will repay themselves over a period of years, how much goes to dead-loss items such as military defense which are nonetheless vital, and how much goes to the daily operation of those services we, as a people, have asked our Government to provide.

A capital budget would, in my judgment, go a long way in clarifying the objectives of these expenditures. I have, therefore, conferred with the Library of Congress about the works available on capital budgeting. I asked the Library to furnish me with an analysis of current budgeting procedures and some of their shortcomings and irregularities. I also asked for a study of the requirements of capital budgeting. I offer, as a result, a speech today based in large part upon the work of the Library of Congress.

Of course, I take full responsibility for it because the Library only followed my instructions in preparing the material. Moreover, I have changed it somewhat for purposes of this speech. It represents only my views, but much of the scholarly work was done for me by the Library.

BUDGET FORM AND CONGRESSIONAL CONTROL OF FEDERAL FINANCES

The budget document originally was developed to improve the method of stating estimates of money needed for Federal activities. The improved statement would enable Congress better to judge needs for appropriations.

The pursuit of that purpose has continued in legislation relating to budget and accounting procedures and in modifications by the Budget Bureau of the form of the document.

The form of the budget should be adapted to helping Congress relate annual action to continuing purposes, in appropriating money for Federal use. The purposes guiding action on appropriations have included: First, economy and efficiency in operation of departments and agencies; second, meeting defense emergencies and general economic emergencies, and other movements of less than emergency magnitude in employment, income and prices; and, third, helping local governments, enterprises, and individuals, to realize aims which the Congress considers valuable.

The first of these purposes—economy and efficiency in operation—is a necessary subject of inquiry by the Congress. But it remains a matter of management into which the Congress may inquire, yet not a matter that will take first rank in determining the size of appropriations granted.

The great changes in amount of money appropriated have been responses to defense and economic problems of great magnitude. I stress this point. National and international events and needs have dictated the tremendous increases in outlays of the past decades. These problems and needs continue to be ever-present and ever-changing, and the present statutory responsibilities of the Congress towards them assure that they will continue to dominate the consideration of estimates of appropriations.

It is time we reconsidered the question, Are the contents and the form of the budget document adapted to giving first rank to the purposes of adjusting appropriations action to the major economic and defense developments, and assistance toward an equitable position for all the classes, enterprises and communities of the Nation?

A brief review of the developing form of the budget will indicate that in past generations the major purposes have been served, that some changes have given the appearance of economy, and that appropriations for some similar activities are so lacking in uniformity as to make the budget misleading. I think such a review will also indicate that some further changes in the budget are required to help the Congress determine the proper amount of appropriations for various programs, and for all programs together. The point considered here is whether the budget ought to be reshaped to make a dual budget distinguishing capital and operating expenditures, or whether modifications in line with recent evolution would make the document sufficiently informative about capital expenditure programs. The discussion is intended as an argument of the matter rather than as a statement of the considerations supporting a decision.

DEVELOPMENT OF FORM OF THE BUDGET

The most significant change in the form of the budget document has been the consolidation of many separate appropriation items, usually for organizational units, into a few items each of which covers a program. Accompanying this development are descriptions of programs undertaken, with statistical data to justify the proposed requests for money. Another significant change has been the inclusion of information on Government corporations in summary tables of budget totals, and of detailed data within the text of the budget. In budgets presented during the formative years of the more important corporations, the information was exhibited in annexes to the budget or was excluded from budget totals and from any presentation in the budget. The inclusion of the corporations and of other activities which involve investment of Government

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

funds, rather than operating expenditures of funds, distinguishes the Budget of the United States from the dual budgets—capital and operating—of some foreign governments as well as business, some municipalities, and States.

When all of these expenditures—operating, investment, trust fund—are summarized in one total figure, the budget apparently can be related easily to economic problems, in ways that were more tedious or impossible with earlier budget forms. It should be seen that some of the changes may give an appearance of greater economy in budgetary expenditures. When operations are conducted through the form of a corporation, budgetary expenditures are not expenditures after deducting applicable receipts; if conducted by a department, the budget would show the whole amount of expenditures—such as the whole amount of loans disbursed—without deduction of receipts—such as interest and loan repayments. The establishment of trust funds also reduces apparent expenditures by several billions per year, taking them entirely out of the category of budgetary expenditures.

Year-to-year comparisons of expenditures may give a false impression of economy unless such differences are taken into account.

The magnitude of Federal programs is obscured by quotation of net expenditure figures alone. When a program is self-supporting, measurement of its impact requires the use of gross as well as the net expenditure figures, and other measurements of activity. The data are available, but not in one place. It is necessary to read various budget summary tables as well as the exhibits supporting the appropriation requests, and some of the special analyses following the main body of the budget.

The investment programs have been presented in the budget in the forms customary in business financial accounting. Financial accounting similar to that of private business has been extended to intragovernmental buying and selling, and cost accounting also has been introduced.

BUDGETING OF INVESTMENT PROGRAMS AND BUSINESS-TYPE ACCOUNTING

These developments should be considered with respect to their influence on the budget document. Do they make it more adequate and appropriate to the needs of the Congress in controlling the expenditure of Federal money? Consider first the inclusion of the investment programs in the budget, and second the use of business-type statements and other applications of business accounting principles.

Investment programs are included in the same Federal budget with programs that involve principally operating expenses. The combination of capital outlay and current expense is one set of estimates and one set of expenditures accounts is contrary to business accounting practices. It is contrary also to the emphasis on the businesslike aspects of the investment programs, an emphasis that appears both in financial reports and in the statutory requirement of a commercial type audit of the activities. The financing of investment programs—long-term lending and public construction—is not uniform. Nor are business operations of the current production and sale type financed uniformly.

The authorization of money for many of the investment programs takes the form that would fit possible proposals of a capital budget. The money is authorized not through appropriations but as authority to incur obligations and to make expenditures from borrowed money—borrowed from the Treasury, from the public, or old notes canceled to restore borrowing authority. The budget does not summarize these in a separate place in detail by organizational unit. It is necessary to use Treasury reports for that information. The public debt receipts financing form is used for REA, TVA, and several others, but not for Reclamation nor for the Engineer Corps construction. This possible first step toward a capital budget—a special method of authorizing expenditures—therefore has not been taken uniformly. It gives more leeway as to time of expenditure, and thus is the exact opposite of the accrued expenditure limitation legislation of this session of Congress. It is not always part of a revolving fund. It is used for some short-term operations, the largest of which is the CCC, but not for others, such as industrial funds.

A lack of uniformity is to be found in Government enterprise accounts as to recording of major receipt items, such as repayments of money loaned. Receipts appear sometimes as offsets to gross expenditures, as for the Army industrial fund; expansion of defense production; Export-Import Bank; St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation; Small Business Administration; TVA; United States Information Agency informational media guarantee fund; General Services Administration general supply fund, buildings management fund, and so forth; HHFA; Upper Colorado River Basin fund; and various others. The Government corporation and the revolving fund may place their receipts with the Treasury, but not in the Treasury, and the receipts are available for expenditure on the program without appropriation by the Congress. But in other enterprises, such as the REA and the Farmers Home Administration, receipts—for example, repayments of loans—are stated only in statistical tables, so that authorizations and reported expenditures are on a gross basis. The corporation's receipts are available for its use; the departmental enterprise receipts go into the Treasury and are not available for the use of the enterprise. The enterprise can use only money authorized by an appropriation act—which includes expenditures from public debt receipts.

Thus neither statutory requirements nor budget form make uniform distinctions according to the length of capital outlay, or even the occurrence of capital outlay, in providing the funds for Federal activities; nor does the budget treat uniformly the enterprises that require repayments of funds expended. They are not summarized separately from the enterprises not requiring repayments. Tabulations showing gross and net budget expenditures further obscure this difference.

Presumably a budget which made the fundamental business distinction between current and capital expenditures would require uniformity of financing according to the nature of the program.

Aside from the distinction which business accounting principles would require, the fundamental purpose of informing Congress is not now being met. It is not possible, without detailed and skilled accounting work, to relate the appropriations request for each enterprise to the basic figures of Government surplus and deficit.

When receipts are counted as offsets to expenditures, budgetary authorizations and expenditures are net; when receipts are not counted as offsets, authorizations and expenditures are gross. The appropriations required for the same amount of lending are larger in the second than in the first instance. The appropriations and expenditures figures are also affected by the method of handling receipts. But the contribution of the activity to the Government's surplus or deficit is unaffected by the difference in presentation of the receipts figures. However, in the budget tables summarizing receipts and in the receipts tabulations of the Daily Treasury Statement, the receipts on account of REA, and so forth, are not stated separately, so that the net expenditures and the contribution to the Federal surplus or deficit are not exhibited.

An erroneous impression of the added Federal debt resulting from REA and similar programs is likely to be obtained. The fact that the expenditures will be repaid, thus not adding permanently to the debt, is obscured by the method of reporting their finances.

The lack of uniformity in presenting data on loan repayments and interest receipts reflects differences of the legal form in which the activities are conducted.

In favor of uniformity of organization and separate budgeting are these arguments:

First. The receipts of payment or of repayment would be disclosed uniformly instead of being undisclosed or inconsistently disclosed.

Second. Uniform organization of loan, construction, and other businesslike activities in revolving fund form would enable comparisons to be made of the cost to the taxpayer of each of the activities, both in budget summary tables, and from the appropriations data for each.

Third. Uniform organization and financing would facilitate comparisons among activities with respect to the gross additions they make to Federal and other assets, and to the liabilities of others to the Federal Government.

In opposition to uniform organization of all so-called business-type activities are these arguments:

First. Many different purposes are pursued in activities now organized as revolving funds, corporations, and regular departmental offices. Some of the funds are for management purposes,

some of the agencies are for public purposes where repayment and gain or loss considerations are minor or irrelevant, and lending or building are matters of policy rather than of market demand. Uniform organization as revolving funds would reduce congressional control over finances where policy considerations rather than gain or loss should dominate.

Second. Differences in the period over which loans are extended, or between supplying materials and constructing dams; and differences in appropriate arrangements regarding repayments, would make misleading the reports obtained from diverse activities cast into one organizational pattern conforming to business accounting concepts. If repayments of loans which had been made at low price levels were related to new loan disbursements of a year that followed a period of increasing prices for structures and equipment, experience under the program would appear unfavorable even though all repayment contracts had been fulfilled.

Third. The distinction between capital and current expenses does not require uniformity of organization.

Although these are the arguments offered on both sides of the budget question, I am of the personal opinion that the business of the Government—the business of the American people—should be conducted on a businesslike basis.

We need a national budget that is uniform and informative. Such a budget need not contain any more information than the present document, but the information would be presented more directly and in one place. I would include both working capital and long-term capital activities. Such a budget would be a capital budget, and it is that proposal that I ask Congress to consider.

CAPITAL BUDGET AN EXTENSION OF RECENT BUDGET DEVELOPMENTS

A capital budget would require extension of the business accounting principles which are only occasionally found in the present budget. It could not be prepared unless accounts reflecting the valuation of assets were to be developed. Estimates of real and personal property held by each agency of the Government have been developed, but real property accounts are rare in the budget. Related depreciation accounts have been developed for a few agencies, for example, TVA and GSA.

The financial statements of revolving funds ordinarily are not complete; many of the funds are only working capital funds. They are a device for management and accounting for operations similar to those conducted by private business, but, unlike a private business, the entities are not proprietorships and therefore not directed toward the increase of net assets. Net assets and profit and loss statements cannot be prepared without development of accounts for real property and equipment, showing both cost and changes in valuation as through depreciation.

Depreciation accounts are essentially measurements of an amount of costs that ought to be recovered from sales in each accounting period. When a salable product is not the goal of the activity and the Government is not intent on avoiding any net cost, depreciation accounts cannot perform their usual function. They measure an imputed cost, not current expenses which require financing. But if developed, they might be put to another use, to indicate when retirement and replacement of buildings and other assets will need to be considered.

Profit and loss estimates are used for CCC to determine the extent of capital impairment resulting from program operations. The amount of the impairment is restored or forgiven by the Congress so that the borrowing power and thus the lending power of the CCC remains undiminished.

A capital budget that is concerned with financial capital would require governmentwide development of profit and loss information.

Conceivably, however, a capital budget could be concerned not only with the measurement of the Government's capital, but also with capital as an increase in the productive power of the economic system. I think this is the key to the idea of the fully productive economy the Government is pledged to promote in the Employment Act of 1946.

Some of the information in the accounts developed with business accounting titles can assist in appraising the impact of Federal programs on the productive power of the economic system. Recent budgets have begun to measure the cost of Government activities, that is, the amount of work performed and materials used. This is supplementary to the usual information about the amount of funds obligated for a program. The difference between costs and obligations, as reconciling statements make plain, is a difference in the year to which the financial data refer.

Emphasis on costs may provide measurement of additions to assets in the year when they are built. Less desirable is the possibility that emphasis on costs will divert attention from aspects of Federal programs which are of first importance in times of economic change.

Whether cost and accrued expenditure figures measure the additions to productive capacity which result from Federal programs, depends on the object classifications used in presenting the data on costs.

The present classifications, and the organization of the textual and tabular materials in the budget, make it easier to obtain an overall view of the volume of only the broad classes of assets such as lenders' claims, public works, commodities, and equipment. A more detailed idea can be obtained only by reading the text of the budget plus the appended special analyses plus, in some cases, the justifications presented to the appropriations committees. The last of these do not become available in time to be of any real service to Members of Congress who are not on the appropriations committees.

While the text of the budget document and the special analyses appended to it disclose most of the details of the Government's capital expenditures, they do not have the effect of budgeting capital expenditures. They cannot be used to determine in detail what the Congress is authorizing for each program involving capital expenditures. The reason is that the text and the special analyses do not contain the same information, and that the two cannot be reconciled completely without an amount of strictly accounting work that would leave no time for reflection and further investigation.

Solution to the problem of providing usable information on assets would require an object classification that would disclose them, and then either a separate budget for investment and other programs involving additions to capital, or else including within the text of the budget the new information plus all that now appears in the special analyses. The former, I think, is more businesslike, more in conformity with usual accounting practices, although the latter would facilitate getting an overall view of the budget for economic analysis.

SHOULD DATA REFER TO COSTS, EXPENDITURES, OR OBLIGATIONS?

Aside from the arrangement of the material, is it stated on the basis that is most appropriate to Congressional action on economic problems? The emphasis is on accounting for work done—costs incurred—or of work paid for (expenditures). These are not adequate for analysis of the impact of Federal programs, as they also are not adequate for analysis of the position of a business or of the position of all businesses.

And they are totally inadequate for determining the desirability of new capital investment on the basis of our national needs.

HOW SHOULD CAPITAL BE DEFINED?

The problem then is to define capital and development expenditures. In the present budget, they are not identical. Capital outlays include loans and purchases of physical assets; other developmental expeditures are not considered capital. The definition of capital apparently turns on the length of life of the asset—whether it is a loan or is a physical asset.

Definition of developmental expenditures is not consistent with accounting or tax definitions of capital. But it is consistent with a definition of capital as additions to the longer term productive resources of the Nation. The basis of improvement in productivity is technological knowledge. Physical assets only embody technical knowledge. Expenditures which have the purpose of making substantial contributions to technological knowledge and to productive physical assets should be counted as capital, as they now are counted as developmental expenditures. Expenditures for development of knowledge should be marked as capital expenditures in the text of the budget and in an overall summary.

Expenditures for physical capital should indicate the purposes for which the expenditures are made, or for which costs are incurred, or for which orders are placed. The purposes include adding to the productivity of the shipbuilding industry, the agricultural industries, mining industries, electrical industry,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

and others; to aid an industry to maintain profits as is done for local housing projects; to provide the construction required for water or highway transport, and so on. The exhibits should indicate how much of the expenditures are for purchase of land and existing facilities, how much for new construction, how much for administration, operation, maintenance and repair, and so forth. The information relating to additions to Federal assets should describe the productivity of the assets, their probable disposability, and the likelihood of profit or loss from them. The estimated life of the assets should be indicated in the original request for funds, and depreciation accounts of course need to be maintained where the useful life of the asset and the possibility of recovering its cost justify such accounts.

The practice now followed in the special analysis of public works, of indicating the eventual total cost of the program currently authorized and under construction, should be followed in all presentations regarding capital assets.

Capital assets would be distinguished in expenditure accounts and in balance sheets which ought to be prepared for individual agencies and departments, and in an overall balance sheet for all of the Government. Valuation accounts ought to be exhibited as offsets to the appropriate asset accounts. The kinds of valuation accounts that are desirable are a matter for debate. Probably depreciation should be computed only for assets that are put to some businesslike use. For similar assets used in programs that do not involve lending or any other operation yielding a monetary return, some sort of memorandum indicating the extent of deterioration and obsolescence may be desirable. But where the recovery of cost of a building is irrelevant to the financing of a program, the computation of depreciation is unnecessary.

Capital assets—and I stress this—should include only the productive assets. Military items which are built to be destroyed and are subject to very high rates of obsolescence should not be included in capital assets if the accounts are to measure additions to the productive power of the economic system.

Difference in the useful life of assets is the basis for separating capital from current expenses in accounting. In an enterprise conducted for profit the distinction between capital and current expenses guides the charging of cost against revenues in the years in which revenues are derived from the costs. The distinction is necessary in arranging the financial plan for the budget of the private enterprise. An obvious rule for separating capital and current charges is between assets with an expected useful life of 1 year and those with more than 1 year of useful life. This obvious rule is not always adopted in private accounting, nor is uniform adoption desirable. George May stated with respect to fixed assets that "A fixed property expense is one the benefit of which is expected to extend over a number of accounting periods; what number is a question to which no uniform answer can be given." The statement is understood to mean that the minimum number of years over which the benefit is yielded in order that a property may be classified as fixed, is uncertain. If a uniform rule were sought, it probably would require that the average useful life of the property be about 5 years.

The purpose of the business accounts for property is not to measure the life of the assets, but to charge the cost of them either against revenues in determining profit, or against accumulated income—surplus—of the enterprise.

The Federal Government does not face the necessity of recovering its payments for assets except as policy requires recovery. And policy may be oriented toward any of several purposes. Whether the assets are for Federal use, or are acquired by private persons with Government loans or aid payments, the length of their life need not influence the choice between taxes and borrowing and use of receipts from prior loans, by which the Government finances their construction or acquisition. Some public works, as well as loans, are productive of income, and repayment can be made to the Government. But the Government is not dependent on these repayments for its capacity to continue in operation or to continue to build public works or make loans. The Federal Government has the power to create money as well as to levy taxes. A 40-year loan therefore would not necessitate Federal borrowing for 40 years; and consequently does not need to be carried as a capital item in any Federal accounts by reason of its financing. The way the Government raises the money should depend on the needs the economic system has for more money or for restrictions on the money supply and income; and these considerations will overrule any artificial rules which might be set up relating to the financing of particular loans or Federal assets.

Capital assets should be distinguished not so much as a guide to methods of financing particular programs, but as a means of obtaining information about the contribution of the Government to the growth of the economic system.

The length of useful life of assets which are to be reported in the budget as capital assets perhaps could be stated in legislation, in order to bring uniformity among agencies and to accumulate significant information. Because of the large amount of repairs and maintenance on assets of short useful life, the minimum average life expectancy perhaps ought to be at least 5 years before an asset is counted as adding significantly to the stock of productive equipment. A further consideration is that agencies making working capital loans may extend credit for 5 years; economy in reporting would be gained by automatically ruling out their activities.

I think the greatest contribution to a better understanding of the assets owned by the American people and the desirability of expanding their productive quality would be a Federal capital budget.

It would demonstrate that funds—taxpayers' funds—spent by Congress for a dam or other project has value. It would total up what our people really own by way of property. I know that it would add up to billions and billions of dollars.

But even more important is the guide it would provide to the future.

We saw in this session of Congress a fumbling but necessary effort to ward off depression. It was done by expanding—at least in Senate-passed legislation—housing, roadbuilding, and community facility construction. But at no time was the Congress aware of the overall effect of these measures taken together. We took them up one at a time. We did not know exactly what the effect of each would be alone upon the economy, nor of all taken together.

A capital budget would make our problems much simpler. We would have a clearer idea of how to expand Federal public-work programs to meet the needs of the domestic economy. And our people would know that the money so expended was not on make-work projects.

The bill I am introducing at this time is only the most tentative proposal. I am not at all certain about the definition of "capital item" it contains. Perhaps the life of the item should be fixed; I hope that introduction of the bill will bring forth some expert advice on this point. Neither am I certain that the definition should be confined by law to those operations which yield income in the form of fees or charges. I put that in the bill only as a proposed definition.

I offer it in the hope that it will draw comment and suggestions between now and the opening of the 86th Congress from the people who have explored this critical field of Government finance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 2 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended (31 U. S. C. 2), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"The term 'current operations' when used in relation to the budget refers to all activities of any branch, department, agency, or instrumentality of the Government other than those involving the acquisition, operation, administration, or disposal of capital items.

"The term 'capital item' means any operation of any branch, department, agency, or instrumentality of the Government—

"(a) which will, as determined by the President upon advice furnished by the Director—

"(i) yield income in the form of fees or charges paid by the public for the use of certain facilities provided by such branch, department, agency, or instrumentality;

"(ii) involve the furnishing by such branch, department, agency, or instrumentality, under lease, or other contract, of real property or facilities to a Federal, State, or local governmental agency for a stipulated rental or other charge resulting in revenue sufficient to cover the cost of administering such property or facility and all principal and interest charges thereon;

"(iii) involve the holding and servicing by such branch, department, agency, or instrumentality, of revenue producing assets; or

"(iv) involve the acquisition of assets by such branch, department, agency, or instrumentality, for resale under specified conditions or circumstances; and

"(b) for which there has been approved by the President, for submission to the Congress, a definite plan for—

"(1) the issuance of securities of the United States, or of an agency or instrumentality thereof, for the designated purpose of obtaining the capital funds required for such operation; and

"(2) the repayment within a prescribed period of time of the principal amount of the funds so obtained, the interest payable upon such securities, and the costs involved in the administration of such operation from income derived from such operation, from annual appropriations to be made by the Congress chargeable to current operations of the Government, or from both such sources."

(b) (1) Section 201 of such act is amended by striking out so much of the second sentence thereof as precedes paragraph (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"The budget shall be transmitted in a form which separates receipts and expenditures for the various major categories of Government activities as follows:

"Part I—Current operations; cash items.

"Part II—Current operations; noncash items.

"Part III—Capital items.

"Part IV—Trust account operations.

"Part V—Debt operations.

"Part VI—Grand summary.

"There shall be set forth in the budget in such part or parts thereof, and in such form and detail, as the President may determine."

(2) Such section is further amended (A) by redesignating paragraphs (d) through (j) as paragraphs (e) through (k) respectively, and (B) by inserting after paragraph (c) a new paragraph as follows:

"(d) A summary statement of (1) the actual cash receipts and cash disbursements of the Treasury for the last completed fiscal year, and (2) the estimated cash receipts and cash disbursements of the Treasury for the fiscal year in progress, but such statement shall not include receipts and expenditures for capital items."

(c) The amendments made by this section shall be effective with respect to each budget transmitted to the Congress pursuant to section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended, after the date of enactment of this act.

PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN ACTS INVOLVING IMPORTATION, TRANSPORTATION, POSSESSION, OR USE OF EXPLOSIVES

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on May 28, I called the attention of the Senate to the repeated defiance of law and authority evidenced by a series of bombings in which homes, churches and schools had been damaged. Since then there have been two additional bombings. In all, there have been 47 instances of such outrageous conduct.

It appears that this defiance of law and order is part of an interstate conspiracy, for the bombings follow a discernible pattern, and they seem to be directed at those of our citizens who have expressed their constitutional right to free speech, freedom to assemble, freedom of religion, and freedom to vote. In some instances there have been only a vague connection between the object of the attack and civil rights, but by telephone calls and other devices, the attackers have indicated that the explosions were designed as threats.

Regardless of the divergent views many of us may express upon civil rights, I know that all Members of this body and all citizens condemn this use of force and violence. The various State authorities have been unable to take effective action because of the interstate character of the offense. The Federal Government has indicated that it lacks authority to investigate until it can prove the interstate nature of the offense.

Although it is late in the session, and it is apparent that no action will be taken in this area before adjournment, I believe it would serve a useful purpose to consider what legislation would be appropriate to curb these criminal elements. I therefore introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which, if enacted, will prohibit certain acts involving the importation, transportation, possession or use of explosives for these purposes. I hope that hearings may be held on this bill next year when I will introduce it again.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4327) to prohibit certain acts involving the importation, transportation, possession, or use of explosives, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE NAVY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am sending to the desk, and sometime later today I expect to call up, H. R. 12212, for the relief of certain civilian employees of the Navy, some 16 individuals who performed service in connection with our program of aiding Turkey.

The minority leader has made this request. The House bill and the report will be on the desk, if any Senator desires to examine them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received; and will lie on the desk.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

Address delivered by him at Fort Worth, Tex., on August 3, 1958, at the annual Texas Department Encampment of the American Legion.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

Statement by him relating to the enforcement of Coast Guard regulations.

By Mr. JAVITS:

Report by him to the people of the State of New York, 85th Congress, autumn 1958.

By Mr. LANGER:

Statement prepared by him on work of World Tape Pals, Inc., and World Tapes for Education.

THE FACTS ABOUT OUR RELATIVE DEFENSE STRENGTH

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it was not my purpose to talk again, at this session, on the subject of national defense. After reading the RECORD of day before yesterday, however, I believe some clarification is necessary.

As pointed out the same day by the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], in one of his outstanding speeches on our foreign relations, the military segment of our overall security problem is but one of many. In effect, in normal times it is but an extension of our foreign policy.

Nevertheless, it is a vitally important segment, because no foreign policy, however wise in concept it may be, can succeed against the Sino-Soviets unless that policy is backed up by adequate strength.

The record shows that in their relations with foreign nations, the Communists respect only power.

That is my premise. Therefore, the people must have all the truth about our relative military strength vis-a-vis that of the Communists which will not help the possible enemy.

Consequently, I make the following observations:

First, in the debate Thursday there was an effort to show that mistakes were made before this administration took over. That is true. Mistakes were made prior to that time—and Korea proved it.

If in the Thursday debate any Member was attempting to tell the people this country is ahead in medium-range ballistic missiles, that is not correct. The Russians are well ahead of us.

If the implication was that this country is ahead in long-range ballistic missiles, that also is incorrect.

In this latter field, the Russians are at least 2 years ahead of the United States.

If there was implication that our submarine strength is equal, or almost equal, to that of the Russians, that is not correct.

If there was implication this Nation is not seriously deficient in airlift for both its ground armies—that is, the Army as well as the Marines—that is incorrect.

As the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] pointed out, we have now reached the point where criticism results in the accusation that we are selling the country short.

This is a new line—a guilty-conscience line, now blended with the line that this country is well ahead.

A figure of 130 ICBM's was referred to by one Senator—and the assertion made that the United States had programs for producing more than 130 intercontinental ballistic missiles by 1962.

That is not correct—and it is very, very dangerous to our national security to assert that it is correct.

If the implication was that the missile program is now being run on a crash basis, based on what in business is normally considered a crash program, that is not correct.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

If the implication was that we will soon have even one operational Polaris submarine, that is not correct.

The statement that the production rate on the Atlas intercontinental ballistic missile is rising is not correct. Obviously this could not be true, because to date this Nation has never made an operational ICBM.

The statement that the Russians are only a few months ahead in the intercontinental ballistic missile field is not correct.

The implication that under present programs the Soviets are not increasing their lead in the ICBM field is incorrect.

With respect to the reduction in previous estimated production of the longest range Soviet bombers—mentioned several times in the debate—that is true; the reason for the policy change being either their tremendous strides in the missile field, or their interest in a new bomber comparable to our interest in a new bomber.

But the Soviets still have many thousands more military jet aircraft than we do—including more bombers.

To me, the most unfortunate aspect of the presentations of August 21 is the fact there was a comparison of what this country could do, but does not plan to do—as against the best estimates of what the Russians are actually doing.

Mr. President, on the floor of the Senate July 21, 1954, in a talk entitled "The Intercontinental Ballistic Missile," I made the following statement:

Mr. President, have we now reached a period in America's history when we are even afraid to admit that danger exists, let alone face it?

Has our national spirit quailed to the point where we want our public officials to shield their eyes from unpleasant truth?

In the twilight of Greece's glory, the flabby citizens of Athens stoned messengers who brought them news of danger.

Have we Americans become so complacent amid our luxuries and pleasures that our leaders have become afraid of being punished if they point out what sacrifices are necessary to perpetuate our freedom?

If we are to survive in this dangerous world, the people must know the brutal truth about the growing military strength of the Communists.

In recent months, in what at times would almost seem a deliberate effort to confuse, we have been regaled with speculation about various new weapons and superweapons, atomic and nonatomic.

All possible means of delivering these new weapons have been analyzed and advocated—from old-fashioned cannon to satellite missiles.

It is important not to be distracted by unrestrained fancy—rather to isolate and examine what is known beyond all doubt.

That statement was true then. It is even more true today.

As this Congress adjourns, there are many things of which we cannot be certain, just as we did not know, when we adjourned last year, that the optimistic claims for our military policies would be blasted in a few weeks by the launching of the first sputnik.

Of one thing we can be very sure, however; namely, under our present plans and programs, the Sino-Soviet empire will be militarily stronger next January vis-a-vis the strength of the United States than it is today.

If we are not willing to face up to the facts, and thereupon act in recognition of those facts, this situation can only get worse instead of better.

In that connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial in the Washington Post of yesterday, August 22, entitled "File and Forget?" be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FILE AND FORGET?

President Eisenhower says that he considers American defenses adequate and more powerful than ever before. By the way, what ever happened to the Gaither report?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I have several other matters I should like to place in the RECORD, but I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania if he wishes to comment on my recent remarks.

Mr. CLARK. I hope this clear and forthright statement by the distinguished Senator from Missouri will receive the attention in the press and across the Nation which it deserves. There has been a great deal of nonsensical talk about the state of our national defense, both on and off the floor of the Senate, in recent days. The Senator from Missouri is a man who has devoted his whole career in public life to our national defense, first in the executive department, and now, more lately, during 6 years in the Senate. He knows what he is talking about, and I hope the country will listen to him.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank my able and distinguished friend from Pennsylvania, whose continuing interest in our national security shall be a stimulus to all of us.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. If we were not in the closing day of the session, I would speak at great length in answer to the speech made 2 days ago by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. I simply want the RECORD to show I consider the speech of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] thoroughly unsound and, in my opinion, a speech that cannot stand careful analysis in view of the failure of this administration to give to the American people the defense protection they are entitled to.

I am delighted to have heard the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] make his remarks this morning, because once again he has presented forewarnings to the American people, to which they had better give heed. In my judgment, everything he has said this morning is an effective rebuttal to much of the Saltonstall speech. But come next January, a group of us on this side of the aisle will continue to make clear to the American people that they have not been protected in their national defense needs by the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank my able and distinguished colleague from Oregon, who is an authority in this field.

As we all know, the Rockefeller report recommended that we do a great deal more. Actually, we are doing less, particularly when we consider the decreasing value of the dollar, as we should to get a measure of actual effort. The Gaither report, so far as we know, recommended that we do much more. Actually, we are doing a great deal less. The Johns Hopkins study, as well as the report by the Committee for Economic Development, also recommended that we do more. Yet, we are doing much less.

I appreciate what my colleagues have said on this vital matter this morning.

INDICTMENT OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the Association of State Supreme Court Justices is meeting this week in California. These are the highest judicial officers of the respective States and have had many combined years of judicial experience. Their committee on Federal-State relations has submitted a report that is the most severe indictment of the United States Supreme Court within the annals of American history. These judicial officers, who should know better than any other persons in America, have stated that our Supreme Court has entered upon legislation rather than judicial interpretation. Their report should be read by every American citizen.

I point out that of the nine Justices submitting this report, seven were from States outside the South, including the chief justices of Massachusetts, New York, Michigan, Wisconsin, Oregon, Minnesota, and Maryland. These justices can hardly be charged with southern bias.

David Lawrence, in his column in the Washington Star, dated August 22, 1958, has written a strong commentary on this report. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SUPREME COURT IS REBUKED—TEN STATE CHIEF JUSTICES' CRITICISM OF LEGISLATIVE TREND IS CITED

(By David Lawrence)

The chief justices of the highest court in each of nine States—seven of them in the North—have just issued the most penetrating criticism of the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States that has emanated from any source in recent years. They were joined by one associate justice.

Coming as it does at the very time when the Senate and the House here have been debating whether to pass laws to restrict the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and in some instances to reverse some of the points on which the Court has erroneously interpreted the intent of Congress, the wording of the document is of more than passing interest.

The report of the committee on State-Federal relationships was made public at Pasadena, California, where the annual meetings of the Conference of Chief Justices and

of the American Bar Association are being held. The chief justices of Massachusetts, New York State, Michigan, Wisconsin, Oregon, Minnesota and Maryland can hardly be charged with a "southern bias." Indeed, the report of the chief justices did not mention the segregation issue at all but dealt solely with the abuse of the rights of the States by the Supreme Court of the United States. The document says in part:

"We are now concerned specifically with the effect of judicial decisions upon the relations between the Federal Government and the State governments. Here we think that the over-all tendency of decisions of the Supreme Court over the last 25 years or more has been to press the extension of Federal power and to press it rapidly.

"There have been, of course, and still are very considerable differences within the Court on these matters, and there has been quite recently a growing recognition of the fact that our Government is still a Federal Government and that the historic line which experience seems to justify between matters primarily of national concern and matters primarily of local concern should not be hastily or lightly obliterated. A number of Justices have repeatedly demonstrated their awareness of problems of federalism and and their recognition that federalism is still a living part of our system of government. * * *

"We believe that, in the fields with which we are concerned and as to which we feel entitled to speak, the Supreme Court too often has tended to adopt the role of policy-maker without proper judicial restraint. We feel this is particularly the case in both of the great fields we have discussed—namely, the extent and extension of the Federal power, and the supervision of State action by the Supreme Court by virtue of the 14th amendment. In the light of the immense power of the Supreme Court and its practical nonreviewability in most instances, no more important obligation rests upon it, in our view, than that of careful moderation in the exercise of its policy-making role.

"We are not alone in our view that the Court, in many cases arising under the 14th amendment, has assumed what seem to us primarily legislative powers. See Judge Learned Hand on the Bill of Rights. We do not believe that either the framers of the original Constitution or the possibly somewhat less gifted draftsmen of the 14th amendment ever contemplated that the Supreme Court would or should, have the almost unlimited policy-making powers which it now exercises.

"It is strange, indeed, to reflect that, under a Constitution which provides for a system of checks and balances and of distribution of power between National and State Governments, one branch of one government—the Supreme Court—should attain the immense and, in many respects, dominant power which it now wields. * * *

"It has long been an American boast that we have a government of laws and not of men. We believe that any study of recent decisions of the Supreme Court will raise at least considerable doubt as to the validity of that boast. We find first that, in constitutional cases, unanimous decisions are comparative rarities and that multiple opinions, concurring or dissenting, are common occurrences.

"We find next that divisions in result on a 5-to-4 basis are quite frequent. We find further that, on some occasions, a majority of the Court cannot be mustered in support of any one opinion and that the result of a given case may come from the divergent views of individual Justices who happen to unite on one outcome or the other of the case before the Court.

"It seems strange that, under a constitutional doctrine which requires all others to recognize the Supreme Court's rulings on constitutional questions as binding adjudications of the meaning and application of the Constitution, the Court itself has so frequently overturned its own decisions thereon, after the lapse of periods varying from 1 year to 75, or even 95 years. * * *

"The Constitution expressly sets up its own procedures for amendment, slow or cumbersome though they may be. If reasonable certainty and stability do not attach to a written constitution, is it a constitution or is it a sham?

"These frequent differences and occasional overrulings of prior decisions in constitutional cases cause us grave concern as to whether individual views as to what is wise or desirable do not unconsciously override a more dispassionate consideration of what is or is not constitutionally warranted. * * *

"It is our earnest hope which we respectfully express, that that great Court exercise to the full its power of judicial self-restraint by adhering firmly to its tremendous, strictly judicial powers and by eschewing, so far as possible, the exercise of essentially legislative powers when it is called upon to decide questions involving the validity of State action, whether it deems such action wise or unwise."

The 10 justices declare, moreover, that at times the Supreme Court Justices seem to manifest an impatience with the slow workings of our Federal system and an unwillingness to wait for Congress to make clear its intention to exercise the powers conferred upon it by the Constitution.

The report says also that the Supreme Court seems to be impatient with the slow processes of amending the Constitution which that instrument provides, and that it should be adhering to the limitations of judicial power, instead of merely giving effect to what it may deem desirable.

This is a scathing rebuke of the present Supreme Court, though the criticism does go back in some instances to previous personnel as well. There can be no doubt that many men of the highest judicial experience in America have begun to question whether the attitude of the present Court isn't really legislative instead of judicial.

RESOLUTION OF MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, at the request of officials of the Missouri Department of the Veterans of World War I, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a resolution adopted by the department at its State convention, May 18, West Plains, Mo.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the veterans of World War I, United States of America, are in need of economic aid for an American standard of living; and,

Whereas all war veterans groups, since the Revolutionary War, have been granted an age pension, establishing a 100-percent precedent for an age pension for war veterans for almost 200 years; and

Whereas the public charities and the Veterans' Administration has utterly failed to aid destitute old veterans of World War I, as evidenced by the veteran of World War I, who jumped from a 17 story window, last year in New York City because he was destitute and had been refused food and shelter by public charity and the Veterans' Administration; and

Whereas an age pension by H. R. 2201, will create a cash buying power in every Congressional District in the Nation, thereby aiding small business and stop the recession, and save the Nation from the danger of communism: Therefore be it

Resolved, by the Missouri Department of the Veterans of World War I, United States of America, Inc., at its annual convention, held in West Plains, Mo., May 17 and 18, 1958, That the Congress of the United States, is hereby respectfully requested and urged to promptly grant an age pension to the veterans of World War I, by passing H. R. 2201, at this session of Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That copies hereof be mailed to Members of Congress, asking their aid in helping their needy old war veterans who saved the Nation 40 years ago.

B. E. KOEGER,
Commander.
H. L. BRATTON,
Adjutant.

AN END TO NUCLEAR TESTS?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, a thoughtful and constructive editorial appears this morning in the New York Times, entitled "An End to Nuclear Tests?"

I respectfully commend its contents to the interest of my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent that it appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of August 23, 1958]

AN END TO NUCLEAR TESTS?

The President's statement yesterday offering a beginning toward the ending of nuclear tests must be welcome to the great majority of Americans and, indeed, to all humanity. Speaking so soon after the successful conclusion of the Geneva technical talks on means of detecting nuclear tests, the President yesterday successfully met the challenge which the heartening cooperation of Eastern and Western scientists in Geneva had posed.

There are, we know, patriotic and devoted Americans in Washington who are uneasy about the President's decision. It is natural that officers in the Pentagon should want more tests to improve and refine nuclear weapons. A similar feeling is understandable in the Atomic Energy Commission. We can understand, too, those in Congress who, justifiably suspicious of the Soviet Union, wonder if the President's statement has not opened the way for our falling into a Soviet trap.

Nevertheless, we believe the President has done the right thing. He has chosen a course which for the moment at least walks successfully the narrow path between gullible acceptance of Soviet words on one side and on the other side callous—and politically stupid—disregard of the fear of millions of human beings. By his statement yesterday he has now put the Soviet Government in a position where it must put up or shut up, where it must agree to his reasonable offer in a reasonable time or take upon itself responsibility for resumption of atomic tests.

Whether justified or not—and it is an issue on which there is still much disagreement among scientists—millions of human beings have been and are afraid of the near and long term consequences of continued nuclear weapons tests. By playing upon that fear the Soviet Union and its allies have been able to win important propaganda advantages, posing as the opponents of continued nuclear tests and depicting us as mad imperialists determined to continue such tests regardless of consequences.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Our refusal to fall victims to the worst of this Soviet propaganda finally forced Moscow to send its scientists to work out a suitable method of enforcing a ban on future tests. We now offer to implement such a ban, provided such implementation is accompanied by progress toward actual disarmament, and the President's statement yesterday correctly stressed that ending the tests is not in itself a disarmament step. If the Russians refuse to meet our reasonable conditions we can, however reluctantly, resume testing. It is up to them.

AN UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR LATIN AMERICAN AFFAIRS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on Wednesday, August 20, there appeared an editorial in Diario Las Americas, Miami, Fla., entitled "An Undersecretary of State for Latin American Affairs."

Mr. President, as world conditions now develop, it would appear of utmost importance that we give fullest consideration to our friends and neighbors in this hemisphere. This editorial, representing as it does some of the thinking of the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], would appear to offer a unique and constructive approach to the problem.

Inasmuch as it is presented by one in the Senate who knows at least as much about this part of the world as any of our colleagues, I believe it to be of interest to all other Senators, and therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Miami (Fla.) Diario Las Americas of Wednesday, August 20, 1958]

AN UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR LATIN AMERICAN AFFAIRS

Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, of Florida, has submitted to the consideration of the Senate in Washington the idea of elevating to the category of Under Secretariat of State the regional offices which, within the Department of State, are in charge of the relations and affairs of the United States with the 20 Latin American Republics.

The proposal of the distinguished Florida Senator is of marked importance for inter-American relations and, if approved and adopted, will bring excellent results for the United States in her policies toward the above-mentioned Republics.

At present, the Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs and his immediate collaborators, all of them well prepared and enthusiastic Pan Americanists, have multiple limitations of political and administrative order in the discharge of their functions, limitations that would disappear, at least in part, with the creation of the Under Secretariat for Latin American Affairs, since these matters would be then within a higher category and could be resolved more promptly, or consulted in a more direct form with the White House, simplifying procedures when necessary.

In order that inter-American policies of the United States acquire more importance and increase in achievement, it is necessary that in the mind of the Federal Government a conviction exists that something substantial must be done to give new impulse to the foreign relations of this great country with her allies in this hemisphere. Without doubt, the proposed Under Secretariat, which logically would have adequate political support, would help immensely to that accelerated advance that inter-American relations require on the part of the United States.

Because of well-known reasons, the inter-American relations are at present having difficult moments of trial, which it is to be hoped will be resolved for the benefit of the prestige of the inter-American system and, besides, for the benefit of the world prestige of the United States. The 21 Republics of America must do everything in their power to strengthen the bonds which unite them, and each of the Foreign Offices, not only in Washington, are under the obligation of revitalizing their policies of inter-American reapproachment and cooperation, so that the solidarity of all the 21 Republics becomes a functional reality of reciprocal convenience.

A PROPHECY ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the Congress has now passed a farm bill. This bill is of some immediate advantage to a few farmers, but of no permanent advantage whatever to nearly all farmers.

The American farmer faces problems even more serious than those of recent years, years in which the farmer's economic situation has steadily deteriorated.

Because it would appear that we may now be planning disaster, and because there may still be time to avoid it, herewith is presented an analysis of what is facing the feed-grain-livestock segment of our farm economy.

I have had business experience, and some agricultural experience in a cattle breeding operation. But my knowledge of the overall problems of agriculture was far from extensive when I came to the Senate.

Agriculture means much to my State, however. Missouri ranks among the top few States in farm cash receipts. Therefore, I sought membership on the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee; and have now served on that committee for over 2 years.

During these years I have come to realize that, in effect, operating a farm is but another private business, with its problems of inventory, of surplus, of profit and loss, of merchandising policy, and so forth; and although it does have its own peculiar problems, as does any other business, basically the reasons behind the success or failure of a farm are comparable to the reasons behind the success or failure of any bank or other private business corporation.

Well operated, a farm can succeed, provided it gets support reasonably comparable to that granted other segments of the economy.

Without that support, few agricultural undertakings can succeed over the long pull, regardless of their efficiency.

This is a serious matter, not only to the millions who now live on our farms, but also to the Nation as a whole. Unless the agriculture policies characteristic of this administration are altered, there is grave danger that agriculture will ultimately drag down the rest of our economy.

Mr. President, over a year ago I became alarmed at the continued build-up of feed-grain stocks held by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Many others in the Senate shared my concern, and joined with me in passing a resolution on May 8, 1957, requesting the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a thorough study of possible methods of improving the feed-grain price-support program.

The Secretary of Agriculture responded with a report on July 15, 1957. This report, among other things, said:

The evidence is convincing that we should move in the direction of more freedom for our farmers to produce, unfettered by allotments determined by rigid formulas • • • the Government should adjust its farm programs in a manner designed to remove the constant infringements on farmer decisions.

Therefore, it is herewith recommended that the price of corn be supported in the same manner as prices of other feed grains (0-90 percent of parity at the discretion of the Secretary without acreage allotments).

Elsewhere in the report the statement is made that under such a feed-grain program, prices would be expected to stabilize at about 60 percent of parity.

The Secretary's report also stated:

And there would be the possibility that slightly lower livestock prices might result. However, net incomes of livestock producers might be as high, or almost as high, as under current support programs.

After that report was written, in the fall of 1957 this Nation harvested by far the largest crop of feed grains on record. As a result, next October 1 we shall have a record addition to surplus stocks.

The large crop in 1957 was produced in spite of the fact that several million feed-grain acres were made idle by the Soil Bank program.

The Department of Agriculture's August crop report indicates that the total feed-grain crop will establish a new record again this year. This record level is in spite of our now having 6.6 million corn acres in the Soil Bank; and also several million acres of cropland in the conservation reserve.

This year, as has been the case for the last several years, we shall have a production of feed grains which will be 5 to 10 percent greater than what is needed for domestic utilization and normal shipments abroad.

Mr. President, when we were discussing S. 4071, which incorporated the recommendations of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to the corn program, I protested that the corn provisions were wholly inadequate and unrealistic.

Because of concern for the economic welfare of the producers of feed grains and livestock, I have had an analysis made of the probable supplies and prices of feed grains and livestock if the present trend toward Government abandonment of the farmer were carried to the ultimate by Secretary Benson and his aides.

Marketings of feed grains and livestock products account for 60 to 65 percent of the dollar value of all farm marketings.

At the present time, because of a combination of factors, meat animal producers are enjoying a more favorable level of prices and income than they have had for several years.

But they know, and we know, that this is because they have been sending fewer, rather than more, animals to market, while feed grains continue to pile up in the Government warehouses and storage bins of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Our studies conclude that feed grain prices would drop quickly to 40 to 50 percent of parity if all price supports were removed and unlimited production permitted. This would be followed by a similar, but somewhat slower, decline in livestock prices.

Let us remember that on October 1 we will have a carryover of feed grains equal to two-thirds of a normal crop of corn.

Let us remember also that in spite of acreage allotments, 3 years of Soil Bank programs, and 4 years of foreign disposal programs under Public Law 480, we shall have record wheat stocks on hand at the end of this marketing year.

Moreover, it is not realistic to consider the effects of the removal of price support for feed grains in the next few years without allowing for either increased feeding of wheat, or increased production of feed grains on additional acreages diverted from wheat production.

I am advised by those most familiar with feed grain and livestock statistics that, after allowing for increased feeding of wheat up to 100 million to 150 million bushels a year, and allowing for an orderly reduction of feed grain stocks to about one-third of current levels over a period of, say, 6 or 7 years, we might expect total feed utilization by livestock producers to increase about 20 percent under completely uncontrolled market conditions.

If part of our tremendous wheat stock is utilized in this fashion—that is, for feed—corn prices will be forced down to 75 to 80 cents per bushel.

That would mean corn prices at 40 to 50 percent of parity. Of course, the prices of other feed grains would likewise be depressed.

If feed-grain supplies and prices sank to these levels, it is probable that broiler production would thereupon expand 40 to 50 percent, turkey production 20 to 30 percent, and egg production 10 to 20 percent.

It is also fair to assume that milk production would then be increased by 5 to 10 percent, due, in part, to the low prices for other livestock products.

Beef production, in all probability, would go up 10 to 15 percent. Hog production, which responds more promptly to increases in the supplies of feed grains, would probably increase by 25 to 35 percent.

With livestock production increasing to these higher levels, even though our population is increasing, livestock producers would receive even lower prices and lower incomes.

Those few poultry producers who in the next few years may be able to expand their broiler or turkey output rapidly and in substantial amounts may look forward to slightly higher incomes. In the absence of any Government cooperation in feed grains, however, most poultry producers would not share in this situation.

Other livestock producers would realize lower incomes. Hog producers, under such a market policy, with a 25- to 35-percent larger volume of marketings, could expect prices to average $10 to $12 per 100 pounds.

Consequently, the gross value of their sales, including the sale of the increased production, would be only 75 to 80 percent of the 1956–57 levels.

These are, indeed, dismal statistics. Based on the best information available, however, they are realistic and, therefore, need to be given careful consideration by all who are interested in the future of the family farmer.

The Department of Agriculture publishes information on farm costs; also returns on commercial, family operated, farms in different parts of the United States.

Information of this type is available for four different types of commercial, family operated farms, typical of those in northern Missouri and in the Corn Belt.

First are the hog-dairy farms in the Midwest, which receive about one-third of their income from the sale of dairy products. Another one-third is from the sale of hogs, and the remainder comes from the sale of cull dairy animals, poultry, eggs, and various other miscellaneous products.

In 1956–57 this type of farm had cash receipts of about $10,600 per farm.

If production of feed grains and livestock were expanded on Midwest hog-dairy farms over, say, the next 5 to 7 years in line with the estimated national totals under completely uncontrolled market conditions; and if prices declined as indicated earlier, hog-dairy farmers would receive about $1,000, or some 10 percent, less income each year than they received in 1956–57.

Production expenses would be higher for the larger volume of output; therefore it is estimated that net farm income would be at least 25 percent lower than in 1956–57.

Second are the hog-beef raising farms, typical of much of Missouri and the southern Corn Belt. They receive about half of their cash income from the sale of hogs, one-fourth from the sale of beef cattle, and the remainder from the sale of miscellaneous products.

In 1956–57, the average cash receipts for these farms were about $6,750.

Without any Government cooperation in feed grains and livestock products, cash receipts on these farms would drop about $600, or 9 percent.

That is not the whole story, however. With the increased expenses incident to the larger volume of production, it is estimated that net farm income would decrease by at least 20 percent.

Hog-beef fattening farms are also common in northern Missouri and other parts of the Corn Belt.

The average farm of this type purchased about $5,000 of feeder cattle and pigs for fattening in 1956–57, and had cash receipts of about $18,000.

In the next 5 to 7 years, in the absence of production adjustment or a price-support program, the average farm of this type might expect a decrease in cash receipts of $500 to $1,000. The critical result, however, would be the expected reduction of 20 percent in net income because of increased expenses associated with their larger livestock production.

On the more level lands in the corn belt, which would include many farms in northwest Missouri, cash grain farming is characteristic. These farms tend to be above average in size, and are highly productive.

In 1956–57, their average cash receipts were $13,800. In the absence of any Government cooperation, they might expect a reduction of $3,000 in cash receipts; and therefore a reduction in net income of 40 percent or more.

These statistics form a dismal picture for the future if present policies continue—from the point of view of both the farmers themselves and the country as a whole.

The United States is already producing excess supplies of feed grains. Furthermore, acre yields are increasing at a rate equal to, or greater than, the rate of our population increase.

To compound the problem, year to year increased efficiency in livestock feeding about equals our rate of population increase.

In other words, if we are going to utilize our expanding feed-grain production through livestock, we must immediately jump our rate of feeding more than 10 percent. Then we must continue to increase it on a yearly basis about twice the rate of population growth.

In other words, if we are to avoid piling up an even greater surplus of feed grains, livestock output must be expanded at about twice the rate of the population increase.

Few people realize how rapidly livestock producers have already increased their output. In the last 20 years, livestock farmers have been producing meat, milk, eggs, and poultry at a rate which permitted consumers to increase their consumption of animal protein from 1 to 1½ percent per year.

As illustration, consumers' diets now contain about 30 percent more animal protein per capita than in 1935–39.

Increases in per capita supplies have been greater in meat and poultry than in dairy products and eggs.

As compared to 20 years ago, consumers are now eating 36 percent more animal protein from meats, poultry, and fish on a per capita basis. That is 15 percent more than 10 years ago.

If feed production continues to expand as expected in the absence of any adjustment program, and this increase is channeled into livestock production, during the next few years per capita supplies of meat and poultry will increase another 10 to 15 percent.

There will also be an increase in eggs and dairy products.

At the present time, domestic consumers receive two-thirds of their proteins from animal products—about 64 grams of animal protein per capita per day.

If the increased supplies of animal protein are to be channeled through domestic consumption, meat and poultry prices can only decline sharply.

Under these conditions, more total dollars would be spent for increased supplies of meat and poultry. But after deducting the marketing charges on the increased volume, farmers would actually receive less money for their increased production.

It is estimated that, for the next 6 to 7 years, a 10-percent increase in per capita supplies of meats and poultry would mean 10 percent fewer dollars than all livestock producers received in 1956–57.

These are the economic facts of life.

The effect of these facts will, of course, vary to some degree in light of possible changes in consumer habits, distribution of per capita income, and fluctuations in the rates of inflation or deflation. However, they do reveal the projected seriousness of the farmer's relative position.

In summary therefore, according to agricultural specialists in the Department of Agriculture and the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, the ultimate effects of unlimited production with only a theoretical price or income supporting program would mean:

First. Feed grain prices at less than 50 percent of parity.

Second. Hog prices at $10 to $12 per hundredweight.

Third. Sharply reduced prices for other livestock products.

Fourth. Substantially less net income for feed grain-livestock producers.

My purpose in presenting this analysis is to point out to all farmers, and particularly to feed grain and livestock farmers, what they can expect if the present course of agricultural policy is pursued.

Fortunately, there are other alternatives if farmers decide they do not want to continue in the present direction.

The three I have in mind would be:

First. Producers may, through cooperative effort, with or without Government assistance, develop an adjustment program which would maintain production at levels commensurate with demand; and at reasonable prices.

Second. A program could be developed which would provide for supplementary distribution programs, both at home and abroad, thereby diverting a portion of the total livestock production into consumption outside of normal commercial channels. Technicians indicate that, for each $100 million of meats diverted from commercial markets, farm income is increased by at least $125 million. As example, Public Law 480 could be expanded to include significant quantities of meat and poultry.

Third. A compensatory payment program could be adopted, which would allow prices to seek their normal level in the market place, and at the same time would give the farmer a reasonable chance for a fair return for his products.

Any one or a combination of these three alternatives would be preferable to the present program.

However, it is not my purpose, at this time, to suggest the adoption of a specific feed grain-livestock program. Rather, this is an effort to present a factual analysis, with various alternative actions, regarding the serious problems facing this important segment of agriculture.

In this way farmers may be informed, and therefore will be able to choose the course they believe best.

Once given the facts and the opportunity to choose, I believe farmers will work out a program that will bring to them returns reasonably comparable to those received in other segments of the economy.

APPLICATIONS FOR WRITS OF HABEAS CORPUS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to introduce into the RECORD a series of items on H. R. 8361. I assure the Senate that if I am allowed to speak uninterrupted I will be within the time limit, if we add up the 3 minutes for each item.

Mr. President, I want to place myself on record as being opposed to enactment of H. R. 8361, and I should like to state briefly some of the reasons for my opposition to the bill.

This bill, as I understand it, would restrict the present use of the writ of habeas corpus in Federal courts and would limit the opportunity now afforded a prisoner convicted in a State court to seek a review in a Federal court.

When this bill first came to my attention, it immediately aroused my interest because it deals with the writ so vitally important in our judicial processes, the writ of habeas corpus. I sought to obtain copies of the hearings held on the bill, in order to learn more about it and to learn the arguments for and against its various provisions. I was surprised to learn that no hearings have been held on the bill or even the general subject covered by it during the course of the entire 85th Congress, and that the latest hearings on the subject matter took place more than 3 years ago in the other body. Under these circumstances, it was shocking to me to learn that the Members of this body were being asked to consider and act upon this bill now in such a hurried fashion and in the closing hours of the session. A matter as vital to our judicial system and our machinery of justice as the writ of habeas corpus is far too important to tamper with without the most careful consideration and a complete weighing of all the pros and cons.

Without question the writ of habeas corpus is one of the most important instruments the individual has in our society to protect himself against possible tyranny and injustice. The late Zachariah Chafee, one of this country's greatest authorities on civil liberties and rights, after a lifetime of study, reached the conclusion that the writ of habeas corpus was the most important of all the writs available to the individual in our judicial system to protect his rights and his freedom.

Since the writ of habeas corpus is so vital and indispensable to the protection of individual rights in our society, no action should be taken to limit or restrict its use in any way without the most serious consideration and careful scrutiny. I do not think that adequate consideration has been given to the present bill and for this reason, I am unalterably opposed to its enactment at this time.

But, Mr. President, my objections to this bill do not stop there.

Turning to the provisions of the bill itself, H. R. 8361 would limit authority of the Federal courts to issue writs of habeas corpus to those applications which present substantial Federal constitutional questions, first, which was not theretofore raised and determined; second, which there was no fair and adequate opportunity theretofore to raise and have determined; and third, which cannot thereafter be raised and determined in a proceeding in the State court, by an order or judgment subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States on writ of certiorari. What this boils down to is that the proposed bill says that a State prisoner should have but one chance before the Federal courts to vindicate his constitutional rights, and that having had the opportunity to petition the Supreme Court for a review of his conviction in the State court, the prisoner should not have a second chance by habeas corpus.

Let me digress to say, Mr. President, that if a defendant had a poor lawyer who overlooked some constitutional right in the case of the first petition, he would forever be estopped from raising a question as to violation of his constitutional rights. Since when, I ask, have we reached a point in the United States when the protection of one's constitutional rights is going to depend upon the competency of a lawyer one hires in the first instance? The courts in this country for decades have made clear that it will be the court which will protect constitutional rights, irrespective of the competency of the lawyer who first represents the defendant in a case.

Therefore, Mr. President, I could not think of voting for a bill which seeks to close a door to a free man or woman in this country, who may happen to be a defendant in a case, to raising at the last step, if necessary, before a Federal court, a claim that his or her constitutional rights have been violated.

The bill further provides that an order denying an application for a writ of habeas corpus by a person in custody pursuant to a judgment of a State court shall be reviewable only on a writ of certiorari by the Supreme Court of the United States.

But, this procedure overlooks or entirely disregards the fact that denial of a petition for certiorari to review a State conviction does not mean that the petitioner has ever had a full review by the Supreme Court. In the leading habeas corpus case of *Brown* v. *Allen* (344 U. S. 443 (1953)), the Supreme Court pointed out that "the denial of a writ of certiorari imports no expression of opinion upon the merits of the case" because "a denial of certiorari means only that, for one reason or another which is seldom disclosed, and not infrequently for conflicting reasons which may have nothing

to do with the merits and certainly may have nothing to do with any view of the merits taken by a majority of the Court, there were not 4 members of the Court who thought the case should be heard." Thus the denial of certiorari is in no way an adjudication on the merits, and in making the denial of certiorari the conclusive adjudication of a petitioner's constitutional rights in the Federal courts the pending bill would in effect deny him even one fair hearing in the Federal courts.

Mr. President, I do not believe that even the proponents of the legislation intend that it should result in such a harsh denial of judicial review.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by the Industrial Union Department of the AFL–CIO last July 8 which was sent to Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, chairman of the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, opposing passage of H. R. 8361. This statement, in my opinion, ably expresses and amplifies the objection to the proposed legislation which I have just made.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSTON: There is pending before your subcommittee H. R. 8361, a bill recently approved by the House, which is designed to deprive the Federal courts of the authority they have exercised for nearly 100 years to determine by writ of habeas corpus whether persons imprisoned pursuant to State proceedings have been denied their constitutional rights.

The undersigned direct your attention to the enclosed memorandum on the pending bill, which demonstrates that there has been no showing of need for elimination of this traditional habeas corpus remedy in the Federal courts; that, on the contrary, the existence of the habeas corpus remedy has promoted greater solicitude in State proceedings for observance of constitutional guaranties and on occasion, where those constitutional guaranties have been evaded, has even saved the lives of persons unjustly convicted; and that by eliminating the time-honored habeas corpus remedy, the bill would deny persons imprisoned pursuant to State proceedings any effective hearing in any Federal court for the vindication of their Federal rights.

If your committee is considering taking any action on the pending bill, we request full public hearings at which we may express our most serious opposition to legislation depriving Federal courts of the habeas corpus power which serves as a foremost Federal safeguard of the constitutional rights of our citizens.

Sincerely yours,
ARTHUR GOLDBERG,
Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO.

THE PROPOSAL TO DENY STATE PRISONERS THE PROTECTION OF THE FEDERAL WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

For some years there have been pending in Congress bills which would deprive Federal courts of jurisdiction to review applications for habeas corpus by persons in custody pursuant to a judgment of a State court except on a ground which presents a substantial Federal constitutional question (1) which was not theretofore raised and determined, (2) which there was no fair and adequate opportunity theretofore to raise and have determined. Proponents of this measure explain its effect in the following terms: "If the question has been raised and decided in the State court, that should end the matter. If the prisoner wishes a review, he should seek certiorari from the Supreme Court."[1]

The gist of the argument of the proponents is that a State prisoner should have but one chance before the Federal courts to vindicate his constitutional rights, and that having had the opportunity to petition the Supreme Court for a review of his conviction in the State court, the prisoner should not have a second chance by habeas corpus. But the proponents disregard the fact that denial of a petition for certiorari to review a State conviction does not mean that the petitioner has ever had a full review by the Supreme Court. The pending bill would thus deprive him of even one full and fair hearing in the Federal courts for the vindication of his Federal rights.

I. THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION WOULD DENY STATE PRISONERS A SINGLE FAIR HEARING IN THE FEDERAL COURTS

Proponents of the pending bill claim that if a prisoner has been denied a review of his case by the Supreme Court when he had opportunity to apply for a writ of certiorari from his State conviction, he has had his fair day in the Federal courts for the vindication of his constitutional rights. But this is plainly incorrect, as the Supreme Court itself took pains to point out 5 years ago in its decision in *Brown* v. *Allen* (344 U. S. 443, 488–514). There the Court reemphasized its traditional stricture (at pp. 491–492) that the denial of a writ of certiorari imports no expression of opinion upon the merits of the case, because a denial of certiorari mean only that, for one reason or another which is seldom disclosed, and not infrequently for conflicting reasons which may have nothing to do with the merits and certainly may have nothing to do with any view of the merits taken by a majority of the Court, there were not four members of the Court who thought the case should be heard. Thus the denial of certiorari is in no way an adjudication on the merits, and proponents of the pending bill who would make the denial of certiorari the conclusive adjudication of a petitioner's constitutional rights in the Federal courts would in effect deny him even one fair hearing in the Federal courts.

Furthermore, to limit recourse to Federal courts to the certiorari procedure may necessarily deny a petitioner any opportunity for Federal redress of his constitutional rights because of the inadequacy of the State record upon which his contentions are based. In *Brown* v. *Allen, supra* (at pp. 492–494), the Court analyzed the cases challenging State convictions by certiorari to demonstrate that in many of these cases it denied certiorari review simply because of the inadequacy of the record for the decision of the constitutional question:

"To treat denials of certiorari in cases in which applications for habeas corpus are subsequently made in effect as adjudications here, presupposes, at the least, that such 'determinations' are based on records of litigation in which issues are more or less carefully shaped by competent lawyers, as is after all true of the ordinary flow of certiorari cases. Such an assumption is shown to be wholly baseless by the study of the 126 certiorari files on which this opinion is based. It is also an assumption that falsifies the picture of the habeas corpus problems facing the district judge.

"These petitions for certiorari are rarely drawn by lawyers; some are almost unintelligible and certainly do not present a clear statement of issues necessary for our understanding, in view of the pressure of the Court's work. The certified records we have in the run of certiorari cases to assist understanding are almost unknown in this field. Indeed, the number of cases in which most of the papers necessary to prove what happened in the State proceedings are not filed is striking. Whether there has been an adjudication or simply a perfunctory denial of a claim below is rarely ascertainable. Seldom do we have enough on which to base a solid conclusion as to the adequacy of the State adjudication. Even if we are told something about a trial of the claims the applicant asserts, we almost never have a transcript of these proceedings to assist us in determining whether the trial was adequate. Equally unsatisfactory as a means for evaluating the State proceedings is the filing of opinions; in less than one-fourth of the cases is more than a perfunctory order of the State courts filed. We would have to have very different records and to alter our consideration of these cases radically if a denial could fairly be deemed to be an undisclosed decision on the merits."

Thus Supreme Court denial of certiorari review of a conviction in a State court may mean no more than that for reasons beyond the control of the prisoner the record is insufficient at that stage for an adequate Supreme Court review. Indeed, in *Sheffield* v. *La.* (348 U. S. 850), in the absence of a transcript of the trial the Court denied certiorari to review a State conviction and death sentence, but the Court went out of its way to point out that its decision was "without prejudice to petitioner to apply to the appropriate United States district court for a writ of habeas corpus."

At least one American citizen unjustly convicted is alive today because of the habeas corpus remedy which the pending bill would abolish. In 1952, one Camilo Leyra was convicted of murder notwithstanding his contentions regarding coercion in the obtaining of his confession, and sentenced to die (304 N. Y. 463, 108 NE 2d 673 (1952)). The Supreme Court denied certiorari (345 U. S. 918), thus refusing to review the case at that juncture. Subsequently Leyra sought a review of his conviction by means of the writ of habeas corpus in the Federal courts. This time the Supreme Court reviewed the case, concluded that his confession was invalid and reversed his conviction (*Leyra* v. *Deane*, 347 U. S. 556). Thereafter Leyra was tried again but his conviction was reversed by the New York Court of Appeals which found that "the prosecution has produced not a single trustworthy bit of affirmative, independent evidence connecting defendant with the crime * * *" (1 N. Y. 2d 199, 210, 134 NE 2d 475), and in April 1956. Leyra was finally freed.

Mr. Leyra's case gives dramatic illustration to the fact that the pending legislation would deny State prisoners even one fair hearing in the Federal courts for the vindication of their constitutional rights. Clearly, for Mr. Leyra as for every other defendant who seeks review in the Supreme Court from his State conviction, often on the basis of inadequate or nonexistent records, habeas corpus is an indispensable remedy. Habeas corpus saved Leyra's life, if it did no more than save one life in a decade or a century, the writ would serve an indispensable function in the vindication of the Federal Constitution and the right of the innocent to life and liberty.

II. NO ADEQUATE REASON HAS BEEN PRESENTED FOR THE ABOLITION OF THE HISTORIC CONSTITUTIONAL SAFEGUARD OF THE GREAT WRIT

The theory of the pending legislation has been vigorously criticized by the late Judge

[1] Hearings on H. R. 5649 before Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, 84th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 7–8.

Jerome Frank[2] and by Circuit Judge Denman.[3] The Supreme Court itself has vigorously rejected the idea that Federal courts are "authorized to deny an application for habeas corpus merely because the issues may have been considered by this court in denying a petition for certiorari."[4] Recently Justice Walter V. Schaefer of the Supreme Court of Illinois, the State from which the largest volume of habeas corpus petitions is filed by State prisoners, has added his voice to the opposition.[5] Judge Schaefer points out that the habeas corpus relief which the present bill seeks to abolish has not only provided an indispensable safeguard in the Federal courts not available by any other means, but that it has tended to assure a higher standard of care in the State courts themselves. Judge Schaefer concludes that "The existence of the Federal remedy has stimulated the State courts to devise post-conviction procedures. That stimulus should not now be removed.[6]

As against the safeguard provided by the habeas corpus remedy in the Federal courts and as against the salutary effect of this remedy upon State postconviction procedures, there is no showing that it has caused any undue burden upon the Federal courts since it was first enacted in 1867, nor that the pending legislation would actually diminish the number of cases arising under the habeas corpus provision. Thus during the year ending in June 1956, in all the Federal courts there were only 710 habeas corpus cases filed involving attacks on State imprisonment. In the previous year there were 660. The latest time-study report of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts showed that these habeas corpus cases represent less than one-half of 1 percent of the time of the district courts. Indeed, of the cases filed, ordinarily only about 5 percent ever reach the hearing stage. Under these circumstances it certainly cannot be said that this vital and time-honored remedy has placed any serious burden on the Federal courts sufficient to warrant its abolition.

Nor would enactment of the pending legislation diminish the number of habeas corpus cases initiated to review State imprisonment for State prisoners would undoubtedly continue to seek habeas corpus in the Federal courts. Many of the cases in this area involve denial of fundamental rights such as the right to counsel[7] or to a fair grand or petit[8] jury. Under the pending legislation if there has not been a "fair and adequate opportunity" to raise these issues in the State proceedings, habeas corpus is still an available remedy. Thus the passage of the pending legislation may actually create a greater burden upon the Federal courts, which will have the additional problem of deciding in which cases the petitioner had a "fair and adequate opportunity" to raise his constitutional contentions in State proceedings and in which he did not.

Finally, there are ambiguities in the pending measure which may give rise to voluminous and time-consuming litigation. Thus, for some unexplained reason the measure limits all Federal habeas corpus applications to those involving a substantial Federal constitutional question. There are important areas where State imprisonment does not raise any Federal constitutional question but is nevertheless invalid because in conflict with Federal statutes (see, e. g., *Pennsylvania* v. *Nelson* (359 U. S. 497); *Boske* v. *Comingere* (177 U. S. 459)). Why nonconstitutional Federal questions have been removed from the protection of the habeas corpus writ, and whether or not purposefully so, is unexplained.

Furthermore, the pending measure is a restriction on the jurisdiction of "a justice of the Supreme Court" rather than the Supreme Court itself. If this is an intentional emission, it would appear to impose upon the Supreme Court an unprecedented and possibly unconstitutional[9] flood of original applications for habeas corpus.

In sum, the pending measure does not appear to promise any reduction in the negligible burden imposed on Federal courts since 1867 by the habeas corpus jurisdiction to examine into detention of State prisoners. If anything, the legislation is likely to create an additional volume of complicated and time-consuming litigation in the Federal courts.

CONCLUSION

As the Supreme Court has recently stated: "The uniqueness of habeas corpus in the procedural armory of our law cannot be too often emphasized. It differs from all other remedies in that it is available to bring into question the legality of a person's restraint and to require justification for such detention. It is not the boasting of empty rhetoric that has treated the writ of habeas corpus as the basic safeguard of freedom in the Anglo-American world. The great writ of habeas corpus has been for centuries esteemed the best and only sufficient defense of personal freedom."

Habeas corpus to review imprisonment by State authorities was granted to the Federal courts almost 100 years ago to safeguard the statutory and constitutional rights created shortly after the end of the Civil War. Unfortunately, the great civil rights then established in the Constitution and safeguards by the habeas corpus statute have not yet been secured to all American citizens. In many quarters there are practices which deprive citizens of their constitutional rights in the State criminal process. (See, e. g., *Kubanka* v. *Louisiana*, Supreme Court, October term, 1957, No. 550, decided May 27, 1958.)

We live in a time of greatly increased tensions, especially as concerns the effort to secure to all our citizens the equal protection of the law; some States have recently made use of their criminal processes for the very purpose of denying equality and equal protection to Negroes and those who support their cause. (See, e. g., *NAACP* v. *Alabama* and *Scull* v. *Virginia*, Nos. 91 and 929, Supreme Court, October Term, 1957.) This is certainly no time to abolish the protections of the great writ.

It may be that there are means other than habeas corpus to safeguard to every person convicted in a State criminal proceeding his right to a fair day in Federal court for vindication of his Federal rights. But the pending measure does not safeguard that one fair hearing; rather, it abolishes it altogether. If there is any compelling reason why Federal courts should no longer vindicate Federal constitutional rights, none has been advanced in support of the pending legislation. It is absolutely essential that public hearings be had and that Congress demand a compelling showing of need before it curtails the time-honored writ by which citizens may secure their freedom from unlawful and unconstitutional deprivation of life or liberty.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, one of the chief arguments made by the proponents of the bill is that under the present law dealing with writs of habeas corpus the Federal courts are being flooded with applications for such writs. The present bill is advanced as a plug for the hole in the dike. The truth of the matter is, however, that this bill, if enacted, will not prevent State prisoners from filing such applications, even though the applications might be acted upon unfavorably. The courts will still carry whatever burden they carry today. Instead of lessening the burden on the Federal courts, the bill would have just the opposite effect. For, in addition to deciding whether the bill stated a meritorious complaint, the courts will be confronted with the additional burden of deciding whether or not there has been a "fair and adequate opportunity" in the State courts to raise the issue complained of in the application.

And even if the bill did prove a plug in the dike insofar as the Federal district courts are concerned, H. R. 8361 would result in swamping an already overburdened Supreme Court with requests to review denials of writs by the lower courts. What possible justification is there for overloading the Supreme Court to make it a little bit easier on the lower Federal courts?

Mr. President, it is a primary responsibility of the United States courts to pass upon the Federal constitutional aspects of State action, regardless of what the views of the State courts may be. I do not think we should encourage our Federal courts to abdicate this responsibility. After all, constitutional rights have little meaning if we take away the means by which those rights historically have been enforced and protected.

Finally, Mr. President, I should like to point out that H. R. 8361 may well be unconstitutional. Article I, section 9, clause 2 of the Federal Constitution provides that "The privilege of the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in cases of rebellion or invasion the public safety may require it." This provision is a limitation on the Congress as well as everyone else. Passage of H. R. 8361 would amount not only to a suspension of the writ, but an out-and-out denial of it in some cases. I shudder, Mr. President, over the headlong rush to enact legislation of such doubtful constitutionality, especially when there have been no public hearings on it and no opportunity to adequately consider whether it is constitutional or not.

Mr. President, even admitting that from time to time there has been some abuse of the writ of habeas corpus, such abuse does not alarm me. I consider it to be just another one of the necessary prices we pay to live in a democratic society. It is the price of trying to accord constitutional due process to every person, both guilty and innocent. I do not condemn prisoners for taking advantage of every legal means available to secure their freedom and their life. The desire to live and the desire to be free are two of the most compelling instincts of living creatures. Our Nation has long been known for its fairness and its humanity to those accused of breaking its laws. I do not think that restricting the historical writ of habeas corpus in order to

---

[2] See Hearings, *op. cit. supra*, n. 1, pp. 16–17.

[3] See statements filed with Senate Judiciary Committee in April and May 1956.

[4] *Brown* v. *Allen*, 344 U. S. 443, 496.

[5] See Schaefer, "Federalism and State Criminal Procedure." 70 Harv. L. Rev. 1.

[6] 70 Harv. L. Rev. at p. 24.

[7] See *Wade* v. *Maye*, 334 U. S. 672.

[8] See *Ex parte Hawk*, 321 U. S. 114.

[9] See art. III of the Constitution; *Mooney* v. *Holohan*, 294 U. S. 103.

make it easier for the courts is in keeping with that tradition.

Mr. President, I offer for the RECORD a series of statements and exhibits in opposition to H. R. 8361. I want this material contained in the RECORD, because thus far in this session of Congress the RECORD has been filled with what I consider to be unsound and fallacious material in support of the bill. In these closing hours I want the RECORD to contain what I consider to be unanswerable legal arguments against the bill, on which there have been no hearings in the Senate committee, but which reached the Senate calendar.

If it had not been for a group of us, and the wonderful cooperation extended to us by the majority leader, the danger was great that the bill might have been called up for a vote in the Senate; but had it been, or if it is still to be called up for a vote in the Senate in the closing hours of this debate, I assure the people of this country who have written to us urging protection of their habeas corpus rights that we will stand on the frontline in the debate for as long as may be necessary to stop this kind of invasion of constitutional rights and personal rights of the free men and women of this country.

I pledge that the senior Senator from Oregon will fight this bill until he drops, or until the people of the country can become aware as to what is involved in this attempt to encroach upon one of the most precious safeguards of liberty in our whole democracy, namely, the writ of habeas corpus.

In support of my position, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a statement on this question by the American Civil Liberties Union.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION OPPOSING H. R. 8361

My name is Irving Ferman. I speak on behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union as director of the Washington, D. C., office. The union is a private, nonpartisan organization, interested in the promotion of the Bill of Rights. It has interested itself for over 30 years in the protection of civil liberties of our citizens.

The union wishes to express its firm opposition to H. R. 8361.

When the framers of our Constitution wrote clause 2 to section 9 of article 1, they took for granted that the Federal courts would always provide a ready forum for those seeking the writ which is the greatest safeguard to our personal liberty embodied in the common law.

We feel that H. R. 8361 violates this intention of our Founding Fathers.

Indeed, in this very real sense, this proposal would violate clause 2 of our Constitution, by further limiting a prisoner access to Federal Courts on a writ of habeas corpus solely because the State courts have ruled against him.

Likewise, the provision making applications renewable only on writs of certiorari is objectionable. In a recent case, Rice versus Sioux City, the Supreme Court held that it acts on certiorari only in cases of great public interest. So, if this proposal is enacted into law, we could be faced with a situation where a violation of constitutional rights of grave concern to the individual, but not to the public, would go unremedied despite the guaranty of habeas corpus. This would be a shocking derogation of the privilege of habeas corpus, the most fundamental element of due process of law embodied in our Anglo-American tradition.

This bill is the result of recommendations of sorely pressed Federal judges whose courts have been flooded with habeas corpus petitions. We appreciate this concern. Indeed, our own organization is flooded with such applications with the request that we assist, as well as by requests from prisoners that we undertake to supply counsel to begin such actions. Since we ourselves turn down a goodly number of the requests for such aid and spend an inordinate amount of time in examining the papers submitted to us, we understand the concern of many judges.

The proposal before this committee will not cure this evil. Desperate men in our prisons will continue to file such petitions in undiminished vigor and with undiminished frequency. Nothing, of course, should prevent an individual from filing a petition for a writ of habeas corpus.

Of course, H. R. 8361 would give additional grounds for denying such petitions, but, nonetheless, the courts would still be under the duty of examining each petition to see whether the requirements of the proposal have been complied with. Added to this additional work for the judges would be involved, in all probability, litigation on whether the application was barred by the proposed legislation. On the other hand, in the absence of such legislation, the application itself might well have been disposed of with much less litigation and difficulty, on the merits.

In addition, an examination of the proposal before this committee poses questions which would result in burdensome litigation. First, subsection B refers to cases when a Supreme Court Justice or a circuit judge shall entertain an application for a writ of habeas corpus. But at the present time, there is no provision of law under which an individual Justice or a circuit judge may, in any event, entertain such an application. The application itself must be made to the district court; the circuit court will only hear an appeal from its disposition; no individual Justice of the Supreme Court or the circuit court may, in any event, entertain such an application. While the Supreme Court as a whole may entertain an original motion for a writ, in practice the Court has used its discretion to deny such writs and require that petitioners exhaust other judicial remedies first. But this section of the bill may lead many to think that the Congress has conferred power on individual justices and judges of the higher Federal courts to individually entertain writs of habeas corpus. Doubtless much litigation will result on this question. And whatever such litigation settles, there would doubtless be many prisoners unskilled in the law who would constantly be harassing individual judges for writs of habeas corpus.

Another confusion is caused by the last paragraph of the bill which makes an order denying an application for a writ of habeas corpus in those cases reviewable only on petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court. Surely this is not meant to mean that a person denied the writ may appeal only to the Supreme Court, and that he cannot take an appeal to a United States court of appeals. But doubtless there will be litigation to establish this question, too. If, indeed, it is intended that the court of appeals be bypassed, this would seem to be an improper denial of the right to appeal. For the Supreme Court's failure to review on certiorari is discretionary; there may be many cases in which an incorrect district court decision would be set aside by a court of appeals but with which the United States Supreme Court would not intervene. Hence, to single out the class of persons in State custody and to deprive them of their right to appeal to a court of appeals, would be unjust. It would permit an erroneous decision of a lower court to stand, thus violating the equal protection of the law clause, since it arbitrarily discriminates against a particular class of persons, without any reasonable basis.

Even more litigation may be compelled by the requirement that a Federal court cannot entertain a habeas corpus application unless there was no fair and adequate opportunity theretofore to raise and have determined a Federal constitutional question. There would inevitably be serious questions as to what opportunities are fair and adequate. If a State court denied a habeas corpus motion without opinion, can it be told whether there was fair and adequate opportunity. If the section means that even the United States Supreme Court cannot on certiorari consider the Federal constitutional question, if there was a fair and adequate opportunity to raise it and determine it in the State courts, does this not debar the Supreme Court of its historic function of being the supreme authority on questions involving the United States Constitution and improperly delegate that power to a State court?

It seems to us that there are two alternatives to this legislation which would preserve constitutional rights and yet help ameliorate the unconscionable burden presently placed upon Federal courts. (1) If the State courts themselves more readily granted hearings on habeas corpus writs, there would be a better and clearer record for the Supreme Court to review on certiorari. If the Supreme Court then agreed to review such cases, the matter could be terminated then and there, without further recourse to the Federal courts. Similarly, if the State courts were more generous in granting hearings, doubtless many cases might be resolved upon the facts, so that, unless the findings seemed to be grossly against the evidence, the lower Federal courts would not have to hold any hearings or make any new findings, but could speedily and quickly deny the writ of habeas corpus, if in law it should be denied. (2) The other method of removing the burden from the lower Federal courts would be by Congress encouraging the United States Supreme Court to grant review when the matter first comes up through the State courts. Any such encouragement would be good from another point of view, in that lower Federal courts are understandably reluctant to interfere with judgments of the highest State courts, which poses in turn the danger of their leaning over backwards to uphold State court decisions. Conversely, it seems more appropriate, if there is to be interference with a State judgment, for such interference to come from the Supreme Court of the United States rather than from an inferior Federal court. At the present time Congress has confined review on habeas corpus cases to the discretionary method of certiorari. The result is that there may well be a violation of constitutional rights in a case but the Supreme Court will not review it unless it involves an important public question. To encourage the Supreme Court to take these cases when they first come through the State courts, it would seem appropriate to change the method of review to appeal. This suggestion, if adopted, would ease the task of lower Federal courts by allowing them to attach some significance to denial of review, recourse to the lower Federal courts would be deterred to some extent, and full constitutional rights preserved nonetheless.

We submit, in conclusion, that this committee report unfavorably on H. R. 5649 because it is confusing, vague, and derogates from the most fundamental guaranty of habeas corpus.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed

in the RECORD at this point a telegram which has been received from professors in various law schools, including Yale, Columbia, University of Pennsylvania, University of Chicago, Harvard, and the University of Texas, in opposition to the bill.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 13, 1958.

Hon. LYNDON JOHNSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As law teachers we are profoundly concerned at the action of the Senate Judiciary Committee in endorsing, without holding hearing, the habeas corpus bill which would so drastically curtail vital and historic segment of Federal jurisdiction. There have been no House committee hearings on the proposal other than those in 1955, and there have never been any Senate committee hearings to insure full and thoughtful committee inquiry into the fairness of the proposed legislation and into its impact on judicial administration, including particularly the work of the Supreme Court, we urge that the bill be returned to the Judiciary Committee for hearing. We are satisfied that any legitimate grievance with the present scope of Federal habeas corpus for State prisoners can be rectified without making such substantial inroads on Federal rights as the present bill entails.

Dean Jefferson B. Fordham, University of Pennsylvania; Dean Eugene V. Rostow, Yale; Professors Boris I. Bittker, Yale; Ralph S. Brown, Jr., Yale; Richard C. Conelly, Yale; Caleb Foote, University of Pennsylvania; Paul Freund, Harvard; Gerald Gunther, Columbia; Philip B. Kurland, University of Chicago; Monrad G. Paulsen, Columbia; Louis H. Pollak, Yale; Curtis R. Reitz, University of Pennsylvania; Albert M. Sacks, Harvard; Herbert Wechsler, Columbia; John B. Weinstein, Columbia; Harry R. Wellington, Yale; Charles A. Wright, University of Texas.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter which I have received from Prof. Louis H. Pollak, of Yale University, along with a copy of a telegram which sets forth the views of other professors of law in opposition to the bill.

There being no objection, the letter and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YALE UNIVERSITY LAW SCHOOL,
New Haven, Conn., August 14, 1958.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: For your information I am sending you a copy of a telegram sent to Senator LYNDON JOHNSON on August 12, with reference to the pending habeas corpus bill.

Sincerely,

LOUIS H. POLLAK.

AUGUST 12, 1958.

Hon. LYNDON JOHNSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As law teachers we are profoundly concerned at the action of the Senate Judiciary Committee in endorsing, without holding hearings, the habeas corpus bill which would so drastically curtail a vital and historic segment of Federal jurisdiction. There have been no House committee hearings on the proposal other than those in 1955 and there have never been any Senate committee hearings. To insure full and thoughtful committee inquiry into the fairness of the proposed legislation and into its impact on judicial administration, including particularly the work of the Supreme Court, we urge that the bill be returned to the Judiciary Committee for hearings. We are satisfied that any legitimate grievance with the present scope of Federal habeas corpus for State prisoners can be rectified without making such substantial inroads on Federal rights as the present bill entails.

Jefferson B. Fordham, Eugene V. Rostow, Boris I. Bittker, Richard C. Donnelly, Ralph S. Brown, Jr., Caleb Foote, Paul Freund, Gerald Gunther, Philip B. Kurland, Monrad G. Paulsen, Louis H. Pollak, Curtis R. Reitz, Albert M. Sacks, Herbert Wechsler, Jack B. Weinstein, Harry H. Wellington, Charles A. Wright.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on the west coast there lived for many years a great judicial officer who has served the people of our circuit and the people of the United States in a most able fashion. I refer to the great Judge William Denman, who retired from the bench on July 3, 1957.

He is a keen scholar of judicial procedures. He is a keen scholar of the whole field of habeas corpus. There was received from him, under date of February 14, 1956, when there was an early attempt to undermine the protection of the writ of habeas corpus, a long memorandum, scholarly in nature, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS,
NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT, UNITED STATES POST OFFICE AND COURTHOUSE,
San Francisco, Calif., February 14, 1956.

Re H. R. 5649, depriving the Negro of the right to seek habeas corpus in the United States district courts.

Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Chairman, Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have advocated this bill as a member of the Judicial Conference of the United States—which drew and recommended it—and elsewhere. I now withdraw from that position and urge its defeat or amendment in the Senate for the following reasons:

The Conference drafted the bill and recommended it for enactment on September 23, 1954, after the anti-Negro segregation decision of *Brown* v. *Board of Education* (347 U. S. 483) on May 17, 1954. In these 4 months the revolt of the South against the Brown decision had not become apparent, the Emmett Till case had not been decided, and the climax of anti-Negro hatred had not been reached in the violence of the people of Alabama over the district court's order for admission of Autherine Lucy to that State university.

What H. R. 5649 does to the Negro is to take from him the right to apply for habeas corpus in any Federal court. In the Southern States it means that the questions of fact in such cases will be decided by a State judge elected by people in the passion shown in the Lucy case.

When the case from the State court finally reaches the Supreme Court that Court will have no power to reverse what in nearly all cases will be certain, namely, an anti-Negro judgment based on conflicting white and Negro testimony.

This means that H. R. 5649 should be defeated or amended to accomplish its main purpose which is to stop the abuses in repetitious applications for writs of habeas corpus by State felons. Such an amendment should give the applicant the right to make but one application except in the unusual circumstances provided for in 28 U. S. C. 2255 for Federal convicts. Unlike section 2255, the single application should be made to the Federal district court instead of to the State court trying the case.

Very faithfully yours,

WILLIAM DENMAN,
Chief Judge.

STATEMENT FOR THE STANDING SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY BY JUDGE WILLIAM DENMAN, CHIEF JUDGE, UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS, NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

I am William Denman, Chief Judge of the Ninth Judicial Circuit, and a member of the Judicial Conference of the United States. I am pleased to give a statement of my views for the subcommittee for improvements in judicial machinery in connection with its consideration of H. R. 5649 providing: "An act to amend section 2254 of title 28 of the United States Code in reference to applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court.

"Be it enacted, etc., That section 2254 of title 28, United States Code is amended by placing '(a)' before the present language of the section and adding thereto subsection '(b)' as follows:

"'(b) A Justice of the Supreme Court, a circuit judge, or a district court or judge (but not the Supreme Court) shall entertain an application for a writ of habeas corpus in behalf of a person in custody pursuant to a judgment of a State court, only on a ground which presents a substantial Federal constitutional question (1) which was not theretofore raised and determined, (2) which there was no fair and adequate opportunity theretofore to raise and have determined, and (3) which cannot thereafter be raised and determined in a proceeding in the State court, by an order or judgment subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States on writ of certiorari.

"'An order denying an application for a writ of habeas corpus by a person in custody pursuant to a judgment of a State court shall be reviewable only on a writ of certiorari by the Supreme Court of the United States. The petition for the writ of certiorari shall be filed within 30 days after the entry of such order.'"

The omission of the Supreme Court, supra, leaves it the only Federal body which can consider applications for the writ of habeas corpus, it being so required by title 28, United States Code, section 2241 (a) which provides:

"Writs of habeas corpus may be granted by the Supreme Court, any Justice thereof, the district courts, and any circuit judge within their respective jurisdictions."

My statement has to do with the highly undesirable and generally unrecognized consequences of H. R. 5649 and with an alternative which would meet the problems sought to be remedied by that bill without its inherent dangers.

(A) THE BURDEN ON THE SUPREME COURT

A staggering burden will be imposed on the United States Supreme Court if Congress designates it as the only Federal court available to a State prisoner applying for a writ of habeas corpus. There is no reason to suppose that State prisoners would direct substantially fewer applications to the Supreme Court under the proposed bill than they presently direct to the district courts of the 11 circuits. There were 597 applications

made to the district courts by State prisoners in the fiscal year 1954.[1] In fiscal year 1955, the number had risen to 660.[2]

All nine Justices of the Supreme Court would have to examine each application to determine whether it alleged a prima facie infringement of constitutional rights. Then, as the law would stand if H. R. 5649 were enacted, in every case where the State prisoner's application made out a prima facie case the Supreme Court would have to hold a hearing, or make use of the other devices now available to the district courts,[3] to determine the facts.

Hearing witnesses, considering documentary evidence, and making findings of fact undoubtedly would take a great deal of time. It must be recognized that the responsibility of factfinding could not be delegated to a master or referee since title 28, United States Code, section 2243 now provides, in part, that the—

"Court [entertaining an application for a writ of habeas corpus] shall summarily hear and determine the facts, and dispose of the matter as law and justice require." [4]

Thus the net result of placing the burden of State prisoners' original applications on the Supreme Court would be to detract from that Court's ability to handle the appellate cases coming to it by appeal and certiorari. The Supreme Court would have to give such applications prompt attention.[5] To accomplish this, it would have to either give less time to each case or grant certiorari in fewer cases of public importance.

(B) IN EFFECT THE ACT DESTROYS THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE HISTORIC CIVIL WAR HABEAS CORPUS AMENDMENT OF 1867

As the Supreme Court is now constituted its heavier work requires a 4-months' adjournment during which it can study matters to come before it for consideration. During this adjournment period no right to apply for habeas corpus would exist, thus giving the historic right an existence of but two-thirds of the year.

Even assuming the Supreme Court were never to adjourn, the factor of distance would mean that a right to make application to the Supreme Court for habeas corpus would not adequately guard individual freedoms. As previously pointed out, the hearing would have to be before the Supreme Court itself. This would require an applicant, say in Seattle, Wash., in San Diego, Calif., in Bangor, Maine, or in Miami, Fla., not only to file his application in Washington, D. C., but to go there himself [6] and bring his witnesses if the Supreme Court granted him a hearing.

An applicant would have to persuade witnesses to travel such a distance to appear. The necessary travel would increase the burden on a court-appointed attorney, the typical counsel in a habeas corpus case, with the consequence that even fewer lawyers would be willing to accept such assignments. Time-consuming distances would lead to even greater delays before hearings could be held than exist under the present law.

Moreover, distance would make it much more difficult for a prisoner condemned to die to present his application after State remedies had been exhausted. This is illustrated by *Thomas* v. *Duffy* (191 F. 2d 360 (Cir. 9, 1951), a case which I considered. I was advised by telephone at my home at 8:30 in the morning by the warden of San Quentin Penitentiary that a petition for a stay of execution, based on an application for a writ of habeas corpus, would be filed in my office by the time I reached it. I arrived there at 9, read the petition, and stayed the execution from 10 o'clock to 11 and then from 11 to 12, and then I granted the petition and ordered the execution stayed indefinitely. The application for habeas corpus was later heard. Under the proposed law the prisoner would have been executed at 10 o'clock that morning unless his petition for the stay and the application for the writ could have reached Washington, a decision made, and a stay issued and communicated to the warden by that time.

(C) RACIAL DENIAL OF JUSTICE IN CONFINING APPLICATIONS FOR THE WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS TO STATE COURTS

It may be suggested that the State prisoners of all races and in all States should be deprived of any right to apply to a life term Federal judge for a writ of habeas corpus. Reliance on the elected State court system to protect the Federal constitutional rights of State prisoners and would not adequately protect those freedoms in many cases. In every habeas corpus case where a violation of due process is alleged, some court must determine first what happened and then apply a constitutional standard to the facts as found.[7] For example, in a case where a Negro prisoner alleged that his confession was coerced by smashing in his nose and closing his eyes an elected court must first determine whether the State police officer so treated the prisoner and it must then consider whether such conduct violated the guaranties of due process.

The proposed bill gives the United States Supreme Court full opportunity to reverse a State court when it misconceives the constitutional standard which was applicable. However, under this bill the responsibility for determining the facts of the case would rest almost entirely with the elected State trial judge who initially considered the application.

Unlike Federal judges who are appointed for life, most State judges are elected for fairly short terms.[8] Officials are elected to make them responsive to the will of the electorate. Unfortunately, those who elect trial judges in some States today, as in the past, have a prejudice against particular racial minority groups and would deny members of these groups their Federal constitutional rights in many situations.[9]

The present habeas corpus legislation was passed in 1867 to assure members of one such minority group the protection of their newly won rights by the independent Federal judiciary. During the 76 years between the adoption of the Fifth amendment and the Fourteenth the Negro could not seek any remedy in the courts for wrongs done him as he was a slave. The Civil War changed this. For 89 years the Federal district courts have considered the claims of those imprisoned in their districts that the State government had deprived them of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.

The events of the past year violently demonstrate that protection of the Negro's Federal constitutional rights by the independent Federal judiciary is still needed. During this time we have seen the mood of many individuals who live in our Southern States. One need only list what has happened in the Autherine Lucy case in Alabama, the recent acquittal of white men charged with the murder and kidnaping of a Negro in the Emmett Till case in Mississippi, and the defiance of the Supreme Court's decree ending segregation in public schools.

We know that the slavery of the Negro existed in the Southern States for over a century and a half after it had been abolished in the Christian nations of Europe. To justify this to themselves, Southerners taught their children and clergymen preached to their congregations and parishes the racial inferiority and necessary servility of the Negro race. Such beliefs are deeply and passionately held by a great percentage of the voters in many areas of the Southern States today. As a consequence, efforts to gain racial equality have stirred resentment.

It seems to me extremely unlikely that a State trial judge who decided a habeas corpus case in favor of a Negro in which, for example, there was divided evidence on a question of whether the Negro had been tortured into the confession of a crime of violence against a white man, would be reelected to his office.

The same would be true of a judge who decided in a habeas corpus case that the Negro's attorney had combined with the white prosecutor to procure a conviction, *Betts* v. *Brady* (316 U. S. 455 (1942)), or a judge who decided that the trial in which a Negro was convicted was dominated by a mob demanding a verdict of guilty. *Moore* v. *Dempsey* (261 U. S. 86 (1923)).

I am not reflecting on the courageous State judges who would treat these cases with the same detachment as a lifetime Federal judge not subject to the disapproval of the voters. What I am asking you to consider is the pressure to which an elected State judge would be subjected. All men are not courageous in such a situation.

We Californians are in no "holier than thou" position as shown by our history. You have heard the phrase "A Chinaman's chance." That was applied to the chance the Chinese had in their litigation against the white man before an elected State judge in the period when the Chinese were pouring into California prior to the passage of the Chinese exclusion bill in 1882. Chinese were as casually stoned, bludgeoned and killed as Negroes are shot today for persuading other Negroes to register to vote. The elected judges of California reduced the rights of these immigrants to a "Chinaman's chance" in response to this statewide bias.

This antioriental feeling is not entirely a matter of history in my State. One only need remember the reaction of many Californians to the Americans of Japanese ancestry living among them at the beginning of World War II.[10] Only a few months ago

---

[1] Director of Administration, Office of U. S. Courts, Annual Report for fiscal year 1955, p. A–15 (1955).

[2] Ibid.

[3] See e. g., 28 U. S. C. §§ 2245–2249, *Brown* v. *Allen*, 344 U. S. 443 (1953).

[4] The Supreme Court has so construed section 2243, *Holiday* v. *Johnson*, 313 U. S. 342 (1941); *United States* v. *Hayman*, 342 U. S. 205, 213 n. 16 (1952).

[5] 28 U. S. C. sec. 2243 provides: "A court * * * entertaining an application for a writ of habeas corpus shall forthwith award the writ or issue an order directing the respondent to show cause why the writ should not be granted.

"When the writ or order is returned a day shall be set for hearing, not more than 5 days after the return unless for good cause additional time is allowed."

[6] Distance would present a problem to State prison officials who would have to transport an applicant who had been granted a hearing to Washington, D. C.

[7] See the opinion of Mr. Justice Frankfurter in *Brown* v. *Allen*, 344 U. S. 443 (1953).

[8] In all the Southern States but Florida the trial judges are elected. Alabama Const., art. 6, sec. 152; Arkansas Const., art 7, secs. 19, 29; Georgia Const., art VI, sec. III; Louisiana Const., art 7, sec. 33; Mississippi Const., art. 6, sec. 153; North Carolina Const., art. IV, sec. 21; South Carolina, art. 5, sec. 13; Tennessee Const., art 6, sec. 4; Texas Const., art. 5, secs. 7, 15; Virginia Const., art. VI, sec. 99; West Virginia Const., art. VIII, sec. 10. In Florida he is appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the senate. Fla. Const., art. 5, sec. 8.

In California the trial judge is also elected. Calif. Const., art. 6, sec. 6.

[9] See discussion in *Romero* v. *Weakley*, 226 F. 2d 399 (Cir. 9, 1955), a case arising in California.

[10] This racially prejudiced reaction is set out in detail in Ten Broek, Barnhart, and Matson, Prejudice, War and the Constitution (1954).

an Olympic champion diver and doctor, who was an American of Korean descent, had great difficulty in buying a home in California.

You also know the phrase, "A good Indian is a dead Indian." When I was 15 years of age I shot duck with an aged hunter upon whom I used the phrase. He replied, "Oh, we made a lot of good ones. We were camped in the lower Sacramento Valley in 1843 and missed two horses. We then went over and killed every man, woman, and child that we could find in the Indian village nearby."

Some of the Indians escaped and buried the bodies. They were dug up 2 years ago with their smashed skulls and smashed chest bones, men, women, and children. Even today in the Far Western States one hears this phrase, "A good Indian is a dead Indian."

We cannot forget that in California we also have Americans of Mexican descent, another minority too often subjected to the effects of prejudice.

Similar attitudes exist throughout the United States to some degree. Only the spark of a crime of violence between white and nonwhite is needed to bring pressure to bear on the courts from the whites seeking revenge. Elected State judges would be required to stand up to that pressure. Not all will be able to do so.

Some may reply that the Supreme Court has the power to review the case on certiorari. However, appellate review of findings of fact is necessarily limited to determining whether there is evidence to support such findings.

An example may illustrate the point: Suppose a case like *Brown* v. *Mississippi* (297 U. S. 278 (1936)), where confessions were extorted from Negroes by torture. Suppose in a State habeas corpus proceeding a Negro condemned to death for first degree murder testifies that to obtain the confession on which his conviction was based, his face was beaten by State officers. This testimony is supported by that of a Negro doctor who treated the prisoner's torn face, and that of another Negro who testifies that he was with the prisoner when he was arrested, that at that time his face was untouched, and that he witnessed the beating which stopped only when the prisoner confessed. Suppose that opposed to this is the testimony of two white witnesses, the arresting police officer and one of his friends. They testify that the Negro's face was injured before the arrest, and that the Negro calmly made his confession under no duress.

A southern trial judge, near election time, finds that there was no beating. Under such circumstances that decision would be final. It would be impossible to say that the decision was not supported by evidence unless the United States Supreme Court were to radically broaden its scope of review in habeas corpus cases and hold a trial de novo.

It should be noted that the Committee of the Conference of the Chief Justices of the State Courts sought no such elimination of all Federal power to consider applications for writs of habeas corpus. On the contrary, it sought an amendment to title 28, United States Code, section 2254, making it read as follows:

"An applicant shall not be deemed to have exhausted the remedies available in the courts of the State, within the meaning of this section, if he has the right under the law of the State to raise, by any available procedure, the question presented (June 25, 1948 c. 646, 62 stat. 967). Such application shall not be granted by any district court or circuit judge unless it further appears that the prisoner has sought review of the State proceedings in the Supreme Court and unless the Supreme Court shall have denied relief and shall have expressly reserved to the prisoner the right to apply for habeas corpus to a district court or circuit judge solely upon the issues presented to the Supreme Court for review.[11]

I must admit that at the meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States in the week of March 12, I raised some of my objections to the abandonment of the historic writ of 1867 at a time when racial feelings in one section of the country are inflamed. I proposed two amendments, but my motions were defeated, my vote being the only one in the affirmative.

(D) THE SIMPLE REMEDY TO AVOID REPETITIOUS APPLICATIONS OF STATE PRISONERS BY GIVING THEM THE SINGLE FEDERAL APPLICATION, PROVIDED FOR FEDERAL PRISONERS UNDER TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 2255

Prior to the adoption of section 2255, the Federal prisoners had the same right to husband their contentions and to repetitious applications that now exist for the State prisoners, and the same very large number of applications were filed. This situation was remedied by section 2255, making the single adverse decision res judicata.

The following statute amending title 28, United States Code, section 2254 would accomplish substantially the same result:

"An act to amend section 2254 of title 28 of the United States Code by relieving the courts of the multiplicity of applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody pursuant to the judgments of the State courts.

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 2254 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding thereto the following paragraphs:

" 'The decision of the district court upon the application shall be res judicata of all issues of law and fact existing at the time of its filing, save those of fact then concealed from the knowledge of the applicant.

" 'An order denying an application for a writ of habeas corpus by a person in custody pursuant to a judgment of a State court or an order denying relief if such a writ be granted shall be reviewable only on a writ of certiorari issued by the Supreme Court of the United States. The petition for the writ of certiorari shall be filed within 30 days of the entry of such an order.' "[12]

I strongly urge that you give full consideration to such a bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, when one reads the analysis of Judge Denman, one has an understanding as to why the senior Senator from Oregon has taken the position he has assumed on the floor of the Senate today, in opposition to the attempt, which was on its way, to undermine the rights of the American people to full protection under the historic habeas corpus writ.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a brief description of H. R. 8361, taken from the House report; also a legal analysis of the bill.

There being no objection, the description and analysis were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF H. R. 8361, TAKEN FROM HOUSE REPORT

Until recent years a judgment of a court, having jurisdiction of the parties and the subject matter, was binding everywhere until reversed on appeal by usual appellate procedures, or on writ of error.

A person imprisoned under the judgment of a court could be released on habeas corpus, only on a showing that the court was without jurisdiction to render it. However, recent decisions of the Supreme Court hold, in effect, that even though a court may have had jurisdiction at the inception of a case, it may lose jurisdiction as the result of the violation of a defendant's constitutional rights in the course of the proceedings, and that a person imprisoned under its judgment may seek relief through the writ of habeas corpus and establish the violation of such constitutional rights by evidence outside of the record made in the case.

These decisions led to the frequent use and abuse of the writ of habeas corpus by prisoners after conviction for crime. The matter was the subject of investigation by the Judicial Conference of the United States and, upon its recommendation, provisions were inserted, in 1948, in title 28, United States Code.

Section 2254 was directed at the abuse arising from applications by prisoners convicted in State courts who seek to have their convictions reviewed in the lower Federal courts.

This section, however, has not been effective in preventing the abuse because of the interpretation and construction placed on it by the Supreme Court in *Brown* v. *Allen* (344 U. S. 443) wherein the Court held that such a prisoner, after exhausting State court remedies, could, by filing a petition before a Federal district court judge, have the State court proceedings reviewed even where the judgment of conviction had been affirmed by the highest court of the State and certiorari had been denied by the Supreme Court of the United States.

PROVISIONS OF BILL

Under the instant bill, an application for writ of habeas corpus on behalf of a person imprisoned under the judgment of a State court may be entertained by a Federal court or judge only if it meets all three of the following conditions:

1. The question must be one which was not theretofore raised and determined in the State court proceeding.

2. Even if the question has not been theretofore raised and determined, it must appear that the prisoner had not had fair and adequate opportunity to raise and have his question determined.

3. Even if the question has not been raised and determined, and even if the prisoner has not had fair and adequate opportunity to have it determined, it must appear that it is a question which cannot thereafter be raised and determined in the State court by an order or judgment subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States on writ of certiorari.

MEMORANDUM—H. R. 8361: FEDERAL HABEAS CORPUS FOR STATE PRISONERS

H. R. 8361, passed by the House of Representatives on March 18, is intended to meet three major criticisms of present Federal habeas corpus practice in regard to State prisoners. Those criticisms are that the jurisdiction, as exercised, puts a heavy burden on the Federal courts; that it causes unwarranted delays in the execution of State capital sentences, and that it affronts proper Federal-State relations.

The Department of Justice has recognized the need for corrective legislation. During the 84th Congress a bill identical to H. R. 8361 was endorsed. (H. Rept. 1293, 85th Cong., pp. 5–6.) However, further study of this complex problem has led the Department to the conclusion that in its present form H. R. 8361 will not remedy the existing evils in the habeas corpus practice as effectively as possible and may in some instances cause new difficulties, and that a modified version

---

[11] Hearings before subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary on H. R. 5649, 84th Cong., 1st sess., page 94 (1955).

[12] Such a bill would also require amendment of section 2253 of title 28, United States Code, to eliminate appeals to the courts of appeal and the certificate of probable cause procedure.

of corrective legislation would more adequately deal with the problem.

There now exist a number of restrictions on the exercise of Federal habeas corpus jurisdiction for prisoners in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court. No Federal court may grant the writ unless the prisoner has exhausted all remedies available in the State courts. (28 U. S. C. 2254.) Such exhaustion of remedies must usually include a petition for certiorari in the Supreme Court of the United States. (*Darr* v. *Burford*, 339 U. S. 200.) If the prisoner had an adequate State remedy but waived it, he is foreclosed from Federal habeas corpus. (*Daniels* v. *Allen*, 344 U. S. 443, 482–7.) The Federal court need not reexamine findings of fact previously made by the State courts unless there was a vital flaw in the State proceeding. (*Brown* v. *Allen*, 344 U. S. 443.) The court need not entertain the application if the legality of the prisoner's detention has been determined previously in a Federal habeas corpus proceeding, unless the application presents a new ground not before considered. (28 U. S. C. 2244.) No appeal by the prisoner from a decision on a State prisoner's application for Federal habeas corpus may be taken unless a certificate of probable cause is issued. (28 U. S. C. 2253).

The proposed legislation would add to these restrictions the further rule that the writ may issue on behalf of a State prisoner only on a Federal constitutional ground which (1) has not been raised and determined, (2) there was no fair and adequate opportunity to have determined, and (3) cannot thereafter be determined in a State court proceeding subject to review on certiorari in the Supreme Court. The proposed legislation further provides that an order denying an application for the writ be reviewable not in the courts of appeals but only on certiorari in the Supreme Court.

The purposes of the legislation relate to the three areas of criticism of present habeas corpus practice as to State prisoners.

First, Federal district judges have repeatedly complained of the burden put on their time. (H. Rept., p. 2.) The strongest objection is to successive petitions filed by the same prisoner. (See H. Rept., pp. 13–20.) This practice is made possible by the present provision of title 28, United States Code, section 2244 requiring the Federal court to consider any new ground raised by a State prisoner; applicants assert a new constitutional ground in each successive application. The proposed legislation attempts to deal with this problem of the time burden on district judges by further narrowing Federal habeas corpus jurisdiction, as specified in paragraph 1 of the bill.

Second, there has been general criticism of the use of Federal habeas corpus to delay execution of State capital sentences. Again, the chief problem appears to be the filing of successive petitions by the same prisoner, each purporting to raise a new Federal constitutional ground on which to challenge the conviction. Appeal is sought from successive denials of the writ, and the execution is repeatedly stayed pending determination of the appeals. The provision of the proposed legislation limiting review of decisions to petitions for certiorari in the Supreme Court is intended to meet this problem of delay in capital sentences. (Rept., pp. 3–4.)

Third, the practice of lower Federal courts passing on the constitutional validity of convictions previously affirmed by the higher State courts has been critized as an affront to State dignity and a strain on Federal-State relations. The theory of H. R. 8361 is that, in any State which provides adequate means to test the constitutionality of a conviction, the only Federal review of the asserted Federal rights should be in the Supreme Court of the United States. (H. Rept., p. 2.)

A department study of habeas corpus practice in the lower Federal courts, of recent Supreme Court decisions and of relevant statistics suggests a number of shortcomings in the proposed legislation.

1. The legislation would probably have no significant effect in reducing the burden of the State habeas corpus jurisdiction on the Federal district courts.

At present, under the rule of *Brown* v. *Allen*, supra, the district courts may rely on the State court record in passing on a State prisoner's habeas corpus application unless there is a vital flaw in the State proceeding. As a result, most of the applications are denied after a mere reading of the moving papers. During 3 recent years the district courts held factual hearings on only 83 of some 1,993 applications. (Reports of the administrative office of the United States courts.) Only 0.4 percent of district court time is devoted to State habeas corpus cases. (Time study by the administrative office.)

The objection, then, runs not so much to the few cases requiring hearings but to the preponderant number of entirely worthless applications, many of them repetitive. The proposed legislation attempts to meet this problem by requiring the applicant to show that he had not had and does not have adequate means to have his constitutional question determined in the State courts.

But under the proposed legislation State prisoners could be expected to file in the Federal district courts about the same number of habeas corpus petitions as at present. The more informed and ingenious could easily assert that they had not had a fair opportunity to test their claims in the State courts. The petitions now filed indicate that prisoners by and large have been wont to make exaggerated claims, and it would not be too difficult to draft a petition appearing to meet the new requirements.

The district courts would still have to examine each petition to determine whether in fact it did meet the new jurisdictional standards. And this would not always be a simple question. Whether a petitioner has had a fair and adequate opportunity could be an arguable point. And it may be equally hard for the district court to discover whether the ground asserted has actually been determined by the State courts. This is so because the higher courts seldom write opinions in these cases. (Among the in forma pauperis petitions filed in the Supreme Court from State court decisions, fewer than one-fourth of the decisions below consist of more than a perfunctory order.) *Brown* v. *Allen*, *supra* (334 U. S. at 494.) In the end the district courts would certainly find the preponderant majority of the applications without merit, as is the case now, but there is likely to be no appreciable reduction in the work of passing upon the papers.

2. The legislation may have important effects, not so far considered, upon Supreme Court practice.

It is a truism that denial of certiorari by the Supreme Court implies no decision on the merits of the case. Especially is this so in the typical petition for review in a State criminal case. Most of these petitions are filed in forma pauperis, are poorly drafted, and are submitted in single typewritten or even handwritten copies. Justice Frankfurter's opinion in *Brown* v. *Allen* (344 U. S. 443, 493, 494) discussed the nature of these petitions in some detail:

> These petitions for certiorari are rarely drawn by lawyers; some are almost unintelligible and certainly do not present a clear statement of issues necessary for our understanding, in view of the pressure of the Court's work. The certified records we have in the run of certiorari cases to assist understanding are almost unknown in this field.
>
> Whether there has been an adjudication or simply a perfunctory denial of a claim below is rarely ascertainable. Seldom do we have enough on which to base a solid conclusion as to the adequacy of the State adjudication.
>
> * * * * *
>
> We would have to have very different records and to alter our consideration of these cases radically if a denial could fairly be deemed to be an undisclosed decision on the merits.

The Supreme Court at present handles about 350 such petitions per term. It does not have the time for disposition of so many cases on the merits, nor does the Court have the facilities to examine the often obscure facts in these cases. As the law now stands, the Court can deny certiorari, where the facts are unclear, with the knowledge that a prisoner is free to seek habeas corpus in a Federal forum better equipped to find the facts, the district court.

Under the proposed legislation a denial of certiorari is intended to be the final Federal review of a State prisoner's constitutional claim. But the Supreme Court cannot be expected to base such a final decision on the unclear, inadequate records now available to the Court in many State criminal cases involving attempted relief by collateral attack or some postconviction remedey. Hence it appears likely that the Court would have to establish new procedures to handle these cases. Several alternatives are possible. The Court could appoint lawyers to investigate the facts as to each doubtful petition and make recommendations. It could grant certiorari and remand to a special master or possibly a Federal district court to hold factual hearings and report findings back to the Supreme Court. Or it could remand to the State courts with instructions to file findings of fact and conclusions of law which could be reviewed intelligently.

These alternative procedures all present obvious difficulties. Any of them would take additional time of the Supreme Court, whose caseload is already extremely heavy. And all run the risk of affronting State feelings just as much as present Federal habeas corpus practice.

Finally, all those habeas corpus applications which the proposed legislation would require lower Federal courts to deny could be filed directly in the Supreme Court for its consideration on the merits, further impinging upon the time which that Court should devote to more important cases.

3. The legislation may have the unintended effect of multiplying meritless appeals of habeas corpus decisions and increasing delays.

At present title 28, United States Code, section 2253, provides that the final order of a district court in a State habeas corpus case is subject to review, on appeal, by the court of appeals for the appropriate circuit, but only if a certificate of probable cause is issued. The proposed legislation, in limiting review to certiorari in the Supreme Court, makes no mention of this existing provision. Hence, it would appear to eliminate the requirement of a certificate of probable cause for review.

During the fiscal year 1956, the Federal district courts handled some 710 habeas corpus cases involving State prisoners. But during the same year there were only 50 appeals of such cases to the courts of appeals. (Report of the administrative office.) Many appeals evidently were cut off by the requirement of probable cause. In the absence of this requirement, many more State prisoners will undoubtedly seek review of adverse district court decisions by the only available method under the proposed legislation—certiorari in the Supreme Court. As indicated above, delays and difficulties in the disposition of these petitions can be anticipated. And the proposed legislation would not deal directly with the primary

cause of delay in executing capital sentences—the right of State prisoners to bring successive Federal habeas corpus petitions on asserted new grounds.

The conclusion of the Department, after study, is that an alternative approach would more effectively achieve the three chief purposes of H. R. 8361: To reduce the workload of the Federal courts, to end excessive delay in the execution of State capital sentences, and to ease Federal-State friction resulting from the habeas corpus jurisdiction.

This alternative legislation would have three main provisions. They can be summarized as follows:

1. Require a State prisoner to raise in his first petition for Federal habeas corpus all grounds which he can then raise.

The most prominent abuse in present habeas corpus practice would appear to be the filing of repeated petitions by the same prisoner. This is made possible by the provision of title 28, United States Code, section 2244, requiring the Court to consider the petition if a ground not previously raised in the Federal courts is presented. The burden on the Federal courts, and the delays in execution of State sentences, could be sharply reduced simply by amending this section to provide that a Federal court need not entertain a State prisoner's application unless it raised grounds which had not previously been decided in a Federal habeas corpus proceeding and which the prisoner could not have raised in an earlier proceeding.

2. Provide that a Federal court shall not grant a hearing on a State prisoner's application for habeas corpus unless the State record fails to provide an adequate basis for determining the merits of the claim.

Since the decision in *Brown* v. *Allen*, supra, most district courts have disposed of State prisoners' applications by reviewing the State record, without holding a factual hearing. Such hearings are a possible source of Federal-State friction and of delay, and it would seem desirable to codify and amplify this rule by statute. The legislation could provide that a Federal court might order a hearing on a State prisoner's habeas corpus application only after reviewing the available State records and finding that they provided an inadequate basis for determining the merits of the claim.

3. Provide that no State prisoner may be released on Federal habeas corpus except with the approval of the Supreme Court.

It is the deep feeling of many that decisions of the higher State courts should not be upset in the Federal judicial system except by the Supreme Court. There is a direct way to accomplish this end without requiring the Supreme Court, as discussed above, to deal with large numbers of factually unclear petitions for review. This is to provide that the respondent in any such habeas corpus proceeding (the State or its official) may have review of a final decision in favor of the prisoner by appeal to the court of appeals, and then (if necessary) by direct appeal to the Supreme Court rather than certiorari, and to provide that the order granting the writ shall not become effective unless and until it has been affirmed by the Supreme Court. Such a provision would require the Supreme Court to decide on the merits not the whole gamut of in forma pauperis State cases, but only those few cases in which petitioners have been successful in the court of appeals. The Federal district courts would be able to get the facts when necessary but would not have independent authority to order release of a State prisoner; neither would the court of appeals have such authority. The State would be protected not only by the normal review in the court of appeals but by appeal as of right to the Supreme Court.

The attached draft of a revised bill incorporates these three provisions.

A BILL TO AMEND TITLE 28 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE IN REFERENCE TO APPLICATIONS FOR WRITS OF HABEAS CORPUS BY PERSONS IN CUSTODY PURSUANT TO THE JUDGMENT OF A STATE COURT

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

1. That section 2244 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking therefrom the phrase "presents no new ground not theretofore presented and determined," and inserting in place of that language the phrase "fails to present a new ground which could not reasonably have been presented and determined on the prior application,";

2. That section 2253 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"In a habeas corpus proceeding in behalf of a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court, any decision by a Justice of the Supreme Court, a court of appeals, a circuit judge, or a district court or judge which orders the release from custody of that person shall be stayed pending appeal by the respondent, and process ordering such release shall not issue unless and until the Supreme Court has affirmed that decision or the respondent has failed to appeal within the time allowed. The respondent in a habeas corpus proceeding in behalf of a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court shall have a right of appeal without a certificate of probable cause to the court of appeals, from such a decision by a circuit judge or a district court or judge, and to the Supreme Court, from such a decision by a court of appeals or a Justice of the Supreme Court, and in each case the appeal time shall be 30 days.";

3. That section 2254 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by placing "(a)" before the present language of the section and adding thereto subsection "(b)" as follows:

"(b) An application for a writ of habeas corpus in behalf of a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court shall be denied without hearing if the records of State proceedings made available to the judge, court, or justice considering the application demonstrate that the petitioner's claim is without merit."

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION OF OREGON STATE LABOR COUNCIL, AFL–CIO

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a series of resolutions adopted by the Third Annual Convention of the Oregon State Labor Council, AFL–CIO, held recently in Roseburg, Oreg.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 15, 1958.

OREGON CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION: Complying with the instructions of the Third Annual Convention of the Oregon State Labor Council, AFL–CIO, the attached resolutions are being forwarded to you for study.

Very truly yours,

J. T. MARR,
Oregon State Labor Council, AFL–CIO.

RESOLUTION 14

Whereas although the Pacific Northwest is currently enjoying a surplus of power but at the same time is unable to attract industry in relation to that surplus because it is temporary; and

Whereas the Pacific Northwest has undergone two power shortages in recent years; and

Whereas Pacific Northwest Senators have introduced a bill providing for a regional power corporation which, in their opinion, is the best available method for improving the financing and administration of the region's power program to assure a more adequate, low-cost and long-range power supply, and at the same time to assist sound development of water resources: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oregon State Labor Council, AFL–CIO, assembled in convention at Roseburg, Oreg., August 4–8, 1958, endorse the regional corporation principle; and be it further

Resolved, That the Oregon State Labor Council urge Congress to give early consideration to an attempt to solve the power problem of the Pacific Northwest; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the entire Oregon Congressional delegation.

RESOLUTION 28

Whereas an amendment enacted in 1949 excludes from the protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 employees of forestry and logging operations in which not more than 12 employees are employed; and

Whereas even major lumber producing employers in the western lumber industry are now exploiting their employees, through the amendment, by contracting their logging operations to small groups of 12 or less employees; and

Whereas this results in eliminating from the protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 approximately one-third of all the employees of a major western industry; and

Whereas this leads to longer hours at lower wages and to increased unemployment in a basic western industry already afflicted with serious unemployment and economic insecurity; and

Whereas this exemption encourages unfair competition to fair logging operators who try to maintain fair wages, hours, and safe working conditions: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the State Labor Council, AFL–CIO go on record supporting legislation providing for fair labor standards for employees in operations of 12 or less employees.

RESOLUTION 31

Whereas there are 51.9 million acres of tree planting area remaining to be seeded in the United States; and

Whereas planting so far has been too slow in view of the projected demands for timber and the need to get presently understocked areas into production and to keep them producing; and

Whereas planting offers an effective way to restore some nonstocked lands to productivity, to improve stocking some poorly stocked land, and to shorten the lapse of time waiting for natural regeneration; and

Whereas diseases cause 22 percent of the growing stock mortality and 56 percent of the growth loss, representing 45 percent of the impact on total national growth; and

Whereas the impacts of many of the diseases can be materially lessened through corrective silvicultural measures; and

Whereas insects kill 28 percent of the growing stock and 10 percent of the national growth in the West the percentage figures are much higher; and

Whereas insect control can be hastened through artificial propagation and by modifying timber stands so as to make conditions less suitable for insect attack; and

Whereas the watershed protection services being performed by our forests are below par; and

Whereas such devices as terraces, contour trenches, water spreaders, diversion ditches, and check dams must be installed in order

to control erosion and encourage infiltration of water into the soil; and

Whereas about 300 million acres of forest land could be used for additional recreation purposes to meet great increase in future population; and

Whereas very little is being done to interest young men to work in the lumber industry; and

Whereas young men without higher education opportunities are finding it increasingly difficult to get jobs; and

Whereas social delinquency and crime are on the increase among young unemployed men during this recession period: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this 13th annual convention of District Council No. 9 go on record in support of a proposition to institute a setup similar to the old Civilian Conservation Corps; and be it further

Resolved, That we call upon the international union and the national AFL–CIO to recommend to the United States Congress legislation toward this end; and be it finally

Resolved, That the program be designed to provide forest improvement, thinning, tree planting, gathering forest seed, fighting forest fires, building access roads and truck trails, doing general research into better silvaculture methods, developing additional recreation facilities, improving wild life reserves and grazing areas, and building watersheds.

RESOLUTION 38

Whereas the Interstate Commerce Commission has scheduled a hearing for August 18 in San Francisco, on the case designated as Investigation and Suspension Docket No. 3933—Lumber-California & Oregon to California and Arizona; and

Whereas this case involves the question of modification or adjustment of present rates on lumber shipments from Oregon to California and Arizona points primarily; and

Whereas the matter of rates applied to the shipment of lumber from Oregon is of vital concern directly to the lumber industry of Oregon and to the workers in the industry and indirectly to the economy of the State; and

Whereas many interested Oregon parties may not be able to participate in the hearing if it is to be confined to San Francisco, but who would be able to contribute their views and opinions if a part of the hearing were scheduled to be held in Oregon: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oregon State Labor Council go on record requesting that a part of the hearing on ICC Docket No. 3933 be held at a central location in Oregon; and be it further

Resolved, That the Honorable HOWARD FREAS, chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D. C., be advised of this urgent request; and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Congressional delegation from Oregon.

RESOLUTION 43

Whereas the continuing greatness and prosperity of any people or nation is primarily dependent on the health and virility of each succeeding generation; and

Whereas in a world of fierce competition among nations we in America can no longer afford to be profligate in our attitude toward the younger generation, since none of our children are expendable; and

Whereas nearly all of the Western nations recognize this priceless resource by providing a family allowance that cares for the bare minimum of needs to rear a child free from malnutrition, exposure, and disease, thus assuring a healthy and virile new generation capable of supporting an ever-increasing load of elders; and

Whereas the family allowance is tax money returned to the family mother with instructions that it be used only for the benefit of the child, and has proved successful in all countries where it is now employed; and

Whereas it is not only the privilege, but the duty of organized labor to lead in social improvements in the same manner, and with the same daring as used by Samuel Gompers when he sponsored public schools: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we favor a family allowance for the United States similar to that now in effect in Canada and other Western countries; and be it further

Resolved, That the Oregon delegation be invited to sponsor such legislation in the Congress of the United States and work for its enactment.

RESOLUTION 45

Whereas the Oregon State Industrial Accident Commission recognizes services rendered by licensed, qualified chiropractors, covering treatment resulting from injuries on the job; and

Whereas most health and welfare programs established through unions and employers recognize and provide for such services; and

Whereas under the present law the Veterans' Administration is not permitted to furnish such services for those disabled veterans who are eligible for and desirous of such services: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this 41st semiannual convention of the Oregon State Building and Construction Trades Council, convening at Roseburg, Oreg., August 2 and 3, go on record in favor of the enactment of such laws which would permit the Veterans' Administration to furnish the services of licensed, qualified chiropractors for those disabled veterans who are eligible for and desirous of such services; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our representatives in Congress, seeking such legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That such Federal legislation include a provision for those States whose requirements for chiropractic licensure provide for 2 academic years of preprofessional education at the college level, and 4 academic years of professional education, with a minimum of 4,000 hours; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be introduced by the Building Trades Council at the third annual convention of the Oregon State Labor Council, AFL–CIO, convening at the Indian Theater, Roseburg, Oreg., August 4, requesting they take similar action.

RESOLUTION 58

Whereas contract negotiations of Portland Newspaper Guild Local No. 164, AFL–CIO, representing reporters, photographers, editors, artists, and circulation office workers with the Oregon Journal and the Oregonian are hobbled by refusal of the firm to disclose detailed policies on health, welfare, and pension programs; and

Whereas threat of a strike of the two Portland newspapers is growing nearer, posing the chance of shutdown of newspaper community services affecting the State of Oregon: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oregon State Labor Council, AFL–CIO, at its annual convention convened in August 1958, does hereby go on record endorsing Federal legislation such as proposed in 1 of the 2 measures recommended by the Senate McClellan committee which provides for public reporting of employer and union health, welfare, and pension programs in detail, and that the secretary so inform Members of the United States House of Representatives from Oregon and the House Labor Committee where the measure is pending.

RESOLUTION 62

Whereas this Nation's 6 million unemployed and millions more of part-time workers are in dire need of jobs; and

Whereas the basic economic and human right is to have a job at adequate wages to keep the worker and his family in good health; and

Whereas these unemployed workers want jobs and not doles; and

Whereas when private enterprise cannot absorb these workers in industry, then it becomes the duty of the Federal Government to create public-works programs such as the building of schools, hospitals, dams, roads, reforestation, etc., thus creating jobs that will enable the worker and his family to live: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That this Oregon convention of the AFL–CIO go on record favoring Federal works projects to absorb the unemployed workers; and be it further

Resolved, That this Oregon convention of the AFL–CIO instruct our secretary to send a letter to President Eisenhower pointing out the need of these Federal projects; and be it finally

Resolved, That our secretary send letters to our Congressional delegation asking them to press for same.

RESOLUTION 64

Whereas 2,000 American scientists, including Dr. Linus Pauling and Dr. Ralph Lapp, one of the fathers of the first A-bomb, and Adlai Stevenson have warned President Eisenhower and the American people on the horrible consequences of further nuclear testing; and

Whereas Dr. Albert Schweitzer and Senator WAYNE MORSE have stated that further contamination of the atmosphere will cause thousands of people to die of leukemia and bone cancers; and

Whereas West German scientists protested further tests noting a 350 percent increase in deformity of newborn babies; and

Whereas the Soviet Union has won a propaganda round by their cessation of nuclear tests but we can win the next round by ceasing our tests and calling for the cessation of all further testing: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That this Oregon convention of the AFL–CIO show that we are people of commonsense and good will and join in this great humanitarian drive in calling for the cessation of further nuclear testing; and be it further

Resolved, That the State secretary send a letter to President Eisenhower informing him of our stand; and be it finally

Resolved, That the State secretary send a letter to Senator WAYNE MORSE for his courageous stand in this matter.

RESOLUTION 72

Whereas many residents of the metropolitan area of Portland, including the city of Vancouver, Wash., must by necessity use the interstate bridge each day traveling to and from their places of employment; and

Whereas the present plans of the State Highway Commission call for a toll to be assessed to each user; and

Whereas this causes undue hardship and economic loss to users who must cross the State line for employment: Be it

Resolved, That the Oregon State Labor Council use its good offices in an effort to have the new interstate bridge be included in the Federal highway-building program.

RESOLUTION 77

Whereas we believe that democracy means full participation by all of the people in the functions of government including political campaigns; and

Whereas the extravagant cost of political campaigns makes it exceedingly hard for a

man of integrity to win public office without owing favors to special interests which have financed his campaign; and

Whereas the trend in recent years is to sell a candidate to the public as one would sell soap or toothpaste by saturation advertising, and

Whereas during the 1956 national campaign 5 families in the United States contributed more to candidates or parties than the 15 million members of organized labor: Therefore be it

Resolved, That in order to stimulate more widespread participation and interest in political campaigns we call for legislation to provide by law: That each taxpayer may deduct any amount not to exceed $10 from his income tax when his return is accompanied by a receipt, or receipts, for contributions to any party, measure, candidate, or political organization; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our delegation in Congress with a request for favorable action; and be it further

Resolved, That the executive board of the Oregon State Labor Council, AFL–CIO, cause such legislation to be introduced at the next session of the Oregon Legislature.

RESOLUTION 83

Whereas the need for a trans-Columbia bridge on highway 101 at Astoria grows daily as traffic on this vital north and south highway increases; and

Whereas when completed highway 101 will take part of the traffic load currently on highways 97 and 99 thus improving traffic conditions on all 3 highways; and

Whereas surveys have been made, plans have been drawn, hearings held by the army engineers, and all that remains is the proper financing of the project: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, The Oregon State Labor Council, AFL–CIO, do go on record as supporting this project and urge the legislatures of the States of Oregon and Washington to pass legislation appropriating money to build this trans-Columbia bridge at Astoria thus completing the final link of Highway 101.

THE GOVERNMENT'S LOYALTY AND SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have received letters from the League of Women Voters, of Corvallis, Oreg., in opposition to Senate bill 1411. I ask unanimous consent that those letters, together with a memorandum which the League of Women Voters prepared in opposition to the bill, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS
OF CORVALLIS,
Corvallis, Oreg., July 21, 1958.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Corvallis League members are disturbed over the provisions in S. 1411 because they depart so completely from the original S. 1411 which passed the Senate last August. We believe that the substitution of Representative WALTER's H. R. 981 for the provisions of the original bill propose what league members considered untenable during their study of the Government's loyalty and security program.

This legislation is not needed inasmuch as our present laws can be used to bar Communists from Government employment. Summary suspension and dismissals in the interest of national security can be accomplished in the case of any Federal employee occupying a sensitive position; nonsensitive positions can be handled under the standard civil-service procedures. We believe this legislation will bring about unnecessary and administratively confusing reextension of the security program to cover nonsensitive positions.

We understand that the Department of Justice has suggested that it would be well to defer legislation in this area until the executive has completed its study of the recommendations of the Commission on Government Security. League members would like to suggest that the Senate not pass S. 1411 at this session, but wait until a better measure can be submitted following the findings of the executive department.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. JOHN W. WOLFE,
President, Corvallis League of
Women Voters.

THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS
OF CORVALLIS,
Corvallis, Oreg., April 7, 1958.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The Corvallis League of Women Voters is opposed to passage of House bill No. S. 1411, as amended. If this bill is passed and referred to a conference committee or to the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, we would appreciate very much your conveying our opposition to the appropriate committee.

After a 4-year study, the League of Women Voters of the United States went on record as believing that the Federal loyalty-security programs should be modified so as to provide the greatest possible protection for the individual. In announcing the league position, our national president, Mrs. John G. Lee, said on January 17, 1958:

"In the interest of strengthening national security and maintaining our traditional concepts of freedom, the League of Women Voters of the United States believes that the Federal loyalty-security programs should be modified so as to:

1. Limit the coverage to sensitive positions and provide for more realistic classification of information;

2. Institute more uniform procedures in the administration of the programs;

3. Apply a commonsense standard in judging the individual; and

4. Develop procedures which will provide the greatest possible protection to the individual."

Corvallis League members were pleased to note that this statement from our national office stated very clearly the consensus reached by Corvallis League members at the conclusion of our study nearly a year ago.

As you can see, the bill as amended by the House is clearly in conflict with the league position. We feel that this legislation, rather than simplifying and improving the program is only another stopgap measure which further complicates its already haphazard condition.

It appears that the bill was developed under pressure of time without thorough enough consideration of the President's Commission and the Citizens' Advisory Committee report of last spring. We feel it would be a waste of time and approximate cost of $733,000 which was spent on this study. Thus it would seem foolish to pass this inadequate legislation at this time.

It is our hope that a more thorough consideration of the already existing recommendations would bring about the needed changes for a more adequate total loyalty-security program.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. JOHN W. WOLFE,
President, Corvallis League of Women
Voters.

MEMORANDUM—LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF S. 1411, 85TH CONGRESS

S. 1411, entitled "A bill to amend the act of August 26, 1950, relating to the suspension of employment of civilian personnel of the United States in the interest of national security" was introduced by Senator JOHNSTON (by request) on February 27, 1957. The bill provided that nothing in the act of August 26, 1950 (Public Law 733, 81st Cong.), "shall be deemed to require the suspension of any civilian officer or employee prior to hearing or termination."

The bill was referred to a subcommittee of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. A hearing was held on May 29, 1957 (not printed as yet) and favorable testimony was received from the Department of Justice, Civil Service Commission, and representatives of employee groups. There was no adverse testimony, according to the committee report.

S. 1411 was unanimously reported to the Senate without amendment on July 19, 1957. (S. Rept. No. 686, 85th Cong., 1st sess., Calendar No. 707.)

On call of the calendar on August 8, 1957, the Senate considered the bill. Senator JOHNSTON gave a brief explanation of its purpose, and the bill was passed without objection and without amendment.

On August 9, 1957, the bill was referred to the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. No hearings were held on the bill, and it was reported to the House with a committee amendment on August 20, 1957. (H. Rept. No. 1201, 85th Cong., 1st sess., Union Calendar No. 474.)

The House committee amendment was in the nature of a substitute for the text of the original S. 1411, and was actually the text of H. R. 981, a bill introduced by Representative WALTER on January 3, 1957.

H. R. 981, entitled "a bill to protect the national security of the United States by permitting the summary suspension of employment, and dismissal, of civilian officers and employees of the Government, and for other purposes," was the subject of hearings by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee on July 16, 17, 19, and 23, 1957.

The House considered the amended S. 1411 on July 10, 1958. During the debate, two amendments were offered by Representatives ROOSEVELT and CHURCH, and were adopted. (ROOSEVELT's amendment: "On page 2, line 9 of the bill, strike out the words 'and welfare.'" Mrs. CHURCH's amendment: "On page 5, line 8, after 'truth' insert 'and merit.'") An amendment was offered by Representative PORTER ("On page 3, line 8, after the word 'hearing' insert 'conducted in accordance with due process of law, and'") but this was rejected.

The bill was passed with the committee amendments as well as two House amendments on July 10, 1958.

The amended bill was referred to the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and a hearing was conducted on the House version on July 18, 1958. (Hearings not printed.) Adverse testimony was given by representatives of employee groups. A representative of the Civil Service Commission recommended amendment of the bill. Letters from the Department of Defense and the Department of Justice commenting on the bill have been received by the Senate Committee. These recommend deferment of S. 1411.

The Senate requested a conference on the bill on July 29, 1958, and the House agreed on July 30. Members of the conference were Senators JOHNSTON, CHURCH, CLARK, MARTIN of Iowa, and MORTON; and Representatives MURRAY, MORRISON, DAVIS of Georgia, REES of Kansas, and CORBETT. A conference report was filed on August 21, 1958 (H. Rept. 2687, 85th Cong., 2d sess.) which was signed by all of the House conferees, and by Senators JOHNSTON, MARTIN,

and MORTON. The report recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment.

The amendment proposed by the conferees would become section 2 of the House-passed S. 1411; it reads as follows:

"SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this act to the act of August 26, 1950, shall be effective with respect to any action or proceeding for suspension or termination of employment commenced prior to July 1, 1959, except that the provisions of section 4 of such act of August 26, 1950, as contained in such amendment, shall not be effective with respect to any case in which any such termination of employment was effected prior to the date of enactment of this act. Such act of August 26, 1950, as in effect immediately prior to such date of enactment, shall be held and considered to remain in effect with respect to proceedings for suspension or termination of employment commenced subsequent to June 30, 1959."

JULY 11, 1958.

MEMORANDUM

To: Charles H. Slayman, Jr., chief counsel and staff director, Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights.

From: M. MacNaughton.

Subject: House debate on S. 1411, concerning the Federal employees security program.

S. 1411, as amended in the House Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittee, was passed by the House late Thursday, July 10, 1958. The vote was 295 for the bill, 46 against it.

Listed below are (1) the 3 amendments offered during the House debate, 2 of which were accepted; and (2) a very brief résumé of the major arguments which the opponents of the bill made during the debate.

AMENDMENTS ADOPTED ON FLOOR

1. By ROOSEVELT (p. 2, line 9 of the bill): "To strike out the words 'and welfare.'"

The bill had provided that "To the extent that such agency head determines that the interests of the national safety, security, and welfare permit, the employee concerned shall be notified of the reasons for his suspension."

2. By Mrs. CHURCH (p. 5, line 8 of the bill): After "truth" insert "and merit."

This amendment would insure that the Civil Service Commission could review the decision of an agency head with respect to the validity, truth, and merit of the charges made and with respect to the procedure followed.

(Proponents argued that the Church amendment was unnecessary since the words "validity" and "truth" implied "merit," and that, under the same words in the Veteran's Preference Act an appeal is heard de novo: HOLIFIELD, an opponent of the bill, pointed out that under the Administrative Procedure Act there have been many cases where the merits of the case itself were not considered on appeal.)

AMENDMENTS REJECTED ON THE FLOOR

By PORTER (p. 3, line 8 of the bill): "After the word 'hearing' insert 'conducted in accordance with due process of law, and,'".

This amendment would have provided that the agency-level hearing have all the requirements of due process. This, by PORTER's definition, meant production of evidence against the person charged, the right to cross-examine the witnesses, and the right to counsel.

In meeting this amendment, proponents of the bill raised the question of giving agency heads authority to determine whether there should be disclosure of FBI files (p. 12198). They also cited the Bailly case in connection with the procedural rights which an employee does not have at a hearing pertaining to his job.

BRIEF LIST OF ARGUMENTS MADE AGAINST THE BILL ON THE FLOOR

Other laws

1. HOLIFIELD. There are already 2 laws on the books, dealing with employment of subversives: (1) Public Law 831, the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, which provides that it is unlawful for anyone to accept employment with the Government who is a member of a Communist, a Communist-front, or any type of organization that has been declared to be subversive; and (2) Public Law 252, the Hatch Act, section 9 (a) (1) which makes it unlawful for any person employed in any capacity by any agency of the Federal Government to have membership in any political party which advocates the overthrow of the constitutional form of government to have employment with the Federal Government.

No right to appeal

2. DOLLINGER. There is no assurance that a person would have the right to appeal to the courts from the decision of the Civil Service Commission (which the bill makes final).

YATES. The only ground for appeal to the courts would be the constitutionality of the law.

Vague terms

3. YATES. There is no precise definition of the term "security risk."

No necessity

4. PORTER. There is no necessity for such a law, and no emergency as was described at the time the bill was introduced in 1957.

HOLIFIELD. Cases in the committee report do not prove the need for the law.

No due process

5. PORTER. There is no due process of law in the hearing procedures.

CHURCH. Merits of a case would not be considered on appeal.

Not temporary legislation

6. DENNISON. This is not temporary legislation. At the time of the hearings in 1957, it was said that WALTER's bill, H. R. 981, was stop-gap legislation, a temporary measure to take care of the security situation until Congress acted on the recommendation of the Wright Commission.

No real support from executive department

7. Both the Civil Service Commission and, as of July 10, 1958, the Justice Department, recommend deferment of the bill until the executive department completes its study of the Wright report.

This list of arguments is not complete, but it does include the major ones made by opponents of S. 1411 (as amended, by inclusion of H. R. 981, the Walter bill, at the House committee stage of S. 1411's legislative history).

THE OMNIBUS HOUSING BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the second reading of Senate bill 4323.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

A bill (S. 4323) to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the renewal of urban communities, and for other purposes; read the first time by its title, and ordered to lie on the table, was read the second time by title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will lie on the table. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is this the bill with respect to which the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] objected to the second reading last night?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct; and the reason for asking for a second reading of the housing bill is that I am informed by the Parliamentarian that this is in order during the morning hour, and should be done at this time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have no objection personally, but I did not know whether we should check with the Senator from Arizona, if unanimous consent is required. Cannot the request be withheld until we can get in touch with the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may we have a ruling by the Chair on this question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Delaware state his parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. WILLIAMS. If unanimous consent is required for a second reading of the bill, I wish to protect the rights of the Senator from Arizona in connection with the objection. He is not present at this time. I should like to reserve the right to object until he can be consulted. If unanimous consent is not required, I shall not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that the second reading can be made without unanimous consent. The rule so provides.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then I have no objection.

LEGACY FROM THEODORE ROOSEVELT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may I say facetiously and good naturedly that, from time to time I am confronted by the wholly erroneous charge that I do not like Republicans. This is a source of deep disturbance to me because some of my political mentors have been great Republicans. They were men like Teddy Roosevelt, fighting Bob LaFollette, and George Norris. I only wish that we had today in the Republican Party men of similar stature and vision. If we had, on many of the rollcall votes of the session just concluding, I am confident that they would have been shoulder to shoulder with some of us in an effort to turn high principle into solid legislation in the public interest.

I make these remarks, Mr. President, by way of introduction of a series of articles published in the August issue of the National Union Farmer. These articles, entitled "T. R.: He Knew Farm Problems, T. R.: He Started Public Power, and T. R.: He Boosted Co-ops," should be required reading for our friends on the other side of the aisle. It is in an effort to be helpful to them in reminding them of the glorious political heritage that is in their political background that I ask unanimous consent that these articles to which I have alluded be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

T. R.: HE KNEW FARM PROBLEMS

For a city-bred man, Theodore Roosevelt showed an extrordinary understanding of the problems of the farmer and of country-dwellers in general. And he went to bat for the farmers many times.

This is an example of his remarkable "empathy," or capacity to put himself in the other fellow's place. It governed his actions throughout the Presidency. His time in the White House was marked by events of extraordinary value to rural people.

One was the formation of the National Farmers Union, which sprang out of farming conditions that T. R. cleary saw as intolerable.

Second was the Country Life Commission, which he created and which did extraordinary work in throwing more light upon rural conditions than had been afforded before. The Commission's report, and Roosevelt's accompanying message to Congress, reads even today like a charter of better conditions for farm dwellers.

This Commission was created in August, 1908. To celebrate its half-centennial a modern Country Life committee headed by Roy C. Buck, of Pennsylvania State College, is working to organize another such commission to report on farm life, and to make recommendations as of 1958-59. This, like its predecessor, would be authorized by Congress and would report to Congress.

STARTED FARM CHANGES

Many of T. R.'s acts and utterances on farm policy, as in other fields, laid the groundwork for even more decisive action later by his great cousin, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. But he was always his own best spokesman, and often sounds as if speaking today. The story is best told by his own message to Congress transmitting the report of the Commission he created, because, as he said, "the social and economic institutions of the open country are not keeping pace with the development of the Nation as a whole."

"I warn my countrymen that the great recent progress made in city life is not a full measure of our civilization; for our civilization rests at bottom on the wholesomeness, the attractiveness, and the completeness as well as the prosperity, of life in the country.

"* * * The Commission has tried to help the farmers to see clearly their own problem and see it whole; to distinguish clearly between what the Government can do and what the farmers must do for themselves; and it wishes to bring not only the farmers but the Nation as a whole to realize that the growing of crops, though an essential part, is only a part of country life.

"Crop growing is the essential foundation, but it is no less essential that the farmer shall get an adequate return for what he grows; and it is no less essential—indeed it is literally vital—that he and his wife and children shall lead the right kind of life.

"The Commission pointed out, and I concur, that the most important help the Government * * * can give is to show the people how to go about these tasks of organizaion, education, and communication, with the best and quickest results."

T. R.: HE STARTED PUBLIC POWER

If George Norris and Franklin Delano Roosevelt were father and uncle respectively of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the world's greatest example of public resource management, then Theodore Roosevelt might be called its grandfather.

For if T. R. had not vetoed what its sponsor plaintively called a "small local act" in March of 1908, the heart of what later became TVA would have been irrevocably given away—so there would have been no power site or powerplant to build the great Federal project around.

The bill would have granted N. F. Thompson and associates a perpetual free franchise to build a powerplant on the Tennessee River at Muscle Shoals, Ala., at a site improved by the Army engineers for navigation.

For years, as the new science-industry of electric power developed, it had been customary for Congress to give away such sites to the first comers—to promoters who in effect followed the Army engineers around like cats, or who spotted natural falls or rapids where a powerplant could be built.

There was as yet no effective rate regulation. So if you could get a nice valuable power site for free, and sell the power back to the people (who had owned the site) for all the traffic would bear, you'd have it made.

NO PUBLIC ENTERPRISE THEN

The very thought that the public might develop such sites for its own service was abhorrent to private enterprise of the time. Already the power companies were rapidly forming into the great private collective later to be known as the power trust.

Scores of sites were quietly given away before the public learned what was going on. On this March 4 of 1903, Mr. Richardson, the Alabama Representative, plaintively observed that this bill "protects the interest of the Government as much as any such bill that ever passed the House." This was true—exactly as much.

Roosevelt's veto therefore contained assertions that, though they seem commonplace today, were startling then. He said:

"The recent development of waterpower to the production of electricity for use at considerable distances has revealed an element of substantial value * * * wherever the Government has constructed a lock and dam for purposes of navigation. It does not seem right or just that this element of local value be given away to private individuals of the vicinage, and at the same time the people of the whole country should be taxed for the improvement."

T. R. BOOSTED PUBLIC INTEREST

T. R. advocated a new policy by which values added by "the advance in electrical science" should not be given away, but disposed of "in such a way as to conserve the public interest."

The earlier Roosevelt pursued this policy with vigor and widened it. Even then, the best waterpower sites in the United States were in the western mountains, still largely owned by the United States Government.

With Gifford Pinchot, next to T. R. himself the great champion of conservation of natural resources, hundreds of possible waterpower sites were reserved for the people in the national forests and on the "public domain." Governors of some Western States, working for private power interests, said that under western water law the States own the water. Pinchot conceded the point, but pointed out that the Federal Government owns the stream banks, and that it would be difficult to build a power dam without using the banks.

Neither T. R. nor Pinchot conceived, at the time, of a policy by which the Federal Government itself would build and operate the power facilities on a nonprofit basis for the benefit of the people. Their thinking did not, as yet, go that far.

But they insisted that the people should retain ownership; and that the license to build power facilities should be for a limited time and for a fee, just as the Government was beginning to sell timber, and to charge fees for the grazing rights on the public domain and in the national forests. These, too, had formerly been free to all comers.

POWER IGNORED AT FIRST

In fact it was only the development of Federal reclamation under the act of 1902 (with T. R. riding herd) that more or less forced their hand here. The first concept of reclamation was that the settlers should be able to pay for the Federal improvements out of crop incomes. The power potential was disregarded—a few small powerplants were built for construction purposes, then, in effect, given away, usually to the project settlers.

But the two great conservators soon saw the potentialities of power, always salable in a growing new country, to help pay for these projects. So in 1905 the Reclamation Service put into operation its first powerplant, a 1,000-kilowatt generator in a cave on the Salt River project near Phoenix.

Soon thereafter, and with T. R.'s hearty approval, Congress established the preference clause by which power from such Federal projects goes first to nonprofit public distributors—like city systems, and farmers' REA's.

This principle in particular is now threatened by T. R.'s own political party. When it turns all power rights on a Federal project over to a private power company—the so-called partnership policy by which the Government builds the nonprofitable parts and a private company reaps the profit—the company is, of course, not bound by the preference clause, and the clause vanishes.

T. R. VETOED GIVEAWAYS

Meanwhile, back in Washington the nationwide struggle was still going on as to who should get the benefit from power developed on the Nation's rivers. T. R. vetoed bill after giveaway bill.

In 1908, the Inland Waterways Commission which he himself had advocated, and which is a landmark in national development, reported to him. In sending the report to Congress, which had financed the study, T. R. said:

"The material wealth and natural resources of the country related to waterways are being steadily absorbed by great monopolies. Among these monopolies, as the report of the commission points out, there is no other which threatens, or has ever threatened, such intolerable interference with the daily life of the people as the consolidation of companies controlling waterpower.

"I call your special attention to the attempt of the power corporations, through bills introduced at the present session, to escape from the possibility of Government regulation in the interests of the people. These bills are intended to enable the corporations to take possession in perpetuity of national forest lands for the purposes of their business, where and as they please, wholly without compensation to the people."

However, the attempts to induce Congress to give away valuable water powers went on without ceasing. Many were mere get-rich-quick speculations. That is, a group would get Congress to grant it a valuable site, and would then sell the site to the highest bidder.

TAFT DUMPS T. R. POLICIES

T. R. dealt with this in April 1908, when he vetoed a bill giving away the waterpower of the Rainy River in Minnesota:

"We are now at the beginning of great development in waterpower. Its use * * * is entering more and more largely into every element of the daily life of the people. Already the evils of monopoly are becoming manifest. * * * The present policy pursued in making these grants is unwise in giving away the property of the people in the flowing waters to individuals and organizations practically unknown, and granting in perpetuity these valuable privileges. * * * In some cases the grantees apparently have little or no financial or other ability to utilize the gift, and have sought it merely because it could be had for the asking."

He quoted this message in his last and most trenchant on the subject, the James River veto delivered January 15, 1909. This was just 7 weeks before he handed over these and similar policies to his chosen successor, William Howard Taft, to carry out. And Taft promptly carried them out to the trash can.

"Believing that the National Government has this power (i. e., to regulate other uses of the rivers subsidiary to navigation) I am convinced that this power ought to be exercised. The people of the country are threatened by a monopoly far more powerful, because in far closer touch with their domestic and industrial life, than anything known to our experience. * * * To give away, without conditions, this, one of the greatest of our resources, would be an act of folly. If we are guilty of it, our children will be forced to pay an annual return upon a capitalization based upon the highest prices which 'the traffic will bear.'"

T. R. GETS INDIGNANT

"They will find themselves face to face with powerful interests intrenched behind the doctrine of 'vested rights' and strengthened by every defense which money can buy, and the ingenuity of able corporation lawyers can devise. Long before that time they may, and very probably will have, become a consolidated interest controlled from the great financial centers, dictating the terms upon which the citizen can conduct his business or earn his livelihood, and not amenable to the wholesome check of local opinion."

T. R. was not yet done with this subject, however. Upon his return from Africa and Europe in 1910 he received a hero's welcome, but found that his chosen successor had discarded most of T. R.'s policies in the resource field, and had fired many of the people upon whom T. R. had depended.

He contained his indignation for awhile, but eventually it burst out. The issues had changed somewhat. The great power combines were by now arguing that the States should control the water powers from Federal lands. In a speech delivered at Denver on August 28, 1910—48 years to the day before the forthcoming great western water-and-power meeting to convene there in his honor—T. R. exclaimed:

STATE CONTROL COMES UP

"We should make it our duty to see that hereafter power sites are kept under control of the General Government for the use of the people as a whole, in a way that shall encourage development of the waterpower, but which shall not create a monopoly or permit the development to be antisocial, to be in any respect hostile to the public good.

"The Nation alone has the power to do this effectively, and it is for this reason that you will find those corporations which wish to gain improper advantage and be freed from official control on the part of the public, doing all they can to substitute State for national action.

"There is something fairly comic about the appeal made by many of these people in favor of State control, when you consider that the great corporations seeking these water power privileges in any given State are at least as apt to be owned outside the State as within it. * * * If we are foolish enough to grant their requests, we shall have ourselves to blame when we wake up and find that we have permitted another privilege to entrench itself, and another portion of what should be kept for the public good to be turned over to individuals for the purpose of private enrichment."

There is a sad ironic aftermath, and a glorious aftermath, to the story.

The ironic aftermath: The present administration quickly resumed the policy of giving away power sites, including the West's last big one, that at Hells Canyon on the Snake River in Idaho. Doubly ironic it is that this site was one of those specifically reserved for the people by T. R. and Gifford Pinchot a half century ago.

SAME FORCES AT WORK TODAY

A smaller irony is that whereas the giveaway was characterized by the administration as "partnership with local interests" the Idaho Power Co. is domiciled in Maine where it holds its annual meetings. Idaho Power Co. fits in every particular T. R.'s characterization of a "great corporation * * * owned outside the State."

The glorious aftermath is that without the physical foundation T. R. provided in keeping the Muscle Shoals site in the hands of the people by his 1903 veto, the Tennessee Valley Authority would have been impossible; as would much of the western reclamation program without his executive encouragement.

The Tennessee Valley Authority has turned out to be the world's foremost and most successful experiment in developing a whole river basin for the good of man. On the power side alone, it now furnishes more than 10 million kilowatts, three-fifths of it for the national defense, and, with all net proceeds going back into the Treasury, will ultimately even moneywise, be one of the best investments the United States has ever made on behalf of its people.

It is probable that increased income taxes paid to the United States Government from the prosperity of the Tennessee Basin resulting from TVA have already more than repaid the total costs of this gigantic enterprise, "democracy on the march" as former Director David E. Lilienthal has called it.

The Bureau of Reclamation powerplants furnish more than 5 million kilowatts, have a net income of more than $40 million yearly, and have contributed greatly to the growth of the West, and hence to the United States Treasury. Here a direct accounting has been made. The total of all net power revenues returned to the Treasury through 1957 is $359 million. Total such revenues for the next 50 years could be more than $2 billion.

Further, the total cost of Federal reclamation through 1957 was just under $3 billion, while the Bureau says that Federal tax revenues from reclamation areas since 1940 alone total $3.2 billion, or more than the whole cost of the program.

T. R.: HE BOOSTED CO-OPS

In 1915 Theodore Roosevelt wrote about an Indiana woman who found a note in some potatoes saying that the farmer got 69 cents a bushel for them, and how much did she pay? She wrote him, $4 a bushel.

In 1958 a Congressional committee was told in New York City that the New York housewife pays 29 cents a head for lettuce which brought the California grower 5.5 cents—15 cents of the sales price, or 52 percent, was added right in New York City.

Thus the farmers seem to have about held their own in 43 years. T. R. advocated, as always, that farmers form cooperatives to sell their products rather than State operation (as was just beginning in North Dakota) but he said: "There are things so important for farmers, that the Government must do them directly if no one else can."

He added: "A single farmer today is no match for the corporations * * * and business enterprises with which he must deal. Organized into cooperative associations, however, the farmers' power would be enormously increased."

He described how European farmers' cooperatives sell direct to consumers' cooperatives in the cities; and he described some early cooperative efforts in America, including farmers' credit unions.

He declared that cooperation is "the spirit both practical and lofty, deferential both to commonsense and to idealism, considerate of both one's own needs and of those of one's fellows, in which we should approach the problems of our farming population—and all our other problems also."

This spirit of course led to the creation of the numerous farmer cooperatives of today under the banner of the Farmers Union and other farm organizations. These include the REA which has brought electricity to the farms to relieve both what T. R. called the gray and sterile drudgery of the farm life, and to bring "Willie Wiredhand" to the farmers' own aid.

One can imagine "Teddy's" eyes snapping with delight, and his strong teeth displayed in a joyous grin, at the story of REA as originated under his distant cousin.

GAINS FOR FARMERS UNDER T. R.

Some events of Theodore Roosevelt's Presidency important to agriculture:

1902: The Farmers Union and the Society of Equity were formed.

1902: The Pure-Butter Act was passed.

1902: A reorganization of the Department of Agriculture created the Bureau of Soils, Forestry, Chemistry, and Plant Industry.

1903: First effective hog-cholera serum.

1905: Animal Quarantine Act approved.

1905: The national forests were transferred to the Department of Agriculture.

1905: The insect-pest law was approved.

1906: Pure Food and Drugs Act passed with jurisdiction in Department of Agriculture.

1907: The Meat Inspection Act passed.

1908: T. R. organized the Country Life Commission.

T. R. ON THOSE COLD AND TIMID SOULS

It is not the critic who counts; not the man who points out how the strong man stumbled, or where the doer of deeds could have done better. The credit belongs to the man who is actually in the arena, whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood; who strives valiantly; who errs and comes short again and again, because there is no effort without error and shortcoming; who does actually strive to do the deeds; who knows the great enthusiasm, the great devotion, spends himself in a worthy cause; who at the best knows in the end the triumph of high achievement, and who at the worst, if he fails, at least fails while daring greatly, so that his place shall never be with those cold and timid souls who know neither victory nor defeat. (Theodore Roosevelt.)

More briefly, T. R. once wrote: "I would never have gotten anywhere, if I had not been willing to make mistakes."

THE WORK OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, one of the proudest series of votes I have cast during my 16 years as a Member of Congress has been in behalf of the National Institutes of Health at Bethesda, Md. It is one of the outstanding institutions not only in this country, but also in the whole world. There go people with little hope. While some of them do not come out whole again, many of them are given the necessary benefits to allow them to live as useful citizens.

An esteemed and faithful employee of the Capitol, Mr. Ben Schwartz and his wife, have two boys, one aged 4 and one 5, who were born with holes in the inner chambers of their hearts. Last year,

Howard Schwartz, 5, underwent an operation at the National Institutes of Health. That operation was successful. Next week his brother, Richard, aged 4, goes to the same institution for a similar operation.

The fact that children like these have an opportunity to go to the National Institutes of Health and receive treatment is a tribute to the outstanding foresight, energy, and ability of the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who has done so much in the field of research and who has consistently supported larger appropriations for this particular institution. I certainly hope that Richard Schwartz will have a successful operation, too, as did his brother Howard. I wish to express my deep appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Alabama and to all the Members of Congress, as well as to the administrations of this and past years, all of whom have done so much to keep this wonderful institution in operation.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I thank the distinguished Senator for his very kind remarks. However, the program has been advanced in Congress by the teamwork of many, particularly those who have served on the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which handles these funds.

While the Senator speaks so kindly of those of us who have supported the works and who have worked and fought for these funds, I would pay my tribute to the wonderful men and women at the National Institutes of Health who in their dedicated lives give of themselves that this great work for the health of the people may go forward.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would express to the Senator from Alabama the fact that there are many Mr. and Mrs. Ben Schwartzes in our country who are indebted to the Senator for his energy, his ability and his enthusiasm in behalf of this program.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point an article on this subject published in the Washington Post of yesterday.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECOND BROTHER FACES RARE OPERATION

(By George Clifford)

Richard Schwartz, 4, of 520 Maple Road, Morningside, who has had company on his previous trips to the National Institutes of Health, will be alone when surgeons there cut into his chest next week.

Richard, and his brother, Howard, 5, were both born with holes in the inner chambers of their hearts, and had been together on previous trips to the NIH.

Howard was operated on last October and doctors now say he is completely recovered. Only a yoke shaped scar on his chest—left by the 64 stitches needed to close the incision—remain to remind him of the condition that would have spelled an early death a few years ago.

"Now it's Ricky's turn to be operated on," his father said. "He has been treated before, but it will take this operation to cure him."

DOUBLED UP

"The nurses told me that was the only time in the history of the NIH that they had two boys in one bed. They would put Ricky and Howard in separate beds, and come back to find them together again. It was strictly against the rules, but the nurses couldn't stop them."

The heart defect is not inherited and finding brothers with this type of ailment is one of the rarest things in the world, the father said.

Mr. Schwartz, a Capitol employee, was once a sports announcer for radio station WGAY, and his voice seldom betrays the worry he feels about the upcoming surgery.

CONFIDENCE

"I have nothing but confidence in the doctors," he said, "and Dr. Andrew Morrow, the heart clinic's chief surgeon, told me the machine they use to keep the heart beating during the operation has been greatly improved since Howard's operation.

"But on an operation like this, you're always worried."

The operation will be complicated by the fact that Ricky has type AB negative blood, the world's rarest. "But the Red Cross said it will give us the blood for the operation," Mr. Schwartz said.

The brothers have been spending the hours before Ricky goes to the NIH together—mostly riding Ricky's new tricycle.

"The doctors told us to treat Ricky as a normal child," Mr. Schwartz said. "We've done just that. But he tires faster than other children. He should be better soon, though."

"The operation isn't so bad," Howard said. "But I want to go with Ricky."

CRITICISM OF WHITE HOUSE PRACTICES WITH RESPECT TO THE GRANTING OF INTERVIEWS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have received a copy of a letter which Mr. Larsten D. Farrar sent to Mr. James Hagerty, Press Secretary to the President, in which Mr. Farrar makes certain criticisms of the White House in regard to what he believes to be discriminatory policies practiced by the White House in respect to some newspapermen. I ask unanimous consent that the copy of the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 18, 1958.*

JAMES C. HAGERTY,
Press Secretary to the President,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HAGERTY: Sincere thanks to you and Mr. Eisenhower for your letter of August 12, in which you state that "when the President took office in 1953 it was necessary for him to adopt a policy of not contributing to individual publications, just as he does not grant exclusive interviews. I feel sure you will understand."

To tell you the truth, Jim, old pal, I don't understand at all.

If you want to know why I don't understand, just take a glance at Parade, issue of August 17, 1958, which was being advertised in the Washington Post and Times Herald on the same day I received your letter. This issue of Parade, in case you don't read it, contains a contribution by the President, on an exclusive basis, to an individual publication, and, in the judgment of anyone who knows how to add 2 and 2, undoubtedly would be classified as an exclusive interview.

I might add that in 1955, while I was writing a book Washington Lowdown, I wrote to Mr. Eisenhower asking him not for an exclusive interview but merely for a chance to tell him some facts I had learned about him in order to give him the chance to refute the facts, if he chose to do so. At that time, you replied in the same vein—i. e., that the President never granted exclusive interviews. Within 2 weeks, in that year, I picked up a national magazine on whose front cover were these words: "Exclusive Interview With President Eisenhower." Indeed, at that time, Mr. Donovan, who wrote a book, Eisenhower: The Inside Story, was doing research in the White House, according to statements made later by his publisher and never contradicted by any White House spokesman. Needless to say, it, like the Parade article, amounted to a snow job—better known as a press agent's piece.

Do not think that this instance, or many other similar instances which might be gathered to show the extreme inconsistency of Mr. Eisenhower and those around him, perturbs me. I learned long since never to be perturbed, or to lose my sense of humor, over the antics of the typical promising United States politician, or his sycophants. But I am writing this down merely so it will be a part of the record, if anyone is ever interested in getting to the full truth of how the Republicans acted during the last term they ever held the White House during the 20th century.

If you will pardon me for giving you advice, what you should answer honest people, who write in sincere vein, as I did, who are looking for straightforward and honest answers from their public servants, is this:

"No, we do not grant interviews to anyone unless he is on our payroll, unless the publication is owned by our Ambassador to Great Britain, or unless we know from experience that he can be trusted to give a very favorably slanted story about our great President and all his flunkies and everything they have done, even if it is wrong, since they have been in office."

This, I submit, would get you far more friends—among intelligent people—than the rather contradictory policies you now are pursuing. Of course, it is not necessary that you take my advice, but it is offered only in candor and good spirits.

Sincerely,

LARSTEN D. FARRAR.

EDUCATION OF MENTALLY RETARDED CHILDREN

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on August 21, 1957, a year ago, the Senate passed a bill, which was introduced by me, to encourage expansion of teaching in the education of mentally retarded children. The bill was sent to the House. Instead of the House of Representatives taking up and considering the Senate bill and passing the Senate bill, with such amendment as it might see fit to add to it, it proceeded to pass a House bill, H. R. 13840. The House bill is similar to the bill which the Senate passed. I might say that the Senate passed its bill unanimously after it had been unanimously reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 13840.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 13840) to encourage expansion of teaching in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher

learning and to State educational agencies, which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MUTUAL SECURITY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Mutual Security Act exemplifies the difficulty which confronts any Member of the Senate in trying to act conscientiously in the field of foreign policy. This is not a new measure which we are considering today. We have approved many aid bills over the years. We have voted billions upon billions of dollars for their support. Yet, each time this legislation is before us—and increasingly in recent years—I find, as I am sure other Members have found, that I can support it only with many misgivings.

Those of us who have spent countless hours in committee in the study of foreign aid programs have an appreciation not only of their worth but of their weaknesses. Year in and year out, we have pounded away at the shortcomings which produce the weaknesses in this program. We have seen some of them corrected. Yet, Mr. President, other shortcomings remain. We know that they remain and that they threaten the worth of the aid programs. We know, too, that these shortcomings can be corrected only by firm leadership and dedicated day-to-day efforts to improve the concepts and execution of the program—a leadership and effort which must come largely from the administration. If it is not forthcoming, however, what alternatives do we, as Members of the Senate, have? The time comes to vote. We can vote "no" and, if enough of us do, in this fashion put an end not only to the shortcomings but to the entire program. In so doing, however, we shall have acted against the admonitions of the President. We shall have ignored his warnings as to the vital necessity of this program to the Nation. In so doing, we shall override our own knowledge of the constructive contribution which the program, if properly administered, is capable of making to the welfare of the United States; indeed, the constructive contribution which it must make.

In these circumstances, we give the benefit of the doubt to the programs. We vote its continuance, with misgivings. It seems to me, Mr. President, that we can justify this course to our conscience, only if, at the same time, we renew our determination to improve this instrumentality of foreign policy. Indeed, we must exert ourselves for this purpose until the weaknesses are eliminated, until the wheat is separated from the chaff, until the administration brings this program more into line with today's realities and needs, until the foreign aid program brings a return, in terms of the Nation's welfare, that is commensurate with its cost.

What is true of the mutual security program is true also of other aspects of foreign policy. A gap exists between what we do and what we believe ought to be done. That is true, not only in the Middle East, but in Latin America, in Asia and elsewhere. As in the case of the foreign aid program, however, here too there is the same burning issue—the same question of alternatives for the Senate. Shall we acquiesce in or reject the foreign policy of the Nation as conceived and administered by the President and the Secretary of State? Shall we, in the Senate, cooperate with them or break in opposition to them? The second course can never be ruled out in a free society. To every Senator is reserved the right to make that choice and only the peoples whom he represents are qualified, in the last analysis, to pass judgment on his choice.

But, Mr. President, while recognizing this right, we cannot fail to recognize, too, that in this country, the Congress—the Senate—cannot substitute for the President and the executive branch in matters of foreign policy. It seems to me that this leaves only one door open, if we are to function at all in foreign policy. That is the course of responsible cooperation with the executive branch. We can live with this course in honesty, this course of general support of the executive branch in foreign policy, however, only if at the same time we act to improve that policy. We must, as individual Members and as a body concentrate on closing the gap—as far as it is in our power to do so—the gap between what is done and what we believe ought to be done in foreign policy. We must try to end the lag between when the Nation acts and when it ought to act in foreign policy. In short, Mr. President, in the Senate we can no more refrain, in good conscience, from responsible and constructive criticism of foreign policy than we can attempt to administer that policy. And, occasionally, Mr. President, we can even give a positive impetus to those who are responsible for its administration.

If we weigh the record of the Senate of the 85th Congress beginning with the penetrating debate on the Eisenhower doctrine in January 1957, it is, in my opinion, a record for which no apologies are necessary. The Senate made constructive contributions to the Eisenhower doctrine, to the foreign-aid program, and to many other measures which were before us. Individual Members advanced constructive ideas, some of which have already found their way into foreign policy and others of which will inevitably follow that pattern. I believe Members on both sides of the aisle will agree that the work of the distinguished majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON] in bringing about the creation of a civilian space agency may, in the long run, be the single act for which this Congress is remembered in decades to come.

As I noted earlier, Mr. President, many of us can support the appropriations bill for the Mutual Security Act which is now before us only with grave misgivings, and in the same fashion, many Members of the Senate are deeply concerned with other aspects of foreign policy. There is only one answer to this concern. Whatever the constitution of this body in the next Congress, the Senate must recognize, as this Senate has recognized, the ultimate responsibility of the President in foreign relations. It must refuse, however, as the Senate has refused, to accept soothing assurances from the executive branch in place of facts. It must refuse, as this Senate has refused, to abdicate its obligation to deliberate and to act on the dictates of its deliberations. It must refuse, as this Senate has refused to lay aside constructive criticism in order to put on the false face of a bipartisanship which fools no one but the people of the United States. It must continue to probe, as this Senate has probed, honestly, patiently and responsibly for weaknesses in every aspect of foreign policy and its conduct. It must press boldly, as this Senate has pressed, for the changes which will help eliminate these weaknesses. In matters of foreign policy, in short, the next Senate must act, as I believe this Senate has acted, in an independent but responsible fashion, in a fashion which is worthy of the trust of the peoples of the States represented herein and in the highest interests of the Nation.

OLD AGE—A BURDEN OR A BLESSING?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have had forwarded to me today an article entitled "The Problem of Our Old People," written by George Todt, of California. One paragraph caused me to reminisce about certain experiences I have had concerning so-called elderly persons. One paragraph of the article reads:

> I asked mother what she thought about the situation. "Jobs are what the older people want, not handouts," she told me. "I'm fortunate in being able to do something useful in my advanced years, and I feel exactly 20 years younger than I would if I wasn't working." And she looks it, too. This proud little pioneer mother of mine has never yielded to the numerous requests Irene and I have both made of her to retire. Once she pointed out to me a classic example which I have never forgotten.

A few months ago, I talked to a friend of mine who had plenty of money and who had retired from business. He said he was going out to his cottage and take life easy. He did. But 6 months later he was ill. He went to a doctor. The doctor said, "There is nothing wrong with you. You need to go to work." So although he had sold his business, my friend took up another line of work, and regained his health immediately.

I know other persons who have gotten into a rut in their work. It might be the work of a Senator; it might be the work of a businessman; it might be the work of a professional man, or one engaged in any other line of work. Such a person, when he stops his work, has no other resource.

In conjunction with what we have done for the benefit of elderly persons, I think the editorial also brings up the thought that man has a mind; and that as he works in his profession, he can also develop an avocation.

I know one man who has told me, "I am having lots of fun now. I am going

back and am rereading James Fenimore Cooper's books, which I read as a boy. Then I am doing a little painting on the side." He did not have to do those things.

But there is a larger class of elderly persons who have not had the ability to accumulate a reserve. We should be particularly interested in developing opportunities in their communities to enable them to do useful work and to earn a little additional money.

One physician told me that he learned that keeping elderly persons occupied reduced the percentage of sick people in the community.

If an elderly person once begins to think that all he has to do is lean back; that he is no good any more; such an attitude immediately affects his physical being and causes detrimental effects.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Todt be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROBLEM OF OUR OLD PEOPLE

(By George Todt)

"It would be well to remember that a sufficient income is, more often than not, the sole difference between the elderly and the aged"—(R. M. Wend, D. D. S.).

Should old age be a burden or a blessing?

This was a question posed in the July issue of Family Circle, which belonged to my 70-years-young mother, and which she asked me to read.

The article dealt with the varied reaction of the readers of the magazine to A Cursory Glance at Old Age, in February issue written by 83-year-old Mrs. Marion Woodruff. The thought-provoking views of this lady were centered about the theme: That medical science is doing a disservice in prolonging the lives of certain old people—those who, due to physical and mental deterioration, are helpless, hopeless, and senile.

Mrs. Woodruff did not advocate euthanasia—"mercy killing" as it is sometimes called. In the words of the Family Circle editor, "nothing was further from her thoughts." Her protest was against the practice of keeping alive, through use of new drugs and other treatment, those suffering old people whose minds and bodies have disintegrated beyond all hope of recovery or desire to live.

The article described problems of the countless old people who suffer from bitter loneliness, chronic ill health, boredom, loss of one or more faculties, relocation in an old-age home, or bewilderment at limitations brought by the accumulation of years.

The chief value of Mrs. Woodruff's work, it seems to me, lay in the fact that it aroused a tremendous reaction clear across the Nation with nearly everybody conceding that not only was the article thought-provoking but that solving old-age problems is a responsibility we all share.

In a day when so-called social planners beg increased reliance upon big government and the welfare state, I think it is time we went to work with a vengeance to treat the problems of the aged with intelligence, affection, and warm humanitarianism—not with the cold, impersonal, and compulsory practices that befit the concept of Marxist socialism.

Unfortunately, we already have much of the latter in our national fabric by this time, although many do not know or understand it—since the Marxism is always generously labeled with high-sounding terminology which sounds anything except un-American, which it is. But that is another story which we will discuss at some future date.

As for the immediate problem of the aged—which is a pressing problem which will double its numerical components within the next 15–20 years—it should appear readily to the most cursory inspection that we have not had the right approach to this matter in the past. Our philosophy has been wrong. There is an increasing tendency to retire people from their vocations and work at an ever-earlier age. One must almost compulsorily retire at 60 and it is hard for many capable and skilled persons to get jobs after 40 these days.

"Many of the ills of the aged," said Dr. Frank H. Krusen, M. D., recently before Congress, "are the direct result of the inferior role in which this group has been placed. Their experience, wisdom, and know-how are being wasted and the resulting lack of meaningful activity has led to emotional frustration and physical breakdown.

"This is a trend which has numerous dangerous implications. Basically the problem calls for aggressive leadership at the family and community level to help bring these millions of potentially useful citizens back to their rightful place in society and to give their lives purpose and dignity."

I asked mother what she thought about the situation. "Jobs are what the older people want, not handouts," she told me. "I'm fortunate in being able to do something useful in my advanced years, and I feel exactly 20 years younger than I would if I wasn't working." And she looks it, too. This proud little pioneer mother of mine has never yielded to the numerous requests Irene and I have both made of her to retire. Once she pointed out to me a classic example which I have never forgotten.

"Look at the finest automobile in Los Angeles," she said. "Run it a little bit every day and it will last you for many years if you take care of it. But what if you had to go away suddenly and inadvertently left it on the street over a long period of time? Say several months, or even a year? What would that fine automobile look like after that? Tires rotted, motor rusted, paint gone—why it wouldn't even run, I suppose. And all this after merely being retired and just resting for a few months without any work to do. Well, is the human body any different? I don't think so—and for this reason I don't want to retire as long as I can hold a job down. Working is the key to living. People just go to seed when they don't have work to do or a real purpose in life. Don't you agree with me?"

And stay active she does, too. Every morning she marches off proudly to her work in a downtown office, and she can afford to hold her head up high. Fortunately for her—and I only wish all her contemporaries were blessed with this kind of knowledge—she is just as useful a member of society as any other working members of her family. Not long ago, when my Irene was ill and had to go to the hospital for a week, mother stepped into the breach and ran the house, too. What a woman—70 years young. And who could be more useful in her twilight years than she?

ICELANDIC FISHERIES CONTROVERSY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, an international controversy concerning the Icelandic fisheries is now in progress. When I was in London last week, in connection with the meeting of the NATO parliamentarians, I as the representative of the United States delegation participated in a conference of one of its sections consisting of a subcommittee of representatives from Iceland, Norway, Canada, and the United States. The subcommittee adopted a resolution urging that action be taken by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Council to settle the dispute.

I speak this morning because the deadline of September 1, which has been set by the Icelandic Government, is approaching rapidly, and much is being printed in the Icelandic and British newspapers about the conflict between British trawlers, escorted by British gunboats, and Icelandic trawlers.

The essence of the dispute is the assertion by Iceland of exclusive rights to fish off the 12 mile limit around Iceland, and the contesting of that right, or the assertion of that right, by the Government of the United Kingdom and other European governments.

The matter of juridical decision is one which has been very long debated, and probably is impossible of settlement within the short compass of time which is available now. But a practical economic settlement is entirely possible, because the real nub of the question is that Iceland's staff of life is literally its fishing industry and the economic stability of this country is of great interest to Great Britain and other nations.

Therefore, I urge that Paul Henry Spaak, Secretary General of the NATO organization, who holds a position equivalent in NATO to that of Dag Hammarskjold in the United Nations, should personally undertake to mediate this question on the economic level, and that our Government—and I have so communicated my views to the Secretary of State—should back Mr. Spaak in this effort, and also in such cooperation as may be needed to bring about a settlement which will be fair to the economy of Iceland, so seriously affected by the situation.

There is a dire alternative: Communists are very active in Iceland. Iceland is the seat of a United States defense base. Our troops are in Iceland. It is a supremely important outpost of the Free World in the North Atlantic. I think it is fair to say that it is indispensable to the defense activity of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Accordingly, as time is short, and this is probably the last day the Senate will meet, I again call attention to the work which was done in London and urge upon the NATO Council the designation of Paul Henry Spaak to act as personal mediator, in order to settle this very vexing Iceland fisheries dispute. I emphasize: Settle it upon the economic level.

Mr. President, in that respect, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a resolution adopted in London by the subcommittee of which I have the honor to be a member, together with a statement reporting the consideration of this problem.

There being no objection, the resolution and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FISHERIES DISPUTE—RESOLUTION OF THE AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE ECONOMIC SECTION OF THE GENERAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Resolved by an ad hoc subcommittee of the Economic Section of the General Affairs Committee of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference consisting of Mr. B. Grondal (Ice-

land), Mr. H. Seip (Norway), Mr. H. Macquarrie (Canada), and Senator J. K. Javits (United States of America, in the chair) as follows:

Whereas the economic development of the members of NATO must properly enjoy a high priority in the consideration of all questions of economic aid for development by individual members of NATO; and

Whereas a serious economic problem now faces Iceland in respect of the exercise of fishing rights off its coasts, as well as other interested NATO nations fishing in northern waters; and

Whereas there is dispute with other nations as to the geographical limits of such rights; and

Whereas the juridical questions involved are not susceptible of immediate solution within the time available since the Government of Iceland has announced that the effective date of the new offshore limits for fishing off Iceland will be September 1, 1958.

The subcommittee expressed concern at the possible threat to the harmonious relations between some members of the North Atlantic Alliance which will exist for as long as no solution acceptable to the interested NATO countries actively fishing in northern waters is achieved.

For this reason, welcomed the present discussions taking place on the problem within the North Atlantic Council.

Expressed the view that the urgency of the situation requires the governments of the interested NATO countries to regard as a matter of high priority a settlement of the question as an economic problem.

Resolved, therefore, that members of the standing committee and delegations of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference be asked immediately to urge the governments of their countries to take all possible expeditious action to bring about a prompt, fair, and realistic solution.

FISHERIES DISPUTE—STATEMENT OF NATO PARLIAMENTARIANS' ECONOMIC SUBCOMMITTEE

After the meeting of Parliamentary Economic Rapporteurs, members of the Economic Section of the General Affairs Committee of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, in London at 10, Carlton House Terrace, on August 14 and 15, 1958, a subcommittee under the chairmanship of Senator J. K. JAVITS (United States), met to consider the Icelandic fishing limits dispute.

The subcommittee expressed concern at the continuing threat to harmonious relations between some members of the North Atlantic Alliance, until such time as a solution acceptable to the interested NATO countries actively fishing in northern waters is achieved; welcomed the present discussions taking place on the problem within the North Atlantic Council and expressed the view that the urgency of the situation required the governments of the interested NATO countries to regard as a matter of high priority a settlement of the question as an economic problem.

The subcommittee's views have been conveyed to the President and members of the North Atlantic Council. Members of the Standing Committee (the Executive Committee) of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference have been requested to urge the governments of their countries to take all possible expeditious action to bring about a prompt, fair, and realistic solution to the problem.

VISITS BY "NAUTILUS" AND "SKATE" TO CERTAIN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the press tells us this morning that both Denmark and the United Kingdom have waved away our atomic submarines—Denmark has barred the *Skate*, and the United Kingdom has kept the *Nautilus* from docking at ports in populous areas. At the same time there is the firm assertion by the United States Government that both of these submarines are safe, in terms of being free from any nuclear hazard.

Mr. President, I believe that the coordination between ourselves and our NATO allies and the European countries who are so very friendly to us should be closer than that, and that under those circumstances a degree of self-restraint should be exercised by the Governments of Denmark and the United Kingdom, in order to endeavor, without public announcement, to settle with the United States any differences of opinion in regard to nuclear radiation hazards.

I respectfully submit to them—because they are our close friends—that it makes a very poor impression upon the whole world if nations so closely related to the United States as are Denmark and the United Kingdom express doubts about an American scientific achievement of such momentous magnitude and triumph, both in terms of maritime achievement and scientific skill, as the development of the submarines *Skate* and *Nautilus*, which so recently have sailed under the North Pole. These two vessels constitute triumphs for our country; and I believe that before their accomplishments are jeopardized by such close allies, they certainly should clear the matter with the United States, and should not make this subject a matter of public announcement.

So, Mr. President, I hope that both we and they will profit from this little lesson, in terms of better public relations, rather than worse public relations, as regards the whole world, including our friends and allies, and also the Communist countries.

Mr. President, I turn now to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

UNITED STATES ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING SUSPENSION OF NUCLEAR TESTING

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an editorial entitled "An End to Nuclear Tests?" which was published in the New York Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN END TO NUCLEAR TESTS?

The President's statement yesterday offering a beginning toward the ending of nuclear tests must be welcome to the great majority of Americans and, indeed, to all humanity. Speaking so soon after the successful conclusion of the Geneva technical talks on means of detecting nuclear tests, the President yesterday successfully met the challenge which the heartening cooperation of Eastern and Western scientists in Geneva had posed.

There are, we know, patriotic and devoted Americans in Washington who are uneasy about the President's decision. It is natural that officers in the Pentagon should want more tests to improve and refine nuclear weapons. A similar feeling is understandable in the Atomic Energy Commission. We can understand, too, those in Congress who, justifiably suspicious of the Soviet Union, wonder if the President's statement has not opened the way for our falling into a Soviet trap.

Nevertheless, we believe the President has done the right thing. He has chosen a course which for the moment at least walks successfully the narrow path between gullible acceptance of Soviet words on one side and on the other side callous—and politically stupid—disregard of the fears of millions of human beings. By his statement yesterday he has now put the Soviet Government in a position where it must put up or shut up, where it must agree to his reasonable offer in a reasonable time or take upon itself responsibility for resumption of atomic tests.

Whether justified or not—and it is an issue on which there is still much disagreement among scientists—millions of human beings have been and are afraid of the near and long term consequences of continued nuclear weapons tests. By playing upon that fear the Soviet Union and its allies have been able to win important propaganda advantages, posing as the opponents of continued nuclear tests and depicting us as mad imperialists determined to continue such tests regardless of consequences.

Our refusal to fall victims to the worst of this Soviet propaganda finally forced Moscow to send its scientists to work out a suitable method of enforcing a ban on future tests. We now offer to implement such a ban, provided such implementation is accompanied by progress toward actual disarmament, and the President's statement yesterday correctly stressed that ending the tests is not in itself a disarmament step. If the Russians refuse to meet our reasonable conditions we can, however reluctantly, resume testing. It is up to them.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in connection with the editorial, I should like to state that what the President has done represents the most auspicious moment in postwar history for a first step toward disarmament with effective controls. This step is signaled by the United States announcement that it is asking the Soviet Union to negotiate for the suspension of nuclear testing.

Our country's determination to find a true scientific basis for an agreement to end nuclear testing is clearly evident. The whole world now awaits with deep consciousness of its historic significance the demonstration of the U. S. S. R.'s real willingness to agree, both in regard to nuclear testing and in regard to true disarmament.

I call this matter to the attention of the Senate because I believe it demonstrates one very fundamental point, namely, that when the United States is sincere and when the United States shows to the rest of the world that quality, our Nation is at its greatest, for our sincerity is really our unique national attribute.

The United States has said, all along, that it wishes to have nuclear testing ended, providing there is some promise of actual achievement of that objective, and provided the effort in that direction is soundly based in terms of scientific findings. Now, as soon as there is a sound basis, bottomed on scientific findings, as the result of the meeting at Geneva, the United States is prompt to come forward with this proposal, thus

laying at rest all the calumnies which have been directed against us—for instance, such statements as the ones that we are looking for wars or that we are bloodthirsty tyrants, or all the other nonsense that one hears on the Moscow or other Communist-controlled radio.

I sincerely submit that when the President spoke on yesterday, he was actually bespeaking both his own sentiments and those in the hearts of the American people.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from New York and I may disagree on the time schedule; but I wish to join him in hailing the action the President took yesterday. I think it is long overdue, but I am glad that a record has finally been written in support of suspension of nuclear tests.

In 1956, I campaigned on this issue, as one of the major issues of my campaign. That issue was supposed to be one of the issues which would result in my defeat. But the people of my State gave their answer—quite clearly, I think—on this issue.

In 1956, I discussed the scientific evidence which then was being presented to us by the scientists of the country—in fact, it had been presented as early as 1954, and I made it clear that, from the standpoint of moral principles, the United States should stop the testing of nuclear weapons. I made that issue a major issue of my campaign. The presidential candidate of our party in 1956 likewise made that issue an issue of his campaign.

I agree with the Senator from New York that at this time, in view of the President's statement of yesterday, partisanship should be out the window and we should stand before the world urging—not only in the interest of world security, but also in the interest of world health—that there be an end of nuclear testing on the part of all nations. It seems to me it now constitutes one of the tests—which is put squarely up to the Russians—as to whether they are acting in good faith in regard to the matter of cessation of nuclear tests.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I appreciate my colleague's concurrence in my remarks; but I would be less than frank if I did not point out that I thoroughly believe in the conditions the President has attached, namely, that there must be an effective system of detection and control, and also that it must be a step in the direction of disarmament.

I hope the other countries of the world realize that, and also realize its essentiality in terms of the Free World.

Mr. President, I turn now to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

TRIBUTES TO SIX RETIRING MEMBERS OF THE NEW YORK REPUBLICAN DELEGATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to pay tribute to six retiring members of the New York Republican delegation in the House of Representatives, all of whom have served their country and the Congress in the highest sense of duty and good conscience. They are Representatives COUDERT, GWINN, KEARNEY, WILLIAMS, RADWAN, and LATHAM.

Mr. President, I pay my tribute to them as fine Americans, outstanding citizens of the State of New York, and men who have done their best to serve their country to the best of their ability, and have served it with honor.

I ask unanimous consent that a brief biography of each of them be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the biographies were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Six New York Congressmen retiring. All six are Republicans.

1. FREDERIC RENE COUDERT, Jr., 17th District. World War I, served in France. Born in New York City. Bachelor of arts from Columbia University, 1918; bachelor of laws, 1922. New York lawyers committee against Jones Act (prohibition law), chairman, 1929. State senator, 1939–46. Chairman of Rapp-Coudert Joint Legislative Subcommittee to Investigate Public Education in City of New York. Elected to 80th and succeeding Congresses. Member of House Appropriations Committee.

2. RALPH W. GWINN, 27th District. Born in Indiana, 1884. Graduated from DePauw University and Columbia. Religious leader (Reformed Church). Former president of National Republican Club. Author of articles on politics, agriculture, and religious education. Elected to 79th Congress and thereafter to succeeding Congresses.

3. BERNARD W. (PAT) KEARNEY, 32d District. Born in Ithaca, 1889. Graduated Union University and Albany Law School. Served in many battles in France in World War I. (Enlisted as private in New York National Guard in 1909; retired as major general in 1940.) Medals: French Legion of Honor, Croix de Guerre, Commander, Legion of Honor (Philippines). Elected to 78th Congress and thereafter. Coauthor of GI bill of rights and gave it that name. (Commander in chief of VFW, 1936. Also commander of American Legion in Fulton County for four terms. Recent citation by VFW.)

4. WILLIAM R. WILLIAMS, 34th District. Born in Brookfield, N. Y. Occupation, farmer. State legislature, 1935–43. Sheriff of Oneida County, 1943–51. Elected to 82d Congress and thereafter. Served on Agriculture Committee and subcommittees.

5. EDMUND P. RADWAN, 41st District. Born in Buffalo, 1911. Graduated University of Buffalo Law School. Before that, Canesius College. Lived in Buffalo all his life. Practicing attorney. State senate from 1945 to 1950. Active in veterans' organizations. Elected to 82d Congress and thereafter. On Foreign Affairs Committee.

6. HENRY J. LATHAM, Fourth District. Born in Brooklyn, 1908. St. John's College and Brooklyn Law School of St. Lawrence University; bachelor and master's degrees in law. New York State Assembly, 1941–42. United States Navy, served in Atlantic and Pacific war theaters. Commander in United States Navy Reserve. Elected to 79th Congress and thereafter to succeeding Congresses. Member of Rules Committee.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF SURGEONS GENERAL OF ARMY AND NAVY OUTSIDE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on August 5, 1957, more than 1 year ago, the Senate passed an act to relieve the Surgeons General of the Army and Navy of certain responsibilities outside the Department of Defense. These responsibilities were given to the Surgeons General before there was a Food and Drug Administration and before there were certain investigative bodies on the part of the Department of Agriculture and other departments of the Government.

At this time, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 2006.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORTON in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2006) to relieve the Surgeons General of the Army and Navy of certain responsibilities outside the Department of Defense, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) section 4818 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to administrative decisions in respect to adulterated butter) is amended—

(1) by striking out "(a) Taxability.—"; and

(2) by striking out subsections (b) and (c) thereof.

(b) (1) Section 4835 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to administrative decisions in respect of filled cheese) is repealed.

(2) The table of sections for subpart A of part II of subchapter C of chapter 39 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out

"Sec. 4835. Administrative decisions."

(c) Paragraph (2) of section 7303 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (providing for forfeiture of certain property) is repealed.

SEC. 2. Section 351 (d) of the Public Health Service Act (58 Stat. 702; 42 U. S. C., sec. 262 (d)) is amended by striking out "regulations made jointly by the Surgeon General, the Surgeon General of the Army, and the Surgeon General of the Navy, and approved by the Administrator," and inserting in lieu thereof "regulations,".

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the House has added to the bill an amendment which is entirely acceptable to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Defense, the Treasury Department, and all the other departments.

Therefore, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to.

MISSILE DEVELOPMENT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the remarks I wish to make are in no way designed to detract from the work of any branch of the armed services. All of them, I feel sure, are doing their best as they see it.

On Thursday my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], presented a list of military achievements which he cited as the hard facts of our defense posture. One of the achievements he named was the Bomarc, which the senior Senator from Massachusetts described as "a deadly defensive missile which has been fired with incredible accuracy."

It is not my purpose to take issue with this statement, but rather to fill a void which exists in the information presented by the senior Senator from Massachusetts. Through inadvertance, I feel sure, my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts failed to mention as a major element of our defense structure, the only operational land-based air-defense missile we have in our arsenal—the Army's Nike family of anti-aircraft weapons.

Nike-Hercules, the second generation of the Nike air-defense weapons, is the most lethal and most advanced air-defense weapon in the hands of our forces today. We have no other operational weapon which approaches its lethality, accuracy, range, or reliability. The growth potential of the Nike-Hercules is unrivaled, and has been proved beyond question. The next generation of Nike missiles—the Nike-Zeus is in the hardware-development stage. It is the only anti-ICBM missile in our arsenal which is beyond the drawing board. Its developers are certain of its success.

Without intending to take issue at this time with what the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts has said about our defense posture, I believe it is in order to clarify our capabilities in the field of air defense. Therefore, it is necessary, I feel, to point out the operational effectiveness of Nike-Hercules and its proven growth potential. On the other hand, the Bomarc missile is, in fact, an unmanned interceptor. It is not operational, and its reliability is discouragingly low—something on the order of 25 percent of the proven reliability of the Nike-Hercules. Its altitude range is distinctly limited. Thus far, approximately $1 billion has been spent on the Bomarc program, and, I repeat, it is not yet operational. This is more than twice the amount which has been spent to date on the development of the Nike family and the land-based Talos.

Mr. President, I should like to conclude these remarks by calling attention to the essential and fundamental part which has been played in the development of the Nike missile family, the Redstone, the Jupiter, and, as a matter of plain fact, the general development of our missiles by the great missile team at the Army Ballistics Missile Agency in Huntsville, Ala. The experience and know-how of this group of experts in Alabama is unmatched elsewhere in this Nation. It is to this group we owe what success we have made in the field of earth satellites, and to them we should in all logic look for greater and greater developments.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOL FOOD SERVICES ACT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1764) to amend the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1764) to amend the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act, which was, on page 1, line 10, after "cost" insert ": *Provided*, That such reimbursement shall be made only in cases where such lunches are served to children of families who are recipients of public assistance granted by the government of the District of Columbia."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will concur in the amendment which has been made by the House of Representatives to S. 1764, a bill passed by this body on August 23, 1957, in order that the measure may be sent for Presidential signature. I state the unanimous opinion of the District of Columbia Committee.

The amendment of the House provides that reimbursement for lunches served in accordance with section 9 of the National School Lunch Act shall be made only to children from families receiving public assistance.

It does not limit the serving of free lunches or lunches at reduced cost to other children determined by the school authorities to be unable to pay for lunches. The limitation, I repeat, Mr. President, is upon the reimbursement that can be claimed, not upon the provision of school lunches to those who are in need.

The amended version, I am informed, is acceptable to the school authorities.

Mr. President, the amendment of the House is acceptable. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

The motion was agreed to.

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1959

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, has morning business been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is making inquiry as to whether there is any further morning business. If not, the Chair will lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13192) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Has there been an agreement to have a call of the calendar following conclusion of morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The order was to have a call of the calendar sometime during the day. No definite hour was set.

The pending question is amendment lettered C, offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JAVITS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to call the calendar at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will state the first measure on the calendar.

RESOLUTIONS AND BILLS PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 24) to amend rule XIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, was announced as first in order.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask that Calendar No. 69 (S. Res. 24) to amend rule XIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate;

Calendar No. 131 (S. Con. Res. 20) authorizing an investigation by the Federal Trade Commission into the activities and practices of companies engaged in the production, distribution, or sale of newsprint in interstate commerce;

Calendar No. 249 (S. 1164) to make the evaluation of recreational benefits resulting from the construction of any flood-control, navigation, or reclamation project an integral part of project planning, and for other purposes;

Calendar No. 264 (S. 1639) to provide for the suspension of the vesting of alien property and the liquidation of vested property, under the Trading With the Enemy Act;

Calendar No. 415 (S. 931) to provide for the reorganization of the safety functions of the Federal Government and for other purposes;

Calendar No. 585 (S. 2150) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes;

Calendar No. 722 (S. 1168) to amend the Securities and Exchange Act, as amended;

Calendar No. 726 (S. Res. 118) to amend rule XXVI so as to require committee reports proposing legislation or ratification of treaties, involving expenditure of public funds, to show the estimated costs thereof;

Calendar No. 861 (S. 1483) to amend the act of August 27, 1954, relating to the rights of vessels of the United States on the high seas and in the territorial waters of foreign countries;

Calendar No. 1074 (S. 984) conferring jurisdiction on the court of claims to make certain findings with respect to the amount of compensation to which certain independent ore producers are equitably entitled for uranium supplied by them to the United States during the period May 1, 1943, to August 5, 1945,

and to provide for payment of the amounts so determined;

Calendar No. 1153 (H. R. 7168) to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes;

Calendar No. 1183 (S. J. Res. 80) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women;

Calendar No. 1198 (S. 50) to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union;

Calendar No. 1298 (S. 5) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to prevent the allocation of procurement contracts to certain designated geographical areas, and for other purposes;

Calendar No. 1337 (S. 213) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon claims of customs officers and employees to extra compensation for Sunday, holiday, and overtime services performed after August 31, 1931, and not heretofore paid in accordance with existing law;

Calendar No. 1343 (S. 3039) amending the Agricultural Trade and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended;

Calendar No. 1392 (S. 3441) to provide for a minimum acreage allotment for corn and other purposes;

Calendar No. 1393 (S. 3408) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, so as to provide that cotton acreage allotments for the States for 1958 and subsequent years shall be no less than in 1956, and for other purposes;

Calendar No. 1486 (S. 2861) to extend for an additional 4-year period the provisions of the National Wool Act of 1954;

Calendar No. 1499 (S. Con. Res. 62) to request the President to use his best efforts to bring about a meeting of representative citizens from all the North Atlantic Treaty Organization nations to examine ways to promote greater cooperation among those nations;

Calendar No. 1518 (H. R. 2783) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, to provide for the free importation of amorphous graphite;

Calendar No. 1534 (S. Res. 17) to amend section 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate;

Calendar No. 1616 (S. 2646) to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in certain cases;

Calendar No. 1644 (S. 3862) to establish certain provisions with respect to the removal and the terms of office of the members of certain regulatory agencies;

Calendar No. 1647 (S. J. Res. 16) to establish a joint committee to investigate the gold-mining industry; and

Calendar No. 1672 (S. 3918) to authorize the sale of nonessential vessels of the merchant marine national defense reserve fleet be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills and resolutions will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3560) to authorize the construction of a courthouse and a Federal office building in Memphis, Tenn., and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARRETT. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 83) to refer to the Court of Claims the bill (S. 819) for the relief of Mary A. Ford, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask that Calendar No. 1990 (S. Res. 83) to refer to the Court of Claims the bill (S. 819) for the relief of Mary A. Ford;

Calendar No. 2009 (S. 3290) to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act in order to remove the exemption with respect to certain mines employing no more than 14 individuals;

Calendar No. 2056 (S. 11) to amend the Robinson-Patman Act with reference to equality of opportunity;

Calendar No. 2063 (H. R. 1435) for the relief of John I. Strong;

Calendar No. 2086 (S. 3185) to promote the conservation of migratory fish and game by requiring certain approval by the Secretary of the Interior of licenses issued under the Federal Permit Act;

Calendar No. 2091 (H. R. 6995) to amend Public Law 883, 84th Congress, to provide for the conveyance of certain additional property of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg., and for other purposes;

Calendar No. 2104 (S. 4146) providing for payments as incentives for the production of certain strategic and critical minerals, and for other purposes;

Calendar No. 2109 (S. 237) to regulate the interstate transportation of lobsters, and to define the term "lobster" for the purpose of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act;

Calendar No. 2139 (S. 4162) to further amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended;

Calendar No. 2146 (S. Res. 353) opposing the suspension of deportation of James Chin Lee;

Calendar No. 2241 (S. 2142) to amend section 8 (e) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, to provide for the extension of the restrictions on imported citrus fruits, sliced figs, dried figs, and fig paste;

Calendar No. 2258 (H. R. 13192) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes;

Calendar No. 2280 (H. R. 8361) to amend section 2254 of title 28 of the United States Code in reference to applications for writs of habeas corpus for persons in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court;

Calendar No. 2282 (S. 337) to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effects of acts of Congress on State laws;

Calendar No. 2386 (S. 4091) to amend the act of August 9, 1955, relating to the regulation of fares for the transportation of schoolchildren in the District of Columbia;

Calendar No. 2387 (S. 3229) to provide a 5-year program of assistance to enable depressed segments of the fishing industry in the United States to regain a favorable economic status, and for other purposes;

Calendar No. 2394 (S. 2373) for the relief of Janet R. Parker;

Calendar No. 2400 (S. 3626) to establish a teaching hospital for Howard University, to transfer Freedmen's Hospital to the university, and for other purposes;

Calendar No. 2411 (S. 411) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended;

Calendar No. 2427 (S. 2020) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act;

Calendar No. 2428 (S. 1313) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act so as to provide increases in benefits and for other purposes; and

Calendar No. 2479 (S. 1870) to amend section 1 (e) of title 17 of the United States Code with regard to the rendition of musical compositions on coin-operated machines be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills and resolutions will be passed over.

BILL PLACED AT FOOT OF CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 13254) to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the use in food of additives which have not been adequately tested to establish their safety was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk on this bill, which has been cleared with the committee. I should like to have the amendment considered.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, inasmuch as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is not presently on the floor, I ask that the bill go to the foot of the calendar, to be considered after arrival of the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be placed at the foot of the calendar.

MRS. BOYD DINEHART AND RICHARD REAMS

The bill (H. R. 1803) for the relief of Mrs. Boyd Dinehart and Richard Reams was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 6789) to provide for reasonable notice of applications to the United States Courts of Appeals for interlocutory relief against the orders of certain administrative agencies was announced as next in order.

Mr. CLARK. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

PETER JAMES O'BRIEN

The bill (H. R. 4073) for the relief of Peter James O'Brien was considered,

ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I wrote to the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] in reference to this bill.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 18, 1958.*

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIM: It has been brought to my attention that there is pending before your committee H. R. 4073 for the relief of a Peter James O'Brien.

I will call your particular attention to the comments of the House Committee on Judiciary in the report accompanying this bill, pointing out that Mr. O'Brien should be granted relief as provided for in H. R. 4073 in spite of the adverse reports of the VA and the Department of Labor.

Favorable action on this bill by your committee will be very much appreciated.

My kindest regards,
Sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senator.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 8496) for the relief of William H. Pearlmutter was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARRETT. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 11817) for the relief of Adele M. Parker was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARRETT. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 3193) for the relief of Toley's Charter Boats, Inc., Toley Engebretsen, and Harvey Homlar was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARRETT. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 2) to authorize the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test on a 3-year basis the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CLARK. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

CALIFORNIA INTERNATIONAL TRADE FAIR AND INDUSTRIAL EXPOSITION, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 658) authorizing and requesting the President to invite the countries of the Free World to participate in the California International Trade Fair and Industrial Exposition to be held in Los Angeles, Calif., from April 1 to 12, 1959, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY, EL PASO, TEX.

The bill (H. R. 11456) to authorize the exchange of certain real property heretofore conveyed to the city of El Paso, Tex., by the United States, for other real property of equal value, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM FRANKLIN ROLLINS

The bill (H. R. 1684) for the relief of William Franklin Rollins was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

W. G. HOLLOMON AND MRS. HOLLOMON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 8759) for the relief of W. G. Hollomon and Mrs. W. G. Hollomon.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. TALMADGE. I shall be delighted to give an explanation.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay the sum of $3,189.15 to Mr. and Mrs. G. W. Hollomon, in full settlement of all claims against the United States. Such sum represents compensation for personal injuries sustained as a result of being shot by United States soldiers in their place of business at Brooklyn, Ga., on September 2, 1956.

The statement of facts contained in House Report No. 1907 is as follows:

It appears that two soldiers attached to the Army at Fort Benning, Ga., entered the place of business of W. G. Hollomon, at which time Mr. Hollomon and his wife were present and undertook to perpetrate a robbery by violence and force, and in the process of such robbery, one of the soldiers began shooting and Mr. Hollomon returned the fire, even though he had been shot three times and received serious injuries from which he has never fully recovered. The soldier, Kirchner, was killed in the exchange of gunfire.

The Department of the Army opposed the enactment of the bill stating that the guns used by the soldiers were not property of the Government and there is no legal liability to pay for their action. However, the Congress has passed and the President has signed many bills into law under such circumstances. The Department in its report states that under these conditions Private Law 201, 81st Congress, and Private Law 1013, 81st Congress, were enacted, but in these cases the Army had a more direct relationship to the crime in that the weapons utilized were Government property. Your committee is of the opinion that this is not a proper defense and it makes no difference as to the ownership of the weapons used in the attack. They were nevertheless soldiers of the United States Army.

Listed below are private laws enacted by the Congress which are of similar nature.

Private Laws 264, 78th Congress, 90 of the 78th, 388 of the 79th, 40 of the 80th, 98 of the 80th, 190 of the 81st, 201 of the 81st, 708 of the 82d, and many more too numerous to list. Mr. Hollomon lost a sum of money in the robbery, but your committee has not allowed this loss. Also, Mr. Hollomon being postmaster could file for compensation under the Employees' Compensation Act. Therefore, a provision has been made in the bill to bar him from receiving compensation from this source at any future date.

The report dated September 12, 1957, from the Department of the Army to the chairman gives in detail the history of the proposed legislation. In view of the many bills enacted of similiar nature, your committee disagrees with the recommendation and recommends favorable consideration of the bill as amended.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. I am delighted to yield to my friend from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. Can the Senator tell me whether or not these servicemen were on duty at the time, and in uniform?

Mr. TALMADGE. No, they were not in uniform, but because they disguised their identities by wearing civilian clothes does not alter the fact that they were soldiers. A soldier is a soldier 24 hours a day regardless of the apparel he may be wearing at a given time.

I would also point out to the Senator that at this session of the Congress we have enacted legislation to pay the private claim of a conductor of a railroad who was assaulted and attacked by a soldier while he was aboard the train. So the situations are quite parallel.

I would also point out that I know Mr. Hollomon and his wife. They are good citizens of the rural community of Brooklyn, Ga., which is located on the very outskirts of Fort Benning, Ga., where soldiers come and go at will.

I believe that this claim has a great deal of merit, and I hope the Senator from Wyoming can approve passage of the bill.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the distinguished Senator. I withdraw my reservation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 8759?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. MINNIE PERREIRA

The bill (H. R. 9258) for the relief of Mrs. Minnie Perreira was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN F. SHEEHAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3545) for the relief of John F. Sheehan, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the word "of", where it appears the second time, to strike out "$1,115" and insert "$1,415", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That John F. Sheehan of Westwood, Mass., is hereby relieved of all liability for payment to the United States of the sum of $1,415, representing overpayments of per diem which he received as an employee of the Department of the Navy while he was assigned to duty at the Golcuk Navy Yard, Ismet, Turkey, such overpayments having been made as a result of administrative error.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any

money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said John F. Sheehan, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The resolution (S. Res. 386) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Armed Services was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services, or the Military Construction Subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to military construction.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee, from September 1, 1958, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) employ upon a temporary basis such personnel as may be necessary; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $12,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADMINISTRATIVE SITE FOR YOSEMITE NATIONAL PARK, CALIF.

The bill (H. R. 12281) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide an administrative site for Yosemite National Park, Calif., on lands adjacent to the park, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROMOTION OF CERTAIN PERSONS WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE DEFENSE OF THE PHILIPPINES

The bill (S. 2765) to provide for the promotion of certain persons who participated in the defense of the Philippines was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretaries of the military departments concerned shall convene boards of officers to recommend for promotion or advancement on the retired list to the next higher grade (1) any member on active duty and (2) any member or former member who is on a retired list and entitled to retired or retirement pay, who—

(1) participated in the defense of the Philippine Islands while in active service at any time after December 6, 1941, and before May 8, 1942, prior to which date General Jonathan M. Wainwright surrendered all the forces under his command;

(2) was incarcerated while so serving; and

(3) was not promoted or advanced on a retired list at any time after he was so incarcerated.

If not promoted to a higher grade while on active duty, a member on active duty who is so recommended shall, if nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate, after his relief from active duty or after being placed on a retired list with entitlement to retired or retirement pay, be advanced to the grade concerned. A member or former member who is on a retired list and entitled to retired or retirement pay who is so recommended for advancement shall, if nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate, be advanced on the retired list to the grade concerned.

SEC. 2. A member who is advanced to a higher grade under this act may be ordered to active duty under any provision of law which authorized his being ordered to active duty in either the grade to which advanced under this act or in the grade which he held at the time of that advancement. While on active duty he is entitled to the pay and allowances of the grade in which ordered to active duty.

SEC. 3. The retired, retirement, or equivalent pay to which an officer advanced in grade under this act is entitled is not increased by that advancement.

ROGER P. AMES

The bill (H. R. 7544) to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever," approved February 28, 1929, by including therein the name of Roger P. Ames was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

APPOINTMENT OF ADJUTANT GENERAL OF PUERTO RICO

The bill (S. 4129) to amend title 32 of the United States Code to permit the appointment of the Adjutant General of Puerto Rico as provided by the laws of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a bill coming over from the House (H. R. 13666) to amend title 32 of the United States Code to permit the appointment of the Adjutant General of Puerto Rico as provided by the laws of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico which was read twice by title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 4129 is indefinitely postponed.

EDWARD ARTHUR PATTERSON LAKE

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 179) to designate the lake to be formed by the water impounded by the Dickinson Dam in the State of North Dakota as "Edward Arthur Patterson Lake" was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by the Dickinson Dam in the State of North Dakota shall hereafter be known as "Edward Arthur Patterson Lake," and any law, regulation, document or record of the United States in which such lake is designated or referred to shall be held to refer to such lake under and by the name of "Edward Arthur Patterson Lake."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 13856) making appropriations for sundry executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, that is an appropriation bill, and is not properly calendar business. It should be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

PROHIBITION OF USE OF UNTESTED ADDITIVES IN FOOD

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Calendar No. 2487, House bill 13254, was passed to the foot of the calendar. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 13254) to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the use in food of additives which have not been adequately tested to establish their safety.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement which I have prepared on the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This bill, which is the result of some 6 years of very intensive hearings held by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, was reported unanimously by that committee to the House, passed the House without dissent and has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The bill has as its objective the correction of two deficiencies in the existing laws under which we undertake to assure the safety of the foods sold to the people of the United States.

In the first place, this legislation would require the processor of foodstuffs who proposes to add to the food any new chemical additive to first prove that the proposed addition will be safe. Under present law the burden of proving any particular additive poisonous or deleterious to humans lies with the Food and Drug Administration. Sometimes a chemical may be added to foodstuffs and used for a considerable period of time before anyone begins to suspect that it may be having ill effects. When and if suspicion has been aroused, more time passes before the Food and Drug Administration can schedule it for investigation. The scientists of our Food and Drug Administration then undertake investigatory procedures involving testing the chemical additives on small animals. This may take 2 years or even longer. In the meantime, millions of people may be eating the foodstuffs containing the perhaps seriously deleterious additive. An overwhelming percentage of America's food processors of course

have voluntarily undertaken to thoroughly test any additives before using them. This bill would require that all processors do so and that no new additives be used without their safety having first been established. The burden of proof is placed where it belongs: Not on the Government, but on the concern which intends to add the chemical to our food.

The second change in existing law would permit American industry to promote new technological developments in food handling calculated to make foods more tasteful and appetizing, to enable them to be kept longer, or to otherwise improve them, through the use of additives now proscribed under a blanket provision of existing law. This legislation, which has the approval of the Food and Drug Administration, would permit the use of additives at safe levels in order to advance our food technology.

I have said that the bill before us passed the House unanimously. I have also pointed out that it has the support of the Food and Drug Administration, which is charged by law with responsibility for protecting the public's health with respect to the foods it eats. I am happy, Mr. President, to be able to also announce that our records indicate that this measure now has the overwhelming support of the major industrial and business concerns which would be affected by it. Its prompt passage is urged not only by the Administration and the committee but by such business groups as:

"National Canners Association; National Dairy Products Corp., Kraft Foods Division; Grocery Manufacturers of America; Millers National Federation; American Bakers Association; Manufacturing Chemists Association; and the Dairy Industry Committee, speaking for: the American Butter Institute; the American Dairy Milk Institute; the Evaporated Milk Association; the International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers; the Milk Industry Foundation; the National Cheese Institute; and the National Creameries Association.

The bill will further strengthen the administration of the Pure Food and Drug Act and the protection afforded the American people by that act.

Mr. President, I note the presence of the distinguished senior Senator from Montana, Mr. MURRAY. He is a former chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and is always greatly interested in the strengthening of the Pure Food and Drug Act. We owe much to him and his able and devoted leadership.

Questions were raised concerning the interpretation of two words in the bill. The questions were taken up with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Following is a letter from the Department giving its interpretation of those words:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, August 20, 1958.

Hon. LISTER HILL,
Chairman, Committee on Labor, and Public Welfare, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Two questions have arisen about the correct interpretation and the legislative intent of section 2 of H. R. 13254, referred to as the "Food Additives Amendment of 1958." Those questions, and the viewpoints of this Department and of the Food and Drug Administration, are as follows:

1. Does the word "substance," as used in that section, include a food or food component consisting of two or more ingredients? Our interpretation is in the affirmative.

2. Do the words "common use," as used in that section, include a wide use of such a substance by many consumers, even though such a substance may have been used by only a single manufacturer of food or food components? Again our answer is in the affirmative.

We would greatly appreciate it if you would place this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in connection with the presentation of the bill for Senate consideration.

Sincerely yours,

ELLIOTT L. RICHARDSON,
Assistant Secretary.

I would add that the term "otherwise affecting the characteristics of any food" refers to an effect not generally recognized as safe among experts qualified by scientific training and experience to evaluate the safety of food additives; but innocuous effects of packaging, such as protection from dirt, retarding moisture loss, preserving shape, providing convenience in use, handling and storage, and the like, would not be covered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with amendments, on page 15, after line 5, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 8. The annual rate of basic compensation of the Commissioner of Food and Drugs shall be $20,000.

And after line 7, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 9. Section 208 (g) of the Public Health Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 210 (g)), is amended by striking out the phrase "in the professional and scientific service" and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase "in the professional, scientific, and executive service" and by striking out the phrase "of specially qualified scientific or professional personnel" and inserting in lieu thereof "of specially qualified scientific, professional, and administrative personnel."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I offer the amendments which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from Delaware will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 21, after the word "Act," it is proposed to insert the following: ", the Poultry Products Inspection Act (21 U. S. C. 451 and the following)."

On page 15, line 3, after the words "pursuant to," it is proposed to insert the following: "the Poultry Products Inspection Act (21 U. S. C. 451 and the following) or."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Delaware that these are very fine amendments. The Department of Agriculture favors the amendments. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has no objection to them. I hope the amendments may be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Delaware.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a brief statement which I have prepared in connection with my amendment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILLIAMS IN CONNECTION WITH AMENDMENT TO H. R. 13254, AS REPORTED BY THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE WITH AMENDMENTS

The bill as reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as indicated by the provisions of section 2 and section 7 relating to the Meat Inspection Act, is not intended, as indicated by the committee report on page 9, to affect the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture under the Meat Inspection Act. Apparently through an oversight similar reference is not made in the bill to the Poultry Products Inspection Act, which was enacted during the last session of this Congress, dealing with a mandatory inspection program for poultry. This omission of reference to this act may have been due to the language of section 18 of the Poultry Products Inspection Act which indicates clearly the Congressional intent with respect to the scope and nature of the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture under that act. However, in order to make it abundantly clear that, as in the case of the Meat Inspection Act, it is not the intention of the Congress in passing this bill to in any way affect the scope or nature of the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture under the Poultry Products Inspection Act, I am offering an amendment which will include in the bill references to the Poultry Products Inspection Act similar to those made to the Meat Inspection Act.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That concludes the calendar.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Chair advise the Senator from Oregon where the call of the calendar was started?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The call started at the beginning, but all the order numbers up to 1684 were objected to; also order numbers 1990 to 2479 were objected to, and were passed over.

The call was resumed with order No. 2487, a bill which was passed to the foot of the calendar when it was called, and which has just now been passed.

Mr. MORSE. Was any action taken on Calendar 2091, House bill 6995?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was passed over with a group of bills en bloc.

Mr. MORSE. What action was taken with regard to Calendar 2427, Senate bill 2020?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was passed over with a group of bills en bloc.

AMENDMENT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT AND RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, would it be out of order for me to make a brief statement in connection with Calendar No. 2427, Senate bill 2020?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to Calendar No. 2427, Senate bill 2020, a bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. I hope it can be considered some time before adjournment. I should like to tell the Senate why, and I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], who is familiar with the bill, as is the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who is also a member of our committee, and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA]. They are the only members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare whom I see present in the chamber. I call upon them to check the statement I am about to make to the Senate.

This is a technical bill. It is a bill which seeks to bring to an end the jurisdictional conflict between the Railroad Retirement Board and the Social Security Board in connection with so-called freeze disability cases, disability cases where the person disabled worked for a time for a railroad, then for a time did not work for the railroad, and became disabled. Who will have jurisdiction? Will the jurisdiction be had by the Railroad Retirement Board or by the Social Security Board? The interesting thing is that the pattern of settling these cases by way of disability allowance is the same whether the cases are handled by the Railroad Retirement Board or by the Social Security Board. We all know, however, that in governmental departments there develops a desire to hold on to whatever any given agency thinks comes within its jurisdiction, and not yield jurisdiction to another agency in what it thinks is an encroachment in the field of jurisdiction. That is the problem which confronted us in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and in our subcommittee.

Therefore we said to both agencies: "Get your heads together. Stop bothering us with this kind of administrative detail." There is no reason in the world why these two agencies should not sit down and decide how they are going to solve this little jurisdictional conflict. The result was that we received a letter some time later which advised us that they had gotten their heads together. We took their agreement, and it is now in the form of S. 2020.

I wish to be completely accurate, and therefore state that subsequent to the submission of the joint agreement between these two agencies, someone in the Social Security Administration had a second thought, and wanted a further modification made. We took the position it was too late. We said they had worked out a fair agreement in the first place and we had accepted it, and we were going to stand on that acceptance.

Mr. President, we should not go into another year without passing this technical bill. We should pass it now. If it does not work out to the satisfaction of both agencies, they can come back to us. However, I will tell Senators what the result will be if Congress makes this administrative decision based upon the joint understanding which the agencies have reached. It will mean that both agencies will adjust to it and we will hear nothing further about it. If we keep the bill on the calender, and adjourn with it on the calendar, we will keep the fires of dispute and disagreement between these two great agencies burning. The time has come to squelch them.

I hope at some time today we will bring up S. 2020, for not more than a minute's debate, and get it behind us, and get it to the House and get it voted on, so that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, come January, can devote its time to more important matters than to have these agencies come before the committee and wash their jurisdictional linen in front of us. That is my plea. I can say no more. I ask my chairman, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and other members of the committee if I have said anything that is not in accord with the facts.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if we can pass the bill in a minute, I ask unanimous consent that we proceed to its consideration.

Mr. MORSE. I have made my case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2020) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with amendments on page 2, line 1, after the word "subsection", to strike out "and all purposes of title II of the Social Security Act"; in line 18, after the word "year", to strike out "*Provided*, That no such period of disability shall be deemed to have begun if the employee died before July 1, 1955:"; in line 21, after the word "*Provided*", to strike out "*further*"; on page 3, line 3, after the word "July", to strike out "1957" and insert "1958", after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "*And provided*" and insert "*Provided further*"; in line 11, after the word "act", to strike out "For purposes of section 5 (k) (2) of this act, any determination by the Board of a period of disability for an employee shall be considered a determination of such a period for such employee by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under section 216 (i) of the Social Security Act, and for such purposes section 222 (b) of the Social Security Act shall not apply with respect to any individual whose period of disability is determined by the Board under this paragraph" and insert "An application filed with the Board pursuant to this paragraph shall be deemed filed as of the same date also with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the purpose of determining a 'period of disability' under section 216 (i) of the Social Security Act"; on page 7, line 17, after the word "sentence", to strike out "after" and insert "beginning with"; on page 9, after line 13, to strike out:

Section 5 (k) (1) of such act is amended by striking out "for the purposes of sections 203 and 216 (1) (3) of that act" and inserting in lieu thereof "for the purposes of section 203 and, with respect to an employee who will have completed less than 10 years of service, section 216 (i) (3) of that act."

At the beginning of line 20, to strike out "(f)" and insert "(e)"; on page 10, line 9, after the word "act", to strike out "where such determination would otherwise result in a denial, or a decrease in the amount, of monthly or lump sum benefits under either the Railroad Retirement Act or the Social Security Act)""; at the beginning of line 13, to strike out "(g)" and insert "(f)"; at the beginning of line 20, to strike out "(h)" and insert "(g)"; on page 11, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "(i)" and insert "(h)"; at the beginning of line 11, to strike out "(j)" and insert "(i)"; on page 12, line 7, after the word "is", to strike out "amended—"; after line 7, to strike out:

(1) by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence a comma and the following: "including expenses, tuition, and salaries of employees of the Board who are designated by the Board to attend courses of instruction or training at institutions (whether or not such courses are conducted by the United States), not exceeding 240 class hours in any one calendar year for any one such employee."; and

At the beginning of line 16, to strike out "(2)"; on page 13, line 12, after the word "and", to strike out "2 (j)" and insert "2 (i)"; on line 15, after the word "sections", to strike out "2 (h)" and insert "2 (g)"; at the beginning of line 16, to strike out "2 (i)" and insert "(2 (h)"; in line 22, after the word "by", to strike out "sections 1 (b) and 2 (c)" and insert "section 1 (b)"; on page 14, line 7, after the word "and", to strike out "2 (g)" and insert "2 (f)"; in line 10, after the word "sections", to strike out "2 (f)" and insert "2 (e)"; on page 16, line 15, after the numeral "11", to strike out "(a)"; after line 23, to strike out:

(b) Section 11 (c) of such act is amended by inserting after "when authorized by the Board" the following: "and expenses, tuition, and salaries of employees designated by the Board to attend courses of instruction or training at institutions (whether or not such courses are conducted by the United States), not exceeding 240 class hours in any one calendar year for any one such employee."

On page 17, line 16, to strike out "1957" and insert "1958"; in line 19, after the numerals "30", to strike out "1957" and insert "1958"; and after line 22, to insert:

PART III—AMENDMENTS TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

SEC. 301. Section 202 (t) of the Social Security Act is amended by changing the period at the end of paragraph (4) thereof to a comma and inserting thereafter the word "or" and the following:

"(E) the individual on whose employment such benefit is based had been in service covered by the Railroad Retirment Act which was treated as employment covered by this act pursuant to the provisions of

section 5 (k) (1) of the Railroad Retirement Act."

SEC. 302. The amendments made by section 301 of this act shall apply with respect to monthly benefits under section 202 of the Social Security Act for months after December 1956, and with respect to lump-sum death payments under such section 202 in the case of deaths occurring after December 1956.

So as to make the bill read:

PART I—AMENDMENTS TO THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT OF 1937

SECTION 1. (a) Section 3 (c) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "If the 'monthly compensation' computed under this subsection is not a multiple of $1, it shall be rounded to the next lower multiple of $1."

(b) Section 3 (e) of such act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"For the purposes of this subsection, the Board shall have the same authority to determine a 'period of disability' within the meaning of section 216 (i) of the Social Security Act, with respect to any employee who will have filed application therefor and (i) have completed 10 years of service or (ii) have been awarded an annuity, as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would have to determine such a period under such section 216 (i) if the employee met the requirements of clauses (A) and (B) of paragraph (3) of such section, considering for purposes of such determination that all his service as an employee after 1936 constitutes 'employment' within the meaning of title II of the Social Security Act and determining his quarters of coverage for such purposes by presuming his compensation in a calendar year to have been paid in equal proportions with respect to all months in which he will have been in service as an employee in such calendar year: *Provided*, That an application for an annuity filed with the Board on the basis of disability shall be deemed to be an application to determine such a period of disability, and such an application filed with the Board on or before the date of the enactment of this paragraph shall, for purposes of this subsection and section 216 (i) (4) of the Social Security Act, be deemed filed after December 1954 and before July 1958: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Board shall have the authority to make such determination on the basis of the records in its possession or evidence otherwise obtained by it, and a determination by the Board with respect to any employee concerning such a 'period of disability' shall be deemed a final decision of the Board determining the rights of persons under this act for purposes of section 11 of this act. An application filed with the Board pursuant to this paragraph shall be deemed filed as of the same date also with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the purpose of determining a 'period of disability' under section 216 (i) of the Social Security Act."

(c) Section 3 (f) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(f) (1) Annuities under section 2 (a) which will have become due an individual but will not have been paid at the time of such individual's death shall be payable to the person, if any, who is determined by the Board to be such individual's widow or widower and to have been living with such individual at the time of such individual's death and who will not have died before receiving payment of such annuities. If there be no such widow or widower, such annuities shall be payable to any person or persons, equitably entitled thereto, to the extent and in the proportions that he or they shall have paid the expenses of burial of such individual, and to the extent that he or they will not have been reimbursed under section 5 (f) (1) for having paid such expenses. If there be no person or persons so entitled, or if the total of such annuities exceeds the amount payable under this paragraph to such person or persons, such total, or the remainder thereof, as the case may be, shall be paid to the children, grandchildren, parents, or brothers and sisters of the deceased individual in the same manner as if such unpaid annuities were a lump sum payable under section 5 (f) (2).

"(2) Insurance annuities under section 5 which will have become due a survivor of an employee but will not have been paid at the time of such survivor's death shall be payable to the person, if any, who is determined by the Board to be such employee's widow or widower and to have been living with such employee at the time of the employee's death and who will not have died before receiving payment of such annuities. If there be no such widow or widower, such annuities shall be payable to the children, grandchildren, parents, or brothers and sisters of the deceased employee in the same manner as if such unpaid annuities were a lump sum payable under section 5 (f) (2).

"(3) Annuities under section 2 (e) which will have become due a spouse of an individual but which will not have been paid at the time of such spouse's death shall be payable to the individual from whose employment such spouse's annuity derived and who will not have died before receiving payment of such annuities. If there be no such individual, such annuities shall be paid as provided in the last two sentences of paragraph (1) of this subsection as if such annuities were annuities due under section 2 (a) to an individual but unpaid at the time of such individual's death.

"(4) Applications for accrued and unpaid annuities provided for in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of this subsection shall be filed prior to the expiration of 2 years after the death of the person to whom such annuities were originally due.

"(5) For the purposes of this subsection and paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 5 (f) of this act, a widow or widower of an individual shall be deemed to have been living with the individual at the time of the individual's death if the applicable conditions set forth in section 216 (h) (2) or (3) of the Social Security Act are fulfilled.

"(6) If there is no person to whom all or any part of the annuity payments described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) can be made, such payments or part thereof shall escheat to the credit of the railroad retirement account."

(d) Section 3 (h) of such act is amended by striking out "$2.50" and inserting in lieu thereof "$5."

(e) Section 3 of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(i) If the amount of any annuity computed under this section, or under section 2 or section 5, is not a multiple of $0.10, it shall be raised to the next higher multiple of $0.10."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 5 (f) (1) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is amended—

(1) by striking out the first three sentences and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Upon the death, after the month in which this act is enacted, of a completely or partially insured employee who will have died leaving no widow, widower, child, or parent who would on proper application therefor be entitled to receive an annuity under this section for the month in which such death occurred, a lump sum of 10 times the employee's basic amount shall be paid to the person, if any, who is determined by the Board to be the widow or widower of the deceased employee and to have been living with such employee at the time of such employee's death and who will not have died before receiving payment of such lump sum. If there be no such widow or widower, such lump sum shall be paid to any person or persons, equitably entitled thereto, to the extent and in the proportions that he or they shall have paid the expenses of burial of such deceased employee.";

(2) by striking out "widow, widower, child, or parent" in the fourth sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "widow or widower"; and

(3) by striking out all of the fourth sentence beginning with "a payment to any then surviving widow" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "a payment equal to the amount by which such lump sum exceeds such annuities so accrued after such deductions shall then nevertheless be made under this paragraph to the person (or, if more than one, in equal shares to the persons) first named in the following order of preference: the widow, widower, child, or parent of the employee then entitled to a survivor annuity under this section."

(b) Section 5 (f) (2) of such act is amended by striking out "to the person or persons in the order provided in paragraph (1) of this subsection, or in the absence of such person or persons, to his or her estate, a lump sum" and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "to the following person (or, if more than one, in equal shares to the persons) whose relationship to the deceased employee will have been determined by the Board and who will not have died before receiving payment of the lump sum provided for in this paragraph:

"(i) the widow or widower of the deceased employee who was living with such employee at the time of such employee's death; or

"(ii) if there be no such widow or widower, to any child or children of such employee; or

"(iii) if there be no such widow, widower, or child, to any grandchild or grandchildren of such employee; or

"(iv) if there be no such widow, widower, child, or grandchild, to any parent or parents of such employee; or

"(v) if there be no such widow, widower, child, grandchild, or parent, to any brother or sister of such employee; or

"(vi) if there be no such widow, widower, child, grandchild, parent, brother, or sister, to the estate of such employee,

a lump sum."

(c) The first sentence of section 5 (h) or such act is amended by striking out "prior to" and inserting in lieu thereof "after."

(d) Section 5 (i) (3) of such act is amended (1) by inserting "and" after the semicolon in subparagraph (i); (2) by striking out all of subparagraph (ii) after "Title II of the Social Security Act" and inserting in lieu thereof a period; and (3) by striking out subparagraphs (iii) and (iv).

(e) Section 5 (k) (3) of such act is amended—

(1) by inserting in the first sentence after "service" the following: ", of determinations under section 3 (e) of this act, or section 216 (i) of the Social Security act, of periods of disability within the meaning of such section 216 (i),";

(2) by inserting in the first sentence after "this section" the following: ", section 3 (e) of this act,"; and

(3) by inserting in the second sentence after "therein" the following: "(except in the case of a determination of disability under section 216 (i) of the Social Security Act)."

(f) Section 5 (l) (6) of such act is amended by striking out the parenthetical phrases in the first and second sentences and by inserting at the end thereof the following

sentence: "Wages, as defined in this paragraph, shall be credited for the purposes of this section in the manner and to the extent credited for corresponding purposes of title II of the Social Security Act."

(g) Section 5 (l) (7) (ii) of such act is amended by striking out "40 or more quarters of coverage" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "either will have had 40 or more quarters of coverage or would be fully insured under title II of the Social Security Act if his service as an employee after December 31, 1936, were included in the term 'employment' as defined in that Act."

(h) Section 5 (l) (8) of such Act is amended (1) by striking out "will have had (i)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(i) will have had," (2) by inserting "either will have had" after "(ii)," and (3) by inserting before the final period a comma and the following: "or would be currently insured under title II of the Social Security Act if his service as an employee after December 31, 1936, were included in the term 'employment' as defined in that act."

(i) Section 5 (l) (9) of such act is amended—

(1) by striking out "quarter in which he will have died" each place it appears in clauses (A) and (B) and by inserting in lieu thereof "employee's closing date";

(2) by striking out the last proviso; and

(3) by inserting after the first sentence the following new sentence: "An employee's 'closing date' shall mean (A) the first day of the first calendar year in which such employee both had attained age 65 and was completely insured; or (B) the first day of the calendar year in which such employee died; or (C) the first day of the calendar year following the year in which such employee died, whichever would produce the highest 'average monthly remuneration' as defined in the preceding sentence. If the amount of the 'average monthly remuneration' as computed under this paragraph is not a multiple of $1, it shall be rounded to the next lower multiple of $1."

SEC. 3. Section 10 (b) (4) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is amended by inserting after the third sentence the following new sentence: "For purposes of its administration of this act or the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, or both, the Board may hereafter place, without regard to the numerical limitations contained in section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, 4 positions in grade GS–16 of the General Schedule established by that act, 4 positions in grade GS–17 of such schedule, and 1 position in grade GS–18 of such schedule.

SEC. 4. Section 13 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is amended (1) by inserting "(a)" after "Sec. 13."; (2) by inserting ", or both" before the final period, and (3) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) All fines and penalties imposed by a court pursuant to this act shall be paid to the court and be remitted from time to time by order of the judge to the Treasury of the United States to be credited to the Railroad Retirement Account."

SEC. 5. (a) The amendments made by sections 1 (a), 1 (d), 1 (e), and 2 (i) shall be effective with respect to annuities awarded under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 on or after the date of the enactment of this act.

(b) The amendments made by sections 2 (g) and 2 (h) shall be effective (1) with respect to deaths occurring on or after the date of the enactment of this act and (2) with respect to any death occurring before such date if none of the survivors of the deceased individual became entitled before such date to monthly benefits, by reason of the individual's death, under title II of the Social Security Act.

(c) The amendments made by section 1 (b) shall be effective with respect to determinations of periods of disability, within the meaning of section 216 (i) of the Social Security Act, made on or after the date of the enactment of this act.

(d) The amendments made by sections 1 (c), 2 (a), and 2 (b) shall be effective with respect to deaths occurring in months after the month in which this act is enacted.

(e) The amendments made by sections 2 (c), 2 (d), and 2 (f) shall be effective with respect to annuities accruing for months after the month in which this act is enacted.

(f) The amendments made by sections 2 (e) and 3 shall be effective on the date of the enactment of this act.

(g) The amendment made by clause (3) of section 4 shall be effective with respect to offenses committed on or after the date of the enactment of this act; and the other amendments made by section 4 shall be effective with respect to fines and penalties imposed on or after such date.

PART II—AMENDMENTS TO THE RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

SEC. 201. (a) (1) The second proviso in section 1 (k) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by striking out "second" and inserting in lieu thereof "first", and by striking out "first" and inserting in lieu thereof "second."

(2) The second paragraph of such section 1 (k) is amended by striking out "one dollar" and inserting in lieu thereof "three dollars."

(b) Section 1 (q) of such act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "in the unemployment trust fund."

SEC. 202. Section 4 (a–1) (ii) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by striking out all that follows "sickness compensation law" and precedes the first proviso and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "other than this act, or any other social-insurance payments under any law."

SEC. 203. Section 8 (a) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following: "and in determining such balance as of September 30 of any year, the balance to the credit of the railroad unemployment insurance administration fund as of the close of business on such date shall be deemed to be a part of the balance to the credit of such account."

SEC. 204. (a) Section 904 (a) of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting after "the railroad unemployment insurance account" the following: "or the railroad unemployment insurance administration fund."

(b) Section 904 (e) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "and the railroad unemployment insurance account" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", the railroad unemployment insurance account, and the railroad unemployment insurance administration fund."

(c) Section 904 (f) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "fund as the Railroad Retirement Board" and all that follows and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "railroad unemployment insurance account for the payment of benefits, and out of the railroad unemployment insurance administration fund for the payment of administrative expenses, as the Railroad Retirement Board may duly certify, not exceeding the amount standing to the credit of such account or such fund, as the case may be, at the time of such payment."

SEC. 205. (a) Section 11 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by striking out the first sentence and the first two words of the second sentence, and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The Secretary of the Treasury shall maintain in the unemployment trust fund established pursuant to section 904 of the Social Security Act an account to be known as the railroad unemployment insurance administration fund. This unemployment insurance administration fund."

SEC. 206. The second paragraph of section 12 (l) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by striking out "Classification Act of 1923, except that the Board may fix the salary of a director of unemployment insurance at $10,000 per annum" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Classification Act of 1949, as amended."

SEC. 207. (a) The amendments made by section 201 (a) shall be effective with respect to registration periods in benefit years after the benefit year ending on June 30, 1958.

(b) The amendments made by section 202 shall be effective with respect to days in benefit years after the benefit year ending on June 30, 1958.

(c) The remaining amendments made by this part shall be effective, except as otherwise indicated therein, on the date of the enactment of this act.

PART III—AMENDMENTS TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

SEC. 301. Section 202 (t) of the Social Security Act is amended by changing the period at the end of paragraph (4) thereof to a comma and inserting thereafter the word "or" and the following:

"(E) the individual on whose employment such benefit is based had been in service covered by the Railroad Retirement Act which was treated as employment covered by this act pursuant to the provisions of section 5 (k) (1) of the Railroad Retirement Act."

SEC. 302. The amendments made by section 301 of this act shall apply with respect to monthly benefits under section 202 of the Social Security Act for months after December 1956, and with respect to lump-sum death payments under such section 202 in the case of deaths occurring after December 1956.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We have had a statement on the bill, which has been approved by both sides. I would suggest that we pass the bill and return to the consideration of the Mutual Security Appropriation bill, which is a very important bill, and which will have to go to conference.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there are certain typographical errors in the bill. I have prepared an amendment, and I ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 23, it is proposed to substitute single quotes for the double quotes.

On page 5, in line 13, substitute "payable" for "payble."

On page 10, in line 12, restore the closing parenthesis.

On page 16, line 15, restore "(a)" where it appears the second time, and strike "(a)" where it appears the first time.

On page 18, after line 13, insert the following: Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Unemployment

Insurance Act, and the Social Security Act."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PAYMENT OF BOUNTIES ON DOGFISH SHARKS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2719) to provide for the payment of bounties on dogfish sharks to control the depredations of this species on the fisheries of the Pacific coast, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to prosecute, for a period of not to exceed 4 years from the date of approval of this act, investigations of the abundance and distribution of dogfish sharks, experiments to develop control measures, and a vigorous program for the elimination and eradication or development of economic uses of dogfish shark populations.

SEC. 2. In carrying out the foregoing purposes and objectives the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to cooperate with the official conservation agencies of the States bordering on the Pacific coast, with the commercial fishing industry, and with other governmental or private agencies, organizations, or individuals having jurisdiction over or an interest in the fisheries of the Pacific coast.

SEC. 3. There is authorized to be appropriated from time to time, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary not to exceed $95,000 per annum to carry out the purposes and objectives of this act.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and eradicate the predatory dogfish sharks to control the depredations of this species on the fisheries of the Pacific coast, and for other purposes."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, before moving to concur in the House amendments, I wish to say that I am disappointed that the House has removed from the bill the provisions which would authorize the payment of bounties for the eradication of dogfish sharks and substituted provisions for a research program. While I am heartily in favor of the research program, there is immediate and pressing need for a concrete program to eradicate this very real menace to our Pacific fisheries. However, in view of the imminent adjournment of the Congress manifestly it is not practical to go to conference on this legislation. I sincerely hope that the language of the bill as amended by the House is sufficiently broad to permit the Fish and Wildlife Service to institute a modest program of control and eradication in the immediate future. The Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fish and Wildlife, the Honorable Ross Leffler, has been doing a remarkable job and has been most sympathetic to the needs of our fishermen. I am confident he will do his utmost to institute a positive control program at the earliest possible date.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

THE REA PROGRAM

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a speech prepared by my distinguished colleague from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA].

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HRUSKA

The REA program has been strongly supported by the Eisenhower administration and has been greatly improved under him. The program has made giant and solid strides in the past 5 years.

It is to be greatly deplored that these last 2 or 3 election years have been marked by vigorous efforts to thrust the REA program into partisan politics. These efforts have been made within the Halls of Congress as well as out in the field by political enemies of the administration.

This is unfortunate, because when Old Man Politics comes on the scene the one who suffers is the ultimate consumer and the rural electric system which delivers and sells the power he uses on the farm.

Since the attacks have been made by those opposed to the Eisenhower administration, let us review the record of the past 5 years to see whether there has been any crippling, strangling, or emasculating, or whether, on the contrary, the spirit and the declared purposes of the REA, as enacted by Congress, have been greatly advanced in their progress.

CAPITAL NEEDS HAVE BEEN MET

Loans approved (in millions for fiscal years ending June 30 in each case)

1954	$167
1955	167
1956	189
1957	300
1958 (estimate)	242

Carryover including electrification and telephone. (Funds available but not used as of June 30 of each year.)

	Million
1954	$55
1955	61
1956	94
1957	60
1958 (estimate)	176

Sometimes budget estimates, which are prepared more than a year in advance of the first day of a fiscal year, are not in line with needs as they actually arise. This happened in 1957, when there was a bulge unforeseen by anyone. When it became clear that applications would exhaust the available loan funds, action was quickly recommended to add $200 million in loan authorization. This recommendation was by the REA Administrator, the Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of the Budget, and by President Eisenhower. Congress promptly acted to grant the additional loan authority.

During this 5-year period, no instance was shown where uncertainty of loan funds has led to a slowdown in new construction.

Also, during those 5 years, procedures for loan applications were modernized and streamlined. It now takes less paperwork and less time to get a loan processed than it did before. This has made it possible to hold the backlog of applications down to a minimum.

POWER SUPPLY NEEDS

America has witnessed a gigantic increased demand for power these past 5 years. There never has been anything like it. It has made itself felt in the REA also. Result: A greater part of REA loans has gone for generation and transmission than ever before.

In 1953, about 16.5 percent of total loans went for this purpose.

In 1957, it was 40.6 percent.

This shows strong support for an indispensable part of the REA program.

COST OF WHOLESALE POWER TO REA

REA-financed electric system .78 cents per kilowatt-hour in fiscal year 1953.

In fiscal year 1957, they paid .71 cents. A reduction of nearly 10 percent in wholesale cost was made during a period when almost every field in business and industry witnessed sharp and substantial increased costs.

WHAT ABOUT THE RURAL CONSUMER?

His costs per kilowatt-hour have been cut about 14 percent—and from 2.92 cents in 1953, to 2.51 cents in 1957.

The farmer has found electricity to be his least expensive hired man, and yet one of his most reliable and hardworking. So, he has increased his use of it. Its average monthly use by consumers on REA-financed rural electric systems rose from 250 million killowatt-hours in 1953, to 364 million kilowatt-hours in 1958.

REA systems finances vastly strengthened

	1953	1957	Increase
Sales in kilowatt-hours	11,800,000	19,600,000	7,800,000
Sales in dollars	$363,000,000	$529,000,000	$166,000,000
Net worth	$161,000,000	$365,000,000	$204,000,000
Number of customers	3,858,396	4,361,896	403,500
Miles of energized line	1,244,545	1,382,737	138,192

PAYMENT RECORD

The payment record is a source of pride for those in managing and using REA service, 1953 and 1957.

Principal payment: $43 million, 1953—$74 million, 1957.

Interest payments: $23 million, 1953—$41 million, 1957.

Delinquent borrowers: 1953, 45—1957, 6.

Amount delinquent: 1953, $718,000; and in 1957, $123,000.

Prepayments March 31, 1958, were $127 million.

RURAL TELEPHONE PROGRAM

This has been developing well. In calendar 1953, loans totaled $50 million. In 1957, this total was $76 million. A total of $100 million of loans is expected in 1958.

The telephone part of REA has also been fully and strongly supported toward its goal of modern, dependable dial telephone service to link rural America to the rest of the Nation. These benefits are now enjoyed by 1 million such users.

REA IN NEBRASKA

My State shares the proud record recounted in this statement.

In 1935, when REA began, Nebraska had 9,544, or 7 percent of its farms electrified. As of January 1, 1958, there are 94,850, or over 94 percent of its farms electrified.

There has been approved for borrowing $155.2 million. Of this, $134.4 million has been advanced to borrowers.

There are in operation 57,152 miles of line serving 97,892 rural customers, mostly farms. As soon as current construction is completed, there will be 60,353 miles of line to serve 106,648 rural customers, mostly farms.

In 1949, Nebraska farmers consumed an average of 184 kilowatt-hours a month per farm. In 1958, this average was 358 kilowatt-hours.

As of January 1958, REA borrowers in Nebraska paid back $15.2 million in principal, $11.9 million in interest, plus $5.1 million ahead of schedule. No borrower was currently delinquent.

NEBRASKA REA TELEPHONE PROGRAM

There have been approved for borrowing $3.5 million. Of this, $1.6 million have been advanced to borrowers.

There are in operation an estimated 3,059 miles of line. As soon as current construction is completed, there will be 1,571 new subscribers and 6,584 subscribers which include servers. Six exchanges have been changed over to full dial operation.

SUMMARY

Mr. President, this record is an outstanding one. It shows competent and able management of farmers and rural area businessmen in charge of these REA systems and those who use the power made and distributed by them. It testifies to their dedication and loyalty to the declared objectives of the program as enacted by Congress.

It shows something more, Mr. President. This record proves a strong, active, and sympathetic support of the program by the present administration throughout. It is a continuation of consistent, nonpartisan policy and support in Congress and from successive national administrations.

It is fervently hoped that it will be kept that way, and that efforts to degrade it to a level of vicious ward politics will be stealthily and firmly rejected by the real friends of this program.

EDITORIAL REACTION TO SENATE PASSAGE OF SO-CALLED NO-SURRENDER AMENDMENT

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on August 15 the Senate voted, by a margin of 88 to 2, for an amendment to the Supplemental Appropriations bill which forbade the use of any funds to reimburse a person or corporation which might study any plans for the surrender of the United States Government.

This amendment, while seemingly plausible and patriotic, has been quite thoroughly criticized and assailed by some of the most thoughtful and informed newspapers in the United States. So that the record of this episode may be complete, I believe that a representative cross-section of some of these editorials should appear in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I am particularly gratified that the press of my own State of Oregon has not been stampeded over a substantially inaccurate newspaper report concerning so-called surrender studies. Our State has a deserved reputation for being level-headed and calm in times of emotionalism and excitement over public issues of this type.

I think this is once again demonstrated by the editorial reaction in Oregon in this instance. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a column by former Gov. Charles A. Sprague, publisher of the Salem, Oreg., Statesman, of August 17, 1958; and editorials in the Oregonian of Portland of August 18, and August 21; the Portland Oreg., Journal of August 11, the Astorian Budget, of Astoria, of August 18; Eugene Register-Guard, of Eugene, of August 18; St. Louis Post-Dispatch, of St. Louis, of August 16; the Washington Post of August 16; Worcester Daily Telegram, of Worcester, of August 16; Louisville Courier-Journal, of Louisville, of August 18; and the Lewiston Morning Tribune, of Lewiston, Idaho, of August 17.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Salem (Oreg.) Oregon Statesman of August 17, 1958]

IT SEEMS TO ME

(By Charles A. Sprague)

The furor in Washington which arose over reports that the Defense Department had authorized studies over conditions of possible surrender in event of war showed more of emotional response than mature good sense.

The President sought to allay the uproar by branding talk about surrender as nonsense. Through Press Secretary Hagerty, he called the matter "too ridiculous for comment."

This didn't satisfy the Senators, however. RUSSELL, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, offered an amendment to the military appropriations bill to forbid use of Government funds to pay for any surrender study. In a burst of patriotic fervor the motion carried, 88 to 2, the lone dissenters being COOPER, of Kentucky, and NEUBERGER, of Oregon.

Adoption of this resolution will suspend any Defense Department spending on a surrender study; but it will not erase the possibility of such a development in event the United States is crushed in some massive nuclear blow.

In theory, Americans may agree it were better to die than to live under Communist tyranny; but how would survivors react after H-bombs dropping mysteriously out of the skies had laid waste the cities, demoralized transportation, and communications, spread radioactive waste through the countryside?

It is not unpatriotic to study the survival potential of the country, in which the psychological response of the people is a prime factor. Such studies have been made by the private individuals—one of them was briefly reviewed in the article in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch by its military critic, Brig. Gen. Thomas R. Phillips, which made the stir in Washington.

If the Defense Department has not studied our defense capabilities, including the limits to which organized warfare can be sustained, and the possible subsequent eventualities, it has been delinquent.

Part of the military schooling consists of studies in how to conduct retreats. It isn't that generals or colonels plan for retreats, but they know enough military history to know that retreats may be forced, and that skill in retirement of forces is essential, either to secure ground or for reorganization preliminary to a fresh attack.

At Gettysburg, General Meade detailed a staff officer to prepare a plan of retreat for use if it became necessary. It wasn't, and he should have had his man preparing a plan for a counterattack and crushing the army of General Lee, but it was not unpatriotic to prepare for a possible retreat. General Burnside made a very skillful retreat after his repulse at Fredericksburg.

So, in the present stage of weapons development, those responsible for the Nation's defense have to study the whole spectrum of possibilities, though their major attention must be devoted to erasing the possibility of national defeat or surrender.

Here is the problem our military leaders face. To quote Kissinger, Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy:

"As for the United States, our strategic problem is complicated by the fact that we have explicitly rejected surprise attack as an instrument of policy."

That exposes us to such an attack from some less scrupulous enemy. Since the advent of the atom bomb and long-range bombers, the advantage in warfare has shifted greatly to the nation which strikes the first blow; and this is magnified by the still newer types of weapons such as long-range missiles. We have been told often that by a careful selection of targets our national life could be completely demoralized within a matter of hours if such an attack were launched and if our defenses proved inadequate. Our reliance has been first on a strategic air force operating from dispersed bases capable of immediate retaliation, on an extensive warning system and on improved fighter planes and antiaircraft missiles. Our exposure is nonetheless grave.

[From the Portland Oregonian of August 18, 1958]

WASHINGTON DOG DAYS

August days are warm and humid in Washington, D. C., and the closing days of a Congressional session are always a bit maddening. Perhaps this is the explanation for the wave of summer hysteria that swept the Capital last week as the result of a report that the Pentagon was studying surrender plans.

It mattered not that an investigation stemming from the White House itself proved the rumor to be false in most of its details. Congress dignified the scare by rushing through a rider on an appropriation bill unctuously proclaiming that no Congressional appropriation should ever go to any functionary so lacking in good, red American blood as to make plans for surrender.

Too bad some patriot of the legislative Chambers did not think to make it retroactive. To have suggested, for example, that Gen. Jonathan Wainwright should be docked for the Corregidor capitulation or that there was something wicked in Gen. Robert E. Lee's mission to Appomattox Courthouse would have shown the whole business up for just what President Eisenhower called it, nonsense.

[From the Portland Oregonian of August 21, 1958]

PHONY SURRENDER ISSUE

The mystery which remains after the emotional and utterly pointless debate in the United States Senate on national surrender is whether or not the initial report which touched it off had any substance of truth.

This was a news feature story in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch (reprinted in the Oregonian Saturday as background information) which related that Rand Corp., an Air Force-supported foundation of scientists, technicians, and educators, was studying, among other potentialities, the situation which would confront the United States should a major portion of its population and military power be knocked out by atomic missiles. In short, at what point the United States would be forced to surrender.

President Eisenhower denied categorically that any public funds had ever been spent to study "how or when the United States might surrender," and that any funds would be so spent. He said the whole matter (presumably including the Senate resolution and debate along with the study) was too ridiculous for further comment.

Some reporters, including Joseph Alsop, stated, however, that the study had been made. There was no public confirmation from the Air Force or Rand.

From what we know of the activities of Rand—which is not very much—we would say it is not only possible but probable that somewhere in its research and planning it has considered carefully the circumstances which could make surrender or complete annihilation the alternatives. This can be projected in terms of surprise attack, num-

bers of missiles delivered by an enemy, civilian and military targets and known factors of radioactive destruction. Anyone can do it as a paper exercise.

But to refer to this as a study of how and when the Nation would surrender—as if the problem were real rather than imaginative—projects a note of hysteria into the Senate Chamber which is almost incredible.

The solemn resolution by Senator RUSSELL of Georgia, a hardheaded man with long experience in military matters, forbids the use of Federal funds "to pay any person, firm, or corporation * * * to conduct a study or to plan when and how or in what circumstances the Government of the United States should surrender this country and its people to any foreign power."

After the President's statement, Senator after Senator arose to assert that he did not think anyone was making a plan to surrender the country. Yet 88 Senators voted for the resolution several of them called frivolous or without substance. Senator WATKINS of Utah, laid it on the line. Said he:

"Because there may be some implication raised, if I vote against it, that I am in favor of working out plans for a surrender, I have decided to vote for it, even though I do not think it is at all necessary."

This appeared to be the typical attitude of political timidity among the Senators—with the notable exception of Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER (Kentucky Republican), and Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER (Oregon Democrat). These were the lonely dissenters.

Senator COOPER'S statement made clear what most of his colleagues chose to ignore: That such a resolution was, in effect, an accusation by the legislative branch that the executive branch—in this case, the Air Force—was secretly and treasonably preparing a plan to surrender the Nation. A portion of Senator NEUBERGER'S statement also caustically criticized Senate action expressing lack of confidence in the President and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

But the Senators who had a Roman holiday on this synthetic issue would not approach the heart of the matter. Was the report true? If Rand is making such a study, does it involve requirements for defense, or plans to surrender under certain conditions? There is no question in our mind that the study is directed toward survival and victory, not surrender. But the Senate would not take the time to find out the facts. It would not vote to send the resolution to Senator RUSSELL'S Committee on Armed Services for a hearing to determine the truth. The Senate's action in adopting such a resolution was disgraceful.

[From the Oregon Journal of August 16, 1958]

UNDUE NERVOUSNESS IN WASHINGTON

This is a fantastic age, but it need not be made more fantastic by our United States Senate engaging in a rather "wild" discussion of a study made on the "possibilities" in a "possible" nuclear war.

The debate, or whatever it was, was triggered by a report made by the Rand Corp., a private nonprofit research organization, which resulted in a book entitled, "Strategic Surrender," by Paul Kecskemeti.

The Senate vote not to spend any money on any study of plans for a "surrender" seemed hardly necessary and a little hysterical.

There seems to be considerable confusion about the book and some hasty conclusions made without study. The book primarily deals with possibilities and probabilities in the case of a surprise nuclear attack on the United States—the casualties, the power of retaliation and the resources to sustain ourselves. It's an "iffy" sort of thing that defense planners must always consider, provided it is based upon a reasonable gathering of facts.

Why some Members of the Senate should get so excited about it when there have been many similar studies and estimates would indicate an undue nervousness possibly brought on by the summer heat in Washington.

The facts are grim enough and we need to face up to them. But for heaven's sake, let's not have a "nervous Nellie" approach to them on the floor of the Senate.

[From the Astorian Budget of August 18, 1958]

IT SHOULD BE STUDIED

The Congressional fuss over a news story that said the Pentagon people were studying plans for possible surrender by the United States seems pretty silly.

The administration has denied that any such study has been made, and the fuss has subsided.

But why shouldn't the Pentagon's military planners consider the possibility of surrender? These planners should study all possible military contingencies, and certainly there exists the possibility that the United States could be atom-bombed or hydrogen-bombed to the point of military impotence.

It's a contingency no one likes to think about, but should we hide our heads in the sand and refuse to face the possibility that such a horrible alternative might some time occur?

A frank facing up to the possibility of military defeat and what it could imply might be good for the whole country. It might help to shake us out of some of our complacency.

[From the Eugene Register Guard of August 18, 1958]

SURRENDER TALK ON A DULL SUMMER DAY

Congress, we have read, is eager to go home. Thus, we are puzzled over the arm-waving demonstration of silly season politics about American surrender in case of a war. Senators BRIDGES and RUSSELL (silliness can be bipartisan) profess great indignation over reports that the Pentagon has been contemplating surrender. The White House denies such a thing is so. The Pentagon says very little. Apparently it all started when the Senators learned that the Rand Corp., an independent, nonprofit organization which does research in national defense matters, turned out a document called Strategic Surrender, the Politics of Victory and Defeat. That was enough for Senator BRIDGES, who said, "The people who concurred in this (study) in the Defense Department ought to be fired." And it was enough for Senator RUSSELL, who trumpeted that the vast majority of Americans would prefer death to surrender.

The Senator's views, aimed probably at the folks back home, suggest that in war there are only two choices—absolute victory or absolute defeat. They rule out the possibilities of fighting another day. Once upon a time, the Germans knew better. By the summer of 1918 Western Europe was pretty badly messed up. Belgium and France were badly damaged, Germany was not. By the fall of that year it was plain to Generals Hindenburg and Ludendorff that Germany could not win the war. An armistice was arranged and Germany was not destroyed. The German strategists traded a limited defeat for a limited Allied victory. It was a cynical move, but war is a cynical business. Twenty years later Germany, building on what the wise old generals had salvaged, was ready to try again. Only this time a madman headed the Government. There was no plan for strategic surrender. Germany was ground into the ashes.

Senators BRIDGES and RUSSELL are lawyers. Presumably in courts of law they have fought with all the power they had in the interests of their clients. They fought to win and believed they'd win. Yet in the back of their minds, we daresay, was the possibility of defeat. So they watched carefully, noting each possibility of getting an appeal, should they need it. That they were preparing themselves to fight a new battle another day in another court did not mean they were faint of heart. It meant only that they were shrewd and determined to win in the long run.

If war comes, it may not come at the time we're ready nor on the ground we'd choose. It would be cowardly, dull of wit, and mighty poor strategy to insist on going down in some sort of glory if a possibility for survival and victory could be found. War is no athletic encounter. The rules of sportsmanship do not apply. It is not enough to play the game. The object is to win; the motto, "It matters not how you play the game; it's whether you win or lose." If you can't win, don't play. Wait until circumstances favor you, until you've got the enemy outgeneraled, outgunned, and preferably taken by surprise.

One of the glorious chapters in World War II is the British defeat at Dunkirk. The British did not fight to the last man. They got out and let the Germans have the place. But in so doing they lived to fight another day and to win. One wonders if the irate American Senators would have preferred to have the 335,000 troops at Dunkirk stay on and fight.

In the tragic circumstance that we should be hopelessly in danger of annihilation, our going down in glorious defeat would leave the whole planet—and possibly even greater realms—under the domination of people who do not value the things we value, who would destroy all that free men have treasured over the centuries. Sometimes it is cowardly to die. But to live to fight another day is to live up to one's obligations. Strategic surrender does not mean giving up forever and ever. It is a means of regaining the initiative.

In its brief statement on the matter, the Pentagon pointed out what sophomore students of military science all know. That one must study, in military planning, all the possibilities, including those unlikely to arise. It would be foolish to do otherwise.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of August 16, 1958]

THE SENATE AGAINST SURRENDER

The Senate has voted, 88 to 2, to deny the use of public funds for any study of plans for surrender in a future war. President Eisenhower says no such study has been or will be made anyway. So everybody seems to be agreed that war plans ought not to include surrender plans.

An air of unreality, almost of hysteria, has pervaded the whole controversy. Partisan motives complicated the issue, and inflated it far beyond the proportions of common sense.

The one firmly established fact is that a book was written called Strategic Surrender, by Paul Kecskemeti, of the Rand Corp., embodying the results of a study for the Air Force. The book was published this spring by Stanford University Press. It is a theoretical and historical survey of surrender in warfare—of surrender as a strategic and a political concept; of the French surrender in 1940, the Italian in 1943, the German and Japanese surrenders in 1945; of the consequences and alleged fallacies of the allied doctrine of unconditional surrender in World War II; and, finally, 13 pages on "surrender in future strategy."

Was there anything reprehensible about the Air Force commissioning such a study? One might argue that it was something of an academic boondoggle. What business does the Air Force have spending public funds on what the author calls "a problem in political theory"? But to treat the project as a sinister evidence of the beginning of "appeasement," as one Senator put it, is drawing a mighty long bow.

There is a world of difference between a theoretical study of surrender by either party to a war, and a study of plans for surrender by the United States. The Kecskemeti book clearly falls in the first category. Yet most of the Senate controversy assumed that the second category was involved.

It can be argued that war planning ought to include consideration of all contingencies, and that the planners ought to know what conditions impel a surrender in order to prevent those conditions from arising. This is a complicated question of military technique on which many civilians will hold no firm opinion. But surely it is a misconception in any case to argue that, because a theoretical study of surrender was made with Air Force funds, therefore somebody in the Defense establishment must be contemplating surrender in a future war. Surely it is a misconception to say that a study of the subject proved that our defenses are pitifully weak and defeatism is taking root among the very men who are responsible for defense.

Yet these false inferences were the starting point for the Senate's incredible wrangle. The wrangle brought very little credit to either side.

[From the Washington Post of Saturday, August 16, 1958]

SURRENDER TO NONSENSE

With a flamboyant show of patriotism, the Senate has worked itself into an altogether silly lather over the question of surrender. President Eisenhower looked little better in the hasty disavowal that his administration would ever even consider the conditions which might lead to surrender in war.

Such flag waving is all fine to impress the audience, but it is no contribution to intelligent discussion. In the first place, the Senators and the President seem to have misconceived altogether the purpose of this particular study, which certainly was not to advocate surrender. In the second place, surely it is or ought to be the business of military and political planners to envisage all possibilities, including the possibility that this country might lose a nuclear war. This is not defeatism; it is prudence.

No one can really predict what would happen if, as the result of nuclear attack, this country suffered 100 million casualties. Would there be the will to continue the fight, even though the result might be to wipe out all the remainder of humanity everywhere? It is a nice question, and a far deeper question than considerations of individual bravery or national confidence.

The question becomes the more complicated because of the prevalent semantic confusion over victory and surrender in the nuclear and missile age. Although it certainly would be possible to lose a nuclear war, in any wholesale exchange of nuclear destruction no one could really win. The only way to win such a nuclear war is to prevent it in the first place. And this is the task not merely of an adequate military deterrent to limited war as well as big war, but also of flexible diplomatic and economic policies. The irate refusal even to consider the horrid word "surrender" unfortunately adds very little to understanding of how to avoid the circumstances that might bring such a tragedy about.

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Daily Telegram of August 16, 1958]

THE UPROAR OVER "SURRENDER"

President Eisenhower is reported to have been upset by the rumor that the Pentagon, in connection with possible nuclear war, had been studying theoretical situations in which the United States might have to surrender.

This isn't a very happy subject for study, nor is a military paper on the surrender question likely to be a popular document. But defeat and surrender are just as much the realities of warfare as victory and its policies are. The responsibilities of military planning require objective views of every reality.

This becomes particularly true in the context of nuclear war, which carries the threat of sudden and extensive destruction of military forces, war production facilities, and civilian populations. The potential horror is such, in fact, that one wonders whether any side in future war could actually be a victor, in the old meaning of the word.

But the Pentagon, charged with national defense in a world situation where nuclear weapons are one of the brutal facts of life, has no choice. We must be ready to defend ourselves, even in a war that made no sense. So there is every reason for contemplating all of the contingencies. If the idea of national disaster is disturbing, we must accept the idea of being disturbed. The only alternative is greater effort toward eliminating the possibility of war, if we can.

It can properly be hoped, however, that while the Pentagon is weighing all the possibilities, the Russians are doing the same thing.

[From the Courier-Journal of August 18, 1958]

TRULY ROUSING VOTE FOR NO SURRENDER

The United States Senate likes to hear itself called the greatest deliberative body in the world. But it acted like an hysterical flock of adolescents in voting, 88 to 2, to forbid any Federal employee to study plans for the surrender of this Government.

JOHN SHERMAN COOPER was given praise for courage by Senators who agreed with his strictures against such foolishness—but who went ahead to vote with a majority that obviously could be depended on to give a similar rousing endorsement to motherhood and the flag. Only Oregon's NEUBERGER stood with the sensible Kentuckian.

The real issues in this foolishness are discussed by Joseph Alsop on this page today. It is a pity that "the greatest deliberative body in the world" did not turn its attention instead to the grimness of the prospect outlined by Senator KENNEDY. But we'll grant the Senate majority one thing—they might not have confused their constituents, but we'll bank on it the Kremlin is puzzled.

[From the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune of August 17, 1958]

THE "GREAT DEBATE" ABOUT SURRENDER

President Eisenhower, it seems, has had the last word—or certainly what ought to be the last word—on the "great debate" that has rocked the Senate the last few days. It wasn't a debate, actually, although that's what the news reports have been calling it, because everyone was on the affirmative side of the question. Nor was it great, exactly, because the thing blew up as suddenly as a summer storm, and now, after 3 short days, has practically blown away. Nevertheless, there was a fearful hullabaloo, and "great debate" is as good a term as any to apply to the Senate's commotion over our Government's studying the question of surrendering in an atomic war.

"All this talk about surrender is nonsense," the President said in a formal statement issued in the evident hope of putting an end to the noise and giving himself and the Senate a chance to get back to work.

And nonsense it was. It was one of the silliest pieces of business to come out of Washington in many years.

The fuss began after Senator STUART SYMINGTON (Democrat of Missouri) inserted a newspaper story in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the effect that a study was being made for the Defense Department as to when the United States should surrender in an all-out nuclear attack. The story was spotted by three Republican Senators, WILLIAM KNOWLAND of California, STYLES BRIDGES of New Hampshire and EVERETT DIRKSEN of Illinois. Sniffing treason, they rushed to the White House. They came back, describing the President as hopping mad and turning the Pentagon upside down to get to the bottom of the matter.

That did it. Defense Secretary Neil McElroy and his deputy, confirming the terrible truth of the report, hastened to reassure the Senators that the study was "only theoretical," that no surrender was imminent. But it was too late. Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL (Democrat of Georgia), "shocked beyond expression," recovered in time to record his conviction that Americans will die rather than surrender. Senator BRIDGES was on his feet, crying for the heads of those who had ordered the study. And so it went, for 2 days. Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL (Republican of Massachusetts) sought to steady the boat with the suggestion that it was only the possibility of Russian surrender that was under study, but his words were lost in the storm. Someone drew up a bill to forbid the use of funds at any time for a study of surrender possibilities, and the Senate passed it in short order. The President, to make doubly certain, assured the Nation that, even if the Senate hadn't passed the bill, no funds under his administration would be spent for such a purpose.

No doubt the Russians, to say nothing of the rest of the world got a whale of a laugh out of the episode. Well, a little kidding won't hurt us, and the thing will be forgotten in a week. Before the matter is completely forgotten, however, it is worth recording that, if anyone was most to blame for this rumpus, it was the very man who suffered the most embarrassment from it: President Eisenhower himself. As a former military commander, and a highly successful one at that, he should have known far better.

It is surprising that the President should have allowed himself to be stampeded when the three Republican Senators came to him with the report about the surrender study. It is so surprising, in fact, that one wonders whether it was not some unidentified White House spokesman, and not the President, who got so hopping mad about the study. For the President, as a former military commander, could hardly have forgotten the military lesson that preparedness is the first prerequisite for victory; that preparedness involves the study of all possible exigencies, and that these exigencies range all the way from total victory to total defeat. He could hardly have forgotten that among the Nation's battle plans (and all nations have them) there must be plans which provide for disaster, which lay down policy guidelines for military commanders who may have to confront the question of surrender. Surely he could not have allowed himself to forget—as most of the Senate seemed to have forgotten—the elementary distinction between studying the question of surrender and actually planning to surrender.

If the President has forgotten all this then we are in poor hands indeed, for it could well mean that our military security is based on little more than patriotism and pipedreams. If, as seems more likely, this is just another case of the President being caught asleep at the switch or out of the office, we can at least breathe easily and enjoy the joke on him, for that has happened many times before, and doubtless it will happen many times again.

In the meantime, the surrender study will be filed away for a while. In a week or a month it will be taken down again, dusted off, given a new name and perhaps a new director. With the great debate just a painful memory, the study will quietly pick up where it left off. And quite rightly so.—S. H. D.

THE WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, H. R. 8361, known as the habeas corpus bill,

was voted out of the Senate Judiciary Committee. This bill is now pending before the Senate.

It is interesting to note a recent article in the New York Times dated August 16, 1958, in which 15 professors and 2 deans of law schools have urged the Senate majority leader, Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, to block the measure on the habeas corpus bill. It is nice to know that such eminent scholars in the law have agreed with my position before the Senate Judiciary Committee, where I voted against the bill being reported favorably.

I ask unanimous consent that the above-mentioned article from the New York Times entitled "Law professors assail new bill" be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAW PROFESSORS ASSAIL NEW BILL—15 TEACHERS AND 2 DEANS BID JOHNSON BLOCK MEASURE ON HABEAS CORPUS

WASHINGTON, August 15.—Seventeen law school professors and deans have wired Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON asking him to put off action on a bill restricting the right of Federal courts to issue writs of habeas corpus.

The bill, already passed by the House, was voted out of the Senate Judiciary Committee recently without hearings. It may be called to the Senate floor momentarily.

The measure would largely forbid use of habeas corpus by the lower Federal courts to order the release of State prisoners because their convictions violated the Federal Constitution. The courts would retain this power as to Federal prisoners.

"We are profoundly concerned," the telegram to the Texas Democrat, who is Senate majority leader, said, "at the action of the Senate Judiciary Committee in endorsing, without holding hearing, the habeas corpus bill which would drastically curtail so vital and historic a segment of Federal jurisdiction."

The telegram urged that the bill be returned to the Judiciary Committee for hearings on the impact of the proposed legislation on judicial administration, particularly on the work of the Supreme Court.

"We are satisfied that any legitimate grievance with the present scope of Federal habeas corpus for State prisoners can be rectified without making such substantial inroads on Federal rights," the telegram concluded.

The bill has been approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States and the Justice Department. But some judges are understood to have developed reservations about it, especially about the possibility that many cases now handled by the lower courts will pour into the Supreme Court.

The signers of the telegrams included Deans Jefferson B. Fordham of the University of Pennsylvania Law School and Eugene V. Rostow of Yale Law School.

The law school professors who signed were Paul and Albert M. Sacks of Harvard, Boris I. Bittker, Ralph S. Brown, Jr., Richard C. Conelly, Louis H. Pollak, and Harry R. Wellington of Yale, Gerald Gunther, Monrad G. Paulsen, Herbert Wechsler and John B. Weinstein of Columbia, Philip B. Kurland of Chicago, Caleb Foote and Curtis R. Reitz of Pennsylvania and Charles A. Wright of Texas.

A TRIBUTE TO THE LEADERSHIP AND THE MEMBERS OF THE 85TH CONGRESS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in these, the closing hours of the 85th Congress, I should like to say just a few words with regard to the record of the Congress itself.

In so speaking, I should like to pay tribute to the spirit of sportsmanship and parliamentary cooperation which has characterized these 2 years.

I am well aware of the fact that the members of the 2 great political parties will tend to differ in their interpretations as to the overall record of legislation during 1957 and 1958.

Republicans and Democrats will disagree as to individual elements of that record, and as to degree of cooperation with the national administration of President Eisenhower.

COOPERATION AMONG 531 INDIVIDUALISTS

I do not think any Member of the Congress will disagree with this statement: Once more the legislative branch of our Government has demonstrated the remarkable parliamentary process at work. Once more we have seen how 531 individualists can work together and come up with a solid body of accomplishments.

As I look down the list of legislation which we have written, I see instance after instance where, by the process of compromise, so-called "impossible" bills have been written into law.

Critics have moaned that the reciprocal trade agreements bill was allegedly doomed. Yet a fine bill has now been signed by the President.

Analysts had bewailed the possibilities of an effective mutual security authorization and appropriation bill being written.

Yet here again we see that, despite certain imperfections, by and large, the mutual security program will be enabled to continue on an effective basis.

Look down the list of other bills, and you will see the same remarkable record. You will see subjects fraught with controversy, subjects on which there were all sorts of predictions that Congress would never be able to come to agreement—yet, subjects on which Congress not only did come to agreement, but wrote most constructive legislation.

I cite, for example, the streamlining of the Defense Establishment. I cite the National Defense Education Act which will strengthen American education. I cite the Alaskan statehood bill, the bill creating a new National Space Agency—and many other measures, including the social security bill and the various tax bills.

So far as I am concerned, many of these bills have serious shortcomings. They are a long way from perfect.

There are many bills which I would like to have seen enacted into law which have not been passed.

CHECKS AND BALANCES WITHIN CONGRESS

But almost any Member of Congress might give a similar reaction.

After all, when you are dealing with 2 Chambers, 2 political parties, more than 3 dozen individual Senate and House joint committees, individual wings and factions within the 2 parties, strong-minded chairman of various committees and strong-willed memberships, as well—when we are dealing with all of these many variables, you cannot expect that all of the results will suit any one man's taste.

There is a dynamic system of checks and balances within the Congress, just as there is a system of checks and balances within the United States Government as a whole, and within our overall economy.

The legislative branch is not a perfect working mechanism. It frequently acts slower on some subjects, or faster on other subjects, than we might prefer. But the fact is that it is the mirror of America; it is the symbol of the changing views of a changing nation.

Partisans will disagree as to whether this 85th Congress could have achieved more had it been under Republican leadership rather than Democratic leadership. Partisans will disagree so far as to which party should best be in control of the 86th Congress.

As a Republican, I cannot help but feel special pride and special interest in my own party.

TRIBUTE TO BOTH PARTIES LEADERSHIP

But, I would be among the very first to say that the distinguished majority leader of the Senate, Mr. JOHNSON, the distinguished Speaker of the House, Mr. RAYBURN, are not only great patriots, but great leaders—not simply of their own party, but of the Congress and of the American people as a whole.

They are masters of the parliamentary process, masters of the art of legislative give and take, of sound-principled compromise in the public interest.

And I believe that even the most partisan of my Democratic colleagues would agree that the Republican Party has been fortunate, as I have indicated previously, that it has had the services of the great Senator from California, Mr. KNOWLAND, and the beloved former Speaker of the House, and now its minority leader, Mr. MARTIN. These two gentlemen symbolize, as well, the very best that the United States Congress offers in the way of not only legislative craftsmanship, but dedicated public service.

Critics, then, may on occasion condemn the legislative branch on some specific issue. But what they cannot in justice refute is the fact that the Congress of the United States is a magnificent symbol of representative government. The Congress of the United States represents one of the great hopes of mankind. It has not let those hopes down. It has proven worthy of its responsibilities to the American people.

All of these remarks, I should like to point out, bear not simply upon this 85th Congress, but rather upon the record of preceding Congresses, as well: the Republican 83d and 80th Congresses, for example.

Legislative government, whatever its problems, is the symbol and the hope of freedom everywhere.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1913) to amend the Code of Law for the District of Columbia by modifying the provisions relating to the attachment and garnishment of wages, salaries, and commissions

of judgment debtors, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13489) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7 to the bill, and concurred therein, that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 10, and 12 to the bill, and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4 to the bill.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 11749. An act to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 6 months, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 13580. An act to increase the public debt limit.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 13343) to authorize the appropriation of $500,000 to be spent for the purpose of the Pan American Games to be held in Chicago, Ill., in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 109. An act to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans, U. S. A., National Memorial, Inc.;

H. R. 1061. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments to settle certain claims for damage to, or loss of, property or personal injury or death, not cognizable under any other laws;

H. R. 1494. An act for the relief of the Southwest Research Institute;

H. R. 1695. An act for the relief of Harry N. Duff;

H. R. 3366. An act to validate overpayments of pay and allowances made to certain officers of the Army, Navy, Naval Reserve, and Air Force, while undergoing training at civilian hospitals, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4642. An act to establish a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure;

H. R. 7710. An act to provide for the lumpsum payment of all accumulated and current accrued annual leave of deceased employees;

H. R. 7860. An act to amend section 1 of the act of July 24, 1956 (70 Stat. 625), entitled "To provide that payments be made to certain members of the Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe of Indians as reimbursement for damages suffered as the result of the establishment of the Pine Ridge aerial gunnery range.";

H. R. 9370. An act to permit illustrations and films of United States and foreign obligations and securities under certain circumstances, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9817. An act relating to venue in tax refund suits by corporations;

H. R. 9950 An act for the relief of D. A. Whitaker and others;

H. R. 11668. An act to amend section 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, as amended;

H. R. 11889. An act to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Minnesota State Fair and Centennial Exposition to be held at St. Paul, Minn., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12808. An act to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 and 1958 by advancing the date for submission of the revised estimate of cost of computing the Interstate System and to extend the approval of such estimate for an additional year;

H. R. 12858. An act making appropriations or civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and the Tennessee Valley Authority for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 635. Joint Resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 13343) to authorize the appropriation of $500,000 to be spent for the purpose of the Pan American games to be held in Chicago, Ill., was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1959

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13192) making appropriations for Mutual Security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes.

TIGHT MONEY

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared on the subject Tight Money.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LONG

On August 30 of last year I made here a rather extensive analysis of economic conditions in the United States. I attempted to portray objectively what had been happening during the preceding 9 months. I attempted to forecast, within the limits of human fallibility, what then seemed to be in prospect.

I was not happy about what had already happened. I was even less happy about what it seemed to me was going to happen. I find no pleasure in the fact that the forecast which I then made has so substantially come to pass.

I shall not undertake at this time to tax the Senate with so extensive an analysis as I made almost a year ago. There is no need. My remarks at that time dealt with what I thought was going to happen, which required a lot of analysis. What has now already happened can be stated more categorically and more quickly.

A year ago I attributed our economic difficulties, then in process, in large measure to what I called the economically unsound and socially unjust policies of the Federal Reserve Board. The term "the tight money policy" has provided an apt tag for these policies.

After some relaxation of these tight money policies during the early months of this year we are now witnessing a return to these same policies. They were demonstrably wrong a year ago. They are still wrong, and they are still economically unsound and socially unjust.

To be sure, the Federal Reserve Board has made some rather spectacular and rather well advertised shifts in its policies since a year ago. When the recession, which the Board did not foresee and which it helped to generate, descended upon us in full force, the Board took some feeble steps from a so-called anti-inflationary policy to a so-called antideflationary policy. These were inadequate, although the very limited economic recovery which we have thus far experienced has been made the occasion for great paeans of praise of the Federal Reserve Board.

Far more important, the Reserve Board most recently has been taking various steps in the direction of the reactivation of the tight money policy. And again we hear the paeans of praise. But I maintain that these steps are, if anything, even more misdirected and even more dangerous than the tight money steps against which I protested a year ago—and in fact even a year and a half ago. They are endangering an economic recovery which is much too slow.

In order to get to the heart of this matter, we must look at the forest and not just at the trees. The tight money policy is wrong not only in detail. It is wrong not only in a particular stage of recession or recovery. In its recent and current applications, the tight money policy is fundamentally wrong throughout.

The reasons why it is fundamentally wrong are two-fold:

First, it is not geared to those two factors which should be our most basic economic purposes as a Nation, namely, economic progress and economic justice. It subordinates and even sacrifices these two basic purposes, in its sole preoccupation with price stability and the prevention of inflation.

Secondly, the tight money policy would be wrong even if its scale of values were not wrong, because it produces more inflation rather than less inflation.

The tight money policy, in its practical effects, does not make a choice between economic progress or social justice and price stability. In its practical effects, it defeats all of these objectives at one and the same time, because the managers of this policy have not understood that all of these objectives are interrelated, and that damage to one of them does damage to them all.

From early 1957, when the Senate Finance Committee first commenced to concern itself with the tight money policy, and especially in my address here a year ago, I have been challenging the tight money policy on all of these grounds. On grounds of economic or social justice, I have maintained that the tight money policy rationed income and credit in the wrong direction, thus favoring those who are strong at the expense of those who are weak.

It has favored the large financial institutions, which lend money at higher interest costs, at the expense of the weaker elements in the economy, who have had to borrow the money at the higher interest costs. These weaker elements have included the small-business man, the farmer, the home owner, and the average family purchasing durable goods on time. In support of these statements I refer to pages 1402–1405 of the 1957 hearings before the Finance Committee and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 103, part 12, pages 16726–16728.

On grounds of economic progress which means economic growth for the economy as

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN FINANCIAL

a whole in real terms, I have maintained that the tight money policy repressed such growth, and must ultimately bring on a substantial economic recession. It repressed this growth because, bearing so heavily upon the consumer, it aggravated the tendency of consumption to run behind our increasing ability to produce.

This was the main cause of the recession through which we have been passing. But until the recession came, the tight money policy did little to check the investment boom running ahead of consumption, because the predominant investors were not primarily dependent upon outside capital. They financed their investment mainly through internal earnings, or mainly through the price structure. In this connection I would refer to pages 1335, 1338, and 1341 of the 1957 hearings before the Committee on Finance.

On grounds relating to price stability, I have maintained that the tight money policy would accelerate inflation, until it succeeded in producing so large a downturn in production and employment that the temporary price stability thus achieved would not be worth the cost. The tight money policy contributed to inflation for the very simple reason that rising interest costs, like other rising costs not supported by rising productivity, were tacked on to prices, and pushed prices upward.

Thus, in all aspects, the tight-money policy has served to increase the imbalances within our economy which brought on the recession, instead of to correct them. Of course, after the arrival of the recession, the investment boom collapsed, and aggravated the recession. It always happens that way. This is not to the credit of the tight-money policy; it is a mere demonstration of the damage done by the tight-money policy.

On the ground of the sound management of public finance and of the national debt, I have maintained that the tight-money policy would further unbalance the Federal budget and further enlarge the national debt, for the very plain and simple reason that bad economic policies throughout the Nation cannot produce salutary results in public finance or debt management.

In the interest of relative brevity, I shall not detail today, as I did a year ago, the economic or social injustice of the tight-money policy. It is obvious that unwarranted and unmerited unemployment is about the most serious form of economic and social injustice. By the middle of this year, or for the first half of this year as a whole, unemployment seasonally adjusted, was more than 50 percent higher than in 1957 as a whole, and about twice as high as a sound minimum level. While the economic recession has hurt practically everybody, it is too obvious for argument that recessions or depressions hurt those most who can least afford to be hurt—especially when, as in this case, the recession is accompanied by an acceleration of price inflation.

But let us concentrate upon the other major aspects of what has been happening, and is still happening. In early 1957, and a year ago, I stressed that the tight money policy was a prime factor in producing throughout the whole economy a very slow rate of real economic progress or growth.

I pointed out that, during several years under the tight-money policy, our average annual rate of economic growth had been only about 2 percent, contrasted with the 4 to 5 percent annually that we need to absorb our growing labor force and our advancing technology. I pointed out that this repressed rate of economic growth had already cost us scores of billions of dollars in lost production, and had already resulted in several million man-years of excessive unemployment.

More important, I pointed out that this repression of needed economic growth must necessarily result, if not corrected, in a serious economic recession. My views in that connection were reflected in pages 1335–1345 of the 1957 hearings.

It is hard for me to state correctly to the Senate the position which the representatives of the Federal Reserve Board took, with respect to my criticism, early last year or in the middle of last year.

Some of their testimony last year seemed to indicate that they were impervious to the fact that a serious recession was just around the corner. Other parts of their testimony seemed to take the position that they were perfectly willing to risk this recession or even to expedite it, since the only cogent explanation which they could make of the price inflation was what they called the great and unparalleled prosperity of the country. It does not really make much difference which of these two viewpoints we ascribe to the Federal Reserve Board, because both of them were palpably wrong.

Now, what has happened, in brief, since I spoke on this subject a year ago? I must use the most recent available figures. Comparing July 1958 with July 1957, unemployment is up about 80 percent. Industrial production is down about 9 percent.

Comparing first quarter 1958 with first quarter 1957 in uniform 1957 prices—the very slightly improved second quarter 1958 figures are not yet fully available—total national production was down 4.5 percent; total national income, down 5.2 percent; total wages and salaries, down 3.5 percent; residential nonfarm construction, down 2.1 percent; gross private domestic investment, down 19.7 percent; and corporate profits (including inventory adjustment), down 23.3 percent.

I come next to an examination of whether this contrived and serious recession furthered the cause of curbing inflation. The Federal Reserve Board took the position early last year, and in the middle of last year, that the inflation was being caused by excessive demand pressing against our productive capabilities. The Board maintained that the tight money policy, by restraining this total demand, would restrain inflation.

Along with some other members of the Senate Finance Committee, I pointed out, on those occasions, that most of the major factors in our economy were already slack, and that obviously there was a deficiency rather than an excess of total demand. We pointed out that the inflation then in process was not because the real economy was advancing too rapidly, but rather because it was already advancing too slowly. To fortify this position, we made comparisons of price trends and other trends over a long span of years.

These comparisons demonstrated conclusively that, aside from the economic problems of wartime mobilization and reconversion, a low and inadequate rate of economic growth brought more price inflation than an adequate rate of economic growth. In short, we challenged the whole central thesis of the Federal Reserve Board, and we forecast that its policies would not only translate an inadequate rate of economic growth into an absolute recession, but would also bring more price inflation.

This is precisely what has happened. During the period from September 1956 to September 1957, when the tight money policy and other similar policies held the real annual growth rate of the economy down to the extremely low figure of 1.7 percent, consumer prices nonetheless rose 3.4 percent, and wholesale prices rose 2.2 percent. During the recessionary period from September 1957 through March 1958, while the economy as a whole was declining at a real annual rate of 10 percent, consumer prices rose at an annual rate of 3.6 percent, and wholesale prices rose at an annual rate of 2.9 percent.

Let us carry this price picture a bit further, to show what has been happening when we include the period during which, some say, we are recovering well from the recession. During the 9 months from September 1957 through June 1958, consumer food prices rose 3.9 percent, or at an annual rate of about 5.2 percent.

Prices have also risen, or are about to rise seriously, in key industrial sectors. The recession in these sectors really commenced very early in 1957. Yet, from January 1957 through June 1958, steel prices have risen about 1.5 percent, and the further steel prices announced in July may bring this up to about 5 percent.

From January 1957 through June 1958, prices in the seriously depressed automobile industry rose almost 3 percent; and in the seriously hurt electrical machinery industry, prices rose about 4.5 percent. These price increases occurred when production in these three key industries was declining 33 percent, 42.5 percent, and 19 percent, respectively.

The following table demonstrates that we had much greater expansion of our economy and less inflation during the 1948–53 period before the advent of the tight money policies:

Price inflation compared with other economic trends

[Annual rates of change, in percent]

Period	Consumer prices	Wholesale prices	Industrial prices	Gross national product (1957 prices)	Civilian employment	Industrial production
	High overall growth period					
1948–53	+2.2	+1.2	+2.1	+4.8	+1.0	+5.5
	Period of practically static economy					
September 1956 to September 1957	+3.4	+2.2	+2.4	[1] +1.7	−0.2	0
	Basic recessionary period					
September 1957 to March 1958	+3.6	+2.9	−0.5	[2] −10.0	−3.2	−22.2
	From basic start of recession to date					
September 1957 to June 1958	+2.7	+1.3	−0.7	[3] −6.7	−1.6	−13.8

[1] 3d quarter 1956 to 3d quarter 1957.
[2] 3d quarter 1957 to 1st quarter 1958, at annual rate.
[3] 3d quarter 1957 to 2d quarter 1958, at annual rate.

What clearer proof do we want, that the striking of hammer blows against our whole economy with tight money and high interest rates when manpower and machinery are not being fully utilized cannot and does not restrain price inflation?

Now let us look where we are today, and where we seem to be going. Instead of making my own forecast, I shall try to summarize the average forecasts of the most competent acknowledged experts, inside and outside of the Government. They say that we are now moving out of the recession, but very slowly. They say that the rate of real economic growth during the next couple of years or so is likely to be very low, even from the recessionary base where we now are. They say that it is likely to be early 1961, before we get back to the early 1957 level of total national production in real terms.

This obviously would mean, by early 1961, that we would really be 4 years behind, because our economy needs to grow 4–5 percent a year to hold its own, and should grow much faster than that from a recessionary base. It follows from these forecasts, and the forecasters so acknowledge, that the level of chronic unemployment is going to remain very high for a long time. They say that it may well be higher in early 1959 than in 1958.

Certainly it is an understatement to say that the economic situation now is less favorable than in early 1957. Yet the Federal Reserve Board, today and recently, is reverting in substantial measure to its earlier tight-money policies.

Again, the Board is mistaking an entirely unsatisfactory fundamental economic situation, on the low side, for an overall inflationary boom. Again, the Board is attempting to place a brake rather than an accelerator upon the economy as a whole. Again, the Board has been confusing a stock market boom with fundamental economic conditions, and seeking to improve these fundamental conditions by fiddling around with margin requirements on the stock exchange. I am not prepared to say that the recent lift in margin requirements was undesirable; it may well have been desirable, but it certainly was not anything fundamental. Again, the rediscount rate has been raised in one of the Federal Reserve System areas, and it is said that the other areas will follow suit.

Even more broadly, the Federal Reserve Board is still failing to attempt any reconciliation between the fundamental requirements for economic growth and progress, and for reducing unemployment to tolerable levels, and the objective of price stability. Once again, the Board is wholeheartedly committed to the insupportable thesis that we cannot at one and the same time achieve a healthy and growing economy and price stability.

We are told that the tight money policy has succeeded in producing some price stability in recent months. This may be so, but only at the cost of a very serious recession from which we have by no means recovered. And we are now told, in attempted justification of the revival of the tight money policy, that a revival of inflation threatens us long before we recover fully from the recession or resume a satisfactory rate of economic growth.

Is this not the best possible proof that the tight money policy offers no formula for combining a healthy economy with price stability? Is this not the best possible proof that the Federal Reserve Board is again willing to do damage to the whole economy, in another vain effort to check price inflation through the wrong methods? Is this not why more and more responsible analysts are now warning us that we must find some other road to price stability?

Where can the continuation of these policies lead us? Must we resign ourselves eternally to high unemployment and price inflation at the same time? Must we resign ourselves eternally to the loss of more than $50 billion a year in potential production, in the misguided belief that scarcity rather than abundance will bring us price stability?

Must we sacrifice the social security expansion that we need, the public works that we need, the housing that our people need, the national defense improvement that we need—all on the ground that we cannot afford them, or cannot afford them except at the cost of too much inflation—when the truth is that we are not affording them only because the Federal Reserve Board type of thinking does not realize that the fundamental source of what we can really afford is the power of our economy to grow and to increase production? Must so many millions of our people continue to live in poverty, and so many others be denied their full measure of economic progress, while they pay the double costs of inflation and economic stagnation?

I did not believe that we needed to suffer these double liabilities a year ago, and I do not believe it now.

I turn, finally, to the effect of these erroneous national policies upon the Federal budget and the management of the national debt. In early January of this year, the executive branch of the Government was predicting a small surplus for fiscal 1959.

More recently and now, the executive branch of the Government has been predicting a fiscal 1959 deficit, ranging from $8 to $13 billion. What has produced this great changeover in so short a period of time? Some small part of it may be due to the increases in Federal spending for national defense and other purposes, although it may well be argued that, but for these increases and their stimulatory effect upon the general economy, our general economic situation and therefore the Federal budgetary situation would be even less fortunate than they now are. Most of this immense changeover in the Federal budgetary situation is not due to the increased spending. It is due rather to the fact that the revenue side of the picture has changed, and it has changed solely because the overall economic forecasters are less optimistic and more realistic today than they were in January.

All of this only demonstrates the obvious proposition that, under current world and domestic conditions which necessitate a very high level of Federal spending, the only way to maintain a tolerable balance in the Federal budget is to draw upon our potentials for real economic growth instead of repressing these potentials. This vast changeover in the Federal budgetary picture is truly exhibit No. 1 in the collapse of the economic and financial policies which the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury, in cooperation, so proudly paraded before the Senate Finance Committee last year.

To demonstrate the amount of increases in interest and the effect on the annual charge against the national debt I prepared the following two tables:

Trends in various interest charges, 1950 to date

[Index numbers, 1950=100]

	U. S. Government securities		State and local government bonds	Corporate bonds	Bank rates on short-term business loans, 19 large cities
	9- to 12-month issues	3- to 5-year issues			
1950	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
September 1955	169.8	181.3	139.2	115.7	139.6
September 1957	319.0	262.0	200.5	155.2	178.9
May 1958	96.0	150.0	160.8	139.9	[1] 154.4
July 1958	100.3	169.3	167.5	140.6	

[1] June 1958. May and July not available.

Interest charges on the public debt, 1952 to July 1958

	Interest-bearing public debt (in millions)	Computed annual interest rate (percent)	Annual rate in millions		
			Computed annual interest charge	1952 interest rates applied to debt level	Excess due to increased interest rate
1952 (end of fiscal year)	$256,863	2.329	$5,981	$5,981	
September 1955	274,879	2.402	6,601	6,405	$196
July 1958	273,910	2.632	7,209	6,382	827

The debt management story completes the picture. The vast changeover in the Federal budgetary outlook is necessitating a lifting of the ceiling on the national debt. This is not all. Just as last year, the Federal Reserve policies were and very recently have been playing havoc with the management of the national debt. The bonds or obligations of the United States Government, which should be the least speculative of all investments held by the general public and by our financial institutions, have been made instead among the most speculative of investment media. Not long ago, the yields on bonds were falling and the prices on bonds were rising, and dabblers in these bonds were reaping a rich harvest. In the final analysis, this harvest can be only at the expense of the people and the taxpayer, because at any given level of total national product, the gain of some must represent the loss of others.

Still more recently the bond yields have been rising, and the bond prices have been falling. A sharp, unpredictable, and irregular swing of bond prices and yields in either direction confounds the whole problem of debt management, leads to correlative irrationalities in the stock market as the relative yields of bonds and stock change rapidly, and thus contributes to the bedevilment of our economic policies no less than our debt management policies.

In April of this year, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board and some of his assistants were again before the Senate

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Finance Committee. I shall not now review their testimony in detail, although there will be occasion to do so at a later time. There is just one point that I want to mention.

Early in his testimony this year, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board said that "The current recession is a reaction to both the investment boom and the inflation which accompanied it. The growth of business capital spending beginning in early 1955 was at a rate that was unsustainable. An economy with a long-run upward growth trend of about 3 or 4 percent per year cannot sustain for long an increase in business investment of about 10 percent per year in real terms, such as we experienced in 1955–56."

I agree with this phase of the analysis by the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, but I also marvel at it. For last year before the Senate Finance Committee, I pressed without success upon the Chairman, and also upon the Secretary of the Treasury, the point that the investment boom in the expansion of productive facilities was racing far ahead of the expansion of consumption.

I pointed out that this was one of the central causes of the slow-down in the whole economy; that it was leading us inevitably toward a recession; and that we should slow down investment and speed up a consumption, so that the economy could get back into the balance and thus resume a satisfactory rate of growth.

But all last year before the Senate Finance Committee, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board and the Secretary of the Treasury insisted that the inflationary trouble was due primarily to excessive consumption. We had a great deal of discussion on this subject.

The Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board and the Secretary of the Treasury were then arguing that the tight money policy would fight inflation by increasing savings. When I pointed out that an increase in savings through this method would merely restrain consumption further, and also that the increase in savings would either flow into still more investment and thus exaggerate the investment boom at the expense of consumption, or in the alternative that the increase in savings would quickly result in more unemployment if the savings became frozen and were not used at all. I could get no satisfactory response from the FRB Chairman or the Secretary.

I am glad that, by April 1958, the FRB Chairman had partially revised his analysis of the past, to make it more nearly correct than it was last year. But the action of the Federal Reserve Board is more important than the testimony of its members, and in this I can see no fundamental change.

I am still hopeful that those of us who have been calling attention to these matters will have more influence in the future than in the past. We can and must have economic progress and price stability at one and the same time. We must get closer to the fundamentals of our economic problems, and recognize more fully the true conditions of economic strength.

Monetary and financial policies are necessary, but they are merely means to an end. The substitution of the mere juggling of monetary and financial policies for programs directed toward full employment and full production in a growing economy, and toward the real building of our national wealth, can never be successful. We cannot succeed by failing to profit from experience, or by repeating by rote the errors of the past.

I shall continue to make this case from time to time, because I believe that it is valid and in the best interests of the country.

SO-CALLED MUTUAL SECURITY—AMERICAN TAXPAYERS' MONEY TO BUILD FOREIGN PLANTS TO COMPETE WITH AMERICAN WORKINGMEN AND INVESTORS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, this is a bill to give $3,518,092,500 to foreigners—call it three and a half billion.

The money we are being asked to appropriate today to aid foreigners in foreign lands would provide $13,078,408 for every distressed area in the United States—$13 million plus for every area.

Some of these areas embrace two or more cities so there are more distressed cities than there are distressed areas.

The money we are being asked to give away to foreign countries would provide $10,473,330 for each distressed city in America if divided equally among them—nearly ten and a half million.

CONGRESS PASSES OUT BILLIONS TO FOREIGNERS; SNUBS AMERICANS

It would give every State of the Union that has distressed areas in it more than $105,000,000 if used to aid American instead of foreigners.

Mr. President, today Congress seems to have a fanatical passion for helping foreigners and kicking Americans in the teeth.

Only yesterday the House killed a bill that would have provided a mere $150 million this year and $77 million in each of the next 4 years to aid our national security, our general economy, and our distressed mining areas by stockpiling critical and strategic metals; namely, copper, lead, zinc, fluorspar, and tungsten.

Mr. President, it will be remembered that the State Department from the beginning, not under Mr. Dulles, but under Mr. Dean Acheson, realized full well what this foreigners-first program would do to employment and investments in the United States. They have, almost from the beginning of the program, proposed legislation to assess the taxpayers further to get the money needed to train unemployed workingmen for different occupations and to pay their fare to another area and job. I suppose a miner or a textile worker or a steel worker or a crockery worker would be taught how to make watches. The only trouble with that idea is that the watch business has also been substantially reduced. Also, some money would be included in the bill to reimburse stockholders in corporations and individuals whose businesses were destroyed through the remaking of the industrial map of the United States, meaning industries or products deliberately traded to further a foreign policy.

PRESIDENT HAS POWER TO TRADE AWAY ONE INDUSTRY FOR FOREIGN POLICY

Under the recent extension of the Trade Agreements Act for 4 years, there is no check on the President, except that by a two-thirds vote by each House of Congress against what he has done, he can be stopped after he has done it. The President, under the 1934 Trade Agreement Act as extended, has full power to trade any industry in the United States or any product in the United States to a foreign nation to further his foreign policy. He can buy the foreign nation's signature to a treaty to further his foreign policy.

Since 1934, when the trade-agreements program was inaugurated, a Secretary of State, for the first time in the history of the United States, can trade an industry to a foreign nation and can give away billions of dollars to buy a signature to a treaty.

CONSTITUTION SEPARATED FOREIGN FROM DOMESTIC POLICY

The Constitution of the United States specifically forbids such a transaction. The Constitution deliberately and pointedly separates the regulation of the national economy from the fixing of foreign policy. Article I, section 8, fixes in the legislative branch the regulation of the national economy. Article II, section 2, fixes in the executive branch the matter of establishing foreign policy.

CONGRESS IGNORED CONSTITUTION WHEN SUBORDINATED DOMESTIC ECONOMY TO FOREIGN GAINS

But a later Congress, in 1934, in its wisdom tied the two policies together without first having amended the Constitution. The Constitution was violated. It was known full well that if such a proposal were put before the people of the United States for a vote, the proponents of the amendment would be ridiculed and probably impeached. At least, they would be defeated for reelection for having made the suggestion.

But so long as no amendment to the Constitution has not been offered, the members of the Government can make their nice speeches.

We have tried to get the President to protect our industries, but he has refused to do so. The legislative branch—the Senate and House of Representatives—knows full well that it has a responsibility to do the job.

AID DENIED UNITED STATES MINERS WHILE MILLIONS IN AID SUBSIDIES HEAPED ON FOREIGN COMPETITORS

American aid for Americans—as the miners' bill—was defeated in the House by a vote of 182 to 159. I wonder what the vote on the miners' bill would have been had it been designed to assist the miners of foreign countries. We do not have to conjecture about that. That is what the bill before us will do. It will do a thousand other things which will aid foreign nations to develop their mines and assist their miners, whose products will be shipped to the United States under a virtually free trade policy.

We are pouring millions upon millions of dollars into foreign countries to be used in producing foreign copper, foreign zinc, foreign lead, foreign fluorspar, and foreign tungsten.

GOVERNMENT LOBBIES FOR FOREIGN PRODUCERS WHILE DOMESTIC INDUSTRIES, WORKERS, SACRIFICED

Had the bill defeated yesterday been to aid foreign metal mines, I suspect the State Department would have been on the Hill lobbying for it in full force, just as it is lobbying for the bill now under consideration.

The only difference is that the minerals bill was to help domestic producers, while the mutual security appropriation bill will help foreign producers. Probably the great Eric Johnston would be propagandizing for it throughout the country.

HOLLYWOOD UNEMPLOYED PROTEST FOREIGN FILMS WHILE SPOKESMAN ERIC JOHNSTON PLUMPS FOR GREATER IMPORTS AID

By the way, I have just received a letter from the motion picture photographers in Hollywood, protesting the importation of foreign films. I have not answered it yet. I did not have the heart to tell them that their own Eric Johnston was here with a thousand people, propagandizing and trying to bluff Congress and scare Congress—as they did—into voting for a free trade bill, which will permit foreign films to come into the United States at a time when many persons are unemployed in Hollywood. But I will answer that letter. I will probably send them a copy of this speech.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the letter from International Photographers of the Motion Picture Industries, local 659, Hollywood, Calif. The letter is dated August 14, 1958.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL PHOTOGRAPHERS OF THE MOTION PICTURE INDUSTRIES,
Hollywood, Calif., August 14, 1958.

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: We seek to enlist your services for the purpose of obtaining a Congressional investigation on the reasons why motion pictures are being made abroad to a greater and greater extent, thus lessening the employment opportunities of so many thousands of people in the city of Los Angeles, and to a degree in the city of New York. It is our belief that there are certain conditions which can be attributed to this situation. We feel that only through a proper Congressional investigation can these facts be brought out into the open. Once this is done, I feel certain that appropriate legislation can then be proposed to correct this evil.

To further explain the case I am taking the opportunity of acquainting you with myself and the thinking of so many of us.

I am the business representative of local 659, International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees and Moving Picture Machine Operators of the United States and Canada, which consists of 1,100 photographers, primarily male and of which 925 are employed in the city of Los Angeles. I am the official spokesman of the aforementioned and to a degree all others besides the members of our organization who are now being plagued with the foreign film-production problems. These people I speak about generally render services in the city and county of Los Angeles.

We currently find ourselves faced with a drastic unemployment problem. A receding box office hardly explains away the case as some pictures gross tremendous sums and others do not do so well. Management as a whole is not the most efficient on the top level. Nevertheless, motion pictures have a place in our sphere of life and if the number of pictures customarily made are continued to be made in this country we would be enjoying a fairly healthy condition.

Employment was at its highest about a year ago. Since then there has been a noticeable decrease in the making of motion pictures for television as well as for theatrical release. As to the number of television pictures being less, that can be explained by the fact that a retrenchment has been taking place in the industry which reflects itself in the advertising budgets and again is reflected in a tightening up by the ad agencies. Some networks have encouraged the making of pictures in foreign lands for television release to sponsor American products so that they can be sold on the American market. As it is, this has not been our most serious problem. The television medium is also suffering from the fact that advertisers are searching for a better way to market products other than the present use of established style. Possibly we may see the introduction of some new ideas and production will then become accelerated in this country. However, tax advantages and subsidies could eventually bring us irreparable damages.

As to the theatrical motion-picture market, the unemployment situation can be attributed to the production of American-financed and controlled films in foreign lands.

To us this trend is increasing with a more positive attitude. As for the reasons, it is obvious that so much can be written off as expenses. Furthermore, labor of all kinds, be it common labor, extras, or technicians, cost so much less than it would in the American market.

England offers the Eady plan under which one-third of production costs are subsidized by the Government. Moreover, certain stars and producers are forming corporations in Italy and Switzerland which acquire an interest in these pictures and which corporations serve to accumulate all of the foreign revenue. In turn the star acquires a considerable fortune from this foreign corporation which is then used to produce further pictures in foreign lands. The foreign corporation I refer to always retains the European rights to any picture, and what we call the American negative or American rights come back to this country. Without a doubt the yield from the American negative rights gives the star, producer, or director, more than their salary and what is made by the foreign corporation is untaxable income that just keeps on increasing. Thus you have it—why the trend is to make pictures out of the country.

Loyalty to this country and the regard for human dignity of the American craftsmen has become a theory no longer applicable because of those whose efforts are directed to acquire wealth through selfish means.

Certain people of this country would lead you to believe that it is a mistaken concept to live in a free country, take its benefits and support it in every way possible. When we look back upon those who gave their lives and those who were fortunate enough to return we wonder whether their mission in life was meaningful.

I have concluded that the only answer to this problem is for you to initiate this Congressional investigation in behalf of our constituents so that the entire subject may be fully explored.

Only through your help can a brighter future be found for the thousands of people in our community.

Only through your help can faith be resuscitated within those who have given their all to pioneer an industry.

Only through your help can this community whose allied industries have likewise suffered retrenchment be stabilized and continue in business.

Only through your help in initiating this investigation can a means be found to correct the evil practices which have hurt some and will destroy others.

We are earnestly calling upon you to put into work the necessary machinery to bring this matter before Congress.

Respectfully yours,

HERBERT ALLER,
Business Representative.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, this is the letter with a teardrop and a drop of blood on every paragraph. The letter begs for protection, so that the members of this group can find work in Hollywood, although their very good friend, Eric Johnston, who has brought hundreds of people to Washington, favors free trade. But now the members of this group are unable to find work.

EVERYTHING ASKED FOR FOREIGN COUNTRIES PASSED BY CONGRESS; LITTLE PASSED ASKED FOR AMERICANS

Had the minerals bill been a bill to assist the mining industry of foreign countries we would have had our internationalist commentators and columnists praising it to the skies. Then it would have passed. Of course it would have passed.

Congress has passed everything which has been asked for by foreign countries for the past 24 years, especially the last 12 years, since World War II.

Only a few weeks ago, the House passed overwhelmingly the foreign aid appropriation bill which is before the Senate today.

The miners' bill was only a little old American bill. It offered nothing for foreigners. It was only for Americans. So the House defeated it. The bill simply would have enabled the miners to eat for another 2 or 3 years; to keep their mines open; to keep the American mining industry a going concern. That is all the bill provided.

DISTRESS IN AMERICA GROWS WHILE CONGRESS VOTES BILLIONS FOR OUTSIDE WORLD

Mr. President, the time is coming—and it will come soon—when the people of the United States will demand legislation for Americans, not for foreigners. The American people are sick of supporting nations and colonies throughout the world, while the number of unemployed and the number of distressed areas in our own Nation mounts monthly.

When, last June, the foreign aid authorization bill was first debated this year in the Senate, I reported that the United States now had 243 distressed areas. This was 56 more distressed areas than there were in March, 129 more than there were in January, and 206 more than there were 5 years ago.

In July, when the Trade Agreements Act was being debated, I reported that during the month of June, 16 more distressed areas had been added, bringing the total to 259, and I listed them by States.

FOREIGN AID, FREE TRADE, TWIN ACTS AGAINST AMERICANS

The Trade Agreements Act is merely another form of foreign aid. Its purpose is to stimulate foreign prosperity and production by giving foreign producers a free market in America at the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN FINANCIAL

expense of American workers and investors. It is a bill for foreigners and against Americans. So is the so-called mutual-security bill, which, if it were honestly labeled, would be simply the foreign subsidy bill. It is really a third part of the international socialist theory of the division of wealth. That is what it is.

Mr. President, I may say in passing that no Senator, Representative, or anyone else can consistently oppose free immigration if he is for free foreign trade and free imports. The only difference is that free immigration brings the foreigners from every nation at will.

FREE TRADE TO LEAD TO FREE IMMIGRATION

Free trade and free imports bring the products of the cheap foreign labor into the United States at will. I am not so sure that free immigration would not be an improvement, because at least the immigrants would come under the domination or the influence of Americans and get some ideas of higher living standards. But when they live in a foreign country having low wages and low living standards, American investments in Europe and Asia are used to employ cheap labor and American machinery and know-how, and the foreign products are then sent to the United States without the payment of any duty or tariff and are sold for whatever the traffic will bear. Perhaps that is worse than free immigration. But free immigration will come if we keep up this pattern of one world, one government, and world government; when, as some people advocate openly, we modify the sovereignty of this Nation and join with 75 or 80 other nations, each having one vote. That is what it is coming to; and each of them will have one vote, as in the case of the United Nations. Mr. President, what do you think will happen to the United States then? Then the United States will be taxed according to its ability to pay.

FREE TRADE THE DIRECT, FOREIGN AID THE INDIRECT CAUSE OF AMERICA'S DISTRESSED AREAS

So, Mr. President, like the Trade Agreements Act, the so-called mutual security bill is for foreigners and against Americans.

Mr. President, recently we have noticed that plans have been made to make the desert of the Middle East bloom like the rose and to finance the Arab nations. That work is proposed to be done by nations all over the world—although by means of agreements which no one but the United States will keep.

The Trade Agreements Act and the gates it has opened to floods of low-cost, low-wage imports from low-living-standard nations are the primary cause of our distressed areas.

The foreign-aid program, which has financed foreign companies in the production of this deluge of goods to flood our markets, is a secondary cause of our distressed areas.

Each month, the number of distressed areas and the number of States in which American distressed areas are located continue to mount. The State Department expects that; it expects the redistribution and reorganization of the industrial map of the United States, which has been going on for the last 24 years.

Mr. President, how can any private investments be made in any business in the United States when the potential investors know that either the Chief Executive or the Geneva trade organization can trade off any American business tomorrow, and the company concerned will not know anything about what has been done to it until it finds that it is unable to sell its goods.

AMERICAN BUSINESS SOLD OUT TO FOREIGN TRADERS WHILE CONGRESS GIVES LIPSERVICE TO UNITED STATES INDUSTRIES

Mr. President, the Members of Congress are giving lipservice to American industries, but only after they allow imports from cheap-labor countries and countries with low taxes to enter the United States. Then the Congress votes some sort of sop for the American businesses, in an effort to make them believe that Congress favors them.

But, Mr. President, no business in the United States should have to ask a Member of Congress for anything, except perhaps a small publication or two that may be available to all persons in the United States.

But now, at Geneva, the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade makes the tariffs. The 37 nations which belong to that organization make the tariffs; but the United States has only 1 vote in that connection. So the other 36 competitive nations continue to complete the job of dividing among themselves the markets of the United States; and the businessmen of the United States are not able to do anything about it. They used to have Senators and Members of the House of Representatives who would act to protect them; that was the case during the first 150 years of the life of this country. But now, all that has been changed.

Today, pressure is exerted from the White House, the State Department, and from Hollywood, by means of Eric Johnston, Paul Hoffman, and all the rest of their ilk, in an attempt to pressure the Members of Congress into permitting Geneva to continue dictating our economy. And then, Mr. President, of all things, some out-of-work movie actors ask me to help them. It would be better for them to ask Eric Johnston to help them.

DISTRESSED AREA TOTAL REACHES 269; INCLUDES 334 CITIES IN 35 STATES

The July report on the distressed areas in the United States is just out. It lists 269 distressed areas, containing 334 cities, and located in 35 States of the Union—36, if we include Alaska. Some of these areas, as I stated before, embrace several cities.

For example, Los Angeles and Long Beach, which were added to the distressed areas list last month, are listed as one area, although they are separate cities. Minneapolis and St. Paul are in the same area, as are Duluth and Superior, although they are in different States. Albany, Schenectady, and Troy are also included in one area; so are Utica and Rome; so are Wheeling, W. Va., and Steubenville, Ohio. It is one way the Department of Labor has to reduce the number of distressed areas.

The Department of Labor distinguishes between what it calls major areas and what it calls smaller areas, although some fair sized cities are in the latter.

LABOR DEPARTMENT'S DISTRESSED AREA CRITERIA

For the so-called major areas they have six classifications, A, B, C, D, E, F. Cities go into the distressed-area class when they hit the "D" classification. The "A" classification is for cities where there is a labor shortage. There are no "A" cities left in the United States and there has not been for a year.

The "B" classification is for cities in which "job opportunities for local workers are slightly in excess of job seekers." There are no longer any class "B" cities either.

The "C" classification is for cities in which job seekers are slightly in excess of job openings, or, in other words, where there is 3 to 5.9 percent unemployment. These are not considered distressed areas where unemployment is less than 6 percent. Of the 149 major areas listed by the Department of Labor in July there were 60 "C" areas, leaving 89 distressed major areas in different degrees of distress.

An area or city with 6 to 8.9 percent of it workers jobless is a "D" area; one with 9 to 11.9 jobless is an "E" area, and one with 12 percent or more out of work and unable to find jobs is an "F" area.

In July there were 49 "D" areas, 19 "E" areas, and 21 "F" areas. A year ago there were only 16 "D" cities included in the major areas, 7 "E" cities, and 1 "F" city.

The smaller areas, so-called, are not broken down into A, B, C, D, E, and F classifications. They are listed simply as "areas of substantial labor surplus, which means they are areas of substantial unemployment. Unemployment is considered substantial when 6 percent or higher of the workers cannot find employment because there are no jobs to be had.

NATION'S UNEMPLOYED VICTIMS OF FREE TRADE

Mr. President, I am certain that an unemployed worker in a so-called smaller area is just as hungry and despairing as the jobless wage-earner in a major area, possibly more so because his opportunities of finding some form of gainful employment are more limited in a small city than in a large city.

I know that in distressed areas like Butte, Mont.; Jasper, Ala.; Okmulgee and Henryetta, Okla.; Joplin, Mo.; and Richlands-Bluefield, Va., where mining is a dominant industry, there are few if any jobs that an unemployed miner can hope to turn to.

There are more than 5 million employed now in the United States. Free trade has destroyed their job opportunities. Foreign aid has subsidized sweatshop foreign labor which has driven them out of the labor market, and as they suffer, we here in the Senate contemplate adding to their distress and

misery by voting another $3.5 billion subsidy to increase their misery through foreign competition.

NATION'S 269 DISTRESSED AREAS LISTED

I now list the distressed areas named in the July report of the Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security:

Alabama: Major areas: Birmingham, Mobile. Smaller areas: Anniston, Florence-Sheffield, Gadsen, Jasper, Talladega. Total: 7 areas, 8 cities.

Alaska: Smaller area, Anchorage. Total, 1.

California: Major area, Los Angeles-Long Beach. Smaller areas: Eureka, Ukiah. Total, 3 areas, 4 cities.

Colorado: Smaller area, Pueblo. Total, 1.

Connecticut: Major areas: Bridgeport, New Britain, New Haven, Waterbury. Smaller areas: Ansonia, Bristol, Danbury, Danielson, Meriden, Middletown, Norwich, Thompsonville, Torrington, Willimantic. Total, 14.

Georgia: Major area, Columbus. Smaller areas: La Grange, Toccoa. Total, 3.

Illinois: Major areas: Chicago, Joliet, Peoria. Smaller areas: Canton, Centralia, Decatur, Harrisburg, Herrin-Murphysboro-West Frankfort, La Salle, Litchfield, Mount Carmel-Olney, Mount Vernon, Springfield, Woodstock. Total, 14 areas, 16 cities.

Indiana: Major areas: Evansville, Fort Wayne, Indianapolis, South Bend, Terre Haute. Smaller areas: Anderson, Connersville, Lafayette, Marion, Michigan City-La Porte, Muncie, New Castle, Richmond, Vincennes. Total, 14 areas, 15 cities.

Iowa: Smaller area, Ottumwa. Total, 1.

Kansas: Smaller areas: Coffeyville-Independence-Parsons, Pittsburg. Total, 2 areas, 4 cities.

Kentucky: Major area, Louisville. Smaller areas: Corbin, Frankfort, Hazard, Madisonville, Middlesboro-Harlan, Morehead-Grayson, Owensboro, Paducah, Paintsville-Prestonburg, Pikeville-Williamson. Total, 11 area, 15 cities.

Maine: Major area, Portland. Smaller areas: Biddeford-Sanford, Lewistown. Total, 3 areas, 4 cities.

Maryland: Major area, Baltimore. Smaller area, Cumberland. Total, 2 areas.

Massachusetts: Major areas: Brockton, Fall River, Lawrence, Lowell, New Bedford, Springfield-Holyoke, Worcester. Smaller areas: Fitchburg, Greenfield, Haverhill, Marlboro, Milford, Newburyport, North Adams, Pittsfield, Southbridge-Webster, Taunton, Ware. Total, 18 areas, 20 cities.

Michigan: Major areas: Battle Creek, Detroit, Flint, Grand Rapids, Lansing, Muskegon, Saginaw. Smaller areas: Adrian, Ann Arbor-Ypsilanti, Bay City, Benton Harbor, Escanaba, Ionia-Belding-Greenville, Iron Mountain, Jackson, Marquette, Monroe, Owosso, Port Huron. Total, 19 areas, 22 cities.

Minnesota: Major areas: Duluth-Superior, Minneapolis-St. Paul. Total, 2 areas, 4 cities.

Mississippi: Smaller area, Greenville. Total, one.

Missouri: Major areas: Kansas City, St. Louis. Smaller areas: Cape Girardeau, Flat River-De Soto-Festus, Joplin. Total, 5 areas, 7 cities.

Montana: Smaller areas: Butte, Great Falls, Kalispell. Total, 3 areas.

Nebraska: Smaller area: Lincoln. Total, one.

New Jersey: Major areas: Atlantic City, Newark, Paterson, Perth Amboy, Trenton. Smaller areas: Bridgeton, Long Branch, Morristown-Dover, Plainfield-Somerville. Total, 9 areas, 11 cities.

New York: Major areas: Albany-Schenectady-Troy, Buffalo, New York City, Syracuse, Utica-Rome. Smaller areas: Amsterdam, Auburn, Batavia, Elmira, Glens Falls-Hudson Falls, Gloversville, Jamestown-Dunkirk, Newburgh-Middletown-Beacon, Oneida, Oneonta, Watertown. Total, 16 areas, 23 cities.

North Carolina: Major areas: Asheville, Durham, Greensboro-High Point. Smaller areas: Fayetteville, Kinston, Morganton, Mount Airy, Rockingham-Hamlet, Rocky Mount, Rutherfordton-Forest City, Shelby-Kings Mountain, Thomasville-Lexington, Waynesville. Total, 13 areas, 18 cities.

Ohio: Major areas: Akron, Canton, Cleveland, Dayton, Hamilton-Middleton, Lorain-Elyria, Toledo, Youngstown. Smaller areas: Ashtabula-Conneaut, Athens-Logan-Nelsonville, Cambridge, Defiance, East Liverpool-Salem, Findlay-Tiffin-Fostoria, Kent-Ravenna, Kenton, Lima, Mansfield, Marietta, Marion, New Philadelphia-Dover, Portsmouth, Chillicothe, St. Marys, Sandusky-Fremont, Springfield, Zanesville. Total, 26 areas, 38 cities.

Oklahoma: Smaller areas: McAlester, Okmulgee-Henryetta. Total, 2 areas, 3 cities.

Oregon: Major area: Portland. Smaller areas: Albany, Coos Bay, Eugene, Pendleton, Roseburg. Total, 6 areas.

Pennsylvania: Major areas: Allentown-Bethlehem, Altoona, Erie, Johnstown, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Reading, Scranton, Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton, York. Smaller areas: Berwick-Bloomsburg, Butler, Clearfield-Dubois, Lewistown, Lock Haven, New Castle, Pottsville, Sayre-Athens-Towanda, Sunbury-Shamokin-Mount Carmel, Uniontown-Connellsville. Total, 20 areas, 29 cities.

Rhode Island: Major area, Providence. Smaller area, Newport. Total, two.

Tennessee: Major areas: Chattanooga, Knoxville, Memphis. Smaller areas: Bristol-Johnson City-Kingsport, Lafollette-Jellico-Tazewell. Total, 5 areas, 9 cities.

Texas: Major areas: Beaumont-Port Arthur, Corpus Christi, Fort Worth, Houston. Smaller areas: Laredo, Texarkana. Total, 6 areas, 7 cities.

Utah: Smaller area, Provo. Total, one.

Vermont: Smaller areas: Burlington, Springfield. Total, two.

Virginia: Major area, Roanoke. Smaller areas: Big Stone Gap-Appalachia, Radford-Pulaski, Richlands-Bluefield. Total, 4 areas, 7 cities.

Washington: Major areas: Spokane, Tacoma. Smaller areas: Aberdeen, Anacortes, Bellingham, Bremerton, Everett, Olympia, Port Angeles. Total, nine areas.

West Virginia: Major areas: Charleston, Huntington-Ashland, Wheeling-Steubenville. Smaller areas: Beckley, Bluefield, Clarksburg, Fairmont, Logan, Martinsburg, Morgantown, Parkersburg, Point Pleasant-Gallipolis, Ronceverte-White Sulphur Springs, Welch. Total, 14 areas, 18 cities.

Wisconsin: Major areas: Kenosha, Milwaukee, Racine. Smaller areas: Beaver Dam, Beloit, La Crosse, Lake Geneva-Whitewater, Watertown. Total, 8 areas, 9 cities.

NO RELIEF IN SIGHT FOR DISTRESSED AREAS

Mr. President, in each of these areas and cities that I have listed above there is serious unemployment. Not only that but, according to the Department of Labor's criteria before an area or city is listed current unemployment is expected to continue for at least the next four months. In other words no immediate or early relief is in sight.

On the basis of the record which this Congress has achieved, unemployment will grow instead of diminish.

We have passed a Trade Agreements Act to bring in more low-wage foreign goods and products and destroy more American jobs.

Many of these job-destroying imports were financed by foreign aid.

It is now proposed to give foreigners another $3½ billion to finance more foreign products for foreigners to pour into our markets through the free trade sleeve, destroying still more American investments and American jobs.

Many nations have been destroyed by substituting imported foreign goods for domestic products—Rome, Venice, Spain, and Portugal are good examples—but ours is the first government where the taxpayer has been compelled to finance his own destruction, and that is what we are doing through foreign aid.

VOTE FOR FOREIGN AID A VOTE TO CREATE MORE DISTRESSED AREAS

A vote for this bill today is a vote to aid foreigners at the expense of America's security and economy. It is a vote to increase more distressed areas in the United States.

A vote against this bill is a vote to aid America, its taxpayers, its industries, and its wage earners.

Our taxpayers are going broke, our industries are closing down, and our wage earners are going jobless.

I intend to vote against this bill to aid foreigners.

Voting against this foreign aid bill, I will aid Americans, which I consider the first obligation of every Member of this body.

FOREIGN NATIONS LOOK TO DAY WHEN ALL UNITED STATES A DISTRESSED AREA DRAINED OF MONEY

Mr. President, all these records are kept by Bureau officials. Any Bureau official can keep records. There is an old saying, Mr. President, as you know, that "figures don't lie, but liars will figure." By regrouping and by every other known subterfuge, unemployment in the depressed areas of the Nation is misrepresented and minimized. The only trouble is that once the United States runs out of money, "Uncle" has no uncle; no one else has been so generous. Many of the other nations are looking forward to the time when the United States will run out of money.

Mr. President, a reading of the newspaper dispatches is enough to discourage anyone. In the New York Journal-American for August 22, I noticed an article entitled "Dag Plans Swift Recall of Troops."

The reference is to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Dag Hammarskjold. Mr. President, for whom is he working? I will guarantee that he is not working for the United States of America.

I shall read part of the article:

Dag Hammarskjold mapped plans today for speeding the withdrawal of Anglo-American troops from Jordan and Lebanon after the unanimous approval in the U. N. Assembly of an all-Arab resolution for keeping peace in the Middle East.

Mr. President, we sent our troops into Lebanon. Just imagine how the people of the United States would feel if Russia sent troops into Cuba.

EDITORIAL DECRIES "IDEALISTIC IMPERIALISM"

Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal is a great newspaper that is entirely in favor of free trade. Therefore, it is quite natural, as a result of the "funny money" policy the Wall Street Journal advo-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

cates—although others call it inflation—that we find published in that newspaper an editorial with the heading, "The Fixer for the World."

Mr. President, sometimes even the Wall Street Journal publishes a fairly sensible editorial, perhaps after it has a lapse of memory, or something of the sort, in regard to its regular policy.

I read from the editorial:

It might be useful for the administration and the Congress to take note of some remarks made the other day by Dr. Henry M. Wriston of Brown University, and George V. Allen, head of the United States Information Agency and the Voice of America.

Mr. President, the United States Information Service is a great organization. The only thing it cannot find out is what is going on in Europe and Asia. Outside of that, it is a very valuable organization, especially for reporting on tea parties.

I read further from the editorial in the Wall Street Journal:

While these gentlemen spoke at different places and on different subjects, what each of them had to say is closely related to one basic phase of our foreign policy that deserves the most critical examination.

Dr. Wriston, who 4 years ago headed a committee to advise Secretary Dulles on State Department personnel problems, offered in New York some advice on other Department matters. The United States, he said, should beware of a policy of idealistic imperialism.

EFFORTS TO REPLACE BRITAIN IN EMPIRE ROLE WITLESS

I do not know whether it is idealistic or not, but it is another form of imperialism. The only thing is we are doing it for other nations. We say we have taken the place of Great Britain. Great Britain's fleet was destroyed when the airplane dominated the British fleet. The fleet has not been out of the harbor since, and never will be again. So it is said we have taken the place of Great Britain. I point out that the way we have taken the place of Great Britain is the way a spendthrift would take the place of a frugal man.

Great Britain never lost a dollar on a foreign nation in its colonial business. It received dollar for dollar, and made a profit on it. It dominated the markets of the smaller nations, as it did our own country until 1776, when we got fed up with it and were the first to break away. Now we are trying to hold her and other colonial nations in our power by taking Great Britain's place. We protect the empires of colonial nations by furnishing them arms, so they could fight to hold their colonial empires. However, when we take over an area, we put out money. It is a loss every time we turn around. No money comes to us. No loans are returned. It means no trade for us, as it meant for Great Britain under the empire preferential trade policy.

I read further from the editorial:

"The United States," he said, "should beware of a policy of idealistic imperialism." This he defined as the notion that anything that's wrong anywhere in the world, it's up to us to fix it.

UNCLE SAM ESSAYS ROLE OF "MR. FIXIT"

In other words, we must pay a nation to sign a treaty it never intends to keep.

The editorial continues:

The United States, Dr. Wriston argued, has a moral commitment to let the other fellow alone to work out his own scheme of government. We would be ready to advise—if asked—to cooperate, to work through the United Nations. Beyond that, we should not interfere whether we like this ruler or that kind of government.

Well, the United States, whether under Republicans or Democrats, has long suffered an itch to make over the world in its own likeness, and that brings us to the remarks of Mr. Allen, whose Voice of America is our most voluble tool in seeking to impress upon others the image of America. Mr. Allen said in Washington that he is perfectly willing to have the Voice of America monitored by the United Nations.

That creates an interesting problem, to be sure, for there are two views on the reasons why we have a Voice of America. One is that the Voice is supposed to mirror America. The other is that it is supposed to be an out-and-out propaganda arm in the cold war.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial appear in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIXER FOR THE WORLD

It might be useful for the administration and the Congress to take note of some remarks made the other day by Dr. Henry M. Wriston of Brown University and George V. Allen, head of the United States Information Agency and the Voice of America. While these gentlemen spoke at different places and on different subjects, what each of them had to say is closely related to one basic phase of our foreign policy that deserves the most critical examination.

Dr. Wriston, who 4 years ago headed a committee to advise Secretary Dulles on State Department personnel problems, offered in New York some advice on other Department matters. The United States, he said, should beware of a policy of idealistic imperialism. This is defined as "the notion that anything that's wrong anywhere in the world, it's up to us to fix it."

The United States, Dr. Wriston argued, has a moral commitment to let the other fellow alone to work out his own scheme of government. We would be ready to advise—if asked—to cooperate, to work through the United Nations. Beyond that, we should not interfere whether we like this ruler or that kind of government.

Well, the United States, whether under Republicans or Democrats, has long suffered an itch to make over the world in its own likeness, and that brings us to the remarks of Mr. Allen, whose Voice of America is our most voluble tool in seeking to impress upon others the image of America. Mr. Allen said in Washington that he is perfectly willing to have the Voice of America monitored by the United Nations.

That creates an interesting problem, to be sure, for there are two views on the reasons why we have a Voice of America. One is that the Voice is supposed to mirror America. The other is that it is supposed to be an out-and-out propaganda arm in the cold war. We know of no other reasons offered for its existence. The question now is whether the Voice can serve either purpose if it is monitored by U. N. censorship, for the monitors are likely to see to it that the broadcasts are in a mirror of what the U. N. wants the world to find in America. That gives even less reason for the existence of the Voice.

Still, the Voice and the United States Information Agency, costly, controversial, and dubious of value as their critics think them, are, like foreign aid only an outgrowth of our propensity to right all the wrongs of the world.

For the fact is that if we had enough sense to abandon the notion that it is our duty to be the fixer for the world we would have much less use for foreign aid and none at all for Government propaganda.

UNITED STATES ARMS FLOWN TO REBELLION-TORN INDONESIA

Mr. President, I read another headline from a newspaper under the dateline of August 19. I may say, Mr. President, I get discouraged reading such dispatches. All one has to do is pick up any newspaper and he will read them. This headline reads, "United States Arms Go to Indonesia in Hush Pact."

The dispatch reads in part:

The United States announced today that it was flying internal security arms to the neutralist Indonesian Government under a secret agreement signed in that country's capital last Wednesday.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES ARMS GO TO INDONESIA IN HUSH PACT

WASHINGTON, August 19.—The United States announced today that it was flying internal security arms to the neutralist Indonesian Government under a secret agreement signed in that country's capital last Wednesday.

The action marked an apparent softening in the United States attitude toward the government of President Sukarno now that the Indonesian rebellion has been virtually stamped out. The United States previously refused to sell arms to Indonesia.

SHIPPED BY PLANE

A State Department spokesman said the shipments, by the United States Air Force Globemasters, consisted of small arms, trucks, jeeps, communications equipment, and similar items needed by the army for internal security operations.

Indonesia will pay for the equipment either in dollars or Indonesian currency. The Department said Indonesia promised that the arms would be used only for internal security and self-defense, in accordance with United Nations principles.

Department press officer, Joseph W. Reap sidestepped a reply when asked if the agreement had any connection with new Red Chinese threats in the Formosa area.

SENATOR RECALLS VISIT TO SUKARNO IN INDONESIA

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I visited Indonesia in 1948. The Dutch Government had complete control at that time. Sukarno had his rebel army in another part of the island. I asked permission—and did not get it—to see Sukarno and meet with his outlaw cabinet. So before daylight one morning I arrived at the airport, knowing that a plane was leaving, stepped on the plane, and went to see Sukarno. I found him to be a very interesting young fellow. He had a very attractive and intelligent wife, who was helping him at every turn. Of course,

he married 2 or 3 more women. Nevertheless, he was fighting the Dutch and the Communists at the same time. In time, he took over control.

UNITED STATES SHOULD MIND AMERICA'S BUSINESS FIRST, NOT THAT OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES

We do not have any idea of what is going on in Indonesia or what government we should choose to help us. What business is it of ours to furnish arms to Indonesia? What business is it of ours to furnish arms to France so she may hold north Africa in colonial subjugation? Our Government sent marines into Lebanon. Why? Because, it was said, we have to protect the oil supply to Europe. This country became involved in three wars because it was said we had to have strategic materials located across major oceans.

I take pride in two reports which I directed and which came out of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The first one was Senate Report 1627, 83d Congress. It was shown conclusively that the Western Hemisphere can be made self-sufficient in everything we need in war or peace. The other report was Senate Document 83, 84th Congress, which broke down the economic structure and entity of 42 nations, and showed exactly how they handled their internal affairs.

I have visited every nation in the Western Hemisphere, as I have every nation in the world. I thought I had to see our star boarders first. I went behind the Iron Curtain, stayed there 2½ months, and traveled 14,000 miles in Russia, and saw every one of the Soviet Republics and saw many of their industries.

ARMS SUPPLIER OF THE WORLD: UNITED STATES NOW DISTRIBUTING ATOM POWER

This country is picking out governments and dictators all over the world that it thinks it should support and to which it should furnish arms. Those arms, like those which are going to Indonesia, will be turned against us when the time comes.

I have another headline from the Wall Street Journal of August 21, 1958, reading, "House Sends President Bill To Assist Europe Develop Atomic Power. Program Calls for United States to Provide $100 Million to 6 Nations in Next 10 Years." It reads in part:

Congress endorsed a long-range program of United States financial aid for peacetime atomic power development in Europe.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal of Thursday, August 21, 1958]

HOUSE SENDS PRESIDENT BILL TO ASSIST EUROPE DEVELOP ATOMIC POWER—PROGRAM CALLS FOR UNITED STATES TO PROVIDE $100 MILLION TO 6 NATIONS IN NEXT 10 YEARS

WASHINGTON.—Congress endorsed a long-range program of United States financial aid for peacetime atomic power development in Europe.

Under the measure sent to the President by a voice vote in the House yesterday, this country would provide a total of $100 million to the 6-nation European Atomic Energy Community during the next 10 years to help finance 6 nuclear reactors.

The Senate on Tuesday ratified an agreement already worked out between the United States and the six nations—Belgium, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, France, West Germany, and Italy.

An initial $3 million is authorized in the legislation for the present fiscal year for research and development. The so-called Euratom nations would match the United States grant that would total $100 million over a 10-year period.

By 1963, the projects are expected to produce a million kilowatts of nuclear-generated electricity. Private utilities in the European countries would built, operate, and own the plants.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I am trying to point out where the money is going. Of course, no one knows where all the money is going. I do not believe even the CIA, the great organization handled by Mr. Dulles' brother, could ever find out where all the money is going. At least, if they can they do not tell anybody. The Representatives and Senators cannot find out.

NATIONS ENRICHED BY UNITED STATES BOUNTY BEG FOR MORE

Another editorial from the Wall Street Journal of August 21 is entitled "Incidental Ironies From All Over."

They made two mistakes, or at least two lapses of memory from their general policy in a few days. The editorial reads in part:

If the following notations seem puzzlingly unrelated, don't blame us:

Lebanon plans to send Uncle Sam a bill for $100 million in foreign aid. The money will be spent, it says here, for immediate financial support and reconstruction and also for long-range development of the country.

Indonesia, which a few months back was bitterly accusing Uncle Sam of aiding and abetting the rebels there, now is praising Uncle Sam for selling the Loyalists military equipment.

Pakistan's Finance Minister complains in a foreign aid review report that the millions Pakistan gets don't go far enough. The reasons: Uncle Sam makes Pakistan spend some of the money in the United States, and United States things cost more; United States aid experts cost Pakistan an average of $2,520 a month and some of them aren't up to their jobs; some of the Pakistani projects get stalled because Pakistani experts and Uncle Sam's experts don't get along.

I have met these experts all over the world, Mr. President, and I will say now that most of them could not hold a job as an office boy in an engineering firm in this country. They are out of the country because they cannot get jobs here, most of them. There are some good men.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the rest of the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

NEHRU AGAINST EVERYTHING AMERICAN BUT AMERICAN DOLLAR AID

There being no objection, the remainder of the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

India, Prime Minister Nehru says in a speech in New Delhi, is opposed to all but 1 of the 6 points suggested by President Eisenhower as a basis for a Middle East settlement. The single point Mr. Nehru supports is, as you may have guessed, Uncle Sam's foreign aid.

Well, puzzling or not, the notations aren't at all unrelated. The ironies from all over stem from a common cause: Kind Uncle Sam's mission to take on his shoulders the responsibilities of everybody all over.

Mr. MALONE. This is a very interesting dispatch. We have given hundreds of millions of dollars to Germany. In the hearings before the Senate Committee on Finance, as to the economic structure and welfare of this Nation, it was brought out under my cross-examination that Germany had loaned $100 million to the World Bank at 4 percent interest. The money, of course, we had previously given Germany. It was a very fine round robin and a good way to make money, if one can do it.

The dispatch says in part:

A total of 60 million deutschemarks, about $15 million, will be diverted from the Marshall plan counterpart funds. The export credit fund will be increased to 260 million deutschemarks by subsequent advances from the same source and to about 500 million marks by the recourse to the private capital market.

GERMANY PLANS OWN FOREIGN-AID PROGRAM WITH UNITED STATES DOLLARS: OBJECT, EXTENDED CREDIT

In other words, they take our funds through the counterpart funds and loan them to foreign nations in order to extend their credit.

The first paragraph of the dispatch is:

BONN, GERMANY, August 16.—The foreign-aid program, designed to pump substantially more of the West German capital goods into underdeveloped countries, is in a final stage of preparation.

It is a very interesting dispatch, Mr. President.

While we are discussing the matter of counterpart funds, which is a very interesting subject, I have with me a copy of a document entitled "United States Owned or Controlled Local Currencies Related to the Mutual Security Program." This is worldwide. It says in part:

There are three principal categories of foreign currencies, owned or controlled by the United States, which are related to operations under the mutual-security program.

COUNTERPART FUNDS A HOAX ON PUBLIC

We understand, of course, the mutual-security program. The counterpart funds were created to fool everybody. This system even fools the Government which appropriates the money for it. At least, no one in the Senate or in the Congress seems to know much about it.

I read further:

Counterpart is the local currency sales proceeds or commensurate value of United States commodity assistance furnished under the mutual-security program. With the exception of such amounts up to 10 percent as are set aside for use by the United States for administrative and other purposes—

That is for use in the foreign country, not in our country—

it belongs to the aid recipient country and is deposited in a special account to be used for programs agreed to by the United States

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

in carrying out the purposes of the Mutual Security Act.

In other words, a certain amount of the funds is converted to counterpart funds, and 90 percent of that is spent in the foreign country. The counterpart funds indicate perhaps we get something out of it, but the remaining 10 percent is spent for administrative purposes in the foreign country. That is 100 percent, if I add it up correctly.

As of last June 30, deposits of such currencies on hand amounted to $980 million, of which all but $363 million had been committed.

COUNTERPART FUND STATUS SHOWN

Mr. President, I shall not take the time of the Senate to read this very interesting and informative document, but I ask unanimous consent to have the statement printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, including a table showing the status of local currency funds (counterpart) in thousands of dollars and also a table entitled "Analysis of Availabilities of MSP-Administered Local Currencies by Country and Source of Currency—Worldwide Summary by Country Groups and by Types of Currency—Actual as of June 30, 1957 and Estimated Through June 30, 1959."

There being no objection, the statement and tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES-OWNED OR CONTROLLED CURRENCIES RELATED TO THE MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

A. CATEGORIES OF LOCAL CURRENCIES

There are three principal categories of foreign currencies, owned or controlled by the United States, which are related to operations under the mutual-security program.

Counterpart is the local currency sales proceeds or commensurate value of United States commodity assistance furnished under the mutual-security program. With the exception of such amounts up to 10 percent as are set aside for use by the United States for administrative and other purposes, it belongs to the aid recipient country and is deposited in a special account to be used for programs agreed to by the United States in carrying out the purposes of the Mutual Security Act. As of last June 30, deposits of such currencies on hand amounted to $980 million, of which all but $363 million had been committed.

The second category is the proceeds from the sales of surplus agricultural commodities under authority of section 402 and its predecessor, section 550, of the Mutual Security Act. These currencies are owned by the United States. Under the terms of the sales agreements, they are available only for the purposes of the Mutual Security Act and are usually available only for use in the country in which generated. However, in some instances, these sales proceeds are available for purchase of goods and services for use in the mutual-security programs in other countries. With the exception of this latter type, called "triangular" currency, sections 402 and 550 currencies are similar in many respects to the counterpart discussed above. The chief difference is ownership. In substance there is little difference, since both kinds of currencies are used for the benefit of the host government and for purposes outlined in the Mutual Security Act. In both categories there is a lag of about a year between the obligation of the mutual security dollar and the deposit of local currency. This timelag is required to place commodity orders, receive shipments, and place the items in normal trade channels. Thus, currency programed for use in fiscal year 1959 consists largely of currency generated from fiscal year 1958 dollars. As of last June 30, sections 402 and 550 deposits on hand amounted to $309 million, of which all but $216 million had been obligated.

The third type of local currencies available to ICA and defense for purposes related to the mutual-security program are those available under certain provisions of Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act. These provisions are those authorizing the use of local currency sales proceeds for the common defense (subsection 104 (c)), for grants for economic development (subsection 104 (e)), and for loans for economic development (subsection 104 (g)). These currencies are owned by the United States and are generated by the sale of surplus agricultural commodities to foreign countries under the provisions of Public Law 480. Public Law 480 currencies differ from the two categories discussed earlier in that (1) they were not generated by mutual security activities with the result that they are not all available within mutual security countries, and (2) currencies under 104 (g), the largest account, are available only for loans, not for grants. In addition, a very limited quantity of Public Law 480 currencies is available under subsection 104 (d) for procurement of goods and services for export to other friendly countries. As of last June 30, deposits on hand earmarked for use under these 4 provisions amounted to $867.7 million. Of this total $645.9 million had not yet been obligated.

B. THE USEFULNESS OF SUCH CURRENCIES IN THE MUTUAL-SECURITY PROGRAM

There are three important considerations relative to these local currencies which indicate their limitations as well as their value in the conduct of the mutual-security program.

First. Local currency cannot be used to provide additional physical resources for use in the country in which it is generated, because it cannot be used to import goods and services into that country. A country's own currency, far from being a resource to that country, is a claim against its existing resources. It is to the country the same as a checkbook is to an individual bank account; writing more checks does not create more resources in the bank. Neither does expanding currency supply make more resources available in the country. Additional economic resources can be brought into these countries only by using dollars or other convertible currencies which can be used for imports. Thus, because the furtherance of mutual security objectives requires that the United States make new resources available to a cooperating country, local currency previously generated in that country cannot further such objectives by meeting this requirement for new resources. By the same token, the use by the United States of local currencies to export goods and services for mutual security purposes in other countries would, in effect, take back the assistance originally given.

Second. On the other hand, the device of generating local currencies and setting them aside helps in assuring cooperation of the host country in the mutual-security program and in directing the use of the physical resources available in the country. In many of the less developed countries, it is the most effective and practical method of making available budgetary resources that ordinarily in a developed economy would be created by taxation and government borrowing.

In other countries, however, this local currency is of little or no current value to mutual security objectives. Some countries have no need for the local currencies generated by United States programs, although they did and still may need the dollar commodities which generated such local currencies. The purpose and the timing of the use of local currencies depend on the monetary situation of the country as well as the economic condition of the country. Where inflation threatens or already exists, unrestrained use of such funds would be contrary to the objectives of helping in maintaining or building up the economy of the aid-recipient country. In some instances, although it might be a service to the country to make its own currency available to it, there are important reasons why the country would rather obtain the currency through its own internal methods rather than to borrow such currency from the United States, which would entail obligations of repayment of both principal and interest and of maintaining the value of such repayments against a decline in the value of its currency. This may in some cases inhibit the usefulness of currency which is available only for loans.

Third. To the extent that United States assistance constitutes an element in an annual understanding with a country, not only the dollar assistance but the local currency proceeds from that assistance are considered as the United States contribution for that year. Therefore, even though the local currency proceeds from 1 year's program may still be available for use in the next year, they cannot be considered as part of a second year's understanding. In other words, you cannot count the same dollar twice even though it changes form in the process of being used.

In several of the countries receiving the largest amounts of economic assistance, the basic need for the appropriated dollars is to assure a flow of goods and services into the economy in order to serve such purposes as combating inflation or helping to build, or supply raw materials for, productive facilities. This group would include, among others, Korea, Taiwan, Pakistan, Turkey, Greece, and Spain. In these countries if a substantial backlog of uncommitted or unobligated local currency existed (which in most of these countries it does not) it could not be used to meet the requirement in fiscal year 1959 for a continued flow of goods and services into the country. The currency resulting from this flow of goods and services is frequently useful to the full achievement of our objectives. But it cannot achieve the purposes of new appropriated dollars. It is the second step in a single transaction, begun at an earlier time, and cannot be used in lieu of the first (or dollar) step in the transaction which must be started in fiscal year 1959.

These three factors lead to the conclusion that the generation and availability of local currencies, both under MSP and Public Law 480, are in some cases useful in improving the use of resources available to these countries but cannot be substituted for the external resources needed by the country. To furnish such resources requires foreign exchange supplied by our aid dollar.

C. AN EXCEPTION: "TRIANGULAR" CURRENCIES

An exception to the above discussion on the usefulness of local currency is a limited amount of currency which can be used to procure goods and services for use in mutual-security program in third countries. The largest amount of this currency was generated under section 402. These generations do not reduce the need for MSP dollar appropriations since the surplus commodities must be purchased with these funds. The dollars which purchased the agricultural commodities are charged against the dollar program of the country which will receive the benefits from such currency. The generated currencies are in

effect a part of the pipeline from earlier appropriations and have been taken into account in making the request for dollar appropriations for fiscal year 1959.

D. VALUE AND AVAILABILITIES OF LOCAL CURRENCIES

Great difficulty is encountered in producing global tables involving inconvertible currencies in dollar equivalent values which are at all realistic. Deposits in the various accounts discussed herein are made at agreed rates, which may vary from agreement to agreement, depending on the nature of the transaction. While every effort is made to negotiate agreements at the most favorable possible rates, provision is seldom made to cover devaluation after the foreign currencies have been deposited and before they have been expended. The dollar equivalent figures used in the attached tables are shown at agreement rates which in many instances do not reflect the true current value. In total, this results in stating a dollar value considerably in excess of the actual market value.

A substantial portion of the accumulations of local currencies is in countries for which no economic aid other than technical cooperation is proposed under the Mutual Security Act. While the major portion of such accumulations are in Public Law 480 currencies, some accumulations of counterpart exist in countries for which no defense support or special assistance program is proposed for fiscal year 1959.

A substantial portion of present counterpart currency accumulations results from the fact that, in certain cases, it has been agreed with the host government not to release such currencies into foreign economies. In such cases, while a dollar equivalent value can be assigned to these frozen currencies, they have no program value since they cannot be used at present. Approximately $341.7 million of the unprogramed balances as of June 30, 1959, are in this nonusable category.

To clarify the above points and reflect their importance, the following table shows the major accumulations of MSP-related foreign currencies by country and source. It will be noted that, of the estimated total unobligated balances of $778 million as of June 30, 1959, $117.2 million is in countries not scheduled to receive defense support or special assistance in fiscal year 1959, and $341.7 million is estimated to be unavailable for program purposes because it has been frozen, leaving unprogramed only $319.1 million of usable currencies in countries scheduled to receive defense support or special assistance.

There are also attached four tables showing the cumulative status of United States-owned or controlled local currencies as of the end of fiscal years 1957, 1958, and 1959.

In developing programs to be carried out in the various countries under the mutual-security program, all existing and potential local currency assets are taken into account. A reference to the individual country tables will show the planned uses of these currencies. The country tables show the amounts planned for obligation for military and economic purposes in the country. The economic uses are distributed by field of activity and individual project.

COUNTERPART AND UNITED STATES-OWNED LOCAL CURRENCY IN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES NOT PROGRAMED TO RECEIVE DEFENSE SUPPORT, SPECIAL ASSISTANCE OR TECHNICAL COOPERATION IN FISCAL YEAR 1959

Counterpart and United States-owned local currencies that have been derived from prior year dollar aid and surplus commodity sales programs are not totally expended in some European countries no longer receiving mutual-security program economic assistance. Local currency proceeds are also being generated currently from sales of surplus agricultural products under mutual-security program (sec. 402) and Public Law 480 title I program in these nonaid countries.

COUNTERPART

No unexpended balances are expected to remain in the counterpart accounts for any of the nonaid European countries after June 30, 1959.

All of the equivalent $9.4 billion in counterpart generated and deposited since 1948 in nonaid countries is expected to be committed to agreed purposes by the end of fiscal year 1958, except for $28.1 million in Austria. An equivalent of $33.3 million will remain unexpended on June 30, 1958, representing the total of unexpended balances in Austria, Ireland, and the United Kingdom.

The unexpended balance in Austria includes repayments of loans made under the Zablocki amendment and a small amount of counterpart that have never been programed. An overall counterpart settlement is being negotiated with the Austrian Government which will cover the foregoing unprogramed amount and all funds now programed to revolving loan accounts. However, the final settlement is not expected to be reached before fiscal year 1959 because of the internal political situation in Austria. The use of the unexpended balance shown for Ireland as of the end of fiscal year 1958 has already been agreed for financing an agricultural institute and funds can be withdrawn in fiscal year 1959 or as soon as current discussions on details are completed. A small balance of $550,000 worth of sterling is being retained unexpended in the United Kingdom counterpart account into fiscal year 1959 in case any refund actions should arise from audit of old dollar obligations.

MUTUAL-SECURITY PROGRAM UNITED STATES-OWNED LOCAL CURRENCIES

Of the total mutual-security program United States-owned local currencies derived from the sale of surplus agricultural products under section 402 and section 550, about 10 percent was allocated to the Department of Defense for offshore procurement, about 35 percent was made available for host country uses, slightly more than 50 percent was set aside for financing purchases of commodities in the host country for use in third countries, and the remaining 3 percent consists of section 550 funds programed for French and British DOT's, Somalia, and other uses. Local currencies earmarked for specific third country programs have been taken into account in estimating new dollar requirements for those programs. By the end of fiscal year 1959, all mutual-security programs United States-owned local currency is expected to be fully obligated but unexpended balances of $2.6 million will remain in Italy for offshore procurement, as well as $300,000 in Somalia and $354,000 in the British DOT's.

The unobligated and unexpended balance in the United Kingdom at the end of fiscal year 1958 consists largely of section 402 sterling originally intended for United States use for offshore procurement for third countries, administered by the Department of Defense, and section 402 sterling which ICA is holding for host country military use subject to direction from the Department of Defense. The original programing of these funds is under review and is in the process of adjustment in the light of current military requirements. These accounts are expected to be closed out in fiscal year 1959.

About 95 percent of the section 550 funds programed for the British DOT's is expected to be expended by the end of fiscal year 1959. The rate of expenditure has been relatively slow because of a lag in the DOT development plans with which the prior year local currency projects are associated, but the territories are now moving ahead with these projects and expenditures will be accelerated in fiscal years 1958 and 1959. The rate of expenditures is also expected to improve in Somalia.

PUBLIC LAW 480, TITLE I PROGRAM

Public Law 480, title I sales agreements totaling a market value equivalent of $263.9 million were negotiated during fiscal year 1955–57 with 9 nonaid countries in Europe. Under these agreements a total of $119.7 million was reserved for United States uses. Most of the remaining $144.2 million was earmarked for loans to the countries purchasing the surplus commodities to promote multilateral trade and economic development, the remainder or $26.5 million being reserved for financing procurement of goods and services for use in programs in third countries. Generally, the Budget Bureau apportions "third country" currency only in exchange for appropriated dollars.

Except in the case of Finland, all ICA-administered local currency generated and deposited under the foregoing programs is expected to be obligated by the end of fiscal year 1958. All deposited funds are expected to be expended by June 30, 1959, except in Finland and Portugal.

An obstacle to rapid programing of available funds in Finland has been the limited types and amounts of goods that can be supplied by Finland at world market price and that are needed in the underdeveloped areas. A Presidential determination has been made to loan the remaining balance to Finland for economic development under section 104 (g).

In the case of Portugal, all the Public Law 480, title I local currency generated and deposited was fully obligated by June 30, 1957, for loans to the Portuguese National Development Fund to construct food storage facilities. However, actual construction is not scheduled to begin until January 1958, and will extend beyond fiscal year 1959. Approximately 60 percent of the funds deposited, although fully obligated, will remain unexpended on June 30, 1959.

Expenditure of funds will be fully completed in Italy by the end of fiscal year 1959. The lag in fiscal year 1958 reflects the nature of Italian governmental procedures that necessitate passage of authorizing legislation for each separate use. Similarly, in Austria the Public Law 480 funds obligated for loans to Austrian industry are not disbursed until loan applications are processed and approved.

OTHER CURRENCIES (COAL PROCUREMENT FUND)

Sales of United States surplus coal, generating a total equivalent of $17.3 million in local currency, were made in fiscal 1955, to six European countries not now receiving mutual-security program economic assistance. Only in Denmark is there expected to be any unexpended balance of local currency remaining on June 30, 1958 or 1959.

Reduction in the amount of this unexpended kroner balance is dependent on the availability of Danish export goods of suitable types and at competitive prices, as needed for United States aid programs in underdeveloped countries. The Danish coal procurement fund is expected to be 80 percent obligated by the end of fiscal year 1958 and fully obligated by the end of fiscal year 1959; but about 35 percent will remain unexpended at the end of fiscal year 1959 because of the length of time required for delivery on some of the capital goods being procured.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Status of local currency funds (counterpart)

[In thousands of dollars]

Area and country	Cumulative June 30, 1957 (actual)			
	Potential generation	Deposits	Commitments	Expenditures
Europe:				
Austria	841,850	841,850	698,881	689,870
Belgium-Luxembourg	31,604	31,604	31,604	31,800
Denmark	227,057	227,057	227,057	227,057
France	3,241,300	3,241,300	3,240,900	3,240,818
Germany, Federal Republic (including Berlin) [1]	1,158,459	1,154,300	1,158,459	1,135,400
Iceland [1]	28,163	29,300	16,500	16,500
Ireland	17,300	17,300	17,300	5,090
Italy	1,452,031	1,452,000	1,450,700	1,374,938
Netherlands	855,600	855,600	855,600	800,761
Norway	367,050	366,300	366,300	362,702
Portugal	23,500	23,400	22,800	22,800
Spain	157,358	82,645	121,708	65,383
Trieste	35,300	35,300	35,300	35,100
United Kingdom	2,426,900	2,426,900	2,426,900	2,426,350
Yugoslavia	263,986	251,416	235,574	224,717
Total, Europe	11,127,458	11,036,272	10,905,583	10,658,586
Africa:				
Libya				
Morocco				
Tunisia	5,300			
Total, Africa	5,300			
Near East and South Asia:				
Egypt	2,105			
Greece	770,023	770,023	532,968	532,968
Iran	148,426	132,612	142,426	131,466
Israel	121,260	121,260	120,968	120,968
Jordan	5,199	5,199	5,199	5,121
Lebanon	2,500			
Pakistan	147,321	74,137	33,775	33,775
Turkey	452,057	342,832	365,474	342,832
Total, Near East and South Asia	1,642,891	1,446,063	1,200,810	1,167,180
Far East:				
Burma	8,000	7,157	6,879	6,879
Cambodia	95,852	73,186	89,005	68,230
China (Taiwan)	501,367	[2] 384,325	361,405	351,411
Indonesia	31,555	27,226	8,793	8,793
Korea	[3] 825,650	[4] 465,319	440,633	283,558
Laos	120,148	98,385	120,148	96,322
Philippines	106,404	81,156	81,156	75,976
Thailand	76,780	59,766	53,970	39,617
Vietnam	639,955	[5] 579,917	628,152	[5] 524,779
Total, Far East	2,405,711	1,776,437	1,790,141	1,455,565
Latin America: Bolivia [6]	19,800	3,588	2,368	865
Total, Latin America	19,800	3,588	2,368	865
Grand total	15,201,160	14,262,360	13,898,902	13,282,198

[1] Includes counterpart loan repayments.
[2] Includes $12,293,000 not available for program purposes.
[3] Includes following amounts not available for program purposes; fiscal year 1957, $339,609,000.
[4] Includes following amounts not available for program purposes; fiscal year 1957, $92,901,000.
[5] Includes deposits of $56,971,000 and expenditures of $31,546,000 from the Government of Vietnam to finance its contribution to military budget.
[6] Includes deposits from stabilization account.

Analysis of availabilities of MSP-administered local currencies by country and source of currency—Worldwide summary, by country groups and by types of currency—Actual as of June 30, 1957, and estimated through June 30, 1959

[In thousands of dollars equivalent]

	Status as of June 30, 1957				Fiscal year 1958				Fiscal year 1959			
	Unexpended deposits	Deduct unliquidated obligations	Unobligated or uncommitted deposits	Not available for use (frozen)[1]	Estimated new deposits	Estimated obligations or commitments	Estimated unobligated or uncommitted deposits, June 30, 1958	Not available for use (frozen)[1]	Estimated new deposits	Estimated obligations or commitments	Estimated unobligated or uncommitted deposits, June 30, 1959	Not available for use (frozen)[1]
Countries programed to receive defense support or special assistance in fiscal year 1959	1,349,232	527,117	822,115	276,761	1,358,385	1,480,011	700,489	261,785	1,240,341	1,279,991	660,839	341,705
MSP (United States owned)	181,941	49,668	132,273		240,776	253,732	119,317		158,842	201,796	76,363	
Counterpart	678,139	459,950	218,189	276,761	791,594	755,789	253,994	261,785	832,694	687,940	398,748	341,705
Public Law 480	464,174	17,499	446,675		320,958	467,502	300,131		248,805	371,255	177,681	
Other (country-owned)	24,978		24,978		5,057	2,988	27,047			19,000	8,047	
Countries programed to receive only technical cooperation in fiscal year 1959	175,731	21,641	154,090		306,744	296,690	164,144		148,665	236,678	76,131	
MSP (United States-owned)	38,953	19,899	19,054		38,909	20,975	36,988		856	19,846	17,998	
Counterpart					2,500	2,500						
Public Law 480	136,030	1,622	134,408		264,328	271,580	127,156		147,259	216,282	58,133	
Other (country-owned)	748	120	628		1,007	1,635			550	550		
Countries not programed to receive defense support, special assistance, or technical cooperation in fiscal year 1959	469,424	193,619	275,805	111,947	100,230	311,448	64,587		41,800	80,744	25,643	
MSP (United States-owned)	88,490	24,040	64,450		30,475	81,301	13,624		32,800	43,947	2,477	
Counterpart	302,023	156,754	145,269	111,947	881	118,051	28,099			28,099		
Public Law 480	72,591	7,807	64,784		68,874	111,492	22,166		9,000	8,000	23,166	
Other (country-owned)	6,320	5,018	1,302			604	698			698		
Undistributed Public Law 480 availability for countries not receiving defense support or special assistance in fiscal year 1959					6,100	3,000	3,100		38,600	26,300	15,400	
Grand total	1,994,387	742,377	1,252,010	388,708	1,771,459	2,091,149	932,320	261,785	1,469,406	1,623,713	778,013	341,705
MSP (United States-owned)	309,384	93,607	215,777		310,160	356,008	169,929		192,498	265,589	96,838	
Counterpart	980,162	616,704	363,458	388,708	794,975	876,340	282,093	261,785	832,694	716,039	398,748	341,705
Public Law 480	672,795	26,928	645,867		660,260	853,574	452,553		443,664	621,837	274,380	
Other (country-owned)	32,046	5,138	26,908		6,064	5,227	27,745		550	20,248	8,047	

[1] The figures in this column represent a portion of the preceding column ("Unobligated or Uncommitted deposits"). Amounts represent those portions of balances on which formal or informal agreements with the host government have been reached that no releases are to be made for the indefinite future. Many other cases exist, not set forth in this column, where portions of the unobligated deposits are being withheld from programing on a temporary or indefinite basis in order to avoid harmful inflationary effects.

EXHIBIT B

International Cooperation Administration—Balance of special counterpart account as of Dec. 31, 1957

Country	Currency	Units of currency	Special counterpart account (dollar equivalent)	Country	Currency	Units of currency	Special counterpart account (dollar equivalent)
Countries currently receiving economic assistance:				Countries currently receiving economic assistance—Continued			
Bolivia	Bolivianos	518,742,266	$60,565	Vietnam	Vietnam piasters	1,351,367,885	$38,228,229
Burma	Kyats	1,336,560	279,908	Yugoslavia	Dinars	8,208,396,379	13,680,661
Cambodia	Riels	86,638,690	2,488,188	Subtotal			572,311,291
China	New Taiwan dollars	534,869,847	21,584,740	Countries not currently receiving economic assistance:			
Germany	Deutschemarks	76,472,189	18,198,998	Austria	Schillings	1,086,391,417	41,784,285
Greece	Drachmae	3,680,368,514	122,678,950	Belgium-Luxembourg	Francs	20,304,928	405,936
Haiti	Gourdes	1,250,000	250,000	France	do	169,004,330	402,391
Iceland	Kronur	192,695,278	11,807,309	Ireland	Pounds	3,588,121	10,082,620
Indonesia	Rupiah	365,720,322	13,347,457	Italy	Lire	51,434,407,277	82,295,052
Iran	Rials	382,692,762	5,002,520	Netherlands	Guilders	8,943,200	2,359,061
Israel	Pounds	107	50	Norway	Kroner	698,470	97,784
Jordan	Dinars	658	1,849	Portugal	Escudos	19,142,471	665,825
Korea	Hwan	94,385,390,455	188,770,781	United Kingdom	Pounds	196,619	552,490
Laos	Kips	21,285,141	611,291	Subtotal			138,645,453
Pakistan	Rupees	305,948,460	64,750,997	Grand total			710,956,744
Philippines	Pesos	8,773,127	4,377,808				
Spain	Pesetas	1,053,113,030	25,074,120				
Thailand	Baht	400,725,007	19,175,445				
Turkey	Liras	60,441,566	21,943,416				

Prepared by Office of the Controller, ACC/PRB, Feb. 28, 1958.

COST OF LIVING IN UNITED STATES HITS ALL-TIME PEAK

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to comment at this time on a dispatch from United Press International which says in part:

The cost of living climbed to an all-time high in July, setting a record for the 21st time in the past 23 months, the Government reported yesterday.

It set a record for the 21st time in 23 months. Those are monthly reports.

The Labor Department's consumer price index rose by one-fifth of 1 percent, to 123.9 percent of the 1947–49 price average. The rise was caused chiefly by increases in the cost of transportation, some foods and medical care.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COST OF LIVING RISES BY TWO-TENTHS PERCENT, SETTING 21ST NEW HIGH IN 23 MONTHS

(By Edward Cowan)

The cost of living climbed to an all-time high in July, setting a record for the 21st time in the past 23 months, the Government reported yesterday.

The Labor Department's consumer price index rose by one-fifth of 1 percent, to 123.9 percent of the 1947–49 price average. The rise was caused chiefly by increases in the cost of transportation, some foods, and medical care.

However, Ewan Clague, Commissioner of labor statistics, held out hopes that living costs would level off soon. He foresaw a period of price stability that would persist for 6 months, maybe a year.

The index last month was 2.6 percent above that of July 1957.

The latest rise in consumer prices brought wage increases of 1 to 4 cents an hour for some 500,000 workers whose pay scales are pegged to the Government's price index.

The Labor Department also reported that the weekly take-home pay of a factory worker with three dependents average $75.88 last month, compared with $75.55 in June.

The Department said the biggest factor in last month's increase in consumer prices was a 1-percent boost in transportation costs. The increase stemmed from a jump in used-car prices and an increase in gasoline prices as price wars ended in several cities.

Five cities also boosted transit fares.

The Department's report showed that food prices rose one-tenth of 1 percent last month, with increases in pork, eggs and milk more than offsetting seasonal declines in fresh fruits and vegetables. Average food prices in July were 3.7 percent above a year ago.

[Food prices in the Washington area went up one-half of 1 percent. This brought the food price index to a peak of 123.4, or 3.4 percent higher than a year ago.

[Prices of fruits and vegetables led the upswing with an increase of 1 percent. Meat, poultry, and fish were 0.8 percent higher, mainly as a result of a 2.6 percent rise in pork prices. Dairy products increased 0.7 percent.

[Center-cut pork chops reached a record of $1.05 a pound, while the average price of bacon went from 85 to 87 cents a pound and ham jumped a penny to 71 cents a pound.

[Food is the only major item in the consumer index which was priced in Washington during July. A complete index of August prices is being tabulated.]

TRAINMEN PROTEST COST OF LIVING RISE

Mr. MALONE. A memorandum was furnished me yesterday from the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. The source of the information is Mr. Homer, of the Labor Bureau of the Middle West. The memorandum reads as follows:

MEMO TO SENATOR MALONE

Cost of living rise from January 1956 to July 1958: January 1956, 114.6 percent; July 1958, 123.9 percent; percentage of increase, 8.1 percent.

Source of information: Mr. Homer, of Labor Bureau of Middle West.

COST OF LIVING INCREASES SHRINK FIXED INCOMES, PENSIONS

Yesterday the Senate amended a bill by including the railroad brotherhood pension adjustment, which amounted to 7½ percent. About 2 years ago or a little more, there was an adjustment. The present appropriations amount to $3½ billion which brings the total to more than $70 billion since World War II. That means that it is almost impossible to keep wages, pensions, disability compensation for veterans, and other items up to date. Just about every year or two we have to increase them, simply because, if we do not, the boys cannot eat.

Here is a dispatch from the New York Times of August 20, 1958. It is headed "Britain Will Ease India's Debt Load. Other Nations To Be Asked To Join in Loan Cut Talk in Washington Monday."

That is current. The dispatch reads in part as follows:

LONDON, August 19.—Britain is planning to help India out of her present economic difficulties.

Where does she get the money to help anyone out of any difficulties? Out of the many billions of dollars we have given England. It is said that was because of a dollar shortage. Of course, Senators know what a dollar shortage is. If not, I shall outline it for the RECORD.

FOREIGN NATIONS CREATE FICTION OF A DOLLAR SHORTAGE TO GRAB MORE UNITED STATES AID

An individual can have a dollar shortage only by spending more each month or each year than his income. You and I probably have known what that kind of dollar shortage means. But a nation can have a dollar shortage in another way. A nation can have a dollar shortage by spending more than it earns each month or each year, but it can also have a dollar shortage by setting the price of its currency, in terms of the dollar, higher than the market price, and no one will pay it but the Congress of the United States, which does not understand it.

So we have been making up the dollar shortage; and Britain can give aid to anyone. She gives aid to many other nations in situations in which she can control the trade. If we investigate such transactions, we find that trade is involved.

I read further:

This was leaked authoritatively today—

"Leaked"—that is a good word—

but there has been no official comment on the extent or form the aid will take.

These are secret treaties. They are not made in such a manner that Con-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

gress can know where the money which we give to England and the other nations is going.

BRITISH TRADE WITH COMMUNISTS BRISK SINCE WORLD WAR II

Let me say at this point that England and all the nations of Europe have been trading with Russia continuously since World War II. They were the first to recognize Communist China, followed by almost every other nation of Europe, and they traded with Communist China up through the Korean war. It was uncovered by a Congressional committee that England was sending Russia copper wire. That is copper in any man's language. Copper can be melted, and made into many things.

That was only a part of the story. I made a trip to the Balkans. First I was in Paris, France, then in Geneva, then in Czechoslovakia, Austria, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Rumania, and Bulgaria before I went into Russia. We are helping Austria out of her troubles by shipping her materials. It is all right to ship materials to Austria. But I have news for Senators. Any time Russia wanted any of the materials, they were never unloaded in Austria. We know it. If we did not, we ought to disband our information agency.

UNITED STATES ARMS "SALES" TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES REALLY GIFTS

Here is another dispatch, from the New York Times of August 20, 1958. It is headed "Indonesians Hail United States Arms Sales."

When we sell anything to them, Senators can make up their minds that we are giving it to them. We will get their money, but it goes into counterpart funds. What are they? Ninety percent is spent in the country, and 10 percent for administrative purposes, in the country. One hundred percent of the fund is spent in the country. None comes back here. That is what an American taxpayer does not understand. The counterpart funds were invented to evade an explanation to the American taxpayer as to what is done with his money.

YUGOSLAVIA'S TITO WORKING "BOTH SIDES OF STREET"

Then there is the great Mr. Tito, of Yugoslavia. I have been in Yugoslavia. It is a great country. They have some fine horses there. I saw some of those great horses, which are brought to this country for exhibition and show purposes. They are wonderful.

They also have some pretty good industries there. But Tito knows how to work both sides of the street.

It is said that we are to give them $300 million, because Tito is again wavering with regard to Russia. Perhaps he is a little short of money—a dollar shortage, as Senators will understand. When he gets that money, he will then have another conference with Mr. Khrushchev. Mr. Khrushchev is a smart, intelligent man, tougher than a boot, and he is for Russia. That is what Mr. Dulles cannot understand. He has just met someone who is for his own country. Mr. Churchill is for England. What we had better do is to develop some men in our foreign service or in executive provisions who are for our country.

BRITAIN TAKING ACTION TO AID AILING COTTON MILLS WHILE UNITED STATES PERMITTING ITS INDUSTRY TO DIE

Here is another interesting dispatch. It is headed "Britain Acts To Aid Ailing Cotton Mills." It is from the New York Times of August 21. It is from Manchester, England, where many of the mills are located. It reads in part as follows:

Sir David Eccles, president of the board of trade—

That is a good organization, too. Its members understand what they are doing. The board of trade understands just exactly what is accomplished by shading tariffs, and what an import permit or an exchange permit means in terms of forcing industries to build plants in their own country. We have not yet learned what the shading of a tariff means. The shading of a tariff can influence the location of a plant so as to make a profit, or take the profit out of it, if it is not located in that country. That is exactly what is done.

Sir David Eccles, president of the board of trade—

And I respect the board of trade. I met some of the members when I was there—

said today he was fully conscious of the serious difficulties that confront the British cotton industry.

The Manchester Cotton Association has expressed grave concern about the contraction in industry and called on the government to take immediate and positive action.

RETURN TO FAIR AND REASONABLE TARIFF WOULD REVIVE SICK UNITED STATES INDUSTRIES

Our cotton textile industry is under quite a strain, but I have not noticed any positive action yet. All we need to do is to turn to the Constitution of the United States. With respect to textiles, machine tools, crockery, and 5,000 other products, let the old policy inaugurated in 1789, under the Constitution, operate. Let the tariff represent the difference between the effective wages and the cost of doing business in this country, as compared with similar costs in the chief competing countries with respect to a particular product. With a flexible tariff, the tariff goes down as the living standard of other nations goes up. If they ever learn to live as we do, free trade will be automatic. I am for that kind of free trade, while we are helping them.

TEXTILE JAPANESE TEXTILE FLOOD ENCOURAGED BY TRADE ACT EXTENSION

Just recently we have passed a bill extending the free importation of textiles from Japan, where they pay 20 cents an hour to their labor. Of course the State Department was able to get Japan to restrain itself a little while until we had renewed the act, and to allow our industries to live for another 6 months. It is a great thing when we must be under the domination of Japan, which we had destroyed completely only a few years ago, because they got a little too rambunctious in other parts of the world. We are riding for that again, in case anyone has not heard about it. Probably the next time they will join Russia. That would be a tough combination to beat.

DEBT LIMIT DISCUSSED

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to ask the Senator if he voted last night to increase the debt limit.

Mr. MALONE. I did not understand the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Did the Senator vote to increase the debt limit?

Mr. MALONE. Did I vote for it? I did not. I never voted for it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Neither did I. I believe if a few more of the Members of the Senate voted as the Senator and I voted, we would not have to increase the debt limit.

Mr. MALONE. We had a surprising 20 Senators voting with us. If we had held off on it for another week or so, we could have beaten it. We could have held it off.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If we could cut down a little bit on expenditures, we would not have to raise the debt limit.

Mr. MALONE. It is nothing more than blackmail all over the world. That is all it is.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We would not have to raise the debt limit if we could cut down on the $60 billion we give away, plus interest.

Mr. MALONE. It is past $75 billion, for the information of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina. The interest on it alone is much more than the national debt was a few years ago. That is only what we have given away.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is 4 or 5 times what it cost to run the entire Government in 1911.

PINCERS TO DESTROY NATION BEGAN CLOSING 24 YEARS AGO

Mr. MALONE. That is correct. There is a pincers movement on to destroy the Nation. It started 24 years ago. It started when we went off the gold standard and we priced ourselves out of every market in the world through deliberate inflation. Then we distributed the wealth of this country. We extract billions of dollars from the little taxpayers of this country. Even a stenographer who gets $150 or $200 a month has to pay $20 or $30 of her money in taxes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not true that we have built up the foreign production in the field of textiles, and also in the field of agriculture, in which we have large surpluses, and we have been teaching foreign people how to grow wheat and how to grow cotton and tobacco, and we have spent billions of dollars teaching them how to grow these things, and then they have taken the markets away from us? Is that not true?

Mr. MALONE. It is not only true, but we are encouraging Americans to use cheap labor and to take our machinery and know-how to foreign countries so that the job can be done.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. How many millions of dollars did we give to Japan to rehabilitate its textile industry?

ACHESON-DULLES TREATY WITH JAPAN RECALLED

Mr. MALONE. It has been $750 million a year. The peace treaty was worked out by Mr. Dulles, when he was working for Mr. Acheson. Of course Mr. Dulles was once appointed as a member of this body, but when that term ran out he was not elected to the Senate by the people of New York. So he worked with Mr. Acheson, and he made the treaty with Japan for Mr. Acheson. I was so aggravated with what he did in San Francisco I took the floor for 20 or 30 minutes. That speech has been reprinted many times. It predicted what would happen, and that is exactly what did happen.

JAPAN NOW MEMBER OF GATT WITH VOTE EQUAL TO THAT OF UNITED STATES

We took the Japanese in at Geneva. They are in Geneva as one of the 37-member countries. They have 1 vote, just as we have 1 vote. They are helping to divide the markets of the United States among the nations of the world. Twenty-five thousand products are affected.

I have read a news article, datelined at Jakarta. It reads:

Foreign Minister Subandrio summoned United States Ambassador Howard Jones today to express Indonesian anxiety over the arrival of United States Marines in Singapore. Japanese newspapers issued fresh warnings against American intervention.

I suppose as long as it is necessary for us to have Marines and a Navy, we have to send them somewhere.

Let me tell Senators that the next time we start a little war and murder those kids, the way we did in Korea—that is what Mr. Truman did when he would not let them win and would not let them lose, and those kids were murdered going up and down those snowy hillsides—if another President starts that again, the American people will not take it. They will not stand for it.

EXPANDED FLEET OF SUBMARINES NEEDED TO SAFEGUARD AMERICA

All we need do is to keep up with the new inventions we have. We have sent two nuclear submarines to the North Pole, and they travel 5,000 miles without stopping. They stopped only when they had reached their destination. We have about five of those submarines now. Perhaps we ought to have a hundred of them. I do not know how many we should have. However, we can put 20 or 30 of them under the Arctice ice, and they are good for years, so far as supplies are concerned.

If any nation were to try to destroy us, it would be destroyed completely by those submarines. The next war will be fought under the seas and in the air. It is not going to be fought with marines, or with artillery on the ground, the kind I had in France in 1917 and 1918. That kind of warfare is through and gone. It takes us a long time to catch up. If we have the planes and the submarines to do this job, we can destroy any nation long after it has destroyed us. No nation will try to do it as long as they know we can destroy them. Of course I do not know about that, judging by the way we are handling things now.

SENATOR IN 1947 AND 1948 FORECAST THREATS TO PEACE

I dislike to go back for anything, but I have before me a reprint of my debates in 1947 and 1948. I said then:

Mr. President, the peace and safety of this Nation is seriously threatened at this moment through the complete absence of a definite foreign policy telling our own people and the nations of the world what we consider will threaten our ultimate peace and safety—and the complete absence of a military organization spearheaded by an Air Corps to enforce our pronouncement.

The atomic submarines have come along since then, and we are ahead of everybody else in that field. If only we will stay that way.

We have no basic international policy.

ABSENCE OF BASIC FOREIGN POLICY NOTED BY SENATE 10 YEARS AGO

I said that in 1948 on the floor of the Senate:

We have no basic international policy, having definitely ignored the 125-year-old Monroe Doctrine under which we had announced to the world in 1823 that we intended to protect the integrity of the nations, which we at that time considered necessary for our own ultimate safety—naming the area to be protected.

In its place has been substituted a hodgepodge of Executive orders and gifts of large sums of money to foreign nations, founded upon no principle at all and with no consistent thought as to where such actions might lead us in foreign entanglements.

EXCERPTS OF 1948 SPEECHES CITED

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point marked excerpts from my speeches on the floor of the Senate in 1948. I have marked pages 5 and 6, 12, 13, 14, and 16.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRADE AGREEMENTS BETWEEN MARSHALL PLAN COUNTRIES AND EASTERN EUROPE

We have already reported the fact (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 4 and 5) that England and Belgium have trade agreements with Russia and are shipping steel and products made of steel to Communist Russia.

Further investigation reveals that France has a trade agreement with Russia and trade agreements with seven other countries in eastern Europe which are dominated by Communist Russia. These seven other countries are Bulgaria, Finland, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia.

All of this simply amounts to a manufactured in transit rate from our country to Russia and her satellite countries—which corresponds to our shipments of scrap iron and oil to Japan almost up to Pearl Harbor and World War II.

Appendix I shows the date these agreements were entered into and the expiration date of the agreements.

Although the Netherlands do not have a trade agreement with Russia itself, they do have trade agreements with seven countries which are dominated by Communist Russia entirely, plus Austria and Eastern Germany, which are partially dominated by Russia.

The seven Communist-dominated countries with which the Netherlands has trade agreements are as follows: Bulgaria, Finland, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia.

* * * * *

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the peace and safety of this Nation is seriously threatened at this moment through the complete absence of a definite foreign policy telling our own people and the nations of the world what we consider will threaten our ultimate peace and safety—and the complete absence of a military organization spearheaded by an Air Corps to enforce our pronouncement.

INTERNATIONAL POLICY

We have no basic international policy, having definitely ignored the 125-year-old Monroe Doctrine under which we had announced to the world in 1823 that we intended to protect the integrity of the nations which we at that time considered necessary for our own ultimate safety—naming the areas to be protected.

In its place has been substituted a hodgepodge of Executive orders and gifts of large sums of money to foreign nations, founded upon no principle at all and with no consistent thought as to where such actions might lead us in foreign entanglements.

BASIC SUBJECT NEVER DISCUSSED WITH THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The basic subject of international policy has never been discussed with the American people, through two World Wars and now the Marshall plan.

The basic subject at issue is now—and was in 1823 when the Monroe Doctrine was established—what nations in the European and Middle East areas including Asia and the South Seas is it necessary for us to currently protect for our own ultimate safety. Until this decision is made no plan to make it effective can be intelligently discussed.

When that issue is decided and the nations named whose integrity we must currently protect for our own ultimate safety—then we have the 125-year-old precedent for announcing to the world and to our own people that if the integrity of these nations is threatened in a manner to disturb the friendly and established trade relations, through infiltration or military attack, it will be considered an overt act against the United States.

This pronouncement by President Monroe 125 years ago, later became known as the Monroe Doctrine.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

* * * * *

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS AND MATERIALS

Mr. President, I wish to note that on page 2201 of the RECORD of yesterday a misprint appears in the next to the last paragraph. It should read "$120 billion" instead of "$150 billion," relative to strategic minerals and materials.

I desire to discuss further the hope expressed yesterday that the United States would gain something in return for the money which it is to extend to Europe through the Marshall plan legislation.

The statement made here during this debate yesterday that it is contemplated by the Foreign Relations Committee that we should get strategic and critical minerals and materials in return for that part of our money listed as loans—in other words be repaid through minerals and materials from the 16 Marshall plan countries, which includes the Empire of Great Britain, France, the Netherlands, and Belgium—could leave a terrific impact on the raw materials and processed products produced in this country.

I point out to the Senate of the United States that the $17 billion we are now loaning and giving the 16 Marshall plan countries under the bill which is now under discussion could shut down every mining and textile enterprise in the United States for a

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

period of more than 4 years, if the 16 nations banded together and furnished us such minerals and textile raw materials free of any charge whatever, since the total strategic and critical mineral production and such textile raw materials in this country totals approximately $4.3 billion annually.

Obviously they are not going to give us such minerals and materials without charge since they must pay their labor, pay their own taxes, and pay for the raw materials, except such part as we might furnish them free of charge. So the best they could possibly do, looking at it realistically, would be to give us the profit on their production of such raw materials and manufactured goods in their own countries and assuming a net profit of 5 percent for all such were paid, which is reasonable, I point out that 5 percent of the total amount would be $215 million annually, and that this amount divided into $17 billion would require 80 years to repay. This could close the strategic mineral production and the textile raw-material production for a period of more than 80 years on the present rate of production.

Mr. President, none of these things is likely or even possible since anyone in business must keep a part of the profit in whatever country he resides. It is simply a delusion presented to the American people without thinking the problem through, leaving not only our people confused but, I fear, some of our own officials.

I point out that we here on the Senate floor could be, according to this line of reasoning, inaugurating a policy of appropriating Government money to buy foreign raw materials and manufactured goods to replace our own production. Where do we think we are heading in adopting such a policy? The first thing we know, there would be no taxable property left in the United States or incomes from which to collect taxes to furnish such appropriations. It is the road to bankruptcy, and not a very long road at that.

Mr. President, to continue from where I halted last evening when the Senate recessed, let me say that, in my opinion, it is impossible to consider the feeding of hungry people, the stopping of communism, and the rehabilitation of industry all in one breath or in one paragraph. We only confuse ourselves. The result is that we mix our emotions with the facts, and become unwilling victims of the greatest propaganda machine ever established in Washington. In any intelligent discussion of the subject we must take them one at a time:

First. Feeding the hungry people of Europe or of any other area is a matter of charity and must be so considered apart from other considerations. The Congress of the United States has appropriated nearly $1,500,000,000 during the past 12 months for that purpose alone, and has appropriated nearly $24 billion and handed it to the nations of the world without hope of repayment since the close of World War II in 1945.

The last appropriation of $597 million is expected to carry on until March of this year.

Second. Stopping communism and protecting the integrity of the nations throughout the European and Asiatic areas that we decide, after full discussion and study, we must currently protect for our own ultimate safety, is a matter of our own integrity and frankness with our own citizens and with the people of the world.

In President Monroe's pronouncement on December 1, 1823, he left the door open to extend the doctrine when and if conditions changed, when he said:

"To this we have adhered and shall continue to adhere, provided no change shall occur, which in the judgment of the competent authorities of this Government, shall make a corresponding change, on the part of the United States, indispensable to their security."

The entire matter could now be reviewed in the light of experience gained through two world wars in our generation, and what additional areas and nations of the world we must now currently protect for our own ultimate safety, considering the improvements in the methods of waging defensive and offensive war.

If it should be decided that a threat to the integrity of any member nation of the United Nations by any other nation would constitute a threat to our ultimate safety, then President Monroe's exact words could be utilized in announcing the extension of the Monroe Doctrine, leaving out any reference to this hemisphere, to say in effect to the world and to the American people: "We owe it therefore to candor, and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers, to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system, as dangerous to our peace and safety."

We should then build at once a military force spearheaded by an air corps that would bear silent evidence to all concerned that we were ready and able to enforce the extended doctrine, just as we have enforced the original Monroe Doctrine for 125 years. It is my opinion that we would, through this procedure, usher in another era of peace comparable to that following the original announcement of the Monroe Doctrine in 1823.

* * * * *

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, so long as the question has been raised I should like to comment on it briefly. In the first place, I will say that I had quite a lengthy conference, and a very interesting one, with Sir Stafford Cripps, who seems to be the dominating influence in the economy of England. From my conference with him, and with Mr. Monnet in France, and with others, I have no reason to suppose that there is any difference between the ideologies embraced by them.

Let us consider the production of coal. The Senator from Massachusetts says that the production of coal in England has increased. The United States at this time, Mr. President, is shipping coal to Newcastle, at least such shipments were being made until very recently. In the fourth reader we read, as an example of something impossible to happen, the carrying of coals to Newcastle. It has happened. We are doing just that. We are giving the coal to England. No one, I believe, is naive enough to believe that we will be paid for it. We are paying from $20 to $22 a ton for the coal we shipped to Newcastle, when coal can be produced in England for 8 or 9 dollars a ton; what is really needed is some West Virginia miners. We could double their wages and make money on the deal.

Before the war England exported more than 40 million tons of coal annually. Beginning with the war and until 1948 England did not export a ton of coal, and if she is exporting coal at this moment it is a very small amount. England, along with Germany, furnished to the rest of Europe largely the coal needed there. When I was in England I went down into some of the coal mines with Mr. Collins, who was at that time in charge of the English coal mines. When I went to France someone there said facetiously—but I did not consider the remarks very facetious—that the English people did not produce enough coal to keep themselves warm, so they were placed in charge of the Ruhr coal mines. I found that to be literally true.

Sir Stafford Crippe was very frank with me, and said directly, with a slightly hostile note, probably thinking I would not entirely agree with him, that the steel industry was next on the program of nationalism, and he had told me not 5 minutes before that Britain had to have the Marshall-plan money.

* * * * *

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I must agree with my distinguished colleague from Nebraska that this loosely drawn bill may involve every industry in the United States. I want to say, since reciprocal-trade agreements have been mentioned, that the reciprocal-trade plan is a selective free-trade act. As a result of the operation of the selective free-trade acts—selective by the State Department, which is supposed to handle foreign affairs and not domestic affairs, just as one example—and it can happen with respect to any industry—90 percent of the mines in the United States have been shut down; 2,400 mines in California have been cut down to 350. In Nevada the proportion is about the same, and perhaps throughout the country. Based upon the record, I am convinced that that is what would happen. If the textile industry were treated as the mineral industry has been treated—and it could be done at any time—the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Lodge, might be very much interested. If he were here, I would make a further remark with regard to that, but I see he has left the floor.

Further to consider the matters which have been raised and in order to clear them up, I note that in the European recovery program prepared by the State Department, the United Kingdom intends to import iron and steel, finished, crude, or semifinished, pig iron, scrap, and iron ore through 1948 and 1949. The finished product amounts to 1,204,000 tons; the crude and semifinished to 944,000 tons, I could continue to read from the report, but that report is evidence in itself.

I point out to the Senate that we are now, and for some time have been, exporting from 6 million to 8 million tons of steel annually. I shall cover that a little further along in my address and point out how we might stop some of that importation by a simple change in Executive orders, allowing that amount to be added to the German production.

An agreement was signed between the United Kingdom and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in Moscow, December 27, 1947, and I wish to give a short summary of that trade and payment agreement.

"From the U. S. S. R. to the United Kingdom, out of the 1947 harvest, for delivery during a period of 8 months from February 1, 1948, to September 30, 1948, inclusive, 450,000 metric tons of barley, 200,000 metric tons of maize, and 100,000 metric tons of oats."

For the benefit of my colleague from Nebraska, Mr. Wherry, maize is a sort of Kaffir corn, as it is called in Nebraska.

I point out further that Russia got paid for the amount of grain referred to perhaps from some of the money furnished under the Marshall plan.

From the United Kingdom to Russia there were shipped:

"Light rails with fishplates, bolts, and nuts for narrow-gage railways; 25,000 English long tons (including not less than 10,000 English long tons from new production and the balance from the United Kingdom military surpluses)."

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I recommend for interesting reading the debate on the ICA and the Marshall plan as of the dates of my addresses.

DEBATES OF 1949 FORETOLD REARMING OF RUSSIA THROUGH INDIRECT FOREIGN AID

In the reprint of my debates of 1949, pages 109 and 123 of the reprint in the United States Senate, March 30 and 31 and April 1, 4, 6, 7, and 21, 1949, I said, when we started that debate, that we

were on the way to arming Russia for world war III. I intend to show that we are arming Russia for a third world war through money and supplies furnished to 16 European nations under MSA or so-called mutual security and that the recipient nations are shipping everything from locomotives to ship engines to Russia and Russian satellite countries.

These supplies are largely produced with materials and money furnished by the United States through the ECA.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the excerpts I have marked on pages 109, 110, 112, 123, 124, and 125.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARMING RUSSIA—WORLD WAR III

I intend to show that we are arming Russia for the third world war through money and supplies furnished the 16 European nations under the ECA—and that the recipient nations are shipping everything from locomotives to jet engines to Russia and Russian satellite countries. These supplies are largely produced with the raw material and money furnished by the United States through ECA.

* * * * *

PRIVATE INVESTMENT GUARANTEED

American companies are now moving into European countries to utilize European low-wage living standard labor—and not only furnish the foreign market, but will include a large sector of the American market—with commodities which will displace American workers at home.

The President of the United States has gone so far as to propose that such foreign investments by American companies be guaranteed by the United States—with the inevitable result that their products will flood American markets and throw millions of our workers out of employment.

He is doing this at a time when we already have 4 million men unemployed—and 9½ million workers on part-time jobs—and that estimate of unemployed men does not include the thousands of railroad men on the extra board—waiting for the callboy to knock at the door.

* * * * *

SPHERES OF INFLUENCE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I intend to show that the United Nations is being bypassed in a series of administration moves and financial manipulations, and that the world is being swiftly divided into spheres of influence between the United States and Russia. Last year the Marshall plan, now known as ECA, was authorized and financed by the Congress for 1 year. At almost the same time the 1934 Trade Agreements Act was extended for 1 year—and there was considerable discussion of bringing to the Senate the charter of the International Trade Organization Treaty, which originated several years ago shortly after the International Monetary Fund, but its consideration was postponed. It is duly signed by the 54 nations and has been signed for over 1 year, yet it is withheld from the Congress until such time as the first two parts of the program have been adopted by the Congress, because it is the final rivet in the free-trade program.

THREE-PART FREE-TRADE PROGRAM—CONSIDER TOGETHER

The fact that the 1934 Trade Agreements Act was extended for only 1 year, so its consideration would also coincide with the date when the ECA, the Marshall plan, would again be before this body, and the time of consideration of the International Trade Organization Treaty before the Senate, was not an accident. The State Department program had always encouraged bringing each of the three-part free-trade scheme before Congress—each as a great emergency in its own right.

They were, however, timed to come before the Senate at approximately the same date this year because the three are indelibly linked together.

The Marshall plan, now known as the ECA, the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, and the International Trade Organization treaty form a three-part economic legislative program designed to distribute the wealth and the markets of this Nation throughout the world, and to adopt the free-trade principle as the definite and settled policy of this Nation. That is, put the low-cost Asiatic and European labor in direct competition with the American workers on an even basis.

This three-part free-trade program is designed to undermine the basic economic structure of this country, with the one objective of dividing our wealth and leveling our high-wage living standard with the low-wage living standards of such Asiatic and European nations.

The provisions of each part of the three-part free-trade program include:

First. The ECA appropriations are admittedly established to make up the trade-balance deficits of the European nations with hard-currency nations in cash each year. Our chief export is cash.

Second. Extend for 3 years the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, under which the State Department has adopted a selective free-trade principle, to divide the markets of this Nation with foreign nations, on the theory that, to the extent that we divide our markets with them, their trade-balance deficits will decrease.

Third. Adoption of the International Trade Organization Treaty, including ultimately 58 nations with 58 votes, in which we will have 1 vote—the same as Siam or Lithuania—and this organization is designed to meet once each year and add up the remaining production and markets of the world and divide them between the nations of the world eventually on a basis of population, thus making free trade the permanent and accepted policy of this Nation.

The first step of the three-part program, that of making up the trade-balance deficits of the European nations in cash each year through ECA, began rather modestly with scattered gift loans to the European nations, leading up to UNRRA—then to the gift loan of $3,750 million to England in 1946—and then to the $17 billion program which is soon to be followed by the Truman global recovery program.

The second step inaugurated through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, currently known as reciprocal trade, under which the State Department has adopted the selective free-trade principle, is to be extended for 3 years at this session of Congress and the principle later to be made permanent through the adoption of the International Trade Organization treaty.

The phrase "reciprocal trade" does not occur in the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—it is simply a catch phrase to sell free trade to the American people cloaked with the more involved and less understandable phraseology.

The third and final step of this very clever three-phase program—to divide the markets and to distribute the wealth of this Nation throughout the world—is the adoption of the presently proposed International Trade Organization under which the selective free-trade principle will be made permanent and become the settled policy of this Nation.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. MALONE. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I am very much interested in what the Senator from Nevada is saying. I wonder just where the Bank for International Settlement, which was agreed on at Bretton Woods, fits into this picture. As I understand, the Government of the United States invested the sum of $6 billion under the Bretton Woods agreement, and Bretton Woods seems to have been largely forgotten. Like most of the predecessors of the Marshall plan, it seems to be unhonored and unsung, and also forgotten. I ask the Senator just where Bretton Woods fits into this picture he is drawing for us.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, every one of these organizations—the International Fund, the Bretton Woods agreement, the organizations of different character each in its turn, UNRRA, the British loan—all have come along each to be a complete answer, "This is all we will ever have to do. This will put every nation on its feet." Each has faded out like the mist before the sun, and there is always another proposition to take its place—to gift-loan. I do not suppose anyone is naive enough, least of all a United States Senator, to believe that any of the money we have put out under any of these organizations and ideas will ever be returned to the United States Treasury. Yet we go for each in its turn, as a cure-all.

Now we have ECA, the Marshall plan, under which money is being furnished to the participating nations. As I said in the beginning of my address, I intend to prove we are arming Russia with this money and materials, just as we did Japan for 5 years prior to Pearl Harbor. In other words, it is just another matter of manufacturing and processing the raw materials purchased with money from the United States Treasury—everything from engines to locomotives, and sending them along to Russia, or her satellite nations.

* * * * *

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, yesterday when I delayed completing my statement in order that the Senate might recess until today, I had submitted an amendment, which the Senators will find in the RECORD.

FREE TRADE AGAINST AMERICAN WORKINGMEN

I stated at that time that I would attempt to show that this administration is giving lipservice to labor through proposed legislation while pulling the jobs out from under their feet through this 3-phase, free-trade program. That program consists—first, of making up the trade balance deficits of the ECA or Marshall plan nations with hard-currency nations in cash each year. Our chief export is cash.

Second, the extension for 3 years of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, which is erroneously referred to as the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. There is, of course, nothing reciprocal included in the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. It does not operate that way, and that is not the effect. The phrase does not occur in the act itself, but it was a trick phrase invented to sell free trade to the American people, and on that basis the State Department has adopted a selective free-trade policy, beginning 10 years or more ago, selecting a few industries at a time in the beginning. Now, however, nearly all the industries have come under the hammer, and practically all the import fees or tariffs are below the critical point representing the differential in cost of production of an article in this country and the cost of production in the country where the chief competition is located.

There are very few, if any, products that cannot be produced at a lower cost in some foreign nation and shipped into this country, as compared with the cost of the same article produced here without any protection.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The third part of the three-phase free-trade program is the International Trade Organization, which will come along later. Heretofore it has been soft-pedaled so far, waiting for the passage of the first two parts of the program. It is the third part of the three-phase program, and the most dangerous part of all since the ECA Act, including the appropriation, and the extension for 3 years of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act can be terminated. But when the International Trade Organization Act is adopted to make permanent the free-trade policy of this Nation, there is no retreat.

What is the International Trade Organization Treaty? It includes 58 nations. Fifty-four have already signed, and the others will sign, as they have nothing to lose. They can only gain. There will be 58 nations, with 58 votes; we shall have exactly the same vote as Lithuania or Siam. The representatives of those nations are supposed to meet once each year in conference and add up the remaining production and markets of the world and divide them between the nations of the world eventually on the basis of population, thus making free trade the permanent and accepted policy of this Nation. That, Mr. President, will be the last of the workingman of America, as we know the standard of living of this country.

THE WORKERS AND FREE TRADE

Mr. President, maybe the workers do not know it, but while labor legislation is being promised them the three-part free-trade program which will flood this Nation with cheap labor products is being promoted by the same administration. I recommended that they take a careful look into this matter and decide how far they are willing to go in letting the goods produced by low-cost foreign labor come into this country.

It is a long-range program dominated by low-living standard foreign nations to divide the American market. Doctrinaire tariff cutting, if persisted in, will swell the flood of incoming cheap labor goods and the standard of living here will go down just as certainly as night follows day.

* * * * *

EUROPEAN-ASIATIC CHEAP LABOR

Mr. MALONE. While our dollars are helping to build up the competitive industries of Western Europe, we are blithely going ahead and increasing their chance to invade the United States market by further reducing our tariff structure. Mayhew, from England, let the cat out of the bag when he said that Britain's economic recovery is virtually complete. That is the purport of this article. Yet, Mr. President, we are talking about appropriating another $5 billion to increase their productive capacity. In the meantime, socialization is going ahead at a rapid pace in the ECA countries. The Bank of England, transportation, communication, the coal mines, the electrical industry, and steel production are now being nationalized, and 20 or more industries are being examined as to their suitability for nationalization.

Churchill has claimed that the United States dollars are keeping the labor movement in power in England. That is the same Mr. Churchill who is in our town today, and is almost at this moment making one of his very excellent speeches. I am very fond of him—and only wish he were taking care of our best interests, as he is trying to care for the best interests of his homeland. While on this side we are doing everything possible, by reducing tariffs and import fees, to increase the competitive advantage enjoyed by the low-labor-cost countries in our markets, and to displace the American worker through the importation of the products of European and Asiastic cheap labor.

But that is not all, Mr. President. Many years ago American manufacturers began to migrate, so as to get around the trade restrictions in foreign countries. The purpose then was to enable American manufacturers to get inside an otherwise forbidden market. Now the migration has recommenced, but this time with a very different motive. Today the migration of American manufacturers to foreign countries is for the purpose of taking advantage of the lower-paid foreign labor and the lowered American import fees and tariffs. In other words, American manufacturers are establishing themselves abroad, where they use cheap labor to make goods to ship back into the United States. Not only is it their purpose to be able to sell their goods in the foreign markets, as was formerly their intention; but they also intend to ship their foreign-made goods into our country, and that is possible because of the lowering of United States tariffs and import duties, which now constitute no protection whatever to American workers. In fact, they now have been lowered below the critical point of making up the differential of cost between the cost of production by American labor and the cost of production by the low-wage foreign labor.

The result has been that American manufacturers are using the goods they manufacture in foreign countries with the aid of foreign labor, to supply the market in the United States, just as formerly they sent their goods from the United States into the markets of foreign countries.

* * * * *

FREE TRADE—FREE IMMIGRATION

Let me say here and now that I see no difference in effect between allowing such foreign-made products to come into the United States free of duty or import fee, or under a duty lower than the critical point which makes up for the difference between the cost of production in the United States and the cost of foreign manufacture—in short, allowing the products of foreign labor to come into the United States and displace the products of American labor—and allowing free immigration of such low-cost labor—the effect upon American labor is exactly the same—idle men.

* * * * *

AMERICAN KNOW-HOW

Mr. MALONE. I am very glad the Senator has brought up that particular point, because the stereotyped answer for 40 years, of all economic theorists, has been, "Of course, with our improved methods and techniques and know-how, we have nothing to fear from foreign cheap labor." But, Mr. President, today I want to inform the Senate of the United States that the very latest machinery and technical know-how and assembly-line methods are available to Mr. Jim Rand, in Scotland, where he is manufacturing typewriters; and to Mr. Ford, in England, where he is manufacturing automobiles; and, similarly, the latest American methods and techniques will be available to any other foreign factories. So, as of today, the only differences in costs between United States manufacture and foreign manufacture are the differences in wage-living standards and in efficiency.

Mr. KEM. I wish to ask the Senator if the requisite dollars for that purpose are made available now because the Marshall-aid plan is furnishing wheat and other commodities customarily imported by those countries. In other words, under these circumstances they do not have to pay in dollars for the wheat and the other imports they are receiving under the Marshall-aid plan, so they have dollars available for the purpose of purchasing the latest American machinery and technical equipment, and thus will be able to compete with American manufacturers and workmen. Is that correct?

SOURCE OF FOREIGN IMPORTS

Mr. MALONE. I think that is entirely true. In fact, the situation is practically reversed from what it formerly was. In other words, in former times because of the protection we provided, our high-wage-living-standard labor was producing in the United States commodities for both the United States market and the foreign markets, for the foreign nations were buying from us what they needed to buy. It is well understood that no nation or individual ever purchases anything from any particular nation or person if he can get it somewhere else cheaper. Consequently, so long as we protected our workers and were able to produce commodities which they needed, and which they themselves were not then able to produce, we were selling those commodities abroad. But now not only are we ruining our market abroad, but we are taking jobs away from labor in the United States, by permitting such importations from abroad; for instance, the importation by the Ford automobile company of English-made Fords, to be sold in the United States; and also the importation of chinaware, watch movements, and other commodities made by American manufacturers in foreign factories or by foreign manufacturers with our machinery and technique.

Mr. President, the time will come when the jobless auto worker in Detroit will begin asking questions about British-made Ford cars rolling through Grand Circus Park, with its owner wearing a suit of clothes made of foreign cloth.

The time will come soon when unemployed American workers will ask questions about washing machines and vacuum cleaners made by manufacturers abroad. I suggest that the workers of this country take this unpleasant prospect under consideration right now.

REASONS FOR TRADE AGREEMENTS

Periodically over the years since 1934 several reasons for the trade-agreements program, one part of the three-part free-trade program, has been advanced to the Congress. In 1934, it was to cure the depression. In 1937, it was to obtain world peace through increased trade. Through increased world trade, we were going to have world peace. We all remember how that turned out. In 1943, the plea was "Don't rock the boat." In 1948, it was to permit the United States to dump its surpluses abroad. In 1949, it is to permit foreign countries to dump in the United States the surpluses they do not yet have.

But we are preparing their machinery and their labor to send their surpluses back to the United States without any import fee or protection for the worker of any kind necessary to make up the differential in the cost of production. That is the latest reason why we must extend the 1934 Trade Agreements Act for an additional 3 years.

STATE DEPARTMENT PROGRAM

The State Department itself has recently admitted the interrelationship of its three-part economic program. Willard L. Thorp, Assistant Secretary of State, in his testimony before the Ways and Means Committee on extension of Trade Agreements Act, January 24, 1949, said—I quote:

"The trade-agreements program is an integral part of our overall program for world economic recovery.

"The European recovery program extends immediate assistance on a short-term basis to put the European countries back on their feet. As a part of this program we have asked them, and they have agreed, to follow certain fundamental policies. The basic principle of the European recovery program, as stated in the OEEC"—

That is the organization of the 16 Marshall-plan or ECA countries—

"As stated in the OEEC programs and as reaffirmed in the bilaterial agreements between the participating countries and ourselves, they will increase production, put their financial houses in order, and expand

their trade with each other and with the rest of the world.

"So far as the United States has it in its power to do so, it must support and encourage these three objectives. They are fundamentals of economic recovery.

"Obviously we cannot urge countries to adopt policies directed toward economic health if we do not pursue the same objectives ourselves."

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Missouri for a question?

Mr. MALONE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator think that what he has read from Mr. Thorp's observations fits in with that sentence of the proposed North Atlantic Pact which reads:

"The signatories to the pact will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them."

NO UNITED STATES OF EUROPE

Mr. MALONE. I may say in answer to the question of the Senator from Missouri, I think the actions of the European countries in entirely forgetting a plan for a United States of Europe, entirely forgetting all cooperation among themselves, and now reaching out for our markets and our money, constitute in effect a very great deviation from the spirit not only of the North Atlantic Pact but of all other agreements they have made with us.

THREE-PRONGED PINCERS DESTROYING ECONOMY

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I have long discussed in the Senate the base of our monetary system. Of course, all these things are a part of the pincers movement to destroy. First there is deliberate inflation. Second, free imports of goods produced by cheap labor. Third, the export of the taxpayers' money.

I have 2 bills in the Senate, 1 to provide for a free market for gold, to see what it would be worth, so that we could deal in the free market, with gold as the base of our currency.

FACTS AND FANCIES ABOUT GOLD AND SILVER

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Gold Today," written by Rene Leon, one of the outstanding experts on the subject of money exchange.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOLD TODAY

Why does our Treasury buy gold? Surely not because gold is money, for we are forbidden to own gold, let alone use it as a medium of exchange. Do we use gold as a settler of international payments balances? Only fractionally for, were it otherwise, we would not be called upon to extend foreign loans, credits, grants-in-aid, etc., to balance other countries' deficits in their international payments positions often caused by their own economic mismanagement.

We are constantly reminded from abroad that, as the richest Nation we have the obligation to come to the aid of the needy and underdeveloped countries of the world. But how rich are we? What is the sum of our Federal, State, and municipal debts which, when added to our private obligations far exceed our national income? And is one rich who earns a dollar and owes two? The true index of our financial condition is the status of our dollar which daily loses value.

Why do we buy gold at all? Is it because some still believe the myth that gold has been money from time immemorial? This, of course, is not supported by the facts for, with the exception of less than one century, gold throughout history has been but the hoard of the very few rich. The money of the masses was always silver. For instance: The pound Sterling was 1 pound of silver 0.925 fine. The French word for money always was, and still is, "argent-silver." The Spaniards have two words for money, in Spain it is "dinero," a word unrelated to gold, while in Latin America it is "plata," Spanish for silver.

The gold standard has had but a very short life. England renounced bimetallism and adopted the single gold standard in 1816. Germany followed suit in 1872, the Latin Union and the United States joined the movement a year later. The consequent demonetization of silver, by destroying the gold equivalence which bimetallism had created, reduced the metallic reserves required by the system of credit which is now universal and whose phenomenal growth continues to be speeded by the development of communications and transport. As a result, gold today constitutes but the pinpoint of an inverted pyramid of currency and credit and its monetary usefulness has dissolved despite all attempts to restore it. From the gold coin standard we've gone to the gold exchange standard, then the gold bullion standard, finally the International Monetary Fund, an utter failure recently turned into another lending agency—as though we needed still another lending agency. One has but to glance in any newspaper at what the International Monetary Fund facetiously calls the official rates of exchange followed by the free currency rates which, though often called black-market rates actually represent a truer picture of real exchange value. Not so the official or pegged rates which all circumvent who can. The sooner we scrap the International Monetary Fund, and rid ourselves of the army of bureaucrats needed to enforce its regulations, the sooner we shall face realities and act accordingly.

There is another angle of approach to the problem of gold, and a most important one. Because of the Communist threat to the Free World, we taxpayers are called upon to contribute vast sums for armament. Defense expenditures listed in the Federal Budget constitute the largest item of all. But there exists an unlisted item, invisible to the taxpayer's naked eye, which adds heavily to his burden. Despite its obviousness the existence of this item appears unsuspected by our authorities, for no sign of it whatsoever can be traced to our Treasury. That item is the "foreign aid" we extend to Russia: Under the terms of the International Monetary Fund, Harry Dexter White's legacy to the country he betrayed, the Treasury is obligated to buy gold at $35 per fine ounce regardless of origin. Russia is far too intelligently managed to look upon gold as anything but a commodity. She publishes no figures of her gold production or consumption. She is known to be the second, if not the first, largest gold-producing nation, while through slave labor, she certainly is the lowest cost producer. We know the extent of her gold exports to free nations but she throws no light on the amounts she uses for economic and political penetration in many lands. Her success in penetration would suggest that gold in no mean volume is used to open doors and keep them open. Russia does not ship gold directly to the United States; she ships it to England, to Switzerland, and to other countries which, in turn, affix their own seals on the yellow bars which then become acceptable to our Treasury. That is how we buy gold regardless of origin. That is how, through our $35 price guaranty, we give "foreign aid" to Russia and then bewail the disastrous impact of our economy of Russia's growing international trade.

The scantiness of the stocks of gold in monetary use has been the basis for loud and repeated demands for an advance in its guaranteed fixed price by the United States. The favored argument, emanating principally from the gold producers, is that the price of gold should be "adjusted" to the price level of other commodities. Disregarded is the fact that the prices of commodities are determined by supply and demand while the price of gold is arbitrarily and uneconomically fixed. But, assuming that we were senseless enough to yield to this propaganda, who would profit by our action? To a very small extent the marginal producers such as Canada, Mexico, Peru, Australia. But the real gains would go to Russia and to South Africa which, together, are responsible for an overwhelming proportion of total world production. Rating South Africa's role as a contributor to the general world economy, we find that this small country's chief exports, gold and diamonds, are strictly nonessentials. The case of Russia is totally different. Sworn enemy of the Free World Russia is a threat to its peace and well-being. Hence to promote her inroads into the free nations is as disastrous as it is senseless.

Like all other commodities gold belongs in the free market. Instead of worrying about our recent losses of gold "reserves" we should encourage this movement and let any nation willing to pay for it have our share of this near useless commodity. Our Treasury can then buy or sell gold only when, if, and as it suits our interests, not otherwise. Only 30 percent of world gold production goes to industry; what proportion of the balance goes to hoarders everywhere is problematical. Suffice to say that, without Uncle Sam's minimum price guaranty, hoarding will assume a different outlook. Today it is expensive in that it entails the paralyzation of the capital involved plus the cost of storage; if to these is added the speculative risk, heretofore unexisting, of a lack of minimum price guaranty, we may well see gold selling below its cost of production.

It is time we adapted our monetary and exchange policies to present day conditions, deciding whether balance or fixity bring about true stability. We do welcome the balance resulting from supply and demand in our commodity and security markets; why, then, not extend this sound principle to our foreign commerce which is but a fraction of our total trade. Or shall we continue, through pegged exchange rates, to readjust our own price level to that of other countries in disregard of wage and cost differentials? Free exchanges alone can bring balance in international payments positions permitting us in time to do away with tariffs, quotas, subsidies and controls of every kind.

Another problem which requires solution is that of our lack of control over the circulation of United States currency notes outside our borders. For these were created to serve as mediums of exchange for the people of the United States, not as the tools of alien hoarders and tax-evaders nor, least of all, as instruments for the promotion of the trade of the enemies of our country. Neither Russia's ruble nor Red China's "people's yuan" has any market outside the Communist orbit hence, in addition to Russia's gold, they make use of our notes. In the Paris, Zurich and other free markets the greatest demand for our notes originates from Russian and Chinese agents, and this demand is far greater than generally realized. Self-protection demands that we recognize the power of our dollar and so regulate its movements as to serve the best interests of our country.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

An absurd belief is gaining currency among many, namely, that Russia's large and growing gold production may result in her establishing a gold convertible ruble thus threatening the West's preponderance as the world's financial centers. In Russia there exists no banking system outside the State's own institution. Her past manipulation of the ruble—1 for 10 on the last occasion—is not likely to instill confidence in the ruble as an international medium of exchange, nor is a ruble bill of exchange likely to be accepted by any but those held in Russian bondage. Moscow is very far from becoming a leading discount center.

In conclusion it should be borne in mind that gold has nothing whatsoever to do with the value of our dollar. That value is determined solely by the fiscal and credit policy of our Government and by the international payments position of our country.

RENÉ LÉON.

PRINCETON, *July 4, 1958.*

RUN ON UNITED STATES GOLD SUPPLY EXPOSED

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Why Market Is Rising—Look at Our Gold Policy," written by Leslie Gould, financial editor, and published in the New York Journal-American of July 23, 1958.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY MARKET IS RISING—LOOK AT OUR GOLD POLICY

Rene Leon, who has forgotten more about foreign exchange than some of our experts will ever know, writes from Princeton:

"To your collection of opinions as to why the market is headed higher you might add the following:

"To me, at least, it is plain as day that there is a flight from the dollar.

"Proof thereof is found in:

"1. Loss of gold.

"2. Weakness in Government securities.

"3. Strength in equities (common stocks)."

WE'RE HELPING RUSSIA

"The bankruptcy of our foreign policy is in parity with that of our monetary policy. Instead of attacking Russia where it will hurt—in her gold and in her ruble—we promote her trade and mourn our own loss of business.

"Instead of exulting over our dollar with the pride of children, we should recognize its (the dollar's) strength and so control it to serve our country first and last."

The United States is again losing gold—the third such "run" on the dollar since the war. From the high point in February, the gold loss exceeds $1½ billion. In February the Treasury's gold holdings were $22,784,000,000. Latest figures put the total at $21,283,000,000.

The United States Treasury lost nearly $3 billion—$2.9 billion to be exact—from September 1949, after the British devalued the pound, through 1950, when the Korean war broke out. When the United States was spending so heavily on the military around the world from August 1952 to April 1955, the United States Treasury lost $1.7 billion.

PRESSURE TO BOOST PRICE

In the current run, the British have been the heaviest withdrawers of gold, but other countries are also getting into the act. There is pressure for the United States to advance its gold buying price from the present arbitrary $35 an ounce.

The chief benefactor in any rise in the United States official gold buying price would be the Communists. Russia is one of the world's biggest gold producers. Thanks to the United States floor of $35 an ounce under the gold market, the Communists have been able to finance with gold their international intrigue—such as that currently in the Middle East—and their trade war, now so hot in Latin America.

SHOULD END FIXED PRICE

The way to meet this Russian threat and at the same time keep the United States Treasury from being played for a sucker by the gold speculators is to end the fixed buying price and permit a free gold market. Then, the law of supply and demand would make the price. This would also serve as a check on squandering American politicians.

AMERICAN INVESTMENTS IN BRITAIN NOW EXCEED $1.2 BILLION

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I desire to read a paragraph from a very interesting document called British Record, issued by the British Information Services, the issue of August 6, 1958. On page 3, the paragraph reads:

A recent study shows that investment by United States business interests in British manufacturing industry now exceeds $1,200,000,000 and that it has been increasing at the rate of 10 percent a year. At present, more than 300 branch subsidiaries of United States corporations and jointly financed Anglo-American concerns give employment to close on 350,000 people in Britain.

DOLLAR LOSS TO BRITAIN INCREASES UNITED STATES UNEMPLOYMENT ROLLS

Mr. President, that contributes to our unemployment of approximately 6 million persons. I have previously said several times in the Senate that the British are experts in foreign exchange and trade control. They know exactly the effect of a shaded tariff, an import permit, an exchange permit, and just how to force industries to build plants in their countries to get the market there.

We talk about reciprocal trade. That is a phrase which has never been included in the act, but which has been extended for 4 years. It never was intended to be reciprocal. None of the agreements which are made under that act are reciprocal or being kept by foreign nations. In the provisions of the GATT charter, under which the operations in Geneva take place, there is a specific provision that the nations do not need to keep their trade agreements so long as they can show that they are short of dollars with which to make their payments. They can do that until all the wealth of this country, its markets and its cash, has been distributed equally among them.

GATT INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

Mr. President, it is an international socialist scheme. That is all it is.

I want to refer briefly to hearings going on at this time in the investigation of the financial condition of the United States. They were started last fall by the Committee on Finance, in the 1st session of the 85th Congress. Now they will continue into another year. They could develop into one of the most important hearings and one of the most important reports which has ever been made in the history of the Nation, if the hearings are followed through to completion.

UNITED STATES FINANCING ITS OWN FOREIGN COMPETITION

Mr. President, it is not only the loss of our gold which should concern us. I have gone into this before on the Senate floor. We have been giving the foreign countries folding money also under the Marshall plan, ECA, and Mutual Security. They take the money and do three things with it. They build up foreign-dollar balances, for which gold can be demanded under our policy. They buy the dictators of the foreign nations, and the foreign nations themselves. They use American machinery and American know-how, so that foreigners can compete with American working men and the investors of our own country. So we not only price ourselves out of their markets; we distribute our own markets among them, and then finance our own competition.

Mr. President, I intend to vote against the bill to aid foreigners to usurp our markets. No one objects to domestic competition on a fair and reasonable competitive basis. We always encouraged American competition. For nearly 150 years Americans prior to 1934 had been competing with Americans for American markets, with a tariff representing roughly, ever since 1789, a duty to make up the difference in the wage standard of living and the cost of doing business in this Nation and in the chief competing nation on each product. That duty has been lowered as a foreign country has raised its standard of living so that it has reached our approximate standard of living, and free trade then is automatic and immediate.

AMERICAN POLICY OF NEARLY 150 YEARS REVERSED BY TRADE ACT

It had always been the policy of the Government to enable Americans, those just getting out of school and those who are older, who are seeking to make a few dollars, to enable them to go into business, if they could find a product which they thought, in their judgment, they could make to compete with other Americans; and then to get enough money to back them in their deal or in their business, if their judgment proved correct. If it was not, they went out of business.

That is the way we did business for nearly 150 years. Americans knew that all they had to do was to be sure they could compete with other Americans. Congress for a long time had a policy of protection up to the difference in cost. It was an equalization of costs. The 1930 Tariff Act was an equalization of costs. Section 336 provides for the equalization of the costs of production. The Tariff Commission is directed in the 1930 act to hold hearings when, in its judgment, it is necessary, or upon request of the President or Congress or a consumer or a producer, and to readjust the tariff to equal the production cost difference.

But that authority was usurped or sidetracked by the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, laughingly called Reciprocal Trade Act. This meant, of course, simply a division of our markets with the rest of the world.

UNITED STATES DEFEATED JAPAN, THEN FINANCED IT TO COMPETE AGAINST UNITED STATES WORKERS

The United States Department of Commerce, in "Foreign Grants and Credits" for December 1957, the latest

publication so far received, gives the total of grants and credits to Japan since World War II as $2,444,000,000, of which grants have totaled $2,230,000,000, credits $214,000,000, and of loans to Japan, $1,056,677,000, of which $679,000,000 were by the Export-Import Bank.

The United Kingdom, France, West Germany, and Italy are the only countries which have received more aid than Japan.

Japan has jeopardized and is jeopardizing the American textile industry, our farm industry, and many other industries because of the 20- and 22-cent-an-hour labor which prevails in Japan. Japan is using our machinery and our American investments in those plants. Her plants are using cheap labor, while they laugh at the workingmen and investors of the United States.

But the great philanthropists of Japan agreed that they would let our textile industry live another 6 months by reducing their shipments into the American markets, until after we have extended the free imports bill for another 4 years.

UNITED STATES TAXPAYERS FINANCING GLUT OF JAPANESE TEXTILES IN UNITED STATES MARKET THROUGH EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Now I think it will be another story. But imagine the effect on our cotton textile industry of such imports from Japan.

Mr. President, the Export-Import Bank had as of December 31, 1957 advanced Japan $679,125,121.105. The last Export-Import Bank credit prior to that date was $115 million for the purchase of cotton. Of course, Mr. President, further grants and credits have been advanced since then and the cotton is sold to Japan for a lower price than the price the textile mills in the United States have to pay. The $115 million loan was the largest Export-Import Bank loan during the last half of 1957, during which the bank loaned $353 million to 23 other foreign countries.

BREAKDOWN OF EXPORT-IMPORT LOANS TO JAPAN

Samuel C. Waugh, president of the Export-Import Bank, in an article published in the Journal of Commerce, February 28, 1957, gave the following breakdown of loans up to that time to Japan:

During the year 1956 the bank approved its sixth annual credit to finance the export of United States cotton to Japan, a $60 million loan. The 5 previous cotton loans to Japan have totaled $260 million, 4 of which have been paid in full, both principal and interest. * * * The bank also authorized credits in Japan this past year for $34 million for the development of electric power projects as well as $16.5 million for the purchase of United States jet commercial aircraft as these come off the production lines in 1959 and 1960. The credits for electrical power expansion are enabling Japanese companies to expand their generating capacity with United States equipment in order to meet the shortage of electrical energy that has prevailed since the end of World War II, and is expected to continue through 1961.

In addition to the $115 million line of credit given to Japan in the latter half of 1957, the Export-Import Bank signed a $60 million loan agreement with the Bank of Japan, to finance cotton purchases during the crop year beginning August 1, 1957.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a release of September 28, 1957, by the Export-Import Bank.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Export-Import Bank of Washington has signed a $60 million loan agreement with the Bank of Japan to finance purchases of cotton in the United States during the crop year beginning August 1, 1957.

The agreement was signed at the bank September 27 by T. Fujisawa, New York representative of the Bank of Japan, and Samuel C. Waugh, President of the Export-Import Bank.

The credit was authorized by the Board of Directors in June together with a $115 million line of credit, also in favor of the Bank of Japan, to finance United States agricultural commodities, including cotton, to be purchased by Japanese importers.

It is anticipated that the line of credit made available under the agreement signed September 27 will be used subsequently to the $115 million commodity loan.

Under the two credits approximately $110 million will be used by Japan to finance the importation of cotton. Purchases and shipments of cotton financed are to be made in the customary manner with orders being placed by the Japanese purchasers, or their agents, with United States shippers.

FOREIGN AID STIMULUS MAKES JAPAN TOP SHIPBUILDER OF THE WORLD

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, much of the military assistance proposed in this bill will go to Japan, our former enemy, and Guam, our friend. Much of it will go to stimulate Japan's industry, including not only its textile industry but its shipbuilding industry, now the greatest in the world.

In a publication titled "The Mutual Security Program—Fiscal Year 1959—A Summary Presentation," issued jointly by the Department of State, Department of Defense, and International Cooperation Administration, it states:

Military assistance: The fiscal year 1959 program provides for continued military assistance to Cambodia, Japan, Korea, Laos, the Philippines, the Republic of China, Thailand, and Vietnam * * * as in recent years, the bulk of this aid will be provided to Korea, Taiwan, and Japan.

Technical cooperation: Under technical cooperation programs assistance is being given in eight countries of the Far East in the form of training and demonstration activities; in Japan, assistance is being given to a special productivity program.

JAPAN WORLD'S GREATEST SHIPBUILDER TWO CONSECUTIVE YEARS

Japan in 1956 and again in 1957 built more ships than any other country in the world.

The United States has dropped to seventh place in ship construction, with Britain, Germany, Italy following Japan in leadership in that order.

About two-thirds of Japan's shipbuilding was to supply other countries, including the United States.

United States firms have on order in foreign countries at the present time 158 tankers of approximately 7,254,416 dead weight tons; 4 huge ore carriers of 159,000 dead weight tons and 10 dry cargo carriers of 79,650,000 dead weight tons. These orders are for the most part distributed between Japan, Germany, the United Kingdom, and Sweden. Some very large tankers are being built in Japanese yards for American firms.

These are private American firms not receiving Government aid or operating differential subsidies from the United States Government, which refuses such aid or subsidies to foreign built ships. But then only 15½ percent of United States shipping is being subsidized.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a London dispatch of January 22, 1958, published in the New York Journal of Commerce under the heading "Japan Yards Widen Lead in Ship Work."

There being no objection, the news article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAPAN YARDS WIDEN LEAD IN SHIP WORK

LONDON.—Japanese shipbuilders wound up 1957 with a firm grip on the world production lead they captured a year earlier.

Lloyd's Register returns showed that Japan launched 124 ships totaling 699,366 tons in the last quarter, bringing the year's total to 2,424,000 tons.

This was 678,000 tons more than in 1956, the year Japan ousted Britain from her traditional place at the top.

British launchings this year amounted to 1,407,000 tons, 24,000 tons more than in 1956.

Detailed figures for the last 3 months of 1957 revealed that Britain launched 71 ships of 453,940 tons. British ships completed—fitted out after launching—totaled 72 vessels of 341,131 tons.

Japanese completions during the quarter were 136 ships of 599,348 tons.

In third place again was West Germany, with 114 ships of 357,376 tons launched and 406,116 tons completed. Germany's completion figure was thus higher than Britain's, but it is the launching total which is usually taken as the index of output.

The Lloyd's return showed that at the end of December there were 1,681 ships of 9,947,977 tons under construction throughout the world. Over half this tonnage consisted of oil tankers, with Britain building the largest number.

The survey covers every shipbuilding country except Soviet Russia and Red China, and covers ships of 100 given tons and over.

The breakdown by countries showed an overall 341 ships (2,345,408 tons) under construction in Britain, mostly for home registration.

Japan was building 161 ships (1,589,280 tons) with about two-thirds of the tonnage for export. German shipyards were working on 223 ships (928,087 tons), well over half for export.

Italy was high on the list of countries building for export. Of the 928,087 tons being constructed, 585,764 tons were for registration abroad.

The United States came seventh in the quarterly output tables with 10 ships of 102,866 tons launched and 11 ships of 70,771 tons completed.

STEPSTONES TO NATIONAL DESTRUCTION BLUEPRINTED

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, again I wish to call to the attention of this distinguished body the fact that not only is it about to vote on a proposed gift of $3,500,000,000 to foreign nations, but such action will be an additional arm of the pincers movement.

I ask the Senate to stop and think of the various steps which have been taken: Deliberate inflation; going off the gold standard in 1933—following England, of

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

course; deliberately pricing ourselves out of every foreign market in the world; free imports, with no equalization between the costs of production in the United States and those in other nations which have lower wage-living standards; then the gifts of cash, which we are discussing today; then, without discussing all its implications, a political pincers movement.

NATION'S CITIZENS BEING TAKEN ON ROLLER-COASTER RIDE TOWARD WORLD GOVERNMENT

Mr. President, one of the arms of that political pincers is the Status of Forces Treaty, by which we utterly desert every GI who leaves our shores; if he commits a crime in another nation, he is tried under that nation's laws.

So we are moving toward world government; and we are moving toward it so rapidly that it should scare almost to death everyone in the Senate and everyone else in the United States. Some may favor world government, but I do not.

So, Mr. President, I shall vote against the pending bill.

PARTICIPATION IN WORLD SCIENCE-PAN PACIFIC EXPOSITION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to S. 3680.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3680) to provide for participation of the United States in the World Science-Pan Pacific Exposition to be held at Seattle, Wash., in 1961, and for other purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the President, through an executive department or independent agency designated by him, shall cooperate with the Washington State World Fair Commission with respect to, and determine the extent to which the United States shall be a participant and an exhibitor at, the World Science-Pan Pacific Exposition (hereafter in this act referred to as the "exposition") which is being held at Seattle, Wash., in 1961. The purposes of such exposition are to—

(1) commemorate the centennial of the physical fixing of the boundary line between the United States of America and Canada,

(2) depict the role of science in modern civilization, and

(3) exhibit the varied cultures of the nations of the Pacific Rim.

The President is authorized, by proclamation or in such other manner as he may deem proper, to invite the several States of the Union and foreign countries to take part in the exposition: *Provided*, That no Communist de facto government holding any people of the Pacific Rim in subjugation be invited to participate.

SEC. 2. There shall be in the designated department or independent agency a Commissioner for the exposition who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall receive compensation at the rate of $17,500 per annum. The head of the designated department or independent agency shall prescribe the duties of the Commissioner and may delegate such powers and duties to him as are deemed advisable in order to carry out this act.

SEC. 3. In carrying out the provisions of this act, the head of the designated department or independent agency may—

(1) appoint, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, such persons as he deems to be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, except that no person appointed under this paragraph shall receive compensation from the United States at a rate in excess of that received by persons under the Classification Act of 1949 for performing comparable duties;

(2) enter into such contracts as may be necessary to provide for United States participation in the exposition;

(3) erect such buildings and other structures as may be necessary for United States participation in the exposition, on land owned by the State of Washington or by any local government of such State or any political subdivision or instrumentality of either: *Provided*, That all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of work on such buildings and other structures shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Bacon-Davis Act, as amended (40 U. S. C., sec. 276a–276a–5);

(4) purchase books of reference, newspapers, and periodicals;

(5) incur such other expenses as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act; and

(6) accept any gifts, loans, donations, or devices to be used in carrying out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 4. The head of each department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government is authorized—

(1) to cooperate with the head of the designated department or independent agency with respect to United States participation in the exposition, and

(2) to make available to the head of the designated department or independent agency, from time to time, on a reimbursable basis, such personnel as may be necessary to assist the designated department or independent agency in carrying out its functions under this act.

SEC. 5. (a) The President shall report to the Congress during the first regular session of Congress which begins after the date of enactment of this act with respect to (1) the most effective manner of representation of the United States at the exposition, taking into account the avoidance of undue competition among governments, and (2) the amount of appropriations which are necessary to accomplish such representation.

(b) The President shall report to the Congress within 6 months after the date of the official close of the exposition on the activities of the Federal Government pursuant to this act, including a detailed statement of expenditures. Upon transmission of such report to the Congress, all appointments made under this act shall terminate.

SEC. 6. After the close of the exposition, all property purchased or erected with funds provided pursuant to this act shall be disposed of in accordance with the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, and other applicable Federal laws relating to the disposition of excess and surplus property.

SEC. 7. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $125,000 to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS DURING THE 85TH CONGRESS

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have prepared a statement on the activities on the Committee on Public Works during the 85th Congress. In order to save time, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS DURING THE 85TH CONGRESS

Under the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act, the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate has jurisdiction over legislation relating to flood control, improvement of rivers and harbors, public buildings, public roads, waterpower, bridges over navigable waterways, pollution control of navigable waters, and public reservations and parks in the District of Columbia.

Since the beginning of the 85th Congress, 273 measures were referred to the Committee. The committee approved 131 bills, of which 34 were included in Public Law 500 (the Omnibus River and Harbor-Flood Control Act), 54 bills have been signed into law, with 14 bills passed by both Houses and awaiting approval of the President. Committee resolutions for review of previous reports for flood-control and river and harbor studies were adopted in a total number of 100, and the Corps of Engineers will report to the committee on these studies, after completion.

Under provisions of Public Law 1018, 84th Congress, which amends the Watershed Protection and Flood Control Act, the Committee on Public Works approved projects which provide more than 4,000 acre-feet of total capacity in any one plan. The Committee on Public Works approved 13 such projects.

Legislation which is of national interest is discussed briefly as follows:

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT

It has been 2 years since the passage of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956. Since

Fiscal year	1956 act		1958 act		Total (billions)
	Federal	State	Federal	State	
Interstate:					
1959	$2,000,000,000	$200,000,000	$200,000,000	$20,000,000	$2.42
1960	2,200,000,000	220,000,000	300,000,000	30,000,000	2.75
1961	2,200,000,000	220,000,000	300,000,000	30,000,000	2.75
Total					7.92
Primary, secondary and urban:					
1959	875,000,000	875,000,000	400,000,000	200,000,000	2.35
1960			900,000,000	900,000,000	1.80
1961			925,000,000	925,000,000	1.85
Total					6.00

July 1, 1956 and through June 30, 1958, total funds including Federal and State in the amount of $6.965 billion have been obligated for improvements on the Interstate Highway System and on the primary, secondary, and urban roads. Of this amount, $3.184 billion represents obligations of Federal funds and $320 million of State funds for improvements on the Interstate System and $1.801 billion represents obligations of Federal funds and $1.661 billion of State funds for improvements on the primary, secondary and urban systems. According to the schedule as set up by the Bureau of Public Roads, the obligations to July 1, 1958, have exceeded by about 5 percent the total obligations anticipated.

The 1958 Federal-Aid Highway Act provides additional authorization for fiscal year 1959 of $200 million which in addition to the $2 billion previously authorized provides $2.2 billion for fiscal year 1959. The act also provides an authorization of $2.5 billion for fiscal 1960 for the Interstate System and a similar amount for fiscal year 1961, thereby providing for the 3 years a total of $7.2 billion authorization and with the States matching share the total for the 3 years would amount to $7.92 billion.

The 1958 act provides an authorization of $400 million for the primary, secondary, and urban programs which is in addition to the $875 million provided for in the 1956 act. In addition, the 1958 act authorizes $900 million for fiscal year 1960 and $925 million for fiscal year 1961 making a total authorization of $3.1 billion Federal funds and adding the required State contribution, there would be available a total of $6 billion.

The 1958 act directs that the authorizations for fiscal year 1959 be apportioned immediately upon enactment of the act and those apportionments have been made. In addition, $115 million was authorized for use by the States in lieu of a portion of the State matching share of projects financed under the $400 million authorization for the primary, secondary, and urban program. This amount is to be deducted from any apportionment made for fiscal years 1961 and 1962.

To insure prompt action in utilizing funds and to aid in reducing unemployment we specified in the 1958 act that the $400 million would be available only for work placed under contract or work commenced prior to December 1, 1958, for completion prior to December 1, 1959. The ratio of participation for these particular funds was changed from 50–50 to two-thirds Federal and one-third State.

As pointed out above, the 1958 act revises the fiscal year 1960 authorization for the Interstate System from $2.2 billion to $2.5 billion and a similar amount for fiscal year 1961. Authorization for the primary, secondary, and urban programs for fiscal years 1960 and 1961 was provided in the amount of $900 million and $925 million, respectively.

In the 1958 act, we made it possible for apportionments for fiscal year 1960 to be made immediately instead of deferring apportionments to the latter part of the year.

I am informed that over 1,000 project contracts have been awarded for construction on the Interstate System and over 8,000 construction contracts have been awarded for the primary, secondary, and urban system.

It has been estimated that about 70 percent of the total funds available for the Interstate System represent funds which would be available for contract work. The balance of 30 percent would represent costs of rights-of-way and preliminary engineering. I am also informed that about 85 percent of the total funds for the primary, secondary, and urban system would be available for contract work. The other 15 percent would be used for rights-of-way and preliminary engineering.

The preceding table indicates the authorizations of Federal funds for fiscal years 1959, 1960, and 1961 and the total amount when the States matching share is included.

In addition, the following funds were authorized by the 1958 Highway Act for fiscal years 1959, 1960, and 1961:

Forest highways	$71,000,000
Forest development roads	65,000,000
Park roads and trails	36,000,000
Parkways	32,000,000
Indian roads	24,000,000
Public lands roads	7,000,000
Total	235,000,000

RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL

The committee approved a comprehensive rivers and harbors, beach erosion control, and flood control bill to carry forward these important programs for development and improvement of the rivers and harbors of our Nation, for protection of our citizens against the ravages of floodwaters, and for the general development of the Nation's water resources. Additional authorizations are believed necessary at this time to continue the unified basin water resources developments now in progress, to round out basin programs where changing conditions have shown the necessity for extensions or modifications, and to provide for individual projects found to be necessary and justified. Completion of these projects will contribute materially to the economic well-being of the Nation.

The rivers and harbors and flood control program has produced a fine system of inland waterways and harbors on our seacoasts and Great Lakes and the flood control program has more than justified its cost by returning in benefits more than $3 for each $1 invested.

Hydroelectric power which is an important product of the multiple-purpose program is of great value to our country with a total capacity now in excess of 7.6 million kilowatts.

The committee has reported 3 rivers and harbors and flood control bills in the past 3 years. Two of these were vetoed because of the contention of the President that certain projects should not have been included which did not reflect the substantial benefits which would result to the beneficiaries and because in certain cases reports of the agencies had not been reviewed by the President. However, in spite of these setbacks, our committee proceeded in the perfecting of the bill which is now public law, and which has authorized projects as shown in the following tabulation.

Summary of projects in 1958 Flood Control Act

[Cost of new work]

TITLE I. RIVERS AND HARBORS	
53 navigation projects	$178,814,000
14 beach-erosion control projects	11,627,700
1 eradication of water hyacinths	4,725,000
1 upper Fox River, Wis.	300,000
1 Calumet-Sag project, Illinois	9,884,000
1 Illinois and Mississippi canal	2,000,000
Total, title I	202,350,700
TITLE II. FLOOD CONTROL	
67 new projects or project modifications	$495,289,800
12 increased basin authorizations	608,300,000
1 Oroville Dam, Calif.	[1] 50,000,000
1 Missouri River Basin, Department of the Interior	200,000,000
Total, title II	1,353,589,800
Grand total	1,555,940,500

[1] Estimated cost by the Bureau of the Budget.

A major contribution to the encouragement of the development of municipal and industrial water supply by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation is contained in title 3 of the 1958 Flood Control Act which is entitled "Water Supply Act of 1958." This language contained in title 3 will greatly assist State and local agencies in planning cooperatively with the Federal Government their future municipal and industrial water supply needs.

WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION

The Senate Public Works Committee amended the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (Public Law 566, 83d Cong.) in the 84th Congress. The amendment became Public Law 1018 of the 84th Congress. The principal amendments extended the authority of the Soil Conservation Service to construct reservoirs with total capacity of 25,000 acre-feet. This provision plus others incorporated in Public Law 1018 provided an opportunity for development of most reservoir sites to their full potential capacity which improved flood storage capacity, irrigation water storage capacity and capacity for municipal and industrial water supplies.

The amendment to Public Law 566 provided that the Senate Public Works Committee would have the responsibility for approving plans involving any single structure of more than 4,000 acre-feet of total capacity.

There follows a list of those projects which were acted on during the 85th Congress by the Senate Public Works Committee.

Resolutions approving projects under Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act

[Public Law 566, 83d Cong., and Public Law 1018, 84th Cong.]

Project	Cost		
	Federal Public Law 566	Other	Total
Sandy Creek watershed, Oklahoma	$1,549,139	$1,717,251	$3,266,390
Sulphur Creek watershed, Texas	1,050,565	213,961	1,264,526
Alamo Arroyo watershed, Texas	652,865	11,994	664,859
Diablo Arroyo watershed, Texas	425,808	16,920	442,728
Upper Bayou Nezpique watershed, Louisiana	662,861	1,656,150	2,319,011
Elm River watershed, North Dakota	858,780	740,002	1,598,782
Mud River watershed, Kentucky	1,539,996	5,603,529	5,143,525
Tramperos Creek watershed, New Mexico	323,733	148,994	472,727
Dry Devils River and Lowrey Draw, Tex.	1,662,349	485,978	2,148,327
Upper Lake Fork Creek, Tex.	1,386,400	1,023,506	2,409,906
Lower Willow Creek, Mont.	292,100	465,010	757,110
Whitegrass-Waterhole Creek, Okla.	542,306	732,098	1,274,404
Little Schuylkill River, Pa.	1,937,388	321,934	2,259,322
Total	12,880,290	11,137,327	24,021,617

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

SENATE BILL 2261 TO AMEND AND EXTEND PUBLIC BUILDINGS PURCHASE CONTRACT ACT OF 1954 (LEASE-PURCHASE)

On June 27, 1957, Senate bill 2261 was reported to the Senate, with a large number of the members of the Public Works Committee sponsoring the bill. This bill passed the Senate on July 3, 1957, and was referred to the House Public Works Committee. The House Committee suggested an approach which would provide for direct appropriations rather than a lease-purchase route and at the end of the Congress no action had been taken to perfect legislation which would provide for a continuing and orderly program of public building construction which is very essential to our country. It is anticipated that in the next Congress consideration will be given to legislation which will provide the executive agencies with the basis for studying and recommending public building construction.

SENATE RESOLUTIONS 148, 281 AND 248

A great deal of time was spent by the Senate Public Works Committee in consideration of Senate Resolution 148 and Senate Resolution 281, which were perfected for the purpose of outlining to the executive agencies concerned with water resources development projects, the type of information which both the Public Works and Interior and Insular Affairs Committees would like to have contained in reports submitted in connection with the projects for Congressional approval.

Considerable time was also spent by the Committee in working on Senate Resolution 248, which has to do with the relationship of river and related water resources development programs of the United States, Soviet Russia and Red China.

OTHER LEGISLATION

In addition to the activities of the Committee on Public Works relating to bills of national interest, we dealt with several which, although of sectional or regional interest, drew national interest because of their great importance. These bills are discussed briefly as follows:

DEVELOPMENT OF POWER AT NIAGARA FALLS, N. Y.

The resolution of various controversies with respect to the development of this tremendous hydroelectric power potential was finally accomplished after several unsuccessful attempts. There was no controversy as to the most desirable engineering plan, but there was great controversy as to who should develop this power. Finally, the problem was resolved by authorizing the Power Authority of the State of New York to construct the necessary works.

The Power Authority of the State of New York proposals contemplate a project with a total installed capacity of 2,190,000 kilowatts. Of this, 1,800,000 kilowatts will constitute firm power on a 17-hour basis. This development will be interconnected with the St. Lawrence project with a total firm capacity during a 17-hour day period amounting to 2 million kilowatts.

The law provides that the Federal Power Commission shall issue a license to the Power Authority of the State of New York, requiring that 50 percent of the power developed at Niagara Falls be made available at the lowest rates reasonably possible to public bodies and nonprofit cooperatives within economic transmission distances. The law provides flexible arrangements so that if preference power is sold to the utility companies withdrawal can be made upon reasonable notice and fair terms. The law also provides that a reasonable portion of the power subject to the preference provisions should be made available to neighboring States within reasonable economic transmission distances in an amount not to exceed 20 percent of that power subject to the preference provisions.

I am informed that the New York Power Authority is proceeding quite rapidly in the development of this important hydroelectric power development, and that it will utilize the United States portion of the Niagara River water which was made possible by the 1950 treaty between the United States and Canada.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY ACT

The Senate Committee on Public Works studied the problem of providing authority for the TVA to finance additional power-generating capacity to supply the growth for defense installations and other demands in the area. TVA is the sole supplier of power for an area of about 80,000 square miles in which over 5 million people live and work. The bill which was reported by the Committee on Public Works (S. 1869) passed the Senate, however, no action has been taken by the House on this matter.

Senate bill 1164 which is designed to allow a better basis for evaluation of fish and wildlife benefits and to permit the use of recreational values in computing such benefits to multiple-purpose reservoirs was given a great deal of consideration by the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control and was reported to the Senate. However, no action has been taken on this bill during this Congress. However, it is anticipated that studies and hearings will be continued in another session or in the next Congress to effect this type of legislation.

I have only discussed a few of the major pieces of legislation which have been before the Senate Public Works Committee. Each piece of legislation required careful consideration and a large amount of work by the committee, and at this point I would like to include in the RECORD a summary of the bills handled by the committee which have become law, those which have passed both the Senate and House and those which have passed the Senate only.

Summary of activities of the Committee on Public Works, U. S. Senate, 85th Cong.

Public Law	Date approved	Title of bill	Estimated cost
3	Jan. 25, 1957	S. 466—Amend Public Law 954, President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space	0
23	Apr. 23, 1957	S. 1682—Merrimack River flood control compact	0
85	July 10, 1957	S. 1430—Increased allowance for office building for Senate	$2,846,000
93	do	S. 1428—Furniture and so forth for additional Senate Office Building	Indefinite
95	do	S. 1429—Enlarging and remodeling suites in existing Senate Office Building	Indefinite
106	July 17, 1957	S. 1054—Toll bridge, Rainy River, Baudette, Minn	0
130	Aug. 17, 1957	S. 2217—Authorizing Secretary of Army to sell lands at McNary lock and dam project, Oregon and Washington, to port of Walla Walla, Wash	0
138	Aug. 14, 1957	H. R. 3077—Designate lake created by Jim Woodruff Dam as Lake Seminole	0
146	do	H. R. 3996—Authorizing utilization of storage space in Lake Texoma for water supply for Sherman, Tex	0
148	Aug. 16, 1957	S. 2441—Rates of tolls on bridge across Missouri River near Rulo, Nebr	0
159	Aug. 21, 1957	S. 2406—Authorizing construction of improvement in Niagara River for power and other purposes	[1] Indefinite
169	Aug. 28, 1957	S. 620—Transferring ownership to Allegany County, Md., of bridge loaned to county by Bureau of Public Roads	0
178	do	S. 1823—Authorizing conveyance of Bunker Hill Island to Commonwealth of Kentucky for park purposes	25,000
221	Aug. 30, 1957	S. 1829—Amending act providing for bridge across Bear Creek, Lovel Point, Md	0
230	do	H. R. 2580—Increase storage capacity of Whitney Dam and Reservoir	0
233	do	S. 2535—Amending Alaska Public Works Act	[1] Indefinite
242	Aug. 31, 1957	S. 2603—Amending act concerning appropriations for construction, repair, etc., of certain public works on rivers and harbors, etc	0
245	do	S. 268—Provide Secretary Army return certain mineral interests in land acquired by him for flood control purposes to former owners of land	0
294	Sept. 4, 1957	S. 1520—Amend act providing for disposal of Federally-owned property at obsolescent canalized waterways, etc	112,500
327	Feb. 15, 1958	H. R. 3770—Rename the Strawn Dam and Reservoir in Kansas as John Redmond Dam and Reservoir	0
329	do	H. R. 6660—Naming William Bacon Oliver lock and dam on Black Warrior River, Ala	0
357	Mar. 28, 1958	S. 1984—Transferring of certain art collections of Smithsonian to Civil Service Commission	0
363	do	H. R. 9653—Naming Walter F. George lock and dam, Chattahoochee River	0
381	Apr. 16, 1958	H. R. 9821 (S. 3414)—Amend Federal-Aid Road Act	[2]
429	May 29, 1958	S. 728—Authorizing space for additional Senate Office Building	950,000
452	June 6, 1958	H. R. 7840—Authorizing additional funds for Inter-American Highway	10,000,000
480	July 2, 1958	H. R. 4260—Authorizing Chief of Engineers to publish certain bulletins and publications	Indefinite
484	do	H. R. 2548—Authorizing payment for wells near New Cumberland Dam project, Ohio	35,000
490	do	H. R. 12613—Naming Thomas J. O'Brien lock and dam	0
494	do	H. R. 4683—Authorizing rentals, Lake Greeson Reservoir, Narrows Dam	0
496	do	H. R. 12073—Naming J. Percy Priest Dam and Reservoir	0
500	July 3, 1958	S. 3910—Authorizing certain works on certain rivers and harbors for navigation, etc	1,555,940,500
502	June 3, 1958	H. R. 8033—Bridge across Mississippi River	0
504	do	H. J. Res. 382—Lake Champlain Bridge Commission	0
512	July 11, 1958	H. R. 11861—Bridge across Mississippi River, Ill	0
518	do	H. R. 11936—Tolls of bridge across Missouri River, Brownsville, Nebr	0
522	July 15, 1958	H. J. Res. 633—Naming Lake O'the Pines, Tex	0
526	July 16, 1958	S. 2964—Compact between Connecticut and Massachusetts for flood control	0
535	do	S. 2109—Amend Public Buildings Act of 1926	Indefinite
542	do	S. 2108—Amend Public Buildings Act of 1949	0
562	July 28, 1958	S. 1785—Naming Lake Tschida, N Dak	0
591	Aug. 6, 1958	S. 495—Authorizing property for Senate	650,000
592	do	H. R. 855—Naming Howard A. Hanson Dam, Wash	0
597	do	H. R. 10426—Amend Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to increase period construction commences on rights-of-ways	0

[1] To be developed by New York Power Authority.

[2] Increases over 1956 act: Federal $3,260,000,000; State $2,115,000,000.

Summary of activities of the Committee on Public Works, U. S. Senate, 85th Cong.—Continued

Public Law	Date approved	Title of bill	Estimated cost
598	Aug. 6, 1958	H. R. 11305—Authorizing funds for 1961 meeting of Permanent International Association of Navigation Congresses	$180,000
607	Aug. 8, 1958	H. R. 7898—Tolls on bridge across Mississippi River near Jefferson Barracks, Mo	0
629	Aug. 14, 1958	Bridge across Mississippi River, Rock Island, Ill	0
636	do	Crisfield Harbor, Md	0
640	do	S. 2158—Procedure for altering certain bridges over navigable waters	0
643	do	S. 3833—Providing for survey of Coosawatchie and Broad Rivers in South Carolina, vicinity Dawson Landing	10,000
646	do	H. R. 13200—Albeni Falls Reservoir, Idaho, adjustments	0
665	do	S. 2793—Conveyance of pumping station of Intracoastal Waterway System at Louisiana	1,420,000
Private law			
531	do	S. 3053—Relief of Nettie L. Richard, etc	
341	Aug. 7, 1957	H. R. 8576 (S. 2531)—Conveyance of lands within Old Hickory lock and dam project, Cumberland, Tenn., to Boy Scouts of America	Indefinite

Reported by Committee on Public Works and passed Senate and House

Bill No.	Title	Estimated cost
S. 497	Authorizing work on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, etc	Vetoed
S. Con. Res. 7	Print for committee certain data on the Arkansas, White-Red River Basins and water resources of New England-New York region.	Indefinite
H. R. 6701	Tennessee River Basin water pollution control compact	0
H. R. 4142	City of Clinton Bridge Commission (H. R. 4142 passed in lieu of S. 1081 in Senate)	0
S. Con. Res. 68	Acceleration of civil construction programs for which appropriations have been made	0
S. 4021	To establish study commission on certain river basins	Indefinite
S. 4266	Establishing U. S. Study Commission on Neches, Trinity, Brazos, Colorado, etc., River Basins	Indefinite
H. R. 12216	Naming Cordell Hull Dam and Reservoir	0
H. R. 12808	Amend Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958	0
H. R. 8160	Tensaw River, Ala	$20,000
H. R. 13342	Parish Line Canal, La	15,000
H. R. 11697	New York Harbor and Hampton Roads Harbor, prevention of harmful deposits	300,000
H. R. 13500	Disposal of federally owned property of the Hanson Co. and Houma Canals, La	0
H. R. 12776	Codifying and enacting into law title 23 of the United States Code, entitled "Highways"	0
H. R. 8652	Rescind authorization for Waldo Lake tunnel	0
H. R. 12883	Capitol Power Plant improvements	6,550,000
H. J. Res. 654	Recommendations for reimbursement to States for certain highways on the Interstate System	Indefinite
S. 3776	To extend time for collection of tolls to amortize cost including reasonable interest and financing cost of construction of bridge across Missouri River, Miami, Mo.	0
S. 3335	National Capital Center of Performing Arts	Indefinite
S. 3712	Rama Road in Nicaragua	4,000,000
S. 1985	National Air Museum	Indefinite

Reported by committees and passed Senate

Bill No.	Title	Estimated cost
S. Res. 34	Additional help for Committee on Public Works	Indefinite
S. J. Res. 50	Relocation of Ferry County, Wash., highway by Department of the Interior	$10,000
S. 1869	Amend Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933	0
S. 2117	Direct Secretary of Army to transfer certain buildings to Crow Creek Sioux Indian Tribe	6,000
S. 2228	Amend sec. 5 of Flood Control Act of 1941	0
S. 2261	Amend Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 and Post Office Department Property Act of 1954	Indefinite
S. Res. 148	Prescribe procedures and contents for reports to Senate by executive agencies (land and water resources)	Indefinite
S. Res. 213	Additional help for Committee on Public Works	Indefinite
S. Res. 248	Investigate relationships of river and related water-resource development programs	0
S. 3524	McAlpine locks and dam (name designation)	0
S. 3571	Provide for equal treatment of all State-owned hydroelectric projects with respect to taking over of such projects by United States.	0
S. 3975	Fireproof annex building for Government Printing Office	0
S. 4179	Tahchevah Creek project California	1,658,000
S. 4192	Trinity River, Tex	6,992,000
H. R. 11456	Authorizing exchange of certain real property to the city of El Paso, Tex	0
S. J. Res. 179	Designating lake formed by Dickinson Dam on Heart River in North Dakota as the Edward Arthur Patterson Lake	0

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR FLANDERS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I desire to say a few words in appreciation of the services of the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. Senator FLANDERS has announced that he is retiring from the Senate at the conclusion of this term.

It has been my privilege to serve with Senator FLANDERS on the Committee on Armed Services. I have been with him on some of the trips when we visited missile-development plants. Until I was with him at some of the informal briefings which were held at those plants, I never realized the wealth of imagination and the understanding of intricate scientific developments and engineering problems that the Senator from Vermont has.

I had known that in our questioning of representatives of the Defense Department, he had always shown a great alertness to problems of that nature. But until one sees him in action on one of these inspection trips, one does not fully realize the capacity of this man.

We shall miss Senator FLANDERS in the committee. The whole Nation will miss his valiant service on the committee, and also his dedicated service as a Member of the Senate as a whole.

I know it is a matter of regret to all of us that in these closing days of the session, Senator FLANDERS has been obliged to be absent, due to the illness of his wife.

To Senator FLANDERS and to Mrs. Flanders, I desire to express my affection, and my hopes that Mrs. Flanders may soon be restored to health, and that they may enjoy together the rest and release from daily duties which will come with the adjournment of the session.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am very happy to have this opportunity to join in the tribute to Senator FLANDERS.

During the years of his service, Senator FLANDERS has been a good friend. He is of a philosophical turn of mind, although in the past he has been a very successful businessman. He and his dear wife have been very close friends of practically every Member of the Senate. I have enjoyed his discourses, although I have not agreed with him at times. As I have said before, that again is the privilege of being an American. We can be friendly, even though we may not go to the same church or may not have the same political or economic philosophy. With Senator FLANDERS, at least, I feel I can say he is a man of integrity, a man of ability, a man of fine Christian ideals. So we wish him and his dear wife many more years of health and happiness.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

DIVERSION OF WATER FROM LAKE MICHIGAN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to submit some thoughts on House bill 2, which contemplates the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway.

First. The bill provides that the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago increase by 1,000 cubic feet per second its take from Lake Michigan. It wants to be able in dry weather to take a flow of 5,000 cubic feet per second and, in wet weather, take nothing.

Second. There is pending in the Supreme Court an action in relation to requiring the sanitary district to return the domestic pumpage to the lake. This bill would do away with the issue before the Court.

Third. The lake level is down 7 feet now. When you realize that water had been continuously taken and none given by Chicago, this dangerous lowering of the lakes—impairing cargo-transporting capacity—clearly shows the necessity for no more diversion.

Fourth. This is, in effect, a bill to subsidize Chicago's disposal of sewage by authorizing it to drain away water to another watershed. The precedent of this bill would be followed by other lake cities until the Great Lakes no longer would be the wonderful waterway we planned and spent millions to improve.

Fifth. The bill is not required in the slightest for navigation purposes. There will be no necessity again for an order such as the United States Supreme Court's justifiable temporary order which permitted the emergency diversion in 1956. Congress is appropriating funds for building a reservoir dam for storage on the Mississippi River.

Sixth. The Congress should not condone the action of the Department of State in attempting to pressure one of our greatest friends—Canada—to withhold opposition from legislation injurious to our good neighbor. I am particularly distressed that the Department of State would do such a thing on behalf of a special interest in a particular State. The Department of State referred the Canadians to a past favor and then arbitrarily asked that the Canadian Government refrain from interposing objection to H. R. 2. This is like holding a gun at the head of a friend.

Nevertheless, Canada has expressed its objection, but in the most diplomatic and polite form. It has gone easy in expressing its objection, but it was objecting, nevertheless. A reading of the Canadian Aide-Memoire of January 6, 1958 makes that clear.

Seventh. In its closing hours, the Senate should not be diverted from pressing national and international problems to debate Chicago's sewage problem. That is Illinois' own State and local problem which I am sure it can solve as other States and cities have done, if they will spend enough of local tax income to do so. The waters of the Great Lakes—liquid gold to the bordering communities, States, and sections—is their precious joint possession.

Eighth. Chicago's problem is not a navigation problem, such as Congress is authorized and accustomed to handle.

The bill would still authorize a 3-year diversion. The Senate Public Works Committee did not amend it to conform to the 1-year diversion which the testimony of Chicago witnesses stated would be sufficient. Therefore, he urged that the bill be tabled or returned to committee for amendment.

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1959

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13192) making appropriations for Mutual Security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, may I be recognized, or does the Senator from Texas have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). The present occupant of the chair, having just taken the chair, is informed that the Senator from Texas has the floor.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I want to direct the attention of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee to a particular part of the bill, to which I may wish to make a point of order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield for that purpose, with the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Section 108, which appears on page 7 of the bill, reads:

> Not to exceed 50 percent of the foreign currencies heretofore generated in any country under section 402 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, may, notwithstanding prior provisions of law, hereafter be used in accordance with the provisions of that section: *Provided*, That quarterly reports of the use of foreign currencies pursuant to this section shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives.

It occurs to me that on its face that is legislation in an appropriation bill. I would be inclined to make a point of order against it. I wondered what was the reason for the Appropriations Committee's concluding that the paragraph should be placed in the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. There is not any question that it is legislation. We thought it was advantageous for us to use foreign currencies where we have them, rather than American dollars.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would those funds be used for the same purposes that appropriated dollars would be used for?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That seems desirable. What I feared was that it might provide for some new expenditures which would be beyond the control of Congress.

Mr. HAYDEN. That was not the understanding at all. The purpose simply was that where we had foreign currencies available in a certain country funds could be used for assistance to that country.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It has been generally my feeling that we ought to tighten the use of foreign currencies. We do not count them as dollars in our computations, because they are not now taken directly out of the Treasury; but I have a feeling there should be a full-fledged review of the amounts of the foreign currencies, and that Congress should more directly watch them. In fact, in a previous bill I proposed that those currencies be placed in the Treasury, and that the currencies be appropriated from the Treasury, as we appropriate dollars.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have a statement I can place in the RECORD with regard to the matter. The statement relates to currencies in Austria, Belgium, Germany, Italy, and Yugoslavia where assistance will be authorized under the amendment. I shall read from the part of the statement which pertains to Yugoslavia:

> Since by mutual agreement Yugoslavia is no longer receiving military assistance or defense support aid, it is not now desired to use available balances of Yugoslavian local currency, which were generated by defense support appropriations, in furtherance of military objectives. Under the proposed amendment, the dinars would be used for mutually agreed upon economic development unconnected with military objectives but within the purposes of the Mutual Security program. It would be in the best interests of the United States that these dinars do not remain unused but that they be used in directions favorable to United States policies.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I agree with every word the Senator has said. I think what is done is desirable. I think it is desirable that the Yugoslav dinars which are "on ice," so to speak, and not being used, be utilized for purposes that would advance the policies of the United States.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the distinct understanding we have with respect to all these currencies.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In general, would these foreign currencies be used to save dollars, or would they represent an increase or an augmentation of an appropriation?

Mr. HAYDEN. After listening to the testimony before the committee, my understanding was that the currencies would be used instead of dollars. Otherwise, if we wanted to get things done, if we did not utilize the foreign currencies, we would be asked to use our own money.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. With that explanation, I shall not make a point of order; but I will be interested in examining the quarterly reports provided for in that paragraph of the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. We thought it was highly desirable to have quarterly reports provided, so there would not be long lapses in providing Congress with information as to what was being done.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I trust the staff of the Appropriations Committee will examine the reports as they come in, and keep the members of the Appropriations Committee, as well as Members of the Senate, advised if something seems to be wasteful or profligate.

Mr. HAYDEN. The staff will be glad to inform Senators.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield the floor so my friend from Louisiana may be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, before I go into a discussion of the pending bill, I must say it seems almost incredible to me that the Senate, in the dying hours of this session, should consider, in a matter of hours, this most important bill. I would like to point out to Senators that this measure would saddle every man, woman, and child in this Nation of ours with a burden of a little over $20.

The bill, if adopted as presented by the Senate Appropriations Committee, will entail the expenditure of over $3½ billion. That huge sum, Mr. President, would be sufficient to cover complete costs, of almost one-half of all the Corps of Engineers public works projects which this Congress has authorized in the last 40 years.

Senators will know the difficulties which confront us in our attempts to obtain sufficient funds to carry on public works which are vital to the stability and economy of our Nation. Senators know the difficulty we encounter in having the Bureau of the Budget provide sufficient funds to take care of worthy reclamation, flood control, and navigation projects—projects, Mr. President, the neglect of which will doubtless weaken our economy as long as they remain unfinished.

I have been advocating ever since I have been a Member of the Senate, for the past 22 years, that we spend an amount sufficient to preserve our precious natural resources, topsoil, and water. Yet in the space of less than 12 hours, if the Congress adjourns as is proposed, there will be an expenditure authorized of a sum which would complete. I repeat, of half the authorized public works projects which have been approved by Congress in the last 40 years.

No opposition to passage of this giant foreign giveaway program is put forward from the administration. But when the matter of expenditures to protect and preserve our own national resources is under consideration, there is much hullabaloo raised.

Mr. President, for several years I have endeavored to prevail upon the Congress to restore a rule of reason in the expenditure of public funds, particularly in respect to our foreign-aid programs under their various forms and names.

I respectfully refer Senators to Senate Document No. 78 of the 85th Congress, 2d session, for a short history of these programs.

I have spent considerable time during each Congressional recess visiting countries all over the world in an effort to learn firsthand how these programs have worked and how they have affected our foreign policy. During the past 3 years I have advocated a comprehensive review and revision of our foreign policy, particularly as it has been guided by our many aid programs.

In this connection, I am pleased to see that President Eisenhower himself has called for a new look at our foreign-aid program.

In his recent speech before the United Nations, the President mentioned the possibility of creating a loan fund, which would be used to help the Arab countries help themselves.

As I have reminded Senators many times in the past, this basic program of making loans—not grants—to nations to help them help themselves was the original basis of the Marshall plan.

Yet, we all know how far afield of this original concept the Marshall plan has strayed.

Therefore, while I applaud President Eisenhower in his move to find some new approach with which we can solve the pressing Middle East problem, I am still somewhat suspicious.

Ringing statements from the podium of the United Nations are one thing. Actual accomplishments along this line are another.

I will want to take a long, hard look at such a program to make sure that none of our dreamy-eyed planners of the State Department who believe that the more money we give away, the more friends we will have, ever have the slightest opportunity to get their give-away hands on this program.

I, personally, would like to see the loans secured by revenues of these countries to whom we extend the loans. I think it would be good business if sizable loans to Middle East countries, for instance, could be secured by the oil revenues of those countries.

In other words, I would not object to seeing Uncle Sam take the role of banker. But I do oppose him being a sucker.

I should also like to see that such a program would be carried out on a completely businesslike approach, and that for every American dollar we loan we ultimately will be returned other American dollars—and not the currency of the country receiving the loan, which too often is subject to suspicious fluctuations in value.

I also note that President Eisenhower has suggested that this Arab development fund be open to all nations to contribute. Before I make up my mind on such a program I would like the answer to this question:

Is this to be another United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, into which the United States puts the vast majority of the funds, but the Soviet Union takes all the credit?

I remind Senators that of the $3.66 billion spent by UNRRA to aid the war-ravaged peoples of Europe, the United Kingdom and the United States contributed a total of 97 percent. Yet, as we all remember, the Soviet Union took the opportunity to claim credit for furnishing this aid to the peoples of Eastern Europe.

If the United States is to put up the money, then in my judgment any such program should be administered by this country and subject to the review of the Congress.

Today, as the Senate once again debates foreign aid appropriations, I believe it is important that we remember these things. In addition, I believe it is important that we preface our action here today with sober consideration of what the now-called mutual security program, the successor of a series of such programs, has accomplished, where it has failed, and where its defects lie.

Our country cannot afford, either economically, or strategically, to continue the pursuit of outmoded and unworkable policies—particularly in this day and time when militant world communism perches like a vulture on the ramparts of despotism and awaits the opportunity to feed and grow fat upon our mistakes.

Unfortunately, our foreign policies thus far have supplied a varied and nourishing diet for Communist ambitions. Our mistakes have been too many; our shortcomings have been too obvious. The men in the Kremlin have scored victory after victory, particularly in the propaganda field, and they threaten to score more—victories which, I respectfully submit, have been more or less handed to our cold war opponents on a silver platter.

The issue before the Senate today, as it has been for the past several years, is simple, yet basic: will we continue to lend our endorsement and support to an unimaginative and unrealistic foreign policy based almost solely upon dollar disbursements, or shall we attempt to restore America's prestige and regain freedom's leadership in the cold war?

That, bluntly speaking, is the decision the Senate faces today.

Thus, the Senate now has an opportunity to place itself on record as opposing dollar diplomacy as the basic tool of American foreign policy.

We have the solemn duty of serving notice on the President, charged under the Constitution with guiding our Nation in foreign policy matters, that as he calls for a new concept of foreign aid to the Middle East so must he call for the same new look all over the world.

Under these circumstances, Mr. President, I would be unfaithful to the trust reposed in me by the people of my State, if I blindly acquiesced in the pleas that this bill be approved without change. I would be derelict in my responsibilities if I, in effect, gave another vote of confidence to a policy which events abundantly show has failed, and failed miserably.

In evaluating the failure of foreign aid, Mr. President, it is first necessary for us to see and understand how the present program began, how it has grown, and what it now embraces.

Nineteen hundred and forty-seven was a fateful year in our history. The wartime alliance between the Soviet Union and the Western Allies had fallen apart. The expansionist desires of the Communist system were forcing the West into an untenable position.

Wisely, I believe, the decision was made that Western Europe must be preserved for freedom. Following that decision, the Congress—after considerable study—overwhelmingly endorsed the Marshall plan.

The first official statement of what was to become the Marshall plan was made on May 8, 1947, by then Under

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Secretary of State Dean Acheson, substituting for President Truman as a speaker before the Delta Council at Cleveland, Miss.

He outlined a five-point program implementing American international political and economic policies. He mentioned the relief and reconstruction measures already undertaken by the United States and he added:

As great as is our supply of commodities and service to the world during the current year, it is still far short of what the people of the world need if they are to eat enough to maintain their physical strength and at the same time carry on essential measures of reconstruction and become self-supporting.

But it remained until June 5, 1947, for Secretary of State George Marshall, speaking at commencement exercises at Harvard University, to outline the ideals which would develop into the plan that was to bear his name.

In discussing the plight that a war-ravaged Europe found itself in on that spring day, Marshall said:

It is logical that the United States should do whatever it is able to do to assist in the return of normal economic health in the world, without which there can be no political stability and no assured peace. Our policy is directed not against any country or doctrine, but against hunger, poverty, desperation and chaos.

Its purpose should be the revival of a working economy in the world so as to permit the emergency of political and social conditions in which free institutions can exist. Such assistance, I am convinced, must not be on a piecemeal basis as various crises develop. Any assistance that this Government may render in the future should provide a cure rather than a mere palliative.

Marshall continued—

It would be neither fitting nor efficacious for this Government to undertake to draw up unilaterally a program designed to place Europe on its feet economically. This is the business of the Europeans. The initiative, I think, must come from Europe.

Thus was born the American concept of the Marshall plan—that the United States would be willing to aid any nation if that nation shows that it desires to help itself.

This, I respectfully submit, is the same concept that President Eisenhower has endorsed in his speech before the United Nations. It now appears, Mr. President, that we have run the full circle. Our noble objectives of the late 1940's, after having been strewn in wasteful amounts all over the world, have now come home again. Let us also hope that sanity is also coming home again.

President Eisenhower in his United Nations speech also returned to another concept of the original Marshall plan—the inherent American dislike of becoming involved in another nation's internal affairs.

President Eisenhower said, and I quote:

I hope it is clear that I am not suggesting a position of leadership for my own country in the work of creating such an institution (for development of the Arab countries). If this institution is to be a success, the function of leadership must belong to the Arab states themselves.

General Marshall, in a statement before a joint session of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs more than 11 years prior to President Eisenhower's statement, likewise pointed out:

Loans should be made to cover imports of capital equipment and raw materials which will directly produce the means of repayment and where such repayment can reasonably be expected.

At the same time, every encouragement should be given to early initiation of private financing so as to eliminate as far as possible the necessity for direct assistance from the United States Government. * * * It is obvious that the basic responsibility for European recovery rests on the European countries themselves. However, this Government must have assurance that the aid it provides is effectively utilized for the achievement of European recovery as rapidly as possible.

Following Secretary Marshall's speech at Harvard, the Foreign Secretaries of Britain and France opened talks in Paris dealing with raw materials, tariffs, currency, and priorities of aid. The meeting was broken off in order to invite Russian Foreign Secretary Molotov.

A Big Three meeting was set for June 23, at which Molotov opened Russian opposition to the United States plan, and Russia vetoed any concerted action by the three Foreign Ministers.

As a consequence, Foreign Secretaries Bevan of England and Bidault of France issued a joint communique inviting 22 additional European nations to meet in Paris on July 12 to consider a recovery plan.

When the meeting opened, 16 nations were represented—Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, and the United Kingdom.

The Conference created a general overall committee, known as Committee for European Economic Cooperation (CEEC), which later would be expanded to the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC), which on September 22, submitted its recovery plan to the United States.

The 16 participating nations, keeping in mind the then dominant thought in American foreign-aid policy that only nations that helped themselves would be granted aid from this country, outlined production targets for a 4-year period, which was then considered as all the time necessary to reestablish the economic solidarity of Europe.

The report to the United States also listed proposed measures for coordinated action to achieve the production targets providing for a freer flow of goods and labor and a fuller use of their own resources.

The group estimated that Western Europe's dollar deficit—that amount of money they would need to purchase needed goods from the United States above and beyond their current capacity for purchase—would amount to some $22 billion over the 4-year period.

This, then, was the amount of aid being requested by the CEEC, as the amount needed to put Europe back on its buying feet within a 4-year period.

In the meantime, a number of committees had been named, both by the President and by the House of Representatives, to study the concept of the United States furnishing aid in great quantities to Europe.

One report, named after its chairman, the Honorable W. Averell Harriman, discussed the principles under which aid could be given to the countries of Europe.

Some items from this report make interesting reading in the accumulated light of 10 years of giveaways since they were written:

We believe that the future of Western Europe lies very much in its own hands. * * * Such aid being supplied from outside Europe must be viewed not as a means of supporting Europe, but as spark which can fire the engine.

The report also contains this item which, apparently, seems to have been forgotten:

For all its resources, the United States is no limitless cornucopia. The population of this country represents something less than 7 percent of the population of the world.

Nevertheless, the committee report recommended that the United States enter into a program of aid for Europe, and estimated that it would cost the United States approximately $5.75 billion for the first year of a 4-year program as outlined by the report of the CEEC.

In addition, the Harriman Committee report said total cost for the program would be between $12 billion and $17 billion, depending upon a number of factors.

However, the committee report added:

But the committee cannot emphasize too strongly that any aid extended to Europe must be on a year-to-year basis. It must be subject to constant, vigilant review by Congress.

While the various committees, including those appointed by President Truman, as well as those of the Senate and House of Representatives, continued their studies of the possibility of a long-range aid to Europe plan, the Department of State, in cooperation with other agencies of the Government, began a review of the CEEC's report.

On the basis of all investigations, as well as the State Department's findings, President Truman presented his recommendations to the Congress for a long-range program of aid to Europe, by the United States for a period of approximately 4 years and a total cost of $19 billion.

In April of 1948, the Congress passed the Economic Cooperation Act to furnish the means for covering essential import needs of the participating countries for commodities and equipment which could not be financed by their own efforts and to support the measures of self and mutual help on the part of the participating countries necessary to achieve true economic recovery.

At the outset, the Marshall plan envisioned the United States priming the pump of a gushing outpour of production which in turn would enable Europe to recover its economic stability. In addition, the Marshall plan originally envisioned the lending of money to aid European countries to get these factories back into production.

The United States was willing to foot this bill if it would bring back into proper

balance one of the world's most important centers—Europe.

Mr. President, I say as I have said many times in the past, I have no regret for having voted for the original concept of the Marshall plan. I supported it, and I supported every item that was requested during the first 4 years of the program, in order to carry out the plan in its original form.

From this opening concept of the Marshall plan whereby the United States would furnish aid, it appears now that the United States has been saddled with the entire burden. In fact, in just 3 years' time, the Marshall plan itself was transformed from a helping hand to a heaping hand.

But the job had been done.

The report from the officials of the ERP at the end of 1950 pointed out:

The industrial production of Western Europe had by that time greatly exceeded prewar levels, and agricultural production had almost completely recovered from the damage of a world war.

The dollar deficit in the balance of payments of all the 18 countries participating in the recovery program had been reduced from $7 billion in 1947 to less than $2 billion in 1950.

Trade among the participating countries had more than doubled.

With the exception of only 3 nations—Italy, Belgium, and Germany—there was virtually full employment.

Rationing of almost all consumer items had been abolished and recourse to black market for the necessities of life had been virtually eliminated.

In addition, we found that the Organization for European Economic Cooperation was providing the general direction to the recovery program on a new basis of cooperation. A new economic union was being forged between Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg which would shortly show the way for even greater union and dissolution of trade barriers.

At this time the plan was, indeed, working in Europe. This, probably, was America's high point. Waste, no doubt there was, but the United States had accomplished its aim—to reestablish a tottering European economy upon solid legs of trade and credit.

Yet, America then seemed hypnotized by the sound and sight of its own success. The panacea of a good dosing of American dollars had worked wonders upon the feeble, almost infirm body of Europe.

So, the next move, naturally, was to try this wonder drug—dollar diplomacy—upon the rest of the world.

As the emphasis of assistance changed, the volume of aid continued. War in Korea provided further excuses for more United States expenditures in that area. In addition, motivated by foreign policy expediencies, our Nation added other countries to the aid list.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization was created, amid hullabaloo and fanfare. American troops were to remain in Europe, in order to provide a small, but important, part of a vaunted shield against aggression to blunt and repel any armed attack from the East.

Reinforced by token forces from other United Nations member-countries, American troops in Korea fought the hordes of Red China to a standstill, after completely destroying what had been a well-armed North Korean Army.

During the early 1950's, America was concerned with many things—the bloody battlefields of Korea; the almost insatiable demands of Western Europe for more and ever more aid, and, finally, those potential trouble spots scattered about the globe where the State Department sought to preserve the status quo with foreign aid funds. Yet, while America's attention was concerned thusly, ominous events were taking place in other parts of the world.

There was war in Indochina.

There were constant threats of conflict in the Near East, where rising Arab nationalism was threatening an area vital to Western Europe's industry.

Algeria and all of North Africa threatened to burst into flames.

Latin America showed signs of dissatisfaction with a good neighbor policy which was by this time little more than a fancy name and without real substance.

Into this situation stepped a new national administration, elected on a platform which promised that the United States was to take the offensive in world affairs.

Chiang Kai-shek was to be unleashed. The 7th Fleet was to be removed from the Straits of Formosa.

Captive nations were to be encouraged to throw off the yoke of Communist domination.

Foreign policy was to be completely changed. The so-called policy of containment was to be discarded, and the Nation was promised a new, streamlined and effective foreign policy.

None of these promises have been fulfilled.

The Seventh Fleet was removed, but Chiang Kai-shek remains holed upon his island fortress, with one eye upon the mainland, and both hands in the American Treasury.

Poland and Hungary have been torn by revolution, but still remain under Communist bondage.

Foreign policy has not been changed or modified. We are still on the defensive. As a matter of fact, American prestige abroad has sunk to an all-time low, and we are finding difficulty mustering enough votes in the General Assembly of the United Nations to even maintain a semblance of world respect.

In brief, Mr. President, world leadership is quickly passing from our hands, by default.

Allies which should be standing at our sides, helping us carry the Free World's burden, continue to free-load at our expense.

Neutral nations, which we have hoped to win over to the cause of freedom, openly pit the United States against the Soviet Union in order to make the most advantageous deal possible—in order to get as much assistance from both sides as they can.

In brief, Mr. President, despite vast and far-reaching changes in the world situation, we are continuing today to pursue a foreign policy originally devised over a decade ago. In addition, insofar as foreign aid is concerned, the original Marshall plan has been changed, expanded, and extended to practically every country in the world.

Foreign aid is being used as a poor substitute for a foreign policy. The United States has sought to cure with a flood of dollars festering wounds which require, instead, the soothing medication of understanding and reasonable assistance.

I do not intend to burden the Senate with a long and repetitive recitation of how and why our present policy has failed, and will continue to fail. The facts are abundantly available to all who desire to look and see for themselves.

Suffice it to say that evaluated even under the most charitable conditions, these facts demonstrate that adoption of the bill which is now pending before the Senate will do more to injure the United States than help us.

Foreign aid, as we now understand it, is the crutch which has supported this administration for too many years. I do not mean to say that this administration is without any variations on the foreign-aid theme.

One good example is the so-called Eisenhower doctrine, which was the first attempt at solution of the Middle East problems.

Instead of approaching the then impending crisis in the Middle East in a realistic manner by facing up to the basic issue involved, that is, the Arab-Israeli conflict, the administration has followed its usual pattern of instituting a policy based, first, upon the use of dollars in an effort to soothe international ills, with the promise that if dollars failed to do the job, military force would be applied.

Events of recent weeks demonstrate the failure of dollar diplomacy in the Middle East. They also show clearly that the alternative—that is, the use of troops—is equally as devoid of concrete results.

We must remember that the motivating force in this troubled spot is Arab nationalism. If we fail to grasp the true significance of this movement, we will do nothing but further widen the chasm that now exists between us and the Arab people.

Mr. President, I warn Senators that the fiasco which confronts us in the Middle East as the result of our barren policy there threatens to grow and expand to other areas. The sorry patchwork of dollar bills which Secretary Dulles and President Eisenhower have pasted over each and every trouble spot in the world today threatens to fall apart. We will face many other crises as a result of these policies unless they are changed.

The Senate has before it a golden opportunity to serve notice on this administration, as well as on our so-called western European allies, that Uncle Sam is sick and tired of giving, giving, giving, and getting little in return. The time has come for us to serve notice on Western Europe that we are no longer going

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

to be a soft touch. We have an opportunity to put the administration on notice that a second-rate policy based upon outmoded concepts, stereotyped ideas, and pious platitudes will no longer serve, despite the fancy pronouncements of high powered propagandists.

Is it too much, Mr. President, to urge Senators to look behind the sugar-coated generalities in which the foreign-aid program is clothed before voting on this bill? I do not believe it is.

Then, let us proceed to do so.

First, let us lay at rest the notion that the $3.5 billion which this measure would appropriate will purchase us security, friendship, or respect.

Of the $3.5 billion carried in the pending measure, approximately $1.5 billion or more than one-third is for so-called military aid.

I know that many Senators have heard it proclaimed time and time again, that by providing these funds, the United States is increasing the defensive strength of the Free World to such an extent that our own burdens are reduced. We are told, "reduce this amount, and we will have to increase draft calls."

This is downright asinine.

The record abundantly shows that we cannot depend upon the token armies we are creating in the many underdeveloped countries of the world for even token assistance in stamping out brush-fire wars. As a matter of fact, one of the countries which we have helped considerably—Iraq—by the way, to the extent of $50 million in military aid—only recently used the arms we have supplied to overthrow the Government we supported in the past. A cornerstone of the Baghdad Pact has crumbled, and Uncle Sam has had to step in and pick up the pieces.

American troops are in Lebanon to forestall the possible success of an armed revolt there—a contingency, which, I might add, is not covered by the terms of the vaunted Eisenhower doctrine.

We have also been bombarded with the statement that for every $1 the United States spends for foreign military aid, our European allies put up $5.

That statement, Mr. President, is a fraud, pure and simple.

In order to attain that ratio the eager-beaver planners in the State Department and the International Cooperation Administration have totaled the defense budgets of all NATO countries, placed that total beside the military aid we are extending, and come up with grand and glorious, sacred and sanctified, ratio of 5 to 1.

Why does not the executive branch tell the whole story?

If the total defense expenditures of all European countries is to be the basis for calculating overall defense effort, then should not our total defense expenditure also be counted?

Of course it should.

But it is not.

Why?

Because if we count the $40 billion per year we are spending upon domestic defense in computing the comparative ratio of spending by the United States and our allies, it becomes all too clear that the ratio cited by the executive branch mathematicians is cockeyed—the ratio shows that Uncle Sam is spending better than $3 to each $1 our so-called European allies are spending for defense. All the 5-to-1 ratio really means is that in addition to supporting our own military establishments, we are paying from 20 to as much as 40 percent of the military budgets of our so-called allies.

Mr. President, as I shall point out later in my remarks, the pending bill contains an item of more than $300 million for countries of Western Europe that we have already nursed back to economic health, and which today enjoy a degree of prosperity far greater than they have ever enjoyed before. Yet in the pending bill we provide for further aid to them, and that aid would be in the form of borrowed dollars. Just think of it, Mr. President. On yesterday the Senate passed a bill to increase the debt limit by $8 billion, in anticipation of a gross debt of $288 billion. Thus we are going further into debt so that one can continue to give aid to countries that no longer actually need that aid.

The truth of the matter is, Mr. President, that the entire foreign-aid program has become huge, unwieldy, and submerged in pious and false propaganda. It is well-nigh impossible to obtain the true facts as to how this program operates, much less to disseminate them to the American people.

Mr. President, I have before me, and I also have in my desk, much data which I should like to reveal to the American people. But I am unable to do so, because the material is stamped "secret."

Mr. President, why should this data be stamped "secret?" It is stamped "secret" because the administration's policy is not to let one country know what another country receives. In other words, today our foreign aid is based not on need, but on which squeals the loudest, so to speak.

It makes my blood boil to see, for instance, that in addition to our own military research and development expenditures of about $6.5 billion a year, the pending bill calls for the expenditure of $40 million to defray nearly half of NATO's research and development program.

In the light of the huge amounts of money we have provided in the years past to Western Europe, would it be asking too much to suggest that our so-called allies there make their research available to us?

And there is the matter of facilities assistance, for which the sum of about $20 million is carried in this bill. Facilities assistance, involves United States money to build, in Europe arms factories, to produce weapons for arming European troops.

Since Europe's recovery has been achieved, since Europe is financially sound, and economically strong, would it be asking too much of our friends there to request that they build their own factories to manufacture their own weapons of war? Of course if that were done, France could not sell as many automobiles in the United States as she has been, nor could the United Kingdom; but I doubt seriously that the unemployed automobile workers in Detroit would break into tears at that thought.

In addition to these amounts, there is in this bill a sizable item for offshore procurement. That sum, Mr. President, would be used to supply our NATO allies with weapons for which we have already paid part of the development costs, and which are to be manufactured in factories we have already helped to build.

Since NATO has already cut back tremendously on her troop strength, I do not think it would be asking too much to request our so-called partners to pay for their own arms. Of course, that might work some hardship upon the French troops who are using United States weapons in fighting Algerian nationalists. But I think it could be done.

And what about other parts of the world? What about the backward, struggling countries upon whom we impose the burden of large armies, equipped with already antiquated weapons—armies which, I submit, would be about as useful to us as though we created a popgun corps to defend the city of Washington against our own armed might.

The high-powered justifiers, who cry great crocodile tears before the Appropriations Committee, and who predict dire consequences unless every penny asked for is appropriated, throw up their hands and scream at the very thought of reducing aid to those countries. They say: "Senators, if you do that, who will take care of brush-fire wars?" The answer to that question is obvious. Brush-fire wars would be taken care of by the same troops who are going to take care of them anyway—United States GI's and marines. The Defense Department has already admitted that the token armies created in many countries are not capable of even slowing down, much less halting, any act of armed aggression.

That admission took the form of a special Army Corps, created only a few months ago, to deal with brush-fire wars. Senators may have read in the newspapers of the creation of the STRAC; if they have not, I ask unanimous consent that a newspaper article which describes that Army Corps be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of May 24, 1958]

THE NEW ARMY CORPS—STRATEGIC FORCE BELIEVED DEFICIENT IN POWER TO WAGE A LIMITED WAR

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

WASHINGTON, May 23.—The belated announcement this week of the organization of a Strategic Army Corps stems from weakness rather than strength.

The mission of STRAC, as announced officially, is to "meet the initial requirements of limited war or to provide initial reenforcements in a general war." Despite this ambitious goal, many senior Army officers agree that the Army's ability to fight a conventional war continues to be weakened as the Nation concentrates on space rockets and nuclear weapons.

The grouping of four Army divisions in STRAC into what the Department of Defense said was to be a "mobile combat ready force—operationally ready on a moment's notice"—represents a devout hope rather

than an accomplished fact, in the opinion of experts.

The so-called corps has actually been in loose existence for 2 to 3 years. Its four divisions have been more tightly identified and tabbed in the last 3 months. Actually, the corps is largely a paper grouping—the assignment to a corps organization of divisions that have been in existence and that already had been earmarked as part of the Army's strategic reserve in the zone of the interior, the Continental United States.

THE DIVISIONS EARMARKED

Four divisions have been earmarked for STRAC; the 82d and 101st Airborne and the 1st and 4th Infantry Divisions. A corps headquarters, also long in existence—the XVIII Airborne Corps at Fort Bragg—has been designated as the command echelon.

Of the four divisons, only the 101st, which furnished the troops that were recently sent to the Caribbean, probably meets STRAC's mission of operationally ready on a moment's notice, and fulfills its slogan—"skilled, tough, ready around the clock."

Some senior officers contend that the 82d Airborne is also ready, but this division still contains a number of relatively green men. Two of its battle groups are scheduled to be rotated to Germany to be replaced by two battle groups now assigned to the 11th Airborne Division.

The other divisions in the corps have so many green men and—in common with the rest of the Army—experience so large a personnel turnover that they are engaged in a virtually continuous training cycle—particularly pronounced during the summer.

Experienced officers, therefore, regard very large elements of STRAC as more closely approximating training units, rather than combat-ready forces.

THE STUMBLING BLOCKS

Several factors militate against the achievement of true combat readiness by STRAC. The first and most important is the present budgetary ceiling on Army manpower and dollars. Other stumbling blocks are the Army's extensive overseas commitments, which require units in this country to act largely as replacement training units for divisions overseas; the unending training cycle for inductees, volunteers, reserve personnel and Regulars and the legal obligation of the Army to induct large numbers of hard-to-train lowest-mental-category men.

The present difficulties may further increase when the Army's gyroscope operation—its program of rotating units to overseas duties—shifts fully from divisions, as the unit of rotation, to battle groups. This plan will break up tactical units that have trained together and have a common battle tradition—like the famous 1st Division—and will disperse some of their component parts to other parent units with a possible consequent impairment of unit pride and morale.

PICTURE OF UNREADINESS

The STRAC divisions, like all the rest in the Army, have as yet limited and incomplete amounts of the new equipment designed to arm the new so-called Pentomic or five-sided divisions. The Pentomic divisions, designed to have an ability to fight either nuclear or nonnuclear battles, are as yet in a state of betwixt and between; they do not have sufficient new weapons to make them combat effective on a nuclear battlefield and yet their capability to fight conventional war has been severely reduced.

What makes this rather bleak picture of unreadiness worse is the limited amount of air transport and amphibious lift available to rush the nation's fire brigade to the site of threatened conflagrations.

Two airborne battle groups were alerted in Germany last week for possible service in the Middle East if requested by the Lebanese Government. But there were not enough air transports in Germany to fly them there; the planes had to be flown from this country to Germany, with a consequent loss of time.

Similarly the Venezuela riots against Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON revealed the dangerous extent to which the Army had been stripped down in the Caribbean-Panama area.

A PAPER CORPS

Today, there is only one infantry battle group in the Canal Zone, and some military men fear that United States garrison forces in the zone have been thinned down to such an extent that the canal could not be protected effectively against local riots or dangers. Yet quick reenforcement of the Caribbean area by major forces of divisional size or larger would be possibly only if all presently available military air transport facilities were earmarked solely for this task at the expense of other vital jobs.

Thus STRAC today is more a paper corps that demonstrates the Army's interest in the problem of limited war than a really ready force. The public announcement this week of a force that has long been in existence unfortunately adds nothing to the combat readiness of the Nation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Remember, Mr. President, that article refers to the creation of a United States armed force, which will have the special duty of fighting brush-fire wars. However, let us also remember that the main justification advanced by the administration for the expenditure of the military assistance funds in this bill is to create armies in those countries which would take care of such situations.

In other words, Mr. President, even our military leaders have recognized the futility of trying to equip popgun armies in small and backward countries to a point where those forces could be of any use in turning back an act of armed aggression. During the recent hearings on our unprecedented peacetime budget for our armed services, the Senate Appropriations Committee got almost complete details about this new striking force.

I do not mean to say there is not room in our foreign-aid plans for a modest program of military assistance designed to make it possible for countries which are desirous of doing so to protect themselves against internal subversion. On the contrary, that would be a laudable objective.

It would not, however, require the expenditure of $1.5 billion a year, nor would it involve fastening an unbearable military burden upon the economies of young and struggling nations.

Actually, Mr. President, there is no need for all the military-aid money carried in this bill, despite the cries of anguish which arise from the executive branch when efforts are made to reduce those funds. The record shows that since 1950, approximately 10 percent of the funds appropriated by Congress for military assistance has either lapsed or been transferred to other appropriations. This, of itself, should demonstrate that, despite consistent reductions in aid funds below budget requests, the Congress has, on the whole, still been giving the foreign-aid administrators more money than they could use.

I refer Senators to page 100 of the hearings now on their desks, where there appears a table which shows the transfers out of military assistance appropriations, fiscal years 1950–57. I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Detail of transfers out of military assistance appropriations, fiscal years 1950–57

[In millions]

Year	Amount transferred	Country or program	Transferred to—	Authority	Amount lapsed and returned to Treasury
Fiscal year 1952	$300.0	United Kingdom	Economic and technical assistance, Europe, sec. 101 (a) (2).	Sec. 101 (b) Public Law 165 (82d) as amended	
	100.0	France	do	do	
	78.2	Greece, Turkey, and Yugoslavia.	do	do	
Total	478.2				
Fiscal year 1953	125.0	France, Yugoslavia, and Berlin.	Economic and technical assistance, Europe, sec. 101 (a) (2).	Sec. 101 (b) Public Law 165 (82d) as amended	$116.2
Fiscal year 1954	75.0	Coal-steel Community loan	Mutual defense financing, sec. 101 (a) (2)	do	318.7
Fiscal year 1955	20.0	Egypt	Development assistance, Near East area, sec. 201 (a) (1).	Sec. 501, Public Law 665 (83d)	175.5
	20.0	Iran	do	do	
	35.9	Pakistan	Defense support, Near East area and South Asia, sec. 131 (b) (2).	do	
	1.3	Guatemala	Development assistance, Latin America, sec. 201 (a) (3).	do	
	.7	Haiti	do	do	

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Detail of transfers out of military assistance appropriations, fiscal years 1950–57—Continued

[In millions]

Year	Amount transferred	Country or program	Transferred to—	Authority	Amount lapsed and returned to Treasury
Fiscal year 1955	$15.5	Italy	Defense support, Europe, sec. 131 (b) (1)	Sec. 501, Public Law 665 (83d)	
	4.8	Yugoslavia	do	do	
	15.5	Spain	do	do	
	1.2	East Europe—Danube flood relief.	do	do	
	261.3	Indochina (unliquidated obligations).	Southeast Asia and Western Pacific, sec. 121	Sec. 121, Public Law 665 (83d)	
Total	376.2				
Fiscal year 1956	6.0	Pakistan	Defense support, Asia, sec. 131 (c) (3)	Sec. 501, Public Law 665	$14.0
Fiscal year 1957	.0				14.2
Transfers	1,060.4				638.6
Add return to Treasury.	638.6				
Grand total	1,699.0				

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to say that the pending amendment, which I have submitted and sent to the desk, would cut $100 million from the over $1½ billion recommended for military assistance by both the House and the Senate committees.

The pipeline for military-assistance appropriation at the beginning of the fiscal year 1959 will carry the program for a little more than a 2-year period, based on expenditures of $2.2 billion.

Consider these figures, Mr. President:

[In billions]

Unexpended balance July 1, 1958	$3.359
House allowance	1.515
Total	4.874

At this point, it might be appropriate for me to discuss what our striped-pants administartors have named "defense support."

Mr. President, somehow, somewhere, someone got the idea that defense support has something to do with our own defense. It has become more or less a sacred cow.

Let us take a look at some of the projects which have been undertaken with defense support money, and let us see just how closely tied to defense these projects really are.

I hold in my hand Senate Document 31, 85th Congress, 1st session, entitled, "Report on Overseas Operations of the United States Government." The document contains examples of foreign aid defense support expenditures. These are not my own data. They were obtained from ICA records during one of my many investigations of the program conducted in Korea.

Transportation branch. Project title: Rehabilitation of Seoul and Pusan streetcar system.

The amount expended during the year I visited there was almost $200,000.

This is defense-support money.

I read another example of defense support:

Transportation branch. Project title: Procurement of coal tar pitch.

Benefits: Coal tar pitch and petroleum coke on this project will be used in production of coal briquets for the KNR, utilizing coal production in Korea.

Not only have we rehabilitated the railroads in Korea, and not only have we rehabilitated all of the steam-generating plants that produce electricity for the use of the people on that peninsula, but we have also spent millions of dollars for rebuilding dams to generate electricity from falling water, under the guise of defense support. We are today in the process of expending a good part of $42 million for the erection of a single dam in the northern part of South Korea.

The same comment applies to Formosa. One could almost jump across that little island. Yet our Government is spending millions of dollars, in the name of defense support, to construct and erect projects which are used, not to furnish electricity for the military, not to assist soldiers, but to generate electricity so that the Chinese Government can sell the power to the inhabitants of Taiwan. All of these projects are justified in the name of defense support. I say defense support is just another name for economic aid, and the facts bear me out.

One would imagine, Mr. President, that since Formosa and South Korea have both increased their food and industrial production tremendously, compared to a few years ago, that United States aid would be decreasing.

We are not curtailing assistance to those countries. We are increasing it. There seems to be no end to this giveaway program. There will be no end to it if we continue simply to follow the advice of the horde of job holders this Government has all over the world—those who are administering this giveaway program—those who are its stanchest advocates and principal exponents.

Let me point out, Mr. President, that Congress does not depend upon the recipient country to make an adequate justification so that it might receive aid. Instead it depends upon the advice of Americans who are serving as paid administrators of the programs in various countries. If the countries we assist cannot make an adequate case for aid then they turn to these jobholders, who receive handsome salaries and who are supposed to represent America, to make the case for them.

I could go on and cite many examples of out and out economic aid being given in the defense support, just so these jobholders can keep their comfortable and well-paid positions.

Let me turn now to some of the public works projects.

Here is an item, "Rehabilitation of Suwon National Prison, fiscal year 1955. Building construction and equipment."

We are building jails under the guise of defense support. I would like to point out to Senators that I visited a tire plant built under the defense-support program in Korea. It is being operated by a person who obtained it for a price of little or nothing. Yet in the name of defense support, the American taxpayers are now furnishing the money for its operation. The justification furnished the Senate Appropriation Committee are the magic words "defense support" for the ROK army in South Korea.

All of this money listed in defense support for South Korea has been used and is being used to rehabilitate that country. It is not part of a defense program. It is purely economic aid.

I turn to another example under the heading "Manufacturing and Processing." We have spent money to build four flour mills in Korea. It sounds ridiculous, but it is true. There is little wheat produced in Korea. As a matter of fact, the South Koreans are generally rice eaters. They live mostly on a diet of rice and fish and have done so for centuries.

What was the justification for the four flour mills? The aid was given in the name of defense support, and was justified by ICA spokesmen on the basis that South Koreans could be taught to eat bread, and this would enable them to export their rice.

Can anyone imagine United States officials supporting such a program, much less conceiving it, when in this country we are presently producing 40 percent more rice than we need and must export it to the Far East? Yet we are assisting a country, in the name of defense support, to become an economic competitor in the exporting of rice. In addition, we have built flour mills in

Korea, when little or no wheat is produced in that country.

Mr. President, I note another defense support item—book publishing. This is something else we have undertaken in the name of defense support. Perhaps it is a necessary program, but I make the point that defense support, as the people of this country understand it, is assistance to soldiers—to clothe them, to feed them, and to arm them. Yet we find that defense support funds are not used for that purpose. This money is used to develop the economies of the various foreign countries on our aid list.

I do not want to take the time of the Senate to list all of these programs, but I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point some examples of how the money is being used—not to maintain armies, as some American people believe—not to sustain an Army of 20 or 30 divisions—but to aid the economies of foreign nations.

There being no objection, the illustrations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRANSPORTATION BRANCH

1. Project title: Rehabilitation of Seoul and Pusan streetcar system (rectifiers). Type: Transportation. Location: Seoul and Pusan.

2. Benefits: Provides 2 new rectifiers 1 each for Seoul and Pusan streetcar systems. This will replace one war damaged rectifier in Seoul and provide an additional rectifier for Pusan to allow for extension of the street railway system in this overcrowded city.

3. Estimated total cost: $210,000.

4. United States contribution in percent: 85 percent; fiscal year 1955, dollar, $178,500.

5. Local contribution in percent: 15 percent, fiscal year 1955, cash contribution, $31,500.

6. Engineering costs: $2,000 (local) (included in local labor costs).

7. Status: PA issued. Bids received and evaluated. Contract will be concluded by OSROK in near future.

8. Estimated completion date: July 31, 1956.

PUBLIC WORKS

1. Project title: Rehabilitation of Suwon National Prison, fiscal year 1955. Type: Building construction and equipment. Location: Suwon, Korea.

2. Benefits: Provides quarters for 800 additional inmates, utilities, mess, and shops for personnel rehabilitation through vocational training.

3. Estimated total cost: $1,350,000.

4. United States contribution: 68.55 percent, fiscal year 1955, (a) dollar, $300,000; (b) counterpart, $625,000.

5. Local contribution: 31.45 percent, fiscal year 1955, (a) labor, $117,000; (b) domestic materials, $308,000.

6. Engineering costs: $13,500, included in local labor costs.

7. Status: Preliminary drawings completed. Invitations are being sent out to bidders.

8. Estimated completion date: December 1957.

MANUFACTURING AND PROCESSING

1. Project title: Auto tire plant. Type: Manufacture of rubber tires and tubes. Location: Pusan, Korea.

2. Benefits: Rubber tires and tubes are essential to the operation of civilian and military motor vehicles in Korea. The production of such commodities in Korea will save considerable foreign exchange and will thus contribute to the establishment of an economy of self-support.

3. Estimated total cost: $635,000 (estimate).

MANUFACTURING AND PROCESSING

1. Project title: Flour mill No. 1. Type: Food processing. Location: Pusan, Korea.

2. Benefits: Expansion of flour milling facilities in South Korea enables Korea to take advantage of a differential price in wheat as compared to rice. It also accelerates a desirable trend away from such a great reliance on rice. Substitution of wheat for rice in the diet makes for a better use of Korean uplands where wheat may be grown to greater advantage than rice. This resulting expansion of agricultural output as well as the use of foreign wheat makes additional rice available for export. The milling industry thus makes a considerable contribution to the establishment of a self-supporting economy in Korea.

3. Estimated total cost: $765,000 (estimate).

4. United States contribution in percent: 85 percent:

	Fiscal year 1955	Fiscal year 1956
(a) Dollar	$280,000	
(b) Counterpart		$250,000

5. Local contribution in percent: 15 percent:

	Fiscal year 1955	Fiscal year 1956
Amount	$70,000	$45,000

6. Engineering costs: None. (See remarks.)

7. Status: Under construction.

8. Estimated completion date: May 1956. Remarks: The project made no separate provision for engineering expenses. Any required engineering on the purchased equipment was included in the purchase price. The end user is responsible for all local engineering.

MANUFACTURING AND PROCESSING

1. Project title: Flour mill No. 2. Type: Food processing. Location: Seoul, Korea.

2. Benefits: Expansion of flour milling facilities in South Korea enables Korea to take advantage of a differential price in wheat as compared to rice. It also accelerates a desirable trend away from such a great reliance on rice. Substitution of wheat for rice in the diet makes for a better use of Korean uplands where wheat may be grown to greater advantage than rice. This resulting expansion of agricultural output as well as the use of foreign wheat makes additional rice available for export. The milling industry thus makes a considerable contribution to the establishment of a self-supporting economy in Korea.

3. Estimated total cost: $270,000 (estimate).

4. United States contribution in percent, 63 percent:

	Fiscal year 1955	Fiscal year 1956
(a) Dollar	$120,000	
(b) Counterpart		$50,000

5. Local contribution in percent, 37 percent:

	Fiscal year 1955	Fiscal year 1956
Amount	$80,000	$20,000

MANUFACTURING AND PROCESSING

1. Project title: Haptong book printing plant. Type: Book publishing. Location: Seoul, Korea.

2. Benefits: Korea is deficient in printing plants for the printing of necessary scientific and general educational books. This plant will provide much-needed facilities in this field.

3. Estimated total cost: $475,000.

4. United States contribution in percent, 79 percent.

	Fiscal year 1955	Fiscal year 1956
(a) Dollar	$200,000	
(b) Counterpart		$175,000

5. Local contribution in percent, 21 percent:

	Fiscal year 1955	Fiscal year 1956
Amount	$75,000	$25,000

6. Engineering costs: 0. (Included in local labor costs.)

7. Status: Contract negotiations are being conducted.

8. Estimated completion date: March 1956. Remarks: The project made no separate provision for engineering expenses. Any required engineering on the purchased equipment was included in the purchase price. The end user is responsible for all local engineering.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I return to the proposition that I have never seriously objected to assisting Formosa or South Korea to some extent. I will say to the Senate it was my privilege to visit Formosa on 4 occasions and to visit South Korea on 5 occasions. I have never seen such progress. We have rebuilt those areas of the world to the extent that the people of these countries are better off than they have ever been before.

We are now being called upon to put borrowed American dollars into the economies of those areas, to further projects which our own administrators are advocating. Our administrators in those two areas, Mr. President, are suggesting the expenditure of millions of dollars in order to try to balance agriculture with industry, when there is nothing to work with. My good friend from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] on one occasion traveled with me to South Korea and Formosa. In those areas, Mr. President, I submit that it is impossible to develop industries, since there is very little in the way of natural resources to work with.

When one speaks of balancing industry with agriculture, when there is nothing to work with, I say it would be money foolishly spent. We do not have the money to spare. The money proposed to be spent must be collected from all the people, such as those in the galleries, who pay income taxes. I am sure few of our people escape burdensome income taxes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Louisiana mentioned the trip I enjoyed

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

making with him to Asia in the fall of 1956. I should like to reiterate what I have said on many occasions. Because of the diligence and persistence of the Senator from Louisiana, who has acquainted himself with the program of so-called mutual aid in many countries of the world, the Senator has been able to render exceptionally outstanding service to the Senate and particularly to the Committee on Appropriations, of which he and I are members, by helping to clarify some of the problems and by helping to solve many of the problems.

If I have been able to reach any conclusion as a result of the trips I have made—and I think the most important trip was the one in 1956—it is that I have been greatly concerned that the beneficiaries of these programs, in the various countries where hundreds of millions of dollars of American taxpayers' money have been expended, have a complete lack of appreciation of the programs in effect and the contributions being made by the United States in the effort to bulwark their economic conditions and build up their military establishments.

I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana if he has any particular opinion or view as to the reason for our inability over the past decade to make friends, to retain friends, and to obtain proper recognition for the money which has been spent and for the efforts which have been made by the Unfted States in pursuing these various programs.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it is my considered judgment that nations are not different from individuals. One can have the best neighbor in the world living next to him, but if he permits his neighbor to borrow from him and the neighbor fails to pay it back, it is easy to see what will happen. We have been donating vast sums of money to people around the world only to make these foreign nations dependent upon us. It seems that we cannot break away from this program. There seems to be no end to it. If we were to stop or curtail some of the programs which we now have, let us say, in South Vietnam, we would immediately incur the disfavor of the Vietnamese, although today that part of the world is much better off than it has ever been, because of our aid. They would simply look to us to continue those programs ad infinitum.

The great difficulty, I will say to my good friend from Idaho, is simply that instead of entering into these programs slowly and letting the people help themselves, we go to these countries and tell the people what to do. We say to them, "If you do thus and so you can be in the same position as we. Your economy can grow and become equivalent to ours overnight." We make these people very ambitious. But when these people reach a certain point they cannot continue further because they lack the natural resources, education, and know-how. Then they must call upon us. If we fail to respond, the friendship which was created simply fades away and the seeds of communism have been planted.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one additional question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. There have been indications during the past year or two that Paul Hoffman and other self-appointed spokesmen for the program have indicated the likelihood that we ought to continue for another 5 years, 10 years, or indefinitely, a program involving several billion dollars annually. Does the Senator from Louisiana feel that a great disservice is being rendered to the beneficiary countries, in that they are being led to believe that there is no end to the program, that all they have to do is continue with various kinds of projects, to accept our largesse, to carry on notwithstanding the fact that what was originally envisioned by the program may have been accomplished, merely because so many officials or spokesmen representing the administration are creating the impression, whether justifiably or not that they may expect the program to continue indefinitely? What is the Senator's reaction to that question?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, that is the gospel which is being spread by our administrators. The great difficulty to my mind is that our program administrators in the various countries simply make the native people believe that money grows on trees in the United States. When one tells the leaders of these countries, "The money we have been letting you have is borrowed money," they do not believe it. I have heard many of them say, "Senator, I cannot believe that. Do you mean to tell me the money we get from the United States is borrowed money?" They simply will not believe it.

An Englishman I talked to in Beirut told me we could blame only ourselves for creating that idea in the minds of the people we are trying to assist. If we had done as General Marshall originally suggested, namely, try to help people to help themselves, we would have gotten somewhere. But today people all over the world are so dependent on us that they will not be able to move without us. If we stop or attempt to slow down the program, they become angry at us.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. I was struck by the similarity between the replies of the Senator from Louisiana to the questions of the Senator from Idaho and the expression by Shakespeare:

> Neither a borrower nor a lender be;
> For loan oft loses both itself and friend,
> And borrowing dulls the edge of husbandry.

That has been proved time after time, in connection with the foreign-aid programs.

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no doubt about it. We have made the people of many of the countries we have assisted dependent upon us. They take the position, "What is the use of our doing this, that, or the other? We will get it from good old Uncle Sam."

I have always been for a program of technical assistance. I think that is one of the greatest programs upon which we have ever embarked. It is a program to help backward people; to give them the simple tools with which to work with what they have. We can teach them almost overnight how to use those tools, although it took us generation to learn. A program of that kind is beneficial, but, I repeat, it should be carried out by the people of those countries themselves. It should not be carried out by pouring in vast sums of money to build hospitals and schools and other things. When we do that, they say, "What is the good of a hospital? We have no doctors." Then we have to go there and educate doctors for them. If we build a school to teach farming in an advanced stage, far beyond their capability, they say, "What is the use of doing that? We expect you to send teachers in order to teach our teachers how to teach our farmers."

To my mind it is silly for us to attempt to put a highly complex operation into a backward country. These people must be taught to crawl before they can walk, to walk before they can run.

The way these programs have been operating is silly. They have been very costly. We seem to have made little progress in actually helping those people. We could have spent a third of the amount which has been spent in many of those countries, and obtained more results simply by following the path of prudence and not overeager ambition.

Now, Mr. President, I would like to return to my discussion of the item "defense support" in the pending bill.

Of course, the eager-beaver administrators have an answer for my objections to this category. They say that because we impose military burdens upon countries far beyond their capacity to maintain, we must provide economic aid, in the form of defense support, in order to take up the slack.

The answer to that is obvious, and twofold.

In the first place, if we did not go in and impose useless military burdens upon those countries, defense support could, for all practical purposes, be considerably reduced and in some areas eliminated. In other words, Mr. President, we find ourselves in a vicious circle.

We impose military burdens on tiny countries far beyond their capacity to carry alone. Thus, in order to entice them, or compel them—take your choice—into bearing these burdens, we must provide economic aid and defense support.

Yet the fact remains, that, if we had sense enough to recognize that the armies we are building in those countries are, for all practical purposes ineffective, then not only could we save much money in outright military aid, but we could save substantial amounts in defense support, as well.

As I said yesterday, I have two amendments for consideration by the Senate today. The first is to reduce military aid by $100 million. The other is to reduce defense support by $50 million. When I offer the individual amendments, I shall cite figures showing the amount on hand

and the amount spent in the past on each of these two categories.

In addition, although the planners made much of the argument that military aid and defense support go hand in hand, we are confronted with an anomaly in the pending bill. Last year, military aid was $1.8 billion; defense support was $749.8 million. Defense support was 41 percent of military assistance.

Of the 2 amendments which I have submitted, 1 would cut military assistance, as I have stated, by $100 million; and the other would cut defense support by $50 million, which would maintain the ratio of defense support to military aid as is contained in the bill now under consideration.

The pending bill calls for $1.5 billion in military aid, and $790 million in defense support. This year defense support is more than 52 percent of military assistance.

Thus, on the basis of elementary mathematics, even if the full $1.5 billion were appropriated for military aid, only $621 million in defense support—or the 41 percent used last year—should be required in order to support a military program of that magnitude.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to my colleague from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Has there not been alarming evidence that a great portion of the defense support money has been handled in such a way that foreign rulers and other foreign politicians, as well as those who do business with them, pocketed a large amount of the defense support money, both in the way they handled the exchange of currencies and the way they overpriced the articles being purchased, and in the buying and selling of articles involving defense support money?

Mr. ELLENDER. I will say to my distinguished colleague there is no doubt about that. I pointed out that very thing in the summary of my many reports on overseas operations of the United States Government, which are now on file with the Senate Appropriations Committee.

There is no doubt in my mind that many of the so-called foreign-aid programs, particularly the economic program, whether it be called defense support or any other name, have benefited most those who have needed help the least. Let us take a case like Iran, which is a country rich in oil and other natural resources. That nation seems to be incapable of forcing its people to pay their proper share of taxes. If the people who are able to pay taxes in Iran were to pay the same amount, proportionately, that we pay, there would be no need of our giving any assistance to the poor people in Iran. Iran is rich in resources, and could use these resources to assist its poor people. The trouble is, however, that the aid we have given to those countries has been used by the rich classes to further improve their own position. As long as our aid continues in this manner, the people who most need help will not get the benefit.

Mr. LONG. The Senator knows that there have been cases—and this has been admitted by the administration—when foreign countries have overvalued their money, as compared with our money, to the extent of 3 to 1. Then the politicians in those countries would take our commodities and do business with them with their friends in such a way that two-thirds of our money would be pocketed by certain politicians and friends of politicians, and one-third of the money would eventually go to defense support. Then, as has been said, the big stealing starts.

Mr. ELLENDER. We have had cases of that type in Laos, where it is a known fact that some of the bankers have obtained dollars based on a rate of exchange of 35 kip to $1. Then these same bankers took the dollars to Hong Kong and obtained kip at the rate of 100 to 1. Of course a good deal of this has been stopped but I am sure some other device will be discovered to enable the thieves to continue getting richer while the poor in Laos continue to suffer because our aid is directed to the wrong people.

Mr. LONG. Can the Senator say with certainty that these examples have been stopped? My impression is that they have not stopped. In one country, Laos, the Government has refused to let us see what is happening to our money, and we have refused temporarily to send any more money. That does not mean that the practice has been stopped. The Government has refused to let us see what is happening to our money. We are at an impasse. The administrators will not give them any more money temporarily, and the Government still refuses to let us see what happened to the money.

Mr. ELLENDER. Members of the Appropriations Committee were told during this session of Congress that some of this abuse has been corrected. Our people have been working on it, and as we have been told they have succeeded in stopping it. That does not mean that it will not be continued. We must keep a close watch on such programs. The minute we turn our backs, these manipulators will resort to the same practice.

Mr. President, this defense-support program, as it is currently administered also provides us with an excellent example of the very aimlessness and lack of direction of the so-called mutual-security program.

Last year, spokesmen from International Cooperation Administration came before the Congress and in glowing terms outlined a program of defense support to 15 countries, which would cost a total of $725 million.

But looking over last year's actual records, we find that somewhere and somehow this program changed its shape so that a total of $749,810,000 was expended in 12 countries.

That means that the program cost almost $25 million more than what Congress approved, and that, in addition, this aid went to only 12 nations, and not the 15 mentioned by ICA in attempting to justify the program.

Mr. President, as I said before, this is a graphic example of how the Congress has turned over—without a whimper—the purse strings of our Nation to the misty-minded bureaucrats who want to pour the hard-earned wealth of this Nation all over the world without a thought to the welfare of the people who have fought and earned this wealth, the American taxpayer.

For this year, fiscal 1959, the Senate Appropriations Committee, in the pending bill, has recommended the appropriation of $790 million for defense support to the same 12 countries.

Thus we see that instead of the program tapering off, it is on the increase. Last year I pointed out that we spent $750 million on this program. This year we are being asked to provide $790 million.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. How are we to be sure that this is the program that will actually be followed? What will we find out next year if the Congress should be so unwise as to now approve this entire amount?

To my mind, this is just one more element of proof that insofar as the so-called mutual-security program is concerned, we are throwing prudence to the winds.

This brings us to consideration of the Development Loan Fund.

Mr. President, if any kind of a foreign aid program can be justified, it is the establishment of various loan funds—be it the Development Loan Fund, or this new fund President Eisenhower has suggested to aid in the development of the Arab countries.

Senators will recall that earlier in my remarks I quoted from the recommendations offered by General Marshall, when he first suggested the Marshall plan. The pertinent portion of the remarks reads as follows:

> Loans should be made to cover imports of capital equipment and raw materials which will directly produce the means of repayment and where such repayment can reasonably be expected.
>
> At the same time, every encouragement should be given to early initiation of private financing so as to eliminate as far as possible the necessity for direct assistance from the United States Government.

It is my considered judgment—and I think history bears me out—that if we had followed General Marshall's advice 10 years ago, we would not be in the boat we find ourselves today.

Now, 10 years after the program was started, the executive branch has finally come back to life and decided that the principle of loans, not handouts, is the correct one to follow in extending economic aid. I applaud the executive branch for that decision.

For that reason, I shall not attempt to reduce the committee recommendations of $580 million for the Development Loan Fund. The unfortunate aspect of this new approach is that we may have difficulty in creating a revolving fund for use in all underdeveloped countries since the loans are repayable in soft currencies. My guess is that Congress will be called upon for more and more cash to replenish the capital of the fund.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

In other words, Mr. President, Congress has been led to believe that this is a "revolving fund." It has been justified to us on the basis that the crying need of most underdeveloped countries is for American dollars.

However, repayment of loans made from the fund need not be in dollars; as a matter of fact, the testimony before the legislative and appropriations committees of both Houses of Congress offers ample proof that there will be little if any effort made to obtain repayment in dollars.

Under these circumstances, since loans must be in dollars but repayments will be in soft currencies, the fund will never revolve. One witness testifying before the House Appropriations Committee indicated that the development-loan program could last for a generation or longer.

Thus, I fear that we will wake up to the fact sometime that we will be bound to continue to appropriate dollars in order to maintain the Development Loan Fund's capital, since it will not be replenished by loan repayments in soft currencies.

This is the same fear I voiced earlier about any new development fund being set up for the Middle East countries.

I regret to inform the Senate, also Mr. President, that the Loan Fund's policy at this time is to confine the use of repayments to the country where the loan was made. In other words, if we lend dollars to country X, country X repays that loan in her own currency. However, instead of using those repayments where we might be able to gain some benefit, such as in country Y, for example, they must be used in country X.

The net result of this approach will be to pile up local currencies all over the world, which are deposited to our credit, but which we cannot use.

Experience should have amply demonstrated the futility of such an approach. Tables in the House hearings on this year's foreign-aid bill show that the United States already owns some $1.8 billion in local currencies, derived from prior-year foreign-aid programs, from Public Law 480, and other sources.

In a number of instances that currency cannot be used by us even to pay for day-to-day expenses of our Government operations in those countries. It just accumulates until its existence becomes more than our money-hungry planners can stand. Senators well remember that only a few weeks ago, I opposed a barefaced attempt to raid the special counterpart account by making it possible for those funds to be used without regard to existing law.

The funds at which the legislative change was directed had accrued to our credit in Austria. They were just lying there; they could not be used. They provided a tempting tidbit to anxious and eager administrators desirous of getting their hands on a little more money.

Under the circumstances, Mr. President, I approach the loan fund idea with fear and trepidation, but, as I have stated, I am compelled to more or less endorse it because it holds out the only prospect of our obtaining some return, no matter how small, on any further foreign-aid expenditures the Congress may provide. However, I warn Senators that they must not regard the Development Loan Fund as a bright and shining hope. The factors I have already enumerated emphasize the dangers in the fund as it is now proposed to be operated. If, in addition to these, it is remembered that the fund is now incorporated, then the cause for apprehension becomes more acute.

I, for one, do not want to see this program turn into an international RFC, but today it has the earmarks of becoming just that.

I must warn the Senate that the rats have been in the corncrib already. The Development Loan Fund already shows signs of being raided by the big-shot bureaucrats who administer the program.

Senators will recall that the purpose of the Development Loan Fund is to make needed capital available to underdeveloped countries on a loan basis when those countries are unable to obtain loans from other sources, such as the World Bank, the Export-Import Bank, and others.

Yet, testimony before the Appropriations Committee—meeting in executive session—shows that at least one country which does not meet those criteria is going to get a loan from the fund.

Another thing which the record shows is that many of the countries into which we dump billions of dollars do not need to make applications for loan funds. I believe that these funds should be used in order to assist countries which are really and truly underdeveloped.

I wish I could refer Senators to the exact testimony, but the record before the Appropriations Committee has been heavily censored; almost every scrap of information which might be of use to the public, and to the Senate, in properly evaluating this program has been deleted. It is all "secret."

At any rate, I urge Senators to keep a close eye on this fund. It should not be used to assist countries that have already received a bountiful share of our generosity. If we turn our backs, it will be raped, just as the philosophy behind the original Marshall plan has been torn and shredded by the would-be empire builders in the executive branch.

Here, as in other areas of the program, our administrators want to go "all out" in demonstrating to the world that Uncle Sam has an inexhaustible source of dollars, that we are going to cover the globe with a layer of greenbacks. This approach may be easier than making intelligent foreign policy decisions, but it is the primary reason why we are losing the cold war, battle by battle, day by day.

I might add that the administration keeps demanding more "flexibility" in despensing foreign aid funds. Goodness knows, Mr. President, this bill is already about as flexible as any piece of legislation can be and still stay within the constitutional requirement that no legislative power be delegated to the executive branch.

There is no requirement in the bill that the programs submitted to either the Foreign Relations Committee or the Appropriations Committee be carried out as justified. Country-by-country breakdowns which have been furnished by the State Department and the International Cooperation Administration in so-called "justification" of the measure are purely "illustrative." The bill before us does not appropriate funds on a country by country basis. Thus, within the general appropriation headings of this legislation, the administrators have almost 100 percent flexibility.

In addition, there are specific "slush funds" which can be used for any purposes the administrators may desire—for military aid, economic aid, or for any other purpose, with no strings attached.

For instance, the "special assistance" category can be used for economic aid just as the executive branch sees fit. The House provided $185 million for this purpose. The Senate Appropriations Committee, acting in a spirit of complete generosity, raised this to $200 million dollars.

Then, there is the contingency fund. This is a "slush fund" if one ever existed. As I recall, not only can the administrators use this amount as they desire, but a portion of it need not even be accounted for—no vouchers for that portion need be provided.

The House cut this amount to $100 million, but, again, the Senate committee has raised the House amount and has recommended $155 million.

Of course, the plea is made: "Do you not trust the President? Do you not think he would use this authority wisely?"

That begs the question, I must respectfully submit. The President, as a practical matter, does not make the decisions in this area. Someone else makes those decisions for him, and while I might trust the President, I certainly do not see any point or purpose in handing $155 million to some anonymous bureaucrat to do with as he may please.

In this regard, Mr. President, it should be recalled that the administration is once again engaging in the old shell game with the Congress, insofar as these categories of aid are concerned. This year, as in years past, the bureaucrats once again are proving that the administrative hand is quicker than the Congressional eye.

During fiscal 1958, a grand total of $225 million was provided for both special assistance and the contingency fund. This amount was deemed sufficient to provide for special categories of economic aid, and also to take care of any unforeseen contingencies which might arise. Actually, Mr. President, as I have already pointed out, the Chief Executive already has an abundance of discretion to deal with such situations.

Now, for fiscal 1959, the foreign-aid planners have split the 1958 fiscal year special assistance and contingency fund. Where there was 1 fund, we now have 2 funds.

Each, of course, has its separate appropriation. For special assistance this bill carries $200 million and for contingencies, $155 million. Thus, in this bill, there is a total amount of $355 million

to provide assistance to areas where $225 million was deemed sufficient last year.

In other words, again I wish to point out that, instead of tapering off the program, every year we are increasing it.

Is it the Senate's wish to perpetuate conditions which bring us into disrepute, and which actually handicap the attainment of what should be our objectives?

Senators should go into the field, and see how our foreign-aid program actually operates, if they desire specific proof of the damage it is doing to us. In Iraq, for example, where we have spent much money—both for military aid and for economic aid—the very conditions which we created had, I believe, much to do with the revolt there.

How can Senators expect the masses to be grateful to the United States, when in most instances the aid money we provide makes the rich richer, but extends no appreciable benefit to the poor or the hungry? Senators must see for themselves such conditions, as I saw them in country after country, the rich living in big houses, enjoying the best of everything, while millions go hungry in the streets or, at best, live on the very edge of starvation.

Senators should see some of the great work we have done in increasing agricultural production on lands owned by wealthy landlords. The progress has been marvelous; but those who till the land do not obtain any benefit. On the contrary, the landowner's profits merely grow larger while the poor remain poor, and the hungry still starve.

In his recent speech, President Eisenhower said that one of the objectives of his new Middle East plan would be a concentrated effort to bring aid to the people who really need help—the starving masses.

Mr. President, again I respectfully submit that what is good for the Middle East is good for the entire world. If there is a realization on the part of the President that our present wasteful aid program in the Middle East is not getting through to the masses of people in that area, then surely there must soon dawn on him the realization that the same situation must exist in other parts of the world.

I applaud the President's statement, but I should also like to point out that nothing has been changed by his speech; the old giveaway program still continues in all its shameful waste.

Of course, it will be said that three countries, which formerly obtained their share of this largess from defense support, have been transferred from that category into the special assistance category. This might be a plausible argument if the defense support had been reduced proportionately. But, as I have already stated, the amount of defense support for the fiscal year 1959 has been increased over the amount of defense support for the fiscal year 1958.

This factor, coupled with the double-up and catch-up techniques used to obtain more money for special assistance and the contingency fund, emphasizes the wizardry and sleight-of-hand which some of our giveaway artists possess.

Mr. President, I have already spoken at length, and I do not intend to take up much more of the time of the Senate by going into the details of this proposed legislation.

A splendid case can be made, on purely reasonable and logical grounds, for the making of sizable cuts in this program.

Why, in the name of common sense, we should continue blithely to appropriate vast sums of money to maintain a program which has not been effective, is beyond my comprehension, and is beyond the comprehension of most of the American people.

For example, Mr. President, in 1952, I visited Liberia, where we were maintaining a rather large technical-aid program. At that time, I complained that what the fishermen of Liberia needed, for instance, were fewer theoretical fishery surveys, and more nets with which to catch the fish they knew were there.

On page 1508 of the hearings held by the House Appropriations Committee on the 1959 foreign-aid appropriation bill is found the official ICA comment on my recommendation. Here is what ICA said:

> Following investigations of deep-sea fishing conditions by ICA and U. N. experts, a Liberian businessman entered the sea fish business. He has been highly successful.

In other words, Mr. President, our expenditures for fishery surveys in Liberia seem to have redounded to the benefit of one individual businessman who has made much money. No wonder the masses of the people frequently do not know of American aid. And, when they do, they often believe that we are desirous of making the rich even richer, instead of bettering the lot of the common man.

Let me give the Senate just one more example of how this program operates.

In 1956, and again in 1957, I filed with the Committee on Appropriations reports—which were available to all Senators—covering my inspection of foreign-aid programs in a number of countries. Copies of these reports were also sent to the State Department, to the foreign-aid administration, to the Defense Department, and to other interested agencies of government.

In those reports, I criticized our aid program to Afghanistan, particularly our ambitious scheme to build airports in that tiny country, to train pilots to fly airplanes for an Afghan airline, and to provide aircraft for the airline.

Some interesting things about that airline transaction are now coming to light.

For instance, on page 737 of the House hearings, Mr. John O. Bell, regional director, Office of Near East and South Asia Operations, stated with reference to Afghanistan:

> We have provided assistance to the airfield development, also for the purchase of equipment, and we have been providing technical assistance for a contract with some Pan American people for technical services.

In other words, it now develops that Pan American World Airways has the technical assistance contract—for which our Government pays—to extend technical aid to that Afghan airline.

Mr. President, guess who owns 49 percent of that Afghan airline company stock.

Pan American World Airways does, of course. Here, again, I quote from page 737 of the House hearings, with reference to the Afghan airline:

> Mr. ANDREWS. Who owns the airline company?
>
> Mr. BELL. Forty-nine percent is owned by Pan American, and the balance is private and public Afghanistan capital. In other words, 51 percent represents private and public Afghanistan capital, and 49 percent Pan American.

Since the majority interest is split among public and private capital, Mr. President, it would seem to me that Pan American World Airways actually controls an airline company to which Pan American extends technical assistance under a contract with ICA.

It is things such as that, Mr. President, that have given foreign aid such a bad name abroad, and are injuring our Government in its efforts to obtain from the common people—the people we are actually trying to help—sympathy and understanding for our point of view.

At this point, it might also be well for me to mention, for the record, that according to biographical data provided in the House hearings, the present ICA administrator, Mr. James Hopkins Smith, served for 3 years—1946 to 1949—as vice president of Pan American World Airways in charge of the Atlantic division—Europe, Middle East and India. I refer to page 58 of the House hearings.

The facts are there for all to see, but they are ignored. Certainly, they are never admitted by those who demand continued enactment of so-called mutual security legislation.

If Senators desire to vote to continue the program as now constituted, they are free to do so. For my own part, I will not vote for one dime for foreign aid as we now know it.

I refuse to be a party to creating in backward countries conditions which provide fertile grounds for Communist agitators. Anywhere we find vast wealth and abysmal poverty existing side by side, with Uncle Sam helping to line the pockets of the rich, we can expect international communism to gain a foothold and to make progress.

I refuse to pay tribute to oil-rich potentates of the Middle East, in an effort to keep them on our side, while their people remain hungry, diseased, ill fed, and ill clad. I am opposed to the use of American dollars to provide a platform from which Red agitators can denounce our way of life, our foreign-policy objectives, and frequently turn those words into actions.

I am sick and tired of having our country pour millions of dollars into country after country, on the premise that we are "buying" security, when all we are doing is casting intolerable burdens upon young nations which are striving for dignity and independence.

If what we hope to achieve with this so-called mutual security program is to strengthen Free-World defense and to obtain the respect and friendship of other nations, we should stop attempting to stand astride the world, brandishing a

checkbook in one hand and a hydrogen bomb in the other.

We will not win the war for men's minds by demanding that they either take our dollars and respect us or suffer the threat of atomic extermination.

Mr. President, let us be realistic.

Freedom exists in the world today not by virtue of the billions upon billions of dollars we have lavished throughout the world, but upon American military strength and the strength of our own economy.

If we continue to rely upon a foreign policy based upon useless dollar gifts, not only will we actually encourage dislike for us and our objectives, but we run the terrible risk of so burdening our own economy that we will be unable to meet future challenges. I remind the Senators of the action we took yesterday in raising the debt limit to $288 billion.

All of us know, or have heard, that during this fiscal year our Government will probably sustain a deficit of from $10 billion to as much as $13 billion. Anyone with common sense knows that we cannot keep our economy strong if we continue to pile debt upon debt. It is becoming very clear that we do not have to get into a war to destroy ourselves. If we simply destroy American initiative by overtaxation we will succeed in accomplishing what the Communist could never accomplish on the field of battle.

I should like to refer Senators to the recent hearings held, wherein our Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Anderson intimated that if this country goes into the red as much as is anticipated, taxes will have to be increased. This situation does not make sense to me. We are still spending money to assist our so-called friends across the sea, while they are in a position not only to cut their taxes, but to reduce their armies. Yet, there is a distinct possibility that we may have to increase our taxes to continue giving this aid. It does not add up.

If that happens, freedom is doomed, and the Red tide of communism is going to engulf the world.

I plead today for reason, Mr. President. I beg Senators to wake up and recognize what they are doing to the cause they seek to further, the injury which this bill will work upon that cause, by continuing to blindly, haphazardly vote billions upon billions to finance a program which is not working, and which is actually dangerous.

It now remains for us to carefully study the record of this past policy and decide whether or not we wish to continue down the road we have been following.

When the original program was enacted into law, the people of the United States were advised that it was merely temporary, that the United States would simply extend a helping economic hand to peoples in need, so that the threat of their being taken over by a Communist form of government could be averted.

Through this medium of foreign aid, we were told that if we could rehabilitate nations in need through a short-range program, then they could thereafter provide for themselves, and assist us in carrying the burden. But, Mr. President, as I have just indicated, and as I will demonstrate later, we have spent billions of dollars in Western Europe. Those countries are in better financial shape than they have ever been in their history. Yet, we are still carrying from 38 to 40 percent of the cost of their military budgets, aside from our own. That is the kind of help we are getting from them, notwithstanding the amount of money we have been spending in those countries.

We were even told that by granting aid we could make these needy countries strong ones, ready to stand by our side if the worst were to come.

Paul Hoffman, Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration, in testimony before the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate on June 8, 1949, said:

Listen to this, Senators. This is Paul Hoffman speaking:

> This economy cannot go on indefinitely spending $15 billion or more a year for military defense.

That was Paul Hoffman speaking only 7 years ago. He said we could not go on spending $15 billion a year for defense without courting disaster, yet now our defense budget has reached the astronomical total of over $40 billion per year. Instead of getting better, the situation seems to be getting worse, Mr. President, despite the extension of foreign aid far beyond the recommendation of ECA.

Let me quote further from Mr. Hoffman:

> The surest way I know of to reduce the danger of war so that we may reduce our Military Establishment is to carry on the recovery program, to the point where a free and self-sustaining and unified Europe is able to play its full role in cooperation with the United States and other free countries in maintaining the peace and prosperity of the world.

I remind Senators, that was Mr. Paul Hoffman speaking, 7 years ago.

At the same hearing, Mr. Hoffman also predicted that by 1952 European industrial production would be at 125 percent of prewar production, and that such an accomplishment would signal the end of ECA in Europe.

I read from the hearing:

> Senator CORDON. Now, Mr. Hoffman, let us assume success at the end of 1952. Let us assume that your target, which I believe is 130 percent of prewar production, has been achieved at that time.
>
> Mr. HOFFMAN. I think it goes a little less than that; I think it is about 125 percent, Senator.

The Senate should be advised that the industrial production of Europe today is not 125 percent or 130 percent of prewar, but it is over 166 percent of prewar production. Despite this, it seems impossible to convince planners that our aid to this area should cease.

We are now supporting our own military establishment. We are also paying for some 38 to 40 percent of the military budgets of Western European countries. In addition we are carrying the whole load in practically all of Southeast Asia, Formosa, and South Korea.

In this very bill there is an item of $12 million to pay for logistical support of the few token foreign forces in South Korea. These token forces amount to about 5,600 troops. Is it not shameful that we are maintaining over 2½ divisions of our own troops in South Korea, with all the other United Nations furnishing only 5,600 soldiers, and in addition, good old Uncle Sam must furnish the money to feed those token troops? I think it is ridiculous. But I say as I have said many times in the past, as long as we permit other nations to lean on us, they are going to continue to do so.

The American taxpayer has put a substantial amount of money into foreign aid. Let us see what he has received for his dollars today.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization was to be the bulwark against any possible Communist military strike into the West. As originally proposed, it was to be composed of 66 divisions, of which 6 were to be United States troops.

Today, the paper strength of NATO is 30 divisions—both active and reserve. Of the 12 active divisions, in Western Europe, 5½ are staffed by the United States troops. The seven remaining active divisions are European.

I do not include the nations of Turkey and Greece in the statement, but I am speaking only of the area of Western Europe, as where we have spent, as I shall show in a moment, billions of dollars.

England has seen its taxes cut, while personal earnings are rising. Yet, England, too, still leans upon the United States.

France, another of our wartime partners, continues to ask for aid even though French industry is at a higher level than in prewar days. In effect, the United States is being asked to pay for France's pursuit of a colonialistic policy and negotiations are now in progress for further aid to France to bolster her economy.

In the Middle East we see our aid poured into the laps of the very wealthy, with little seeping through to the people we intend to aid. We also find the United States helping to maintain the economies of countries in which the wealthy pay comparatively low taxes.

In Southeast Asia the United States is bidding dollars against rubles to win allies away from the Communists.

From the high point reached by the Marshall plan, the people of the United States have seen the wealth of this country poured into other lands with almost complete abandonment, with little if any long-range results.

It now remains to take a new look at our foreign policy.

We must determine if we can continue this almost indiscriminate spending of money with declining results.

I am satisfied, Mr. President, an objective appraisal will reveal that we cannot.

Mr. President, as I said previously, the pending amendment would cut $100 million from the military assistance program. We can do that easily, Mr. President, without endangering the program in any manner. As I pointed out, there will be sufficient money, if we cut this item by $100 million, to carry this program until September of 1960.

Let us not continue to burden the underdeveloped countries all over the world with armies they cannot possibly sustain. That is what we are doing. The more we do that, of course, the more so-called defense support will be needed.

Mr. President, I have submitted two amendments. One provides a cut of $100 million from military assistance. The other provides a cut of $50 million from defense support. These 2 amendments, if adopted, will keep the 2 funds in balance, as they have been in the past.

Mr. President, in addition to all the direct aid we are now being asked to make available to these countries, there is also a Public Law 480 program through which we assist our friends by furnishing to them millions of dollars in goods and commodities. For instance, in those countries already getting defense support—and I ask Senators to pay particular attention—for 1959 we are providing $135 million in surplus goods, under Public Law 480.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may propound a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Louisiana may yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum without losing his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the provisions of section 139 (a) of the Reorganization Act, which requires appropriation bills to be reported 3 days before they are taken up, there be an order to take up the independent offices appropriation bill today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3028) for the relief of Laszlo Cseri, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11382) to authorize the conversion or exchange, under certain conditions, of term insurance issued under section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6282) for the relief of the former shareholders and debenture note holders of the Goshen Veneer Co., an Indiana corporation.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13247) to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12226) to amend the Virgin Islands Corporation Act (63 Stat. 350), and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 3571. An act for the relief of Boris F. Navratil; and

H. R. 10495. An act to amend that part of the act of June 9, 1896 (29 Stat. 313), relating to the establishment of postal stations and branch post offices, so as to permit them to be established within 10 miles of the boundary of the adjoining city.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bill and joint resolution of the House:

H. R. 13254. An act to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the use in food of additives which have not been adequately tested to establish their safety; and

H. J. Res. 675. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 704) establishing that the first session of the 86th Congress convene at noon on Wednesday, January 7, 1959, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 9700. An act to consolidate into one act all of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 648. Joint resolution providing for a joint session of Congress for commemorating the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1959

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13192) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, what is the pending amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment is the Ellender amendment lettered "C."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. May we have the yeas and nays ordered on that amendment?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am informed that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] desires to make a brief statement, lasting perhaps 5 minutes. The Senator from Louisiana wishes to make a brief statement. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] will reply, and I hope there may be a yea-and-nay vote on the pending amendment.

The Senator from Louisiana has another amendment which he expects to offer immediately, and we would like to have the yeas and nays ordered on it. We shall request the yeas and nays as soon as he offers it. If Members will cooperate by remaining in the Chamber, we expect to vote shortly on the pending amendment, and when the next amendment is offered, I have agreed to ask for a yea-and-nay vote on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana retain the floor?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I was detained this morning from attendance in the Chamber, but I entered the Chamber on several occasions and observed that many other Senators were as busy as I was outside the Chamber. Therefore, I did not have the opportunity to get the full purport of the amendment which the Senator from Louisiana offered.

I wish also to make some inquiry of him with respect to some evidence which I find in the committee report. I am sure this can be illuminated by the statements of the Senator.

For example, on page 4 of the Senate committee report, I find a statement with respect to the defense support which is provided for in the pending bill.

I am aware, from personal conference with the Senator, and from his testimony before a joint committee representing both the Public Works Committee and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, that he has visited a great part of the world in his endeavors to find out what is being done in foreign nations, in the way of their own activities, and by way of expenditure of American funds.

I find on page 4 the statement that the Bureau of the Budget made a re-

quest for $835 million for defense support. This, of course, is a request transmitted in the name of the President. The appropriation for 1958 was $725 million, according to the committee report. There is a table on page 2. So the estimate submitted by the President was $110 million more than the entire expenditure for defense support in 1958.

The House of Representatives reduced this amount to $700 million. That was $25 million less than the appropriation in 1958. However, it has been increased by the Senate committee by $90 million, to $790 million. Does the Senator know why that increase was recommended by the Senate committee?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senate committee tried to approach a bit closer to the authorization; $810 million request was authorized to be appropriated.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The authorization act provided for——

Mr. ELLENDER. Eight hundred and thirty-five million dollars.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No. the authorization act provided for $810 million. So the estimate submitted by the President was $25 million above the authorization, but the amount reported by the House committee was $110 million below the authorization act, and $125 million below the estimate. However, the House recommended $700 million, and the Senate committee has recommended $790 million, which, of course, is not oply $90 million more than the amount in the House bill, but it is more than the appropriation for 1958. What is the explanation for that increase?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know. I have been trying to taper off this assistance. I pointed out in my main address a moment ago that although the authorization for defense support last year was $725 million, there was transferred from the military assistance fund some $24 million which brought the defense support total to $749 million. I sought to point out during my main speech that notwithstanding the increase last year, over and above the amount appropriated by transfer, with 3 countries less than were supposed to have been taken care of last year, this year we have provided almost $50 million more money. That is my reason for offering an amendment to reduce the amount to $740 million.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator's amendment relate to defense support?

Mr. ELLENDER. My second amendment relates to defense support. Despite a proposed reduction of $50 million, it would still provide for defense support in an amount that is $15 million more than was appropriated last year.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Knowing the diligence of the Senator from Louisiana in visiting foreign countries, I should like to read to him a paragraph from the committee report on page 4. After reciting that the Budget Bureau had made a request for $835 million, and pointing out that $45 million was for Europe, $195 million for the Near East and South Asia, and $595 million for the Far East, I find these words:

> The amounts for individual countries are classified. The countries included are: Spain, Greece, Iran, Turkey, Pakistan, Cambodia, Korea, Laos, Philippines, Taiwan, Thailand, and Vietnam.

The Senator from Louisiana has visited Indonesia and he has visited Taiwan, and he has visted Vietnam.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have heard reports from persons who claim to have been there, and they have told me that the employees of the United States, who are spending this money, are living in homes and palaces of the upper classes in Indonesia and are thereby earning the enmity of the common people of those lands. Is there any basis for that statement?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no question but that our employees live in the best homes available in Taiwan, in Indonesia, in South Vietnam, and, in fact, all over the world. The Senator remembers that last year there was a burning of our Information Service Center in Taiwan.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I believe that a great deal of the enmity which develops comes from the fact that people who represent us forget that they are living in Taiwan or another foreign country. Instead they want to enjoy the use of the finest automobiles and live in the finest homes just as if they were at home. They must remember that they are representatives of the United States in a foreign country and must live according to the style and customs of that country. I have no doubt that that is a great cause of that feeling of enmity to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Do they give the impression that they are the emissaries of freedom, or do they give the impression that they represent the ruling classes?

Mr. ELLENDER. They are not, in my judgment, very good ambassadors of good will insofar as our country is concerned. There are exceptions, of course. Some employees are a credit to our country, but I must sadly admit that, in my opinion, the vast majority are not.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What was the reaction among the people, as the Senator observed it?

Mr. ELLENDER. They do not like it. I am talking about the common people of these countries themselves. We have had criticisms of our people from natives of foreign countries because of the way of living maintained by these representatives. I also remember on several occasions getting this reaction from some people: That we advised them they should have certain kinds of hospitals and health centers. We built samples of those facilities. Yet, we found that if we built in one area and not in another area, we created dissatisfaction. In other words, we advocated the establishment of facilities far beyond the economy of those countries to maintain. We are getting ourselves into a great deal of trouble in doing that, because we are trying to build in these relatively backward countries complex and modern facilities in use in this country.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me call to the Senator's attention a sentence in the report, just before the list of 12 countries. The report says: "The amounts for individual countries are classified." Does that mean that we are not able to advise the people of the United States the amount of money which will be taken from our revenues to be spent under the circumstances the Senator has described?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. I have complained about that on many occasions. The reason given is that our representatives do not want the people in Indonesia, for instance, to know what the people in South Vietnam are getting. They do not want the people in South Vietnam to know what the people in Taiwan are getting, for fear of arousing jealousies. The funds are not being distributed on the basis of need, but on the basis of who gets what as compared with his neighbors.

When I was in Thailand in 1956 I saw some editorials in which the complaint was made that Thailand was getting only $25 million, whereas South Vietnam was getting much more. The question was asked: Why is not Thailand treated like the other country?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator believe that there is any reason, within the objectives for which this country is struggling, namely, the establishment throughout the world of free governments, why the people of the United States should not know what is being done over there, and why the people of those countries should not know what their governments are doing?

Mr. ELLENDER. Our people should know. They have a right to know. That has been my position throughout. Yet, for one reason or another, these figures are classified.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Who classified them?

Mr. ELLENDER. ICA or the State Department.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Has the President classified them?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know. I presume so. Those agencies represent the President.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Was any inquiry made at the hearings as to who classified them?

Mr. ELLENDER. I have no information on who classified them.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator agree with me that what the people of the United States should do, in leading the world to freedom, ought to be done on the table so that everybody could see it?

Mr. ELLENDER. When we render aid to country A, we should make it known to the people who pay for this aid. Why it should be kept secret is beyond my comprehension. I believe the practice developed in the Middle East. I have often heard it said that the only excuse for helping Lebanon was that we were helping Israel. That was the excuse given. The fear was that if it were revealed how much money we were spending in Jordan or how much money

we were spending in Israel, or how much money we were spending in Iraq, jealousy would develop among the countries, and more trouble would evolve than if we kept the figure secret. However, the countries do find it out.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. They all find out except the people of America.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is right.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know the Senator has been on his feet for a long time, and I appreciate his answering my questions. His answers have been very helpful to me. I shall not burden him further.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish first to commend the distinguished Senator from Louisiana for a very fine and factual statement, a splendid, logical argument with reference to the bill, and for his very fine down-to-earth, practical, and arduous work from year to year in connection with this subject matter. He gives the Appropriations Committee more practical down-to-earth and factual information, as it really exists at the ground level, than anyone else.

I wish briefly to mention my growing concern, which I believe is also the growing concern of people throughout the Nation, with respect to increasing the programs and increasing the appropriations.

At a time when we are blithely going along with a $12 billion to $14 billion deficit in the current fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense tells us of the possibility of a $60 billion to $70 billion military budget within the next few years. That would be the amount of the appropriations for the military alone for each year. We are voting larger and larger appropriations.

However, at the same time we are actually voting on tax reductions. Just a few days ago the Senate Committee on Appropriations was discussing the Supplemental Appropriation bill carrying $3.8 billion. It finished its work at about 6 o'clock in the afternoon. When we came on the Senate floor there was in progress very active and vigorous debate concerning tax reductions.

The pending amendment at that time, which had some chance to be adopted, would have provided for at least a $3 billion tax reduction. We are told that the approximately $4 billion in the bill is necessary for our national survival. Anything which is necessary for the survival of a nation or to save it or its people certainly deserves the making of sacrifice and retrenchments elsewhere. But where is there a move to save and reduce appropriations for other agencies of the Government or other programs in the Government, in order to provide the $4 billion which is alleged to be necessary for our survival? I do not find it. Where is the recommendation to tap some other source of revenue to obtain this money? I have not found that in Congress. I have not found it in the executive branch of the Government.

I do not speak in personalities when I ask: Where is the effort on the part of those who sponsored the bill to do something toward reducing expenses somewhere else, in order to provide the money for this program; or if not that, to provide the increased taxes with which to pay for it? There simply is not any leadership in that direction.

We are blindly going along, merely borrowing the money, and passing the debt on to someone else, rather than to ourselves, thereby, at the same time, cheapening and decreasing the value of the dollar and, therefore, the savings of the people.

So I say it is time for a halt; time for a reappraisal; time to look for the real, positive kind of leadership. If such a program is necessary, then we must have the kind of leadership which will make us endure the hardships necessary to meet these problems. But we are simply not taking those steps now. When we fail to do so, we are misleading the people of the United States. I think the people are correct in assuming—and they do assume—that if the money is necessary, and if the other funds of the Government are necessary, then we will measure up to the courage and responsibility not simply of appropriating to meet these obligations, but also to make certain that the funds are provided.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield briefly; I do not have too much time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I shall not interrupt the Senator, then; I wanted to make some comments about what he has said.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator, I have almost finished.

There are others who know more about the operation of the bill than I do. But I at one time supported measures such as this, until I was made a member of the Committee on Appropriations and learned more about how, unfortunately, these funds are spent. I am fully convinced, even though I think we have to have some program rather than turn our back on all these activities, that the bill provides far more money than is actually needed, certainly until the program has been greatly revised.

I think it is another part and another step in our own unfortunate policy of sending more guns and more ammunition all over the world, sending money all over the world, trying to patch up the cracks and stop the leaks, rather than devising a new program which will really meet the situation.

The aid part of the program has now reached the point where it is simply a question of outbidding Russia; that we must do this or that because Russia is doing it. It is the overwhelming nonsense of having such a policy as that which convinces me that the program cannot possibly be successful and, in addition, will bring us untold trouble and unheard-of problems.

I am happy to support the very modest amendment of the Senator from Louisiana, not only with respect to the military funds for guns, but also for the so-called military support. I feel certain in my own mind that these amendments should go far beyond what they propose.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I am in substantial agreement with the thoughts expressed by the Senator from Mississippi. Last night, after the Senate voted to increase the debt ceiling from $280 billion to $288 billion, when I got home I began to ponder the significance of what we did. With lightness of attitude, we increased the ceiling $8 billion. We thought that was the solution of our problem. Many of the citizens of the country, reading about it, probably feel that is the solution. Yet, upon reflection, I cannot help thinking that all we did was temporarily to make possible the printing of a lot of bonds to pay the deficit which was created by Congress in the national fiscal status.

I pondered the fact, as expressed by the Senator from Mississippi, that my bequest to posterity has been a program of spending, on my part, and a burden of paying the debt by those who will follow.

Last night, expressions were made about the lifting of the debt ceiling. Out of a combination of several expressions, in my judgment, came the truth. Those who have voted for every spending measure should have gladly supported the increase in the debt ceiling. They should have said, "Yes; I have been for spending, and I will bequeath to my children the responsibility of paying the taxes which will liquidate the debt."

I think that in the next session of Congress there should be two primary objectives: First, to avoid in the maximum degree the spendings which are not indispensable; second, to plug the leaks in the tax collections. That was the composite thought which was expressed on the floor last night.

Our country is in danger. If my home were in danger of being consumed by fire, my spending would be in the direction of stopping the conflagration. I would not be out spending money on many things which could wait. But that is not what we are doing in the Senate. We are spending, of course, to the extent that we believe is necessary for the national defense. But that spending becomes backbreaking, because accompanying it we are doing much spending which could wait.

Mr. President, some newspapermen should search the records of this Congress and should study the arguments made in regard to each spending bill. Everyone of those bills was supported by the appealing argument, "The life of the Nation is dependent upon this proposal." I doubt that Senators will find a single one of the money-spending bills that was not supported by the argument, "Unless this money is provided by the Congress, the Nation will fail."

Mr. President, if the Nation fails, it will be because of the backbreaking burden of being militarily strong, while at the same time giving no heed to retrenchment in things which are not indispensable, and giving no heed to the plugging of the tax leaks and to the effort to collect taxes where their collection is justified.

Last night, some true revelations were made. I heard some statements regarding fixing the responsibility for the $288 billion public debt. I think that responsibility lies equally upon the administra-

tion and the Congress. The President has vetoed many bills. He should have vetoed many more; and the Congress should have passed many less bills involving unjustified spending.

My commendations go to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

However, I must say to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] that, for myself, I will give heed to the President's words, as set forth on the second page of the transcript of the evidence—namely, that the funds provided in this mutual aid bill are needed for the defense of our country.

I would prefer to err in the direction of voting against other expenditures, rather than to err in the direction of voting against the expenditures proposed by means of the pending bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] that, if my memory serves me correctly, it was just 40 years ago this month that I was on the western front, in World War I, as a soldier. Since that time, at least a score or more of nations have gone down the drain, and have lost their identity. So far as I know, they did not lose their identity because of overspending. Instead, they lost their identity because they could not defend themselves.

At the moment, we are dealing with a proposal to cut by $100 million the amount the Senate and the House have already agreed upon. The President requested $1,800,000,000. In the authorization bill, the Congress made a cut—a substantial one—of $195 million. The House made a cut of $90 million more.

The Senate has accepted that figure; the House provided for $1,515,000,000, and the Senate has agreed to the $1,515,000,000.

Now the Senator from Louisiana proposes a reduction of an additional $100 million. He does not specify where the reduction should be made; he proposes a meat-ax cut, and nothing more.

Senators can take their choice. On the one hand, we have the President; on the other hand, we have the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

On the one hand, we have the Security Council; on the other hand, we have the Senator from Louisiana.

On the one hand, we have the Joint Chiefs of Staff; on the other hand, we have the Senator from Louisiana.

On the one hand, we have the Secretary of Defense; on the other hand, we have the Senator from Louisiana.

As for me, the choice is quite a simple one to make. I intend to vote for the amount on which we have already agreed, because I think it is an irreducible minimum; and, even then, it may not be enough.

We cannot expect countries to deliver their young men to the perimeter of freedom without putting weapons into their hands. In many cases, these countries do not have the capacity to produce the necessary weapons. I have been over that trail several times in Asia, and a good many times in Europe, the Middle East, and Latin America.

I wish to make a confession—and I believe it applies to everyone who has visited those countries: One cannot visit a foreign country for 48 hours, and then, when he comes away, truly be an expert on the subject, because, at very best, in the course of such a visit one can obtain only a very superficial estimate of the entire problem.

If we go along with the amendment proposed by the Senator from Louisiana, then, among other things, it will be impossible to carry on the kind of forward planning which should be done in connection with a program that is worldwide in scope. Adoption of the pending amendment would make it virtually impossible to do the job which should be done in modernizing some of the outmoded weapons we have provided, some of which date back to World War II, and are hopelessly out of date in 1958 and 1959.

The amounts provided by the bill as it now stands are the least we can provide. These amounts have been carefully calculated.

Would we be justified at this point in making an additional cut of $100 million, without assigned a specific reason for the cut?

O Mr. President, I am familiar with all the statements which have been made in an attempt to justify the proposed adoption of the pending amendment. But the judgment of those who have labored month in and month out on these figures is certainly to be trusted more than is the judgment arrived at on the basis of testimony hurriedly taken. I regret that, because of the scheme of things, we cannot devote more time to this subject.

I recognize that the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has performed a notable and a noble service. But the question is one of judgment.

On one side, we find the Commander in Chief, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Department of Defense, the International Cooperation Administration, the Security Council, and all the rest; on the other side, we find the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. I prefer to rely on the judgment of the Commander in Chief, the Department of Defense, and the others who share their view in regard to a matter which, after all, affects the defense of the Nation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to support the position by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

As he has pointed out, in connection with the pending amendment, the amount reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee is precisely the same as the amount provided in the bill as it was passed by the House of Representatives. That amount had already been reduced to the danger point, in view of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Defense Department.

Mr. President, in order that Senators may make no mistake about the matter, I read now a dispatch which came over the wire service only a short time ago:

> Communist Chinese shore batteries poured a massive barrage of 55,000 to 80,000 high-explosive shells on the Nationalist Chinese southern group of Quemoy Islands tonight.

Mr. President, I know of nothing which would give more encouragement to the Communist Chinese to move against Free China, Korea, and Southeast Asia than the receipt of word that today the Senate of the United States—in the face of the tense situation which exists in that part of the world—reduced by $100 million the amount of the appropriation for this item, which deals with military assistance to nations with which we are allied in mutual-security pacts.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope the amendment submitted by the Senator from Louisiana will be rejected.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, much as I think of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]—who is one of the hardest working members of the Appropriations Committee—I believe that in this instance the Senator from Louisiana has taken an incorrect position.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall support the view of the distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] and of the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who believe that the Senate should support the amount agreed to in connection with the authorization bill, which amount is provided in the pending bill.

Mr. President, in connection with this question, we must also consider the fact that the House is ready to adjourn. Under the circumstances, I do not know how a conference could be obtained with the House.

For that reason, in addition to the real necessity for the fund set forth in the pending bill, I urge that the amount provided by the bill, as reported by the committee to the Senate, be approved, and that the amendment submitted by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] be rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I, too, am a member of the Appropriations Committee; and I, too, took an oath of office, as a Member of this body, just as did the loyal and patriotic Senators who are opposing the amendment which has been submitted by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

I know the history of the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana. The committee previously acted on it, and the committee did not regard it as a sacred thing. The amendment was proposed in the committee; and the members of the committee were not unanimous in their attitude on it; among the committee members, there were differences of opinion.

The motion of the Senator from Louisiana was defeated by a majority

of only one of those attending the committee meeting. So I do not see any reason whatsoever to take the Senator from Louisiana to task because he dares to come on the floor of the Senate and offer an amendment which was lost in committee by only one vote.

I am willing—and I think the people of the United States are willing—to go the limit to feed people who are hungry. But I know there are people by the millions in the United States who do not want to provide guns to France so they will kill Algerians in North Africa, or to provide guns to anyone else so he may kill. That is the only difference. Some of us think we should go as far as we can to feed hungry people, but not to give guns to people in order that they may kill. That is the whole question involved.

It is my purpose, as a member of the committee, to support the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate more than a few minutes. I merely desire to make it plain that, on a program which was to last 4 years, in which expenditures were to be $18 billion, we have, through June 30, 1957, actually spent $60 billion. The estimates, through June 1958, show that there will be added to that amount by that time $3½ billion, making a total expenditure, through June 30, 1958, of $63,592,571,000 on foreign aid.

Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senate that besides the appropriations we are now being asked to make, there is still an unexpended balance of $5,466,338,000. In other words, the amount we have already spent, plus the amount appropriated, plus that unspent balance, aggregates $69,058,909,000 for foreign aid, through June 30, 1958.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table I have in my hand be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Net U. S. Government foreign grants and credits since July 1, 1945

[In thousands of dollars]

	Obligations
Military through June 30, 1957	20,057,267
Economic and other (including Public Law 480) through June 30, 1957	39,940,304
Grand total	59,997,571

Net U. S. Government foreign grants and credits since July 1, 1945—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Obligations
Through June 30, 1957	59,997,571
Estimated expenditures, fiscal year 1958	3,595,000
Total through June 30, 1958	63,592,571
Unexpended at June 30, 1958	5,466,338
Total aid through June 30, 1958	69,058,909

Source: Office of Business Economics, Department of Commerce. Data through June 30, 1958, unavailable. However Treasury reports mutual security program military expenditures for fiscal year 1958 at $2,176 million and nonmilitary as $1,419 million.

Mr. ELLENDER. For the military assistance program, the one we are now talking about, there is now on hand an estimated unexpended balance, as of June 30 of this year, of $3,568,157,000. That money is there and available to be spent.

Even if my amendment prevails, there will be added $1,415,000,000, to that amount which will make in excess of $5 billion available to be spent in the military program during the current fiscal year.

The amount we are being asked to appropriate provides many millions more to be spent on our so-called NATO friends in Western Europe, countries whose industrial capacity has been increased more than 166 percent over prewar.

Mr. President, it strikes me that most of these countries are well able to take care of themselves. Why should we give assistance to Belgium? I wish I could state the amount. The amount is in this statement, but I am precluded from stating it because it is a secret figure. We are called upon to give borrowed money to a little country like Belgium, which is able to take care of itself, in order to assist them.

Mr. President, I repeat, if the amendment which I have presented is agreed to, the military program will not suffer. Those administering the program will still have in excess of $5 billion to spend. I ask, I plead, that the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YOUNG (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. If he were present and voting he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] are absent on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. If present and voting the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] would vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOBLITZELL], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent because of illness in his family.

If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] would each vote "nay."

The pair of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has been previously announced.

On this vote, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is paired with the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maine would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOBLITZELL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] would vote "yea," and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOBLITZELL] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays, 45, not voting 15, as follows:

YEAS—36

Anderson	Frear	McClellan
Bible	Fulbright	Morse
Byrd	Hill	O'Mahoney
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Proxmire
Chavez	Jordan	Robertson
Church	Kefauver	Russell
Cooper	Kerr	Sparkman
Cotton	Langer	Stennis
Curtis	Long	Talmadge
Dworshak	Magnuson	Thurmond
Ellender	Malone	Williams
Ervin	Mansfield	Yarborough

NAYS—45

Aiken	Hayden	Mundt
Allott	Hennings	Murray
Barrett	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Beall	Humphrey	Pastore
Bennett	Jackson	Potter
Bush	Javits	Purtell
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Revercomb
Carroll	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Case, N. J.	Knowland	Schoeppel
Clark	Kuchel	Smathers
Dirksen	Lausche	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Martin, Iowa	Symington
Goldwater	McNamara	Thye
Gore	Monroney	Watkins
Green	Morton	Wiley

NOT VOTING—15

Bricker	Flanders	Jenner
Bridges	Hoblitzell	Martin, Pa.
Butler	Holland	Payne
Carlson	Hruska	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Ives	Young

So Mr. ELLENDER's amendment was rejected.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. It is designated "8–20–58–B."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 8, it is proposed to strike out "$790,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$740,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have the yeas and nays ordered on the amendment?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have always voted against foreign aid since I have been in the Senate. I have prepared a statement which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD following the remarks of my distinguished friend from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LANGER

It is sometimes easy to understand why the American people may have lost complete confidence in the Department of State, and sometimes in the Congress itself. It is in measures like this Mutual Security Act where it sometimes seems we do not seem to know, or care, what happens.

In the course of the debate on this appropriation bill, we shall hear just a few arguments. The arguments will revolve around the program of the President, the necessity of doing this in a Free World, or the call of economy.

The Committee on Appropriations considered this bill for the most part in executive sessions. About the only thing the American people had opportunity to hear were the threats by the President against any cuts in his foreign aid requests, and of a special session unless we do exactly as he asks. I would be willing to have a special session on this bill alone in order that we might air it to the United States and to the world.

The secrecy is largely the fault of the Department of State. I can say this advisedly because it also happens frequently before the Committee of Foreign Relations, of which I am a member. Truthfully, the Department of State plainly and frankly doesn't want one country to know what another is receiving in economic or military assistance, or why it receives it. The net result is that not only is the whole program, and its effect, kept from those we try to help, but even the American people do not know what they are paying out billions for. I put this question to the people of my State, and it was defeated 3 to 1.

I think the whole thing should be thrown right out into the open, and the Members of the Congress should openly fight for or against what they really believe. I think it vital that each country know exactly what and why another country gets certain financial assistance and certain programs, and more importantly, that the American people know, too.

The opinions of those sitting right above the clock, and who sell their opinions for a nickel or a dime ought not to supply the nerve or the fear in the Members of the Senate. The newspaper editors of the United States of North Dakota have never worried me, or caused me to swerve from what I thought I ought to do. I have never hesitated to tell them freely and frankly—that is the truth as I see it.

It does not surprise me to see that Time, Life and Fortune hastened to smear the entire membership of the Congress in connection with the Adams-Goldfine situation in an effort to erase any ashes from the office of the President and the administration. I don't know why so many Republican Members of the Congress concern themselves over their failure to be able to personally contact the White House. They can read Time or Life any week and get the official White House policy. If any of us voted according to the dictates of Henry Luce, he wouldn't get many votes either. I can only suggest that any man who controls news media like Time or Life, can hardly be impartial in the field of foreign affairs. By the same token, if you read the New York Times only, within 4 weeks you wouldn't know what was going on in these United States.

Mr. President, it is my reluctant duty to call attention to the fact that we have before us a bill appropriating money from the United States taxpayers which contains one item for which there has been no justification or question. It is the item continuing the $120 million credit program to Venezuela for strictly military equipment.

This credit, most lavish of all in the hemisphere, was begun in 1956, and has continued each year, limited only to $25 million in any one year. Mr. President, since you were down there in your role of Vice President of the United States and harvested the greatest insults heaped upon America in my memory, you are aware of the fact there has been a complete change of government in Venezuela since 1956, and not for the best either, I might suggest. I should imagine someone would have wanted to reappraise the entire program.

It is my understanding that no one from the Department of State testified during the executive hearings of the Appropriations Committee on whether or not the program should be dropped or canceled. The Department of State never raised the question, and I am reliably advised it never raised the question in Venezuela. I was informed no member of the Appropriations Committee raised any question either. So here we have a $25 million a year item for a country which has not said if it wants it, based upon no justifications for this year, and continued with a governmental structure which no longer exists, and probably for a purpose which no longer exists. I say we are careless about this mutual security bill; that we do not know what is in it. I do not lay this blame to the Appropriations Committee, because after all the committee is there to hear requests from the President and to make inquiries into those requests.

But, I should imagine that the Congress would have cared enough about the Venezuelan incident to rip out everything in the bill for Venezuela and simply start all over again on a new course with that country and in light of the new government.

There were a number of outraged speeches in the Congress to withdraw mutual security funds from the Dominican Republic when some movie actress chose to use the mutual security debate and her appearance in a Washington nightspot as a means of some good personal publicity, whether accidental or planned, because of a gift. But, when Mrs. Nixon is spit upon, when the Vice President of the United States and the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate is insulted, we don't even bother to ask questions about that appropriation. Neither did any of those crusading editors, who compete for prizes for what they can dig out of some corner that was overlooked.

Do we know, Mr. President, if this Venezuelan Government wants, or should have, the credit program for military equipment. The last purpose for which it went to my knowledge was for cargo aircraft for the Air Force.

While on the subject of Venezuela, Mr. President, let me point out that for some 8 years the former President of Venezuela, R. Betancourt, languished in the United States in exile, and while under our protection fomented unrest in the hemisphere. There were no outcries he be returned to Venezuela to be strung up by his heels. It may be remembered that it was General Marcos Perez Jimenez who headed the junta which ousted Betancourt and the Communists. It is not surprising that today Venezuela is demanding the return of General Jimenez. I am inclined to resist any and all efforts to return him to Betancourt, or to interfere with his asylum in the United States. It is curious to note that Betancourt's brother is the registered agent here for the Cuban rebels.

I have pointed out some carelessness, Mr. President, and I now believe it our duty, the duty of the Committee on Appropriations, to move to strike out Venezuela from the bill. This will make sense in this hemisphere and in the world; it will uphold the dignity and honor of the presiding office of the United States Senate, and cause other nations to reappraise their attitudes and their cooperation.

Loans and assistance alone, Mr. President, will not create the favorable conditions which we have set our sights upon in this mutual security program. If they did, then with this, most lavish of all in the hemisphere, the Vice President would have been met with flower strewn paths and honor rather than spit and vilification. With mercy, we need firmness, and we need complete understanding and objective.

Unless there is some personal planning and objective put into this mutual security program, there is a far more simple and just as sense-making way to appropriate the American taxpayers' funds.

Each country can provide facts on its economy, its needs, and its problems. The information can be fed into a State Department Univac, watched over by three Members of the Congress, and out of this machine will come a methodical but indifferent calculation of what each country ought to have. But, Mr. President, we cannot be indifferent in something as expensive and vital as this. The Senate must show Venezuela's ruling government officials and her party leaders, and must show the world, that the Senate is not indifferent.

THE NATO SCIENCE PROGRAM

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, we are finally making practical progress in programs to improve the development and utilization of scientific and technical talent in the NATO community. The Mutual Security Appropriation Act before us will be the general source of funds for the initial support of the NATO science program, including two projects which are of special concern to me.

These two projects are the NATO-wide fellowship-scholarship program and the advanced-study institutes program.

Mr. President, on November 20, 1956, at the Second Conference of Members of Parliament from the NATO countries, I proposed the setting up of a special committee on scientific and technical personnel to make recommendations on

how NATO countries might more effectively develop their potential scientific and technical talent. I ask unanimous consent that the text of that resolution be inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECOND CONFERENCE OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT FROM THE NATO COUNTRIES—RESOLUTION PROPOSED BY SENATOR HENRY M. JACKSON (UNITED STATES OF AMERICA), ADOPTED AT THE FINAL SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE

Whereas the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty have agreed "separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid" to "maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack" and to "encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them";

Whereas the capacity of NATO to resist armed attack and to continue that economic growth which is the cornerstone of its freedom depends in large part upon the development and use of its existing and potential scientific and technological talent; and

Whereas there is evidence that members of NATO may not have directed sufficient energy either (a) toward the maximum utilization of existing scientific and technological talent, or (b) toward the development of new talent: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this Second Conference of Members of Parliament from the NATO countries:

1. Establishes a Special Committee on Scientific and Technical Personnel to consist of one representative from each state participating in this Conference;

2. Requests such Special Committee, the Chairman of which shall be designated by the President of the NATO Parliamentary Conference, to submit to the next session such findings and recommendations as it deems appropriate with respect to:

(a) The present situation with respect to the training of scientific and technological personnel in the NATO countries;

(b) The relationship between NATO utilization of its existing potential resources in this field and the utilization of similar resources by the Soviet bloc;

(c) The development of resources of scientific and technological personnel sufficient to enable the NATO countries to maintain their individual and collective capacities to resist armed attack and to continue their economic growth essential to their strength and well-being.

3. Requests the parliaments of states members of NATO, as well as the executive agencies of those states, to assist the special committee created by this resolution in its study.

Mr. JACKSON. Appointed chairman of the Parliamentary Committee on Scientific and Technical Personnel, I undertook to prepare a report in accordance with the resolution. In preparing that report I had the full cooperation of the executive branch and the advice and support of a distinguished group of American scientists, educators, and industrialists. The advisory group was composed of the following members: Dr. Detlev W. Bronk, president, National Academy of Science; Dr. Richard Courant, director, Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York University; Dr. David Griggs, professor of geophysics, Institute of Geophysics, University of California, Los Angeles; Mr. Eric Johnston, president, Motion Picture Association, Chairman of the International Development Advisory Board; Dr. J. R. Killian, Jr., then president, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Mr. Kenneth Mansfield, assistant to the general manager, nuclear division, Combustion Engineering, Inc.; Dr. Maria Geoppert Mayer, professor of nuclear physics, the Enrico Fermi Institute for Nuclear Studies, University of Chicago; Dr. Rubin F. Mettler, program director, Air Force IRBM program at the Ramo-Wooldridge Corp., Los Angeles, Calif.; Dr. Howard A. Meyerhoff, Executive Director, Scientific Manpower Commission; Mr. David Sarnoff, chairman of the board, Radio Corporation of America; Dr. Edward Teller, then associate director, radiation laboratory, University of California, Berkeley; Dr. John A. Wheeler, professor of physics, Palmer Physical Laboratory, Princeton University.

Dr. Wheeler served as chairman and Mr. Mansfield as secretary of the advisory group.

Thanks to the help of this distinguished Advisory Committee, as well as advice from members of the international NATO Committee, I filed a report with the Third NATO Parliamentarians' Conference in November 1957 entitled "Trained Manpower for Freedom." That report, with a few amendments, was unanimously adopted by the Conference.

In that connection special recognition should be given to the excellent work of four of my distinguished colleagues at the Conference, Senator GREEN, Senator KUCHEL, Representative CORBETT, and Representative FRANK SMITH.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD major portions of that final report.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRAINED MANPOWER FOR FREEDOM—EXTRACTS FROM THE REPORT BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE PROVISION OF SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL PERSONNEL IN THE NATO COUNTRIES

THE PROBLEM

The member states of NATO confront a genuine crisis in the form of serious shortages of skilled scientific and technical manpower.

This shortage is due above all to the scientific revolution through which the world is now passing.

Useful atomic power automation, and the thousand and one other practical applications of the scientific discoveries of the past 50 years can raise standards of life throughout the world to a new plateau.

At the same time, this revolution has immensely complicated the problem of resisting military aggression. The NATO community must be able to defend itself against ballistic missiles, nuclear bombs, and an entire panoply of other new weapons systems.

The scientific revolution has created an unprecedented demand for qualified scientists and engineers. Only with more trained managerial and technical brainpower can NATO take full advantage of the new opportunities for industrial progress and economic well-being. More and better skills will also be needed if the Atlantic nations are to continue their historic role of the chief exporters of science and technology to the underdeveloped areas of the world.

The need for more skilled personnel is underlined by the Soviet military and educational effort. Scientific manpower is being graduated in the Soviet Union at a present per capita rate approximately twice that of the NATO community as a whole. Russia now turns out more scientifically trained people than any western nation, and is accelerating the output at a higher rate than any nation. Furthermore, Soviet instruction is of high quality.

The fact that the Soviet Union was the first to launch an earth satellite is proof enough of their great technical competence.

One fact requires emphasis, however. NATO would need more trained manpower even if there were no Soviet Union and no defense effort. The root causes of the shortage are long term in nature. They stem from the scientific revolution itself, and its technological consequences.

To realize the full promise of the scientific revolution NATO must solve a triple problem. There is the problem of quantity—how to increase the total number of qualified scientists and engineers. There is the problem of quality—how to discover and nurture the truly exceptional talents, the Maxwells, the Fermis, and the Bohrs of coming generations. There is the problem of utilization—how to employ our technical brainpower in the most efficient manner.

ENDS AND MEANS

The long-term goal should be this: No barriers to the development of talent. Nothing is more precious. It is the greatest resource of the State and of the free world community. It should be sought out and nurtured.

Every qualified young person within the NATO community who wishes for a career in science and engineering should be encouraged to try for one, and should be able to secure the necessary education. Yet today in all NATO countries, countless young people with marked ability for scientific and engineering careers end their education with the secondary school.

In many cases, students do not have the money needed to complete their education. In other cases the incentive to go further is absent. In some countries artifical social barriers hold back students of great native ability.

A similar need for more open doors to opportunity, of course, exists in the humanities and the social sciences. This report, however, is confined to the problem of scientific manpower.

The goal of "no barriers to talent" may not be reached for decades, or even generations. Before the goal is reached a whole new public philosophy toward science and technology may be required. Far more than they are today, the teaching and practice of science and engineering must come to be regarded as among the greatest human callings.

We should never lose sight of the long-term goal. Meanwhile, however, we confront the immediate problem—how to take additional practical steps to remedy the manpower storage.

Governments can do much to help, but by no means all. Over the long run, it is the people themselves who will decide the success or failure of corrective measures. It is the people themselves, as parents, who must take major responsibility in encouraging gifted young persons to follow careers in science and engineering. Over and above all else, it is the people themselves, and not their governments, who must create a social climate in which intellectual exploration is recognized as a great odyssey of the human spirit.

We should not exaggerate the potential contribution of cooperative international measures. International agencies cannot assume the primary responsibility for of-

ficial action in this crisis; this must be accepted by national governments.

Without exception, the member states have begun remedial programs. In each country, the problem has a different specific form. Some countries particularly lack technicians. In others, basic science is relatively strong, and applied technology comparatively weak. In still others, women graduates in science find difficulty in securing appropriate employment; in yet others, educational facilities in the form of inadequate laboratories are the greatest single obstacle to progress. Most NATO countries report a shortage of science teachers in secondary schools and universities.

In almost all the NATO countries there are numbers of qualified scientists who could be utilized more effectively than at present.

It is important that national programs be supplemented and assisted by cooperative international actions. However, the resources available to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization are limited. They should not be dissipated on projects, however meritorious, of secondary importance. Our practical problem is to get the maximum benefit out of these resources.

Ideally, NATO activities should be catalytic in nature. That is, they should aim at initiating chain reactions which extend over the broadest possible scientific and technological front.

By the same token, we believe that the resources available to NATO should primarily be used to support and broaden the work of existing schools, research centers, and agencies in this field, rather than to create wholly new institutions.

Therefore, this report makes the following recommendations:

PART I

Recommendations

1. An Atlantic community talent development program: It is recommended that there now be established a NATO-sponsored and NATO-financed talent development program, designed to produce annually at least 500 doctoral degree holders with research experience in the fields of maximum importance for the defense and economic well-being of the NATO community.

Certain disciplines are today of overriding importance for the future of the NATO community—both for strengthening our military defenses and for promoting technological progress. Among these fields are applied mathematics, aero and fluid dynamics, basic electronics, nuclear physics, solid state physics, physical chemistry, and metallurgy.

Last year, American universities awarded a total of less than 450 doctors of philosophy in these fields. The number of comparable degrees granted in Europe was apparently considerably smaller.

A relatively small number of additional trained people of outstanding talent in these disciplines could have the catalytic effect which we deem so important.

Three obstacles now exist:

(1) Too few qualified instructors;

(2) Too many students with great potential leaving school before receiving advanced training; and

(3) Inadequate laboratory facilities in the schools.

An Atlantic community talent development program should be designed to produce annually 500 doctoral degree holders in the fields of greatest importance for the defense and welfare of the NATO community. The doctoral degree, as used here, would require 2 or 3 years of research work, a thesis and an examination on the thesis.

Such a program would give financial assistance to students, in the form of fellowships, and to universities in which the fellows enrolled, in the form of special development grants to help improve teaching facilities. Atlantic Community fellows could be selected through a NATO-wide competition patterned after the Rhodes scholarship plan. Regional nominating boards might be established in each country, and final awards would be made by a NATO-wide group.

It might be desirable to establish two types of fellowships. One would be granted at the equivalent of the American freshman year in college and would be renewable annually until the fellowship holder received his doctorate. The other would be awarded at the level equivalent to the first year in an American graduate school, and would also be renewable. Each type of fellowship program might be geared to produce 250 doctors of philosophy annually.

The awards might range from $500 to $3,000 annually for each fellow, depending on his age and training.

Fellowships granted to students coming directly from high school would presumably pay less than those for more advanced students. Younger students would also presumably be left as free as possible in their choice of scientific fields.

At the same time that each fellowship was awarded, a special development grant would be made to the university in which the student enrolled. Depending upon the cost of facilities and instruction and the field chosen, such grants to universities might range from $1,000 to $4,000 per each fellow enrolled.

Since the manpower shortage problem is most acute in Europe, the large majority of the fellowships should be awarded to European students, for use primarily in European universities.

Atlantic Community fellows, other factors being equal, would choose to study at the leading European center for their particular discipline. The grant to the university associated with each fellowship would enable the institution to strengthen its facilities and improve its faculty still further. In time, this program could encourage the development of truly outstanding centers in each of the fields to which the program is applicable.

We estimate that this talent development program, in full operation, would cost a total of between $8 million and $10 million annually.

At the very outset, this program would probably be financed very largely by contributions from NATO itself and from the member governments. However, industry and privately endowed foundations could also be encouraged to make grants.

2. An awards program for teachers and students in secondary schools: It is recommended that NATO sponsor and finance an annual awards program in mathematics or science for outstanding secondary school students, together with their instructors.

Many authorities maintain that the root cure of the scientific manpower problem lies in attracting more qualified students into mathematics and science at the level of the United States high school. One important way of accomplishing this is through raising the quality of instruction, since behind every good student there is a good teacher.

In order to give both teachers and students in the secondary schools an additional incentive for effort and excellence, it is proposed that NATO sponsor an annual competition, which would give monetary awards to outstanding students, together with their instructors.

For example: An annual mathematics competition could be established. Students of a designated age level would take national examinations of uniform difficulty. Those scoring highest nationally would then be eligible to compete for grand prizes in a NATO-wide contest. Five thousand prizes of $300 each would be provided, together with perhaps 100 grand prizes of $1,000 each for the overall NATO competition. Each prize would be divided between the student and his teacher, with perhaps one-half going to the teacher or possibly to the school. The total cost of such a program would approximate $1,600,000 annually. This NATO-wide mathematics awards program is considered a minimal one. We would hope that each of the 15 members of NATO would follow through with its own program of awards.

Such a NATO-wide competition could be applied in other fields, for example, in physics, and awards could be granted for general attainment in the sciences. Whatever specific form the competition took, certainly for relatively modest outlays of money, it should help to raise the level of instruction and study in our secondary schools.

It may also be desirable to develop other positive means to stimulate interest in science at the high-school level. For example, book prizes long have been a feature of many secondary schools with high traditions of training. Members of NATO might experiment with student award programs which take the form of a distribution of outstanding monographs on science.

3. Summer study institutes: It is recommended that immediate steps be taken to increase the number and variety of summer study institutes within the NATO community, in order to extend the influence of outstanding scholarly talent in fields now hampered by a shortage of teachers.

The summer study institute has been an important postwar educational development both in North America and in Europe. More than 100 institutes concerned with mathematics, the sciences, and engineering have been held this year in the United States, 96 of which were supported by the National Science Foundation. Two typical European summer study institutes are those at Les Houches in France and Varenna in Italy. The former, sponsored by the University of Grenoble and the French Ministry of Education, offers summer seminars in modern physics. The latter, sponsored by the Italian Physical Society, the Ministry of Education, and Italian industry, holds summer seminars in different fields of physics each year.

Summer institutes serve different purposes. One gives advanced training to graduate students in specific disciplines; another brings together mature research scholars for a summer-long seminar in particular scientific problem areas; yet another offers refresher courses in science or mathematics to secondary school or college teachers.

Unlike more ambitious undertakings, the institutes are relatively easy to establish. They focus on one problem area; their enrollments are limited; they are held at places where study and recreation can be combined; they attract a more international student body and faculty than is customary for an ordinary graduate center; they are administered by existing organizations; they meet during the academic vacation period when university instructors are free of their normal duties.

Several additional institutes should be established, both in North America and Europe, by the summer of 1958, and the number of institutes could be increased in succeeding years. Nuclear engineering, applied mathematics, solid state physics, agriculture, fisheries, and medicine are natural fields of study for such existing and new institutes. These institutes would be staffed and attended by professors, research workers, and highly qualified young students from throughout NATO and other European countries.

Summer institutes might also be held (1) in the learning and teaching of mathematics, for secondary school and university teachers; (2) in methods of acquainting young people with the world of science, for public opinion

leaders in NATO countries, and (3) in managerial techniques, for key personnel in industry, education and government.

It should be possible to rely chiefly on existing institutions in setting up the summer programs. Qualified centers would be invited to submit proposals for summer study programs, and these proposals would be evaluated on the basis of the competence of the proposed teaching staff and the adequacy of the available facilities. Also, the institutes could be administered by existing centers, for example, under the general sponsorship of the National Science Foundation or the Academy of Sciences in the United States, and by their counterpart organizations in the other NATO countries.

Since many outstanding younger students would find it financially difficult to attend summer institutes, consideration should be given to a scholarship program, with modest stipends, for predoctoral students. Funds for such scholarships might come, in part at least, from nongovernmental sources.

The idea of a European-wide center of postgraduate studies—internationally staffed and financed and drawing to it the finest students in Europe—has long excited the imagination of scholars on the Continent.

In time, it may be practical and desirable to establish a postgraduate school, which could constitute a NATO center for advanced technology. Such a center might evolve organically from less ambitious NATO-sponsored activities in the manpower field. Several years of preparatory planning, however, would probably be necessary.

At present, it seems best to place primary emphasis on programs along the lines of those proposed in this report, which would strengthen existing centers of study. It is estimated that $100,000 would be a sound initial NATO contribution for the summer institute program. This fund would be supplemented by funds from private foundations and other sources and would permit the immediate planning of at least two key institutes in the summer of 1958.

4. International exchanges of scientific and technical personnel: It is recommended that NATO member states expand their international exchange-of-persons programs involving scientists and engineers and advanced students, and in this connection, enter into agreements to mutually recognize equivalent degrees.

The value of this program has already been fully demonstrated. A vastly stepped-up program is now required.

Personnel exchanges and foreign visits are generally designed to serve an educational purpose in the broad sense. They may serve to familiarize the technically trained visitor with new discoveries and techniques which may then be applied more widely. In the narrower academic sense, many thousands of students from NATO countries receive their scientific and, especially, technological training outside their home country.

Under present Government programs the exchange of civilian scientific and technical personnel among NATO countries is relatively small. Personnel in the humanities, the social sciences, and art, predominate.

Expanded programs of exchange of scientists and engineers would have the immediate advantage of improving the usefulness of persons already recruited for scientific work.

For example, it is suggested that particular attention be given to expanding exchanges for post-doctoral students who are just beginning their careers. This is a critical period when many excellent people are lost to their chosen field. Stimulating contact with the best experience abroad could help open their eyes to the importance of the contribution they may be able to make.

The exchange-of-persons programs will be aided if prompt steps can be taken by NATO countries to recognize equivalent degrees.

5. Cooperative project research under NATO sponsorship: It is recommended that NATO sponsor and finance additional important cooperative training and research projects which particularly lend themselves to international action.

Seven years ago the NATO-sponsored and NATO-financed Advisory Group for Aeronautical Research and Development (AGARD) was established to invigorate the study of aerodynamic theory within the NATO community. Leading scientists and engineers from all the NATO countries participate in the organization and technical panels of AGARD. Its next general conference will attract 400 to 500 representatives from throughout NATO. Following an AGARD recommendation, a training center for experimental aerodynamics was established in Brussels. This center, supported directly by NATO, brings together outstanding teachers and graduate students from the entire NATO community, and it has functioned with outstanding success.

The precedent of the aerodynamic training center should now be extended to other training and research problems when it can clearly be shown by scientific opinion that cooperative international action is appropriate. A long-term program of cooperative meteorology research, under contract to NATO, is an example of a project deserving further consideration.

In a few fields, it might be necessary to establish new training centers. Wherever possible, however, such NATO contract support should be given to established all-European study centers in fields relevant to military defense and economic progress, as leaders in such fields of study come forward with concrete and outstanding proposals.

6. A European-wide Employment Clearing House: It is recommended that a European-wide employment clearing house for scientists and engineers be established.

One of the most serious practical problems faced today is equating the supply of scientific skills with the demand for these skills. In the highly industrialized parts of the NATO Community, demand for highly trained technical manpower exceeds supply. But in other areas, there is underemployment or actual unemployment for scientists and engineers, particularly those just finishing their training.

One obvious way to help remedy this situation is through a European-wide scientific and engineering employment clearing house. The employment rosters of American scientific societies offer a precedent for such a clearing house.

The goal would be to assemble in one register, and at one place, a list of employment opportunities available throughout Europe, together with a list of qualified applicants for such positions.

Once such a register was prepared, and kept current, industry, the universities, research centers, and technical personnel would, beyond question, find it of great usefulness.

7. The role of industry: It is recommended that industry give a greater support to academic institutions by making scientists and engineers in its employ available for teaching and assignments in secondary schools and universities, and by helping sponsor and staff summer teaching and research institutes.

There has been a traditional barrier between science in the university and science in industry. The campus has been the home of pure research, with industry the home of applied research and technology. Commonly, there has been little commingling between the two.

In a few countries, this traditional barrier is now breaking down. For instance, more than one-half of the advanced-degree holders in science and engineering in the United States are today working in industry. In a few countries industry is now lending schools heavy support through contracts for on-campus research, and grants for new professorial chairs, additional facilities, and scholarships and fellowships. In return, schools are giving industry much needed assistance through such means as consulting services.

This exchange between the schools and industry is mutually profitable, and is much to be encouraged.

Industrial companies could make a regular practice of granting sabbatical leaves to selected scientists and engineers in their employ, and loaning them for full-time teaching assignments in colleges, universities and secondary schools. Further, industry could immediately help sponsor and staff summer teaching and research institutes.

8. Maintenance of national remedial manpower programs: It is recommended that the member governments be invited by the NATO Council to maintain appropriate programs for remedying the manpower problem on the national level.

Toward this end they should be invited to do the following:

(a) wherever possible encourage and stimulate higher standards of scientific training;

(b) initiate, expand and continue their studies of scientifically and technically trained manpower, with particular reference to numbers, employment, utilization, and their future needs;

(c) request their appropriate educational authorities currently to review the adequacy of their educational facilities for providing scientific training, especially in view of the growth of populations and of the demand for education on the part of large numbers of people, and annually (or at some other frequent and regular interval) hereafter to prepare for NATO a report on progress made in this field;

(d) request their appropriate educational authorities to determine whether enough time is now devoted to the study of mathematics and science at the high school level;

(e) examine the supply and training of teachers in technical fields; and

(f) give wide public currency to their findings.

9. An informed public opinion: It is recommended that the NATO Parliamentary Conference, the NATO Council, the member governments, and all nongovernmental bodies concerned, maintain a continuing and vigorous program to focus public attention on the necessity of remedying the manpower shortage problem.

A successful long-term program for remedying manpower shortages must rest on wide-spread popular support. The problem will not be solved until there is a far greater public awareness of the problem's dimensions and importance.

The NATO Parliamentary Conference can itself help focus attention on the manpower problem. The Conference is composed of elective officials from the member states—legislators who are in daily touch with their constituents, and who are responsible for inviting the attention of their electorates to questions of great consequence.

There are certain practical steps the NATO Parliamentary Conference can now take:

(a) the problem of scientific and technical personnel should be given a prominent place on the agenda of each annual meeting of the Parliamentary Conference;

(b) the Special Committee on Scientific and Technical Personnel should be made a permanent and continuing body of the Conference; and

(c) The Conference should sponsor an annual stocktaking report on this entire problem. This report might be prepared in cooperation with the Organization for European Economic Cooperation and other organizations active in this field. Such a re-

port prepared in a nontechnical and readily understandable format, would be a periodic review of progress made and problems yet unsolved in raising the quantity and quality of technical manpower. Efforts should then be made to give these annual reports the widest possible circulation.

10. Administrative questions: The problem of how best to coordinate scientific manpower activities sponsored or encouraged by NATO is difficult and important.

Obviously, these programs would have to be administered with extreme flexibility. We take it for granted that national educational authorities would be closely consulted throughout, and that due regard would be given to the particular problems of specific member states.

We doubt that NATO, as such, should be directly involved in the day-to-day administration of these matters.

The possibility of contracting out the administrative direction and coordination of these activites to some already existing academic or research organization has been carefully explored with leading authorities both in Europe and America. These inquiries have indicated that there is probably no existing organization which could assume these duties.

The best way to proceed may be to establish an Atlantic Community Foundation. The governing board of the foundation would be composed of two eminent representatives of each of the NATO countries, possibly nominated by the appropriate national academies or scientific societies. The governing board, which could meet semiannually or quarterly, would elect a chairman, who would in turn appoint a full-time executive director plus a small administrative staff.

The foundation could work under contract to NATO, and it might also receive funds directly from member governments and from nongovernmental sources.

The foundation might find it desirable to establish its headquarters at some already existing European university or research center of outstanding reputation.

The executive director of the foundation should be selected on the assumption that his drive and good sense could be the determining factor in implementing an effective scientific manpower program in the NATO Community.

A draft administrative budget for the Atlantic Community Foundation should be developed for presentation to the meeting of the NATO Council on December 16.

PART II

Recommendations

1. A NATO Defense Missile Training Center: It is recommended that a NATO Defense Missile Training Center be established immediately.

Today, some of the member states are relatively familiar with the complex planning and operational problems which will be posed by the integration of defensive missiles into the NATO armed forces. Other members of our community, however, now have little acquaintance with these same problems.

A common minimum level of familiarity with these armaments is needed by our entire community. To secure this, a long, and intensive, and systematic training program will be necessary.

We, therefore, propose that a NATO Defense Missile Training Center now be established, for the purpose of handling this problem on a NATO-wide basis.

The first aim of the center would be to give NATO engineers and technicians, and armed forces members, a better understanding of the elementary practical problems involved in the use of missiles.

Once this foundation were laid, the center might develop means for the testing of missiles employed on a NATO-wide basis. A NATO-sponsored missile training and testing range could be established, where practical experience in the use of operational missiles could be gained.

Still later, at this or other centers, basic research programs might be sponsored in scientific areas relevant to the technology of missiles and missile countermeasures. Such programs would aim at utilizing more effectively and broadly the skills of our community's scientists.

2. A North Atlantic Institute for Defense Studies: It is recommended that a North Atlantic Institute for Defense Studies (AIDS) be immediately established.

It is today more and more recognized by military leaders that effective defense planning cannot be improvised, nor done on an intuitive basis. Today, almost any specific defense mission can in theory be performed by a wide variety of different weapons systems. There is no quick and easy way to determine which of these many systems can do the job most effectively. In this missile era, ambitious programs of operational research, employing very complex and advanced scientific and mathematical techniques are required, more than ever before, to secure rational and objective answers within an acceptable time period.

Recognizing this, some of the NATO member states have established defense study centers which aim at bringing the techniques of modern science to bear on such problems. The Rand Corporation, which works under contract to the United States Air Force, is an example. Commonly, such study groups include on their staffs mathematicians, physicists, economists, and representatives of other fields of science. Commonly, also, such groups work under contract to the military but, nevertheless, possess a high degree of autonomy.

Based on experience to date, this type of defense study center performs an indispensable role in sound military planning. The need for such scientific analyses should grow progressively greater as weapons systems and defense problems become more complex.

No counterpart of such a group now exists on a NATO-wide basis. We therefore believe that a North Atlantic Institute for Defense Studies (AIDS), which could be made responsible to SHAPE, should be established immediately.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the Parliamentarians' Conference directed its standing committee to submit this report to the North Atlantic Council urging that it be brought to the attention of the December heads of government meeting.

On December 16, Secretary Dulles announced that the United States (a) was prepared to participate in, and contribute to an annual talent development program for 500 predoctoral and postdoctoral scientific fellowships, and (b) would assist in an expanded program of summer study institutes in Europe.

On December 19, 1957, the heads of governments meeting in Paris formally charged the new NATO Science Committee with responsibility for making specific recommendations on the valuable proposals put forward by the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference.

Since that time the NATO Science Committee has considered our report and at its July 9–11, 1958, meeting, agreed to recommend that the North Atlantic Council approve a fellowship-scholarship and summer institutes program along the general lines of the Parliamentarians' Conference recommendations.

The Department of State has informed me that these two programs are the only elements of the NATO science program sufficiently advanced at this time to require a specific decision as to financial contributions by the United States. I am further informed that the United States has conditionally pledged to contribute a maximum of $575,000 toward meeting the initial cost of these two projects.

It is the declared intention of the Department of State to recommend that this money be drawn from the contingency fund which is authorized by section 451 (b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended. I have been assured that no difficulty with this procedure is anticipated since the contingency fund can properly be used to cover needs generally foreseen, the precise cost of which could not be estimated at the time of presentation to Congress.

In this connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter dated July 25, 1958, from Mr. William B. Macomber, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 25, 1958.

The Honorable HENRY M. JACKSON,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: Your letter of July 21, concerning the NATO science program, refers to my letter of June 26 to Senator GREEN, and asks for additional information as to financing. As I indicated to Senator GREEN, a firm decision as to a United States contribution could not be made before the Science Committee had a chance to study working party proposals with respect to fellowship and summer institutes programs. The United States representative was authorized to support these proposals fully, however, and I am glad to inform you that the committee agreed at its July 9–11 meeting to recommend that the North Atlantic Council approve them without substantial change, subject to one reservation on the institutes program.

As agreed by the Science Committee, the fellowship program would cost $1 million for the first year, and the United States representative was authorized to offer 50 percent of the total funds required, subject to availability of funds and subject to the willingness of other governments also to make proportionate commitments for their shares.

A similar offer was made with respect to the proposed summer institutes program (renamed Advanced Study Institutes program), which would cost $150,000 for the first year of operation. The committee agreed to recommend Council approval of this program, subject to a United Kingdom reservation which the United Kingdom representative was fairly certain would be lifted.

These are the only elements of the NATO program sufficiently advanced at this time to call for a specific decision as to a United States contribution, but assuming Council approval, the United States is conditionally pledged as stated above to contribute a maximum of $575,000 toward meeting the cost of these two projects. The general source of these funds would be the Mutual Security Appropriations Act, 1959. The exact source is not yet definitely decided, but it is our present intention to recommend

that the contingency fund be used, which is authorized by section 451 (b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended. I would anticipate no difficulty with this procedure, in view of the fact that the contingency fund may properly be used to meet needs generally foreseen, but the cost of which could not be predicted with precision at the time of the Congressional presentation.

The exact amount of fiscal year 1959 funds to be contributed is not yet certain, since no decision has been reached as to the handling of the advance made NATO from fiscal year 1958 funds. It was clearly understood that this advance would be taken into account when the United States considered a subsequent contribution. Of the total $100,000 advance, $25,000 was made available to the NATO science adviser to meet immediate needs. The balance of $75,000 is available, but has not as yet been drawn, and may be deducted from our contribution to the fellowship-institutes programs or used for other approved projects for which a financing need is apparent before the two larger projects actually get under way.

In any case, as far as the United States is concerned, we foresee no financial problem inhibiting the development of the NATO science program. The two key projects to which your letter refers will presumably go to the Council for decision in the near future, and the United States representative there will be prepared to support them fully.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on July 30 the NATO Council meeting in Paris agreed in principle to both the fellowship-scholarship program and the advanced studies institutes program.

The NATO Council also agreed to discuss detailed financial plans at its first meeting in October.

Meanwhile, Dr. Ramsey, NATO science adviser, has given assurances that sufficient funds are on hand to continue the basic planning for implementation of the two programs.

I am hoping by the time the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference convenes in November this year, that the fellowship-scholarship program, and the advanced-studies institutes program will have passed out of the planning stage into reality. The funds we will be voting here today can contribute to that end.

At best, however, we are only at the beginning of a full-scale NATO science program.

I believe the people of the Atlantic Community will make the needed effort for survival if their enthusiasms are engaged in great undertakings—if they feel they are building something—not simply defending something.

Improving the state of science is such a common cause, if we will only make it so. Through better science, free people can advance not only their security, but their prosperity as well.

Common scientific and technical programs within the NATO alliance will not only promote the security and welfare of the Atlantic Community. They will also assure a greater reservoir of brains and know-how for technical cooperation in Asia and Africa.

I trust this country will continue to develop and initiate bold projects to help the entire NATO Community implement a broad program of scientific and technical cooperation.

STATE OF THE NATION'S FINANCES

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, last evening the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] had intended delivering an address in connection with the state of the Nation's finances and also to make certain recommendations.

Because of the lateness of the hour and the desirability of obtaining a vote on the debt limit bill, Senator BRIDGES decided to forego his address.

However, I obtained a copy and, because of its significance, I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, on January 13, 1958, Congress received the President's budget for fiscal year 1959 which contemplated a half-billion-dollar surplus.

At the time I said that was too thin a margin for comfort. I said the surplus could easily become a deficit unless Congress held tight rein on the public purse.

Events have confirmed my worst fears.

Today, just 7 months after the budget was submitted, the Congress is no longer confronted with a surplus. We now face an entirely different and alarming situation. Instead of a slim surplus, there looms the prospect of a budget deficit of $12 billion.

HOW THE FISCAL PICTURE WORSENED

How in the short span of 7 months could the Nation's fiscal picture worsen so radically?

Part of the answer is sputnik.

Part of the answer is near panic inspired by a dip in the economy, which led to a rash of spending proposals in Congress.

Part of the answer is declining revenues as a direct result of the dip in the economy.

Part of the answer is enactment by this Congress of many new programs and expansion of many programs—all pointing to expenditure of large sums out of the National Treasury.

Add all these factors together and we learn why the Federal budget has mushroomed beyond all reasonableness and proportion. What is worse, I fear our red ink problems are only beginning.

In my estimation, the full impact of the downturn in the Nation's economy has not yet been felt on Federal receipts.

Further, in my considered judgment, the upturn in Government spending is just beginning.

TESTIMONY OF BUDGET BUREAU ILLUMINATING

Mr. President, the recent testimony of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Maurice Stans, is very illuminating. Speaking to the Members of the House Ways and Means Committee, Mr. Stans documented the higher spending outlook. I should like to quote from page 15 of the hearings, July 30, this portion of Mr. Stans' remarks:

"1. Defense. On the basis of administration recommendations for additional authorizations and the civilian and military pay raises, spending for military functions may be about five hundred to seven hundred million dollars more than the budget estimates. This is in addition to the $500 million for defense contingencies included in the budget.

"2. Pay raises. The cost of pay increases enacted for postal and classified employees exceed the total amount included in the budget and the expenditure impact of the retroactive provisions has come largely in fiscal 1959. Outside the Department of Defense, the extra cost is about $400 million.

"3. Agriculture. The exceptionally large wheat crop and other factors such as changes in the outlook and programs for exports will increase the cost of agriculture programs by perhaps as much as $1.5 billion over the original estimate.

"4. Housing. The housing legislation already enacted will lead to increases of about $1 billion in spending for mortgage purchases and direct housing loans to veterans. Other housing legislation is pending in Congress which would add still more to budget estimates.

"5. Unemployment benefits. The temporary program of advances to States for supplemental unemployment benefits to those workers who have exhausted their regular benefits, together with increases over the original estimates for the regular programs of unemployment compensation to veterans and former Federal employees and the grants to States for administering unemployment compensation and employment offices, are estimated to add more than $600 million.

"6. Other increases. Expenditures for numerous other programs are being increased. A special payment of $589 million to the civil service retirement fund is pending before the Congress. The postage rate increases fall short of the President's recommendations. Construction programs of the Corps of Engineers and the Department of the Interior have been accelerated. The new agencies for space activities and for civilian aviation will have larger programs than their predecessors. The administration recommended an authorization increase for atomic-energy programs, and the action to date in Congress has raised that. The overall effect of all these various changes will be an increase of roughly $1½ billion.

"7. Reductions. The only significant decrease from the January estimates is for interest on the public debt, because of lower interest rates. There is pending in Congress the possibility of appropriation reductions of $500 million in military construction and an indefinite amount for mutual-security programs; however, the effect of such reductions on 1959 expenditures would be considerably less than the cut in appropriations that may eventually be made.

"These seven categories I have reviewed add to a total increase of between $4.5 billion and $5 billion to the budget. You will notice that I have not included any allowance for pending legislation such as the community facilities loans bill passed by the Senate. If this and other proposals now pending are enacted, the budget could be increased by another $1 billion or more.

"If we take $5 billion as the total presently estimated increase over the budget, expenditures in fiscal 1959 will be $79 billion. Thus, if we use this $67 billion revenue estimate of the Treasury and of the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, we would have a budget deficit of $12 billion."

Mr. President, when Government spends more than it receives in income, as it is doing now, it makes up the deficit by borrowing—as the Government is also doing now. We all know this fact, but it never hurts to remind ourselves of this dangerous procedure.

Deficit spending plus borrowing spells inflation and more inflation. Any hope of tax relief goes out the window.

Because of the adverse spending outlook, the Congress earlier this year raised the present $275 billion debt limit temporarily to $280 billion. Now Congress is about to complete action on a bill to raise the permanent statutory debt ceiling to $285 billion, plus an additional temporary hike to $288 billion until June 30, 1959. I wouldn't be surprised if we have to raise it again next year.

Under the proposed debt ceiling the Government will be able to borrow an additional $10 billion without violating Federal statute. Such fantastic debt will merely violate all the laws of reason, common sense, and sound money.

ACCENTUATING OUR PRESENT DILEMMA

By raising the debt limit, we give legal sanction to deficit spending. What is more basic, however, is that the Congress itself is daily passing legislation to increase Federal spending, accentuating our present dilemma.

Mr. President, we all agree the survival of this Republic as a free and independent federation of States is first on our priority list. There is abroad in the world a massive threat to our way of life. Modern weapons place our home soil in jeopardy. Spending for the necessities of defense for survival is increasing. We are in a period of sharply rising military costs. Where our very existence is at stake, we would not want our defense program to suffer for lack of funds.

The fact is, however, the greatest increase in rate of Federal spending is for nonmilitary, or civilian, purposes. Domestic civilian spending in 1954 totaled $19 billion. For fiscal year 1958, it totaled $29 billion. It will probably exceed $30 billion in fiscal year 1959 and may hit $35 billion in 1960.

So far as I can see, Federal spending is on a booming upswing, with no relief in sight.

What this Congress and the past few Congresses have done is to fill the tank with high-octane fuel and at the same time remove the brakes.

EIGHTY-FIFTH CONGRESS PLACED NO DAMPER ON INFLATION

Except for some reductions in a few appropriations measures, this Congress has not attempted to put any kind of damper on the fires of inflation.

On the contrary, this Congress has heaped live coals on embers which have been smoldering all these months during the so-called recession.

Some of the new programs inaugurated or under consideration this year by Congress will have small initial costs in fiscal year 1959. Of course, this is an argument advanced to obtain enactment. But, as these programs—housing, area development, minerals stabilization, and so on—gather momentum, costs will begin to rise sharply. Future budgets are going to be burdened with heavy spending for programs over which neither the Congress nor the executive branch will have much control.

This is primarily because Congress continues to write legislation which bypasses our appropriations committees.

Congress continues to write laws with matching-fund provisions which commit future Congresses to honor them no matter what the state of the Nation's finances at the time.

Congress continues to write laws which have inflationary features built into them.

Already this session of Congress has authorized spending of almost $4 billion by the public debt transaction method and has under consideration more than $1 billion additional, including the minerals stabilization bill and the national defense education bill.

For the most part, approval of expenditures under public debt financing is a perfunctory action to honor commitments already made by Government agencies. Real spending control by the President, as well as by the Congress, is virtually nil.

The power of the purse which Congress once prized and cherished and guarded as a real control over the Nation's fiscal affairs is now only a feeble shadow, with little substance.

Just 2 or 3 years ago, there was a glimmer of hope that Federal taxes might be cut. With this Congress that hope has evaporated in my opinion, at least for the foreseeable future.

The American people today are caught in a squeeze between rising prices and higher taxes. The cost of living continues to climb. State and local taxes mount steadily upward and there is every likelihood Federal taxes of one kind or another—income taxes, social security taxes, gasoline taxes—will go up also. By whatever name, these are all taxes, and they come out of the income of taxpayers.

Mr. President, it is very late in our history to try to remedy the appalling situation the country faces: Continuing inflation, declining buying power of our dollar, and an ever-increasing drain on the Federal Treasury.

ONLY HOPE IT IS NOT TOO LATE

I only hope it is not too late. The shores of history are strewn with the wreckage of governments that failed to heed such elementary rules of fiscal behavior as: "Don't spend more than your income," and "Don't undertake commitments that will overburden the Treasury as years go by."

Yet, in justification for the many spending proposals, we are told: "This is what the American people want, need, and demand."

Mr. President, I submit the American people want, need, and demand a stable cost of living, a firm dollar, and a reversal of the high tax trend.

WHAT AMERICANS MUST BE TOLD

It is about time the Congress had the collective courage to tell the American people: "You can't have everything."

Some desirable activities will have to give way to those of greater urgency. The American people will have to curb their appetite for Federal services.

A RECOMMENDATION

Mr. President, it is not my purpose just to criticize. I have a concrete proposal to offer today.

I urge the Senate, on convening next January, to establish a Select Committee on Federal Finances and Budget which would look into the many aspects of Federal finance, such as public-debt transactions, social security and highway trust funding, direct borrowing from the Treasury, contingent liabilities, and so on.

Each Congress deals in piecemeal fashion with the legislative program. The nearest Congress comes to having a comprehensive plan before it is in the President's budget. That in itself is inadequate to give a picture of the financial condition of the Government because an increasing number of programs are beyond the purview of the budget.

The select committee would study our fiscal dilemma and report back to the Senate by March 31, 1959. The report would contain an analysis of the current state of the Nation's finances and the fiscal outlook, together with any appropriate recommendations.

As I conceive the task of the committee, it would gather all pertinent data on the potential extent of direct borrowing from the Treasury, for example, as well as the actual extent. In other words, the committee studies would be sufficiently broad so that the committee could advise the Senate on the outlook for several years hence. Let us at least know where we are, fiscally speaking, and where existing statutory programs would lead us for the next few years.

FISCAL MAGNA CARTA

I would hope the committee would come up with a kind of fiscal Magna Carta—a charter of freedom for the American taxpayer from the financial chains that bind us.

Surely, a nation that can split the atom can find ways and means to reduce the cost of government.

America is the inspiration of the world. If we were to fail—whether through military defeat or financial collapse—the world would be plunged into an era of despair and hopelessness.

It could happen.

It won't happen if we start right now to set our fiscal house in order.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to support a proposal I have made today as a necessary step toward fiscal solvency. Coupled with a strong national defense, fiscal solvency would go a long way toward insuring our survival.

TEXTILE MISBRANDING

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I ask unanimous consent that the colloquy I shall have with the Senator from Washington may appear in the permanent RECORD in connection with the conference report on H. R. 469.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have had a number of telegrams in protest against the conference report because it is said it would seriously interfere with the marketing to consumers of textile fiber products. I therefore would like to ask the chairman of the committee these two questions.

In section 12 of the bill, H. R. 469, as it was agreed to in conference, the Federal Trade Commission is allowed to exclude from the provisions of the act other textile products. Does the Senator construe that to mean all textile products coming under the bill other than those exempted by section 12 (a)?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That would be my interpretation, and I believe that was the intent of Congress in the passage of the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. In view of the right of the Commission to exclude from the provisions of the act a complete textile fiber product, does the Senator believe it may also exclude from the provisions of the act yarn or fiber which is part of the fiber textile product?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I would think that it would, and I wish to say to the Senator from New York that the Senator from Washington in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce would be the first to insist that the Federal Trade Commission in the administration of this act follow the intent of the Congress and be equitable in its provisions and applications.

Mr. JAVITS. They would be requested to make it practical?

Mr. MAGNUSON. They would make it practical rather than just picking the provisions of the act to pieces.

Mr. JAVITS. Rather than throwing the rule book.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1959

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13192) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana will make a brief statement in regard to his amendment. The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] will make a brief reply. If Senators will remain in the Chamber, I hope we can expedite action on the bill. It must go before the

Rules Committee of the House to have a rule adopted before it is acted upon by the House, and we are very desirous of getting it over there.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am going to vote for a substantial and adequate amount of foreign aid. But I am beginning to have serious misgivings about Formosa in the administration of the funds allocated to this area.

It is no longer a fiction but a fact that Chiang Ching-Kuo, son of the Generalissimo, is the strong man and wields more power behind the scenes in Formosa than is realized. The power that he wields far transcends the nominal posts he holds in the Nationalist Chinese Government. The police and security forces of Formosa seem to be virtually under his control. The fact that the American Embassy and USIA offices in Taipei were wrecked on May 24, 1957, by Chinese rioters was because the man who had the power to deter the attacks apparently did not do much about it.

The humiliation of the American flag, insult to its Government officials, and the destruction of American properties began their ignominious course in a supposedly friendly country, Nationalist China, whose government owes its very life to the support given by the United States Government.

As I understand that Chiang Ching-Kuo was trained and indoctrinated in Russia for many years; therefore, one cannot help but wonder what is his real intention and where his loyalty lies. In light of this we certainly should not squander away our aid into the hands of someone in whom we do not have full confidence. I am very glad to see that the Congress of the United States has adopted an amendment concerning the Chinese Nationalist Government to this effect, in which we frowned upon the idea of using some of this money for pensions and some of the things it is being used for in Formosa. It shows that probably I am not the only one who entertains these views. I believe that next year, when the appropriation bill is before us, we had better take a long look, not as to the policy of giving money to Formosa or to the Nationalist Government, but to the way it is being administered over there. I believe it calls for some searching inquiry.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the pending amendment would cut $50 million from the defense support program. I wish to point out to the Senate that last year, for fiscal 1958 the amount that was appropriated for defense support for the use of 15 countries was $689 million. In addition to that, we reappropriated unexpended balances of $36 million, for a total of $725 million of new and old money.

In addition to that, Mr. President, there was transferred from the military, $24,810,000, which gave, for defense support alone, to the 15 countries, $749,810,000. Although the request was made for 15 countries, as a matter of fact, the money was used by only 12 countries. In addition to this sum, in this year's budget we have provided two special accounts. Last year we had a special assistance fund which provided $225 million. This year that amount is $200 million.

We also have the so-called emergency contingency fund, which is in addition to the fund we had last year, and it amounts to $155 million, so that this bill already provides the President with $355 million for use in any way the President sees fit. He can use that amount for economic aid, for military aid, or for both.

My amendment merely cuts back the defense support sum to about what it was last year. If my amendment is adopted, with the appropriation that was made last year, of new money and old money, plus the $24 million which was transferred, the fund will be short only $9 million.

Mr. President, let me point out to the Senate that we have already made available $5,196,179,000 in military aid to the countries to which we are now giving assistance by way of defense support. For economic assistance, we have already made available to these countries, $5,856,840,000. These very countries, which have received so bountifully from us in the past, will be the recipients of the $790 million which the bill provides, plus a large portion of the $355 million which the President can use as he sees fit.

I believe we are driving these programs into the ground. Instead of tapering them off, we are increasing them from year to year. It is time to call a halt.

I wish to read a short statement which was made by my good and eloquent friend the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. He stated his views on economic aid on August 31, 1951, while the economic aid program was before the Senate. At that time my good friend from Illinois was trying to cut that program considerably. This is what he had to say as the third reason which he advanced:

> The third reason which I advance in favor of the adoption of my amendment is that I think the time has come to liquidate.

This was in 1951, when we had spent less than $17 billion. Today, as I pointed out, we have spent in excess of $63 billion, plus $6 billion of unexpended funds, for a total of almost $70 billion. Yet my good friend from Illinois, who is now championing the cause of the administration, said back in 1951:

> This plan was intended as a 4-year plan, and we should now set liquidation in motion. Congress intended, when the plan was adopted, that there should be a termination date.

That was the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] speaking in 1951. I continue:

> If this program continues, I think we shall tend to develop in the world a kind of complex whereby these countries will become perpetual pensioners.

Mr. President, I am in full agreement with my good friend from Illinois. When he made that statement, we had spent less than $17 billion on foreign aid. Now we have appropriated for that purpose almost $70 billion. I should like to know what the Senator from Illinois thinks about the program now.

I quote further from his statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 97, part 8, page 10877:

> Mr. President, I wonder whether it is possible finally to develop a pensioner complex in the world if we are so free and easy with our funds, and if we long pursue the mania which we have pursued in previous years.
>
> Furthermore, there is a possibility, it seems to me, that if this program continues too long with a very substantial amount of money, ultimately we shall reach the point where new plans will be set up; and before we get through, they will become more or less perpetual.

Mr. President, that is what is happening now. I continue to read:

> I saw the statement by Mr. Foster and some of his associates in the ECA not so long ago. They now have an idea that perhaps they have not quite met their objective in one sphere, namely, that the aid which has been tendered has not reached down to the grassroots.
>
> In the period of time when I was sojourning in and doing some official work in Europe and elsewhere, I developed considerable fan mail, and today I get correspondence from there. Those who write to me point out the same thing. My answer is, What have they done with the $11 billion which was made available under the Marshall plan, if after more than 3½ years of endeavor they say that in one particular they have failed, namely, they did not get down to the grassroots?

Mr. President, I was in error. I said the amount was $17 billion, but it was only $11 billion which had been spent at the time the Senator from Illinois made his speech. I continue:

> That seems to me to be rather strange, indeed. Perhaps there is something to it; but that should be all the more reason why the program should be cut off before we undertake a new work and make this a permanent endeavor.

Mr. President, I have been reading from a speech made on August 31, 1951, by my good friend from Illinois, who has been championing the foreign aid cause so eloquently. I could cite more of his speech; but because of the lack of time, I ask unanimous consent that the extracts I have marked in the speech of the distinguished Senator from Illinois be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Let me point out that the amendment is sponsored by 16 Members of the Senate. It would reduce economic aid, insofar as Europe is concerned, by $500 million. I have not sought to cut aid under the other titles of the bill, and there is a reason for it.
>
> As I indicated, I could assign perhaps a score of reasons for agreeing to the amendment, but I shall content myself with stating only a few of them. I believe that if anyone goes to the trouble of examining the supporting data in connection with the bill he will discover that there is still a good-sized amount of money left in the bill available for expenditure over and above that which is included in the bill, namely, some unexpended balances.
>
> Mr. President, the second reason which I advance in favor of the adoption of my amendment is that if the economic aid had not been successful by this time, there would have to be some real and sustained doubt as to whether belaboring it with further funds would make it successful in the future.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The third reason which I advance in favor of the adoption of my amendment is that I think the time has come to liquidate. This plan was intended as a 4-year plan, and we should now set liquidation in motion. Congress intended, when the plan was adopted, that there should be a termination date. If this program continues, I think we shall tend to develop in the world a kind of complex whereby these countries will become perpetual pensioners.

Mr. President, I wonder whether it is possible finally to develop a pensioner complex in the world if we are so free and easy with our funds and if we long pursue the mania which we have pursued in previous years.

Furthermore, there is a possibility, it seems to me, that if this program continues too long with a very substantial amount of money, ultimately we shall reach the point where new plans will be set up; and before we get through they will become more or less perpetual.

I saw the statement by Mr. Foster and some of his associates in the ECA, not so long ago. They now have an idea that perhaps they have not quite met their objective in one sphere, namely, that the aid which has been tendered has not reached down to the grassroots.

In the period of time when I was sojourning in and doing some official work in Europe and elsewhere, I developed considerable fan mail, and today I get correspondence from there. Those who write to me point out the same thing. My answer is, What have they done with the $11 billion which was made available under the Marshall plan, if after more than 3½ years of endeavor they say that in one particular they have failed; namely, they did not get down to the grassroots.

That seems to me to be rather strange, indeed. Perhaps there is something to it; but that should be all the more reason why the program should be cut off before we undertake a new work and make this a permanent endeavor.

What have they done in all these years? Has there been a sense of urgency over there? Why did they not get busy with the money we have made available up to this time? Where is the evidence that they are going to get their armament plants started? If something is necessary, I am sure that the line between economic and military aid is such that, if it properly comes within the sphere of defense, it will offer no difficulty.

The next reason I would assign is that with an agency like this, which operates in the foreign field, sooner or later peculiar personnel, in the sense that they have a peculiar viewpoint, finally get into it, and that situation makes me very unhappy. I do not charge the whole ECA operation with being filled with people who do not express the American viewpoint. I am sure that Mr. Foster is a typical American, but there are others who get into it.

Within the past few days, I see that Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., has been sent abroad at $50 a day for the purpose of sitting on a board which will allocate strategic materials between the foreign countries. Who is Mr. Blaisdell? He was in the Department of Commerce. He is the man, it will be remembered, who defended William Remington. I am not going to put the finger on Mr. Blaisdell. I simply say that I do not like his viewpoint. When a man defends Mr. Remington, after the testimony which was available to Congress, he does not quite measure up to my requirements, at least, of one who articulates and expresses the kind of viewpoint I want to see disseminated abroad. Either Mr. Remington was a knave or he was a fool—a man who had a Dartmouth education, who could sit on a stool in a drugstore in Washington, and testify before the committee, and say, naively, "Well, maybe my guard was down," as he talked to Mrs. Bentley. It seems to me to be a waste of money and of confidence to have a man like that in the service, and then, when his defender comes along, and his boss, I do not want him in it, either. I do not say he is a bad person. I simply say he is not "for my money." And I do not think he is for the taxpayers' money in this country.

Another reason why I think this $500 million reduction should be approved by the Senate is that I believe the time has come to set ourselves against the crisis cry. It seems to me—and I say this to my old friend from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], with whom I served for 10 years in the House—there was not a month when we were not confronted with some social or political crisis in all the years since 1933.

Mr. President, the Senate was in session until 6 minutes before midnight last night, and I stayed long enough to get the tenor of a great many of the addresses. With what passion, with what fervor, it was said that this money must be furnished, that it is world-shaking in its import.

It is strange that the crisis is advanced and presented to us just about the time when it becomes necessary to vote for money. It is strange that the crisis cry suddenly hits the blue just about the time of a political campaign.

Well, Mr. President, I have become a little punch drunk because of the crises about which I so frequently hear; I am becoming a little wearied about so much guesswork and some of the false assurances that this is the road to peace, or that is the road to peace; that here lies the road to stability; that there is the avenue to salvation. When it is all over, suddenly we come up with a great sense of frustration and a burden of futility, because it was not the road after all.

Mr. President, I am becoming increasingly concerned about the solvency of America because, if it fails, the whole world will fail. In England, France, Germany, and Austria leaders used to take me by the lapel and say, "In God's name, let nothing happen to the solvency of America because, if it fails, all fails, and the hope and the light of the world will go out." I think I could refresh myself from the notebooks I carry and name many names of leaders who saw that the hope of the world lay in the solvency of America.

* * * * *

Let me say to my friend from Kansas that I wonder if there is a finite mind under the canopy of heaven that can grasp the astronomical figures with which we deal today. I served for 12 years on the Appropriations Committee of the House, but I have no adequate concept of what a billion dollars is. How can we express it? We can express it in terms of the number of youngsters who can be educated or the number of schoolhouses that we can build for a million dollars apiece, but it is still in the stratosphere.

* * * * *

I suppose so. I remember addressing a meeting sometime last year. I confessed the complete inadequacy of my mind to sense how much a billion dollars was. I received a letter from an old man who said, "I will tell you what a billion dollars is. Look at your watch; look at the second hand as that hand goes around every second, every minute, every hour, every day, every night, every week, every month, every year, and in 33 years the second hand will have ticked a billion times."

How much is a billion? I do not know, and I do not believe anyone in this body or in Government has a conception of what a bilion dollars really is. I do know that it is painful and anguishing to sweat it out of the American people, and the time has come to have some regard for them and for the solvency of our economy as we put larger and larger burdens upon them. But we must not be deluded and taken down some fallacious avenue of emotionalism of which we have heard so much. It seems to me that giveaway has become a mania. It is astonishing, I say to my friend from Vermont, what a strange passion has grown up in the country that the checkbook is a cure for every problem, foreign and domestic. I do not share that idea, because the progress we have made so far does not support and justify that kind of a theory.

If there were a sense of urgency on the part of the people in Europe it would be another thing. Senators have gone over there and have returned, and I have talked with some of them. Many of our people go abroad, but they cannot sense in the air the emotion of urgency, that there is some great, almost indefinable danger in Europe today. They do not sense it. For that reason, the people over there are not so given to the program as we are in this country. If the situation is as dangerous as we are led to believe it is, it is time they awakened and that there be a more lively interest on their part. First of all, this is their show. America will survive, in my judgment. The day I embrace the defeatist gospel and say that the life of America hangs in the balance, the situation will have to be much worse than it is at this time. I do not believe that defeatism is worthy of one who has been generously led and who has received the beneficences of this country.

Mr. President, another reason I assign for the cut proposed by the amendment is that when it is made it will leave substantially the same amount that ECA asked for, had there been no particular tie-in between their activities and the military program in Europe.

I read from page 23 of the report of the committee:

"The Administrator for Economic Cooperation, Mr. Foster, indicated in his testimony before the joint committee that the job of the Marshall plan in Europe as originally contemplated was virtually complete. The Deputy Administrator, Mr. Bissell, testified that if the Western European countries had not found it essential to build up their defensive strength, the Economic Cooperation Administration would have requested $672 million for aid to Western Europe for this year, primarily to prevent serious economic deterioration such as would carry with it the threat of Communist internal subversion in countries of great strategic importance."

Mr. President, we have a $257 billion debt. It will grow larger, I have no doubt, in the face of the expenditures which are contemplated. The backing behind our currency is not of such a kind as would make us as happy as we would be if we could say that there was 100 percent gold backing behind it, as can be said for Venezuela. Yet our country, with its budget now in the $60 billion bracket, with a huge debt, and a tremendous deficit looming in the days ahead, is now going to make money available to South America. Is this wise?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall now conclude. I have taken too much of the Senate's time already. I wish to refresh the minds of Senators respecting the set of figures placed in the RECORD last night by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] just before adjournment. The figures are rather interesting. In order to maintain the necessary classification the figures are set forth for various countries on the alphabetical basis instead of by countries. In the first place the Senator from California pointed out that the United States defense effort calls for 68.1 percent of the total budget. Compared with the 68.1 percent which the United States is putting into the

defense effort, country A is putting in 45 percent of its total budget.

Country B is putting in 32.2 percent.
Country C is putting in 27.4 percent.
Country D is putting in 26.2 percent.
Country E is putting in 22.7 percent.
Country F is putting in 22.4 percent.
Country G is putting in 17.1 percent.

Someone in the State Department raised the query as to whether that was a fair basis for comparison. He said the comparison should be made on the basis of gross national income. Well, that is also set forth by the Senator from California. He said that in the year 1951 the United States Government was putting into defense 14.1 percent of the gross national income. He said it is expected, of course, that for the current fiscal year that amount will be raised perhaps as high as 20 percent of gross national income because of our expenditures in the defense field. I cite as authority for that no less a person than the Honorable Charles Wilson, the Mobilizer, who appeared before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency only yesterday morning. He indicated that by late 1952 we would probably reach the 20 percent level. What about the other countries? Country A, 8.3 percent; country B, 9.3 percent; country C, 8.8 percent; country D, 2.3 percent; country E, 6.4 percent; country F, 4.7 percent; country G, 4.1 percent; country H, 2.7 percent; and country I, 5.7 percent.

Is it quite fair? I think the time has come when there must be a more tangible and persuasive manifestation of will and spirit on the part of those who have been the recipients of American largess. Until that time I think, among other things, that we have a responsibility to think about the self-preservation of America and to think about the inordinate burden which is being pressed upon our own compassionate and humble people.

For that reason, and for the other reasons which I have assigned, I hope this amendment begets the favor of a majority of the Senate, so that we can say to the country, "We are interested in the fiscal problem, and we are going to give attention to it. Here is some tangible evidence of our interest."

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

How will the purposes of the amendment be achieved? They will be achieved by sending our dollars to the Western European countries and also sending there certain persons from the United States to study competition there and to hold jobs there while they are making those studies. When all that is done—and it will take a long time—it is said that then productivity will be encouraged. How will it be encouraged, Mr. President? It will be encouraged by showing those countries how to manufacture shoes, tractors, Coca-Cola, and almost anything else as cheaply and efficiently by assembly-line methods as they are manufactured in the United States.

O Mr. President, it is wonderful. That is why the proponents of this plan say they are interested in an expanding economy; that is what they have in mind in this respect.

O Mr. President, this is a honey. We shall send over there several regiments, before we get through, to deal in the internal affairs of some 18 countries there and to expand their economies and to tie up their economies with every manner of social reform.

This plan will make the ECA permanent; we shall be in it up to our necks; we shall never get out of it, and we shall be making permanent pensioners by the millions. When that is done, the solvency of the United States of America will be sunk.

Mr. President, let me refer further to the press release which was issued from New York City on July 26. It was stated that "to formulate this program the administration has ventured into some daring ideas of economic policy."

I will say they are daring; and the word will be spelled with a capital D before they get through.

In the press release it is further said that "a policy of novel assistance is contemplated."

Mr. President, is that not grand? If that plan goes into effect, Senators should telephone the folks in their home States and should tell them to get ready to go to any one of those countries in Europe, to proceed to participate in that novel drive to make it possible, under the concealment of general language which those who sponsor this plan have had in mind for months, for the ECA finally to proceed to capture for those countries every market in the world, with our help.

My friend from Connecticut has a great solicitude for union labor. So have I, Mr. President. However, I wonder to what extent we shall aid union labor when those who favor this proposal succeed in building up the program in such a way as to make sure that every market in the world will go glimmering, so far as our people are concerned, and thereby diminish and sharply reduce the standard of living in our country.

O Mr. President, this amendment is grand. I like nothing better than this. I wish I were the Administrator, for I believe that under language of this kind I could proceed to take over at least 18 countries in the world.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, although the item under discussion is labeled "defense support," it is nothing more than economic aid. What I do not like is that we have given until it hurts. Instead of tapering aid amounts off as the economies of recipient countries improve, we seem to increase the amount. This does not add up—it does not make any sense.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will vote for this amendment and save a measly $50 million.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the fact is that the defense support funds go to the countries with which we have mutual assistance pacts and where we have obligations for the common defense.

In the estimates presented by the President, which have been examined by the National Security Council, by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, by the Department of Defense, and by the mutual aid authorities, the recommendation for defense support was $835 million.

When the authorization bill passed the 2 Houses of Congress, that amount had been cut to $810 million.

The amount which was recommended by the Committee on Appropriations was $790 million.

In the testimony before the committee, at page 163 of the hearings, Assistant Secretary of Defense Mansfield D. Sprague, who I think all members of the committee recognize as one of the ablest officials we have in this field, with great knowledge of the problems which confront us in the matter of mutual assistance, had this to say relative to the defense support program:

This is particularly so in the case of the defense support program which goes primarily to key countries on the periphery of the Sino-Soviet bloc, such as Turkey, Pakistan, Vietnam, Taiwan, and Korea. Serious cutbacks in defense support will cause such countries to lag dangerously in the military effort required by their strategic location. Reductions in defense support below the amount of the authorization will, therefore, have a direct and adverse effect on our collective security.

The problem of maintaining freedom in the world is not a bargain counter matter. We have seen what has happened in the instances when we have let down the guards of the Free World. Communism moved into Korea. It has attempted to move into other areas of the world.

The particular item under consideration relates to some of the stoutest allies we have: To Turkey, for example, which stood by our side and sent divisions clear around the world, when very few nations were standing with us in the Korean war. It relates to the little Republic of Korea, which today is maintaining an armed force of some 600,000, in order to maintain that part of the world against the possible encroachment of Communist China, which once attempted to move down into the Korean Peninsula. The item maintains a force of some half million on the island of Taiwan, in the Republic of China. That force certainly is a deterrent to communism moving into southeast Asia.

The very nations which would be most adversely affected are the nations which we have urged to maintain strong defenses in the periphery along the Soviet-Sino borders, in order to help maintain the freedom of this Nation. The divisions of our allies can be maintained in those areas at a cost which is much less than the cost of maintaining American divisions in those countries.

I think it would be the height of folly at this time to make the proposed reduction in the defense support items for the countries which bear so heavy a burden and are looking down the throats of the Soviet Union and Communist China.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it is true that the information which the Senator from California has given comes from the military, but it all emanates from the eager beavers we have abroad, those job holders who make up the budget. These amounts are not even submitted to the host countries—they are made up by our own people.

For instance, the economy of Korea has progressed to the extent where it is now better than it has ever been. Why should it not be? We have spent in Korea, for economic aid alone, in the last 5 years, $1,174,485,000. Korea is a country which has made progress. But instead of tapering off our program of assistance to Korea we have increased it considerably. I am not permitted to tell the Senate the amount.

The Senator from California mentioned Pakistan. In Pakistan we have spent $267,625,000. This measure provides quite a sum more to help Pakistan. That is being done notwithstanding the opposition of India and Afghanistan to our assistance to Pakistan.

Mr. President, this money does not do the job that my good friend the Senator from California states it does. I can state frankly and candidly that this sum of money can easily be trimmed. If it is, no one will miss the amount that is eliminated, because the amount we are now providing gives those countries the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

same amount they received last year. Today their situation is improving. Their economies are much better. They are producing more.

As I said awhile ago, it seems to me that the more we help their economies, the more we improve them and improve them and improve them, the more money they demand and the more money we send them.

I am getting sick and tired of doing that, particularly when the money we use for this program is borrowed.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this money goes to 12 countries on the periphery of the Red bloc. In six of those countries, we have major bases today.

I make only one other statement for the RECORD: My friend, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], has honored me by inserting in the RECORD a speech I made 7 years ago. All I can say is that in my life I find that I must either grow or die. I am glad that I have grown a little in the last 7 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to make a final point. Cambodia has given representation to the Reds. I am not permitted to say what funds the United States is giving to Cambodia. But our country has already made available to Cambodia more than $120 million. The pending bill provides—I wish I could tell the Senate and the American people the exact amount—a large sum of money.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am afraid that my good friend, the Senator from Louisiana, has overlooked the Cambodian army. Just think of what we have obtained for these funds.

Mr. President, it is indeed a very sad thing to contemplate that this program has become a permanent part of our Government. I know of no way by which we shall ever get rid of this foreign-assistance program. In times past, I undertook to point out that when we have an entrenched bureaucracy which makes up its own budget estimates and requests, it almost becomes permanent.

In addition, we now have the vested interest in the foreign-aid program by those who sell their goods to the agencies which purchase them for delivery abroad. A great many of them are powerful interests in this country. They have reached the stage where they obtain much more in the way of profits from the goods they sell to the foreign-aid program than the amount of the taxes they have to pay to support it. So in this way, they are protected. But by virtue of that vested interest, the average taxpayer is being saddled in perpetuity with the cost of a program which the Congress should begin to pare down.

But the recipients have received it for so long that they think we cannot reduce it; they say that if we reduce it, we shall lose our friends.

Thus we see the vested interest of a bureaucracy which makes up its own budget estimates, and has no one to argue against them, when it presents to the Congress its budget estimates; the vested interests who produce everything from magazines to tanks, and therefore support the program, in the political arena, with all their powerful means of communication; and, then, the vested interests on the part of the recipients, who now tell us, "If you reduce it by one dime, we will leave you."

Mr. President, I am sad when I contemplate increasing this program over that allowed last year. If the program is increased, the day when that is done will be a tragic one for the taxpayers of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRETT (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished junior Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE]. If the Senator from Maine were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. COOPER (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. If the Senator from New Jersey were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. GOLDWATER (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the distinguished junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOBLITZELL]. If the Senator from West Virginia were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. YOUNG (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. If the Senator from New Hampshire were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] would vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOBLITZELL], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent because of illness in his family.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] would each vote "yea."

The respective pairs of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOBLITZELL], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] have previously been announced.

On this vote, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea," and the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 41, not voting 19, as follows:

YEAS—36

Anderson	Johnston, S. C.	Mundt
Bible	Jordan	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Kefauver	Proxmire
Case, S. Dak.	Kerr	Revercomb
Chavez	Langer	Robertson
Curtis	Long	Russell
Dworshak	Magnuson	Schoeppel
Ellender	Malone	Sparkman
Ervin	Mansfield	Stennis
Frear	McClellan	Talmadge
Fulbright	Monroney	Thurmond
Hill	Morse	Williams

NAYS—41

Aiken	Green	Morton
Allott	Hayden	Murray
Beall	Hennings	Neuberger
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Bush	Humphrey	Potter
Capehart	Jackson	Purtell
Carroll	Javits	Saltonstall
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Church	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Clark	Knowland	Symington
Cotton	Kuchel	Thye
Dirksen	Lausche	Watkins
Douglas	Martin, Iowa	Wiley
Gore	McNamara	

NOT VOTING—19

Barrett	Flanders	Martin, Pa.
Bricker	Goldwater	Payne
Bridges	Hoblitzell	Smith, N. J.
Butler	Holland	Yarborough
Carlson	Hruska	Young
Cooper	Ives	
Eastland	Jenner	

So Mr. ELLENDER's amendment was rejected.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I was paired against the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, to cut $100 million from the funds provided for military assistance in the bill. I would much prefer to make grants to such countries as Turkey and Korea, in order to permit them to maintain their forces in the field to contain the onslaught of the forces of communism rather than to send our boys to do that job.

Mr. President, I voted for the amendment to cut $50 million from the item for defense support, more properly

known as economic aid. In view of the fact that this country is obliged to borrow a good many billion dollars to conduct the annual operations of the Government, I am constrained to vote against the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments, and the third reading of the bill.

The CHIEF CLERK. H. R. 13192——

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, is this the third reading of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. I have a statement I wish to make before the third reading.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah has been recognized. The bill has not been read the third time.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I intend to discuss my proposed amendment to H. R. 13192.

This amendment would authorize the President to use appropriations under the mutual-security program and other such funds as are necessary in order to negotiate and carry out agreements with foreign nations, in order to alleviate economic hardships experienced by workers in foreign countries whose production will be adversely affected by action hereafter taken under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended. That is the escape-clause provision. It has to do with the minerals program, and it was defeated in the House 2 days ago.

In addition, the amendment I have prepared would increase the special assistance fund by $2,500,000, to its authorization limit of $202,500,000.

The Senate Appropriations Committee already has proposed increasing the contingent fund to its authorized limit of $155 million. That is provided under another discretionary fund. The use of these two funds is discretionary with the President.

Furthermore, the act specifically authorized the President to utilize these funds to "promote political or economic stability." I point out that political and economic stability are highly important objectives of the program. Hence the use of the funds for that purpose is a very legitimate use of mutual security appropriations.

Two recent developments prompted me to bring up my amendment at this time:

First, Congress recently passed the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, which increased the effectiveness of escape-clause action for essential domestic industries adversely affected by foreign imports.

This action, together with the platform pledges of both parties, indicates that a more vigorous use will be made of this escape hatch for domestic industries.

Industries which are threatened by foreign importations should be interested in what I am saying and in the proposal I am making.

These industries now are being undercut and destroyed by competition from foreign firms which do not have to meet the same level of wages, taxes, and other business costs imposed upon American businesses.

Second. For many years now, the free-traders have been asserting that it would be far cheaper to subsidize the losses of domestic firms rather than to impose restrictive tariffs and import quotas.

But we have just had an object lesson in what happens when this solution is assayed.

The administration came forward with a proposal for a subsidy program for certain domestic minerals as an alternative to tariff-import quota relief for the major industry involved, lead and zinc mining.

Mr. President, I find it difficult to compete with other Senators who are talking.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, may we have order? Some of us are interested in what the Senator is saying.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is not in order. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator may proceed.

Mr. WATKINS. I do not intend to speak for long, I will say, but I think what I have to say is very important.

This program would have cost only $75 million a year for 5 years through 1962, when it was expected that the increased domestic and foreign consumption would have stabilized the minerals market.

Many of us who supported this measure did so reluctantly, because we have felt, and still feel, that the tariff route is preferable to subsidies. But the lead-zinc industry has been depressed for 8 years, and it had gone the full route of tariff investigations on two occasions, with unanimous recommendations of the Tariff Commission that escape-clause relief be provided.

In view of these circumstances, the Senate voted overwhelming support—70 to 12—for passage of this measure, and it seemed that relief was, at long last, in sight.

However, as we well know, our colleagues in the House have just harpooned this measure with a 23-vote margin, and it appears quite definite that effective relief via this alternative route cannot be provided this session.

Under these circumstances, it appears that the President has no alternative other than to invoke tariff increases and import quotas for lead and zinc under the escape clause of the Trade Agreements Act, as recommended in a still-pending action of the Tariff Commission. And I and many other Members of Congress from minerals-producing States have importuned him to take such action.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the letter I sent to the President immediately after the vote in the House.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 22, 1958.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have just been advised that the House of Representatives defeated the minerals stabilization bill. This will be sad news to the thousands of workers and their families throughout the United States who have been out of work for a considerable length of time because of the depressed prices in the minerals market, and most specifically in the lead-zinc field. They had been hoping and praying that Congress would act favorably upon this bill. Many of these unemployed workers reside in my State of Utah. The defeat of this measure also will be sad news to the hundreds of thousands of stockholders in the companies which operate lead and zinc mines and other minerals in the United States. And it should be sad news to all those who are interested in keeping the economy of America strong and prepared for any emergency.

Although stockpiles of lead and zinc and some other minerals are plentiful for defense purposes, still the economy of this country cannot afford to be without a vigorous and prosperous mining industry. They certainly could obtain a stranglehold on the economy of this country if our mines are closed to the extent that we are wholly dependent upon foreign sources of supply.

Personally, I want to express my very sincere appreciation for the loyal, and the most part effective, work of Secretary Fred Seaton and other members of the administration who have strongly supported the defeated bill. You, of course, were the inspiration for this particular type of legislation, because, as you expressed it, you thought it in the best interests of the United States to give relief particularly to our lead and zinc mining industry by way of a stabilization program rather than through the methods recommended by the Tariff Commission. Members of Congress from the States of the Union where these metals are produced were all vigilant and energetic in supporting the bill, but all the effort put forth was of no avail, even though we won a more or less spectacular victory in the Senate.

Now we come to the only source of relief open to us, and that is to follow the method set forth in the Reciprocal Trade Act as it was recently amended. After an exhaustive hearing, the Tariff Commission has made its recommendation, and you have the power to put into effect an effective program for assisting the lead and zinc industry. I need not review, Mr. President, the pledges of both the Democrat and Republican Parties with respect to the escape clause provision of the Reciprocal Trade Act, nor your assurances that this act would be faithfully and expeditiously enforced.

I very reluctantly agreed with you and Secretary Seaton that we should try this other method, but since it has failed after an honest, faithful effort to make it succeed, I now appeal to you in behalf of the thousands of miners who are out of work to use the full powers given you under the amended Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to give this industry the protection it needs in order for it to be in successful operation again.

I am sure you will agree with me that after the long delay incident to the contest to secure relief by legislative act, no time should

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

be lost now in using your powers to relieve this mining industry. You have before you the recommendations of the Tariff Commission, and under the amended act you have additional power to grant relief. I earnestly hope you will act expeditiously to put into effect such measures as will be effective to put this industry on its feet again. It has been my conviction all along that our mutual aid program should be used to relieve the lead-zinc mining industry in any of the countries that might be affected by an increase in tariffs and the imposition of quotas. Our friendly allies in this hemisphere who are the producers of lead and zinc could be helped in the event their industries are seriously damaged by the imposition of tariffs and quotas if quotas should be a part of the remedy.

When the mutual security bill comes before the Senate I intend to offer an amendment to specifically authorize you to use some of the funds voted under this program to aid countries which might be dangerously damaged by any remedy which you might impose to help our lead and zinc industries. I am enclosing copy of an amendment I had prepared to offer to the reciprocal trade extension bill when it was before the Senate.

In conclusion, Mr. President, may I say that I have appreciated the position you took and your sincerity and honest conviction in urging a stabilization program rather than follow the recommendations of the Tariff Commission. But since our efforts have failed, I now have every confidence that you will act in accordance with the pledge of the Republican Party at its San Francisco convention in 1956.

With all good wishes, I am,

Cordially yours,

ARTHUR V. WATKINS.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, relief for the other minerals involved apparently will have to await legislative action next session, because in no other case is an escape clause decision pending.

This amendment will not obviate the necessity for the President to take escape clause action for a domestic industry facing ruin from foreign imports. It merely will make it possible for the President to take such action whenever he deems it necessary, then to go beyond the authority in the Trade Agreement Act and soften the economic blow of the escape clause action through the mutual security program. Certainly such action to aid our friends and stave off Communist efforts to take advantage of the situation is within the purview of this act.

The President's action under this authority would be discretionary, just as it is under much of the existing mutual security program. However, it could involve such cushioning measures as these:

First. Negotiations to advance a loan for an adversely affected country to build a new industrial facility to produce goods that are not ruinously competitive with American domestic industries.

Second. Provision of assistance to build processing facilities so that a friendly producer could ship refined metals to other markets.

Third. Provision of shipping to enable a friendly producer to sell goods to more distant markets.

I have not had time to work out specific, acceptable recommendations for action to counter the effects of escape clause action, but our State Department staff, which helps foreign countries invade our markets, certainly is ingenious enough to solve this problem. The major limitation, at present, would be a lack of funds under the 1959 program, because the President really needs more money for these two funds than the Congress has authorized.

However, I feel sure that if a well-considered and reasonable program is worked out between now and January under this authorization, the new Congress will be amenable to providing adequate funds under a supplemental appropriation. Furthermore, it should be considered that before such funds are needed, escape clause action would increase tariff rates, thereby providing some offsetting revenues.

If this program is carried through, we will be taking constructive action in support of friendly trade relations that no other country, to my knowledge, has put into practice.

Most other countries apply tariffs, quotas, and other import control devices to protect their domestic industries, with little regard for the effect such action may have on other countries, friendly or hostile.

Moreover, I believe it is true that no other country has gone so far as we have since 1934 in opening our market to foreign competitors.

Now, if the Congress passes this amendment, we will be saying, in effect, to our foreign friends: "We intend to apply the escape clause effectively and expeditiously in defense of our essential domestic industries, just as you protect your industries, but we are going farther than any other nation we know of, and will do what we can to cushion the economic blow which you may suffer from this action."

I believe that such a policy would be respected and appreciated by our foreign friends.

And it most certainly would be appreciated by our depressed domestic industries which cannot hope to compete with low-cost foreign competitors.

Furthermore, if our foreign friends complain strongly about our application of the escape clause, we need merely remind them that our failure to save domestic industries from ruin by foreign imports could mean the eventual death of our trade agreement program and the imposition of tariffs and import controls which would make the Smoot-Hawley tariff seem weak by comparison. This is no threat; it is just a realistic appraisal of the situation.

In suggesting this amendment, I am making a constructive effort to save our present trade program without sacrificing our essential domestic industries or alienating our friends in these difficult times. The President has a most difficult and challenging task to promote good international relations and to administer the foreign trade program. I sincerely hope that my colleagues will support the policy involved in this proposal, offered purely on my own initiative, to help the President adequately utilize the more effective escape-clause tool which the 85th Congress has just given to him.

Mr. President, I invite attention to the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by the present Congress.

The amendment I propose is, on page 2, line 23, strike out "200,000,000;" and insert in lieu thereof "202,500,000:" and then add the following language:

Provided, That the President is authorized and requested to use such funds as are necessary in order to negotiate and carry out agreements with foreign nations in order to alleviate economic hardships experienced by workers in foreign countries whose production is adversely affected by action hereafter taken under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended (escape clause provision);

That is the escape clause provision.

On page 4, line 5, immediately before the semicolon, it is proposed to insert the following: ": *Provided*, That the President is authorized and requested to use such funds as are necessary in order to negotiate and carry out agreements with foreign nations in order to alleviate economic hardships experienced by workers in foreign countries whose production is adversely affected by action hereafter taken under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended—escape clause provision."

The reason I am making this proposal is that since the mineral stabilization bill has been defeated, and since the States in which these industries are located have done everything in their power to get an alternative program, other than going the tariff route, and have failed, I am assuming that the President of the United States will now proceed to carry out the recommendations of the Tariff Commission with respect to lead and zinc.

I am assuming also that he was acting in good faith—and I am sure he was—when he said, in effect, that it would be dangerous, in some of our neighboring Republics in this hemisphere, if we were to adopt a tariff, rather than to use the subsidized-mineral bill which we had before us, and which received such a large vote in the Senate.

In order to carry out the program without damaging those people and making it possible for the President to have at hand a remedy to take care of that sort of situation, should it arise with any friendly nations, he should have authority, if he does not already have it, to do that sort of thing.

I have checked with the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. HAYDEN]. My attention has been called—and we had already investigated it—to title IV, "Special Assistance and Other Programs," contained in the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as we amended it this year. That provision reads as follows:

SEC. 400. Special assistance: (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1959 not to exceed $202,500,000 for use on such terms and conditions as he may specify for assistance designed to maintain or promote political or economic stability.

That is precisely the thing the President may be confronted with if he goes the tariff route and puts into effect tariff provisions without any quotas.

If we find that kind of situation developing through the American Republics which produce lead and zinc, he apparently has the authority—that is the question which has been raised; and I wish to be sure that he has the authority—to deal with that possibility. I wish to direct attention to the possibility, so as to make it easier for the country to support the President, and for the President to take that kind of action.

Before I ask the chairman some questions, I invite attention to another section of the Mutual Security Act, namely, chapter III, section 451, under the heading "Contingency Fund."

SEC. 451. President's Special Authority and Contingent Fund—(a) Of the funds made available for use under this Act, not to exceed $150,000,000, in addition to the funds authorized for use under this subsection by subsection (b) of this section, may be used in any fiscal year, without regard to the requirements of this Act or any other act for which such funds are authorized by this Act or any act appropriating funds for use under this Act, in furtherance of any of the purposes of such Acts, when the President determines that such use is important to the security of the United States.

That gives him an additional fund of $150 million, provided there is that much unused in the other funds. I think the record shows that there are many millions more than that still available. As I understand, the present bill, in the first section, provides for $200 million in the special assistance fund. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct. Let me point out to the Senator, first, that so far as his amendment is concerned, it could not be entertained in connection with this bill because both paragraphs are legislative in character. They would change existing laws and could not be included. Second, with respect to what he has read in regard to existing law, the President now undoubtedly has rather wide discretion with respect to what he considers to be assistance designed to maintain or promote political or economical stability. Will the Senator read that section once more?

Mr. WATKINS. The section reads as follows:

Section 400. Special assistance—(a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1959 not to exceed $202,500,000 for use on such terms and conditions as he may specify for assistance designed to maintain or promote political or economic stability.

Mr. HAYDEN. It would be a question in the judgment of the President as to what he should do with the money we propose to appropriate in the bill now, and if he should decide to take action under proper legal advice, which I have no doubt he would get, to promote the interests of the United States, he could take that action. That is my judgment.

Mr. WATKINS. Without mentioning any particular Republic, if he found, for example that X Republic in the Western Hemisphere was a producer of lead and zinc, and that should he impose the tariff recommendations of the Commission that nation would be seriously damaged and its political and economic stability upset, he would be within the law, it seems to me, if he made the finding that he could then use funds authorized under section 4 of the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. That would be a matter within his discretion.

Mr. WATKINS. Also with respect to section 451, which authorizes up to $150 million of other funds, he could do the same thing, could he not?

Mr. HAYDEN. That view appears to me to be perfectly clear from a reading of the law.

Mr. WATKINS. What I was trying to do was to make abundantly clear the extent of his authority. I was in some doubt when I prepared this amendment whether he had the authority, and I did not know to which bill I might propose that amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. The President will not come to ask me what I think he ought to do, but undoubtedly he will ask the Attorney General and others who can properly advise him. But, so far as I am concerned, it seems to me he has the necessary authority.

Mr. WATKINS. That has to do also with the other section pertaining to the $202 million?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is right. It applies to both sections.

Mr. WATKINS. I wanted to make that understanding clear, so the President may be able to examine the legislative history for the action I believe he will take in carrying out the provisions of the law.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask a question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is there any question in the minds of members of the committee with respect to the answer just given?

Mr. HAYDEN. This is the first time I have heard the question asked. If some action taken by the United States adversely affected the economy of another country, the language of the amendment appears to be broad enough to enable the President to do something about it. What he would do and the steps he might take to do it I have no idea.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Has the Senator heard any expression of opinion to the contrary by any of the members of the committee?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. This is the first time I have heard the subject mentioned.

Mr. WATKINS. I have read the record of the committee and I believe it is a fair statement that the President would have the right to use funds authorized under section 400 of the Mutual Security Act as amended this year. He would also have the right to use $155 million under section 451.

Mr. HAYDEN. He is clearly given broad discretion under that legislation.

Mr. WATKINS. I wanted to make that position abundantly clear. I have heard nothing to the contrary. I appreciate the help and assistance I am getting from the coaches on the side.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!

Mr. WATKINS. I have not offered the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have waited until the third reading of the bill to make the observations I wish to make at this time. I was detained and could not make them heretofore. I wish to make my position precise, for the benefit of the leadership and those who will be conducting the conference on the part of the Senate.

Speaking for myself, and I believe a number of other Senators in the Chamber, we have deep convictions about the Development Loan Fund. We felt that the Development Loan Fund was too low to serve the national interest of the United States. I had filed an amendment to raise it to $825 million. The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania had filed an amendment to raise it to $625 million. I deeply believe the Appropriations Committee went as far as it felt it could go in terms of the temper of the most of the Members of the Senate in fixing the figure at $580 million. I believe that is a fair figure in view of the fact that the administration asked for only $625 million, whereas it should have asked, based upon the testimony of Douglas Dillon himself, for $825 million. But it did not. That is its mistake.

In any event, considering what the Appropriations Committee faced, I believe it handled the matter very fairly. The problem will arise in conference, and I did not think it was fair, knowing the tough kind of conference that the conferees will have and that the leadership will have to face in coming to a final conclusion, to refrain from emphasizing the vital importance of this Development Loan Fund in the whole national security interest of the country.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate for more than 2 minutes.

I would like also for the RECORD to indicate I had pending at the desk an amendment which I did not call up. That amendment would have restored to this appropriation bill the full amount in every category which had been contained in the authorization bill. It is my deep conviction that we are making a mistake in this body and that a mistake will be made in the other body of Congress in not giving the President of the United States every cent he requested for the military assistance defense effort, development loan fund, and special assistance authorization.

The time is long past when we can concern ourselves with whether or not this is a permanent part of our national policy. It is. It is necessary to our national security. We have the combined

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

judgment of all the executive departments of the Government in this matter. I think we should pay attention to it.

Mr. COOPER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to my colleague from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. I join with the Senator from New York. I voted to reduce military aid by $100 million a few minutes ago. I believe that is the first vote I have cast to reduce an appropriation for mutual aid. I did so in the firm conviction there is a great challenge to this country at this time and in the years ahead with respect to our willingness to provide a large measure of economic assistance to countries which are struggling to maintain their independence and raise the standards of living of their people. I earnestly hope that the Development Loan Fund will be maintained, and I hope that next year the amount which the President asked for last year, $800 million, will be made available.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President——

Mr. JAVITS. Does the Senator from Missouri wish me to yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is seeking recognition in his own right.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Mr. Douglas Dillon, Deputy Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, testified the $625 million request for the Development Loan Fund was at most no more than the barest minimum. That $625 million represents an aggregate—if we do appropriate what was asked—of $925 million for the whole economic development loan activity of the United States, taking it with the $300 million appropriated last year. Now we are actually giving them $880 million if this bill passes.

Mr. President, we talk a great deal in this Chamber about competition with the Soviet Union, and we have appropriated over $40 billion for military defense this year in respect to that competition.

The Soviet Union is not quite as tight as we are in terms of economic defense—although we are a great deal richer than they are—because they know what it means. They have spent an average of $600 million a year. To give the Senate an example of the relationship of their programs to ours, in two countries in the Middle East—Syria and Egypt—during the last 3 years the Soviet Union has given in economic aid, $449 million. Our total economic aid program for the whole Middle East, in the same 3-year period, was approximately $480 million. Theirs was for only 2 countries; ours for the whole area.

I heard the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana ask the question: Where are we going to get the money? It is a fact that the budget of the United States is large and that our national debt is increasing. However, the situation is the same as you encounter in the running of any business. It is not what we spend, but what we have. The fact is that in 1946 the national debt was 136 percent of our national income. It was more than one-third larger than the national income. In June 1957, the national debt was three-fourths of the national income. In short, our position in that 11-year period improved very materially, and the United States is not bleeding itself white in order to do the job that needs to be done.

There is a tremendous deficiency of private investment capital in the underdeveloped areas where the Development Loan Fund could be used. United States direct private investment in the less developed countries of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East averaged only $119 million a year during the 3 years 1954 through 1956. I am referring to the testimony of Douglas Dillon, Deputy Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, when he testified before the Committee on Foreign Relations.

In short, Mr. President, there is a real insufficiency of capital in this area.

I believe that by now no one needs to be convinced of the importance of the people in those undeveloped areas—countries like India, Thailand, and Burma. And, if they do not see hope, in that enormous area, they will not be on our side, because the Communists are willing not only to expend the propaganda ideology, but also the hard cash to win them over.

One other fact which Mr. Dillon gave us was that the Development Loan Fund will have received applications deserving serious consideration in the amount of $3.3 billion by June 30, 1959. By that date the aggregate amount which will have been made available to meet those requests will be $880 million, if the present bill is passed.

We have heard some very long speeches by people on the proposition that we could and should save some money. I deeply feel that if we save money on this item we will be putting in jeopardy the national interest of the United States. I say that because we can make all the speeches in the world we want to on the subject that we are better than the Soviet Union, and that we ought to beat them at their own game. The hard fact is that in this case we must either put up or shut up.

Mr. President, in conclusion I should like to read some lines from a very wise man, Paul-Henri Spaak, Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. This is what he said on the very subject we are discussing today:

> Peaceful coexistence means a life and death struggle between the Communist system on the one hand, and the way of life and political, economic, and social structure known as Western civilization on the other. It must be realized that this struggle will be carried into all fields, though it will be fiercest in the economic field, and is a challenge which must be accepted.

Mr. President, Khrushchev has said he declares war on us in the peaceful field of trade. Unless we appropriate the full amount of $580 million, which is specified in the bill, then we shall be inviting disaster in respect of that challenge. Dictators always tell us what they propose to do. The trouble with us is that we do not listen. I strongly urge that we listen now.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared stating why I am in favor of the passage of the pending bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SALTONSTALL

The Senate Appropriations Committee has added $440 million to the mutual security appropriations bill passed by the House. Although this brings the total appropriation to more than 3½ billion, it is still substantially smaller than the amount which the administration has determined to be necessary. The amount which would be appropriated under the committee bill is therefore a very small amount in the light of the program regarded as necessary by the President.

Most of the funds which the committee has restored will go to carry out our programs for economic development abroad. Mr. President, much has been said and written about these schemes, and their usefulness has been debated in all quarters. Generally criticism of them runs along the line that they have not bought allegiance to us, they have not resulted in democratic governments, the funds have been wasted through poor administration by our officials, or have been swallowed up by corrupt governments.

To some degree, although I think it is a small one, all of these things are true. But have we ever appropriated money for any program the administration of which was certain to be perfect, the results of which were plainly foreseeable, or the objectives of which were realized exactly as they were visualized? If there is conjecture and chance in appropriating this money, we are dealing with the rule—not the exception. But although the possibility of our receiving value for these funds is more remote than is usual, we must recognize that the catastrophes which we seek to avert are more imminent. It should not surprise us that the insurance is more expensive when that risk, if it occurs, is likely to be more costly.

The proposition has often been put to us that many countries in the world are so poor that their entire income must be spent upon subsistence items. They cannot lay enough aside to begin to accumulate those basic capital resources which are necessary for development of an expanding economy. To one who has traveled, this proposition is strikingly true. The question which confronts this body is whether the continuation of such conditions is in our national interest.

Let me first speak in long-range terms. The President of the United States said to the United Nations last week, "We are living in a time when the whole world has become alive to the possibilities of modernizing their societies. Material progress should not be an overriding objective in itself; but it is an important condition for achieving higher human, cultural and spiritual objectives." Mr. President, we cannot expect anyone to strive for these objectives nor can we expect ideas which are friendly to our own to grow in the sort of climate which prevails in some underdeveloped countries. There is the most intimate connection between economic and social conditions and the national policies which spring from them. Our way of life and the conceptions which are fundamental to it have developed in an atmosphere relatively free of the misery and poverty which prevail in much of the world today. To the extent that we can foster such an atmosphere abroad—an atmosphere of economic progress and freedom—we will be laying a groundwork for the growth of ideals that are in harmony with our own.

But even if this objective is too distant to strive for, there are other pressing considerations which demand passage of this bill and which are easily justified on national security grounds.

For better or worse, economic warfare has become the order of the day, and the Russians have picked up the weapon which we have introduced to the world. I read from time to time of Russian moves in this field—buying surplus products from countries which will otherwise suffer severe depressions, supplying arms where we have refused to do so, sending in swarms of technical advisers and military experts who subvert and proselytize. Economic aid has become, as the use of force was in the 19th century, the accepted method of filling a power vacuum. It is difficult for us to maintain the balance of power without it, particularly in view of our unwillingness to resort to force in other than extreme circumstances, and our rejection of subversion as an instrument of national policy.

Providing military aid is simply not enough, Mr. President. Many countries upon whose support and good will we depend will not accept such aid, or if they will, are not greatly influenced by it. A loan is often a more effective way of gaining confidence than the supply of a destroyer or a jet aircraft. And we should recognize that our position in foreign countries is much better assured in the event of a change of government, if our links are economic rather than military. The former much more easily endures a change of regime.

In conclusion, I cannot too strongly urge the passage of this bill in the form reported by the committee. The amount appropriated will be the very minimum upon which our foreign operations can proceed with effectiveness. To provide less would be to put ourselves in the most unnecessary danger.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared on the pending bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN END TO THE FOREIGN AID GIVEAWAY

(By Senator SCHOEPPEL)

The United States began providing emergency economic help to Europe right after World War II. Surely no one dreamed back in 1945 that 13 years later we would still be giving away money at the rate of $3 billion a year for foreign aid. How is it possible that free people have let themselves be talked into this monstrous giveaway that has cost them nearly $60 billion, or about $350 for every American citizen?

Foreign aid started out as a way of helping a prostrate Europe back on its feet after the destruction wrought by the Second World War. It was only supposed to last a few years and for the most part, it was to be given to our wartime allies. But instead of coming to an end, this European-centered "emergency" aid has become a permanent drain on the American economy. It has been enlarged so that we now provide both economic and military help all over the world. We are trying to industrialize all the underdeveloped areas that are not under Soviet rule; we are trying to arm both the nations of Western Europe and any others that are allied with us in the struggle against the Soviet military drive for world domination. I say we must call a halt to this spending of your tax dollars and my tax dollars in every case where it is not clearly in the interests of America's own security. How can we cut down? First, we must look at what has already been done and see what we can learn from these past successes and failures. Then, we have got to take a long, cold look at what foreign-aid activities can do for us today and the best way in which it can do the job. I am convinced that the end result will be a greatly reduced drain on the American pocketbook, more defense for the dollar, and greater respect abroad for the United States.

The Marshall plan that put Europe back on its feet after the Second World War was to last from 1948 to 1952, but after only 2 years it had increased European productivity beyond the 1938 figures. At the end of its allotted 4 years, industrial output was 40 percent above prewar levels and agricultural production was up 15 percent beyond the prewar level.

If the Marshall plan was successful, it was because it had a practical goal. The job was to repair European industry and agriculture that had been destroyed and help establish new factories and farms. Since Europe was already highly industrialized it was feasible for American dollars to do the job when they were added to Europe's own funds and manpower resources.

It was because Europe and America worked together. It was because we were helping nations that, for the most part, had been our wartime allies, rather than trying to buy new friends by gifts of money. Despite the fact that many American servicemen gave their lives in World War II and this country spent billions of dollars, our allies suffered more severely from the war than did the United States. The cities of Europe were subjected to heavy bombing, a high percentage of allied servicemen were killed, and much of the farmland and industrial plants were damaged. In a sense, the Marshall plan recognized these facts. We were helping our allies who had fared so much worse than we had fared in the common struggle against Nazi Germany.

It was successful because the aid was appropriate to the requirements of the individual countries. Delegates from the European nations and the United States sat down together and carefully planned just what American aid was needed in each country to supplement the domestic resources. There was no "monument building," or expensive projects that serve only to increase the prestige of the local political figures. There was undoubtedly some waste, for there would have to be some in such a gigantic program.

Finally, I believe we must recognize that the Marshall plan was not designed to make democracies out of states that had never before experienced a democratic way of life. The countries of Western Europe had long since fought the battles for democratic freedom. We were merely helping democratic governments to maintain themselves in the face of terrible economic and political dislocation that provided an opening for local Communist Parties to make a successful appeal to the poorer factory workers and some tired intellectuals.

We embarked on the great giveaway of economic aid to the world at the same time we began the shift in Europe from emergency economic help to military aid. Our experience with the Marshall plan should have taught America a lesson about economic assistance. It should have taught us the criteria for a successful program of foreign aid. But alas, this did not happen. So often programs which are meritorious have a way of extending far beyond the limit of their usefulness. Bureaucratic empires are built, vested interests establish profitable footholds which they are reluctant to relinquish. Propaganda barrages obscure in a fog of slogans the true nature of the operation.

When we set out to industrialize the underdeveloped areas of the world, we have set ourselves a goal that is beyond the limits of what we can reasonably expect to accomplish even with the billions of American dollars that have been spent and that we are continuing to spend in these countries. We have given billions to governments and peoples for economic development when they have demonstrated neither the capacity nor the incentive to set their own courses toward economic development. We have poured our aid into countries that are not our allies and even into some that spent their time attacking American foreign policy. The aid which we have supplied has often been quite unnecessary in terms of the actual requirements for economic development in the particular country. This has increased the waste and inefficiency that characterize the administration of our current economic assistance program. It is also clear that we have sometimes provided economic assistance to the less-developed countries in the vain belief that our money can buy democracy in these lands that have had little if any experience with the democratic way of life. These are not the only problems that pervade our massive programs of economic assistance. But they are problems that would not be with us if we had only taken the trouble to learn the lessons of success and failure from our experience with the Marshall plan.

We are naive if we think the American aid dollars can make any substantial contribution to the hundreds of billions that will be needed to turn poverty-stricken, disease-ridden, agricultural countries like India into modern industrial nations. Clearly it is not feasible for the American economy to provide sufficient assistance to raise the income of 400 million Indians to that of Europeans, to say nothing of Americans. I mention India only because it is such an outstanding example. But, approximately the same situation exists in the other nations of Asia and Africa. The only way United States economic grants could dent the surface of the problem of economic development in these countries is to increase our appropriations several times over and continue to give this volume of assistance for several generations. I believe this is more than the American people will stomach.

The United States does not have the responsibility for making such enormous sacrifices to modernize the economics of Asia and Africa. And it is foolish for us to give our money away in the attempt to reach such an impossible goal. These funds can serve a more useful purpose elsewhere. Perhaps we might even be sensible enough to reduce the present tax burden in America. Or would that be asking too much?

The European aid program should have taught us to help only those who are willing to help themselves. Europe took the lead in its own reconstruction. This is not the case in many of the countries of Asia and Africa. We seem almost to be urging money upon them. And in some cases we won't even make the local government draw up a carefully worked out plan for development. Nor do we require that the government put a substantial portion of its own income into development projects. It is notorious that the oil-rich feudal monarchs of the Middle East who receive American economic assistance have consistently held back from putting their own money into programs for economic development. It's so much easier to get it from Uncle Sam who seems determined to come in and modernize their country for them. Now, I don't mean to imply this is true everywhere that we give economic aid today. Indeed, there has been a revolution of rising expectations throughout the underdeveloped parts of the world, but this doesn't mean the people are willing to set before themselves the goal of a higher standard of living and then make the sacrifices necessary to save and invest in their own future economic development. It is a waste of hard-earned American dollars to provide economic aid where the people are not willing first of all to help themselves. We helped Europe help herself until she got back on her feet. But we aren't going to give money

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

to Asia and Africa forever and especially not when many of the countries there don't save what money they do have to help themselves.

Despite all these roadblocks to a successful aid program, the record shows that we have often provided one kind of economic aid when in fact, the country needed something quite different. We have tended to make economic development mean industrialization always and everywhere. It is foolishness for us to give away billions of dollars to build steel mills, hydroelectric plants, and superhighways in places that have no industries to use the steel and the electric power and few automobiles to travel on the paved highways. Now it is popular to justify the foreign aid expenditures on the theory after all we are assisting our own economy; that by giving billions of dollars, we are in reality making money; that it is a profitable venture for American industry, American agriculture, American shipping, American banking, etc. This in my opinion is nonsense.

As I view the trends in the American agricultural situation, the textile industry, the lumbering industry, the steel industry, the automobile industry, the mining industry and a host of other vital segments of our economy, I am becoming more and more convinced that unless an end is put to this wasteful mismanaged, scoop-shovel, giveaway foreign aid program, we will have serious economic dislocations in this country.

I do not wish to destroy the standard of living of the American working people. I do not wish to reduce to a common denominator the free Americans with that of peoples all over the world. I do not want the American workingman riding to work on a bicycle as his foreign counterpart in many areas of the world does today. I do not want American labor competing with those who work for 20 cents an hour with no retirement, no sick leave, no vacations, no social-security benefits, no opportunity to own their own homes, worship in their own church, or raise their children in accordance with the dictates of their conscience. I inherited from my forebears, who struggled hard in Kansas, an opportunity which, so long as I am in a position to do so, I shall fight to transmit to those who follow us.

I assure you that I shall never vote for any program which guarantees full employment in New Delhi, Rangoon, Paris, and Rome if it also promises unemployment and bread lines in Topeka and Wichita. Perhaps this is a selfish nationalistic point of view. If it is, I plead guilty. Any other position insofar as I am concerned is a form of national suicide.

I cannot subscribe to the theory that providing economic aid to the less-developed countries will cause them to become democracies rather than totalitarian states. This is something I would have expected Karl Marx to say. I would not expect to hear it from an American.

I do not believe that a country chooses Western democracy or Soviet communism on the basis of whether it receives more economic help from the United States or from the Soviet Union. Yet there are those in our country who act as though they are afraid Khrushchev will get ahead of us and give away more money than we do. Is that possible? Maybe. But, so far, the Soviets have given very little money to anyone. Most of the much-touted Soviet economic aid is in the form of trade credits and not outright gifts. Moreover, while the Sino-Soviet bloc has committed itself to about $1.9 billion of aid, they have actually delivered only about one-fifth of the economic assistance parts of their promised aid. Perhaps they expect the countries they help to turn into Communist states. I don't know, but there is little evidence to suggest that President Nasser of Egypt wants any part of communism in his country. Nasser has been wined and dined by the Soviets and has received the largest single slice of Russian economic and military aid, but he has consistently followed the strategy of trying to play off the Soviets against the Free World and get the most he can from both parties.

It is ironic that in the face of such claims that our economic grants to the less-developed lands will help to guarantee the success of democratic governments, there is strong evidence to suggest just the opposite.

I have tried to show you why we have failed so miserably. We have failed primarily because we have expected economic aid to do things that it was inherently impossible for it to do. It is a failure because it is not vital to the interests of the United States to give economic grants to the underdeveloped areas for long-term development and therefore represents a net loss of billions of dollars to this country. It is a failure because it has nurtured contempt for the United States around the world. We have come to be regarded as a soft touch, as nervous, jittery, and unsure of ourselves before the challenges presented by the Soviet Union.

If we are ever going to stop the giveaway and put this country's foreign-aid program on a sensible basis, we will have to call a halt to all grants of economic aid and make sure that our military aid goes to only those nations whose defense is clearly in the interests of American security. The American people will want to give help to foreign peoples in case of disasters like floods and earthquakes and fires, but we must not give money for the economic development of other countries unless it is on a sensible loan basis. This is a waste of our tax dollars unless we use some commonsense in this respect. It is an insult to the self-respecting peoples of other nations to put them on an American dole. I believe the entire foreign-aid program needs an overhauling. There is no question that some military assistance is needed.

As the Senator from Kansas, I must accept the recommendations of our military authorities when they request funds for the defense of the Free World. However, I know that under the blanket of national defense which to me is a sacred obligation some very strange creatures are being hidden. It seems to me that a group of global do-gooders are trying to provide bathtubs and two televisions for everyone in Timbuctoo, and many other impractical ventures. Now you may think I am intending to be facetious. Far from it—far from it. Some of the things which we have done in foreign countries under the guise of foreign aid would make the Mad Hatter of Alice in Wonderland look like Solomon.

The time has come, therefore, when we must revise our entire approach to this most difficult subject. The sad record indicates that our generosity, if it is generosity, certainly has not won friends or influenced any people. It has not helped us either here or abroad. We have let the entre program become a "Sacred Cow." Anyone who dares to criticize it calls down upon his head the wrath of every leftwing outfit and one world outfit throughout the Nation.

So be it. I have opposed the program as it is now constituted. If it continues in its present form, I shall continue in opposition. If it is revised and becomes selective—if it becomes a program which furnishes needed military assistance to those who are on our side, and which eliminates unnecessary and wasteful economic assistance, if the management is put on a businesslike basis and the bureaucratic morass is eliminated, I shall then support those phases of such a program that seem most likely to achieve that which we all desire; namely, freedom and security throughout the world.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I am including in my remarks a statement of economic aid by the United States as printed in the New York Times under date of May 23, 1958. This clearly shows the staggering sums we have spent and contemplate continuing to spend, as follows:

ECONOMIC AID BY UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON, May 23.—Following is a table showing how much economic aid has been committed to foreign countries by the United States in the years ended June 30, 1956, and June 30, 1957, and how much is contemplated in the year ending June 30, 1958. Military aid figures are not available on this basis.

The table was prepared by the International Cooperation Administration for a House Appropriations Subcommittee. As announced, but unsigned, $75 million Development Loan Fund loan for India has been added to the ICA figures for the current year.

Country	Year ended June 30, 1956	Year ended June 30, 1957	Year ending June 30, 1958 (estimated)
Afghanistan	$18,300,000	$14,391,000	$5,800,000
Argentina	84,000	----------	350,000
Bolivia	25,400,000	23,300,000	20,100,000
Brazil	3,604,000	4,512,000	4,700,000
Burma	----------	----------	12,700,000
Cambodia	45,100,000	34,500,000	26,000,000
Ceylon	5,000,000	6,083,000	1,400,000
Chile	2,174,000	2,456,000	2,500,000
Colombia	1,323,000	1,156,000	1,290,000
Costa Rica	907,000	994,000	1,050,000
Cuba	471,000	569,000	570,000
Dominican Republic	265,000	156,000	190,000
Ecuador	1,660,000	1,809,000	1,880,000
Egypt	2,623,000	686,000	----------
El Salvador	934,000	1,069,000	1,000,000
Ethiopia	2,923,000	9,600,000	Classified
Ghana	----------	360,000	500,000
Greece	26,800,000	25,700,000	15,700,000
Guatemala	18,176,000	17,518,000	12,400,000
Haiti	6,361,000	2,126,000	Classified
Honduras	1,156,000	1,324,000	1,350,000
Iceland	----------	8,462,000	5,100,000
India	60,400,000	68,700,000	81,300,000
Indonesia	11,100,000	11,700,000	21,300,000
Iran	65,500,000	51,000,000	26,600,000
Iraq	2,277,000	3,640,000	2,200,000
Israel	23,984,000	26,847,000	9,000,000
Japan	900,000	2,300,000	2,500,000
Jordan	7,500,000	21,200,000	31,700,000
Korea	326,900,000	305,700,000	220,300,000
Laos	48,700,000	44,500,000	Classified
Lebanon	7,800,000	12,100,000	2,700,000
Liberia	1,782,000	1,716,000	2,000,000
Libya	7,520,000	19,280,000	12,400,000
Mexico	705,000	888,000	680,000
Morocco	----------	20,067,000	Classified
Nepal	1,958,000	4,347,000	4,065,000
Nicarsgua	756,000	681,000	900,000
Pakistan	106,700,000	98,700,000	55,800,000
Panama	1,096,000	1,023,000	1,170,000
Paraguay	1,801,000	1,530,000	1,480,000
Peru	2,819,000	2,594,000	2,850,000
Philippines	29,100,000	33,900,000	19,000,000
Saudi Arabia	----------	22,000	25,000,000
Somalia	60,000	1,387,000	650,000
Spain	58,426,000	69,999,000	56,150,000
Taiwan	73,300,000	83,700,000	60,000,000
Thailand	34,500,000	34,500,000	24,000,000
Tunisia	----------	8,489,000	Classified
Turkey	107,800,000	58,800,000	74,500,000
Uruguay	154,000	254,000	200,000
Vietnam	196,700,000	269,400,000	179,200,000
Venezuela	150,000	135,000	170,000
West Berlin	17,278,000	11,406,000	11,170,000
Yugoslavia	29,803,000	14,992,000	11,750,000

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I shall vote for the bill, because the Commander in Chief assures us that the money involved is essential to the security of the United States.

Especially for one reason, however, I do so with reluctance.

That reluctance is because it is hard for me to support foreign industry and development to the tune of billions of dollars, while at the same time we sit idly by and watch American mineral industries go down the drain.

This Congress has utterly failed to provide any kind of aid for the copper, lead, zinc, acid-grade fluorspar and tungsten industries of this Nation. In addition,

the President so far has failed to use such remedies as are available.

We have been told time and time again that a healthy, efficient operating domestic mining industry is a necessary and vital component of the mobilization base.

Actually, there was no need to be told this. The conclusion that a healthy mining industry is important, not only to the economic welfare, but also to the national security, is inescapable.

Thousands of miners, particularly in the lead and zinc industry, are idle.

Their fellow workers still employed are working at reduced work weeks and reduced pay.

This idleness is a burden upon their communities; and also upon the unemployment insurance and welfare funds.

This idleness also is reflected in reduced income-tax revenue, both at State and national level; and this includes the companies which have laid these workers off, as well as the workers themselves.

Therefore, to repeat, it is with reluctance that I vote to provide these billions for foreign aid—some of which will assist in the development of foreign mineral resources—when at the same time we are treating our American miners and domestic industries in such shabby fashion.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I compliment the Senator from Missouri not only upon his statement on the bill proper, but also upon his concern for certain mineral industries and the employees who are out of work.

My own State of Tennessee has a copper industry and a zinc industry. I know they are largely closed down and that many employees are out of work. I had hoped that the minerals stockpile bill, which the Senate passed, would give some relief. Undoubtedly it would have given some relief, but it has not been given clearance by the Committee on Rules of the House. Is that a correct statement?

My SYMINGTON. I believe that is correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does the Senator from Missouri know whether there is any possibility of getting action on the mineral stockpile bill at this session?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do not.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I certainly hope that this bill might be reconsidered in the House, or that the program might be cut down, if necessary, because some relief is very necessary.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank my able and distinguished colleague for his kind remarks. It has become more and more evident that the United States cannot eat its cake and have it too.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, inasmuch as a yea-and-nay vote will not be had on the bill, I desire to state that I shall vote in the negative—against the bill. I do so without reluctance, and on one of the few occasions I can do so, on a vote on an important measure, without having any doubt.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from the President of the United States in connection with the bill.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, August 4, 1958.

The Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LYNDON: As you know from our many conversations on the subject, the cuts in the mutual security appropriations have troubled me a great deal. The carefully planned program I submitted last February was cut by almost $275 million in the authorizing legislation recently enacted by the Congress. The appropriation bill recently voted by the House of Representatives was further reduced by nearly $600 million from this already reduced amount.

I am advised of your view that the Senate is likely to restore only $440 million of the House cut. Of this $440 million, I understand that $90 million would be for defense support, $15 million for special assistance, $55 million for contingencies, and $280 million for the Development Loan Fund. I have two reactions: First, that it falls short of the authorization by $157.5 million and is that much too low; second, that, at our calculated rate of expenditures, it would at least bridge the adjournment period without forcing program changes that would unduly increase our risks. Thereafter, unless world conditions should improve, I would expect to request additional funds to meet the cost of our required programs. On this basis a $440 million restoration would enable us to carry on our calculated programs until Congress returns.

It is, of course, the duty of Congress ultimately to determine how much this program requires. But before that decision is reached my duty is equally clear—to emphasize the utter gravity of the House cuts. The restoration of these funds is of the utmost importance to ourselves and to friendly nations throughout the world. I hope you will use this letter, to the degree you deem advisable, throughout the Senate, for in this matter the stakes for America are no less than crucial.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Mr. KNOWLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately preceding the vote on the mutual-aid bill a statement by the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] who was unavoidably absent.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

It is a great regret to me that circumstances have prevented my being present on the floor of the Senate while the mutual-security appropriation bill is being considered.

It has been my sincere hope that the Senate would have been in a position to restore the full amount of the authorization as passed by both the House and Senate. I have some apprehension that anything less than that may make the final figure suffer some further reductions in conference. In spite of the foregoing, if I were present, I would vote for the report of the Senate Appropriations Committee recommending a restoration of the $440 million, and I feel the wisest course is to stand solidly for this with the hope and expectation that in our negotiations with the House and with the strong feeling on the part of the President, the final figure after conference will be substantially this amount.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the passage of the bill.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H. R. 13192) was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. THYE, and Mr. DIRKSEN conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I was unaware that a yea-and-nay vote would not be taken on the bill. I wish the RECORD to show that I voted against the passage of the mutual security bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I desire to have the RECORD show that I voted for the passage of the mutual security bill. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement I have prepared on the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR COOPER

Today, I have voted for the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to reduce the appropriation for military assistance by $100 million below the $1,515,000,000 recommended by the Senate Committee on Appropriations. Later, by pairing with the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], I expressed my support for his amendment to reduce the appropriations for defense support by $50 million below the $790 million recommended by the committee. Both of these items deal with growing military assistance, military equipment or funds to other countries, 12 to 15 in number.

I voted to reduce the appropriation, because I believe our program of assistance is too heavily weighted on the side of military assistance, and too small on the side of economic assistance.

The total appropriated by the bill is $3,518,092,500; $2,305,000,000 is allocated for military assistance to other countries. Conceivably, nearly all of the remaining $1,213,092,500 could be used for economic assistance, but it is not likely that it will be. Actually, $580 million is appropriated to the redevelopment loan fund for economic assistance, compared to the budget request of $625 million, and still short by $245 million of the amount the President asked for, and thought necessary for, the fiscal years 1957 and 1958.

Mr. President, countries in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and our neighbors in Latin America, who have chosen democratic institutions and hold democratic value, are struggling against almost insuperable handicaps to build their economies and improve the standards of living of their peoples. Their chance to remain free and independent, for some countries, could depend on the ability of their governments to provide a better standard of living for their people.

These countries cannot advance unless they secure foreign exchange to purchase needed capital equipment, materials, and even food.

The Soviet Union recognizes that these countries are in the throes of an economic

SYMINGTON OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

revolution. Khrushchev has declared that the Soviet Union is at war with the United States in this field of economic aid and trade, and they are at work, in the Middle East area. And now Russia is making gestures toward our neighbors in Latin America. I believe that Russia should help carry a part of the burden of economic assistance. It had done nothing during the Stalin years, while we gave our assistances freely to the newly independent countries of the world.

But now, we cannot withdraw from this field, or we will find ourselves isolated from the majority of the peoples of the world.

The honorable John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, Under Secretary of State, Douglas Dillon, and indeed the President have spoken of the imperative necessity to provide funds for the Development Loan Fund, from it loans can be made in an orderly fashion, and in a way, which preserving the self-respect of other nations, will promote better relations between the United States and other countries.

I believe our effort in this direction is still inadequate, and that we are placing a disproportionate emphasis on military assistance as compared to the Development Loan Fund.

These facts, in addition to the tremendous deficit which we will have this year, occasioned in chief by our national military budget of over $41 billion, lead me to believe that $100 million could be cut from military assistance to other countries.

The amendment having failed, I will vote for the mutual security bill as I have in the past, for it is an element of our national security—and our responsibility in the world.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, with reference to the mutual security appropriation, two exhibits relating to the Development Loan Fund.

There being no objection, the exhibits were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Announcements of loans by the Development Loan Fund to Aug. 4, 1958

Country	Amount	Date of notification	Purpose	Country	Amount	Date of notification	Purpose
Honduras	$5,000,000	May 9, 1958	Road construction.	India	$75,000,000	May 21, 1958	Import and purchase of equipment.
Taiwan	3,200,000	May 16, 1958	Taiwan Railway Administration.	Greece	12,000,000	June 20, 1958	Construction of fertilizer plant.
Turkey	10,000,000	do	Industrial development.	Thailand	1,750,000	do	Purchase of dredge.
Taiwan	2,500,000	do	Asia Cement Corp.	Paraguay	2,500,000	do	Equipment for building gravel road.
Ceylon	750,000	do	Purchase of diesel-powered coaches.	Pakistan	4,200,000	do	Economic development purposes.
Taiwan	686,000	do	Fishing industry.	Do	40,000,000	July 3, 1958	Assistance for 7-year program.
Ceylon	1,600,000	do	Irrigation and land development.				
Do	900,000	do	Road improvement and expansion.				
Pakistan	5,500,000	do	Water supply and sewage disposal.	Total to Aug. 4, 1958	180,586,000		
Israel	15,000,000	May 20, 1958	Import of equipment and materials.				

Development Loan Fund

Loan recipient	Nature of loan	Interest rate	Terms of repayment of principal
Government of Honduras: $5,000,000.	To assist in financing local currency costs of road construction.	3½ percent per annum, payable semiannually.	40 successive semiannual installments; payments of principal and interest to be made in Honduran lempiras.
Taiwan Railway Administration of Government of Republic of China: $3,200,000.	To assist in improving and expanding locomotive and traffic control facilities in Taiwan railway system.	do	22 successive semiannual installments; payments of principal and interest to be made in new Taiwan dollars.
Industrial Development Bank of Turkey: $10,000,000.	To assist the Industrial Development Bank in financing loans to meet foreign exchange costs of private industrial development in Turkey.	5 percent per annum, payable semiannually.	20 successive semiannual installments; payments of principal and interest to be made in Turkish liras.
Asia Cement Corporation of Taiwan: $2,500,000.	To assist in expanding the cement production facilities of this privately owned corporation in order to meet an increasing demand.	5½ percent per annum, payable semiannually.	14 successive semiannual installments; payments of principal and interest to be made in new Taiwan dollars.
Land Bank of Taiwan: $686,000	To assist the Land Bank in making loans to private individuals and organizations for improvement and expansion of the fishing industry in Taiwan.	5 percent per annum, payable semiannually.	9 successive semiannual installments; payments of principal and interest to be made in new Taiwan dollars.
Government of Ceylon: $1,600,000.	To assist in financing the purchase and import of equipment and materials for irrigation and land development and for rehabilitation of flood-damaged reservoirs.	3½ percent per annum, payable semiannually.	40 successive semiannual installments; payments of principal and interest to be made in Ceylonese rupees.
Government of Ceylon: $900,000	To assist in financing the expansion and improvement of roads in connection with Ceylon's 6-year road program and, initially, the rehabilitation of roads severely damaged by recent floods.	do	20 successive semiannual installments; payments of principal and interest to be made in Ceylonese rupees.
Government of Pakistan: $5,500,000.	To assist in financing the import of equipment and materials for use in the construction of a water supply and sewage disposal system for the city of Karachi.	do	60 successive semiannual installments; payments of principal and interest to be made in Pakistani rupees.
Government of Israel: $15,000,000	To assist in financing the import of equipment and materials for economic development.	5¼ percent per annum, payable semiannually.	30 successive semiannual installments; payments of principal and interest to be made in Israel pounds.
Government of India: $75,000,000	To assist in financing the purchase and importation of equipment, components, and materials for the expansion of transportation and selected industries in India.	3½ percent per annum, payable semiannually, on railroad portion of loan ($40 million); 5¼ percent per annum, payable annually, on balance of loan.	40 successive semiannual installments on railroad portion of loan; 30 successive semiannual installments on balance of loan; payments of principal and interest to be made in Indian rupees.
Government of Greece: $12,000,000.	To assist in financing the construction of a nitrogenous fertilizer plant.	5¼ percent per annum, payable semiannually.	24 successive semiannual installments; payments of principal and interest to be made in Greek drachmas.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I desire to have the record show that I voted for the passage of the mutual security bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I desire the record to show that on the voice vote, I voted against the passage of the mutual security bill.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, H. R. 12212, for the relief of certain employees of the Navy, is now at the desk. The bill which is identical to S. 4184, introduced by the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], would relieve any Navy Department employee who was assigned to the Golcuk navy yard in Turkey during the period from November 23, 1955, to April 30, 1957, of any liability to refund any overpayment of per diem paid as the result of administrative error. The bill further provides for the payment of any funds withheld because of these overpayments.

Three private bills directed toward the same situation have passed the Senate. Approval of this bill would obviate the necessity for consideration by the committee and the Senate of an additional 13 private bills.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 12212) for the relief of certain employees of the Department of the Navy, which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the persons covered by the bill come from Maine, Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, California, and South Carolina.

Sixteen persons, in all, are involved.

The amount in question, according to the Navy Department, is $11,015.30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to the proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVERSION OR EXCHANGE OF TERM INSURANCE ISSUED UNDER NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11382) to authorize the conversion or exchange, under certain conditions, of term insurance issued under section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act, and for other purposes, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That, effective as of January 1, 1959, section 723 of title 38, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (b) is redesignated as subsection (c).

(2) Insert the following new subsection immediately after subsection (a):

"(b) Any term insurance heretofore issued under section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, may be converted to a permanent plan of insurance or exchanged for a policy of limited convertible 5-year level premium term insurance issued under this subsection. Insurance issued under this subsection shall be issued upon the same terms and conditions as are contained in the standard policies of national service life insurance, except (1) after September 1, 1960, limited convertible term insurance may not be issued or renewed on the term plan after the insured's 50th birthday; (2) the premium rates for such limited convertible term or permanent plan insurance shall be based on table X–18 (1950–54 Intercompany Table of Mortality), and interest at the rate of 2½ percent per annum; (3) all settlements on policies involving annuities on insurance issued under this subsection shall be calculated on the basis of the annuity table for 1949, and interest at the rate of 2½ percent per annum; (4) all cash, loan, paid up, and extended values, and, except as otherwise provided in this subsection, all other calculations in connection with insurance issued under this subsection shall be based on table X–18 (1950–54 Intercompany Table of Mortality), and interest at the rate of 2½ percent per annum; (5) insurance and any total disability provision added thereto issued under this subsection shall be on a nonparticipating basis and all premiums and other collections therefor shall be credited directly to the revolving fund referred to in subsection (a) and payments on such insurance and any total disability provision added thereto shall be made directly from such fund."

(3) The second sentence of the subsection redesignated by paragraph (1) as subsection (c) is amended to read as follows: "The rate of interest on such obligations shall be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury at a rate equal to the rate of interest, computed as of the end of the month preceding the date of issue of such obligations, borne by all marketable interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt that are not due or callable until after the expiration of 5 years from the date of original issue; except that where such average rate is not a multiple of one-eighth of 1 percent, the rate of interest of such obligations shall be the multiple of one-eighth of 1 percent nearest such average rate."

And to amend the title, so as to read: "An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to authorize the conversion or exchange, under certain conditions, of term insurance issued under section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, and for other purposes."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this is a veterans' bill. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives to the amendments of the Senate.

The amendments were agreed to.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MANSFIELD

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, as the hour for adjournment of the 85th Congress is almost reached, I wish to express my deep appreciation for the able, conscientious, fruitful leadership of the distinguished junior Senator from Montana, MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD, Democratic whip of the United States Senate. The great productive record of this Congress is in no small part the result of the patience, the understanding, the fellowship, and the foresight that have characterized his leadership.

A tall man among his colleagues, MIKE MANSFIELD can see when the vision of others is blurred, can lead where others can only follow, shows courage when the example of courage is priceless.

In the vital field of world affairs, the voice of the junior Senator from Montana has been clear and constant in support of realism and action. In the field of national security, his course has been one of strength and firmness. In dealing with the myriad problems of our domestic economy, his record is one of understanding, sympathy, and identity with the public interest.

It is a joy and an opportunity to serve with a representative of the people so great as the junior Senator from Montana.

LET CONGRESS DO IT

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a most excellent article entitled, "Let Congress Do It," which appeared in the August 18 issue of Broadcasting Telecasting Magazine. This fine magazine has rendered a real public service in publishing an article which deals with a subject of vital importance to all the people of our Nation—the spectrum—one of the Nation's great natural resources.

Senate Joint Resolution 106 which I introduced contemplated establishment of a Commission to investigate the utilization of the radio and television frequencies allocated to the agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government. Such an investigation is urgently needed in the public interest. As the article points out, the allocations problem cannot be swept under the rug. It is more than regrettable that the House did not act favorably on my resolution.

The investigation which my resolution contemplated cannot be delayed much longer. If it is, the job that ultimately must be done will become increasingly more difficult, the problems more complex.

Although I had suggested establishment of a Commission to conduct the necessary investigation, I hold no particularly strong feelings as to what vehicle might be used to accomplish the desired results—if as the article suggests, activation of a Joint Congressional Committee on Spectrum Utilization and Allocation would be a better approach, I would most certainly support such a proposal. In my judgment Congress must promptly face up to its responsibility in the area of frequency allocations. Failure to do so will only compound the near chaotic situation that exists today in this vital field.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET CONGRESS DO IT

The death of the Potter resolution at this session of Congress contributes nothing to solution of the dilemma over frequency allocations and the imminent danger both to existing television and FM allocations through threatened Government (military) invasion of their domain.

The Potter bill was killed because broadcasters felt, in their battle for self-preservation, that they had no alternative. The White House-OCDM amendments entailed too great a risk in the waning days of the session. More had to be known about the reason for the shift in emphasis from military to broadcast use of the spectrum.

If there had been time prior to the rush for adjournment, the Potter measure might have been reamended to satisfy all sides. But even the Congressional leadership itself got delayed misgivings after it discovered that the proposed five-man Commission would probably be dominated by the executive branch, whereas the licensing responsibility belongs to Congress.

The need for a full-scale spectrum analysis is urgent. It has existed for decades—before TV or FM became factors and before the widespread industrial demands for frequencies. The President assigns space to the Government, without regard to or action by the FCC. And the FCC assigns what's left to non-Government users. This is an untenable situation perhaps without parallel in any other regulatory field. There is need for unified control of the spectrum. That can come about only through well-reasoned legislation.

The original Potter intent was to have the high-level Commission his resolution would create undertake an analysis of Government use of the spectrum. To be proved or disproved are persistent charges that the military is not effectively using the substantial space allotted to it.

Are frequencies being kept in the deep freeze against the day they might be needed? If so, couldn't they be used commercially except for certain tests or exercises? Do new combat techniques require the preemption of additional VHF space, including that occupied by lower band TV and by FM? Is it essential to cloak in secrecy all military allocations, even to the extent of barring the information from officials having top security clearance?

In a national emergency no one can challenge the right of the military to preempt any resource needed in the defense of the Nation. Today, despite tensions, no such emergency exists.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

But the allocations problem cannot be swept under the rug. Broadcasters should not have to live in dire fear of military usurpation of their assignments. Maximum utilization, in the interests of conservation and efficiency, must be made of the spectrum. Some 58 percent of existing VHF TV assignments are on channels 2–6. One network has 41 percent of its affiliations in this band. All of the 550 FM assignments are in the VHF area upon which the military is said to have designs. The FCC's hands are tied as long as there's divided authority, with the military refusing to show its hand.

Congress, in the first and last instance, is the arbiter. It has the licensing authority which it delegates to the FCC, except for Government use. It wrote the law dividing the authority more than 30 years ago. Then only the long and medium waves were usable, an infinitestimal portion of the existing usable spectrum.

Congress must consider the problem anew at the next session. It must know exactly where it is going. Congress has established joint committees to handle important problems; atomic energy and defense production are recent examples. Why not a Joint Committee on Spectrum Utilization and Allocations? It would be bipartisan. It could have an expert staff to evaluate uses now being made, appraise new techniques, and determine whether in fact vast expansion of service would not be possible.

The spectrum is one of the Nation's great natural resources. It cannot be used to maximum efficiency for the benefit of all the people if a substantial part of it is concealed in military security. The responsibility, both as to military and nonmilitary use, belongs to Congress. We believe the logical answer, in the national public interest, is in the activation of a Joint Committee on Spectrum Utilization and Allocations at the next session of Congress.

PRESERVATION OF ROCK CREEK PARK

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, for the last 6 years highway authorities have been striving to put Highway 240 down Rock Creek Park, making this beautiful recreation area a speedway.

I have authored legislation to prevent the park from becoming such a speedway into downtown Washington. I did not press the measure because those who would violate the park apparently abandoned their efforts to get around existing laws, and because Federal and District officials have vigorously defended the park from encroachment by the bulldozers. The Secretary of the Interior, the National Park Service, the city park authorities, the National Capital Planning Commission, and President McLaughlin of the Commissioners for the District of Columbia, all have appeared determined to save this beautiful area.

Now, just before we are to adjourn, comes the announcement in the press that Maryland highway officials are acquiring right-of-way to build Highway 240 from the circumferential highway in Rock Creek Park to a point just east of Wisconsin Avenue at East-West Highway. Doing this would constitute flagrant violation of an agreement between Maryland authorities and the National Capital Planning Commission. The agreement was entered into at the time consent was given to build the circumferential from Wisconsin Avenue across Rock Creek Park to Forest Glen and Georgia Avenue. That agreement forbids the extension of the southeast leg of Highway 240 beyond its intersection with the circumferential at Wisconsin Avenue.

If the southeast leg is built to Rock Creek Park at East-West Highway it will flaunt the agreement. It will pour a glut of traffic onto East-West Highway and thereby make resistance much more difficult to carrying Route 240 southward through the park. Those who want to put the highway in the park know this. They seem determined to force their way regardless of cost in dollars or in honor.

I want to give notice that I intend to press a measure at the opening of the next Congress which will forbid the use of the park for a highway regardless of any treacherous efforts which may be made to force the highway into the park while Congress is away.

There are other ways to accommodate traffic needs than the proposed extension of Route 240 to East-West Highway. There are less costly ways. I trust that Federal and local agencies will continue to oppose the proposal vigorously and prevent any progress with respect to it until Congress is back. Then we can lend whatever help is needed to preserve the greatest and most unique park in any city in all the world.

MINERALS STABILIZATION LEGISLATION

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the House of Representatives—as it had the right to do—killed S. 4036, the minerals stabilization bill.

The vote was impressive, being 159 for and 182 against the measure.

In contrast, the Senate has passed S. 4036 by the overwhelming vote of 70 to 12.

Examination of Wednesday's RECORD shows that only 46 Republican Congressmen voted in favor of the measure; 106 Republicans voted against.

Mr. President, the overwhelming Republican vote against this piece of legislation constituted a revolt against the leadership of the President.

The original draft of the bill was sent to the Congress by Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton with the knowledge of and by the direction of the President of the United States.

On numerous occasions since, publicly and in meetings with his party's Congressional leaders, President Eisenhower has described S. 4036 as must legislation and urged its enactment.

Since submission of the proposed legislation to the Congress, Secretary Seaton and his staff have worked, in season and out, day and night, for its passage.

The bill had the active support of the State Department and the Department of Commerce. Under Secretaries of both Departments testified before the committee, calling for enactment.

It was good legislation, carefully designed and considered, to keep alive and productive some of our basic minerals industries so as to protect and preserve the national security.

In this connection, I quote Representative WALTER ROGERS, manager of the bill on the floor of the House, as he closed the debate. Representative ROGERS stated:

> A vote for this bill is a vote for America.

Early this week Secretary Seaton addressed a letter to all Republican Members of Congress, in which he advised them, and I quote from his letter:

> Without this legislation domestic industries producing these commodities would face an uncertain future, to say the least. The capacity of these industries will be needed for our foreseeable future requirements in peacetime and in a national emergency, should one arise. To replace this capacity in the future would require many times the expenditures necessary to maintain it today.

Mr. President, I am at a loss to understand why the vast majority of his party in the House revolted against the President in this matter so vital to the security of the Nation.

I have read the arguments of the revolters and find them without even the color of validity, just as I find invalid the arguments presented in opposition by the 76 Members of my own party who voted against the bill.

Thousands of idle miners throughout the land can be proud, as I am, that the majority of Democrats in the House voted for the bill, uninfluenced by the fact that it carried the administration label.

I also point with pride to the fact that Montana's two Congressmen, LEE METCALF and LEROY ANDERSON, stood shouder to shoulder with me and Senator MIKE MANSFIELD in support of S. 4036.

But, Mr. President, pride in the voting record of a group of Congressmen does not put food in the kitchens of idle miners and their families.

As things stand today, only the President of the United States can put food in the kitchens of idle miners and their families.

The Office of Defense Mobilization has informed us that there is ample room in the national stockpile for the 150,000 tons of copper which would have been purchased by the Government under the authorization in the bill.

The President has held up approving the Tariff Commission recommendations to increase tariffs for lead and zinc on the assumption that S. 4036 would pass the Congress. He also vetoed the bill which would have extended for a year Public Law 733 on the same assumption.

The question now is, Mr. President, what the administration will do to salvage the mining industry of this country. The President can, and should, put the Tariff Commission recommendations for lead and zinc into effect immediately. He has ample authority under existing law to purchase the copper and to put into effect additional programs for fluorspar and tungsten if he wishes to do so.

As S. 4036 was lost largely due to lack of Republican support in the House of Representatives, he should take immediate administrative action to rectify the situation.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MORSE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the York, Pa., Gazette and Daily recently paid a well-deserved tribute to the senior Senator from Oregon, our colleague WAYNE MORSE.

The newspaper is in agreement with the Senator that food, medicine, schools, factories, and the means of producing goods are more important weapons for peace than arms. Arms may be necessary for defense against the common enemy of free governments, but the hearts and minds of people in the disadvantaged nations of the world can best be won by assisting them in improving their living standards.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD the editorial from the York, Pa., newspaper.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR MORSE

Although his name is seldom mentioned in any listing of outstanding leaders of the Democratic Party, it is possible that the qualities of Senator WAYNE MORSE of Oregon entitle him to a very high ranking among American politicians. One of the things about Mr. MORSE which is particularly striking, in our opinion, is the intelligent attention he gives to international affairs, the area wherein so many of our leaders are weak and, apparently, unambitious as far as basic facts are concerned.

Senator MORSE has the rare faculty, one can judge from his political behavior, of recognizing what is really important to the American people in the great international issues of the day. His recent letter to his Oregon constituents on the subject of Africa and Asia, for example, a report of which was carried not long ago in this newspaper, contained sensible and detailed recommendations for a revised foreign policy toward the so-called uncommitted and underdeveloped nations of Asia and Africa.

Mr. MORSE pointed out that the present policy of regarding these sectors from a predominantly strategic point of view, leading us to seek bases of military operation and to offer arms and weapons to governments, was mistaken. He said that the peoples of Asia and Africa see no advantage in accepting arms when what they want and need is help toward a better life. They need food, medicine, schools, factories, and the means and techniques of producing the goods of life rather than bombs and bullets, Mr. MORSE declared.

His remarks, moreover, were not the consequence of observation from afar. He headed the United States Senate delegation to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference in New Delhi, India, where he met and talked with leaders of the Asian and African nations, among them Prime Minister Nehru of India. Of Mr. Nehru, Senator MORSE said:

"The masses of Asia and Africa are following the views of Prime Minister Nehru of India in preference to the views of the Government leaders of Great Britain and the United States. Make no mistake about it. Nehru's emphasis on the strengthening of the political rights of the individual and his economic standards has a wide appeal in the underdeveloped countries. They see in Nehru and his 5-year economic plan for India a world leader who not only speaks a political philosophy of peace and humanitarian idealism, but who also offers a specific program for the economic betterment of the mass poverty of Asia and Africa. They refer to Nehru's program as the best possible offensive against communism."

On another major international issue, that of testing of nuclear weapons, Mr. MORSE was, as far as we know, the only Senator to offer a resolution in the Senate calling upon our Government to do everything possible to find ways of ceasing the tests pending definitive reports on the worldwide danger of radiation poisoning.

It seems to us that at a period when the need for high-minded leadership in the United States is so great, and when the caliber of most persons in public life leaves much to be desired, the Democratic Party and the American people would do well not to overlook the capacities of Senator MORSE.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 2020. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and the Social Security Act;

S. 2117. An act directing the Secretary of the Army to transfer certain buildings to the Crow Creek Sioux Indian Tribe;

S. 2469. An act for the relief of Dr. Brant Bonner;

S. 3142. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to extend the authority to lease out Federal building sites until needed for construction purposes and the Act of June 24, 1948 (62 Stat. 644), and for other purposes;

S. 3503. An act for the relief of Marie Inette Konomos;

S. 3741. An act to facilitate administration and management by the Secretary of Agriculture of certain lands of the United States within national forests;

S. 3754. An act to provide for the exchange of lands between the United States and the Navaho Tribe, and for other purposes;

S. 3915. An act for the relief of Chiyoko Yoshimoto;

S. 3944. An act to authorize the negotiation of a compact between the State of Minnesota and the Province of Manitoba, Canada, for the development of a highway to provide access to the northwest angle in such State;

S. 4032. An act for the relief of Mercede Svaldi;

S. 4088. An act to approve a repayment contract negotiated with the Heart Mountain Irrigation District, Wyoming, and to authorize its execution;

S. 4113. An act for the relief of Harold Pangelinan; and

S. 4214. An act for the relief of Mary F. C. Leute, the widow of Joseph Henry Leute.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2039) to clarify the requirements with respect to the performance of labor imposed as a condition for the holding of mining claims on Federal lands pending the issuance of patents therefor, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11477) to amend chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for the admission of certain evidence, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13192) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. GARY, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. DENTON, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. CANNON, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. FORD, and Mr. MILLER of Maryland were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 13262. An act to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act; and

H. R. 13760. An act to provide for the denial of passports to persons knowingly engaged in activities intended to further the international Communist movement.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 3368. An act to amend section 1870 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the district courts to allow additional peremptory challenges in civil cases to multiple plaintiffs as well as multiple defendants;

H. R. 6282. An act for the relief of the former shareholders and debenture note holders of the Goshen Veneer Co., an Indiana corporation;

H. R. 9262. An act for the relief of the estate of A. A. Alexander;

H. R. 10473. An act for the relief of Nipolito C. DeBaca;

H. R. 12126. An act to provide further protection against the introduction and dissemination of livestock diseases, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12226. An act to amend the Virgin Islands Corporation Act (63 Stat. 350), and for other purposes;

H. R. 13247. An act to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13450. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13475. An act to authorize an exchange of lands at the Rochester Fish-Cultural Station, Indiana;

H. R. 13580. An act to increase the public-debt limit; and

H. R. 13678. An act to provide in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for a loan service of captioned films for the deaf.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 13856, Calendar 2562, the independent offices appriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 13856) making appropriations for sundry executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 13856) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Washington; I wish to retain the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this is the independent offices appropriation bill for 1959, to replace the bill vetoed by the President on August 4.

In titles I, II, and III of the bill, the amounts for the 16 agencies and 10 corporation activities are identical with the amounts agreed to in conference on the vetoed bill (H. R. 11574), with 2 exceptions: The payment of $589 million to the civil service retirement and disability fund is deleted; and $100,000 was added by the House to the General Services Administration, to provide for the monetary allowance to former Presidents, together with staff and office space, and for pensions to widows of former Presidents, as authorized this week in Senate bill 607.

The total in the bill for independent offices is $5,993,404,900; and the total in the vetoed bill was $6,582,304,900.

In title IV of the bill, the committee has recommended additional supplemental estimates for several departments and agencies, in the amount of $110,052,000, as compared to estimates totaling $244,210,000. Most of these requests were supplemental estimates, sent to the House, as well as to the Senate, and are authorized by legislation passed this week. In considering these estimates, the committee determined which items are urgently needed and which items can be deferred until the next Congress, and recommended a scaling down of the estimates accordingly. It was necessary for the items to be handled in this manner, because the House committee had determined that no other appropriation bills would be initiated.

One of these items is for inpatient care in the Veterans' Administration in the amount of $1,802,000, to offset the lack of reimbursements, due to payments not being made by insurance companies on the basis of court decisions.

I defer to other subcommittee chairmen, to have them explain the items with which they are more familiar.

The amounts I have stated are those which will have to be maintained.

The several chairmen of the other subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee sat in on the deliberations on yesterday. Although these items technically are not part of the independent offices appropriation bill—for they belong in the appropriation bills for the other departments—yet it is necessary, under the circumstances, that the items be considered at this time, in connection with this measure.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc; and that the bill, as thus amended, be then considered, for the purpose of amendment, as original text, provided that any point of order against any amendment shall not be deemed to have been waived by the adoption of this proposed agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 46, after line 11, to insert:

"TITLE IV—ADDITIONAL SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

INDEPENDENT OFFICES"

On page 46, after line 14, to insert:

"SOUTH CAROLINA-GEORGIA-ALABAMA-FLORIDA AND TEXAS WATER STUDY COMMISSIONS

"For necessary expenses of the United States Water Study Commission for South Carolina-Georgia-Alabama-Florida, $50,000, and for the United States Water Study Commission for Texas, $50,000: *Provided*, That these appropriations shall be effective only upon enactment into law of S. 4021 and H. R. 12216."

On page 46, after line 22, to insert:

"VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

"Inpatient care

"For an additional amount for 'Inpatient care', $1,802,000."

At the top of page 47, to insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

"Bureau of Employment Security

"Unemployment Compensation for Veterans and Federal Employees

"Appropriations for the current fiscal year for 'Unemployment compensation for veterans,' and for 'Unemployment compensation for Federal employees,' are hereby merged into a single account to be known as 'Unemployment compensation for veterans and Federal employees'."

On page 47, after line 9, to insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

"Office of Education

"DEFENSE EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

"For grants and payments under the National Defense Education Act of 1958, $53,300,000 of which $8,000,000 shall be for capital contributions to student loan funds; $25,000,000 for grants to States and loans to nonprofit private schools for science, mathematics, and modern language teaching facilities and $1,800,000 for grants to States for supervisory and other services; $5,000,000 for grants to States for area vocational education programs; and $7,200,000 for grants to States for testing, guidance, and counseling: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H. R. 13247, 85th Congress."

At the top of page 48, to insert:

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses,' $750,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H. R. 13247, 85th Congress."

On page 48, after line 5, to insert:

"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"White House Council on Aging

"For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of the White House Conference on Aging Act, including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946, as amended (5 U. S. C. 55a), $100,000."

On page 48, after line 11, to insert:

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT

"Bureau of the Mint

"Salaries and Expenses

"Not to exceed $2,500 of the appropriation granted under this head for the fiscal year 1959 shall be available for the purposes of section 1 of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 201), authorizing the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to confer a medal on Rear Adm. Hyman George Rickover, United States Navy."

At the top of page 49, to insert:

"POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

"(Out of postal funds)

"Transportation

"For additional amounts for 'transportation,' fiscal year 1957, $23,000,000, and fiscal year 1958, $31,000,000."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at this time I shall be very glad to yield to any Senator who wishes to ask questions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington desire to retain the floor?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I shall hold the floor, in order to yield to any Senator who wishes to ask questions about the independent offices portion of the bill. The chairmen of the other subcommittees are here, and will be glad to answer questions about the items with which they are concerned which were added to the bill.

Mr. President, at this time I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. As I understand, all the amendments in the bill—except the appropriation item for the civil service retirement fund—which were in the other bill when it was passed by the Congress and was sent to the President, have been retained.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes, they have been retained.

For the information of the Senators from Tennessee, let me state that the long-needed item for planning the Federal building in Memphis is included in the bill.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate that. My colleague [Mr. GORE] and I are very much interested in it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. As I understand, in the deficiency bill which was passed by the Senate last week, $7 million-plus was restored to the civil-defense funds, so that the obligations of the Government under Public Law 606, on a matching basis, could be paid to the administrative help, teachers, and trainers, for civil defense. I understand this amount was eliminated in the conference, and was not agreed to in connection with the deficiency bill.

I understand that the pending bill also provides appropriations for civil defense; but I am unable to find any portion of

that fund which is earmarked for the application the Congress already has pledged itself to make—but without any funds to carry it out.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct; no funds are included in this bill for that particular portion of the civil-defense program, because the law was passed after we had considered the original independent offices appropriation bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In the supplemental bill on which the Senate acted, as the bill went to the conference, there was in it a proviso that the $3 million which was provided in the independent offices bill was to be carried over, for purposes of the new public law which was passed in July.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct, and the Senator from Minnesota was one of the sponsors of the amendment.

For some reason, the House conferees decided to eliminate it. It was to be available from the 1958 portion. It is not in the 1959 budget.

I am not familiar with what the conferees on the supplemental bill did; I was not one of the conferees. I hoped the amount would be retained; but it was not.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Are we to understand that this bill does not provide any funds for civil defense?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The bill does provide funds for civil defense; it provides $38,500,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the bill provide any amount for the purpose of implementing Public Law 606?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; nothing specifically for that purpose.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will funds for that purpose be available?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Well, a specific authorization for that would have to be had.

Mr. MONRONEY. Would it not be in order for the Congress to legislate at this time on that point? As I understand from the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], there was a cut in some of the funds which were included for other purposes, although those funds would not thus be used, in order to make possible the use of approximately $7 million which was urgently needed if the tens of thousands of people on which we must rely in the case of a national catastrophe are to be properly trained and maintained in a ready organization for civil defense.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I was a member of the conference committee. The conferees on the part of the House would not accept a specific appropriation for Federal contributions. But $3 million is available from previous years.

I would suggest to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] that they leave that available as it is, and permit the Director—if he cares to do so—to make it available for the Federal contributions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Can he do so?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes, he can; as I understand; it is available for the uses of civil defense.

But if we tried to earmark it for that, we would run into difficulties, and it would be put out. I am confident of that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Are the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] and I to understand from this colloquy that it is the understanding of the chairman of the Independent Offices Subcommittee [Mr. MONRONEY] and also the understanding of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who is one of the ranking minority members of Appropriations Committee itself, that the $3 million, which is a carryover from 1958, can be used for the purposes of Public Law 606, for the Federal contributions aspect of that law?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is my understanding it can be used for the purpose of civilian defense if the Director wants to use it for that purpose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The money is not available for matching purposes for the States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is available for use.

Mr. MONRONEY. In other words, we would have to pay 100 cents on the dollar.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Can we not ask permission to have it apply to Public Law 606, and thus have the $3 million do $6 million worth of work?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The bill is open to amendment. Provision for civilian defense is a part of the appropriation bill. If the Senate sees fit to put the matching funds provision in the bill, as it did in the supplemental appropriation bill, it can do so.

Personally, I think it should be done. The House has been adamant about this matter. This bill is a new version of a vetoed bill, which leaves the amount the same, with the exception of the two items I have mentioned.

I point out, however, that if the Senate puts an amendment such as this in the bill, it will have to go back to conference with the House, and the House has been almost adamant about the fact that we should not go to conference with this bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Why cannot the House accept our amendment?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It can if it wishes to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It seems to me the House ought to be accepting something. My experience in conferences has been that when we go to conference, the House gets what it wants.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have had that experience myself.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Washington has had more experience than I have had in that respect. Possibly he is immune to this sort of treatment. I must say my tender political skin seems to smart when, after a conference with our beloved brethren in the other House, we come out with less than what we thought was desirable, and much less than we thought should be provided.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The House comes out whole; we come out a little "skinned down."

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not a fact that having an amendment containing a provision making available the $3 million plus the $3 million matching money from the States, would provide $6 million payroll funds for teachers and others in the administrative functions of the State defense agencies?

Mr. MAGNUSON. If that is done; yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. But if we do not put such an amendment in the bill, we shall not be adding a cent to the bill making those funds available under Public Law 606. If nothing more than the $3 million were added, so that we would receive only $3 million worth of work, the House would be obstinate and not mindful of its task of watching the expenditures of the Treasury, if it turned down an amendment which, if adopted, would result in obtaining $6 million worth of work for an expenditure of $3 million in funds, rather than insist on paying $3 million, all in Federal money, for the work.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to say, respectfully, to the chairman of the committee and my colleagues, that I am just as much interested in this matter as they are; but it has been called to my attention that we agreed, in a conference on the supplemental appropriation bill, to strike out this amendment, after long hours of discussion.

Mr. RUSSELL. The conferees refused to recede on this amendment, and we made the House conferees take it back for a separate vote, and it was voted down in the House.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It would be very difficult for the Senate conferees to have the amendment considered again.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In the report on the supplemental appropriation bill we stated we were perfectly amenable, and Congress would at least be susceptible, to a sympathetic consideration of the matter, if and when the civil-defense agencies came forward with their plans.

Mr. MONRONEY. New money was added in the deficiency bill, with other totals changed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. We are not making a request for new money. We are merely trying to save the Government $3 million by providing for $3 million in matching funds, which would be available if the funds could be provided for under a one-line amendment in the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That would be true if the $3 million as provided in the bill were used for that purpose, but I want to be frank. I do not think the $3 million will be used for that purpose. I think the agency will wait 3 or 4 months to see what plans the States bring in under the law enacted with respect to matching funds for civil defense.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. It so happens I was in the conference on the supplemental appropriation bill. I think we all ought

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

to have full knowledge of what transpired. I would be one of the last to defend action taken by the House which conflicts with the collective views of the Senate; but in this case the Senate had proposed $4 million for matching funds of States, cities, and counties for the employment of personnel in the Civilian Defense Agency. The House refused to accept that amendment in conference. The Senate refused to recede. The House then took it back for a separate vote. The House insisted on its provision. We were prepared to go back and propose conferring further. I am not sure about the figures, the clerks of the committee will know the accurate figures; however, as I recall, the House agreed to allow $2½ million. We insisted on our position in the Senate for the second time. It went back to the House, and the House allowed $2½ million, or it may have been $2 million.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Two and one-half million for salaries and expenses.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sure of this; we allowed $2½ million. I think it was amendment No. 23. The House allowed $2½ million for payments to States, cities, and counties to match payments for personnel. We accepted that. After the House voted on it twice and the Senate voted on it twice, and we had agreed to it, I apprehend the bill would hit a considerable snag if the Senate increased the amount of $2½ million, because it was voted on twice in each body.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The $2½ million was for salaries and expenses.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I did not understand that was the action on the supplemental bill. I am appreciative to the Senator for this information. I understood the amount was well over $2 million for emergency costs, and $2 million for equipment and supplies, and nothing for Public Law 606 contributions.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is in error. It was either $2 million or $2½ million.

Mr. MAGNUSON. For salaries and expenses, which could be used for that purpose.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I know there are problems connected with this bill, and that the leader wants to get the bill over to the other body, and I am for that. Will the Independent Offices Appropriation Subcommittee look with favor upon a supplemental or deficiency request on this item in January?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Speaking for myself personally, I think we should. I think it is going to be a good program when the plans are received from the States. That is stated in the report. We passed the law. I think we ought to follow it up.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am in error. I want to correct it now. I am advised by the clerk who worked on the supplemental bill that the $2½ million was for salaries and administration. I was definitely of the opinion that it was for Federal contributions. It turned out the House, having voted twice on it, did not allow anything for that purpose.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I regret that this is the case, but I am also a realist about the problem the bill faces and the time element involved. I recall the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] told me the other day he would look with favor upon a legitimate, reasonable request relating to the purposes of Public Law 606. On that basis, with the assurances we have had from the chairman of the subcommittee, the chairman of the committee, and the ranking members of the committee I would say to my good friend from Oklahoma, who is such a great tower of strength in the effort to build our civil defense program, we ought to permit the bill to go on its way.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I appreciate the attitude of my friends from Oklahoma and Minnesota. The Senate committee was forced to add a few amendments, I would say of a rather minor nature. Those amendments have been reviewed by the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee with the chairman of the committee in the other body. I have the feeling that if the Senate should add any further amendments to the bill all we would do is require that the bill go to conference. Then we would have to spend some time in conference, which would delay the adjournment that we hope to have by this evening.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. For the third time, I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee on appropriations dealing with the independent offices. What is the status of the upgrading of manganese in the Butte, Mont., area, and especially in the domestic mining plant in Butte, Mont.?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The $3 million is still in the bill. That would make the Butte operation eligible. The Senator from Montana, who has been so diligent about this matter, and I have been in contact with the Office of Defense Mobilization. We are hopeful the agency will carry out the intent of Congress in relation to the $3 million, and Butte would be eligible. I think there would be a top priority. I hope the agency will not drag its heels, because I think this makes common sense.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I appreciate what the distinguished Senator from Washington has said. What he said is in fact the view of the ranking Republican member of the committee, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, that is all I have to say on the independent offices portion of the bill. As I stated previously, there are some urgent matters which were added because of the fact that this bill is the last appropriation bill. I think those matters involve definite obligations of the Congress to appropriate money by reason of legislation which we have passed recently.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senators from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. COTTON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senators from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH and Mr. PURTELL], the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA and Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], call up my amendment identified as 8–22–58–B.

Mr. President, I will not take long to explain the amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have promised not to take long in explaining the amendment, but in order that the Members may be on notice that there will be a vote, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may we ask that the amendment be read before action on the request for the yeas and nays? I think the Senate is entitled to know what is in the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Surely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. . The Congress hereby requests the President, from time to time during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, to review the expenditures programed by the executive branch for such fiscal year and to issue such directives to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and other officials in the executive branch of the Government as may be necessary to achieve the maximum reduction in the expenditures of the executive branch during such fiscal year consistent with the objectives of maintaining essential Government services, providing adequately for the common defense, and fostering a healthy national economy; all with a view toward achieving an aggregate of at least 2 percent on defense appropriations and at least 4 percent on other appropriations but not more than 10 percent on any one item, reduction in the expenditures programed by the executive branch as of July 1, 1958, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to authorize executive action to decrease expenditures for interest on the public debt, veterans' compensation, or pensions, Federal and State cooperative benefit programs, and expenditures from trust funds. A report of action taken under this chapter shall be contained in the 1960 budget.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I make a point of order. The amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill, and is therefore subject to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona makes the point of order that the amendment is legislation and is subject to a point of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will require a two-thirds vote to suspend the rule.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I accept the fact that the amendment is legislation. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and I filed notice in this regard. I ask for the yeas and nays on a vote to suspend the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been requested. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I renew my request for the yeas and nays on my motion to suspend the rules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays are requested. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, inflation is still a number one threat in America. It is not only a serious threat, but it is one the solution of which has not been met either by the legislative or the executive branch.

Today, instead of tackling this problem we are being asked to merely raise our debt ceiling further, thereby to enable us to finance our deficit spending schemes and further postpone the day of reckoning.

H. R. 13580, which was passed by the Senate yesterday, calls for an increase in our public debt by another $8 billion. This is the second proposed increase this year.

The need for this increase is based upon the prospect of a $12 billion deficit for the current fiscal year. This deficit comes on top of a $3 billion deficit for last year. This is serious, and the sooner Congress recognizes the inflationary aspects of this situation the better.

The only real way to deal effectively with this situation is to cut spending or face the inevitable result of higher taxes. Therefore, I am joining Senator BRIDGES and others in introducing an amendment to this bill which would authorize a 4 percent reduction in the expenditures of every Government agency except military below that amount which has been appropriated for fiscal 1959, and a 2 percent reduction in our military appropriations. This still leaves the military appropriation higher than requested by the Defense Department or the budget.

Under this amendment the cuts would not be mandatory. However this is an expression of opinion on the part of the Congress that it is our recommendation the funds should be rolled back. This is comparable to the action Congress took in 1950, at which time we passed a similar resolution to ask for a cutback in the appropriations.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I understand that the cut would not be compulsory. This would be an expression on the part of the Senate that we believe, in looking at the overall budget, the executive agencies and the various departments should be able to tighten their belts and squeeze out a little water and make some reductions. We have set as a goal the hope the reduction might be 4 percent on civilian matters and 2 percent on military matters. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct. As I explained, we have a precedent for this. We took this same action in 1950.

This week, when Mr. Stans, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, testified before the Senate Committee on Finance, I asked him a direct question as to whether he would recommend such an amendment be adopted to an appropriation bill, and I will read his reply into the RECORD at this point.

I asked:

> Would you say it would be advisable for us to make a broad, as an amendment to the final appropriations bill, cut across the board in the overall total, with discretionary authority in the administration as to how to apply it in various departments?
>
> It has been done before.

Mr. Stans said:

> As I recall, it was done in 1950 with respect to the 1951 budget.
>
> If the Congress undertook to do that, I personally not only would encourage it, but would do my best to see that it was properly applied.

Mr. President, the adoption of our amendment should result in a savings of around $2 billion in next year's budget.

This reduction would not apply to expenditures for interest on the public debt, veterans' compensation or pensions, Federal and State cooperative benefit programs or expenditures from trust funds. It would apply to all other departments and agencies of Government.

As these appropriation bills were considered many of us tried to reduce the amounts, but were unsuccessful. This is our last chance.

It should be pointed out that this is not the first time such procedure has been taken to cut appropriations. In 1950, Congress took similar action. As I have stated, only last week when testifying before the Senate Finance Committee, Mr. Stans, the Director of the Budget, endorsed such an approach as being the most feasible manner in which to make an overall cut. He went further and told our committee that in his opinion such action, in the face of the present inflationary threat, was not only in order but necessary.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. The amendment also provides, as I understand it, that at the end of the fiscal year there would be a report to the Congress as to what the agencies and departments have been able to do as to carrying out the legislative hope. Is that a correct understanding?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct. In the colloquy with Mr. Stans, we pointed out that there could be some withholding of spending on programs which have been authorized recently to combat the threat of recession. Now we have the renewed threat of inflation. Mr. Stans said he did not think we in Congress should criticize the executive branch for spending after we had appropriated the money unless we now go on record as being in favor of these cuts. Many of us have tried, unsuccessfully, to cut these appropriations. This is another and perhaps our last chance this year to curtail expenditures. Congress should go on record and express itself either for or against these expenditures and take its share of the responsibility.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. There are at least two reasons—perhaps three—why we might hope that progress could be made in the direction of the goal set out in the amendment.

First. The recession with which we were wrestling in the early part of the year has subsided in many areas, and has been alleviated in all.

Second. There is reason to believe that the rising cost of living scale which has been indicated by the index figures month after month is about to reach a plateau. So the increased costs which we anticipated when some of the bills were passed will not necessarily follow.

Third. World conditions are more stabilized than they were at the time some of these measures were passed.

There is nothing mandatory about the amendment. It simply expresses the hope that various agencies and departments will make these curtailments. It seems to me that some agencies would respond to the appeal so as to have a good scorecard when they make their report to Congress. I shall support the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, any effort at economy is laudable, but 2 or 3 questions arise in my mind with respect to this amendment.

We all know that the Congress and the President do not always see eye to eye with respect to appropriations which are made. We have an example of it today. The Congress did not give the President as much as he wanted in the foreign aid appropriation. We gave him more than he said he wanted in the defense appropriations.

Would not the effect of this amendment be to give the President a sort of item veto, so that he could take all the saving out of some fund which Congress may have thought was essential to be provided, while maintaining those with respect to which Congress had to reduce the amount which the President had requested?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No. It would give the President certain discretionary authority. However, on page 2, line 5, there is the limitation that not more than 10 percent reduction on any one item in the expenditures programed by the executive branch may be made.

We do not propose to repeal appropriations or authorizations. We are merely suspending and delaying the spending on projects which can be postponed or abandoned. That is the only way to reduce spending.

The only other alternative would be for Congress to review all the appropria-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

tion bills and make specific cuts. This we were unable to do even when the bills passed. As the Senator from Georgia knows, we were unable to do it at the time we passed the appropriation bills. I know that he tried to reduce these appropriations on many occasions. He pointed out last night when we passed the debt ceiling bill, that Congress had failed to control expenditures and said then that some action was needed. He reviewed the record, showing where we had failed to roll back appropriations to what we conceived might be a more realistic level, in line with our ability to spend.

As the Senator from Georgia points out, there is a certain amount of discretionary authority being given to the President under this amendment, but we did this in 1950. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and I and other Senators who were studying the subject could conceive of no other way which would be fair, other than to go over all the bills, and spell out the specific items. That would be impossible. This does give to the executive branch instructions to reduce expenditures and pledges to them our full support.

Mr. RUSSELL. The purpose is worthy, but I greatly fear the effect of the amendment. Let me cite one illustration.

There has been a controversy between the Congress and the executive branch as to the size of the National Guard for 1959. The Executive had requested that the guard be reduced to 360,000, which was a reduction of exactly 10 percent. Congress said, "No; we are going to maintain the size of the guard at the present level. We will maintain it at 400,000."

Under this amendment, the authority of the Congress to maintain the National Guard at 400,000 could be specifically thwarted, because, by the 10-percent reduction which the President might make, he could throw the National Guard back to where he wanted it originally. All the effort we have exerted to try to maintain the National Guard would go for naught, and we would immediately give the President the instrument to annul our action in seeking to maintain the National Guard at a strength of 400,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I supported the position the Senator speaks about, and would be just as much concerned as he is if we were jeopardizing the National Guard. But I insist this amendment does not do that. Even without the adoption of this amendment, the President could withhold spending, and do exactly what we are talking about. All we do under this amendment is give our approval and pledge of support.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. This was done in 1950, when the Korean war broke out President Truman—and I supported him in it—blocked many appropriations of Congress, and suspended further expenditures until after the Korean war was over.

The President has discretionary authority now. This amendment would give him the necessary moral support of Congress. With our endorsement these cuts can and would be made. It is not quite fair for us to appropriate $80 billion to spend the next year, and then go back home and say, "The executive branch is throwing away money," when we ourselves were not willing to answer the rollcall and say, "Let us cut it back."

This amendment places the responsibility in the Congress, where it belongs. I think we should accept it. We did the same thing before, in 1950, and I think our country faces an equally serious crisis today.

The administration's requests to Congress through the Budget Bureau have been substantially increased by our action in nearly every instance.

Billions above budgetary requests have been appropriated by this Congress, and most of it has been justified as antideflationary measures.

We should not go home without rescinding some of this especially in the light of the renewed inflationary threat.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish the amendment could have that effect, but, as the Senator has correctly stated, the President can now withhold the expenditure of appropriations. However, this amendment would be an invitation to him to withhold the expenditure of funds for purposes in which the Congress was interested and had appropriated more money than the President had asked for, while spending every dime of the appropriations which had been allowed, with respect to which Congress had given the full amount of the budget estimate by a very small majority vote.

In effect, I believe that the amendment would enable the President to exercise item vetoes with respect to certain items on which the views of the Chief Executive and the Congress are in conflict.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I am aware that this is not as good a way to reduce expenditures as though we had cut the appropriations when they were reported; but the time for doing that has passed.

Over a period of years an idea along this line has been proposed. It is workable. It would do no lasting harm. I sincerely hope the Senate will adopt the amendment.

I do not wish to occupy the floor at any length, because of the lateness of the hour on this closing day of Congress, but I urge the adoption of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Delaware and others, including my colleague from Nebraska.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this is obviously an attractive amendment at first impression but I agree with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] as to its effect and therefore believe it unwise. I think it would lead us into a very serious trap, especially in times of grave concern for the national security like this. When we place a fixed fiscal roof over ourselves in certain categories with percentages when we face the problems which we face in the world, we are making a tense resolution underwriting the concern of those who say that we put a price tag on everything—even security—that we are not worried about national security, but only about costs.

I feel I must vote "nay" on this particular amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I respect the position of the Senator from New York, and I am not questioning his sincerity in voting against the amendment. But in my opinion it is just as important to protect the security of the American economy as it is to protect the security of the world. I believe that the adoption of this amendment, if it were properly applied—and I do not believe we should vote for it unless we fully intend that the executive branch shall place it in operation—would result in a saving of between $1½ billion and $2 billion in next year's budget.

This is the minimum step we should take in the face of a $12-billion deficit for this current fiscal year.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I believe this is an excellent approach. I wish to have my name added to the amendment as a cosponsor. I congratulate the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DWORSHAK and Mr. COTTON addressed the Chair.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I believe that the adoption of the amendment is a means of placing discretionary authority in the hands of the President more strongly than it is there already, by way of encouragement. We must remember that the amounts which Congress has voted are substantially in excess of the budget requests called for. This is an excellent way to encourage the use of discretion on the part of the President, and I am happy to join the Senator in cosponsoring the amendment. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. I merely wish to take the opportunity to express my own appreciation to the Senator from Delaware for offering his amendment. It is an amendment on which the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has spent a great deal of time and thought. As the Senator from Delaware knows, the senior Senator from New Hampshire feels very strongly about this subject. From his many years of experience on the Committee on Appropriations and as chairman of that committee, he feels very strongly that it is perfectly feasible to adopt such an amendment. He is unavoidably absent from the Senate tonight, but he wished to make sure that the Senator from Delaware understood that the amendment had his very careful attention and that, from his experience on the Committee on Appropriations, he feels it is a very practical and feasible way to hold down expenditures.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the Senator for his support. It is true that the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire not only is in favor of the amendment but he drafted the amendment in cooperation with the Bureau of the Budget with respect to the language. He would have presented the amendment himself had he been here, but in his absence I have taken over that task.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Delaware very highly for presenting the amendment, to which

I have also added my name as a cosponsor. I believe the amendment points up the need for an item veto. It also shows the need for a single appropriation bill. We have now come to the end of the session, and we find the only recourse we have, after all the appropriating has been done, is to adopt an amendment like this. I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations I have consistently sought to cut appropriations and to economize wherever possible. However, I was one of those in committee who favored increases in our national budget to provide additional jet bombers and Polaris submarines, because I believe regardless of deficits or economies, and the need to economize, we should give top priority to national defense as we face Communist aggression and the many problems we face around the world.

I believe also that efforts have been made quite successfully throughout this session of Congress to attach the label of national defense to every conceivable spending program which had no justifiable reason to be adopted.

On the basis of national preparedness I believe we can give all the consideration to necessary spending, even if it is in excess of budget requests, but at the same time we must curtail all other programs which we can possibly curtail, and in that way cut down the potential deficit.

I should like to point out to the Senator from Delaware—and I am sure he is aware of the situation—that we have more than 2½ million civilian employees in the Federal Government, and that the payroll currently is almost $1 billion a month, which is approximately the size of the anticipated deficit. On that basis we could cut by at least 10 percent, if not more, the number of the employees, as the Senator from Virginia has frequently pointed out. We could probably save a billion dollars, if not a billion and a half dollars by cutting out unnecessary employees in the civilian branch of our Government. On that basis I think we can justifiably contend that we could have greater economy and greater efficiency in the operations of the Federal Government without jeopardizing in any way the need of giving top priority to the national defense budget.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator.

I, too, have complete confidence in the President in applying the cuts where they could be made without jeopardizing our national defense or security. I am in favor of giving the item veto power to the President, and its adoption would certainly help cut unnecessary expenditures. We will not really meet this problem or be able to cut unnecessary expenditures until we do give the President that authority. In the meantime we can adopt this amendment. It is an effort to achieve some degree of financial stability in our country.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. PURTELL. I am very much pleased to be a cosponsor of the amendment. I believe we should emphasize and reemphasize that it is not a mandatory provision.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct. However, it would have the effect of reducing expenditures.

Mr. PURTELL. It is a discretionary provision. We should take into consideration the fact that certain actions were taken in Congress earlier this year to meet conditions which have changed since we took the actions. Is that not correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

Mr. PURTELL. The amendment would permit the President to use discretionary power to cut those expenditures in connection with which conditions have changed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct. It would be an expression of our support for the President in reducing next year's expenditures by nearly $2 billion.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. At the outset I should like to commend the distinguished Senator from Delaware and the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire for their wisdom in offering the amendment at this stage of the session. It seems to me that Congress has forgotten the ardent support most Members had for cutting appropriations a year ago.

Today it seems to me that in view of the deficit which has been piled up, not only for fiscal 1958, but for fiscal 1959 also, inflation is our major problem in this country. Deficits certainly feed the fires of inflation. I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment and give the President discretionary authority to cut the appropriations wherever they can be cut.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the Senator for his support.

I emphasize that our amendment does not affect those expenditures such as interest, VA compensation, pensions, and so forth, the rates of which are fixed by law. Also, we leave certain discretionary authority with the President and the heads of each agency as to how they can best apply these cuts in each respective agency.

In the face of a $12 billion deficit for the next fiscal year, it is imperative that this minimum reduction of $2 billion be made.

Every Member of Congress knows that many of the increases in appropriations this year were made and defended as antirecession measures. The popular theme was spend—spend and borrow the difference—with the result that our appropriations for fiscal 1959 reached an alltime high for peacetime spending.

Our $12 billion deficit for fiscal 1959 represents more than the total expenditures on all Government operations for any of the New Deal years prior to World War II. In not a single year between 1933 and 1940 did total Government expenditures reach the $12 billion figure which now represents only next year's estimated deficit.

Our financial situation in America faces a crisis. Unless the stability of our Government is guaranteed, Government bonds will lose their popularity as the soundest investment.

Either we have to cut down spending—raise taxes—or face ruinous inflation.

Let us not forget the important lessons of history. More governments have failed as the result of reckless extravagance and disastrous inflation than ever were destroyed by armies. The historian Gibbons tells us that the great Roman Empire fell not as a result of the invasion of the armies from without, but as a result of the moral decay of its public officials and the people, accompanied by waste and extravagance on the part of the Government and the ruinous inflation resulting therefrom.

Some of the great powers of today are in serious financial difficulty as a result of the destruction of their currency through ruinous inflation. That must not happen in America.

Nobody wants to raise taxes and, apparently, not enough want to stop spending. But let us stop kidding the American people. This present fiscal policy of having our Government spend a billion dollars per month above its income cannot be defended and it has to stop.

The inflationary effects of our failure to deal with this huge prospective deficit can be disastrous. Already, more than one-half of the value of the American dollar has been destroyed during the past 20 years. That means that in 20 years, one-half the purchasing value of every savings account, every pension fund and every Government bond has been destroyed by this erosion of the American dollar.

Today, we are confronted with another round of deficit spending and another spiral of inflation which will only further depreciate our currency.

Only last week, the Federal Reserve System, recognizing this threat, raised the discount rate from 1¾ percent to 2 percent and in so doing clearly indicated the step was being taken to check the threat of another round of inflation. Their action was described as a method of applying the brakes. Yet, we are applying the brakes without first taking our foot off the accelerator. Let us cut down on the gas, or Government spending, and we would not need so much to use our brakes.

Heavy Government spending and huge Federal deficits are the basic causes of inflation. Large deficits and heavy Government expenditures represent extra gas being poured into our economy for the purpose of accelerating the boom.

We are now confronted with the situation where we are pouring these billions into our economy through the various antirecession proposals for the avowed purpose of accelerating our economy, and at the same time we find the Federal Reserve Board raising interest rates as a method of applying the brakes to check these inflationary threats; and there is even some talk of reestablishing price and wage controls. This is just as ridiculous, and it will be just as de-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

structive, as it would be for a man speeding down the highway at 70 miles an hour to step on the accelerator at the same time he was applying the brakes in an effort to bring his car under control.

America is a great country. It is our responsibility to keep it rich and strong both morally and physically as well as financially. But we can only do this by each of us doing his part.

First. We, as public officials, must stop promising everything to every pressure group for the sole purpose of getting ourselves reelected or for the purpose of perpetuating our political party in power; and,

Second. Each of us, in our individual capacity as State or local officials, as business, farmer, or labor groups, or as just average citizens, must stop trying to unload on the Federal Government all those responsibilities which we once recognized as our own.

Let us not overlook the fact that the interest alone on our national debt today is more than the total cost of all Government operational expenditures in any peacetime year prior to 1938.

The addition of the $12 billion deficit for the next 12 months to our national debt, without any foreseeable method of paying it, means not only are we saddling the future generations with this extra $12 billion debt but also that it will cost them another $360 million per year in extra interest charges to service this extra debt over the years to come.

Think of it. It will cost our children and grandchildren an extra $1 million per day just to pay the interest on this $12 billion deficit which we propose to add to the national debt next year.

It is argued that our huge national debt is the inevitable result of war. However, I point out that over one-third of our $280 billion debt is not the result of war, but the result of peacetime deficit spending. In the past 28 years, our Government has lived within its income only 4 times.

Our estimated deficit for fiscal 1959 added to our last year's deficit will more than cancel out the total of all the accumulated surpluses in the only 4 years of the past 28 in which we did have a balanced budget.

I strongly urge that Congress face this problem and adopt this amendment, thereby making this minimum cut in next year's expenditures by the $2½ billion as proposed.

Unless some such action is taken to deal with this prospective $12 billion deficit, the 85th Congress will go down in the RECORD as the most "financially irresponsible Congress in American history."

To those who are not concerned over this threat of inflation and say, "It can't happen in America," I say, "It is happening."

We are already well advanced toward that road where Government deficits are looked upon as just something to be expected or something that, if ignored, the evil will pass away.

As public officials we apparently neither have the will to cut expenditures nor the courage to levy the necessary tax to meet expenses. I ask this question, "If we don't do it now, when are we going to meet this challenge?"

It is time that we re-establish both in the mind of every Member of Congress and in the mind of every member of the executive branch that sound Jeffersonian principle:

> I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers to pursue our independence. * * * The same prudence which in private life would forbid our paying our money for unexplained projects, forbids it in the disposition of public money. (Thomas Jefferson.)

Mr. President, I think the adoption of this amendment is very clearly in the best interests of the American economy. I repeat what I said earlier: There is nothing mandatory, but it is an expression on the part of every Senator voting that we will support the executive branch if it will make these cuts, even though it hurts some of our own pet projects, and if properly applied the saving would be around $2 billion.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I may say that the question was before the committee and was thoroughly discussed at various times. It is definitely legislation upon an appropriation bill. It will be necessary to suspend the rule. It is a rider.

We have heard many discussions on the floor about improper procedure when we endeavor to suspend the rule to attach a legislative rider to an appropriation bill. That is one procedure to which I object.

But my specific objection is that if such an amendment were adopted, it would have a bad effect, to which I shall not be a party, namely, it would place in the hands of the President the discretion to make economies in the reserve operations of the defense, in the National Guard, or elsewhere. I shall not impose such restrictions upon the President or demand of him that he use his discretion to make a reduction of that kind.

The committee has endeavored, in every phase of its consideration of the military appropriation, to reduce items as they came to us from the different units of the Department of Defense, as well as from the Bureau of the Budget. To the best of our judgment, what we as members of the committee have recommended to the Senate and to Congress, has been the minimum which we could determine after many weeks and months of hearings, during which we developed the facts concerning our military needs.

I do not favor accepting, at the last minute, a proposal of this kind, which would say to the President, "You must make a reduction, percentagewise, from the total sum appropriated. Where you apply it will be at your discretion."

I will not agree to imposing such a burden and responsibility on the President. I have endeavored at every step of the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations, using my best judgment, after all facts had been given to us, to recommend and to vote for the sum of money which I thought was the wisest amount to appropriate.

Therefore, I shall have to oppose the amendment for two specific reasons. First, it will be necessary to suspend the rule, and I will not agree to that. Second, we have done our best to report the proper amount in the military appropriation. I will not say, after I voted in committee, that I did wrong, and that I am now asking the President to use his judgment to reduce what I thought was proper, when I voted for the sum contained in the appropriation bill.

Therefore, I have to oppose the amendment, even though I know my friend, the distinguished Senator from Delaware, is one of the ablest Members of this body. He possibly is one of the greatest financiers in the Senate, in that he can analyze any item relating to an appropriation or items relating to funds. He is one of the ablest members of the Committee on Finance. There is nothing about legislative procedure with which he is not familiar.

I know that he is acting on behalf of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the senior ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, in offering the amendment, because the Senator from New Hampshire is unable to be on the floor at this time.

I hope the amendment will be rejected. It is not a good amendment to be placed upon the bill at this time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Again I emphasize that this would not be the first time the rule had been suspended for the adoption of such an amendment. We did it in 1950, when President Truman was in the White House. If I recall correctly, both the Senator from Minnesota and I supported the amendment at that time. I have just as much confidence in President Eisenhower as I had in President Truman. If we want to reduce expenditures this is our last chance.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I have a high regard for the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from New Hampshire. I would not wish my remarks before to indicate anything to the contrary. I respect their sincerity and skill, and wisdom as they see it in what they propose. I should like to ask the Senator from Delaware this question, however.

As we all know, ceilings tend to become floors. The amendment really specifies certain percentages as objectives for the President. In addition, I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that certain categories of expenditures are not the type in which to make reductions. They are set forth in the next to the last paragraph—interest on the debt, veterans' compensation, Federal and State cooperative benefit programs, and so on.

In view of the volition which we all have, and the confidence in the President which we have, certainly on this side of the aisle, I wonder if we will not establish what we think are floors, but which will really become ceilings on reductions in the whole budget-making process, and therefore frustrate the whole design of the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think this is the proper way to cut appropriations. It is now our only way. That opinion is shared by Mr. Stans, the Director of the Budget, who has endorsed the principle of this amendment.

I have complete confidence in the President. I am certain that he will properly administer the proposed cuts. Certainly there will be no cuts in the interest on the debt. That is a fixed payment. So are the payments for veterans' compensation, pensions, and certain other payments fixed by law.

This is not only a proper amendment but it is exactly what we did in 1950, when confronted with a deficit of a small fraction of that confronting us today.

Mr. JAVITS. Would the Senator say that the condition of the world, in terms of national security, does or does not indicate the need to retain flexibility in fiscal affairs, a flexibility of which the amendment tends to deprive us?

Mr. WILLIAMS. This does not unduly restrict the President. I think the amendment would tend to improve our fiscal condition, as did a similar amendment in 1950. We were then confronted with a deficit of $1,500,000,000. Today, when we are spending at the rate of $1 billion a month over and above the amount which is being taken in, I as one Member of Congress think we should, before we go home, give some indication of our concern about these expenditures and serve notice that we intend to reduce them.

Let us not forget that we have completely ignored the administration's recommendations in many instances by appropriating billions above their requested needs. Such extravagance by Congress cannot be defended in the face of a $12 billion deficit. This amendment should be adopted.

Mr. JAVITS. If we made a material reduction in the number of unemployed—there are now approximately five million—the gross national product and the national income of the United States would far overtake the deficit, and trade policies and development policies will help us to do that.

Our real problem is that we reef in our sails when we ought to be sailing commensurately with the modern situation and our great opportunities.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I shall vote against the suspension of the rule. I shall do so, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, for a very practical reason. The bill has once been vetoed. It is back in the same form. The committees of the Senate and the House have agreed to 4 or 5 additional amendments, which the House has agreed to accept.

If we suspend the rule and attach this amendment—with the substance of which I agree in great part—we shall simply tie up the bill and will not be able to proceed to finish the business of the Senate tonight.

I hope the Senate will not vote to suspend the rule.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wholly concur in what the Senator from Massachusetts has said. I think the proposed course would be bad policy and bad practice. If this amendment were adopted, I believe we would do nothing but delay the Senate.

So I hope the Senate will not vote in favor of the motion to suspend the rule.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to speak for only a minute on this matter.

There are other reasons why the amendment should not be added to the bill. First of all, I doubt very much that the amendment is constitutional. The Constitution provides that the President shall either sign a bill or shall return it to the Congress; the President is not given the power of an item veto.

Furthermore, the amendment would say, in effect, that the Appropriations Committee would be 90 percent correct and 10 percent wrong, no matter what it might do, and that thus the President could eliminate the 10 percent.

Furthermore, the Congress is trying to adjourn sine die tonight; but if the rule is suspended and if the amendment is agreed to, and if the Congress then adjourns sine die, it might just as well turn over the government to the Bureau of the Budget. In that event, what would happen to the National Guard or the Rural Electrification Administration, to post office projects, to the Federal building's under General Services Administration, and to other important projects? In such cases, no matter what the Congress might have provided, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget could select any post office project—for instance that he did not like, and could say, "This is out."

This amendment would not lead to economy. Instead, it would lead to more tugs of war and more political manipulations—and more so than any other piece of legislation the Congress could pass.

If the Congress is responsible for the appropriations it makes, this power should remain in the Congress, not in the Bureau of the Budget.

The Bureau of the Budget submits its budget estimates to Congress. The Congress assumes that the Bureau of the Budget has carefully examined the estimates, and then tells the Congress what it thinks it needs or what it thinks should be spent.

This amendment, if agreed to, would only give more political power to enable some persons to juggle around the appropriation items that Congress already had voted. In addition, the amendment is unconstitutional, because, in practical effect, it amounts to a provision for an item veto.

Mr. President, if the Senate wishes to adopt the amendment, after suspending the rule, it can do so. But at this time, the Members of Congress are looking forward to returning to their homes. If the process this amendment involves were begun, the Members of Congress would, upon their return home, stay home, and never would have to return to Washington, for then they would have permitted the Bureau of the Budget to run the Government, and Congress would have nothing to say about these matters.

Mr. President, I have known the Bureau of the Budget to be wrong on many, many occasions.

Furthermore, at the present time the President can withhold appropriated funds from expenditure; that has been done on many occasions. But when that action is taken, it is subject to public opinion. Believe me, Mr. President, when that is done, a State or district that is hurt will immediately let that fact be known to the Senators from the State and to the Representatives from the district concerned.

Talk about making promises, in order to be reelected. Mr. President, what do my colleagues think this proposal is? In effect, this proposal says that no one in Washington, other than the Bureau of the Budget, knows anything about economy.

In all the appropriation bills this year—with rare exceptions, and they are exceptions which we felt were urgent necessities—the appropriations made were within the Budget estimates. Congress has not been spending money wildly—as some may charge. The administration has requested all these appropriation items.

But now it is proposed, on behalf of the administration and the Bureau of the Budget, "Well, we didn't mean it, boys. So let us take back 10 percent."

If the proposed action were taken, then, Mr. President, when the Appropriations Committees met—once such a provision had been enacted into law—if an appropriation item of $1 million were needed, the Appropriations Committees would have to recommend the appropriation of $1,100,000, so as to make sure that the $1 million which the committees were convinced was needed would actually be made available.

Furthermore, the proposed amendment should be handled by the Finance Committee, of which the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is a member; and the Finance Committee should hold hearings on the amendment.

In addition, the amendment would establish an unheard of precedent; and the amendment also would be unconstitutional.

Mr. President, I hope the motion to suspend the rule will be rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Washington, particularly his reference to the effect of the amendment, when he said it would increase the power of the Bureau of the Budget.

Certainly we should be restricting the power of the Bureau of the Budget, not enlarging it, because I believe too much power already has been delegated to the Bureau of the Budget.

I believe the amendment is nothing but a disguised attempt to delegate legislative power; and the Senator from Washington and I know that Congress does not have that power.

If I were to place a label on the amendment, I would label it the Sherman

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Adams amendment [laughter], for the amendment would entrench further a man who should be out of the White House, not in it, because he has already demonstrated his betrayal of the public trust and the fact that he is unfit for public service.

But by means of the amendment, in my judgment, he would be given even more power over the fiscal affairs of the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to suspend the rule, in order that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], on behalf of himself and other Senators, may be entertained.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If they were present and voting, they would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOBLITZELL] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay," and the Senators from West Virginia and North Dakota would each vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOBLITZELL], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] would each vote "yea."

The pair of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] has been previously announced.

On this vote the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOBLITZELL] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from North Dakota would each vote "yea," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 45, not voting 21, as follows:

YEAS—30

Aiken	Dworshak	Morton
Allott	Goldwater	Mundt
Barrett	Hickenlooper	Potter
Bennett	Knowland	Purtell
Bush	Kuchel	Schoeppel
Capehart	Langer	Smith, Maine
Case, S. Dak.	Lausche	Thurmond
Cotton	Malone	Watkins
Curtis	Martin, Iowa	Wiley
Dirksen	Martin, Pa.	Williams

NAYS—45

Anderson	Hennings	Monroney
Beall	Hill	Morse
Bible	Humphrey	Murray
Carroll	Jackson	Neuberger
Case, N. J.	Javits	O'Mahoney
Church	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Clark	Johnston, S. C.	Proxmire
Cooper	Jordan	Robertson
Douglas	Kefauver	Russell
Ellender	Kerr	Smathers
Ervin	Long	Sparkman
Fulbright	Magnuson	Stennis
Gore	Mansfield	Symington
Green	McClellan	Talmadge
Hayden	McNamara	Thye

NOT VOTING—21

Bricker	Flanders	Kennedy
Bridges	Frear	Payne
Butler	Hoblitzell	Revercomb
Byrd	Holland	Saltonstall
Carlson	Hruska	Smith, N. J.
Chavez	Ives	Yarborough
Eastland	Jenner	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present not having voted in the affirmative, the motion to suspend the rule is rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion to suspend the rule failed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, there is a clerical error on page 48 of the bill. The item is for the necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of the White House Conference on Aging. The title reads "Council." On page 48, line 7, I move to strike out the word "Council" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "Conference."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 47, between lines 9 and 10, it is proposed to insert the following:

BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS

Salaries and Expenses

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," including performance of safety functions of the Secretary under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended; performance of functions vested in the Secretary by section 8 (b) and (c) of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, 1958; and rental of office space in the District of Columbia; $300,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). The Senate will be in order. Senators will take their seats, and refrain from conversation. It is impossible for the Senator to be heard in the Chamber.

The Senator from Colorado may proceed.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the amendment which I offer is for the purpose of obtaining an appropriation of $300,000 to start work on two of the pieces of legislation which the Congress has enacted. The first is the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, and the second is the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act.

Many Members of the Senate will recall that I was not particularly enthusiastic about the form of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, which was enacted, but I bow to the will of the Senate and I bow to the will of the other body as it has been expressed in the enactment of the legislation.

I supported the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act. I thought the other act was a very picayunish and weak attempt to deal with a very serious subject.

According to the terms of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, all businesses must begin filing reports with the Department of Labor the first of the year. We must get started with the work. We have to take care of the matter. We have to provide for the work.

The amendment has been discussed with the senior Senator from Arizona, and I understand the amendment is not acceptable to the Senator. Nevertheless, I feel the amendment should be acted upon favorably at this time.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this matter was considered by the committee. Our information was that in the regular appropriation $1.4 million was available, and we thought the Department could get along until January without additional money.

Mr. ALLOTT. It is my understanding that the Department will have no money until January, until the Congress meets and appropriates money, to handle these two acts.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is not our understanding. In any event, the committee saw fit, after consideration, not to undertake the provision of additional funds. The committee felt the matter could very well go over until January.

Mr. ALLOTT. I have stated my understanding, Mr. President. That is the only personal information I have on it. If we can spend days, weeks, and years passing these acts, it is time we started to appropriate money to implement them.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MORTON. Has the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act been passed?

Mr. ALLOTT. That is the longshoremen's safety legislation we considered.

Mr. MORTON. That is not the act we amended last night?

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes; that is the one.

Mr. MORTON. Did the House pass the bill without our amendment? I do not see how that act could have been passed.

Mr. ALLOTT. I cannot be certain what the situation is in the House. The situation, with respect to the other matter, is that the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act will be the law, if the President signs it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. (Putting the question.)

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I respectfully request, and ask unanimous consent, that the Chair restate the question, because it is very obvious that with the confusion in the Senate, when the Chair asked for the "ayes" one Senator answered in the negative. It was obvious that the confusion was such that the question was not understood.

I ask unanimous consent that the question may be repropounded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair will put the question again.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 47, after line 2, it is proposed to insert the following:

GRANTS TO STATES FOR UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE ADMINISTRATION

Funds appropriated under this head for the current fiscal year shall be available for basic grants or allocations for each State based on a weekly average of State-insured unemployment of 2,200,000 and contingency funds provided thereunder for unemployment compensation increased claims loads shall be available for workload increases in excess of those upon which each such basic grant or allocation was made.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, the purpose of my amendment is to make clear the workloads which the State employment security agencies are expected to perform in 1959. The amount of the appropriation will remain the same as was approved by the conferees and subsequently by the House and the Senate, $325,600,000. This $325,600,000 is divided between a basic appropriation of $301,400,000 and a contingency fund of $24,200,000. The basic amount of $301,400,000 is to take care of known workloads at cost levels prevailing when allocations are made to the States.

The problem to which this amendment is addressed arises from the fact that the report of the conferees requires the State employment security agencies to process the workloads associated with insured unemployment averaging 2,500,000 per week for $301,400,000 in 1959.

In acting on the regular Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill for 1959, the Congress approved a base appropriation of $295 million to process workloads at an insured unemployment averaging only 2 million per week. Also, in 1958, when insured unemployment averaged 2,200,000 per week the State employment security agencies expanded $295 million. To perform the same workload in 1959 will require an additional $6,400,000 because of certain mandatory cost increases, including the cost of the increased postage rates recently approved by the Congress.

Department of Labor officials have informed me that the only way in which claims to unemployed workers were paid promptly in most cases in 1958 was by diverting staff from the employment service and other necessary functions. When unemployment is as high as it is it does not make sense to me to take staff away from job placement activities. More job placement work needs to be done.

If the action of the conferees is not changed the State employment security agencies will have to do the same work as they did in 1958 with 4,000 fewer people. Under such circumstances Congress will have no one to blame but itself if there is an increase in erroneous unemployment-insurance payments. The present amendment will correct this inequity.

I urge that the amendment be approved.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I wish to say to the Senator from Michigan that I associate myself with everything he has said. I think he is proposing a good amendment, which is basically sound. Unless this amendment is adopted 4,000 people will have to be discharged, in offices which are already overtaxed and overburdened with a number of cases far beyond the estimates made by the Department of Labor at the time the quota was set and the allocation was made.

I further assure the Senator that the question was fully discussed before the committee. The proposal was put to a vote, which resulted in a tie, and therefore it did not carry.

I will support the Senator from Michigan in every way I can in connection with his amendment, because of its basic soundness. However, at this moment I think we are fighting a losing cause.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I concur in what the Senator from Rhode Island has said. I supported the amendment in the committee. I feel that it is a worthy amendment. Many Members felt that there should be more testimony before the amendment was placed in the bill. I sharply differed with their viewpoint, but I realize that we had to go along after the amendment was voted down.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, we are faced with a very serious situation. I am quite sure that the House would not accept this amendment if it were sent over, particularly in view of the fact that it is subject to a point of order. It would change existing law. That would make it doubly sure that the House would not accept it. My advice to our friend is that we shall have to let it go, without action.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will accept the amendment. If the House is adamant, I know that nothing can be done. However, I do know that many Members of the House are familiar with what this amendment would do. All States would be affected equally by the amendment, and I think the action of the House has been based more upon misinformation than upon any attempt to study the program.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, unfortunately the amendment would make a change in the law. For that reason it is subject to a point of order, and for that additional reason I am sure the House would not accept it. Under those circumstances I am afraid we shall have to drop the amendment.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief comment on the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan. I am not a member of the Appropriations Committee, as are the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Rhode Island, and the Senator from Michigan. I cannot comment on it with the familiarity with which they can discuss it, but I support the general purposes of the Senator's amendment. I come from a State which, unfortunately, has had a very high degree of unemployment in recent years because of prices in the lumber industry. Had I been a member of the Appropriations Committee I would have voted to support the amendment.

Mr. POTTER. I thank the Senator. I know the views of the distinguished chairman of our Appropriations Committee, who also supported the provisions of the amendment. I had hoped that we might adopt the amendment and that it might go to conference, with the understanding that the conferees on the part of the Senate would do the best they could.

Mr. HAYDEN. The bill is not going to conference. It will be sent back to the House. Clearly, inasmuch as the amendment provides that money appropriated for one purpose shall be available for something else, it is subject to a point of order, and I shall be compelled to make the point of order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I think we are all sympathetic toward the objectives of the amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Surely we are.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The quota was based on an unemployment roll of 2,200,000.

Mr. POTTER. That is correct.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. MAGNUSON. I hold in my hand the morning newspaper. The Department of Labor says the figure is 2,200,000.

Mr. POTTER. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Department of Labor is wrong, we need more money. However, the allotment is based upon that figure.

I think we can handle the situation. We cannot go to conference. If we were to go to conference on this question, we might arrive at some adjustment. We are hopeful that the agency will get along. If it does not, we shall be the first to see that funds are made available. All we can do is to follow the estimates of the Department of Labor.

Mr. POTTER. The Department of Labor based its estimates on a figure of 2,200,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is what it says this morning.

Mr. POTTER. But the conference report is based upon 2,500,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The figure stated this morning is 2,282,000. I am sure that is not typical of the situation in Detroit.

Mr. POTTER. I hope the situation will improve. I recognize the parliamentary situation we are in at the present time, and I hope the colloquy we have engaged in will serve as an impetus when Congress reconvenes in January for action on our part.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I have a breakdown showing what this means State by State. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRANTS TO STATES APPROPRIATION, FISCAL YEAR 1959, ESTIMATED DISTRIBUTION OF POSITIONS TO BE ELIMINATED BY STATE

Region I:	
Connecticut	80
Maine	20
Massachusetts	160
New Hampshire	20
Rhode Island	44
Vermont	12
Region II:	
New Jersey	180
New York	508
Puerto Rico	20
Virgin Islands	-----
Region III:	
Delaware	8
District of Columbia	24
Maryland	76
North Carolina	68
Pennsylvania	344
Virginia	36
West Virginia	36
Region IV:	
Alabama	64
Florida	76
Georgia	52
Mississippi	32
South Carolina	40
Tennessee	64
Region V:	
Kentucky	56
Michigan	216
Ohio	212
Region VI:	
Illinois	204
Indiana	84
Minnesota	56
Wisconsin	56
Region VII:	
Iowa	36
Kansas	32
Missouri	76
Nebraska	16
North Dakota	12
South Dakota	8
Region VIII:	
Arkansas	44
Louisiana	44
Oklahoma	44
Texas	172
Region IX:	
Colorado	32
Montana	16
New Mexico	16
Utah	24
Wyoming	8
Region X:	
Arizona	36
California	372
Hawaii	12
Nevada	12
Region XI:	
Alaska	8
Idaho	20
Oregon	44
Washington	68
Total	4,000

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I must make the point of order that the amendment changes existing law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona makes a point of order against the amendment. The Chair has examined the amendment. It is the ruling of the Chair that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, and therefore subject to a point of order. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 13856) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to table was agreed to.

INCREASE IN DIVERSION OF WATER FROM LAKE MICHIGAN INTO THE ILLINOIS WATERWAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2) to authorize the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test on a 3-year basis the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

MESSENGERS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 13861.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 13861), to repeal certain provisions of law relating to messengers for the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the bill was passed yesterday by the House of Representatives. It affects the position of messengers with the Ways and Means Committee of the House, and makes the messengers members of the committee staff as such. It does not create any new positions. It is a matter which relates entirely to the House of Representatives. In view of the comity which exists between the two Houses of Congress, I ask that the Senate approve the measure at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 13861) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TOLEY'S CHARTER BOATS, INC., AND OTHERS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 3193.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3193) for the relief of Toley's Charter Boats, Inc., Toley Engebretsen, and Harvey Homlar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement explaining the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay Toley's Charter Boats, Inc., the sum of $37.65, and to pay Toley Engebretsen and Harvey Homlar, of Salerno, Fla., the sum of $3,227.10. The payment of such sums represents a refund of taxes paid pursuant to section 3469 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 (relating to tax on the transportation of persons).

STATEMENT

Section 3469 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 was amended by the Revenue Act of 1951, so as to make clear that the tax on the transportation of persons did not apply to amounts paid for transportation by boat for the purpose of fishing from such boat. Under the amendment no further returns relating to such transportation were required. This amendment of the Internal Revenue

Code did not provide for refund of taxes previously paid. On March 31, 1953, the United States District Court for the Northern District of Florida (110 F. Supp., Fla., 892) held that the transportation tax did not apply to fares paid prior to November 1, 1951, for fishing parties and that, therefore, the tax was legally assessed and collected.

The records of the Internal Revenue Service indicate that the sums involved in this bill represent taxes which were paid with respect to charges made for the charter of fishing boats by the partnership of Toley Engebretson and Harvey Homlar for the period from February 1945, through July 1951, and by Toley's Charter Boats, Inc., for the months of August, September, and October 1951. The last payment was made by the partnership on August 1, 1951, and the last payment was made by the corporation on November 5, 1951. No further returns were required because of the amendment of the Internal Revenue Code by the Internal Revenue Act of 1951.

On November 15, 1955, the district director at Jacksonville, Fla., received claims for refund from the taxpayers for the amounts involved in this bill. On September 28, 1956, letters were sent to these taxpayers advising them that the 4-year statute of limitation on credits or refunds provided by section 3313 of the 1939 code had expired prior to the date the claims were filed and that no consideration would be given to the claims.

The Department of the Treasury in its report on this legislation states that it is not in favor of the enactment of the bill, citing the expiration of the statute of limitations as the reason for the unfavorable recommendation.

The committee, however believes that the legislation should be approved. It is clear as a result of the decision of the United States district court that the Government has received moneys to which it was not entitled under the general provisions of the internal-revenue laws. It is also clear that by the time this decision was rendered the claimants' opportunity to file claim for refund had expired. These facts taken together lead the committee to believe that the claim is meritorious and that it should be favorably considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3193) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ARTHUR LEROY BROWN

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 165) for the relief of Arthur LeRoy Brown, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding any statute of limitations or lapse of time, the jurisdiction conferred upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi by subsection (b) of section 1346, title 28, United States Code, is hereby extended to a civil action, which may be commenced not later than 1 year after the enactment of this act, asserting any claim or claims of Arthur LeRoy Brown, of Purvis, Miss., against the United States for money damages arising out of personal injuries and property damage sustained by him in an accident which occurred near Camp Shelby, Miss., on February 26, 1942, between a United States Army vehicle and a vehicle owned and operated by the said Arthur LeRoy Brown.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to S. 165.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

WILLIAM F. PELTIER

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2146) for the relief of William F. Peltier, which were in lines 3 and 4, strike out "the act of October 20, 1951 (65 Stat. 574)" and insert "title 7 of the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 (71 Stat. 115)", and in lines 8 and 9, strike out "for the benefits of such act prior to October 20, 1956" and insert "for the benefit within the time limit prescribed in section 705 of title 7 of the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957: *Provided*, That the said William F. Peltier shall file an application for such benefits within one year of the effective date of this act."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

PORTSMOUTH, R. I.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2836) for the relief of the town of Portsmouth, R. I., which were, on page 1, lines 6 and 7, strike out "the amount due such town from the Public Housing Administration as"; and on page 1, line 11, strike out all after "Act" down through and including "thereof" in line 1, page 2.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

LASZLO CSERI

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3028) for the relief of Laszlo Cseri, which were, on page 2, line 1, strike out all after "Act" down through and including "Act" in line 4; on page 2, after line 4, insert:

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dorothy Margarethe Hadjisky, Maria Miceli, and Francesco Riso may be issued visas and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That suitable and proper bonds or undertakings, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

SEC. 3. The exemptions provided for in this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Laszlo Cseri, Dorothy Margarethe Hadjisky, Maria Miceli, and Francesco Riso."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on August 14, 1958, the Senate passed S. 3028, to waive the excluding provision of existing law relating to one afflicted with feeblemindedness in behalf of the minor beneficiary. The House of Representatives has passed S. 3028, with amendments to include the beneficiaries of 3 individual similar Senate bills, S. 3814, S. 3950, and S. 4061, which also passed the Senate and were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, on August 14, 1958. The beneficiaries of these bills are either the spouses or children of United States citizens or lawful resident aliens, and the House of Representatives, because of the lateness of the session, has grouped them together to insure passage prior to adjournment so as to prevent further separation of the families involved.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to S. 3028.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

REQUIREMENT FOR PERFORMANCE OF CERTAIN LABOR ON MINING CLAIMS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2039) to clarify the requirements with respect to the performance of labor imposed as a condition for the holding of mining claims on Federal lands pending the issuance of patents therefor, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That the term "labor", as used in the third sentence of section 2324 of the Revised Statutes (30 U. S. C. 28), shall include, without being limited to, geological, geochemical and geophysical surveys conducted by qualified experts and verified by a detailed report filed in the county office in which the claim is located which sets forth fully (a) the location of the work performed in relation to the point of discovery and boundaries of the claim, (b) the nature, extent, and cost thereof, (c) the basic findings therefrom, and (d) the name, address, and professional background of the person or persons conducting the work. Such surveys, however, may not be applied as labor for more than 2 consecutive years or for more than a total of 5 years on any one mining claim, and each such survey shall be nonrepetitive of any previous survey on the same claim.

SEC. 2. As used in this act—

(a) The term "geological surveys" means surveys on the ground for mineral deposits by the proper application of the principles and techniques of the science of geology as they relate to the search for and discovery of mineral deposits;

(b) The term "geochemical surveys" means surveys on the ground for mineral deposits by the proper application of the principles and techniques of the science of chemistry as they relate to the search for and discovery of mineral deposits;

(c) The term "geophysical surveys" means surveys on the ground for mineral deposits through the employment of generally recognized equipment and methods for meas-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

uring physical differences between rock types or discontinuities in geological formations;

(d) The term "qualified expert" means an individual qualified by education or experience to conduct geological, geochemical or geophysical surveys, as the case may be.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, this matter has been cleared by the chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and has also been cleared on the minority side. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS AND SENATOR MANSFIELD OF MONTANA

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, very soon we will have finished up our work and the Senate can adjourn. We will melt away in every direction. I am reminded of what happens when a glob of mercury is dropped—little bits of that quicksilver scatter to the four winds, and only God can get it back together. Once the Members of this Congress separate, we are like that mercurial globule, as we will never be again together as we are today. This makes me sad, as it has been an interesting time, with not a dull man or woman in the Senate.

I cannot leave here without trying to express a deep and personal feeling. As Shakespeare put it in Henry IV, I have a "dear and true industrious friend." He is probably the most impatient of us all, as being in a hurry is, I think, one of the tributes he pays to life. Nevertheless, I would like to express for myself, and I am certain it is shared by many others, our genuine gratitude and respect for the magnificent job he has done as majority leader of the United States Senate.

LYNDON JOHNSON will be the first to protest, to tell us he can do nothing by himself, and any glory of accomplishment during this hectic 85th Congress should be shared among each and every Member of the Senate and the House. In this humility, my friend is right, as it took 20 separate mules to pull the wagon trains across the western deserts in the days when 20-mule teams were all we had to do the heavy pulling I might point out to him that we have replaced the power used in pulling, but the great trains of today still have to have a driver; and behind the robots of tomorrow there will always be some skillful hand and experienced mind to guide them, even if just to push the buttons.

I am sure LYNDON JOHNSON will be with us for many, many years; and, believe me, I would be less hopeful for the future if I did not feel that way. His wisdom, his experience, his capacity for work, and his devotion to this country are ingredients sorely needed in any recipes for the future of this troubled world.

Among these outstanding Americans on both sides of the aisle, LYNDON JOHNSON stands out as one of the most effective leaders of our era. He is dedicated to his responsibilities, so much so that even those who sit beside him, on occasion rebel because he drives so hard, because he sometimes gets tough, and because he is forceful. LYNDON has acquired such skill and mastery of leadership that he amazes even those of us who think we know him. In every way he has become an artist. He loves the work he does, and he has acquired perfection in the manner he performs that work. This would seem to be the ultimate to any man, and a blessing to those for whom such man would do his work. I only hope the people of this country realize what he represents. He is indeed that rare man who has so much to give, and so little to get. To me, this makes him a statesman.

In my judgment, our majority leader has been particularly magnificent in his courage, his strength of conviction, his willingness to work and fight, and his rare quality of having time to think things through, without "holding up the game." He deserves loyalty—and he gets it. He needs a fine staff—and he has it. He faced a grim battle—and he won it. He merits our respect—and we give it.

Now I hope he enjoys a long and restful vacation—because he needs it—and so do we all.

Now, Mr. President, no leader can operate effectively without a loyal and conscientious staff. It is doubly fortunate, Mr. President, that in having an outstanding leader we also have the benefit of his fine staff. I have particular reference to Bobby Baker, the secretary for the majority, a young man who has that rare gift of getting things done with a minimum of time and a maximum of efficiency. I like to refer to Bobby Baker as LYNDON, Junior, an accolade he well deserves. Bobby Baker, in turn has the benefit of an extremely able assistant in the person of Jay McDonnell, whom we all know and like for his devotion to the many tasks at hand and his sparkling Irish disposition. No two men have been more cooperative and helpful than our Secretary of the Senate Felton "Skeeter" Johnston and our Sergeant at Arms Joe Duke, and I would be amiss if I did not say thanks. Time forbids me from listing by name all of the many fine people we are fortunate to have with us, Mr. President, so I would like to pay tribute to them en bloc.

Mr. President, in expressing my feelings on our excellent leadership, it is only natural to pay deserved tribute to our tireless majority whip, the distinguished junior Senator from Montana. MIKE MANSFIELD, the able, amiable right hand of the leader, has performed yeoman's service in the leader's absence and has constantly impressed his colleagues with his broad grasp of legislative problems. I will never forget his unstinting support of the Minerals Stabilization bill when that measure was under debate and I happened to be acting as floor manager. Drawing from his vast knowledge gained first as a hardrock miner and later as a mining engineer, MIKE MANSFIELD'S contributions to the progress of that legislation in the Senate will long be remembered by those who have the interests of our country's mining at heart. A man of great versatility, Senator MANSFIELD is equally at home in the field of international relations and his great understanding of foreign policy was rewarded by his appointment by the President of the United States as a delegate to the United Nations Assembly. Quite apart from his accomplishments as an outstanding lawmaker is the pleasant, easy-going, friendly man who manages to get so much done with so little fuss and fanfare. His trademark is his pipe and he has done more for that particular type of smoking equipment that any man since Sherlock Holmes. It is a genuine pleasure, Mr. President, for me to add the name of MIKE MANSFIELD to that illustrious roll of Senate leaders who constantly work for a better Nation in a better world.

SENATOR MARTIN OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I note the presence in the Chamber of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]. When felicitations were being extended to him yesterday I was necessarily absent from the floor. I should like to associate myself with the tributes which have been expressed to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania. I wish for him a long life of happiness full of recognition as one of the great gentlemen of the Senate and one of the great soldiers of our country. He carries with him from the Senate the best wishes of every Member of the Senate.

It was my pleasure to be his seatmate for a time in the rear of the Chamber. I learned much from his willingness to share his knowledge with those who know so much less than he does. All of us extend to him and his lovely wife our very best wishes for a long life.

MR. AND MRS. CARMEN SCOPPETTUOLO—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4059) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Carmen Scoppettuolo. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

SOLUTION OF TEXAS WATER PROBLEM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, tremendous advances in reaching

a solution to the Texas water problem were made during the second session of the 85th Congress.

A total of $28,993,000 was appropriated for work on 38 water development and conservation projects in Texas.

A joint report, entitled "Water Developments and Potentialities of the State of Texas," was prepared by the State Board of Water Engineers, the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Soil Conservation Service. This document outlined the necessary mechanics for interagency cooperation for a unified Texas water program.

Legislation providing for establishment of a study commission on the river basins of Texas was passed.

Money was authorized for the construction of five experimental plants for the conversion of salt and brackish water into fresh water.

The 38 projects for which appropriations were voted during this session of Congress represent sound investments for the future. The study commission we have established provides the framework for an integrated and cooperative investigation and survey of the Neches, Trinity, Brazos, Colorado, Guadalupe, San Antonio, San Jacinto, and Nueces River Basins.

It should be pointed out that this commission respects the concept that basic leadership in the field of water must come from the grassroots. It will be dominated by State-level people. It will in no way authorize the Bureau of the Budget to withhold approval of funds for projects in Texas already authorized on the basis that surveys have not yet been completed.

The advantages of such a study commission have been demonstrated in other States. In 1949, I was cosponsor of similar legislation calling for a study of the Arkansas, Red, and White Rivers. The obvious benefits from this approach led to a Presidential directive in 1951 to set up a similar study for seven New England States.

Legislation authorizing construction of the water-conversion plants is of major importance not only to Texas but to the Nation and to the world. President Eisenhower in his address before the United Nations General Assembly on August 14 pointed out that new horizons are opening and amazing progress is being made in the desalting of water.

These experimental plants represent a significant advance in achieving economical means of desalting seawater in the coastal areas and treating brackish water in the interior.

In Texas we have 370 miles of coastal area and 3,826 square miles of inland water area. Successful and economical conversion of sea and brackish waters is essential. The fresh-water problem is getting more serious all the time, and the five new water-conversion plants will represent the first major progress we have made toward reaching a solution.

The importance of these programs cannot be underestimated. But neither can we afford to underestimate the extreme urgency of the water problem in Texas. We are 20 years behind in seeking solutions. Water use in Texas has increased 24 times since 1940. Expanding industry, swelling metropolitan populations, increased agricultural irrigation have resulted in sharp increases in water consumption—and further increases in consumption are ahead.

Texas is green again. Heavy rains this year and last have provided major breaks in the 11-year drought. But we cannot permit the comforting picture of lush pasturelands over the State to lull us into beautiful thoughts about the future. Substantial progress has been made from a legislative standpoint. But we must continue to work for necessary programs.

Weather experts predict a recurrence of the Texas drought—even though heavy rains in the spring of 1957 and 1958 gave us much relief. University of Texas meteorologists expect that we will once again suffer the pangs of public and private thirst within the next 15 or 20 years.

We must go forward now so that we will be prepared for the future.

NINETIETH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF FORMER VICE PRESIDENT JOHN NANCE GARNER ON NOVEMBER 22, 1958

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as we enter the closing days of this session, I call attention to an approaching anniversary of a great American who once presided over this body.

On November 22, 1958, John Nance Garner, former Vice President of the United States, and former President of the Senate, will celebrate his 90th birthday, and it is an event which will find Texans and Americans everywhere wishing him well.

Jack Garner was a master legislative craftsman. He combined a penetrating knowledge of political reality with a firm determination to advance the best interests of his country. That combination was brought to bear in both branches of the Congress.

Mr. Garner of Uvalde is a living legend who will serve as a source of inspiration to Texans for generations to come. I know that we all join in wishing him well.

POSTMASTERS—MONTANA AND COLORADO

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, the Chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, a question. I have contacted the Senator on several occasions relative to a vacancy in the Anaconda, Mont., postmastership. I wonder if anything is going to be done at the present time to fill the vacancy.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President. The junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] was kind enough to advise me a short while ago that he intended to ask me about the confirmation of the postmaster at Anaconda, Mont. Since he advised me to that effect, I have looked into the matter. I find that the nomination has not been confirmed because the committee has a number of substantial objections which it is looking into. This cannot be done fully and satisfactorily overnight. It requires a certain amount of time. I do wish the Senator to know, however, that the committee is proceeding as expeditiously as time and facilities permit and that when the investigation has been completed, the committee will then be in a position to consider the nomination properly.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, while we are on this subject I should like to make inquiry about a postmastership for Colorado Springs, which has been under committee consideration for some months now. A statement has been filed with the committee by both Senators from Colorado to the effect that the appointment is satisfactory to them, yet the committee has not acted upon the nomination.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think the Senator will find the same is true in that particular case as is true with respect to the Montana case.

Mr. ALLOTT. May I ask the Senator, are we entitled to have a copy of the objections which have been filed?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator can go to the committee and get them.

Mr. ALLOTT. We have not been able to get them. For that reason I formally request them.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I wish the Senator had approached me on the subject. This is the first time I have known anything about the matter. The truth of the entire matter is that we have had to handle about 2,000 postmaster appointments. I cannot carry all the information in my mind.

Mr. ALLOTT. The situation is that the postmastership has been pending for many months. Both the junior Senator from Colorado and the senior Senator from Colorado have in writing requested approval of the appointment, yet we have not been able to get the committee to report.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We have several cases which perhaps are in the same position.

Mr. ALLOTT. Surely they have not been pending 5 or 6 months.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think the committee members will say that has been true.

Mr. ALLOTT. Have the other nominations been pending 5 or 6 months?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The one with which I am concerned has been pending longer than that.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Some of them have been pending longer than that and some for less time.

Mr. ALLOTT. I have the Senator's assurance that if I make inquiry of the committee I will receive a copy of every objection which has been filed with respect to the appointment?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator can go to the committee and get the information. I will authorize that.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to hear that, because so far I have not been able to find out why the appointment has not been acted upon.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I will say again, I wish the Senator had approached me on the subject, or asked some member of the committee to approach me. This is the first I have heard about the particular postmaster appointment.

Mr. ALLOTT. I think the Senator will recall that I spoke to him about the matter some 2 or 3 months ago, and I have not heard anything about it since.

HAILSTORM LOSS AT LEMMON, S. DAK.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, a few days ago there was quite a run of water at Lemmon, S. Dak., which was accompanied by a large amount of hail. Because of reports of extensive damage, I wrote to one of my friends at Lemmon, Mr. Carney O. Peterson, cashier of the Bank of Lemmon, and asked him if there was any way in which the losses required the interest of the Federal Government.

I have received from Mr. Peterson a letter which is so characteristic of the spirit of the people in Perkins County that I wish to read it into the RECORD:

BANK OF LEMMON,
Lemmon, S. Dak., July 16, 1958.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRANCIS: We wish to thank you very kindly for thinking of us relative to our hail loss which is the worst we have had in many years, but true to West River spirit, we are not asking for any assistance from outside sources. Everyone is going about repairing or having repaired the buildings and soon the hail damage will only be history.

The crops suffered, some being total loss but again no one is crying over what has happened. We just buckled up our belt a little tighter and maybe next year we will have a good crop without hail.

I believe the total loss will run over a million dollars for our area. No buildings in our city escaped. We are very fortunate that no lives were lost.

Yours sincerely,
CARNEY O. PETERSON.

I thought the letter exhibited a good Western spirit, and might be a welcome contribution in connection with what we are called upon to do, these days, in the name of the Federal Government.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

DEATH ON THE HIGHWAY

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I should like to read a newspayer account of a tragic automobile accident. The account was written by Tom Ingvalson, a student at the South Dakota School of Mines and Technology, who happened to drive by the scene of an accident near Hill City. Tom wrote the following article, which was published in the Rapid City Journal:

EYEWITNESSES: VIEWERS STUNNED AT ACCIDENT SITE

(By Tom Ingvalson)

I saw death's hand at work on the highway yesterday and it was a picture that will remain engraved on my memory for the rest of my life.

It was midafternoon and I was returning from Sylvan Lake when I came to the railway underpass south of Hill City. Several people were milling around and I stopped to see what had happened.

A 1950 Plymouth apparently had missed the curve north of the underpass and struck cement supports underneath. The people around me were quiet and subdued. I could feel the shocked sympathy in them, it didn't take any words.

Several of the car's occupants were still seated or pinned in the badly damaged car. They were either dead or unconscious. An elderly lady was sitting on the grass nearby and appeared to be the only person not rendered unconscious by the crash. She was calling for someone in an incoherent manner.

One little girl was taken into the home of a nearby resident. A passing motorist took charge at the accident scene. He held onlookers back and cautioned them against smoking in the area. The smell of gas fumes was strong. There seemed to be little the spectators could do. A truck driver sent some people into Hill City for a doctor.

People came and they looked and they drove away. Most likely they drove safely and cautiously. For the first few miles, anyway.

I think that is a very telling report of the accident, and provides a moral or lesson which might well be considered by everyone, these days, when highway safety is a matter of national concern.

LEGISLATION TO PROMOTE THE USE OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the evaluation of the work done by a Congress sometimes must await the passage of time. In some ways, this is true of the 85th Congress, now drawing to a close. However, there are other ways in which it may be possible to evaluate now some of the accomplishments of this session. One of these aspects is atomic energy.

The adjournment of the 85th Congress will bring to 4 the number of years which have passed since the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 was written. Momentous things have transpired since then. It is not my purpose today to review the whole of those 4 years—years in which the Democratic leadership of Congress has recognized and responded to the civilian and military nuclear requirements.

In the course of these undertakings, the Congress fulfilled all requests from the executive department. In others, the Democratic leadership either instituted brandnew programs, or expanded very significantly proposals originating in the Atomic Energy Commission. In so doing, the Congress frequently encountered determined opposition from the Bureau of the Budget as well as some segments of private industry.

The United States atomic energy program, which in the beginning was very small and wholly military, has grown through the years to include many civilian and peacetime applications. In the process of growth, the usefulness of atomic energy has increased many times. We have learned as the program advanced that nuclear energy cannot be confined to weapons. Further, an atomic energy program of any consequence cannot be confined to the shores of the continental United States. This is a force which demands utilization throughout the world—and perhaps throughout the universe.

So although the evolutionary steps of the atomic energy program have been great in the past, the 85th Congress brought progress which, in my opinion, forever changes the nature of the program. Although these changes are not as spectacular as the explosion of an H-bomb, nor as tangible as the launching of the *Nautilus*, they are nevertheless fundamental and powerful. They are the foundations for the future.

I refer particularly to the fact that during the 85th Congress, under the guidance of a Democratic majority, the whole of the atomic energy program in the United States was broadened to reach for the first time beyond our shores and become international in character and purpose, both as to peacetime applications and as to weapons.

Further, through a study on outer space propulsion by nuclear energy, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy may have so altered the concept of the atomic energy program that it eventually may reach out to the nearby planets—and further.

And to guarantee that we have knowledge with which to follow up this broadened program, the Joint Committee wrote into legislation provisions for a vastly broadened basic research program which would give us answers to fundamental questions of atomic power reactor design and operation, the riddles of nuclear propulsion, and the very nature of the forces which bind atoms one to another.

All told, the Joint Committee received 58 bills and resolutions for consideration during the 85th Congress. In addition, hearings were held on various topics of national and international interest. An example of the latter might be the hearings on radioactive fallout held during June of 1957. They contributed the first definitive record of the pattern of worldwide and local fallout and established a proper forum from which outstanding geneticists and physicists and scientists were able to present their views on the effects of nuclear weapons testing. This is a subject which affects every organism on earth.

Mr. President, I desire at this time to summarize the major accomplishments of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the House and Senate during both sessions of the 85th Congress. And I think credit for their performance should be divided equally insofar as possible between the Houses and between the respective political parties. However, overall responsibility for the performance of the Congress on any program lies with the majority party and its leadership. Thus, to Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON of the Senate and Speaker SAM RAYBURN of the House goes much of the credit for the very significant record established by the 85th Congress in the field of atomic energy.

There are committee in the Congress which receive great numbers of bills during a session, depending upon their nature and upon the nature of the subjects they handle. Literally hundreds of private bills are handled by the respective judiciary committees for example. But in a field as specialized, as new and, in many respects, as secret as atomic energy, there is no similar quantity of legislation to be considered.

I do not mean to imply that the Joint Committee lacks work. We are indeed very busy with our workload which, by its very nature, requires the most careful scrutiny and consideration. Thus, Mr. President, I do not intend to relate any long list of achievements, even if it were possible. I am listing instead the major accomplishments.

The atomic-energy program has three major duties to the American people: weapons, power, peaceful pursuits. Each category also has its foreign phase.

First. Under the weapons program, the Joint Committee met every request from the President and also contributed its own ideas. Naturally it is not possible to detail all developments in this field, but it is possible to say without breaching security that the Joint Committee heard testimony on all phases of our atomic-weapons program and as a result recommended that greater emphasis be placed upon the development of a family of small nuclear weapons.

To support the development of small weapons, the Joint Committee determined—after repeated and detailed interviews with the military—that provision for greater domestic plutonium production should be provided in the fiscal 1959 authorization bill. This provision was included in the act sent to the President for signature.

Other weapons applications of atomic energy were evaluated by the Joint Committee and from these evaluations recommendations were formulated. Among them was the strong appeal that the Atomic Energy Commission push with all possible vigor studies into nuclear rocket propulsion.

The Joint Committee also approved after serious consideration legislation authorizing the exchange of military atomic information with our allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Second. The power reactor program did not produce the degree of agreement within the committee or within the Congress characteristic of the weapons program. However, with the inclusion of the various reactor design studies in the authorization bills, the domestic program gained a base upon which to project a long-term program. These studies will furnish the information necessary to the power reactor construction program which will be undertaken by the Government if private industry either does not desire or cannot afford to proceed.

Euratom will provide the foreign reactor program in this category.

Third. Other peaceful atomic pursuits include the operating authorization for the Atomic Energy Commission's Division of Biology and Medicine, its radioisotopes program and basic research activities. In the category, also, might be the Community Facilities Act which permits the AEC to conduct the affairs of its atomic laboratory communities.

Under this heading also might fall the International Atomic Energy Agency and such mileposts as the hearings on fallout, the problems of the uranium mining industry, and outer space propulsion.

SUMMARY OF ATOMIC ENERGY ACTIVITY DURING THE 85TH CONGRESS

INTERNATIONAL

The following authorizations were approved:

1. United States participation in the International Atomic Energy Agency.

2. Exchange with allies of classified information and materials, including weapons. (NATO bill.)

3. Euratom participation. It was not possible nor desirable to attempt to cover in the limited time available to the Joint Committee the entire list of Euratom arrangements and authorize the entire program. It was possible, however, to approve the international arrangement and part of the cooperative program.

REACTOR HAZARD INSURANCE

1. Legislation was enacted authorizing the Government to underwrite up to certain amounts the indemnity available from private companies to operators of power and research reactors. Statutory status was provided for Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards.

POWER REACTOR DEVELOPMENT

1. Expenditure of millions authorized for design studies on plutonium, gas-cooled, and plutonium-recycle reactors.

2. Destroyer reactor plant at West Milton, N. Y. authorized.

3. Provision included in Atomic Energy Commission facility authorization bill for construction at a cost of $120 million of a plutonium-production reactor to which will be added, at a cost of $25 million, facilities which will make it convertible to the generation of power at a subsequent date upon further authorization and appropriations by the Congress.

LONG RANGE POWER PROGRAM

The Joint Committee and its staff held informal discussions with the Atomic Energy Commission on the outline of a long-term atomic power program which would be issued in the form of a separate report by the Joint Committee. It is believed that the committee and the Commission are relatively close to agreement on this long-term program. It is possible the report may be issued by the end of this session.

BASIC RESEARCH

Following the annual hearings on the State, growth and development of the atomic-energy program, the Joint Committee wrote into the 1959 authorization bill provisions for a basic research program in atomic energy vastly greater than that proposed by the administration. Included are accelerated studies into the control of the thermonuclear reactor for power (Project Sherwood) and for nuclear propulsion (Project Rover and Project Pluto) and a score of research projects including construction of several accelerators. Extensive hearings were held on basic research in the atomic-energy field and these hearings are being printed, together with a summary analysis of the hearings. These hearings are of great interest in the atomic-energy field and provide the basis for the committee recommendations in the authorization bill on physical research and design studies for promising power reactor types.

URANIUM MINING INDUSTRY PROBLEMS

Domestic uranium ore production and milling capacity reached the point during 1957 where, in combination with imports which the United States is obligated by contract to accept, all weapons and peacetime demands could be met, once programed mills were built.

As a consequence, the Government had to decide whether to continue its past policies of stimulating unlimited uranium ore discovery and mining or to curtail capacity to meet actual demand.

The Government chose the latter course last October and the uranium mining industry immediately protested that it had not received adequate notice and that the decision was working undue hardship. As a consequence, the Joint Committee early in the year conducted hearings aimed at determining the impact of the cutoff order. The AEC was requested to furnish the Joint Committee a report on a field survey of hardship cases.

As a result, the Atomic Energy Commission in April announced a modified cutback program which eased considerably the impact on small miners and also provided mills for mining areas which otherwise would have had no market for their ores.

This development, though it required no legislative action by the joint committee, did have significant consequences in the domestic uranium mining industry. I think it represents one of the mileposts of the 85th Congress with respect to the atomic energy program. It also represented the first time in the AEC history when the raw materials program had undergone a thorough and searching inquiry by the Congress. If the outlook in the uranium mining industry has been stabilized since last October, and I believe it has, the stability is due in large measure to the steps taken by the joint committee during the 85th Congress.

NUCLEAR PROPULSION FOR OUTER SPACE

The first Congressional hearings on the possibilities of utilizing nuclear power to propel space vehicles were held by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The hearings, which were printed, show clearly that any long-range exploration in space will require engines of such size and sustained output that atomic energy now appears to be the only possible propellant.

In addition to emphasizing the desirability of research on nuclear rocket engines, the hearings served to solidify the recognition among drafters of space propulsion legislation that atomic energy be afforded a significant role in any agency directed to explore outer space on a manned and round-trip basis.

PROGRESS OF RECLAMATION IN THE 85TH CONGRESS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, within the next few hours the 85th Congress will adjourn. When that hour arrives, the record of the 85th Congress will have become history. It will be a record based upon the legislation enacted and the policies and programs initiated, emphasized and enunciated by the political parties, the various committees and individual Senators.

I desire at this time to call the attention of Senators—and the attention of the public—to the record established by the 85th Congress in recognizing and responding to the national need for certain programs with respect to the conservation and development of domestic water resources, recreation resources, the reclaiming of wastelands and the generation of hydroelectric energy.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

In some respects, the 85th Congress is lacking in what might be termed eye-catching reclamation enactments due, in part, to the fact that it encountered in the administration several eye-catching frustrations.

An illustration of the problem might be the introduction and passage in the Senate against administration protests of the Hells Canyon Dam authorizing legislation. The bill was defeated in the House.

In almost every other aspect, however, the record of the 85th Congress and particularly the Senate is one of steady and comprehensive progress toward the goal of greater speed and more consistent efforts to meet the reclamation needs of the 17 Western States.

The Senate adopted early in the closing session of the 85th Congress a resolution calling for an accelerated construction program for currently-authorized and ready-to-go reclamation projects. The accelerated program proposed would have just about doubled the program recommended by the administration.

Following the adoption of this resolution, the administration acceded to the principle sufficiently to recommend inclusion in the fiscal year 1959 construction program a few previously bypassed projects.

Thus, the reclamation program fared rather well in the Senate. I think there is a clear recognition among Senators as to the reason why reclamation has had such success during this Congress. That reason is Democratic leadership, and especially the foresight, the planning, the ability, and enthusiasm of the Democratic Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON. Without his warm support, the outstanding reclamation record of the 85th Congress might otherwise have been dismal.

Let me cite first the record of reclamation legislation handled by the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I am chairman of the subcommittee. After that I will mention briefly the work of the Senate Interior Committee with reference to the saline water program and the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.

THE RECLAMATION PROGRAM

The Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs during the 85th Congress considered more than 100 bills, resolutions, and special actions relating to the reclamation program, including irrigation, hydroelectric power, and procedural legislation.

Virtually every one of these measures was handled by the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, with the able and sympathetic cooperation of the chairman of the full committee, Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana.

Authorization of new projects recommended by the committee and passed by the Senate included the following in addition to saline water, Senate Joint Resolution 135:

Hells Canyon, Idaho-Oregon, to produce more than a million kilowatts of hydroelectric power from the Snake River, a tributary of the Columbia. Defeated in the House.

Fryingpan-Arkansas, a $160-million irrigation and multiple-purpose development in Colorado. Pending in House.

San Angelo multiple-purpose project, Texas, to cost $32,220,000 for flood control, municipal water, and irrigation.

Pecos River resolution to protect waters vital to New Mexico and Texas in the McMillen Delta area, another important type of legislation.

Burns Creek project on the Snake River in Idaho, to produce 90,000 kilowatts of power and cost $44,240,000.

Greater Wenatchee division, Chief Joseph project, Washington, for irrigation.

UPPER COLORADO RIVER DEVELOPMENT

In the 84th Congress, the Senate passed and the House agreed to the billion dollar Upper Colorado River development. As a followup to this authorization, the Senate committee has under consideration a bill to authorize the Navaho Indian irrigation and San Juan Chama diversion projects in New Mexico to cost $221 million.

The impetus given by the demand for an accelerated reclamation construction program produced these further results with respect to the Colorado River storage project:

First. An additional budget estimate was submitted to speed up construction of the multiple-purpose Glen Canyon Dam in Arizona, the key structure and cash register of the Colorado River storage project on which initial contracts had been awarded.

Second. Reversal of the administration's opposition to starting actual construction of Navaho Dam in New Mexico and a budget estimate of $7 million to get a contract under way.

Third. Speedup of awarding construction contract for Flaming Gorge Dam, Utah-Wyo.

The three major storage dams of the Upper Colorado River project are now under construction contracts, and actual work is under way.

CALIFORNIA'S SAN LUIS PROJECT

Another project under active consideration is authorization of the San Luis unit, Central Valley project, California, to irrigate 400,000 acres and cost approximately $300 million. There still may be time to enact this legislation this session.

GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT

Another major development under consideration is the first stage of the Garrison diversion unit of the Missouri River Basin project in North Dakota to divert water stored at Garrison to irrigate more than half a million acres. The first stage would cost $250 million.

ACCELERATION OF RECLAMATION CONSTRUCTION

The chairman of the Irrigation-Reclamation Subcommittee initiated a program for the acceleration of construction of authorized reclamation projects, of which there is a backlog of more than $3 billion. Soon after this move was initiated, the Eisenhower administration sent to the Congress supplemental budget estimates increasing its recommendations for appropriations for fiscal year 1959 by nearly 50 percent.

The committee pressed for further acceleration and the Senate unanimously agreed to Senate Resolution 299 urging an increase in reclamation construction by 100 percent, including not less than 20 new starts of reclamation projects. This proposal ran head on into the Eisenhower administration's opposition to any new starts.

The Senate Appropriations Committee under the able leadership of Senator HAYDEN went along with the acceleration of the reclamation program to a substantial extent and fought valiantly for increases and new starts in conference with the House committee.

SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS

The committee initiated legislation to implement the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 under which loans are made without interest for the development or rehabilitation of non-Federal irrigation districts. The President had objected to the degree of Congressional participation in the program provided in the original act and his objection was met by an amendment.

However, it was not until February 7, 1958, that the Interior Department sent up the first development approval under the Small Projects Act. This was the application of the Cameron County Water District of Texas—Harlingen Division—for a loan of $4,600,000, which was promptly approved by our committee.

Since then four additional small project loans have been approved by the committee. They are:

South Davis County Water Improvement District, Utah.

Bountiful Water Sub-Conservancy District, Utah.

Walker River Irrigation District, Nev.

Goleta County Water District, Calif.

REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT LOANS

The committee is also charged with responsibility for approving loans for the rehabilitation and betterment of existing reclamation projects. Eight loans have been approved during the 85th Congress for this purpose.

RUSSIAN PROGRESS IN WATER DEVELOPMENT

Jointly with the Committee on Public Works, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee held hearings on the progress Soviet Russia is making in water developments. Senate Resolution 248 reported by the two committees directs the bodies to continue their surveillance of the progress Soviet Russia is making in hydroelectric power, irrigation, and related developments.

TWO GREAT FORWARD STEPS

The committee took a great forward step in behalf of reclamation in holding hearings on and reporting favorably Senate Resolution 148, to improve procedures and contents of reports to Congress on proposed reclamation projects. The resolution was recommended jointly with the Committee on Public Works and was agreed to by the Senate over the surreptitious opposition of high Eisenhower administration factions.

Two major project authorizations concluded the committee's reclamation program for the session. These were:

S. 3648, to authorize the Navaho Indian Irrigation and San Juan-Chama diversion projects in New Mexico. More than

half of the population of the State, including the Navaho Indians, will be benefited by the development for irrigation, domestic, municipal, and industrial water supplies. As passed by the Senate, S. 3648 is agreeable to Texas interests.

S. 1887, to authorize the extension of the Central Valley Reclamation project in California to include the San Luis unit to irrigate half a million acres of highly productive land in the San Joaquin Valley that is threatened by receding underground water supplies. An olive branch is held out to the State of California to participate so as to pave the way for a joint venture that would make the San Luis Reservoir a feature of California's State water plan.

Here are two outstanding instances of aggressive plans for cooperation with reclamation States.

SALINE WATER PROGRAM

Mr. President, a review of the accomplishments of the Senate during the 85th Congress would be incomplete if it failed to mention the work of the Senate Interior Committee in holding hearings on and reporting favorably Senate Joint Resolution 135, a proposal to demonstrate with production-size plants the economic and operating feasibility of saline water conversion processes.

This legislation was introduced by a Democrat but it quickly drew the support of two Senate Republicans, and when it was ready to be reported, a second Senate Democrat received permission to add his name as a sponsor. I am referring to the very able majority leader, LYNDON JOHNSON.

The majority leader, recognizing the increasing importance to the United States of the early development of economic saline water conversion processes, did more than add his name as a sponsor. He expressed his strong desire that the measure pass the Senate. Subsequently, and without debate, the measure was adopted, embodying the principles and provisions developed in the hearings.

Now why is this legislation important? Anyone who has had opportunity to read the transcript of the hearings is well prepared to answer that question. However, for the benefit of those who have not had opportunity to read the hearings, and because I believe it is virtually impossible to lay too much emphasis on the need for further development of our saline and brackish water resources, I wish to state once again—briefly—why so many Members of the Senate, and the Democratic Senate leadership, attach so much importance to this joint resolution.

The United States is becoming increasingly dependent upon an ample supply of fresh water. Studies by a large industrial firm show that roughly 1,500 gallons of fresh water are required daily for every man, woman, and child in the United States. That figure rises every day, as our population rises.

Obviously, each of us does not drink that much water every day, but we do manage personally to dispose of about 40 gallons per day. The remainder of our huge daily per capita consumption of fresh water goes into the making of steel and other industrial products, into the food and textile industries, into the chemical and refining industries, and into the production—through irrigation—of the food we eat.

Nature blessed the United States with a large supply of clean, fresh water. The immense industrial and agricultural wealth of the country has been a direct result of our fortunate water supply.

But even such a continent as North America does not have uniform water distribution. There are desert areas and areas which, although water in plentiful, are blighted by the fact that the water is brackish or otherwise unfit for drinking or for irrigation. So the demand for water in these areas is never met; use does not increase because the ceiling on population and industry has been reached, a ceiling placed there by water.

Currently afflicted is the southern part of California. Because of its climate and easy access, southern California has attracted an ever-growing population. Los Angeles each year adds to its water demand the equivalent population of a Salt Lake City, Utah, an El Paso, Tex., or an Albuquerque, N. Mex.

At the other end of California, 40 million acre-feet of good fresh water annually flows unused into the sea. Southern California has met its thirst in part in the past by transporting overland the waters of the Colorado River. Because water from this river is limited and because it flows through other water-short regions, the demand for Colorado River water always is greater than the supply. As demand grew, so did the arguments over who was entitled to the greater share of the flow. The courts have been asked to adjudicate the rights of Arizona and California in this dispute and the Congress has heard many arguments on the same and similar disputes.

Recently California drew up a master water plan which contemplates diversion southward of some of the abundant and unused waters of its northern section. The cost is estimated at more than $11 billion, a price so high that serious thought is being turned toward the Pacific as a source of water. The key to the use of this water—which would remove forever the water ceiling now placed upon southern California and the disputes over Colorado River water—lies in the early development of saline water conversion processes.

Recognizing this possibility—and also the needs of inland brackish water areas—the Democratic leadership of the Senate acted vigorously and with foresight to meet the need.

There is no doubt whatever that the United States is rapidly outgrowing its water supply—despite conscientious efforts to store and use all available natural supplies. Total consumption is expected to equal total runoff by 1980. Such consumption will require utilization of some waters not now considered fit for beneficial use. After 1980, we must turn to other sources—the saline and brackish waters—to meet our expanding needs.

Men always have sought ways to convert the unlimited waters of the seas into fresh water. Almost without exception, the methods devised have been too expensive for use on a large scale.

However, during recent months great strides have been made in the steam-distillation and ionic-membrane conversion processes for the beneficial treatment of both sea and brackish waters. The processes have been under study 5 years following the adoption in 1952—by a Democratic Congress—of the Saline Waters Act.

The time has come to demonstrate—and to test on a production scale—the work of the past 5 years. The time has come to put into deeds the faith and foresight of Democrats who initiated the saline water program.

I am happy to report that the adoption by the Senate of Senate Joint Resolution 135 was a manifestation of the leadership the Democrats are exercising in this field—and are prepared to continue to exercise.

If Senate Joint Resolution 135 is enacted, it will permit the construction of five demonstration plants at a total construction cost of $10 million. The plants are to be located as follows: One on the east or gulf coast, one on the west coast, one inland in the northern Great Plains, one in the Southwest, and one in the Virgin Islands.

It is my hope and belief that this program, encompassing as it does a study of the water needs of water-short areas, will lead to an easing of the pressures between Arizona and California, Upper and Lower Colorado Basins, Los Angeles and northern California, and all other localities afflicted with water disputes.

RECREATION RESOURCES REVIEW PROGRAM

Since World War II, phenomenal increases have taken place each year in the use of our outdoor recreation facilities. Last year nearly 50 million visitors were counted in the national forests, more than 50 million visitors in national parks and more than 183 million visitors in the State parks. There were over 25 million licensed fishermen and hunters, and millions of boating enthusiasts, using our streams and lakes. These numbers are increasing every year.

Contributing to this growth are population growth, higher incomes, shorter working hours, improved transportation, more and better highways, better automobiles, and safer and faster air service. These factors enable more people to reach our national parks and monuments, our national forests, lakes, and ocean shores more easily and to have more time to enjoy the many benefits of America's outdoors.

Outdoor recreation is basic. It is essential to physical and mental well being. The Democratic leadership in Congress has been quick to recognize that this kind of recreation should be encouraged and increased. Likewise, Democrats in Congress have recognized that presently available recreation areas and facilities are inadequate to meet the growing need.

The Government has some temporary 5- and 10-year programs going for improvement of our park areas. These programs are good as far as they go. However, programs of this type are at

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

best stopgap programs. We are so far behind now in providing public recreation areas and facilities that work done under these short-term programs, even if completed could not furnish adequate recreational opportunities for all our people today. Even now we find long waiting lines at some of our park entrances and it is impossible for all desiring to go camping to find room in approved areas of our forests. Can you imagine what the situation would be in the year 2000 unless something is done? The waiting lines at such places as Yellowstone National Park would then become so long that hundreds of families hoping to visit such wonders could never pass through the gates.

The Democrats in the Senate have recognized the need for action to provide recreation for the present and future generations and so legislation was introduced and enacted into law to answer this demand during the 85th Congress. Here is how it happened:

In 1957 it became evident that the time was ripe for the introduction of legislation to provide for a complete national review of our outdoor recreation resources. It was my good fortune to be the principal sponsor of Senate bill 846 to set up a commission for that purpose. One of the Commission's duties will be to evaluate outdoor recreation resources and opportunities, and to make recommendations for a long-range program. I was greatly pleased to have a number of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to join me in this task. The able majority leader of the Senate was quick to recognize the importance of the proposal and when it was reported to the Senate and he scheduled the bill at the appropriate place to insure early passage.

It is gratifying to me to know that this legislation has now become Public Law 85–470. We are hopeful that the President will complete appointment of the Commission authorized under the bill at an early date. The Senate members of the Commission have been appointed and as one of the Democratic members of the Commission, I hope for early organization of the Commission program.

To the best of my knowledge this is the first time in the history of our country that Congress has established a firm policy to assure present and future generations such quality and quantity of outdoor recreation as is necessary and desirable in the light of our national heritage.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF 2D SESSION, 85TH CONGRESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it has been customary for many years for the majority and the minority leaders to end the session with a report on the year's activities.

I have never looked upon this report as simply a summary of the work of the majority or the minority. I look upon it as a report upon the whole Senate, the Senate that belongs to all the people of the United States, regardless of their partison affiliations.

This Senate has been a body deeply aware of the obligations to all the people. It has been creative and constructive. It has emphasized the substantial rather than the trivial. It has sought achievement rather than discord.

And it has been one of the most nonpartisan Congresses in many years.

As an American, I received a great deal of personal satisfaction the other day from looking over some of the votes by which major bills were passed in this Senate. The votes were very revealing.

We created a new agency to launch America's venture into outer space by a unanimous vote. We passed the emergency housing act by a unanimous vote. We approved the reorganization of the Defense Department by a unanimous vote.

And when we came to final approval of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, 36 Members of the majority and 36 Members of the minority stood together to permit that measure to become law.

That has been the pattern of this session, and it is a pattern which has enabled us to pass so much legislation for the benefit of our people.

I do not think the success or failure of any Congress can be measured in terms of individual or partisan viewpoints. The Congress is a success to the extent that it can make progress in reconciling the differences and transacting the business of the American people.

This Senate is composed of 96 Members. Each has his own individual viewpoint and each is capable of expressing it forcefully.

The fact that votes were nonpartisan did not mean that any Member sacrificed his principles or yielded on his convictions. What it did mean was that the Senate gave the highest priority to doing the job that had to be done.

Any legislative body will be paralyzed if each member insists that no bill pass unless it carries every single one of his views. But it is not necessary for an honorable man to take such a course.

The needs of the Nation require that business be transacted responsibly, forcefully, and prudently. This can be done if we concentrate upon our points of agreements and arrive at a collective judgment.

I suppose there are two ways in which a Congress can conduct itself. One is to look at the next election as the objective of legislation. The other is to regard the last election as the expression of the will of the American people on what should be done.

The first view would create issues; the second view would resolve issues. By any test, I believe that this is a Senate which has tried to resolve issues rather than to create them.

This session started just as it had become apparent that the United States was confronted with the greatest menace to freedom in all history. That menace was embodied in the high degree of technical proficiency which the Communist world had acquired. The facts were gathered for the Senate by the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee.

That group, of which I had the honor to be chairman, made 17 recommendations. The recommendations had the solid backing of both majority and minority Members.

The Senate, to the limit of its constitutional responsibilities, has acted to support all of the recommendations.

We have granted authority to reorganize the structure of the Defense Department. We have provided the authority for a freer exchange of scientific information between the nations of the Free World. We have voted incentives to retain trained personnel in the military services.

And we have provided all of the funds—and even more funds—that the executive agencies said they could use to carry out the other recommendations.

The Senate was not content with merely issuing a report. It followed through on that report and took every conceivable step to strengthen the defenses of this country.

In the long view of history, possibly the most important step that we took during this session was to establish an agency to guide America's effort in the exploration of outer space.

Just 1 year ago this would have seemed like a page out of a Jules Verne novel. The idea that men were about to burst loose from the atmosphere and venture into the heavens beyond was strictly within the realm of science fiction.

Our complacency on this score was rudely shattered when the Russians lofted into the skies a satellite—the first manmade object ever to be placed in orbit around the earth.

We investigated. We discovered to our shock that we had left the field of outer space to a few sporadic developments by individual scientists and to a few coordinated efforts by the military to develop weapons. It was not enough.

Our scientists have placed in our hands keys to open a whole universe. For centuries to come, the exploration of outer space will dominate the minds and lives of men just as the exploration of the Western Hemisphere dominated the course of the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries.

As the leader of the Free World we had an obligation to engage in that exploration not just from the military standpoint but to shape the exploration in the image of freedom.

Outer space will be explored. It will become the domain of free men or of men whose minds are enslaved. Either we meet our responsibilities or abdicate to the totalitarians the dimension which will shape the lives of the coming generations.

The responsibility was recognized by Congress—that body which has the obligation of determining the policies of our Nation. It was not only recognized, it was acted upon. Out of that recognition, and in cooperation with the executive agencies, grew the new space agency, our hope for the future.

It is a strange universe into which we are venturing. We have less idea of our destination than did Columbus when he set sail to the west with a few primitive instruments and some charts drawn entirely from imagination.

But we know already the tremendous potentialities of outer space. We know

that men will pioneer the heavens just as LaSalle and Cadillac pioneered the tremendous regions of the north.

We know there will be a Coronado who will search the planets for the fabled seven cities of Cibola. We know that a DeSoto will explore the spaceways that lead to the stars.

We know that daring men, adventuresome men, men of vision and courage will brave the hazards of outer space just as our pioneer ancestors braved the dangers of the western plains.

There is, however, a difference.

When the Western hemisphere was opened to exploration, small groups of men could form companies for the venture. A group of merchants in London could put together the money for a ship and provisions. A duke in Spain could pawn a few jewels and finance a flotilla.

But the exploration of outer space will require a national effort. We hope it will not be just a national effort but a world effort.

One of the finest actions of this Congress was its clear expression that the exploration of outer space should be a joint venture by all members of the United Nations.

This is a true road to lasting peace. Men who work together to launch great and daring enterprises are men who can live together in harmony and in mutual understanding.

To this end, this Congress established the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and expressed its unmistakable will that this agency should be an instrument of peace and not of war.

I think that all of us realize that the major issue before the country and before the world today is peace. Beside that overriding need, all other problems and all other disputes fade into insignificance.

I am proud of this Congress because it took the steps that it felt were necessary to promote the goal we must all reach. And that goal will not be reached unless our Nation is strong—not just strong in a military sense but strong in moral fiber; in dedication to the ideals of the free way of life; in determination to lead the people of this world along the paths of individual dignity and integrity.

The adjournment bells will soon ring and the 85th Congress will become another chapter in the annals of our legislative history. We will go home to our people—the people whose interests we are here to represent.

But the issues which tear unceasingly at the vitals of this tortured world will not go home. There will be no rest for the men and the women who must handle—on a day-to-day basis—the problems and the worries and the burdens of conducting the policies of these United States.

Most of us know that there is no end in sight to the strife that has torn this world into three camps—the forces of freedom, the forces of communism, and the forces that are uncommitted and which regard with skepticism the other two camps.

The United Nations has just adjourned, after deliberating over the problems of one of the most strife-ridden parts of the world—the Middle East. A crisis was quieted. But all that happened was that an illness which had been acute has been reduced to a stage where it is only chronic.

We have heard, on the Senate floor, proposals and suggestions advanced by some of the most learned men of our times. Those proposals and those suggestions have stimulated all of us to thought and to a prayerful desire for action.

There is only one way in which to determine the merits of a proposal. That is to try it out. The test of action is the most compelling and the most convincing.

As we go back to our people, we must think about the future. We must try to draw from them strength and ideas, because America will not rise or fall on the concepts of one man, and one man alone.

I believe that any group of reasonably intelligent men could sit down and devise a program that would solve the problems of the Middle East or any other of the troubled nations of the world. We know our objectives, and we know what best serves the interests of our country.

It is to the interests of the United States that the nations of the world be free.

It is to the interests of the United States that the nations of the world be prosperous.

It is to the interests of the United States that nations be able to choose their own destiny after reasonable discussion.

We seek to hold no other people in subjugation. We seek no advantage from the misery and suffering of others.

Our country was built upon the basic belief that prosperity feeds upon prosperity, just as misery feeds upon misery.

But the difficulty that we have is that no program can serve any good purpose unless it can be carried into effect. And it seems to me that this is the basic weakness of our finest proposals.

As a nation, we know that our people are better served if misery and degradation can be eliminated from this world. But forces which feed upon misery and degradation have been unleashed.

Ambitious dictators have discovered that the forces of poverty and the dynamics of misery are excellent vehicles to power and prestige. They do not wish to put an end to poverty and degradation, because by doing so they would eliminate the very forces which have swept them into power.

All of us have, in the course of our lives, met those who prefer the issue to the achievement; who insist that all progress must be made at one leap, because secretly they desire that there be no progress at all.

The men who create the problems are men who do not want to have them solved. That is the heart of the issue which confronts us in this world.

No dispute can be settled unless both parties to the dispute have some desire to end it. And no fight will come to a conclusion if one of the parties has no compulsion to be reasonable.

In this respect, we have failed in our policy toward the rest of the world. We have failed because we have not as yet reached the hearts and souls of the people who alone can stop the dictators with a mad desire for domination.

Even the most absolute of dictators must have a degree of popular support. A country will not fall to subversion and infiltration unless the people have a feeling of receptiveness to the aggressor.

We are in trouble in the Middle East because the people in the countries that are still independent do not feel a kinship of any kind with our ideals and our goals. We have given them no adequate reason why they should resist the growing power of a 20th century Pharaoh.

At the end of World War II we devised the Marshall plan, one of the great concepts of history. It was a program which had force because it held out hope to countries that were shattered and to people who were poor.

The Marshall plan had strength.

The Marshall plan had logic.

The Marshall plan worked.

But it worked only because of the efforts of men and women who could reach into the hearts of the people of Western Europe and convince them of America's sincerity.

We are now dealing in areas of the world where our historical ties are not so close. We are dealing with people who speak alien tongues and who have inherited customs and traditions from civilizations even older than our own.

We have not reached those people. We have not convinced them of our earnest desire that they, as well as we, enjoy the life of plenty that has been opened up to society by the science and the technology and the industrialization of the Western World.

They have known the Western World in the past only in terms of administrators who came to oppress and soldiers who came to suppress. Their contact with Western civilization has been the contact of a slave to a master.

They were suspicious, and they cannot be blamed. They have had no opportunity to explore our true desires and our real intentions.

A weird turn of history has made a brutal tyranny appear as a liberator, and a nation of freedom appear as an imperialist.

We are not going to solve this problem by the kind of advertising that sells soap or the kind of slogans that win a campaign in a city ward. The techniques of mass merchandising are not the techniques of mass friendship.

The more fruitful road has been explored by men like the junior Senator from Arkansas, [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. I sometimes think that the student exchange program which bears his name has done more to maintain the prestige and the security of these United States than have all of the weapons that have been built and all of the soldiers that have been trained since World War II.

Somehow, we must rest the security of this country upon the appeal of people to people. Propaganda will not do the job, because that is a game at which we always lose. The only propaganda that

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

will serve our needs is that of the honorable appeal of Americans to the people of other lands.

I am not, in this statement, digressing from my basic theme. The achievements of this Congress are well recognized, and need little restatement from me.

But we must look forward to the next Congress, and the Congress after that. And there is no problem that should dominate our thoughts—and the thoughts of all other agencies of government—more than that of reaching the souls of the rest of mankind.

Every informed man knows that if the world of the uncommitted enters the Soviet orbit, we will be overwhelmed. Every informed man also knows that if the world of the uncommitted can maintain its independence and grow in prosperity, our way of life will be saved.

The uncommitted people care little about abstract political philosophies. Most of them are ground down in poverty, degraded by centuries of oppression, hungry and ragged and ravaged.

They have seen a backward nation in the course of 40 years progress from the horse-drawn sled to the sputnik. This has set them to wondering whether communism may not, after all, be a better way of life.

They are determined to enjoy the benefits of modern civilization—the food, the clothing, the housing. They will follow whichever course holds forth those benefits—communism or the Free World.

We in this country can argue and dispute over many things. We can fight about issues both trivial and great, and our land will still survive, because we have mastered the art of finding a solution to a disagreement without exterminating those who advocate the losing side of the argument.

But if we allow the rest of the world to remain in poverty and ignorance, our days are numbered. And the first and most important step is to smash through the barriers that have been erected by those who feed off poverty and ignorance.

Mr. President, this has been a Congress which conducted itself in the finest traditions of American Government. It was calm and deliberate. It sought to eliminate rather than to create strife. It tried to unify, rather than divide, our people.

I believe this is the real mood of the American people. I believe this Congress rose to great heights because the American people are ready to rise to great heights.

The political institutions of the Nation are never better than the people who comprise that Nation. In a sense, I suppose it can be said that the credit for this Congress should be shared, not only by its Members, but by all the people of the United States.

I am placing in the RECORD a list of some of our most important achievements. I shall not bother to read that list now, because it speaks for itself.

At this point I merely wish to thank all of my colleagues, not just as a Senator, and not just as the majority leader, but simply as an American who is proud of the way he has been served by this Congress.

CLINICAL EVALUATION OF THE EFFECT OF CERTAIN CIGARETTES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a letter and statement on a clinical evaluation regarding the effects of the smoking of a certain kind of cigarettes. The statement was prepared by Dr. Murrill M. Szucs, of Youngstown, Ohio. For the information of the Senate, I ask that the letter and statement be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MURRILL M. SZUCS, M. D., F. C. C. P.,
Youngstown, Ohio, August 12, 1958.

To Whom It May Concern:

The enclosed clinical evaluation tests on Diplomat cigarettes were done at Out-Patient Clinic, 822 Dollar Bank Building, Youngstown, Ohio; Out-Patient Clinic, St. Elizabeth Hospital, Youngstown, Ohio; Out-Patient Clinic, New Bedford, Pa.; and Perrysville Out-Patient Clinic, Perrysville, Pa.

Sincerely,

M. M. SZUCS, M. D.

CLINICAL EVALUATION IN 52 CASES AND WITH 26 CONTROL CASES OF CIGARETTES CALLED DIPLOMAT, MANUFACTURED BY NORTH AMERICAN CIGARETTE MANUFACTURERS, INC.

The advent of the use of tobacco—its chief alkaloid is nicotine—has no therapeutic importance, but there is considerable scientific and toxicological interest. Much has been written by investigators, especially by the United States Public Health Department, concerning the irritating effects of tobacco, particularly cigarettes, and its relation to lung cancer.

The chief importance of nicotine is in its habitual use in the form of tobacco as an enjoyment poison, as a stabilizer and lubricator. Tobacco habit: It is smoked, chewed, snuffed, or rubbed on the gums for tranquilizing and stabilizing effect on the psychic and emotional functions. Tobacco smoke contains other toxic constituents, as pyridine, nitrogenous bases, violatile acids, tar, phenol substances, furfural, acroleine, and glycerol. These counter irritants used by chronic smokers cause especially local irritation of the respiratory tract, digestive and intestinal disturbances, functual cardiac arrythmia, depression of various parts of the central nervous system, neuralgias, and more rarely impairment of vision.

Habitual users experience a certain pleasure, which appears to resolve itself into a calming and stabilizing effect on the nervous equilibrium. The effects of smoking—whether cigarette, cigar, or pipe—is in the smoke which constitutes the nicotine and basic irritants as tar, pyridine, nitrogenous bases, volatile acids, furfural, phenols, and glycerol. These irritants in the smoke constitute the local effects of smoking, which causes constant irritation to the mucous membrane of the mouth, throat, and pharynx which directly leads to smokers' respiratory syndrome, as chronic pharyngitis, trachial wheezing, bronchial dyspnea, cough and chest pains, hoarseness, and a tendency to respiratory infections.

The irritants of cigarettes as tar, pyridine, nitrogenous bases, volatile acids, phenol, furfural, and glycerol are chiefly responsible for these effects as edema of vocal chords, which in turn leads to edematous fibrosis, bronchitis, and continued chronic irritations by these toxic irritants cause chronic inflammation of the bronchus. Long, continued irritations by these irritants, especially tar, phenol, nitrogenous bases, volatile acids, pyridine, etc., probably favors development of cancer of the air passages in disposed individuals.

Lung cancer, incidentally, appears to have increased markedly. The lung is now the leading site of fatal cancer in males especially, because of the constituents of the cigarettes as paper, tar, phenols, nitrogenous bases, pyridine, furfural and glycerol, and not due to the nicotine content of a cigarette. Pipe and cigar smoking do not appear to produce the effect unless smoke is inhaled.

CHEMICAL COMPOSITION OF TOBACCO

Nicotine percentage of American brands of cigarettes:

	Average Nicotine (percent)
Domestic	2.5
Blends	1.5 –2.5
Oriental	1.25–1.5
West Indies	.9 –1.4
De-Nicotinized	.9 –1.4
Diplomat	1.0 –1.2

Nicotine content of tobacco smoke varies with the moisture content at the time of smoking. With cigarettes all nicotine may pass into smoke without oxidation or decomposition.

The prime constituents of cigarettes are paper, nicotine varying from 0.5 percent to 8 percent; the average cigarette contains 1.5 percent nicotine. In addition, tobacco contains pyridine and other nitrogenous bases, volatile acids, tar and phenol substances, furfural, acroleine and glycerol. These substances together with nicotine contribute to the irritation of mucous membrane, nasopharyngeal and bronchial irritation. These irritations on mucous membranes, nasopharyngeal and broncial from tobacco smoking other than nicotine are the principal irritants.

The physiochemical action of nicotine is on the autonomic system, consisting of first primary transient stimulation and followed by a secondary depressive action on all sympathetic and parasympathetic ganglia. The peripheral action of nicotine is a curae-like action, first mild vasodilation followed by a stronger and more lasting vasoconstriction of skin by marked fall in skin temperature. Vasoconstriction action on blood vessels causes a rise in systolic and diastolic blood pressure, especially in malignant hypertensive types of individuals.

In the gastro-intestinal tract, nicotine's action is primarily stimulation of salivary and bronchial secretions, followed a short time later by an inhibition. Smoking produces nausea, emesis, and violent diarrhea followed by constipation. The emetic action is mainly central—the intestinal action is mostly peripheral. Smoking does effect emptying time of the stomach and increased gastric acidity.

The standard brand cigarette has an effect on respiratory action, small doses produce brief stimulation followed by temporary apneic inhibition with toxic doses. The circulatory effects by nicotine, tars, phenol, etc., of standard brand cigarettes are complex, which include the carotid sinus, cardio-aortic reflexes, direct action on the vagus and vasomotor centers, causing stimulation and later paralysis of the vagus, stellate, vasomotor, splenic ganglia, and direct action on the cardiac and vascular muscle; together result in initial slowing of the pulse, then acceleration of the heart and rise of blood pressure, with a definite fall in blood pressure later, also causing heart arrythmias, extrasystoli, etc. The principal physiochemical action of cigarettes, especially standard brands, is stimulation with prolonged vasoconstriction of vessels, anemia, lowered hemoglobin, drop in skin temperatures, and changes in oscillometric readings causing

circulatory insufficiency. Tissue oxidation is checked by effects chiefly on lactic and pyuric acid. Skeletal muscle action causes fibrillation of muscle fibers which could go into toxic contraction.

The upper respiratory effect as reported before due to smoking of standard brand cigarettes increased the congestion in the mucous membrane of the throat, mouth, and bronchus, with increased cough and susceptible to upper respiratory infection. The constant irritation increases the tendency to carciogenic action from standard brand cigarettes, while on Diplomat cigarettes and cigars most irritants have been removed, and as a result ear, nose, and throat men have reported that much of the irritations to the mouth, pharynx, bronchus, and cough have stopped. The mucous membrane examination by specialists revealed very little or no mucous membrane irrigation from smoking Diplomat cigarettes and cigars. Therefore, definitely the carciogenic action was diminished, and the tendency of upper respiratory infection was also diminished in these individuals.

The principal physiochemical changes caused by cigarettes are not by the nicotine content, but by the irritants contained in the tobacco, such as pyridine, nitrogenous bases, volatile acids, tar, phenol substances, furfural, acroleine, and glycerol. These irritating substances are all found in standard brand cigarettes, while the Diplomat cigarette furnished by the North American Cigarette Manufacturers, Inc., has by a special process eliminated the greater part of these counterirritants and neutralized the nicotine content. This is verified by the clinical study done on 52 cases, which did not show any or very minor changes as was observed by standard brand cigarettes.

The types of cases studied with Diplomat cigarettes were:

Vascular cases	10
Heart cases	10
Hypertensive cases	8
Duodenal ulcer cases	7
Arthritis cases	5
Liver insufficient cases	6
Upper respiratory cases	6

In all these cases the physiochemical changes by Diplomat cigarettes were minimal or negligible, as stimulation, irritation and vasoconstriction, anemia, lowered hemoglobin, muscular cramps, etc.; while by the standard brand control cases, the physiochemical changes were definitely seen as stimulation, prolonged vasoconstriction, anemia, gastrointestinal upset, muscle cramps due to circulatory disturbances caused by anemia, lowered hemoglobin and vasoconstriction of blood vessels. This also caused definite rise in systolic and diastolic blood pressures due to the vasoconstrictive action of the constituents of the standard brand cigarettes.

The physiological and clinical changes seen in the 52 cases were definite because very little from normal was observed, while standard brand cigarettes did give a profound irritability to vasoconstrictions, etc.

SUMMARY

There is a definite health advantage in smoking Diplomat cigarettes treated by this special method which removes most of the counterirritants causing the physiochemical changes in a smoker's body. The improvement will still be greater when the paper wrapping around cigarettes is replaced by tobacco, as there is counterirritation also from burning paper and from the filters attached to some standard brand cigarettes.

There is very little nicotine absorbed by individuals even by inhaling, and this is not the chief clinical irritant; but those other counterirritants as pyridine, nitrogenous bases, volatile acids, tar, phenol substances, furfural, acroleine, and glycerol plus paper wrapper and filters are the chief irritating substances of a cigarette. These are eliminated in the new Diplomat cigarette, manufactured by the North American Cigarette Manufacturers, Inc.

Our results in this small series are very gratifying and we hope to continue to further study its effects over a longer period of time in the individuals.

Types of cases—52 cases studied

	Cases
1. Peripheral vascular disease:	
a. Diabetic arteriosclerotic	6
b. Burger's disease	2
c. Raynaud's disease	2
Total	10
2. Heart cases:	
a. Old coronary artery (more than one attack)	7
b. Angina pectoris, mild type	3
Total	10
3. Hypertensive cardio vascular diseases:	
a. Malignant hypertension	4
b. Moderate hypertension	4
Total	8
4. Duodenal ulcer cases	7
5. Arthritis cases:	
a. Rheumatoid	3
b. Osteoarthritis knees	2
Total	5
6. Liver insufficiency cases:	
a. Chronic gall bladder	3
b. Hepatitis	3
Total	6
7. Upper respiratory cases:	
a. Chronic smokers of other brands	3
b. Infectious type	3
Total	6

Control cases—26

1. Peripheral vascular on other standard brands	5
2. Duodenal ulcer cases on standard brands	6
3. Heart cases, chronic coronary on standard brands	5
4. Hypertensive cases, on standard brands	3
5. Arthritis cases on standard brands	2
6. Upper respiratory cases, on standard brands	5

Laboratory studies done on all cases: C. B. C.; B. U. N.; B. S. P.; E. C. G., transaminase; throat cultures; skin temperatures; gastric acid study; oscillometric studies and X-rays, as needed; five cigarette tests on standard and Diplomat cigarettes.

These procedures were all done before tests on controlled and other cases. In some cases, tests were repeated in ½- to 2-hour intervals as was necessary when doing the 5 cigarette tests in peripheral vascular diseases and old coronary cases and duodenal ulcer cases.

Fifty-two cases studied with laboratory procedures before, after, and during with cigarette "A" or Diplomat, no changes were noted in peripheral vascular cases, nor on skin temperatures, oscillometric and blood studies.

In the heart cases there was also given the 5 cigarette test with standard brands 1 day and Diplomat the next day. These all showed definite E. C. G. changes, C. B. C., skin temperatures, and oscillometric changes on standard brands, but no changes on Diplomat.

In the duodenal ulcer cases no adverse effects were noted while smoking Diplomat, but on standard brands there were some acidity changes and gastric pains.

In the hypertensive cases on standard brands there were definite C. B. C. changes, elevation of systolic and sometimes diastolic pressure took place in all cases, with vasoconstriction as seen on skin temperature and oscillometric readings. With Diplomat, no changes were observed in C. B. C. and no elevation of blood pressure or changes in skin temperature on oscillometric readings or vasoconstriction.

In arthritis cases, changes appeared on standard brands as C. B. C., vasoconstriction as observed on skin temperature and oscillometric readings.

In liver insufficiency cases, no changes were observed on C. B. C. or B. S. P., transaminase, skin temperature or oscillometric readings, while on standard brands all changes appeared.

In upper respiratory cases, throat and cough irritations were diminished on Diplomat and C. B. C., etc., were within normal range; while on standard brand cigarettes, cases showed congested mucous membrane of throat, cough persisted, and changes in C. B. C., were noted.

As noted on the graph of the 25 control cases studied using Diplomat cigarettes compared to standard or domestic brands.

The individuals smoking the standard brand cigarettes produced inadequate blood flow; in turn, this would facilitate oxygen dissociation with increase in tissue acidity. This taking place would cause increased pulse rate, rise in blood pressure and cardiac irregularity further causing slowing of the pulse, lowering of the blood pressure and continued cardiac irregularity with ensuing precordial pain.

These conditions mentioned above did not occur on individuals smoking Diplomat cigarettes. The skin, subcutaneous and muscle temperatures did not fall. The pulse remained constant without a rise or fall; also the heart beat remained constant. The electrocardiogram remained unchanged showing no cardiac irregularities in rhythm or rate.

M. M. Szucs, B. S., M. D., F. C. C. P.

GEORGE E. KETCHUM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives in regard to Senate bill 3321 for the relief of George E. Ketchum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3321) for the relief of George E. Ketchum, which was, on page 2, line 1, after *"Provided,"* insert "That payment made under this act shall not be subject to any right of subrogation or claim for reimbursement in whole or in part under any contract of insurance, and no payment made hereunder shall absolve any insurer of any obligation under any such contract: *And provided further,"*.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to Senate bill 3321.

The motion was agreed to.

INCREASE IN DIVERSION OF WATER FROM LAKE MICHIGAN INTO THE ILLINOIS WATERWAY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2) to authorize the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test on a 3-year basis the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, do I understand correctly that H. R. 2 is now the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is correct.

Mr. WILEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, at the suggestion of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, as I understand, the business before the Senate is H. R. 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois to that bill.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I oppose the passage of this bill in its present form for many reasons. H. R. 2, if it becomes law, will constitute, in my opinion, a wholly unwarranted taking of waters belonging to all of the Great Lakes States solely to assist the city of Chicago, Ill., in solving its sewage problem, a problem incidentally which it has failed to solve in the past 70 years because of inexcusable procrastination, inaction, and delay on the part of the city of Chicago.

H. R. 2 is not new legislation by any means. It differs but slightly from H. R. 3220 enacted in the 83d Congress and vetoed by President Eisenhower and H. R. 3300, enacted in the 84th Congress, which was also vetoed by the President. All 3 would authorize the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, to withdraw water from Lake Michigan at a rate of not more than 2,500 cubic feet per second—in addition to all domestic pumpage—for a period of 3 years. H. R. 2 differs from the two previous measures only in that the name of the Chicago Sanitary District as set forth in H. R. 3220 and H. R. 3300 has been changed in H. R. 2 to the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago.

There is nothing new about this question of diversion of waters of Lake Michigan. This question has been before our courts for many years. In fact a case is now pending in our Supreme Court on this same issue.

Diversion of the waters from Lake Michigan by the city of Chicago goes back to the beginning of this century when Chicago conceived a plan to dispose of its raw sewage by cutting a canal from the upper end of the Chicago River—which up until that time flowed into Lake Michigan—through a hilly area south of Chicago. This hilly area constituted a natural boundary between the Great Lakes Basin, and the Mississippi River Basin. The canal, a narrow body of water about 36 miles long reversed the flow of the Chicago River so that instead of flowing into Lake Michigan it flowed southwesterly through the canal thence into the Des Plaines River, thence into the Illinois, and finally into the Mississippi.

H. R. 2 would authorize a diversion of 2,500 cubic feet per second from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway for a period of 3 years. Two thousand five hundred cubic feet does not sound like very much, but the average person usually thinks of water as a liquid, and he measures liquids by liquid measure. Furthermore, the number of cubic feet is spelled out "per second." My curiosity was aroused so I computed the number of gallons involved and I found it would actually amount to about 600 billion gallons in 1 year. The bill also provides that this diversion shall be "in addition to all domestic pumpage." Domestic pumpage now is being carried on at the rate of 1,800 cubic feet per second. Reducing this to gallons it amounts to nearly 400 billion gallons for 1 year. Multiply this by 3 for the 3-year period and we find ourselves in the realm of higher mathematics. So this is quite a flow of water, although it does not sound like very much as we read it in the bill.

Mr. President, my concern is primarily because of the adverse effect this bill would have on all of the people of my State of Michigan. They are strongly opposed to this proposed diversion. We in the Great Lakes States fear this foot-in-the-door approach. To us it is simply another version of the camel and the Arab's tent. If a 2,500-cubic-foot diversion for 3 years is now enacted, then another 5,000 will probably be sought in another few years, and so on. It is undisputed that this diversion would lower the levels of all of the Great Lakes except Lake Superior. A hydrograph prepared by the Corps of Engineers conclusively shows that the lake levels in Lake Superior, Lake Michigan, Lake Huron, and Lake St. Clair have been steadily dropping since 1952. Senate hearings in 1956 brought out that the level of Lake Michigan had dropped 2½ feet since the 1952 level, in the 4½-year period from 1952 to July 1956.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me, provided it is understood that in yielding to me, he will not lose the floor?

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I am willing to yield under those conditions—with the understanding that in yielding to the Senator from Vermont, I shall not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am greatly disturbed over the type of discussion which is taking place in regard to the Chicago diversion bill, so-called. We are in one of the most critical periods of world history. A cold war is being waged everywhere, with tension high in foreign countries, even in the Western Hemisphere. This afternoon the mutual security bill, which calls for many agreements with foreign countries, was passed. We already have agreements with other countries all over the world. While we are considering these agreements, and are talking about more agreements, it seems incredible that here on the Senate floor, supposedly intelligent Members of this body would stand up and deliberately talk about violating a treaty with another country.

Perhaps some of us take Canada for granted; but I do not believe Canada takes for granted the treaty we made with her 49 years ago. I believe Canada takes it seriously. In that treaty each country wishes to have the right to its own water resources, and neither country is permitted to divert its own tributary waters in any way which would affect adversely the boundary waters between the two.

Yet, here last night we engaged, and tonight we are engaging, in a very dangerous discussion when we talk of diverting the waters of Lake Michigan in such a manner as to adversely affect the water resources of Canada.

I have heard it said that Canada is willing that we shall do this. I do not believe that for a moment, and I have read every communication which we have had from the Canadians over the last few years. I can find nowhere in those communications a statement that Canada agrees or consents to our adversely affecting any part of her water resources. Certainly it does not appear to me that the Canadians consented in any way, and knowing Canadians as I do, I know they were not born yesterday. I know they are people of good judgment, and appreciate what belongs to them, and intend to keep it. I cannot for a minute believe they would agree to let the city of Chicago take her resources without any recompense whatsoever. Perhaps the Canadians would be willing to make a "deal." It may be that for a consideration they would permit 5,000 second-feet of water to go down the Chicago River during the low-water period. I do not believe they would, but perhaps they would.

Perhaps they would say, "Let us have the headwaters of the Columbia River." Certainly if we diverted part of their water resources down the Mississippi River, we would have no right to protest if they diverted the headwaters of the Columbia. But assuming they are willing to make a deal of that nature, then it should be done in an orderly manner, perhaps by an abrogation of the treaty which we have with them. We should not do it in a highhanded manner, just by an act of Congress. I do not believe we should take resources from one State and give them to another State by an act of Congress, either. I believe the Supreme Court came to that conclusion, too, not many years ago.

But if there is any trade with Canada, let it be made in an orderly manner, and in the form of a notice of desire to abrogate the treaty which we have with the Canadians. Let us not be highhanded.

As we deliberate here tonight, I cannot help but thinking of the impact on the rest of the world when Members of the Senate talk about friendships and then advocate taking resources from one of their best friends, Canada. I think we all agree Canada is that. What would be the effect on the Arab States and the Latin American States? Would they not

be justified in saying, "What is the use of making any agreement with the United States if they are not going to observe their agreements?" That question disturbs me more than do the other aspects of this measure.

Of course, I believe it is silly for Congress to promote stream pollution clean-up and sewage-disposal programs and at the same time say to our second largest city, "We did not mean you. You do not have to have sewage disposal like that provided by the small cities and towns. You can go ahead and pollute the streams, if you want to. That is something that is of a domestic nature."

I rose particularly to point out the bad effect this discussion can have on other countries. I do not think we should even talk about violating a treaty with another country, particularly a country which has given us no justification whatever to even think of abrogating that treaty, which I suppose we could do by serving a notice at a certain time. I am more concerned over that fact than I am over the fact that the bill would divert 5,000 second-feet of water, during a low-water period, from the St. Lawrence River. I do not know exactly what it would cost the State of New York, the Province of Ontario, the Province of Quebec, or the New England States which receive St. Lawrence power. There is a difference of opinion. Certainly, hundreds of millions of kilowatt-hours would be lost, and the financial loss would run into millions of dollars.

The Province of Ontario estimates it may lose, as a result, 200 million kilowatt-hours per year based on existing plants. The Army engineers have made an estimate below that figure, 140 million or 150 million kilowatts. The Power Authority of the State of New York estimate is much higher than that of the Army Engineers. But it represents a loss only to existing plants.

I may point out that after the St. Lawrence River leaves American soil it enters the Province of Quebec, where there exist sites for the development of tremendous amounts of power, which have not been developed yet. I think the amount estimated is 2 or 3 million kilowatts. So the future development of the Province of Quebec would be affected.

I do not know about the effect on navigation on the lake. I understand if the water level were lowered during a dry season, navigation would be seriously affected, and this country's investment in the St. Lawrence Seaway would suffer a great loss. I do not know about that aspect of the problem, because I am not engineer enough to know. I simply know what I have been told. I simply say that to openly discuss, on the floor of the Senate, or to advocate, violation of a treaty with a friendly country, is something that ought not to occur.

Mr. McNAMARA. I want to thank the Senator for his very fine comment. I think the allegation has been made over and over again by the proponents of the bill that Canada has agreed to the proposal. I agree with the Senator from Vermont. I have seen no evidence of that in the record at any point.

I think the concern of the Senator from Vermont about violation of the treaty is well justified. That justification applies, furthermore, to the point the Senator has made that there seems to be a national program on the part of conservationists and allied groups for the elimination of stream pollution. By passage of the bill we would, in effect, be authorizing the second largest city in the United States to go ahead with such a program as this and add to stream pollution.

I shall be glad to yield further.

Mr. AIKEN. I am simply going to reiterate that if there is to be any diversion of Canadian water, it should be arranged for by an agreement between the two countries and it should become a codicil—I am never quite sure of the proper word to use—to the existing treaty. Such action should not be taken simply by an act of Congress.

Mr. McNAMARA. Again I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. I will also say that in this aid memoire, the latest document from the Canadian Government, the last line reads:

All rights under the provisions of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 are specifically reserved.

That language means the Canadians do not willingly give up a pint of that water so that Chicago may put more sewage into the river which flows to the south.

Mr. McNAMARA. The statement seems to justify the Senator's position very well.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont has touched upon a very vital aspect concerning the subject which we are discussing. Several weeks ago one of the supreme dignitaries of Canada spoke at a Virginia university. I received a copy of his talk. The copy is in my office. I regret I do not have it with me, so that I could have it included in the RECORD.

There is one thing he said which stands out in my mind. He said it with a bit of regret and reluctance. It was, in general: "You are advocating the thought of a brotherhood of pan-American nations. We take you at your word, yet your deeds, as to things which are happening, are not in conformity with the words which you express."

His mind was directed primarily toward the disposition of our surplus grains.

I agree with the Senator from Vermont that on the floor of the Senate tonight we are discussing a proposal to violate an agreement with the Dominion of Canada. It is said that Canada has consented to a 1-year diversion. My query is, What would Canada say if we asked Canada to consent to a 3-year diversion? What would Canada say if we asked Canada to consent to a permanent diversion?

The Senator from Vermont is absolutely correct when he says that in his mind Canada cannot and will not subscribe to a diversion of this type.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] is the present Presiding Officer. Would the Senator state that Oregon would subscribe to a diversion of the Columbia headwaters if Canada contemplated doing so?

In regard to the 1,000 cubic feet of diversion, provided by the bill——

Mr. AIKEN. Five thousand cubic feet.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There is 1,000 cubic feet provided in the bill, but it can accumulate to 5,000 cubic feet.

Mr. AIKEN. May I point out that there is a maximum of 5,000 feet during the dry weather season, the low-water period, and that would mean 5,000 cubic feet of water taken from the St. Lawrence, at a time when needed the most.

On page 2 of the bill, at line 12, it says the maximum direct diversion from Lake Michigan shall not at any time exceed a flow of 5,000 cubic feet per second.

I forget how much that diversion amounts to in horsepower. I figured the amount out 2 years ago, when the bill was under consideration. There is a tremendous amount of electricity which would be lost at a time when needed.

May I say to the Senator that what concerns me the most and makes me feel so keenly about the matter tonight is that a month ago the Senate authorized the Committee on Foreign Relations to appoint a subcommittee to explore methods of arranging a better understanding between the members of the Canadian Parliament and the Members of the United States Congress. The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, who is sitting with us tonight, appointed a committee. I am very proud to say the chairman appointed me to be a member of the committee.

The committee has directed me to go to Ottawa next month to meet with Canadian officials to discuss methods of a closer relationship between the Canadian Parliament and the United States Congress.

Can anyone imagine how cheap I would feel if I had to go to Canada to say, "The United States Congress has just voted to take part of your resources without asking you whether you like it or getting your consent?" Can Senators imagine what position that would put me in? I do not relish the trip if I have to go under those circumstances. I would not want to go to any country immediately after the United States Congress had voted to preempt some of the resources of that country.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Vermont mentioned that the Columbia River has been the subject of discussion as to diversion. The talk has been about a quantity of 20,000 cubic feet to be diverted from the Columbia River headwaters. Let us assume that the Congress should say, "We will take the 1,000 feet at a minimum and 5,000 cubic feet at a maximum for Chicago." Let us assume we take a unilateral action affecting Canada. My query is, would not Canada be justified at a later date in saying, "You acted unilaterally in the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Great Lakes Basin. Why shall we not do so in the Columbia River Basin?"

Mr. AIKEN. There is no reason in the world why the Canadians should not divert the headwaters of the Columbia River without even consulting us if we divert water from the Great Lakes without a proper agreement with the Canadians.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am very grateful to the Senator from Michigan for yielding.

Mr. McNAMARA. I appreciate the Senator's remarks.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McNAMARA. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin for a question.

Mr. WILEY. I should like to have the attention of the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be happy to pay attention.

Mr. WILEY. The other night when we got into such a friendly contest the Senator from Illinois in a rather sarcastic way suggested I had been talking to some girl in Canada.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is that not true?

Mr. WILEY. Please. I hope the Senator will stop the habit of butting in. Let me finish, and then the Senator can butt in. Let me relate the story. I think the Senator wants the truth.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; I do.

Mr. WILEY. I called Mr. Smith, the Minister of External Affairs. Mr. Smith was either in the Parliament or in conference. I was called to the judiciary room. Harrison Cleveland, the head of the American section of the Canadian Department of External Affairs, came to the telephone. A series of questions was put to him, and the questions and answers were taken down in shorthand.

I want to say that Mr. Cleveland is the head of the Canadian side of the External Joint Commission. One of the questions put to him was, "Has Canada agreed to the diversion?" And he answered "No." That was taken down by Mrs. Cato in my office.

I am interjecting this because it is apropos of what the distinguished Senator spoke about.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Who was the young lady to whom the Senator telephoned?

Mr. WILEY. The Senator is as confused as ever.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Wisconsin said he called up a young lady in Ottawa. Who was she?

Mr. WILEY. I said that I telephoned Mr. Smith, the Minister of External Affairs. Then this young lady came to the telephone, and I asked for the Minister——

Mr. DOUGLAS. What was her name?

Mr. WILEY. Just a moment. She came to the telephone, and I asked for the Minister. She said, "I will see if he is busy."

Then I had to go to the Judiciary Committee, and the person who came to the telephone was not Mr. Smith, but Harrison Cleveland, head of the American section of the Canadian Department of External Affairs, directly under Mr. Smith, Minister of External Affairs. Among other questions that were put to him was the question, Has Canada agreed to the diversion?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Did the Senator himself hear that?

Mr. WILEY. No.

Mr. DOUGLAS. When messages are relayed from person to person to person, they are frequently distorted.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator is speaking about his own experience.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. That is the experience of mankind.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator is good at distortions. He ought to be practical enough, as a former school teacher, to realize what actually happened. Because I had to go to the Judiciary Committee, my secretary waited until someone came to the telephone. Who was that someone? Harrison Cleveland, who was the head of the American section of the Canadian Department of External Affairs, directly under Mr. Smith, the Minister of External Affairs. That question was asked.

I place this information in the RECORD because the other day the Senator from Illinois put on a little circus stunt, and confused everyone in the gallery by walking back and forth and saying that I had talked to a little girl. I have observed that the Senator from Illinois does not object to that himself. But this time I was not talking to a little girl.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a minute?

Mr. WILEY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Wisconsin asked me to listen to him. I have done so. I wonder if I may have the courtesy of an opportunity to make reply.

I intend to keep out while this filibuster is going on, and not take any part in it, because I well know the plans to talk this bill to death.

Permit me to quote from page 5 of the report. I read from a letter to Representative SIDNEY R. YATES from the Assistant Secretary of the Department of State, William B. Macomber, Jr.:

> DEAR MR. YATES: This is in reply to your inquiry regarding the Canadian position on the proposed Chicago diversion project. The State Department understands that the Canadian Government has no objection to a 1-year temporary diversion of an additional 1,000 cubic feet of water per second from the Great Lakes system at Chicago.

Mr. WILEY. Did the Senator say 1 year?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. WILEY. That is a good thing to remember.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I have the floor. I think this has gone far enough.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me——

Mr. McNAMARA. No. I wish to talk a little about the alleged filibuster. I will not permit anything until I get the record straight.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is the Senator from Illinois circulating a cloture petition?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). The Senate will be in order. The rules of the Senate provide that the Senators who wish to address the Senate shall first address the Chair. That rule will be enforced.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I resent very much the implication on the part of the Senator from Illinois that I am participating in a filibuster. That is a most unjust charge. I do not understand why anyone should accuse me of engaging in a filibuster at this stage of the Congress. I deeply resent it.

This shows the weakness of the position of the people of Chicago. Their case has no merit. I do not know how far one can go in being ridiculous; but when a Senator resorts to such tactics as accusing me of engaging in a filibuster when this question has been before the Senate for only 24 hours, and I am the first speaker in opposition, and have talked for about 20 minutes, that is a ridiculous charge.

Mr. President, I shall continue from the point where I was interrupted.

This drop has already increased considerably the cost of dredging the connecting channels of the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway. I previously pointed out the drop between 1952 and 1956. These connecting channels are being dredged to a 27-foot depth and in many cases the dredging is being carried on through almost solid rock at a tremendous expense to the United States Government. It would seem foolhardy on one hand to continue with this costly dredging of these connecting channels on the Great Lakes Waterway and the St. Lawrence Seaway and at the same time to lower the lake levels of the Great Lakes thereby necessitating even more and costly dredging of the connecting channels between the Lakes.

Mr. President, we are presented with a new concept of legislative procedure, legislation by committee report.

We were told in our Committee on Public Works that we should pass H. R. 2 in its present form providing for a 2,500-cubic-foot diversion for a 3-year period, but that we do not really mean it because what we really mean is that it will only be for a 1-year period because the Sanitary District of Chicago will only take the water for 1 year. We are told that the sanitary district has made this commitment in the form of a letter to the Public Works Committee. And the commitment is in our committee report. I submit that this is a new high in legislative achievement.

While I am not a lawyer I am aware of the legal proposition that where the terms of a statute are clear and unequivocal, the courts will give to the language of the statute its plain and ordinary meaning and when we say in a bill that there will be a diversion for 3 years I assume that any reasonable person would conclude that 3 years are what we meant. It seems highly irregular and highly illogical to require a person reading 3 years in a statute to go to a committee report to find out that Congress actually only meant 1 year. I have proposed an amendment to H. R. 2

so that the bill will read the way the Senate Public Works Committee says that it should be read. Notwithstanding my submitting this amendment I am not in favor of the bill as it now reads nor will I be favor of it if my amendment is adopted. I simply feel that the bill should so read that any person with a moderate amount of intelligence can determine from reading the bill itself what the proposal is. There are many other faults with the bill, all of them based on supposed commitments by the Chicago Sanitary District to the Public Works Committee. For example, the sanitary district says that the Secretary of the Army's report will not be made until 3 years after the enactment of this measure, yet the bill itself, as it now reads, requires a report from the Secretary of the Army within 2½ years after such enactment.

To summarize, this proposed study cannot be justified on the theory that it would assist in navigation on the Chicago Sanitary District Canal and the lower Illinois River and part of the Mississippi.

The proposed increased diversion in H. R. 2 would adversely affect navigation and Canadian and New York power projects on the St. Lawrence. Moreover, Canada now proposes a diversion of a portion of the headwaters of the Columbia River in the Pacific Northwest and if we go ahead with this Chicago diversion without Canada's consent we will have established a precedent which may preclude us from objecting to a Canadian proposed diversion in the Northwest.

It would also adversely affect the constitutional right of citizens of the Lake States to enjoy their God-given blessings in the form of waters of the Great Lakes and the tributaries thereto. It will result in a tremendous loss of shipping on the Great Lakes in addition to injuries to navigation.

Furthermore, Chicago has no legal, moral, or constitutional right to a single drop of water from Lake Michigan. As pointed out, the Chicago River originally flowed into Lake Michigan until its course was reversed by action of the city of Chicago in digging a canal, thereby causing the water of the Chicago River to flow southward into the Mississippi.

Moreover, Chicago's remedy lies with the Supreme Court of the United States, which authorized its present 1,500-cubic-feet-per-second diversion in addition to domestic pumpage. Chicago has gone to the Court time after time to secure additional diversion and it has on several occasions secured additional diversions by an appropriate plea to the Supreme Court. She should seek the same forum now. While the diversion will unquestionably aid Chicago in solving its sewage problem, Chicago has had nearly 70 years to resolve that problem and she is in no worse a fix now than any of her sister cities of the Middle West, who, for reasons of health, have been forced to construct suitable sewage-disposal plants.

I have gone into this matter at some length because I feel very strongly about this bill. Practically every community in our State has voiced opposition to this measure. H. R. 2 is bad legislation. It should be defeated.

Mr. President, I call up my amendment, identified as "8-18-58-H."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 9, it is proposed to strike out "3-year" and insert in lieu thereof "1-year."

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I wish to commend my distinguished colleague for his very excellent statement and the outstanding minority views on the bill.

He well knows, as do other Senators from the Great Lakes States, that we are discussing a measure affecting not only the Great Lakes States, but also the Provinces of Canada. Yet we find that only the Senators from Illinois, from the Great Lakes area, the region which would be affected, are supporting the measure. All the other Senators from the other Great Lakes States are opposing it, for the very reason I have given. I know of no other instance in connection with proposed legislation when Congress was asked to legislate in behalf of one State to the detriment of adjoining States.

As my distinguished colleague has so well pointed out, this matter has always been subject to court adjudication. Yet it is now being brought into Congress, even though the case has been decided many times by the courts. The problem arises from the fact that the city of Chicago has never complied with the court order. We are asked to take up a problem which rightly belongs to the city of Chicago.

I was interested in the comment of my distinguished colleague with respect to what might happen. Canada has opposed this kind of legislation in the past. I am confident from the report of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin that Canada still opposes it. If we insist on enacting this kind of legislation, certainly Canada will be in a position as the Senator has mentioned, to divert the headwaters of the Columbia River.

We have had great concern with respect to Canada's intention to impose tolls on the Welland Canal. We have always considered the Welland Canal as a part of the connecting channels, just as we consider the Sault Ste. Marie locks and the Detroit River as connecting channels. We are spending more than $100 million in improving our connecting channels, and Congress has voted money for that purpose.

It has always been our opinion that the connecting channels should be toll-free. We do not charge tolls on our connecting channels. Now Canada, by statute, has decided to apply toll charges on the Welland Canal. It puts the United States in an awkward position with respect to protesting against the imposition of tolls on the Welland Canal, when we through Congress would divert the waters which partly belong to Canada. It pulls the rug from under the position of our Government in dealing with Canada on the imposition of toll charges.

I commend my colleague for his work in this field and for his address this evening, and particularly for his excellent minority views.

Mr. McNAMARA. I thank the Senator for his contribution and his cooperation in this matter.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I was interested in reading the report from the House. All the way through the House committee report stated it wanted 3 years, not a split up period, and the House wanted the water to run for 3 years.

Then what happened? They did not amend the bill, to provide for 1 year. They passed the bill and sent it to the Senate. Then they took it up with the Executive Office of the President and the Bureau of the Budget. I have the letter before me from the Bureau of the Budget, signed by Mr. Robert W. Jones, Assistant Director. Among other things in that letter, Mr. Jones states:

> However, it is considered that such legislation need authorize an additional diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second for 1 year only since a year should be devoted to a more definite study of present sanitary conditions in the waterway and up to a year will be required to write a report.

Mr. President, that is a very significant statement, because that is not what the report of the committee says. The committee wants 3 years. Then they changed it a bit. I read further from the letter:

> The Department of State has now completed discussions with the Canadian Government on the proposed increased diversion. No formal indication has been received from the Government of Canada that there would be any change in its position on this legislation. However, it is believed that the more limited authority discussed above would be less objectionable to Canada than the proposed 3-year diversion.

Then Mr. Jones says:

> In the event that the Congress were to determine that a study of this matter is justified, the Bureau of the Budget would not object to legislation which would limit the period of an additional diversion to 1 year and provide for an equal sharing of the cost of the study by the sanitary district and the Federal Government.

I have read those statements to show the process of reasoning. I remember so well when the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] presided at the hearings—and he was a very good presiding officer—when the point came up that they were asking for 1 year instead of 3 years for the drawing of the water. He called attention to the fact that the bill itself provided for 3 years.

Then it was that someone got the idea that Congress ought to pass a law, definite and certain, which would provide for a 3-year taking of water. Then they decided with a clear statement like that, there could be made another statement which could affect a definite, clear, and unambiguous law. So they came forth with the idea, as was said by the Senator from Illinois the other night, that they wanted 6 months to get ready. Then they wanted 12 months to draw water. Then they wanted another 12 or 18 months to prepare a report. The bill provides for a continuous flow of water for 3 years. That is the purpose of the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

amendment the Senator from Michigan has offered.

Mr. McNAMARA. That is the purpose.

Mr. WILEY. Certainly in justice the amendment should be considered as full context. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McNAMARA. I do not yield for that purpose at this time. I yielded to the distinguished Senator for another purpose. I did not yield for that purpose.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire letter, from which I have read, placed in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield to the Senator for that purpose.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., July 2, 1958.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in further reply to your request for the views of the Bureau of the Budget on S. 1123, a bill "to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes."

We have previously advised your committee that the Bureau of the Budget would recommend that action on this legislation be deferred. In our letter we called attention to certain unresolved problems, and stated that we would comment further at a later date. While our questions are not yet fully answered, it is believed that some additional comment may be helpful to your committee in your further consideration of this legislation.

It would appear that there are basically two alternative methods of attacking the problems of sanitary conditions in the Illinois Waterway. The method contemplated by S. 1123 is dilution by means of an additional diversion of water from Lake Michigan. The method discussed in a report dated April 29, 1957, from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is additional treatment measures by means of chlorination and aeration. Both methods could increase the supply of dissolved oxygen in the waterway to the same extent.

The cost of an additional diversion, the dilution method, has been estimated in terms of economic losses to navigation and hydroelectric power in the report of the Chief of Engineers submitted to the Congress on February 13, 1957, and printed as Senate Document No. 28. In that report losses to navigation from a permanent diversion of an additional 1,000 cubic feet per second were estimated at $240,000 annually, and losses to hydroelectric power in the United States and Ontario were estimated at $708,000 annually. These estimates are admittedly conservative since they do not evaluate losses to hydroelectric powerplants in Quebec, to Canadian fleet commerce, or to future commerce on the Great Lakes resulting from the St. Lawrence Seaway development.

The cost of the second method, additional treatment measures by the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, is estimated in the enclosed report of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated April 29, 1957, to be between $750,000 and $1,500,000 annually with an initial investment in that same range. The estimates of the Metropolitan Sanitary District are not significantly different, as indicated in its report of June 21, 1957, a copy of which is enclosed. This is attested to by a further report from the Public Health Service, dated July 17, 1957, a copy of which is also enclosed. Thus, it would appear that the cost of these two alternative methods of improving sanitary conditions in the Illinois Waterway and the benefits which would result from them are about equal. It is recognized that all of the facts about these two alternatives have not yet been determined with complete accuracy. For this reason your committee may wish to consider legislation authorizing a study by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in cooperation with the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago of the benefits from the two alternative methods for improving sanitary conditions in the Illinois Waterway and of the costs of additional treatment measures. However, it is considered that such legislation need authorize an additional diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second for 1 year only since a year should be devoted to a more definitive study of present sanitary conditions in the waterway and up to a year will be required to write a report. In addition, because of the purpose and character of the study, it is believed that its cost should be shared by the sanitary district and the Federal Government.

The Department of State has now completed discussions with the Canadian Government on the proposed increased diversion. No formal indication has been received from the Government of Canada that there would be any change in its position on this legislation. However, it is believed that the more limited authority discussed above would be less objectionable to Canada than the proposed 3-year diversion.

In the event that the Congress were to determine that a study of this matter is justified, the Bureau of the Budget would not object to legislation which would limit the period of an additional diversion to 1 year and provide for an equal sharing of the cost of the study by the sanitary district and the Federal Government.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER W. JONES,
Assistant Director.

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator mentioned a communication from the Bureau of the Budget. I suppose it is merely coincidental, but the gentleman who sent it happens to come from Chicago. I am sure he is an estimable man. I cast no aspersions on him. But sometimes our thinking is affected by such things.

Mr. President, I have received a telegram from Hon. Averell Harriman, Governor of the State of New York, which I shall read:

ALBANY, N. Y., *August 18, 1958.*

Hon. PAT MCNAMARA,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

It is a matter of utmost importance to the people of the State of New York, and the 50 million residents of the Great Lakes Basin, that the Senate not, repeat, not approve H. R. 2, providing for the diversion of further waters from Lake Michigan to the Chicago Sanitary System.

The measure before the Senate would permit diversion of as much as 5,000 cubic feet per second at any one time. This diversion will take place at times of low water and its effect will be experienced at the hydroelectric installations at Niagara at precisely the moment when the regular flow is lowest. The firm capacity of hydroelectric plants is of course determined by the amount of water available at the driest time of the year. Under this bill our plants will be affected when they can least afford it. The enactment of the measure would cost the consumers of Niagara and St. Lawrence power a minimum of 75 million over the period of the New York State Power Authority license. In addition the enactment of the measure would jeopardize the entire navigation system of the St. Lawrence Seaway. The vast construction program now underway is predicated on the maintenance during the navigation season of a level between 244 and 248 on Lake Ontario. If diversion of water at Chicago is permitted under the terms of the measure before the Senate it will be most difficult, if not indeed impossible, to maintain the level of Lake Ontario at 244 during periods of low water on the Great Lakes.

It is unthinkable that this special legislation should be approved in the face of the State opposition and compelling arguments of every State in the Great Lakes Basin save the one beneficiary. The Congress, having approved the development of Niagara power and the St. Lawrence Seaway on which vast sums are being expended, would now be approving a measure that would gravely jeopardize the investment in both these projects.

I ask your urgent consideration of this matter which may seem of small concern, but which is in fact an issue of vast implication.

Best regards.

AVERELL HARRIMAN.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the pending question is on agreeing to an amendment which would do what obviously should be done—namely, spell out what the proponents of the pending bill say they wish to have provided for, namely, a diversion for 1 year.

Their proposal has been presented to the Senate as a 1-year proposition; and the report indicates that it is for 1 year. But the language of the bill itself states that it is for 3 years.

My amendment will correct the language of the bill, so as to bring the bill into conformity with the views of those on the other side of the question.

Under the circumstances, I think the floor managers of the bill certainly should accept the amendment. I now ask whether they will accept it for the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Michigan addressing his question to me?

Mr. McNAMARA. I do not know who is the floor manager for the bill. I assume the floor manager to be the chairman of the subcommittee, acting for the committee. However, I may be in error about that.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. McNAMARA. I am happy to yield for the purpose indicated.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, there is no Member of the Senate whose request would have more influence with me; and nothing would give me greater pleasure than to comply with any wish the distinguished Senator from Michigan has in regard to either this matter or any other.

However, I must remind my good friend, the Senator from Michigan, that the practical effect of granting his request would be to extinguish whatever

remote possibility might remain to have this bill enacted by this Congress.

The pending measure is House bill 2, which has been passed by the House of Representatives. The bill came to the Senate, was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and has been reported, without amendment, by that committee to the Senate.

I am advised that, for all practical purposes, the House of Representatives has wound up its part of this Congress; that at this moment it is in recess; and that it has no thought of engaging in further legislative proceedings.

So I know that my good friend, the Senator from Michigan, is aware of the fact that in asking the managers of the bill to accept an amendment which would compel the return of the bill to the House of Representatives, for action by it, he is, in reality, requesting that the bill be killed.

Inasmuch as I very much favor the bill, much as I should like to cooperate with my good friend, the Senator from Michigan, I must state that he has asked something which it is not within my power to grant.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I desire to thank the distinguished floor manager of the bill for his courtesy. I believe he has explained a situation which is quite apparent to all of us.

The proposed legislation, which in some form or other has been before the Congress for many, many years—perhaps for 50 years, should not be here. The bill, according to the language used in it, provides for a 3-year period. Canada has made some reference to the fact that she would not have much objection or would not raise objection, although Canada did not say that directly; it was said through an Assistant Secretary of Foreign Affairs I believe. But Canada was making reference to a 1-year term. However, the pending bill calls for a 3-year period. Certainly the 3-year period could not be "sold," under any circumstances, to Canada.

We are told that it is too late in the session for the House to act on any amendment. In that case, Mr. President, what manner of legislation would Senators now have us engage in? Of course it is too late for the House to consider an amendment; and, in all reason, it is too late for this measure to be acted on by the Senate, under the circumstances.

I submit that this matter comes before the Senate at much too late an hour—at a time when any amendment the Senate might adopt could not be considered by the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I shall have to insist upon my amendment.

At this time I relinquish the floor, and hope that other Senators will pursue this matter.

Mr. KERR. Before the Senator from Michigan relinquishes the floor, will he yield to me?

Mr. McNAMARA. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I should like to put the RECORD straight on 1 or 2 matters which have been referred to by several Senators, if I may have the permission of the distinguished Senator from Michigan to proceed at this time.

Mr. McNAMARA. I shall be happy to have the Senator from Oklahoma proceed, if I may be permitted to relinquish the floor, and to have the Senator from Oklahoma recognized in his own right for the few minutes that he has indicated he desires to proceed—if that will be satisfactory to him.

Mr. KERR. Yes, indeed.

Mr. McNAMARA. Incidentally, I wish to leave the Chamber, to get something to eat. [Laughter.]

Mr. KERR. I think that is a very profound and fundamental statement, and gives a valid picture of a legitimate need on the part of my good friend. And I wish to say to him that inasmuch as I have already performed that little operation for myself, I can well understand his desire to do so. [Laughter.]

Mr. McNAMARA. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, there has been considerable debate this evening about a treaty between the United States of America and the Dominion of Canada. In my opinion, the debate has been engaged in by men who are unfamiliar with what is in the treaty. The distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] talked about this measure as being a proposal for the diversion of Canadian waters. Nothing could be more inaccurate than that statement.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is here. I shall make a statement; and if it is in error, I should like to have him interrupt me and correct me. I make the statement that, in my judgment, the Senator from Vermont has not read the treaty to which he has referred.

I make the statement, without much fear of contradiction, that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], who discussed this treaty at great length, has not read it.

I make the statement, without much fear of contradiction, that the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], who spoke previously about the treaty, has not read it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I rise to challenge the statement of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. KERR. If I may do so without losing the floor, I shall be glad to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I merely wish to say to the Senator from Oklahoma that the Senator from Ohio has read the treaty.

The Senator from Ohio has likewise read the communication sent by the Dominion of Canada to the United States Government, stating that Canada would not countenance a diversion of the water contemplated in a 3-year period.

Mr. KERR. The treaty said that?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Ohio said—and I am standing quite close to the Senator from Oklahoma—that he has read the letters that were sent to him by the officials of the Dominion of Canada to the Department of State on March 10, 1954, August 24, 1954, and February 13, 1956, respectively, protesting the diversion of water as contemplated in the bills that were pending at that time.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the statement the Senator from Oklahoma made was that, in his judgment, the Senator from Ohio had not read the treaty—not the private correspondence with public officials in Canada. I repeat that in my judgment the Senator from Ohio has not read the treaty to which he referred.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Ohio understands distinctly that the officials of the Dominion of Canada have quoted the provisions of the treaty in the 3 communications which I have mentioned, that under the treaty of 1909, I believe it is, the parties bound themselves to the effect that neither one of them, neither the United States nor the Dominion of Canada, would divert waters to an extent that would cause substantial injury to the navigational facilities on one or the other side of the boundary.

Mr. KERR. Could the Senator, who has read the treaty and seems to be so familiar with it, advise the Senate of the provision in the treaty with respect to the settlement of any question or matter of difference arising between the high contracting parties?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I——

Mr. KERR. I yield only for the purpose of propounding a question to the Senator, if I may do so without losing the right to the floor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma asked me whether I had read the treaty.

Mr. KERR. No; I did not ask whether the Senator had read the treaty. I insist upon a response to the question I asked him. In view of the fact that the Senator said he has read the treaty and is familiar with it, I ask the Senator if he will tell the Senate—if I may ask the question and make that request without losing the floor—the provision in the treaty setting forth the manner of settlement of any matters of differences arising between the high contracting parties. I yield to him for the purpose of answering that question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Ohio may respond to the inquiry of the Senator from Oklahoma without losing the floor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Ohio will read the parts of the treaty that are essentially pertinent to the question being discussed and contemplated by the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. KERR. I do not yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma declines to yield for that purpose.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Oklahoma would like to have me to speak only in the manner that would be

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

acceptable to his wishes, but much as the Senator from Ohio respects the Senator from Oklahoma, he must insist that he be given an opportunity to express his own views, even though they are in conflict with those of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, that illustrates and proves the statement that I made. The Senator, in my judgment, has not read the treaty. He does not know what is in the treaty. I asked him a question about it, and he begins a diversion, not of water, but of thought. I am sure if he knew what this treaty provided with reference to the specified manner for the settlement of differences in controversy, he would have said so without saying that his right to express his opinions was being infringed. I did not ask him for an opinion. He said he had read the treaty. He said he knew what was in it. I asked him a simple question about one of the most important features in it, and from the look on his face it came as a shock and surprise; in my judgment he had never heard about it.

If he has, if I may be permitted to do so, I now request that I may yield to him to answer the question. What is the provision in the treaty as to how the matter shall be settled if differences arise between the parties?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The issue that is before the Senate is whether the United States Government has authority to divert waters out of Lake Michigan without the consent of Canada, and if the Senator from Oklahoma will permit me, I shall read the provisions of the treaty on which I rely.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I do not yield for that purpose. [Laughter.]

I ask that I be permitted to ask the Senator another simple question with respect to the treaty, if he is willing for me to do so, without my losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair desires to say, for the information of the Senate, something that every Member knows, and that is that when a Senator has the floor, under the Rules of the Senate he may yield to another Senator only for the purpose of asking a question, unless there is unanimous consent.

Mr. AIKEN and Mr. WILEY addressed the Chair.

Mr. KERR. I remind the Presiding Officer that I asked for unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands. The Chair was about to say that the Senator from Oklahoma had made the request, the Chair had propounded the question as to whether unanimous consent was given, and it was given on several occasions; but the Chair wanted it clearly understood what the rules are.

The Senator from Oklahoma has the floor.

Mr. KERR. I now again ask unanimous consent that I may propound a question to the Senator from Ohio with reference to another provision in the treaty, without my losing the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma that he may interrogate the Senator from Ohio? No objection is heard. The Senator from Oklahoma may ask his question.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Vermont. I do not yield to him for any speech.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I rise to a point of personal privilege.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield for that purpose?

Mr. KERR. If I may do so without losing the right to the floor if, and if the time of yielding does not exceed 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Rules of the Senate provide that the Senator having the floor may yield only for a question; but by unanimous consent, of course, a Senator may yield for another purpose.

Mr. KERR. I do not ask unanimous consent for any special privilege for the Senator from Vermont, much as I would like to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma has the floor.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I thought it was quite interesting that the distinguished Senator from Vermont objected to a procedure by unanimous consent.

Mr. AIKEN. Apparently the Senator from Oklahoma does not want the question answered.

Mr. KERR. It was a little unusual. I sat in my seat while the distinguished Senator from Michigan had the floor. I must say there was as near to a three-ringed circus going on on this floor as I have seen in my lifetime, and I have paid admissions to a few circuses, and I have been to the Dallas Fair twice. [Laughter.] No Senator objected to that informal discussion, because either a contribution was being made to the subject before the Senate or gratification on the part of Senators to be heard was being had by them.

Yet when I asked unanimous consent to propound a question to the distinguished Senator from Ohio, the Senator from Vermont, who had been violating the Rules of the Senate this afternoon with impunity and without objection on my part, exercised his right and privilege, which he is certainly entitled to do, if he so desires, to become technical with the Senator from Oklahoma. It is interesting and illuminating with reference to the attitude of the Senator from Vermont.

I was about to ask the Senator from Ohio if he knew how long the term of the treaty was. I was about to ask the Senator if he knew of the provision in the treaty whereby it could be brought to an end, and under what circumstances.

If the Senator from Vermont can answer that question I will yield to him for a question in the form of whether a certain statement expresses the facts with reference to what is in the treaty.

I believe some Senators do not know what is in this treaty. From what some Senators have said, I do not think they have ever seen the treaty. I believe some Senators do not know who negotiated the treaty. Some may not even know who are the contracting parties. [Laughter.]

There has been talk on the floor of the Senate to the effect that "We are discussing a proposal to violate an agreement with Canada. We are being asked to provide for a diversion of Canadian waters."

Mr. President, since those statements are not accurate, I indulge the presumption on a friendly and sincere basis that the statements were made by reason of a lack of knowledge rather than by reason of an intent to mislead the Senate.

Mr. President, I should like to read to the Senate what the man who negotiated the treaty said. The treaty was negotiated for the United States Government by Mr. Elihu Root. Mr. Root not only knew what he was doing, but he was able to remember it after he did it, and he was able in an articulate manner to express and put down what had been done so that people could understand. That would be quite a diversion in the present atmosphere and environment. [Laughter.]

I should like to read what Mr. Elihu Root said in an appearance before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations at the time the treaty was under consideration for ratification. I wonder if the Senator from Ohio knows that the Senate, when it ratified the treaty, adopted an amendment to the treaty which was later accepted by the other contracting party.

For the benefit of Senators who have been making statements, I will tell the Senate who made this treaty. This treaty was made between the United States of America and His Majesty the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions Beyond the Seas, Emperor of India. That is who made this treaty. [Laughter.]

I am reminded of the fellow who went off to school and came home. His old man sent him to a spelling bee. The old man found out the next morning that the boy had misspelled a word, and when the boy told him what the word was the old man said, "No wonder you can't spell it; you can't even pronounce it."

There has been talk about a treaty, yet some Senators did not even know who were the parties to the treaty, for how long it was to run, how it could be terminated, how it could be changed, and what the provision in it is with reference to how differences between the contracting parties may be settled.

Men who speak on their responsibility as United States Senators should not indulge in such wishful thinking and operation.

I am reminded of a current song, or of a song which was current not long ago:

> Oh, the wayward wind is a restless wind,
> A restless wind that yearns to wander.
> And I was born the next of kin—
> The next of kin to the wayward wind.

I shall read what Mr. Elihu Root said. I think the men who talk about the treaty ought to listen, because information and facts never hurt anybody.

The treaty starts by defining the boundary waters as "the waters from main shore to main shore of the lakes and rivers and connecting waterways or the portions thereof along which the international boundary between the United States and the Dominion of Canada passes, including all bays, arms, and inlets thereof, but not including tributary waters which in their natural channels would flow into such lakes, rivers and waterways, or waters flowing from such lakes, rivers, and waterways."

The waters of Lake Michigan are as clearly and completely excluded from the treaty as both national sovereignty and solemn declaration can make them. The waters of Lake Michigan are not a part of the boundary waters between our country and the Dominion of Canada. Those waters are not even part of the boundary waters between this country and Ireland or India. One of the parties to the treaty was His Majesty the King of the United Kingdom. That is who made the treaty; the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions Beyond the Seas, Emperor of India. Canada is not even mentioned. [Laughter.] Canada came in under the provision of "whom it may concern." [Laughter.]

There is no part of Lake Michigan which is any nearer the borders of Canada than the statements of the Senators to whom I have referred have been to the question before the Senate. I think the nearest distance is 35 miles, Mr. President. That is how far it is from the nearest part of Lake Michigan to Canada.

I live in the valley of the Arkansas River. It flows into the mighty Mississippi, and from there into the Gulf of Mexico, where its waters mingle with the waters of the Gulf Stream, which, through a natural phenomenon the explanation of which I do not know, find their way across the Atlantic, where, Mr. President, the gentle zephyrs which cross it warm the Emerald Isle, that great island of Britain; also Normandy.

Under this treaty the waters of the Arkansas River, which eventually affect the waters of the Gulf Stream, which help to control the climate of Great Britain, which is a signatory to this treaty, are just as much under the jurisdiction of the treaty as are the waters of Lake Michigan.

Mr. President, I have studied this treaty. I am not a stranger to it. I am not shocked when men ask me questions about it.

Let me tell the Senate what Mr. Elihu Root said. I wonder if he knew as much about it, inasmuch as he is the man who helped to write it and who agreed to it, as men who have never seen it.

The treaty begins with a definition of the boundary waters involved. I think that was appropriate. If the negotiators were to make a treaty with reference to those waters, they should be defined. After all, when a treaty is made about something it should be defined. It must start somewhere and end somewhere, or it may start in North Dakota and wind up in New Mexico. Elihu Root says:

> The treaty starts with defining the boundary waters as the waters from main shore to main shore of the lakes, rivers, and connecting waterways, or the portions thereof along which the international boundary between the United States and the Dominion of Canada passes, including all bays, arms, and inlets thereof, but not including tributary waters which, in their natural channels, would flow into such lakes, rivers, and waterways, or waters flowing from such lakes, rivers, and waterways.

Specifically excluding the waters of Lake Michigan.

To make it crystal clear, Mr. Elihu Root, who was a careful man, then told the Foreign Relations Committee this:

> I have carefully guarded the terms of this treaty in order not to include Lake Michigan, and in order not to involve Senator Cullen's constituents in the drainage canal in the treaty in any way.

The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has been chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. He is one of the finest men I know. He is a great Christian gentleman, and I have a great affection for him. He has been chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. He knows who Elihu Root was. He was of his party—or at least a party which had the same name as the one to which the Senator from Wisconsin belongs.

The Senator from Wisconsin understands the solemnity of a statement by a Secretary of State of the Republican Party to a Foreign Relations Committee in a Republican Congress and Republican Senate. I commend to the Senator from Wisconsin the statement of Mr. Elihu Root on this question. Mr. Elihu Root said—and I quote again:

> I have carefully guarded the terms of this treaty in order not to include Lake Michigan, and in order not to involve Senator Cullen's constituents in the drainage canal in the treaty in any way.

For the sake of my uninformed friend—I mean my good friend from Ohio—article X provides that—

> Any questions or matters of difference arising between the high contracting parties involving the rights, obligations, or interests of the United States or of the Dominion of Canada, either in relation to each other or to their respective inhabitants, may be referred for decision to the International Joint Commission by the consent of the two parties.

The question before the Senate is very simple. The Sanitary District of the city of Chicago wants the right to divert a thousand cubic feet of water per second for 1 year from Lake Michigan into the operation of its sanitary canal and navigable waterway.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. WILEY. Did not the Senator leave out one very important clause of the treaty?

Mr. KERR. I say to my good friend that—I am sure, to his great surprise—there are 14 articles to the treaty, and a resolution of the United States, which became a part of it. So the Senator knows that the Senator from Oklahoma knows he has not read all the treaty. I am surprised that the Senator from Wisconsin did not know that. If he had been remotely familiar with this treaty he would have known that I had not read 5 percent of it. However, what I have read, I have read accurately.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. When I have paid my respects to the first question.

Mr. WILEY. Let the Senator tell the truth about it, then.

Mr. KERR. If the Senator is getting around to the point where he wants to be devoted to the truth, I am delighted.

I say to him, in relation to the other question which he asked me—and I do not blame him for rushing from the first question to another without giving me time to respond to it—I must insist, in the due and courteous relationship between Senators, especially those who have such high regard, esteem, and respect for each other as do the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Oklahoma, that once a question has been addressed by one Senator who asks another Senator to yield for that purpose, the Senator to whom the question is addressed should respond to the question. I do that only on the basis of my right, and not on the basis of being granted the privilege by the Senator from Wisconsin.

As I said, the Senator from Wisconsin knows that, since this treaty is as long as it is, and since it has 14 articles and a resolution adopted by the United States and accepted by the other contracting party, the brief excerpts I have read from it do not constitute the entire treaty. But I say to my good friend that I did not lift anything from context to color its meaning. I read a sufficient amount of any part which I quoted to make its purport clear. I say to the Senator that, as I have read the treaty—and I say to him that I have read all of the treaty—there is nothing in it that would destroy the effectiveness or the significance of the language I have read to him.

As I was about to say, this is a very simple question. Shall this Congress permit the Sanitary District of Chicago to divert a thousand acre-feet of water per second for 1 year——

Mr. DOUGLAS. A thousand cubic feet.

Mr. KERR. A thousand cubic feet of water per second—to be diverted for 1 year, to carry out an experiment to determine, first, how much benefit it will be to the people of Chicago; and second, what damage, if any, will be done to others.

I say to the champions of Canada that the Dominion of Canada does not object to this request. I say to those who would read a message from the Bureau of the Budget and from the State Department in 1952 and 1954 and 1956, that they would do well for themselves, for their own information, if they would read the communications from those sources which were delivered in 1958. I say that because those who objected in 1954 and 1956 now approve. The

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

proposed legislation would do no harm to anyone. The problem of the city of Chicago is great. Its need is great. The city asks for permission from others who would not be damaged by permitting this diversion.

I say to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin that in my judgment, if his interpretation of the treaty is right—which God forbid and facts disprove—and if I understand the remark that he made on the floor of the Senate last night, he believes the great city of Milwaukee, and not the city of Chicago, is the offender. I do not choose between Milwaukee and Chicago. I ask only to help to do that which would benefit one and do no harm to the other. I should like to read from the RECORD a statement made last night by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. The Senator was speaking about Milwaukee. I believe he was referring to the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. He said:

> We in Milwaukee remove up to 95 percent of the sewage. Instead of putting the sewage back into the lake, we put back the liquid which has been purified.

Mr. President, I gather two or three things from that statement. First, I take it that they are putting the effluent from their sewage plants back into the lake. That is inherent in the language. If I am in error in that statement, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Wisconsin to correct me.

Mr. WILEY. I shall be happy to respond.

Mr. KERR. I ask only unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator to correct me if my statement that the effluent of the Milwaukee sewage disposal plants is returned to Lake Michigan is in error.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Wisconsin may respond to the invitation.

Mr. KERR. To the question.

Mr. WILEY. I believe that when a Senator asks a question, the one who is asked the question has the right to answer it the way he believes it should be answered, and not the way the questioner thinks it should be answered.

Mr. KERR. Anyone has the right to answer a question in any way he wishes provided he answers it correctly.

I asked the Senator a question. Since he does not care to cooperate, or is not willing, I withdraw my request, and say again to the Senate that, on the basis of the Senator's statement, the sewage disposal plants of Milwaukee return their effluent to Lake Michigan.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, was the Senator's request granted?

Mr. KERR. I withdrew it.

Mr. WILEY. I should like to know who is in the chair.

Mr. KERR. The chair is occupied by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. WILEY. I should like to know.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma asked unanimous consent that the Senator from Wisconsin be permitted to answer his question. The consent was granted, because there was no objection. Before the Senator from Wisconsin could reply, the Senator from Oklahoma withdrew his request. [Laughter.]

Mr. KERR. Mr. President——

Mr. WILEY. The Senator from Oklahoma is in good form tonight.

Mr. KERR. If it were not for the fact that at this moment the Senate is occupied by numerous Senators and the gallery by numerous people who witnessed what took place, I presume to make a correction in the statement of my friend who occupies the chair. However great my esteem, respect, and affection for the occupant of the chair, and however complete my knowledge that witnesses by the hundreds know just as well what happened, as does the occupant of the chair, I will not seek to make a correction in the statement of the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is very grateful to the Senator from Oklahoma. [Laughter.]

Mr. KERR. I said a while ago that on the basis of the record, the Milwaukee sewage disposal plants return the effluent to Lake Michigan. There is this statement in the RECORD by the Senator from Wisconsin: "We remove up to 95 percent of the sewage." I do not know how many people there are in the Milwaukee Sanitary District—and I shall not ask the Senator from Wisconsin [laughter]—but it is big enough to entice out there the Brooklyn Dodgers from the greater metropolitan area of New York, and big enough to have the people who go to their ball games set a new record for major league baseball attendance. Therefore, I am not doing violence to truth or accuracy by indulging the presumption that there must be upward of 500,000, 600,000, 800,000, 900,000, to 1 million people living out there.

The Senator from Wisconsin said they remove up to 95 percent of the sewage. I merely wish to say that if I lived in a community below there, which would be dependent on the effluent for its water supply, I would want to know how near up to 95 percent was removed. [Laughter.]

Then he said, "Instead of putting the sewage back into the lake, we put back the liquid that has been purified."

I should like to know what kind of animal, producing that sewage, can operate in such a way that up to 95 percent of the sewage has been eliminated from the total bulk of the entire amount and be thereby purified. If there are a million people living there, and if even 5 percent of them are producing sewage which is not removed from the effluent, I say the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has an imagination beyond that which I possess to indulge the assumption that with that amount remaining in the liquid, the liquid has been purified. However, anyone who can read into the treaty words which are not there, a meaning which does not exist, and prohibitions without foundations, I presume should have no trouble in indulging in the thought that the removal of up to 95 percent purifies the liquid. He said up to 95 percent. That is between 1 percent and 95 percent. That means it was also down to 1 percent. That is the spread—1 to 95. He did not say "We eliminate 95 percent of it." He said, "We eliminate up to 95 percent."

That reminds me of what the farmers are getting under the Benson parity formula, which provides a support program up to 90 percent, with which he has not been within speaking distance since he got into office.

Mr. President, if they do return the sewage waters to Lake Michigan—and that statement is in the RECORD; and if it does have a minimum of 5 percent of unpurified sewage; and if the waters of Lake Michigan are under this treaty; then I say to the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin that his great city is violating the treaty.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. For a question.

Mr. WILEY. Did I not say last night that 95 percent of the solids were put into milorganite fertilizer; and that the other 5 percent, which is liquids, is returned to the lakes substantially as clear as lake water, and with approximately 95 percent of its polluting material removed?

Mr. KERR. I will answer the Senator's question. I read from the RECORD on page 19127. The Senator, who quotes things, ought to look at the RECORD. He has it before him. I challenge him to tell the Senate if I have not quoted his words.

Mr. WILEY. Did I not read from the authoritative telegram exactly what I said?

Mr. KERR. I understood the telegram which the Senator read from was from the Sanitary District of Chicago.

Mr. WILEY. Not on this subject. This is that one. If the Senator wants to discuss that subject, I shall be glad to discuss it, too, with him.

Mr. KERR. I now answer the Senator's question. On page 19127, in the middle of the last column, about half way down, I find this language:

> Mr. WILEY—
>
> And for his information, I say to him that that is the way the RECORD identifies the speaker. The presumption is indulged that the words following "Mr. WILEY" were the words of the Senator from Wisconsin. This is what he said:
>
> I shall be glad to put it in the RECORD, because it comes from the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago. It came in today.

Mr. WILEY. That is the other quotation we discussed.

Mr. KERR. Was that what the Senator said?

Mr. WILEY. That is down in Chicago.

Mr. KERR. No; it is in this RECORD. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILEY. I am glad the Senator from Oklahoma can see it. [Laughter.]

Mr. KERR. I continue to read what the Senator from Wisconsin said:

> Furthermore, the RECORD shows clearly that Chicago has been guilty of failing to comply. The Senator has spoken of Milwaukee.

I was not in the Chamber at that time, but from the RECORD I take it that the Senator was referring to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]; and we cannot tell from the RECORD anything except that they were on friendly terms.

Mr. WILEY. Read on, Macduff.

Mr. KERR. I wonder what he is quoting now. [Laughter.] I thought he had been quoting the treaty. But who knows whether it was Hamlet or Midsummer Night's Dream?

But accuracy compels me to return to the RECORD as printed and as being the words of the Senator from Wisconsin. He said:

> We in Milwaukee remove up to 95 percent of sewage. Instead of putting the sewage back into the lake, we put back liquid that has been purified.

That is what the Senator said.

Mr. WILEY. Read the rest of it.

Mr. KERR. The night is not long enough for me to read the rest of what the Senator said. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILEY. I did not think the Senator was growing weak.

Mr. KERR. I am saying to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin and to this great body these things: If this treaty applies to Lake Michigan, if the waters of Lake Michigan are included in those referred to as boundary waters; and if the statement the Senator made about the effluent from the Sanitary District of Milwaukee is correct then they are in violation of this treaty and of article III, which, in part, reads:

> The foregoing provions are not intended to limit or interfere with the existing rights of the Government of the United States on the one side and the Government of the Dominion of Canada on the other, to undertake and carry on governmental works in boundary waters for the deepening of channels, the construction of breakwaters, the improvement of harbors, and other governmental works for the benefit of commerce and navigation, provided that such works are wholly on its own side of the line and do not materially affect the level or flow of the boundary waters on the other, nor are such provisions intended to interfere with the ordinary use of such waters for domestic and sanitary purposes.

Article IV reads, in part:

> It is further agreed that the waters herein defined as boundary waters and waters flowing across the boundary shall not be polluted on either side to the injury of health or property on the other.

So if these are boundary waters—which they are not—and nothing which the Senator from Wisconsin can say can make them so—but if they are, then the operation of the sewage facilities of the city of Milwaukee violates the treaty, because Milwaukee is putting sewage into the waters of Lake Michigan which has somewhere between 5 and 100 percent of the original sewage yet remaining in it. That is not calculated to fail to pollute the waters, even of Lake Michigan.

As I said before, Mr. President, the question before the Senate is very simple: Shall we do that which benefits one of the great cities of the world, and harms no one?

Often in the treaty there occur provisions in which we find the language, "operations that do not materially affect the level of the water."

On the basis of the testimony of the Army engineers, the ordinary fluctuation of the water level of Lake Michigan is 6½ feet in the periods of dry years and wet years, and somewhat less than that over 12 months. It goes up and down. The level is from 6 to 6½ feet higher at times than it is at other times.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair admonishes those who are on the floor and those who are in the galleries that conversation should cease during the debate.

The Senator from Oklahoma may proceed.

Mr. KERR. In a situation in which God in His infinite wisdom, through the operation of the laws of nature, produces a condition in which the normal level of the lake is as much as 6½ feet more at certain times than at others, who would seriously contend that a proposal to do that which would affect the level of the lake to the extent of somewhere between three-eighths of an inch and one-half inch would constitute an operation which would materially affect the level or flow of the water?

Even if the waters of Lake Michigan were under the treaty, which they are not; even if the Dominion of Canada were objecting, which she is not; even if the action sought were carried out; who would seriously say that an operation which for 12 months would affect the level of water in that lake less than one-half of 1 inch would violate a commitment to refrain from doing that which would materially affect the level of the water?

That is the bill before us, in simple terms. Honorable and sincere men say, "Yes, but the bill provides for a diversion for 3 years."

I am reminded of the old Dutchman who was looking for his horse. He got home after about 90 days. His wife asked him, "How did you get along?"

The old fellow replied, "I looked for the horse for 90 days; when I find him, I find him in 30 seconds." [Laughter.]

The bill does provide for a diversion for 3 years. But the evidence of the department of the Government under which the system will operate is that there would not be more than 12 months' diversion.

The Sanitary District of Chicago puts its statement in the record and says that it agrees to limiting the diversion to 12 months.

The committee which brings the bill to the floor says the bill is recommended on the basis that the diversion will be limited to 12 months. Mr. President, we are men of good will. Who will say that those solemn declarations are meaningless and have no significance? Who will say that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is attempting to deceive the Senate?

Is it said that the solemn obligation, signed by the Sanitary District of Chicago, namely, that it would do everything to comply with the 12-month diversion, and no more, is without significance, and is intended to mislead?

Is it said that the Senate Committee on Public Works has done a useless and a senseless thing in including in the report the statement that the bill is recommended in reliance on those solemn declarations and commitments?

Mr. President, those who would so describe the situation can neither be serious nor of a mind that Senators who read this RECORD and listen to this debate will not believe what we say and what the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has said and what the Sanitary District of Chicago has said and what the Senate Committee on Public Works has said.

So the matter is just that simple. We are in the closing days of this Congress. But this question is not a new one. The Senate has passed this bill twice before. This matter has been debated almost as much as has the wearing apparel of certain members of the executive branch of the Government. [Laughter.] The provisions and matters affected by the bill are well known.

No one is trying to slip up on someone's blind side—although, after listening to the debate, I am not sure but that one is available if it were sought. [Laughter.]

We seek only the acquiescence and approval by the Senate of a bill which has been passed by the House of Representatives, has been reported, without amendment, by the Senate committee to the Senate, and whose only chance of becoming law depends upon having the Senate pass the bill without amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE obtained the floor.

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that I may yield to the Senator from Michigan, with the understanding that I shall not thereby lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Very well; I yield.

Mr. MCNAMARA. Regardless of the statements about letters or communications from various authorities, I wish to call attention to the fact that the language on which the Senate is asked to pass at this time—as is clearly apparent from reading line 9, on page 2—makes no reference whatever to 1 year; the reference is only to a 3-year period.

I repeat that it is unfortunate that we do not have time to change the proposed legislation, so as to bring it into line with the statements which have been made.

If this matter is to be continued before the courts of the land—and I assume that it is, for at the present time it is in the Supreme Court—the Supreme Court will be more concerned, I am sure, although I am not an attorney, and am not familiar with the law; I speak only as a layman—with legislation passed by the Senate than with any communications or letters from any drainage district or any other governmental agency.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The pending bill is what the Senate is asked to pass upon. The pending bill does not provide for 1 year; it definitely provides for 3 years. It is now too late to amend the bill. I have stated the situation which now confronts us. I have stated that the pending amendment would change the language of the bill, so as to bring it into conformity with the request of everyone concerned—namely, for a period of 1 year.

Therefore, Mr. President, the amendment should be adopted by the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the junior Senator from Illinois, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Very well; I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wish to respond to the Senator from Michigan. If the bill is returned to the House, obviously the bill will be lost, and no action will be taken on it at this session.

In my judgment, this is an imperative situation, which has been in existence for nearly 70 years. It involves the health of hundreds of thousands of people.

If anyone will take the trouble to examine the report, he will find that the Sanitary District has already formalized what it is willing to do; and it is so recited in the report, over the signature of the president, in a formal resolution.

In addition, not even one pint of water could be taken out of the lake, except under the jurisdiction and control of the Corps of Army Engineers.

Finally, they have agreed with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to accept the proposal which was made by that agency.

I do not know what more would be wanted under the circumstances, because that makes the whole case clear, in that it shows that, although this program is one for 3 years, there are to be 18 months of study, then a year of diversion, and then 6 months of study and recommendations. So that arrangement cuts down by two-thirds the original request which was before the 84th Congress, and also was before the 83d Congress.

I do not know what else they can do.

Inasmuch as this matter involves the health of a great many persons, I believe it merits the consideration of the Senate.

In the committee, I pointed out that, in the current year, the United States is spending $29 million on the control of malaria in all corners of the earth. Last year, the expenditure was $28 million. Is it wrong for us to request this for our own people, when only a moderate amount of money will be lost, in terms of possible power losses?

I do not think this is too much to ask.

We have dealt with the peoples of other areas of the world who have been beset with tropical diseases and all other manner of diseases. But when we make a reasonable request here, we are met with what looks like a filibuster.

But, Mr. President, I submit this is an imperative matter, which involves the health of people.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I shall yield in a moment.

First, Mr. President, I should like to state that if this is a filibuster, it has been conducted by the proponents of the bill, for I would estimate that the proponents of the bill, those who want the bill passed by the Senate, have used approximately 90 percent of the time in which the bill has been debated. The opponents of the bill have yet to obtain the floor.

I wish to make a few references—which may take a few minutes—to the treaty and to other matters.

But certainly it is not proper for any Senator to say that those of us on this side are filibustering.

In a moment, I shall be glad to yield to my friend, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Vermont, without thereby losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me inquire whether the Senator from Wisconsin will include in his request an allowance for me.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I shall be delighted to yield to the Senator from New York for 4 minutes, because I know he has an important statement to make on the bill, and has been looking forward all evening to making the statement. Therefore, I amend my request accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the amended request of the junior Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none; and it is so ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, since the statement has been made, here on the floor, that the Senator from Vermont and other Senators have not read the treaty between the United States and Canada, I wish to state that I have read it, not once, but many times. In fact, I read that treaty every time the proponents of this legislation undertake to preempt from the Great Lakes and from the St. Lawrence River waters that do not belong to them.

When the Senator from Oklahoma rose to speak, I did not know but that he might have some facts in his possession with which I was not familiar. However, when he stated that the Dodgers moved from Brooklyn to Milwaukee, I knew we were definitely safe from any barrage of facts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is yielded the floor for 4 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the interests of the State of New York in this controversy are of very long standing. I had the honor of submitting a statement on the subject before the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], not so very long ago, and also dealt with the matter when I was attorney general of New York, because New York is one of the parties to the litigation in the United States Supreme Court.

The State of New York has just invested considerable of its interest in power production on the St. Lawrence and at Niagara and there is a very deep feeling in the State on this question. The Power Commission of the State of New York feels strongly and has represented in its memorandums before the subcommittee that this diversion will have a material effect on the power production of New York. Here I am in an area which is uniquely the area of my colleague from Oklahoma, and I must report what our people report to me in the most authoritative way.

This is a matter which I must, in all honesty to my State, represent to the Senate. The power commission is in opposition, and the Governor and the whole governmental organization of our State is in opposition.

There has been a long-standing policy in opposition to this diversion by the State of New York. I am familiar with the Supreme Court proceedings, and I feel perhaps some little contribution to the resolution of this matter may be made by reference to those proceedings.

There has been a very long history of those proceedings, and on previous occasions, the Court, when appealed to, has made accommodation for the peculiar and special problems of the city of Chicago.

Stripped of all of the very colorful discussion which has been going on in the Senate for some time, it seems to me if there is a forum for relief, that would be a very, very important argument against the kind of relief which is sought in this bill.

I respectfully submit that the Supreme Court, and the decree, which has been modified from time to time, offers a forum for relief in which there can be a trial of the issues, as there has been before.

It has one other advantage. Let us assume the issues were actually tried before the subcommittee, and then went to the full Committee on Public Works, which brought in a report. Congress is in no position to continue to keep pace with the facts. A court is. So the use of court machinery for the very same purpose which is sought to be served in this legislation seems to me to be much more opposite to justice in the case for all parties concerned, the Great Lakes States, as well as the city of Chicago.

Mr. President, I would be less than frank if I did not say a great city like Chicago has our sympathy, because we have enormous problems in the city of New York, and the city of Buffalo, too. That is why I emphasize there is a way out, and the Supreme Court decree has been used before, and continues to present the right way out.

This bill again brings before the Congress a problem which it has considered before on a number of occasions and on which it has twice passed legislation subsequently vetoed by the President.

The bill also brings before the Congress a matter which has been before the Supreme Court for more than 25 years. The Court has issued a number of decrees balancing the interests of the many States involved and, as to which the Court retains jurisdiction to act further when such additional action would be required.

The Chicago Sanitary District, after submitting itself to the Court for decisions on this issue and accepting the decisions of the Court when they were favorable, has now again come to Congress for relief which the Court would not grant after considering the interests of all the parties. I seriously question such an approach, particularly in a field covered by such old, established, and basic common-law rules of property as exist in the field of riparian rights.

The long history of conflict with respect to the diversion of water at Chicago should make it clear to all that it cannot be settled by forcing upon the States on one side the solution framed and desired by the parties on the other.

I believe that the present relationships among the interested States established under the decrees of the Supreme Court offer the most equitable balance of interests which can now be achieved. These decrees do not grant to the parties on either side everything they want, but have balanced the legal rights of the Great Lakes States with the admittedly serious sanitary problems of Chicago. Under the present situation the Court could accomplish everything provided for under this bill, including the additional diversion for the purposes of study, should it be demonstrated to the Court that such additional study is really required. I am also convinced that the Department of the Army and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare could participate in such a study without additional legislation if diversion for study purposes is permitted by the Supreme Court.

If the State of Illinois desires to submit the equity of the city of Chicago in a sympathetic way to the other States, it might invite the other Great Lakes States to convene a little summit conference of governors in order to lay these equities before them and the people of their States.

It is suggested in the committee report on this bill that the Chicago district wishes to divert the additional water for only 1 year during the 3-year period provided for by the bill, and that the tests which would be undertaken offer a new contribution to the problem. This suggestion could well be made to the governors of the other States at a conference of the type I suggest, in order to elicit their reactions to the proposal. Our governors have never been unwilling to discuss the problems of a neighboring State; they are, however, duty bound to protect the property rights and the investments of their States and their citizens.

I believe that to leave this matter with the Supreme Court to examine the equity of the claims of the Chicago Sanitary District would be the best approach for Chicago and for the State governments which have vital interests of power, navigation, and riparian rights involved in this problem. In any case, the Chicago district and Illinois can continue to lay their arguments and equities before the people of their neighboring States in the traditional American way to solve difficulties between the people of different States.

In short, the Supreme Court decree is a safety valve, a way in which justice can be done juridically. I believe the presentation of the equities of the case to the other States also is another avenue which can be used by the Chicago Sanitary District.

We in New York State believe that is the right approach. For those reasons, the State as a whole—I say "we" advisedly, not just myself—have taken a position against the bill.

SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS, MAJORITY LEADER

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an insertion?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, all of us in this Chamber who observe the distinguished Senator from Texas day after day know what a great leader he is. However, it is gratifying, it is encouraging, to find that other discriminating observers also recognize the real merits of our majority leader.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article from the Sunday Times of London.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DEMOCRATS' POLICY PAYS—SUCCESS BY MODERATION

(By Henry Brandon, representative of the Sunday Times)

WASHINGTON.—The most curious aspect of the session of Congress which is about to end is that while President Eisenhower secured the passage of most of the legislation he asked for, it is the leader of the Democratic majority in the Senate, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas, who gets most credit for it.

This is not unreasonable. Mr. Eisenhower certainly has gained prestige from his program, his intervention in Lebanon and his address to the United Nations General Assembly, but it is Senator JOHNSON who has emerged as a most astute and powerful politician, not only in the Democratic Party, but in Washington generally.

He has not a creative mind but he is undoubtedly the cleverest parliamentarian in Congress today. He is something of a statesman in his own right and would like to be a kingmaker for the 1960 Presidential elections.

STRUGGLE AVOIDED

Last autumn, everybody expected a bitter struggle between the President and a Congress dominated by the opposition party. But Mr. JOHNSON decided against it. He thought it was better for the inner unity of the Democratic Party and for its standing in the country to exude moderation.

Congress gave the President a 4-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act, reorganization of the Defense Department, and extension of unemployment compensation. It agreed to Alaska becoming a State and to sharing atomic secrets with Britain. The Senate saved the foreign-aid bill from being seriously crippled.

Some appropriation requests were even increased above the President's requests. And there was complete cooperation between Democrats and Republicans in staving off a tax cut, which has proved to be sound politics.

WORRIED ABOUT UNITY

Why was Senator JOHNSON so eager to build a record of moderation instead of exposing the President's political weakness? One reason was that he is profoundly worried about the future of the unity of the Democratic Party and wanted to place himself at its helm as a great moderator.

The expectation is that the Democrats will make substantial gains in the autumn elections and that this new blood will be of strong liberal vintage. He is afraid that these liberals will force southerners on to the defensive, especially on the civil-rights issue, or try to dispense with them altogether as Mr. Truman almost did in 1948.

Mr. JOHNSON, in this session, tried to prove that the Democrats can have a united stand as long as it is moderate and that it could, nevertheless, have a great attraction for voters. He is out to disprove that southerners, as northern liberals say, are ballast to the party and that it can regain leadership only if it can make sure of the Negro and labor vote.

The Republicans will have little ammunition for the autumn election campaign. They are bitter and scared now that authoritative word has been passed out from the White House that the President will keep Mr. Sherman Adams at his side.

They are worried that even foreign affairs may turn against them, though the beginning of the withdrawal of marines from Lebanon and Mr. Eisenhower's well-received speech before the United Nations may offset the feeling that the administration has bungled in the Middle East.

What the Republicans are hoping for is that the public continues to be indifferent, that it has not formed any real convictions and that, therefore, Democratic achievements will not weigh so heavily. Senator JOHNSON, on the other hand, has assumed that Mr. Eisenhower's influence and popularity has largely withered away, that it was not so important to fight him destructively as to establish a constructive record for the Democratic Party.

MUTUAL SECURITY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator yield for two insertions?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, because of a House-Senate conference today, I was unable to speak upon the Mutual Security Appropriation bill. I therefore ask unanimous consent that my statement may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNITED STATES IS LIVING BEYOND ITS MEANS AND CANNOT SUCCESSFULLY SUPPORT THE WORLD ON DEFICIT SPENDING

The United States is living beyond its means. This solemn fact should be printed in red letters on the front page of every newspaper in the country. It should be broadcast every hour, on the hour, from every radio and television station in America.

For, if Congress allows these extraordinary expenditures to continue, the country will not only be unable to support the world, it may be unable to support itself.

DEBT LIMIT INCREASED TWICE THIS YEAR

I say the Nation is living beyond its means and I make this statement not as a critic of the administration but as a Senator of

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the United States who has read the testimony of the Secretary of the Treasury, Robert B. Anderson, before the Finance Committee on August 15 last. Twice within this year Secretary Anderson acknowledged that he has appeared before the committees of Congress to ask for an increase of the statutory limit on the public debt. These are his words: "I appeared before this committee last January to urge the enactment of a bill to provide a temporary increase of $5 billion in the statutory limit on the public debt. The bill was enacted and approved on February 26, 1958, and provides a temporary increase from $275 billion to $280 billion until June 30, 1959."

Last night this Senate, in response to the President's second request on July 28, passed the bill increasing the permanent (not the temporary) debt limit to $283 billion, so that the overall debt limit, now that this bill has been agreed to by the House, will be $288 billion.

Although $5 billion of this will be temporary through June 30, 1959, nevertheless at this moment the new debt limit for this fiscal year is fixed at the figure requested by the President, namely $288 billion. Twice in 1 year, because we have been spending more money than we can raise by taxation, we have authorized the Treasury Department to borrow $10 billion more than the $275 billion ceiling of last January. Thus it is clear that we are living beyond our means.

Secretary Anderson has explained the reason so that nobody need be in doubt. He told the Finance Committee a week ago yesterday that the Treasury could "no longer operate with a $5 billion temporary extension of the $275 billion limit because we cannot look forward to a debt of $275 billion or less on June 30, 1959. The estimated deficit will result in the public debt outstanding on June 30, 1959, of nearly $285 billion."

CUT IN MUTUAL-SECURITY FUNDS COULD REDUCE DEFICIT

The mutual-security program offers an opportunity for economy by which this deficit can be at least partially reduced. Condemned as it is by the General Accounting Office as wasteful and ineffective in many of its aspects, Congress must think twice, indeed should think a dozen times, before further risking the substance of this country in programs, particularly of military expenditure, in foreign countries over which Congress can and does exercise little, if any, control. If we would lead the world to freedom it must be by husbanding our own resources instead of wasting them in enterprises we cannot supervise. The appropriations in the mutual-security program are made to the President in name, but the expenditure of these moneys is made by subordinate employees here and abroad whose activities are actually beyond our control.

OUR INCOME LAGS BEHIND EXPENDITURES

Secretary Anderson made it clear that ever since 1954 public-debt obligations were being issued by the Treasury Department "in excess of the permanent debt limit." The Department was hoping that the excess expenditures could be repaid from tax collections prior to the expiration of the temporary debt limit, Secretary Anderson said, but then added "in the situation we now face that is not the case." In other words, it is the testimony of Secretary of the Treasury Anderson to the committee, to the Congress, and to the country that tax collections now foreseeable are not enough to pay the expenditures we are currently making.

ANOTHER DEBT LIMIT INCREASE LOOMS

The country doesn't know it, but Secretary Anderson knows it, and he told the Finance Committee on August 15 that "we should bear in mind that at current rates of expenditure the Treasury is spending approximately $1,500,000,000 on every 5 working days." Then he added, "With increased expenditures contemplated for next year these expenditures would increase. It would appear that the only sound course at the present time is to permanently increase the statutory limit to $285 billion." Then he added that a further increase of $3 billion was desirable to provide a margin for contingencies.

CONTINGENCIES ARE PROVIDED FOR IN FOREIGN SPENDING

Let it be remembered that in the mutual security bill before us there is a contingency fund for expenditure by the President of $155 million, whereas there was no such appropriation in the mutual security appropriation bill for 1958. The only explanation of this contingency fund for mutual security contained in the President's request or the report of the committee is that it is intended to meet situations "which can be foreseen but without certainty as to the amount which may be necessary," as well as to contingencies which cannot be foreseen.

The contingencies which face the Treasury are more important to the people of America and to the people of the world than the contingencies for which provision is made in the mutual security bill. This I say, because it must be apparent to anybody who is willing to look at the facts, that the decline in our revenues is actually a threat to our survival.

REVENUE IS DROPPING

Don't take it from me. Take it from Secretary Anderson. This is what he told the Finance Committee: "Now the deficit which has occurred at the end of this fiscal year is essentially brought about by a decline in revenues.

"In January we estimated there would be $72.4 billion of revenue. The revenues which have been collected thus far are $69.1 billion. * * * Now the deficit which is anticipated for fiscal 1959 is represented generally by a decline of $7 billion in estimated revenue receipts, and about $5 billion in increased expenditures over the budget estimates." All this was apparent last fall when the recession began. Profits were declining. The economic situation was worsening and yet, when the President's budget was submitted in January, despite all the warnings, an increase in revenues was predicted. Secretary Anderson has acknowledged that an increase of $3 billion in tax receipts, as compared to the previous year, was predicted. And so the deficit of not less than $2.8 billion was apparent at the end of fiscal 1958, and a deficit of $12 billion is now predicted for the end of 1959.

WE PAY FOR FOREIGN AID WITH DEFICIT SPENDING

In the light of this huge deficit predicted by the Secretary of the Treasury, we are asked to support a mutual security bill which increases the appropriation for fiscal 1959 by more than $749 million over the appropriation for fiscal 1958. Does anybody doubt that deficit spending is inflationary? Secretary Anderson acknowledges that it is. This is what he told the Finance Committee a week ago yesterday. "A deficit is certainly on the inflationary side, and a continuation of deficits would be more inflationary than a single deficit."

With clear insight into the gravity of the fiscal situation in which we find ourselves, Secretary Anderson then said: "I think what this country has got to realize is that it must pay its bills, and that whatever is required we must not allow either inflation or deflation in this country to run a ruinous course."

OUR EXPENSES CLIMB

Does anybody doubt that the effects of inflation are with us? Yesterday the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the United States Department of Labor, under Secretary Mitchell, issued a statement on the Consumer Price Index for July 1958. That's last month. "Consumer prices," it said, "in United States cities, increased 0.2 percent by the end of July 1958." This included higher prices for transportation, food, and medical care. This is acknowledged by the Department of Labor to be an increase of 2.6 percent above that of July last year. It is 23.9 percent above the average for the years 1947–49.

DEFENSE SUPPORT INCREASES

It is clear, therefore, that as we deal with this mutual security appropriation; namely, a total of $3,518,092,500 as reported by the committee, we are dealing with an increased expenditure of almost three-fourths of a billion dollars, and an examination of the details of this expenditure reveals extraordinary and appalling facts. For example, we are asked to appropriate $790 million for defense support. Although this is $45 million under the estimates submitted by the President, it is $65 million above the appropriations for 1958 and is $90 million above the House appropriation. The money will be expended in 12 different countries: Spain, Greece, Iran, Turkey, Pakistan, Cambodia, Korea, Laos, Philippines, Taiwan, Thailand, and Vietnam. The amounts which these countries will receive individually, however, is classified. The people of the United States are denied knowledge of where, when or how the money from an empty treasury will be expended for defense support abroad.

The last appropriation bill for mutual security provided $300 million for the Development Loan Fund. The President asked for $625 million, more than twice what was used a year ago. The House recommended $300 million. The Senate committee has increased this by $280 million.

WE GUARANTEE INVESTMENTS ABROAD

In appraising this appropriation we must take into consideration the fact that under the terms of the mutual assistance program this country, with its deficit of $2.8 billion for fiscal 1958 and its estimated deficit of $12 billion for fiscal 1959, will be guaranteeing to United States investors abroad that the currency they receive in foreign countries can be converted into dollars. More than that, the program is to guarantee that the United States will compensate these investors against any losses due to expropriation, and finally against losses due to war damage. As of September 30 last the total guaranties outstanding amounted to more than $176 million.

CONGRESS IS BYPASSED IN LOAN PROGRAM

Let us not forget that the United States is living beyond its means. We have that on the word of the Secretary of the Treasury. How then can we undertake to extend these guaranties for payment in dollars for a program which Secretary Dulles himself testified would involve a great risk? His statement will be found on page 5 of the Foreign Relations Committee hearings of May 22, 1957, when Secretary Dulles explained the development loan program. He not only acknowledged that the Fund involves a great risk, but he said that the proposal to provide an initial appropriation and borrowing was a "new approach" which "we contemplate requires that we get away from annual authorizations or appropriations." Here is a plain assertion by the Secretary of State that he wants to be bothered no longer with securing authorizations or annual appropriations from the Congress of the United States which, under the Constitution, is the custodian of the funds belonging to the people. Mr. Dulles would like to spend these funds in lump sums without detailed explanation. As a matter of fact, when the mutual security law was passed a year ago, it was clearly provided that the report of the manager of the fund should be made only after the consummation of a transaction and not before the financing operation was undertaken.

SUCH SPENDING RESULTS IN INFLATION

Appropriating money to be expended in such a manner is only an invitation to continued inflation. It is easy to report from the testimony of the Department of Defense that the cost of building and operating the weapons of defense is constantly increasing. Only last March Assistant Secretary of Defense W. J. McNeil, addressing various business groups, described the expensive impact of technological progress on the defense budget. For example, he said: "With one or two exceptions there is hardly a production model aircraft on the Air Force's 1959 procurement list that was included in the 1955 program. All the fighters and bombers proposed for 1959 procurement will be capable of supersonic speeds and the employment of guided missiles and nuclear weapons. Of the $1.5 billion of aircraft, engines, and aeronautical equipment the Navy expects to buy in 1959, about 80 percent will go for models which were not being bought in production quantities only 3 years ago. In 1959 over 40 percent of the Army procurement will be for missiles and related equipment, compared with approximately 10 percent in 1955."

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I had prepared with respect to the Packers and Stockyards Act, as amended by H. R. 9020, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT, AS AMENDED BY H. R. 9020, IS AN IMPROVEMENT OVER PRESENT LAW

Yesterday, on my motion, the Senate considered and passed the bill H. R. 9020, which amended the Packers and Stockyards Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act. Time did not permit an extended debate on the important issues raised in this bill. However, I could not permit the 85th Congress to come to a close without making a more detailed explanation of the reasons which impelled us to adopt the meatpacking bill passed by the House on August 12, 1958.

HELD HEARINGS ON REASONS FOR PRODUCERS' SHRINKING SHARE OF CONSUMER DOLLAR

This legislation is the culmination of hearings which I began in May 1956 when I was acting chairman of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee. At that time, the precarious economic condition of farmers and livestock producers made it abundantly clear that effective legislation was needed to curb practices which reduced their share of the national income. Farm income in the United States had been declining. During the period 1947 to 1956 farmers' cash receipts from the sale of livestock and livestock products declined from $16.5 billion to $16.3 billion. In this same period farm animal slaughter increased significantly. While prices received by the livestock producer declined 29 percent from 1947 to 1956, the retail cost of meat and meat products to the consumer declined only 5 percent. It was apparent that the spread between the price received by the producer and the price received by the retailer had widened, with the processer receiving the benefits of lower livestock prices. The hearings which we conducted at that time to discover the reasons farmers and livestock producers were receiving an increasingly smaller share of the consumer dollar immediately disclosed the basic inadequacies of the Packers and Stockyards Act and the complete failure of the Department of Agriculture to enforce this act in such a way as to produce the maximum benefits to livestock producers, meatpackers and the consuming public.

SENATE BILLS INTRODUCED TO STRENGTHEN PACKERS ACT

We quickly discovered that the large national food chains had found loopholes in the Packers and Stockyards Act whereby they were able, through various devices, to qualify as meatpackers and, thus, completely escape from the supervisory authority of the Federal Trade Commission. Senator WATKINS and I introduced separate bills in the 84th Congress, designed to plug this loophole in the law and to transfer jurisdiction over meatpackers from the Department of Agriculture to the Federal Trade Commission.

In the 85th Congress, Senator WATKINS and I joined in sponsoring the bill S. 1356, which, after long hearings and considerable study, and after some modification by the Committee on Agriculture, was ultimately adopted by this body on May 15 of this year. From its inception, the bill has received the active and enthusiastic support of certain small independent meatpacking companies who were suffering from the monopolistic practices of their large meatpacking competitors. Substantial groups representing livestock producers came forward in support of the bill. The National Wool Growers Association, the National Milk Producers Association, and the National Farmers Union, which speak for producers in many States, were vocal in their support. A substantial number of State organizations rallied behind the bill, including the Wyoming Stock Growers Association, the Utah and Idaho Wool Growers Associations, and the Utah Cattlemen's Association. Similar strong support was voiced by important segments of the food industry, including wholesale grocers, milk producers, food brokers, independent businessmen, consumer, supply, and service cooperatives, candy wholesalers, dry goods distributors, and the fishing industry.

HOUSE BILL ACCEPTED BY SENATE

In my opinion, S. 1356 represented the best solution possible to the difficult problem of properly dividing jurisdiction over meatpacking activities between the Department of Agriculture and the Federal Trade Commission. However, the Committee on Agriculture in the House of Representatives reported out the bill H. R. 9020, subsequently passed by the House, which retained in the Department of Agriculture more jurisdiction over meatpackers than the bill adopted by the Senate. I have consistently expressed my preference for the meatpacking bill which was approved by the Senate. However, in the closing days of the Congress, it became apparent that because of the press of time it would not be possible to obtain a conference between the two Houses in an effort to obtain legislation similar to that endorsed by the Senate. Under the circumstances, I felt that we could not afford to lose the benefits of all our efforts in the past 2½ years by permitting the Congress to adjourn without obtaining some legislation in this vital area. Accordingly, I discussed this measure with the other sponsors and supporters of the bill in the Senate, and with the leaders on both sides of the aisle, and we concluded that we should ask the Senate to give favorable consideration to H. R. 9020.

BILL PLUGS TWO GAPING LOOPHOLES

It has long been my experience in the legislative field that we make progress one step at a time. While I am certainly not in complete sympathy with the House bill, I recognize full well that it accomplishes many of the important objectives we sought to achieve when we first began our study of this problem. I feel it is a long step forward in the direction of more effective antitrust enforcement. The bill completely closes the loophole in the Packers and Stockyards Act whereby large national food chains have successfully escaped Federal Trade Commission surveillance. This feature of the bill in itself is sufficient to justify its passage by the Congress at this time. With all the principal national food chains now qualifying as packers, and others rapidly gathering themselves under the protective umbrella of the Packers and Stockyards Act, the position of the independent retail and wholesale grocer throughout the United States was becoming increasingly perilous. The anguished cries of these independent businessmen asking the Congress to subject their bigger national competitors to uniform standards of trade practices oblige the Congress to act now.

The great number of groups and organizations who have worked so diligently with the Senate committees in their efforts to enact needed legislation can take much comfort in realizing that their efforts have not been in vain and that legislation has been adopted which rectifies many of the grave situations about which they complained. Since the enactment of the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, all activities of the meat packers, no matter how remote from their meatpacking activities, were under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture. H. R. 9020 carefully limits jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture over the activities of meat packers insofar as it relates to livestock, meats, meat food products, livestock products in unmanufactured form, poultry or poultry products. The bill restores complete jurisdiction to the Federal Trade Commission to regulate the nonmeat activities of the large meat packers, such as the production and sale of pharmaceuticals, sporting goods, leather in various forms, and such unrelated items as salt, fertilizers, and ice cream confections.

The hearings conducted by the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee laid bare the glaring inadequacies of the Packers and Stockyards Act and the failure of the Secretary of Agriculture to enforce the act against meatpackers. Because of the threat by this subcommittee of more stringent regulation, the large meatpackers through the American Meat Institute, were forced to recommend changes in the existing law, and accordingly they agreed to the proposal permitting the Federal Trade Commission to have jurisdiction over their nonmeat activities.

The bill corrects another grievous defect in the law which permitted manufacturers of oleomargarine to avoid Federal Trade Commission jurisdiction under the Oleomargarine Act. H. R. 9020 restores jurisdiction to the Federal Trade Commission over transactions in oleomargarine. In addition, the bill makes clear that retail sales of meat, meat-food products, livestock products in unmanufactured form, and poultry products remain within the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission.

"HOT PURSUIT" PROVISION INCLUDED

The Department of Agriculture in testimony before the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee conceded that it had been lax in enforcing the unfair-trade practice provisions of the Packers and Stockyards Act against meatpackers. The Department has now given its support to the so-called hot-pursuit provision contained in H. R. 9020, which permits the Federal Trade Commission, for the purpose of perfecting its jurisdiction at the retail level, to pursue its investigation against meatpackers back to the wholesale level, provided the Agriculture Department does not have pending an investigation of, or a proceeding for, the prevention of a violation of the Packers and Stockyards Act involving the same subject matter. Conversely, H. R. 9020 permits the Department of Agriculture to proceed in a similar manner against meatpackers down to the retail level if necessary to perfect its jurisdiction over wholesale transactions. In order to determine whether the enforcement activities of either agency are being frustrated by

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the other, the bill provides that both the Secretary of Agriculture and the Federal Trade Commission shall include in their respective annual reports information with respect to their administration of the hot-pursuit provisions.

PROCEDURE IS EXPERIMENT

It is apparent that this procedure has certain definite weaknesses. Nevertheless, support of this provision is an acknowledgement by the Department of Agriculture that there is an area in the meatpacking field where there is need for antitrust enforcement by the Federal Trade Commission. In approving this procedure we recognized that this was an experiment, the success of which could be determined only after a trial and error period. Senator DIRKSEN stated on the floor yesterday that after the bill is passed, if any weaknesses develop, or if under the provisions of the bill a satisfactory job is not done, he will join with me next year in proposing improvements in the program.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT TO HAVE ENFORCEMENT UNIT

In an effort to ensure effective enforcement of the new law, the bill provides that the Secretary of Agriculture shall maintain within the Department of Agriculture a separate enforcement unit to administer and enforce title II of this act. Small independent meatpackers can take much comfort from the fact that their testimony concerning the failure of Agriculture to police the activities of the large meatpackers has resulted in legislation which requires the Department of Agriculture to set up a separate enforcement unit for the enforcement of title II of the Packers and Stockyards Act.

AUTHORITY OF AGRICULTURE SECRETARY BROADENED

Furthermore, section 2 of the act, which has had active support in both the Senate and House committees, strengthens the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture over stockyards under title III of the Packers and Stockyards Act by permitting him to control livestock transactions at auction yards and county buying points and by removing from the definition of stockyards the 20,000 square feet requirement. In this and other ways the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to correct practices involving livestock transactions which now are escaping regulation.

By the passage of this act we have given the Department of Agriculture all the tools which it has requested and which it has felt necessary in order to police effectively the unfair trade practices of the large national meatpackers. With the cooperation of the Department of Agriculture the Federal Trade Commission too will have an area of responsibility for dealing with meatpacker problems. The Congress will maintain a careful scrutiny to determine whether the Agriculture Department has fulfilled its trust. The Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee will continue its vigilant examination of meatpacking activities to ensure that large meatpackers comply with the same standards of trade practice required of all other industries.

REVIEW OF THE 85TH CONGRESS BY SENATOR THYE

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, as the time for the adjournment of the 85th Congress draws near, I think we should take a look at our work to compare it with past performances and to have it serve as a guide for the future. In my estimation, this Congress has accomplished as much during the past 7 months as any session I can remember. It has been a constructive Congress. The record of its achievement will stand high for years to come.

The Senate has been very fortunate in having majority and minority leaders of extreme ability and distinction—Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON and Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND. Senator JOHNSON has demonstrated a fine spirit of cooperation. He is a reasonable man. His course has been set by the principle of what is best for the country and not what is best for any one group or faction. He has been a great coordinator, showing a rare ability to bring together diverse interests and working out acceptable and positive agreements. In all my experience and contact with this great Texan, I have never felt that he had anything but the best interests of the Nation at heart.

Senator KNOWLAND has never failed to stand up for the little man—the small-business man or the man who represents a minority interest or a little-recognized group. KNOWLAND has a vast comprehension of the legislative process. His knowledge is awe-inspiring, and he has worked honestly and four-square for our country. I sincerely believe that Senator KNOWLAND is one of the most dedicated men in the Senate today, a man who has brought honor and stature to a great State. The Senate will suffer a great loss when Senator KNOWLAND retires.

Both of these men represent the very finest in positive, brilliant leadership. It has been an honor to serve in the Senate if only because of the opportunity to associate and learn from these men.

I pay tribute to all members of the staff on the Senate floor, including the pages, and also the members of the staffs of the many committees who serve the Senate.

I would, of course, like to go on and commend each Senator who has been a part of the 85th Congress, but my purpose is merely to point to the highlights of this session in very short form. These include the admission of the Territory of Alaska as our 49th State, the creation of a new Space Agency, the creation of a Federal Aviation Agency to coordinate all air flight activities in the interest of air safety, the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, the reorganization of the Defense Department, and the strengthening of mutual security.

A few of the other key legislative achievements include the increase of social-security benefits, tax relief for small business, salary increases for postal and classified Government employees and many other constructive and worthwhile laws.

Legislation has been passed embodying the provisions of bills I introduced to continue the operations of Public Law 480, the extension of the school milk program, equity financing for small-business concerns, tax relief for small business, continuation of the brucellosis-control program, to provide citizenship for alien orphans adopted by missionaries, to provide for expanded research into the industrial uses of agricultural products, to facilitate prosecution of those who use the United States mails for distribution of obscene literature, to pay unemployment compensation to discharged servicemen.

I am particularly appreciative of the action taken to make the Small Business Administration a permanent agency. I was the author of legislation which established this agency in 1953, and I have continued since that time to urge that the agency be made permanent.

Of particular interest to the State of Minnesota is the passage of my proposal to transfer certain Federal drainage lands to the State. Toward the end of this session we enacted a companion bill to my proposal to establish a Grand Portage National Monument in Minnesota, and Congress has consented to a compact between Minnesota and the province of Manitoba concerning an international highway to the Northwest Angle. During this session we have also provided funds for planning the Bethel Airbase at Bethel, Minn. Flood-control funds have been provided for projects at Mankato, St. Paul, and Lost River. Funds also have been provided for commencing work on the Minnesota River navigation project. Provision has also been made for the settlement of the so-called Lake of the Woods flood damage claims. The dollar limitation on the authority of the Secretary of the Navy to settle air-crash claims has been raised so that most claims arising out of last year's Memorial Day plane crash in Minneapolis can now be settled administratively.

There is so much more to say. Now we should let these achievements speak for themselves. We will let the record speak for itself. It is a good record. It has been a good Congress.

INCREASE IN DIVERSION OF WATER FROM LAKE MICHIGAN INTO THE ILLINOIS WATERWAY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2) to authorize the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test on a 3-year basis the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senate of the United States and the almost full galleries have been regaled and entertained by a magnificent speech delivered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Probably no one in America can give a more amusing speech than the great Senator from Oklahoma. However, I think any kind of analysis of the speech of the Senator from Oklahoma would make it necessary to classify the great speech as a diversion from the point. I think I can prove that statement.

I think I can prove that the bill under consideration is a bill which would do provable damage to the property of people who live in other States. The bill under consideration simply cannot be justified as a health measure, which is the only possible justification to be put forward for the bill.

Mr. President, before I discuss the merits of the bill I should like to point out the peculiar circumstances under which similar bills have always come before the Senate.

A bill similar to this was brought before the Senate in 1954. The date the bill was considered in 1954 was August 20. The bill was taken up by motion on adjournment night, about 30 minutes before adjournment. The bill was rushed through the Senate, and was passed by a voice vote. There was little opportunity for opponents to make a fight on the bill, because of course the Senate was about to adjourn.

This kind of bill is not the earth-shaking kind we usually consider at adjournment. Therefore, the bill moved along rapidly and was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). The Senator will suspend. Will those who desire to engage in conversation retire to the cloakrooms? The Chair will insist that the speaker be heard. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a similar bill was again taken up for consideration in 1956. Again there was a motion to consider the bill on the very last night of the session. That is quite a coincidence. At that time the opponents made a strong fight and did the best they could. Of course, the opponents were overwhelmed, because of the fact that the Senate was about to adjourn. The opponents did not have a chance to put into the RECORD a real case against the bill, which they could have put into the RECORD if there had been more time. The result was that the bill was passed, by a fairly close vote. There was no opportunity to discuss the bill in detail.

This bill, I will say, has implications which are very complicated. It requires an extended discussion before the provisions of the bill can be fully understood and before one can prove the fact that the bill would do discernible damage and provable damage. It takes time to establish clearly the fact that the bill cannot be justified, based upon the purpose argued by the proponents of the bill.

Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to another point. There were hearings on the bill in the Senate. There were extensive hearings, the transcript of which covers 768 transcribed pages. I hold a copy of the hearings in my hand. These hearings have not been printed, although galley sheets have been run and are available for a few Senators who are on the committee or who have a special interest and have asked for them.

Contrary to the procedure with respect to most bills which come before the Senate, there is no opportunity for Senators to have copies of the hearings placed conveniently before them on their desks so that they can study the hearings.

Mr. President, any Senator who studies these 768 pages of hearings, who reads the hearings carefully in an objective way, having no personal reason on the basis of the interest of his State to support the bill, will come to the conclusion, I am convinced, that the bill should be opposed and should be defeated.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Washington for 3 minutes without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1959

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the amendments of the Senate to the independent offices appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 13856, which was read as follows:

In the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.
August 23, 1958.

Resolved, That the House agrees to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 12 to the bill (H. R. 13856) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, and concur therein; and that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate No. 8 to the bill, with the following amendments:

Strike out "$53,300,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$40,000,000."

Strike out "$8,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$6,000,000."

Strike out $25,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$19,000,000."

Strike out "$1,800,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,350,000."

Strike out "$5,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,750,000."

Strike out "$7,200,000" and insert in lieu lieu thereof "$5,400,000."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to Senate amendment No. 8.

I will state briefly that the House accepted the independent offices appropriation bill in toto, with the exception of the one item for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Senate put in an item of $53.3 million, and the House reduced it to $40 million, with appropriate reductions down the line on the grants for science and mathematics and other sections of the bill. That was the only change.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Does the item cover an appropriation for the new defense education setup?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. What does the amendment do to the capability for operating under that provision?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Alabama has informed me that probably this amount will be sufficient for operations until the Congress reconvenes in January. In January or February we will have the program well underway. This should be a sufficient amount.

We would have liked to provide a little more, but I think the House was quite generous. The House had no opportunity to consider this item. The House had to take our word for the matter.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from Alabama feels we can do the job until the Congress returns?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator feels we can live with this amount.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator feels we can live with this amount until Congress reconvenes?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a comparative statement of action taken on H. R. 11574 and H. R. 13856 with appropriations for 1958, and estimates and amounts recommended for 1959.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparative statement of action taken on H. R. 11574 and H. R. 13856 with appropriations for 1958, and estimates and amounts recommended for 1959

TITLE I

Item	Appropriations, 1958	Budget estimates, 1959 [1]	Recommended in H. R. 11574 for 1959 (vetoed)	Recommended in House and Senate bills for 1959 and finally approved H. R. 13856
INDEPENDENT OFFICES				
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION				
Salaries and expenses	$18,300,000	$18,420,000	$18,200,000	$18,200,000
Investigations of United States citizens for employment by international organizations	491,800	383,000	350,000	350,000
Payment to civil service retirement and disability fund			589,000,000	
Annuities, Panama Canal construction employees and Lighthouse Service widows	2,391,000	2,328,000	2,300,000	2,300,000
Administrative expenses, Federal employees life insurance fund	(123,800)	(123,800)	(123,800)	(123,800)
Total, Civil Service Commission	21,182,800	21,131,000	609,850,000	20,850,000

[1] Does not include supplemental amounts considered in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1959.

[2] Including $2,915,000 in S. Doc. 89 for consolidation of delegated functions.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Comparative statement of action taken on H. R. 11574 and H. R. 13856 with appropriations for 1958, and estimates and amounts recommended for 1959—Continued

TITLE I—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1958	Budget estimates, 1959 [1]	Recommended in H. R. 11574 for 1959 (vetoed)	Recommended in House and Senate bills for 1959 and finally approved H. R. 13856
INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Continued				
FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION				
Operations	$17,000,000	[2] $22,315,000	$18,500,000	$18,500,000
Emergency supplies and equipment	3,300,000	18,000,000	18,000,000	18,000,000
Research and development	2,000,000	4,400,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Federal contributions	17,000,000			
Total, Federal Civil Defense Administration	39,300,000	44,715,000	38,500,000	38,500,000
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT				
Disaster relief	25,000,000			
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION				
Salaries and expenses	8,365,000	8,950,000	8,900,000	8,900,000
FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION				
Salaries and expenses	5,666,000	6,385,000	6,385,000	6,385,000
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION				
Salaries and expenses	5,950,000	6,025,000	5,975,000	5,975,000
GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE				
Salaries and expenses	36,050,000	38,300,000	37,000,000	37,000,000
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION				
Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service	132,689,000	138,500,000	136,539,000	136,539,000
Repair and improvement, federally owned buildings	65,000,000	50,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000
Sites and expenses, public buildings projects	20,000,000	20,000,000	39,915,000	39,915,000
Construction, public buildings projects	2,125,000		152,810,000	152,810,000
Payments, public buildings purchase contracts	1,331,100	1,265,000	310,900	310,900
Construction, Federal office building numbered 6, Washington, D. C.			14,000,000	14,000,000
Construction, United States Court of Claims and Federal office building, Washington, D. C.		1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
Construction, United States Mission Building, New York, N. Y.		3,975,000	3,750,000	3,750,000
Hospital facilities in the District of Columbia	2,000,000			
Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service	[3] 3,360,000	[4] 3,615,000	[5] 3,460,000	[5] 3,460,000
Expenses, supply distribution	17,765,000	19,500,000	18,765,000	18,765,000
General supply fund	12,500,000	15,000,000	6,250,000	6,250,000
Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service	7,293,000	7,650,000	7,443,000	7,443,000
Operating expenses, Transportation and Public Utilities Service	1,500,000	2,000,000	1,850,000	1,850,000
Strategic and critical materials		70,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator	260,000	200,000	200,000	300,000
Administrative operations fund (limitation)	(10,530,000)	(11,100,000)	(11,043,000)	(11,043,000)
Total, General Services Administration	265,913,100	332,905,000	464,492,900	464,592,900
HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY				
Office of the Administrator:				
Salaries and expenses	7,380,000	8,850,000	8,000,000	8,000,000
Urban planning grants	1,275,000	3,500,000	3,250,000	3,250,000
Farm housing research	75,000			
Reserve of planned public works (payment to revolving fund)	5,000,000	8,500,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
Capital grants for slum clearance and urban renewal		50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000
Total, Office of the Administrator	13,730,000	70,850,000	68,250,000	68,250,000
Public Housing Administration:				
Annual contributions	[6] 98,900,000	114,000,000	107,500,000	107,500,000
Administrative expenses	11,440,000	12,200,000	11,800,000	11,800,000
Total, Public Housing Administration	110,340,000	126,200,000	119,300,000	119,300,000
Total, Housing and Home Finance Agency	124,070,000	197,050,000	187,550,000	187,550,000
INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION				
Salaries and expenses	16,750,000	17,500,000	17,000,000	17,000,000
NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS				
Salaries and expenses	74,720,000	80,480,000	78,100,000	78,100,000
Construction and equipment	41,200,000	26,220,000	23,000,000	23,000,000
Total, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	115,920,000	106,700,000	101,100,000	101,100,000
NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY				
Operation and maintenance of properties	38,000	45,500	38,000	38,000
NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION				
Salaries and expenses	49,750,000	140,000,000	130,000,000	130,000,000
International Geophysical Year	2,000,000			
Total, National Science Foundation	51,750,000	140,000,000	130,000,000	130,000,000
RENEGOTIATION BOARD				
Salaries and expenses	3,000,000	2,900,000	2,850,000	2,850,000
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION				
Salaries and expenses	6,700,000	7,100,000	7,100,000	7,100,000
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM				
Salaries and expenses	27,000,000	28,000,000	27,500,000	27,500,000
VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION				
General operating expenses	161,374,000	149,582,000	147,500,000	147,500,000
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses	21,763,400	21,481,000	26,000,000	26,000,000
Inpatient care	[6] 710,378,000	[7] 706,902,000	715,465,000	715,465,000
Outpatient care	79,000,000	75,798,000	75,399,000	75,399,000

[2] And $1,600,000 from proceeds of surplus personal property disposal.
[4] And $1,865,000 from proceeds of surplus personal property disposal.
[6] Includes $3,900,000 pending in Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1959.
[6] And in addition $6,656,000 from reimbursements.
[7] Including $1,802,000 in S. Doc. 94.

Comparative statement of action taken on H. R. 11574 and H. R. 13856 with appropriations for 1958, and estimates and amounts recommended for 1959—Continued

TITLE I—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1958	Budget estimates, 1959 [1]	Recommended in H. R. 11574 for 1959 (vetoed)	Recommended in House and Senate bills for 1959 and finally approved H. R. 13856
INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Continued				
VETERANS ADMINISTRATION—continued				
Maintenance and operation of supply depots	$1,827,800	$2,136,000	$2,055,000	$2,055,000
Compensation and pensions	3,082,250,000	3,232,000,000	3,200,000,000	3,200,000,000
Readjustment benefits	814,047,000	717,960,000	700,000,000	700,000,000
Veterans insurance and indemnities		51,100,000	51,100,000	51,100,000
Grants to the Republic of the Philippines	1,579,802	1,250,000	1,230,000	1,250,000
Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities	42,500,000	9,145,000	19,295,000	19,295,000
Major alterations, improvements, and repairs	2,028,000			
Military and naval insurance	4,275,000			
National service life insurance	7,600,000			
Servicemen's indemnities	32,127,500			
Service-disabled veterans insurance fund	1,500,000			
Total, Veterans' Administration	4,962,250,502	4,969,354,000	4,938,064,000	4,938,064,000
Total, title I	5,714,905,402	5,927,060,500	6,382,304,900	5,993,404,900

TITLE II—CORPORATIONS ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

[Limitations on amounts of corporate funds to be expended]

Corporation or agency	Authorizations, 1958	Budget estimates, 1959	Recommended in H. R. 11574	Recommended in bill for 1959
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	$1,250,000	$1,600,000	$1,600,000	$1,600,000
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation	675,000	720,000	720,000	720,000
General Services Administration:				
Abaca fiber program	47,000	47,000	47,000	47,000
Federal Facilities Corporation	50,000	50,000	25,000	25,000
Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Fund	800,000	54,000	50,000	50,000
Housing and Home Finance Agency:				
College housing loans	1,377,000	1,675,000	1,675,000	1,675,000
Public facility loans	400,000	[1] 750,000	400,000	400,000
Revolving fund (liquidating programs)	1,100,000	673,000	600,000	600,000
Federal National Mortgage Association	4,750,000	4,750,000	4,750,000	4,750,000
Federal Housing Administration	7,260,000	7,400,000	7,300,000	7,300,000
Public Housing Administration	[2] 12,420,000	[2] 12,700,000	[2] 12,258,000	[2] 12,258,000
Total, administrative expenses	17,709,000	17,719,000	17,167,000	17,167,000

[1] Includes $200,000 in S. Doc. 94.

[2] Includes funds available by appropriation in title I and by transfer from the revolving fund (liquidating programs), and is not included in totals to avoid duplication.

TITLE IV—ADDITIONAL SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

S. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate	Amounts approved by House and agreed to by Senate
	INDEPENDENT OFFICES				
	SOUTH CAROLINA-GEORGIA-ALABAMA-FLORIDA AND TEXAS				
-------	Water Study Commissions	----------	----------	$100,000	$100,000
	VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION				
S. 94	Inpatient care	----------	----------	1,802,000	1,802,000
	Total, Independent Offices	----------	----------	1,902,000	1,902,000
	DEPARTMENT OF LABOR				
	BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS				
-------	Salaries and expenses	$500,000	----------	----------	----------
	BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY				
S. 117	Salaries and expenses	110,000	----------	----------	----------
S. 117	Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administrative	4,300,000	----------	----------	----------
S. 117	Unemployment compensation for veterans and Federal employees	[1] 66,000,000	----------	Language	Language
	Total, Department of Labor	70,910,000	----------	----------	----------
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE				
	OFFICE OF EDUCATION				
S. 117	Defense educational activities	117,200,000	----------	53,300,000	40,000,000
S. 117	Salaries and expenses	2,100,000	----------	750,000	750,000
	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY				
-------	White House Conference on Aging	----------	----------	100,000	100,000
	Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	119,300,000	----------	54,150,000	40,850,000

[1] And $10,700,000 to be derived by transfer.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Comparative statement of action taken on H. R. 11574 and H. R. 13856 with appropriations for 1958, and estimates and amounts recommended for 1959—Continued

TITLE IV—ADDITIONAL SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS—Continued

S. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate	Amounts approved by House and agreed to by Senate
	TREASURY DEPARTMENT				
	BUREAU OF THE MINT				
-------	Salaries and expenses	(?)	----------	(?)	(?)
	POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT				
	(Out of postal funds)				
S. 117	Transportation (1957 and 1958)	$54,000,000	----------	$54,000,000	$54,000,000
	Total, title IV	244,210,000	----------	110,052,000	96,752,000

RECAPITULATION

Title I	$5,927,060,500	$5,993,404,900	$5,993,404,900	$5,993,404,900
Title IV	244,210,000	----------	110,052,000	96,752,000
Total, all titles	6,171,270,500	5,993,404,900	6,103,456,900	6,090,156,900

? Language authorizing use of $2,500 for medal for Rear Admiral Rickover.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

INCREASE IN DIVERSION OF WATER FROM LAKE MICHIGAN INTO THE ILLINOIS WATERWAY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2) to authorize the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test on a 3-year basis the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, what is the purpose of the bill? I shall read a very brief part of the bill, which I think will establish the stated purpose of the bill. The bill states:

To authorize the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes.

It is said a study is to be made. Let me read what the study is supposed to provide:

The effect of increased diversion of water from Lake Michigan upon the Illinois Waterway and the degree of improvement in such waterway caused thereby, the effect of such increased diversion upon commerce among the several States and navigation on the Great Lakes and the Illinois Waterway, and the extent to which such increased diversion may affect the level of Lake Michigan.

Mr. President, that latter phrase is simply window dressing. All anyone has to do to establish that fact is to examine the hearings. The fact is that there is no intention whatsoever to study the effect of this diversion upon commerce among the several States and navigation on the Great Lakes. The only purpose is to study the effect of this diversion on sanitation, for the city of Chicago and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago.

Mr. President, I can establish that fact by reading from the hearings, on page 100 of the transcribed hearings, the statement prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which was put into the RECORD by the Honorable THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, House of Representatives, as follows:

This investigation would accurately measure changes in sanitary water quality that would result from experimental increased diversion from Lake Michigan to the Illinois Waterway authorized in H. R. 2 and would indicate how these changes might affect uses of the waterway.

Using such indexes as dissolved oxygen, intestinal bacteria, fertilizing and other chemical values, and several forms of aquatic life, calculations may be made concerning the pollution assimilation capacities of critical reaches of the waterway. Various combinations of climatic conditions, pollution loads, and flow regimes will be used. The data obtained will be valuable in efficiently adjusting diversion flows to sanitary requirements.

This is the procedure:

In order to evaluate changes induced by increased diversion, it is necessary to have reliable information on water quality under past and current waterway operating conditions. Much valuable data are now available in the files of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago and have been reviewed by the Public Health Service. While these data are quite comprehensive insofar as showing certain chemical characteristics of the water, they do not sufficiently portray important biological conditions of the stream and their effects upon necessary water uses. Such information, together with additional chemical and physical determinations, will have to be obtained by routine monitoring and special field studies to provide a thorough evaluation of water quality.

The study goes on to point out that samples will be taken for a distance of 169 miles in the Illinois Waterway between Peoria and Lake Michigan. There is no reference to a study of the effect of the diversion on commerce on the Great Lakes. That section of the bill is simply ignored in the study that will take place under the bill. I believe that is important, because the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] made the point earlier tonight that health was the real justification for the bill, the health of the people of Chicago, and I believe that a reading of the study would indicate that indeed health is the only justification for that kind of study.

Obviously by studying the chemical content of the water one can tell very little, probably nothing, about the navigation even in the Illinois Waterway, and I believe I can establish to the satisfaction of the Senate a little later that the diversion will in no way improve the navigational aspects of the Illinois Waterway.

Health is the only possible justification for the study. I believe I can establish that this study cannot be justified on the basis of improving or assisting the health of the people of Chicago.

Last night I engaged in a colloquy with my highly respected friend from Illinois, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and in the course of that colloquy I asked the distinguished Senator from Illinois whether there was any study by the Chicago Board of Health, the Illinois Board of Health, the Public Health Service, or by any health agency or group of physicians of this problem, or whether the problem had even been established on the basis of any kind of health study, and the answers of the distinguished Senator from Illinois are in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I invite the attention of Senators to the answers. The answers were in the negative in every single case.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] for a question without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not correct that the RECORD shows that the reply of the senior Senator from Illinois was that by

the terms of the proposed legislation the Illinois Sanitary Water Control Board would have no authority whatsoever over the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Chicago, and therefore it could not make such a study?

Secondly, the city of Chicago is only one of the governmental bodies included in the Metropolitan Sanitary District, and therefore could not make such a study. The only body that could make such a study was the Metropolitan Sanitary District itself, and it is that body which is here asking for relief for the people and the industries of the Metropolitan District of Chicago.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The distinguished Senator from Illinois, as usual, makes the best possible situation out of a most unfortunate case. I have in my hand a volume of some 1,200 pages entitled "The Chicago, Cook County, Health Survey." This study was made by a group of eminent medical doctors, eminent health authorities. Let me read some of the names: K. E. Miller, M. D., Medical Director, United States Public Health Service; Robert H. Flinn, M. D., senior surgeon, United States Public Health Service, Acting Director of Survey; William F. Petersen, M. D., Chicago Medical Society, and a long list of prominent outstanding health authorities, including the nationally known Dr. Herman Bundesen, who has been a leader in the Chicago Board of Health for many years.

The revelations in this study with respect to the health aspects of Chicago's water supply, as far as the Sanitation District is concerned, indicate that there is a great deal of work which the Sanitation District should do before it comes to the Congress of the United States and asks for more diversion from Lake Michigan. Later tonight—I hope I shall have time tonight—I will call to the attention of the Senate the recommendations which have been made with regard to the action that the Sanitary District should take before asking for additional diversion from Lake Michigan. I shall be delighted to give those recommendations to the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Illinois was unable to give me——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois for a question without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not correct that the report to which the Senator refers was made in 1947?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The report was made in 1947. It was published in 1949. Since that time there have been some changes. However, since that time the efficiency of the Metropolitan Sanitary District first improved rather greatly, and then the efficiency deteriorated considerably. A number of the recommendations made by the eminent physicians who engaged in that study have not been carried out. They should be carried out before the Congress gives Chicago or the representatives of Chicago what they are asking for. I do not state that as my opinion as a Senator representing Wisconsin; I say that is the recommendation of the outstanding health authorities in Chicago itself.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Illinois for a question without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator does not require unanimous consent to yield for a question.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I wish to protect my right to the floor when I yield for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator needs unanimous consent only when he yields for some other purpose.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I understand it is my responsibility to protect my rights. If no question is asked, it is my responsibility to protect my right to the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Illinois for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that in the 11 years which have passed since this report was made the Metropolitan District of Chicago has grown greatly in population and in industry, and that the problems today are more difficult than the problems which we had to face then?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The answer is that since the report was made the health situation has improved greatly in Chicago. The health problem is not now as serious as it was. It is true that the population has increased. It is true that industry has increased. However, the fact is the Sanitary District has helped to solve that problem, and while no health problem existed to an extent that would warrant Chicago in coming to the Congress of the United States and asking for assistance at that time, the situation is even less persuasive now.

I would like to point out that there are no figures available in the 768 pages of the hearings in 3 years of trying to secure passage of this bill from anyone, qualified or unqualified, to show that a single death or even a single illness during the past 20 years was the result of inadequate diversion. There is no attempt to prove that.

I hold in my hand the report which I received today from the Public Health Service. This report shows illnesses from typhoid and amoebic dysentery in 1956 and 1957 in the 4 or 5 great cities of this country. I refer to the cities of New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Philadelphia and Detroit. On a per capita basis, the situation is better in Chicago than in any of the other four cities.

The situation is also established by the Metropolitan Sanitary District itself in a publication which has come out within the past several months, I believe, in which they say on page 7 of their publication:

> The Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago was destined to make the city one of the healthiest metropolises in the world.

Then they go on, at page 38 of the study to say:

> Their work in the past has helped make this one of the healthiest major population centers in the world; their work in the future could help make this the largest, wealthiest and most productive community on earth.

I shall establish, furthermore, that there are reasons—good, solid, sensible, economic reasons—why Chicago wants this diversion. They have nothing to do with health. They relate to water power, rather than health considerations. It has everything to do with the fact that they can handle the sanitation problem more economically under the proposal before us, from their standpoint, although from the standpoint of the Nation, it would be far more expensive.

That is a serious charge, and I shall establish it to the satisfaction of any prudent and objective person.

Last night we established the fact that the sanitation facilities 20 years ago, 15 years ago, and 10 years ago discharged a far greater absolute amount of oxygen-deficient effluent, as well as 4 times the proportion of BOD without any established health menace. Since that time there has been a considerable improvement in the quality of the effluent which goes into the Illinois Waterway. There has been an improvement to the point where the situation now is far better than it was 20 or 15 or 10 years ago. At that time there was no serious health problem in Chicago.

In 1941, when the BOD measure of pollution was more than four times greater than it is at the present time, the special master appointed by the Supreme Court found that there was no serious health problem. That is a matter which has been established and which has not been challenged in the hearings. Certainly, anyone has had ample opportunity to do so over the past 3 years.

I should like to come now to something which is even more serious. The fact is that equivalent purification—that is what Chicago and its representatives are seeking to secure—can be provided, according to the Public Health Service, in a memorandum dated April 8, 1957, by any one of four processes which would give similar water quality with respect to absorbed oxygen. The Public Health Service says that water characteristics other than low absorbed oxygen have not been a significant pollution problem in the Illinois Waterway.

These are the four choices which the Public Health Service has said Chicago has available to it, if it decides to use any of these measures, which would make diversion of Lake Michigan water unnecessary, and which would solve the sanitation problem which the city has confronting it.

The first is:

> 1. Measures to keep to an absolute minimum the amount of untreated sewage discharged to streams or into sewers during storms.

I have been talking with authorities in the Public Health Service, and they tell me that there is no question that this method would help immensely to

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

reduce the pollution problem in Chicago. It is a matter of dollars and cents. Every community, and certainly every industrial city in America, has the problem of handling its sewage. It is a matter of doing the job and spending money to provide the facilities. It is a matter of dollars and cents. It is a matter of taxes.

I shall show in a moment that the city of Chicago is well able to pay these taxes, in fact far better than other cities, including the city I am proud to represent.

That is one choice.

The second choice, according to the Public Health Service is this:

2. Significant reduction of hydraulic and organic wasteload placed upon the treatment facilities by a program of industrial waste control at the source.

The State of Wisconsin has gone to a great deal of trouble to establish by statute the requirement that our industries treat their waste before it pollutes the streams of the State. That is something we have done at great risk, because it has discouraged industry from moving into Wisconsin. As a member of the State legislature I well recall the battle we had to keep the streams free of pollution and the battle we had when industries threatened to leave the State. I would not be surprised if some of the industries have located in other places than Wisconsin because of our determination to keep the streams free of pollution and to force industries to treat their waste before expelling it into the streams. I have a detailed study of the job that has been done by Wisconsin. I am very proud of it. It is one of the best jobs that has been done in the country. We are not the only State that has done it. It has been done elsewhere, and it could be done in Chicago.

I should like to read from a professional opinion on industrial waste treatment by Kenneth S. Watson, executive secretary-engineer of the West Virginia Water Commission, at the Fourth Industrial Waste Conference, at Purdue University in 1948.

Mr. Watson had this to say:

The water commission feels that the solution of industrial waste problems is the direct responsibility of each plant. This philosophy has been adopted because the technical men in the industries and the available consultants are completely familiar with plant processes and wastes and are better qualified to devise recovery and treatment methods than anyone else. The staff of the commission is available, however, to supply every aid possible in the form of effluent and stream specifications, orientation in the technique of sanitary-chemical analyses, counsel with reference to the general principles of treatment, and coordination of the statewide pollution control program to insure just interpretation of effluent requirements to all industries.

At this time, I do not wish to say more, because I believe I have established the point. At a later time, if it is desired, I shall establish it more clearly.

Chicago, itself, could solve this problem very easily and simply by adopting a city ordinance which would require industrial plants to do what industrial plants must do in Wisconsin and elsewhere, namely, treat their effluent before it is expelled, in a way which will give it enough oxygen so that it does not exhaust the regular amount of oxygen.

That was the second proposal that was made by the Public Health Service. It is a matter of dollars and cents. It can be done easily by the city of Chicago, just as it has been done by the people of Wisconsin and the people of other States.

The third choice is—and I know this is likely to be controversial, and I would expect an argument on it—

3. Use of chemicals, such as chlorine, to reduce the decomposable dissolved and suspended solids that remain even in well-treated effluents.

This is something that can be accomplished. Again it is a matter of cost. According to the cost estimates of the Public Health Service, it would cost in the neighborhood of a million and a half dollars, or less. With a budget of something like $20 or $22 million a year, it is obvious that this is not a large increase in the burden on the Metropolitan Sanitation District of Chicago. To nail this down, I should like to call attention to the fact that the people of Chicago must pay 30 cents a hundred in their taxes for sanitation. The proposal of the Public Health Service would increase this amount by a penny or two per hundred of valuation. It would be a modest increase, one that they could afford.

The most practical and most useful of all methods is the fourth method:

4. Treatment by aeration or other means of the sewage water in the waterway below the point of sewage discharge.

This method of aeration is one which is extremely promising because its process is so scientific, and, as I said before, it has been established by the Public Health Service that the real problem in the Illinois Waterway is water-quality characteristics other than low absorbed oxygen.

This is a method of putting oxygen into the water precisely where it is needed, by blowing it or diffusing it in. Engineers assure me that this can be done. They assure me that it can be done very economically. They can do it, as I understand, on the basis of about $1,500,000 to $2 million to begin with, and then at a cost of $250,000 a year.

The city of Chicago itself could solve this problem. This fact is established in a memorandum issued by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated July 12, 1957, in which the Department discussed these alternatives very thoroughly. They point out the cost and emphasize that the first cost of the aeration would be $2 million, and the annual cost $250,000. It can be done by a very interesting method.

What happens is that after the effluent is put into the waterway, it begins to decompose and exhausts the oxygen of the waterway. When it reaches a point about a mile or 2 miles or 3 miles from where it goes in, the oxygen deficiency is at its greatest. Consequently, at this point oxygen can be put into the waterway, and the water cleansed. As has been established before, and as I have read several times, the primary problem of the Illinois Waterway is low oxygen content.

In that connection, I shall make another spectacular point in just a minute. But before I make that point I should like to say that when a city asks to divert water, it seems to me that one of the questions which might be asked is whether that city is a provident user of water, to begin with.

I ask any Senator to mention any city in the country which uses as much water per person for domestic purposes as Chicago uses.

Chicago uses far more water per person than does Philadelphia, Cleveland, or New York; 30 percent more than Los Angeles and Milwaukee; 100 percent more than San Francisco or Baltimore.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Illinois for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is not that true because the city of Chicago has higher standards of cleanliness than do the inhabitants of other cities?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I say to my good friend from Illinois that the city of Chicago certainly has high standards of cleanliness. I take my hat off to them. They have a clean-minded senior Senator and a clean-minded junior Senator. However, the people of Milwaukee and the people of New York are able to keep just as clean, and we have just as clean people, as the Senator knows, with the use of far less water.

I call the attention of my good friend from Illinois to a statement which has been prepared by his distinguished compatriots in Chicago, outstanding doctors and health authorities whom I mentioned earlier. I quote what they say:

The average daily per capita consumption of water in Chicago in 1945 was 262.8 gallons. The 1930 average daily per capita consumption of 301.9 gallons was the highest value recorded in any year by the city of Chicago. Comparing the standing of Chicago with other large cities in the United States, it is seen that the daily per capita consumption is nearly twice that in the other cities. The average daily per capita consumption in communities outside of Chicago supplied by the Chicago Waterworks in 1945 was 151.3 gallons. The water users in these communities are 100 percent metered. Such differences are excessive and warrant careful engineering study.

In other words, if meters are installed in the stores and flats, the use of water is reduced. Without meters, the use of water is increased sixfold.

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that Chicago has less metering than any other comparable city. I have the percentage of metering in other outstanding cities in the country.

Hackensack, N. J., with a population of about 30,000, has 100 percent metering. San Diego, Calif., has 100 percent metering. Miami, Fla., has 100 percent metering. Atlanta, Ga., has 100 percent metering. Indianapolis, Ind., has 100 percent metering. Minneapolis, Minn.,

has 100 percent metering. Cincinnati, Ohio, has 100 percent metering. Columbus, Ohio, has 100 percent metering.

How can Senators who represent States in which those cities are located vote for a diversion of water to Chicago, which does damage to other States, when their States have metering; which results in no inconvenience and a reduction in expense to their citizens; which results in a conservation of water; while Chicago is so extravagant that its people use twice as much water as other cities, and only 28.7 percent of its water users are metered?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me, with the understanding that he will not thereby lose his right to the floor?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania for——

Mr. CLARK. For 3 minutes?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for 3 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered; and the Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to state briefly my reasons for opposing the pending bill.

First, the increased diversion will inevitably lower the level of all of the Great Lakes except Lake Superior; and even though this decrease would measure less than an inch on Pennsylvania's shore on Lake Erie, there would be measurable damage to the shipping interests of the Commonwealth which gage ship-bottom clearance at the Great Lakes locks and sills in fractions of inches.

Second, there is no sound reason why the Congress of the United States should permit one State to take advantage of its unique natural position on the edge of two great watersheds, to process municipal sewage more cheaply by diverting waters of one watershed from their natural course and into the other, at the expense of the navigation and power interests in all other States on the same and all lower levels on the Great Lakes and in our great and friendly neighbor to the north, Canada. In this connection, I submit that it is idle to attempt to justify this bill in terms of the need for further studies of the effects of the increased diversion, as set forth in section 2 of the bill. In the 58 years in which this diversion has been flowing continuously, but at different rates of flow, its effects have been studied exhaustively, in all conceivable aspects; and no convincing proof has been submitted to indicate that further studies are needed.

Third, the sanctioning of this increased diversion without full Canadian approval would set an extremely bad precedent in international law, which would unquestionably be used against us in the sensitive and vital negotiations which our Government is engaged in with Canada concerning the development of the Columbia River Basin in our own Northwest.

Mr. President, I know that Canada has stated that she is not actively and formally objecting to the proposed diversion. However, it is my view—although I may be in error—that this is because, a little later, Canada hopes to be able to control the headwaters of rivers which flow from Canada into our Northwest, and to be able to control them in a way which, in my judgment, would be of considerable detriment to United States citizens on the United States side of the border.

Mr. President, the Governor of Pennsylvania, the Honorable George Leader, has written to me a letter in which he requests me to call these matters to the attention of my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Governor Leader to me be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania be so kind as to read the letter into the RECORD?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, my friend, the distinguished junior Senator from Ohio, has requested that I read the letter to the Senate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania may read the letter to the Senate, without my losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Hearing none, it is so ordered; and the Senator from Pennsylvania may proceed.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, let me say, parenthetically, to my good friend, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], that we in Pennsylvania do not object to a little informality in letters; and thus it is that the letter which I am about to read is addressed "Dear JOE." [Laughter.]

The letter is dated June 6, 1958; and the text reads as follows:

I wish to call to your attention the very serious adverse effects upon Pennsylvania of Senate bill 1123.

That bill is practically identical with the bill now under consideration by this body.

I read further from the letter:

This bill would permit the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Chicago, Ill., to divert out of the Great Lakes 2,500 cubic feet per second of water for a period of 3 years. At the present time, the Metropolitan Sanitary District diverts 3,500 cubic feet per second from the Great Lakes Basin pursuant to a decree of the United States Supreme Court.

The additional diversion which would be authorized by this bill would lower the level of Lake Erie 1½ to 2 inches. While this may appear to be but a slight matter, it would affect adversely all riparian landowners and seriously interfere with the operations of the port of Erie. Much effort and funds have been expended to maintain a deep channel at this port. The lowering of the lake level vitiates this work.

Moreover, the lowering of the lake level would result in a loss of 1 to 1½ million tons of shipping each year for each inch by which the lake level is lowered. The Great Lakes barges, which carry so much of the commerce of this region, are loaded to the nearest inch. Consequently, the maintenance of lake levels is of utmost importance to the shipping industry and the commerce of the Great Lakes area.

The lowering of the lake level also affects the power potential at Niagara. Since a large section of Pennsylvania will be among the preferred users when the hydroelectric power is developed, this potential loss of cheap power also affects Pennsylvania adversely.

The diversion of water, one of our most precious natural resources, out of its watershed area in order to benefit some other area constitutes a new and dangerous principle of law. The companion bill to Senate bill 1123 has already passed the House.

That is the bill the Senate is considering at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 3 minutes yielded to the Senator from Pennsylvania have expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Pennsylvania without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered, and the Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the remainder of the letter addressed to me by the Governor of Pennsylvania reads as follows:

No Representative from Pennsylvania appeared to protest the bill. I urge that you vote against this measure and protest its passage.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania will state it.

Mr. CLARK. Is the Senate operating under a unanimous-consent agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 6, 1958.

Hon. JOSEPH S. CLARK,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOE: I wish to call to your attention the very serious adverse effects upon Pennsylvania of Senate bill 1123. This bill would permit the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Chicago, Ill., to divert out of the Great Lakes, 2,500 cubic feet per second of water for a period of 3 years. At the present time, the Metropolitan Sanitary District diverts 3,500 cubic feet per second from the Great Lakes Basin pursuant to a decree of the United States Supreme Court.

The additional diversion which would be authorized by this bill would lower the level of Lake Erie 1½ to 2 inches. While this may appear to be but a slight matter, it would affect adversely all riparian landowners and seriously interfere with the operations of the Port of Erie. Much effort and funds have been expended to maintain a deep channel at this port. The lowering of the lake level vitiates this work.

Moreover, the lowering of the lake level would result in a loss of one to one and one-half million tons of shipping each year for each inch by which the lake level is lowered. The Great Lakes barges, which carry so much of the commerce of this region, are loaded to

the nearest inch. Consequently, the maintenance of lake levels is of utmost importance to the shipping industry and the commerce of the Great Lakes area.

The lowering of the lake level also affects the power potential at Niagara. Since a large section of Pennsylvania will be among the preferred users when the hydroelectric power is developed, this potential loss of cheap power also affects Pennsylvania adversely.

The diversion of water, one of our most precious natural resources, out of its watershed area in order to benefit some other area constitutes a new and dangerous principle of law. The companion bill to Senate bill 1123 has already passed the House. No representative from Pennsylvania appeared to protest the bill. I urge that you vote against this measure and protest its passage.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to say that we in Pennsylvania have had a rather unhappy experience with the diversion of our natural water rights. In Pennsylvania, we have the Delaware River. New York, with the approval of the Supreme Court, has taken an enormous gallonage out of the Delaware River, to provide water for the city of New York.

I see on the floor at this time my distinguished friend, the Senator from Oklahoma. Last year, he and I and our friend, the Senator from Ohio, had a rather spirited argument about how much of the power from the Niagara project should go to the electric cooperatives in New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania.

I hope that, as a result, there will not follow—as seemed to me then to be likely; and, in all good humor, I say that it seems now to be likely—an unfortunate precedent in respect to preventing water from flowing where it wants to flow, to the detriment of the owners of the riparian rights.

For that reason, I support my friend, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] in his opposition to the pending bill.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania for his excellent statement.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 3728) to incorporate the Big Brothers of America.

The message also announced that the House agreed to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 12 to the bill (H. R. 13856), making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, and concur therein; and that the House agreed to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8 to the bill, with the following amendments:

Strike out "$53,300,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$40,000,000."

Strike out "$8,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$6,000,000."

Strike out "$25,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$19,000,000."

Strike out "$1,300,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,300,000."

Strike out "$5,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,750,000."

And strike out "$7,200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$5,400,000."

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4059) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Carmen Scoppettuolo.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 546) designating the week of November 21–27, 1958, as National Farm-City Week, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 469. An act to protect producers and consumers against misbranding and false advertising of the fiber content of textile fiber products, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1684. An act for the relief of William Franklin Rollins;

H. R. 3571. An act for the relief of Boris F. Navratil;

H. R. 4073. An act for the relief of Peter James O'Brien;

H. R. 8943. An act to amend titles 10, 14, and 32, United States Code, to codify recent military law, and to improve the code;

H. R. 9258. An act for the relief of Mrs. Minnie Perreira;

H. R. 10495. An act to amend that part of the act of June 9, 1896 (29 Stat. 313), relating to the establishment of postal stations and branch post offices, so as to permit them to be established within 10 miles of the boundary of the adjoining city; and

H. R. 13861. An act to repeal certain provisions of law relating to messengers for the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

CONVENING OF THE 1ST SESSION OF THE 86TH CONGRESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President——

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished majority leader, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I send to the desk a joint resolution, for which I request immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 704) establishing that the 1st session of the 86th Congress convene at noon on Wednesday, January 7, 1959.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me ask whether this constitutes a motion for the adjournment of this session of Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No; the joint resolution provides only the convening date for the 1st session of the 86th Congress, next January.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is this an indication of how coming events cast their shadows before?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 704) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DESIGNATION OF THE WEEK OF NOVEMBER 21–27, 1958, AS NATIONAL FARM-CITY WEEK

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate House Joint Resolution 546.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 546) designating the week of November 21–27, 1958, as National Farm-City Week, which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have consulted the majority leader and the minority leader about taking up the resolution. A similar resolution has been adopted each year for the past 2 years.

I move its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 546) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUMMARY OF WORK OF SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me, with the understanding that he does not lose the floor?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Alabama with the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a summary of the work of the

Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare during this session of Congress.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

INCREASE IN DIVERSION OF WATER FROM LAKE MICHIGAN INTO THE ILLINOIS WATERWAY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2) to authorize the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test on a 3-year basis the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], my colleague, has been doing a wonderful job. He has procured from the Sanitary District of Greater Chicago a report that gives an answer to how Chicago can solve its problem without diversion. The report points out that between 1952 and 1957 the percentage of biochemical oxygen removed declined from 93.6 percent to 85.6 percent.

The best way to understand the matter, which admittedly is difficult to explain in terms of arithmetic, is that the remainder that was not removed in 1952 was 6.4. The remainder that was not removed in 1957 was 14.4.

In other words, there has been more than a doubling of the material. There has been about 110 percent increase in unpurified sewage between 1952 and 1957. Admittedly the problems of the sanitary district are very great. Undoubtedly the population has increased between 1952 and 1957.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1959—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Texas, if I may do so without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Wisconsin be permitted to yield to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] for the purpose of submitting the conference report on the military construction bill (H. R. 13489), with the understanding that at the conclusion of action on that conference report, the Senator from Wisconsin will be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13489) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today, p. 19589, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I move that the conference report be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to make a very brief observation with respect to this report. I did not feel I could conscientiously, as a conferee, sign the report. That feeling grew out of the fact that in my opinion the Senate was compelled to yield on a number of items that are most vital to our defense effort. The Senate was able to secure only about $130 million out of some $500 million, nearly all of which were purchases by the Department of Defense, in the conference report.

It might not have been as sad as it was to yield no greater an amount than that if the items the Senate secured had been of the highest priority; but the House conferees were adamant with respect to a large number of items not only for which there were budget estimates, but which the Department of Defense had stated were of the very highest priority.

I do not, of course, blame my colleagues on the conference for finally signing this report. I was present at enough of the conference to realize the atmosphere which obtained and the difficulties which confronted them. But I do wish to express my regret that the Senate was compelled to yield on items of the very highest priority, because I feel it will be detrimental to our overall efforts to secure this country against any contingency.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, with reference to what the Senator from Georgia has stated, I agree with him completely. I shall have a short statement inserted in the RECORD. The last paragraph is to the effect that the Senate conferees were not happy with the bill, but the House conferees were firm in opposition to nearly all requests for restoration.

That, in total, details the Senate conferees' position on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives with reference to certain amendments of the Senate to H. R. 13489.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 13489, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
August 23, 1958.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7 to the bill (H. R. 13489) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$6,250,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$295,000,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10 to said bill, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 612. No part of the funds provided in this act shall be used for purchase of land or land easements in excess of 110 percent of the value as determined by the Corps of Engineers or the Bureau of Yards and Docks, except: (a) where there is a determination of value by a Federal court, (b) purchases negotiated by the Attorney General or his designee, and (c) where the estimated value is less than $25,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

"SEC. 614. Such appropriations of the Department of Defense, available for obligation during the current fiscal year, as may be designated by the Secretary of Defense shall be available for the purposes of section 1 of the act approved April 3, 1958 (72 Stat. 78): *Provided*, That any such appropriations so utilized shall be accounted for under the limitation established by section 4 of said act."

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to Senate amendments Nos. 2, 3, 10, and 12, and that the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared with reference to the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CHAVEZ

The conference agreement you have before you appropriates $1,353,850,000 for military construction for the Department of Defense. This compares with $1,720,115,000 as provided by the Senate and $1,218,815,000 as provided by the House. The conference figures do not include $5.5 million for one project which was in disagreement. The funding program for the individual items contains similar reductions.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

In submitting the conference report on this bill, I do so most reluctantly. The House made large-scale reductions in both the funding program and the cash appropriations. The Senate, as you will recall, made substantial restoration. In conference we found the House members adamant in regard to practically all items. Your Senate conferees labored long and arduously, presenting all the facts regarding the necessity for these requested programs. In some few items, the House yielded. In most, they remained firm. It was only after prolonged debate that a majority of the Senate conferees agreed to sign the conference report you have before you.

You will find in the House Report No. 2699 a list of the Senate restorations which remain in the bill. These, coupled with the items which the House originally provided, less a few unauthorized projects deleted in the Senate, comprise the items still in the bill.

I might mention 1 or 2 items of special note. The House provided no new appropriations for Army Reserve and National Guard construction. The Senate added $28,330,000 for such construction. The House conferees refused to appropriate more than $6,250,000, which is the amount in the report before you.

For the Titan program, the House reduced the request by $90,000,000. The Senate restored this amount. The House refused to go above $70,000,000 in restorations.

Nearly all the departmental requests for barracks, bachelor officer quarters, hospitals, messes, family housing, and like items, which the Senate restored, the House refused to accept.

Your Senate conferees were not happy with the bill, but they faced firm opposition to nearly all requests for restoration.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a tabular summary of the appropriations action on the bill be included as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Appropriations summary: H. R. 13489, the military construction appropriation bill for fiscal year 1959

Item	Budget estimate	House bill	Senate bill	Conference report
Office of Secretary of Defense:				
Advanced Research Projects Agency	[1] ($50,000,000)	[1] ($50,000,000)	[1] ($50,000,000)	[1] ($50,000,000)
Interservice activities:				
Loran stations	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000
Department of the Army:				
Military construction, Army	340,000,000	214,564,000	327,847,000	230,000,000
Military construction, Army Reserve components			28,330,000	6,250,000
Department of the Navy:				
Military construction, Navy	360,253,000	274,751,000	351,343,000	295,000,000
Military construction, Naval Reserves	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000
Department of the Air Force:				
Military construction, Air Force	991,900,000	687,350,000	974,995,000	785,000,000
Military construction, Air Force Reserve components	9,600,000	[2] 14,150,000		
Military construction, Air National Guard	(9,600,000)		9,600,000	9,600,000
Total	1,730,653,000	1,218,815,000	1,720,115,000	1,353,850,000

[1] To be derived by transfer from existing OSD funds available to ARPA.
[2] Includes $4,550,000 in the budget estimates for Air Force Reserve and $9,600,000 for the Air National Guard.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, it is a source of very keen disappointment to me and to my colleague from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] that the appropriation for the Cold Weather Research Laboratory at Hanover, N. H., was deleted from the bill in conference.

I wish to express my appreciation, however, to the Senate conferees—including my colleague, the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] for doing their utmost to keep this appropriation item in the bill.

As a matter of record, I wish the situation regarding this appropriation item to be set forth in the RECORD, for the future.

For more than 4 years, it has been the endeavor of the Defense Department to construct a Cold Weather Research Laboratory at Hanover, N. H. The site was selected after long consideration. Heretofore, five Cold Weather Research Laboratories had been located in various parts of the country. It was determined to consolidate them at one suitable location.

The site for this one was selected because the weather conditions at that spot are ideal for the purpose of experiments incident to the work; also because of the fact that Dartmouth College, which is situated at Hanover, has been making experiments in this field for a long period of time, and has the best library on cold-weather conditions and experiments in existence in the country; and also because Dartmouth College was donating the land to the Department of Defense, for use in connection with construction of the laboratory.

Finally, after 4 years, in last year's appropriation bill an appropriation item for the construction of the laboratory was included. But because of improper estimates and changing conditions, the amount included was not sufficient. So an additional sum was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget this year, passed by the Senate, and included in the bill.

Unfortunately, the conferees on the part of the House were adamant in opposition to this project; and it is not included in the conference report.

I am sincerely appreciative of the attempts of our Senate conferees; and I hope this item will be provided for next year. Mr. President, the two great nation that bestride the world today—Soviet Russia and the United States of America—meet at the Arctic Circle. The Arctic Circle thus becomes the new frontier for our country. The Cold Weather Laboratory is a focal point in the defense of this Nation.

Although I regret this failure, I take some comfort—although it is cold comfort [laughter]—in the fact that the failure was due to the action of the House of Representatives, and that the Senate conferees did their very best to have this item included in the bill.

I wish this statement to appear in the RECORD, because we do not intend to give up our endeavor to have this necessary facility constructed.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF SENATE COMMITTEES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we are on the eve of the adjournment of one of the most creative and constructive Congresses in many years.

By any reasonable standard of judgment, this Congress has one of the most productive records in many years.

A productive record is not an accident. It doesn't happen simply because a turn of the wheel brings up the lucky number.

A productive record means days and nights of exhausting work. It means careful attention to detail.

And in the Congress of the United States, it means committee work of the very highest caliber.

The issues which confront us are complex and grow increasingly so with each passing year. It would not be possible for the Congress of the United States to approach any issue with confidence unless we had unbounded confidence in our committees.

No legislation could be debated fruitfully on this floor without the work of the men who had devoted time and care to the intricate details. Since we must consider so many bills, we can be assured that we understand them only when they have been scrutinized carefully in advance.

In this Senate, we have had committees in whom we could have unbounded confidence. They have conducted themselves prudently, carefully, and effectively. Without them our record would have been poor indeed.

Frequently I have been asked what is the formula for legislative success. The answer is simple. It is, good committee work.

I have requested the chairman of each committee to summarize the outstanding activities of this session. They have replied in written form, and I ask unanimous consent that their replies be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, so the Senate and the Nation may know the deep debt of gratitude that we owe to these men.

There being no objection the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON
AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY,
August 18, 1958.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Attached is a list of bills and resolutions reported to the Senate during this session of the 85th Congress, as requested by a staff member of the Majority Policy Committee.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

Attached is a list of all bills approved by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry during the second session of the 85th Congress.

The committee reported 56 bills and 19 have been enacted into law. In addition one Senate measure was rejected by the Senate and one vetoed by the President.

LIST OF MEASURES FAVORABLY REPORTED TO THE SENATE BY THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY, 85TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

Senate bills and joint resolutions

S. 666, to remove wheat for seeding purposes which has been treated with poisonous substances from the "unfit for human consumption" category for the purposes of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933. March 20, 1958, reported to Senate, with an amendment (S. Rept. 1406). Indefinitely postponed and H. R. 11581 passed Senate in lieu thereof on August 11, 1958. (See H. Rept. 2295.)

S. 1436, to amend section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to provide for administration of farm programs by democratically elected farmer committeemen. May 29, 1958, reported to Senate, with an amendment. (S. Rept. 1646.)

S. 1939, to amend the Federal Seed Act of August 9, 1939 (53 Stat. 1275), as amended. August 1, 1958, approved. (Public Law 85–581.)

S. 2142, to amend section 8e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (of 1933), as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide for the extension of the restrictions on imported commodities imposed by such section to all imported citrus fruits, and to sliced figs, dried figs, and fig paste. August 5, 1958, reported to Senate, with amendments. (S. Rept. 2191.)

S. 2444, to authorize cooperative associations of producers to bargain with purchasers singly or in groups and for other purposes. July 15, 1958, passed Senate, with amendments.

S. 2861, to extend for an additional 4-year period the provisions of the National Wool Act of 1954. April 21, 1958, reported to Senate, with an amendment. (S. Rept. 1460.)

S. 2937, to provide equitable treatment for producers participating in the soil bank program on the basis of incorrect information furnished by the Government. May 16, 1958, approved. (Public Law 85–413.)

S. 3039, amending the Agricultural Trade and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended. February 26, 1958, reported to Senate, with amendments. (S. Rept. 1323.)

S. 3076, to amend section 12 of the act of May 29, 1884, relating to research on foot-and-mouth disease and other animal diseases. July 31, 1958, approved. (Public Law 85–573.)

S. 3120, to exempt the production of durum wheat in the Tulelake area, Modoc and Siskiyou Counties, Calif., from the acreage allotment and marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. May 1, 1958, approved. (Public Law 85–390.)

S. 3248, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to exchange lands comprising the Pleasant Grove Administrative Site, Uinta National Forest, Utah, and for other purposes. July 21, 1958, passed Senate.

S. 3333, to facilitate the insurance of loans under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, and the act of August 28, 1937, as amended (relating to the conservation of water resources), and for other purposes. August 11, 1958, passed Senate.

S. 3341, to extend the Armed Forces dairy products program for 3 years. March 3, 1958, passed Senate.

S. 3342, to continue the special milk program for children in the interest of improved nutrition by fostering the consumption of fluid milk in the schools. July 1, 1958, approved. (Public Law 85–478.)

S. 3343, to extend the accelerated brucellosis control program under section 204 (e) of the Agricultural Act of 1954 for 2 additional years. March 3, 1958, passed Senate.

S. 3385, to amend section 114 of the Soil Bank Act with respect to compliance with corn acreage allotments. March 11, 1958, reported to Senate, with an amendment. (S. Rept. 1372.)

S. 3406, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to wheat acreage history. April 4, 1958, H. R. 11086 approved. (Public Law 85–366.)

S. 3408, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, so as to provide that cotton-acreage allotments for the States for 1958 and subsequent years shall be no less than in 1956, and for other purposes. March 11, 1958, reported to Senate, with amendments. (S. Rept. 1371.)

S. 3420, to extend and amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. March 20, 1958, passed Senate, with amendments.

S. 3439, providing for the reconveyance to Salt Lake City, Utah, of the Forest Service fire warehouse lot in that city. July 21, 1958, passed Senate, with amendments.

S. 3441, to provide for a minimum acreage allotment for corn and other purposes. March 10, 1958, reported to Senate. (S. Rept. 1370.)

S. 3478, to insure the maintenance of an adequate supply of anti-hog-cholera serum and hog-cholera virus. July 31, 1958, approved. (Public Law 85–574.)

S. 1356, to amend the antitrust laws by vesting in the Federal Trade Commission jurisdiction to prevent monopolistic acts or practices and other unlawful restraints in commerce by certain persons engaged in commerce in meat and meat products, and for other purposes. May 15, 1958, passed Senate, with an amendment.

S. 3741, to facilitate administration and management by the Secretary of Agriculture of certain lands of the United States within national forests. July 21, 1958, passed Senate, with an amendment.

S. 3858, authorizing Commodity Credit Corporation to purchase flour and cornmeal and donating same for certain domestic and foreign purposes. August 5, 1958, reported to Senate. (S. Rept. 2196.)

S. 3861, to provide for the control of noxious plants on land under the control or jurisdiction of the Federal Government. May 21, 1958, passed Senate.

S. 3890, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to permit the transfer of 1958 farm acreage allotments for cotton in the case of natural disasters, and for other purposes. June 11, 1958, H. R. 12602 approved. (Public Law 85–456.)

S. 4071, to provide more effective price, production adjustment, and marketing programs for various agricultural commodities. June 28, 1958, reported to Senate. (S. Rept. 1766.) Further current action. July 25. Passed Senate with amendments.

S. 4100, to provide for the increased use of agricultural products for industrial purposes. July 2, 1958, reported to Senate. (S. Rept. 1795.)

S. 4151, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, so as to establish uniform provisions for transfer of acreage allotments. August 11, 1958, passed Senate, with an amendment.

S. J. Res. 162, to stay any reduction in support prices or acreage allotments until Congress can make appropriate changes in the price support and acreage allotment laws. March 31, 1958, vetoed. (S. Doc. 85.)

S. J. Res. 163, to stay any reduction in support prices for dairy products until Congress can make appropriate provision for such support prices. March 13, 1958, rejected by Senate.

S. J. Res. 181, extending for 60 days the special milk program. June 26, 1958, passed Senate, with an amendment.

S. J. Res. 334, to study matters pertaining to tobacco marketing practices. August 4, 1958, reported to Senate. (S. Rept. 2163.) August 6, 1958, agreed to by Senate.

House bills and joint resolutions

H. R. 6765, to provide for reports on the acreage planted to cotton, to repeal the prohibitions against cotton acreage reports based on farmers' planting intentions, and for other purposes. May 29, 1958, approved. (Public Law 85–430.)

H. R. 8490, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to rice acreage allotments. June 4, 1958, approved. (Public Law 85–443.)

H. R. 8308, to establish the use of humane methods of slaughter of livestock as a policy of the United States, and for other purposes. July 29, 1958, passed Senate, with amendments. August 13, 1958, House agreed to Senate amendments.

H. R. 5497, to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. May 26, 1958, reported to Senate. (S. Rept. 1630.)

H. R. 10843, to amend section 114 of the Soil Bank Act with respect to compliance with corn acreage allotments. April 7, 1958, approved. (Public Law 85–369.)

H. R. 376, to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to prohibit trading in onion futures in commodity exchanges. July 1, 1958, passed Senate, with an amendment. Senate and House agreed to compromise. Reported August 15, 1958.

H. R. 7953, to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes. June 20, 1958, approved. (Public Law 85–464.)

H. R. 11058, to amend section 313 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to tobacco acreage allotments. July 2, 1958, approved. (Public Law 85–489.)

H. R. 11424, to extend the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to extend special livestock loans, and for other purposes. July 11, 1958, approved. (Public Law 85–516.)

H. R. 11399, relating to price support for the 1958 and subsequent crops of extra long staple cotton. July 2, 1958, approved. (Public Law 85–497.)

H. R. 12164, to permit use of Federal surplus foods in nonprofit summer camps for children. July 2, 1958, approved. (Public Law 85–483.)

H. R. 6542, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in the State of Wyoming to the town of Dayton, Wyo. August 11, 1958, passed Senate. Approved August 18, 1958. (Public Law 669.)

H. R. 10321, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to exchange lands comprising a portion of the Estes Park administrative site, Roosevelt National Forest, Colo., and for other purposes. July 28, 1958, approved. (Public Law 85–567.)

H. R. 11253, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to exchange land and improvements with the city of Redding, Shasta County, Calif., and for other purposes. July 28, 1958, approved. (Public Law 85–565.)

H. R. 11800, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey a certain parcel of land and buildings thereon to the city of Clifton, N. J., August 11, 1958, passed Senate.

H. R. 12161, to provide for the establishment of townsites, and for other purposes. July 31, 1958, approved. (P. L. 85–569.)

H. R. 12224, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with re-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

spect to acreage allotments for peanuts. August 11, 1958, passed Senate.

H. R. 12840, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. August 11, 1958, passed Senate.

H. R. 8481, to amend title IV of the Agricultural Act of 1956 to provide that the provisions of such title shall apply in Hawaii. August 18, 1958, passed Senate.

H. R. 12494, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture in selling or agreeing to the sale of lands to the State of North Carolina to permit the State to sell or exchange such lands for private purposes. August 18, 1958, passed Senate.

H. Con. Res. 295, favoring the establishment of a Hall of Fame for Agriculture. August 11, 1958, passed Senate.

H. R. 12126, to provide further protection against the introduction and dissemination of livestock diseases, and for other purposes. August 4, 1958, reported to Senate, with amendments. (S. Rept. 2186.)

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
August 16, 1958.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
Majority Leader, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: In compliance with your request, this letter summarizes the legislative action of the Committee on Armed Services during the 2d session of the 85th Congress. The four measures of perhaps greatest significance are these:

1. H. R. 11470, the military pay bill, now Public Law 85-422. This act substantially increases the compensation of members of the Armed Forces in an attempt to attract and retain career personnel of the desired qualifications. In a congressionally modified form, it incorporates recommendations of the Defense Advisory Committee on Professional and Technical Compensation, familiarly known as the Cordiner Committee.

2. H. R. 12541, the Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1958, now Public Law 85-599. This measure clarifies and strengthens the authority of the Secretary of Defense but preserves the constitutional role of the Congress respecting the Armed Forces. It encourages greater emphasis on research and development. It clarifies the organization and authority of unified commands and permits the establishment of a new chain of command to unified commands.

3. H. R. 13015, an act that provides more than $1.6 billion in construction authorization for the active forces and $57 million in construction authorization for Reserve components. The authorization provides operational, training, and support facilities.

4. H. R. 9739, the supplemental military construction authorization, now Public Law 85-325. This bill provided more than $500 million in military construction authorization, including among other things, initial authorization for a ballistic missile detection system.

During the current session, the committee considered and reported 51 other measures, of which 32 were legislative proposals of the Department of Defense. Details on these bills are available in the committee.

I hope that this letter is responsive to your request.

Sincerely,

DICK RUSSELL.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
August 18, 1958.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
Majority Leader, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: The 1958 activities of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency may be summarized as follows:

1. S. 3149, which provides an increase of $2 billion in the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, will substantially assist international development and promote the sale of United States capital goods abroad.

2. Senate Resolution 264: This measure promotes study of establishment of an International Development Association as an affiliate of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Its purpose is to explore the possibilities of a new source of international development loans for underdeveloped nations. It contemplates loans for longer periods of time at lower rates of interest, repayable partly in local currencies, from a separate fund for subordinate loans to supplement the World Bank's lending activities.

3. S. 3418, an emergency housing bill designed to help more families achieve home ownership and at the same time stimulate the national economy. This was done by lowering downpayments on FHA single-family housing, extending the GI housing program for 2 years, and providing full FNMA support for FHA and VA home mortgages of less than $13,500. Recent increases in the number of housing starts, which has stiffened the economy against further large declines, has often been credited to this program.

4. Senate Joint Resolution 171, which provides an increase of $4 billion in the mortgage insuring authority of the FHA, keeping the program in operation.

5. S. 3497. This measure called for a $1 billion community facilities loan program to help localities proceed with needed public works with long-term loans available at a low rate of interest. Unfortunately, the bill has not been passed by the House of Representatives.

6. S. 4035, the Housing Act of 1958, which provided (a) a long term slum clearance and urban renewal program, (b) a more constructive approach to public housing, (c) promotion of construction of badly needed rental housing, (d) promotion of housing for the elderly, (e) extension and broadening of the college housing loan program, and (f) FHA insurance for mortgages on nursing homes. At the moment the fate of this measure in the House is still doubtful.

7. S. 3323, Defense Production Act amendments of 1958, which extended standby allocations authority and strategic materials stockpiling.

8. S. 3683, an area redevelopment bill providing economic aids to low-income areas or those hit by severe and prolonged unemployment.

9. H. R. 7963, a measure to extend and make permanent the Small Business Administration, which provides loans to small businesses.

10. S. 3651, legislation creating a Small Business Investment Company Administration under the SBA, to provide equity-type capital for small businesses. The new program provides tax and loan incentives to the formation of investment companies, loans to State and local development companies, and a fund for management counseling.

The committee also reported S. 2920, providing additional small business disaster loans; S. 3093, extending the Export Control Act; H. R. 12586, extending Federal Reserve Board authority to make direct purchase of United States obligations; S. 4162, providing new defense production borrowing authority; and Senate Joint Resolution 201, providing for a medal for Rear Admiral Rickover.

In all there were 63 Senate bills, 2 House bills, 3 Senate joint resolutions, 5 Senate resolutions, and 1 Senate concurrent resolution referred to the committee during the second session. In addition, the committee reported favorably to the Senate seven nominations to positions in the executive branch, which the Senate confirmed.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT, *Chairman.*

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
August 18, 1958.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
Majority Leader,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: In compliance with your telephone request of August 16, 1958, I am happy to submit a report of activities of the Committee on the District of Columbia during the 85th Congress, 2d session. This report includes actions of the committee through today.

Cordially,

ALAN BIBLE.

REPORT OF ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, 85TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

The Committee on the District of Columbia received for consideration in the 85th Congress, 2d session, the following:

Thirty-eight Senate bills, seventeen House bills, four Senate joint resolutions, one Senate concurrent resolution, two House joint resolutions, six nominations; grand total, 68.

Hearings were held by subcommittees on 34 Senate bills, 7 House bills, 2 Senate joint resolutions, and 1 House joint resolution. The full committee held hearings on four nominations.

The full committee met seven times.

Of the 26 Senate bills reported to the Senate, 22 were passed by the Senate and 3 were indefinitely postponed and companion House bills were considered and passed in lieu thereof. One bill, having passed the Senate, was recalled and is awaiting reconsideration. Of the 18 House bills reported to the Senate, 16 were passed by the Senate. One Senate joint resolution was reported and passed by the Senate, and two House joint resolutions were reported, one of which was passed by the Senate. Five nominations were reported favorably by the committee, and action was deferred by the committee on one nomination.

As of this date, 2 Senate bills, 2 House bills, and 1 House joint resolution are pending on the Senate calendar.

Conference committees were appointed on 4 bills and 4 conference committee meetings were held. As of this date, the Senate has acted favorably on three conference reports.

A field trip of an investigatory nature was made in connection with legislation pertaining to salary increases for school teachers.

The following is a statistical summary of committee action:

Status of bills, acts, resolutions and nominations received by the committee during the 2d sess. of the 85th Cong.

Number of bills, acts, resolutions, and nominations referred to committee	68
Number of bills, acts, resolutions, and nominations reported to Senate	36
Number of bills, acts, and resolutions in process (hearings held)	1
Number of bills, acts, and resolutions disposed of through consolidation with other Senate bills or House acts	1
Number of bills, acts, and resolutions indefinitely postponed within committee	15
Number of bills, acts, and resolutions awaiting initial action	[1]15

[1] 11 of these bills, acts, and resolutions were received after July 1, 1958.

Number of bills, acts, and resolutions received during the 1st sess. of the 85th Cong. upon which the committee has acted during the 2d sess.

Senate bills reported favorably	10
House acts reported favorably	7
Senate bills in process	1
House acts in process	0
Senate bills postponed indefinitely	14
House acts postponed indefinitely	1

The following is a list, by title and number, of (1) all bills, acts, and resolutions passed by the Senate during the 2d session of the 85th Congress, and (2) acts approved by the House in the 2d session which had passed the Senate in the 1st session. Those that became law are indicated by the public or private law number.

S. 105, to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Association of Colored Women's Clubs, Inc. Private Law 85–496.

S. 532, to revise and modernize the fish and game laws of the District of Columbia. (At the White House.)

S. 969, to prescribe the weight to be given to evidence of alcohol in the blood or urine of persons tried in the District of Columbia for operating vehicles while under the influence of intoxicating liquor. Public Law 85–338.

S. 1040, to amend the acts known as the Life Insurance Act, approved June 19, 1934, and the Fire and Casualty Act, approved October 9, 1940, so as to bring related sections of law applicable to the business of life insurance into conformity with corresponding sections applicable to the business of fire and casualty insurance. Public Law 85–334.

S. 1041, to amend the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1911, and for other purposes," approved May 18, 1910, so as to allow the use of illustrations in annual District reports.

S. 1706, To amend the act entitled "An act to grant additional powers to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 20, 1944, as amended, so as to authorize the Commissioners to establish a fund to defray the cost of procuring, handling, and mailing municipal publications and to make advanced payments to Federal agencies for supplies or work. Public Law 85–491.

S. 1708, to amend the act entitled "An act relating to children born out of wedlock," approved January 11, 1951, so as to provide that when previously unwed parents of an illegitimate child have married subsequent to the birth of the child, the paternity of the child may be acknowledged by the husband in an affidavit sworn to before a judge or clerk of a court of record, or before an officer of the Armed Forces authorized to administer oaths, or before any person duly authorized to administer oaths. Public Law 85–382.

S. 1764, to amend the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act, so as to authorize payment from appropriated funds of the cost of free school lunches.

S. 1841, to authorize the District of Columbia Board of Education to employ retired teachers as substitute teachers in the public schools of the District of Columbia. Public Law 85–385.

S. 1843, to amend the act entitled "An act to create a recreation board for the District of Columbia, to define its duties, and for other purposes," approved April 29, 1942, so as to permit the recreation board to allow night differential to be paid to certain of its employees for unscheduled work. Public Law 85–383.

S. 1846, to provide for the District of Columbia an appointed governor and lieutenant governor, and an elected legislative assembly and nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes.

S. 1908, to amend the District of Columbia Hospital Center Act in order to extend the time and increase the authorization for appropriations for the purposes of such act, and to provide that grants under such act may be made to certain organizations organized to construct and operate hospital facilities in the District of Columbia. Public Law 85–328.

S. 2419, to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act and for other purposes, so as to make possible a variety of desired administrative changes in the application and operation of the Unemployment Compensation Act in the District of Columbia. Public Law 85–557.

S. 2725, to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Council of Negro Women, Inc., in the District of Columbia. Private Law 85–388.

S. 2728, to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the District of Columbia Government to establish an Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes," approved August 11, 1950, so as to more adequately meet the needs of the District of Columbia in respect to planning, training, and preparation for civil defense in case of attack, and for the exercise of emergency powers after an attack or in case a major disaster should occur in the District.

S. 3057, to amend the Disrtict of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, so as to increase the salaries of the Superintendent of Schools and the Board of Commissioners to $19,000 per annum. Public Law 85–552.

S. 3058, to amend the act regulating the bringing of actions for damages against the District of Columbia, approved February 28, 1933.

S. 3059, to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to remove dangerous or unsafe buildings and parts thereof, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1899, as amended.

S. 3243, to permit certain foreign students to attend the District of Columbia Teachers College on the same basis as a resident of the District of Columbia. Public Law 85–384.

S. 3259, to further amend the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 896), as amended by the act of October 25, 1951 (65 Stat. 657), as the same are amended, to provide for an increase in the authorization for funds to be granted for the construction of hospital facilities in the District of Columbia, so as to increase the authorization of funds for construction of hospital facilities for Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-in-Asylum and Georgetown Medical Center. (At the White House.)

S. 3493, to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act of 1935, as amended, so as to permit voluntary payments upon the part of employers into the unemployment compensation fund to protect experience ratings previously earned, raise the maximum benefit payment from $30 per week to $48 per week; extend the duration of benefit payments from 26 weeks to 34 weeks; and replace the present variable 4- to 9-week disqualification provisions with a straight 6-week disqualification provision with no cancellation of benefits.

S. 3510, to amend the act entitled "An act relating to the levying and collecting of taxes and assessments, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1938, so as to permit District of Columbia officials to use registered or certified mail in notifying property owners of special assessments for public improvements.

S. 3827, to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942, as amended, so as to authorize the Commissioners to use moneys in the fund established by section 7 of the Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act to alleviate a traffic situation resulting from the presence of a parking facility or to improve or widen a street. (At the White House.)

S. 3941, to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia, approved May 25, 1954, and for other purposes, so as to improve administration under the act, to remove inequities stemming from its operation, to clarify certain of its provisions, to remove a provision limiting the amount of insurance to be carried by taxicabs, and to make minor adjustments in the language of the act.

S. 3970, to facilitate the acquisition of real property under the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act.

S. 4153, to authorize the delivery of sewage from Virginia into the sewerage system of the District of Columbia and the treatment of such sewage, and for other purposes. (At the White House.)

S. J. Res. 167, directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to cause a study to be made of all factors involved in the construction of a heliport within the District of Columbia.

H. J. Res. 582, to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to promulgate special regulations for the period of the Middle Atlantic Shrine Association meeting of A. A. O. N. M. S. in September 1958, to authorize the granting of certain permits to Almas Temple Shrine Activities, Inc., on the occasion of such meetings, and for other purposes. Public Law 85–551.

H. R. 3486, to provide that the Uniform Simultaneous Death Act shall apply in the District of Columbia. Public Law 85–356.

H. R. 3778, to amend the act of May 29, 1930, with respect to the stream valley parks in Maryland, so as to vest certain discretion in the National Capital Planning Commission, upon agreement with the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission, to increase the authorization provided under section 1 (b) of such act, for the acquisition of lands in the State of Maryland. (At the White House.)

H. R. 6306, to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing and directing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct two 4-lane bridges to replace the existing 14th Street or Highway Bridge across the Potomac River, and for other purposes.", so as to increase the authorization for the construction of two 4-lane bridges across the Potomac River. Public Law 85–501.

H. R. 7300, to amend section 15 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act so as to permit the continued operation of a licensed business when the zoning is changed to a more restricted zoning classification. Public Law 85–423.

H. R. 7349, to amend the act regulating the business of executing bonds for compensation in criminal cases in the District of Columbia, so as to provide that the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, instead of the criminal divisions of such court, shall have jurisdiction to make rules prescribing the qualifications of persons engaging in the bonding business. Public Law 85–537.

H. R. 7450, to make the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act Amendments of 1957 applicable to retired former members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police force, the White House Police force, and the United States Secret Service; and to their widows, widowers, and children.

H. R. 7452, to provide for the designation of holidays for the officers and employees of the government of the District of Columbia for pay and leave purposes, and for other purposes. Public Law 85–533.

H. R.7568, to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953 to provide that service in the grade of inspector and the grade of private in the Fire Department of the District of Columbia shall be deemed to be service in the same grade for the purpose of longevity increases. Public Law 85–421.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

H. R. 7785, to provide for the appointment of an additional judge for the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia.

H. R. 7863, to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, so as to provide for the payment of alcoholic beverage control taxes on wine by a reporting or affidavit method in lieu of the present tax-stamp method. Public Law 85–558.

H. R. 9271, to authorize the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution to use certain real estate in the District of Columbia as the national headquarters of such society. Private Law 85–369.

H. R. 9285, to amend the charter of St. Thomas' Literary Society, so as to remove from existing law the $500,000 limitation on the value of the property that the society may hold at any one time and to remove from the charter that portion of the existing law which holds the individual corporators liable for all debts of the society. Public Law 85–541.

H. R. 9304, to amend section 12 of the act approved September 1, 1916, as amended, so as to change the effective date for increased rate of deduction under the Police and Firemen Retirement and Disability Act amendments of 1957. (At the White House.)

H. R. 12356, to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes," approved August 30, 1954, so as to authorize and direct the Commissioners to construct, maintain, and operate a low-level bridge to be known as the Theodore Roosevelt Bridge, over the Potomac River. Public Law 85–446.

H. R. 12377, to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to borrow funds for capital improvement programs and to amend provisions of law relating to Federal Government participation in meeting costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City. Public Law 85–451.

H. R. 12643, to amend the act entitled "An act to consolidate the Police Court of the District of Columbia and the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia, to be known as 'The Municipal Court for the District of Columbia,' to create 'The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia,' and for other purposes," approved April 1, 1942, as amended, so as to permit each judge, the clerk and each deputy clerk of the Municipal Court of Appeals to administer oaths and affirmations and take acknowledgements. Public Law 85–539.

H. R. 13218, to enact a certain provision now included in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1958, so as to authorize the Commissioners to use District-owned vehicles for transportation of children of employees of the District of Columbia government residing at Children's Center between Children's Center and Laurel, Md. (At the White House.)

H. R. 13531, to amend the act of June 29, 1938, as amended, to increase the insurance coverage required to be carried by cabs for hire in the District of Columbia for the protection of passengers and others, and for other purposes. (At the White House.)

H. R. 12162, to amend the District of Columbia Stadium Act of 1957 to require the stadium to be constructed substantially in accordance with certain plans, to provide for a contract with the United States with respect to the site of such stadium, and for other purposes. Public Law 85–561.

H. R. 13088, to fix and regulate the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, of the United States Park Police, and of the White House Police, and for other purposes. Public Law 85–584.

H. R. 13132, to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, so as to increase the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia.

The following is a list of nominations confirmed by the Senate in the 2d session of the 85th Congress:

Harold A. Kertz, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1959.

Andrew McCaughrin Hood, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge of the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia for a term of 10 years.

Richard R. Atkinson for reappointment as a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency for a term of 5 years, effective on and after March 4, 1958.

George E. C. Hayes, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years expiring June 30, 1961.

Robert E. McLaughlin for reappointment as Commissioner of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

United States Senate

Major Accomplishments of Committee on Finance, 85th Congress, 2d Session

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

H. R. 11630, providing a permanent unemployment compensation program for exservicemen on the same basis as benefits are now provided former Federal civilian employees. In effect, an exservicemen's tour of duty in the Armed Forces would be treated in the same manner as if he had been employed by a private employer in his State or by the Federal Government in a civilian capacity. (Awaiting President's signature.)

H. R. 12065, enables an unemployed individual who has exhausted his unemployment compensation rights under the laws of his State to be covered for an additional period equal to 50 percent of maximum number of weeks previously available (overall average of about 13 weeks). This made immediate relief available to 2,650,000 persons who had exhausted their benefits after June 30, 1957. (Public Law 85–441, June 4, 1958.)

SOCIAL SECURITY

H. R. 5411, liberalizes existing law to enable a widow who loses mother's old-age and survivors insurance benefits because of remarriage to continue to receive such benefits if her husband dies within 1 year of such marriage. Also provides for coverage of policemen and firemen who are employees of joint instrumentalities (context of S. 3366) as well as the State of Washington. (Awaiting the President's signature.)

H. R. 7570, to facilitate social security coverage of certain employees of tax-exempt organizations which erroneously but in good faith failed to file the required waiver certificate in time to provide such coverage. (Awaiting President's signature.)

H. R. 8599, provides inclusion of sick leave in definition of wages for purposes of State agreements under the Social Security Act. (Awaiting President's signature.)

H. R. 8865, strengthens existing law provisions on collection of taxes withheld by employer from employee's salary by providing penalties for failure to comply. (Public Law 85–321, February 11, 1958.)

H. R. 11346, permitting Massachusetts and Vermont to divide their retirement systems into 2 parts so as to obtain social security coverage for those employees who so desire it; and affords an additional opportunity for obtaining social security coverage to individuals who were included in the group of persons not desiring coverage. (Awaiting President's signature.)

H. R. 13549. This bill made many worthwhile amendments to existing social-security law which will grant relief to our elderly and disabled citizens. A brief analysis of the major changes follows:

Increases in benefits and earnings base

First. Increases benefit amounts for all beneficiaries—those now on the rolls and those who will come on in the future—by about 7 percent, with an increase of at least $3 in the amount payable to the retired worker. Increases the maximum on total benefits payable to a family from $200 to $254. Benefit increases will be effective for January 1959. The increased benefits will be reflected in checks received February 3, 1959:

Second. Increases, effective in 1959, the maximum amount of annual earnings taxable and creditable toward benefits from $4,200 to $4,800.

Tax rate

Increases the scheduled rates in the law by one-fourth of 1 percent each for employees and employers, and three-eighths of 1 percent for the self-employed, above the rates now scheduled and provide for the scheduled increase in the rates to take place every 3 years instead of every 5 years.

Disability

First. Provide benefits for wives, dependent husbands, and children of disability insurance beneficiaries like those now provided for dependents of old-age insurance beneficiaries. Sets forth requirements for entitlement and amends appropriate provisions in present law to apply to such benefits.

Second. Eliminates the disability benefits offset provision for disability insurance benefits and childhood disability benefits.

Third. Liberalizes the eligibility requirements by eliminating the provision requiring the disabled worker to have 6 quarters of coverage out of the last 13 calendar quarters before disablement.

Fourth. Postpones for 3 years the June 30, 1958, deadline for filing fully retroactive disability freeze applications.

Benefits for dependents

First. Where a person over age 18 is the child of a deceased or retired insured worker and has been disabled since before age 18, provides for the payment of benefits to the child without requiring proof, as required under present law, that he has been dependent upon the worker for one-half of his support. The change would make the requirement for the disabled adult child the same as for the child under age 18.

Second. Provides benefits for the dependent parent of a deceased worker even though there is a widow or child of the worker who is, or may become, eligible for benefits. Benefits payable to other survivors of a worker in the month of enactment will not be decreased if a parent comes on the rolls.

Third. Removes the 3-year adoption requirement for the child of a retired worker.

Retirement test

First. Provides that a person will not lose a benefit under the retirement test for any month in which he has not earned wages in excess of $100—rather than $80 as under present law—provided he does not perform substantial services in self-employment in that month.

Second. Drops the requirement that a person who is not entitled to receive benefits during a year because he is working and who has in fact not received any benefits nevertheless must file an annual report of his earnings under the retirement test.

Coverage

The bill modifies the existing law to facilitate the social-security coverage of employees of nonprofit organizations and certain State and local government workers.

Public assistance

The bill would change the formula determining the Federal share of assistance payments to provide an average maximum on

State expenditures for assistance in which there can be Federal sharing including assistance in the form of medical care and as money payments, and make a portion of the Federal contribution related to the per capita income of the States.

The maximum amount of payment to the aged, blind, and disabled persons in which the Federal Government will participate was increased from $60 to $65, thereby enabling the State to increase benefit payments under these public assistance programs. The effective date of increases in the Federal share of payments will be October 1, 1958.

The bill extends the benefits of the four public-assistance programs to Guam with a dollar limitation on the total Federal grants of $400,000.

The dollar limitation on total Federal grant to Puerto Rico is increased from $5,312,500 to $8,500,000 and to Virign Islands from $200,000 to $300,000.

Blind programs—Missouri and Pennsylvania

Special provisions regarding State blind programs in Pennsylvania and Missouri would be extended from June 30, 1959, to June 30, 1961.

Maternal and child welfare

The authorization for maternal and child health would be increased from $16.5 million to $21.5 million, the authorization for crippled children services from $15 million to $20 million, and the authorization for child welfare services from $12 million to $17 million. These increases would raise the total authorized for the 3 programs from $43.5 million to $58.5 million.

VETERANS

H. R. 1140, allows reservists, enlisted and officers, of the uniformed services (approximately 18,000) to waive a portion of their retired pay in order to draw compensation from the Veterans' Administration. Public Law 85-376, April 11, 1958.

H. R. 358, increases the monthly rates of pension payable to widows of deceased veterans of the Spanish-American War, Civil War, Indian Wars, and Mexican War to $75 for those widows who were married to the veteran during his service period and to $65 for those widows who married the veteran since his war period (were receiving $54.18 and $67.73 respectively) and provides pensions to veterans and widows of veterans of the Confederate Army who served during the Civil War. Public Law 85-425, May 23, 1958.

H. R. 10461, increases the special rate of compensation for blind veterans from $309 monthly to $359 monthly. Public Law 85-652, August 14, 1958.

H. R. 5322, extends dependent's or survivor's benefits to the husband or widower of the female veteran if he is totally and permanently disabled and thus dependent on his wife. Public Law 85-655, August 14, 1958.

H. R. 11801, increase the veterans burial allowance from $150 to $250. Public Law 85-674, August 18, 1958.

H. R. 11577, modifies the National Service Life Insurance Act to provide greater disability benefits for servicemen by allowing them to increase from $5 to $10 per month for each $1,000 national service life insurance in force the amount of total disability income benefits which may be purchased. Public Law 85-678, August 18, 1958.

H. R. 9700, another major achievement of the Committee on Finance was enactment of this bill which consolidated and codified all of the existing veterans laws. In integrating these laws into one comprehensive act, the committee was able to simplify the language in many instances which will be of invaluable assistance to all veterans. (Awaiting final action.)

H. R. 11382, to facilitate the conversion of national service life insurance term insurance and also provide a 1-year period during which veterans may obtain a national service life insurance policy. (Awaiting House concurrence of Senate amendment.)

H. R. 3630, provides that an additional aid and attendance allowance of $150 per month shall be paid to certain service-connected severely disabled or paralyzed veterans during periods in which they are not hospitalized at Government expense. This bill will enable many of these veterans to live with their families instead of being confined in the hospital. (Awaiting signature of President.)

TARIFF

For the free importation of items for use and display in trade fairs and expositions to be held in the States of Washington, Oregon, California, Kentucky, Minnesota, and for the Chicago International Fair. (H. R. 11889, H. R. 9655, H. R. 10242, H. J. Res. 439, H. J. Res. 556, and H. R. 11019.)

A suspension of the duty for the periods named on the following products: Crude chicory (with compensatory rate on ground or prepared chicory) for 2 years; personal and household effects brought in under Government orders, for 2 years; certain alumina and bauxite, for 2 years until July 16, 1960; certain lathes used for turning shoe lasts, for 2 years; certain coarse (carpet type) wools, 2 years, until June 30, 1960; metal scrap, continuation of present suspension for 1 year, until June 30, 1959, with amendment eliminating nonferrous materials. (H. R. 11407, H. R. 9917, H. R. 2151, and H. R. 10015.)

Provided for the free importation of: Automobiles and parts for show purposes only, 6 months time limit; guar seed; religious vestments and regalia presented to religious or charitable organizations; old-style pistols and revolvers not using fixed ammunition; sound recordings and slides or transparencies for use in certain nonprofit radio and television broadcasts and films for such use, but a 2-year time limit was placed on the latter; certain mica and mica films and splittings; newsprint, to a minimum of 13 inches rather than the 15-inch present minimum, with an amendment insuring the continued free entry of certain tanning extracts (myrobalan). (H. R. 776, H. R. 10112, H. R. 7516, H. R. 1126, H. R. 7454, H. R. 10277, and H. R. 6894.)

Provided changes in rates of duty as follows: Harpsichords and clavichords to have the same tariff rate as pianos; paint roller handles to have the same tariff rate as paint brush handles. (H. R. 5208 and H. R. 7004.)

Provided clarification and definition of tariff classifications as follows: Certain types of footwear, clearer definition for import purposes; clarified definite import classification for certain manmade fibers (nylon, orlon, etc.). (H. R. 9291 and amendment to H. R. 10277.)

Provided for temporary free importation of certain items for certain purposes: Articles to be repaired, altered, or processed within defined limitation; automobiles rented abroad and driven into the United States as a part of the foreign trip by United States citizens. (H. R. 9923 and amendment to H. R. 11889.)

Extended the privilege of substitution, for the purpose of drawback after reexportation to all classes of merchandise. (H. R. 9919.)

Adopted amendment which clarified, simplified, and speeded up the operation of the Antidumping Act of 1921. (H. R. 6006.)

Adopted, after extensive hearings and executive sessions, the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958. Provided for additional authority for the President to enter into trade agreements and further reduce tariffs. Provided strengthening amendments to escape clause, peril point section, and to the section on national security, as well as other additions to the present act tending to give added assurance to those who might be affected by the act. (H. R.12591.)

In order to provide adequate information for possible future action which may be desirable to aid and assist domestic industries the Finance Committee instituted, by committee resolution, Tariff Commission investigations on tungsten, mercury, iron ore, clothespins, and carpet wool.

PUBLIC DEBT

H. R. 9955, provides a $5 billion increase in public debt limit for temporary period up to June 30, 1959 (advocated by the administration). Public Law 85-336.

H. R. 13580, increases the permanent public debt ceiling by $8 billion (from $275 billion to $283 billion). Reported by the Committee on Finance, August 15, 1958.

TAX BILLS ENACTED INTO LAW

H. R. 5938, makes the marital deduction for estate tax purposes available with respect to certain decedents who were adjudged incompetent before April 2, 1948. Public Law 85-318.

H. R. 7762, adjusts existing law in respect to use of corporation property by a share holder. Public Law 85-319.

H. R. 9035, removes inequity in existing law by providing a new basis for a restricted stock option at the date of the employee's death. Public Law 85-320.

H. R. 8216, the bill was designed to prevent unjust enrichment by precluding refunds of alcohol and tobacco taxes to persons who have not borne the ultimate burden of the tax. Public Law 85-323.

H. R. 10021, this bill continued for another year the 1955 tax formula for life insurance companies, Public Law 85-345.

H. R. 8268, to accord same tax treatment for income distributed with respect to limited-partnership interests held by certain testamentary charitable trusts that is presently accorded income derived from dividends received by such trusts. Public Law 85-367.

H. R. 8794, to provide exemptions from the admissions tax for athletic games between teams composed of students from elementary or secondary schools or colleges: (1) where the gross proceeds are divided between the schools or colleges involved and hospitals for crippled children and (2) where the proceeds inure to an exempt educational, charitable, or religious organization operated exclusively for the purpose of aiding and advancing retarded children. Public Law 85-380.

H. R. 12695, 1-year extension of present corporate income tax and existing excise tax rates on distilled spirits, tobacco and automobiles (recommended by the administration). (A Senate floor amendment was added to this bill repealing the 3 percent excise tax on transportation of property.) Public Law 85-475.

TAX BILLS AWAITING FINAL ACTION

H. R. 11794, 6-month extension of the Renegotiation Act. (Awaiting action of Senate.)

H. R. 7125, this voluminous 450-page measure is a comprehensive revision of the technical and administrative provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to Federal excise taxes. In addition to numerous changes in virtually all classes of the miscellaneous excise taxes, the provisions relating to the communications and documentary stamp taxes, and the important credit and refund provisions have been entirely rewritten. Some of the changes were: (1) Exemption for nonprofit educational organizations from the retailers, manufacturers, communications, and transportation of persons taxes; (2) the exemption for admissions not in excess of 90 cents was revised to provide an exemption of the first dollar of any admission (whether or not the total charge is in excess of $1); (3) an exemption was provided for most admissions where the proceeds inure exclusively to an organization

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

organized and operated exclusively to provide scholarships and fellowships for study above the secondary school level; (4) excise tax exemption of admissions to nonprofit community swimming pools and skating rinks; and (5) the bill provides a general technical revision of the distilled spirits provisions and also the occupational-tax provisions relating to wholesale and retail dealers in alcoholic beverages. (Awaiting Presidential action.)

H. R. 8381, the Committee on Finance spent 6 months in its consideration of this particular bill. At least 48 additional Senate bills and about 30 or more House measures were considered in conjunction therewith. It is a major step in the elimination of substantive unintended benefits and hardships in the existing income, estate, and gift tax provisions and also removes many technical errors and ambiguities in the tax statutes.

H. R. 13382, the small-business tax relief bill, as approved by the Committee on Finance, was incorporated in H. R. 8381 by Senate floor action. This measure provided for ordinary-loss treatment of losses up to $25,000 a year per taxpayer, a 3-year carryback of business losses, and allows up to 20 percent of the cost of tangible personal property of a small business to be written off in the year of acquisition. (Awaiting Presidential action.)

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
August 18, 1958.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: It is my understanding that you have requested a report from the Committee on Foreign Relations listing its major accomplishments during the 2d session of the 85th Congress.

The staff of the committee has prepared the enclosed statement for your information.

Sincerely yours,

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Chairman.

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, 85TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

1. Mutual Security Act of 1958: H. R. 12181, to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended and for other purposes. Approved June 30, 1958. Public Law 85-477.

2. Double taxation conventions: Pakistan (Ex. N, 85-1), advice and consent given, July 9, 1958 (84-0); Belgium (Ex. B, 85-2), advice and consent given, July 9, 1958 (84-0); United Kingdom (Ex. C, 85-2), advice and consent given, July 9, 1958 (84-0); United Kingdom (Ex. A, 85-2), advice and consent given, August 13, 1958 (90-0).

3. Payment for Danish vessels: S. 2448, to authorize a payment to the Government of Denmark. Approved, June 6, 1958. Public Law 85-450.

4. Czechoslovak claims: S. 3557, to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended. Approved, August 8, 1958, Public Law 85-604.

5. International Labor Organization contributions: S. J. Res. 73, to amend Public Law 843, 80th Congress, as amended, providing for membership and participation by the United States in the International Labor Organization and authorizing appropriations therefor. Passed Senate June 27, 1957. Provisions included in Public Law 85-477, the Mutual Security Act of 1958.

6. Contributions to the International Council of Scientific Unions: S. J. Res. 85, to amend the act of Congress approved August 7, 1935 concerning United States contributions to the International Council of Scientific Unions and certain associated unions. Approved, August 14, 1958. Public Law 85-627.

7. Interparliamentary Union contributions: S. 2515, to amend the act of June 28, 1935, entitled "An act to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union." Passed Senate, August 5, 1957. Provisions included in Public Law 85-477, the Mutual Security Act of 1958.

8. Acceptance of foreign decorations: S. 3195, to authorize certain retired personnel of the United States Government to accept and wear decorations, presents, and other things tendered them by certain foreign countries. Passed Senate, July 11, 1958.

9. Return of treaties in accordance with Presidential requests: The return of the following treaties was requested by the President on April 22, 1958 and they were ordered returned on June 19, 1958: Conciliation Treaty with the Philippines (Ex. C, 80-1); ILO Convention No. 70 (Ex. T, 80-1); Inter-American Copyright Convention (Ex. HH, 80-1); ILO Convention No. 63 (Ex. G, 81-1); ILO Convention No. 88 (Ex. B, 82-1); Understanding to ILO Convention No. 63 (Ex. H, 82-1); ILO Conventions Nos. 91, 92, and 93 (Ex. J, K, and L, 82-1).

10. Additional Assistant Secretary of State: S. 1832, to authorize the appointment of one additional Assistant Secretary of State. Approved, July 18, 1958. Public Law 85-524.

11. Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission: S. 2933, to extend the life of the Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission and to increase its authorization. Approved, August 8, 1958. Public Law 85-601.

12. Assistant to the Secretary of State: S. 3112, to provide for the appointment of an assistant to the Secretary of State to be known as the Assistant for International Cultural Relations. Passed Senate, July 28, 1958.

13. Foreign Service annuities: S. 3379, to provide for adjustments in the annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system. Passed Senate, August 11, 1958.

14. Hungary: S. Con. Res. 94, H. Con. Res. 343, expressing indignation at the execution of certain leaders of the recent revolt in Hungary. Passed Senate and House, June 19, 1958.

15. United Nations force: S. Con. Res. 109, H. Con. Res. 373, to express the sense of the Congress on the establishment of a United Nations force. Passed Senate July 23, 1958.

16. Foreign policy study: S. Res. 336, to authorize a study of United States foreign policy. Passed Senate, July 31, 1958.

17. Latin American study: S. Res. 330, authorizing a study of United States Relations with the American Republics. Passed Senate, July 31, 1958.

18. Alaskan salmon: S. Res. 263, favoring negotiations with the Government of Japan for the protection of the Alaskan red salmon fisheries. Passed Senate, August 8, 1958.

19. Canadian relations: S. Res. 359, concerning increased systematic discussions between legislators of Canada and the United States. Passed Senate, August 8, 1958.

Sundry bridge and highway bills.

Sundry endorsements of expositions and fairs.

Greetings to various nations.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,
August 18, 1958.

Hon. LYNDON JOHNSON,
Majority Leader, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: In accordance with your request, I am attaching a brief outline of the legislative action taken by the Senate Committee on Government Operations during the 85th Congress.

As you will note, the report has been broken down to show action taken on administration proposals as distinguished from general legislation reported by the committee.

Trusting this is the information desired, and with kind regards, I am,

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman.

LEGISLATIVE ACTION, SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, 85TH CONGRESS

ADMINISTRATION PROPOSALS

Legislation requested by the President

1. Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1958, to consolidate the Federal Civil Defense Administration with the Office of Defense Mobilization in the Executive Office of the President. Plan became effective on July 1, 1958.

2. S. 1791, extension of date on which reorganization plans may be submitted to Congress to June 1, 1959. Public Law 85-286, September 4, 1957.

3. S. 434 (H. R. 8002), to provide for improved methods of stating budget estimates and estimates for deficiency and supplemental appropriations. Passed Senate June 5, 1957. H. R. 8002 substituted in House; passed Senate, amended, July 31, 1958; House agreed to Senate amendments, August 14, 1958.

4. S. 4059, to amend Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1958 in order to change the name of the office established under such plan. Passed Senate August 4, 1958. Passed House August 12, 1958.

Department of the Treasury

1. S. 1799, to facilitate the payment of Government checks, and for other purposes. Public Law 85-183, August 28, 1957.

Department of Justice

1. S. 1538, to provide for the adjustment of the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over land in the several States used for Federal purposes. Passed Senate, March 3, 1958; Senator HUMPHREY requested reconsideration of passage March 24, returned to Senate Calendar March 25, 1958, under motions for reconsideration.

Department of Commerce

1. S. 1941, to authorize the payment by the Bureau of Public Roads of transportation and subsistence costs to temporary employees on direct Federal highway projects. Public Law 85-143, August 14, 1957.

Government Printing Office

1. S. 4010, to provide for the receipt and disbursement of funds, and for continuation of accounts when there is a vacancy in the office of the disbursing officer for the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes. Passed Senate August 4, 1958. Pending before House Committee on Government Operations.

National Science Foundation

1. S. 4039, to authorize the expenditure of funds through grants for support of scientific research, and for other purposes. Passed Senate August 4, 1958. Reported in House August 15, 1958. To be called up under suspension of rules, August 18, 1958.

United States Civil Service Commission

1. H. R. 11133, to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for the payment of travel and transportation cost for persons selected for appointment to certain positions in the continental United States and Alaska, and for other purposes. (Scientists and engineers.) Passed House June 26, 1958. Passed Senate August 11, 1958, amended. House agreed to Senate amendments August 14, 1958.

General Services Administration

1. S. 1535, to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to

authorize the Administrator of General Services to make contracts for cleaning and custodial services for periods not exceeding 5 years. Passed Senate June 6, 1957. Pending before House Committee on Government Operations.

2. H. R. 5110 (S. 1036; S. 1536), to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes. (Transfer of records to National Archives.) Public Law 85–51, June 13, 1957.

3. S. 2224, to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, regarding advertised and negotiated disposals of surplus property. Public Law 85–486, July 2, 1958.

4. S. 2231 to amend section 203 (c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the exercise of options contained in certain leases of Government property. Passed Senate March 3 1958. Pending before House Committee on Government Operations.

5. S. 2283, to further amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes. (Administrative operations fund.) Passed Senate March 3, 1958. Pending before House Committee on Government Operations.

6. S. 2533, to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the Administrator of General Services to lease space for Federal agencies for a period not exceeding 15 years, and for other purposes. Public Law 85–493, July 2, 1958.

7. H. R. 8795 (S. 2631), to amend section 507 and subsection 602 (a) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended. (Franklin D. Roosevelt Library.) Public Law 85–341, March 15, 1958.

8. S. 2752, to amend section 207 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to modify and improve the procedure for submission to the Attorney General of certain proposed surplus property disposals for his advice as to whether such disposals would be inconsistent with the antitrust laws. Passed Senate March 3, 1958; passed House with amendments, July 7, 1958. Senate agreed to House amendments, August 6, 1958.

9. S. 3140, to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for training of employees. Superseded by S. 385, Public Law 85–507, July 7, 1958.

10. S. 3141, to authorize acquisitions by the Administrator of General Services of certain land and improvements thereon located within the area of New York Avenue and F Street, and 17th and 18th Streets NW., in the District of Columbia. Passed Senate June 25, 1958. Pending before House Committee on Public Works.

11. S. 3142, to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to extend the authority to lease out Federal building sites until needed for construction purposes and the act of June 24, 1948 (62 Stat. 644), and for other purposes. Passed Senate June 23, 1958. Pending before House Committee on Government Operations.

12. S. 3224, to improve opportunities for small business concerns to obtain a fair proportion of Government purchase and contracts, to facilitate procurement of property and services by the Government, and for other purposes. Passed Senate August 14, 1958. Passed the House, August 15, 1958.

13. S. 3873, to amend section 201 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the interchange of inspection services between executive agencies, and the furnishing of such services by one executive agency to another, without reimbursement or transfer of funds. Passed Senate June 23, 1958. Reported favorably in the House of Representatives, August 7, 1958.

GENERAL LEGISLATION

1. S. 5, to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to prevent the allocation of procurement contracts to certain designated geographical areas, and for other purposes. Reported February 10, 1958. Senate Calendar, Order No. 1298.

2. S. 6, to eliminate claims of immunity from State and local taxes based on contracts with the United States or its agencies or instrumentalities. Passed Senate March 4, 1958. Pending before House Committee on Ways and Means.

3. S. 931, to provide for the reorganization of the safety functions of the Federal Government, and for other purposes. Reported June 5, 1957. Senate Calendar, Order 415.

4. S. 1141, to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to donate to the Philippine Republic certain records captured from insurrectos during 1899–1903. Public Law 85–81, July 3, 1957.

5. S. 1408, to provide allowances for transportation of house trailers to civilian employees of the United States who are transferred from one official station to another. Public Law 85–326, February 12, 1958.

6. S. 1585, to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States. Passed Senate April 4, 1957. Pending before House Committee on Rules.

7. S. 3126, to create a Department of Science and Technology; to establish National Institutes of Scientific Research; to authorize a program of Federal loans and loan insurance for college or university education in the physical or biological sciences, mathematics, or engineering; to authorize the establishment of scientific programs outside of the United States; and for other purposes. Rereferred to Senate Special Committee on Space and Astronautics, April 25, 1958.

8. S. 3677, to extend for 2 years the period for which payments in lieu of taxes may be made with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments. Public Law 85–579, August 1, 1958.

9. S. Res. 347, authorizing a study of worldwide health activities. Reported by Committee on Government Operations, August 4, 1958; by Committee on Rules and Administration, August 13, 1958. Senate Calendar Order No. 2414.

The committee also reported 20 bills and joint resolutions providing for the transfer of Federal surplus property, title clearance, etc., of which 15 became law, with 4 pending before the House Committee on Government Operations. One bill, H. R. 6995, on Senate Calendar, Order No. 2091.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND
INSULAR AFFAIRS,
August 18, 1958.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
Majority Leader,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LYNDON: Knowing of your interest in the committee's activities, I should like to provide you with some information with respect to our accomplishments during the second session. In some 70 hearings and meetings our committee considered in excess of 130 Senate bills, 75 of which were reported to the Senate. Eighty-three House bills were referred, and 79 of these were reported to the Senate. In my judgment, of the bills reported, the following were of particular significance:

INDIAN AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE

S. 3051, amending the Klamath Termination Act of 1954, solved a most complex Indian termination problem.

H. R. 6322, amending the act terminating Federal supervision over the Menominee Tribe of Wisconsin.

H. R. 2824, terminating some 40 Indian rancherias in California.

IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION SUBCOMMITTEE

S. 3684, authorizing the San Juan-Chama irrigation project in New Mexico and S. 1887, authorizing the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project in California. These latter two measures provide for the irrigation of nearly three-quarters of a million acres of land and provide industrial and municipal water supplies. The total cost of the two projects is in excess of a half-billion dollars.

The committee approved the first six loan proposals submitted by the Department of the Interior under the Small Projects Act. In addition, six rehabilitation and betterment loans to reclamation projects were approved by the committee as recommended by the Department. The small projects and rehabilitation and betterment loans approved total some $20 million.

S. J. Res. 135, saline water program, sponsored by Senator ANDERSON, an epochal approach to national and international water problems in the Middle East and elsewhere.

MINERALS SUBCOMMITTEE

S. 3186, extending for 1 year the Government's purchase program for tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum.

S. 3817, providing a program for the development of the mineral resources of the United States by making available financial assistance as a means of encouraging exploration for domestic minerals.

S. 4036, providing a program for the purchase by the Government of fixed quantities of domestically produced copper, lead, zinc, acid-grade fluorspar, and tungsten as a means of stabilizing the market prices of these selected minerals.

TERRITORIES SUBCOMMITTEE

H. R. 8054, providing for the leasing of oil and gas deposits of land beneath navigable waters in the Territory of Alaska which clears the way for the current oil boom in Alaska, thus facilitating the 200 to 300 million dollar investment expected to be made in Alaska by oil companies in the next few years.

I think you will appreciate that the committee and its members have been most active in treating of their legislative workload this year. I think we have reason to be proud of our accomplishments.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY, *Chairman.*

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND
FOREIGN COMMERCE,
August 39, 1958.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
Majority Leader, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: As per your request, this is a short résumé of the legislation which the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has handled during the 2d session of the 85th Congress.

While perhaps I should not single out one piece of legislation as more important than other bills, still the Transportation Act of 1958, the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, and the Educational Television Act can certainly be considered as among the very important bills this committee has handled.

Briefly the Transportation Act of 1958 authorizes the Interstate Commerce Commission to guarantee loans from private sources up to $500 million to the railroads, repayable in 15 years; modernizes many of the laws affecting railroad operation including transportation of exempt commodities, discontinuance of railroad trains that cause loss

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

to the owning railroads, while protecting State rights; and clarifies the decision of the Supreme Court in the Brooks Transportation case.

After some shocking air accidents, your committee brought to the floor, and the Senate approved, a bill completely revamping the agencies of our Government that handled the air transportation and air traffic of our Nation.

The bill, among other things, would regulate all air traffic in the United States, both civil and military.

Another very important bill was sponsored by Senator BRICKER and myself to provide $1 million for each State and Territory, on a matching basis, to set up statewide educational television systems. Many channels are reserved for this purpose, but because of lack of funds, are today unused. We believe this legislation, which has widespread support from our educational leaders, will expedite the use of these channels to meet our growing educational needs.

Among the many bills reported and passed by the Senate were the authorization of 2 superliners, 1 to operate on the east coast and the other on the west coast of the United States; the authorization for a Commission to Study the Federal Utilization of Radio and Television Frequencies; the extension of the Federal Airport Act; legislation requiring automobile manufacturers to label new cars so that purchasers would be protected; a stopgap bill to continue in effect for 2 years the dual rate system of vessel conference agreements so as to provide time for the Congress to study the impact of a Supreme Court decision; and a bill to guarantee funds to cover Government-insured vessel mortgages.

I might say with reference to the Airport Extension Act that the country is facing a serious problem in that our airlines will shortly be operating commercial jet airliners while the development of adequate airports to handle them is lagging. As you know, in the early days of this administration funds for the airports were seriously curtailed. While the development of fast and large aircraft continued, the expansion of landing areas could not keep pace. This problem, together with the need for a single agency to control and regulate air travel, took considerable time of your committee.

We spent a great deal of time on the resources of our Nation represented by our fisheries and our wildlife areas. We increased the revolving fund provided in the Fisheries Act of 1956 from $10 million to $20 million. We reported other legislation that would provide guaranteed loans for updating processing plants and the fishing fleet. We had legislation that would protect our lobster fishermen from foreign imports and we provided for a Fisheries Extension Service for the general good of the industry. We reported legislation that would aid in the eradication of predators that cause great damage to our fishing industry. We authorized a study of the effect of insecticides on wildlife and we were successful on legislation that would increase the cost of duck stamps from $2 to $3 so that these funds could be used in increased land procurement for protection of wild fowl and we approved, and the Senate passed, legislation to develop the commercial production of fish on flooded lands in rotation with rice crops.

Besides the legislation we handled, the committee engaged in a study of the Military Transportation Services, radio and television channel allocations, automobile insurance, textile industry problems, and the transportation industry problems.

With respect to textiles, we also reported a bill designed to protect and inform the ultimate consumer in his purchases of textile fiber products used or intended to be used in household textile articles. Incidentally, this bill defines household textile articles as articles of wearing apparel, costumes and accessories, draperies, floor coverings, furnishings, bedding, and other textile goods of a type customarily used in a household regardless of where used in fact.

This bill is in the tradition of the Wool Labeling Act of 1939 and the Fur Products Labeling Act of 1951, and is based on the same underlying principle that while the Government should not set quality standards, the purchaser should be protected by disclosure of basic information about the composition of items not ascertainable by sight or touch. Of course, wool and fur products remain under their respective acts.

We also reported, and the Senate passed, a major safety measure that would promote boating safety on our navigable waters, return to the States jurisdiction over such waters if the States enacted enabling legislation, and make uniform the boating laws of the country.

I am afraid if I continue this letter will be too lengthy for your purposes, but the foregoing are the highlights of the session. Following is a statistical table as of August 18, 1958, indicating the workload of the committee.

I take this opportunity to thank you on behalf of myself and of the committee for the excellent and thoughtful leadership you have given us during this session.

Accomplishments of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 85th Cong., as of Aug. 18, 1958

Number of bills (Senate and House), and resolutions referred to committee	308
Number of bills reported by committee	109
Number of bills passed by Senate	102
Number of Senate bills pending in House committees	15
Number of Senate bills reported by House committees	31
Number of Senate bills passed House	38
Number of conference reports filed in House	8
Number of meetings of conference committees	14
Number of bills signed by President	54
Number of bills vetoed by President	1
Number of routine nominations referred to committee and confirmed	1,080
Number of major nominations referred to committee and confirmed	29
Number of executive meetings of full committee and subcommittees	54
Number of open hearings conducted by full committee	80
Number of days of open hearings conducted by subcommittees:	
Aviation Subcommittee	19
Communications Subcommittee	13
Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee	9
Surface Transportation Subcommittee	37
Automobile Marketing Practices Subcommittee	8
Special Subcommittee to Make a Study of the Operation of the Military Air Transport Service (MATS) and the Military Sea Transportation Service (MSTS)	4
Special Subcommittee to Study Textile Industry	3
Subcommittee on S. 86	2
Subcommittee on S. 1483	2
Subcommittee on S. 1552	1
Subcommittee on S. 3850	2
Total number of days of subcommittee hearings	100
Printed pages of public hearings	9,962
Unprinted pages of public hearings	6,129
Number of witness appearances before the committee	1,085

Sincerely yours,

WARREN G. MAGNUSON, *Chairman.*

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
August 20, 1958.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
Majority Leader, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: The Senate Committee on the Judiciary during the 2d session of the 85th Congress has, to date, reported a total of 596 general and private bills.

Major general bills reported by the committee during the second session include the following:

H. J. Res. 424, Federal sentencing bill (to improve the administration of justice by authorizing the establishment of institutions and joint councils on sentencing, and to provide additional methods of sentencing).

H. R. 11477, to provide for a statutory rule of evidence for the admissibility of statements and confessions in criminal proceedings in Federal courts (Mallory).

S. 337, to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws.

S. 2646, to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in certain cases.

S. 654, to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize the enforcement of State statutes prescribing criminal penalties for subversive activities.

H. R. 11033., recording the admission of certain Hungarian refugees. Provides for the adjustment of status of refugees from the Hungarian revolution who were paroled into the United States.

S. 411, providing for the payment of American war damage claims and the return of vested assets to United States citizens.

H. R. 11102, amending the jurisdiction of district courts in civil actions with regard to the amount in controversy and diversity of citizenship.

S. 11, to amend the Robinson-Patman Act with reference to equality of opportunity.

H. R. 8361, to amend section 2254 of title 28 of United States Code in reference to applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court.

S. 1356, to amend the antitrust laws in regard to commerce in meat and meat products.

H. R. 7168, to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies.

H. R. 13, to amend the Bankruptcy Act to revise chapter 11.

Other significant general bills reported by the committee during the second session include the following:

S. 3275, to provide for the representation of indigent defendants in criminal cases in the district courts of the United States (public defender).

H. R. 10154, to empower the Judicial Conference to study and recommend changes in, and additions to, the Rules of Practice and Procedure in the Federal Courts.

S. 3874, to amend section 4083 of title 18, United States Code relating to penitentiary imprisonment and to provide that a prisoner convicted of an offense punishable by imprisonment for more than 1 year be sentenced to 1 year or less, may be confined in a penitentiary when such confinement is deemed desirable.

H. R. 7260, to amend title 18, United States Code, so as to permit confinement in jail-type institutions or treatment-type institutions in connection with the grant of probation on a one-count indictment.

H. R. 982, to amend section 77 (c) (6) of the Bankruptcy Act, in regard to railroads in reorganization.

H. R. 7261, making the Federal Probation Act applicable to the District of Columbia.

S. 1963, to increase the punishment for giving false information concerning the destruction of aircraft.

S. 1439, to amend title 28 with respect to fees of United States marshals.

S. 1438, to amend title 28, United States Code, relating to bonds of United States marshals.

S. 163, extending the time for filing claims by former prisoners of war under section 15 of the War Claims Act of 1948.

H. R. 11874, recording the lawful admission for permanent residence of certain aliens who entered the United States prior to June 28, 1940.

H. R. 13378, facilitating the naturalization of adopted children and spouses of certain United States citizens performing religious duties abroad.

H. R. 13451, amending section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Provides for the adjustment of status of certain aliens without leaving the United States and grants nonquota status to certain aliens with approved first-preference petitions.

S. 3009, special naturalization benefits for Korean war veterans.

S. 3653, Immigration and Naturalization Service training school. Provides for acquisition of sites and construction of buildings.

S. 3942, certain aliens; provides for 1,500 nonquota immigrant visas for people in the Azores Islands distressed as the result of natural calamity.

S. 1416, granting the consent and approval of Congress to a Great Lakes Basin compact, and for related purposes.

S. 1864, to authorize an increase in the membership of the Board of Appeals of the Patent Office; to provide increased salaries for certain officers and employees of the Patent Office, and for other purposes.

H. R. 7153, giving the consent of Congress to a compact between the State of Oregon and the State of Washington establishing a boundary between those States.

H. R. 985, to provide that chief judges of circuit and district courts shall cease to serve as such upon reaching the age of 75. (Amended to substitute the age limit of 70 years for 75 years.)

H. R. 8943, to amend titles 10, 14, and 32, United States Code, to codify recent military law, and to improve the code.

H. R. 11549, to provide for the preparation of a proposed revision of the Canal Zone Code, together with appropriate ancillary material.

H. R. 7306, to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide that notice of an action with respect to real property pending before a United States district court must be recorded in certain instances in order to provide constructive notice of such action.

S. 3987, granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway development compact.

H. R. 8252, to amend section 3237 of title 18 of the United States Code to define the place at which certain offenses against the income-tax laws take place.

H. R. 8826, to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of international conventions, and for other purposes," approved July 5, 1946, with respect to proceedings in the Patent Office.

H. R. 7866, to amend title 28, United States Code, relating to the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

H. R. 12292, to amend subsections (b), (c), and (d) of section 294 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the assignment of retired judges to active duty. Committee amendment made this bill a part of the reported bill on H. R. 7866.

S. 1870, to amend section 1 (e) of title 17 of the United States Code with regard to the rendition of musical compositions on coin-operated machines.

H. R. 2767–S. 921, to clarify the scope of the authority of heads of executive departments to withhold information (amending section 161 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 22)).

H. R. 1061, to authorize military departments to settle certain claims not cognizable under any other law.

H. R. 6789, to provide for reasonable notice of applications to United States courts of appeals for interlocutory relief against orders of certain administrative agencies.

H. R. 6788, to authorize abbreviation of the record on review or enforcement of orders of administrative agencies by the courts of appeals.

H. R. 4642, to establish a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure.

H. R. 9022, to authorize the Secretaries of the military departments to settle certain claims and partially pay others.

H. R. 6238, to provide for opportunity to appeal interlocutory orders of district courts.

S. 3875, to permit taxation of costs against the United States in tax refund suits brought against district directors of Internal Revenue.

H. R. 9817, defining venue in tax refund suits by corporations.

S. 4169, to authorize participation by the United States in the International Criminal Police Organization.

H. R. 12894, to authorize the making, amendment, and modification of contracts to facilitate the national defense.

S. 721, to amend section 11 of the Clayton Act to provide for the more expeditious enforcement of cease and desist orders issued thereunder, and for other purposes.

S. 1615, to prohibit the removal to district courts of the United States of actions commenced in State courts under State workmen's compensation laws.

H. R. 9989, to provide for the presentation of a medal to the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely,

JAMES O. EASTLAND, *Chairman.*

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND
PUBLIC WELFARE,
August 18, 1958.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
Chairman, Democratic Policy Committee, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: In response to your request, I am happy to submit herewith a list of bills, resolutions, and nominations reported to the Senate by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare during the second session of the 85th Congress.

The committee reported 29 bills during the present session, as follows: 3 education bills, including the national defense education bill, and extension of federally impacted areas legislation; 8 health bills, chief among which were extension of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act for 5 years, extension of the Health Research Facilities Act for 3 years, and legislation to forbid the use of inadequately tested food additives; 9 bills affecting labor, notably, employee welfare and pension plans legislation, labor-management reporting and disclosure legislation, and Railroad Retirement Act amendments; 8 veterans bills, including a major proposal for unemployment compensation for peacetime veterans; and a bill providing for a White House Conference on the Aging.

The committee also reported 3 resolutions and 18 major nominations, as well as hundreds of routine Public Health Service nominations and promotions. Nominations were approved for appointments in the Department of Labor, the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review, the National Labor Relations Board, the National Mediation Board, the National Science Foundation, the Railroad Retirement Board, and the Public Health Service.

Among the major legislative proposals approved by the committee in this session, six were outstanding, either with respect to their importance to the American people, or with respect to the amount of time and effort devoted to them by the committee, or both.

EDUCATION

The first of these to be considered was the national defense education bill, reported under No. S. 4237. When Congress convened in January, a large number of Senators introduced legislation designed to strengthen America's educational system in the face of the challenge of Soviet scientific and educational achievements.

During January, February, and March, the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare held exhaustive hearings and received testimony from more than 90 witnesses, including some of the Nation's most eminent scientists and educators.

After lengthy executive consideration, the committee reported a bill S. 4237, which was a compromise between the bill introduced by Senator SMITH of New Jersey and 10 other Senators on behalf of the administration, and the bill introduced by me and 26 other Senators. This bill, which passed the Senate early on August 14, 1958, by a vote of 62–26, establishes a 4-year program estimated to cost approximately $1.5 billion.

In reporting S. 4237, the National Defense Education Act of 1958, to the Senate, the committee approved a coordinated program for strengthening the national defense through an interrelated set of proposals designed to assist State, local, and private effort to develop America's brainpower for defense, by stimulating students, teachers, parents, and school authorities to seek the highest possible attainment in learning. The program includes scholarships, student loans, laboratory equipment, institutes for teachers, graduate fellowships, aid to States for guidance and counseling services, centers for language development, research and experimentation in the use of television and other modern communications for education, area vocational schools, and a science information service.

HEALTH

Of the eight bills in the field of health reported by the committee this session, three are of major importance to the public. The first of these, is H. R. 12628 (Hill-Burton extension). This bill would extend for 5 years the life of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act which has proved so helpful in making available hospital and other health facilities throughout our Nation, and particularly in those areas which were completely lacking in such essentials for the provision of modern medical care.

The second bill reported by the committee which is of major importance to our people is H. R. 12876 (health research facilities). This bill, which will do much to speed research into the causes and cures of diseases which cripple and kill mankind, extends by 3 years the life of that act under which the Federal Government makes available $30 million a year to be used on a matching basis to help construct and equip the laboratories and other facilities needed by those scientists who are dedicating their efforts in attempts to eradicate disease.

The third bill, H. R. 13254 (food additives), would bring about a major change in those laws, administered by the Food and Drug Administration, designed to protect the American people from the addition to food products of additives which might be injurious to health. Whereas, under present law, any processor is free to add to our foodstuffs any newly discovered chemical, and can continue to use such an additive in

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

foods until the Food and Drug Administration has been able to establish scientific proof that it is deleterious to health (which sometimes takes years), because of this bill food processors will not be permitted to add such substances to food until they have been able to prove, scientifically, that they are safe.

LABOR

Following intensive investigation by a special subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare during the latter part of the 83d and all of the 84th Congresses, bills were introduced designed to safeguard employee welfare and pension plans.

The committee held hearings on these bills during the first session of the present Congress, and in the second session, reported S. 2888, a bill providing for the reporting and disclosure of information about pension, health, and welfare funds. This bill, which was passed unanimously by the Senate, provided that administrators of all types of plans should make reports to their beneficiaries and to the Secretary of Labor, would grant the Secretary of Labor broad investigatory and limited police power, and imposed stiff criminal penalties for embezzlement, insurance kickbacks, and falsification of reports.

During this session, the committee expended great effort on union financial and administrative practices and labor-management relations. During 16 days of hearings, the Subcommittee on Labor compiled a massive record of testimony on 44 bills dealing with these subjects. It reported a bill, S. 3974, which provides for the reporting and disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and employers, seeks to prevent abuses in the administration of trusteeships by labor organizations, provides standards for the election of officers of labor organizations, and amends the Taft-Hartley Act in a number of respects.

Attached hereto is a list of these and all other bills reported by the committee during the second session of the 85th Congress by number and short title.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,

Very sincerely,

LISTER HILL,
Chairman.

BILLS REPORTED BY THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE, 85TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

EDUCATION

S. 4237 (National Defense Education Act of 1958): To strengthen the national defense, advance the cause of peace, and effect the intellectual eminence of the United States, etc.

H. R. 11378 (federally impacted areas): To amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, to make permanent programs providing financial assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities, etc.

S. 3268 (National Science Foundation Act): To amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes.

HEALTH

H. R. 12638 (Hill-Burton extension): To amend title VI of the Public Health Service Act to extend for an additional 5-year period the Hospital Survey and Construction Act.

H. R. 12876 (extension of Health Research Facilities Act): To extend title VII of the Public Health Service Act (relating to health research facilities) for 3 years, and for other purposes.

H. R. 12694 (Hill-Burton loans): To authorize loans for the construction of hospitals and other facilities under title VI of the Public Health Service Act.

H. R. 13254 (food additives): To protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the use in food of additives which have not been adequately tested to establish their safety.

H. R. 11414 (aid to schools of public health): To amend section 314 (c) of the Public Health Service Act, so as to authorize the Surgeon General to make certain grants-in-aid for provision in public of nonprofit accredited schools of public health, etc.

S. 3727 (Surgeon General's functions): To amend the Public Health Service Act, as amended, so as to clarify the functions and responsibilities of the Surgeon General with respect to international health activities, etc.

S. 3694 (Indian sanitary facilities): To amend the act of August 5, 1954 (68 Stat. 674), and for other purposes.

S. 3626 (Freedmen's Hospital): To establish a teaching hospital for Howard University, to transfer Freedmen's Hospital to the university, and for other purposes.

LABOR

S. 3974 (labor-management reporting and disclosure): To provide for the reporting and disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and employers, and so forth.

S. 2888 (welfare and pension plans): To provide for registration, reporting, and disclosure of employee welfare and pension benefit plans.

S. 1313 (railroad retirement): To amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, so as to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes.

S. 3290 (coal mine safety): To amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act in order to remove the exemption with respect to certain mines employing no more than 14 individuals.

S. 3486 (safety program for longshoremen): To amend section 41 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to provide a system of safety rules, regulations, and safety inspection and training, and for other purposes.

S. 2020 (railroad retirement technical amendments): To amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

H. R. 12140 (war risk hazard): To amend the act of December 2, 1942, and the act of August 16, 1941, relating to injury, disability, and death resulting from war risk hazard and from employment, and so forth.

H. R. 12728 (longshoremen's compensation): To amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, with respect to the payment of compensation in cases where third persons are liable.

H. R. 12967 (minimum wage review): To amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, with respect to the frequency review of minimum wage rates established in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

VETERANS

S. 3710 (unemployment compensation): To extend, until such time as compulsory military service under the laws of the United States is terminated, the provisions of title IV of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 to veterans who entered active service in the Armed Forces after January 31, 1955.

S. 4031 (veterans education): To amend section 223 of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, as amended, relating to change of educational or training program by an eligible veteran.

S. 4213 (veterans vocational rehabilitation): To afford vocational rehabilitation to certain veterans in need thereof to overcome the handicap of a disability rated 30 percent or more incurred in or aggravated by active service subsequent to January 31, 1955.

H. R. 6908 (hospitalization in the Philippines): To authorize modification and extension of the program of grants-in-aid to the Republic of the Philippines for the hospitalization of certain veterans.

H. R. 7251 (veterans' education in Panama and the Philippines): To amend the definition of the term "State" in the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act and the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act, etc.

H. R. 9369 (refunds to veterans): To authorize refunds by the Veterans' Administration of amounts collected from former servicemen by the Government pursuant to guaranty of life-insurance premiums under the original Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940.

H. R. 13559 (handicapped war orphans): To amend the War Orphans Educational Assistance Act of 1956 to authorize the enrollment of a handicapped eligible person in a specialized course of educational training, and at age 14.

AGING

H. R. 9822 (White House Conference on Aging): To provide for holding a White House Conference on Aging to be called by the President of the United States in January 1961, etc.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE,
August 18, 1958.

Hon. LYNDON JOHNSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, during the 2d session of the 85th Congress, carried and completed an unusually heavy workload. This was true not only because of the complexity of the issues involved in some of the major measures acted upon, but because of the large number of measures considered.

The major measures acted upon which became public law are:

1. Public Law 85-426, Postal Policy Act of 1958:

This measure accomplished three major objectives: First, it established for the first time in history a policy for the operation of the postal service; second, it completely revamped postage rates for the first time in years; and third, it accorded postal employees a justified and long overdue adjustment in compensation.

2. Public Law 85-462, Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1958: This measure accorded employees in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government an adjustment in compensation comparable to that given postal employees under Public Law 426.

3. Public Law 85-465, adjustment in retirement benefits: This measure adjusted the benefits of over a quarter of a million former employees, or the survivors of former employees, on the civil service retirement rolls.

4. Public Law 85-507, Government Employees Training Act: This measure provided for the first time authority for the Government to establish, on an overall basis, suitable training programs for its employees, necessary to keep par with advancements in science, medicine, and other similar and important fields.

5. Public Law 85-399, equipment allowances for rural carriers: This measure adjusts the equipment allowance for rural carriers and establishes, for the first time, a minimum allowance.

6. Public Law 85-550, to implement treaty wtih Panama: This measure implements item 1 of a memorandum of understandings attached to the treaty of January 25, 1955, between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Republic of Panama.

Among the minor measures acted upon which became public law are:

1. Public Law 85-368: Relating to contracts for postal stations.

2. Public Law 85-371: Revising the laws relating to the handling of short paid and undeliverable mail.

3. Public Law 85-372: Granting permanent authority to the Postmaster General to establish postal stations at camps of our Armed Forces.

4. Public Law 85-377: Giving authority and funds to the Civil Service Commission to take over certain employee beneficial associations.

5. Public Law 85-392: Revising the laws relating to the advertisements of rural routes.

6. Public Law 85-432: This measure corrects certain inequities with respect to step and longevity increases of postal employees.

7. Public Law 85-525: This measure extends overtime pay rates to certain employees required to work after completion of regularly established tours of duty.

8. Public Law 85-560: This measure provides for additional charges to reflect certain costs in the handling of business reply mail.

In addition to the measures so far enacted into law, there are in the process of enactment or on the President's desk awaiting action, 18 measures—both of a major and minor nature.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

OLIN D. JOHNSTON.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
August 18, 1958.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
Majority Leader,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: In compliance with your request, a short summary of the major accomplishments of the Committee on Public Works during the 2d session of the 85th Congress is as follows:

During this session there were 124 measures referred to the committee, of which 59 were enacted into law as separate bills or included in other bills. The committee approved 8 small watershed projects of the Department of Agriculture, and authorized 43 surveys of navigation and flood-control projects, by committee resolution. Hearings were held for a total of 41 days. Five nominations were considered by the committee and reported favorably to the Senate. There were 10 bills approving changing names of civil works projects, and 7 minor bridge bills.

Public Law 357: Authorizing the transfer of the Civil Service Commission Building to the Smithsonian Institution to house certain art collections of the Smithsonian Institution.

Public Law 381: The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958. Amends the Federal-Aid Highway Act to provide the following authorizations:

An additional amount of $400 million for fiscal year 1959 for the regular Federal-aid systems, to be expended on a two-thirds Federal, one-third State basis, and $115 million for advances to the States for matching their share up to two-thirds of the amount.

Nine hundred million dollars for fiscal year 1960 for the regular Federal-aid systems, the ABC roads, and $925 million for fiscal year 1961 for those systems.

Forest highways: $5 million for fiscal year 1959, $33 million for fiscal year 1960, and $33 million for fiscal year 1961.

Forest development roads and trails: $5 million for fiscal year 1959, $30 million for fiscal year 1960, and $30 million for fiscal year 1961.

National park roads: $18 million for fiscal year 1960, and $18 million for fiscal year 1961.

Indian reservation roads: $12 million for fiscal year 1960, and $12 million for fiscal year 1961.

Parkways: $16 million for fiscal year 1960, and $16 million for fiscal year 1961.

Public lands highways: $1 million for fiscal year 1959, $3 million for fiscal year 1960, and $3 million for fiscal year 1961.

Interstate System: Increase the authorization for fiscal year 1959 from $2.0 billion to $2.2 billion; for fiscal year 1960 from $2.2 billion to $2.5 billion; and for fiscal year 1960 from $2.2 billion to $2.5 billion; and approved the estimates of cost for completing the Interstate System submitted by the Secretary of Commerce as a basis for making the apportionment to the States for fiscal year 1960.

Established a national policy for control of the use of and improvement of areas adjacent to the Interstate System by controlling the erection and maintenance of outdoor advertising signs, displays, and devices adjacent to that system.

Signs would be limited to certain types, and where a State agrees to control their erection, the Federal share would be increased by one-half of 1 percent.

Public Law 429: Authorize acquisition of a portion of the property in square 724 in the District of Columbia for the purpose of extension of the United States Capitol Grounds, and for use of the United States Senate. Estimated cost $950,000.

Public Law 452: Authorize the appropriation of an additional amount of $10 million for completion of paving for the Inter-American Highway through the Central American Republics to the Canal Zone.

Public Law 500: The Omnibus River and Harbor Flood Control Act of 1958. Authorized the construction of 139 individual projects in 44 States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, and increased basin authorizations in 18 river basins, as follows:

Types of projects	Number of projects	Estimated cost
Flood control	68	$545,579,000
Basin authorizations	13	808,300,000
Rivers and harbors	57	190,723,000
Beach erosion control	14	111,627,700
Total	152	1,656,230,500

In addition, the act authorized 62 surveys for flood control and navigation in 29 States.

The act also provided authority for the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation to include storage for immediate and future water supply in Federal navigation, flood control, irrigation, or multiple-purpose projects on a basis which will permit the Federal Government and local interests to share equitably in the benefits of multiple-purpose construction, and that storage may be included in any reservoir project surveyed, planned, constructed, or to be planned, surveyed, and/or constructed by these agencies.

Public Law 526: Granting the consent and approval of Congress to a compact between the States of Connecticut and Massachusetts relative to a flood-control compact for the Thames River Basin.

Public Law 591: Authorize acquisition of most of the remaining property in square 725 in the District of Columbia, and the construction thereon of additional facilities for the United States Senate. Estimated cost $650,000.

Public Law 597: Amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to increase the period of time construction must commence on rights-of-way acquired for such purposes from 5 to 7 years.

Public Law 665: To authorize conveyance of a pumping station and other facilities of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway to the local drainage district, to relieve the Federal Government of responsibility for maintenance and operation. Estimated cost $1,420,000.

S. 497: Omnibus river and harbor-flood control bill. Action completed thereon, vetoed by the President. Public Law 500 enacted in lieu thereof. Passed Senate April 2, 1958, vetoed April 15, 1958.

H. R. 6701: Granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Tennessee River Basin water pollution control compact, with authority for any of seven Tennessee Basin States to enter into agreement relative to the storage and use of water pollution abatement purposes, provisions for enforcement, assignment of responsibilities, and protection of rights of the United States in the area. Passed Senate July 28, 1958.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 68: Stating the consensus of the United States Senate favoring the acceleration of civil construction programs for public works for which appropriations have been made. Passed Senate March 12, 1958, and passed House March 19, 1958.

S. 4021: To authorize the establishment of a United States Study Commission which would be responsible for the preparation of integrated and cooperative investigations, studies, and surveys of land and water resources in the southeastern portion of the United States. The area encompassed by the study includes that portion of the southeast drainage basins which would be bounded on the northeast by the Savannah River Basin, on the south by the St. Marys-Nassau River Basin, and on the west by the Perdido-Escambia River Basin system. Passed Senate August 1, 1958.

S. 1985: Authorizing the preparation of plans and specifications for the National Air Museum under the Board of Regents for the Smithsonian Institution, to be located on the south side of the Mall opposite the National Gallery of Art, be in keeping with that building, and be prepared by the General Services Administration, the location approved by the National Capital Planning Commission, and the design approved by the Commission of Fine Arts. Passed Senate June 26, 1958.

Senate Resolution 248: Declaring the sense of the Senate that the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Public Works continue the joint study of relationship of river and related water resource development programs of United States, Soviet Russia, and Red China, and submit their findings and recommendations of ways and means to accelerate the development and utilization of the natural resources of the United States. Agreed to by Senate July 28, 1958.

S. 3335: To establish in the Smithsonian Institution a Board of Trustees of the National Cultural Center, composed of 15 specified Federal officials, members ex officio, and 15 general trustees appointed by the President, to cause to be constructed for the Institution, with funds raised by voluntary contributions, a building to be designated as the National Cultural Center on a site in the District of Columbia, bounded by Rock Creek Parkway, New Hampshire Avenue, the proposed Inner Loop Freeway, and the approaches to the authorized Theodore Roosevelt Bridge. The Board would present programs of the performing arts, lectures, and provide facilities for other civic activities. The lands for the National Cultural Center and related activities would be acquired by the National Capital Planning Commission, with plans and specifications for the building approved by the Commission of Fine Arts. Passed Senate June 20, 1958.

S. 3712: Authorizes the appropriation of $4 million to remain available until expended, for completion of the survey and construction of the Rama Road in Nicaragua, under the provisions of section 5 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952. Passed Senate July 28, 1958.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

S. 3975: To provide for the construction of a fireproof annex building for the use of the Government Printing Office adjacent to the present building, with heating, lighting, one floor air conditioned, for storage of paper and publications. Estimated cost $6,500,000. Passed Senate June 26, 1958.

H. R. 12776: To revise, codify, and enact into law, title 23 of the United States Code entitled "Highways." A revision and restatement of all highway laws since 1916 into one act, for simplification and easier use. Passed Senate August 5, 1958.

S. 4192: To authorize construction of the Bardwell Reservoir on Waxahachie Creek, Tex., for flood control and water conservation, at a total cost of $6,992,000, with local contribution of $1,888,000, leaving Federal cost of $5,104,000. Benefit-cost ratio of 1.10. Passed Senate August 15, 1958.

S. 4179: To authorize construction of the Tahchevah Creek flood-control project, at Palm Springs, Calif., at an estimated Federal cost of $1,658,000, and local contribution of 5.8 percent, or $102,000. Benefit-cost ratio 1.18. Passed Senate August 18, 1958.

S. 4266: To authorize the establishment of a United States Study Commission which would be responsible for the preparation of integrated and cooperative investigations, studies, and surveys of land and water resources in that part of the State of Texas which would be bounded on the northeast by the Neches River Basin and on the south and west by the Nueces and Colorado River Basins. Passed Senate August 15, 1958. Included as amendment to H. R. 12216 on August 18, 1958.

H. R. 11697: To amend the act of June 29, 1888, relating to the prevention of obstructive and injurious deposits in the Harbor of New York, to extend the application of that act to the Harbors of Hampton Roads and Baltimore. Estimated annual cost $300,000. Passed Senate August 18, 1958.

H. R. 12808: To extend approval of the estimate of cost of completing the Interstate Highway System in each State, transmitted to Congress on January 7, 1958, by the Secretary of Commerce, as the basis for making apportionment of $2.5 billion of the Federal funds for fiscal year 1961, and for advancing the date for submission of a revised estimate of cost for completing the Interstate System from January 12, 1962, to January 12, 1961. Passed Senate August 18, 1958.

H. R. 2: To authorize the diversion of an additional 1,000 cubic feet per second of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway through the Chicago Sanitary Canal. Reported to the Senate August 19, 1958.

S. 2883: To amend the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, to eliminate the requirement that the extension, reconstruction, and replacement of the central portion of the United States Capitol be in substantial accord with scheme B of the architectural plan of March 3, 1905. Reported to Senate March 7, 1958. Defeated in Senate August 14, 1958.

S. 3560: Authorizing construction of a courthouse and a Federal office building at Memphis, Tenn., at an estimated cost of $20 million. Reported to Senate June 4, 1958.

H. R. 12883: Providing for certain improvements relating to the Capitol powerplant and its distribution systems. Estimated cost $6,550,000. Reported to Senate and passed August 18, 1958.

All in all, I believe that the Committee on Public Works has had one of the most constructive sessions ever. The committee has worked hard and diligently. I have received the utmost cooperation from the members and the subcommittee chairmen. Our programs have contributed much to the economy of the Nation and to the benefits of our citizens.

Sincerely yours,

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

UNITED STATES SENATE, COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION,
August 18, 1958.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
Majority Leader, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: As the Congress again approaches adjournment, I desire to make this brief report on the work of the Committee on Rules and Administration. During this 2d session of the 85th Congress, 130 items of proposed legislation were referred to or originated in the Committee on Rules and Administration for consideration. Of that number, 109 measures were actually reported to the Senate, frequently accompanied by amendments reflecting modifications made pursuant to the committee's studies. Of the remaining 21 items—5 were indefinitely postponed because of collateral action making their further consideration unnecessary, 1 was rejected, and 15 remain under review.

During the current session, and based on extensive prior hearings, the Committee on Rules and Administration reported Senate Resolution 17, to amend section 2 of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and filed a comprehensive statement on the proposed amendments, together with individual views. The committee also reported Senate Resolution 327, agreed to by the Senate on July 24, 1958, which established the new Standing Committee of the Senate, known as the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

By adjournment, it is expected that the Senate will have authorized additional funds for Senate committee activities in the amount of $4,164,250. Of this amount, the Senate has already approved $4,100,500; the balance of $63,750, being represented by four resolutions pending on the Senate Calendar at this writing. The above total financial authorization represents many individual requests contained in resolutions which have been, in turn, analyzed and appraised by the committee before Senate consideration.

In addition to its plenary legislative agenda, the Committee on Rules and Administration also dealt with an unusually large number of policy problems and matters of general business which required more than cursory treatment and decision to effect efficient management of Senate administration. One of the committee's most challenging current projects is the utilization of space available to Senators and Senate activities attendant upon the occupancy of the New Senate Office Building and the extension of the east front of the Capitol.

As chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, I am indebted to my colleagues on the committee who have contributed generously of their time and talents to make the above record possible. I am also grateful to the committee's most competent staff on whom the committee has heavily relied for counsel and support.

Thanking you for the confidence and cooperation which you have always extended toward the endeavors of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and with kind regards, as always.

Yours sincerely,

THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.,
Chairman.

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY IN THE 85TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy can list some solid accomplishments—legislative and otherwise—during the 2d session of the 85th Congress. The Joint Committee is unique in that it is the only committee in Congress comprised of representatives of both bodies which has legislative responsibilities.

Aside from its legislative and investigative work, the committee has traditionally carried on other major activities, including active participation in formulation of policies governing our atomic-energy program and informational activities designed to create better public understanding of this program.

The major accomplishments of the Joint Committee during the 2d session of the 85th Congress may be summarized as follows:

First, the committee, after lengthy hearings, reported out a bill to facilitate the exchange of information and materials with our allies in the field of nuclear weapons development. The bill was enacted into law on June 30, 1958, and approved by the President on July 2, 1958 (Public Law 85-479). Immediately thereafter the President submitted a proposed agreement for cooperation with the United Kingdom, and hearings have been held by the Joint Committee on it. The committee has submitted a report to Congress in support of the agreement.

Second, the committee has reported out an AEC facility authorization bill of some $386,679,000 to provide new construction for the atomic-energy program. The bill also includes provisions concerning the atomic-power program and Congressional review of proposed cooperative power projects with nongovernmental organizations. This bill passed the Senate on July 15, 1958, and was approved by the President on August 4, 1958 (Public Law 85-590).

In addition to the annual fiscal authorization legislation, increases in previous authorizations were approved by the Congress. AEC's fiscal 1958 authorization was increased in the amount of $35 million for the construction of a land prototype destroyer nuclear propulsion plant to be constructed at West Milton, N. Y. The bill passed the Senate on May 7, 1958, and was approved May 16, 1958 (Public Law 85-412).

An increase in fiscal 1956 authorization in the amount of $9,406,000 for the particle accelerator program, plus a further increase in fiscal 1958 authorization of the $2,250,000 for project Sherwood passed the Senate on July 2, 1958, and was approved on July 15, 1958 (Public Law 85-519).

Third, the committee and its staff have held informal discussions with the AEC on the development of a long-term atomic-power program statement. A staff study, reflecting the substance of these informal discussions will be issued shortly by the committee as a basis for further discussions next session on the long-term aspects of the atomic-power program.

Fourth, the committee held extensive hearings last February on basic research in the atomic-energy field. Copies of these hearings, together with a report by the Research and Development Subcommittee, are being distributed to Members of Congress, the scientific community and the general public to provide detailed information on basic research work as it is actually being carried on in our laboratories and universities. These hearings are of great interest in the atomic-energy field and provided the basis for the committee's recommendations in the authorization bill to increase the present level of support of projects under the AEC physical research program.

Fifth, the committee has acted favorably upon two bills providing legislative authority for the United States to cooperate with the six nations of the European Atomic Energy Community in a joint program of atomic power development. The goal of this program is to produce 1 million kilowatts of electric power through nuclear energy in Europe by 1963. The Middle East crisis has given urgency to the need for providing atomic power assistance to Europe as a means of offsetting dependence on Middle East oil.

One measure approved by the committee is a brief statement of intent in the form of a concurrent resolution and the other is

a bill to authorize American participation in the program, including funds for research and development and fuel element guarantees. These two measures were approved by the Senate on August 18, 1958.

Sixth, other bills reported out by the committee during the second session includes indemnity legislation exempting State universities and other educational institutions from provisions of last year's Indemnity Act providing for governmental indemnity against reactor hazards. This bill was passed by the Senate on August 5, 1958. Another bill was reported out providing indemnity for the atomic merchant ship *Savannah*. This measure was approved by the Senate on July 28, 1958, and by the President on August 8, 1958 (Public Law 85-802).

Finally, the committee has reported out the AEC omnibus bill, containing certain provisions including long-term contract authority which the AEC considers to be necessary for its program. This bill was enacted on August 5, 1958, and approved by the President on August 19, 1958 (Public Law 85-681).

In addition, the committee held extensive hearings on the raw materials program concerned with the AEC announcement of the limitation of mill capacity. As a result of the committee's review of the suject, the Commission increased its requirements to the satisfaction of the raw materials industry.

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT LEGISLATIVE RECORD OF 2D SESSION OF 85TH CONGRESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement and accompanying legislative review of the legislative record of the 2d session of the 85th Congress be printed in today's RECORD, and that the same material, with suitable revisions and extensions, be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the statement and review were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF THE LEGISLATIVE RECORD, 85TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION, JANUARY 7, 1958, TO AUGUST 24, 1958

Statement by the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, United States Senator from Texas, together with digests of legislation passed by the Senate

MAJOR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS 85TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION (PASSED BOTH HOUSES AS OF AUGUST 23, 1958)

National Defense and Internal Security

1. Reorganization of the Department of Defense.
2. Authorized $54.6 million for expansion of missile bases and warning systems and created ARPA.
3. Authorized $386 million for AEC construction and expansion.
4. Authorized atomic powered destroyer.
5. Military Compensation Act.

International Affairs

1. Authorized $3.03 billion for mutual security program.
2. Reciprocal Trade Act.
3. Authorized exchange of mutually essential atomic information and materials with allies.
4. Increased lending authority of Export-Import Bank by $2 billion.
5. Adjustment of status of 30,000 Hungarian escapees.
6. Resolution relating to the establishment of an international plan for the peaceful exploration of outer space.

Governmental Organization

1. National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958.
2. Admitted Alaska as a State to the Union.
3. Classification Act employees increase.
4. Authorized training of Government employees in outside schools.
5. Increased the jurisdictional amount required for civil suits in Federal courts.
6. Passed Freedom of Information Act.
7. Adopted act providing for improved budgetary procedures.
8. Federal Aviation Act.

National Economy

1. Emergency $1.8 billion Housing Act.
2. Increased $4 billion authorization for FHA mortgage insurance.
3. Authorized $5.5 billion for highway construction, including $1.8 billion additional to create jobs and expedite work.
4. Provided optionally to States, for repayment in 5 years, up to 15 weeks additional unemployment compensation.
5. Authorized Federal guarantee of railroad loans up to $700 million.
6. Increased postal rates and postal pay.
7. Authorized advanced purchases of supplies and equipment from fiscal year 1959 appropriations to stimulate business.
8. Broadened lending authority of Small Business Administration.
9. Small Business Administration made permanent, its lending authority increased and interest rates reduced.
10. Authorized construction and sale by Maritime Board of two passenger superliners.
11. Small Business Investment Act.
12. Small Business tax relief.
13. Extend the Renogotiation Act.

Agriculture

1. Barred reduction of 1958 farm price supports below 1957 level and barred cuts in acreage allotments for 2 years. (Vetoed.)
2. Extended soil conservation program for 4 years.
3. Extended Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act for sales of surpluses abroad.
4. Agricultural Act of 1958.

Natural Resources

1. Authorize $1.5 billion for flood control, rivers and harbors.
2. Extended program for critical material exploration.

Social Security, Health and Welfare

1. Extended for 3 years special school milk program with authorization of $75 million annual expenditure.
2. Authorized $1 million grants-in-aid to train public health specialists, technicians and administrators.
3. Increased civil-service annuities.
4. Extended for 3 years the Hill-Burton Hospital Survey and Construction Act.
5. Authorized the largest expenditures in history for medical research—$294,383,000, which exceeded the budget estimate of $211,183,000 by $83,200,000. The amounts provided for the various research activities as compared with the budget estimates are:

[In millions of dollars]

Activity	Budget	Appropriation	Increase
General Research	$17.742	$28.974	$11.232
Cancer	55.923	75.268	19.343
Mental Health	37.697	52.419	14.712
Heart	34.712	45.613	10.901
Dental	6.293	7.420	1.127
Arthritis	20.592	31.215	10.623
Allergy	17.497	24.071	6.574
Neurology	20.727	29.403	8.676

6. Extended Federal assistance programs for school construction in areas affected by Federal activities.
7. Required reporting and full disclosure of employee welfare and pension funds.
8. National defense education bill.
9. Area Redevelopment Act.
10. Authorized grants to expand teaching in the education of mentally retarded children.
11. Authorized agencies of the United States to make grants to support scientific research.
12. Enacted Food Additives Act.

DIGEST OF LEGISLATION PASSED BY THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES DURING THE 2D SESSION OF THE 85TH CONGRESS (CONVENED JANUARY 7, 1958, ADJOURNED AUGUST 24, 1958)

Agriculture

Price Supports and Acreage Allotments

S. J. Res. 162:

This resolution would have barred reductions in price support for 1958 and in acreage allotments for 1958 and 1959 for all basic commodities except tobacco (which is covered by other legislation).

It was the intent of Congress to prevent the drop in price supports Secretary of Agriculture Benson scheduled for the 1958 crops, some effective on April 1, 1958. Presidential veto March 31, 1958.

Farmer Committeemen

S. 1436:

This measure amends section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to provide for the democratic election of farmer-committeemen to local and county committees. Members of State committees are to be appointed by the Secretary, but 1 member, if the State committee is composed of 3 farmers, or 2 members, if the State committee is composed of 5 farmers, are to be appointed from nominees chosen at an election by the members of the county committee.

Passed Senate August 8, 1958.

Soil Bank—Equity for Producers

S. 2937:

This measures authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to compensate producers for hardships suffered under the 1956 Soil Bank program as a result of incorrect information furnished by county committees. The 1956 program was put into effect hurriedly after the Agricultural Act of 1956 was approved, and certain mistakes occurred.

As a result of these mistakes, some producers have suffered hardships due to being given erroneous information by county committees or due to the failure of county committees to properly inform them as to program requirements.

Public Law 85-413, approved May 16, 1958.

Insurance of Loans Under Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act

S. 3333:

This bill amends the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and the Water Facilities Act, so as to facilitate the making and insuring of loans by the Secretary of Agriculture for the acquisition, enlargement, or improvement of farms and the conservation of soil and water resources thereon, make such loans more attractive to investors, make the program self-supporting to a greater degree, facilitate the refinancing of such loans on an uninsured basis and make such insured loans eligible for investment for certain banks. It will accomplish these objectives by—

(1) Authorizing the conversion of direct loans into insured loans;

(2) Authorizing limited use of the mortgage insurance fund in making loans, if they can and will be converted to insured loans without undue delay;

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

(3) Authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to receive a larger share of the interest payments on loans sold on an insured basis than he receives under existing law on insured loans;

(4) Authorizing the sale of any loan as an uninsured loan with the written consent of the borrower, or without such consent when the borrower has failed to comply with his agreement to refinance from another source when it is possible to do so at the prevailing rate;

(5) Giving the Secretary of the Treasury discretion to fix the interest rate on borrowings from the Treasury for use of the mortgage insurance fund, taking into consideration the "current average market yields of outstanding marketable obligations of the United States" having comparable maturities (such interest rate is now fixed by law at "the average rate of interest * * * borne by all interest-bearing obligations of the United States * * *; and

(6) Amending the National Bank Act to permit a national bank to loan as much as 25 percent (instead of 10 percent) of its capital and surplus to 1 individual in the case of loans insured by the Secretary of Agriculture under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act or the Water Facilities Act.

Public Law 85-748, approved August 25, 1958.

Agriculture Armed Forces Dairy Products Program—Extension

S. 3341:

This measure extends the Armed Forces dairy products program for 3 years until December 31, 1961. In addition, it extends the benefits of this program to the Coast Guard and the Merchant Marine Academy.

The authority for the program is contained in section 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, which requires the Commodity Credit Corporation to make dairy products acquired through price-support operations available to (1) the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to supplement the ration in VA hospitals, and (2) the Secretary of the Army to supplement the ration of the Army, Navy, and Air Force and the ration of Defense Department hospitals. Similar provision is made for supplementing the ration of the Coast Guard and the Merchant Marine Academy.

Passed Senate by voice vote March 3, 1958.

Agriculture Special School Milk Program—Extension

S. 3342:

This measure extends the special school milk program for 3 years to June 30, 1961. The present authority for this program is contained in the Agricultural Act of 1949. In order to recognize the primary purpose of the program as improved nutrition for schoolchildren, the extension is by separate legislation and not amendatory of the 1949 act.

This measure specifies that amounts expended under either the original or the extended program shall not be considered as amount expended for price support purposes.

This program includes all schoolchildren, all nonprofit nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and similiar nonprofit institutions devoted to the care and training of underprivileged children.

Pulic Law 85-478, approved July 1, 1958.

Brucellosis Eradication Program—Extension

S. 3343: This measure extends the accelerated brucellosis eradication program for 2 years until June 30, 1960. This program is provided for by the Agricultural Act of 1954, which authorizes the transfer of $20 million of Commodity Credit Corporation funds annually to the appropriation available for brucellosis eradication to accelerate the program through (1) increasing indemnities; (2) increasing the number of indemnities; and (3) defraying additional administrative expenses.

Passed Senate by voice vote March 3, 1958.

Agricultural Trade Development Act—Extension

S. 3420: This measure extends for 2 years, through June 30, 1960, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act. Increases from $4 billion to $4.5 billion in fiscal 1958, to $6 billion in fiscal 1959, and $7.5 billion in fiscal 1960 the amount of surplus agricultural commodities which may be sold for foreign currencies to friendly nations.

Enlarges the uses which may be agreed upon for the foreign currencies acquired under title I to include the educational exchange of agricultural leaders, labor leaders, journalists, and civil leaders; and assistance to schools and workshops. Prohibits discriminatory treatment of extra long staple cotton under Public Law 480.

Passed Senate by voice vote March 20, 1958.

Noxious-Plant Control—Federal Lands

S. 3861:

This measure provides for the application of State weed-control plans to Federal lands. It authorizes the State commissioner of agriculture to destroy noxious plants on Federal lands if the agency having jurisdiction of the lands consent, and has not already complied with the requirements of the program. Requires the Federal Government to reimburse a State upon presentation of an itemized account of the expenses incurred as a result of complying with the program.

Passed Senate May 21, 1958.

S. 4071. Agricultural Act of 1958

This measure provides more effective price, production adjustment, and marketing programs for various agricultural commodities.

The bill provides for:

Cotton: 1. A program for upland cotton for 1959 and 1960 under which producers can elect to take a 40-percent increase in their acreage allotments coupled with a 15-percent-of-parity reduction in price support. Price support for those choosing higher support will be by purchase only, and Commodity Credit Corporation would be required to sell cotton at not less than 110 percent of the lower support.

2. Upland cotton price support after 1960 at 90 percent of the average market price of Middling 1-inch cotton for the preceding 3 years, but not less than 30 cents per pound or 60 percent of parity, whichever is higher.

3. Minimum upland cotton marketing quotas after 1960 adequate to assure a stable supply to meet world needs, but not less than the larger of (a) domestic consumption and exports less 1 million bales or (b) 10 million bales.

4. A minimum national upland cotton-acreage allotment of 16 million acres.

5. A new formula for computing national marketing quotas for extra-long-staple cotton after 1960, designed to minimize the effect of carryover.

6. Use of a 3-year adjusted yield instead of a 5-year yield in converting the national marketing quota to a national acreage allotment.

7. Permanent extension of the small farm cotton-allotment provisions of existing law with amendments to (a) increase the national reserve to meet States' needs for acreage to establish minimum farm allotments to 310,000 acres; (b) increase the minimum farm allotment to 10 acres or the 1958 allotment, whichever is smaller; and (c) permit estimation of States' needs after 1959 to save the cost of making a trial allotment to determine such needs.

8. Allotment of such further acreage as may be necessary to increase each farm-acreage allotment to the prescribed minimum, with provision that no part of the additional acreage allotted to States, counties, or farms by reasons of provisions relating to minimum allotment shall be counted in computing their respective allotments.

9. Use of the previous year's allotment as a base in making allotments, if it will facilitate effective administration.

10. Retention of surrendered cotton acreage in the county so long as any cotton farm desires it.

11. Use of Middling 1-inch instead of Middling seven-eighths as the standard grade after 1960.

12. Effective August 1, 1961, increase of minimum prices for Commodity Credit Corporation sales of cotton for unrestricted use to 115 percent of the current support price plus reasonable carrying charge; and exemption from this requirement of a quantity equal to that by which the national marketing quota is less than domestic consumption and exports.

13. Express preservation of the cotton export sales program provided for by section 203 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

14. Purchase by Commodity Credit during 1959 and 1960 marketing years of an amount of cottonseed and soybean oil equal to the amount of increase in such oil production by reason of the production of cotton on increased acreage allotted to farmers; and the donation of oil so purchased for use to aid needy persons outside the United States.

Corn and Feed Grains: 1. Discontinuance of corn-acreage allotments and the commercial corn-producing area.

2. Price support for corn at 90 percent of the 3-year average price, but not less than $1.10 per bushel or 60 percent of parity, whichever is higher.

3. Price supports for oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghums at fair and reasonable levels in relation to corn, but not less than 60 percent of parity.

4. Repeal of the provision for a different corn-support level in the noncommercial area.

Rice: 1. Permanent extension of the present minimum national and State acreage allotments.

2. Price support for 1959 and 1960 at between 75 and 90 percent of parity without regard to the supply percentage.

3. Price support, beginning in 1961, at 90 percent of the 3-year average price, but not less than $4 per hundredweight or 60 percent of parity, whichever is higher.

4. Review of farm-acreage allotment for 1959 crop, if farmer dissatisfied.

Wool: 1. Extension of National Wool Act of 1954 to March 31, 1963.

2. Ceiling of 85 percent of parity on support price, beginning with 1959, if Secretary determines that expenditures by the Commodity Credit Corporation for payments to producers will exceed the 70 percent of gross receipts of specific duties specified in section 705 of the Wool Act as a limitation on appropriations.

Public Law 480: 1. Agreements for sale of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies in each fiscal year up to $1.5 billion plus any amount by which agreements entered into in prior fiscal years, beginning with fiscal year 1958, will call for appropriations to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation in amounts less than authorized.

2. Use of foreign currencies for financing interchange of persons programs, and for expanding and operating in foreign countries of schools to carry on vocational, professional, scientific, technological, or general education programs and to support workshops in American studies or educational techniques or chairs in American studies.

3. Extension of authority to enter into transactions until June 30, 1960.

4. Limitation of authority of Commodity Credit Corporation to acquire strategic or critical materials by barter or exchange to acquisitions for national and supplemental stockpiles, foreign assistance, and offshore construction programs.

5. Making available for sale of extra-long-staple cotton in same manner as any other surplus agricultural commodity is made available, and making available for sale of products from upland or long-staple cotton as long as cotton is in surplus supply.

(For complete information on S. 4071, see Vote Nos. 142–148.)

Industrial Uses of Agricultural Products

S. 4100: This measure:

1. Declares the need for developing new and improved uses for farm products and that public and private research agencies and others should be used for an all-out attack on the development of new and improved uses and new and extended markets and outlets for farm products and byproducts.

2. Establishes in the Department of Agriculture, the Agricultural Research and Industrial Administration with the duty to coordinate and expedite efforts to develop, through research, new industrial uses, and increased use under existing processes, of agricultural products; to develop new replacement crops; and to reduce the stock of commodities owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

3. Authorizes the new agency to provide graduate scholarships and fellowships and for this purpose to make grants to individuals.

Passed Senate July 29, 1958.

Uniform Provisions for Transfer of Acreage Allotments

S. 4151:

This measure amends the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to substitute a provision treating all commodities alike for the existing varying sections providing for the transfer of acreage allotments for cotton, peanuts, rice, tobacco, and wheat in cases where farms are acquired by agencies having the right of eminent domain. A uniform provision will be more equitable, easier to administer, and better understood by farmers. It is particularly needed at this time in view of the lands being acquired under the highway program.

Passed the Senate August 11, 1958.

Mexican Farm Labor

S. 4232:

Extends the Mexican farm labor program for 1 year until June 30, 1960. Under that program the Secretary of Labor recruits agricultural workers from Mexico pursuant to an agreement with the Republic of Mexico and subject to conditions designed to protect the rights of both foreign and domestic workers.

Passed the Senate August 14, 1958.

Study of Tobacco Marketing Practices

Senate Resolution 334:

Authorizes the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to make a complete study of all matters pertaining to tobacco marketing practice related to loose and tied tobacco in order to determine why tobacco farmers receive a price differential for tying tobacco in some States and not in others, and requires a report by January 31, 1959.

Passed Senate, August 6, 1958.

Onion Futures

H. R. 376:

This measure provides that no contract for the sale of onions for future delivery shall be made on or subject to the rules of any board of trade. A violation is made a misdemeanor subject to fine.

Public Law 85–839, approved August 28, 1958.

Cotton Acreage Reports

H. R. 6765:

This measure changes the existing law relating to cotton-acreage reports by—

Basing the July cotton-acreage report on planted acreage instead of acreage in cultivation;

Advancing the second cotton-acreage report from September 1 to August 1, the beginning of the marketing year; and

Permitting the Department of Agriculture to report on farmers' intentions to plant cotton by removing the present prohibition.

Public Law 85–490, approved May 29, 1958.

Forest Service Administration

H. R. 7953:

This measure is designed to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service by:

Raising the limitation from $50 to $2,500 on reimbursment to owners of equipment rented under verbal agreement for damages occurring while in use by the Forest Service.

Authorizing contracts with private parties to train, work, and care for Government-owned pack stock held in reserve for fire-emergency purposes.

Permitting reimbursement to employees for casualty damages to personal effects occurring at places of temporary storage while the employees are engaged in connection with these casualties.

Authorizing the Government to pay for transporting employees' automobiles between points in Alaska, in connection with transfer of official stations.

Permitting the Government to pay the cost of notifying employees in isolated locations of serious illness or death of close relatives, and the cost of transporting these employees to the nearest public transportation.

Permitting the transfer to States of fire-lookout towers and other improvements for fire control no longer needed by the Forest Service.

Broadening existing authority to pay for telephone calls for official use in private residences.

Permitting money received from forfeitures, judgments, or settlements to be used to carry out the work made necessary by the action which led to the forfeiture, judgment, or settlement.

Permitting payment of costs of publishing technical articles in scientific publications.

Increasing the amount available for purchase of administrative sites from $25,000 to $50,000 a year.

Public Law 85–464, approved June 20, 1958.

Humane Slaughter of Livestock and Poultry

H. R. 8308:

The measure:

1. Declares it to be the policy of the United States that the slaughtering of livestock and the handling of livestock in connection with slaughter shall be carried out only by humane methods.

2. Defines as humane slaughter, (a) the rendering of the animal insensible to pain by a single blow or gunshot or an electrical, chemical, or other means that is rapid and effective before being shackled, thrown, cast, or cut; or (b) slaughter in accordance with religious requirements of the Jewish faith or any other religious faith which prescribes a method where the animal loses consciousness by anemia of the brain through the simultaneous and instantaneous severance of the carotid arteries with a sharp instrument.

3. Forbids after June 30, 1960, except in period of national emergency, the procurement by any agency of the United States of livestock products produced in the plant of a slaughterer using methods not approved by the Secretary of Agriculture as humane.

4. Authorizes Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research into the development of humane methods.

5. Authorizes Secretary to designate, on or before March 1, 1959, methods conforming to the policy of the bill but permits him to designate methods not in conformity with the policy if he deems it more effective.

6. Authorizes the establishment of an Advisory Committee.

7. Preserves the religious freedom of any person or group against abridgment and exempts from the terms of the bill retail slaughter of livestock and the handling and preparation of livestock for slaughter. Retail slaughter is defined as slaughter in accordance with religious practices as set forth in section 2 (b).

Public Law 85–765, approved August 27, 1958.

Rice Acreage Allotments

H. R. 8490:

This bill makes several technical changes in the rice acreage allotment law to improve the administration of the program by—

Restricting old producer allotments in any State to those with production history in that State;

Preventing a producer or a farm from becoming an old producer or farm by planting rice without an allotment;

Preventing a producer from becoming an old producer by reason of engaging in production jointly with another who was entitled to the allotment and received the entire production history on the allotment;

Permitting the Secretary of Agriculture to divide a State into two areas and make allotments on a producer basis in one area and on a farm basis in the other area;

Providing for pooling allotments of lands acquired by agencies having the right of eminent domain, and using the pooled allotments to establish allotments for other farms owned or acquired by the former owners of the lands.

Increasing the marketing penalty to 65 percent of parity; and

Providing for terminating previous quotas whenever current quotas are terminated.

Public Law 85–443, approved June 4, 1958.

Soil Bank Contracts

H. R. 10643:

This measure permits farmers in 38 counties designated in 1958 as commercial corn areas to remain eligible for Soil Bank payments even if they did not comply with their new acreage allotment requirements.

It further provides that if there is an acreage reserve program in 1959, the same exemptions will apply for counties added in 1959, except to be eligible, participants must sign up for the acreage reserve before January 1, 1959.

Public Law 85–369, approved April 7, 1958.

Tobacco Acreage Allotments

H. R. 11058:

This measure amends the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide that in the event a second crop of tobacco is harvested for marketing from the same acreage, the allotment next established for the farm shall be reduced by an amount equivalent to the acreage from which more than one crop of tobacco was grown and harvested.

Public Law 85–489, approved July 2, 1958.

Agriculture Wheat Acreage History

H. R. 11066:

This measure is designed to prevent any farm from losing acreage history by reason of overplanting its allotment in 1958. It will prevent any State, county, or farm from losing acreage history by reason of the overplanting of any farm allotment in 1959 or any subsequent year if the farm marketing excess is delivered to the Secretary or stored to avoid penalty.

Under Public Law 203, approved on August 28, 1957, Congress provided that acreage planted in excess allotments would not count as history toward future allotments; however, by the time this information was conveyed to farmers many had already planted their wheat crops. By changing the rules

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

without adequate notice, the existing law imposed an excessive penalty or would compel the farmers to plow up acreage already planted which would result in loss to them.

Public Law 85-366, approved April 4, 1958.

Long Staple Cotton—Price Support

H. R. 11399:

This measure establishes the price support level for extra long staple cotton at not more than 75 percent of parity nor less than 60 percent of parity. At present, this commodity is supported at 75 percent of parity.

Extra long staple cotton is a specialized commodity which is produced in this country in only relatively small quantities and in a limited area. Its natural competitors are similar cotton imported from a few foreign areas and certain synthetic fibers.

It is the belief of the producers that a support level of not more than 75 percent will provide them an adequate return, and will maintain the market position achieved through a highly successful promotion campaign.

Public Law 85-497, approved July 2, 1958.

Special Livestock Loans

H. R. 11424:

This measure extends for 2 years, through July 14, 1961, the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to extend or make supplementary advances in connection with special livestock loans which have been made under existing law providing for various types of disaster and emergency loans.

This bill affects only the authority of the Secretary to make supplemental advances or renewals of existing loans in order to more effectively protect the Government's interest. It does not authorize new loans.

Public Law 85-516, approved July 11, 1958.

Poisonous Seed Wheat

H. R. 11581:

This measure seeks to plug a loophole in the import laws whereby foreign countries can treat wheat with poisonous substances to prevent diseases, label it "unfit for human consumption" and pay an import duty of 5 cents per bushel instead of 21. The bill requires that wheat for seed purposes which has been treated to make it unfit for human consumption be classified as "wheat" rather than "wheat unfit for human consumption."

Vetoed August 20, 1958.

Nonprofit Summer Camps—Surplus Foods

H. R. 12164:

This measure clarifies existing law relating to the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to donate surplus food commodities to nonprofit children's summer camps. Under existing provision of law, nonprofit school-lunch programs are eligible to receive surplus food commodities and the Department of Agriculture has been following the general policy that nonprofit summer camps are an extension of the school activity and should likewise be eligible to receive surplus foods.

This bill clarifies this provision of law so as to leave no doubt that summer camps for children, operated on a nonprofit basis, have the same eligibility to receive surplus foods as do nonprofit school-lunch programs.

Public Law 85-483, approved July 2, 1958.

Peanut Acreage Allotments

H. R. 12224:

This measure makes two minor changes in the peanut marketing quota law. Production of peanuts without an allotment will not affect the farm's status as new or old. Present provision permitting any farm to harvest up to 1 acre for nuts without penalty will not be applicable if the producers share in peanuts produced on any other farm.

Public Law 85-717, approved August 21, 1958.

Farm Acreage Allotment

H. R. 12602:

This measure permits the transfer of 1958 cotton acreage allotments in disaster areas from farms, on which they cannot be timely planted or replanted, to farms in the same or adjoining counties on which the same producers are engaged in cotton production. It would be effective only in counties where a substantial number of farms were affected, and transfers could be made only if authorized by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Many cotton farms are now under water so they either cannot be planted, or having been planted, cannot be replanted. These farmers, as a result, will lose their principal cash crop for 1958. This bill provides a means whereby they might obtain some relief if they were able to make arrangements to plant their crops on lands not under water.

Public Law 85-456, approved June 11, 1958.

Tobacco Allotments

H. R. 12840:

Authorizes the Department of Agriculture to combine allotments for Virginia fire-cured and Virginia sun-cured tobacco on any farms having allotments for both types.

Public Law, 85-705, approved August 21, 1958.

Flour and Cornmeal

H. R. 13268:

Authorizes the Commodity Credit Corporation to purchase flour and cornmeal and to donate it under flour and cornmeal donation programs.

Public Law 85-683, approved August 19, 1958.

Hall of Fame for Agriculture

House Concurrent Resolution 295:

The purpose of this concurrent resolution is to encourage efforts which are being made by private citizens to establish a Hall of Fame for Agriculture. Some of the most distinguished agricultural leaders of the country have been enlisted in the efforts to establish a hall of fame to commemorate and keep alive the great contributions which agriculture has made to the greatness and prosperity of the United States.

Passed the Senate August 11, 1958.

District of Columbia

Heliport—Study

Senate Joint Resolution 167:

This resolution authorizes the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make a study of all factors involved in the construction of a heliport within the District, including recommendations of a site.

Passed Senate May 7, 1958.

District of Columbia—Fish and Game Laws

S. 532:

This measure authorizes the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to promulgate appropriate regulations to revise and modernize the fish and game laws of the District.

Public Law 85-730, approved August 23, 1958.

District of Columbia—Commissioners—Additional Powers

S. 1706:

This measure grants additional powers to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to authorize them to:

Purchase, sell, and to give to certain persons, institutions, and governmental agencies, both municipal and Federal, at the discretion of the Commissioners or their designated agent, copies of various municipal regulations:

Make advance payments to Federal agencies for supplies to be furnished or work to be performed in accordance with agreements between the Commissioners and agencies;

Empower the Commissioners to authorize the several departments, establishments, bureaus, and offices of the government of the District of Columbia to place orders with other agencies of the District, and to make payment for such orders either in advance or on a reimbursement basis.

Public Law 85-491, approved July 2, 1958.

Substitute Teachers

S. 1841:

This measure authorizes the District of Columbia Board of Education to employ retired teachers as substitute teachers.

Difficulty has been experienced by the schools in maintaining a sufficient list of substitute teachers in the District. An average of 131 substitute teachers are used daily in the District of Columbia public schools.

The act provides that the retirement annuities of such substitute teachers will not be interrupted by becoming employed in this capacity.

Public Law 85-385, approved April 24, 1958.

District of Columbia Recreational Board

S. 1843:

This measure permits the Recreation Board of the District of Columbia to prescribe rules and regulations governing the payment of night differential for nonregularly scheduled work of its employees who are subject to the Classification Act of 1949.

Public Law 85-383, approved April 23, 1958.

District of Columbia Compensation Act Amendment

S. 2419:

This measure makes possible a variety of desired administrative changes in the application and operation of the Unemployment Compensation Act in the District of Columbia.

Among the changes accomplished are:

Exempts from the operation of the act persons employed by Members of Congress.

Wages unpaid solely because of a court order appointing a fiduciary would be considered paid when due.

Stops the running of interest upon unpaid contributions when these nonpayments result from bankruptcy receivership or probate court proceedings.

Permits a 15-day grace period before the invocation of penalty provisions for late filing of reports or payment of contributions.

Public Law 85-557, approved July 25, 1958.

District of Columbia—National Council of Negro Women, Inc.

S. 2725:

This measure exempts from taxation property owned and occupied by the National Council of Negro Women, Inc., located at 1318 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. This exemption applies so long as the property is owned and occupied by the National Council and is not used for commercial purposes.

The National Council was incorporated in the District of Columbia on June 26, 1936, and is a charitable and volunteer organization. It is a coordinating body of 22 national affiliates and some 90 local and junior councils, having a total membership of 850,000 women throughout the United States. The headquarters serve both the national and local activities of the organization.

Private Law 85-388, approved April 23, 1958.

Civil Defense—District of Columbia

S. 2728:

This measure makes a number of clarifying amendments to the 1950 act setting up an Office of Civil Defense for the District of Columbia.

Passed the Senate August 14, 1958.

District of Columbia—Teachers' Salary Act, Amendment

S. 3057:

This measure increases the salary of the Superintendent of Schools of the District of

Columbia to $22,000 a year. A study of the salaries paid the superintendents of schools in 18 cities of the United States having a population of more than 500,000 currently places Washington, D. C. in 18th place in terms of salary paid to its Superintendent of Schools.

Public Law 85-552, approved July 25, 1958.

Damage Actions

S. 3058:

Under existing law there is no right of action against the District of Columbia for unliquidated damages to persons or property unless the claimant within 6 months after the injury or damage was sustained gives notice in writing to the Commissioners of the approximate time, place, cause, and circumstances of the injury or damage, except that a report in writing by the Metropolitan Police Department is regarded as sufficient notice.

This measure changes the time for giving notice of unliquidated damages to person or property from 6 months to 60 days. This is similar to provisions in statutes of 15 of the States.

In the event injury or damage is caused by snow or ice, or both, the notice must be given within 10 days after the injury or damage was sustained, with a proviso that if by reason of physical or mental incapacity, the person injured fails to give such notice within such 10-day period, the claimant, under this measure, may give notice within 10 days after the incapacity has been removed.

This measure omits proviso in existing law, that a report in writing by the Metropolitan Police Department in regular course of duty shall be regarded as sufficient notice.

Provision is made that this act shall apply to all actions for unliquidated damages to person or property brought against the District of Columbia against unreasonable claims for damages and at the same time offer adequate protection to the rights of individuals.

Passed Senate June 9, 1958.

District of Columbia—Unsafe Buildings

S. 3059:

This measure amends the act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to remove dangerous or unsafe buildings. The Commissioners are authorized to require that unsafe structures be vacated under penalty of $300 fine or imprisonment of not to exceed 30 days after 5 days' notice to repair or take corrective action has been given, or immediately if the danger is imminent.

Establishes time limits and changes the present method for assessment and collection of costs for repairs made by the District upon unsafe structures, including changes in the "grace period," during which interest does not run, from 90 days to 60 days, and changes the rate of interest from 10 percent a year to one-half of 1 percent a month.

Permits administrative changes in the methods of serving notice upon the owners of property to simplify and standardize the procedures.

Passed Senate March 17, 1958.

District of Columbia—Teachers College—Foreign Students

S. 3243:

This measure permits a total of 25 foreign students who are in the United States on valid unexpired student visas to attend the District of Columbia Teachers College without the payment of tuition. By granting this permission, there is created a special exception from present law which prohibits the use of District of Columbia appropriations for the free tuition of pupils who are not residents of the District.

Public Law 85-384, approved April 23, 1958.

District of Columbia—Uniform Simultaneous Death Act

H. R. 3486:

This measure is designed to enact for the District of Columbia the Uniform Simultaneous Death Act. It will provide the District with an orderly plan for the distribution of estates which are dependent upon survivorship, where there has been a common disaster and insufficient evidence as to survivorship. Similar acts have been adopted in 39 of the 48 States.

Public Law 85-356, approved March 28, 1958.

Levying and Collecting of Taxes and Assessments, District of Columbia

S. 3510:

The purpose of this measure is to enable the notice of special assessments for public improvements to be served either by registered mail or by personal service, and thereby give the government of the District of Columbia an alternative method of service not present in existing legislation.

Passed the Senate, August 11, 1958.

Delivery of Sewage from Virginia to the Sewerage System of the District of Columbia

S. 4153:

This measure authorizes the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, from time to time, to enter into and renew agreements, for such periods as they deem advisable, with the proper authorities of the State of Virginia, to provide for the drainage of sewage originating in Virginia into the sewerage system of the District of Columbia for treatment and disposal. The bill provides further that the Virginia authorities shall pay all or part of the cost of construction and maintenance facilities necessary as determined in the individual agreements.

Public Law 85-703, approved August 21, 1958.

Stream Valley Parks in Maryland

H. R. 3778:

The first section of the act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, authorizes the appropriation of $7,500,000 for the development of the George Washington Memorial Parkway outside of the District of Columbia, and authorizes $1,500,000 for the extension of Rock Creek Park into Maryland. H. R. 3778 amends this section of the act so as to authorize the National Capital Planning Commission and the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, by agreement, to use funds authorized for the George Washington Memorial Parkway for the extension of Rock Creek Park.

Public Law 85-707, approved August 21, 1958.

Potomac River Bridges

H. R. 6306:

This measure amends the act of 1946 which authorized the construction of two 4-lane bridges across the Potomac River to replace the bridge known as the 14th Street or Highway Bridge. The cost in 1946 was estimated to be approximately $7 million; however, the extremely rapid inflationary cost of heavy construction has resulted in the final cost of the first of the two bridges amounting to about $6,800,000, or substantially the amount authorized by Congress for both bridges.

Present plans call for the construction of the second of the two authorized spans, at a cost, together with approaches, of approximately $9,200,000. To complete this work, this measure increases the authorization to $16 million to take care of the second bridge.

Public Law 85-501, approved July 3, 1958.

Federal Probation Act

H. R. 7261:

This measure makes the Federal Probation Act applicable to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, as approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States.

Public Law 85-463, approved June 20, 1958.

Criminal Cases—Executing Bonds

H. R. 7349:

This legislation amends the act of March 3, 1933, which regulates the business of executing bonds for compensation in criminal cases in the District of Columbia to accomplish the following purposes:

To remove the obsolete and substitute the current name of the various courts.

To give the United States District Court for the District of Columbia jurisdiction to make rules prescribing the qualifications of persons engaged in the bonding business.

Public Law 85-537, approved July 8, 1958.

EXTENSION OF POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN'S RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY ACT AMENDMENTS

H. R. 7450:

The purpose of this act is to extend to widows and children of policemen and firemen who were retired prior to the effective date contained in Public Law 85-157, which was October 1, 1956, the same survivorship benefits as accrue to the survivors of policemen and firemen who are covered under that act.

Passed Senate August 14, 1958.

DISTRICT GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

H. R. 7452:

This measure permits the employees of the District Government to be placed on an equal footing with employees of the Federal Government so far as the designation of holidays for pay and leave purposes is concerned. The Commissioners are authorized to prescribe regulations similar to those which relate to Federal employees.

Public Law 85-533, approved July 18, 1958.

District of Columbia—Police and Firemen—Wages

H. R. 7568:

This measure amends the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act to provide that service as an inspector and a private in the Fire Department of the District of Columbia is to be considered as service in the same grade for the purpose of longevity increases.

Under existing law the pay of an inspector in the Fire Department is $184 more than the pay of a private, and provides for longevity increases of $129 for each 5-year period of continuous service completed in a grade. As a result of the narrow spread between the pay of a private and the pay of an inspector, a private who has completed one 5-year period of service entitling him to $129 in longevity pay, upon promotion to inspector, receives an increase of $55 a year but loses the credit he has toward his next 5-year longevity period.

This measure permits each private promoted to the grade of inspector to receive the $184 increase and, in addition, he may include his time in the grade of private in determining his longevity pay as an inspector.

Public Law 85-421, approved May 19, 1958.

Juvenile Court—Additional Judge

H. R. 7785:

This measure provides for the appointment of an additional judge for the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia. The workload of the court has increased from a total number of 9,069 cases in 1951 to 17,916 cases in 1957. Up to the present, this workload has been carried on by one judge.

The new judge must be a member of the bar of the District of Columbia for at least 5 years immediately preceding appointment, a resident of the District of Columbia or of the metropolitan area surrounding the District, and must have a knowledge of social

problems and procedures and an understanding of child psychology.

The salary will be $18,000 a year.

Passed Senate April 22, 1958.

St. Thomas Literary Society

H. R. 9285:

This measure amends the charter of St. Thomas' Literary Society to:

Add the purpose of religion to the purposes of charity and education contained in the present law;

Remove from existing law the $500,000 limitation on the value of the property that the society may hold at any one time; and

Remove from the charter that portion of the existing law which holds the individual corporators liable for all debts of the society.

Public Law 85-541, approved July 18, 1958.

Military Construction, Supplemental

H. R. 9739:

This measure provides a supplemental authorization for construction and related activities for the Department of the Air Force within and without the United States, to support the acceleration of certain key offensive and defensive weapon systems. It will stimulate business activity and employment. The need for acceleration became increasingly apparent during formulation of the fiscal year 1959 budget, and was clarified by the dramatic evidence of Soviet capabilities in long-range missiles and satellites.

The precise subjects covered by this legislation are of a highly classified nature and, in the interest of national security, it is not possible to deal with all specific aspects. The overall authorization for the Air Force is $549,670,000 to support the following programs:

Semiautomatic ground environment (SAGE)	$29,670,000
Ballistic missile detection system	189,000,000
Ballistic missiles	112,400,000
Alert and dispersal of strategic forces	218,600,000
Total	549,670,000

Public Law, 85-325, approved February 12, 1958.

Additional Airport for the National Capital

H. R. 12311:

In 1950, Congress authorized the construction of an additional public airport in or near the District of Columbia. The 1950 act authorized to be appropriated the sum of $14 million "for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act." The act further stated: "There are hereby authorized to be appropriated from year to year such sums as may be necessary for the proper development, improvement, maintenance," etc.

Recently a site has been selected and the Government is proceeding as rapidly as possible with plans for construction. However, a question has arisen whether the $14 million mentioned in the 1950 act constitutes a limitation on the total expenditures authorized for the airport, or merely a limitation on the amount of funds to be initially expended.

This measure removes any possible doubt on the point involved and, should additional funds be needed, the request will not be subject to a point of order.

Public Law 85-511, approved July 11, 1958.

Potomac River Bridge

H. R. 12356:

This measure establishes a more satisfactory location for the bridge over the Potomac to be known as the Theodore Roosevelt Bridge. From the location authorized by the act of August 30, 1954, this bill moves the bridge upstream some 800 feet from that point contemplated in the existing statute.

This six-lane low-level bridge is to be constructed from a point north of and in the vicinity of Constitution Avenue in the District of Columbia to the Virginia side of the Potomac River, and will cross the south end of Theodore Roosevelt Island, or the island known as Small Island, or portions of both.

Public Law 85-446, approved June 4, 1958.

District of Columbia Public Works

H. R. 12377:

This measure authorizes a program of construction to meet capital needs of the government of the District of Columbia. The program includes projects relating to education, health, welfare, public safety, recreation and other general government activities.

Two methods are provided to assist the District in financing the program. First, the bill authorizes loans to be made to the District by the United States Treasury in amounts up to $75 million, such loans to bear interest at rates which are equivalent to the cost of money to the Treasury. The loans are to be repaid over a 30-year period, beginning with the second fiscal year after the loans are received by the District. Expenditures of funds raised by such loans would be authorized on an appropriation basis from year to year. Secondly the bill amends the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947 so that the annual payment by the Federal Government toward the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia would be increased by $9 million from the present authorization of $23 million, payable to the general fund.

Public Law 85-451, approved June 6, 1958.

Transportation of Schoolchildren

H. R. 13218:

The purpose of the measure is to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to permit District-owned vehicles to be used for the transportation of the children of District employees residing at the Children's Center, between the reservation and Laurel, Md., in order that the children may attend school.

Public Law 85-670, approved August 18, 1958.

Increased the Insurance Coverage for Cabs in the District of Columbia

H. R. 13531:

This measure makes the following major changes in existing law with respect to insurance on cabs in the District of Columbia:

(1) The required amount of liability insurance is increased from the present $5,000, $10,000, and $1,000 to $10,000, $20,000 and $5,000.

(2) The scope of the coverage is increased to cover any use of the vehicle, by any person, any place within the United States, if the person required by the act to be insured, is liable under the law of the place where the cause of action arose.

(3) Sections 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15 of the Safety Responsibility Act are made applicable to taxicabs to establish with certainty that taxi drivers are subject to the same penalties for not reporting accidents that are applicable to other drivers and to the same service of process requirements.

(4) Authority is given the Public Utilities Commission to inquire into and to revoke the authority of anyone to operate as a self-insurer if it finds such self-insurer does not have sufficient financial capacity.

(5) The legislation provides that the liability of the insurance carrier shall be absolute whenever injury or damage covered by such insurance occurs. The effect of this is to deprive the insurance company of any policy defenses.

Public Law 85-792, approved August 28, 1958.

Education

Merchant Marine Officers—Education

S. 1728:

This measure provides assistance to State and Territorial maritime academies or colleges by:

1. Authorizing the Department of Commerce to make contracts for annual payments with each academy or college for periods up to 4 years, but keeping the actual appropriations on an annual basis.

2. Providing an increase in the level of assistance up to $75,000 a year, or $25,000 if the institution does not meet the requirement regarding admission of out-of-state students.

3. Providing subsistence allowances for cadets at a rate not in excess of $600 per academic year per student.

4. Authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to loan and keep in repair suitable vessels for training purposes.

Public Law 85-672, approved August 18, 1958.

Educational television

S. 2119: To expedite the use of television in our public schools, colleges, and adult training programs, this measure authorizes the Commissioner of Education to make small grants-in-aid to organizations or States that qualify under the provisions of the Federal Communications Act.

To qualify the State or organization must:

1. Pay the operation and maintenance expense of these facilities.

2. Agree that the operation of these facilities will be under the control of:

(a) State agencies or officers primarily responsible for State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools; or

(b) A nonprofit foundation, corporation, or association organized primarily to engage in, or encourage educational television broadcasting;

(c) The State educational television commission appointed by the governor; or

(d) A State college, university or teachers' college.

3. Agree that these facilities will be used only for educational purposes.

Grants may be made to more than one organization but the total of the grants in one State cannot exceed $1 million. Grants will cover acquisition and installation of apparatus necessary for television broadcasting, including closed circuit television, or the improvement of television broadcasting but does not include construction or repair of structures to house the apparatus.

Passed Senate May 29, 1958.

Education—NACA—Graduate School

H. R. 6744:

This measure increases the limitation on the amount that the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics may spend in continuing the salaries of its professional employees while they attend graduate schools in order to increase the value of their services to the Government. The limitation is now $100,000 a year and this act changes the dollar limitation to 2 percent of the total annual salaries of the NACA professional personnel.

During the past 8 years the NACA has granted leave for university graduate study and research in science and engineering to more than 600 different professional employees. Most of the grants of leave were for cumulative periods of a few weeks each, a few were for longer periods, and in half of the cases the employees supplemented their official leave with leave without pay for 50 percent of the period involved. Eighty percent of the persons under the program now are granted graduate leave of a few hours a day to take specialized graduate study at universities near NACA laboratories. This practice has made it possible to increase the number of trained employees with a minimum of interruption to research work.

Public Law 85-349, approved March 17, 1958.

School Construction

H. R. 11378:

This measure amends Public Law 815 and Public Law 874, 81st Congress, to make permanent the programs for financial assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities insofar

as such programs relate to children of persons who reside and work on Federal property, and to extend such programs until June 30, 1961, insofar as they relate to other children.

Public Law 85–620, approved August 12, 1958.

Federal employees

Employee Training

S. 385:

This measure, in recognition of the Hoover recommendations as well as Congress' own interest, authorizes the training of Federal employees at public or private facilities. Training is an essential element in all personnel programs, so Congress, for the first time, has passed legislaton to:

Provide general statutory authority for employee training required to further Federal programs;

Make it possible for all agencies to use whatever facilities can best and most economically serve their training needs;

Provide the President a management tool essential to efficient operation of the departments and agencies;

Establish a central point of responsibility for and control of employee training programs; and

Consolidate a variety of exiting training authorities of limited scope and applicability.

The Government departments are enthusiastic in support of the measure and have agreed that the small cost could be absorbed by each agency and department.

Public Law 85–507, approved July 7, 1958.

Annuity Increase

S. 72:

This measure provides a 10 percent increase to each retired employee or Member of Congress, who, on August 1, 1958, is receiving or is entitled to receive an annuity based on service which terminated prior to October 1, 1956. No retiree, by reason of the 10 percent increase, may receive a total increase in excess of $500 a year.

Gives a survivor a 10 percent increase, but the total increase may not exceed $250 a year.

Provides a limited annuity, not to exceed $750 a year, to certain unremarried widows and widowers of employees and retired employees who died prior to February 29, 1948, either while still in the service or after having retired from the service after having performed at least 10 years of creditable service. To qualify for an annuity the unremarried widow or widower must have been married to the former employee for not less than 5 years. In addition, the widow or widower must not be entitled to any other annuity under the Retirement Act based on the service of the deceased employee. The amount of the annuity for a widow or widower of an employee with at least 10 years' service who died prior to February 29, 1948, either in service or after retirement, will be equal to one-half of the annuity which the employee was receiving on the date of his death if retired, or if he died in service will be one-half of the rate he would have been receiving if retired for disability on such date after making full deposit to the retirement fund. The annuity will cease on the death or remarriage of the widow or widower.

Fixes the effective date of the increase as August 1, 1958, or on the first day of the month in which the application for such annuity is received in the Civil Service Commission, whichever occurs later.

Provides that the increases shall be paid out of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund until June 30, 1960, after which they will not be paid unless financed by appropriations.

Gives a limited number of former employees, who were automatically separated by reason of age prior to October 1, 1956, but who had a sufficient amount of annual leave to their credit to keep them on the rolls until that date, an election as to whether they receive the increase provided by this bill or an increase provided by the October 1, 1956 amendments.

Public Law 85–465, approved June 25, 1958.

Classified Employees Pay Act

S. 734:

This measure provides an across-the-board increase of 10 percent for all employees whose pay is fixed under the Classification Act, or is related thereto. Thus, in addition to the classified employees, this measure includes the Division of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration, the Foreign Service and related functions of the Department of State, agencies such as the Atomic Energy Commission and the Tennessee Valley Authority whose rates of pay are fixed by administration action, employees in the judicial branch, and legislative employees.

The across-the-board 10 percent applies to all grades through GS–18, including postal inspectors, and scientific and professional positions.

Provides for 292 additional supergrades and 307 additional scientific and professional positions, thus making a total of 599 new positions.

Provides 10 percent for legislative and judicial employees. The 10-percent legislative raise as applied to personal offices is at the discretion of the Members of Congress. Raises the ceiling of the administrative assistant and top committee position to $16,300 and provides for 1 such position in each committee and 2 at $15,700.

Insurance increase deemed effective on date of enactment.

Retroactive to first pay period following January 1, 1958.

Public Law 85–462, approved June 20, 1958.

Readjustment of Retirement Benefits

S. 1732:

Authorizes equitable readjustment of the retirement benefits of certain individuals on the emergency officers' retired list.

Public Law 85–587, approved August 1, 1958.

Group Life Insurance

S. 2127:

This measure amends the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to modify both the rate and the extent of the reduction that is made in the face value of a policy when the insured reaches 65.

Present law provides for a monthly reduction of 2 percent commencing with the first month after age 65 until the policy has been reduced to 25 percent of its face value. This amendment cuts the rate of reduction to 1 percent a month and, also, ceases reducing entirely when the value of the policy has been reduced to 50 percent.

To meet the additional costs, the bill raises the premiums by 10½ cents per thousand each pay period. Seven cents of this amount will be passed on to the employees and 3½ cents to the Government.

Existing law provides that an employee's insurance is continued upon retirement provided the employee has 15 years or more service. This requirement is reduced to 12 years in order to extend the benefit on a more realistic basis.

Passed Senate April 22, 1958.

Foreign Service Annuities

S. 3379:

This measure gives Foreign Service annuitants the same 10 percent increase in their retirement benefits which was recently given to civil service annuitants.

Passed the Senate, August 11, 1958.

Foreign Department of Defense Schools

S. 3460:

This measure withdraws positions of teachers in schools operated by the Department of Defense in foreign countries from coverage under the Classification Act, and authorizes the Secretary of Defense to prescribe regulations governing such positions and fixing the rates of compensation.

Passed the Senate August 4, 1958.

Post Office Employees

S 3564:

This measure grants Civil Service Retirement credit for certain post office rural carrier service by employees whom the Post Office Department intended to convert to war service indefinite status pursuant to executive order but who were not converted because of administrative error.

Public Law 85–827, approved August 28, 1958.

Federal Employees International Organizations

S. 4004:

This measure encourages and authorizes details and transfers of Federal employees for service with international organizations.

Public Law 85–795, approved August 28, 1958.

Board of Parole

S. 4096:

Increase salary of members of the Board of Parole to $17,500 per year.

Passed the Senate, August 11, 1958.

Retirement Benefits for Reserve Components

H. R. 781:

Extends to certain persons in Reserve components who performed active Federal service during Korean hostilities Reserve retirement benefits.

Public Law 85–704, approved August 21, 1958.

Chief Judge of Federal Courts—Retirement

H. R. 985:

This legislation is designed to relieve chief judges of the circuit and district courts from their administrative duties upon reaching the age of 70 so they may devote their entire time to the lawwork of the courts instead of administrative details.

The act also provides that a person must have served in a judicial capacity in either a circuit or district court for a year before he can become a chief judge. The act exempts from the provisions of the act any district having two judges in regular active service so long as the incumbent chief judge on the date of enactment continues to hold the position.

Public Law 85–593, approved August 6, 1958.

Clarification of Downgrading Provisions

H. R. 1168:

The purpose of the measure is to remove inequities that have been found to exist in a limited number of instances wherein employees' positions are reduced in grade through no fault of theirs, but who, because of the restrictive language of the law, have been denied the protection and benefits intended to be provided under the law.

Public Law 85–737, approved August 23, 1958.

Coast Guard Personnel

H. R. 3820:

This measure confers upon the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the settlement of claims of members of the Coast Guard the same authority which the Secretary of Defense has with respect to military and civilian personnel in that Department.

Public Law 85–738, approved August 23, 1958.

Civil Service Retirement

H. R. 4640:

This measure amends the Civil Service Retirement Act by authorizing any present or former employee or member to be paid his voluntary contribution account provided application is made to the Commission before receipt of any additional annuity. A withdrawer may deposit additional amount if he becomes subject to the act after a separation from service of more than 3 calendar days.

Public Law 85–661, approved August 14, 1958.

Postal Employees Pay Raise

H. R. 5836:

This measure grants a permanent increase of 7½ percent for all employees under the Postal Field Service Schedule, except those in PFS–20. In addition to the permanent increase, employees in salary levels PFS–1 through PFS–6 will receive a 3-year temporary cost-of-living increase of 2½ percent, and 1½ percent for those in PFS–7. Comparable increases are provided for rural carriers and fourth-class postmasters.

Increases are retroactive to January 1, 1958.

Public Law 85–426, approved May 27, 1958.

Accumulated Annual Leave

H. R. 7710:

The measure authorizes the lump-sum payment of all accumulated and current accrued annual leave of deceased employees.

It also provides that a legislative employee who has completed 2 or more years of service as an employee and who takes employment in a position governed by the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, may receive compensation at any step of the basic salary schedule applicable to the position which does not exceed the highest previous rate of compensation received by him in the legislative branch.

Public Law 85–914, approved September 2, 1958.

Panama Canal Teachers

H. R. 7734:

Exempts certain teachers in the Canal Zone public schools from prohibitions against the holding of dual offices and the receipt of double salaries.

Public Law 85–613, approved August 8, 1958.

Uniformed Services Transportation Allowances

H. R. 7902:

This measure provides authority to pay to members of the uniformed services, who could not select a home of record within the required 1-year period because of hospitalization and medical treatment, travel and transportation allowances.

Public Law 85–576, approved July 31, 1958.

Postal Employees-Longevity Step Increases

H. R. 7930:

To correct certain inequities, this measure provides that all new appointments in the postal field service be made at the minimum rate of the appropriate grade. In the case of a transfer from one position to another, however, the basic compensation of the employee is to be governed by regulations of the Civil Service Commission. It also provides that when employees move to the executive branch from the legislative or judicial branches, their service will be treated the same as other Federal employees under the Civil Service Commission's regulations.

Public Law 85–432, approved May 29, 1958.

Retirement Benefits of Members of Congress

H. R. 8606:

This measure amends the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to annuities of survivors of employees who are elected Members of Congress so as to make the survivor provisions applicable in the event the Member dies after completing at least 5 years of civilian service. Under previous legislation the provisions became applicable only after 5 years of Member service.

Public Law 85–772, approved August 27, 1958.

Retired Pay

H. R. 9673:

The purpose of this act is to restore the retirement pay of persons dropped from the retired rolls pursuant to section 1161 of title 10, United States Code, after December 31, 1954, and before the date of enactment of this act.

Public Law 85–754, approved August 25, 1958.

Civilian Employees, Compensation Claims

H. R. 10504:

This bill provides a solution to a problem that exists in connection with adjudicating claims for death or disability benefits by employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities of the Armed Forces.

Existing law requires nonappropriated fund instrumentalities to provide their employees with insurance covering death and disability suffered while engaged in the performance of official duties. The law, however, provides that these employees shall not be considered as employees of the United States for purposes of the Federal Employees Compensation Act. Ordinarily in these circumstances, these claims would be adjudicated by the State compensation commissions but the State commissions have declined jurisdiction on the ground that these are Federal employees.

Under this measure, the problem is solved by providing for adjudication of the claims of these employees by judicial tribunals established by the Secretary of Labor under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

Public Law 85–578, approved July 18, 1958.

Federal Employees, Travel Costs

H. R. 11133:

This measure provides authority to the Federal Government to pay travel and moving expenses of prospective employees reporting to their first duty station for employment in positions determined to be in shortage categories on the same basis as payments to regular civilian employees upon transfer of official station or on original appointment to an overseas post.

Public Law 85–749, approved August 25, 1958.

Federal Employees, Military Pay Increase

H. R. 11470:

This measure increases the military pay by $576.4 million for approximately 2,592,000 persons. Included are 1,682,000 active duty personnel; 700,000 reserve personnel on inactive duty; and 210,000 retired personnel. Also included are officers of the Public Health Service and the Coast and Geodetic Survey. The raise is a minimum increase of 6 percent in basic pay for most personnel with over 2 years' service.

The basic objective of this act is to establish a career force for the military service. To achieve this objective, the bill makes the following changes in existing law:

Establishes 2 new officer grades, O–9 and O–10, and 2 new enlisted grades, E–8 and E–9, and provides graduated increases which result in the highest increases being granted to those in the upper officer and enlisted grades.

Provides two new alternative proficiency pay systems designed to attract and retain highly qualified enlisted members.

Establishes for the first time on a permissive basis a special responsibility pay for a limited percentage of officers who hold critical positions.

Provides an added incentive for achievement by eliminating longevity increases beyond normal promotion points.

Establishes a special longevity pay scale for officers who had 4 or more active duty years as an enlisted man.

Sets basic pay at $1,875 a month for:

(a) Chiefs of Staff of Army and Air Force;

(b) Chief of Naval Operations;

(c) Commandant of Marine Corps;

(d) Chairman of Joint Chiefs of Staff.

For retired personnel: Provides an increase of 6 percent for most personnel retired prior to effective date of this bill. Authorizes vice admirals and lieutenant generals, now retired, to compute their pay on basis of an additional $100 a month basic pay plus the approved 6 percent increase. Authorizes 4-star generals and admirals to compute their retirement pay on an additional $200 a month plus the 6 percent increase.

Effective date of act: June 1, 1958.

Public Law 85–422, approved May 20, 1958.

Naval and Marine Corps Transfers

H. R. 11504:

This measure extends to Naval and Marine Corps enlisted career reservists, who complete at least 20 years of active service, the same retirement benefits for which regular enlisted personnel of these services are eligible.

Public Law 85–583, approved August 1, 1958.

Naval Aviation Cadets

H. R. 11626:

This measure changes service requirements so as to require a naval aviation cadet to agree to serve as a commissioned officer for at least 3 years after completion of aviation training.

Public Law 85–578, approved July 31, 1958.

Employment of Regular Navy Officers on Shore Duty

H. R. 11636:

This measure repeals the requirement that the determination by the Secretary of the Navy that the employment of an officer of the regular Navy on shore duty is required by the public interest be stated in the officer's order to shore duty.

Public Law 85–588, approved August 1, 1958.

Firearms Permits

H. R. 11700:

This measure authorizes the carrying of firearms or other weapons by civilian personnel of the Department of Defense engaged in investigative or law-enforcement work in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

Public Law 85–577, approved July 31, 1958.

District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary

H. R. 13088:

This measure provides for an overall increase in salaries of 13.8 percent for the members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia. It provides for a starting salary of $4,800 per annum for a private; 2 annual increases of $200 each and 1 of $240; a biennial increase of $280 each; 3 longevity increases of $280 each at 4-year intervals; and a maximum salary of $6,840 after 19 years of service.

Public Law 85–584, approved August 1, 1958.

District of Columbia Teachers' Salaries

H. R. 13132:

This measure provides for an increase in teachers' salaries of 14 percent.

Public Law 85–838, approved August 28, 1958.

Longevity Credit for Service in the Panama Canal Zone Postal Service

H. R. 13404:

The purpose of this measure is to correct an inequity in the postal field service by granting longevity credit to employees in the postal field service in the States for service performed by them in the Panama Canal Zone postal service.

Public Law 85–751, approved August 25, 1958.

Antirecession—Advance Procurement

House Joint Resolution 588:

This measure is designed to stimulate business activity and employment by permitting civilian agencies of the Government to advance their procurement of supplies, materials, and equipment budgeted for the next fiscal year.

This action will not increase Government purchases but will accelerate them and make funds available in 1958 for items which normally would not be ordered until after the

beginning of the new fiscal year on July 1 next.

This resolution authorizes, during the remainder of fiscal year 1958, the use of up to 50 percent of the amounts included in the 1959 budget estimates for supplies and materials and equipment for the departments and agencies in the executive branch, including the District of Columbia, except those for military functions of the Department of Defense and the mutual-security program.

It is estimated that a total of $195 million will be obligated and a total of $54,300,000 will be expended during the next 90 days.

Public Law 85-386, approved April 24, 1958.

Finance, commerce, industry

Unfair Trade Practices in Meatpacking Industry

S. 1356:

This measure is designed to prevent unfair trade practices, and other lawful restraints in interstate commerce by persons engaged in wholesaling or distributing meats, meat products, and nonmeat food and nonfood products.

The unfair trade practices it is designed to prevent are those which fall short of a Sherman Act violation, and thus do not come under the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice.

To accomplish this objective, it amends the Packers and Stockyards Act and the acts administered by the Federal Trade Commission to give:

Department of Agriculture exclusive jurisdiction over all livestock and poultry in interstate commerce, including transactions at posted yards and elsewhere.

Federal Trade Commission exclusive jurisdiction over retail sales of meat and nonmeat products in interstate commerce; and over wholesale operations of nonmeat products.

Joint jurisdiction (to both agencies for a 3-year period) over meats, meat food products, livestock products in unmanufactured form, and poultry products after they have been prepared in form for distribution.

Passed Senate May 15, 1958.

Small Business Disaster Loans

S. 2920:

This measure is designed to enable the Small Business Administration to make disaster loans to small businesses in areas which are affected by excessive rainfall. Existing law authorizes disaster loans in areas where homes and businesses have been damaged or destroyed by floods or other natural disasters. The law also authorizes loans to small businesses suffering economic injury in areas where a drought is occurring.

This legislation changes existing laws in two ways. The first change recognizes that existing law is too restrictive in its treatment of disasters resulting from drought. Present language limits eligibility to an area where a drought is occurring. This amendment permits disaster loans in areas affected by a drought regardless of whether the drought has been broken.

The second change adds the situation of excessive rainfall to the disastrous conditions which may create a need for disaster loans to small businesses.

Public Law 85-335, approved February 22, 1958.

Fishery Extension Service

S. 2973:

This measure authorizes the Secretary of Interior, through the Fish and Wildlife Service, to inaugurate a fishing extension service in connection with public and nonprofit private universities or with agencies of the States, Territories, and possessions. Cooperative work will consist of giving instruction to persons interested in commercial fishing, giving information through demonstrations and publications, and aiding the printing, preparation, and distribution of information.

Passed the Senate August 4, 1958.

Export Control Act—Extension

S. 3093:

This measure extends the Export Control Act of 1949 for a period of 2 years from its present termination date of June 30, 1958. This act, which is administered by the Secretary of Commerce by delegation from the President, authorizes regulation of exports on the basis of standards relating to national security, foreign policy, and domestic shortages.

The act of 1949 authorizes the President to prohibit or curtail the exportation from the United States, its Territories, or possessions of any articles, materials, or supplies, including technical data. Rules and regulations may be issued, which may apply to financing, transporting, or other servicing of exports, to the extent necessary to achieve effective enforcement.

The act directs the agency exercising the authority to seek information and advice from executive departments and independent agencies concerned in the exports; to use private competitive trade channels as far as practicable; and to consult with all branches of the trade concerned. A fine and imprisonment are provided for violations of the act, or of any regulations, orders, or licenses under it.

Public Law 85-466, approved June 25, 1958.

Export-Import Bank—Increased Lending Authority

S. 3149:

This measure increases the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington from the present $5 billion to $7 billion; it makes a corresponding increase in the bank's authority to borrow from the United States Treasury. The principal function of the bank is to aid in financing and facilitating exports and the exchange of commodities between the United States and foreign countries.

Public Law 85-424, approved May 22, 1958.

Tungsten Production Extension

S. 3186:

This measure extends for 1 year, or until December 31, 1959, the Department of Interior's production and purchase program of asbestos and fluorspar.

Public Law 733 of the 84th Congress authorized the purchase of certain materials, in specified quantities and at specified prices, to maintain the production of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum in the United States.

Purchases under the act were to cease whenever specified quantities had been delivered. The program was late in getting under way and, as a result, producers of asbestos and fluorspar were unable to complete deliveries by December 31, 1958. This extension will permit those deliveries to be made.

Vetoed August 12, 1958.

Opportunities for Small Business Concerns To Obtain Government Contracts

S-3224:

The purpose of this measure is to further amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949; section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; the codified Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947; and the Copeland (Anti-Kickback) Act, which contain the basic authority of law with respect to the procurement of supplies and services by the departments and agencies of the Government. The bill increases from $1,000 (in some agencies $500) to $2,500 the present open-market limitations for procurement without formal advertising by the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government.

The bill would improve several aspects of procurement procedure of Government agencies through the promotion of greater uniformity and simplicity, in the interest of the Government and of business particularly of small business.

Public Law 85-800, approved August 28, 1958.

Small Business Investment Act of 1958

S. 3651:

The purpose of this measure is to provide assistance in an area where neither Government nor private institutions can now offer assistance. Commercial banks are not in the business of providing equity capital to small businesses nor are they prepared, in most instances, to offer long-term credit to these businesses. And while the Small Business Administration is authorized to make loans of a maximum 10-year duration, with a possible 10-year extension, it cannot under law go further toward meeting the real long-term requirements of small businesses, and it cannot provide equity capital in any case.

This measure establishes in the Small Business Administration an Investment Division. The Division to be separated from Small Business Administration's other operations, will have a three-fold function:

First. To charter (unless charter can be obtained under State law), regulate, and examine small-business investment companies.

Second. To lend funds to those companies.

Third. To lend funds to State and local development companies.

The investment companies will be organized by 10 or more persons, under charters granted by either the States or the SBA. They must have, as capital and surplus, $300,000 before they commence business; half of that may be invested by the SBA. The SBA may also loan these companies funds up to one-half of their capital and surplus, an as encouragement to their speedy and effective growth. The companies will then be in a position to provide equity capital through the purchase of convertible debenture bonds, to small businesses, and to make 30-year loans. The small businesses receiving equity capital from investment companies will be required to purchase stock in the companies, in an amount equaling from 2 percent to 5 percent of the capital received. In this way, private ownership of the companies will be realized.

Public Law 85-699, approved August 21, 1958.

Civil Construction Acceleration

Senate Concurrent Resolution 68:

This resolution, introduced by 66 Senators, declared as the sense of Congress that all civil construction programs for which funds have been appropriated should be accelerated to the greatest extent practicable. The resolution has three major objectives:

1. To reduce unemployment;

2. To place our productive facilities into more usefulness;

3. To permit earlier completion of these projects.

The resolution also expresses to the President and the executive agencies the commendation of Congress for such action as they have taken to accelerate these programs.

This resolution is one of a series of legislative measures that Congress enacted in an effort to stem the tide of an economic recession. In the field of public works, there is a large backlog of authorized projects available. At the time of enactment of this resolution, there was an unexpended balance of approximately $4 billion in appropriations that have been made for these projects.

Senate adopted March 12, 1958, by vote of 93 to 1; passed House March 19, 1958.

Military Construction Acceleration

Senate Concurrent Resolution 69:

This resolution, another in a series of antirecession measures, declares as the sense of Congress that all military construction projects needed to support the Nation's Armed Forces, and for which funds have been appropriated, should be accelerated to the greatest practicable extent.

The acceleration of these projects has a threefold objective:

1. To reduce unemployment;

2. To strengthen our national defense posture;

3. To provide fuller use of our productive facilities.

The resolution also expressed to the President and the executive agencies the commendation of Congress for any action they have taken to accelerate these programs.

Senate adopted by vote of 76 to 1 on March 14, 1958; passed House March 19, 1958.

Reclamation Acceleration

Senate Resolution 299:

This resolution calls for accelerated Federal reclamation spending by adding 20 new projects and increasing funds for 20 projects already under way. The resolution recommends an appropriation of $330 million for fiscal 1959, which is about a 50 percent increase over the estimates submitted by the Bureau of the Budget.

The primary objective of the resolution is to alleviate acute unemployment in the West and in industrial areas where materials and equipment are manufactured. Another objective is to provide urgently needed water supplies required for the western population and economy. Acceleration will also help in permanently strengthening the Nation's economy.

Senate adopted May 6, 1958.

Amendment of Bankruptcy Act

H. R. 13:

This measure amends chapter XI of the Bankruptcy Act to permit a permission for an arrangement to be filed without being accompanied by a plan of arrangement. It also allows the court to modify a plan after it has been confirmed if it becomes unworkable.

Public Law 85-732, approved August 23, 1958.

Automobile Imports

H. R. 776:

This measure provides that foreign automobiles imported for show purposes may enter the United States duty-free if they are to be used only for show purposes. Cars or parts remaining longer than 6 months will be subject to duty and cars, even for show purposes, imported on a temporary basis will be required to pay duty unless the country of origin provides similar free treatment for cars made in the United States which are sent abroad for show purposes.

Public Law 85-379, approved April 16, 1958.

Bankruptcy Act—Amendment

H. R. 982:

This measure amends paragraph (6) of section 77 (c) of the Bankruptcy Act to afford a former lessor, whose properties are being operated for its account under the provisions of that paragraph, a remedy under the Interstate Commerce Act. Paragraph 6 now provides that if a lease of a line of railroad is rejected, and the lessee, with the judge's approval, elects no longer to operate the leased line, the lessor shall begin operation of the line at a time to be fixed by the judge. However, if the judge finds, after hearing, that operation by the lessor would be impracticable and contrary to the public interest, it then becomes the lessee's duty to continue operation of the line until abandonment is authorized by the Commission but, in such event, the operations are conducted by the lessee for the account of the lessor.

Thus, under this measure, the Interstate Commerce Commission may fix a reasonable and equitable division of rates where a railroad lease is rejected under the provisions of the Bankruptcy Act and one of the parties to the lease is ordered by the judge to operate the line.

Public Law 85-515, approved July 11, 1958.

Chicory—Import Duty Suspension

H. R. 5005:

This measure suspends for a period of 2 years the duty on crude chicory, except endive, and provides for a new rate of 2 cents a pound for the same temporary period. At the end of the suspension the duty on ground or prepared chicory will be restored to 2½ cents a pound.

Public Law 85-378, approved April 16, 1958.

Pistols and Revolvers

H. R. 1126:

This measure adds pistols and revolvers (and parts thereof) to the list of articles in a duty-free status.

Public Law 85-410, approved May 16, 1958.

Import Duties on Wool

H. R. 2151:

This measure suspends until June 30, 1960, the import duties on coarse wool used in the manufacture of rugs and carpets. It is believed this suspension will enable the domestic producers to obtain these wools at competitive world prices.

Public Law 85-418, approved May 19, 1958.

Duty on Harpsichords and Clavichords

H. R. 5208:

This measure provides that harpsichords and clavichords (and parts thereof) are to pay the same rates of duty applicable to pianos.

Public Law 85-417, approved May 16, 1958.

Estate Tax Amendment

H. R. 5938:

Under the 1939 Internal Revenue Code, a marital deduction is available for estate-tax purposes relating to interests in property passing to a surviving husband or wife; however, where the spouse's interest in the property may terminate, or where the interest may fail to pass to the spouse, the marital deduction is available only if the termination of the interest or the failure of the interest in property to pass to the surviving spouse may occur only within the 6 months immediately after the decedent's death, or as the result of a common disaster resulting in the death of both the husband and wife.

This measure adds another exception whereby another type of terminable interest will be eligible for marital deduction. It provides that marital deduction will be available in the case of terminable interests passing to a surviving spouse where the event which could terminate the interest becomes impossible of occurrence within 6 months of the decedent's death. This exception will be available under the bill only in the case of decedents adjudged incompetent before April 2, 1948, the effective date of the act providing the marital deduction, who were not restored to competency before their death. This provision is effective relating to decedents dying after April 2, 1948.

Public Law 85-318, approved February 11, 1958.

Imports—Antidumping

H. R. 6006:

This measure is designed to speed and tighten administrative procedures of the antidumping law protecting American producers from unfair foreign competition. The bill provides that if the Tariff Commission fails to act within 3 months after a complaint against certain imports, or if the Commission's vote was evenly divided, import duties will be imposed.

Public Law 85-630, approved August 14, 1958.

Tariffs

H. R. 7004:

Makes handles made wholly or in chief value of wood imported for use in the manufacture of paint rollers dutiable at the rate applicable to wooden paintbrush handles.

Public Law 85-696, approved August 20, 1958.

Sound Recording and Film

H. R. 7454:

This measure provides that sound recordings, slides, and transparencies may enter the United States duty-free if imported by societies or institutions established for religious, philosophical, educational, scientific or literary purposes.

Provides for a 2-year suspension of duties on exposed or developed picture film imported for the arts, science, or education through broadcasting on a nonprofit basis over a television station owned or operated by the importing organization.

Public Law 85-458, approved June 13, 1958.

Religious Regalia—Importation

H. R. 7516:

Permits duty-free entry of religious investments and regalia for presentation without charge to a church or to certain religious, educational, or charitable organizations.

Public Law 85-408, approved May 16, 1958.

Small Business—Permanent Agency

H. R. 7693:

This measure amends the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended and makes the following major changes in existing law:

It removes the time limit on the life of the Small Business Administration, and makes the agency a permanent part of the Federal establishment;

It increases the revolving fund for business loans by $295 million;

It raises the maximum loan limit for business loans from $250,000 to $350,000;

It directs the Small Business Administration to assist small firms in obtaining Government research and development contracts; and

It lowers the maximum interest rate to 5½ percent from 6.

The measure declares as the policy of Congress to insure that a fair proportion of the total sales of Government property be made to small-business concerns. Liberalizes the provisions calling for assistance to small businesses in the field of procurement to make them applicable on a peacetime basis. Establishes procedures for keeping small businesses informed of proposed disposals of Government property, and for arranging such disposals, wherever practicable, in a way which will enable small businesses to engage effectively in bidding for the property.

It also provides that the Treasury may extend its RFC loans up to 10 years, and subordinates Small Business Administration claims against small businesses to State and local tax liens when the law of the State so provides.

Public Law 85-536, approved July 18, 1958.

Refunds—Alcohol and Tobacco Taxes

H. R. 8216:

Amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to prevent unjust enrichment by precluding refunds of alcohol and tobacco taxes to persons who have not borne the ultimate burden of the tax.

The new section (6423) added by this measure provides that 1 of 2 basic conditions must be met before any refund (or other allowance of a claim) of an alcohol (except occupational taxes) or tobacco tax can be made. This provision will not apply to claims for drawbacks; for credits or refunds where a commodity is withdrawn from the market, returned to bond, or lost or destroyed; or for amounts claimed where a commodity has been lost where a suit has been filed before June 15, 1957.

This provision is to be effective with respect to credits or refunds allowed or made on or after May 1, 1958.

Public Law 85-323, approved February 11, 1958.

Unrelated Business Taxable Income

H. R. 8268:

This measure revises the definition of the term "unrelated business taxable income" contained in the 1954 code. The general effect of this revision is to provide the same tax treatment for income distributed relating to limited-partnership interests held by certain testamentary charitable trusts that

is presently given income derived from dividends received by these trusts.

This excludes from the definition of unrelated business taxable income the income derived from a limited-partnership interest only to the extent that the income attributable to such interest is actually distributed. Provision to be effective with respect to taxable years of trusts beginning after December 31, 1955.

Public Law 85–367, approved April 7, 1958.

Admissions Tax—Exemption

H. R. 8794:

This measure provides exemptions from the admissions tax for athletic games between teams composed of students from elementary or secondary schools or colleges where (1) the gross proceeds are divided between the schools and colleges involved and hospitals for crippled children and (2) the proceeds inure to an exempt educational, charitable, or religious organization operated exclusively for the purpose of aiding and advancing retarded children.

Public Law 85–380, approved April 16, 1958.

Administration of Certain Collected Taxes

H. R. 8865:

This measure secures greater compliance with present law on the part of employers and others in paying over to the Government trust fund moneys withheld from employees or collected from customers. It provides that where an employer in the future is required to collect and pay over income or social-security taxes withheld from an employee, or where a person in the future is required to collect and pay over excise taxes on facilities or services (admissions, club dues, communications, transportation), and he fails to do so, he can by a notification from the Internal Revenue Service be instructed to collect such taxes and deposit them in a special trust account for the United States Government.

Persons failing to comply with this provision (unless excepted) will be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction, will be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

The exceptions apply to those cases where the failure was due to reasonable doubt as to the requirements under law, or where the lack of compliance was due to factors beyond the individual's control.

Public Law 85–321, approved February 11, 1958.

Restricted Stock Options

H. R. 9035:

This measure amends the restricted stock option provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. In general, it provides substantially the same treatment where one of these options is held by an employee at the time of his death and is exercised by his estate as is presently available where the option is exercised prior to the employee's death. Where an option is held by an employee at the time of his death, it receives a new basis for purposes of determining gain or loss with respect to the income tax. This new basis reflects the spread between the option price and the value of the stock at the date of death (or optional valuation date).

Any amount presently taxable as ordinary income at the time of the sale of the stock by the estate or heir, however, still is to be taxable and, as under present law, a deduction is to be allowed at the time of reporting of this income for any estate tax paid with respect to the decedent which is attributable to this income. The principal change made is that any appreciation in value of the stock in which the option is granted, between the time of the granting of the option and the death of the employee (or optional valuation date), no longer is to result in a taxable gain at the time of the sale of the stock by the estate or heir.

The changes are effective with respect to employees dying after December 31, 1956, in the case of taxable years ending after that date.

Public Law 85–320, approved February 11, 1958.

Footwear—Imports

H. R. 9291:

This measure closes certain loopholes in the tariff laws through which foreign producers have continued to avoid an import duty imposed specifically for the protection of domestic rubber-soled footwear industry.

H. R. 6465 of the 83d Congress, which became Public Law 479, was an effort to prevent avoidance of the tariff duties on certain footwear products by foreign producers by redefining the footwear products concerned. Since enactment of this law, foreign producers have devised still further means of avoiding the duties intended to be imposed.

This bill adds an alternative test to the present chief value of rubber. It adds to the chief value of the entire upper test, the alternative test of "composed in greater area of the outer surface." Thus, if the outer surface of the upper is predominantly rubber, the shoe will be classified for purpose of tariff as having an upper made of rubber.

The effective date of the amendment is delayed to give the President a period during which to negotiate such trade agreements as may be necessary as a result of the amendment. The amendment will go into force on a date to be specified by the President to the Secretary of the Treasury, and in any event not later than September 1, 1958.

Public Law 85–454, approved June 11, 1958.

Alumina and Bauxite Duty

H. R. 9917:

This measure continues for 2 years, until July 16, 1960, the suspension of duty on alumina when imported for use in producing aluminum, crude bauxite (not refined or otherwise advanced in condition in any manner), and calcined bauxite.

Alumina is a product used to produce aluminum, and the bulk of the alumina consumed in the United States is used for that purpose. Bauxite is a mineral used in producing alumina, abrasives, chemicals, refractionary and miscellaneous products, and is vital to the domestic industries such as the aluminum, steel, and chemical industries.

Domestic sources of bauxite are inadequate for our aluminum industry, and Canada, our principal competitor in the production of primary aluminum, allows bauxite ore and concentrates to enter duty free. Consequently, the reimposition of a United States duty on crude and concentrated bauxite and alumina would put the United States aluminum producers at a competitive disadvantage.

Public Law 85–415, approved May 16, 1958.

Tariffs

H. R. 9919:

This measure amends the custom drawback law by making applicable the substitute provision, which is now applicable to drawback on certain items, to all items. Under existing law the refund of duties may be obtained in certain cases not only where the imported material is used in the manufacture of goods exported from the United States but also where domestic materials of the same kind and quality have been substituted for imported materials in the goods manufactured for export. The substitution privilege for drawback purposes is made applicable to all classes of merchandise.

Public Law 85–673, approved August 16, 1958.

Imported Articles—Processing

H. R. 9923:

Provides for free entry of articles to be repaired or altered or processed including processes resulting in articles manufactured in the United States except alcoholic beverages.

It is believed this will prove advantageous by increasing the opportunity for a producer to bring in foreign materials for embodiment in goods being prepared solely for export, inasmuch as it would make unnecessary the payment of duty and later filing for drawback. Without changing the tariff position, it simply eliminates the attendant tieup of money and delays involved in such procedures.

Public Law 85–414, approved May 16, 1958.

Finance, Commerce, Industry Public Debt Limit—Temporary Increase

H. R. 9955:

This measure provides for a temporary increase of $5 billion in the Federal debt limit, thus raising the ceiling from $275 billion to $280 billion from the date of enactment to June 30, 1959. The need for the temporary increase was based on (1) the fact that cash balances have been running distressingly low; (2) that there is need for more flexibility for more efficient and economical management of the debt; and (3) that even if the budget were balanced, there would still be large seasonable fluctuations in receipts which make operations under the $275 billion limitation most difficult.

Public Law 85–336, approved February 28, 1958.

Metal Scrap—Duty Suspension

H. R. 10015:

This measure continues for 1 year the suspension of duties on metal scrap. The bill provides, however, that primary or virgin nonferrous metal in pig, ingot, or billet form, which is commercially usable in direct manufacturing without modification, is not included in the duty-free provisions.

Public Law 85–453, approved June 11, 1958.

Finance, Commerce, Industry Life-Insurance Tax

H. R. 10021:

This measure provides that the 1955 formula for taxing income of life insurance companies shall also apply to the taxable years beginning in 1957 until permanent legislation can be enacted.

Under the 1955 formula, a life insurance company is taxed at regular corporate rates on a portion of its net investment income. Net investment income is the gross income from investments, less investment expenses, including such items as taxes and depreciation on rented real estate. Investment income includes not only interest, dividends, and rents, but also royalties, income from negotiation or termination of leases and mortgages and other income from the operation of a business, such as a farm acquired after foreclosure of a mortgage. Under this formula (1955) the net investment income is reduced by a deduction equal to, first, 87½ percent of the first $1 million and, second, 85 percent of any remaining balance.

Enactment of this stopgap measure was required, otherwise a formula adopted in 1942 (and not in effect since 1948) would have come into operation. This 1942 formula was abandoned because it was found to be inequitable and, in some years, yielded no revenue from the life insurance operations of the companies.

Public Law 85–345, approved March 17, 1958.

Guar Seed—Free Duty

H. R. 10112:

Makes permanent the existing privilege of free importation of guar seed. This seed, which is not produced in any quantity in the United States, is used to produce a gum which is utilized by the paper and textile industries, certain food and pharmaceutical industries, any other industries, including uranium mining.

Public Law 85–397, approved May 9, 1958.

Newsprint Paper

H. R. 10277:

Reduces from 15 to 13 inches the minimum width of paper in rolls which may be imported into the United States free of duty as standard newsprint paper.

Public Law 85-645, approved August 14, 1958.

Suspension of Duty on Shoe Lathes

H. R. 10792:

This measure extends to August 7, 1960, the existing suspension of duties on copying lathes used to make rough or finished lasts from models capable of producing more than one size shoe from a single size model.

Public Law 85-416, approved May 16, 1958.

Defense Production Act Extension

H. R. 10969:

This measure provides for extending the remaining powers of the Defense Production Act for an additional 2 years, through June 30, 1960.

There are only three titles of the Defense Production Act still having the force of law.

The first has to do with priorities and allocations. They are designed to insure prompt performance of procurement contracts let by the Department of Defense and the Atomic Energy Commission through the use of preference ratings for orders.

Title III of the act provides financial devices to increase productive capacity and supply. This includes authority for the Federal Reserve Board V-loan program under which private bank loans to defense contractors are guaranteed in whole or in part by contracting agencies. This title also contains the authority for loans and procurement contracts for essential productive facilities and materials, making use of a revolving fund of $2.1 billion. Few new loans and new purchase programs are being undertaken at present, but there is considerable activity under earlier commitments. These provisions may, however, become important in connection with defense measures resulting from nuclear and space programs.

Title 7, which is extended by this measure, contains a number of administrative provisions, the most important of which deals with the authority for voluntary agreements providing for antitrust immunity and for the use of w. o. c.'s (without compensation) and the new executive reserve, with exemptions from the conflict-of-interest statutes.

Public Law 85-471, approved June 28, 1958.

Household Effects—Importation

H. R. 11407:

This measure extends to July 1, 1960, the free entry of personal and household effects of any person returning to the United States under Government orders.

This duty-free privilege avoids undue administrative burdens upon persons evacuated to the United States, and is an important morale and inducement factor in overseas service.

Public Law 85-398, approved May 9, 1958.

The Virgin Islands Corporation Act (63 Stat. 350)

H. R. 12226:

The Virgin Islands Corporation is a wholly owned Government corporation, created by the act of June 30, 1949 (48 U. S. C. 1407), as successor to the Virgin Islands Company incorporated in 1934. The Corporation has succession until June 30, 1959, unless dissolved sooner by act of Congress. The major revenue-producing activities during the fiscal year 1957 were the growing of sugarcane, the manufacturing of raw sugar, the management of certain Navy property in the islands, the generation and distribution of electric power, and the operation of a loan program. In addition, the Corporation is engaged in non-revenue-producing activities to promote, through economic development, the general welfare of the inhabitants of the Virgin Islands.

Failure to extend the corporate life of the Corporation would cause a relief problem in the Virgin Islands and would imperil a substantial investment of the Federal Government. This measure extends the life of the Corporation to June 30, 1969.

Public Law 85-913, approved September 2, 1958.

Federal Reserve Banks

H. R. 12586:

This measure extends for 2 years, until June 30, 1960, the present authority of the Federal Reserve banks to purchase securities directly from the Treasury in amounts up to $5 billion outstanding at any one time.

This authority supplies a two-way street in that within the same limitations, the Federal Reserve banks may sell these obligations directly to the United States.

Under the statute, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System must include in its annual report to Congress detailed information about these direct purchases from or sales to the United States by Federal Reserve banks.

This direct purchase authority of the Federal Reserve banks is important to the Treasury because it can be used to smooth out the effects on the money market of short-run peaks in the Government's cash receipts and disbursements.

Public Law 85-476, approved June 30, 1958.

Corporate and Excise Tax Extension

H. R. 12695:

This measure provides for 1-year extension (to July 1, 1959) of the present corporate income-tax rate of 52 percent, and also provides for 1-year extension (to July 1, 1959) of the existing excise-tax rates on distilled spirits, beer, wine, cigarettes, passenger automobiles, and automobile parts and accessories.

It repeals, effective August 1, 1958, the tax on the transportation of property, including the tax on coal and on the transportation of oil by pipeline.

Public Law 85-475, approved June 30, 1958.

International Development Association Study

Senate Resolution 264:

Expresses the sense of the Senate that a prompt study should be made.

Recommends that the objectives of the study should include:

1. Providing long-term loans available at a reasonable interest rate and repayable in whole or in part in local currencies to supplement the International Bank.

2. Facilitating as to such loans, the use of local and other foreign currencies, including those available to the United States from sale of agricultural surpluses and other programs.

3. Insuring that development funds can be made available by a process which would encourage multilateral contributions.

Passed the Senate, July 23, 1958.

Tax Protocol with United Kingdom

Executive A:

The protocol amends the convention for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, signed April 16, 1945, as twice previously modified, in the following particulars:

1. Royalties paid from the use of copyrights, patents, designs, secret processes and formulas, trademarks and like property, and derived from sources within the United States by a resident of the United Kingdom, who is subject to the United Kingdom tax on such royalties, shall be exempt from United States tax if the United Kingdom resident is not engaged in business in the United States through a permanent establishment, or if he is so engaged, the royalties are not directly associated with the business or carried on through the permanent establishment. An identical exemption is provided for a United States resident with respect to royalties from sources within the United Kingdom.

2. Subject to sections 901 to 905 of the Internal Revenue Code as of January 1, 1958, the United Kingdom tax will be allowed as a credit against the United States tax. If the recipient of a dividend from a United Kingdom corporation includes in his gross income for United States income-tax purposes the amount of the United Kingdom tax, he will be deemed to have paid the United Kingdom tax on the dividend. Likewise, if a recipient of a royalty includes in his gross income for United States income-tax purposes the amount of the United Kingdom tax, he will be deemed to have paid the United Kingdom tax legally deduced from the royalties by or through the person who paid the tax.

Ratified by the Senate, August 13, 1958.

Foreign relations

Glacier National Park Loop Road

Senate Resolution 293:

This resolution requests that the Secretary of State bring to the attention of the appropriate officials of the Government of Canada the deep interest of the Senate in the completion of the loop road linking the Glacier National Park in the United States and the Waterton Lakes National Park in Canada.

Glacier National Park in the United States adjoins Waterton Lakes National Park in Canada. Construction of 3 missing links, totaling approximately 34 miles, will provide a loop road approximately 130 miles long joining the 2 parks. Traffic between them now moves over a single road on their eastern side. Completion of the loop will join them, also, on the west.

Senate adopted unanimously July 1, 1958.

Study of Relations With American Republics

Senate Resolution 330:

This resolution authorizes the Committee on Foreign Relations to make a full and complete study of United States relations with the American Republics.

Passed the Senate July 31, 1958.

Study of Problems of World Disarmament

Senate Resolution 335:

Authorizes the Committee on Foreign Relations to make a full and continuing study of the problems of world disarmament.

Passed Senate July 28, 1958.

Foreign Policy Study

Senate Resolution 336:

This resolution authorizes the Committee on Foreign Relations to make a full and complete study of United States foreign policy. The committee is directed to address its attention to:

(a) The concepts which govern United States foreign relations and the policies by which these concepts are pursued.

(b) The present state of the relations of the United States with principal nations and geographic areas.

(c) The administration and coordination of policies and programs by the State Department and other governmental agencies engaged in activities abroad.

(d) The relationship of other Government policies and activities and private activity which influence United States relations with the rest of the world.

Passed Senate July 31, 1958.

Mutual Security Authorization Act

H. R. 12181.

This measure authorizes a total appropriation of $3.03 billion to continue for another year the programs under mutual security. Of this amount, $1.6 billion is for military assistance and $810 million for defense support.

It incorporates the Development Loan Fund under a Board of Directors consisting of the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs as Chairman, the Director of

the International Cooperation Administration, the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank, the Managing Director of the Fund, and the United States Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

This measure also:

Authorizes $20 million for contributions to the United Nations fund for special projects and technical assistance program.

Prohibits, with certain exceptions, the use of either dollars or counterpart funds to retire debts of foreign governments.

Covers certain employees of the mutual security program, with disability, and death benefits and compensation during internment by an enemy, and compensation for injury or death resulting from war-risk hazards.

Requires review of Western Hemisphere defense plans annually.

Provides for a study, under the direction of the President, by certain Government agencies of the relation of the program to American private enterprise and the American economy, to make recommendations to prevent any possible adverse effects, with special reference to areas of substantial labor surplus, and to further the role of American private enterprise in promoting our foreign policy.

Prohibits officers and employees of United States from accepting compensation or other benefits from foreign governments; except an officer may accept an office from a foreign government.

Creates post of Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

Following is a complete breakdown of the authorization for fiscal 1959:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Administration request	House amounts	Senate amendment	Conference agreement
Sec. 103 (a). Military assistance	1,800,000	1,640,000	2,490,000	1,605,000
Sec. 131 (b). Defense support	835,000	775,000		810,000
Sec. 304. Bilateral technical cooperation	142,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Sec. 306 (a). United Nations technical cooperation	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
Sec. 306 (b). OAS technical cooperation	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500
Sec. 400 (a). Special assistance	212,000	185,000	212,000	202,500
Sec. 405 (c). U. N. High Commissioner for Refugees	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200
Sec. 405 (d). Escapees	8,600	8,600	8,600	8,600
Sec. 406. U. N. Children's Fund	11,000	11,000	11,000	11,000
Sec. 407. Palestine refugees	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
Sec. 408. NATO civilian expenses	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,100
Sec. 409 (c). Ocean freight	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Sec. 410. Control Act expenses	33,000	33,000	33,000	33,000
Sec. 411 (b). ICA administrative expenses	5,500	5,500	5,500	5,500
Sec. 419 (a). Atoms for Peace	200,000	100,000	200,000	155,000
Sec. 451 (b). Contingency fund				
Total	3,297,900	2,958,900	3,068,900	3,031,400

Public Law 85-477; approved June 30, 1958.

Foreign Relations Protection of Alaskan Red Salmon Fisheries

Senate Resolution 263:

The Senate, by unanimous vote, adopted this resolution urging the Secretary of State and other appropriate officials of the United States to initiate negotiations immediately with the Government of Japan for the purpose of further effectuating the 1952 treaty between the United States, Canada, and Japan, in which the Japanese Government agreed to abstain from fishing stocks of salmon in the North Pacific east of a line tentatively set at longitude 175° W. This undertaking was accompanied by an obligation assumed by the United States and Canada to carry out necessary conservation measures for the salmon stocks in specified areas east of this line.

Indications are that there is a depletion of Alaskan salmon resources resulting from intensified Japanese fishing activity upon red-salmon stocks of North American origin in the North Pacific fisheries area.

Senate adopted March 6, 1958 by voice vote.

International Development Association

Senate Resolution 264:

This resolution expresses the sense of the Senate that prompt study should be given by the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems with respect to the establishment of an International Development Association in cooperation with the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Passed Senate July 23, 1958.

Greetings to Israel

Senate Resolution 294:

The Senate unanimously adopted Senate Resolution 294 extending the greetings of the Senate to the State of Israel upon its 10th anniversary as an independent nation on April 24.

Adopted April 23, 1958.

United States-Canada Relations

Senate Resolution 359:

Authorizes the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to establish a subcommittee to explore with appropriate officials of the United States Government and with members of the Canadian Parliament the desirability and feasibility of increased systematic discussion between legislators of the two countries on problems of common concern.

Adopted in Senate, August 8, 1958.

West Indies—Greetings

Senate Concurrent Resolution 77:

This resolution, adopted unanimously by Congress, extends the greetings of the Congress of the United States to the Federal Legislature of the West Indies on the occasion of its first convening.

The Federation of the West Indies, made up of British possessions, came into being on January 3, 1958, with the investiture of Governor General Lord Hailes. Elections for the lower house of the Federal legislature were held on March 25, 1958, in Jamaica, Barbadoes, Trinidad and Tobago, Grenada, Dominica, St. Vincent, St. Lucia, Antigua, Barbuda, St. Christopher, Nevis and Anquilla, and Montserrat. Members of the upper house were appointed by the Governor General in consultation with political leaders in the islands. The Federal legislature will be officially convened for the first time at Port of Spain, Trinidad, on April 22, 1958, under the auspices of Princess Margaret of Great Britain.

Senate adopted April 16; House, April 17, 1958.

Hungarian Revolt—Executions

House Concurrent Resolution 343:

This resolution expresses indignation at the secret trial and execution in Rumania of Imre Nagy, former Prime Minister of Hungary, and his colleagues, Pal Maleter, Miklos Gimes, and Joszef Sziagyi.

In the fall of 1956, Premier Nagy, led a Government which, supported by uprisings of the Hungarian people, sought to lighten the oppressive Communist dictatorship which had been clamped upon Hungary by the Soviet Union. During the uprisings, Soviet military forces were sent into Budapest and other strategic locations and, as a result, thousands of Hungarian patriots perished and tens of thousands were forced to flee the country.

On November 8, 1956, the U. N. General Assembly, by a vote of 50 to 8, condemned the Soviet intervention in Hungary. The Soviet military command in Hungary, ignored the U. N. resolution, forced the Nagy government out of office and replaced it with a puppet regime under Janes Kadar. Premier Nagy sought refuge in the Yugoslav Embassy in Budapest. Lured by promises of sanctuary, Premier Nagy was seized by agents of the Kadar government, and held incommunicado in Rumania. It has now become known that Premier Nagy and his colleagues were tried and executed in secret.

This resolution calls upon the President to join with other nations in expressing revulsion of this atrocious act of political reprisal, and again expresses the sympathy of the American people for the people of Hungary still under Soviet repression.

Adopted by a unanimous vote of the Senate June 24, 1958; adopted by House, June 19, 1958.

United States-Canada Relations

Senate Concurrent Resolution 108:

Authorizes the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs to establish a subcommittee to jointly explore with appropriate officials of the United States Government and with members of the Canadian Parliament the desirability and feasibility of increased systematic discussion between legislators of the two countries on problems of common concern.

Adopted in Senate, August 8, 1958.

United Nations Forces

Senate Concurrent Resolution 109:

This resolution expresses that it is the sense of the Congress that a force similar to the United Nations emergency force should be set up as a permanent arm of the United Nations, to be composed of units and volunteers from members of the Security Council, with its equipment and expenses to be provided for in the regular budget of the United Nations.

Passed Senate July 23, 1958.

Exploration of Outer Space

House Concurrent Resolution 332:

This resolution expresses the sense of the Congress that the United States should strive for an international agreement banning the use of outer space for military purposes; that it should seek an international agreement providing for joint exploration of outer space and establishing a method by which disputes as to outer space will be solved by legal, peaceful methods; and that the United States should press for an international agreement for joint cooperation in the advancement of scientific developments flowing from the exploration of outer space.

Passed Senate July 23, 1958.

World Science-Pan Pacific Exposition

S. 3680:

This measure provides for United States participation in the World Science-Pan Pacific Exposition to be held at Seattle, Wash., in 1961. It establishes a United States World Science-Pan Pacific Exposition Commission, provides for the appointment of a Commissioner and two Assistant Commissioners, and authorizes the necessary appropriations for effective participation by the United States.

The exposition is to commemorate the centennial of the physical fixing of the boundary line between the United States

and Canada, to depict the role of science in modern civilization, and to exhibit the varied cultures of the nations of the Pacific rim.

The Commission is to be composed of 16 persons: the heads of 10 departments and agencies—State, Commerce, Defense; Health, Education, and Welfare; Smithsonian Institute, National Science Foundation, Atomic Energy Commission, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific Research and Development, National Academy of Sciences; and 3 Members of the House appointed by the Speaker and 3 Members of the Senate appointed by the President of the Senate.

Passed Senate June 20, 1958.

Export-Import Bank—Increased Lending Authority

S. 3149:

This measure increases the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington from the present $5 billion to $7 billion; it makes a corresponding increase in the bank's authority to borrow from the United States Treasury.

The bank has broad general powers to engage in banking in order to aid in financing and facilitating exports and the exchange of commodities between the United States and foreign countries.

This bank is the principal instrument of the Federal Government which assists foreign trade on a business basis. Under Congressional mandate, the bank supplements and encourages private capital and does not compete with it; the bank's loans must offer reasonable assurance of repayment; and the bank makes no grants. The bank cooperates with private capital, sometimes through joint lending to individual ventures, sometimes through guaranties of part or all of private loans, sometimes through sales of loans from its portfolio.

The bank makes development loans to private companies in foreign countries, including both American and foreign firms. It makes development loans to other governments or to official institutions, sometimes for the purpose of building needed basic public facilities, such as highways or port improvements, sometimes for the purpose of relending to private enterprise.

Public Law 85-424, approved May 22, 1958.

Olympic Winter Games

S. 3262:

This act authorizes the Department of Defense to support the VIII Olympic Winter Games to be held in California in February 1960 with personnel and equipment, and authorizes a Federal grant of $4 million for the construction of a sports arena for use in connection with these games.

These games are to be held in Squaw Valley, and the State of California is to bear most of the expenses of preparing for the games. The State has appropriated $7,990,000 directly for this purpose, of which $2,990,000 was appropriated to make the Olympic site a permanent State park. In addition, the State of California is spending $43 million to widen the major highways that lead to Squaw Valley to 4 lanes. The State of Nevada has appropriated $200,000 to assist in staging the games.

The competitors in the games will come from approximately 37 countries and, as host for this event, the United States has an opportunity to promote international understanding and to give the visitors a favorable impression of this country.

Public Law 85-365, approved April 3, 1958.

Naval Vessels—Transfer

S. 3506:

This measure authorizes the President to loan to various foreign countries not more than 43 ships from the reserve fleet. The ship types involved are destroyers, destroyer escorts, and submarines. The bill also authorized a 2-year extension of an existing loan of a small aircraft carrier to France.

Recipients and number of ships involved are:

1. North Atlantic Treaty Organization and European area (the Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, Italy, Norway, Spain, and Turkey), not to exceed 19 ships.

2. Latin American area (Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Peru, and Uruguay), not to exceed 17 ships.

3. Far Eastern area (Japan, Taiwan, Thailand), not to exceed 4 ships.

4. A pool of not to exceed three ships to be loans to friendly foreign nations in an emergency.

The ships will be used by the recipient countries to discharge naval responsibilities assumed by them in their areas. Use of these ships will contribute to the total antisubmarine capability of the Free World.

This loan program is valuable to the United States for many reasons. It will assist in the mutual defense of the free nations. It will result in having ships in operation at critical points in the event of an emergency. The United States Navy reserve fleet will become more effectively dispersed; ships in operation are of greater value to us than ships in the inactive reserve fleet.

Another advantage is that these loans will offer the opportunity for extending United States influence throughout the world.

Public Law 85-532; approved July 18, 1958.

Inter-American Highway

H. R. 7870:

This measure authorizes an additional $10 million to complete construction of the Inter-American Highway.

The Inter-American Highway is an international highway extending from the United States-Mexican border at Laredo, Tex., to the Panama Canal, about 3,200 miles in length. The portion in Mexico, about 1,627 miles, has been completed entirely by Mexico with its own funds. The remaining 1,573 miles lies in the 6 independent Republics of Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Panama.

Public Law 85-452, approved June 6, 1958.

AEC Exchange With Friendly Nations

H. R. 12716:

This measure amends the Atomic Energy Act to permit the following military cooperation when the President determines that the actions concerned will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

In the field of information: Communications to friendly nations or defense organizations of additional design information to permit essential training and planning by our allies.

Communications to friendly nations or defense organizations of additional atomic weapons design information necessary to make any delivery systems manufactured by our allies fully compatible with our atomic weapons.

Exchange with friendly nations of information that will improve the receiving nation's atomic weapon design, development, or production capability.

Communications to friendly nations or defense organizations of information necessary to military applications of atomic energy in addition to weapons or military reactors.

In the field of materials and equipment: Transfer of special nuclear material for manufacture into atomic weapons or for other military uses by the receiving nation.

Transfer for military applications of utilization facilities, such as nuclear propulsion and powerplants, and necessary nuclear fuels.

Transfer of nonnuclear parts of atomic weapons to improve the receiving nation's state of training and operational readiness, provided the receiving nation has made substantial progress in the development of atomic weapons, and other nonnuclear parts of atomic weapons system involving restricted data, and if such transfer will not contribute significantly to that nation's atomic weapon design, development, or fabrication capability.

Public Law 85-479; approved July 2, 1958.

General Government

Federal Civil Defense—Reorganization

Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1958:

This reorganization plan provides new arrangements for the conduct of Federal defense mobilization and civil defense functions.

It transfers to the President the functions vested by law in the Federal Civil Defense Administration and those so vested in the Office of Defense Mobilization. This will result in establishing a single pattern with respect to the vesting of defense mobilization and civil defense functions. Under the plan, the broad program responsibilities for coordinating and conducting the interrelated defense mobilization and civil defense functions will be vested in the President for appropriate delegation as the rapidly changing character of the nonmilitary preparedness program warrants.

The plan consolidates the Office of Defense Mobilization and the Federal Civil Defense Administration to form a new Office of Defense and Civilian Mobilization in the Executive Office of the President.

The membership of the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization on the National Security Council is transferred to the Director of the Office of Defense and Civilian Mobilization. The Civil Defense Advisory Council is transferred to the Office of Defense and Civilian Mobilization.

Initially, the Office of Defense and Civilian Mobilization will perform the civil defense and defense mobilization functions now performed by the Office of Defense Mobilization and the Federal Civil Defense Administration. After these actions are taken, the direction and coordination of the civil defense and defense mobilization activities assigned to the departments and agencies will comprise a principal remaining responsibility of the Office of Defense and Civilian Mobilization.

Effective June 23, 1958.

Free Citizenship Day

Senate Joint Resolution 159:

This resolution authorizes and requests the President of the United States to proclaim July 4, 1958, as a day of rededication to the responsibilities of free citizenship in order that America may continue to hold high the torch of freedom as a beacon for all freedom-loving nations.

The Fourth of July commemorates the greatest single event in American history, the achievement of independence. No day of patriotic observance which this Nation celebrates is more replete with inspiration for opposition to the forces of oppression than the day on which the Declaration of Independence was adopted.

The Congress, in adopting this resolution, expressed the belief that this Nation, in celebration of the signing of the Declaration of Independence, should rededicate itself to the ideals which are so well expressed in that basic charter of our freedom.

Public Law 85-498; approved July 3, 1958.

Local Tax Immunity

S. 6:

This measure is designed to prevent the constitutional immunity of the United States from State and local taxes from being extended to cover purchases made by private, independent contractors doing work for the United States. It seeks to accomplish this objective by providing for the elimination of claims of immunity from such taxes by any person on the ground that he is a contractor performing work for and, at the same time,

acting as the agent of the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof, in the procurement of tangible property of any kind for use in the performance of the contract.

The basic objective of this measure is to overcome the effect of a court decision holding that since a (certain) contract with the Navy Department specifically provided that the contractor was to act as purchasing agent for the Government, the real purchaser, the State was actually levying a tax on an instrumentality of the Federal Government which it could not constitutionally do in the absence of consent by the Congress. This act will prevent the immunity of the Federal Government from attaching to what is essentially a tax levied on a private contractor or his supplier through the purchasing agency provision.

Passed Senate by voice vote March 3, 1958.

United States Marshals—Bonds

S. 1438:

This measure permits the Government to purchase a single bond to cover all United States marshals by repealing the requirement that the bond of a United States marshal be approved by a judge of the district court of the district for which the marshal is appointed and filed and recorded in the office of the clerk. In substitution for the existing requirement that a United States marshal give a bond before entering on the duties of his office, the only requirement under this act is that the marshal be bonded.

Passed Senate by voice vote March 6, 1958.

Marshals' Fees

S. 1439:

This measure amends section 1921, title 28, United States Code, so as to change the fees to be collected by United States marshals.

Passed the Senate July 28, 1958.

Patent Office

S. 1864:

This measure authorizes the increase in the membership of the Board of Appeals in the Patent Office from 9 to 15, and increases the compensation of the Commissioner and each Assistant Commissioner.

Passed Senate July 23, 1958.

National Air Museum

S. 1985:

This measure authorizes the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to prepare plans and specifications for the construction of a building for use by Smithsonian as a National Air Museum. The building is to be opposite the National Gallery of Art, and of a scale and design to conform with the gallery.

The building is to be large enough to show the great "firsts" of aviation and the technical and scientific devices that have advanced the science and art of aviation.

Passed Senate June 26, 1958.

Surplus Property—Advertised and Negotiated Disposal

S. 2224:

This measure is designed to prescribe the situations in which the disposal of surplus Federal property, real and personal, must be accomplished by public advertising, and those in which disposals of such property may be accomplished by negotiation.

Requires that surplus property be disposed of by public advertising, unless disposal is made by abandonment, destruction, or donation; through contract realty brokers; on a negotiated basis in certain situations; or, in the case of personal property, by sales at fixed prices.

Sales may be negotiated in the following instances:

Particular lots of property during a national emergency;

To further the public health, safety, or national security;

Where public exigency will not permit delay of advertising;

To prevent dislocation of the national economy from disruptive impacts of disposals on an industry;

Where value of property is less than $1,000;

Where bid prices after advertising are not reasonable or have not been independently arrived at in open competition;

Where character or condition of real property or unusual circumstances make it impractical to advertise publicly for competitive bids;

To State and local governments at fair market value; and

Where otherwise authorized by the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 or other law.

Public Law 85-486; approved July 2, 1958.

Government Property Leases—Options

S. 2231:

This measure clarifies the authority of the Administrator of General Services to review or extend the term of leases of Government property for one or more additional periods, and to permit the exercise of options to purchase pursuant to the practice commonly followed by private business.

Passed Senate by voice vote March 3, 1958.

GSA—Administrative Operations Fund

S. 2283:

This measure authorizes the establishment of an administrative operations fund on a permanent basis. It permits the Administrator of General Services Administration to transfer up to 5 percent of the amount included in each annual appropriation, but not more than the amount included in the respective program appropriations, to an administrative operations fund, from which the cost of legal, financial, administrative, compliance, information and business services are to be charged.

This procedure will make possible some savings to the Government and will simplify the General Services Administration's internal budgeting and accounting systems.

Passed Senate by voice vote March 3, 1958.

Federal Agencies—Leasing Space

S. 2533:

This measure authorizes the Administrator of General Services to enter into leases for periods not in excess of 10 years for the accommodation of Federal agencies in buildings which are in existence or may be erected by lessors, within or without the District of Columbia, and to assign and reassign space to Federal agencies.

The essential purpose of the bill is to improve the economy and the efficiency of GSA's space-leasing program by authorizing the Administrator to use leasing techniques similar to those employed by private enterprise in acquiring space by lease to meet its needs.

Public Law 85-493; approved July 2, 1958.

Surplus Property—Disposals

S. 2752:

This measure is designed to clarify, modify, and improve certain phases of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act and procedures relative to the disposal of surplus property by executive agencies. To accomplish this, it modifies the requirement in section 207 of the act that executive agencies, at the beginning of negotiations, seek the advice of the Attorney General as to whether a proposed surplus property disposal would tend to create or maintain a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws. It would require, instead, that notification to the Attorney General be made whenever such disposal is contemplated by any executive agency, thus leaving it to the agency to determine the appropriate time for submission.

It also requires that when such notice is transmitted to the Attorney General by any executive agency, other than the General Services Administration, a copy of the notification must be transmitted simultaneously to the Administrator of General Services. It exempts from the requirements of section 207 proposed disposals of any surplus property if the aggregate amount of the original acquisition cost to the Government, plus capital expenditures is less than $1 million. It also permits an exemption of proposed disposal of salvage and scrap where the acquisition cost is less than $3 million.

Public Law 85-680, approved August 19, 1958.

Department of State

S. 3112:

This measure establishes in the Department of State a new position of Assistant for International Cultural Relations. The Assistant, who is to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, will have the duty to coordinate the international exchange programs of the Department under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, the Mutual Security Act of 1954, the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956 and other legislation relating to exchange of persons, in order to assure joint policy and planning, equitable budgeting and administrative cooperation.

Passed Senate July 28, 1958.

Federal Building Sites—Leases

S. 3142:

This measure extends the authority of the Administrator of General Services to lease out Federal building sites until needed for construction purposes.

Authorizes the General Services Administration to negotiate leases with former owners or tenants in possession of property immediately after the Government acquired the property. It also permits the GSA to deposit the rent received from lessors into a single building management fund instead of being held in separate special accounts.

It authorizes the General Services Administration to use rental funds for demolition and improvement of property.

Passed Senate June 23, 1958.

National Cultural Center

S. 3335:

This measure establishes in the Smithsonian Institution a Board of Trustees of the National Cultural Center, composed of 15 Federal officials, members ex officio, and 15 general trustees appointed by the President, to arrange for the construction of the National Cultural Center, with funds raised by voluntary contributions.

The Cultural Center is to be located on a site in the District of Columbia bounded by Rock Creek Parkway, New Hampshire Avenue, the proposed Inner Loop Freeway, and the approaches to the authorized Theodore Roosevelt Bridge.

The Board is to maintain and administer the National Center, present programs of the performing arts, lectures and other programs, and provide facilities for other civic activities.

The measure also establishes an Advisory Committee on the Arts, designated by the President, to advise and consult with the Board and make recommendations regarding cultural activities to be carried on in the center.

Passed Senate June 20, 1958.

Immigration

S. 3653:

This measure authorizes the acquisition of sites and the construction of buildings for a training school for the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Passed Senate July 28, 1958.

Property Payments in Lieu of Taxes

S. 3677:

This measure extends for 2 years, from December 31, 1958, the period for which payments in lieu of taxes may be made to State

and local taxing authorities by the Federal Government relating to certain real property on which payments were authorized by Public Law 388, 84th Congress.

Public Law 388 was designed to furnish temporary relief for local taxing authorities under an undue and unexpected burden as the result of transfer of taxable real property from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or its subsidiaries to another Federal agency or department, and which transfer operated to take the property out of taxation. It authorized payments in lieu of taxes only if the property was transferred by RFC, or one of its subsidiaries, to another Federal agency or department on or after January 1, 1946, and only if title to this property had been held continuously by the United States since the transfer. The Government department having custody or control of real property meeting these conditions is required to pay the local taxing authority for the period commencing on January 1, 1955, and terminating on December 31, 1958, an amount equal to the real property tax.

This measure extends this payment period to December 31, 1960.

Public Law 85–579; approved August 1, 1958.

Functions of the Surgeon General

S. 3727:

The purpose of this legislation has but a single objective, namely, to enable the Surgeon General more effectively to promote the cause of peace through promoting the cause of health throughout the world. This is accomplished by amending the Public Health Service Act so as to clarify the functions and responsibilities of the Surgeon General with respect to international health activities and to encourage and facilitate international cooperation in the conquest of disease and the promotion of health.

Passed Senate August 14, 1958.

Penitentiary Imprisonment

S. 3874:

This measure amends section 4083, title 18, United States Code, and provides that persons sentenced for more than 1 year may be confined in any United States penitentiary but that a sentence for an offense punishable by imprisonment for 1 year or less shall not be served in a penitentiary without the defendant's consent.

Passed Senate July 28, 1958.

Taxation of Costs

S. 3875:

This measure provides for the allowance of costs for witnesses and fees paid to the clerk to the prevailing party in suits against the United States or against Internal Revenue officials if the defendant puts in issue plaintiff's right to recover.

Passed Senate July 28, 1958.

National Training School for Boys

S. 3876:

This measure authorizes the acquisition of land and the construction of buildings for the National Training School for Boys at a site to be selected by the Attorney General, and authorizes for sale the Training School real estate in the District of Columbia.

Passed Senate July 28, 1958.

Government Printing Office

S. 4010:

Authorizes the Public Printer to designate deputy disbursing officers to act for a limited period in the case of death, resignation or separation of the disbursing officer.

Passed Senate August August 4, 1958.

District Courts—Guam

H. R. 4215:

This measure increases the salary of the Guam United States District Court judge from $19,000 to $22,500 a year. It lengthens the Guam District Court judgeship of the District Courts of Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, and the Virgin Islands.

Provides the District Court of Guam with jurisdiction of a district court of the United States in all causes arising under Federal laws regardless of the amount involved.

Public Law 85–444; approved June 4, 1958.

Scientific Research

S. 4039:

Authorizes Government departments and agencies which make contracts for basic scientific research with nonprofit universities or research organizations, to make grants to those institutions for the support of basic research and to vest in those institutions title to equipment provided with grant or contract funds.

Passed Senate August 4, 1958.

Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization

S. 4059:

Changes name of "Office of Defense and Civilian Mobilization" to "Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization" so as to avoid confusion of this organization with the Department of Defense.

Public Law 85–763, approved August 26, 1958.

Administrative Office of the Courts

S. 4142:

This measure changes the title of the "Assistant Director" of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts to "Deputy Director" and creates two positions in grade 18 under the Classification Act.

Passed Senate August 4, 1958.

Withholding of Information

H. R. 2767:

This measure amends section 22, title 5, United States Code, which authorizes the head of an executive department to prescribe regulations for, inter alia, the custody, use and preservation of the records and papers of his department to indicate the Congressional intent that the section does not authorize withholding information from the public or limiting the availability of records to the public.

Public Law 85–619; approved August 12, 1958.

Additional Peremptory Challenges in Civil Cases

H. R. 3368:

The present law now permits three peremptory challenges in civil cases to each party, and states that for the purpose of making challenges several plaintiffs or several defendants shall be considered as a single party. However, the law permits an exception to this general rule, where there is more than one defendant. In such an instance the courts may allow the defendants additional peremptory challenges and permit them to be exercised separately or jointly. It is the intention of this legislation to extend the same privilege to multiple plaintiffs.

Vetoed September 2, 1958.

Alaska Public Lands

H. R. 4035:

This measure provides for settlement and entry of public lands in Alaska containing coal, oil, or gas by permitting entry on such lands for homesites, headquarters sites, or trade and manufacturing sites under the act of May 14, 1958, or for purposes of a soldier's additional homestead entry.

Public Law 85–725, approved August 23, 1958.

Pearl Harbor Memorial

H. R. 5809:

This measure authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to cooperate with the Pacific War Memorial Commission of Hawaii, in the development of a design for a proposed U. S. S. *Arizona* memorial and museum at Pearl Harbor, T. H.

The hulk of the U. S. S. *Arizona* lies in Pearl Harbor, where the vessel was sunk during the Japanese attack on December 7, 1941. The memorial and museum is proposed as an appropriate tribute to the 1,102 American servicemen who died during the attack on Pearl Harbor.

Public Law 85–344, approved March 15, 1958.

Hawaiian Organic Act

H. R. 5865:

The purpose of H. R. 5865 is to amend section 80 of the Hawaiian Organic Act (48 U. S. C., sec. 546) with reference to election of members of the board of trustees of the Territorial employees' retirement system.

Under an act of the Territorial legislature, 3 of the 7 members are elected by members of the system. The Territorial attorney general, however, has advised that the election of these members is in conflict with provisions of the organic act which require the Governor to nominate and appoint, with the consent of the Territorial senate, members of any board of a public character created by law.

H. R. 5865 ratifies the existing Territorial statute and confirms the service on the board of present employee members.

Public Law 85–793, approved August 28, 1958.

Pioneer Airplane Events—Commemorate

H. R. 6078:

This measure authorizes, at Fort Myer, Va., the erection of a marker to commemorate the first flight of an airplane at an Army installation and a bronze plaque to mark the site of the first crash of an airplane on an Army installation.

September 3, 1958, marks the 50th anniversary of the first airplane flight on an Army installation. The flight, by Orville Wright, was the first in a series of tests to be made before Government acceptance of the airplane. The flight lasted for 1 minute and 11 seconds. The first crash of an aircraft on an Army installation occurred on September 17, 1908. Lt. Thomas E. Selfridge accompanied Wright on a flight to comply with specifications requiring that the plane be airborne for a specified period with a pilot and one passenger aboard. The plane crashed and Lieutenant Selfridge died as a result of injuries.

Public Law 85–330, approved February 15, 1958.

Abbreviated Records in Reviewing Administrative Agency Proceedings

H. R. 6788:

The purpose of the legislation is to save time and expense by permitting the several courts of appeals to adopt rules authorizing the abbreviation of the transcript and other parts of the record made before Federal administrative agencies when the orders of those agencies are to be reviewed by the courts of appeals. If review proceedings have been instituted in two or more courts with respect to the same order, the bill requires the Federal administrative agency involved to file the record in that court in which the proceeding was first instituted, but in the interest of justice and for the convenience of the parties, such court may thereafter transfer the proceedings to another court of appeals.

Public Law 85–791, approved August 28, 1958.

Lis Pendens in Federal Courts

H. R. 7306:

This act requires that an action with respect to real property pending before a United States district court, must be recorded, if State law so provides, in order to be considered constructive notice that the action is pending.

Public Law 85–689, approved August 20, 1958.

Probation

H. R. 7260:

This measure corrects existing law which limits courts in convictions on a one count

indictment to either the imposition of a jail sentence or placement on probation. The measure would permit confinement in a jail type or treatment institution for a period not exceeding 6 months in connection with the grant of probation.

Public Law 85–741, approved August 23, 1958.

Meetings of Hawaiian Legislature

H. R. 7564:

Authorizes the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to meet annually in regular session. Sessions in odd years, designated as a regular session are limited to 60 days, and sessions in even years designated budget sessions are limited to 30 days. The Governor may extend any session 30 days. The measure also authorizes special sessions.

Public Law 85–690, approved August 20, 1958.

The Court of Customs and Patent Appeals

H. R. 7866:

The purpose of the legislation is to amend title 28 of the United States Code so as to make the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals to be a court established under article III of the Constitution of the United States.

Public Law 85–755, approved August 25, 1958.

Alaska Statehood

H. R. 7999:

This measure provides for the admission of Alaska into the Union without further Congressional action, as a full and equal sovereign State; and for confirmation of the constitution and admission of the State on completion of a State election and ministerial actions necessary to the transition.

Property grant provisions: Allows the State to select within 25 years a total of 103,350,000 acres from Federal lands in Alaska, land area of Alaska is 365.6 million acres; 400,000 acres of this total amount may be selected from national forests to be used for community expansion and recreation sites. After transfer of the total selected amount, the United States will still own about 70 percent of the land in Alaska as opposed to the present figure of 98 percent.

Financial provisions: The new State is granted 70 percent of the net proceeds from sales of fur seals and sea-otter skins from the Pribilof Islands, which will be approximately $1 million a year.

Provisions of Public Law 88 of the 85th Congress is extended to the State and, under this act, the Territory will receive a total of 90 percent of the profits from Government coal mines and 90 percent of the profits from operations under the Mineral Leasing Act. Thirty-seven and one-half percent of the proceeds from mineral operations is earmarked for roads and educational purposes, and the remainder will be available for distribution as the legislature directs.

Grants to the State 5 percent of the net proceeds from sales of public lands in Alaska to be used for public-school purposes.

Grants to the State 37½ percent of the proceeds from its national forests, which is 12½ percent more than is received by other States. Payment of the additional 12½ percent continues only until otherwise directed by Congress and ceases in 10 years without further Congressional action.

Title to the submerged lands is vested in the new State.

The bill also authorizes a Federal appropriation of $15 million to be used for land surveys.

Special nation-defense withdrawals: Provides an area in northern and western Alaska from which the President may make future withdrawals of land for national defense purposes. The area subject to withdrawals contains about 276,000 square miles and 24,000 people. The population includes 15,000 Indians or other natives, and 5,000 persons in military service or in the civilian employ of the Department of Defense. In general, the withdrawal provisions allow the President to place any part or parts of the withdrawable area under exclusive Federal jurisdiction and control if and when it considers it necessary in the interest of national defense.

Judicial system: The present Territorial court, together with its officers, will continue its functions relating to Federal matters until 3 years after admission of the State or until the President proclaims that the new Federal court is ready to operate, whichever is sooner. The Territorial court, together with its officers, will continue its consideration of State matters until the Governor of Alaska certifies to the President that the State courts are ready to operate.

Public Law 85–508, approved July 7, 1958.

Income Tax Offenses

H. R. 8252:

This measure permits persons charged with certain offenses against the income tax laws to elect to be tried in the judicial district in which he was residing at the time the alleged offense was committed if prosecution is begun in a judicial district other than the one in which he resides.

Public Law 85–595, approved August 6, 1958.

Hawaii

H. R. 8478:

Authorizes the Hawaiian Homes Commission to grant licenses for lots under its jurisdiction on which United States post offices and other public improvements may be operated.

Public Law 85–733, approved August 23, 1958.

General Government—Franklin D. Roosevelt Library

H. R. 8795:

This measure permits the Administrator of General Services to maintain and operate the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library under the terms of the General Presidential Libraries Act.

It would also accomplish the following:

Abolish the Board of Trustees of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library.

Establish the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library fund as a separate account within the National Archives trust fund.

Eliminate the present limitations on the purposes for which the Franklin D. Roosevelt trust funds may be used.

Eliminate the 25-cent ceiling on admission fees.

Give statutory recognition to the validity of restrictions placed by donors on the use of papers accepted for deposit.

Public Law 85–341, approved March 15, 1958.

Trial and Appeal Trademark Board

H. R. 8826:

This measure abolishes in contested trademark application cases decisions by examiners with the right of appeal to the Commissioner, and substitutes therefor a single decision by a 3 man panel selected from the members of the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board. The same Board also hears appeals from an examiner's refusal to register. Members of the Board are the Commissioner, the Assistant Commissioners, and Patent Office employees selected by the Commissioner from those whose qualifications have been approved by the Civil Service Commission as qualified for appointment as examiner in charge of interferences.

Public Law 85–609, approved August 8, 1958.

Hawaiian Land Laws

H. R. 9445:

The principal purpose of H. R. 9445 is to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act (48 U. S. C. 665) to permit leasing of public lands of Hawaii on a 65-year basis. At present leases may not exceed 15 years for agricultural purposes and 21 years for general purposes.

Public Law 85–803, approved August 28, 1958.

Sales and Exchanges of Public Lands of the Territory of Hawaii

H. R. 9500:

The purpose of H. R. 9500 is to assist persons who suffered losses in the tidal wave which swept the coast of Hawaii in 1957 by providing for the sale of public lands to them and the exchange of such lands for damaged lands. The measure requires that proposed sales and exchanges be approved by the Governor of the Territory and at least two-thirds of its board of public lands, that sales be at fair market value, and that the value of the private lands taken in exchange, reckoned as of immediately prior to the tidal wave and without regard to improvements, be equal to that of the public lands given in exchange.

Public Law 85–834, approved August 28, 1958.

Hawaii

H. R. 9502:

Permits certain exchanges of public lands in the Territory of Hawaii where the area does not exceed 40 acres and the value is not in excess of $15,000.

Public Law 85–718, approved August 21, 1958.

Reconveying the Lands Acquired for Burke Airport

H. R. 10045:

The principal purpose of H. R. 10045 is to prescribe a special procedure for disposing of federally owned real property at Burke, Va. This land was acquired under the act of September 7, 1950, to be used for constructing a second airport for the Washington area. As a result of the recent selection of a site at Chantilly, Va., for the airport, the Burke property is no longer needed and has been declared surplus to Federal needs by the General Services Administration, the governmental agency for surplus property sales.

Section (a) of the bill would require that during the 90 days immediately following enactment, no Burke property could be disposed of except pursuant to section 13 (h) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 (50 App. U. S. C. 1622 (h)) or section 203 (k) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U. S. C. 484 (k)).

Public Law 85–825, approved August 28, 1958.

Judicial Conference

H. R. 10154:

This measure authorizes the Judicial Conference to study the operation and effect of the general rules of practice and procedure now or hereafter in use in the United States Federal courts and to recommend such changes as the Conference believes desirable to the Supreme Court for consideration.

This legislation does not change the responsibility of the Supreme Court for prescribing rules of practice and procedure in Federal courts nor the responsibility for submitting some of them for Congressional review. It does, however, by statute, permit the Supreme Court to secure the advice and assistance of an existing group which is uniquely qualified to give advice on these matters.

The Judicial Conference is a permanent organization which brings together in one body representatives of the Federal judiciary from all of the geographical areas of the United States. The Conference is under the chairmanship of the Chief Justice of the United States, and is composed of the chief judge of each circuit court of appeals, a

district judge from each of the 11 circuits, and the chief judge of the Court of Claims.

Public Law 85-513, approved July 11, 1958.

Hawaiian Indebtedness

H. R. 11954:

This measure gives additional flexibility to the management of finances by the Territory of Hawaii by excluding from the computation of indebtedness which the Territory may incur bonds issued to finance veterans' homes and farm mortgages, and by deleting the limitation on the amount of indebtedness which the Territory and its subdivisions may incur in 1 year.

Public Law 85-691, approved August 20, 1958.

Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands

H. R. 12303:

The purpose of H. R. 12303 is to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands (68 Stat. 497) in many respects in order to remove ambiguities and imperfections which now exist in the statute.

Public Law 85-851, approved August 28, 1958.

Guam

H. R. 12569:

This measure seeks to clarify the Organic Act of Guam with respect to income taxes and authorizes suits against the government of Guam to recover taxes erroneously or illegally collected or assessed.

Public Law 85-688, approved August 20, 1958.

National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958

H. R. 12575:

This measure provides that all aeronautical and space activities of the United States be devoted to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind and be conducted to contribute materially to the following objectives:

To expand human knowledge in the phenomena of atmosphere and space;

To improve the usefulness, performance, safety, and efficiency of aircraft;

To develop and operate vehicles capable of carrying instruments, equipment, and living organisms through space;

To establish long-range studies of potential benefits to be gained from using aeronautical and space activities for peaceful and scientific purposes;

To preserve the role of the United States as a leader in aeronautical and space science and technology;

To make available discoveries of military value to defense agencies;

To provide for cooperation with other nations in this field;

To effectively utilize United States scientific and engineering resources.

The act imposes upon the President the duty to develop after survey a comprehensive program of aeronautical and space activities to be conducted by agencies of the United States, to designate responsibility for major activities, to provide for effective cooperation between those agencies having responsibility for space activities and to resolve differences arising among Government agencies with respect to such activities.

To advise the President, the act establishes the National Aeronautics and Space Council, composed of the President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, one additional Government member appointed by the President and not more than 3 non-Government members appointed by the President.

The act creates the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to be headed by an Administrator and a Deputy Administrator to be appointed from civilian life by the President.

Responsibility for space activities are divided between the Department of Defense and the new Space Administration. Space activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems, military operations, or the defense of the United States are made the responsibility of the Department of Defense. All other space activities are made the responsibility of the Space Administration.

Public Law 85-568, approved July 29, 1958.

Federal Sentencing

House Joint Resolution 424:

This measure authorizes the Judicial Conference to establish institutes and joint councils on sentencing to study, discuss, and formulate the objectives, policies, standards, and criteria for sentencing.

It also authorizes the court when it imposes a sentence exceeding 1 year either to designate a minimum term at the expiration of which the prisoner shall become eligible for parole, which shall not be more than one-third of the maximum sentence imposed, or to fix a maximum sentence and specify that the prisoner may become eligible for parole at such time as the Board of Parole determines.

The measure also authorizes the court, when it desires more information, to commit the prisoner to custody of the Attorney General for the maximum sentence prescribed by law for study by the Director of the Bureau of Prisons. The Director is required to report his study and recommendations within 3 months, or within 6 months if the court grants additional study time. On receipt of the report the court may place the prisoner on probation, affirm the original sentence or reduce the sentence.

The measure also permits the court to treat defendants between the ages of 22 and 26 under the Federal Youth Corrections Act if it believes the defendant will benefit from such treatment.

Public Law 85-752, approved August 25, 1958.

Code of Ethics

House Concurrent Resolution 175:

This resolution establishes basic standards of conduct as a guide to all privileged to be a part of the Government service; however, it does not create new law, impose penalties, identify types of crime, nor establish legal restraints. It does, however, etch out a charter of conduct against which those in public service may measure their own actions.

It provides that any person in Government service should:

Place loyalty to the highest moral principles and to country above loyalty to persons, party, or Government department;

Uphold the Constitution, laws, and legal regulations of the United States and never be a party to their evasion;

Give a full day's labor for a full day's pay;

Seek to find and employ more efficient and economical means of getting tasks accomplished;

Never discriminate unfairly by dispensing special favors or privileges to anyone; and never accept favors or benefits which might be construed as influence;

Make no private promises binding upon the duties of office;

Engage in no business with the Government, either directly or indirectly, inconsistent with his governmental duties;

Never use confidential information as a means for making private profit;

Expose corruption; and

Uphold these principles, ever conscious that public office is a public trust.

Passed the Senate July 11, 1958.

Health

Dental Health

Senate Joint Resolution 178:

Authorizes the President to proclaim February 8-14, 1959, as National Children's Dental Health Week to stress the necessity of a continuous program for the protection and development of the dental health of the Nation's children.

Public Law 85-830, approved August 28, 1958.

International Health and Medical Research Year

Senate Resolution 361 and Senate Concurrent Resolution 99:

This resolution requests the President to invite the other nations of the world, through the World Health Organization to designate representatives to meet and discuss the feasibility of designating an International Health and Medical Research Year, or of other methods of developing intensive international cooperation in the field of health to cope with major killing and crippling diseases.

Passed the Senate August 11, 1958.

Increase in Funds for Construction of Hospital Facilities

S. 3259:

The measure amends the act to provide for the establishment of a modern, adequate, and efficient hospital center in the District of Columbia, so as to increase the authorization for funds to be granted for the construction of hospital facilities in the District of Columbia by $1,020,000. Previous authorization totals $39,710,000. Total authorization for this purpose under this measure would be $40,730,000.

Public Law 85-715, approved August 21, 1958.

Hospital Survey and Construction

H. R. 12628:

This measure extends the Hospital Survey and Construction Act for an additional period of 3 years.

Public Law 85-864, approved August 14, 1958.

Hospital Construction Loans

H. R. 12694:

This measure authorizes loans for the construction of hospitals and other facilities under the Public Health Services Act.

Public Law 85-589, approved August 1, 1958.

Housing

Housing Emergency—Antirecession

S. 3418:

This measure is designed to encourage and expedite the construction and financing of a substantial number of new housing units. Primary emphasis has been placed on expanding and amending existing programs which can best provide immediate economic relief by:

1. Reducing the minimum downpayment requirements under the FHA sales-type housing program from 3 percent of the first $10,000 to 3 percent of the first $13,500.

2. Increasing by $500,000 the authorization for funds subject to Presidential allocation for purchasing home mortgages.

3. Increasing from $450 million to $550 million FNMA funds for purchasing mortgages on military housing.

4. Creating a new FNMA special assistance revolving fund of $1 billion for purchasing FHA and GI mortgage loans up to $13,500.

5. Increasing to $13,500 (from $10,000) the maximum GI mortgages the Government could purchase directly.

6. Extending the VA direct loan program and authorizing $150 million for each of the next 2 fiscal years.

7. Extending the loan guaranty program for 2 years and authorizing an interest rate ceiling of 4¼ percent.

8. Authorizing an interest-rate ceiling of 4½ percent for military housing mortgages.

9. Eliminating regulation of discounts charged by lenders to increase the yield on FHA insured and VA guaranteed loans.

This measure was considered as the first antirecession measure to be passed by the Senate.

Public Law 85-364, approved April 1, 1958.

FHA Mortgage Insurance—Increase

Senate Joint Resolution 171:

This measure increases the mortgage insurance authority of FHA by $4 billion to a grand total of $29.8 billion. These additional funds will replenish the authority of FHA to insure mortgages and continue the 24-year history of helping millions of families buy homes.

Public Law 85–442, approved June 4, 1958.

Immigration and Naturalization

Immigration

S. 3942:

Makes available 1,500 special nonquota immigrant visas for issuance to certain aliens in the Azores who are distressed as a result of a natural calamity.

Passed Senate August 6, 1958.

Immigration Bonds—Cancellation

H. R. 8439:

This measure permits the Attorney General, on receiving a properly executed application, to cancel departure bonds posted under the Immigration Act of 1924 or the Immigration and Nationality Act, on behalf of any refugee who entered the United States as a nonimmigrant after May 6, 1945 but prior to July 1, 1953, and has since had his status adjusted to that of an alien admitted for permanent residence under any public or private law.

In those cases where the individual is a refugee and qualifies under the bill but the proceeds of the bond have been paid into the Treasury, the person, organization, or corporation entitled to the refund will be paid the refund.

Public Law 85–531, approved July 18, 1958.

Naturalization

H. R. 13378:

This measure provides a means for the expeditious naturalization of alien spouses and adopted children of United States citizens who are missionaries or performing religious duties, and are stationed abroad in pursuance of their religious calling.

Public Law 85–697, approved August 20, 1958.

Immigration

H. R. 13451:

This measure permits the Attorney General in worthy cases to adjust the status of certain aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence without the necessity of requiring the alien to go to Canada and reenter. The act also permits the Attorney General to admit aliens whose services are urgently needed in the United States because of their ability and qualifications if a petition has been approved prior to July 1, 1958.

Public Law 85–700, approved August 21, 1958.

War Claims

S. 163:

This measure extends the time for filing claims under the War Claims Act of 1948 for a period of 1 year from the date of enactment.

Passed Senate, July 29, 1958.

Czechoslovakian Claims Fund

S. 3557:

This measure provides a Czechoslovakian Claims Fund from which United States citizens may be compensated for property nationalized or otherwise taken subsequent to World War II by the Government of Czechoslovakia.

Funds for these claims will be derived from the disposal of certain Czech assets held by the United States Government. Preliminary estimates indicate there are about 1,000 claims to be met. Claimants will probably receive, on the average, a compensation equal to from 30 to 50 percent of their losses.

Public Law 85–604, approved August 8, 1958.

General Grant National Memorial

H. R. 6274:

Authorizes the Secretary of Interior to acquire title to Grant's Tomb in New York and maintain it as the General Grant National Memorial.

Public Law 85–659, approved August 14, 1958.

Oregon-Washington Compact

H. R. 7153:

Approves compact between the States of Oregon and Washington resolving boundary dispute.

Public Law 85–575, approved July 31, 1958.

Outer-Space Investigation

Senate Resolution 256:

The Senate, on February 6, adopted with one dissenting vote a resolution establishing a Special Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration. The Senate, in almost unanimity, authorized the committee to conduct a thorough and complete study and investigation into all the aspects and problems relating to the exploration of outer space; the control, development and use of astronautical resources, personnel, equipment, and facilities.

The committee, consisting of thirteen members, seven from the majority and six from the minority Members of the Senate, appointed by the Vice President from the Committees on Appropriations, Foreign Relations, Armed Services, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Government Operations and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy are: JOHNSON of Texas, RUSSELL, ANDERSON, GREEN, MCCLELLAN, MAGNUSON, SYMINGTON, BRIDGES, SALTONSTALL, HICKENLOOPER, WILEY, MUNDT, and BRICKER.

The committee is empowered to receive and consider all bills and resolutions introduced in the Senate and all bills and resolutions from the House of Representatives proposing legislation in the field of astronautics and space exploration; if necessary, pending legislation to be rereferred to the Special Committee.

A primary function of the committee is to provide an adequate forum for the consideration of a national policy toward the age of space.

The committee to report its findings and recommendations to the Senate before June 1, 1958, or soon thereafter.

Passed Senate February 6, 1958.

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

S. Res. 327:

This resolution creates a new standing Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, to consist of 15 Senators, to have jurisdiction over all legislation and other matters relating primarily to aeronautical and space activities and matters relating to the scientific aspects of such activities except such activities as are assigned to the Department of Defense, and over the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Committee is also given jurisdiction to survey and review, and to prepare reports upon, the space activities of all agencies of the United States.

Passed Senate July 24, 1958.

Dorchester Chaplains

S. 1225:

This measure authorizes the posthumous award of appropriate medals and certificates to Chaplain George L. Fox, of Cambridge, Vt.; Chaplain Alexander D. Goode, of Washington, D. C.; Chaplain Clark V. Poling, of Schenectady, N. Y.; and Chaplain John P. Washington, of Arlington, N. J.

The United States troop ship *Dorchester* was proceeding through Arctic seas during the early morning of February 3, 1943, when an enemy torpedo burst in the ship's engine room. Wounded men, shocked by the explosion, fought their way up through the holds of the disintegrating ship; many of these men had left their lifejackets below. When there were no more lifejackets available, the four chaplins removed their own and gave them to the soldiers. The chaplains knew they were giving up any chance for survival. They were the last men left on the deck. Their conspicuous gallantry was one of the epic examples of heroism during World War II.

Passed Senate May 1, 1958.

Congressional Medal of Honor Society

S. 1857:

This measure confers a Congressional charter on the Congressional Medal of Honor Society of the United States.

This society was organized in 1948 in the State of New York by a group of recipients of the Congressional Medal of Honor to provide a common ground on which all recipients of the medal may meet to preserve the dignity of the Nation's highest award.

The Congressional Medal of Honor is the highest military award for bravery that can be given to any individual in the United States. It is bestowed on those members of the armed services by a high official of our Government in the name of the Congress of the United States for a deed of personal bravery or self-sacrifice above and beyond the call of duty while a member of the American Armed Forces in actual combat with an enemy of this Nation.

Public Law 85–642, approved August 14, 1958.

Government Headstones and Markers

S. 3882:

Authorizes the Secretary of the Army, when requested, to furnish appropriate markers for the unmarked graves of soldiers of the Union and Confederate Armies of the Civil War, members of the Armed Forces of the United States dying in service, former honorably discharged members of such forces, persons buried in post and national cemeteries, and certain members of Reserve and National Guard components.

Public Law 85–811, approved August 28, 1958.

Nuclear Ship Indemnity

S. 4165:

This measure extends the provisions of the AEC Indemnity Act to the operations of the nuclear ship *Savannah*.

Public Law 85–602, approved August 8, 1958.

Space Projects

S. 4208:

Authorizes appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration of $24,500,000 for expansion of existing facilities at Wallops Island, Va.; of $3,750,000 for a space-project center in the vicinity of Washington, D. C.; and $19,550,000 for equipment and instrumentation at various installations now operated by NACA.

Public Law 85–657, approved August 14, 1958.

Military Damages

H. R. 1061:

This measure grants authority to the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries of the military departments to settle claims for damages to, or the loss of, private property caused by a member of the armed services acting outside the scope of his employment, or in excess of his authority.

Expands the settlement power to include claims for personal injury and death.

Permits Congressional review, amendment, or rejection of the regulations authorized by this act.

Vetoed September 6, 1958.

Government Headstones and Markers

H. R. 4381:

Authorizes the furnishing of headstones and markers in memory of members of the Armed Forces dying in service whose remains have not been recovered or identified, or were burned at sea.

Public Law 85–644, approved August 14, 1958.

Supplies to Foreign Vessels and Aircraft

H. R. 5237:

This measure broadens the existing authority of the Secretary of Navy and authorizes him to furnish supplies and services, except ammunition, to naval vessels and aircraft of friendly foreign countries on a reimbursable basis without an advance of funds.

Passed Senate August 11, 1958.

Civil Defense

H. R. 7576:

This measure changes the policy declaration in the Federal Civil Defense Act to read that the responsibility for civil defense shall be vested jointly in the Federal Government and the several States and their subdivisions. It also authorizes the Federal Government to purchase radiological instruments and detection devices and repeals the prohibition against Federal financial contributions to States for civil defense personnel and administrative expenses.

Public Law 85-606, approved August 8, 1958.

Advancement on the Retired List of Certain Persons Who Retired With 30 Years' Service

H. R. 7706:

This measure would permit those persons enlisted before August 25, 1912, who were given double-time credit for service beyond the continental limits of the United States to have their retirement pay based on the highest grade in which they satisfactorily served during World War I.

Public Law 85-790, approved August 28, 1958.

Settlement of Military Claims

H. R. 9022:

This legislation increases the authority of the Secretaries of the military departments to settle claims based on the noncombat activities of the military services now contained in section 2733, title 10, United States Code, from $1,000 to $5,000 and permits partial payment of a sum not to exceed $5,000 where the amount of the claim exceeds $5,000.

Public Law 85-729, approved August 23, 1958.

Nuclear-Powered Icebreaking Vessel

H. R. 9196:

This measure authorizes the construction of a nuclear-powered icebreaker for service in the Arctic regions.

Vetoed August 12, 1958.

Amphibious Vessels

H. R. 11518:

This measure authorizes the construction of not to exceed 20,000 tons of amphibious warfare vessels and landing craft.

Public Law 85-571, approved July 31, 1958.

Naval Vessels

H. R. 11519:

This measure authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to use 3 destroyers, 1 submarine, 1 merchant-type vessel, and up to 10 service craft for experimental purposes.

These ships are to be used by the Navy to conduct tests of newly developed special weapons for underwater detonation to evaluate the safe delivery range for ships that may use the weapons later.

The ships selected for this purpose are the U. S. S. *Howarth*, DD-592, the U. S. S. *Killen*, DD-593, the U. S. S. *Fullam*, DD-474, the U. S. S. *Bonita*, SSK-3, the steamship *Michael J. Moran*, and 8 lighter-type barges.

Public Law 85-436, approved May 29, 1958.

AEC—Authorization

H. R. 12009:

This measure increased the authorization for the Atomic Energy Commission by $85 million to construct a land-based prototype of a nuclear propulsion plant suitable for installation in a destroyer-type ship. This reactor prototype will be constructed at West Milton, N. Y., in the same sphere that was previously used for the sodium-cooled-reactor prototype, the *Seawolf*.

Nuclear ships will be used to escort fast carrier task forces.

Public Law 85-412, approved May 16, 1958.

War Risk Hazards

H. R. 12140:

This measure makes permanent the Defense Bases Act and the War Hazards Compensation Act. It amends the Defense Bases Act to extend coverage to employees of welfare and morale organizations, to define public work to include movable and service projects, and to eliminate discriminatory exclusion of noncitizen employees. It amends the War Hazards Compensation Act to provide war-risk coverage for employees of post exchanges and the like, and to modify the definition of war-risk hazard.

Public Law 85-608, approved August 8, 1958.

AEC Authorization Increase

H. R. 12457:

This measure increases the total current authorization for Atomic Energy Commission appropriations by $2,250,000 and provides the same increase in authorized costs for Project Sherwood construction. The present authorization for Project Sherwood construction at Livermore and Princeton is $7,750,000. Under this bill, the Project Sherwood plant is increased to $10 million, or a net increase of $2,250,000.

Public Law 85-519, approved July 15, 1958.

Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1958—Conference Report

H. R. 12541:

This measure provides as follows:

Department of Defense and military departments:

Eliminates requirement that military departments be separately administered and provides that they be separately organized under its own Secretary and the Secretary of Defense shall have direction, authority, and control over them. The Secretary of a military department is made responsible to the Secretary of Defense for the operation and efficiency of his department.

Provides that an Assistant Secretary of Defense may issue orders to a military department only through the Secretary of the military department or his designee and only if specifically authorized in a specific area by the Secretary of Defense. Such orders must be issued through the military Secretaries.

Requires Secretaries of military departments and their assistants to cooperate fully with Office of Secretary of Defense to achieve efficient administration and to carry out the direction, authority, and control of the Secretary of Defense.

Reduces number of Assistant Secretaries of Defense from 9 to 7, effective 6 months after enactment.

Reduces, effective 6 months after enactment, the number of Assistant Secretaries for each military department from 4 to 3 and eliminates requirement that 1 Assistant Secretary in each department be designated for Fiscal Management and that there be an Assistant Secretary of Navy for Air.

Changes in unified commands:

Authorizes the President, through the Secretary of Defense and on the advice of the Joint Chiefs, to establish unified combatant commands and to determine their force structure.

Requires military departments to assign to unified commands the force structure determined by the President and permits forces so assigned to be transferred only under procedures established by Secretary of Defense and approved by President.

Repeals statutory command authority of Air Force Chief of Staff and Chief of Naval Operations.

Authorizes Secretary of Defense to assign responsibility for support of forces assigned to unified command to one or more military departments.

Changes in functions:

Authorizes the transfer, reassignment, or consolidation (but not abolition) of any function, including combatant functions, until the end of hostilities or threat of hostilities if the President determines such action necessary because of hostilities or imminent threat of hostilities.

Suspends, except during hostilities or threat thereof, the transfer, reassignment, abolition, or consolidation of functions established by law until 30 days after a detailed report has been submitted to the Committees on Armed Services. If during the 30-day period either committee reports a resolution finding that the proposed change involves a major combatant function now or hereafter assigned by law and would tend to impair national defense, change would be further suspended until after 40 days of continuous session following date of report. If during 40 days, a resolution of either House recommending rejection is adopted by a simple majority, the proposed change would not take place.

Excerpts from disapproval procedure the authority of the Secretary of Defense (1) to assign any supply or service activity common to more than one service in such manner as he may determine and (2) to assign or reassign to one or more departments the development and operational use of new weapons and weapons systems.

Defense research and engineering:

Creates a new statutory position of Director of Defense Research and Engineering with such duties as would be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, which would include (1) being principal scientific and technical adviser to the Secretary, (2) supervising research and engineering activities, and (3) directing and controlling research and engineering activities requiring centralized management.

Authorizes the Secretary of Defense, with President's approval, to engage in military research and to contract for research and development through the military departments or by Defense Department personnel.

Joint Chiefs of Staff:

Increases Joint Staff ceiling from 210 to 400.

Authorizes Chiefs of Staff to delegate to Vice Chiefs of Staff such authority and duties as the Secretary concerned approves.

Repeals limitation of right of Chairman of Joint Chiefs to vote.

Authorizes Chairman of Joint Chiefs to select Director of Joint Staff and to assign duties to the Joint Staff.

Limits tours of Director and members of Joint Staff to 3 years except in time of war.

Other provisions:

Changes reporting requirement of Secretary of Defense from a semiannual to an annual basis.

Authorizes Secretary of Defense to establish procedures for transfer of officers between services with consent of the officers concerned.

Provides a statutory basis for the National Guard Bureau and its Chief.

Public Law 85-599. Approved August 6, 1958.

Federal Civil Defense

H. R. 12827:

This measure extends from June 30, 1958, to June 30, 1962, title III of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950. Title III authorizes the declaration of a national emergency for civil-defense purposes and vests emergency powers in the President and the Federal Civil Defense Administrator during such an emergency.

Since the possibility of an attack upon the United States with modern weapons of

enormous destructive powers is at least as great today as when the standby emergency powers were originally authorized, it was felt that the authority should not be allowed to expire.

Public Law 85–514, approved July 11, 1958.

Making, Amendment, and Modification of Contracts to Facilitate National Defense

H. R. 12894:

The purpose of the legislation is to enact into permanent law during periods of national emergency and for 6 months thereafter, with certain exceptions, the authority contained in title II of the First War Powers Act of 1941, which expired June 30, 1958.

Public Law 85–804, approved August 28, 1958.

Atomic Energy Commission Authorization

H. R. 13121:

This measure authorizes for appropriation the sum of $386,679,000 for acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion as set forth in the projects approved.

Public Law 85–590, approved August 4, 1958.

Permanent Professor of Physical Education at the United States Military Academy

H. R. 13170:

This legislation provides for an additional permanent professor at the United States Military Academy who under the supervision of the Commandant of Cadets, will have immediate charge of the physical education program at the Academy.

Public Law 85–723, approved August 21, 1958.

Atomic Energy Indemnity

H. R. 13455:

This measure is designed to facilitate indemnity coverage for universities possessing reactors for atomic energy research. It exempts institutions unable to comply with the financial protection requirements of the indemnity provisions by reason of State constitutions or laws from compliance for limited periods to permit States to amend constitutions or laws. It also authorizes the Atomic Energy Commission to adjust financial protection requirement for any other educational institution.

Public Law 85–744, approved August 23, 1958.

Atomic Energy Act

H. R. 13482:

This measure amends the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, in a number of particulars to keep the act up to date, and to provide the best possible framework for its administration. Its most important provision is to give to the Joint Committee the right to waive the normal 30-day waiting period for proposed international agreements for cooperation.

Public Law 85–681, approved August 19, 1958.

Reserve Components

H. R. 13374:

This measure permits the member of Reserve components to transfer from one component to another without loss of exemption or deferment resulting from Reserve component membership.

Public Law 85–722, approved August 11, 1958.

Natural resources

National Science Foundation—Weather Study

S. 86:

Authorizes the National Science Foundation to undertake a study and research program in the field of weather modification, including methods of increasing rainfall, suppressing hail, windstorms, and lightning.

Public Law 85–510, approved July 11, 1958.

Spokane Valley Project

S. 2215:

As another means of combatting the current recession and, at the same time, irrigate the arid lands of the West, this measure authorizes Federal construction of the Spokane Valley project in Washington and Idaho.

The proposed project will serve some 10,290 acres located in Washington State and some 197 acres in Idaho. Development plans call for replacing existing diversion works and a canal distribution system constructed by private enterprise in the early 1900's with a system for pumping ground water from a number of wells and delivering it, under pressure, through a closed-pipe distribution system.

The estimated cost of the project is $5,016,000.

Approximately 26 percent of the cost will be repaid from surplus power revenues of the Bonneville Power Administration, and the remaining 74 percent is to be repaid within 50 years.

Passed Senate May 21, 1958.

Rivers, Harbors, Flood-Control Authorization

S. 3910:

This measure, a substitute for Senate bill 497 which passed both Houses and was vetoed by the President, on April 15, 1958, authorizes $1,556,230,500 as follows:

Rivers and harbors:	
Navigation projects (52)	$173,814,000
Beach erosion projects (14)	11,627,700
Eradication of water hyacinths (1)	4,725,000
Upper Fox River, Wis. (1)	300,000
Calumet-Sag project, Illinois (1)	9,884,000
Illinois and Mississippi Canal (1)	2,000,000
Total of 70 projects	202,350,700
Flood control:	
New projects or project-modifications (67)	495,579,800
Increased basin authorizations (12)	608,300,000
Oroville Dam, California (1)	50,000,000
Missouri River Basin, Department of Interior (1)	$200,000,000
Total of 81 projects	1,353,879,800
Grand total of 151 projects	1,556,230,500

An additional $4,900 was agreed upon for the new flood-control projects.

Public Law 85–500, approved July 3, 1958.

Conservation of Land and Water Resources

Senate Resolution 148:

This resolution prescribes the procedures for and contents of reports to the Senate by executive agencies with respect to proposed projects for conservation and development of land and water resources.

It specifies the basis on which the benefits of proposed projects can be evaluated, and on which fair and equitable allocations of costs can be made. This will provide full information regarding proposed projects, and it will enable the Congress to specify the terms and conditions particularly with respect to repayments and local contribution. It will provide the basis for fixing rates for sale of electric power generated at Federal projects.

Heretofore, full information on these important matters has not been available to the Congress. As a result, project authorizations have sometimes left the way open for Executive action at variance with Congressional intent.

The procedures provided by Senate Resolution 148, for authorization of multiple-purpose projects and for clearance of watershed protection and flood-prevention projects, will materially improve the means available to the standing legislative committees of the Senate for selecting meritorious projects, and for recommending authorizing legislation that will achieve the purposes intended by the Congress. These procedures will expedite the program of land and water resources projects.

Senate adopted, January 28, 1958.

Saline Water Program

Senate Joint Resolution 135:

This resolution provides for Federal construction of five full-scale demonstration plants for the production, from sea or brackish water, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, or other uses.

Three of these plants are to be designed for converting sea water; two are to have a capacity of not less than 1 million gallons a day.

Two of the plants are for the treatment of brackish water, and at least one is to have a capacity of not less than 250,000 gallons a day.

One of the conversion plants is to be located on the west coast of the United States; a second on the east or gulf coast; and the third in the Virgin Islands or some other Territorial possession.

One of the brackish water plants is to be located in the northern Great Plains area, and the other in the arid areas of the Southwest.

The resolution authorizes an appropriation of $10 million, as needed, for the construction of these plants.

Public Law 85–883, approved September 2, 1958.

Outdoor Recreation Resources—Study

S. 846:

Establishes a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission to study the outdoor recreation resources of the public lands.

The Commission is to be composed of 15 members, including 8 Congressional Members, and will report by September 1, 1961, on outdoor recreation requirements indicated for 1976 and 2000 together with the recommendations of the Commission on meeting those requirements.

Public Law 85–470, approved June 28, 1958.

Preservation of Historical and Archeological Data

S. 1109:

The act of August 21, 1935, the Historic Sites Act, provides a program to preserve historical and archeological data threatened by construction of dams. This measure is more explicit than the Historic Sites Act with respect to historical and archeological salvage, and provides essentially for coordination of archeological investigations and salvage operations with advance planning and construction of dams either by Federal agencies or under permits granted by Federal agencies.

Passed Senate August 11, 1958.

Great Lakes Basin Compact

S. 1416:

This measure grants consent to a compact between the 8 States abutting the Great Lakes to establish the Great Lakes Commission which has as its primary purpose the orderly use, development, and conservation of the water resources of the Great Lakes Basin and to insure that all the Great Lakes may derive the maximum benefit from utilization of public works. The compact will also assist in maintaining a proper balance among industrial, commercial, agricultural, water supply, residential, recreational, and other uses of the water resources of the area.

Passed Senate July 28, 1958.

Coal Development

S. 2069:

This measure increases from 5,120 acres to 10,240 acres the lands which any person may hold under coal leases or permits within any

one State. It also authorizes, if certain criteria are met, additional holdings up to 5,120 acres in any one State.

Public Law 85-698, approved August 21, 1958.

Insecticides—Research

S. 2447:

This measure authorizes the Department of Interior to undertake continuing studies of the effects of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and pesticides upon fish and wildlife to prevent further losses of invaluable natural resources following applications of these materials, and to provide basic data on various chemical controls.

It is anticipated that this research study will determine the amounts and percentages of formulations and chemicals that may be used on wet lands, rangelands, and other lands with a minimum loss of fish and wildlife.

Passed Senate May 29, 1958.

Public Law 85-582, approved August 1, 1958.

Migratory Bird Hunting Stamps

S. 2617:

This measure increases the cost of migratory bird hunting stamps (duck stamps) from $2 to $3. The revenue, after deducting the cost of printing and distributing the stamps, will be used for the location, ascertainment, and acquisition of lands for migratory-bird refuges and waterfowl-production areas.

Grants the Secretary of the Interior discretionary authority to open a maximum of 40 percent of any refuge to be used for hunting migratory and resident waterfowl.

This measure also recognizes the desirability of bringing these lands under Federal control, while, at the same time, permitting waterfowl hunting to continue unabated. A program of preservation through control by Federal acquisition of fee title or lease agreement is contemplated to insure the continued availability of these lands for breeding purposes.

Public Law 85-585, approved August 1, 1958.

Salmon and Halibut

S. 2719:

This measure is an attempt to reestablish the balance of nature between food, sports fish, and a major predator through control of the predatory dogfish sharks. This is to be accomplished through payments of bounties to fishermen for dogfish sharks.

Passed Senate July 31, 1958.

Flood Control Compact

S. 2964:

This bill grants the consent and approval of Congress to the Thames River Valley flood-control compact entered into between the States of Connecticut and Massachusetts, creating the Thames River Valley Flood Control Commission. It defines its powers and functions relative to approval of flood-control projects constructed by the United States.

The compact provides for reimbursement by the States for a portion of the taxes lost due to Federal ownership of lands in certain flood-control reservoirs.

Public Law 85-526, approved July 18, 1958.

Assessment Work—Mining Claims

S. 3199:

This measure changes the period for doing annual assessment work on unpatented mineral claims so that it will run from September 1 to September 1 of the succeeding year. This change is designed to meet the needs of claim holders in high mountainous country by giving them sufficient time to do their annual assessment work with a degree of continuity during the summer months.

Public Law 85-736, approved August 23, 1958.

Fisheries Loan Fund

S. 3295:

This measure increases to $20 million (from $10 million) the fisheries loan fund which is used by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries to make loans to stimulate the development of a strong, prosperous, and thriving fisheries and fish-processing industry. These loans are for a 10-year period and carry an interest rate of 5 percent.

The loans are used by the fishing industry to finance and refinance operations, maintenance, repairs, replacement, and equipment of fishing vessels and gear and for research into the basic problems of fisheries.

Passed Senate May 29, 1958.

National Park—Concessionaire

S. 3371:

This measure increases to 30 years (from 20) the period of time a concession may be leased in the national parks. A concessionaire is required to meet certain standards set up by the Park Service. In many cases, they have experienced difficulty in securing the funds needed to undertake the development of new concession facilities, especially where large amounts of capital are necessary.

It is believed that the 30-year contracts will ease the credit situation, and will result in more suitable accommodations for the millions of people who visit our national parks each year.

Public Law 85-434, approved May 29, 1958.

Tucumcari Project—Repayment

S. 3469:

This measure is an aid to the Arch Hurley Conservancy District in the irrigation development of the Tucumcari project, New Mexico, by lightening the repayment loan while the water users are recovering from a series of adverse circumstances that beset the project.

These include severe shortage of water during a critical drought period; unfavorable weather conditions; disadvantageous farm price-cost relationship; absence of a cash crop suitable for effective production on the project; and the slowness with which lands have been placed under irrigation.

In spite of these difficulties, the project shows evidence of becoming a sound operation with time and encouragement.

This measure provides for an annual repayment of $30,000 each in 1959 and 1960, after which repayments will be made under a variable repayment formula based on the value of crop production. Full repayment is to be achieved in 40 years.

Public Law 85-663, approved August 14, 1958.

National Forests Land Administration

S. 3741:

Makes the rules applicable to Weeks law land applicable to most other land in national forests.

Passed Senate July 21, 1958.

Mineral Resources Program

S. 3817:

This measure establishes within the Department of the Interior, by legislative fiat, a program of financial assistance for the development of the mineral resources of the United States, its Territories, and possessions, by encouraging exploration for minerals, a function which, since 1955, has been performed by a directive issued by the Office of Defense Mobilization under authority of the Defense Production Act of 1950.

As of June 30, 1958, the Office of Defense Mobilization withdrew its financial support of this operation, so it became necessary for the activities of the Defense Minerals Exploration Administration to be continued by this bill.

The need to find new sources of minerals to meet the demands of our expanding economy and of national defense is generally recognized. The DMEA program is contributing significantly to discoveries and developments which are increasing known recoverable reserves. Continuation of this type of program should reduce the need for a frenzied, costly search for new sources of minerals in any future emergency period, when emphasis should be placed on production rather than on exploration.

Established a ceiling of $250,000 as the maximum Government participation in any one project, and provided that funds are to be made available only if the applicant can prove that commercial funds are unavailable at reasonable rate.

Public Law 85-701, approved August 21, 1958.

Rivers-Harbor and Flood Control Projects of 1958

S. 3910:

This measure is a substitute for Senate bill 497, which passed both the Senate and House and was vetoed by the President on April 15, 1958, authorizes $1,556,230,600 as follows:

Rivers and harbors:	
52 navigation projects	$173,814,000
14 beach erosion projects	11,627,700
1 Eradication of water hyacinths	4,725,000
1 Upper Fox River, Wis.	300,000
1 Calumet-Sag project, Illinois	9,884,000
1 Illinois and Mississippi Canal	2,000,000
Total of 70 projects	202,350,700
Flood control:	
67 new projects or project modifications	495,579,800
12 increased basin authorizations	608,300,000
1 Oroville Dam, Calif.	50,000,000
1 Missouri River Basin, Department of Interior	200,000,000
Total of 81 projects	1,353,879,800
Grand total of 151 projects	1,556,225,600

Public Law 85-500, approved July 3, 1958.

Missouri River Basin Project—Modification

S. 4002:

This measure modifies the Glendo Unit, Missouri River Basin project, by authorizing the construction of Gray Reef Dam and Reservoir on the North Platte River downstream from Alcova Dam at an estimated cost of $700,000.

This dam and reservoir will provide a small regulating facility that will protect irrigation, fish and wildlife, and municipal water interests on the stream by stabilizing the flow of the stream throughout the year.

Public Law 85-695, approved August 20, 1958.

Washoe Project

S. 4009:

This legislation authorizes an increased appropriation for the Washoe project, Nevada-California, from $43.7 million to $52 million to permit the construction of Prosser Dam and Reservoir.

A 30,000 acre-foot reservoir is contemplated at the new site which would provide for water exchange to permit water releases from Lake Tahoe to improve fisheries resource, and to give the area added flood protection.

Public Law 85-706, approved August 21, 1958.

River Basin Study

S. 4021:

This measure authorizes the creation of a United States Study Commission, composed of representatives of the United States and of the States of South Carolina, Georgia,

Florida, and Alabama to make an integrated and cooperative investigation, study, and survey for the conservation, utilization, and development of the land and water resources of the Savannah, Altamaha, St. Mary's, Apalachicola-Chattahoochie, and Alabama-Coosa River Basins, and to formulate a plan to carry out its recommendations.

Public Law 85–850, approved August 28, 1958.

Domestic Minerals Stabilization Act of 1958

S. 4036:

This measure provides a 5-year price and production stabilization program for 5 minerals—copper, lead, zinc, fluorspar, and tungsten—all vital to the national defense.

It provides for the purchase of up to 150,000 tons of refined copper, produced from ores mined in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, at not more than 27½ cents a pound; purchases to be made within 1-year period.

Provides for the payment of price-stabilization payments to domestic producers of lead and zinc, rather than for a purchase program as in the case of copper. The stabilization price for lead is 15½ cents a pound and 13½ cents a pound for zinc, or a combined price for these 2 metals of 29 cents a pound. A bonus of up to 1.125 cents a pound may be paid on up to 500 tons a quarter for each producer if the market price of lead does not exceed 15½ cents a pound and up to 0.55 cents a pound for zinc if the market price does not exceed 13½ cents.

Provides for a stabilization price of $53 a ton for acid-grade fluorspar, with a maximum limitation on stabilization payments of $13 a ton.

Provides for a stabilization price for tungsten of $36 per short-ton unit with a maximum limitation on regular stabilization payments of $18 a short-ton unit, plus a bonus payment of $4 a short-ton unit to any producer who has not sold more than 250 units during any quarter; but not to exceed $40 per unit.

Limits annual payments to 350,000 tons of lead; 550,000 tons of zinc; 185,000 tons of fluorspar; and 375,000 short-ton units of tungsten trioxide.

Authorizes the Secretary of Interior to borrow from the Treasury $350 million to make subsidy payments.

Cost possibilities:

Maximum possible expenditures under the bill S. 4036, 1st year:	
Copper, 150,000 tons, at 27½ cents per pound	$82,500,000
Lead, 350,000 tons at 3.9 cents per pound	27,300,000
Zinc, 550,000 tons, at 2.9 cents per pound	31,900,000
Fluorspar (acid grade), 180-000 tons at $13 per ton	2,340,000
Tungsten trioxide, 375,000 short-ton units, at $18 per short-ton unit	6,750,000
Total	150,790,000
Additional possible expenditures under bonus payment provisions of title II (as estimated by the Department of Interior):	
Lead, 90,000 tons, at 1.125 cents per pound	2,025,000
Zinc, 170,000 tons at 0.55 cents per pound	1,870,000
Tungsten, 75,000 units, at $40 per short-ton unit	300,000
Total	4,195,000
Grand total	154,985,000

Passed Senate, July 11, 1958.

Heart Mountain Irrigation District, Wyo.

S. 4088:

S. 4088 would approve and authorize the Secretary of the Interior to execute a repayment contract for the construction costs of the Heart Mountain division, Shoshone reclamation project, Wyoming. The amount covered by the repayment contract is $7 million for the practically complete gravity system serving about 25,800 acres of irrigated land, or $8 million if about 2,000 acres of additional land to be served by pumping are added.

The repayment period would approximate 121 years for the gravity development and 122 years if the pump lands are brought under irrigation.

Passed Senate August 14, 1958.

Coal Research and Development Act

S. 4248:

The purpose of this legislation is to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by creating a Coal Research and Development Commission.

Passed Senate August 14, 1958.

The Hawaiian Nene Goose

S. 4249:

S. 4249 would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to promote a program of research, propagation, and management necessary to effect the restoration of this threatened species of waterfowl in its natural habitat. An appropriation of $15,000 per annum for a period of 5 years is authorized for the purposes of this act.

Passed Senate August 14, 1958.

Bison

H. R. 3402:

Provides for a display pasture for the bison herd on the Montana National Bison Range in the State of Montana so that the herd will be more open to the public and more easily seen.

Public Law 85–622, approved August 12, 1958.

Chief of Engineers—Publications

H. R. 4260:

This bill authorizes the Chief of Engineers to publish information pamphlets, maps, brochures, and other material on river and harbor, flood control, and other civil works activities, including related public park and recreational facilities under his jurisdiction.

It specifically authorizes the sale of this material at a price not less than the cost of reproduction, except for small information booklets.

Public Law 85–480, approved July 2, 1958.

Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir

Senate Joint Resolution 12:

This joint resolution provides for the purchase of some 7,000 acres of Crow Indian tribal lands that are necessary to the construction of Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir in southeastern Montana on the Big Horn River, and fixes the compensation for the land at $2½ million.

Yellowtail Dam is a multipurpose project with numerous benefits—power, irrigation, flood control, recreation, and conservation. It is fully repayable with interest to the Federal Government and will be of great benefit to the Billings-Hardin area which has been feeling the economy pinch for some months; thus it is a perfect antirecession measure in an area where new sources of employment and income are sorely needed.

Public Law 85–523, approved July 15, 1958.

Tennessee River Compact

H. R. 6701:

This measure consents to the States of Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia entering into a compact relating to water pollution control of the Tennessee River and to establish the Tennessee River Basin Water Pollution Control Commission composed of the Commissioners from each State with authority to establish standards of water quality and to enforce orders to secure abatement of pollution adversely affecting waters in the basin. The measure also provides for the appointment of a Federal representative on the Commission to maintain liaison.

Public Law 85–734, approved August 23, 1958.

Land Acquisition—Relocation Costs

H. R. 6940:

This measure authorizes the Secretary of Interior to reimburse landowners and tenants for moving expenses, losses, or damages incurred as a result of land purchases by the Federal Government for water conservation and other public-works projects under the jurisdiction of the Department of Interior, including Federal reclamation projects.

Public Law 85–433, approved May 29, 1958.

Oil and Gas Leases—Alaska

H. R. 8054:

This measure provides for the leasing of oil and gas deposits in land beneath nontidal navigable waters in the Territory of Alaska.

Geologists have estimated that approximately 90 million acres in the Territory of Alaska are geologically promising for oil exploration. Most of this area is composed of various basins. These basin areas contain an extraordinary large number of lakes and streams of all sizes and descriptions. At the same time, only about 1 percent of the total land area in the Territory is surveyed; therefore, it is impossible to describe with precision where these water bodies are located or the areas they cover.

Under existing law, no person or agency has the power to grant oil or gas leases in areas beneath navigable waters. The precluding act declares that tidelands and the beds of navigable waters within the Territory are held in trust for the State or States which may be erected out of the Territory.

Since there is no practical way of ascertaining the area of lands beneath navigable waters which may be within the described boundaaries, the lessee or offeror has been required to pay rental on the basis of the total acreage within the description. It appears that development of the oil resources of Alaska has been impeded because most developers are reluctant to invest the necessary sums of money subject to the chance that legislation might open up the water bottoms to leasing by others who, without expenditure of any funds for development, could come in and acquire lands in any oil structure which might be discovered by the developers.

The overall intent of this bill is to allow leasing of these lands, thereby encouraging the development of this resource.

Public Law 85–503, approved July 3, 1958.

Reclamation Projects

H. R. 8645:

This measure provides for variable repayment formulas which would provide relief for individual reclamation projects without the need to come to Congress for relief legislation.

Public Law 85–611, approved August 8, 1958.

Mapping and Aerial Photography

H. R. 11123.

This measure grants specific statutory authority for the Department of the Interior to perform surveys, investigations, and research in geology, biology, minerals and water resources and mapping to include Antarctica and the Trust Territory of the Pacific islands.

Public Law 85–743, approved August 23, 1958.

Townsites in National Forests

H. R. 12161:

This measure authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to set aside areas of national forest land and other lands as townsites and divide such areas into townlots for public sale.

Public Law 85-569, approved July 31, 1958.

Fish and Wildlife

H. R. 13138:

This measure provides for the consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service by the agencies of Government engaged in construction work before and during the building of Federal water development projects. This would enable the agencies involved to make known to the Service the projects necessary to protect fish and wildlife.

Public Law 85-624, approved August 12, 1958.

Social welfare

Contracts—Indian Tribes

S. 2592:

This measure repeals the requirement that all contracts with Indian tribes, relating to their lands or claims against the United States, be executed before a judge of a court of record. This requirement has placed an undue burden on all contractual parties and has served no useful purpose.

It is felt that the right of review by the Secretary of Interior is sufficient protection to the tribes.

Public Law 85-770, approved August 18, 1958.

Welfare Funds Disclosure Act

S. 2888:

This measure requires the managers of all pension and welfare fund plans, except those operated by governmental agencies or charitable and fraternal organizations, to register with the Department of Labor, giving all pertinent information about the fund's officers and finances.

Places responsibility for policing and improving these plans upon the participants.

Leaves to the States detailed regulation procedures relating to insurance, trusts, and other phases of operation.

Requires that managers of any employee-welfare or pension-benefit plans, unless exempted, register within 90 days after regulations are issued.

Requires annual reporting to show amounts contributed by employer and employee, amount of benefits paid or otherwise furnished, number of employees covered, assets, liabilities, receipts, disbursements, and other financial activities of the plan, salaries or fees charged to the plan, to whom paid and the purpose.

Provides for public examination of these reports.

Provides that managers of plans covering less than 100 employees will not be required to report until 2 years after enactment. Places discretionary authority in the administering agency to exempt small plans from either registration or reporting.

Authorizes the Secretary to investigate violations and to bring injunctive action in the United States district courts to enjoin violations, and grants the Attorney General authority to institute necessary investigation and criminal proceedings.

Provides (a) a penalty of $5,000, or 5 years' imprisonment, or both, for any person willfully violating or failing to comply with the act; (b) a fine of $10,000, or 5 years' imprisonment, or both, for any person who embezzles, steals, or willfully abstracts or converts to his own use moneys or other property of any employee-benefit plan; and (c) a fine of $5,000, or up to 5 years' imprisonment, or both, if a person acts in an official capacity in connection with a welfare fund during a time when his right to vote in a State election has been removed because of a criminal conviction.

Establishes the duration of the act as 4 years; and requires the administering agency to make a comprehensive report to Congress, including continuance, simplification, or modification recommendations.

Public Law 85-836, approved August 28, 1958.

Klamath Indian Tribe

S. 3051:

This measure provides for the continued sustained-yield management of that part of the Klamath Indian Forest which must be sold to pay the tribal members who withdraw from the tribe as the result of prior legislation terminating Federal supervision over the property of the tribe located in Oregon. This act also makes certain that the Indians receive the fair market value of the part of the forest that is sold.

About 70 percent of the Klamath Indians have elected to withdraw from tribal membership and, in order to satisfy the claims of the withdrawees, it will require the sale of almost 2.7 billion-feet of sawtimber during a period of less than 1 year.

This act permits the Departments of Interior and Agriculture, jointly, to define the boundaries of the tribal forest and the tribal marsh. The Indians who elect to stay in the tribe will keep the part of the forest that is allocated to them under a management plan providing for sustained yield management.

The rest of the forest that must be sold on behalf of the withdrawing members will be offered in appropriate units for private purchase—

(a) at not less than the appraised realization value,

(b) subject to sustained-yield requirements that are enforceable by a forfeiture and reversion of title in the event of a violation of the requirements. The Federal Government is also fully protected in the event of a final judgment against the United States resulting from private sales.

Public Law 85-731, approved August 23, 1958.

Shoshone and Arapahoe Indians

S. 3203:

This measure restores to the Shoshone and Arapahoe Tribes of the Wind River Reservation, Wyo., title to the minerals, including oil and gas, and subjects these minerals to administration under the Tribal Mineral Leasing Act. The act of August 15, 1953, extinguished the Indian title to the undisposed of, ceded lands that were located within the Riverton reclamation project, approximately 161,500 acres, added them to the public domain, and provided for payment to the Indians of $1,009,500 as complete compensation.

Although the Indians agreed to the 1953 act at the time, they were not aware that it would result in leasing oil and gas under public land laws without competitive bidding and without bonuses.

This bill, in effect, returns to the tribes the 10 percent of the proceeds retained by the United States under the 1953 act.

Passed Senate July 1, 1958.

Public Law 85-780, approved August 27, 1958.

District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation

S. 3493:

This measure raises the maximum number of weeks for which an eligible unemployed benefit claimant in the District of Columbia may receive payment from 26 to 34, and increases the maximum weekly benefit from $30 to $48.

The measure authorizes voluntary payments by employers to the unemployment compensation fund in order to avert a percentage raise in their contributions. It also substitutes for the variable disqualification provisions by a uniform 6-week disqualification.

Passed Senate August 1, 1958.

Community Facilities Act

S. 3497:

This measure would authorize $1 billion, as an antirecession measure, to provide loans to the State and local governments for the construction of community facilities such as new water systems, sewer systems, hospitals, school buildings, and similar public works.

Prohibit financial assistance if credit is otherwise available on equally favorable terms and conditions, and require that the policy on purchases and loans must assure retirement or repayment.

Permit loans to be made directly or in cooperation or participation with other lending agencies.

Authorize loans with maturities up to 50 years at an interest rate of 3½ percent.

Permit $400 million of the total fund to operate as a revolving fund.

Authorize the Administrator, at the request of the borrowers, to postpone payments of principal or interest or both for up to 2 years, but without reducing the total to be repaid.

Revise provisions of existing law which until recently have resulted in loans almost exclusively for construction of water and sewer systems, thereby making almost every kind of State and local public work eligible.

Increase the authorization for Federal planning advanced from $48 million to $98 million.

Passed Senate April 16, 1958.

Indian Sanitation

S. 3694:

This measure authorizes the Surgeon General to construct sanitation facilities for Indian homes and communities, allowing for participation in projects by Indian groups, local authorities and other public or nonprofit organizations.

Passed Senate July 24, 1958.

Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act

S. 3974:

This measure provides for the reporting and disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and employers, to prevent abuses in the administration of trusteeships by labor organizations, to provide standards with respect to the election of officers of labor organizations.

The major provisions are:

Financial disclosure reports for publication by Secretary of Labor:

Requires unions to file a detailed report of their financial and organizational structure, membership rules, and business procedures, with substance of reports going to each member. Penalties: Destruction of records, false report, or willful failure to report is punishable with a maximum $10,000 fine for the union, and fine and imprisonment for responsible official.

Requires full reporting and public disclosure by employers of expenditures of $5,000 or more to influence or affect employees in the exercise of rights guaranteed by the National Labor Relations Act. Criminal penalties for failure to file or falsification of reports.

Requires management middlemen to file financial reports on activities designed to influence workers in their collective-bargaining rights. Criminal penalties for payments by middlemen to union officials.

Requires semiannual reporting and public disclosure of trusteeships over subordinate unions. Criminal penalties for failure to file or falsification.

Empowers Secretary of Labor to subpena witnesses and books while conducting investigations into possible violations of the reporting sections.

Creates post of Commissioner of Labor Reports within the Department of Labor, to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

Trusteeships: Provides that local unions may be placed under trusteeship only to prevent corruption or financial abuses, assure performance of union-management contracts, restore democratic procedures or otherwise carry out an international union's constitution.

Limits trusteeships to 18 months' duration, but permits the Secretary of Labor to bring civil action against a parent union on "clear and convincing proof" of illegality or an absence of good faith.

Prohibits transfer of funds from the local union under trusteeship to the parent union, and bars manipulation of local's votes for national delegates.

Taft-Hartley revisions: Requires NLRB to assert jurisdiction over all cases covered by the Taft-Hartley definition of interstate commerce instead of using discretion to exclude whole classes of cases, but permits it to cede to the States certain cases when applicable State law is consistent with Federal law. (No-man's-land amendment.)

Permits both replaced strikers and those replacing them on the job to vote in representation elections.

Permits prehire agreements between contractors and unions in the building trades and union-shop clauses may be effective in 7 instead of 30 days.

Union elections: Requires that union officials be chosen by secret ballot in both locals and internationals, except that international officers may be elected by convention delegates who have been elected locally by secret ballot. Maximum term for international officers is 4 years, for local officers 3 years.

Requires that all members receive due notice of elections, and be given an opportunity to nominate candidates. All records must be preserved. Forbids officers to use dues or compulsory levies for campaign purposes.

Insures members the right to remove officers for cause by majority vote, after a hearing.

Permits a union member, after exhausting union remedies, to file a complaint charging a violation with the Secretary of Labor. If the Secretary finds the violation affected the result of the election, he must file suit in Federal court to set aside the election and have a new election ordered.

Corruption procedures: Bars persons convicted of a felony from holding union office until their civil rights are restored by executive pardon.

Bars persons from union office for 5 years if convicted in a civil action of having failed to file financial reports under the bill.

Forbids shakedown picketing.

Forbids improper unloading fee demanded by unions of interstate truckers where no actual work is done and no contract exists.

Makes it a crime for an employer or employer middleman to bribe union officials, or for an official to accept a bribe.

Ethical practices: Establishes an Advisory Committee on Ethical Practices, including labor, management, and public representatives.

Declaration of policy favors ethical practices codes for unions and employers' associations.

Requires non-Communist affidavits from employers seeking access to NLRB.

Passed Senate June 17, 1958.

Social Security

H. R. 5411:

This measure reinstates a mother's insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act of a widow or divorcee that were terminated by remarriage when the new husband dies within 1 year of the remarriage before the woman can qualify as his widow for old age and survivors insurance purposes.

The measure also permits interstate instrumentalities to secure old-age survivors insurance coverage for policemen and firemen who are employed by them and are in positions covered under a retirement system.

Public Law 85–798, approved August 28, 1958.

Hawaiian Home Development

H. R. 8476:

This measure makes funds available to the Hawaiian home-loan fund, which is used for home construction and alteration of homes for persons of Polynesian blood, by providing an additional source of rentals by diverting to the fund certain rentals of the Hawaiian Homes Commission in excess of the rentals needed to meet administrative expenses.

Public Law 85–710, approved August 21, 1958.

Otoe and Missouria Tribes—Membership

H. R. 8524:

This measure authorizes the preparation of a roll of persons of Indian blood whose ancestors were members of the Otoe and Missouria Tribe of Indians, and provides for per capita distribution of approximately $143 million to these members.

Public Law 85–395, approved May 9, 1958.

Inclusion of Two States Among States to Divide Their Retirement Systems

H. R. 11346:

The Social Security Amendments of 1956 included a provision permitting 8 States to divide their retirement systems into two parts so as to obtain old-age, survivors, and disability insurance coverage, under the States' coverage agreements with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for only those State and local government employees who desire such coverage, provided all future entrants into the retirement system are covered under old-age, survivors, and disability insurance. In 1957 this provision was extended to four additional States and to all interstate instrumentalities. This measure extends this provision to the States of Massachusetts and Vermont.

Public Law 85–787, approved August 27, 1958.

Emergency Unemployment Compensation

H. R. 12065:

This is another of a series of measures enacted by Congress to relieve the suffering of some 5.1 million American unemployed, who once were wage earners. Many hundreds of thousands of these people have exhausted their unemployment compensation benefits under State and specified Federal laws, since laws now provided by the 48 States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, and Hawaii are presently designed to take care of the unemployed during limited periods of unemployment.

This measure authorizes payment of temporary unemployment compensation to individuals who have exhausted these rights under State unemployment compensation laws and under Federal laws applying to Federal civilian employees and veterans.

It applies to those persons who exhausted their benefits between June 30, 1957 (or any later date the State may establish), and April 1, 1958.

It provides that the maximum amount of temporary emergency unemployment compensation payable to any individual will be 50 percent of the total amount payable at the time he exhausted his rights before making claim under this act.

The Secretary of Labor is authorized to enter into agreements with States or State agencies who desire to take advantage of this temporary extension.

The act provides that each State receiving these funds reimburse the Federal Government before January 1, 1963, and, in case the State fails to do so, the Federal Government will levy an additional tax of 0.15 percent on employers until the full amount is repaid.

Provides that Federal benefits to a State which had temporarily extended its benefits period be reduced proportionately by the amount provided by the State's temporary extension.

Includes within the definition of "State," Alaska, Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

Public Law 85–441, approved June 4, 1958.

The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938

H. R. 12967:

This legislation provides for industry-committee review of minimum wage rates applicable to employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce in Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, at least every 2 years instead of once each year as is presently the case; but that the Secretary in his discretion may order an additional review during any such 2-year period.

Public Law 85–750, approved August 25, 1958.

Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation

H. R. 13021:

This measure authorizes the Secretary of Labor, through the use of administrative proceedings, to establish enforceable safety regulations in longshore and ship repair work in the Federal maritime jurisdiction on the navigable waters of the United States, including drydocks. Such regulations are to be established in consultation with a nine-member advisory committee. Authority to seek injunctions for violations is vested in the Secretary.

Public Law 85–742, approved August 23, 1958.

Special Training for Handicapped War Orphans

H. R. 13559:

The measure has two major purposes:

(1) To authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to approve specialized courses of vocational training for persons eligible for educational assistance under the War Orphans Educational Assistance Act of 1956, where such courses are found to be suitable to the needs of particular war orphans; and

(2) To permit such specialized vocational training, and also restorative training, to be afforded eligible war orphans at age 14, instead of at age 18, as provided by existing law.

Public Law 85–871, approved September 2, 1958.

Unemployment Compensation Funds

House Joint Resolution 533:

This resolution provides additional funds for unemployment compensation for veterans in the amount of $25 million and $18,400,000 for Federal employees.

Public Law 85–324, approved February 12, 1958.

Transportation and Communication

Use of Radio and Television Frequencies

Senate Joint Resolution 106:

This resolution authorizes the creation of a commission to investigate the utilization of radio and television frequencies allocated to Federal agencies and instrumentalities.

Passed Senate July 21, 1958.

Civil Aviation Organization Session

Senate Joint Resolution 166:

This resolution authorizes the appropriation of $200,000 to enable the United States to hold the 1959 meeting of the International Civil Aviation Organization.

The year 1959 is the 15th anniversary of the International Civil Aviation Organiza-

tion which was established by the Convention on International Civil Aviation signed at Chicago in 1944. ICAO is the principal intergovernmental organization for cooperation in the field of civil aviation and has a membership of 72 countries outside the Iron Curtain.

ICAO's principal functions are (a) to secure uniformity in air navigation regulations and standards; (b) to facilitate procedure involved in international air transport; (c) joint support of radio, weather, and other air-navigation services; and (d) technical assistance in civil aviation matters to underdeveloped countries.

This year's meeting will provide an excellent forum for acquainting the world's aviation leaders with developments in the American jet-transport industry, and for discussion of the problems of jet operations which will be faced generally by the various member governments.

Public Law 85-448, approved June 4, 1958.

Motor Vehicles

S. 375:

This measure amends the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for perfection of security interests in motor vehicles. The measure provides that a security interest will be perfected everywhere against general creditors and subsequent purchasers and lienors.

1. If a certificate of title is issued under a statute requiring or permitting indication of a security interest on the title, and the security interest is so indicated on the title; or

2. If no title has been issued but the security interest is publicly filed or recorded in a jurisdiction where the law requires or permits such filing or recording; or

3. If no title has been issued, and the security interest cannot be perfected by filing or recording but the security interest has been perfected as to general creditors and subsequent lien creditors under the law of the home State.

Public Law 85-728, approved August 23, 1958.

Common Carriers—Government Contracts

S-377:

This measure amends section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act under which the United States is allowed free or reduced rates for carriage, storage, or handling of property, and transportation of persons or property at free or reduced rates.

This amendment provides that offers, or tenders, to the Government under section 22 by carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act shall be conclusively presumed to be lawful and not subject to attack 3 years after date of acceptance by a properly authorized official of the United States. Such arrangements may be canceled or terminated only upon 90 days' written notice.

Public Law 85-762, approved August 26, 1958.

CAA—Security Violations

S. 1380:

This measure authorizes the imposition of civil penalties for violation of the security provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act.

Following the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, legislation was enacted authorizing the Secretary of Commerce, upon the direction of the President, to exercise control of the flight of aircraft over certain areas for national security purposes. On December 21, 1950, the President issued an Executive order directing the Secretary to put the program into effect. At the present, however, the only sanctions which may be applied for violations of the security regulations which have been issued by the Secretary under that authority are either (1) suspension or revocation of the pilot's certificate in cases where the pilot is personally chargeable with the violation or against the air carrier's operating certificate where the air carrier is chargeable with the violation, or (2) in the case of willful offenses, criminal penalties. In most cases, these sanctions are too drastic for the usual offense. Criminal intent is usually lacking in these cases, which usually involve some unauthorized entry into an air-defense-identification zone through oversight or neglect.

It is felt that the normal sanction utilized for minor violations of rules, regulations, or orders is a sufficient penalty to impose—that of a fine which cannot exceed $1,000 for each violation.

Passed Senate by voice vote March 6, 1958.

Alaskan Airports

S. 1366:

This bill amends existing law to permit the Secretary of Commerce to lease real property at the public airports in Alaska and Fairbanks, Alaska, for periods up to 55 years for the purpose of erecting structures necessary to the operation of these airports.

The 1948 act authorized construction and operation of these airports and permitted the Secretary to lease the property on these airports up to 20 years which, at that time, was adequate because, prior to the liquidation of the RFC, it was possible for national banks to make loans for construction of commercial facilities on land held under lease for 20 years. Under present law, however, national banks are prohibited from lending money secured by mortgages on leaseholds having less than 50 years to run from the date the loan is made or acquired. Inasmuch as national banks furnish the principal source of financing for the type construction which is undertaken at these airports by private industry, the 20-year maximum lease term prevents the development of these airports.

Public Law 85-503, approved July 3, 1958.

CAA—Violations

S. 1749:

Amends the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to provide for the imposition of civil penalties in certain additional cases. Title VI of the CAA Act provides for a comprehensive safety program, including the issuance of safety regulations. This act enlarges the scope of section 610 to include any violation of safety requirements by ground personnel, such as mechanics, whose activities, although certified, do not directly involve the operation of an aircraft. It also includes certain employers of such personnel as manufacturers holding production certificates and air agencies. The result of these added prohibitions is to permit the use of civil penalties, as an enforcement tool, in certain additional cases which cannot now be reached under the existing act.

Thus, in effect, this permits the Secretary of Commerce to invoke civil penalties as an appropriate sanction for nonaggravated violations of safety regulations previously denied him.

Passed Senate by voice vote March 6, 1958.

Freight Vessels—Alaska—Washington

S. 1798:

This measure amends existing law to permit merchants of southeastern Alaska to form associations or groups for the purpose of acquiring vessels (not to exceed 150 gross tons) to transfer merchandise owned by any one or more of them to the following places: To or from places within the inland waters of southeastern Alaska and Prince Rupert, British Columbia; to or from places within the inland waters in the State of Washington; and from all places located within inland waters of southeastern Alaska to places within inland waters of the State of Washington via sheltered waters.

This amendment was considered necessary since most of these merchants are small-business men unable to finance shipments in large quantities; and the communities themselves are towns built on stilts over the water or on the sides of mountains, where there are no warehousing facilities or cold-storage facilities, hence these short-hauls and small tonnage will prove best for their economic situations.

Public Law 85-739, approved August 23, 1958.

Aircraft and Vehicle Destruction

S. 1963:

This measure increases the penalties for knowingly giving false information concerning the destruction of aircraft and motor vehicles from a fine of $1,000 and imprisonment for not more than 1 year to a fine of $5,000 and imprisonment for not more than 5 years.

This legislation was prompted by the increasing number of instances where individuals—pranksters primarily—give false or misleading information affecting the operation of commercial aircraft. Such false reports as to bombs being placed on commercial aircraft have caused serious concern not only to airline officials but also to many thousands of persons who utilize this mode of transportation.

Passed Senate May 21, 1958.

National Bureau of Standards

S. 2114:

This measure provides permanent authority for the acquisition of field sites for the National Bureau of Standards. These field sites are needed primarily in connection with the radio propagation research programs conducted by the Bureau's Central Radio Propagation Laboratory now quartered at Boulder, Colo.

Incorporates the provisions of Public Law 618, 81st Congress, 2d session, into the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards. This act of the 81st Congress permits the construction of buildings and facilities and improvements to existing facilities.

It also clarifies the National Bureau of Standards authority to undertake improvements or construction projects and raises the limitations on such projects from $25,000 to $40,000.

Passed Senate March 3, 1958, by voice vote.

Vessels—Towing Lights

S. 2115:

This measure brings the provisions of law which govern the use of towing lights on vessels operating under Pilot Rules for Inland Waters and Western Rivers Rules more nearly into conformity. This will tend to eliminate confusion and possible hazards to vessels going from an area where the inland water regulations are in effect to an area governed by the western rivers regulations, and vice versa.

The act will also provide readily distinguishable and identifiable lights for overtaken and overtaking vessels as another safety precaution.

Public Law 85-635, approved August 14, 1958.

Ship Contractors—Investments

S. 2255:

Amends the Merchant Marine Act of 1956 to authorize the Federal Maritime Board (Maritime Administration), upon application of the contractor, to permit, in its discretion, investment by the operator of some or all of the contractor's capital and special reserve funds in approved securities, upon condition that the income from these securities is deposited in the capital reserve fund. This will eliminate the requirement that the funds be invested in interest-bearing securities, and authorizes investment in any approved securities, including common stocks.

These reserve funds are set aside by law to insure ship replacement. By allowing investment in non-interest-bearing securities, a more equitable treatment of these funds will be achieved. The United States will benefit by this change through increased subsidy recapture and taxes and in terms of greater ability of operators to serve the essential trade routes.

Public Law 85-687, approved August 14, 1958.

Reduced Rates—Air Carrier Employees

S. 2919:

This act supplies statutory authority for granting free and reduced rate passes by air carriers to their retired directors, officers, employees, and members of their immediate families.

In the past, many carriers have regularly granted pass privileges to their retired personnel on a space-available basis under section 403 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act. Under existing law this section allows carriers to give free and reduced rate transportation to their "directors, officers, and employees and their immediate families"; however, on October 18, 1957, the Civil Aeronautics Board issued a ruling that section 403 (b) could not be construed to cover retired employees.

Since this practice has been traditional in the industry and become imbedded in the carriers' labor-relations structures, Congress felt statutory sanction should be given. This measure in no way requires the carriers to extend pass privileges to the persons covered, but merely allows them to do so as space becomes available or on whatever basis the air carriers desire to work out.

Passed Senate by voice vote March 6, 1958.

Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission

S. 2933:

This measure extends the life of the Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission to February 1, 1960, and increases its authorization.

Public Law 85-601, approved August 8, 1958.

Dealers' Aircraft Registration Certificates

S. 3016:

This measure amends the Civil Aeronautics Act to provide specific statutory authority for the Secretary of Commerce to issue dealers' aircraft registration certificates. It also provides that aircraft held under such certificates would be (to the extent provided in regulations of the Commerce Department) deemed registered under the Civil Aeronautics Act, which will make it possible to insure the validity of liens recorded against such aircraft.

These certificates may be used by the holder to operate aircraft for production flight tests, in ordinary trade channels, and for demonstration purposes.

Passed Senate by voice vote March 3, 1958.

Rural Carriers—Equipment Allowance

S. 3050:

This measure increases the basic equipment allowance for rural carriers of the Post Office Department to 11 cents a mile from the present rate of 9 cents a mile, and provides a minimum allowance of $3.50 a day. In actual operation, this means that a rural carrier with a route of 32 miles or less will receive $3.50 as a minimum allowance, and carriers with routes in excess of 32 miles will receive 11 cents a mile.

The equipment allowance for rural carriers has not been increased since 1951. Since that time the cost of automobiles has increased over 30 percent; repairs over 60 percent; license and other taxes over 40 percent; insurance approximately 30 percent; gasoline and oil some 20 percent; and, other operating costs proportionately.

Public Law 85-399, approved May 14, 1958.

Canadian Vessels—Alaska

S. 3100:

Extends for another year (until June 30, 1959) a waiver of the statutory requirement that vessels of the United States registry be used in passenger or freight transportation between the United States and Alaska.

Permits Canadian-flag vessels to carry passengers and freight between Hyder, Alaska, and other ports in southeastern Alaska and foreign ports.

The waiver is necessary because the Alaska Steamship Co., an American concern, has suspended those operations described in the waiver, leaving the southeastern Alaska ports without available American transportation.

Public Law 85-473, approved June 30, 1958.

Transportation Act of 1958

S. 3778:

This measure amends the Interstate Commerce Act so as:

To establish a $500 million program of guaranteed loans for capital expenditures and maintenance under the administration of the Interstate Commerce Commission to aid temporarily in the financing of railroads subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, that are unable to obtain needed funds upon reasonable terms through ordinary commercial channels;

To amend ratemaking section of the Interstate Commerce Act, section 15 (a), to assure consistency on the part of the ICC in cases involving minimum rates in order that carriers may assert their inherent advantages in making rates but subject to the objectives of the national transportation policy;

To make more effective those provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act enabling the Interstate Commerce Commission to remove discrimination against interstate or foreign commerce found to result from intrastate rates;

To vest the Interstate Commerce Commission with authority to authorize, in proper cases, the discontinuance, curtailment, or consolidation of unprofitable railroad services unduly burdening interstate commerce; yet assuring to the State commissions primary jurisdiction over wholly intrastate commerce, stations, depots, or other facilities;

To establish the scope and application of the agricultural commodities clause under which motor vehicles engaged in the transportation of certain commodities are exempt from economic regulation under the Interstate Commerce Act and to redefine the exemption to bring under economic regulation frozen fruits, frozen vegetables, and frozen berries, but excluding from regulation cooked or uncooked (including breaded) fish or shellfish, when frozen or fresh;

To make it clear that all commercial transportation of property by motor vehicle in interstate or foreign commerce, except private carriage and transportation otherwise specifically exempt, is subject to regulation.

Public Law 85-625, approved August 12, 1958.

Day Signals for Certain Vessels

S. 3951:

This measure authorizes the Secretary of Treasury to prescribe day signals for certain vessels.

Public Law 85-656, approved August 14, 1958.

Lake Champlain Bridge Commission

House Joint Resolution 382:

This measure authorizes the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission, set up by the States of New York and Vermont, to continue to collect reasonable tolls for maintenance and operation; to establish a reserve fund for future maintenance and operation of the Crown Point and Rouses Point Bridges across Lake Champlain; and to defray the cost of studies for a proposed third bridge in the vicinity of Plattsburg, N. Y.

These tolls may be collected until the interested States provide a different method and procedure for operating and maintaining these bridges.

Public Law 85-504, approved July 3, 1958.

Vessels—Trade-Ins

H. R. 3210:

This measure extends to June 30, 1962 (now June 30, 1958) the authority of the Federal Maritime Board to declare a vessel obsolete which meets the requirements of the act if 12 years old or older. Without this extension, only vessels that are at least 17 years old may be traded in for an allowance on a new vessel.

With the majority of subsidized vessels now in active service due to reach their normal retirement age of 20 years within the 1962-66 period, financial and shipyard capacity considerations make it imperative that replacement be spread over a term of years. To effect this with the least possible strain on all concerned, some of the vessels involved must be retired prior to their attaining 20 years of service, while others must be continued in service beyond their normal useful life span. Thus, continued authority to accept some vessels for trade-in at less than the 17-year age will afford the Maritime Administration the necessary flexibility for meeting the specific problems of the various lines.

Public Law 85-332, approved February 20, 1958.

Navaho-Hopi Reservation Roads

S. 3468:

This measure amends the Navaho-Hopi Rehabilitation Act of 1950 by providing an additional $20 million authorization for the construction of roads on the two reservations.

In the 81st Congress, after extensive investigation and study a 10-year rehabilitation program was enacted for the Indians residing on these two reservations. To aid in the rehabilitation work Congress authorized $88,570,000 to be spent for special projects to raise the standard of living.

Among the projects was a $20 million road improvement program on the two reservations. At that time, it was believed that 1,000 miles of badly needed country-type roads could be constructed for this amount. Since 1951, however, Congressional appropriations totaling some $14 million have resulted in the construction of only 371 miles of improved roadways due to increased construction costs. This additional authorization is required in order for Congress to live up to its original commitment and thus permit these tribes to continue their economic expansion and development of their tribal assets.

Public Law 85-740, approved August 23, 1958.

Automobile Labeling Bill

S. 3500:

This measure requires car manufacturers or importers to display a price tag on the windshield or window of a new car in the form of a label. The label is to set forth separately the basic retail price of the car suggested—but not fixed—by the manufacturer, the suggested retail price of each accessory, and the total transportation cost to the dealer.

The bill does not infringe upon the freedom of the manufacturer to price his own product; it does, however, assure the purchaser that he has necessary basic cost information. For the purpose of this bill an automobile would remain "new" until it is purchased by a person for purposes other than resale.

For failure to comply with the provisions of this act, a violator may be fined up to $1,000, imprisoned for 1 year, or both.

Makes the act effective October 1, 1958, or upon the introduction of any new model in any line of automobile beginning after the date of enactment, whichever date occurs last.

Public Law 85-506, approved July 7, 1958.

Federal Airport Act Amendments

S. 3502:

This measure extends through fiscal 1933 the Federal Airport Act which is designed to assist local communities in developing new or expanding existing airports so that a system of public airports may be achieved adequate to meet the present and future needs of civil aeronautics. This assistance is in the

form of grants on a matching-fund basis. In the extension, effective at the beginning of fiscal 1959, these funds are increased to $100 million annually.

The bill also provides a separate, emergency fund of $75 million for immediate discretionary allocation by the Secretary of Commerce during fiscal 1959, on a matching-fund basis. This fund is to be used to prepare the country for the advent of the jet-passenger planes, which will require runways from 10,000 to 15,000 feet with heavier bases, wider taxiways, and better loading-ramp facilities.

It eliminates parking lots and certain concession areas in terminal buildings from eligibility for Federal matching funds under the provisions of the act. It provides Federal assistance on a matching basis to certain small airports for runway improvements.

Another change is the requirement that the Secretary of Commerce publish, by January 1 of each year, the proposed program of airport development for the next fiscal year.

Vetoed September 2, 1958.

Shipping Contracts

S. 3916:

Extends for 2 years the provisions of the 1916 Shipping Act relating to dual-rate contract arrangements. Dual-rate contracting is a practice whereby a conference establishes tariffs of rates at two levels, the lower of which is charged to shippers who agree to ship their cargoes on vessels of members of the conference only and the higher of which is charged to merchants who do not so agree.

The measure becomes effective immediately upon enactment, but it is of a temporary nature, and will continue in effect only until June 30, 1960, thus providing a reasonable time for a thorough consideration of the merits of the dual-rate system. It makes valid any existing dual-rate contract arrangements unless canceled or modified by the Federal Maritime Board. In effect, merely continues on a temporary basis a system that has been used by both shippers and shipping lines over the years.

Public Law 85–626, approved August 12, 1958.

Panama Canal Zone—Utility Lines

H. R. 3604:

This measure makes it a felony to injure or destroy works, property, or material of communication, power, lighting, control, or signal lines, stations, and systems operated by the United States in the Canal Zone specifically protecting the public utility installations of the Panama Canal Company.

Offenses of the type to which this bill is directed must now be prosecuted as misdemeanors under Canal Zone Code sections relating to petit larceny or malicious injury to property, telegraph, or telephone lines.

The extension and broadening of existing law against willful or malicious interference with public utility installations in the Canal Zone would also be applicable to offenses involving privately owned and operated facilities.

Public Law 85–419, approved May 19, 1958.

Intercoastal Shipping Act

S. 4196:

This measure grants relief to ocean common carriers in the intercoastal trade by permitting them to issue in lieu of the archaic long form of passenger tickets, bills of lading, dock receipts, and other documents, less costly short form, if the terms and conditions under which they are issued are filed with the Federal Maritime Board, posted conspicuously on the vessel and made available on request to passengers, shippers, or consignees.

Public Law 85–810, approved August 28, 1958.

Postal Stations—Strategic Installations

H. R. 4815:

This measure grants to the Postmaster General permanent authority to establish postal stations at camps, posts, or stations of the Armed Forces, and at defense or other strategic installations.

This authority makes it possible to provide efficient mail service for these installations at the lowest cost to the Post Office Department, by permitting the Department to assign trained postal personnel to man these stations or branch post offices.

Public Law 85–372, approved April 9, 1958.

Air Subsidies

H. R. 5822:

This measure provides that, on or after April 6, 1956, an airline receiving a Government subsidy may retain the capital gains received from the sale of used flight equipment, if the amount is reinvested in new flight equipment. Losses sustained in disposition of flight equipment are also excluded in determining subsidies.

This act has no effect on the payment of income or capital gains taxes by the airlines. Prior to this enactment capital gains of airlines, receiving a Government subsidy, were applied as a reduction of the amount of the subsidy.

Public Law 85–373, approved April 9, 1958.

Postal Rate Increases

H. R. 5836:

This measure increases by $550 million a year the postal revenues when all of the postal-rate adjustments become effective. These increases are:

First-class mail (effective August 1, 1958): Letters, 3 cents to 4 cents; postal cards, 2 cents to 3 cents; drop letters, 2 cents to 3 cents.

Domestic airmail (effective August 1, 1958): Letters, 6 cents to 7 cents; postal cards, 4 cents to 5 cents.

Second-class mail: Three annual increments of approximately 10 percent each on the reading portion of publications, and 3 annual increments of approximately 20 percent each on the advertising portion. Step increases effective January 1 of the next 3 calendar years.

Minimum charge per piece on publications is increased from one-eighth of a cent annually until it reachese one-half cent; however, publications of certain nonprofit organizations and publications designed for classroom use are exempt.

Controlled circulation publications increased from 10 cents for those not over 8 ounces and 11 cents for those over 8 ounces to a uniform rate of 12 cents a pound regardless of weight.

Third-class mail: Piece rate on individual mailings raised from 2 cents to 3 cents on the first 2 ounces and from 1 cent to 1½ cents for each additional ounce. Effective August 1, 1958.

Piece rate on bulk mailings of circulars raised from 1½ cents to an eventual rate of 2½ cents in two equal increments of one-half cent each. Effective January 1, 1959.

Minimum charge per piece for bulk matter by certain nonprofit organizations is 50 percent of the regular minimum rate.

Pound rate on bulk mailings of circulars increased from 14 cents to 16 cents.

Annual fee for mailing permits raised from $10 to $20.

Fourth-class mail: Pound rate raised from 8 cents on the first pound and 4 cents for each additional pound to 9 cents on the first pound and to 5 cents on each additional pound. Effective August 1, 1958.

Postal policy: Provides that the total loss on mail carried free or at reduced rates is to be considered as public service to be paid from the general fund of the Treasury.

Postal modernization fund: Establishes a Postal Modernization Fund in the Treasury for research and development of improved equipment and facilities.

Public Law 85–426, approved May 27, 1958.

Obscene Mail

H. R. 6239:

This measure amends section 1461, title 18, United States Code, so as to allow prosecution for mailing obscene matter not only at the place of deposit in the mails, but also at the place of delivery where the obscenity has its effect on the recipient. It also doubles the penalties if obscene matter is mailed to persons under 19 years of age with the knowledge or reason to believe that the recipient is under 19.

Public Law 85–796, approved August 28, 1958.

Merchant Marine Academy

H. R. 7052:

This measure amends the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, to provide for the appointment of cadets to the Merchant Marine Academy from the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Canal Zone as follows:

Canal Zone: 2 vacancies to be allocated each year.

Guam: 1 vacancy each year.

American Samoa: 1 vacancy each year.

Virgin Islands: 1 vacancy each year.

District of Columbia: 4 vacancies each year.

Under existing law, in addition to the appointment of cadets from the several States, the appointment of one cadet each from the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, is authorized. This measure will accord the same privilege and benefit to young men from Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands, from among candidates nominated by the governors of those areas, as well as to candidates from the District of Columbia, and the Canal Zone.

Public Law 85–331, approved February 20, 1958.

Great Lakes—Navigation Rules

H. R. 7226:

This measure is designed to remove any doubt as to the application of the United States Rules for Preventing Collisions on the Great Lakes to all vessels, of foreign as well as of United States registry, while they are navigating within the territorial waters of the United States.

Present statutes are so worded as to permit the interpretation that foreign vessels are not required to accept and obey the rules which more specifically apply to United States flag vessels navigating on the Great Lakes and their tributary and connecting waters.

Public Law 85–350, approved March 28, 1958.

Social Security

H. R. 7570:

This measure provides social-security coverage for certain employeees of tax-exempt organizations which erroneously but in good faith failed to file the required waiver certificate in time to provide the coverage. This would cover not only failure due to mistaken belief that the waiver was filed but also failure due to an assumption that filing was unnecessary.

Public Law 85–785, approved August 27, 1958.

Free Transit at the Panama Canal for Vessels Operated by State Nautical Schools

H. R. 7779:

The bill restores to training vessels operated by State nautical schools the privilege to transit the Panama Canal without payment of tolls.

Public Law 85–735, approved August 23, 1958.

Issuance of Licenses to Noncitizens for Radio Stations on Aircraft

H. R. 8543:

The purpose of this legislation is to give the Federal Communications Commission

discretionary authority to issue licenses to noncitizens for the operation of aircraft radio stations in the case of persons holding United States pilot certificates or in the case of persons holding foreign aircraft pilot certificates which are valid in the United States on the basis of reciprocal agreements entered into with foreign governments.

Public Law 85-817, approved August 28, 1958.

Vessels—Disposal

H. R. 8547:

This measure authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to dispose of seven uncompleted vessels, namely, the U. S. S. *Kentucky*, the U. S. S. *Hawaii*, the U. S. S. *Lansdale*, the U. S. S. *Seymour D. Owens*, the U. S. S. *Lancetfish*, the U. S. S. *Unicorn*, and the U. S. S. *Walrus*.

The Navy conducted studies of the cost involved in converting these vessels to modern ships and concluded that the cost and manpower could not be justified in the altered design as compared to that of a new ship. Even in an emergency, if time were available the Navy considers that it would be more advantageous, from the standpoint of both time and money, to build new ships.

Public Law 85-438, approved May 29, 1958.

Highway Program—Accelerated

H. R. 9821:

This measure is another in a series designed to alleviate, or help to alleviate, the serious economic condition which the country is facing. The purpose of this act is twofold: Provide additional jobs for the unemployed and, at the same time, give the Nation the highways so badly needed by:

1. Increasing by $400 million, to $1.275 billion, the fiscal 1959 authorization for Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban roads, for immediate apportionment. The $400 million is to be available only for expenditure on contracts awarded by the States before December 1, 1958, which provide for completion of construction before December 1, 1959, subject to delays not the fault of the contractor or created by acts of God. The amount apportioned to a State not expended on December 1, 1958, will lapse. After the $400 million has been apportioned, a State may spend its share of these funds without limitation as to the percentage to be utilized on any one system. Federal share of any project out of the $400 million will be 66⅔ percent and the State's share 33⅓ percent.

2. Authorizes $115 million for fiscal 1959 as advances to assist any State in matching Federal funds for the primary, secondary, and urban systems up to 20 percent of the State's share, to be repaid by the States in two equal installments from funds apportioned to the States in fiscals 1961 and 1962.

3. Increases by $200 million, to $2.2 billion, the fiscal 1959 authorization for the Interstate Highway System to the States on the usual 90-10 matching basis, to be apportioned immediately in accordance with existing law.

4. Authorizes a $300 million increase, to $2.5 billion, in each of fiscal years 1960 and 1961 for the Interstate Highway, the fiscal 1960 authorization to be apportioned any time after June 30, 1958, on the basis of the estimates of cost of completing the Interstate System.

5. Authorizes $900 million for fiscal 1960 and $925 million for fiscal 1961 for regular Federal-aid highway systems, primary, secondary, and urban systems, the so-called ABC roads. These funds to be apportioned to the States in accordance with existing law, and matched on a 50-50 basis.

6. Authorizes a one-half of 1 percent bonus in Federal Interstate Highway funds to States that agree to regulate billboard advertising within 660 feet of new rights-of-way along the Interstate Highway System begun after July 1, 1956. Limits permitted signs to four types along the system and prohibits signs advertising illegal activities. Authorizes reimbursement to the States for the cost of acquiring the advertising easements not to exceed 5 percent of the cost of the right-of-way.

7. Suspends for fiscal years 1959 and 1960 the pay-as-you-go provision of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 under which highway user taxes must be collected in the highway trust fund before apportionment of Federal funds to the State, which, in effect, makes available about $1.2 billion more for the Federal-aid program.

8. Increases by $5 million fiscal 1959 authorizations for forest highways; $5 million for forest development roads and trails; and $1 million for public lands highways. Forest highway authorizations are to be apportioned on the same basis as for 1958.

9. Authorizes for each of fiscal years 1960 and 1961 the following: Forest highways, $33 million; forest development roads and trails, $30 million; national park roads, $18 million; parkways (authorized), $16 million; Indian reservation roads, $12 million; public lands highways, $3 million.

10. Below is a summary of funds authorized for Federal-aid highways (in millions):

System	Fiscal year 1959	1960	1961	1962
REGULAR				
Primary	180	405	416.25	1,001.25
Secondary	120	270	277.50	667.50
Urban	100	225	231.25	556.25
Subtotal	400	900	925	2,225
Advances	115			115
Interstate	200	300	300	500
Subtotal	715	1,200	1,225	3,140

System	Fiscal year 1959	1960	1961	1962
Forest highways	5	33	33	71
Forest development roads and trails	5	30	30	65
Park roads and trails		16	16	32
Parkways		18	18	36
Indian roads		12	12	24
Public lands highways	1	3	3	7
Subtotal (miscellaneous roads)	11	112	112	235
Total	726	1,312	1,337	3,375

Public Law 85-381, approved April 16, 1958.

Highway Construction

H. R. 10426:

This measure amends the Federal-Aid Highway Act by increasing from 5 to 7 years the period in which actual construction shall commence on rights-of-way acquired for such construction.

Public Law 85-597, approved August 6, 1958.

Establishment of Postal Stations

H. R. 10495:

Present law authorizes the establishment of postal stations and branch offices within a radius of 5 miles of the outer boundaries of the adjacent city wherein the main post office is located.

Public Law 85-893, approved September 2, 1958.

Navigation Congresses

H. R. 11305:

Authorizes funds to finance the 1961 meeting of the Permanent International Association of Navigation Congresses.

Public Law 85-598, approved August 6, 1958.

Superliner Passenger Vessels—Construction

H. R. 11451:

This measure authorizes the Federal Maritime Board to construct two superliner passenger vessels, one to replace the steamship *America* on the North Atlantic route, the other for use between the west coast of the United States and the Far East, replacing the steamship *President Hoover*. Both of the vessels to be replaced will have exceeded their normal 20-year useful life before construction of their replacements are completed.

Concurrently with entering into contracts with the shipyards for construction of these vessels, the Board is authorized to enter into contracts for the sale of the vessels, completely outfitted and equipped, to the United States Lines Co. in the case of the steamship *America* replacement for $47 million, and to the American President Lines, Ltd., for the steamship *President Hoover* replacement for $34 million, or 45 percent of the domestic construction cost of the vessel fully outfitted and equipped, whichever is the greater.

Public Law 85-521, approved July 15, 1958.

Section 77 (c) (2) of the Bankruptcy Act

H. R. 12217:

The purpose of the legislation is to amend paragraph (2), subdivision (c) of section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, the railroad reorganization section, to allow the debtor, with respect to safety, location of tracks, and terminal facilities to comply with the lawful orders of a State regulatory body so that needed improvements in railroad facilities can be made prior to the confirmation of a plan of reorganization.

Public Law 85-824, approved August 28, 1958.

Highways

H. R. 12776:

This measure revises and codifies the laws relating to highways.

Public Law 85-767, approved August 27, 1958.

Switchblade Knives

H. R. 12850:

This measure prohibits the manufacture for, or transportation or distribution in, interstate commerce or in any Federal territory, of switchblade knives or other concealed-blade knives which open by operation of inertia or gravity. Penalties are a fine of not more than $2,000 and imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both. Designed to prevent the use of such knives by criminals and juvenile delinquents, the measure excepts from its operation the armed services and those operating under contract with the services and the possession by a one-armed person of such knife with a blade 3 inches or less.

Public Law 85-623, approved August 12, 1958.

Authorizing Certain Payments Out of the Vessel Operations Revolving Fund

H. R. 13371:

This bill would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to pay to any person to whom he

chartered vessels under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended, an amount equal to the fair and reasonable expenses incurred by such person during the calendar year beginning January 1, 1957, to cover the costs of breaking such vessels out of the reserve fleet and activating them for service.

Public Law 85–721, approved August 21, 1958.

Interstate Compacts for Traffic Safety Programs

House Joint Resolution 221:

This resolution would allow the States to enter into agreements or compacts with one another to establish and carry out traffic safety programs. It would also allow the States to establish agencies to carry out such programs. States could enter into compacts to pass uniform traffic laws, driver education and training laws, and other regulations which would provide uniform solutions to common traffic problems. They could also do joint research in safety programs.

Public Law 85–684, approved August 20, 1958.

Veterans

Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952

S. 4031:

This bill amends the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, popularly known as the Korean GI bill, so as to eliminate a highly undesirable situation which sometimes occurs under the provisions of the act concerning a "change of program." The specific purpose of the bill is to provide that, in determining whether a veteran may make a change in his program of education or training under the Korean GI bill—

"a change from the pursuit of one objective or level of education or training to the pursuit of a higher objective or level of education or training in the same field of study or training"

will be considered a continuation of his original program rather than a change to a new program.

Passed Senate August 14, 1958.

Veterans—Widows Pension

H. R. 358:

This measure increases the monthly rates of pension payable to widows and former widows of deceased veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection.

It applies only to widows of advanced age. It increases the Spanish War, Civil War, and Indian War widows' pension rate of $54.18 to $65 a month in case the widow is 70 years of age or over. If the widow was the wife of the veteran during the period of his service, the rate of $67.73 a month will be increased to $75 a month. The pension rates will continue to be uniform for these groups. The measure includes proportionate increases for children. The average age of the widow married to the veteran during the period of his service is 80 years. The Mexican War widows' rates of pension of $52.50 a month are increased to $65 a month.

There are only 4 widows on the roll.

The measure also provides for a pension to the widows of veterans who served in the military or naval forces of the Confederate States of America during the Civil War at the same rates as provided for widows of the Union forces.

Public Law 85–425, approved May 23, 1958.

Reservists—Retired Pay Waiver

H. R. 1140:

This measure extends to retired members of the Reserve components of the uniformed services the provisions of existing law which permit personnel of the Regular components who are receiving retired pay to waive a portion of that retired pay in order to draw compensation from the Veterans' Administration.

Thus, in effect, this legislation grants to reservists, enlisted and officers alike, a privilege that is now applicable only to regulars. The advantage is that a person who can draw compensation from the Veterans' Administration is allowed to exclude that compensation from his income for tax purposes whereas all retirement pay, other than retirement pay for disability, is taxable.

Public Law 85–376, approved April 11, 1958.

Veterans

H. R. 3630:

This measure amends the Veterans Benefits Act of 1957 to provide an additional aid and attendance allowance of $100 per month to certain severe service-connected disabled veterans during periods in which they are not hospitalized at Government expense.

Public Law 85–782, approved August 27, 1958.

Veterans' Benefits

H. R. 5322:

This measure extends dependency and survivor benefits to the dependent husband of a female veteran if he is totally and permanently disabled and incapable of self-support due to his physical and mental disability.

Public Law 85–655, approved August 14, 1958.

Hospitalization in the Philippines

H. R. 6908:

This measure authorizes modification and extension of the grants-in-aid program to the Republic of the Philippines for the hospitalization of certain veterans, to restore eligibility for hospital and medical care to certain veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States, residing in the Philippines.

It is designed to present a more practical and constructive approach as a solution to the varied problems surrounding the extent and type of medical care to be provided for those Filipino veterans who served with our forces during World War II.

The measure also restores eligibility for hospitalization and outpatient medical care for service-connected conditions to United States veterans permanently residing in the Philippines. In addition, hospitalization is authorized for United States war veterans for non-service-connected disabilities if they are unable to defray the expenses of private hospitals.

In effect, this measure terminates as of June 30, 1958, the existing program of grants-in-aid and substitutes a revised and extended program to operate through June 30, 1963. Under this new plan the Veterans' Administration contracts with the Veterans' Memorial Hospital to pay a fair and reasonable per diem rate for service-connected disabilities. The total of these payments, plus any payments for authorized travel expenses in connection with hospital care, is not to exceed $2 million in any 1 fiscal year.

Public Law 85–461, approved June 18, 1958.

Veterans' Readjustment Act Amendment

H. R. 7251:

This measure amends the definition of the term "State" in the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, popularly known as the Korean GI bill, and the War Orphans Educational Assistance Act of 1956, to make clear that the benefits of those acts may be afforded to eligible persons who wish to pursue a course of education or training in the Panama Canal Zone.

The bill also amends the War Orphans Educational Assistance Act so that persons eligible for benefits under the act may obtain these benefits while pursuing a course of training in the Republic of the Philippines. Presently, eligible persons residing in the Philippines must travel to the United States to obtain these benefits, because they are not available unless the person trains in an institution located in the United States, a United States Territory or possession, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. While this amendment does not enlarge the class of persons eligible for the benefits, it does remove the travel problem and, thereby, enlarges the class of persons who may actually obtain benefits.

Public Law 85–460, approved June 18, 1958.

Veterans Reemployment Rights

H. R. 8522:

This measure gives to a member of a Reserve component of the Armed Forces who is ordered to an initial period of active duty for training of not less than 3 continuous months all reemployment rights provided for persons inducted under the Universal Military Training and Service Act. Such a member may not be discharged without cause for 6 months after restoration but is not entitled to any preference rights over a veteran with a superior claim under the Veterans Preference Act.

The measure also provides that both public and private employees, other than those described in the above paragraph, shall be granted leaves of absence for the period required to report for induction into, entering, or performing active duty for training or inactive duty training. At conclusion of training the employee will be permitted to return with such seniority, status, pay, and vacation as he would have had if he had not been absent.

Passed Senate August 4, 1958.

Refunds of Veterans' Insurance Premiums

H. R. 9369:

This measure authorizes the Veterans' Administration to refund approximately $1,642,000 to veterans from whom improper collections for insurance premiums had been made under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act of 1940.

Public Law 85–586, approved August 1, 1958.

Transportation Expenses of Certain Survivors of Deceased Servicemen

H. R. 9721:

Provides for the payment of transportation expenses of certain survivors of deceased servicemen to attend group burials in national cemeteries.

Public Law 85–716, approved August 21, 1958.

Blind Veterans

H. R. 10461:

Increases monthly compensation for veterans who have suffered blindness in both eyes and have only light perception, from $309 to $359.

Public Law 85–652, approved August 14, 1958.

Veterans

H. R. 11382:

This measure authorizes the conversion or exchange of life insurance issued to veterans who served between April 29, 1951, through December 31, 1956. The options available are (1) maintaining the present term policy; (2) exchange of present policy for a limited convertible term policy with lower premiums; and (3) convert to a permanent-type policy.

The measure further provides that upon application within 1 year after the effective date of the act, insurance under the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 may be granted to individuals serving between October 8, 1940, and April 24, 1951.

Public Law 85–896, approved September 2, 1958.

National Service Life Insurance Benefits

H. R. 11577:

Authorizes an increase in the monthly payments under total disability provisions of national service life insurance of $5 per each $1,000 of insurance.

Public Law 85–678, approved August 18, 1958.

Veterans' Burial Allowances

H. R. 11801:

Increases the burial allowance for deceased veterans from $150 to $250.

Public Law 85–674, approved August 18, 1958.

AUTHORIZATION FOR INSERTIONS IN RECORD FOLLOWING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD following the adjournment of Congress until the last edition authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing is published; but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred or to any speech delivered subsequent to the adjournment of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I send to the desk an order, and ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the proposed order.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That notwithstanding the final adjournment of the present session of the Congress, the Secretary be, and he is hereby, authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives after the sine die adjournment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask my distinguished and able majority leader whether this is tantamount to an adjournment of Congress?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No; obviously not.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it another indication that coming events are casting their shadow before them?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am about to send another proposed order to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the order? The Chair hears none, and the order is entered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE TO MAKE APPOINTMENTS

On motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That notwithstanding the final adjournment of the present session of the Congress, the President of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized to make appointments to commissions or committees authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two Houses, or by order of the Senate.

AUTHORIZATION FOR PRESIDING OFFICERS TO SIGN DULY ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 122):

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution be agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I address the same inquiry to the distinguished majority leader. How close are we to adjournment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas does not know. There are conference reports and other actions still to be considered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then there is still hope for lake diversion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 122) was considered and agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank my friend from Wisconsin for yielding.

INCREASE IN DIVERSION OF WATER FROM LAKE MICHIGAN INTO THE ILLINOIS WATERWAY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2) to authorize the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test on a 3-year basis the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, before I yielded to the majority leader I was discussing the efficiency of the sewage treatment analysis made by the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend while order is obtained in the Senate.

The Senator from Wisconsin may proceed.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I submit, Mr. President, that any clear-minded objective analysis of the table will result in the conclusion that the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago itself has furnished us with the evidence which would make it impossible for the Congress of the United States—certainly for the Senate—knowing this information, to approve the bill. This information proves that Chicago simply is not doing its job.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Average flows, 1957

[Millions of gallons daily]

Month	Calumet	North side	West-southwest	West side		Total west-southwest plus west side	Grand total
				Pumpage, including west-southwest sludge	Actual sewage flow		
1957—January	92.4	226.2	298	459.6	450.9	748.9	1,067.5
February	99.7	259.3	348	451.6	445.3	896.9	1,255.9
March	104.2	249.3	368	433.0	423.2	791.2	1,144.7
April	114.2	267.3	339	532.6	523.1	862.1	1,243.6
May	110.7	271.4	321	561.6	553.6	874.6	1,256.7
June	106.1	260.1	324	557.0	551.5	875.5	1,241.7
July	114.0	287.6	416	548.0	538.7	954.7	1,356.3
August	115.9	290.0	432	547.8	542.7	974.7	1,380.6
September	106.4	260.1	411	447.4	440.4	851.4	1,217.9
October	103.9	255.3	384	456.1	453.1	837.1	1,196.3
November	112.9	272.2	357	494.0	489.0	846.0	1,231.1
December	111.3	266.2	320	481.1	476.7	796.7	1,174.2
Average	107.6	263.8	360	497.5	490.7	859.2	1,230.7
Average:							
1956	103.8	226.1	320.4	503.3	494	819.7	1,149.6
1955	109.1	232.1	364	487.3	478.1	841.9	1,183.3
1954	99.1	228.1	373	480	470.2	843.25	1,170.6
1953	94.9	200.5	322.9	493.7	485.5	808.4	1,103.8
1952	87.6	223.3	311.7	490.2	490.2	801.9	1,112.8
1951	86.9	229.2	358	468.4	468.4	826.4	1,142.5
1950	82.5	221.4	356	464.3	463.1	820.1	1,124
1949	73.5	206.2	306	478.4	478.3	784.3	1,064
1948	74.8	215.2	338	437.3	437	775	1,006.5
1947	79.3	222.8	368	428.1	428.1	796.1	1,096.2

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask, what is the source of the table the Senator asks to have printed in the RECORD, to which the senior Senator from Wisconsin referred last night?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The source is listed at the top. The source is the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, Annual Reports of 1952 through 1957.

Mr. DOUGLAS. From whom did the Senators from Wisconsin obtain the report?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I do not believe in hearsay, so I will say that

I procured the report, as I said to begin with, from my senior colleague, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the senior Senator from Wisconsin, may reply to the question of the Senator from Illinois, without my losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none and the senior Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. WILEY. A gentleman went to Chicago and after an interview was given this information.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the senior Senator from Wisconsin say that the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago gave this material to his representative?

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Illinois for 3 minutes for a statement, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Illinois is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I certainly will not question the statement of the honorable Senator from Wisconsin. We in Chicago are very desirous to have all the facts brought out. We believe in the truth being known. It is extraordinary that the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago would give to the opponents of the measure vital information which it has not furnished to the Senator from Illinois, who is defending that district on the floor of the Senate. I have not received a copy of this material. I have not received any information about it. I am reluctant to believe that the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago would give to the opponents of this measure information which it either advertently or inadvertently denied to its advocates.

I do not want to condemn the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago on this point, unless the evidence is clear, overwhelming, and irrefutable.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I wish to establish why it is that the table, by itself, should make it clear that Chicago it not doing its job.

The fact is that the sewage is oxygen-deficient. That is the measure which the engineers use to establish and determine the sewage which needs oxygen. The sewage has increased from 6.4 percent to 14.4 percent from 1952 to 1957. That means that if Chicago could reestablish the efficiency it obtained in 1952 it would reduce the problem by 100 percent.

Mr. President, I point out that no one would contend—I know the proponents of the measure would not contend—that by increasing the diversion from Lake Michigan 1,000 cubic feet, the problem could be reduced by the amount of 100 percent, particularly in view of the fact that at the present time the city of Chicago diverts not 1,500 cubic feet, but 1,500 cubic feet plus 1,800 cubic feet for domestic pumpage, or a total of 3,300 cubic feet. The additional 1,000 cubic feet would be an increase, therefore, of approximately 30 or 35 percent, or on that order. Chicago is failing to solve its problem on the order of about 100 percent. Even if the increase in the efficiency were only part way back to the efficiency of 1952, Chicago could solve its problem alone much better than by relying on this expensive—and it is expensive to Wisconsin, Michigan, Canada, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania—method of diverting water from Lake Michigan.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I say that the two Senators from Wisconsin are highly honorable men. I trust their word. However, we are faced with an extraordinary situation in which the opponents of this measure are apparently furnished information by the body most active in advocating an increased diversion of water, without this information being furnished to those who are the proponents and defenders of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago.

I should like to ask again, most solemnly, was this material obtained from the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Wisconsin for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin?

The Chair hears none, and the senior Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the witnesses—and I will give his name—Gordon McCallum, who lives in the city of Washington, from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, went to Chicago and brought back this information with him. Now the Senator has all the information. I do not like to have the Senator dispute my word.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not dispute the Senator's word. May I ask whether the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago was——

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Illinois may reply to the senior Senator from Wisconsin, without my losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask whether the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago was informed that the information was designed for the senior Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Wisconsin may reply, if he desires, without my losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and the senior Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this is all on the same basis of much we have heard before. It is sort of a Pagliacci proposition.

Let me say that the man testified for the Government in the case. The man gave the facts. We asked the witness to find out what the situation was, and why this additional flowage was wanted. Then we found, as the Senator from Chicago said——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Pardon me. May I say that I am very proud——

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President—Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very proud to come from Chicago, but I also come from Illinois.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I insist on my right to the floor. Mr. President—Mr. President, I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin——

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. WILEY. May I answer?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Wisconsin may reply, without my losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The junior Senator from Wisconsin has the floor. The junior Senator from Wisconsin has yielded 2 minutes to the senior Senator from Wisconsin, who still has 1 minute remaining. The senior Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield? The senior Senator from Wisconsin has 1 minute remaining, and he may proceed.

Mr. WILEY. The situation is just this. I said the distinguished Senator from Chicago and he resented it. I do not blame him.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, I am very proud of it. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILEY. He was telling about the wonderful system they built up. It was just like Ford's first buggy. That was a miracle. So he spoke about this miracle system they had of purifying the water. We want to find out whether they were doing the job. They did it 10 years ago. We would like to know whether it was changed in 10 years. So we got the man who testified at the hearing to get the facts. That is the whole matter in a nutshell.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I will yield to the Senator from Minnesota in just a minute.

Before I do so I wish to establish one fact. The purity of the Milwaukee sanitation methods has been challenged repeatedly tonight. I deeply resent it. I feel strongly that Milwaukee is the cleanest big city in America, in every way, particularly with regard to treating its sewage.

I should like at this point to read into the RECORD the outstanding record of Milwaukee in biochemical oxygen reduction. I point out that Milwaukee is far

better than Chicago was at its best. In 1952, when Chicago reached its peak of cleanliness——

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Before I yield for a question I should like to complete my statement. I would like to point out that the figures indicate Milwaukee was 96.1 percent pure.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma for a question.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma would ask his good friend from Wisconsin just what it is about Milwaukee sewage which gives it an advantage in the matter of purity over the sewage of the city of Chicago? Is it the contents, the origin, the treatment?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I point out to my good friend from Oklahoma that in all those regards the sewage from Milwaukee is far superior. [Laughter.]

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma for a question.

Mr. KERR. I wish to say to my good friend that the observation of the Senator from Oklahoma is that the examples seen here on the floor would tend to give credence to his statement. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Minnesota for 2 minutes without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Wisconsin may yield the floor without asking unanimous consent so that we can facilitate the debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I made a unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will take judicial notice of the request. The Senator does not have to make the request.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Chair take legislative notice of it? We have had enough with reference to judicial matters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will take judicial notice that the Senator from Wisconsin does not have to make that request each time he yields the floor.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I object.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I would like to call the attention of my very good friend from Minnesota to the fact that because he has been in conference and has been working hard, as he always does, he missed some of the history of this project. Earlier this evening there was what the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] called a three-ring circus going on the floor, and I wanted to be sure my rights were protected. I consulted with the Parliamentarian as to how I could preserve and protect my rights to the floor. We have been accused of filibustering, even though I and the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] have consumed less time in speaking tonight than our opponents have consumed on this bill. Since we were accused of filibustering, I wanted to be sure that what I was doing was completely within the rules, so I have constantly asked unanimous consent before I yielded the floor. I have noticed that the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] always follow that policy. I believe the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] always follows that practice. These are the three outstanding parliamentarians of the Senate. I feel what is good enough for them is good enough for me. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Minnesota, without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I merely say to my good friend from Wisconsin that the desire of the Senator from Minnesota was only to facilitate the debate. This debate was becoming so interesting in the discussion of such ethereal topics as sewage, sewage treatment, its quality and quantity, I just thought that a subject matter of this depth and this importance, which is apparently competing with Ivory soap for purity, ought to have the most expeditious type of debate, and that was the only purpose of my request.

But I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin that he ought to protect his right to the floor, and he is doing so very effectively. I gather he has also prepared his position rather effectively. Of course, I did hear some of the debate earlier of the Senator from Oklahoma, and I have received a fine lesson in foreign relations on treaty making and contracting parties. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Minnesota, and I hope later we shall come to a very fair analysis of the treaties. I have a 70-page analysis of the topic. I have also a very comprehensive discussion of the treaty. I can go into some detail on that question. If the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] will be sure to listen to every word, I am quite sure that at the conclusion of the presentation he will be completely unconvinced.

Mr. President, before I leave the subject of water metering, I should like to point out that Milwaukee meters 89 percent of its water. This is one of the principal reasons why Milwaukee is a very provident and careful user of water. This is one of the reasons why Milwaukee uses a far lower percentage of water per capita than does Chicago.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Illinois without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not correct that in Chicago we believe in making water a free good?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, my reply to that question is that while it may be free to Chicago, it is very expensive to Milwaukee, to Cleveland, and to all of the other cities on the borders of the Great Lakes, because we have to pay for the fact that Chicago fails to do what outstanding health engineers say they should do, a project which is most repulsive to my good friend from Illinois, and that is to treat its water adequately and give it back to Lake Michigan. We would be happy to have them do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Illinois without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] that he does not have to request unanimous consent to yield for a question. The only time the Senator needs to request unanimous consent to yield is when he presumes—and I suppose he does in this case—that the Senator to whom he yields wishes to make a statement.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct. The Senator from Illinois did not ask me to yield for a question. He asked me to yield. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Illinois for a statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will put my inquiry in the form of a question: Does not the Senator from Wisconsin mean that Milwaukee believes in polluting Lake Michigan?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Wisconsin certainly does not think that Milwaukee believes in pollution. I hold in my hand a study which I would like the time—I hope I get it—to read to the Senator from Illinois. It is only about 85 pages, and it exhaustively explains what an effective sewage system Milwaukee has.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio for a statement.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Inasmuch as we are discussing the present condition in Chicago, I should like to read what Chief Justice Taft said in 1928 when the judgment was pronounced ordering Chicago to quit diverting the water. This is what he said:

> You have created this problem and it is up to you to find a way out of your dilemma. Certainly it is going to cost some money, but it would be a strange legal doctrine, indeed, if ever our courts were to adopt the theory that a nuisance which should not be abated because it would cost the wrongdoers some money to do so.
>
> We say to Chicago, pointing to the example of what the other municipalities on the Great Lakes have been and are doing, namely, treating their industrial sewage and waste by proper and adequate means, and then returning the used water back to the Great Lakes Basin: Go, then, and do likewise.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Ohio for his statement, which

emphasizes the principal point, and that is that the other cities, like my own city of Milwaukee, and Detroit, Cleveland, and Buffalo, and other Great Lakes cities, have the same kind of problem. They, too, have a sewage problem. They use lake water to a considerable extent, and they return it in purified form. They do not deprive the other people of the Great Lakes communities of their water.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the senior Senator from Illinois for a question.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I object.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield for a question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield for a question.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). The Senator may yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, is it not true that——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa will state it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is not the Senator from Wisconsin yielding to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Wisconsin has yielded only for a question. It is the understanding of the Senator from Wisconsin that he may yield for a question without losing his right to the floor. I ask the Presiding Officer if that is not true?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is not well taken. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I understand the Senator from Wisconsin has been recognized. I object to any further proceeding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Iowa that the Senator's objection is not well taken. The Senator who has been recognized may yield for a question without losing his right to the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the opinion of the then Chief Justice Taft was handed down in 1928?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I believe that is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the order of the Court then was that the diversion of lake water at Chicago should be decreased from 10,000 cubic feet a second to 1,500 cubic feet a second?

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is my understanding that the Supreme Court never authorized 10,000 cubic feet per second on more than a temporary basis. In fact, as I understand, the maximum authorization by the Supreme Court was 4,167 cubic feet per second. There was a great deal of litigation before the Lake States were successful in requiring Chicago to reduce over a period of time their level of diversion down to 1,500 cubic feet per second.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield for a question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Illinois for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the Supreme Court and the master appointed by the Supreme Court ordered Chicago to reduce this diversion to 1,500 cubic feet per second?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is my understanding. It was done over a period of years.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the city of Chicago loyally complied with that order?

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is true that the city of Chicago complied with that order over a period of 7 or 8 years.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the city of Chicago has spent over $350 million initially for the installation of a modern system of sewage disposal?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The $350 million figure is one which has interested me very much. The only way we can arrive at $350 million is by adding up all the sums which have been expended by the city of Chicago for capital equipment from the year 1930 until 1957 or 1958. Every city expends a great deal for sanitation facilities, I do not believe that a showing has ever been made that the amount expended by the city of Chicago has been, on a per capita basis, any greater than that of a comparable city.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the city of Chicago put into operation a modern sewage-disposal plant?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is true. The city of Chicago put in an excellent one, which has been considered by civil engineers to be 1 of the 7 wonders of the engineering world.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his fairness.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to add, to be completely comprehensive on this subject, that since that time, since 1950 or 1951, when this judgment was made, the efficiency of the Chicago sanitary facilities have been, as the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois made clear the other night, has deteriorated very substantially. To get back to the point I was trying to make some time ago, Chicago meters only 28.7 percent of its population, whereas Milwaukee meters 99 percent. A number of cities meter 100 percent. Leading cities of the country do likewise. Los Angeles meters 99 percent. Cleveland, 99 percent. San Francisco, 98.5 percent. New Orleans, 98 percent. Boston, 98 percent. Detroit, 98 percent.

Then I showed, when I read the excellent analysis which has been made by outstanding health authorities, primarily from Chicago, that the fact is that when water is metered, the tendency is to reduce very sharply the amount of water consumed. It takes a most modest kind of mathematical calculation to figure that if we metered even 1,800 cubic feet per second, which is used for domestic pumpage, we could save very nearly enough to give Chicago 1,000 cubic feet additional without bothering to have additional diversion of Lake Michigan water.

It seems to me that Chicago attracts industries from other States in this way. First, it fails to meter its water. It may be that this is a minor attraction, but it is one attraction.

Secondly, it fails to prevent polluted discharge of industrial sewage. That is a very important attraction.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the Senator from Wisconsin has violated clause 3 of rule XIX, which provides:

> No Senator in debate shall refer offensively to any State of the Union.

The whole general trend of the argument by the Senator from Wisconsin has been offensive to the State of Illinois and the city of Chicago. I respectfully request that he be required to proceed in order.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to speak to that point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that under the statement of the Senator from South Dakota, the Senator from Wisconsin must take his seat, and that he may not proceed until he obtains approval to do so by a majority of the Senate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that——

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I demand that the rule be complied with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will take his seat.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would advise that a motion is now in order to permit the Senator from Wisconsin to proceed in order.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I move that the Senator from Wisconsin be allowed to proceed in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama. [Putting the question.]

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin will proceed in order.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Wisconsin is in a very difficult situation.

I am discussing a subject which is a most difficult subject to discuss—sewage—without its apparently being objected to by Senators on the ground that it casts disrespect or disrepute on a great city.

The fact is that I have the greatest regard for Chicago. I particularly have great respect for the outstanding senior Senator [Mr. DOUGLAS], and I have tremendous respect for the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who is one of the truly great conservatives in America. I have great regard for the people of Chicago. As a matter of fact, I was born in a suburb of Chicago. I like the Chicago Cubs. I like the city very much. I do not know how it could be said that I reflected unfavorably on Chicago.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield for a question. Does the Senator from Illinois wish me to yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I can make my statement in the form of a question.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield for a question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I ask my distinguished friend from Wisconsin, Is it not true that his father and mother are still fine Republicans, who have constantly voted for me?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The answer to the question of my good friend, the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois, is that my father was a Republican, my mother is a Republican, my brother was a Republican, my sister is a Republican; and I have many good friends in the Republican Party.

I simply say that I would trust a Republican with anything except public office. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I hope my fellow Senators will listen to what I say, so that I will be protected against such a charge as the outstanding Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] just made. I want to be very careful, because I have gone over the material carefully. I mean this very sincerely. I think the material I am delivering does not reflect on the city of Chicago. It does, however, disclose a situation which I think cannot be denied: That is, that the city of Chicago is failing to do a job that it can do itself; and by not doing it, the tax burden is shifted to other cities.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator from Wisconsin aware of the fact that the water which is discharged south from Chicago must go down the Mississippi River, where many people derive their drinking water and water for various other municipal uses?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Illinois is aware of that. [Laughter.] The Senator from Wisconsin is aware of that, too.

Because I was born in Lake Forest, Ill., I cannot get out of the habit of speaking of Illinois.

But I think, as outstanding engineers think, that the solution to the whole problem is to have Chicago make a real study of how it can improve its effluent and its discharge, so that it can discharge it back to Lake Michigan without polluting the waters of the lake.

It is a problem which health engineers tell me can be solved. The solution will assist greatly in preventing the kind of pollution problem which the Mississippi River Valley might suffer from the discharge of effluent down the Illinois Waterway and into the Mississippi.

However, I think, in all fairness, there probably is not a serious health problem caused either in Illinois or in the Mississippi River Valley by the discharge of the effluent, on the basis of the most careful scientific studies that have been made so far.

No point has been raised, to my knowledge, by any State public health agency or State public health officer.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is familiar with the fact, is he not, that the cities which get their water from the Mississippi River have a very serious problem in cleaning up the water before the water is consumed?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Louisiana raises a point which I think is an excellent one; that is, that the other cities in the Mississippi River Valley, on the Great Lakes, and on other bodies of water have to go to the expense, and do go to the expense, and a very considerable expense, indeed, to purify water and clean the water before they discharge it. That is an excellent point and is another reason why, it seems to me, Chicago should take on the same kind of task.

I hope that statement will not be objected to. It is not intended to be a reflection on the city of Chicago. It seems to me it is true that the only reason which can be objectively established for diversion is that it will keep service costs down in two ways. It will keep the cost down, rather, for Chicago industry in two ways. First, because they will not have to meter their water; second, because they will not have to treat their effluent for pollution from their sewage discharge before they discharge it.

I think if it could be established that Chicago was overtaxed as compared with other cities, Chicago might have a case. I do not think it would be a particularly good case, but I think Chicago would have a case.

However, in Milwaukee, at every level, unfortunately, our citizens have to pay a higher tax than is paid in Chicago. A tax is paid beginning at the income level of $5,000. The real property tax in Milwaukee is $324; in Chicago, it is $218; a difference of 49 percent.

I may say that this information comes from a tax comparison which has been made at my request by the Committee on the District of Columbia, which made a far more comprehensive study of the taxes paid by the people of various income brackets in Washington and many other cities.

The total taxes paid by Chicago residents, as compared with Milwaukee residents, include personal property taxes, which we do not have in Milwaukee; sales taxes, which we do not have in Milwaukee; auto taxes, which are lower in Milwaukee; they are still lower in Chicago than in Milwaukee. The taxes are 12 percent lower at the $5,000 level.

At the $7,500 level, according to this very careful study which was made—and it has been made available to other Senators in other States, and has not been challenged, but has been accepted as authoritative—the total tax paid by persons having an income of $7,500 in Chicago is $446, on the average; in Milwaukee, $547. In other words, in Chicago the tax is 22 percent lower; and it becomes even lower as the income increases.

For the $10,000 income family in Milwaukee, the total tax is $828; in Chicago, it is $572. This means that the tax on the Chicago resident is 44 percent lower as we go into the $10,000 income bracket.

In the $15,000 income bracket, primarily because we have an income tax in Wisconsin, and there is not one in Chicago, the tax in Chicago is $844 compared with $1,448. The tax in Milwaukee, therefore, is 71 percent higher than the tax in Chicago, Ill.

I submit, on the basis of those statistics, that it is clear that there is no equity in lowering the tax or keeping the tax in Chicago lower than in its neighboring city to the north, particularly when the process which would lower that tax—that is, the diversion of Lake Michigan water—would result in increased expense to the people of Milwaukee through the dredging of their harbor and the greater expense for the ships which navigate and operate into the port of Milwaukee.

During the course of the hearings, the statement was made that one of the principal reasons for the diversion is that it would improve navigation on the Illinois Waterway. At this point, I wish to read from the hearings, which unfortunately are not published. Therefore, it will come as a surprise to many Senators, who have not had an opportunity to see the material. On page 315 of the transcript of the hearings, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] discusses the question with Colonel Nauman, who is the representative of the Corps of Engineers, and a very competent man, one whose competence has been established without question. I read from the hearings as follows:

Senator KERR. Did you make an estimate of the economic gain to navigation, increased navigation on the Illinois Waterway that would occur or result from a permanent diversion?

Colonel NAUMAN. Well, sir, we don't feel it would have any effect.

Senator KERR. We had testimony this morning that told us that at some period in the past—and I would be glad to have that given—there was a million and a half tons per year navigation handled, a million and a half tons a year handled by navigation on the Illinois Waterway.

Colonel NAUMAN. Right, sir.

Senator KERR. What year was that?

Colonel NAUMAN. 1935.

Senator KERR. And in 1950 there were 15 million tons handled on the Illinois Waterway, and in 1956 there were 24 milloin tons handled on the Illinois Waterway, and that witness told us that this additional natural water in the Illinois Waterway would enable a still further and considerable expansion or increase in the tonnage to be handled on the Illinois Waterway.

Now would you say that is an untenable position?

Colonel NAUMAN. Well, sir, the Chief of Engineers recently transmitted a report, I believe it has been transmitted to Congress, recommending further improvement of the Illinois Waterway by providing a duplicate system of locks, and this is supported economically by this increased tonnages that the witness earlier brought out.

Senator KERR. Well, would not the volume of tonnage be affected not only by the physical equipment, but also by the volume of water?

Colonel NAUMAN. Sir, we feel that there is a sufficient volume of water presently available, with the authorized diversion, plus the return of domestic pumpage to the

Illinois Waterway to take care of the existing and duplicate locks which have been found favorable.

Senator KERR. Is it your thought that giving, or assuming continued growth of tonnage there, they would never need any more water than they have available to them from their present sources?

Colonel NAUMAN. Not with only the duplicate lock system, if the second set of locks should be constructed, sir.

Senator KERR. But you did not include in this report any estimate of the economic advantages, navigationwise, that would result from the additional diversion insofar as tonnage on the Illinois Waterway was concerned?

Colonel NAUMAN. No, sir.

Senator KERR. Am I incorrect in assuming that there would be some additional economic element there?

Colonel NAUMAN. I do not believe there would be any accruing to navigation, Mr. Chairman.

Senator KERR. Fine. Do you have any further statement, Colonel?

Then they discussed an entirely different subject.

Mr. President, on the basis of that colloquy and on the basis of the established excellence and competence of the Corps of Engineers and the undisputed ability of Colonel Nauman, I submit that is a definitive answer to the contention, which has been made, that navigation on the Illinois Waterway might be improved if the bill were passed. In this case it is perfectly obvious—as in the other cases I shall develop a little later—that the only value of the enactment of the bill would be to permit Chicago to operate its sanitary facilities more economically—not with greater health to the people of Chicago, but only more economically.

I have established, and I intend to elaborate fully on it, the point that alternative methods—which involve only the matter of cost— are open to Chicago and to the Sanitary District.

Mr. President, at this time I wish to establish the fact—which was questioned at considerable length by my good friend, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], who said no harm would be done to anyone if the bill were enacted—that significant loss would result from enactment of the bill. I believe the cost of the proposed diversion has been established.

It will take some little time to develop this point; but I believe it can be established—again, by reference to the hearings. In that connection, I refer to page 4047 of the transcribed hearings, where the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] set forth, by means of a letter he presented, exactly and in detail—in fact, it seems to me he did so in incontestable detail—the cost to the State of New York, and, particularly, to the power facilities of the State of New York, of the proposed diversion. The amount finally estimated by the Department of Engineers is approximately $400,000 to $900,000.

It is true that the great Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]—an outstanding gentleman, and a very able Member—refused to accept those figures; and I believe that fact should be given great weight by other Senators.

But it is also true that, despite the contention of the Senator from Oklahoma, these figures were affirmed by the Corps of Engineers, who stuck to the figures, even in the face of the very strenuous counterattack.

This will be an extensive development, and it will take quite a length of time for me to establish it. But it seems to me that this matter is so complicated, and also is so vigorously questioned by the Senator from Oklahoma, and is such a key factor to many Senators, that I believe I should take sufficient time to establish it. In particular, I shall do so because an outstanding Senator to whom States' rights are very important, pointed out to me that he would be deeply swayed if we could establish that any State would be damaged as a result of enactment of the bill. He said that, in that connection, the amount of the damage to the State would not be particularly material to him; that even a thimbleful of real damage to a State would be persuasive to him.

I believe that the facts I am about to establish from the hearings will establish very clearly and convincingly that the New York power groups will be damaged by enactment of the bill, even if only a 1-year diversion is provided for.

At this point, I may say that in the minds of those who are political realists there is no question that this bill is not merely for a 1-year diversion, but that, instead, it is for a 3-year diversion, at the very least, and that it is more likely to be for a permanent diversion.

Only last evening the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], in colloquy with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], established very clearly that if the pending bill were passed the Senator from Illinois would not give up the fight for permanent diversion; that the Senator from Illinois would feel that it would still be necessary for him to appeal for this increased diversion in the future; and that insofar as the members of the Congressional delegation from the State of Illinois are concerned—a delegation with great strength—they would still return to fight for this increased diversion in the future.

Of course, I think all will concede that the study will show that the increased diversion would be of some benefit to the sanitary facilities—although the benefits would be only those which could be achieved just as well by other means.

So I am convinced that the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] will make that attempt. And on the basis of the great success the Senators from Illinois have had in the past, in connection with other matters, I submit that it is very likely that such an attempt in this connection would be successful.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that what we said last evening was as follows:

Mr. DOUGLAS. Chicago wants a test of 1 year, to be carefully appraised. Then the scientists, engineers, and the Congress can decide whether the program should be continued.

Mr. LAUSCHE. They can decide whether the program should become permanent?

Mr. DOUGLAS. We can decide that later. All we ask is a test. We are not afraid of the truth. We are not afraid of an examination. We are not afraid of a test.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator from Illinois state what is the maximum period of diversion Chicago expects to ask for?

Mr. DOUGLAS. We do not know. We will ask only for what is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. For 1 year?

Mr. DOUGLAS. In this bill, only 1 year.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What, later, after the bill is put into effect?

Then I quoted some poetry, which is not germane.

I read further:

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator does not want to state what Chicago will ask for in the next bill?

Mr. DOUGLAS. All we ask is that the program be tested for a year, and that the results be evaluated. If the results indicate that the experiment is against the interest of the United States and that there should not be any added diversion, we will not ask for it. If it seems to be in the interest of the United States and if there seems to be no real damage to anyone else, we will ask for it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois has given a correct reading of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and I should like to say that on the basis of that reading, I would conclude that, in view of the kind of findings the sanitary district would be almost certain to make—namely, that it would be of benefit to the sanitary district—the Senator from Illinois would be persuaded thereby.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished majority leader, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am informed that, in a short time, the Senate will receive the conference report on the mutual aid appropriation bill.

I have tried to provide a reasonable opportunity for thorough debate on the pending measure. I understand there is at the desk an amendment, submitted by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], which would reduce the period from 3 years to 1 year.

I wonder whether there is a possibility of working out an agreement which would be acceptable to all viewpoints, so that the Senate could vote on that amendment at some reasonable hour.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, after the vote on the mutual-security conference report I stated to colleagues opposing this measure that I would make a motion to table at that time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Since the Senator has an amendment at the desk, I thought we could at least act on the amendment. If that amendment should fail, the Senator could still offer his proposal. While Members are present, the yeas and nays can be ordered, so they will know there will be a vote 30 minutes from now, and there will be 15

minutes to a side on the McNamara amendment.

Does that arrangement satisfy the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. McNAMARA. That is satisfactory.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How does the Senator from Wisconsin feel about it?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think the proposal on the amendment undoubtedly is very fair, although I should like to make it crystal clear that the fact that we are willing to agree to the request to limit debate on the McNamara amendment does not mean that we are willing to do it on anything else.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We will not cross bridges until we get to them. However, an agreement will give Senators who are present an understanding that there will be a rollcall in 30 minutes. Then we will cross other bridges at that time. Is that proposal agreeable?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I ask unanimous consent that after the vote on the amendment I may have the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall be glad to make that request.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in 30 minutes the Senate proceed to vote on the McNamara amendment, the time between now and then to be equally divided between the author of the amendment and the minority leader, and that at the conclusion of the vote the Senator from Wisconsin be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. LAUSCHE. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If there is no objection and the unanimous consent is granted, does it conform to the parliamentary rules?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under unanimous consent, it does.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It does?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, it does.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the majority leader would give consideration to the possibility of voting within the next 5 minutes? There apparently seems to be no further wish to debate the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I direct the attention of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] to the suggestion of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] that the Senate vote in 5 minutes.

Mr. McNAMARA. I have no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is that agreeable to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I understand the Senator from Ohio wishes to address himself to the amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I should like to express my views on the McNamara amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How much time does the Senator desire?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Eight or ten minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 20 minutes be allotted on the amendment, to be equally divided between the proponents and opponents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I would like a little time on the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank my friend from Florida, and renew my original request that the time for the vote be in 30 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May we have the yeas and nays?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Let us get the unanimous-consent agreement first. Then we can get the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I request the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is now operating under limited time.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Ohio, who indicated he wanted about 8 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, from the statements which have thus far been made, I think it is perfectly apparent that the bill as written gives a 3-year right to divert water out of the Great Lakes Basin and carry it over into the Mississippi River Basin. It is now contended by the proponents of the bill that, while the proposal contains a 3-year provision, there is an agreement that it will be operative only for 1 year.

I respectfully submit to my colleagues that that is not a sound method of legislating. I repeat, the bill clearly states that it is for a 3-year period. But an agreement has been made that it shall be operative for only 1 year.

I suggest that the period of 3 years has been reduced to 1 year in order to remove the objections of the Dominion of Canada. Canada has said if it is only for 1 year, she will not object. That means that if it is for more than 1 year, there is objection.

There is a further reason why the bill ought to be made to conform to the intent of the Congress. No test can be made in 1 year, as contemplated by the proponents of the bill. The testimony given by the Army engineers was that it would take 3 years to make a proper test of the impact of the diversion upon the level of the waters in the Great Lakes area.

The damage done from a 1-year diversion produces practically no calculable results. The damage done from a 3-year diversion, according to the Corps of Army Engineers, would produce damage to the navigational capacity and to the hydroelectrical generating capacity on all of the lakes, on the St. Lawrence Seaway, and on its tributary waters.

My point is that 1 year would not produce the test. The proponents of the bill know that if they had asked for a 3-year diversion, Canada would have objected.

On the subject of the treaty with Canada, if my colleagues will give me a moment of further attention, I point out that the treaty specifically provides that if there is a diversion of water, even south of the boundary, materially affecting the navigational capacity of the St. Lawrence Seaway, or of any of the waters belonging to Canada, Canada has the right to object.

I should like to point out further that if we can divert water from Lake Michigan, which affects the navigational and hydroelectric capacity of the St. Lawrence Seaway, then Canada has a right to divert water from the headwaters of the Columbia River Basin. Just as surely as I stand here, if we get by with diverting these waters, Canada will later say to Oregon and Washington and California, "You have diverted water from the Great Lakes on the grounds that Canada had nothing to say about Lake Michigan. If Canada has nothing to say about how Lake Michigan water will flow, then Oregon and Washington and California have nothing to say about how the Columbia River headwaters shall flow."

Out of the Great Lakes Basin there will be diverted 1,000 cubic feet per second. If that diversion is made permanent, the lowering of the water level will be 1 inch.

Mr. President, may we have order in the Senate, please?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I will say to my colleagues that Ohio is a member of the Union. Ohio is an indestructible State of an indestructible Union. In my opinion, Ohio is entitled to equal treatment with every other State in the Union. This Congress should not give to Chicago hydroelectric generating capacity, navigational facilities, sewage disposal facilities, by taking equal value away from a nearby State.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. In just a moment, please. I have only 1 more minute.

I ask my colleagues to remember that Ohio is a brother State or a sister State. I ask my colleagues to give heed to what is sought at the present time. The appeal is being made to take from Ohio and Pennsylvania and Michigan and New York their property, and to give it to Chicago.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Please, I have very limited time.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator has made references to me and has made references to the Pacific Northwest. Is the Senator unwilling to yield for a question?

Mr. LAUSCHE. No. I do not believe I have made any implications which are improper.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator made no implications which are improper

at all, but I think the Senator should yield for a question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Well, the time is allotted. May I be granted a few minutes in addition to the time given to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] controls the time. I do not see the Senator on the floor.

Mr. McNAMARA. I am present.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator have additional time to grant?

Mr. McNAMARA. I do not believe so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio may proceed for an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Ohio is recognized for an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. NEUBERGER. To begin with, Mr. President, I favor the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, because I think it would bring the bill more closely into conformance with the wishes of the Dominion of Canada.

I ask the Senator from Ohio one question. The Senator has been claiming, during most of his talk, that such a bill would be a precedent for diverting the headwaters of the Columbia River. I do not think the bill would furnish a precedent, if Canada consents to the diversion of 1,000 cubic feet for a 1-year period.

On August 4, I received the following letter from the Assistant Secretary of State:

> The State Department understands that the Canadian Government has no objection to a 1-year temporary diversion of an additional 1,000 cubic feet of water per second from the Great Lakes system in Chicago.

I released that letter August 4, nearly 3 weeks ago. If the letter were inaccurate, does not the distinguished Senator from Ohio think the great Government of Canada is articulate enough to have announced, during that 3-week period, that the letter was incorrect?

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I see the letter? I think the reading of the letter will make the point which I should like to impress upon Senators. Canada has said it has no objection to a 1-year diversion of water. That means that if there should be a diversion for more than 1 year, or a permanent diversion, Canada will object.

That is why Chicago—and I say this most respectfully—reduced the 3-year period to a 1-year period, so that they could get the consent to a 1-year diversion.

Mr. NEUBERGER. If the bill is amended in conformance with the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] will the Senator from Ohio support the bill?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I do not say that I will vote for the bill, but if the representatives of Chicago will state tonight that when the 1 year is over they will not seek another extension and will not come to Congress to say, "We want a permanent diversion" I will vote for the bill.

I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois if he does or does not contemplate a permanent diversion of water.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan has an amendment pending which would make the bill conform to the report. Let us not be deceived for one moment.

I shall vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan, but as the distinguished Senator from Ohio stated, I am confident that probably the House would accept the amendment. Then the bill would become law.

Then the camel's nose will be under the tent. Then we can be sure, considering the fight that the city of Chicago has been putting on for 30 years to divert the water, that Chicago will never be content for the diversion to go on for only 1 year or for the cubic feet specified to be so limited.

There are many amendments pending at the desk. As soon as I obtain the floor, after the amendment of my colleague has been voted on, whether the amendment is voted up or down, I shall move to table the bill. I think many Members of the Senate have their minds made up. I think many Members know how they are going to vote. Rather than detain the Senate in these closing hours for a long period of time I think we should vote on this amendment and then, as soon as it is possible to do so, move to table the entire bill.

I am fearful that if the bill should become law, even for 1 year, the camel's nose would be under the tent and Chicago would have gained what Chicago wants. By so doing Chicago will gain an advantage over all the other communities of the Great Lakes area.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] is recognized.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] desires some time.

Mr. WILEY. I do not desire to speak on this amendment.

Mr. McNAMARA. We will be glad to withhold our time, Mr. President, to hear from the opposition if the opposition wishes to use some time.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KERR. Who has control of the time in opposition to the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, does the Senator desire time?

Mr. KERR. I wish to know who controls the time. How much time may I have?

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator may have as much as he wishes, up to 15 minutes.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask that the Senator yield me 7 minutes.

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield 7 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I know that Members of the Senate have probably heard as much about this subject as they care to hear. I am sure most Members of the Senate know how they want to vote on the bill.

The bill is of tremendous importance to the people of the State of Illinois, to the people of the city of Chicago, and to the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago. I know that Members of this body are willing to face the issue presented by the bill.

If the Senate wants to kill the bill it can do so in three ways, at least, if not more. First, the Senate could adopt this amendment. Second, the Senate could agree to a motion to table the bill. Third, the Senate could, by a vote on final passage of the bill, defeat the bill.

I urge that they not do so by the adoption of this amendment. The distinguished Senator from Ohio took the position that he would like to know whether the Senators from Illinois would agree that, if the 1-year diversion were authorized, they would commit themselves not to come back here at the end of that time and ask for additional diversion. I submit to the distinguished Senator from Ohio in a sense of fairness that it would be no more than appropriate for the Senators from Illinois to agree in exchange for a period of 1-year diversion that they would not then come back and have the opportunity to present their case to the Congress than it would be for them to ask the Senators in opposition to the bill that if it were held to 1 year and the experiment were conducted, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the United States Corps of Engineers found that the diversion was needed for the health, sanitation, and navigation around the city of Chicago and second, that the diversion could be had without damage to anyone else, then under those circumstances I wonder if Senators in opposition would agree now that the diversion might be automatically extended?

The purpose of the bill is to permit the conduct of an experiment by the Corps of Engineers in cooperation with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The evidence before the committee, contained in the record and referred to and summarized in the report, is that if the authority were granted for a 3-year period, it would be 6 months before the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare could be ready to start their experiment, and that they would require 12 months in which to observe the operation of the present amount of diversion with reference to which there is no question. So if the bill were limited to 1 year it would defeat itself, because the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would not even be able to get ready and observe the operation of the present situation and posture of the diversion of the authorized amount now going on.

Their evidence further was that after the 12-month observation of the present

diversion, they would observe an additional diversion of a thousand cubic feet per second per year, at which time they would terminate diversion and then they would require 6 months in which to summarize and put their observations into written form and present them to the Congress, so that if the spirit of an amendment for 1 year is agreeable either to the sponsors of the amendment or to the Senate, it can be obtained only by the adoption of the bill without the limiting amendment, because under the language of the bill, that is all that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare can provide and bring about.

So if the Senators want to kill the bill—and certainly they have the right to do so if they desire—it would seem that they would not do so by the adoption of this amendment. They would do so by either tabling the bill or defeating it on final passage. Therefore, Mr. President, I would urge that the amendment not be agreed to.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just one question?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Ohio for a question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I address the question to the Senator from Oklahoma as chairman of the committee. Is it not a fact that the Army engineer who testified said that 1 year's diversion would not make sufficient impact to calculate it in dollars, that a 3-year diversion would show some impact, but that the permanent diversion would lower the levels far greater than the 3-year diversion?

Mr. KERR. No, the Army engineers testified that the continued diversion of an additional 1,000 cubic feet per second would bring about a reduction in the level of the water in the lakes of approximately one-half inch. They gave us evidence of what damage would be done without observation of this additional 1,000 cubic feet per second diversion which would be authorized by this bill. But I say to him that they have a long record of observation of the taking of water from Lake Michigan.

As he knows, just recently the Supreme Court gave permission to divert 8,500 cubic feet per second, I believe, above the present 1,500 for a period of time in a situation of critical emergency. So they have some considerable record to go by.

But the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, as the Senator knows, because he was there, turning themselves to this specific measure, said that if it were passed in the language in the bill and as before the committee and now before the Senate, they could not carry out the mandate of the bill to observe the operation of the increased diversion, make their report, and return it to the Congress on any basis other than by taking the amount of time required to get ready, observing present conditions for 12 months, and observing the condition for another 12 months, whereby the water would be in the process of being diverted, and then taking 6 months to analyze, formulate, and present their report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield an additional minute to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma knows the respect in which I hold him. I do not like to challenge the correctness of his memory, but I ask the Members of the Senate, my colleagues, to read the letter sent by the Corps of Army Engineers to definitely verify for themselves which memory is correct. One year's diversion means nothing; 3 years means, I believe, three-quarters of an inch in Lake Ontario. Permanent diversion means 1 inch with impairment to navigational capacity, hydroelectric generating capacity, and other uses to which riparian owners put their property.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, much has been said about the Canadian memoir. That memoir has been interpreted by some to mean that Canada does not object to a 1-year diversion. From a study of that memoir I do not find that Canada cedes any of its water rights. What is said in the memoire is that if the water is diverted, in spite of the fact that consent is not given, the entire cost or loss due to such diversion must be borne by the American side of the boundary waters. That means the State of New York primarily, and other States to a lesser extent. The State of New York estimates that its loss, if it has to stand all of it, would amount to $2,536,408. I hope that people who have a regard for their State's rights and their own resources will realize that if Congress enacts a law which takes resources from the State of New York and gives them to another State, Congress can also do the same thing to that State.

I do not believe Congress should have that power. I shall vote to table the bill when that motion is made. In the meantime I shall vote for the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA]. I do not believe we are doing the right thing in attempting to say that we can violate a treaty for even 1 year.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a great deal has been said about the State of New York. On the facts and figures, I believe the State of New York should speak for itself.

It is a fact that the Power Authority of the State of New York, a most reliable State commission, headed by Bob Moses, who, I believe, is well known to many Members of the Senate, has made these findings about the power loss in the event this diversion takes effect for the calculated 3-year period.

The figures have already been stated, and I rise to verify them. The total revenue loss of the State of New York in power is estimated to be $1,268,204 in the event of a 3-year diversion, if Canada bears half the loss, and a loss of $2,536,408 if Canada does not share half the cost.

For that reason I shall support the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], reducing the period to 1 year. I shall also support the motion of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] to table the bill.

The State of New York feels very strongly on the subject, and has produced a very well documented case. Notwithstanding my sympathy for the problems which have been explained to us tonight, I feel that the State's position is the correct one. I took it when I was attorney general. I shall support it with my voice and vote in the Senate.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield myself a minute, to state that the question is not, as has been said by some Senators, one of health or sanitation. It is a question of money. Other communities must provide facilities without diverting water to take care of their sanitary systems. It can be done in those communities. The problem is not so much one city, but the growing areas which are continually taken into the sanitary district. That is what brings about the problem. It is not the problem of one city. It is a problem which arises from taking more and more communities into a sanitary district. It is not a mater of health or sanitation, but primarily one of money.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by Gen. E. C. Itschner, Chief of Engineers, under date of January 29, 1957. I ask Senators to read it in the RECORD, to fully understand what he has said on the subject.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, D. C., January 29, 1957.

Subject: Effect on Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River of an increase of 1,000 cubic feet per second in the diversion at Chicago.

To: The Secretary of the Army.

1. I submit herewith a special report on the effects of increased diversions from Lake Michigan at Chicago prepared at the request of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to meet a need for information on this subject as pointed out in the President's memorandum of disapproval of H. R. 3210, 84th Congress, a bill to authorize a 3-year test increase of 1,000 cubic feet per second in the diversion from Lake Michigan at Chicago.

2. The basic report of the Division Engineer, North Central Division, of the Corps of Engineers, submitted herewith, was prepared from data available in part through studies being made for a report on Great Lakes water levels in response to a resolution of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, adopted 26 June 1952 and in part from information available to the Corps of Engineers through its participation in preparation of a report of the International Lake Ontario Board of Engineers to the International Joint Commission dated 14 June 1955.

3. In general, an increase in the diversion from Lake Michigan at Chicago would affect the levels and outflows of Lakes Michigan, Huron, Erie and Ontario and the St. Lawrence River, all of which are downstream, and would not affect the levels or outflows of Lake Superior, which is upstream from the

diversion. A temporary increase in the diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second for 3 years would have temporary effects that would reach a maximum in about 3 to 3½ years and then gradually diminish and disappear about 15 years after the temporary diversion was discontinued. The effects of a permanent diversion would increase progressively to a maximum in about 15 years and would then continue permanently at that amount.

4. The computed effects of temporary and permanent diversions in terms of lowering of mean stages and reduction in average outflows are as follows:

Maximum temporary effects of a 3-year diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second [1]

	Months
Time required to reach maximum effect:	
Lakes Michigan and Huron	36
Lake Erie	39
Lake Ontario	42
Lowering effect on lake levels: [1]	*Feet*
Lakes Michigan and Huron	0.05
Lake Erie	.03
Lake Ontario	.03
Reduction in outflow: [1]	*Cubic feet per second*
Lakes Michigan and Huron	625
Lake Erie	585
Lake Ontario	570

Ultimate effects of a permanent diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second [2]

Lowering effect on lake levels: [2]	*Feet*
Lakes Michigan and Huron	0.08
Lake Erie	.05
Lake Ontario	.05
Reduction in outflow: [2]	*Cubic feet per second*
Lakes Michigan and Huron	1,000
Lake Erie	1,000
Lake Ontario	1,000

[1] These maximum temporary effects would diminish gradually and would disappear approximately 15 years after the temporary diversion was discontinued.

[2] Reached progressively in 15 years and continuing thereafter.

5. The foregoing reductions in outflows that would result from increasing the diversion at Chicago could not be compensated for except by increases in diversions into the Great Lakes system. The lowering of lake levels, however, could be compensated for in various ways. For Lakes Michigan and Huron the lowering could be offset by construction of a deeply submerged sill in the St. Clair River at an estimated cost of $1,530,000. The lowering effect in Lake Erie could be compensated for by operating the control gates of the Niagara River remedial works now nearing completion in such a way as to hold the level of the pool immediately above the works at a stage 0.22 of a foot higher than presently specified. For Lake Ontario, the approved plans for regulation that will be put into effect when the St. Lawrence power structures are completed can be readily adjusted within the prescribed 4-foot range of stage so that there would be no significant change in levels as a result of the increased diversions. All of the foregoing measures would require coordination with Canada.

Temporary hydroelectric

6. The estimated reduction in generation of hydroelectric energy that would result from a 3-year increase in the diversion at Chicago would fall between a minimum of 188 million kilowatt-hours and a maximum of 443 million kilowatt-hours, depending on when the diversions were started and when proposed additional hydroelectric plants are put into operation. This amount of reduction is a small fraction of 1 percent of the total energy production at the plants affected. Excluding the possible reduction at existing and proposed plants on the St. Lawrence in Quebec for which data for evaluation are not available, the estimated value of the maximum possible reduction at plants in New York and Ontario, representing 72 percent of the total involved, would be $918,000 over the entire period that the increased 3-year diversion would have any effect. The total value of the minimum reduction if scheduled new capacity is not added during this period would be $408,000. During this period the increased flow in the Illinois waterway would permit an increase in generation at the existing Lockport plant of 70,400,000 kilowatt-hours, an offset of about 16 percent of the estimated maximum reduction in generation on the Niagara and St. Lawrence. This increase would have a total value of about $202,000. The temporary diversions would affect the dependable capacity of the hydroelectric plants, causing theoretical reductions of 2,750 kilowatts at plants in New York, 2,600 kilowatts in Ontario, and 5,000 kilowatts in Quebec and a theoretical increase of 2,700 kilowatts at Lockport on the Illinois waterway, but these changes are small in relation to the capacity of the power systems involved and would be of such temporary character that assignment of any value to them is not warranted.

Permanent hydroelectric

7. The estimated effects of hydroelectric power generation that would result from a permanent increase of 1,000 cubic feet per second in the diversion at Chicago would be continuing effects and have been computed on an annual basis rather than on a total basis as in the case of the temporary 3-year diversion which would have effect for only a limited time. Assuming that proposed additional installations of generating capacity are made as scheduled the permanent diversion would result in a reduction in generation of 123,400,000 kilowatt-hours annually at plants in New York, 123,400,000 kilowatt-hours in Ontario and 56,300,000 in Quebec. The monetary value of the New York and Ontario reductions, representing 81 percent of the total, would be $708,000 annually. The increase in possible generation at Lockport on the Illinois waterway would be about 8 percent as much as the foregoing reductions or 23,500,000 kilowatt-hours annually, valued at $67,000 annually. The changes in dependable capacity would be a theoretical reduction of 36,800 kilowatts on the Niagara and St. Lawrence and a theoretical increase of 2,700 kilowatts at Lockport on the Illinois waterway. These changes in theoretical dependable capacity are small with respect to the total capabilities of the generation systems involved and assignment of value to the changes is not warranted from a practical operational standpoint.

8. The lowering of lake levels of from three-eighths to five-eighths of an inch and from five-eighths to 1 inch that would result, respectively, from the 3-year and permanent diversions would tend to be beneficial in lessening possible damage to shore property during storms and high-lake stages but the lowering effect is too small to permit monetary evaluation.

Temporary navigation

9. The temporary lowering effects of the 3-year diversion, ranging from three-eighths to five-eighths of an inch, would tend to adversely affect navigation during low-lake stages but the effect is so small and of such temporary nature that it is impracticable to evaluate the effect in monetary terms. The ultimate and continuing lowering effect of five-eighths to 1 inch of a permanent diversion, however, would be likely to affect the loading plans of the vessel expected to comprise the Great Lakes fleet in the United States as of 1985 such that an estimated average annual economic loss of $240,000 would result. No monetary evaluation has been made of the possible adverse effect on the Canadian fleet which currently has 22 percent as much carrying capacity that would be affected as compared with the present United States fleet. The foregoing appraisal applies to traffic on Lakes Michigan, Huron, and Erie. Neither the temporary nor permanent diversions would have measurable effect on navigation on Lake Ontario or the St. Lawrence River.

10. The increased diversions would not affect navigation on the Illinois waterway in any way that warrants monetary evaluation. Estimated beneficial effects of 2 inches and 1.5 inches, respectively, in stages at Alton Lock on the Mississippi and in the reach from St. Louis to Cairo have not been assigned a value because of other measures which have been planned and which are expected to correct the conditions which would be alleviated in part by increased diversions from Lake Michigan.

11. In summary, the desirability of a temporary diversion for 3 years to determine if sanitary conditions could be improved thereby should be considered in the light of: (1) an adverse effect on hydroelectric energy generation evaluated, in part, at from $408,000 to $918,000 depending on timing and amount of future additions to generating capacity, (2) an offsetting increase in generation valued at $202,000, (3) changes in theoretical dependable capacity which are not considered practicable of monetary evaluation, (4) effects on shore property tending to be beneficial but not measurable, (5) temporary effects on Great Lakes navigation tending to be adverse but not measurable and (6) effects on Mississippi River navigation tending to be beneficial but not of measurable monetary value on a temporary basis. Similar considerations, in amounts that would be somewhat greater and more susceptible of measurement and evaluation would be involved if consideration is to be given in the future to the cost and justification of a permanent increase in diversion.

12. I recommend that this report on the effects of increased diversion from Lake Michigan be made available for the consideration of all concerned with such possibilities. This would include officials of the States and local organizations bordering the Great Lakes, Members of Congress and the Congressional committees concerned and interested Federal agencies, particularly, the Department of State in order that discussions can be held with Canadian interests.

E. C. ITSCHNER,
Major General, United States Army,
Chief of Engineers.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. It is a statement in opposition of the bill and in support of the amendment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR BRICKER IN OPPOSITION TO H. R. 2, TO INCREASE THE DIVERSION OF WATER FROM LAKE MICHIGAN INTO THE ILLINOIS WATERWAY

H. R. 2 is merely the most recent form of a measure which I have opposed in one capacity or another since 1923. I participated in the original litigation involving diversion of water from Lake Michigan and later, as attorney general of Ohio, I participated in the contempt proceeding in the Supreme Court against the city of Chicago for failure to comply with the order of the Supreme Court placing a ceiling on the amount of diversion possible.

This bill is far too important to be considered in the closing hours of this session of the Congress. We simply do not have enough evidence available or enough time to evaluate the evidence we have to determine precisely the adverse effects which this bill would have on the Great Lakes States.

At the very end of the last session of the last Congress a similar bill came before the Senate and was passed with inadequate consideration. The President of the United States vetoed that bill, properly in my opinion. It seems to me that action on H. R. 2 should be deferred until next year to permit the Senate to study the record of the hearings before the Senate Public Works Committee and to debate fully all of the domestic ramifications of the proposed legislation.

Because of my long association with this diversion problem, I am firmly convinced that H. R. 2 is legally indefensible, both as a matter of domestic and international law, and economically unsound.

The fundamental legal principle is that littoral and riparian owners of land are entitled to take water from rivers and lakes for lawful purposes provided that they return the same amount of water at the same standard of purity as when it was taken out of the river or lake. The residents of the Chicago metropolitan area are not doing this. Milwaukee, Duluth, Toledo, Cleveland, Detroit, and other Great Lakes cities have not found it impossible to comply with the fundamental legal principle involved.

In addition, the unilateral action proposed by H. R. 2 would flout accepted canons of international law. It is impossible for the United States to permit additional diversion of water into the Illinois waterway without doing some damage to our Canadian friends. The United States has no greater right to the waters of the Great Lakes than does Canada.

H. R. 2 is economically unsound in that it authorizes a costly lowering of the waters of the Great Lakes. For example, it is an established fact that lowering the lake level by 1 inch will result in an annual loss of shipping tonnages in the amount of 1,500,000 tons.

Congress has appropriated many millions of dollars for the St. Lawrence seaway project and is deepening the Great Lakes harbors to a draft of 27 feet. The Congress has already appropriated approximately $144 million for this dredging. The attorney general of Ohio, Mr. William Saxbe, summed up the problem admirably when he said, "An inch off of the top requires another inch off of the bottom."

In the final analysis, the success or failure of the St. Lawrence Seaway will depend on the rates which are established. To authorize additional diversion of the waters of Lake Michigan necessarily means that toll charges on the Seaway must be substantially increased.

Ohio is making great strides in participating in the industrial growth which is promised by the St. Lawrence Seaway development. Other Great Lakes States are doing the same. This economic development should not be stifled by hasty and ill-considered action on H. R. 2.

It can hardly be maintained that further diversion, exclusively for the benefit of residents of the Chicago area, represents the greatest good for the greatest number of American citizens. All the other Great Lakes States have spent the time and money required to make diversion for sanitary reasons unnecessary. I cannot believe that the residents of the Chicago metropolitan area are any less resourceful and that they cannot return all domestic pumpage to the lake from which it came.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA].

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield me 2 additional minutes?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR].

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont has mentioned charging Canada for the water. I presided at the hearings, and I did not hear anything in the hearings about any statement to that effect. I read to the Senate a letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, William B. Macomber, as follows:

AUGUST 1, 1958.

Congressman SIDNEY R. YATES.

DEAR MR. YATES: This is in reply to your inquiry regarding the Canadian position on the proposed Chicago diversion project. The State Department understands that the Canadian Government has no objection to a 1-year temporary diversion of an additional 1,000 cubic feet of water per second from the Great Lakes system at Chicago.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary, Department of State.

Mr. President, I remind Senators the only way there can be a 1-year diversion of water and a study and a report on it is by the enactment of the bill. Therefore I ask that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to point out that the acquiescence read by the Senator from Oklahoma refers to 1,000 cubic feet per second. The bill calls for a diversion of 5,000 cubic feet per second during the dry season. That makes a difference.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do both sides yield back the remainder of their time?

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I am ready to yield back the remainder of my time, if the opposition yields back the remainder of its time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. If he were present and voting, I am informed he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. MAGNUSON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOBLITZELL], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are also necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent because of illness in his family.

The respective pairs of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] have been previously announced.

If present and voting, the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] would each vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT].

If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea," and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOBLITZELL].

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 28, not voting 39, as follows:

YEAS—29

Aiken	Cooper	Javits
Allott	Cotton	Knowland
Capehart	Curtis	Lausche
Clark	Ervin	Martin, Iowa

Martin, Pa.	Potter	Stennis
McClellan	Proxmire	Talmadge
McNamara	Purtell	Thurmond
Neuberger	Russell	Wiley
O'Mahoney	Saltonstall	Williams
Pastore	Smith, Maine	

NAYS—28

Barrett	Green	Mansfield
Beall	Hayden	Monroney
Carroll	Hennings	Morse
Case, S. Dak.	Hill	Mundt
Chavez	Humphrey	Smathers
Church	Johnson, Tex.	Sparkman
Dirksen	Johnston, S. C.	Symington
Douglas	Kerr	Young
Dworshak	Kuchel	
Ellender	Long	

NOT VOTING—39

Anderson	Fulbright	Langer
Bennett	Goldwater	Magnuson
Bible	Gore	Malone
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Morton
Bridges	Hoblitzell	Murray
Bush	Holland	Payne
Butler	Hruska	Revercomb
Byrd	Ives	Robertson
Carlson	Jackson	Schoeppel
Case, N. J.	Jenner	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Jordan	Thye
Flanders	Kefauver	Watkins
Frear	Kennedy	Yarborough

So Mr. MCNAMARA'S amendment was agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILEY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13192) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 8, 9, and 10 to the bill, and concurred therein.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Wisconsin may yield for the purpose of the submission of several resolutions and the conference report on the mutual aid appropriation bill.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for that purpose, without losing my right to the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I submit the resolution which I sent to the desk; and I request the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 388) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join a similar committee of the House of Representatives to notify the President of the United States that the two Houses have completed the business of the session and are ready to adjourn unless he has some further communication to make to them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request for immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

THANKS OF THE SENATE TENDERED THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I submit the resolution which I sent to the desk; and I request the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 389) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the thanks of the Senate are hereby tendered to the Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate, for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner in which he has presided over its deliberations during the 2d session of the 85th Congress.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request for the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

THANKS OF THE SENATE TENDERED THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I submit the resolution which I send to the desk; and I request the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 390) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the thanks of the Senate are hereby tendered to the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, President pro tempore of the Senate, for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner in which he has presided over its deliberations during the 2d session of the 85th Congress.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request for the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1959—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is prepared to submit the conference report on the mutual security appropriation bill. I hope he will do so, in order that the Senate may act on it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13192) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of what the House conferees and the Senate conferees have provided in the conference report, and a statement of how much they have reduced the appropriation items, and where the reductions were made?

Mr. HAYDEN. The conference report provides for appropriations totaling $3,298,092,500.

The total amount of the authorizations was $3,675,592,500.

Does the Senator from New York wish to have me state the difference between the action taken by the two Houses?

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to have the Senator from Arizona state that, if he will; and I should also like to have him state the amounts voted by the Senate and the amounts agreed to in the conference.

Mr. HAYDEN. The bill, as passed by the House, provided, for military assistance, $1,515,000,000. The bill as passed by the Senate provided for the same amount. The conference report provides for the same amount.

For defense support, the bill as passed by the House provided for $700 million. The bill as passed by the Senate provided for $790 million. The conference report provides for $750 million.

In the case of the Development Loan Fund, the House version of the bill provided for $300 million; the Senate version provided for $580 million; the conference report provides for $400 million.

For technical cooperation, the House version provided for $171,500,000; so did the Senate version; and so does the conference report.

For special assistance, the House version provided for $185 million; the Senate version, $200 million; the conference report, $200 million.

For the contingency fund, the House version provided for $100 million; the Senate version, $155 million; the conference report, $155 million.

For other programs, the House version provided for $106,592,500; the Senate version, $106,592,500; and the conference report, $106,592,500.

Mr. JAVITS. May I ask the indulgence of the chairman of the committee, in order that I may make a 1-minute statement regarding the results of the conference? Or, if the chairman of the committee prefers that I make the statement later, I am willing to do so then—whichever may better suit the convenience of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. Very well; I am glad to have the Senator from New York proceed now.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is obvious that the main impact of the cuts made by the conference report has fallen upon the Development Loan Fund.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to express to the Senate, as one Member, my feeling that such action is a great disservice to the country, and is a great mistake; that we have plundered one of the most potent weapons we have in the cold war with the Soviet Union; that we shall rue the day we did it; and I hope the administration will have the courage, as it should, in January to request of the Congress the enactment of a deficiency appropriation item for this purpose, as readily as it would in the case of a military item, for in my opinion this item is just that critical to the security of the Nation and to the security of all the rest of the Free World.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me state that the statement on the part of the managers of the House contains the following statement:

> The amounts contained in the bill agreed to by the conferees were too small, in the view of some conferees—especially in the Development Loan Fund. It is understood that if additional funds are needed next January for the purposes contained in this bill, the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate will give earnest consideration to the recommendations of the Executive, in view of the importance of maintaining our friendly relations with countries with whom we have undertakings.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Arizona for that statement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to speak for only a moment.

I desire to state, also, that I believe the amounts provided by the conference report for the Development Loan Fund are inadequate for the responsibilities with which this Nation has charged itself.

It is one thing for the President of the United States to go before the United Nations and pledge to the other nations of the world, particularly those in the Middle East, that we are prepared to participate in the Mid-East Development Agency, which will require substantial amounts of capital; and it is another thing to perform.

I hope that in January the President will present to the Congress what he believes to be the legitimate requirements of an effective economic program in the Middle East, a program in which we will share—and in that connection, I emphasize the word "share"—not one in which we shall take on the entire burden.

An adequate amount was not called for, in the case of the Development Loan Fund; an adequate amount was not included in what we authorized; and an adequate fund was not included in what we appropriated.

I compliment the chairman of the committee [Mr. HAYDEN] for the hard work he has done on these important measures.

But, Mr. President, again we find ourselves at a late hour having to make decisions which are temporary in a world which needs more than that in terms of our policies and programs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 13192, which was read, as follows:

In the House of Representatives, United States

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 8, 9, and 10 to the bill (H. R. 13192) entitled "An act making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes," and concur therein.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD a table illustrating the amounts for mutual security in the House version of the bill, the amounts in the Senate version of the bill, and the amounts agreed to in the conference.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mutual security appropriations, 1959

Item	Estimates, 1959	Authorization acts	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action
Military assistance	$1,800,000,000	$1,605,000,000	$1,515,000,000	$1,515,000,000	$1,515,000,000
Defense support	835,000,000	810,000,000	700,000,000	790,000,000	750,000,000
Development Loan Fund	625,000,000	625,000,000	300,000,000	580,000,000	400,000,000
Technical cooperation	171,500,000	171,500,000	171,500,000	171,500,000	171,500,000
Special assistance	212,000,000	202,500,000	185,000,000	200,000,000	200,000,000
Contingency fund	200,000,000	125,000,000	100,000,000	155,000,000	155,000,000
Other programs	106,592,500	106,592,500	106,592,500	106,592,500	106,592,500
Total mutual security: Appropriation	3,950,092,500	3,675,592,500	3,078,092,500	3,518,092,500	3,298,092,500
Unobligated balance	(1)		(1 2)		
Total	3,950,092,500	3,675,592,500	3,078,092,500	3,518,092,500	3,298,092,500

[1] Entire unobligated balance of President's fund for Asian economic development (no amount specified) to remain available through June 30, 1959.

[2] Entire unobligated balance of United Nations Relief and Works Agency (no amount specified) made available through June 30, 1959.

SUMMARY OF APPROPRIATION BILLS CONSIDERED IN THE 85TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a summary of the appropriations bills considered in the 85th Congress, 2d session.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Table of appropriation bills, 85th Cong., 2d sess.

Bill No.	Title	House				
		Budget estimates to House	Date reported	Amount as reported	Date passed	Amount as passed
	1958 appropriations:					
H. R. 10146	Supplemental defense, 1958	$1,260,000,000	Jan. 21	$1,260,000,000	Jan. 23	$1,260,000,000
H. J. Res. 533	Supplemental labor, 1958	43,400,000	Feb. 7	43,400,000	Feb. 10	43,400,000
H. R. 10881	Second supplemental, 1958	2,871,465,844	Feb. 20	2,837,882,907	Feb. 26	2,857,882,907
H. J. Res. 588	Advance procurement, 1958		Mar. 28		Mar. 31	
H. R. 12326	Urgent deficiency, 1958	32,411,802	May 1	28,761,802	May 6	28,761,802
H. J. Res. 624	Additional supplemental, 1958	665,700,000	June 9	665,700,000	June 9	665,700,000
	Subtotal 1958 supplementals	4,872,977,646		4,835,744,709		4,856,744,709
	1959 appropriations:					
	Supplemental:					
H. R. 13450	The supplemental	3,226,315,440	July 18	3,131,094,797	July 22	3,131,844,797
	Regular:					
H. R. 11085	Treasury-Post Office	4,121,909,000	Feb. 27	4,100,608,000	Mar. 4	4,106,108,000
H. R. 11767	Agriculture	3,320,888,539	Mar. 28	3,216,988,539	Apr. 1	3,216,988,539
H. R. 10746	Interior	414,484,600	Feb. 14	413,145,600	Feb. 18	413,145,600
H. R. 10580	General Government	15,814,870	Feb. 7 / Mar. 28	15,558,870	Apr. 1	15,558,870
H. R. 12540	Commerce	982,721,000	May 16	917,140,000	May 20	949,892,000
H. R. 11574	Independent offices	(5,922,343,500)	Mar. 21	(6,549,920,900	Mar. 27	(6,549,920,900)
H. R. 12428	State, Justice, Judiciary	589,215,011	May 9	570,722,613	May 15	570,722,613
H. R. 11645	Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare	2,973,737,181	Mar. 25	2,961,862,181	Mar. 27	2,967,955,581
H. R. 12738	Defense	38,196,947,000	May 28	38,310,561,000	June 5	38,409,561,000
H. R. 12948	District of Columbia	(215,153,500)	June 13	(203,276,100)	June 18	(203,276,100)
	Federal payment	27,060,000	...do...	22,860,600	...do...	22,860,600

Table of appropriation bills, 85th Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

Bill No.	Title	House				
		Budget estimates to House	Date reported	Amount as reported	Date passed	Amount as passed
	1959 appropriations—Continued.					
	Regular—Continued.					
H. R. 12858	Public works	$1,077,356,000	June 9	$1,074,117,200	June 19	$1,077,827,200
H. R. 13066	Legislative	97,910,499	June 20	96,942,113	June 24	96,942,113
H. R. 13192	Mutual security	3,950,092,500	June 27	3,078,092,500	July 2	3,078,092,500
H. R. 13489	Military construction	1,730,653,000	July 22	1,218,815,000	July 24	1,218,815,000
H. R. 13856	Independent offices	5,927,060,500	Aug. 22	5,993,404,900	Aug. 22	5,993,404,900
	Subtotal, 1959 regular	63,426,510,300	----------	61,990,819,116	----------	62,139,874,516
	Subtotal, 1959	66,652,825,740	----------	65,121,913,913	----------	65,271,719,313
	Total for session	71,525,803,386	----------	69,957,658,622	----------	70,127,464,022

Bill No.	Title	Senate				
		Budget estimates to Senate	Date reported	Amount as reported	Date passed	Amount as passed
	1958 appropriations:					
H. R. 10146	Supplemental defense, 1958	$1,200,000,000	Jan. 31	$1,200,000,000	Feb. 3	$1,200,000,000
H. J. Res. 533	Supplemental labor, 1958	43,400,000	Feb. 10	43,400,000	Feb. 10	43,400,000
H. R. 10881	Second supplemental, 1958	2,874,144,080	Mar. 4	2,865,963,718	Mar. 11	2,869,406,463
H. J. Res. 588	Advance procurement, 1958	----------	Apr. 1	----------	Apr. 21	----------
H. R. 12326	Urgent deficiency, 1958	34,811,802	May 6	34,684,302	May 8	34,684,302
H. J. Res. 624	Additional supplemental, 1958	685,700,000	June 10	685,700,000	June 11	685,700,000
	Subtotal 1958 supplementals	4,903,055,882	----------	4,889,748,020	----------	4,893,190,765
	1959 appropriations:					
	Supplemental:					
H. R. 13450	The supplemental	4,081,154,221	Aug. 13	3,594,944,978	Aug. 15	3,806,382,978
	Regular:					
H. R. 11085	Treasury-Post Office	4,121,969,000	Mar. 18	4,108,108,000	Mar. 21	4,108,108,000
H. R. 11767	Agriculture	3,320,888,539	Apr. 18	3,207,973,039	Apr. 21	3,207,973,039
H. R. 10746	Interior	414,484,600	Apr. 28	488,939,950	Apr. 30	489,916,950
H. R. 10589	General Government	15,814,870	June 5	14,954,870	June 9	14,954,870
H. R. 12540	Commerce	982,721,000	June 6	1,012,886,000	June 10	1,012,886,000
H. R. 11574	Independent offices	(5,927,060,500)	June 5	(6,137,248,900)	June 9	(6,108,242,900)
H. R. 12428	State, Justice, Judiciary	589,285,011	June 9	588,717,113	June 11	588,717,113
H. R. 11645	Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare	2,975,437,181	June 17	3,204,382,581	June 20	3,205,382,581
H. R. 12738	Defense	38,786,970,000	July 24	40,032,811,000	July 30	40,042,992,000
H. R. 12948	District of Columbia	(215,153,500)	June 27	(206,211,814)	July 1	(206,211,814)
	Federal payment	27,660,600	...do.....	24,360,600	...do.....	24,360,600
H. R. 12858	Public works	1,077,356,000	July 2	1,159,465,835	July 9	1,159,915,835
H. R. 13066	Legislative	123,846,669	July 14	123,320,419	July 15	123,320,419
H. R. 13192	Mutual security	3,950,092,500	Aug. 5	3,518,092,500	Aug. 23	3,518,092,500
H. R. 13489	Military construction	1,730,653,000	Aug. 13	1,714,815,000	Aug. 14	1,720,115,000
H. R. 13856	Independent offices	6,171,270,500	Aug. 22	6,103,456,900	Aug. 23	6,103,456,900
	Subtotal, 1959 regular	64,288,449,470	----------	65,302,283,807	----------	65,320,191,807
	Subtotal, 1959	68,369,603,691	----------	68,897,228,785	----------	69,186,574,785
	Total for session	73,272,659,573	----------	73,786,976,805	----------	74,079,765,550

Bill No.	Title	Public Law			Increase or decrease compared to budget estimates to date
		Date approved	Amount as approved	Law No.	
	1958 appropriations:				
H. R. 10146	Supplemental defense, 1958	Feb. 11	$1,200,000,000	85-322	----------
H. J. Res. 533	Supplemental labor, 1958	Feb. 12	43,400,000	85-324	----------
H. R. 10881	Second supplemental, 1958	Mar. 28	2,861,008,793	85-352	−$13,135,287
H. J. Res. 588	Advance procurement, 1958	Apr. 24	----------	85-396	----------
H. R. 12326	Urgent deficiency, 1958	May 14	29,784,302	85-400	−5,027,500
H. J. Res. 624	Additional supplemental, 1958	June 13	685,700,000	85-457	−5,000,000
	Subtotal, 1958 supplementals	----------	4,879,893,095	----------	−23,162,787
	1959 appropriations:				
	Supplemental:				
H. R. 13450	The supplemental	----------	3,697,305,478	----------	−383,848,743
	Regular:				
H. R. 11085	Treasury-Post Office	Mar. 28	4,018,108,000	85-354	−13,861,000
H. R. 11767	Agriculture	June 12	3,191,875,539	85-459	−129,013,000
H. R. 10746	Interior	June 4	459,675,950	85-439	+45,191,350
H. R. 10589	General Government	June 25	15,679,870	85-468	−135,000
H. R. 12540	Commerce	June 25	971,214,000	85-469	−11,507,000
H. R. 11574	Independent offices	Vetoed	(6,582,304,900)	----------	(+655,244,400)
H. R. 12428	State, Justice, Judiciary	June 30	577,904,113	85-474	−11,380,898
H. R. 11645	Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare	Aug. 1	3,142,606,981	85-580	+167,169,800
H. R. 12738	Defense	Aug. 22	39,602,827,000	85-724	+815,857,000
H. R. 12948	District of Columbia	Aug. 6	(204,033,460)	85-594	(−11,120,040)
	Federal payment	...do.....	22,860,600	85-594	−4,800,000
H. R. 12858	Public works	----------	1,118,128,835	----------	+40,772,835
H. R. 13066	Legislative	July 31	123,297,357	85-570	−549,282
H. R. 13192	Mutual security	Aug. 23	3,298,092,500	----------	−652,000,000
H. R. 13489	Military construction	...do.....	1,353,850,000	----------	−376,803,000
H. R. 13856	Independent offices	...do.....	6,090,156,900	----------	−81,113,600
	Subtotal, 1959 regular	----------	64,076,277,675	----------	−212,171,795
	Subtotal, 1959	----------	67,773,583,153	----------	−596,020,538
	Total for session	----------	72,653,476,248	----------	−619,183,325

NOTE.—Does not include $8,403,000,000 in permanent authorization.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] for his courtesy in connection with these matters.

INCREASE IN DIVERSION OF WATER FROM LAKE MICHIGAN INTO THE ILLINOIS WATERWAY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2) to authorize the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test on a 3-year basis the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as "8–21–58–A", and ask that it be printed at this point in the RECORD, without being read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment submitted by Mr. PROXMIRE is as follows:

On page 1, in line 4 of the title, and in line 4 of the text; on page 2, line 2; and on page 3, lines 8 and 16, strike out the words "Lake Michigan" and insert in lieu thereof "Lakes Michigan, Erie, Huron, and Ontario, and the St. Lawrence River."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to make it crystal clear in this bill that the diversion is not just from Lake Michigan, but is also from the other lakes. The amendment reads, in effect, that wherever the words "Lake Michigan" appear in the bill, there be inserted in lieu thereof "Lakes Michigan, Erie, Huron, and Ontario, and the St. Lawrence River."

Mr. President, this bill very seriously affects the States abutting these lakes. So it seems to me that the bill will be greatly improved by the adoption of this amendment, which includes the other lakes, and makes it clear—as should be done—that the States which border on the other lakes are seriously affected by this proposed legislation.

Mr. President, I desire to stress a point which I made earlier, which is the very serious importance of this whole bill, because it emphasizes the fact that serious damage could result to the property of people residing in another State.

I should like to summarize, as quickly as I can, what we have been able to establish so far. We think it is clear that the whole stated purpose of this bill, which is spelled out to anybody who reads the terms of the bill itself, is to improve sanitation for the Chicago Sanitary District. That is what it says it does, and that is what it does.

We point out that a health problem is not involved. We have testimony from some of the most eminent health authorities in the city of Chicago and in the Nation that the health problem in Chicago is not serious, and that the Chicago Sanitary District does not constitute a health problem.

I have also been able to cite from up-to-date reports of the sanitary district itself, establishing Chicago as the healthiest city in the world.

We have also been able to establish that, on the basis of all the public-health statistics, Chicago has a better record than have any of the other five largest cities in the country, in terms of illnesses caused by pollution of water.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will my colleague yield so that a motion may be made to table the bill?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I promised the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] that I would yield to him for that purpose, if he asked for the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] has the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Since the bill is already dead, does not the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin mean it will only mangle a corpse?

Mr. PROXMIRE. My understanding is the bill is not dead. It still has some life in it.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] with the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I move that the bill be tabled.

The Senate is now considering a bill which violates every principle of fair play. It singles out one municipality, placing its interests above those of six sovereign States surrounding it. Indeed, this bill attempts to balance the concerns of one city against the concerns of the entire United States—and it would have the city come off winner.

Briefly, the aim of the so-called Chicago water-diversion measure is to dispose of Chicago's sewage. I am willing to admit that such a purpose, if not noble, is at least sanitary.

Further, I will concede that the maxim, "Cleanliness is next to godliness," a well-worn admonition for little boys with dirty ears, has a bearing also on cities plagued by sanitation problems.

But by no stretch of imagination could a fairminded person agree that keeping Chicago's ears or sewers clean is worth the price exacted in this legislation.

We are asked to solve Chicago's sewage-disposal problem by sanctioning a grab of almost 2 billion gallons of water per year from dangerously low Lake Michigan.

We are asked to dispose of Chicago's wastes by restricting shipping tonnages on the Great Lakes, thereby killing jobs and incomes.

We are asked to rob electric power consumers in the Northeast.

We are asked to disrupt American-Canadian relations.

We are asked to stifle an expected boom in the infant Great Lakes shipbuilding industry.

We are asked to set an ill-advised precedent which could hamstring hydroelectric power production at the Columbia River Basin.

We are asked to jeopardize the pleasures of fishermen and sportsmen, whose patronage is the rock on which the tourist trade of the Lake States is built.

We are asked to flagrantly waste precious water, a strategic resource, in a manner nothing short of criminal.

And what do we get in return? The mystic exaltation of having helped Chicago flush away her wastes. This, Mr. President, is a bad bargain and surely the Senate of the United States will not permit itself to become an accomplice in such a one-sided deal.

Chicago's sewage disposal system has involved the city in a kind of perpetual civil war from 1900 to the present time, with a varying group of antagonists ranging from the States bordering the Great Lakes—Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and New York—to the Dominion of Canada and such unlikely participants as the cities of Peoria and Beardstown, Ill.

Somehow—in the 83d and 84th Congresses—proponents managed to push through similar water diversion bills to the one we have before us. Both times President Eisenhower vetoed them. He was acutely aware of the narrowness of this attempt and of its disregard of the general welfare. In his veto messages, the President pointed out that diversion of Great Lakes waters has historically been a proper subject of negotiation with Canada. He implied that unilateral action by the United States could jeopardize our harmonious relations with Canada.

Now, once again, under the guise of a 3-year test, backers of this legislation propose to divert 2,500 cubic feet of water per second from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway.

With every tick of the clock 2,500 cubic feet of water will be forever lost. With every setting of the sun 5,000 acre-feet of water will go down the drain. With every revolution of the earth around the sun 1,800,000 acre-feet of water will have been stolen from Lake Michigan and diverted into the Chicago drainage system. That is almost 2 billion—I repeat 2 billion—gallons of precious water each year.

America's fourth seacoast is now almost ready to open in the form of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway. Loss of water in such oceanic proportions is bound to adversely affect the Seaway's economic potential.

For centuries our greatest leaders have envisioned the Seaway as a source of commerce, wealth, and new prosperity for the American heartland. The entire concept of the waterway rests upon a deep-draft navigable channel to the sea. As my distinguished colleagues from the States bordering the Great Lakes well know, navigation potential on the Seaway is measured in inches. Those inches are the key to the Seaway's promise.

In 1954, this Government approved expenditure of $150 million of the taxpayers' money for construction of the Seaway project. A year later this Government undertook to dredge and deepen the connecting channels between the Great Lakes to a uniform 27-foot depth, at an additional cost of $141 million.

Now, we are asked to approve a bill negating the entire Seaway concept, a

bill which would send precious water and precious dollars down the drain at the same time. While we transport the biggest machinery in the world to our northern borders to dredge a 2,500-mile waterway, we would—under this bill—be draining an ocean of water off the self-same channel. How foolish can we get?

According to the Lake Carriers' Association, loss of 1 inch of water to the connecting channels would rob lake ships of 1,500,000 gross tons of carrying capacity per year. The sacrifice of an inch—or a fraction of an inch—of water from lake levels, therefore, strikes a low blow at lake commerce, at cargo shippers, at crewmen, at shipowners and shipbuilders. In wartime, when transportation is vital to defense, such loss of cargo capacity would be tragic.

The Corps of Engineers, also opposed to the scheme, testified before the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee in the same vein. Their experience with vessel operations on the Great Lakes clearly shows that ships are affected—and promptly respond—to changes in depth as small as 1 inch.

The absurdity of the diversion scheme was underscored by the Bureau of the Budget itself in a letter to the full Committee on Public Works. It reported that there exists a perfectly satisfactory alternative for solving sanitary problems in the Illinois Waterway. Additional treatment in the form of chlorination and aeration, which would cost between $750,000 and $1,500,000 per year, could increase the supply of dissolved oxygen in the waterway to the same extent as the proposed diversion.

The cost of the two methods—chlorination and aeration as opposed to diversion—is approximately the same, according to the Bureau.

Obviously, the difference lies in who picks up the tab. The city of Chicago continues to press for Federal action because it wants Uncle Sam to foot the bill for its municipal sewage-disposal system. When one of the wealthiest metropolitan centers in the United States lacks the dignity to fulfill its own municipal obligation and attempts to sluff them off on the Federal Government, we have indeed reached a sorry state of affairs.

Not only does Chicago propose to shirk her lawful obligations, but her proposal would saddle the Federal Government with additional debts relating to diversion. The Corps of Engineers estimates that compensation for permanent lowering of lake levels from diversion would require construction of a deeply submerged sill in the St. Clair River. Estimated cost: $1,530,000.

In view of these factors, I am introducing an amendment requiring the city of Chicago to pay the cost of the study and report authorized in the bill, approximately $430,000. In all justice, Chicago should pay not only study and report costs, but every other cost connected with the proposed diversion.

Mr. President, the United States may one day have to face up to the fact that she is a have-not Nation. Already our steel plants are drawing on foreign sources of iron ore. Rubber, oil, tin—all strategic items—are imported into this country. Fresh water has become a strategic commodity in today's world, and the pressure of demands upon the available supply has transformed this taken-for-granted commodity into a resource more precious than rubies.

In these circumstances, for the Senate to approve an outright 2-billion-gallon-per-year water bonanza from the American people to one selfish community is unthinkable.

The lowest level since 1949 has been predicted for Lakes Michigan and Huron by the Army Engineers. In fact, all lake levels have dropped in the past 4 years, with a 3-foot drop in Lake Michigan alone, according to testimony before the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee.

Legally and historically the rights of navigation are of paramount interest on the Great Lakes, attested by a long line of Supreme Court decisions, many of which were legal milestones.

The Great Lakes Harbors Association, the port cities of the Great Lakes, the Lake Carriers' Association, and the governments of the States bordering the Great Lakes have been united in opposition to the demands of Chicago that the waters of Lake Michigan be exploited for the political or financial benefit of the Chicago Sanitary District. The Canadian Government has repeatedly protested through diplomatic channels the attempts to extract water from an international basin for the benefit of a single community.

By 1930, litigation between Chicago and the other States of the Great Lakes area had been going on for almost 40 years. It was in 1930 that the Supreme Court of the United States pointed out that the Chicago water diversion had caused a permanent lowering of 6 inches in the lakes level, that it had greatly damaged lake commerce by decreasing the cargo capacity of lake vessels, that it had damaged beaches, fisheries, and recreational areas, that it had caused a permanent lowering of the water table in the Great Lakes region with much resulting damage to docks, harbor facilities, and building foundations.

Mr. President, at the Senate hearings, an officer in the Corps of Engineers testified that this unnatural attempt to reverse the direction of nature's flow of a great waterway—even if tested on a 3-year trial basis for a much smaller amount, say only 1,000 cubic feet per second—would have effects lasting as long as 15 years.

He said this would seriously affect the amount of electricity generated at Niagara Falls and the St. Lawrence plants. Loss of power from diversion was estimated by the corps at somewhere between $480,000 and $918,000.

Further, the corps predicted, and I quote:

> The ultimate and continuing lowering effect of five-eighths of an inch to an inch of permanent diversion would be likely to affect the loading plans of vessels expected to comprise the Great Lakes fleet.

Shipping losses from diversion were estimated well into the hundreds of thousands of dollars. During the 1956 shipping season alone 45 vessels in the lakes fleet were not able to load to capacity because of inadequate water depths.

Even the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Oklahoma, predicted on the basis of facts set forth before him during the hearings that this bill is only a means of getting a foot in the door. He said that there is a "great probability that Chicago will ask for continued diversion."

I agree with that prediction. In my statement to the subcommittee, I pointed out that it would be naive to expect that claims to these waters would be relinquished lightly after 3 years' use.

At those same hearings the junior Senator from Oregon expressed foreboding that diversion of international waters for Chicago's benefit would set a dangerous precedent on which Canada could divert water in the Columbia River Basin, as she has long desired to do. Such action by Canada would have a disastrous effect, according to the testimony, upon existing powerplants, constructed at great cost with public funds for the benefit of the various communities and industries of the Northwest.

Although we are rushing toward adjournment, let us pause and think carefully before committing ourselves to this unsound and lopsided bill.

To sum up, we are asked here to vote against development of our maritime economy, to cut our hydroelectric power capacity when demands outstrip production, to denude the Nation's loveliest fishing and recreation areas, to jeopardize tourism around the Great Lakes, to harm our relations with Canada.

We are also asked in this bill to make the United States a laughing stock. Like a giraffe whose head is so far from his tail that one end doesn't know what the other is doing, this Government would pour millions into deepening the connecting channels of the lakes, at the same time pouring out lake water in vast quantities, lowering levels, and dooming itself to endless dredging to replace tons of water siphoned off by Chicago each year.

In return we receive nothing—except the most expensive water-driven waste "dis-pos-all" known to man.

I urge the Senate to reject this measure in the best interests of the Middle West and of the Nation.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] to table the bill. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. I am informed if he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. MAGNUSON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with

the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I further announce that if present and voting the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOBLITZELL], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are also necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent because of illness in his family.

The respective pairs of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] have been previously announced.

If present and voting, the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea," and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOBLITZELL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 30, not voting 38, as follows:

YEAS—28

Aiken	Hennings	Potter
Allott	Javits	Proxmire
Barrett	Knowland	Purtell
Beall	Lausche	Saltonstall
Capehart	Martin, Pa.	Smith, Maine
Clark	McClellan	Wiley
Cooper	McNamara	Williams
Cotton	Morton	Young
Curtis	Mundt	
Dworshak	O'Mahoney	

NAYS—30

Carroll	Humphrey	Morse
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Tex.	Neuberger
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Church	Kerr	Russell
Dirksen	Kuchel	Smathers
Douglas	Long	Sparkman
Ellender	Malone	Stennis
Ervin	Mansfield	Symington
Green	Martin, Iowa	Talmadge
Hill	Monroney	Thurmond

NOT VOTING—38

Anderson	Fulbright	Kennedy
Bennett	Goldwater	Langer
Bible	Gore	Magnuson
Bricker	Hayden	Murray
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Payne
Bush	Hoblitzell	Revercomb
Butler	Holland	Robertson
Byrd	Hruska	Schoeppel
Carlson	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Case, N. J.	Jackson	Thye
Eastland	Jenner	Watkins
Flanders	Jordan	Yarborough
Frear	Kefauver	

So Mr. POTTER's motion to lay the bill on the table was rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I now move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Public Works with instructions to remove the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. With instructions to immediately report the bill back?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; with instructions to immediately report the bill back with the amendment removed. On this motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MORTON. I ask for the yeas and nays, Mr. President, on the motion to lay the motion on the table, the motion to recommit.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been requested. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, what is the motion now pending before this body?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Illinois to recommit the bill to the Committee on Public Works with instructions.

Mr. DOUGLAS. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand that a vote in favor of the motion of the Senator from Kentucky is in effect a vote to kill the bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has not stated a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is not debatable. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. If he were present and voting he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote I would vote "aye." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. MAGNUSON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. If he were present and voting he would vote "aye." If I were at liberty to vote I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], would each vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOBLITZELL], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the

Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], are also necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent because of illness in his family.

The pair of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] has been announced previously.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea," and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOBLITZELL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 28, not voting 40, as follows:

YEAS—28

Aiken	Javits	Proxmire
Allott	Knowland	Saltonstall
Barrett	Lausche	Smith, Maine
Capehart	Martin, Pa.	Stennis
Cooper	McClellan	Talmadge
Cotton	McNamara	Wiley
Curtis	Morton	Williams
Dworshak	Mundt	Young
Ervin	O'Mahoney	
Hickenlooper	Potter	

NAYS—28

Carroll	Humphrey	Morse
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Tex.	Neuberger
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Church	Kerr	Russell
Dirksen	Kuchel	Smathers
Douglas	Long	Sparkman
Ellender	Malone	Symington
Green	Mansfield	Thurmond
Hennings	Martin, Iowa	
Hill	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—40

Anderson	Frear	Langer
Beall	Fulbright	Magnuson
Bennett	Goldwater	Murray
Bible	Gore	Payne
Bricker	Hayden	Purtell
Bridges	Hoblitzell	Revercomb
Bush	Holland	Robertson
Butler	Hruska	Schoeppel
Byrd	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Carlson	Jackson	Thye
Case, N. J.	Jenner	Watkins
Clark	Jordan	Yarborough
Eastland	Kefauver	
Flanders	Kennedy	

So Mr. MORTON's motion to lay on the table Mr. DOUGLAS' motion to recommit the bill with instructions was rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is the pending business before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is the motion of the Senator from Illinois to recommit the bill to the committee with instructions.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Chair please state the motion of the Senator from Illinois?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion of the Senator from Illinois is to recommit the bill to the committee with instructions to immediately report the bill without the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The motion is debatable, is it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is debatable.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, has the motion been tabled?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion has not been tabled.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, that motion is not in order.

Mr. KERR. A point of order, Mr. President.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion of the Senator from Kentucky is not in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. May we have order in the Chamber, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think this is the quickest way to settle the matter. Let us recommit the bill to the committee with instructions immediately to report, striking out the amendment of the Senator from Michigan; bring the bill back before the Senate; vote the bill up or down; and go home.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McNAMARA. Does it not require unanimous consent to consider the bill; otherwise, the bill would have to lay over for 1 day?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the bill is reported from the committee, the bill must lie over 1 day unless unanimous consent is granted to proceed to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, if I correctly understand the parliamentary situation, if the bill were reported to the Senate, it would require unanimous consent for immediate consideration; otherwise, the bill would have to lay over one day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. But all we would have to do, Mr. President, is to make a motion to adjourn 10 minutes, if agreed to, and the Senate could then act on the bill. It would then be another legislative day, would it not, Mr. President?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to defer my inquiry until there is a reply to the inquiry of the Senator from Texas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The statement of the Senator from Texas is correct, since the Senate is in the legislative day of August 23.

Mr. DOUGLAS. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the motion to recommit to the Committee on Public Works with instructions to immediately report the bill to the Senate, in 5 or 10 minutes, with the amendment of the Senator from Michigan omitted, were agreed to, would it then be in order to move that the Senate adjourn for 10 minutes; and, if the Senate adjourned, when the Senate reconvened, would there be a new legislative day?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct; it would be a new legislative day.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the position taken by the Senator from Illinois. I do not blame him one bit. However, I mean what I say—and I never meant anything more sincerely—when I say we have a big case to make tonight. I mean we have a big case to make. I have 756 pages of the record to read, much of which still has to be read. Several pages of the record have been read.

I have the floor now and I am ready to read. I want all Senators to know, if they wish to stay and listen, there is a lot of very good information to be presented. If Senators do not wish to stay, if they come back tomorrow night at this time I will still be here reading.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may propound a unanimous consent request, with the understanding that the Senator will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished minority leader without losing my right to the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PRINTING AS SENATE DOCUMENTS A STATEMENT ON THE RECORD OF CONGRESS AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION SINCE 1953—APPENDIX OF SUMMARIES OF MAJOR LEGISLATION OF GENERAL INTEREST

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as has been customary for a number of years, both majority and minority leaders of the Senate, at the close of a Congress, put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and have printed as Senate documents their respective statements on the record of Congress.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent to have printed such a statement for the minority side in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with a review of the achievements of the Republican administration since 1953. I also request that, with the consent of the Senate, this statement and the review of achievements be printed, with any necessary revisions and corrections after the adjournment of the Congress, as a Senate document, and an appendix of summaries of major legislation of general interest.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPUBLICAN REPORT ON THE 85TH CONGRESS, TOGETHER WITH ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION, JANUARY 1953 TO AUGUST 1958

(By Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, of California, minority leader)

REPUBLICAN REVIEW OF THE 85TH CONGRESS (JANUARY 3, 1957–AUGUST 24, 1958)

The 85th Congress

In our constitutional system of government, our two major political parties—Republican and Democrat—are dominant throughout the Nation. They provide the main machinery for the election of Senators and Members of the House of Representatives to serve in each Congress.

The political party which elects the greater number of Senators gains the power to organize the Senate; the party electing the greater number of Members in the House has the power to organize the House of Representatives. In the national election of 1956, the Democratic Party elected more Senators and more Representatives than did Republicans, although the same election returned President Eisenhower, a Republican, to the White House for a second term.

The success of the Democrats in the 1956 Congressional elections gave them the power to organize the 85th Congress in January 1957. They gained the status of the "majority" in both Houses of Congress. Thus, they organized the 85th Congress. In this Congress, Republican Members are called the "minority."

History will judge the 85th Congress not by the quantity but the quality of its legislative productivity.

In its two sessions beginning January 3, 1957, and ending August 24, 1958, the 85th Congress accomplished a substantial volume of legislative business.

The present report deals only with the highlights, or matters of significant public business, selected from the major public laws and resolutions enacted by the Congress.

Powers Stemming From Control of Congress

The power to control a Congress is very important. It means that the Democrats elect the chairman and the majority membership of all the powerful committees in the Senate and House. All bills and resolutions introduced in either House of Congress are referred to their respective committees. These committees investigate and study the subject matter of such of these bills as they select; they hold hearings upon them; they shape up the language and provisions of the legislation; and finally they may pigeonhole bills or report them to their respective Houses with or without recommendations. Only then does the whole Senate or House take action on the proposed legislation. It can be seen from this that control over the committees of Congress carries with it substantial power to shape the laws which govern the Nation's citizens and their interests.

Control of Congress also includes the power to control the legislative business on the floors of both Houses. Such control determines what measures will be called up for consideration and the order of the priority, subject to the rules of each House.

For example the decision to motion up Alaska statehood but to allow Hawaii statehood to remain on the Senate Calendar was a decision of the policy committee of the Democrats.

Legislation Is Generally a Compromise

This does not mean that the majority party can impose its absolute will on the whole Congress. Legislation in Congress is more often the result of compromise. The compromise is rarely between two tightly organized political parties. Members of both Houses are men of conviction and they vote according to what they believe is best for the national interest as they see it. They may be influenced by political party principles and other interests, all of which enter into the compromise and determine the resulting legislation. On numerous occasions there are what can be termed "party line" votes, where the majority of Democrats vote on one side and the majority of Republicans oppose them; but even here there will be some "crossing of party lines" by individual Members. Moreover, there are some great questions of public policy, like civil rights, labor-management relations, and foreign aid, which cut deeply into each political party and produce party splits or divisions. This is typical of almost every Congress no matter which party controls it.

85th Congress Reflects Political Party Principles

But control of the machinery of Congress does give the majority more power and opportunity to impress legislation with its party philosophy and principles. This was evident in the performance of the 85th Congress. In general, Democrats pressed for greater Federal spending, for the continued expansion of Federal Government powers and activities, for inflationary policies, for further expansion of Federal electric power and other public projects, for Federal subsidies and benefits of all kinds to individuals, States, and localities, regardless of the dangers of inflation, or the encroachment by the Federal Government on the functions of States and local governments, private business, and individuals. In the 85th Congress, too, Democrats were reluctant to remedy abuses by legislation in cases where the legislation might meet with disfavor among certain groups from which the Democratic Party hopes to draw political strength, as in the opposition of New Deal Democrats to effective labor legislation.

Republicans in the 85th Congress, on the other hand, generally voted on lines to curb Federal spending; to restrain the expansion of Federal Government activities except where there was a clear necessity for it; to avoid inflation by maintaining the value of the dollar and by keeping the expansion of money and credit within moderate bounds; to permit the State and local governments to share with the Federal Government in power and other public projects on a partnership basis rather than have the Federal Government do the whole job; and to discourage as much as possible Federal Government interference in the lives of individuals or with the activities of private enterprise. These attitudes stem from the philosophy and historic principles of the Republican Party.

In general too, Republicans in Congress sought to support the Republican administration of President Eisenhower while Democrats, with an eye to the capture of the White House in 1960, recognized no such obligation, except in foreign affairs. While the official Democratic leadership cooperated in many foreign policy issues, there was much carping criticism by Democrats from the sidelines.

It is only against this background of our Republican form of Government, our political party system, and the significance of control over the machinery of Congress that the performance of our two major parties in the 85th Congress can be fairly evaluated.

Highlights in the record of the 85th Congress

The 85th Congress began in January 1957 on a note of economy. It closed its second session on August 24, 1958, with an upward revision of the Federal debt limit to $285 billion.

This change from economy to heavy spending resulted in part from the Russian launching of Sputnik I which led to great concern over the state of American technology, scientific education, and national defense. This concern was translated into larger expenditures in many fields, including the largest peacetime military spending program in history.

However, a large part of the spending reflected the Democratic Party's historic cure for economic recession—the enlargement of Federal Government activities and obligations. Democrats who control both Houses of Congress unleashed a barrage of spending bills, tax cut proposals, and public works plans which were strongly reminiscent of the New Deal. Bills introduced in the Senate alone would have committed the Federal Government to the spending of an extra $43.7 billion in the next 5 years with the comparable House figure much larger. The money for such an extravaganza would have had to come from Government borrowing (causing dangerous inflation) or from increased taxes on our already burdened population. Carrying financial recklessness one step farther, Senate New Deal Democrats proposed to reduce taxes by $6.2 billion.

Healthy Economic Progress Resumed

While Republicans in Congress resisted these attempts to expand Federal Government activities and launch unnecessary spending schemes, the Republican administration took more than 50 constructive steps to stimulate the economy and provide more jobs. Relieved of political pressure to spend its way out of the recession, Congress then supplemented the administration's efforts with legislation to spur the economy and meet the Nation's legitimate needs. Housing construction was stimulated; sound river, harbor, and flood-control projects were approved; water resource programs were expanded; unemployment compensation was extended and supported with Federal aids; defense programs were accelerated; taxes on the transportation of goods were lowered; the Small Business Administration was made permanent and small business enterprises were helped by tax revisions; education and welfare aids were enacted, and other measures offsetting recession were approved.

As the 85th Congress drew to a close, the economy took a healthy upturn with employment rising, business improving, individual income increasing, and personal savings reaching an all-time high. The Republican Party principle by which the Federal Government moderately supplements but does not supplant the operations of States, local governments, and private enterprises again proved to be the soundest means for resuming balanced economic progress.

Other domestic affairs

Safeguarding Farm Progress and Farmers' Freedom

In the course of the session, Democrats sponsored measures to freeze farm price supports and impose further restrictions and controls on farmers. Republicans in both Houses resisted these measures and when their opposition could not prevent the passage of the legislation freezing supports, the President vetoed it. Strong Republican opposition successfully prevented passage of

another farm bill which would have expanded the acreage reserve program and production controls on milk and feed grains. Congress, toward the end of the session, extended the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, the successful program originally launched by Republicans to dispose of farm surpluses abroad. Thwarted in its efforts to scuttle the Republican farm program which has greatly improved the farm economy, the Democratic leadership finally permitted passage of a bill making moderate improvements in Government programs and price supports. The result points to further gains in farm income, farm living conditions, and more freedom for the farmers.

Labor and Management

Investigations of the Senate (McClellan) Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field exposed such shocking abuses in sections of the organized labor movement that remedial legislation was imperative for the protection of rank and file union members. This proved a poser for the Democratic-controlled 85th Congress. Their dilemma was how to satisfy outraged public opinion and union members who were victimized by many unscrupulous union leaders and yet not offend the powerful labor leaders who furnished political strength to the Democratic Party.

S. 2888, a mild bill for registration, reporting, and disclosure of employee welfare and pension plans, was offered to meet this dilemma. It gave the appearance of doing something to protect employees while actually doing very little to safeguard welfare and pension funds and nothing at all about other abuses in the labor-management field. But while Democrats in the Senate strongly rejected all Republican attempts to give union members stronger protection against the real abuses in the labor movement, they were finally forced to come forward with a second bill (S. 3974) to accomplish that purpose. This bill was so inadequate to the need that Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell, in a public statement, voiced his conviction that the bill "would provide only illusory protection to trade union members and to the public, as well as being almost impossible to administer."

Republican Members of the Senate offered many amendments to secure more freedom and democratic rights for rank and file union members, but lacking sufficient votes to override strong Democratic majorities, Republicans saw their amendments voted down. (See provisions of the bill, section on labor and management.)

Sent over to the House, the bill remained in the hands of the Democratic Speaker for over 40 days until public pressure forced its referral to the House Education and Labor Committee. This committee voted against consideration of the bill. Notwithstanding that vote, the House Democratic leadership brought the bill to the floor under the drastic procedure of suspension of the rules which allowed no amendments practically making defeat of the bill certain. It was defeated.

The House went on to pass a companion bill to S. 2888 which, after being reconciled with the Senate bill in conference, was passed by both Houses and approved by the President.

National Defense and Mutual Security

The Russian launching of Sputnik I spurred a drive to accelerate and enlarge national defense programs and to improve and strengthen the military services. Final appropriations for the Department of Defense totaled more than $40 billion for fiscal year 1959, the largest peacetime defense appropriation in the history of the country. This was in addition to increased expenditures in many other fields related to national defense.

The total was further enlarged by appropriations of more than 3 billion dollars for mutual security, the military and economic aid given by the United States to allies and friends abroad. In this connection, Republicans had to put up a strong fight to retain provisions of existing law preventing the extension of economic and financial aid to countries that ship war material to the Soviet Union and its satellites.

Concerned over weaknesses in defense administration and operations, Congress passed the Defense Reorganization Act improving efficiency, providing flexibility, and establishing clearer lines of command authority. By other acts, Congress took many steps to make the military service more attractive as a career. It also raised the mental and physical qualifications for induction into the Armed Forces to help in obtaining more personnel with leadership and technical abilities.

Missiles and Space

Clearly recognizing the implications to national defense, to the national interest, and to the peace of mankind of explorations in outer space, Congress established an independent agency—the National Aeronautics and Space Administration—under civilian direction to plan and guide space activities. This was supplemented by a nine-member National Aeronautics and Space Council, made up of heads of government departments and agencies and private individuals, to plan a comprehensive space program and coordinate the work of Federal agencies dealing with space activities. In addition, each House of Congress set up space committees for surveillance of space problems and activities. Approximately $500 million in all was provided for space programs in the Federal Government for the 1959 fiscal year. By a concurrent resolution, Congress went on record favoring international agreements for the development and use of outer space for the peace and benefit of mankind.

Congress acted promptly to accelerate high priority missile programs and provided new funds for the purpose for use in 1958. The 1959 program for military missiles approximates $6.7 billion and is under the control of the Defense Department.

Atomic Energy

In addition to other legislation in the field of atomic energy, Congress took two significant steps to advance President Eisenhower's historic atoms-for-peace and atoms-for-security proposals. The Senate consented to the ratification of the treaty for the Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency by which the United States participates with 79 other nations in developing atomic energy for peaceful purposes. The Congress also enacted legislation to permit the United States to share atomic information with its allies, subject to certain safeguards in the national interest.

Democratic attempts were made to authorize additional expenditures in the atomic enegy field twice as large as the President requested, but such unnecessary spending was not sustained in the final appropriations for such programs.

Public Works and Natural Resources

Public works is one field where the differences between our two major parties show up quite clearly. Driven by their desire to spend their way out of the recession, Democrats pressed for the enactment of the community facilities bill providing for loans to aid cities and towns in building public works. The Senate measure called for $1 billion for this purpose and the House raised the figure to $2 billion. Fortunately, enough economy-minded Democrats joined with a strong Republican vote to defeat the greatly expanded measure. Another Democratic-sponsored bill would have set up an Area Redevelopment Administration to loan millions of dollars to aid depressed areas. No economic or business standards were set up for such loans and no attempt was made to get at the real causes for depressed areas. The bill was a plain attempt to subsidize certain industries and areas at the expense of others and could have led to loans on the basis of favoritism and political expediency. Another measure sought to expand Federal control of public power by permitting the TVA to build new powerplants with money from bonds instead of coming to Congress for funds. Strong Republican voting in the Senate and House helped to defeat such bills as these on the two principles of curbing Federal spending and restraining the indiscriminate expansion of the Federal Government into fields of State, local, and private concern.

The Omnibus Act of 1958 for rivers, harbors, flood control, and water supply finally became law after two earlier acts were vetoed. This bill, carrying authorizations of $1,556,230,500, covers hundreds of individual projects located in every State of the Nation.

The Congress also approved the Massachusetts-Connecticut flood-control compact which provides for projects to lessen the danger of floods in that area. In addition, Congress provided for a large number of other flood and water conservation projects in many other areas of the country. The 5-year program for the development of the Nation's water resources initiated by the Republican administration in 1954 was carried forward with some 461 new starts made to bring the total of expenditures close to $9 billion for the 5 years. Mineral resources and stabilization programs were approved.

Congress also authorized $3.4 billion for the long-range national highway building program, and $10 million toward the completion of the Inter-American Highway.

Congress rejected the lease-purchase program for private construction of public buildings which would have saved millions of dollars to taxpayers. But taxpayers will save an estimated $500 million by Congress' refusal to approve a Democratic-sponsored attempt to have the Federal Government build Hells Canyon Dam. Federal construction of this dam has been rejected many times since 1950 in favor of private construction which is already under way.

Personal and Public Welfare

The Congress reenacted the impacted area school bill (Public Law 815 and 874, 81st Congress) and amended the law to make permanent the program for children of persons who reside and work on Federal property. The program was extended for 3 years to June 30, 1961. In approving the measure, the President stated he did so "despite serious reservations"; that while it was clear Federal responsibility existed to help local communities meet educational expenses for children whose parents live and work on tax exempted Federal property, Federal aid should not be permanently continued for children whose parents work on Federal property but live in the local community in much the same circumstances as other workers.

In response to the President's request for enactment of a 4-year education program, including scholarships to help develop scientific and technically trained persons, Congress extended the scope of the bill to include fellowships, loans, and State grants. It did not relate the scholarships to science. The Congress also enacted other legislation to further education, including out-service training for Federal employees.

In the field of public health, Congress extended the Hospital Survey and Construction Act for 3 years and expanded its scope to include diagnostic centers, hospitals for the chronically ill, rehabilitation centers, and nursing homes. It also provided other loans and grants for hospitals and medical and dental training facilities. Congress voted more funds for cancer research than can be

efficiently used over the next fiscal year. Grants in aid totaling $1 billion were authorized to train public health specialists, technicians, and administrators.

In addition to the enactment of a $1.8 billion housing program designed to encourage the building of an estimated 200,000 homes, Congress enacted another law to hasten slum clearance and to construct public and college housing. Over strong Republican opposition, Democrats in Congress extended the benefits of public housing from low-income people to the middle-income group—nullifying the principle on which public housing is based.

In response to the President's request, Congress provided for the extension of unemployment compensation in the Federal-State system and retained the existing formula for such payments despite a Democratic-sponsored attempt to shift the whole burden to the Federal Government.

Congress, in its closing days, enacted a bill to increase social security payments by 7 percent, raise the taxable wage base from $4,200 to $4,800, increase payroll taxes, and increase the maximum family benefits to $254 a month.

Veterans

Among the many laws enacted for the benefit of veterans were the increase of 10 percent in compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities, and in allowances for dependents of veterans who are 50 percent or more disabled; increases in pensions to war widows; additional housing benefits for veterans; and an appropriation of $25 million to make additional unemployment compensation payments to veterans.

Government and Civil Service

Spearheaded by Republicans, Congress made the most significant advance in the field of civil rights in 80 years by the enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1957, which is basically designed to protect the Negroes' right to vote.

After many years Congress finally made it possible for Alaska to become a State, but ignored the claims of Hawaii to statehood.

Pay increases for postal workers, classified Federal employees, and unemployment compensation for Federal workers were voted.

In addition to passing over statehood for Hawaii, Congress took no action on home rule for the District of Columbia; no action to relieve the overcrowded dockets of Federal courts by provision of additional judges; no action on the President's urgent request to clarify the Constitution on the question of Presidential inability; and no action to meet the need for more effective laws on lobbying and Federal elections.

Foreign Affairs

On several occasions the 85th Congress had occasion to deal with important matters in the field of foreign affairs. Such measures were strongly supported by bipartisan action.

Middle East Resolution

During the Middle East crisis of January 1957, President Eisenhower asked for authority to use American Armed Forces to assist any Middle East nation requesting help against Communist aggression. A few Democrats in the Senate delayed action for almost 2 months while they vigorously criticized the administration and called for an investigation of its foreign policies. The resolution (referred to as the Eisenhower doctrine) was ultimately passed by overwhelming vote. The policy investigation continued until July but produced no committee recommendations—a fact carrying implications that the Democratic attack was made largely for political effect. During a second Middle East crisis in July 1958 when the President responded to Lebanon's request for troops to help preserve its independence, similar attacks were made by some Democrats prominent in the field of foreign relations. Nonetheless, the administration acted vigorously to defend small nations, to restrain aggressive communism in the Middle East, and to press in the United Nations for international measures to maintain the peace.

Condemnation of Soviet Repression and Brutality

In joint resolutions, under bipartisan sponsorship, Congress severely condemned Russian repression and brutality in Hungary, and expressed "the deep sense of indignation" of the American people on the execution by the Communist regime of former Hungarian Premier Imre Nagy and his colleagues.

United Nations Police Force

The Senate twice passed resolutions favoring the creation of a permanent United Nations police force.

Atoms-for-Peace and Peaceful Use of Outer Space

By Senate and House action, two significant steps were taken to advance President Eisenhower's historic atoms-for-peace proposal. These were approval of American participation in the Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency designed to advance the peaceful uses of atomic energy, and authorization under proper safeguards of the exchange of atomic information and materials with our allies.

Congress also went on record favoring international action for peaceful exploration and use of uter space.

Mutual Security

Collective security having become vital to the Free World's resistance to Communist aggression, Congress continued to appropriate mutual security funds in 1957 and 1958. The act of 1957 made two important innovations. First, economic aid, which up to then consisted largely of gifts, was placed on a repayable basis through the creation of a development loan fund. Second, the definition of "defense support" was tightened to preclude the use of these dollars for any other purpose than to help friendly countries keep a maximum amount of men under arms as a guarantee of protection. Although sharp cuts in mutual security funds were threatened in the appropriation act for fiscal 1959, the critical situation in the Middle East helped to induce Congress to grant funds substantially meeting the President's request.

Immigration

In the closing days of the first session, Congress enacted a bill of limited scope in the field of immigration, in place of the comprehensive program recommended by the President. The bill affected an estimated 60,000 aliens, providing relief in hardship cases and reviving 18,000 visas lost when the Refugee Relief Act expired in 1956. By another act it was made possible for some 30,000 Hungarian refugees to become permanent residents of the United States.

Section-by-section details of the record of the 85th Congress follow:

Agriculture

(Republican agricultural policies—designed to return a greater measure of freedom to American farmers while protecting their income—had some rough sledding in the Democratic-controlled 85th Congress. But even without full Congressional support and implementation those freedom policies began to bear fruit in such forms as increases in farm income, assets, ownership, land value, and improved farm home living.)

Attacks on Soil Bank Program

In the first session of this Congress there was a serious danger that a Democratic majority in the House would end prematurely the acreage reserve part of the Republican-sponsored soil bank program. The House did in fact vote 192 to 187 to kill the acreage reserve after 1957 crops. Of those who voted to kill the acreage reserve, 154 were Democrats and 38 were Republicans. Opposed to the sudden move were 141 Republicans and 46 Democrats. Fortunately for America's farmers, the House later reversed its position when it approved a Senate-House compromise agricultural appropriations bill providing for continuation of the acreage reserve for most 1958 plantings, thus protecting farmers by an orderly close of the temporary program.

Also in the first session, Congress failed to protect the best interest of the Nation's corn growers when Democratic majorities in both the House and the Senate defeated several Republican-sponsored bills designed to head off overproduction by setting more realistic acreage restrictions and encouraging participation in the soil bank.

President Vetoes Unrealistic Democratic-Sponsored Farm Bill

Early in the second session the Democratic-controlled Congress met a Presidential veto when it attempted to thwart the Republican farm program by freezing farm supports at 1957 levels.

The next major attack against Republican farm freedom policies came when House Democrats controlling important committees forced to the floor a farm bill which would have imposed more restrictions on farmers and cost billions of dollars. This bill (H. R. 12954) would have expanded the area of production controls to milk and feed grains. It authorized an acreage reserve program for corn and grain sorghums, although agricultural appropriations legislation just passed provided no funds for a 1959 acreage reserve program. The bill would have resulted in higher consumer costs for milk and bread.

After Republican Representatives and the administration pointed out these and other faults, the House refused 214 to 171 even to debate the measure. Voting to kill the bill were 162 Republicans and 52 Democrats. Voting to consider the catchall measure were 150 Democrats and 21 Republicans.

Congress passed a 3-year extension of the special school milk program just in time to keep the program from expiring and denying milk to children in summer camps, schools, and other nonprofit child-care activities. Extension had been delayed because the popular milk program had been included as a sweetener in the Democratic omnibus farm bill.

Another sweetener in the bill didn't fare as well, but eventually also won separate House consideration and approval. That was extension of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, originally passed by the Republican 83d Congress for the double purpose of disposing of American farm surpluses and fostering sound foreign relations. This successful act expired June 30, and wasn't reinstated by Congress until the very end of the session.

New Farm Bill Aids Farmers

The rejection of H. R. 12954 left a much more workable Senate bill (S. 4071) as the major farm bill pending before the Congress. This bill sought to make changes in Government programs for cotton, rice, corn, and feed grains, commodities generally recognized as having the most serious problems. It incorporated the principle of gearing price supports to average market prices down to certain income-protecting limits. It also sought to give growers more freedom to plant by setting more realistic acreage allotments, eliminating allotments entirely in the case of corn.

Although this bill was reported June 28 this year, it didn't reach the Senate floor for action until July 23, where it was amended and passed on July 25.

The House Agriculture Committee offered a severely amended version of the bill for passage under suspended rules permitting no

amendments. The House rightly refused to accept it.

After still further delay that made it appear no general farm bill would be enacted, House Democrats in key positions relented and finally brought out another version of the bill more nearly in line with Senate provisions and Republican administration recommendations.

This bill won final passage. Although it abandons part of the proposed principle of gearing price supports to market prices, it permits lowering of support floors as a percentage of parity and allows more freedom to plant. Importantly, it also will eliminate escalator clauses for cotton, rice, and possibly corn.

Republican Farm Program Yields Beneficial Results

Progress toward Republican farm freedom goals was slowed but not halted by such Democratic foot dragging. Even with only partial Congressional support, those freedom policies have begun to show results in such forms as (1) a 22-percent gain in realized net farm income in the first half of 1958 over the same period in 1957; (2) total income per person on farms at a new high record in 1957; (3) farm ownership at a record high and farm land values at an all-time high in 1957; (4) cash receipts from farm marketings in the first half of 1958 at 11 percent above the similar 1957 period, with prices of farm products averaging 8 percent higher and the volume of marketings up 3 percent; and (5) the best farm living conditions in history in terms of better homes with more conveniences.

Atomic Energy at Home and Abroad

(Republican policies of atoms-for-peace and Free World security were supported by the 85th Congress. Some Democratic proposals tended backward toward Government monopoly and unnecessary spending. But by and large Republican atomic progress with freedom was advanced.)

The two most significant Congressional accomplishments in the field were consent to the ratification in the first session of the statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency and passage in the second session of legislation permitting the United States to share atomic military information and materials with allied nations. Both accomplishments fulfilled Presidential requests and advanced the use of the atom for peace and security.

International Atomic Energy Agency

The statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency, a treaty signed by the United States and 79 other nations, grew out of President Eisenhower's historic atoms-for-peace proposal at the United Nations in December 1953. The agency is designed to advance peaceful uses of atomic energy and its application to industry, agriculture, and medicine.

Cooperation With Military Allies

The new law permitting, subject to certain conditions, greater exchange of atomic information and materials with military allies was requested by the President as an outgrowth of urgent Free World discussions following the launching of the first Russian earth satellite last October. Its major effect is to lower substantially but selectively the walls of secrecy between the United States and its allies on nuclear weapons development. Congress wisely added safeguards to the President's recommendations to be sure that Congress would have veto power over exchange agreements and that the legislation wouldn't have the effect of creating new atomic powers among nations.

Euratom

Another significant Congressional accomplishment in the second session was passage of legislation approving a preliminary agreement between the United States and the six-nation European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom). The plan calls for the construction of 6 nuclear-power reactors to produce 1 million kilowatts of electricity and to cost an estimated $350 million, of which $135 million would be loaned by our Export-Import Bank. Congress authorized an initial appropriation of $3 million toward a projected $50 million in outright grants to be matched by Euratom for research and development. It also authorized the sale or lease of 30,000 kilograms of enriched uranium fuel.

Appropriations for Atomic Progress

In the second session, the Congress authorized an additional $386,679,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission's construction program.

When it came to fiscal 1959 appropriations for AEC, Congress appropriated $2,647,335,000.

These appropriations, added to the $2.32 billion in the first session appropriations bill, plus earlier appropriations and other sums, helped provide a national and Free World program for harnessing the elemental forces of the universe for freedom's defense and for the advancement of human welfare in many peaceful pursuits.

Government and civil service

(There were notable advances in keeping with Republican principles, both through legislation and Administration action, in promoting increased economy and efficiency in Government operations, in improving the civil service and post office system, and in bettering the status of the Federal employee. Many of these actions implemented Hoover Commission recommendations. Republicans spearheaded other advances in the field of civil rights, including statehood for Alaska.)

Civil Rights

For the first time in over 80 years, Congress enacted significant civil rights legislation. The Civil Rights Act of 1957 was designed basically to protect the Negroes' right to vote. It also set qualifications for Federal jurors, independently of State laws, and provided for an additional Assistant Attorney General to handle civil rights laws. In addition, it established a six-member, bipartisan Commission on Civil Rights, with a life of 2 years. The Commission is empowered to investigate alleged deprivations of voting rights because of color, race, religion, or national origin; and to study and appraise Federal laws, policies, and legal developments constituting denial of the legal protection of the laws.

The law as finally was enacted was limited in scope principally because of Democratic opposition in the Senate to Part III of the House-passed bill, dealing with enforcement powers to protect not only voting rights but a variety of civil rights.

Statehood

While Congress passed statehood for Alaska legislation, the Democratic leadership totally ignored the equally compelling case of Hawaii. The Republican administration had urged statehood for both of these territories in conformity to the platform pledges of both parties in 1956. The difference between Democratic promise and performance stands out, in view of the 1956 Democratic Party Platform pledge of statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii.

Passport Controls for the State Department

The President requested legislation giving the State Department express statutory authority to override recent Supreme Court rulings holding that the Department does not have authority to deny a passport because of a citizen's beliefs or associations. He also sought clarification of authority to prevent Americans from using passports for travel to areas "where their presence would conflict with our foreign policy objectives or be inimical to the security of the United States." The Congress took no action on these recommendations.

Postal Rate and Postal Pay Increases

The Postal Policy Act of 1958 represented the culmination of several years of effort by the Republican Administration to obtain Congressional approval of an increase in postal rates to offset evermounting deficits. (The administration, meanwhile, had modernized the Post Office Department, making effective use of management practices successfully developed by private industry.) These deficits were due to the more than doubled costs of postal service over the past 25 years, during which period postal volume had tripled; and except for parcel post, rates remained at levels that were entirely inadequate in view of increased costs.

This legislation also provided an overall 10 percent increase in pay for 500,000 postal workers, retroactive to January 1, 1958.

Federal Employment

Congress passed and the President approved a 10 percent cost-of-living pay increase for classified Federal employees in the executive branch, as well as for those in the legislative and judicial branches, retroactive to January 1, 1958.

In addition, Congress enacted legislation, requested by the administration implementing a Hoover Commission recommendation, to authorize the training of Government employees outside as well as within the agencies in which they are employed—such training to be under public or private auspices. The sum of $18.4 million was appropriated for the fiscal year 1958 for additional unemployment compensation payments to Federal employees. This was in line with overall provision that was made for appropriations to cover unemployed workers generally throughout the country.

Congress also adopted a model code of ethics to guide all Federal employees and officers in the proper conduct of their duties.

Second Hoover Commission Recommendations

Congress enacted H. R. 8002 to authorize the inclusion of expenditure limitation in appropriation acts and to revise budgeting practices of the executive branch so as to bring long-term spending projects under a mandatory annual review and prevent the accumulation of vast amounts of unspent carryover funds, often beyond further Congressional scrutiny. This carried out a Hoover Commission recommendation, a task force of which claimed substantial savings if budgeting and accounting recommendations were all implemented. Other recommendations and achievements of this Commission are mentioned elsewhere in this report.

Federal Judiciary

Several steps were taken to reduce the excessive workload of the Federal court system. Thus, Congress raised from $3,000 to $10,000 the amount which must be in controversy to give the Federal courts jurisdiction in civil actions; removed jurisdiction of district courts over workmen's compensation cases under State laws; and relieved the chief judge of a circuit or district court from his administrative duties at age 70. But overcrowded dockets in Federal courts were ignored by the failure to increase the number of judges and court personnel.

Presidential Inability

In the light of the incapacity of former Presidents Garfield and Wilson and President Eisenhower's several illnesses, the President recommended that Congress act upon his proposal for legislation to clarify the Constitution, but this Congress did not act.

Campaign Funds and Lobbying

The need for more effective laws on lobbying and Federal elections has been amply demonstrated through investigations by several Congressional committees. Moreover, the activities of labor organizations in these fields were highlighted by revelations of the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field and other Congressional investigations. Nonetheless, Congress enacted no legislation on these subjects.

Reorganization Plans

The Congress extended to June 1, 1959, the authority of the President to reorganize the executive branch of the Government, subject to rejection of a reorganization plan by simple majority vote of either the Senate or the House. Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957 abolished the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transferring its functions to each of several agencies and departments. Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1958 consolidated the Office of Defense Mobilization and the Federal Civil Defense Administration into a new agency, the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, in the Executive Office of the President, thereby establishing a single pattern of authority for nonmilitary defense functions.

Pensions for Presidents

Provision was made for pensions, office space, and staff for former Presidents.

Government finance and taxation

(Following historic principles of prudent and responsible Government finance, Republicans resisted Democratic proposals for income tax cuts and New Deal-type spending measures in the 85th Congress, and most of these proposals were rejected. The 3 percent railroad freight tax was repealed, but the income tax rates on corporate income and various other excise taxes on consumer goods were continued. The 85th Congress twice complied with administration requests to raise the Federal debt limit.)

Federal Debt Limits and Budget Control

After two consecutive balanced budgets under the Republican administration, fiscal 1958 ended with a deficit of $2,813,000,000. This was due to heavily increased defense spending and antirecession programs. The fiscal 1959 budget was set at $73.9 billion.

Congress also enacted a bill to authorize the inclusion of expenditure limitation in appropriation acts and to revise budgeting practices of the executive branch to prevent the large carry-over of unspent funds (see Government and Civil Service, section on Second Hoover Commission Recommendations).

In general, the 85th Congress cooperated with the President's requests regarding the debt ceiling and taxes. There was no increase in existing tax rates.

Freight Tax Repealed

The Congress did effect one important tax cut and that was in the form of a bill which repealed the 3 percent tax on freight shipments, but which extended for another year the wartime tax rates on corporate income and a wide range of consumer goods. The continuation of the excise levies will yield $2,115,000,000. The bill also repeals the 10 percent tax on the transportation of passengers.

Excises Retained—Other Tax Adjustments

The 85th Congress also enacted a measure which continues a stopgap formula for taxation of life insurance companies. This law applies a 1955–56 formula for taxing income of life-insurance companies to the taxable year 1957.

Tax Writeoff Amended

In the first session, the 85th Congress took action on the rapid tax amortization feature of Federal law. Designed to stimulate building of defense facilities, the 5-year fast writeoff has resulted in an estimated postponement of $5 billion in Federal tax revenue over the period of 1950–60, at an interest cost to the Government of about $3 billion. The law was first enacted during World War II, was reenacted during the Korean war and was continued thereafter. It was amended by this Congress to restrict issuance of rapid tax amortization certificates to new or specialized defense facilities and to research and development facilities for defense. As enacted, the new provisions are similar to policies the administration had already adopted.

Labor and management

(The need for effective labor legislation had become evident with revelations of the many abuses exposed in the organized labor movement—abuses which materialized largely because of a need to bring the law up to date. Later, these abuses were, and continue to be, highlighted by the hearings conducted by the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field. While some progress has been made toward effective regulatory legislation, Democratic-controlled Congresses have, for the most part, frustrated every attempt to enact this much needed legislation.)

Recommendations of the McClellan Committee

The legislative recommendations of the Senate (McClellan) Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field called for laws to: (1) Regulate and control pension and health and welfare funds; (2) regulate and control union funds; (3) insure union democracy; (4) curb middlemen in labor-management disputes; and (5) clarify the "no man's land" in labor-management relations. These recommendations were based on over a year-and-a-half of hearings and volumes of sworn testimony. Clearly, the mandate to the Congress was to enact effective legislation.

Many bills were introduced to do just this. However, the Democratic-controlled Labor and Public Welfare Committee saw fit to report out only two bills: S. 2888, to provide for registration, reporting, and disclosure of employee welfare and pension plans; and S. 3974, to provide for the reporting and disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and employers, to prevent abuses in the administration of trusteeships by labor organizations, and to provide standards with respect to the election of officers of labor organizations.

Pension and Welfare Funds

In April, when S. 2888 was being debated, Republicans offered many amendments to carry out recommendations of the McClellan committee. These amendments were then offered because there was a strong belief that the Democratic-controlled Congress might enact a mild bill on pension and welfare funds and do nothing else on labor legislation despite the outrageous abuses in the labor movement exposed by the McClellan committee. A solid phalanx of Democrats defeated the Republican efforts, but were compelled by pressure of public opinion to assure the Senate that a general bill dealing with abuses in the labor movement would be brought before the Senate.

On these assurances, S. 2888 finally passed with 46 Republicans and 42 Democrats supporting it. This bill provides: (1) All welfare and pension plans with membership of over 100 employees must be registered with the Department of Labor; (2) an annual, audited report must be made by the administrator of a welfare or pension fund to the Department of Labor; (3) the Secretary of Labor is authorized to investigate situations in which it appears funds are being jeopardized; and (4) penalties for embezzlement, or other misuse of funds, are established.

The House passed a much milder companion bill (H. R. 13507) to S. 2888, and the two bills went to conference. The bill that came out of conference more nearly favored the House version than the Senate version. It provided mainly for the registration of information on pension and welfare plans, rather than providing for protection to the beneficiaries of such plans. Reporting was enlarged by a provision that exempted only plans covering not more than 25 employees. The bill was considerably weakened by the elimination of the powers of the Secretary of Labor to protect the interests of the beneficiaries of pension and welfare plans by conducting investigations, issuing subpenas, and seeking injunctions to prevent violations of the act. Accepting the conference report as the best legislation obtainable, both Houses cleared the bill for the President.

Legislation to Protect Trade Union Members and the Public

After Republican attempts to amend S. 2888 proved fruitless, public demand virtually forced S. 3974 out of committee.

As reported, the bill was grossly inadequate. In an almost unprecedented move, Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell strongly criticized the measure in these words: "After examining and analyzing the proposals that have just been made to the Congress by the committee, I am deeply disappointed to find that these proposals contain deficiencies and weaknesses of such magnitude that were they enacted into law, I am convinced they would provide only illusory protection to trade union members and to the public, as well as being almost impossible to administer."

As the bill was being debated on the floor, 12 Republican-sponsored amendments, each designed to secure more freedom and democratic rights for rank and file union members, were defeated. An overwhelming majority of Democrats joined together to bring about the defeat of each of these amendments.

Since S. 3974 was the only legislation likely to come from a Democratic-controlled Congress and there was the possibility of additional amendments by the House all Republicans in the Senate save one voted for the final bill. The bill provides: (1) All unions must publicly report their income and expenses, but the Secretary of Labor may exempt locals with fewer than 200 members or income under $20,000 per year; (2) union officials must publicly report their holdings in companies or deals with employers their union represents or does business with; (3) employers and their middlemen agents must publicly report spending to influence workers' union activities; (4) jail sentences and fines are provided for false reporting, nonreporting, and destruction of union books; (5) subpena powers are given to the Secretary of Labor to check the accuracy of reports; (6) any official violating the reporting provisions is barred from union office for 5 years; (7) anyone convicted of a felony is barred from union office until his voting rights are restored; (8) embezzlement of union funds is subject to a maximum penalty of 5 years in jail or a $10,000 fine, or both; (9) unions may not lend more than $1,500 to their officials; (10) an international union must explain in reports why local officers have been supplanted by trustees; also, trusteeships are limited to 18 months unless it can be shown that a longer period is needed; (11) secret elections must be held for all union officers or delegates who select international officers; (12) local union officers are limited to 3-year terms, but international officers must be chosen at least every 4 years; and (13) a majority of a local union may oust their officials for misconduct.

The bill also provides that the National Labor Relations Board must take jurisdiction over all Taft-Hartley law disputes, but it may cede its jurisdiction to State agencies agreeing to follow its rulings; criminal penalties are provided for middlemen as well as employers who bribe union officials or any representative of an employer's workers; picketing to extort money from an employer is prohibited; economic strikers, as well as their replacements, are permitted to vote in NLRB elections to determine union representation; employers, as well as union officials, must swear they are not Communists to use the NLRB; and building trade unions can make agreements with construction employers before workers are hired and the union has established itself as the employees' representative.

S. 3974 as passed is woefully inadequate in many respects. Its major shortcoming is that it fails to carry out the three most urgent recommendations of the McClellan committee: (1) It fails to impose a fiduciary relationship on union officials in charge of union funds (an amendment which would have accomplished this was defeated, with 42 Democrats voting against it); (2) it fails to provide for secret ballots for votes on vital union matters other than election of officers (an amendment which would have accomplished this was defeated by a vote of 31 yeas to 52 nays, with 40 Democrats voting against it); and, (3) it failed to clear up the "no man's land" problem wherein a State is not empowered to act under present law in those labor disputes where the NLRB declines to assert its jurisdiction (an amendment which would have granted authority to the States to take jurisdiction over labor disputes in which the NLRB declines to act was defeated by a vote of 37 yeas to 53 nays, with 40 Democrats voting against it). The bill also did nothing to protect the individual worker against the harmful effects of secondary boycotts and organizational picketing.

The bill (S. 3974) passed by the Senate June 17, 1958 went through a curious course in the House. The Democratic Speaker of the House kept it on his desk for more than 40 days before he referred it to the House Education and Labor Committee. No hearings were held on the bill. When motion was made in the committee to consider the bill, the motion was voted down 22 to 7, every one of the 16 Democrats present voting against it. Notwithstanding that vote, the Democratic leadership brought the bill before the House in the closing days of the session under suspension of the rules. This drastic procedure allowed only 40 minutes for debate—less than one minute for each of the 48 pages of the bill, permitted no amendments to the bill, and required a two-thirds vote for passage. The bill failed to pass by vote of 190 yeas to 198 nays.

National defense and mutual security

(Responding to continued tension in foreign affairs, Congress improved the strength of the Armed Forces by improved organization of the Defense Department, by increasing military personnel levels, by accelerating missile and bomber programs, by larger appropriations for ships and aircraft, and by raising the standards and attractiveness of the military as a career service. The Congress appropriated an unprecedented peacetime total of more than $40 billion for the Department of Defense and more than $3 billion for mutual security.)

Defense Reorganization

At the request of President Eisenhower, Congress enacted the Department of Defense Reorganization Act, strengthening control of the Secretary of Defense, granting flexibility to manage the huge Defense Department, and providing clearer lines of command authority. At the same time, Congress retained its traditional control over the roles and missions of the military services.

In the Reorganization Act, Congress gave statutory backing to the National Guard and the National Guard Bureau and reaffirmed the intent of Congress that there shall be naval aviation and a Marine Corps. Congress also provided that each military department will be separately organized under its own Secretary.

Congress retained the dual role of the military chiefs of staff as members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and also as military heads of their own services. The Joint Staff was enlarged to permit greater planning and advisory assistance for the Secretary of Defense.

Congress resolved the knotty problem of the powers of the Defense Secretary to change military functions by requiring the Secretary to report to Congress proposed changes in functions established by law. The Congress reserved to itself a time period in which to determine whether the proposed change involved a major combatant function or would tend to impair the defense of the United States. If Congress did not oppose the proposed change during a specified time span, the plan would go into effect.

Congress preserved the feature of existing law which grants military secretaries and members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff the right to come to Congress on their own initiative with their recommendations for the Department of Defense.

Under the act the President is permitted to set up unified or specified combatant commands, with the line of authority flowing from the Commander in Chief to the Secretary of Defense to the combatant commander.

Accelerated Missile and Bomber Funds, Fiscal Year 1958

To accelerate high priority missile and bomber programs as requested by the President, Congress, in February 1958, approved $1.260 billion in new funds for use in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958. Funds provided went for such projects as three submarines for launching the Polaris missile, construction of ballistic missile facilities and detection facilities, and building of dispersal and alert facilities for Strategic Air Command combat aircraft. (See Missiles and Space.)

Defense Appropriations, Fiscal Year 1959

For fiscal year 1959, Congress provided $39,602,827,000 in new funds and $535 million in transfers from cash revolving funds for military functions of the Defense Department. This was $815,857,000 more than the President's revised budget request. Congress exceeded the President's request in such programs as increased military personnel strength, numbers of ships and aircraft, and acceleration of missiles.

Funds were provided to maintain the Regular Army at 900,000 strength through fiscal year 1959, instead of dropping to 870,000 by end of fiscal year 1959; to maintain the Army National Guard at 400,000 rather than dropping to 360,000 by end of fiscal year 1959; to build up the Army Reserve to 300,000, instead of 270,000 begin-and-end strength; and to build up the Marine Corps to 200,000 men instead of dropping to 175,000 as provided in the budget. Congress provided for 630,000 Navy and 850,000 Air Force personnel, as requested by the President.

Congress also provided in excess of budget requests: $37 million for Army modernization; $609,043,000 for 4 Polaris submarines in addition to 2 in the budget; $11 million for speeding three Regulus submarines; $48 million for more Hound Dog missiles for the B–52; $90 million to accelerate the Minuteman ICBM; $65 million for the emergency fund of the Secretary of Defense; and $5 million for the Army map program.

With the recent dispatch of United States marines and paratroopers to the Middle East clearly in mind, Congress approved $140 million above the budget for troop carrier aircraft. Two amphibious ships for the marines were authorized by Congress which provided the $89 million budget figure to cover the cost. Seven million dollars were earmarked by Congress for modernization of antisubmarine warfare vessels of the Navy's reserve fleet. To complete two destroyer escorts scheduled for cancellation for lack of funds, $13 million was provided.

Congress funded 15 KC–135 jet tankers more than the administration asked, granting $55,595,000 for aircraft and ground support equipment. These planes are used to refuel aircraft and thereby extend their range.

Military Construction

Congress also provided funds to accelerate military construction programs for ballistic missile bases, detection and warning systems, and for dispersal of Strategic Air Command bomber squadrons. This was an advance installment of the 1959 budget.

For regular military construction, fiscal year 1959, Congress approved more than $1 billion to permit building research and testing facilities, troop and family housing, hospital and medical facilities, communications, aviation and shipyard facilities, and other military construction.

False Surrender Study Rumor

The White House labeled "nonsense" a press report that a nonprofit scientific agency working for the Defense Department was studying conditions in a nuclear war when United States surrender would be advisable.

In a statement issued from the White House August 15, 1958, the President's press secretary said, in part:

"There has been no public money spent to study how or when the United States might surrender. There will be no such money spent for such a purpose."

Referring to an amendment to the supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal year 1959, pending in the Senate at the time, to bar use of Federal funds for such a study, the statement continued:

"Evidently the Senate feels about this as does the President. It wants to require that no appropriations be used for such a purpose.

"As to that, the President wants me to say this. Even if he were given money for this purpose, it would not be spent. The whole matter is too ridiculous for any further comment."

As a further means of assuring the American people and the rest of the world that the United States is not contemplating surrender, the Senate by a rollcall vote of 88 yeas to 2 nays adopted the amendment.

Improving the Military as a Career Service

Combat readiness of our existing forces could be greatly improved if trained technicians and skilled personnel would remain in uniform, instead of leaving after their first or second tour of duty.

Therefore, to make the military service more attractive as a career, the Congress enacted pay raises for servicemen with at least 2 years of active duty, ranging from 3 to 41 percent. In addition, a system of proficiency pay for enlisted men and responsibility pay for officers was provided as a means of rewarding special skills and responsibilities, thereby encouraging trained experts to remain in the service. Hazardous duty pay was provided for military personnel who serve as human test subjects in thermal stress experiments. Military careers for nurses and medical specialists of the Army, Navy, and Air Force were also made more attractive by legislation increasing the permanent grades they may obtain. Further, the Military Construction Act of 1957 authorized

construction of housing, community and recreational facilities, as well as operational facilities, for members of the armed services. Privileges of servicemen overseas to send home duty-free gifts and to bring back their possessions free of duty were extended to July 1, 1959. Navy and Marine enlisted career reservists who complete 20 years of active service, were given the same retirement benefits for which regular enlisted personnel of these services are eligible. Congress also made permanent the Missing Persons Act which authorizes heads of military and other Government Departments to continue payments of personnel absent from their posts while designated as missing.

As another means of obtaining personnel with the leadership or technical ability needed to use today's complex weapons, there was enacted a law to permit raising the mental and physical qualifications for induction into the Armed Forces. Those deferred from induction because of failure to meet the higher standards will be subject to induction in event of an emergency.

To increase combat readiness of the naval air arm, Congress enacted a law requiring naval air cadets to serve at least 3 years of active duty following cadet training.

Republicans led the fight to provide the full budget request for funds to pay for medical care in civilian hospitals of dependents of Armed Forces personnel. In the brief period this program has been in effect, it has been a great morale booster. It is one of the most prized fringe benefits available to the families of men and women in uniform. Republicans were determined not to permit the program to be jeopardized for lack of funds.

Civil Defense and Defense Mobilization

Under Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1958, the Federal Civil Defense Administration and the Office of Defense Mobilization were consolidated July 1, 1958, into a new agency, whose title was changed by subsequent Act of Congress to Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

The President's authority to proclaim a state of civil defense emergency was extended for 4 years to June 30, 1962. This would allow the President to bring into effect certain emergency powers to deal with an enemy attack or imminent attack.

In another civil defense move, the Congress passed a law giving the Federal Government joint responsibility with State and local governments for civil defense. The Federal Government could give to States radiological instruments, detection devices, gas detection kits, and similar devices at a cost of up to $35 million a year for 5 years.

Up to $25 million per year for 5 years could be contributed by the Federal Government to the States for personnel and administrative expenses, provided States employ a full-time civil defense director or deputy director. A maximum of $2 million per year was authorized for contributions to States for personal equipment of State and local civil defense workers.

Miscellaneous Defense Matters

To assure prompt performance on contracts for guided missiles and other essential defense procurement, Congress extended the Defense Production Act for another 2 years to June 30, 1960. Under the act, the President may establish priorities for defense contracts, allocate certain materials for defense purposes, make loans and purchases to build up defense capacity, and establish a reserve for trained executives to fill Government positions in time of mobilization.

Committees of both Houses of Congress investigated the status of our defense preparations, with particular intensity after Russia launched the first sputnik last October 4. The Senate Preparedness Subcommittee January 23 issued a list of 17 principal areas where decisive action should be taken. Progress reports from the Department of Defense were required from time to time.

Congress also authorized the loan of 43 naval vessels to friendly foreign countries, the continued loan of one aircraft carrier, and the experimental use of 15 target vessels.

Mutual Security

President Eisenhower once again asked the Congress to continue support of our mutual security pacts by appropriating funds for military hardware and economic assistance to our allies. In requesting $3.9 billion for fiscal year 1959, Mr. Eisenhower pointed out the consequences of abandoning the program: A severe dislocation and impairment of Free World power; a crumbling of our strategic overseas positions and a forcing of these positions back to our own shores; a massive increase in our own defense budget requiring increases in taxes; a heavy increase in inductions of American youth into the Armed Forces; and ultimately "a beleaguered America, her freedoms limited by mounting defense costs, and almost alone in a world dominated by international communism."

President Eisenhower cited the increased strength of the Free World over the past 8 years. "Since 1950 * * * the ground forces of countries associated with us for collective defense have grown to include nearly 5 million well-trained and equipped fighting men situated at strategic locations around the world. Naval forces have increased by over 100 percent, and the air forces of these nations now include 32,000 aircraft, of which 14,000 are jets."

As a means of preventing Communist subversion and economic penetration, Mr. Eisenhower urged continued technical assistance and economic development programs to help underdeveloped nations.

During debate on the mutual security authorizing legislation, there was an attempt to lift prohibitions in existing law so as to permit economic and financial aid to all Communist countries, except Russia, Red China, and North Korea, at the President's discretion. Under this so-called Kennedy amendment, nonmilitary aid could go to countries that ship war materiel to the Soviet Union or any satellite nation.

Republicans in the Senate led the fight to defeat this amendment, contending United States economic and financial aid to Communist countries only serves to entrench further the hold of Red rulers over their captive peoples. Republicans further argued such aid would involve billions of dollars, would subtract from aid available for nations friendly to us, and would increase the burden of the American taxpayers. By a rollcall vote of 43 yeas to 42 nays, the Kennedy amendment was stricken from the bill. Left on the statute books were Battle Act prohibitions against giving aid to countries that threaten the security of the United States.

Against the President's request for $3.950 billion for foreign economic and military assistance, the Congress approved $3.298 billion.

Missiles and space

(Arrival of space age creates serious military and civil problems for Congress. New agencies are established for space research, technology, and operations. Peaceful exploration and use of outer space is favored. Missile programs are strongly supported.)

Congress Deals With the Space Age

The successful leap into space by manmade earth satellites definitely opened the space age with all its grave military and other implications for the United States.

Both President Eisenhower and the Congress recognized the importance of turning space programs to peaceful purposes for the benefit of mankind. They further recognized exploration into the new dimension of space cut across existing organizational lines and required new arrangements.

Therefore, at the request of the President, Congress provided top-level organization, necessary funds, and facilities for a new civilian space agency to have charge of the Nation's aeronautical and space activities.

Responsibility for the military portion of the space program was left with the Defense Department, where a new Advanced Research Projects Agency will direct military research in space technology and weapons of the future.

Congress established an independent agency, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, under civilian direction to plan, direct, and conduct aeronautical and space activities, to arrange for the scientific community to aid in measurements and observations of space vehicles, and to disseminate widely information and findings.

At the same time, Congress imposed upon the President the duty of developing a comprehensive space program and of resolving differences among Federal agencies in connection with those programs. To aid the President, Congress set up a 9-member National Aeronautics and Space Council composed of the Secretaries of State and Defense, the Space Administrator, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, one other representative of a Government agency, and three private individuals who are eminent in science, engineering, or other professions. The President was designated Chairman of the Council.

The President requested $125 million for the new Space Administration, including $47.8 million for construction, equipment, and facilities needed immediately. Congress approved $80 million. Together with $117 million to be transferred from the Department of Defense, the Space Administration would have a total of $197 million for nonmilitary space programs.

In addition, Congress approved $23 million for research facilities and improvements and $78,100,000 for salaries and expenses of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, which will be absorbed by the Space Administration.

The Department of Defense has about $294 million of 1959 funds for use on space activities primarily military in nature, making about $500 million in all of 1959 funds directly applicable to space programs in the Federal Government.

Congress also took steps to assure continuing Congressional surveillance of space problems and activities. The Senate created a 15-member standing legislative Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences with jurisdiction over the new Space Administration. On the House side, a 25-member standing legislative Committee on Science and Astronautics was established with wider jurisdiction than its Senate counterpart.

Resolution Favors Peaceful Exploration and Use of Outer Space

The House and Senate approved a concurrent resolution putting the Congress on record favoring international agreements for peaceful exploration of outer space, for banning use of outer space for military aggrandizement, and for cooperation in scientific space developments to improve communications, weather forecasting, and other benefits.

Missile Programs Strongly Supported

The Nation's missile programs to date have been under the Defense Department. The total fiscal year 1959 program for missiles is about $6.7 billion, of which about $2.5 billion is for development and improvement of missiles. Of the $4.2 billion for procurement of missiles, somewhat more than half is for missiles going to combat units.

Congress has provided necessary appropriations to carry missile programs forward.

National economy

(The economic downswing which began last fall triggered a torrent of spending schemes by Democrats in both Houses of Congress. The Republican Administration refused to be panicked and, instead, calmly put into operation over 50 constructive steps designed to lead the Nation back to previous record heights of prosperity. As the Congress closed, many indicators pointed to an end of the recession.)

When it became clear in the fall of 1957 that an economic recession had set in, the 85th Congress was confronted with the problem of what it could do to stem the economic downturn.

President Eisenhower and Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks, steadfastly expressed their confidence that the recession would level off and cited facts to support their views. In a matter of months this confidence was increasingly justified as unemployment dropped and business conditions steadily improved.

Democratic Spending Plans

Meanwhile, New Deal Democrats in both Houses of Congress unleased a whole barrage of wild spending bills, unsound tax proposals, and public works plans that were strongly reminiscent of the New Deal. In the House and Senate combined, the total of nonduplicating spending bills introduced by Democrats would have cost the Government an estimated $208 billion in five years. Such a sum amounts to one-half the value of everything made, produced, sold, constructed, and all personal income, profits, savings, etc., in the United States last year. It would have had to come from Government borrowing (causing inflation); or from increased taxes on our already burdened population.

Republican Administration Stimulates the Economy

The President, in contrast, took action and made solid, constructive proposals designed as part of the "orderly acceleration" to help spur business and provide more jobs. It developed that the Administration had taken over 50 seperate actions to stimulate the economy. These steps included the easing of credit, stimulants to home building, increased highway outlays for the current year, a step-up in the urban renewal program, a $5 billion jump in defense procurement in the first half of 1958 over the figure for the last half of 1957, the extension of unemployment compensation benefits, a post office modernization program, and the awarding of defense contracts to "labor surplus" areas.

In the President's annual economic report which he transmitted to Congress last January, he assessed the economic outlook and said: "There are grounds for expecting that the decline in business activity need not be prolonged, and that economic growth can be resumed without extended interruption."

Economic Progress Resumed

The President's appraisal of the economic picture was substantiated as the second session of the 85th Congress approached its close. Personal savings were at an all-time high, employment rose, individual income was climbing, and weekly factory wages hit a record high.

Legislation Speeds Recovery

The second session of the 85th Congress responded to the challenge of a recession by enacting legislation that included increasing the Federal debt limit; a $1.85 billion housing construction bill; a bill authorizing 150 river, harbor, and flood control projects at an estimated cost of $1.5 billion; and supplemental appropriations bills for defense and for the Department of Labor. At the President's request, the supplementary appropriations bill for Labor provided $25 million more for unemployment compensation for veterans and $18.4 million for unemployment compensation of Federal employees. The supplementary defense appropriations bill for fiscal 1958 made available $1.260 billion in new funds and $150 million in transfers from old funds to speed up high priority missile and bomber programs.

Aids to Railroads

As a means of strengthening and improving the national transportation system, Congress amended the Interstate Commerce Act to provide assistance to common carriers by railroad in acquiring and maintaining facilities and equipment. The Interstate Commerce Commission was authorized to guarantee loans to railroads from private sources to the amount of $500 million. Railroads will also gain some advantage from the repeal of the 3 percent tax on freight shipments.

Small Business Aided

Congress made the Small Business Administration a permanent agency. A tax revision bill giving substantial aid to small business was enacted.

Public works and natural resources

(The basic differences between the Republican and Democratic Parties were sharply defined in legislation enacted or proposed by the 85th Congress in the fields of public works and natural resources. Contrasted to the Democratic philosophy of Federal control and Federal expenditures of taxpayers' money by a paternalistic Government, the Republican Party believes that the development of public works should be in the hands of local and State authorities whenever possible and with those authorities sharing the costs; that natural resources should be conserved and utilized but with the consent and authority of those most vitally affected.)

Party Differences Revealed in Legislation

Typical of the basic differences between the two parties was the attempt to enact the Democratic-sponsored community facilities bill as a so-called antirecession measure over the objections of the President. Passed by the Senate, the measure called for $1 billion in loans to aid cities and towns in building public works. The House raised this figure to $2 billion—an increase of 100 percent. This make-work bill would have added to the public debt and bypassed Congress on the loan plan by permitting funds to be paid out of the Treasury without Congressional approval. It would have added fuel to the fires of inflation. Fortunately, economy-minded Democrats joined with Republicans in defeating this expanded bill.

Still another bill designated as an antirecession measure passed by the Senate but not the House is the so-called Area Redevelopment Administration, set up within the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which would have loaned a $100 million revolving fund each for the establishment of industries in both urban and rural areas. Still a third $100 million revolving fund would have been used for public-facility loans to attract new industries to areas currently without sufficient water, sewage, and other facilities. Other provisions included urban redevelopment programs expanded to incorporate nonresidential redevelopment, information programs, vocational training, and subsistence payments for trainees under the guise of aiding unemployment. No consideration was given to economic or business standards or for the reasons for these depressed areas. This form of subsidizing certain industries and areas at the expense of others, with no criteria for eligibility, could have placed the applicants on the basis of favoritism and political expediency.

Another measure adding to more Federal control of public power was the bill, passed by the Senate but not the House, to permit TVA to build new power plants with money from bonds instead of coming to Congress for more funds. The Senate ignored the President's request that TVA should obtain approval from the Treasury Department before issuing bonds and that its operations should be confined to the area now served and its expenditures to be reviewed in the Federal budget.

This Republican administration started and has continued instead the development of natural resources and public works, wherever possible, on the basic theory of shared responsibilities and costs with full participation by the Federal Government, States, and local communities and individuals.

During this second session of the 85th Congress, some of these Republican-supported and sponsored proposals have met with Congressional approval. Some have been defeated, delayed, postponed, or ignored. Some falling by the wayside would have saved overburdened taxpayers money while at the same time improving public works or conserving our natural resources.

Accomplishments in Public Works and Natural Resources

The Omnibus Act of 1958 for Rivers and Harbors Flood Control and Water Supply finally became law after two vetoes by the President—vetoes caused by including projects which were not approved by the Corps of Engineers or whose feasibility were of doubtful value.

Increased authorization was given for the Republican-sponsored national road building program for primary, secondary, and urban roads with some control over billboards. A record $3.4 billion in Federal highway aid is being allocated. The President approved this bill but stated he did so with serious misgivings because certain provisions could create unfortunate precedents. Among them were the substitution of a two-for-one ratio which violated the long established principle of a 50–50 sharing of Federal and State costs; the $115 million Federal advance to the States to aid in financing their one-third share; and incentive payments to encourage the States to regulate highway advertising to be furnished from general tax revenues rather than from highway user tax revenues. This is but another distortion of an Administration-sponsored program with its expanded drain of the Federal Treasury adding to the huge deficit already confronting the taxpayers.

With statehood for Alaska now a reality, encouragement is being given to develop her natural resources and thus Congress approved a measure to stimulate the oil and gas leases of inland underwater areas in that new State.

Other public works receiving approval of Congress include the Massachusetts-Connecticut Flood Control Compact which will lessen the devastation from floods in that area and the authorization to construct four units of the Chief Joseph Dam Project as well as authorization of water conservation projects in New Mexico and Texas to aid in satisfying their water needs.

Another conservation measure approved by Congress is that of limiting withdrawal of public lands by the Defense Department to 5,000 acres unless specifically authorized by Congress.

Also approved was $10 million in funds for the Inter-American Highway; an extension and enlargement of airport aid and a bill to provide coordination between the Government's fish and wildlife conservation programs and its water resource development projects.

In 1954, the Republican administration initiated a five-year program for water resources projects. Projects costing $3,723,300,000 are being carried forward under this

regular five-year program. In addition, there have been 461 newly initiated projects (424 new starts in the Corps of Engineer's civil works program and 37 in reclamation) which will be built at a total cost of $5,020,187,000. Included in this program is the Colorado River storage project, approved in 1956, at a total project cost ceiling of $760 million—the largest single package water resource appropriation ever authorized.

Other Programs Fell by the Wayside

Congress adopted a resolution to accelerate civil construction and commended the administration for what it is already doing. But it rejected the lease-purchase program designed to permit private firms to build much needed post offices and other Federal office buildings and lease them to the Government, with the rent to apply to the purchase price. Thus, a program which would have saved millions of dollars to the taxpayers was not approved by Congress.

Once again there was an effort to revive the issue of a Federal dam at Hells Canyon despite its rejection by the administration and former Democratic-controlled Congresses. Through private construction the American taxpayer is saving an estimated $500 million.

The partnership policy in the development of natural resources initiated by this Republican administration in order that local and State participation would assume a greater part in financing these projects, was given a setback by this Congress. Among these were such projects as the development of the power facilities of the Trinity Division of the Central Valley project in California; and the Fryingpan-Arkansas power and irrigation project authorization in Colorado, strongly backed by the Republican administration as projects where Federal construction is necessary and which was recommended by the administration in 1956, 1957, and 1958.

Personal and public welfare

(The welfare of the American people has always received prime consideration in the policies of both major political parties. The difference lies in the approach to that problem. The Republican Party is opposed to Federal compulsory plans in health, to Federal encroachment upon State and local control of education, and to the dole in any form. Believing that it is a Federal responsibility to assist in care for the aged, chronically ill, and totally disabled, as well as the care of our veterans, the Republican Party follows the adage of our first Republican President, Abraham Lincoln, in doing for the people only those things which they are unable to do for themselves. Freedom is endangered when government follows a paternalistic approach to the welfare of our citizens.)

Federal Aid to Education

The President sent a special message to Congress this year requesting prompt enactment of a 4-year educational program with emphasis on science in the interest of national security. His recommendations resulted in an $887,400,000 education program, but eliminated in this compromise bill was the Chief Executive's proposal for Federal college scholarships. Instead, the Congress agreed upon a loan program for needy students costing $295 million over a 4-year period. In addition to the student loan program, the bill provided for postgraduate fellowships, improved teacher education, an expanded vocational education program, foreign language centers, and Federal aid in the purchase of science-teaching aids. The student loan program would authorize loans up to $1,000 a year at 3 percent interest and to be administered by the colleges and the Federal Commissioner of Education.

Specific Educational Assistance

Among other education legislation approved by Congress was the continuation of school aid for construction and maintenance in areas affected by Federal installations. The President, in approving this legislation, said he did so reluctantly in the belief that Federal aid in this field should be tapered off with the States and local communities assuming more of the financial responsibility for the reason that many Federal workers owned their homes in the communities and paid taxes to the State and community. Also approved were funds for grants-in-aid to public or nonprofit accredited schools of public health training, and in the administration of State and local public health programs; Federal grants to each State to aid in development of educational television; and out-service training for Federal employees to increase their efficiency. The rural library service, enacted in 1956, was extended although with twice as much funds as requested in the President's budget message.

Health

The Hospital Survey and Construction Act (Hill-Burton) was extended for 5 years and funds for four categories were included consisting of grants for construction of diagnostic centers of hospitals for the chronically ill; of rehabilitation centers; and grants for nursing homes, all nonprofit institutions. Also enacted into law were authorizations for loans for construction of hospitals and other facilities for those of certain religious beliefs whose precepts prevent them from accepting grants. Grants were given for construction of dental and medical schools. The Health Research Facilities Act was extended for 3 years, authorizing matching grants of $30 million for the construction of research centers.

No Action Taken on Other Major Proposals

Although the 84th Congress, under Public Law 813, authorized Federal funds to assist the States in establishing committees on education beyond high school, no appropriations were made then or in the 85th Congress. No progress was made in other major recommendations by the President such as Federal grants-in-aid to combat juvenile delinquency; the pooling of resources of small insurance companies and nonprofit associations so that a greater number of people could obtain the benefits of voluntary health insurance. Nothing has been done on legislation to require advance testing of chemicals to be used in foods to assure their safety for human consumption. No action was taken on the bill to create a 21-member temporary Presidential study commission on problems of the blind.

Children

Congress extended for 3 years the special milk program for children in nonprofit schools, summer camps, and other similar institutions. Encouragement was given to the expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to nonprofit institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies.

Social Security and Old-Age Assistance

Approved was a bill for a White House Conference on the Aging to be held before September 30, 1960, with recommendations to be made in such fields as employment, housing, medical care, and community activities for the elderly.

Authorization was given also for $1 million grants-in-aid to train public health specialists, technicians, and administrators.

The President made several requests in his budget message for changes in both social security and old-age assistance. The request for consolidated annual wage reporting for both income tax and social-security payroll tax to relieve employers of needless paper work was not acted upon. Also the request for modernizing the formula for public assistance with a view to gradually reducing Federal participation in its financing, in line with the belief that States should have greater responsibility, fell by the wayside. Nor was action taken on scientific supergrade positions for food and drugs; Indian sanitation facilities; or the transfer of Freedman's Hospital to Howard University for the purpose of increasing facilities for nurses and medical teacher training.

In the first revision of the social-security laws since 1954, increased benefits of 7 percent will go to 12 million retirees. Under this increase the minimum benefit will rise from $30 a month to $33, with an average increase of approximately $4.75. Total benefits payable to a family will be raised from $200 to $254 a month. The first checks will go out in February 1959.

Additional benefits go to the retired person whose earnings exceed $1,200 a year. Those in this category will not lose benefits for any month in which their earnings are $100 or less. Previously, the maximum was $80.

Federal contributions for public assistance provide $197 million for this purpose. For the first time disability benefits are made retroactive. Dependent parents of a deceased person may now draw benefits although there may be a widow or child. In addition, dependents of disabled workers may now draw benefits and a person eligible for social security disability benefits will be permitted to draw full benefits even though drawing benefits from some other system.

There is an increase in the taxable wage rate from $4,200 a year to $4,800, as well as an increase in payroll taxes and an increase in the tax rate for self-employed persons to permit these larger benefits.

Housing

Congress enacted an emergency housing bill providing a $1.8 billion housing program designed to encourage the building of an estimated 200,000 homes by extending the VA home loan guarantee and direct loan programs for 2 years; providing an extra $1 billion to the Federal National Mortgage Association for FHA and VA mortgages on new homes where loans do not exceed $13,500; providing an extra $500 million to the Mortgage Association to be used to buy mortgages at the President's discretion to stimulate the economy; and further provisions for military housing. It also authorized $150 million for direct GI loans and $125 million more than Administration requests for urban renewal programs over the next 6 years. Added to this is $400 million for college housing and a new fund of $250 million for other college needs.

Unemployment Compensation Extension

Congress heeded the President's request for extension of unemployment compensation and followed his recommendation by making the time limit 50 percent of any State limitations. The formula for payments between Federal and State funds was retained despite agitation to place the entire burden on the Federal Government.

Small business

(Congress' concern for the problems of small business enterprises was reflected in several measures. The Small Business Administration was made permanent. Its loan funds were increased. It is empowered to charter privately owned investment companies for equity financing of small enterprises. And small business is the beneficiary of substantial revision of the tax laws.)

Small business enterprises received substantial aid from the 85th Congress on a bipartisan basis.

Small Business Administration Made Permanent

After the operations of the Small Business Administration had been extended several times since its establishment by the Republican Administration in 1953, this Congress made it a permanent agency of the Government. The revolving fund for business loans was increased by $295 million, and the maximum loan limit was raised from $250,000 to $350,000. The SBA was directed to assist small firms in obtaining Government research and development contracts.

Other important measures enacted by the 85th Congress to assist small business were:

Authorization for the Small Business Administration to make disaster loans to small business concerns suffering economic loss as a result of excessive rain. The law amended the Small Business Act of 1953 to add the situation of "excessive rainfall" to conditions which may create a need for disaster loans, and made certain technical changes regarding drought eligibility.

Improvement of opportunities for small-business concerns to obtain a fair proportion of Government purchases and contracts and to facilitate procurement of property and services by the Government. The Act removed needless inconsistencies, complexities an inequities in Government procurement procedures in order to improve small business participation in Government contract work.

Equity Financing for Small Business

A Small Business Investment Division was established within SBA, and is authorized to charter privately owned small-business investment companies. An additional $250 million was authorized to the existing revolving fund of SBA to provide the financial assistance to help meet the initial capital requirements of these new investment companies. These small business investment companies would, in turn, provide equity-type capital to small-business concerns through the purchase of convertible debentures. SBA is also authorized to make loans to State and local development companies to enable them more effectively to assist small businesses.

Tax revision

Amendments to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 provide tax revision for small businesses. This act provides ordinary-loss treatment (up to $25,000 a year or $50,000 a year in case of a husband and wife filing a joint return) where the original holder of small-business stock sells it at a loss; extends the 2-year net operating loss carryback to a 3-year carryback; permits enterprises to write off 20 percent of the cost of their depreciable, tangle personal property (both new and used) in the year of acquisition; increases the minimum accumulated earnings credit from $60,000 to $100,000; and provides that where the estate of a decedent consists largely of an interest in a closely held business, the estate is to have up to 10 years for payment of the Federal estate tax.

The Small Business Administration itself has established and put into operation an effective program of helping small-business firms throughout the country in the 5 years since it was created.

The Agency has approved more than 11,000 loans, totaling more than half a billion dollars; approved over 7,708 disaster loans for more than $83 million; and awarded more than 40,000 individual contracts totaling more than $1,700,000,000 to small-business concerns.

It has assisted countless thousands of additional small firms with their individual problems through counseling and by issuing various publications designed to assist small firms with all types of management and technical problems.

Veterans

(Veterans' benefits and compensation increased. Dependents, widows, and orphans to get liberalized benefits. Housing aids extended. Education assistance broadened. Supplemental funds voted for unemployment compensation. Memorial and museum approved to honor American servicemen who died at Pearl Harbor.)

Benefits and Compensation Increased

Among the more important benefits enacted on behalf of veterans and their dependents in the 85th Congress was legislation providing a 10-percent increase in compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities, and in allowances for dependents of veterans who are 50 percent or more disabled. Pensions for approximately 65,000 widows of the Spanish-American War, 4,000 Civil War widows, and 1,000 Indian War widows were increased to $65 a month for those over 70 years of age, and to $75 a month if they were the wife of the veteran during the period of his service; and proportionate increases were provided for Mexican War widows, of whom there are four on the rolls, and for children. Eligibility for widows' benefits was liberalized to include certain instances where a legal impediment to the marriage existed.

Housing and Education Aids Extended

Additional housing benefits for veterans were provided by extending the VA home loan guarantee and direct loan programs to 1960, by provision of extra funds for direct VA loans, for FNMA purchase of VA mortgages on new homes, and for purchase of military housing mortgages. (See subsection on Housing in Personal and Public Welfare, and section on National Defense.)

Other legislation enacted in the 85th Congress on behalf of veterans accomplished the following: the Korean GI bill (Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act) and the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act were clarified to make their benefits available to veterans and war orphans studying in the Panama Canal Zone, and also to war orphans in the Philippines; a supplemental amount of $25 million was appropriated to make additional unemployment compensation payments to veterans during 1958; and the burial allowance for deceased veterans was increased from $150 to $250. Congress also consolidated into one act all of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

Pearl Harbor Memorial

Also, Congress approved the erection of a memorial and museum at Pearl Harbor on or near the hulk of the U. S. S. *Arizona*, in tribute to the 1,102 American servicemen who died on the ship December 7, 1941, and whose remains cannot be recovered.

Foreign affairs

(Twice during the 85th Congress, the administration, with strong bipartisan support, acted vigorously to maintain peace, defend small nations, and restrain aggressive communism in the Middle East. This emphasized the need for mutual security funds. In other actions, Congress condemned Communist brutality and oppression in Hungary and Red China's failure to account for American prisoners in Korean war; resolutions call for permanent U. N. police force; legislation and treaties advance the atoms-for-peace program; immigration law falls far short of President's request.)

During both sessions, the 85th Congress dealt with serious crises in foreign affairs in addition to many other matters of international concern. The United States acted vigorously for peace as an individual nation, with its allies and friends, and by advancing the efforts of the United Nations toward the establishment of peace, law, and order.

Defending Small Nations in the Middle East

Following the Middle East crisis in January 1957, the President asked Congress for authority to use American Armed Forces to assist any Middle East nation requesting help against Communist aggression. After considerable delay occasioned by Democratic demands for an investigation of American policies, the Congress finally gave the President substantially what he requested. Supported by this authority the President ordered the Sixth Fleet into position to assist the Jordanian Government while the United Nations acted to relieve tension in the area.

Again in July 1958, when a second Middle East crisis arose, the United States moved American troops into the area at the urgent request of the President of Lebanon. At the same time, the United States pressed vigorously for action in the United Nations for preservation of the peace and protection of the independence of the threatened nations.

Mutual Security

Recurrent international crises of the Soviet Union's stepped-up economic drive to win uncommitted nations to communism continued to make collective security vital to American national defense and to the free nations' resistance against aggression. The 85th Congress continued to meet this need by providing our allies with military supplies and economic assistance though the sums appropriated did not meet the President's request. (See National Defense and Mutual Security.) Congress also authorized the loan of certain naval vessels to friendly foreign countries.

Congress Condemns Soviet Repression and Brutality in Hungary

In House Concurrent Resolution 204, the Congress condemned Russia for "brutal forms of armed subjugation" in her suppression of the Hungarian revolt during 1956. Again in June 1958, House Concurrent Resolution 343 called upon the President to express through the United Nations and through all other appropriate channels "the deep sense of indignation" aroused in the United States by the announcement of the Communist regime in Hungary of the execution of Imre Nagy, former Hungarian premier, and his colleagues, Pal Maleter, Jozsef Szilagyi, and Miklos Gimes. The resolution denounced these acts of barbarism and perfidy of the Soviet Union and the Hungarian Communist regime.

Other Resolutions Affecting Foreign Affairs

Resolutions adopted by the Senate or House, or by the 2 bodies jointly, included: condemnation of Red China for failing to account for 450 American prisoners of war taken in Korea; favoring the creation of a permanent United Nations police force; supporting NATO membership for Spain; and requiring the Secretary of State to submit all agreements other than treaties to the Senate within 60 days of execution.

Atoms for Peace

Following up the President's atoms-for-peace proposals, the Senate approved the treaty for American participation in the International Atomic Energy Agency; and authorized the exchange of atomic information and materials with our military allies. Legislation was also passed approving a preliminary agreement between the United States and the six-nation European Atomic Energy Community providing for the construction of nuclear power reactors and for atomic research and development. (See Atomic Energy at Home and Abroad.)

Peaceful Exploration and Use of Outer Space

Congress also went on record favoring international action for the peaceful exploration and use of outer space. (See Missiles and Space.)

Legislation Affecting International Finance, Trade, and Development

Congress approved an amendment to the Anglo-American financial agreement of 1945 providing a more flexible formula for repayment by Great Britain of the $3.750 billion loan. The Senate approved an agreement between the United States and Austria providing procedure for the validation of certain Austrian bonds.

Congress also extended the Export-Import Bank's lending authority for 5 years to June 30, 1963, the Export Control Act for 2 years to June 30, 1960, and the reciprocal trade agreements program for 4 years to June 30, 1962. The new Trade Agreements Act permits tariff cuts up to 20 percent below existing rates, but not more than 10 percent in a single year; and allows the cuts to be made at any time within 4 years beyond the end of the act's extension, or up to June 30, 1966. Congress may, by two-thirds vote, override the President's disapproval of the Tariff Commission's recommendations in escape-clause cases. Weaknesses in the internal economy due to excessive imports are to be considered in determining whether imports should be reduced to prevent harm to the national security. In escape-clause cases the President is authorized to increase duties as much as 50 percent above the 1934 tariff level. The President may also impose duties up to 50 percent ad valorem on imports now coming in duty-free.

The Congress authorized an additional $10 million for completion of the Inter-American Highway. The Senate approved a number of treaties with foreign nations concerning commerce, navigation, fisheries, double taxation, and cultural relations.

Immigration

The Democratic-controlled 85th Congress failed to give President Eisenhower the comprehensive program he sought in the field of immigration. The President requested such changes as an updating of the census date of the national origins quota system, authority to transfer unused quotas under that system, and certain other changes in immigration laws to relieve hardships. Instead, Congress enacted some changes liberalizing the McCarran-Walter Act which were described as a "quarter loaf" of the President's program. The act eliminates mortgages on quotas under prior laws; revives unexpired visas under the Refugee Relief Act; authorizes the entry of an unlimited number of adopted children over a 2-year period, provides relief in hardship cases; gives nonquota status to certain quota immigrants including skilled specialists; and permits the Government to waive some impediments affecting the admission of certain aliens. Another act made it possible for some 30,000 Hungarian refugees to become permanent residents of the United States.

REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION'S ACHIEVEMENTS IN BRIEF, JANUARY 1953 TO AUGUST 1958

Foreign affairs: Waging peace

Ended the stalemated war in Korea and reversed the previous foreign policy that had contributed to the loss of 600 million people behind the Communist Iron Curtain in the decade 1943 to 1953.

Avoided involvement in the hot war in Indochina; took steps to aid Vietnam and build up its army.

Held meeting at Geneva, Switzerland, with the heads of Russia, Britain, and France to pave the way for concrete actions to relieve world tension. President Eisenhower took the initiative by his impressive offer to exchange full armament information under adequate safeguards. Although Geneva fell short of specific agreements and the general understandings did not result in the solution of the problems discussed, the meeting did relax world tensions at the time.

Ratified mutual defense treaties with the Republic of China (Formosa), the Republic of Korea (South Korea), and the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty (SEATO), grouping together Australia, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, Thailand, Great Britain, France, and the United States. Associated the United States with the Baghdad Pact in the security and defense of the members of the pact.

Ended the military occupation of Western Germany and provided for the accession of the Federal Republic of Germany to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Negotiated the Austrian State Treaty (signed by Austria, France, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States) by which Austria was reestablished as an independent state and the military forces of the Allied Powers and the Soviet Union were withdrawn.

Endorsed the President's authority to use the Nation's Armed Forces for the protection of Formosa and the Pescadores Islands, as a move to preserve peace in the Far East.

Developed the "Eisenhower doctrine" authorizing the President to use Armed Forces to assist any nation or nations in the Middle East requesting help in preserving their independence against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism; and exercised this authority to assist Jordan in 1957 and Lebanon in 1958, while strongly supporting United Nations action for peace, stability, law, and order.

Continued economic and military aid to the nations of the Free World, with increasing attention to Asia.

Extended the foreign trade agreements program, permitting tariff reductions under regulations designed to protect American jobs and business. Also, provided for American participation in the International Finance Corporation designed to help nations to develop their resources.

Assisted the new free government of Guatemala which removed the Communist regime.

Took the initiative against communism in all parts of the world.

Reaffirmed official policy against Red China's admission to the United Nations.

Supported a United Germany (resolution of 83d Cong.).

Condemned Soviet mistreatment of minorities and callous disregard of human rights (resolution of 83d Cong.).

Also condemned Russia for armed subjugation in Hungary in 1956; and again in June 1958 called upon the President to express through appropriate channels the "deep sense of indignation" aroused in the United States by the execution of Imre Nagy and other Hungarian nationals by the Communist regime in Hungary (resolution of the 85th Cong.).

Moved for adoption by Western Hemisphere nations of the Caracas resolution declaring communism a threat to freedom and pledging full consultation in the event of aggression.

Negotiated arms pacts to strengthen Central American countries against Communist subversion.

Acted to oust Americans in the United Nations who have served the Communist cause.

Brought about a settlement of the oil controversy in Iran, preventing the threatened Communist subversion of that country.

Proposed an international pool of atomic energy resources for peaceful uses. Approved a treaty by which the United States will participate with 79 other nations in the International Atomic Energy Agency for the application of atomic energy to industry, agriculture, and medicine. Further, the United States offered to furnish research reactors and to make available power reactors (Euratom). Provisions were also made for the exchange of atomic information and materials with our military allies.

Passed the Refugee Relief Act to admit, over a 3-year period, up to 214,000 persons to the United States in excess of the quota limit. Liberalized the immigration laws to afford relief in hardship cases, admit adopted children, revive 18,000 visas that had expired with the Refugee Relief Act, made other changes benefiting an estimated 60,000 aliens, and made it possible for 30,000 Hungarian refugees to become permanent residents in the United States.

Settled by negotiation the Italian-Yugoslav quarrel over Trieste which for years had threatened to cause war between the two countries.

Reiterated the traditional position of the Senate in favor of self-government and self-determination for all peoples in a move designed to give hope to the enslaved peoples of the satellite countries.

National defense: Instant readiness safeguards Nation's security

Developed the greatest military strength the Nation has ever had, short of wartime, with emphasis on continuous combat readiness for any emergency.

Applied almost two-thirds of the Federal budget to national security (military defense, atomic energy development, stockpiling of strategic materials, military aid abroad) compared with only 32 percent in 1950 just before Korea.

Put atomic and other new weapons into the regular military arsenal for strategic and tactical use.

Increased by 50 percent long-range heavy-bomber striking power by increasing the number of planes in heavy-bomber wings to 45 each (formerly 30).

Equipped all Air Force fighter wings with jet aircraft; all medium-bomber wings with B–47's, which have intercontinental capabilities; and heavy-bomber wings (B–36's) are being replaced by all-jet B–52's. An improved model B–52 has just begun to roll off the production line.

Continued research toward nuclear-powered aircraft.

Launched the first nuclear-powered submarine *Nautilus;* others are following along. The *Nautilus* made the first voyage in history from the Pacific Ocean to the Atlantic Ocean by way of the North Pole, pioneering an underwater sea lane between the Eastern and Western Hemispheres. This extraordinary feat raised the prospect of a new trade route for commercial cargo submarines powered by atomic energy.

Brought the Marine Corps, consisting of 3 divisions and 3 air wings, to a high level of combat readiness, increased number of combat planes on hand and added to Marine firepower with atomic weapons.

Installed Nike missile batteries for defense of key American cities; developed the missile master, the country's first electronic system specifically for controlling and coordinating Nike batteries.

Completed reorganization of the Army into Pentomic divisions designed to exploit to the maximum atomic warfare.

Built up the Reserves and National Guard to the highest state of readiness yet, better trained, organized, and equipped than ever before.

Greatly strengthened our continental defense; coordinated Army, Navy, and air units under the Continental Air Defense Command and improved fighter-interceptor forces and antiaircraft weapons.

Brought our combat-ready strategic fighting forces to their highest peak of preparedness in all three services. Strategic Air Command, the Marines, and strategic army forces are ready for action on short notice.

Completed the main portion of the Distant Early Warning line which has gone into operation and began construction on extensions of the system. Extended warning protection along the Atlantic and Pacific approaches by

constructing Texas towers (radar islands) and by Air Force and Navy airborne patrols.

Began reorganization of the Pentagon under the act which became effective August 6, 1958.

Abolished 192 joint committees in the Department of Defense and continued investigation to see whether more committees and advisory groups could be terminated.

Continued military aid to help equip and train forces of our allies, consisting of about 4,700,000 men, 2,500 combat vessels, and 32,000 aircraft (of which 14,000 are jets).

Made changes to improve the morale of service personnel, including pay raises, medical care for servicemen's dependents, liberalized benefits for survivors of servicemen and veterans, free college education for soldiers agreeing to remain in service 3 years for each year of training. Placed military perronnel under the social security system on a permanent basis.

Developed a hydrogen bomb small enough to be carried by a fighter-bomber with a fighter delivery system more accurate than low altitude bombing.

Developed a new germ-killing gas which can disinfect entire buildings upon which germs are dropped.

Let a contract for development of a liquid fuel engine of about 1 million pound thrust.

Let contracts in proceeding on a priority basis with an Air Force bomber dispersal program to give 33 bases by end of 1961 accommodating one heavy bomber squadron per base.

Tightened the security risk program.

Made permanent the Missing Persons Act which continues payments and family allotments in the case of military personnel absent from their posts while designated as missing.

Missiles and space

Proposed an independent agency to direct nonmilitary space programs, which Congress later authorized. A top-level advisory group, comparable to the National Security Council, was authorized to assist the President on space problems.

Launched four earth satellites as part of the United States participation in the International Geophysical Year.

Ordered the Defense Department to work on the problem of sending unmanned rockets and satellites to the moon for the purpose of exploration. Nearly 30 separate projects involving almost $50 million have been programed.

Proposed international agreement that outer space should be used only for peaceful purposes.

Ballistic missile systems are receiving highest priority: Polaris submarine missiles system, Atlas and Titan intercontinental ballistic missiles, Thor and Jupiter intermediate range missiles, and the antiballistic missile Nike-Zeus.

Successfully test fired the complete Atlas ICBM.

The Department of Defense is confident of meeting the schedule calling for operational availability of the Thor and Jupiter IRBM's by December 1958. Under an agreement with the United Kingdom, the Thor will be deployed at launching sites on British soil.

Defense officials also expect to achieve operational status of the Atlas ICBM during calendar year 1959, with Polaris and Titan to follow later.

One of the most difficult problems with ballistic missiles is the reentry problem. Defense scientists have successfully recovered two Jupiter IRBM nose cones and have successfully tested a nose cone which traveled more than 5,000 miles.

Contracts have been let for development of components of the solid propellant ICBM.

Approval was given for building a two-station ballistic missile early warning system and associated communications at an estimated cost of $500 million. Construction is already underway on the first of these stations.

Set up advanced research projects agency in the Defense Department to direct military space projects and weapons systems of the future.

Set up the post of director of defense research and engineering to supervise and coordinate military research projects.

Atomic energy for peace and security

Republican programs based on the principles of developing atomic energy—without Government monopoly—for peace, progress, and Free World security have been an outstanding success in the past 5 years, as follows:

Enlisted free enterprise in a public-private cooperative program under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 for the development of peaceful uses of atomic energy at home. Starting from 2 small civilian power reactor experiments in 1953, there were 8 civilian power reactors in fiscal 1958, producing 78,000 kilowatts. Fifteen more are under construction or scheduled for full operation before 1965. Four plants under construction represent a private investment of $250 million and not a cent of taxpayers' money. For eight jointly sponsored projects not yet under construction, public funds of $150 million are more than matched by private commitments of $200 million.

Strongly supported public and private research on nuclear power production and many other peaceful uses of atomic energy which have resulted in many benefits. Since 1953, both the number of users and the dollar volume of sales of radioisotopes have trebled. A million medical patients are being diagnosed or treated with radioisotopes each year. In industry, saving through isotope use is five times what it was in 1953. Radioisotopes have such varying uses as locating and treating tumors, improving crops, measuring the thickness of tin cans, X-raying castings, locating leaks, preserving food, and eradicating pests.

Launched the atoms-for-peace program calling for international cooperation in using atomic energy for peace, and implemented it through bilateral and multilateral agreements, and through the International Atomic Energy Agency proposed by the President before the United Nations in 1953, and approved by Congress in 1957. A multilateral agreement with the six-nation group Euratom was negotiated and approved by the Congress in 1958.

Made the maximum contribution to national and Free World defense and security by increasing many fold the number of atomic weapons, by improving their design to reduce radioactive fallout and meet specific military requirements, and by permitting a greater exchange of atomic military information and materials with allied nations.

National economy

Established a high level of economic activity—without a war.

Gross national product, personal income, and savings climbed to new high records.

Every year since 1952 saw well over a million housing starts.

Decline in farm income was checked. Prices and income rose.

Small Business Administration became a permanent agency.

Administration refused to panic over business downturn by launching Democratic-favored spending sprees. Instead, it put in operation constructive and well-planned programs, which included the following:

Defense contracts accelerated to $13.4 billion in first half of 1958 as against $7.9 billion in last half of 1957. Calendar year totals: 1958—$23.6 billion; 1957—$17.8 billion.

Spending increased in Federal highway programs by $800 million over last fiscal year and plans call for an additional increase of $600 million in fiscal 1959.

Acceleration of authorized civil works by $200 million in current fiscal year.

Additional $50 million provided in capital grant funds for urban renewal projects.

Reserve requirement of Federal Reserve banks reduced one-half of 1 percent on February 20, 1958, thereby freeing additional $3 billion for lending.

FHA-insured mortgage down payments reduced, encouraging new housing.

Defense Department directed to funnel contracts to distressed labor areas and to small business generally. In February 1958, $102 million in Federal contracts were set aside for small business, double the amount provided in February 1957.

Speed-up ordered in $1 billion worth of urban renewal loans and grants handled by Housing and Home Finance Agency.

President ordered speed-up of $300 million in HHFA loans for college housing.

Interior Department stepped up general construction program by $25 million.

Unemployment compensation benefits extended.

Military construction programs accelerated.

Labor: Advancing interests of working men and women

Gave tax cuts which were the equivalent to a wage increase for every taxpayer; workers now keep more of what they earn.

Promoted harmonious labor-management relations, resulting in less time and wages lost on account of strikes; since Republicans took office there has been greater worker-industry peace than in any comparable post-World War II period.

Extended unemployment compensation insurance coverage to 4 million more people—the first major extension since the program began.

Urged and assisted State and local action on the growing migratory labor problem and developed draft legislation to regulate its interstate transportation.

Established a program of unemployment compensation for approximately 2½ million Federal workers.

Supported the passage of a 10-percent pay raise for all classified and legislative employees.

Urged States to modernize their unemployment compensation; 23 States increased jobless pay benefits and 7 lengthened the period.

Recommended and supported legislation raising the minimum wage.

Blacklisted minimum wage violators and recovered back wages for underpaid employees—in the most vigorous enforcement program since passage of the Davis-Bacon Act of 1935.

Recovered for workers, in 1955 alone, more than $6 million due them from employers who violated either the Fair Labor Standards Act or the Walsh-Healey Act.

Speeded procedures of National Labor Relations Board for handling elections, settling disputes, and disposing of unfair labor practice cases.

Provided more effective attention to problems of women workers through newly created post in the Labor Department of Assistant to the Secretary for Women's Affairs.

Expanded vocational rehabilitation program; strongly enforced child-labor laws and health and safety standards; pushed apprentice-training and on-the-job training programs; helped veterans return to pre-service employment.

Expanded its occupational safety training program and assisted the States in promoting programs to provide safe working conditions.

Vigorously supported legislation to bring about more union democracy and greater freedom for rank and file union workers.

Agriculture: Prosperity and freedom for farmers

The Republican administration has done a remarkably good job of untangling the web of agricultural problems created by the previous administration and heading the whole agricultural economy toward prosperity and freedom, as follows:

Halted the spiraling inflation which from 1940 to 1952 sent the index of prices paid by farmers up more than 100 percent. From January 1953 to June 1958, this index rose only 7 percent.

Continued to attack the basic cost-price squeeze problem to the benefit of farmers. Realized net income of farm operators in the first half of 1958 was at an annual rate of about $13.3 billion—22 percent higher than in the first half of 1957. This was the greatest increase from a year earlier since the end of World War II when price controls were eliminated.

Stopped the postwar downtrend in farm prices. Prices received by farmers in the first half of 1958 were 8 percent above a year ago and 10 percent above 2 years ago.

Helped farmers cut their debts. Farmers have less than $11 in debts for each $100 of assets. In 1940 the ratio was $19 for each $100. Farm assets of $188 billion as of January 1, 1958, are at an all-time high. Farm ownership is also at a record high, 2 out of every 3 farms being free of mortgage debt.

Enacted in 1954 a farm program providing some flexibility in formerly rigid price supports and acreage controls, which had piled up surpluses and depressed farm prices.

Enacted during the same Republican 83d Congress the now widely popular Public Law 480, providing both an effective domestic surplus disposal system and a sound foreign relations program. About $1.5 billion worth of surplus commodities have been sold for foreign currencies and another $1.4 billion bartered for strategic materials under the law.

Achieved notable success in other disposal programs also. In the 2-year period ending June 30, 1958, surplus commodities with a cost value of about $8 billion were moved out of Government storage into consumption. Farm exports in fiscal 1957 set a new record of $4.7 billion.

Started in 1955 the cooperative Federal-State rural development program, which despite Democratic delay, has done much to assist rural people on the lower rung of the economic ladder by helping them to help themselves.

Enacted the Soil Bank program in 1956, after fighting off Democratic attempts to return to rigid supports and controls. The acreage-reserve part of the Soil Bank, now drawing to an orderly close despite Democratic attempts to kill it prematurely, served well in preventing the surplus production in 1957 of 2 million bales of cotton, 6 million hundredweights of rice, 93 million pounds of tobacco, 225 million bushels of corn, and 175 million bushels of wheat. The conservation-reserve part of the Soil Bank continues at higher payment rates to help curb overproduction while conserving soil and water resources for future needs.

Inaugurated in 1956 the Great Plains program to combat wind erosion, dust storms, and floods in 10 States most often beset by these disasters. About 600 contracts for regrassing and other conservation programs have been signed, involving 2 million acres.

Brought soil and water conservation activities through these and other programs to levels never before equaled, and extended more disaster and drought aid to farmers than ever before.

Amended the internal revenue law to permit farmers to deduct expenditures for installing certain soil and water conservation practices. Saved farmers $60 million a year by repealing tax on gasoline used in farming operations.

Extended social-security coverage to farm owners and farmworkers.

Returned the Farm Credit Administration to the control of farmers and in general made the agricultural credit system more responsive to farmers' requirements.

Provided larger loan authorizations for rural electrification loans and for rural telephone loans.

Expanded the special school milk program so that millions of additional children could receive this valuable addition to their diets.

Extended the Sugar Act and the Wool Act, and extended and expanded the brucellosis control program.

Established the Agricultural Marketing Service in the Department of Agriculture reorganization of 1953 to give greater emphasis to marketing and distribution of farm commodities.

Expanded research activities to develop new crops, new uses for crops, new markets, and reduced production costs.

Enacted in 1958, after still more Democratic attempts to increase Government interference, a program for cotton, rice, corn, and feed grains which is partly in line with Republican farm freedom policies.

Natural resources and public works: partnership instead of paternalism

Authorized the joint United States-Canadian St. Lawrence Seaway project.

Authorized comprehensive program for deepening and improving connecting channels between Great Lakes to accommodate ocean-going vessels through the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Approved construction of St. Lawrence River power project by State of New York and Province of Ontario, expected to generate second largest amount of power of any similar project in the country.

Approved 13-year $32.9 billion highway construction and improvement program involving 440,000 miles of United States highways and roads. Total program is largest public works project ever authorized in United States history.

Increased Federal emergency relief highway funds for aid to States in which roads and bridges were damaged or washed out by hurricanes and floods.

Approved $10 million in funds for Inter-American highway.

Authorized a 10-year $500 million water pollution control program, providing grants-in-aid to States and municipalities to construct plants to purify polluted streams and other water sources.

Authorized a nationwide lease-purchase program to build new post offices, customhouses, and other Federal buildings (program rejected by 85th Congress).

Authorized the third largest public power dam in the Nation—Priest Rapids Dam on the Columbia River; authorized hundreds of navigation, flood-control, beach erosion, and other river and harbor projects.

Authorized Federal construction of upper Colorado River water storage project covering 110,000 square miles in five-State area for eventual building of scores of multiple purpose dams and some 35 reclamation projects.

Authorized a $90 million Mississippi Gulf sea level canal.

Approved survey of tides at Passamaquoddy Bay, Maine, for feasibility of hydroelectric power.

Authorized military public works program of between $1 billion and $2 billion in each session of the last three Congresses and approved appropriations for construction of numerous Army, Navy, Marine, and Air Force facilities.

Approved flood and hurricane disaster measures designed to house the homeless and to reestablish communications and transportation facilities.

Authorized scores of new reclamation, irrigation, and power projects.

Permitted the Federal Power Commission to license local public utility districts and private power companies to pay for and construct their own power projects.

Extended Water Facilities Act from 17 States to 48 States in a move to conserve the Nation's water and soil resources.

Authorized research program for feasible uses of saline water for human and commercial purposes.

Permitted Federal loans to local irrigation districts for construction, on Federal reclamation projects, of water distribution systems to be locally owned and operated.

Permitted multiple mineral development of the same tracts of public lands to encourage domestic sources of vital materials.

Provided for upstream watershed protection and flood prevention under local control, reversing a 20-year trend.

Rejected, by a majority vote in the Senate, an attempt to prevent a private utility from constructing Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River as approved by the Federal Power Commission.

Extended minerals purchase program to include incentives for small mine operations.

Inaugurated long-range programs for mining and metallurgical research; intensified study of radioactive metals; continued synthetic fuels research; gave Federal Government more authority on surface resources in granting mining deeds.

Passed measures for additional conservation and propagation of fish and for the protection of grazing lands and wildlife refuges.

Approved extension of Federal Aid Airport Act to authorize a four-year, $252 million program for annual matching funds to provide adequate and safe airports.

Approved conservation programs of many types, including improvement of western grazing lands through reseeding programs, water-spreading systems, and encouragement of soil and moisture conservation practices by range users.

Returned to the States their rights to submerged lands and resources off their coasts to their historical boundaries.

Authorized $100 million Oroville Dam and Reservoir project on Feather River in partnership with State of California.

Authorized partnership plan for San Angelo irrigation municipal water project in Texas.

Established National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission to administer administration's 10-year development programs, namely Mission 66 and Operation Outdoors, under the National Park Service and the Forest Service respectively.

Stimulated oil and gas leases of inland underwater areas of Alaska.

Authorized Massachusetts-Connecticut flood-control compact.

Authorized construction of four units of Chief Joseph Dam project.

Authorized water conservation projects in New Mexico and Texas.

Limited withdrawal of public lands by Defense Department.

Encouraged phosphate production.

Approved Merrimack River flood control compact.

Granted consent for Little Missouri River compact.

Personal and public welfare

General and Public Health

Established first Health, Education, and Welfare Cabinet position.

Enacted 1954 amendments to social security extending coverage to over 13 million more people.

Inaugurated many new health measures, including aid for building more nursing homes and chronic disease hospitals.

Greatly expanded vocational rehabilitation.

Increased medical research into major causes of death and disability.

Expanded training of practical nurses; provided funds for graduate training for public health personnel and for nurses planning careers in teaching, research, or administration.

Expanded the hospital survey and construction program with emphasis on building chronic disease hospitals, nursing, and convalescent homes for the chronically ill, aged, and physically disabled; established diagnostic and treatment centers; and provided special facilities for vocational rehabilitation.

Increased funds for costs of medical care for the aged, blind, disabled, and for dependent children.

Enacted a 5-year, $25 million program for research and technical assistance for the problem of air pollution.

Extended and strengthened Federal-State water pollution control program.

Provided grants to States to support experiments, demonstrations, and studies to improve the care and treatment of the mentally ill.

Developed and provided funds for the Salk poliomyelitis vaccine program.

Greatly strengthened the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Administration to increase the safety and purity of foods, drugs, and cosmetics.

Enacted a stringent Narcotics Control Act.

Extended school milk program to summer camps and other nonprofit organizations.

Initiated program for research in weather modification.

Liberalized the formula for Federal aid to States in public assistance programs.

Created Federal Council on Aging to meet the needs of our rapidly increasing elder citizens in the areas of income maintenance, medicine, mental health, and rehabilitation.

Education

Called White House Conference on Education, the first in history.

Accelerated school construction.

Initiated teacher program to cope with teachers shortage.

Accomplished higher rural school enrollment by strengthening child labor provisions of Fair Labor Standards Act.

Appointed committee of national leaders to consider ways and means of increasing Nation's supply of technically trained manpower.

Continued Federal aid in schools affected by Federal activities.

Extended veterans' educational benefits.

Initiated Federal and State study of education beyond high school.

Initiated program for 4-year science scholarship program.

Initiated legislation providing funds for grants-in-aid to public and nonprofit accredited schools of public health training and in administration of State and local health programs; for Federal grants to each State to aid development of educational television; and for out-service training for Federal employees to improve efficiency.

Authorized funds to develop library services in rural areas.

Authorized establishment of educational assistance program for orphans of World War I, World War II, and Korean conflict.

Set up National Library of Medicine.

Social Security

Extended coverage to farm workers, professional self-employed; to employees of State and local governments and ministers on a voluntary basis; as well as to members of the military services, farm owners, and operators.

Extended benefits to retired persons, permitting them to earn $1,200 a year without losing social security benefits and removing all restrictions on earnings for those retirees over 72 years of age.

Extended benefits to totally disabled persons at age 50 and also to widows by lowering the age requirement to 62.

Housing

Extended FHA-insured loan repayment time, raised loan limits on new and old house values, and lowered minimum down payments.

Continued and improved home and farmhouse loan programs.

Enacted laws for FHA insurance on private construction of rental housing at AEC sites and permanent military installations.

Authorized many thousands of additional federally aided public housing units.

Government finance and taxation

Stimulated national prosperity; maintained the value of the dollar; put restraints on inflation; checked the recession.

Achieved two consecutive balanced budgets. In fiscal 1956, the surplus totaled $1.626 billion; in 1957, $1.645 billion. Only three times in the previous 20-year period of Democratic administration was the budget balanced. It was done in fiscal years 1947 and 1948, as the result of appropiation cuts made by the Republican 80th Congress, and in fiscal 1951, resulting from a "windfall" cutback from Korean war spending.

Reduced Government spending each year well below the $74.3 billion spent in fiscal 1953, Truman's last budget year.

Extended the maturity of the Federal debt; moved more of the debt away from banks, where it contributed to inflation, and into the hands of long-term investors.

Tied in debt management actions with Federal Reserve System moves to keep the supply of money and credit in line with the needs of the country.

Present unbalanced budget (fiscal 1959) grows out of space age challenges and national defense needs.

New records set in savings bonds sales, reflecting public confidence in the country's economic future and in the Government's fiscal policies.

Gave the American people a whopping $7.4 billion in tax cuts in 1954—the first tax cut since the Republican 80th Congress in 1948—including:

Three billion dollar cut in individual income taxes (an average of 10 percent).

One billion dollar cut in excise taxes on household appliances, cosmetics, and other items of everyday use.

Two billion dollar cut by abolishing the excess profits tax which was restricting the expansion of business and jobs.

One billion four hundred million dollar cut by liberalized deductions and fairer tax treatment of millions of persons and thousands of businesses under the 1954 tax code.

Substantially revised taxes on small business.

Revised budgeting practices to prevent large carry-over of unspent funds.

Government and Civil Service

Checked the New Deal-Fair Deal trend toward centralization of power in Washington.

Replaced dictatorial actions, which tried to draft striking workers into the Army and seized private property illegally, with constitutional government.

Sold to private enterprise 25 federally owned synthetic rubber plants and the Inland Waters Corporation; and disposed of many business-type commercial enterprises conducted by the Defense Department and civilian agencies in competition with private enterprise. Property of substantial value thereby was returned to local and State tax rolls.

Put into effect 14 reorganization plans to improve the operations and efficiency of Government departments and agencies, and to lower the cost of government.

Established the second Hoover Commission to study Government functions and operations, and the Kestnbaum Commission to study Federal-State-local functions and fiscal resources and to recommend proper allocation thereof. Government departments and agencies, wherever possible without legislation, have since implemented many of their recommendations (to improve the executive branch). It has been estimated that through 1957 nearly a half billion dollars had been saved by implementing Hoover Commission recommendations.

Modernized the Post Office Department, making effective use of management practices successfully developed by private industry, and substantially reduced its chronic deficit.

Brought about long-needed improvements in the civil service and in various Government agencies; effected pay raises for Federal employees. Hundreds of thousands of Federal employees, who had been under a system of indefinite appointment with few rights, have won career status under an improved appointment system. Since January 1953 the competitive civil service has been extended to cover nearly 40,000 additional jobs. The percentage of all Federal jobs under the classified civil service has risen from 84 percent as of March 1, 1953, to 86 percent as of May 1958.

Provided for Federal employees low-cost group life insurance, with the Government sharing the cost; higher retirement benefits; unemployment compensation coverage; higher travel allowances; fairer overtime pay; longevity pay increases; and incentive awards.

Civil rights: Ending racial discrimination

Ended all segregation in the Armed Forces, veterans' hospitals, schools on military posts, and Government contracts.

Ended segregation in restaurants, theaters, hotels, schools, and places of amusement in the Nation's Capital.

Ended segregation in employment contracts to which District of Columbia is a party.

Prohibited (by Interstate Commerce Commission) discrimination in interstate bus and train transportation.

Protected jury-trial procedures by prohibiting recordings in Federal grand and petit jury deliberations.

Established President's Committee on Government Employment Policy to assure nondiscrimination in Federal jobs. A recent survey of Federal employment in a number of key cities indicated that 24 percent of Federal positions were held by members of minority groups.

Established the Committee on Government Contracts (headed by Vice President NIXON) to prevent discrimination in Government contract jobs, with the result that for the first time white-collar jobs are available to Negroes in public utilities, the chemical and aircraft industries, and the Federal Reserve System.

Announced refusal through Housing Administrator of Federal aid to cities defaulting in obligations to minority citizens.

Upheld Federal court processes in Little Rock, Ark.

Pressed for the first legislation in 82 years dealing with color and racial discrimination and established the bipartisan Commission on Civil Rights (originally proposed by President Eisenhower), as authorized by the Civil Rights Act of 1957. The Commission will investigate and report on alleged deprivations of voting rights, and study and appraise laws, policies, and legal developments constituting denial of the equal protection of the laws.

For the first time in history, Negroes were appointed to serve in high positions such as Assistant Secretary of Labor, Presidential Assistant, and chairman of a presidential committee; since the beginning of 1953, 300 Negroes have been appointed to positions of responsibility in the Federal Government.

Veterans

Granted 5 percent increase in compensation in 1954 for disabled veterans and their dependents.

Granted 10 percent increase in compensation in 1957 for service-connected disabled veterans, and for dependents of veterans disabled over 50 percent.

Provided increased death compensation benefits in 1956 to survivors of veterans who died of a service-connected cause, such payments to be related to rank and pay.

Granted pension increases to widows of Spanish-American War, Civil War, Indian War, and Mexican War.

Liberalized criteria for determining eligibility of certain widows for pension benefits.

Provided farmhouse loan programs for veterans; supported legislation liberalizing direct farmhouse loans and permitting Government guaranteed loans to veterans for farmhouse purchase, construction, and repair.

Extended VA home loan guaranty and direct loan programs to July 25, 1960; provided extra funds for direct VA loans; and for FNMA purchase of VA mortgages on new homes.

Gave Korean veterans the same benefits and preferences as World War II veterans for civil service eligibility, war housing, homesteading, and GI training; extended period for education and training benefits to January 31, 1965; made clear that training benefits for Korean veterans and war orphans extended to Panama Canal Zone, and also to Philippines for war orphans.

Extended period during which veterans suffering loss of one or more limbs or permanent impairment of vision could apply for $1,600 payment on an automobile; and extended eligibility to include veterans whose qualifying disability occurred subsequent to discharge and who applied within a certain period.

Consolidation into one act extensive body of existing laws pertaining to veterans and their dependents; provided automatic renewal of veterans' term insurance policies and simplified handling.

Increased funds for building veterans' hospitals to record amount; speeded construction.

Appropriated additional $25 million for unemployment compensation payments to veterans.

Approved erection of U. S. S. *Arizona* memorial and museum at Pearl Harbor in tribute to 1,102 American servicemen who died aboard ship.

Communism in United States combated

Inaugurated an era of cooperation between Congress and the Executive in combating domestic communism.

Enacted long-needed Communist control laws which (1) outlaw the Communist Party; (2) grant immunity to witnesses before Congressional committees; (3) impose heavier penalties for concealing persons from arrest; (4) impose heavier penalties on bail jumpers; (5) deny a Government pension to any Federal employee convicted of a felony; (6) revoke the citizenship of persons convicted under the Smith Act of advocating overthrow of the Government by force or violence; (7) make peacetime spying a capital offense; and (8) require registration of all printing presses owned or used by Communists.

Set up Internal Security Division in the Justice Department to give exclusive attention to vigorous prosecution of antisubversive laws.

Obtained convictions of 71 persons under the Smith Act.

Ordered Communist Party to register under the Internal Security Act.

Deported more subversive aliens in 3½ years than during entire 20 years of Democratic control.

Weeded out security risks from Federal jobs.

Vigorously pushed Congressional investigation of various Communist activities.

Reaffirmed determination to pursue Congressional probes by joining Democrats in January 1955 in passing Senate Resolution 18 which declared that its appropriate committees should vigorously investigate the Communist international conspiracy.

Revised and improved security system in Government.

INCREASE IN DIVERSION OF WATER FROM LAKE MICHIGAN INTO THE ILLINOIS WATERWAY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2) to authorize the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test on a 3-year basis the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Alabama for 1 minute, without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Kentucky without losing my right to the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORTON. I have tried my best to help the Senator on this matter. I should like to inquire how long the Senator will speak, because I am going home. When may I expect to be awakened?

Mr. PROXMIRE. When I said I had a great deal of documentation to make, I meant that it will take a long, long time. I do not know how long my voice will hold up, but it will be a long, long time.

Mr. MORTON. Does the Senator mind very much if I check out now?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is all right.

Mr. MORTON. Kellogg 7–1704. [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me to present a resolution?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Texas, without my losing my right to the floor, so that the Senator from Texas may present a resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. KNOWLAND, the committee appointed on the part of the Senate to wait upon the President of the United States, appeared in the center aisle, and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas said: Mr. President, your committee, appointed to join a similar committee of the House to call upon the President and to notify him that the two Houses have completed the business of the session, report that the President advised them that he had no further communication to make to them.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I send a resolution to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Con. Res. 123) was read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Sunday, August 24, 1958, and that when they adjourn on said day, they stand adjourned sine die.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the resolution is agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to insert five articles on different subjects in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to be printed after adjournment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INCREASE IN DIVERSION OF WATER FROM LAKE MICHIGAN INTO THE ILLINOIS WATERWAY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2) to authorize the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test on a 3-year basis the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Illinois for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator remember that earlier in the evening the Senator from Illinois stated that the opponents of the diversion bill were organized for a filibuster?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I recollect that statement by the Senator from Illinois. I might say that this is an extremely complicated and difficult and comprehensive subject, and it will take me a very long time to explain it. I do not know the definition of a filibuster. However, I have a long list, drawn up for me by the Library of Congress, which includes many distinguished Senators, including some of the most outstanding on this side of the aisle, who are very good friends of mine, and who have engaged in discussion of bills for 12 days, 13 days, and, in one case, for 16 days. I feel that to discuss the pending bill for another 24 or 36 hours does not constitute a filibuster in the sense that we have had other proposed legislation discussed at much greater length.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from North Carolina for an observation, without losing my right to the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I merely wish to say——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. May we have order in the Chamber?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. ERVIN. I merely wish to say to the able and distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin, whose views on this matter I support, that if any Senator who lives below the Mason-Dixon line had pursued his course in debate, it would have been sufficient evidence beyond a reasonable doubt to prove that he was guilty of running a filibuster.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I appreciate the expression of my friend from North Carolina. Any time he wishes to talk 24 hours on a bill, I certainly shall not consider it a filibuster. The Senate has discussed bills many times on several occasions for longer than the time that will be expended on this bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from South Carolina for a statement, without losing my right to the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senate has a rule whereby we may engage in extended debate, and the Senator is exercising that right. Is that not correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That being so, I assume that the Senator would not be in favor of abolishing that rule. [Laughter.]

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the distinguished Senator wishes to invoke cloture tonight, I shall be delighted to support him.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. No, no. I wish to clarify that point. I am in favor of any Senator speaking as long as he wishes to speak. [Laughter.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Alabama without losing my right to the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO FILE TWO REPORTS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be authorized to file two reports after adjournment; one report in the form of a summary of the committee's activities for this session, and the other an economic study prepared with the assistance of the Library of Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INCREASE IN DIVERSION OF WATER FROM LAKE MICHIGAN INTO THE ILLINOIS WATERWAY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2) to authorize the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test on a 3-year basis the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes.

ADMISSION OF CERTAIN EVIDENCE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Texas without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to have the attention of all Senators.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Wisconsin may yield to the Senator from Wyoming for the purpose of calling up a privileged matter, a conference report.

Mr. MORSE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wonder whether the Senator from Wisconsin would yield the floor, so that the Senator from Wyoming could call up the conference report and explain it, and at least bring it before the Senate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I wish to explain my position.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator will be able to get the floor again.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I understand that I will have the opportunity to speak twice in this legislative day on this issue if I yield the floor. I understand that I will have an opportunity to seek recognition before action is taken on the bill. However, if I yield the floor another time, I shall have lost the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is speaking on the motion of the Senator from Illinois. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. He could speak again on that motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Then he could speak on the bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Or on any amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I can speak on the motion, and then I will have a subsequent opportunity to speak on the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, before the Senator accedes to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin, will he yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it not a fact that under the rules of the Senate a conference report is a privileged matter?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct. A Senator cannot take another Senator off the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I did not ask that question. I should like to make another parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Has it not been decided that if the Senator from Wisconsin should yield the floor for the presentation of the conference report, upon which the House has already acted favorably, he will not be denied the right to speak again on the subject matter which he has been discussing?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will ask the Senator if he will yield for that purpose.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] has been trying to have me yield to him before I accede to the Senator's request. Out of courtesy to him, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Colorado, without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I must object to that, because I have a privileged matter which I desire to present. I should like to present a privileged matter to the Senate before there is any discussion.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CARROLL. As I understand the ruling of the Chair, if the Senator from Wisconsin yields for a privileged matter, he can be taken from the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. CARROLL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Wisconsin may yield to me to make an observation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. By the same token, I object.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11477) to amend chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for the admission of certain evidence, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

Mr. O'MAHONEY obtained the floor.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, as one of the conferees, I desire to be heard on this matter. I object.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think I have the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado objects to the immediate consideration of the report.

Mr. MORSE. Does the immediate consideration of the report require unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It can be taken up by majority vote without debate.

Mr. MORSE. I object.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wyoming to proceed to consider the conference report. [Putting the question.]

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not yield until I make my explanation. I will make the explanation brief and succinct, if I am capable of doing so.

It will be remembered by the Members of the Senate that when the House bill came to the Senate it provided, in subsection (a) of the first section as follows:

> Evidence, including statements and confessions otherwise admissible, shall not be inadmissible solely because of delay in taking an arrested person before a commissioner or other officer empowered to commit persons charged with offenses against the laws of the United States.

When that bill came before the Committee on the Judiciary, the feeling of the majority of that committee was that the language with the word "delay" without any qualification would constitute an invitation——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may we have order?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, there is no way for us to determine what the conferees have done unless we can hear what the Senator from Wyoming is saying.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It was the feeling of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary that the word "delay" standing alone would be an invitation to the police and other law enforcement officers to elicit confessions or statements indicating confession by force or third degree methods. So the committee sought a method to make it clear that the delay was not such delay as would cause such infraction of the law or rules of criminal procedure. Therefore, the committee inserted the word "reasonable" before the word "delay." That was the only amendment which the Senate made in the House bill.

The House receded from its disagreement to the Senate amendment. The House accepted the Senate amendment "reasonable" but asked that there be added to the bill another clause, which would define what was meant. This clause, I want the Senate to understand, was the work of Senate conferees and House conferees. It was the work of Senate conferees, some of whom were Republican, and some of whom were Democrats. It was the work of House conferees, some of whom were Democrats and some of whom were Republicans.

So the clause which I am about to read to the Senate is the work of the conferees of both Houses and the work of bipartisan conferees. The clause reads as follows:

> *Provided,* That such delay—
>
> Meaning "such reasonable delay"—
>
> is to be considered as an element—
>
> Which means, of course, among other elements—
>
> in determining the voluntary or involuntary nature of such statements or confessions.

Let me read that provision again, so that it may appear in one uninterrupted sentence:

> *Provided,* That such delay is to be considered as an element in determining the voluntary or involuntary nature of such statements or confessions.

This provision is nothing more nor less than a restatement of existing law. It does not in any way weaken the amendment adopted by the conferees. On the contrary, it strengthens it, because it makes it crystal clear that the delay——

Mr. President, I think we are entitled to order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming is correct. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. This provision strengthens the original bill, because it does not in any sense or degree constitute an invitation on the part of law enforcement officers to use delay for the purpose of extracting a confession from an accused.

The provision also provides that the delay is an element—one of many elements—to be used by trial courts in determining whether statements or confessions are voluntary or involuntary.

In other words, we have, on behalf of the Senate conferees and on behalf of the House conferees, preserved the Senate amendment, which does not in any way or form reverse the Mallory decision by the Supreme Court. This is not a criticism of the Supreme Court. It does not reverse the misapplication of the Mallory decision in the court of appeals in the District of Columbia. If there were any doubt about that, it would be dismissed immediately by the language used by Judge Burger, of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, when he agreed with those who wrote the opinion to reverse the 3 convictions in 3 separate courts in the Trilling case.

Judge Burger said, in his brief opinion, that he thought the language of Judge Prettyman, who wrote the opinion asking for the affirmation of the conviction, stated what ought to be the law. But he felt that he was compelled by the Mallory decision to vote otherwise. In other words, the judge made a plain confession that he was voting against his better judgment as to what the law ought to be because of his interpretation of the Mallory decision. He said the rulemaking authority ought to review this matter; and furthermore, that perhaps Congress should do it.

The opportunity is here for Congress to do it. Is there a reason why? I think there is.

Most of the discussion which has taken place in the debate upon the bill revolves around the rights of individuals who are being tried for alleged crimes. It is recognized by the Senate; it is recognized by the conferees; it was recognized—Mr. President may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair). Let there be order in the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It was recognized not only by the conferees, but it was recognized elsewhere, that this language has the effect of affirming and supporting the Senate amendment, the word "reasonable."

Most of the debate revolved around the rights of individuals who were on trial. But Justice Frankfurter, in delivering the opinion in the Mallory case, said that rule 5 (a) of the Rules of Criminal Procedure provides a procedure devised by Congress to maintain individual rights without hampering intelligent and efficient law enforcement.

One of the most important things we have had to do in connection with the conference report and the bill has been to realize that the laws against crimes of violence, which are passed by Congress and by the States throughout the land, are laws which are intended to protect individual citizens.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair). The Senate will be in order. Conversations will cease; the aids who are in the Chamber will be seated in the rear of the Chamber. It is important that order be maintained, in the interest of the proceedings of the Senate.

The Senator from Wyoming may now proceed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, the individual citizens who make up the communities in any State of the Nation, and particularly those who constitute the District of Columbia, are entitled to efficient and intelligent law enforcement.

There are those who have said that this matter should be left to the courts to decide. But, Mr. President, it is a matter for the legislature to decide. The Congress is the legislative body for the District of Columbia; and I call upon the Members of the Senate to realize the fact that if we were to allow this matter to go to the courts to be interpreted, we would be saying to every future victim of murder, of rape, of slugging, of yoking, or of any of the other crimes of violence, "You shall not have the protection of the Congress. You must suffer

until the accused has been tried, has been convicted, has taken his appeal to the appellate courts, and, from the appellate courts, has gone to the Supreme Court."

Mr. President, we need to protect the people of the District of Columbia, because we know that crimes of violence are committed. The report the conferees have brought to the Senate preserves everything the Senate provided, and specifies, in the proviso, that we are making it as clear as crystal that the intention, as was stated in the Senate committee report, is to leave these matters to be determined by the trial court.

I read the proviso, as follows:

Provided, That such delay is to be considered as an element in determining the voluntary or involuntary nature of such statements or confessions.

Mr. President, I urge that we redeem our obligation to the citizens of the District of Columbia and the citizens of the United States who are the victims of crime.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, my colleague on the Committee on the Judiciary.

Let me ask him whether the language of the conference report which provides that "such delay is to be considered as an element in determining the voluntary or involuntary nature of such statements or confessions," was in either the House version or the Senate version of the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It was in neither.

Mr. HENNINGS. Then that language is entirely new matter, is it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is entirely new matter.

Mr. HENNINGS. Let me ask the Senator from Wyoming what he thinks it adds. It seems to me exceedingly unclear; and of course, I do not think it means anything, because it says that "such delay is to be considered as an element in determining the voluntary or involuntary nature of such statements or confessions."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator from Missouri will permit me to respond to his statement, let me say that he has just said that he does not believe the provision means anything. In that case it follows, clearly, that we have left the Senate amendment entirely undisturbed.

Mr. HENNINGS. Does my distinguished colleague agree with me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; I do not agree.

Mr. HENNINGS. Is not this statement a redundant one? We know that delay is to be considered by the courts in determining the voluntary or involuntary nature of the statements or confessions, depending on all the circumstances. Is that not true?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But, Mr. President, the other day, when the Senate passed this bill, we indulged for hours in a debate on the legal technicalities. As I said then, I repeat now: We lawyers love to debate legal technicalities.

Mr. HENNINGS. That is what lawyers are for.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I say to my colleagues that this additional phrase is a clarification which does not at all impair what was provided. It carries out the will of the Senate; it carries out the duty of the Congress; it explains and clarifies the decision of the Supreme Court in the Mallory case; and it will afford a great opportunity for the courts of appeals in the District of Columbia and elsewhere to avoid the mistakes which were made by the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield for another question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. HENNINGS. Is not the Senator from Wyoming of the opinion that the conference report will in no wise affect or change either the decision in the landmark case of McNabb or the decision in the Mallory case?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I feel that if we are to enact legislation in this field, we must adopt the conference report. The House has adopted it. The only effect to be gained by a failure by us to adopt the conference report would be to kill the proposed legislation.

The Senator from Missouri was one of the stalwarts in supporting the action of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator from Wyoming; I was glad to contribute as best I could, in my small way.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And I hope the Senator from Missouri will continue his very able support, and will help us give the District of Columbia the assurance it needs.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator from Wyoming. I may seem to appear in the role of the devil's advocate, but I am undertaking to establish the legislative history in the Senate. The other day I spoke for 2½ hours, I believe, on this very proposition; and I supported the Senator from Wyoming in his amendment, which inserted the word "reasonable," instead of the word "unnecessary," which theretofore had appeared before the word "delay."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is quite true; and I am very grateful to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. I did so because I thought it was proper, and might serve the entire country.

Let me ask this question of my learned and distinguished friend: Does he think that in any way the conference report will affect, alter, or change the decision in the landmark case—the McNabb case—or the decision in the more recent case—the Mallory case; or does he think the conference report will tend to have any effect whatsoever upon the original bill, as it was passed by the Senate, with the inclusion of the word "reasonable" as an amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not in its effect——

Mr. HENNINGS. It seems to broaden it, does it not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It does improve it.

Mr. HENNINGS. It broadens it, because it simply states what every schoolboy who has studied criminal law knows, providing that such delay is to be considered an element in determining the voluntary or involuntary nature of such statement or confession. We know that is part and parcel of instructions of a judge to a jury.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course.

Mr. HENNINGS. On the question of admissibility of a statement or a so-called confession.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course.

Mr. HENNINGS. That is the status of the law as it stands now.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think there is another point that ought to be brought out. Is it not also true that if this bill is passed, it will put anybody who commits a crime in the District of Columbia, or in the Federal court, in the same position in which he finds himself in each State at the present time? That is what we are trying to do with this bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I would put it this way, if the Senator will permit me: All of the cities of the land, with the exception of the city of Washington or the District of Columbia, are under not only Federal law, which is applicable to them, but they are also under State constitutions and State laws. Washington and the District of Columbia constitute the only community in the land which is under Federal law alone.

This conference report protects every right a defendant has under the Bill of Rights. It protects every right a defendant has under the rules of criminal procedure. It protects every right every defendant has had from time immemorial in this country. But it also protects the rights that the social community should have, and which it will not have if the Senate fails to act upon the conference report.

I want to say the House of Representatives has already adjourned without day. So that this is the last opportunity that we have to give to the people of the District of Columbia, the people who are the victims, the protection that they ought to have.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. This is only a rule in the Federal courts.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

On motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That the following shall constitute the majority membership of the standing Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences:

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, chairman, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. KERR, and Mr. SYMINGTON.

On motion of Mr. CASE of South Dakota (for Mr. KNOWLAND), and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That the following shall constitute the minority membership of the standing Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences:

Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Senator JOHN W. BRICKER, Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, and Senator JACOB K. JAVITS.

ESTABLISHMENT OF CLUBS FOR BOYS AND GIRLS ESPECIALLY INTERESTED IN SCIENCE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for one more unanimous consent request, I have in my hand House bill 13191, to require the Commissioner of Education to encourage, foster, and assist in the establishment of clubs for boys and girls especially interested in science.

The bill has the approval of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the distinguished minority leader, the occupant of the chair [Mr. ALLOTT], and I ask that the Chair lay the bill before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 13191) to require the Commissioner of Education to encourage, foster, and assist in the establishment of clubs for boys and girls especially interested in science, which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an explanation of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of this bill is to stimulate interest in the study of science on the part of high-school pupils throughout the country. It is the belief of the committee that such an organization could do for the future scientific accomplishment in our Nation what Future Farmers of America has accomplished toward agricultural achievement.

Testimony before the General Education Subcommittee indicated the existence of a number of club activities in various high schools throughout the country which have successfully stimulated science interest. Such clubs could provide the basis for a national organization which the committee believes might be established so that studious youngsters might begin to know the thrill and incentive which impel most American boys to want to develop skill and mastery in such sports as football, basketball, etc. The committee would hope that at some date in the not too distant future a Federal charter would be in order for Future Scientists of America, modeled along the lines of the Future Farmers of America.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

Since the Russian satellite Sputnik I was placed in orbit in the fall of 1957, a vast amount of evidence has been presented in the press and before appropriate committees of the Congress in formal testimony of the great emphasis placed on scientific education in the school systems of Soviet Russia. There is no appreciable disagreement to the premise that in the United States our survival depends upon increasing the emphasis in science training in education in our own schools. In a dictatorship, this result is achieved by a decree from the central government. In a free society, we attempt to achieve the desired result by encouraging and stimulating individual desire and initiative. This legislation is needed as an encouraging stimulant.

ESTIMATED COST

An appropriation not to exceed $50,000 in any fiscal year is authorized to carry out the purposes of this bill. This money would be spent in preparing and distributing information relative to how such clubs could be organized, and to provide a coordinator to assist in pulling together all of the individual clubs into a national organization.

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS

No departmental recommendation was sought on this specific legislation, although the committee believes it would be in accord with the administration's desire for increased emphasis on the study of science.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 13191) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank my dear friend from Wyoming.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions of the Senate:

S. Con. Res. 122. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Presiding Officers to sign duly enrolled bills and joint resolutions after sine die adjournment; and

S. Res. Con. 123. Concurrent resolution that the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Sunday, August 24, 1958, sine die.

SERIES OF INSERTIONS BY SENATOR MORSE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield for a similar request, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. In the interest of saving time, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to insert in the RECORD a series of items: a letter that I have sent to the Attorney General; a letter I have sent to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue; certain material, including a clipping from the Washington Post of August 22; a statement that I am prepared to make on the authority of the President to send troops to Lebanon, the basis for the charge that he engaged in an unconstitutional act; two resolutions and certain newspaper clippings and columns dealing with the Middle East situation; and remarks on Oregon Night at the Watergate.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the Senator restate the request with respect to the statement about sending troops to Lebanon?

Mr. MORSE. It is a legal analysis I have made in support of my view.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it the Senator's own analysis?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; that the President acted unconstitutionally in sending troops to Lebanon under the circumstances in which he sent them.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I withdraw the reservation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 23, 1958.

Hon. WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Attorney General of the United States, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: In a few weeks the country will once again be faced with serious problems of enforcing the constitutional guaranties of equal protection of the laws for Negro children.

I am sure that it has come to your attention that several States have provided for the closing of public schools if they are to be desegregated. An integral part of such plans is the substitution of public schools by supposedly private educational institutions operating in the premises of churches, fraternal organizations, social clubs, and possibly other groups which are the beneficiaries of tax exemption under Federal law.

The purpose of these exemptions is the national policy that certain nonprofit private activities are of sufficient community interest to be in the national interest. Surely the promotion of religion, charitable undertakings, fraternal and social organizations normally meet that test. However, should such organizations participate in schemes to evade and subvert the constitutional guaranties of equal protection of the laws, they should not be permitted to have the benefit of Federal tax exemption.

Attached is my letter to the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service, in which I raise this and a more technical issue on the same subject.

The principal obligation for proper enforcement of the laws of the United States rests with the Department of Justice. For that reason, I am calling this major issue of constitutional policy and morality to your attention.

It is my hope that our Government will not permit private groups to continue to receive favored tax treatment if they destroy the policy basis for their exemption by conscious participation in plans to undermine constitutional rights.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

AUGUST 23, 1958.

Hon. RUSSELL C. HARRINGTON,
Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HARRINGTON: I am writing to raise some major questions regarding the Internal Revenue Code as it applies to private organizations receiving tax exemptions which may participate in allegedly private programs of education as a means of circumventing and defeating the decisions of the United States Supreme Court holding segregated schooling unconstitutional.

As you know, several States have passed laws which provide that public schools should be closed rather than submit to desegregation and that private schools take their place with the assistance of State funds. The plans as reported widely in the

press contemplate the use of buildings, halls, rooms, and other facilities of organizations such as churches, fraternal groups, social clubs, charitable groups, and perhaps business groups.

Section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code provides tax exemption for the income of many organizations which reportedly are to participate in these calculated schemes to evade and subvert the Supreme Court decisions on desegregation of public education. The underlying purpose of the tax exemption to these organizations is that they perform functions of value to their communities and the Nation. However, the reason for the exemption would be completely destroyed if the organizations now exempted from taxation were to be participants in schemes to undermine constitutional guaranties.

Under the law the organization seeking exemption has the burden of proving its original entitlement and the continuation of its exempt status. I am writing to inquire whether you propose to permit such organizations to enjoy tax exempt status and to permit their donors to take tax deductions (for such exemptions depend upon the exempt status of the organization itself; IRC 170).

Further, I understand that the long history of the exemptions under section 501 (and its predecessors) has been that the purpose for which the tax exemption is granted must be the exclusive purpose of the organization. Surely, when such an organization adds to its purposes aiding and abetting defeat of constitutional guaranties that element necessary for exemption has been lost.

I look forward to an early reply to my inquiry as to the policies you will follow in administering the tax laws of the United States in cases of this type.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

MALLORY BILL IN REVERSE?

The Senate has put itself into the strange posture of legislating to save the Supreme Court from distortion of its opinions by the lower courts. The Senate Judiciary Committee's amended version of the Mallory bill was broadly commended by its sponsors as a means of upholding the Supreme Court's decision in the Mallory case last year. In the House the bill had been passed as a means of reversing the Court's Mallory ruling.

The Court had set Mallory free from a rape conviction because the police had detained him to extract a confession instead of arraigning him "without unnecessary delay," as commanded by the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. The House said in its bill that hereafter a confession otherwise valid shall not be thrown out simply because of delay in arraigning the accused. By a vote of 41 to 39 the Senate changed this to require that a confession otherwise valid shall not be held inadmissible because of "reasonable" delay in the arraignment—contending that this is what the Supreme Court meant in its Mallory ruling.

Senator COOPER asked, with unassailable logic, why, in that event, should any bill be passed? Sponsors of the measure replied that there is much confusion among lower Federal courts as to what the Mallory ruling means and a widespread feeling that "something should be done." This is far from being convincing. The Supreme Court has a way of straightening out lower courts which do not faithfully interpret its decisions; and, even if it fails to do so promptly, Congress can hardly expect to reduce the confusion by a vague legislative declaration setting forth what it thinks the Supreme Court intended.

In these circumstances it is not surprising that the Senate and House conferees seem to be hopelessly deadlocked on the bill. We hope the Senate will stand fast against the House version to the last ditch. If this means failure of both bills, so much the better. The courts will then be free to iron out the problem, preferably through a new study of rule 5 (a) by a Supreme Court advisory committee.

REASONS WHY SENATE SHOULD REFUSE TO AGREE TO THE REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE COMMITTEE ON S. 1411

(1) The Senate has never considered S. 1411. What happened was this: On August 8, 1957, the Senate approved a noncontroversial bill to permit hearings in security cases before suspension of the employee. The House Post Office and Civil Service Committee tacked onto this noncontroversial bill a wholly new bill overruling the Supreme Court's 1956 decision in *Cole* v. *Young* and reapplying the Federal employees security program to nonsensitive positions. In conference, the majority of the Senate conferees (Senators CLARK and CHURCH opposing) accepted the House bill limited to June 30, 1959. In other words, S. 1411 now comes before the Senate for the first time just hours before adjournment.

(2) The Justice Department opposed the House version of S. 1411 on the ground that they are studying the whole problem in the light of the report filed last year by the Wright Commission on Government Security. While Justice may be willing to accept the present bill because of its time limitation, they certainly cannot be said to support the measure.

(3) S. 1411 as now presented to the Senate provides in section 3 that "all employees of any department or agency of the United States are deemed to be employed in an activity of the Government involving national security." Thus, in plain language, S. 1411 overrules the Supreme Court's decision in *Cole* v. *Young* limiting the Federal employees security program to nonsensitive jobs and applies the program to all Government employees no matter how far removed from anything to do with national security. It appears particularly unrealistic for Congress to state as a fact that all Federal employees are engaged in activities "involving national security" when everyone knows that the bulk of Federal employees are not so involved and are no different from the ordinary salesgirl or filing clerk.

(4) Not only does S. 1411 apply the security program to all Government employees, but it does so without real procedural safeguards. The bill provides that the suspected employee shall receive a written statement of the charges against him "which shall be stated as specifically as security considerations permit." In other words, if a Government security official decides that security considerations do not permit the employee to know the charges against him, his hearing becomes meaningless. Furthermore, even if he does know the charges against him, he may never be allowed to face his accusers if this same security officer decides that security considerations do not permit confrontation. An American citizen may have his life wrecked by the stigma of being called a security risk without knowing why or by whom he is accused.

(5) In a word, the bill reinstates security screening for 2 million Government employees engaged in nonsensitive work with all the worst practices of the old security program without any showing of need therefor.

(6) The only argument that has been heard in support of the bill is that there may be certain Communists in the Post Office Department at the present time that the Government is unable to get rid of. This argument is fallacious. The Hatch Act of 1939, as amended, forbids the employment by any Government agency of any member of the Communist Party (5 U. S. C. 118j, p. —).

(7) The Association of the Bar of the City of New York made a detailed study of the Federal employees security program in 1956 and recommended strongly that the program be limited to sensitive positions.

(8) The provision limiting the bill until June 30, 1959, is no justification for it. Because of the Cole case, the security program does not presently apply to nonsensitive positions; once reapplied to nonsensitive positions, it would be most difficult to terminate the program again. Furthermore, since no need has been shown for applying the security program to nonsensitive positions even up to June 30, 1959, all the bill does is to ratify the past excesses of the security program and allow them to apply for, at the very least, a period of nearly a year.

(9) The bill raises serious constitutional issues. The only justification for subjecting any employees to security screening and possible stigma of being found a security risk is that he works in an area so vitally connected with our national security that our security demands this type of action. To subject employees to this screening and possible stigma where there are no security considerations, and particularly to do so on the basis of vague charges and secret informers, is arbitrary, capricious, and a violation of due process of law.

(10) The bill, far from strengthening our national security, will actually weaken it. If the intelligence agencies of our Government concentrate on sensitive positions, they can do their job well; if they have to investigate millions of persons in nonsecurity positions, they can only do their job superficially. As has been well said, "If we watch our toothbrushes and diamond rings with equal care, we will lose less toothbrushes and far more diamond rings."

(11) The Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee held a thorough investigation of the Federal employees' security program at the time of the numbers racket. The report of the committee (Rept. No. 5750, 84th Cong., 2d sess.) is a strong indictment of the very program which this bill would reinstitute.

(12) Additional references:

(i) Minority report of House Past Office and Civil Service Committee on S. 1411.

(ii) Report of the special committee on the Federal loyalty security program of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York (1956).

(iii) Case studies in personnel security made in connection with the study of the New York City Bar Association (1955).

(iv) Hearings before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary, 84th Congress, 2d session, pursuant to Senate Resolution 94, November 1955 (Hennings subcommittee).

(v) Hearings before a Subcommittee on Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations, 84th Congress, 1st session, on Senate Joint Resolution 21, March 1955 (Humphrey subcommittee).

BIG TIMBERMEN AND SMALL BUSINESS ACT OF 1958—PART III

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on August 5, I expressed deep concern in the Senate over an indication that spokesmen for the larger timber interests, the Industrial Forestry Association and the National Lumber Manufacturers Association, had been suggesting to the Small Business Administration that it not implement the provisions of a recent amendment to the Small Business

Act which would permit a small business set-aside program for timber—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 16215.

This statement was challenged by the National Lumber Manufacturers Association in a letter dated August 12, which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 14, at page 17615.

Upon receiving the denial of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association, I inserted in the RECORD the original source of my information—a letter dated July 30, 1958, addressed to me by Mr. Wendell B. Barnes, Administrator of the Small Business Administration. In order that there may be no confusion on this point, I ask unanimous consent that the Small Business Administration letter of July 30, be inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., July 30, 1958.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have your letter of July 21, 1958, and want to assure you that in implementing the new provision of our act regarding sales of Government property the interests of small business will be protected. We are currently meeting with representatives of the Forest Service in an effort to formulate mutually agreeable procedures so that a satisfactory program can be conducted in the timber industry.

As you point out in your letter, several association groups have expressed opposition to this new provision of our act. Representatives of the Industrial Forestry Association and the National Lumber Manufacturers Association have met with members of my staff and expressed opposition to the law but also to our implementation thereof. They were advised that we intended to implement this new provision and if they had any suggestions to offer, we would be glad to consider them.

Our discussions with the Forest Service have pointed up the fact that there are regional variations in the size of mills. It may well be that we will have to adopt a different definition for small mills in each of the three major lumber areas of the country.

I appreciate your interest in this program and shall keep you advised of our progress. With regard to the availability of funds, the bill which contains our fiscal year 1959 appropriation is scheduled for consideration by Senate and House conferees within a few days. For your information I am enclosing a copy of my recent testimony before the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Sincerely yours,
WENDELL B. BARNES,
Administrator.

Mr. MORSE. When I received the July 30 letter my concern was very deep, Mr. President, because I know the extremely difficult experience that the true independent small-business segment of the lumber industry has had to undergo in the past few years. Therefore, I deemed it of utmost importance to bring to light anything which might conceivably interfere with legislative attempts to assist small independent loggers and lumbermen.

Yesterday I received two additional letters on this same subject, one dated August 22 addressed to me by Mr. Mortimer B. Doyle, of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association and another of the same date from SBA Administrator Barnes. The latter appears to have been prompted by a request from NLMA, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Doyle's and Mr. Barnes' letters be inserted at this point in my remarks, together with copies of two letters attached to Mr. Barnes' communication.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL LUMBER MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION,
August 22, 1958.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your letter of August 15, enclosing a tear sheet from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 14, which concern an exchange of correspondence between your office and ours relative to the effect of the Small Business Act on the procurement of Government timber by small operators.

We are quite surprised and puzzled, as stated in my letter of August 12, by the comments you made in the Senate on August 5 to the effect that a spokesman for this association had suggested to the Small Business Administration that it not implement the provision of law referred to. As was pointed out in my letter of August 12, our representatives had, on the contrary, assured the Small Business Administration of our helpful cooperation.

The letter you received from Wendell Barnes, Administrator of the SBA, dated July 30, which was printed on page 17614 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, apparently accounts for your misunderstanding of our position. Upon reading Mr. Barnes' letter, our general counsel, Henry Bahr, and the director of our forestry and economics division, A. Z. Nelson, immediately called upon Mr. Donald A. Hipkin, Deputy Administrator of SBA, with whom they had previously discussed the problems of administration of the act and to whom our cooperation had been offered. Mr. Hipkin assured them there must have been some misunderstanding and offered to correct the record.

We are now in receipt of a copy of a letter dated August 22 from Mr. Barnes to you, stating that he was in error in identifying the National Lumber Manufacturers Association in the manner expressed in his letter to you of July 30. We hope that you will see fit to insert Mr. Barnes' letter of August 12 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that any misunderstanding as to our position will be corrected.

Sincerely,
MORTIMER M. DOYLE.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., August 22, 1958.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In all fairness to the National Lumber Manufacturers Association, I must now advise you that the reference to them in my letter of July 30, 1958, was in error. My staff advises that the reference should have been to the Western Forest Industries Association and not the National Lumber Manufacturers Association.

I regret the mistake in identity which caused the error in my letter of July 30. For your information, I am enclosing copies of correspondence between the Small Business Administration and the National Lumber Manufacturers Association.

Sincerely yours,
WENDELL B. BARNES,
Administrator.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C. August 8, 1958.

Mr. HENRY BAHR,
Vice President and General Counsel,
National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BAHR: Thank you for your letter of August 5, 1958, concerning our discussion of the Small Business Act of 1958.

We are busy gathering information concerning the lumber industry and procurement of Government timber, in order that procedures can be developed for effective implementation of the statutory requirements.

You may be assured that any procedures implemented will have been carefully developed and coordinated with other interested Government agencies and discussed with interested Members of Congress. We have always endeavored to guard against hasty or precipitate action in implementing previous provisions of our act.

We appreciate your efforts to gather information which will be useful to us. We also appreciate Mr. A. Z. Nelson's telephone assurance of cooperation by your association.

Very truly yours,
DONALD A. HIPKINS,
Deputy Administrator.

NATIONAL LUMBER MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., August 5, 1958.

Mr. DONALD A. HIPKINS,
Deputy Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HIPKINS: This is a somewhat belated note of appreciation for the opportunity you and Mr. T. J. Waale afforded Mr. Hagenstein, Mr. Nelson, and myself to meet you on July 25 and to discuss the Small Business Act as it may relate to the disposal of Government timber.

We are mindful of your invitation to provide you with any suggestions we have regarding the operation of the Small Business Act as it may apply to the lumber industry and to the procurement of Government timber. At the present time we are trying to obtain information as a basis for doing so. To this end, we have written Senator WAYNE MORSE asking him for answers to a number of questions on this matter and have also written the United States Forest Service. We also propose to discuss the matter with some members of the industry within the next few weeks to get suggestions which may be useful to you. A copy of our letter to the Senator is enclosed, and when a reply is received we will be happy to send you a copy. We will also pass on to you any useful suggestions we may receive.

It is our hope, which was strengthened by our conference with you, that hasty or precipitate action will not be taken on this matter by the SBA.

Sincerely,
HENRY BAHR,
Vice President and General Counsel.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Barnes' latest letter states that there was a case of mistaken identity involved in his letter of July 30, namely, that he mistakenly referred to the National Lumber Manufactures Association when he really meant to name the Western Forest Industries Association.

I had previously informed the National Lumber Manufacturers Association that I would be glad to make a full statement on the floor of the Senate in the event the suggestions NLMA was reputed to have made concerning the timber purchase amendment were not, in fact, made.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am pleased to carry out that promise by including in

the RECORD the complete correspondence that has been directed to my attention on this matter. This correspondence sets forth Administrator Barnes' statement that the letter he wrote to me on July 30 mistakenly identified the National Lumber Manufacturers Association as opposed to the small-business timber-purchase amendment. The RECORD includes NLMA's assurance of helpful cooperation to the Small Business Administration.

Correspondence in my files for June 1958, indicates that Mr. W. D. Hagenstein is executive vice president of the Industrial Forestry Association. Mr. Bahr's letter of August 5 says that Mr. Hagenstein attend the meeting of July 25 with officials of SBA. Those present, in addition to Mr. Hagenstein, were Messrs. Bahr and Nelson of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association and Hipkins and Waale of SBA.

Referring back to Administrator Barnes' letter of August 22, I observe that he has not disavowed the portion of his July 30 letter which stated that a representative of the "Industrial Forestry Association met with members of my staff and expressed opposition to the law, but also to our implementation thereof." Obviously, Mr. Barnes was then speaking of the Federal timber-disposal amendment of the recently enacted Small Business Act of 1958.

The foregoing correspondence presents the interesting situation that must have existed when Messrs. Bahr and Nelson of NLMA and Mr. Hagenstein of IFA got together with Messrs Hipkins and Waale of SBA on July 25 to discuss the Small Business Act as it may relate to the disposal of Government timber. I gather Messrs. Bahr and Nelson were assuring the Small Business Administration of their helpful cooperation while Mr. Hagenstein was expressing opposition to the Federal timber-disposal amendment to the Small Business Act and to the SBA's implementation thereof.

Mr. President, this contrast of attitudes of the two associations representing the big-business segment at the July 25 meeting with SBA officials must have been extremely confusing to officials of the Small Business Administration. Perhaps this explains Mr. Wendell Barnes' confusion, as evidenced by his letters of July 30 and August 22.

In the final analysis, I must say that I am pleased to set forth the rather extensive correspondence that has passed between the Small Business Administration, the National Lumber Manufacturers Association, and my office. I am pleased because it gives me the clear-cut statement in the NLMA letter of August 12 that NLMA did not oppose the small-business timber-disposal amendment, and its statement in the letter of August 22 that it has assured the Small Business Administration of its helpful cooperation. At this point the only thing that would make me more pleased about the entire situation would be similar assurances from the Industrial Forestry Association and the Western Forest Industries Association.

Subsequently, Mr. MORSE introduced a joint resolution (S. J. Res. 203) to provide for the withdrawal of the United States forces in Lebanon, which was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

BLUNDERING OF THE ADMINISTRATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the following columns from Lippmann, Childs, and Alsop bear upon the great blundering the administration has been guilty of in the Middle East. I intended to discuss that record of blundering shortly. However, before I do it, I want to pay my respects to Lippmann, Childs, and Alsop for the great job of fearless journalism they have done on the subject of the Middle East. We have lost great face around the world because of the President's and the Secretary of State's serious mistakes in the Middle East. It is reassuring to have such columnists as Lippmann, Childs, and Alsop write the truth about our Middle East blunders for the people to read.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the articles referred to.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABOUT THE U. N.

(By Joseph Alsop)

NEW YORK.—In the last fortnight the American Government has used the United Nations—and "used" is the right word—to distract the country's attention from the total defeat of the American policy in the Middle East.

By any practical test, for example, the President's loudly touted speech to the General Assembly of the U. N. was a quite exceptionally unimportant event. The President looked well. He said what he had to say with vigor and apparent conviction. He was received with the applause that was due to his great post and his obvious good intentions.

But, in fact, the President's speech and the program it embodied and the forthcoming U. N. resolution that will probably endorse the Eisenhower program in a qualified way are all equally meaningless. They will not save Jordan or Lebanon from the fate that hangs over them. They have not prevented Saudi Arabia from accepting Egyptian suzerainty—and this seems to be what the Saudi Crown Prince Faisal has just done in Cairo. They will not rescue Iraq. They offer no protection against Nasser to Kuwait and the other oil sheikdoms of the Persian Gulf.

Preventing Gamal Abdel Nasser's triumph in all these countries has been the sole object of America's Middle Eastern policy ever since our Government recovered from its strange orgy of self-righteousness during the Suez crisis.

The American policy has now been shatteringly defeated, with incalculable future effect. What has happened here in the United Nations has not altered or diminished the defeat in any way at all.

In a democracy, ugly but important facts that the country needs to understand and face ought not to be given a hucksterish coverup. The U. N. has very obviously been exploited to provide a coverup in this instance. Hence, it must be admitted that this reporter began his inquiry into the present goings-on at the U. N. in an unfriendly mood.

What does one find, after making such an inquiry? First of all unhappily, 99 percent of all the solemn things that are said and written about the United Nations are pretty much drivel. The lack of practical effectiveness of the President's speech to the General Assembly is only a symbol of the lack of practical effectiveness of the whole process, which is always reported as though it were effective.

But because of their own public opinion, the United States and the other Western powers may be hampered and hamstrung by the decisions of the U. N. But the U. N.'s decisions are meaningless to the Soviet Union as Hungary proved. The U. N. will not stop Gamal Abdel Nasser for one moment as present events in the Middle East are proving. The U. N. is even meaningless to the grand Pecksniffs of the modern world, the Indians, as is proven by the case of Kashmir. The U. N. can hurt us, in other words; but it is powerless to police or hurt any nation great or small that will not be policed.

But this very fact that the U. N. can hurt us still needs to be considered in the balance. For this reason it is worth having a sort of LYNDON JOHNSON of the United Nations in the person of Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.

The truth is that a double standard of international morality, typified by United Nations Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold, is now an accepted fact. Hammarskjold and others like him ducked and dodged and pleaded and equivocated in order to avoid doing anything serious about the bloody massacre in Budapest. But Hammarskjold and the others like him might well have joined to inflict a public humiliation on the United States because of the entirely bloodless, officially invited landing in Beirut. With enormous efforts, Lodge has probably averted this kind of public humiliation. This is already something gained. Then the United Nations coverup is positively convenient, when the great nations of the West have decided not to stand by their friends any longer and wish to put the best possible face on their decision to throw their friends to the wolves. In reality, the United States has already abandoned its friends in Lebanon. The United States and Britain are also quite plainly preparing to abandon brave young King Hussein in Jordan. (Remember when we sent the Sixth Fleet, and the President declared that Jordan's independence was essential to the United States?) If such abandonments are unavoidable, it is no doubt better to transfer the onus to the local parliament of man.

So much, unfortunately, is all that any realistic man can say in favor of these strange U. N. goings-on.

JORDAN MAY COST UNITED STATES $200 MILLION

(By Marquis Childs)

UNITED NATIONS, N. Y.—While the American taxpayer has not yet heard about it, the United Nations settlement of the Jordanian crisis will mean a bill to be paid by the Government of the United States at the rate of about $125 million to $200 million a year.

This is the estimate of the U. N. Secretariat, which is planning the recommendations which Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold will take with him when he goes to Amman and Beirut. The figure which the U. N. staff has arrived at is based solely on the cost of shoring up the economy and the Military Establishment in Jordan. It does not cover any of the long-term improvements which must come if the whole operation is to be anything more than a mere standstill arrangement for maintaining a precarious stability.

The British have made it quite clear that they can pay no part of the bill for stabilizing the regime in Jordan. They are paying the cost of sustaining their own troops and they have said that they can do no more. Not so long ago they paid for a large share of the Jordanian Military Establishment when Glubb Pasha, out of another and simpler era, was the real power in the country. The cost was about $90 million a year.

But that day is gone forever as the Macmillan government in London proceeds to cut its losses and scale forces still committed in odd corners of the earth. So the Middle East baby ends up in Washington's lap. The U. N. presence is a beneficent disguise.

This should really surprise no one, for it is a process that has been going on ever since the end of World War II. Several references have been made during this polite talkathon to President Truman's resolute action in taking responsibility for saving Greece when the Communists, with help from across the border, were threatening to wage civil war.

That necessity was abruptly deposited on the American doorstep when the British, whose responsibility that area had been for many decades, found they could no longer afford it. The burden of worldwide orderkeeping was simply beyond the island kingdom in the aftermath of a war that largely depleted its external assets.

Moreover, with Jordan as the latest example the United States can expect this to go on happening. For many months the British have been saying that they must soon pass on or, in any event, share the heavy cost of maintaining the airbase on Cyprus and keeping the warring Turks and Cypriots from annihilating each other. Only the fact that this blood feud continues to tear the island apart has prevented the British from trying to work out some solution that will relieve them of a tariff that comes due with monotonous regularity.

For reasons complex and varied in each instance the dependence on American help seems to be unending. In this connection Formosa, South Vietnam, and South Korea are the wards that immediately come to mind.

Here is an object lesson in relation to Jordan. Merely by paying the rescue costs, up to perhaps $200 million a year, it may be possible to keep this essential buffer in existence. But without very much larger expenditures to try to make it a vital and going concern the prospect is for an indefinite guardianship. And it is not pleasant to think of King Hussein in the role of another and younger Chiang Kai-shek. That will, of course, be the easiest way out when with some semblance of stability the British troops have departed and the crisis is no longer in the headlines.

Lebanon, which was before the current troubles a thriving commercial community, is relatively simple. The Lebanese have asked for $100 million in American aid to restore their economy and while this may be too much, as Washington is now saying, it will be primarily a task of rehabilitation that will have a terminal date.

In Jordan a new entity must be put together. If this is merely a patching job, with the temporary props held in place by American help, we shall see another uneasy guardianship that can have no end except the negative one of holding off disaster. And as the bill for such guardianships grows larger and larger the taxpayer may eventually come to feel that the whole business is a waste of money.

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

THE UNHEEDED ALARMS

A week ago Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY made a powerful and impassioned speech about the prediction, which is widely supported among experts, that within a few years the Soviet Union will be far ahead of us in the big strategic missiles. The period of our inferiority is estimated to be from 1960 to 1964 when the Soviet Union will, according to these estimates, have the power to destroy our Air Force and to devastate "85 percent of our industry, 43 of our 50 largest cities."

Senator KENNEDY's speech was applauded by the Democratic Senators who took part in the debate. The fact of the matter is that the speech contained nothing that could be news to the Russians, nothing that has not been said publicly many times before. The most notable occasion when it was said before was on January 23 of this year, during this session of Congress, in the unanimous report of the so-called Preparedness Subcommittee.

This subcommittee heard some 70 witnesses, interviewed some 200 experts, and took about 7,000 pages of testimony. It reported unanimously that the Soviet Union leads in ballistic missiles and in the number of submarines, that it will soon surpass this country in manned bombers. It reported too what is even more significant and portentous, that "the Soviet Union has a system which enables it to develop new weapons in substantially less time than the United States" and that "the Soviet Union is producing scientists and technicians at a rate substantially greater than our own country." If this is true, the lead of the Soviet Union will increase and the gap will not be closed.

Perhaps the most important question raised by Senator KENNEDY's speech is why, in view of the subcommittee report in January at the beginning of the session, he did not deliver this speech until August 14 at the very end of the session. What has been happening between January, when the alarm was sounded, and August, when Mr. KENNEDY sounded it again? What happened, it is plain enough, is that the failure to respond to the alarm was in both parties, and that there is no discernible difference between the attitude of the Eisenhower administration and that of the Democratic opposition. A few Democratic Senators have made speeches which are on the record but the party as an organization has reacted to the warning as the President himself has reacted.

The bipartisan reaction to the discovery that the Soviet Union is forging ahead in the race of armaments has been governed, I think, by the human propensity to prefer a disagreeable fact which is still in the future to a disagreeable remedy in the present. The danger period, according to these calculations, will not begin for at least 2 years; the remedial measures to cope with it ought to have been laid down in this session of Congress. The bipartisan leadership has avoided the disagreeable remedies, hoping that somehow the alarming predictions of Senators SYMINGTON, JACKSON, and KENNEDY and of Mr. Joseph Alsop will not come true.

Indeed, so far as I know, there does not exist an agreed program of what the disagreeable remedies are. Mr. KENNEDY made a few suggestions but he offered no program; and, although the Democratic opposition is very critical of President Eisenhower, there is no alternative Democratic program before the country.

Why is it like that? I think it is because the real problem—the relatively greater speed of Soviet technological development—cannot be overcome by a spending program alone. It would be quite easy to push Congress into new and bigger expenditures. But what the experts call the missile lag is essentially a weakness in American education and a lack of seriousness in American national purposes, when there is choice between private pleasures and the public interest. We are in competition with a new society which is in deadly earnest, and there is no use pretending that, amidst our comforts and our pleasures, we are serious enough.

That is why, when the alarms are sounded, we turn over and go to sleep again.

THE HOSE IS SWITCHED

(By Joseph Alsop)

While the debate about the Middle East goes windily onward in the United Nations, no one is paying much attention to the many signs of a menacing shift in Communist world policy.

A similar shift occurred after the acute Formosa crisis in the spring of 1955. At that time, the Kremlin switched its pressure hose to the new task of washing out the Western positions in the Middle East. Thereafter, the Far East, which had been so stormy, became temporarily quiescent. But now all the Western positions in the Middle East have been pretty successfully washed out. And another switch of the pressure hose, back to the Far East, now seems to be taking place.

The key preparatory episode was the Peking meeting of Mao Tse-tung and Nikita Khrushchev. Concerning this meeting, much still remains mysterious. But the appearances suggest that the Chinese used their great influence inside the Soviet Communist Party as a lever in order to force Khrushchev into doing several things he cannot possibly have wished to do.

For example, retention of the Soviet monopoly of the absolute weapons is clearly the most vital Russian interest in Russia's relationship with China. Nothing else insures Russian supremacy within the Communist bloc. Yet, reports from Warsaw now suggest that Khrushchev has agreed to hand over to China nuclear weapons and the rockets to deliver them with. If this is true, it is an extraordinary development.

These Warsaw reports can also be read, however, simply as a psychological preparation for quite another development, which there are more solid reasons to expect. As soon as the news of the Mao-Khrushchev meeting was received, it was suggested in this space that the meeting probably presaged a renewed Chinese Communist threat to Formosa's offshore islands and perhaps to Formosa itself. It can now be stated, on highest authority, that the American policymakers believe such a threat is on the way.

The hard evidence for this belief is the military redeployment, especially of air units, that the Chinese Communists have carried out in the last month. Something like two-thirds of their entire 2,700-plane air force has now been concentrated on airfields in the three provinces—Chekian, Kwantung, and Fukien—which are within striking distance of Formosa. A whole complex of new airfields very close to Quemoy and the Matsu Islands has suddenly been occupied by Chinese Communist jet squadrons.

The Chinese Nationalist air units on Formosa are thus outnumbered by at least 3 to 1. Worse still, the best aircraft the United States has given to Chiang Kai-shek's air force are the wholly obsolete F–84 and F–86 fighters. The main Communist strength consists of the vastly superior MIG–17 fighters. And even the Chinese Communist jet bombers, the IL–28's, should do well in any combat with the ancient fighters the Nationalists must use.

In these circumstances, it is clear that the Chinese Communists can beat down any opposition Formosa may offer and can establish an air blockade of Quemoy and the Matsus. If these little islands close to the China coast can no longer be supplied from Formosa, they cannot be held by Formosa. If the Chinese Communists move to establish such an air blockade, the American policymakers will, therefore, have to choose between surrendering these islands, as the Tachen Islands were surrendered in 1955, or using American military power to break the air blockade.

Worse still, as Admiral Stump greatly angered the President by pointing out, American military power in the Pacific is now immeasurably weaker, in terms of men and ships and planes, than it was when the Korean war broke out. If the offshore islands are to be saved by the blockade that is now feared, nuclear weapons will almost certainly

have to be used to save them—which is the very opposite of an agreeable prospect.

The policymakers are, therefore, deeply split by this question they see rushing down upon them. One faction says we simply cannot drop A-bombs and H-bombs for the sake of Quemoy and the Matsus. The other faction points out, quite rightly, that surrender of the offshore islands will be a heavy blow to American prestige in Asia, which will set off a chain reaction of other very grave political consequences, beginning on Formosa itself.

No one says what is also true—that the whole question was handmade by the Eisenhower administration. For Chiang Kai-shek never used to have regular troops on the offshore islands. He was quite brutally pressured into putting his troops there by the American Government. The purpose was to give some color of reality to the famous unleashing that was the first gesture of our dynamic new foreign policy.

U. N. CONCEALING DEEP DIVISIONS

(By Marquis Childs)

UNITED NATIONS, N. Y.—By the slenderest of fictions, the United Nations is concealing the deep divisions of bloc against bloc that make any direct and positive action impossible. While the fiction may be a necessary screen for the reshuffle of power that must now take place in the Middle East, it should deceive no one.

The West, once the Iraqi revolution had occurred, was confronted with a familiar situation—a crisis in which the choice was between action, swift and improvised and desperate, or unrelieved catastrophe. It was possible to buy a little time with the use of armed forces to hold a precarious status quo.

But so much had happened before that the choices, as we see in this emergency session of the General Assembly, are so limited as to be almost nonexistent. The state of Jordan, which has itself been a kind of slender fiction, must somehow be sustained through the offices of Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold.

If he succeeds, he will have greatly enhanced not so much the U. N. as his own reputation for "quiet diplomacy." He may even have advanced somewhat the potentiality of an effective U. N. executive. If he fails, then the flames of a new conflict will put in jeopardy the whole precarious structure of a peace that the U. N., for all its weaknesses, has helped to hold together.

What many delegates have been saying wistfully during the past week is that if only President Eisenhower's program for the Middle East had been put forward 6 years ago, or 4 years ago, or even 2 years ago, the crisis that evoked it might never have occurred.

That is another way of saying that once a crisis is upon us, it is almost, by definition, too late for a program. The deterioration has gone too far. The hatreds have become too bitter.

It is in the angry boiling up of a crisis that the Russians are able, by the techniques of ruthlessness they know so well, to push harder and harder; to exploit to the last inch an advantage that knows no restraints of public opinion or previously declared positions. That is what Andrei Gromyko has been doing, not with the flair and the cynical unconcern of some of his predecessors but with a stubborn, unyielding, unrelenting determination.

In the sober case that he made for the U. N. as a stabilizer in a dangerously unstable world, Sir Leslie Munro, president of the General Assembly, on Sunday's "Meet the Press" radio and television program was asked why, when the Suez crisis of nearly 2 years ago had so clearly revealed the need, the U. N. had not moved to create a permanent emergency force. His frank answer was: procrastination.

This is the besetting sin of the West and in the end it may prove to be a fatal habit. One of the recommendations in President Eisenhower's speech of last week was for a permanent U. N. force that could move quickly to prevent a crisis from happening or damp it down at the beginning. If such a force had been available for Lebanon and Jordan, the United States and Britain would not now be in the awkward position of having to negotiate the departure of their troops as a condition to any approach to a settlement.

There is another situation, which has all the elements of a hideous crisis, about which the U. N. and the West have procrastinated year after year. Nearly a million Arab refugees out of the Palestinian war have been confined in refugee camps scattered through the Arab States. Living on 7 cents a day provided by the U. N.—most of it from the United States—they have demanded the right to return to their former homes in territory now claimed by Israel.

The chief danger is in Jordan, where several hundred thousand of these miserably unhappy people are fiercely opposed to the shaky regime of King Hussein. They have provided many of the recruits for the terrorism that the King with his loyal troops is trying to suppress.

Yet the procrastination continues. The compromise resolution before the Assembly is the barest minimum that decency can accept. It is a patchwork of words put together with such painful effort. Now, after so much procrastination, the U. N. through its Secretary General, has to try to hold off still another crisis.

AUTHORITY OF THE PRESIDENT TO SEND TROOPS TO LEBANON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to speak on the subject of the authority of the President to send troops to Lebanon.

Millions of words have been written on the subjects of the power and the authority of the President to execute the laws, to dispose and command the Armed Forces, to use such forces defensively, offensively, and protectively of American citizens, and to make executive agreements with and commitments to foreign countries. The literature is likewise voluminous on the subjects of the power and authority of the Congress to support and make rules for the Armed Forces, to declare war, to provide for the common defense, to make foreign policy, and to give effect to treaties. The following discussion, based on a hasty review of some of the available material, may be helpful in thinking about the President's action in Lebanon:

First. The power to do something and the authority to do it under the Constitution may not coincide. The two concepts tend to merge, however, if unconstitutional exercise of power goes unchallenged. Executive action precedents have a way of changing the views that people have about what the Constitution means.

Second. In deciding whether or not an action by the President is authorized under the Constitution the following matters should be considered:

(a) The words of the Constitution: The Constitution appears to say that the Congress should decide whether or not the United States should become involved in a war and that the President should direct our forces once war is decided. If this was the intention of the founders it would seem to follow that the Congress should pass upon those foreign-policy questions which bear immediately upon the likelihood of war. The Constitution nowhere states that the President shall make foreign policy or defense policy. All the internal evidence in the document points toward a much narrower function for the President.

(b) Statutory and treaty directions to the President: The laws, treaties, and Congressional resolutions contain many statements regarding what ought to be done about defense and foreign affairs. Sometimes responsibility is placed explicitly on the President; sometimes objectives are stated generally. In either case, the President is the ultimately responsible executor under the constitutional provisions that "the executive power shall be vested in a President" (art. II, sec. 1), and that the President "shall take care the laws be faithfully executed"—(art. II, sec. 3). Bits and pieces of statutory and treaty authority can be put together to justify after the fact a wide range of Presidential actions in the absence of new specific authority in the case in question.

(c) Precedents: Since the Constitution was adopted, there have been more than 125 instances in which the President, without a decision by the Congress and without a declaration of war, has ordered forces into action or to maintain positions abroad. Many of these precedents may be inapplicable to the Lebanon situation upon close inspection. Many of them may have been unconstitutional actions. In the absence of a great constitutional debate, however, they tend to stay in mind as a body of authority for unchecked Presidential action. Certainly they considerably erode the principle that under the Constitution the Congress has a major policy-making role in matters involving war, defense, and foreign relations. The Congress should stop letting the President usurp power. Such inexcusable precedents as the sending of troops into Lebanon should be repudiated by the Congress.

The precedents are usually grouped under the following headings:

First, protection of United States citizens or their property abroad; second, protection of the honor of the United States—insult to the flag, and so forth; third, protection and expansion of foreign commerce—Commodore Perry; fourth, defense of the United States—prize cases, Florida 1818, Texas 1845, Latin American interventions, Iceland and British bases 1941; fifth, execution of a treaty; sixth, occupation of vanquished nations—Germany and Japan; and, seventh, carrying out statutory policy. The largest class is the first listed. The Constitution does not specifically mention such a duty on the part of the President. It is only partly covered by statute. It has been asserted by the courts that this duty inheres in the grant of Executive power.[1]

---

[1] *Durand* v. *Hollins* (4 Blatch 451, 454–455; (1860) 8 Fed. Cas. 111, 112).

Similar argumentation is made to justify Presidential actions without Congressional authorization where the defense of the United States has been given as the ground for the actions.

Some precedents, like the sending by Roosevelt in peacetime—1941—of troops to Iceland at its request, not to fight but to stand by to protect its independence against the possibility of aggression by Germany, are close to the Lebanon case. However, two wrongs do not make a right. Roosevelt should have sought Congressional sanction. It is part of our check-and-balance system.

(d) Congressional approval: First, there is the question of opportunity and time for Congressional action. Is Congress in session? Is there time for consultation, legislative action, or debate? There has never been any quarrel over the proposition that if the country is attacked the President need not wait for Congressional approval before ordering retaliation. This is the rare and easy case, but the assertion goes only to the question of which branch of government should act first. It may well be argued that Congress should perform its policymaking role even though there is nothing controversial to debate.

In the more common and difficult case, there is time for Congressional action in the sense that action is physically possible, but the President acts anyway for a variety of practical reasons. Debate in Congress may take too long, may tip off the enemy, may divide opinion in the country, may hinder effective discussion with allies, and so forth. The more these factors are present the greater the tendency to conclude that Congressional approval, either before or after the President's action, should not be sought. However, that doesn't justify an attempt on the part of a President to execute authoritarian power.

If it be true that Congress has a duty to decide for itself the policy question on which the President has already taken action, this duty has often not been done, or, when done, has been done in ambiguous ways. What is effective approval? Silence? Numerous speeches of commendation of the President? Special appropriations to pay for the troop movement? General appropriations which include the cost of the troop movement? Defeat of a resolution condemning the action? Defeat of a bill directing reversal of the action?

(e) Court decisions—some helpful analyses of the problems discussed in this speech have been made by the courts.[3] These decisions, however, are always rendered long after Presidential action, perhaps undisputed, was taken. They never reflect legal arguments between opposing branches of the Government but arguments by the executive branch against a private party or between two private parties over some incidental effect of the Presidential action. There is perhaps a tendency due to these circumstances for the courts to conclude that what was done was properly done.

[3] *United States* v. *Curtiss Wright Corp.* (299 U. S. 304, 319–20 (1936)); *The Prize Cases* (2 Black 635 (1863)).

(f) Grounds given by the President for acting—theoretically, it may not matter what reason or authority the President gives for his action if there exists in fact a valid reason or authority. Similarly, one good reason is enough even if mixed with invalid ones. Nevertheless, the reason given is important to any debate on the constitutionality of the action taken. The Congress, courts, and the people are likely to accept the President's assertion unless challenged.

Third. The growth of the power of the President beyond what the founders imagined has often been pointed out. Strangely enough, however, the older precedents for Presidential troop action without Congressional approval would be unthinkable now; for instance, sending the fleet to bombard a foreign town so as to loosen up commerce, as the President did in Japan in 1863. The literature nevertheless contains statements to the effect that the power of Congress to declare war is anachronistic, that the making of defense and foreign policy is, for all practical purposes at least, the President's responsibility subject to obtaining treaty approval from time to time and appropriations and other necessary implementing legislation. Maybe so, but if so the Constitution needs to be amended to reflect such a reassignment of functions. Meanwhile Senators should guard against further erosion of the Congressional powers in the field of foreign policy.

Fourth. In the Lebanon crisis, the President acted without Congressional sanction. He acted arbitrarily and without showing a desired sensitivity to democratic checks. In his message to Congress on the Lebanon situation, President Eisenhower cited no authority for stationing troops there. He gave two reasons: first, protection of American lives, and second, to preserve Lebanon's independence. He said the latter action would "strengthen principles upon which the safety and security of the United States depend."

As pointed out earlier, there are numerous precedents for sending troops to protect citizens without Congressional authorization. Whether troops were necessary and have been used for that purpose in Lebanon is a factual question. The other ground cited by the President, preserving Lebanon's independence, would not seem adequate unless somehow related to the defense of the United States.

The question next to be answered is which branch of the Government should have acted first. The facts of the Lebanon case show that a commitment to send troops was made long before they were sent. The constitutionality of this commitment could be questioned; even if there was not time to ask Congress for approval after the Iraq revolution, and this is disputable, there clearly was time for a Congressional policy decision on the wisdom of making the prior commitment. Nevertheless, the President at the time of the commitment through the newspapers, did nothing about it. Later, after the landing ships had started moving toward the beach, there was consultation between the President and certain Congressional leaders, but no legislative action.

These constitutional issues could be raised in the Congress most directly by including them in a resolution or bill of disapproval such as I shall discuss later.

Fifth. What responsibility does the Congress now have? If it be correct that the Congress should approve or disapprove of the policy being followed, or enunciate another national policy, with regards to the use of American forces in Lebanon, how should this be done? If approval is the proper course, it is submitted that silent approval is not enough. At this point in time, however, a resolution of approval, even for those who agree with the policy, may seem superfluous. If disapproval is the proper course, there are various procedures which could be followed: Senate resolution, concurrent resolution, joint resolution, or bill. Unless one of the latter two devices were used, the President could ignore the resolution, and those opposing such measures would have the additional argument that they were gestures anyway. The constitutional and policy issues discussed in this paragraph would be clearly raised in a joint resolution like the following:

Resolved, etc., That within 30 days after the enactment of this joint resolution [act] the intervention of United States forces in Lebanon shall cease and all such forces shall be withdrawn.

Such a joint resolution would be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, if the Legislative Reorganization Act is adhered to. If passed and approved by the President, the troops presumably would be withdrawn. It is conceivable that under some circumstances such a withdrawal would have fewer harmful foreign political consequences than a withdrawal otherwise required, such as a withdrawal required by an adverse vote in an organ of the United Nations. If the joint resolution were vetoed by the President and repassed by a two-thirds vote of both Houses, the President would either comply or precipitate a constitutional crisis.

Mr. President, I close by saying that the President should be repudiated by the American people for his unconstitutional act in sending marines into Lebanon.

OREGON NIGHT AT THE WATERGATE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the 85th Congress in its duration has provided many memories. Among the most pleasant to me personally, was an evening last July when Mrs. Morse and I were privileged to hear a brilliant performance by the Federation of Musicians of my State song. It was a wonderful evening for the Oregon Congressional delegation to have the opportunity to join with so many of our friends in welcoming our fellow Oregonian Herman Kenin into his high office as president of the American Federation of Musicians. It was a night also of personal triumph for Congressman CHARLES PORTER whose campaign for adequate recognition of our

State song, Oregon, My Oregon, culminated in a most successful production enjoyed by the 7,000 who were at the Watergate that night. I know that to both Mrs. Morse and myself, it was one of the major events of this past year. I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Oregon Night Huge Success" which appeared in the August issue of Hi Notes, a publication of the District of Columbia Federation of Musicians appear in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON NIGHT HUGE SUCCESS

Thanks to the efforts of many fine people—including the weatherman—the July 23 concert at the Watergate sponsored by the American Federation of Musicians that featured personal appearances by the Oregon Congressional delegation, newly elected AFM President Herman D. Kenin and a symphonic arrangement of the Oregon State song by Toby Tyler was, to put it mildly, a tremendous success.

The program which, in the main, consisted of melodies from hit Broadway musicals, was conducted by Dr. Henry Goldstein, while Eddie Pierce led the national anthem and Realtor Eddie Carr's I Love Washington, with Toby Tyler conducting his own score of Oregon, My Oregon. The vocals were handled in top form by our good friend and NBC's outstanding personality, Gene Archer. A wonderful change of pace in the program was afforded by the piano team of Helen Myers and Mel Clement who impressed an audience of 7,000 with their ability and myriad selections.

A 25-minute segment of the concert, which included the specially arranged Oregon State song, was broadcast over the facilities of the Mutual Broadcasting System—some 400 stations—and to Brother Phil Lampkin we are indebted for this. Congressman CHARLES O. PORTER, who has been seeking recognition of the Oregon song, and President Kenin were also heard during the broadcast.

Secretary J. Martin Emerson, whose idea it was for the event, formally opened the evening's activities by introducing Oregon Senator WAYNE MORSE who, after a few remarks and recognition of his colleagues in Congress, introduced President Sam Jack Kaufman. President Kaufman then emceed the program in his inimitable Capitol Theater style.

The night that was set aside to salute the State of Oregon and provide a showcase for President Kenin turned out to be a full day for the latter. A high-level luncheon with Assistant Secretary of Defense Charles Finucane and his staff took place in the early afternoon, with a meeting following which was attended by James G. Dunton and Samuel Silver, Office of Public Services at the Pentagon, and President Kenin, Attorney Henry Kaiser, Public Relations Director Hal Leyshon, as well as local 161 officers, President Kaufman, Secretary Emerson, and Treasurer Woods.

The climate of the meeting, which saw both sides take up matters pertaining to the use of service bands, was such that it is believed a much better understanding now exists and that President Kenin made a profound impression upon the Pentagon officials, to the end the federation will now be in a position to more ably assist locals in problems dealing with illegal service band competition.

There wasn't much time after the luncheon, as a preconcert buffet was scheduled for 6 p. m. With Congressman and Mrs. Charles O. Porter hosting, the 2-hour refreshment period provided a unique setting for prominent Oregonians to renew acquaintances. Senator and Mrs. Morse made it in time for a quick bite, while Mrs. Richard Neuberger was a welcome replacement for her Senator-husband, who had a previous speaking engagement. Congresswoman EDITH GREEN and her sons were there, as were Congressman and Mrs. Al Ullman. Many other distinguished Oregonians were present to meet President Kenin in whose honor the affair was given.

The concert that followed was brilliantly performed by an orchestra of 58 of our finest musicians, and the rendition of the Oregon State song was inspiring. As was overheard: "The way the orchestra played our Oregon State song, it made you feel proud to be an Oregonian."

It was a great day—and night—for the American Federation of Musicians and the people of Oregon. Much in the way of good public relations was accomplished, and the press coverage was excellent—all because Congressman PORTER wanted to hear more of his State song at Washington functions he attends and the timely fact that our new president, Herman Kenin, happens to hail from Oregon. An idea that paid off in terrific dividends for all who took part—and to each we extend our profound gratitude.

ADMISSION OF CERTAIN EVIDENCE—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11477) to amend chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for the admission of certain evidence, and for other purposes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to add the statement that the House of Representatives has already adjourned, that this is the only forum now which can afford protection to the community of people in the District of Columbia and throughout the United States who are victims of crimes of violence. Every protection that can be thrown about a person accused of crime is retained by the language of this conference report. The only persons who can lose now are those persons who are the victims of crimes of violence.

I yield the floor.

TRIBUTE TO THE MINORITY LEADER

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, due to the unusual parliamentary situation which has developed during the course of the evening, whereupon the hour of adjournment has been somewhat uncertain, a number of us on this side of the aisle have been awaiting an opportunity to express ourselves with regard to the fact that tonight or this morning will comprise the last period in the Senate of the very distinguished leader of the minority [Mr. KNOWLAND] when we adjourn the session in which we are now participating.

When we adjourn this session in which we are now participating, he will leave his high post in the Senate and return to his native State of California.

Due to the fact that it is 2:20 in the morning, and apparently nobody anticipates any business being conducted in the Senate at this late hour, a great many of the Republican Members who had intended to express some words of felicitation to our beloved leader have gone to their respective homes. However, several Members have asked me to convey to the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], on behalf of them as well as myself, our feeling of deep appreciation for the fine leadership which he has given the minority since he ascended to the high post of minority leader. We have found him always courteous, we have found him always kind, we have found him always courageous in undertaking those responsibilities which go with that high office.

We have respected him as a leader of the minority, because, in fact, BILL KNOWLAND was a leader of the Republican minority of the Senate.

He grasped that concept of leadership which, I believe, is important in this greatest of all deliberative chambers; that is, a leader of the Senate is, precisely, a leader not of his party but of the members of his party who comprise that segment of the Senate of which he is a part.

We have found in dealing with BILL KNOWLAND that he is easy to consult with, he is considerate of the views of others, and once he has determined upon a course of action he goes forward with all the vigor, force, and persuasion of his great personality.

I think it was David Starr Jordan who at one time said that the world has a habit of getting out of the way of a man who knows where he wants to go. BILL KNOWLAND is that type of man. He was that type of leader. As he goes back to California, he will carry with him, when he goes, the admiration and affection, I am sure, not only of every member of the minority, who, by virtue of our political affiliation, perhaps, have worked with him a bit more closely than Members on the other side of the aisle, but, also, I am sure, he will carry a rich measure of devotion and admiration from every Member of the United States Senate.

I am sorry that the approach of adjournment has been as it has been tonight, but I did not want this opportunity to pass, even though it is early morning, and adjournment, when it does come, may come with surprising abruptness, to convey to our leader on behalf of those Republicans who are gone, as well as those who are here, our best wishes and a deep sense of appreciation for a job very, very well done.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the hour is late and I will be very brief. In the service of the very distinguished Senator from California, our minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND], we have had the opportunity to witness greatness in our time—a great student, a keen mind, a sense of patriotism, an ability to speak, and above all profound convictions and a conscience. I pay tribute to him and wish him the very best in all his endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO RETIRING SENATORS

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, in the press of business in the last few days it has been difficult, I am sure, on the part of most of us, to find time to express the sincere feeling which we have for those of our colleagues who are leaving the Senate of their own volition.

No one stands higher in my personal affection and admiration than the senior Senator from California, our beloved minority leader. He and I came to the Senate at almost the same time. I believe he came to the Senate in August, while I came in January of the same year.

We have all paid our respects to BILL KNOWLAND heretofore. I shall not repeat those respects at this time, other than to say I reiterate them and to say that my personal respects, my personal affection, and my good wishes go with him.

Other Members of the Senate are leaving of their own accord. I have already remarked about my acquaintance and my association with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is a man for whom we all have great regard, a man for whom we have great affection. We are sorry to see him go.

The Senator from Indiana is a Senator I have known for many, many years, whose courage, determination, and vigor no one can deny, and whose patriotism stands high in the annals of service to his country. We regret that we will lose his associations, but we also wish him well.

Mr. President, we are also losing the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. He has made a great contribution to the legislative accomplishments of this country. His long experience in public life and his judicious approach to the problems which confront Members of the legislative body are recognized not only here but abroad. We regret exceedingly that Senator IVES is leaving us.

Mr. President, one of the great Americans of not only this generation but perhaps of the past generation—one of the great Americans of the past two generations—Senator MARTIN of Pennsylvania, is retiring at least from this phase of his public life. I have known Senator MARTIN for many years. I first met him when he was Governor of Pennsylvania and I was Governor of Iowa. It probably is sufficient to say that he is not only an outstanding patriot, but a great defender of the American system. There is no man in America today who has done more to defend the ideals of America—as he understands them, and as I am proud to say I agree—than the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, a magnificent soldier of three wars, a great Governor of a great State, a great statesman, a great patriot, and a great friend.

Tonight, Mr. President, it is with regret and with considerable sentiment, I will add, that I personally say "adieu" to these men—men who have been my friends over the years, men whose association in an official capacity will be terminated tonight but whose friendship, association, and acquaintance over the years I firmly hope will continue. It has been a great stimulus to me to know these men. It has been a great help in my own attitude toward public affairs and the performance of my duty.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, on other occasions I have paid tribute to each of the members of the minority who are retiring from the Senate at the conclusion of this term, and I shall not try to mention each of them now or repeat what I have said on other occasions. But on this closing night of the 2d session of the 85th Congress, I wish to pay particular tribute to the service of the distinguished minority leader, the great Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

I have been proud to be a Member of the Senate. I have been proud to be a member of his party when he as minority leader, and for a time the majority leader of the Senate, has spoken the words of a leader on the floor of the Senate. I have said to other people, people from my own State of South Dakota and to others in the gallery, that when Senator KNOWLAND takes the floor and speaks, one can be proud to be an American. Sometimes I have thought that of the men I have known in public life, he might more nearly be compared to the great statesman of England of our generation, Winston Churchill, than anyone I have known. He is a rock of integrity. He is a rock of patriotism. He is a man of character in every sense of the word.

I do not know what the future holds for him, but I cannot personally believe that a man of his ability, his character, and his leadership is closing the door to public service when he leaves the Senate this year. I have confidence that in the days ahead, in times of stress and times of trouble, the people of the United States will call again for the leadership of WILLIAM KNOWLAND of California.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in expressing my high regard for the distinguished minority leader, the senior Senator from California WILLIAM KNOWLAND. There is not much I can add to what I have said over the years in the Senate about BILL KNOWLAND. I have for him a great admiration and affection. He has been an extremely able United States Senator, and he has been an outstanding leader for the Republican Party. I believe the country is better because of men of ability, integrity, and a capacity like BILL KNOWLAND, and when he leaves us I know all of us are going to miss him because of the many contributions he has made. We wish him well in the years ahead.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I, too, wish to speak a few words of tribute to the Senator from California. As a Senator of the United States there are personal relationships that far exceed in importance and significance political relationships. The Senator from California and I have disagreed in our many years together in the Senate on a great many issues because of some basic disagreements we have on political philosophy. The Senator from California and I, however, have stood together also on a great many issues.

I shall always point with pride to the fact that I believe the Senator from California has always recognized that I happened to be the first in the early days immediately to support him in regard to a position that he took in connection with the Communist threat and the importance of keeping ourselves so militarily strong that the Russians would always understand that they had everything to lose and nothing to gain from an aggressive course of action against us or the rest of the Free World.

In spite of all our deep political differences, based upon a difference in my judgment between liberalism and conservatism, I wish to say to my friend from California tonight that in my judgment I have been greatly enriched as a result of my many years of association with him. I have been befriended by him on many occasions, and I wish to express to him, as he sits now possibly for the last hour in the Senate of the United States, at least for some time, my deep appreciation for his friendship.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am sure that as the distinguished Senator from California closes at least this part of his career tonight that he does so with some regret. Yet I believe that he should also have deep satisfaction, because he has been an outstanding Member of the Senate and because he has led his party in the Senate. But even more I believe he should have an even greater sense of satisfaction because he has impressed upon the people of this country great and unusual qualities of mind and of character. The people of the country know him as a man who is devoted to duty, a man of deep and strong convictions, a man of unimpeachable integrity.

I am myself sure that BILL KNOWLAND has not left public life, and that it will be just a short time until he will again be very active in the public life of his State and of our country. So I join with others in wishing him continued success in all the years ahead.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I, too, wish to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to our distinguished minority leader, WILLIAM KNOWLAND. I speak from the desk of my senior colleague [Mr. IVES] who also will be leaving us, to my very deep regret, and about whom I have expressed my views and affection before, because I know that the Senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] would consider it a privilege if he were here to speak his views; therefore I bespeak his views as well as my own.

Senator KNOWLAND has an incorruptible integrity which is so marked as to move the lips of almost every one of us when we think about it. This is the one unquestioned trait of his character which stands out above any other. This is so vital to a man in public life, so tremendously important to the people, for they always want to know where their leaders in so high a place stand, that I think it deserves to be emphasized and reemphasized as all of us have done.

Mr. President, to a new Member the personal friendship, the warm touch,

the sympathy of the minority leader for one of those in his party is tremendously gratifying and tremendously heartwarming.

Finally, as Senator KNOWLAND approaches the electorate of his own State seeking a very high office, which so many of us wish to see him attain, and feel so deeply he deserves, I should like to say that one of the most distinguished performances in legislative life I have seen was Senator KNOWLAND's conduct of the fight in respect to the civil rights bill of 1957. He showed himself a leader of resourcefulness, of courage, of very deep conviction; and perhaps the greatest tribute that can be paid to him is that the bipartisan band he led had equal confidence in him, whether we were Republicans or Democrats, and I shall never forget that the night the bill was passed the very distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and I repaired at once to Senator KNOWLAND's office without any prearrangement, because both of us felt that he was the man entitled to the congratulations.

So for Senator KNOWLAND, his wife and family, as persons and friends, we wish all happiness and fruitful living, come what may, and for him as a public figure I bespeak our greatest hopes and expectations for the realization of his present aspiration of leadership in the executive capacity of his own State.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, in the closing hours of this 85th Congress, I rise to commend its leadership in the Senate. First, I pay my respects to the retiring distinguished minority leader, whose courageous integrity is surely one of the greatest in the history of this greatest legislative body in the history of the world. I know of no better way of expressing my respect for him—I know of no higher commendation that I could give him—than to say that he has truly proved himself a worthy successor to the late Robert A. Taft; that BILL KNOWLAND has filled the shoes of Bob Taft extremely well—in fact, better than anyone else could.

As an American, I want to pay tribute to the distinguished majority leader. I know of no better way to express my feeling about him than to say that, in my opinion, he is the greatest majority leader the Senate has ever had in my time.

He has shaped a brilliant record for the 85th Congress. To do so, he has had to keep his amazing combination of talents of penetrating intelligence, overwhelming persuasiveness, unrelenting firmness and drive, and unexcelled understanding of human nature and of the mental composition of every Member of this body—keep all of these remarkable talents going at full force.

All of us know the tremendous mental and physical courage it has taken for LYNDON JOHNSON to do this. The best way to characterize his dedication to his job and his country is to use LYNDON JOHNSON's own words that he has uttered to his friends when they have urged him to ease up a little and think more of himself and his health because we wanted him to stay around. To this he has replied, "I'd rather burn out than rust out." That in seven short words characterizes LYNDON JOHNSON more accurately than could hundreds of thousands of words in a book.

And I want to commend the 85th Congress as a whole, and particularly the United States Senate, for its great productive record. I invite its comparison with any other Congress in the history of our country. I challenge anyone to cite a Congress that was more bipartisan in character—a Congress that did more to place the welfare of its country and people ahead of partisan politics.

Mr. President, I have extended praise that I am sure many, many Members of this body will second—and that millions of Americans will approve. Now I am going to say a few words that certainly will not make for popularity for me. I am going to say some words of condemnation that undoubtedly will bring bitter condemnation upon me.

I am going to speak in this manner knowing full well what is in store for me as a result of doing so. I have done it before and I am perfectly willing to pay the price because I believe that it is something that needs very desperately to be said.

Mr. President, this has been a great Congress but it has one very black blot on its record. That blot is the failure to deal with the scandalous abuses of labor's right to organize and bargain collectively—the failure to protect the rank and file of labor from the sickening corruption and criminality practiced and condoned by certain labor leaders.

Extremists on both sides—those on one side who would shackle the labor movement through legislation—those on the other side who oppose any labor legislation—have effected a virtual paralysis over the Congress on labor legislation. These extremists have thus effected, in final result, a strange and unholy alliance that has acted against the best interests of Americans.

I commend the Senate for its passage of the Kennedy-Ives bill. Perhaps some of its critics are right in characterizing it as only a mild beginning of an attempt to deal with the abuses of labor's right to organize and bargain collectively. But at least it was a start and a good start. It was a constructive and reasonable start. It is a tragedy that it was not passed.

Mr. President, the responsibility for this truly black blot in the 85th Congress is not solely that of the Congress. As one asute columnist—who is acknowledged to be a vigorous and liberal champion of the cause of labor—has put it, "a dangerous condition of domestic anarchy" exists in our country today.

The responsibility for this condition of domestic anarchy must be shared with Congress by the President of the United States, the Department of Justice, the Treasury Department, and some elements of the labor movement itself from where the anarchy springs. In this connection, I am deeply proud that the labor movement in my home State of Maine has repudiated those labor leaders who have created, spread, and flaunted this domestic anarchy in the face of the Congress, the President, the Department of Justice, the Treasury Department, and the American public.

For 2 years now there has been a constant exposé of criminality, corruption, and killings in certain segments of labor. To its everlasting credit, the AFL–CIO under the courageous and honest leadership of George Meany has repudiated, condemned, and expelled these segments.

For 2 years the headlines of the papers have literally screamed with these shocking revelations. But what has happened? Almost nothing. Instead Congress has been flaunted by some irresponsible labor leaders who practically brag that they cannot be bothered to discipline their ex-convict employees—who claim that much of their income is from gambling on which they make no record or throw the records away.

And, Mr. President, what is the record on cleaning up this condition of corruption, criminality, and anarchy? The defeat of the Kennedy-Ives bill killed any constructive action by Congress.

But what about action on violations of existing law? Where has the Department of Justice been all this time? What has the Treasury Department done? If they have taken any real action it is certainly not evident.

What has happened to our country—to our leaders—to our people? Have we become so cynical and so indifferent that we can't be shocked into action?

Have those of us who say we believe in the honesty and patriotism of most union members become fearful of putting that confidence to the test? Have we become so paralyzed in the middle between the labor haters on one side and the labor anarchists on the other side that we have lost our courage to try to project a middle ground that protects the rank and file of labor from the labor anarchists without destroying the labor movement?

If the answer has to be given now in 1958, I am afraid that it must be a convicting "Yes" for both the legislative and executive branches of the Government.

TRIBUTE TO RETIRING SENATORS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], let me say only that he was a great soldier in peace and war, one who so richly merited all the acclaim that was his at the hands of the people of the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Of the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], I say only that he was a man of conviction and courage to match the hard stone for which his State is noted.

Of the man whose desk I occupy at the moment, the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], I can say that he is a man who was convinced that things are not entirely black or white, but that there are large gray areas which help to clarify the truth.

Of the distinguished junior Senator from my neighboring State of Indiana [Mr. JENNER], I may say that I know of

no person who has shown greater constancy of devotion to those ancient landmarks which were set by the Founding Fathers.

Of my boss, the minority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], I can say that seldom does one see a cartoon which so adequately portrays his character. But on an occasion when I was in California, I picked up a copy of the Los Angeles Times. It portrayed the mountains of California, and at the top was the likeness of Senator KNOWLAND. It carried the caption: "A man to match our mountains."

I could think of nothing more appropriate to describe the integrity, steadfastness, and courage of the minority leader.

As I think of that word "steadfastness," I think of its derivation. It means fast and steady. If ever in our contemporary history there was a man who in his own way, under every circumstance, and even in the face of opposition from his own administration, maintained constantly steadfastness of conviction, it is the distinguished Senator from California, Senator KNOWLAND. I applaud him for his great work well done.

ADMISSION OF CERTAIN EVIDENCE—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11477) to amend chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for the admission of certain evidence, and for other purposes.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order on the conference report. I point to rule XXVII in support of the point of order. I read the following sentence:

> If new matter is inserted in the report, or if matter which was agreed to by both Houses is stricken from the bill a point of order may be made against the report.

I have a copy of the colloquy between the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] and the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. I now read for the record in support of the point of order.

> Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?
>
> Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.
>
> Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, my colleague on the Committee on the Judiciary.
>
> Let me ask him whether the language of the conference report which provides that "such delay is to be considered as an element in determining the voluntary or involuntary nature of such statements or confessions" was in either the House version or the Senate version of the bill.
>
> Mr. O'MAHONEY. It was in neither.
>
> Mr. HENNINGS. Then that language is entirely new matter, is it?
>
> Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is entirely new matter.

Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and as one of the conferees, I refused to sign the report. I think the report explains, more than anything else, whether this language is new matter. The report was drafted by the conferees on the part of the other body. It will be observed that the original bill as passed by the House had to do with a Federal rule of procedure concerning arrest and arraignment, rule 5 (a) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

The House passed a rule of evidence in connection with arrest and arraignment by saying "without delay" with reference to confessions.

The Senate, in a long debate in this Chamber, inserted the word "reasonable," again having reference to arrest and arraignment, and establishing a rule of evidence. The debate all the time related to the question of Federal criminal rule 5 (a).

We now have the statement by the managers on the part of the House—and this is the import of the amendment, by their own statement—that the amendment as agreed to by the conferees of both Houses makes it clear and definite that the existing rule of evidence governing the admissibility of statements and confessions shall not be disturbed by the enactment of this legislation.

I submit that the existing rule of evidence governing the admissibility of statements and confessions has no relationship to Federal criminal rule 5 (a), which relates to arrest and arraignment.

Therefore, I make my point of order.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it is true that when I was interrogated by the Senator from Missouri earlier in the debate, and he asked me whether this proviso was in either the bill passed by the Senate or the bill passed by the House, I said, "No, it was not."

Then, in respect to his question as to whether it was new matter, I said, "Yes." But in making that response to him, I was not talking in terms of the rule on conference reports.

I suggest to the Chair that the proviso which has been added contains the word "delay." The paragraph which was amended by the Senate, and to which the explanatory proviso was added by the conference, is a brief paragraph. Originally it contained 41 words. To that was added the statement:

> *Provided*, That such delay is to be considered as an element in determining the voluntary or involuntary nature of such statements or confessions.

That statement consists of 23 additional words.

I point out that the words "reasonable delay" appear in the very beginning of section (a), in the third line of the section as printed in the bill which came to the Senate from the House. The statement begins in line 9, page 1. The word "delay" appears in line 11, page 1.

From the word "delay" to the end of the sentence is only 25 words. To the word "delay" again are only 4 more words—29 words.

The significance of the proviso is that it modifies, explains, and clarifies the meaning of "reasonable delay" in the beginning of the sentence.

I submit that the point of order is a technical point, without merit by the rule of reason.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall speak briefly to the point of order, and in support of the position taken by the Senator from Colorado.

I feel, in a moment such as this, that I should address the Presiding Officer not as "Mr. President" but as "Your Honor," because he has resting before him, in my judgment, a very serious matter for procedural and judicial determination.

I think the point of order of the Senator from Colorado is well taken, because the bill which went to conference is not the bill which came back from the conference. By that, I mean that the bill which came back from the conference is not the bill which went to the conference, in subject matter, because we did not send to the conference a confession bill; but now we have before us, from the conference—in the form of new matter—a bill which proposes to establish a binding rule in regard to confessions. That was not involved at all in the bill which went to conference.

The bill which went to conference contained the words:

> (a) Evidence, including statements and confessions, otherwise admissible, shall not be otherwise inadmissible solely because of reasonable delay in taking an arrested person before a commissioner or other officer empowered to commit persons charged with offenses against the laws of the United States.

That is the Mallory bill of the House, and it is the Mallory bill which was before the Senate, except the bill was amended by the Senate by the addition of the one word "reasonable" before the word "delay"; and in the conference the difference between the House version and the Senate version with the difference between whether the word "reasonable" should or should not be included.

When we examine the debate of the other day, we find there was long debate in the Senate, as it dealt with that bill.

In regard to the question of what would be the position of the conferees on the word "reasonable," if we consider the debate of the other day, I think we cannot escape the conclusion that in that debate it was made perfectly clear that we did not want to have the bill brought back to us from the conference unless the word "reasonable" was in it.

Now the word "reasonable" is in it; but there is also new matter.

At this time I wish to return to the statements made by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] in the debate earlier this evening, here on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Oregon to say, only a moment ago, that with the proviso which has been added to the bill, it is the Mallory bill which came to us from the House?

Mr. MORSE. No; I said that the Mallory bill which came to us from the House did not have the proviso in it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know the Senator from Oregon said that. But that is

not the question I asked him. Did not he say that the meaning of the bill now, because of this clause, is the Mallory bill which came to us from the House?

Mr. MORSE. Oh, no; I did not say that at all.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I challenge the statement of the Senator from Oregon, and I appeal for a reading of the RECORD; I ask that the Official Reporter read from his notes what the Senator from Oregon said. I do not think I am mistaken; and I make the point—as I stated—that the Senator from Oregon has acknowledged that it is not new matter, in the light of the rule.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say what I mean, and then I shall be very glad to let the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD speak for itself. So let me say what I mean. The Senator from Wyoming is a good enough lawyer, so that, inasmuch as he heard the statement I made, I know he understands exactly what I meant—namely, that the Senate conferees have brought back from the conference a bill greatly different from the bill they took to the conference. The conferees have added materially to the bill, in the conference; in the conference report they have included a rule on confessions that they did not take to the conference. That is new material; and my point is that the conferees brought back from the conference, not the bill which came to the Senate from the House, but a different bill, different from the one which came to the Senate from the House. The conferees have added new material.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. Not now; I wish to finish my statement with respect to what the RECORD shows. I desire to make the statement for the benefit of the Chair.

Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] has read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as it was made by the debate earlier this evening. I wish to repeat part of it; and then I wish to read part of the debate, also earlier this evening, between the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] and the Senator from Colorado, which has not as yet been read.

I now read:

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, my colleague on the Committee on the Judiciary.

Let me ask him whether the language of the conference report which provides that such delay is to be considered as an element in determining the voluntary or involuntary nature of such statements or confessions, was in either the House version or the Senate version of the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It was in neither.

Mr. HENNINGS. Then that language is entirely new matter, is it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is entirely new matter.

Mr. HENNINGS. Let me ask the Senator from Wyoming what he thinks it adds. It seems to me exceedingly unclear, and of course I do not think it means anything, because it says that such delay is to be considered as an element in determining the voluntary or involuntary nature of such statements or confessions.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator from Missouri will permit me to respond to his statement, let me say that he has just said that he does not believe the provision means anything. In that case if follows, clearly, that we have left the Senate amendment entirely undisturbed.

Mr. HENNINGS. Does my distinguished colleague agree with me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, I do not agree.

There the Senator from Wyoming said he does not agree that the addition that has been brought back from the conference leaves the Senate amendment entirely undisturbed.

I read further:

Mr. HENNINGS. Is not this statement a redundant one? We know that delay is to be considered by the courts in determining the voluntary or involuntary nature of the statements or confessions, depending on all the circumstances. Is not that true?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But, Mr. President, the other day, when the Senate passed this bill, we indulged for hours in a debate on the legal technicalities. As I said then, I repeat now: We lawyers love to debate legal technicalities.

Mr. HENNINGS. That is what lawyers are for.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I say to my colleagues that this additional phrase is a clarification which does not at all impair what was provided. It carries out the will of the Senate; it carries out the duty of the Congress; it explains and clarifies the decision of the Supreme Court in the Mallory case; and it will afford a great opportunity for the courts of appeals in the District of Columbia and elsewhere to avoid the mistakes which were made by the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield for another question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. HENNINGS. Is not the Senator from Wyoming of the opinion that the conference report will in no wise affect or change either the decision in the landmark case of McNabb, or the decision in the Mallory case?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I feel that if we are to enact legislation in this field, we must adopt the conference report. The House has adopted it. The only effect to be gained by a failure by us to adopt the conference report would be to kill the proposed legislation.

The Senator from Missouri was one of the stalwarts in supporting the action of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator from Wyoming; and I was glad to contribute as best I could in my small way.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And I hope the Senator from Missouri will continue his very able support, and will help us give the District of Columbia the assurance it needs.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator from Wyoming. I may seem to appear in the role of the devil's advocate, but I am undertaking to establish the legislative history in the Senate. The other day I spoke for 2½ hours, I believe, on this very proposition; and I supported the Senator from Wyoming in his amendment, which inserted the word "reasonable," instead of the word "unnecessary," which theretofore had appeared before the word "delay."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is quite true; and I am very grateful to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. I did so because I thought it was proper, and might serve the entire country.

Let me ask this question of my learned and distinguished friend: Does he think that in any way the conference report will affect, alter, or change the decision in the landmark case—the McNabb case—or the decision in the more recent case—the Mallory case; or does he think the conference report will tend to have any effect whatsoever upon the original bill, as it was passed by the Senate, with the inclusion of the word "reasonable," as an amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not in its effect——

Mr. HENNINGS. It seems to broaden it, does it not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It does improve it.

Mr. President, if one looks to the statement of the managers on the part of the House, he finds further proof that this is additional material, this is new material, this is a modification of the bill that was before us, over and beyond the word "reasonable." So listen to what the House conferees tell us. They say in their statement:

The bill, as it passed the House, provided for a statutory rule of evidence for the admissibility of statements and confessions in criminal proceedings in the courts of the United States. While the House version did not contain the word "reasonable" in referring to delay, it still provided that statements and confessions otherwise admissible should be admitted into evidence and not be excluded solely because of delay in bringing the arrested person before the committing magistrate.

The amendment as agreed to by the conferees of both Houses—

Note this, Mr. President—

is to make it clear and definite that the existing rule of evidence governing the admissibility of statements and confessions shall not be disturbed by the enactment of this legislation. The provision as contained in this amendment is to the effect namely that under all the circumstances, if the statement or confession is found to be involuntary it shall be excluded.

The House can say that if it wants to, Mr. President, but that was not the intent of the bill in the Senate. That was not the discussion in the Senate. The discussion in the Senate was in regard to arraignment, not confessions. The discussion in the Senate was as to whether or not the word "reasonable" should be put before the word "delay" in relationship to its effect upon arraignment. What we have had brought back to us now, Mr. President, is legislation in regard to confessions. We seek now, in this report that has come back to us, to set up entirely new legislation not covered at all by the bill as it came from the House in the first place, in regard to the rule that should apply in connection with the voluntary or involuntary nature of confessions.

Mr. President, we have not had presented to us any hearings or any committee action from the Judiciary Committee on the issue of confessions. The report on the Mallory case did not deal with the matter of adopting a rule in connection with voluntary and involuntary confessions, and the proviso clause as it comes from the House—*"Provided,* That such delay is to be considered"—is an order to the courts—"as an element in determining the voluntary or involuntary nature of such statements or confessions." Is an order to the courts, an evidentiary rule that is laid down in a conference report, not covered by the Mallory bill, not a part of the debate on the Mallory bill, not before us when we went to conference, and, therefore, new matter, not in violation of rule 27?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I respectfully submit that the point of order is not well taken. I respectfully submit

that in applying the rule we should look at substance, and not form. The decision in the Mallory case took a rule of procedure and, by a judicial amendment, made it a rule of evidence, and it did so, as I pointed out the other day, in violation of rule 26, which provided in express terms that in cases not covered by acts of Congress providing otherwise, determinations of questions of evidence shall be by resort to rules of common law.

When the House bill came to the Senate, the House bill declared in very simple language that no statements or confessions otherwise admissible—and that included voluntary statements—shall be excluded merely because of delay. The House bill reestablished in substance the common law rule that voluntary confessions should be admissible. It had a second section providing that, in order for a confession to be admissible, there should be a warning that the man did not have to say anything.

When the Senate adopted the amendment, it put the word "reasonable" before the word "delay" and made no other change. Then the bill went to conference and the conference committee came out with a report which restored the bill in substance. What the bill was when it came from the House was a slight modification to make it specific that a reasonable delay was to be considered as a circumstance indicating voluntary confession, and unreasonable delay as a circumstance indicating an involuntary confession. So the conference report, in effect, is somewhere between the original House bill and the bill as it was amended in the Senate. It restores, as the House bill did, the common law rule about confessions being admissible when voluntary, and it added to that an express restriction that a reasonable delay was to be considered as tending to show a voluntary confession, where as an unreasonable delay should be considered as tending to show an involuntary confession.

That is the meaning of the conference report, and certainly it is within the compass of the original bill as it passed the House and the bill as it was amended in the Senate.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Much as I regret to do so, I am obliged to say that I think the conference report is subject to a point of order, and that it has been properly made.

Rule 27, which deals with conference reports, has three clauses.

The point of order is made under the second, but light on the subject may be shed by examining the third clause, which reads:

> In any case in which a disagreement to an amendment in the nature of a substitute has been referred to conferees, it shall be in order for the conferees to report a substitute on the same subject matter; but they may not include in the report matter not committed to them by either House.

Then there follows this sentence, and this sentence sheds light on the problem. It is the final sentence of subparagraph (a) of paragraph 3:

> They may, however—

And this relates only to the instance where there is a substitute—

> They may, however, include in their report in any such case matter which is a germane modification of subjects in disagreement.

If we had a situation in which the entire text had been stricken or in which there was a substitute, a modification could be included if it were germane. But the provision for modifying the subject matter exists only when there is a substitute under clause 3. Under clause 2 there is no provision for modification, whether germane or not. So since the only provision for a modification arises in the instance in which there is an amendment in the nature of a substitute, it would follow that if the rule were to permit modification, it would also be pointed out that there might be a modification under clause 2.

The very language that is used, "Provided that," suggests that there is a modification. I do not know how it can be argued any other way.

It may be that one may talk about substance, if the original meaning is being restored, or something of that kind; but when the words "provided that" are used, it is a modification, and consequently it would be in order only if there were a substitute, and it would come under clause 3. Since it comes under clause 2, I do not see how any modification could be permitted.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Would the Senator's conclusion be the same if the language added were language to the effect, as used in the sentence, that the word "reasonable" should mean "thus and so," or any particular definition of the word?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes, I think it would. If that definition were with the word "reasonable," perhaps a different construction might be argued. Even then the bounds of the conferees were between the word "reasonable" and no word at all.

Mr. LONG. The point I have in mind is that it seems to me in conference one side can win 100 percent, or the other side can win 100 percent, or there can be a middle ground.

One side could win by having the word "reasonable" agreed to; the other side could win by having the word "reasonable" stricken; or the conferees could find a middle ground between the two. That is the way conferees usually arrange things. They have found that the word "reasonable" would tend to have a certain connotation. That is about the effect of it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. There was no space for the conferees to work. This proviso comes between the last word in the sentence and the period. That is where the "provided" has come in. If there were to be any modification, it seems to me it would have to be where the change comes in the word "reasonable" itself. When words are added, with a "provided" which is inserted at the end of the sentence before the period, clearly it is a modification, and that would be permitted only if there were a substitute so that the conference report would come under clause 3 of the rule.

Mr. LONG. It seems to me that the sentence to which the Senator refers might be interpreted as being a modification of the word "reasonable." The rule states, in part:

> They may, however, include in their report in any such case matter which is a germane modification of subjects in disagreement.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator is overlooking a part of clause 3.

Mr. LONG. If that were included, it would be admissible.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The sentence to which the Senator refers would apply only if there were an amendment in the nature of a substitute. The Senator should read the first part of paragraph 3. There was not an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the 2d session of the 85th Congress will soon be a matter of history. My joy at its coming to an end is exceeded only by the gratification I feel with respect to the progress which has been made and the successes which have been achieved during this session of the Congress.

I am aware, Mr. President, that many men and many ladies have made substantial contributions to the success of this Congress. I am deeply respectful of each of them.

However, Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the distinguished majority leader of the Senate for the great effort he has made, for the enduring devotion he has exhibited, and for his contribution to the success of this session of the Congress.

The Senator from Oklahoma has been in the Senate now for 10 years. This is the 10th session I have had the opportunity to be a part of. I had great interest in the sessions which took place prior to my coming to the Senate. We have had great leaders in the past. I am aware of the distinguished record of the minority leader and of the record he made when he was the majority leader.

But, Mr. President, I do not believe I have ever seen a demonstration of leadership, of patient understanding, of sustained mental and physical effort of the high order of devotion and patriotism such as has been exhibited and manifested by the distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. Before the sun sets, either on this day or this session, I wanted to give expression to that sentiment in that respect.

FAREWELL MESSAGE FROM SENATOR KNOWLAND

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the 2d session of the 85th Congress is about to draw to a close. I am speaking for my last time as the minority leader of the Senate and as a Member of the Sen-

ate of the United States. I would not want this opportunity to pass without paying my respects to all of my colleagues in this body on both sides of the aisle.

I came here as a young man of 37 years of age. I have had the opportunity of serving with these Members, both Democrats and Republicans, and it has been a great inspiration as an American citizen to see the devotion to duty they have all shown in meeting the great issues which confront our common country.

Through the years of my service in the Senate, I have bid sad farewell to some of my friends on both sides of the aisle—friends who have gone on that long journey from which there is no return. I have bid farewell to some who have retired of their own volition to enjoy more leisure with their families and friends. And, yes, I have bid farewell to some who retired involuntarily due to the vicissitudes of elections.

In turn, I have welcomed newcomers into this great body. I have seen them work hard at their duties and rise in stature and responsibility.

To be a Member of the United States Senate is a high honor.

The close of each session of a Congress is a time for reflection—a time for summing up accomplishments. The record is written and it takes its place in history.

In these times of tension, responsibilities ofttimes weigh heavily. Every problem confronting us, every decision we make, touches the lives of all our citizens. International as well as national problems must be dealt with in a manner that their resolving will be for the best interests of the American people.

We have worked diligently many long hours in our struggle to try to solve these problems. All of them have not been solved.

Some of the President's recommendations have been acted upon. Others have been postponed or rejected. I feel we might have done a better job in some fields. However, it is not my purpose to discuss the achievements of the 85th Congress at this time. The appraisal of that record I have offered as a Senate document which will be available to all who are interested.

My present purpose is purely a personal one. It is my desire to pay tribute to a few of those many persons with whom I have had the pleasure of association in my years as a Member of the United States Senate. Many of them have been my close personal friends; many of them have been of invaluable aid in my legislative duties; many of them have made me the recipient of their wise and helpful counsel. All of them have lightened my duties in many appreciable ways.

I know in paying tribute to our Presiding Officers, the distinguished Vice President RICHARD NIXON and the President pro tempore CARL HAYDEN, that I am voicing the opinion of all of you.

No tribute would be complete without speaking of my stalwart friend and able colleague from the Granite State of New Hampshire, STYLES BRIDGES, the senior Republican Senator. His long experience and judicious advice have held all of us in good stead.

And on the other side of the aisle, I pay my respects to the majority leader, LYNDON JOHNSON, for his notable skill and achievements, and to his distinguished and hard-working assistant, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana.

There is no doubt but what this session has been a trying one. Many grave problems have confronted us. Many long hours of hard work have been the lot of all of us as we have toiled during the last 8 months.

During these trying times, the prayers of our Chaplain, the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, are always an inspiration and a guidance. The spiritual influence generated by his words, I feel, has aided in many difficult hours.

As Dr. Harris has attended to our spiritual welfare, our good friend, Dr. George Calver, has attended our physical welfare. We do not always heed his good advice, but without his aid many of us would have found it much harder to contend with the rigors of long, exhausting hours. To both these men, we owe a debt of gratitude for their solicitude for our souls and bodies.

Legislative processes are sometimes very complicated. Therefore, I know this whole Chamber joins with me in paying tribute to our erudite and highly efficient Parliamentarian, Charley Watkins, and to his most able assistant, Floyd Riddick, for their patience with us and their impartial assistance, often under the most trying conditions. They are members of that very able staff, headed by Secretary of the Senate Felton "Skeeter" Johnston, which includes Chief Clerk Emery Frazier, Journal Clerk Edward "Ed" Hickey, Legislative Clerk Edward "Ted" Mansur, Executive Clerk Lewis "Bill" Bailey, Printing Clerk William "Bill" Wannall, and Dorothye Scott, the charming secretary who serves the Senate Secretary with such great efficiency.

There has been discussion about microphones for the use of Senators. Regardless of the pros and cons on that subject, I can well imagine that there are times when the workload of our official reporters of debates would have been lightened under some such circumstances. As it is, James "Jim" Murphy and John Rhodes and their tireless staff have done a magnificent job in recording our sometimes obscure and vagrant words and placing them in their proper sequence. They were ably assisted in this duty by Frank Brodie, former CONGRESSIONAL RECORD clerk who retired this year, and his successor Raymond "Ray" Noyes, as well as Frederick "Fred" Green, who is responsible for the Daily Digest.

I am sure that all Senators will agree with me when I speak of the diligent and faithful service rendered to us by the superintendent of the Senate Press Gallery, Joseph "Joe" Wills; the superintendent of the Senate Radio and Television Correspondents' Gallery, Robert "Bob" Hough; superintendent of the Senate Periodical Press Gallery, William "Bill" Perry; and superintendent of the Senate Press Photographers' Gallery William "Bill" Forsythe. All of us know the excellent cooperation we have received from the administrative officer of the Senate recording studio, Nicholas "Johnny" Lacovara, and the director of the recording studios, Robert "Bob" Coar.

I would be remiss if I did not thank our distinguished Sergeant at Arms, Joe Duke; his deputy, Robert "Bob" Dunphy; and his chief clerk, Dorothy McCarty, who so ably performs her myriad duties, for their unfailing courtesies. In this instance I also want to thank our genial Doorkeeper, Charlie Jones, and his assistant, Lawrence "Steve" Rygg, together with Walter Watt, doorman at the pass door, for their cooperation and readiness to assist in any manner they can to facilitate our work.

Much work of the Senate goes on behind the scenes as it were. Yet, if it were not for those who labor at such tasks, our own work could not be accomplished. I want them to know how much I appreciate their service. I speak of the Superintendent of the document room, Theron Marshall; keeper of the stationery, Andrew "Andy" Kramer, and his assistant, Harry "Gus" Sonnenberg; and of Richard "Dick" Hupman, Senate librarian, and his staff; as well as of Robert "Bob" Brenkworth, financial clerk, and his assistant, William "Bill" Ridgely, and their staff. I would be remiss if I did not express my appreciation of the many courteous services performed by Vernon Talbertt, chief messenger in the Secretary's office, and his staff. Nor can I forget our page boys, ever alert, no matter what the hour or how tired they might be after a long day. I must speak, too, of our Capitol Police force who not only are ever watchful of our comfort and safety, but who cope so ably with the hundreds of thousands of visitors to our Capitol. I am grateful to them.

Others who toil behind the scenes that we may better perform our duties include John "Buck" Chambers, our superintendent of the service department, ably assisted by Charles "Dave" Ebert. I do not want to forget the fine work of the foreman of the cabinet shop, Tillman Huskey. Praise is due also for superintendent of the janitors' department, Robert "Bob" Collins, and his staff.

The Senate Office Building superintendent, Lewey Caraway, and his staff have served us well year after year.

All of us are well aware of how important our mail is and for the excellent service we receive from the Senate post office, we can thank our postmaster, David "Dave" Jennings.

Those who will contemplate the enlarged Capitol and the comfort and efficiency of the new Senate Office Building, owe a great deal to the Architect of the Capitol, George Stewart, together with his assistant, Arthur Cook. George Stewart's knowledge of architecture and his devotion to the beautification of the Capitol are evidenced in the improvements made under his supervision and will stand as a lasting monument to his efforts.

Although our politics are partisan in nature, our friendships and respect for those of the opposition party are deep

and lasting. I count as a friend, whose courtesy and cooperation I have long appreciated, the secretary for the majority, Robert "Bobby" Baker. I speak the same for his assistant, Jessop "Jay" McDonell. I found the same cooperation from the Democratic policy committee counsel, Gerald W. Siegel, and from his assistant, Harry McPherson.

I cannot speak too highly nor can I express adequately my appreciation, as well as that of all Members on this side of the aisle, of the unstinting, devoted, and competent service we have received from our minority secretary, Mark Trice. Aided by the assistant secretary, William "Bill" Brownrigg, and Dorothy Burns, the capable, efficient, and zealous secretary, Mark Trice and his staff have rendered sterling service to all of us. I wish to thank them as well as our Republican cloakroom assistants, Russell Call, William Martin, and Gordon Allott, Jr., for their untiring devotion to our senatorial efforts and needs.

In the matter of legislation with its legal intricacies, I am sure that all of you will agree that we have called repeatedly on the Office of Legislative Counsel. Our legislative problems have been so very ably and competently handled by legislative counsel, John Simms, and his senior counsels, Charles Boots, Dwight Pinion, and John Herberg, and their staff. They have saved us many hours of labor on intricate legal problems that we have been able to devote to our other duties.

I know that all of you join with me in giving public appreciation of the great aid we have received in our committee work by the staffs of our major standing committees and the special committees. I have found them more than helpful in my senatorial work, and I take this occasion to thank them.

If we glance out the windows of our offices or the Capitol, we glimpse the beauty of the Capitol Grounds. These lovely views of trees and flowers and shrubs are the able work of Assistant Landscape Architect Everett Evans, who is also responsible for the Botanic Gardens. We owe him a vote of thanks for this vista for all American people.

There are others who serve us well. Thomas Mulloy, superintendent of garages, and the garage attendants; the Capitol guides, under the able leadership of James Connell, and his assistant, Floyd Kirby, who give of their extensive knowledge of the Capitol and its history to the millions of schoolchildren who visit the Capitol each year and to the adults receiving their first views of our historic buildings.

There are the railroad-ticket people and the airline-ticket people, who often do the impossible in last-minute reservations. They serve us cheerfully, ably, and well. Mr. Joseph Corona, in charge of the Western Union office, has ever been most helpful. We are grateful to him and his staff.

In this electronic age, what would we do without telephones? I think I can vouch for the high opinion all of my colleagues have for Mrs. Elizabeth Coles, chief operator, and her efficient staff. No matter what the crisis nor the hour, they are at their stations, ready and eager to serve.

When we are in our offices and there is a quorum call or when we must hurry to a committee meeting, we find the operators of the Senate subway ready at our command. They, too, must stay on duty with us, no matter how late the hour. At all times I, and I know my colleagues, have found them courteous and eager to get us to our destination. I wish to give this word of appreciation to them for the many years they have served us so well.

Nor can I fail to express my appreciation of the devotion to duty given by Mr. Henry DeKeyser, in charge of the Page School. His is a hard task, for not only do the pages come from many different school systems, but the classes are held in the morning hours when most scholars and their teachers are hardly beginning the day. It is to his credit as well as to the high caliber of our pages that they attain high scholastic standing when leaving us to go on to other schools of higher learning.

Our senatorial duties would be more difficult if it were not for the various departmental liaison representatives who counsel with us and give us of their specialized knowledge in their fields. I have found them extremely helpful, courteous, and efficient. I take this time to give voice to my appreciation of their aid in the course of my senatorial duties.

I stated that my present purpose was a personal one. Under those circumstances I know my colleagues will give me their indulgence when I speak of my great appreciation of the work of my capable assistant, Oliver Dompierre. Dom is well known to all of you for he has spent many years in service on the Hill. It gives me great pleasure to give public recognition for his devoted service over the course of the years.

I know all of my colleagues on this side of the aisle will join me in appreciation of the splendid cooperation and excellence of work done by members of the Republican Policy Committee staff.

Nor can I close without paying a special tribute to Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, Republican Whip. He has been not only an able assistant but a close friend whose wise counsel I shall miss in the years ahead.

I also salute the senior Senator from Massachusetts, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, who has always been a steadying influence in time of stress. I have enjoyed my service with him on the Appropriations Committee.

And so soon I leave you as colleagues. My years spent with this great body—the lasting friendship I have made—the inspiration I have received by being a Member of this Chamber—will remain with me as long as I shall live.

As is true with politics in a republican form of government, we have approached issues in a partisan spirit as free men—free to debate and discuss the questions of the day with each other. But—as free men in a free country—our partisan views have not interrupted our friendships and when it is necessary to make decisions for the best interests of our great Nation, we close ranks—all as good Americans.

Service in the Senate of the United States has a lasting effect upon all those who have ever been Members of this body. It brings an evolution of the soul and mind—a growth and a deepening desire to dedicate oneself to the principles of our Founding Fathers that this Nation will go on to greater glory—and that it stands always as a beacon light for all free peoples—that its shining light will finally permeate all the dark recesses so that all mankind may enjoy the blessings we enjoy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the approach of adjournment always brings to us a certain feeling of sadness. The Congress, of course, in a real sense, never dies. When it departs from Washington it leaves behind it a body of laws and a series of decisions which endure whether they are for good or for bad. But Congress is not merely an institution housed within this historic building. Congress is composed of men and women working together through the long months, which brings to us a closeness which I think is possessed by very few groups.

There is a sense of tenderness about saying goodby. There are memories of days and nights in committee work and on the floor. Issues and pressures which seem so hard and so cruel at the time become tinged with a mellowness that perspective always brings to every man.

I have a deep reverence for the institution of the Senate, and a warm fondness for those who comprise it. I also have a deep sense of gratitude to the men and women who have been so good to me and without whose cooperation I could never have functioned as the majority leader of this body.

I cannot name everyone of them, but I believe Senators know the extent of the affection that I have for each Member of the Senate.

There are a few Members whom I wish to mention specifically. I refer first to the Vice President and to the President pro tempore, who have opened the Senate each morning. For their many courtesies and their constant fairness to me, I express my gratitude.

I refer especially to the minority leader, because when the 86th Congress convenes I shall be very sad because he will no longer be with us.

BILL KNOWLAND and I have had adjoining desks. We are separated only by this very narrow aisle. There have been times when we have disagreed. There have been many times we have agreed. But I believe it is accurate to say that there has never been a time when we were unable to agree on the necessity for acting in behalf of the Nation and for expediting the work of the Senate. No Congress can possibly work if the majority and the minority leaders are engaged in constant warfare. That is something that BILL KNOWLAND and I have never done. We have worked together in harmony, and I believe that that fact alone has been of great importance in making certain that every Member of the Senate has had a full opportunity to present his viewpoints ef-

fectively and forcefully and to arrive at an early resolution of the issues that come before us.

I have the greatest respect for BILL KNOWLAND. He is a man of integrity.

But I do not think it is merely the necessity of working together that has drawn us close. Although we are of opposite political faiths, I consider BILL KNOWLAND one of my closest personal friends, and whatever be my attitude toward the fortunes of elections, as a man I shall always wish him well, and he is always welcome wherever I am.

There are many Senators whom I would like to name. They have been patient with me, cooperative with me and helpful to me. But it would take all night if I attempted to name them.

I regret very much that I was not able to be present when the very able and lovely lady from Maine made her statement. She is one of the greatest of women I have ever known. She has been a tower of strength to me in my committee work since I was a freshman Member of Congress and throughout the time I have served in the Senate. To her I wish to express my deep gratitude because I think she has always put her country first and rendered most distinctive service.

There is one man who I think deserves special mention, and that is the junior Senator from Montana, Mr. MANSFIELD. As assistant leader he has been a tower of strength. I know of no more careful, no more prudent, no more hard working Member of this body. His character is such that, if I were to die tomorrow, I would not hesitate for a moment to name him as a trustee for my little girls. I could have complete confidence that they would be taken care of conscientiously and ably.

We have all heard the scholarly addresses that he has delivered on the Senate floor in the field of foreign policy. We all recognize them as outstanding contributions to our national thought. And when I become discouraged about the future of our Nation there is nothing that dispels the gloom quite so quickly as the realization that this Nation is capable of finding men like MIKE MANSFIELD.

I think I must add here the name of BOB KERR.

The Senator from Oklahoma came to the Senate when I came to the Senate. I have never had an hour of trial or tribulation during which he has not been by my side. There have been times when we differed, but it always seemed to me that when we have he has been the most tolerant and understanding of men and has met me more than halfway. So, I do not want this session to close without saying, "Thank you, MIKE MANSFIELD and BOB KERR."

Mr. President, there is a group of people in the Capitol who are fully as responsible for the success of these deliberations as are the Members of the Senate themselves, and I am referring to the hard working, loyal Senate staffs. They labor from early in the morning until late at night, and their rewards are little more than the satisfaction of knowing that a job has been well done.

There are no headlines emblazoning the names of the staff employees who work late into the night checking over the countless details of legislation. There are no bands to extoll the glories of the committee experts and the technicians. But I think all of us would feel that something would be lacking if the RECORD did not set forth their names.

At the top of the list is Felton M. Johnston, the Secretary of the Senate. I believe all of us regard him as the 97th Senator. Next year it will be the 99th.

I believe all of us know that Skeeter Johnston is one of the great moderators of our times. There is not a member of the Senate who does not at some time during the session turn to him for advice and counsel. And the advice and counsel is always fair and prudent and is based on a life time of legislative experience.

Skeeter is a man who serves his country in the finest traditions of his great state of Mississippi. And I think every Senator who has served during the many years he has been here looks upon him as a warm, close, and personal friend.

Then there is Bobby Baker, the energetic, persevering secretary for the majority.

I wish to take a minute to talk about Bobby, because there have been few times in my life that I have ever seen a young man who combined so much wisdom and maturity with such youthful vigor and enthusiasm as Bobby Baker. I think it is fair to say that a great deal of the success of this Congress has been due to Bobby Baker's alertness, his diligence, his devotion, his dedication, and his insistence that things be done right. He is a young man who has already gone very far and who is going much farther. I believe he will reach much greater heights.

I wish to say a word about Jay McDonnell, his assistant. He has the same dedication to duty and the same keenness for the work he is doing.

There are two young men who have a very difficult time. They have to bear the brunt of the work on the floor. I told Bobby yesterday I was glad we had our falling out last week, because we needed to be in top form the final week of the session.

I do not want to close without referring to J. Mark Trice, Oliver J. Dompierre, and Bill Brownrigg. I like to think these men are my friends. They serve the minority and they serve them well. I hope they are my friends and I know I am their friend.

I doubt if there is any Member of the Senate who does not know Joe Duke, the man who carries on his shoulders the heavy responsibility for our protection and for the arrangements on the Senate side of the Capitol. Joe is ably seconded by his competent and equally pleasant administrative assistant, Bill Cheatham.

Our session opens every day with prayer. And the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, our Chaplain, is the man who administers to our spiritual needs, as Dr. George Calver administers to the ills of our bodies. They are important members of the Senate family.

At the desk in front of the Vice President are a group of men without whom we could not function at all. They pick me up when I fall. They take me by the hand and lead me when I need light. They are Emery L. Frazier, Chief Clerk; Charles L. Watkins, the patient and tolerant and understanding and able Parliamentarian; and his assistant, Floyd M. Riddick; good Ed Hickey, the Journal clerk, who has saved me from so many errors; and Edward E. Mansur, Jr., the legislative clerk, who has always cooperated with me.

They are backed by a series of technicians without whom the Senate would soon be paralyzed. These include Lewis W. Bailey, the executive clerk in charge of nominations; William H. Wannall, the printing clerk, and his assistant, Thomas N. Gay; J. Fred McClerkin, the bill clerk, and his assistant, Harold G. Ast; Harvey Carrell, the enrolling clerk; Harry C. Burke, clerk of enrolled bills; James L. Johnson, registration clerk; and George F. Thompson, his assistant, Vernon Talbertt, the Senate's chief messenger.

No one does a finer job in handling the intricate financial affairs of the Senate than Robert A. Brenkworth, the financial clerk, and William A. Ridgely, his assistant.

Others include Theron W. Marshall, superintendent, Senate Document Room, and his assistant, John T. Waggoner. Andrew J. Kramer is keeper of the stationery, and Richard D. Hupman is in charge of the Senate library. Frederick H. Green and Dwight B. Galt, Jr., handle the Daily Digest. And the very able man who handles the service department is John T. Chambers.

Special thanks are due John Simms, the legislative counsel, and his assistant, Charles Boots. There is Raymond F. Noyes, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD clerk.

And even though he is not, strictly speaking, a Senate employee, we all admire and respect George Stewart, the Architect of the Capitol.

There is a group of men who do one of the most remarkable jobs of any technicians in the world. They are the Official Reporters who are here at 3:40 on Sunday morning—who day after day take down the words which make up the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I shall ask the indulgence of the Senate so that I may say a word about them.

They are headed by James W. Murphy. I know that all of Mr. Murphy's friends are very sorry to learn of his illness and will be happy to know that according to the latest report he is improving; while his very capable associate, John D. Rhodes, supervises the preparation of the RECORD. These are men of a high degree of skill and of great dedication. I wish to list them all: Francis J. Attig, Herbert N. Budlong, Nicholas J. Cinciotta, Charles J. Drescher, Elmer L. Koons, Joseph A. Koons, R. Thomas Loftus, Gregor Macpherson, Williard W. Pruett, Perry B. Smith, Wilbur T. Smith, Placidino Zagami, Julian R. Serles, and Russell G. Greenwood.

Two members of my own staff serve on the floor and are well known, I believe, to all Members of the Senate. They are Gerald W. Siegel and Harry McPherson.

Gerry is leaving us to become a Harvard professor, and all of us hope that what he has learned here in the school of Congress will stand him in good stead.

Two other men are familiar to all the Senators. They are Charlie Jones, the Head Doorkeeper, and Richard Reidel, who is one of our major contacts with the press.

Finally, I believe that special recognition should be paid to Robert C. Pearce, Chief of the Capitol Police, and to Capt. Michael Dowd, of the Metropolitan Police, who is assigned to the Capitol.

I would like to name more, but it would be impossible to do so in the time remaining.

I wish that I could go beyond merely listing these names. Every individual is a devoted and tireless public servant. And their families can be proud of them. They serve America, and they serve it well.

Mr. President, we will soon leave the Capitol to go back to our homes. To all of you, to all of my friends, I wish a restful vacation. I am already looking forward with a sense of wondering about what is going to happen in January.

Before I conclude, I wish to pay tribute to a very wise man, a very able man, the most dedicated public servant I know, a person who has given me the best advice at all times. He is the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

At my request, many years ago, he moved his seat over behind me, and there has rarely been a complicated or complex problem when I have not requested his advice and his counsel, and it has always been good and in the country's interest. I thank all Senators for indulging me, and I am sorry that I have had to take so long.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, there are only three Members of the Senate now sitting who were Members of the Senate when I was first sworn in as a Member. They are the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I wish to say that tonight has been the most touching and moving termination of a session of the Senate that I have observed in all those long years.

I know that every Member of the Senate joins in the tributes which have been paid to the minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and to the majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. The words which have been said here tonight and the statements which have been made by these two men constitute evidence of the essential unity of the Members of Congress. There may be differences and there are differences of opinion about this matter and upon that matter. There are differences which go to the roots of our beings, sometimes; but the evidence which has been produced tonight is that in this session of Congress the leadership on both sides has been such that the affairs of Congress have been carried on in a spirit of sincerity and good will without purely partisan bickering.

I am happy to have the opportunity of saying this out of an experience which began on the 1st of January 1934, when I was first sworn in as a Member of this body. I believe it means much to the future of this country that such a session as this could have been held tonight.

There can be no doubt that the Congress of the United States, like the people of the United States, is facing a most crucial time. These are days of world-wide tribulations. We know that the United States of America is the leading exponent of free government in the world. We know that our progress has been achieved because of that freedom. We know it because opportunity is extended to every man and every woman and every citizen of the United States to make the most of his talents and to use those talents to develop the resources of the United States. We know that that has made us the strongest and most progressive nation in all the world. At the same time, we know that the dictatorship of the proletariat threatens the maintenance of free government in all the world.

I say that when we can give testimony such as has been given here tonight by the two leaders, the majority leader and the minority leader, of a unified desire to serve the Nation, the people of this country, and the people of the world can take courage from that fact.

I am happy, indeed, to associate myself with the tributes which have been paid to Senator KNOWLAND and Senator JOHNSON, and with everything which has been said about the Vice President and the staff of the Senate. This is a great body. It serves a great purpose.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I shall speak for only a moment now, because I was in the chair awhile ago when the tributes were being paid to the distinguished minority leader.

Like other Senators, I could not let this moment pass without doing so myself and placing in the record my own feelings of affection, love, and admiration which I have for him.

When I think of BILL KNOWLAND, I think of sincerity. I think of integrity. I think of courage. I know of no man who has these qualities in greater abundance than BILL. We shall miss him.

I hope and pray that the future will keep a man such as him in public life, performing what I think is one of the greatest callings a man can have, that of being in public service.

ADMISSION OF CERTAIN EVIDENCE—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11477) to amend chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for the admission of certain evidence, and for other purposes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the question before the Senate at the moment is the point of order which has been raised against the report submitted by the conferees of the Senate and the House on the bill, H. R. 11477, the title of which is, "To amend chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for the admission of certain evidence, and for other purposes."

It is alleged by some of those who have spoken against the conference report and in support of the point of order that the proviso which was added by the House is new matter. Nevertheless, while they urge that this proviso is new matter, they say it amounts to nothing. If it amounts to nothing, it is unimportant, and is not new matter of any substance, and the statement of the Senator from North Carolina is sound that the material added in a conference report must be judged according to substance and not according to form.

I read the title of the bill again. I call particular attention to that title.

To amend chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for the admission of certain evidence, and for other purposes.

The whole text of section (a) of the bill which came to the House had to do with the admission of confessions. The proviso which was added also deals with confessions.

The Senate amendment consisted of only a single word, the addition of the word "reasonable" before the word "delay"; and the proviso which is said to be new matter, although meaning nothing, reads as follows:

Provided, that such delay—

The very delay mentioned in the House bill, the very delay which the Senate amendment called "reasonable"—

Provided that such delay is to be considered as an element in determining the voluntary or involuntary nature of such statements or confessions.

I submit that this proviso deals with the substance of the title, with the substance of section (a), with the substance of the Senate amendment, with the substance of the admissibility of statements and confessions.

What we are confronted with tonight is a simple question. The division here is between those who want legislation and those who do not want legislation. That is the only issue. Those who have raised the point of order would rather have no bill than have any bill at all. They would have fought any provision which we brought from the conference.

On the other hand, the great majority of both Houses want legislation, because they feel that it is essential to interpret the decision of the Supreme Court in the Mallory case in such form that we shall not have any more misinterpretations such as that made by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. Those who want legislation desire it because they believe, as Justice Frankfurter said in the Mallory decision, that the purposes of rule V (a) of Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure are twofold: First, to protect individual rights; second, not to injure or harm the effective and intelligent enforcement of the criminal law.

Congress passes criminal laws to defend the individuals who make up the community. They are entitled to our support.

So, Mr. President, I suggest that substance, rather than form, makes it clear that the point of order is not well taken.

Mr. CARROLL. As the one who made the point of order, I cannot let go unchallenged the statement that those who raised the point of order are not in favor of legislation. I think I fought as hard in the debate, and for the passage of the bill as did the Senator from Wyoming, although perhaps with not so much expertness.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Perhaps the Senator from Colorado will permit me to say that I supported his point of order regretfully. I too should like legislation on this subject.

Mr. CARROLL. I am certain of that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I should like to complete my statement.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wished to pay tribute to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I shall be happy to yield, of course. [Laughter.]

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I express my appreciation for the very able and diligent service which the Senator rendered upon the floor in support of the Senate amendment. I thank him for it.

But I wish to make it clear that in my reference to the division between those who want legislation and those who do not want legislation, I have been trying to point out that those who feel that legislation is necessary are following the rule of reason, while those who are supporting the point of order are following the rule of technicality.

Mr. CARROLL. I suggest that the Senator from Wyoming is, of course, entitled to his opinion. I appreciate his commendation.

He knows that I stood by his side, both in committee and on the floor of this body, fighting hour after hour to sustain the word "reasonable," and giving the reasons for it, when other Senators who did not want the proposed legislation enacted voted to the contrary.

But now it seems that their judgment was superior to mine, because as a result of having been in three conferences—and this is why I am making the point of order—I find that the other body never wanted a conference.

In the conference, the Senator from Wyoming and I continually asked the conferees for the other body to accept the word "reasonable." And only last night—for this is now Sunday morning—did we get them to capitulate. And in the capitulation, I think the conference report has established new matter, matter not dealing with the law of arraignments, but matters dealing with confessions, and, therefore, matter not properly before this body, by means of the conference report.

That is one of the reasons why I did not sign the conference report.

I do not want the people of the District of Columbia to think that I do not want to protect them from criminals. But, on the other hand, I do not support a measure which would undermine 3 or 4 Supreme Court decisions—which this measure does, in my opinion.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to take just a minute. The Vice President is a very able lawyer, and I wish to address him for a minute, from the standpoint of his known legal ability and the legal issue involved here.

Mr. President, when it is said that there is no new matter in the conference report, I ask the Vice President to look at the proviso:

> *Provided*, That such delay is to be considered as an element in determining the voluntary or involuntary nature of such statements or confessions.

I do not think the Vice President can escape the fact that that proviso, if written into the law, will become a statutory instruction to the courts that hereafter they shall consider this matter of delay as an element in determining the voluntary or involuntary nature of such statements or confessions. But that provision was not in the Mallory bill; that provision was not in the bill the Senate passed. No hearings have ever been held by the Judiciary Committee on the question of whether we should pass proposed legislation which mandatorily would require the courts to consider such delay as an element in determining the voluntary or involuntary nature of such statements or confessions.

That is why I said, earlier, in connection with the point of order raised by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] that this measure has now become a confession bill; it is no longer an arraignment bill.

The Frankfurter decision in the Mallory case deals with the question of whether there was a proper arraignment. Mr. Justice Frankfurter held, for the Supreme Court, in the Mallory case—in effect—that the delay resulted in a violation of the arraignment rights of the defendant.

That is why I said, in my major speech on this matter during the Senate debate the other day, that what we were dealing with behind the veil, if we wished to pierce the veil of the decision on this matter, was the matter of due process.

So my point is that the conferees have brought back to us a proviso which contains a mandatory instruction to the courts in regard to confessions; but that proviso was not previously before the Senate.

Therefore, I submit that the proviso is new matter, and that the point of order is well taken.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I do not wish to become an advocate as regards what view my colleagues should take on this question. I have examined the measure reported by the conferees; and this is my judgment about it.

The conferees could have agreed on one of the three following possibilities:

First, the word "reasonable" could have been retained in the conference report.

Second, the word "reasonable" could have been excluded from the conference report.

Third, new words, creating a situation midway between a bill with the word "reasonable" in it and a bill with the word "reasonable" out of it, could have been written into the conference report.

I regret that I must disagree with my colleague, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] in his statement that this measure is one that deals with a procedural matter. All of the language of this measure deals with evidence.

In determining whether the conferees have acted within their authority under the rule, we must look to the four corners of the language that is dealt with.

In my humble judgment, the addition of the proviso brings the conference report midway between one which contains the word "reasonable" and one which omits the word "reasonable."

The words added to the conference report are a modification of the word "reasonable," and therefore are a part of the substance, and are within the meaning of the rule under which the conferees must act.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, in the closing words used by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], he brought clearly into focus the rule which makes this conference report subject to the point of order; he used the word "modification." Mr. President, a modification is permitted only under paragraph 3 of rule XXVII, when an amendment in the nature of a substitute is being dealt with.

The closing sentence of paragraph 3 (a) of rule XXVII reads as follows:

> They may, however, include in their report in any such case matter which is a germane modification of subjects in disagreement.

But in that instance, the word "they" refers to conferees who are dealing with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The absence of that sentence from paragraph 2 of rule XXVII—which deals with conferees who are dealing only with an ordinary amendment—highlights the fact that a modification is permitted only when the admendment is in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, it is now 10 minutes past 4 on Sunday morning; and at this bewitching hour we have been listening to a detailed debate about the unreasonableness of the addition of the word "reasonable." [Laughter.]

Mr. President, this Congress will not be able to do anything further about this matter, because the other body has long since adjourned sine die, and has gone home.

Mr. President, it seems to me that if this matter is important enough to be heard at all by the Senate at this hour, it is important enough to be heard by a quorum of the Senate; and, in that case, it is important enough to have a quorum of the Senate present around the clock. If it is not that important, Mr. President, it is not important enough to keep the rest of us here at this Sunday morning hour.

Therefore, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from South Dakota will not suggest the absence of a quorum. I have said that I am prepared to have the Chair make his ruling. And when the Chair rules on the point of order, I think that will take care of the matter.

So I hope the Senator from South Dakota will not attempt to take the leadership away from me.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I am not trying to take the leadership away from the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I can obtain a quorum if I have to; and I will, if I have to. But I hope I shall not have to.

Mr. MUNDT. If we are prepared to adjourn or prepared to have a quorum call, I am willing to do business in an orthodox way.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I can get a quorum if I have to, and will, but I hope I shall not have to.

Mr. MUNDT. I have been here all night, but I think if it is important to continue on and on, ad infinitum and ad nauseam, then I think it is important enough to have a quorum; but I will withhold my suggestion temporarily as a personal favor to a man whom I highly respect.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I appreciate that remark and am grateful for it.

If we can have a ruling from the Chair, Mr. President, I am prepared to exercise the responsibilities of the leadership.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair sustains the point of order.

THE CHALLENGE OF 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we are nearing the closing hours of the 2d session of the 85th Congress. We are about to go back to our States, to make an accounting to our constituents in the course of the 1958 Congressional election.

It seems fitting, therefore, to have some plain talk about the record of the 85th Congress, of the Democratic and Republican Parties, as written by Congress—and, what is probably more important and more tragic, as written by the Eisenhower administration's errors of omission and commission.

Under our form of government the public welfare and the security of the Nation are best served when the President and the Vice President, the only two Federal officials elected by all the people, supply the spark of leadership in the public interest.

Such leadership has declined virtually to the vanishing point in the past 6 years, both in domestic and international affairs.

Leadership in recent years has been supplied by the Supreme Court and the Congress. Progress, under such circumstances, tends to be crabwise, sideways, indirect, slight, and slow, and often too little and too late in the space age.

Much energy is consumed simply in a holding operation—in trying to defend ground already won.

Under these circumstances, and with the narrow margin of the past 4 years, the Congress, under Democratic control and leadership, has done a constructive and commendable job. The record of the second session of the 85th Congress is one of special action, accomplishment, and progress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the highlights of that record be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the highlights were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAJOR LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNAL SECURITY

1. Reorganization of the Department of Defense.
2. Authorized $54.6 million for expansion of missile bases and warning systems and created ARPA.
3. Authorized additional AEC construction and expansion.
4. Authorized atomic powered destroyer.
5. Military Compensation Act.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

1. Authorized $3.03 billion for mutual security program.
2. Reciprocal Trade Act extension, 4 years.
3. Authorized exchange of mutually essential atomic information and materials with allies.
4. Increased lending authority of Export Import Bank by $2 billion.
5. Adjustment of status of 30,000 Hungarian escapees.
6. Resolution relating to the establishment of an international plan for the peaceful exploration of outer space.

GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION

1. National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958.
2. Admitted Alaska as a State to the Union.
3. Classification Act employees increase.
4. Authorized training of Government employees in outside schools.
5. Increased the jurisdictional amount required for civil suits in Federal courts.
6. Passed Freedom of Information Act.
7. Adopted act providing for improved budgetary procedures.
8. Federal Aviation Act with increased aid to airport development.

SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH AND WELFARE

1. Extended for 3 years special school milk program with authorization of $75 million annual expenditure.
2. Authorized $1 million grants-in-aid to train public-health specialists, technicians, and administrators.
3. Increased civil-service annuities.
4. Extended for 3 years the Hill-Burton Hospital Survey and Construction Act.
5. Authorized the largest expenditures in history for medical research—$294,383,000, which exceeded the budget estimate of $211,183,000 by $83,200,000. The amounts provided for the various research activities as compared with the budget estimates are:

[In millions of dollars]

Activity	Budget	Appropriation	Increase
General research	$17.742	$28.974	$11.232
Cancer	55.923	75.268	19.343
Mental health	37.697	52.419	14.712
Heart	34.712	45.613	10.901
Dental	6.293	7.420	1.127
Arthritis	20.592	31.215	10.623
Allergy	17.497	24.071	6.574
Neurology	20.727	29.403	8.676

6. Extended Federal assistance programs for school construction in areas affected by Federal activities.
7. Required reporting and full disclosure of employee welfare and pension funds.
8. National defense education bill.
9. Area Redevelopment Act.
10. Authorized grants to expand teaching in the education of mentally retarded children.
11. Authorized agencies of the United States to make grants to support scientific research.
12. Enacted Food Additives Act.
13. Increased the benefits under social security.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, our record is so good that the Republican Party, judging by the gyrations of the Senate Republican policy committee and the sleight-of-hand of the Republican National Committee, does not want to go to the country, does not want to face an accounting to the American voters in the next 2 months, in a campaign, based on the record of performance of the Democratic Party and the failures of the Republican Party.

CHANGING THE SUBJECT

Yes, instead of running against the Democratic Party, against the Democratic record and against Democratic candidates, it is quite clear that the basic strategy of the Republican Party in the 1958 campaign is to try to change the subject.

Instead of measuring Republican performance against Democratic performance on specific domestic and international issues that mean the difference between prosperity and recession, between the establishment of peace and the continuance and worsening of international tensions under conditions that make our standing weaker, not stronger, the Republican Party obviously has decided to set up and run against a carefully selected set of technicolored scarecrows labeled "the Labor Bosses—America's Third Party."

Mr. President, this set of scarecrows, with whom the Republican political "double domes" hope to frighten the American people into voting for more Republican recessions, more Republican brinkmanship, is pretty exclusive.

Believe it or not, it includes no Republican labor leader.

By what is probably no accident, it excludes the Republican Maurice Hutcheson, who was chairman of the labor division of the Republican National Committee in the 1956 campaign.

It excludes Republicans Dave Beck and James Hoffa; it finds no space to mention Johnny Dio who apparently enjoys Republican innocence by association.

It denies space for the mention of the constructive actions of the AFL–CIO President George Meany, the actions of the AFL–CIO Ethical Practices Committee and the actions of the AFL–CIO conventions in disciplining and, on occasion, expelling large and powerful international unions found in violation of a code of ethical practices that has yet to be equaled by the NAM, the chamber of commerce, or, as far as I know, any other groups of employers.

REPUBLICAN IMMUNITY

In fact, Mr. President, it would seem that, if you are a Republican labor leader, you get Republican immunity; you are omitted from the Republican collection of political scarecrows.

But, if one is a labor leader who has supported Democratic candidates and the Democratic Party, if one is an independent labor leader whose union has on occasion given support to Democratic candidates, then automatically, he is in like sin.

If one is Walter Reuther or George Harris or James McDevitt or Louis Hollander or any of the hundreds of demo-

cratically-elected officers of labor unions who have supported Democratic candidates, he qualifies for the Republicans exclusive set. Never mind the fact that these men have fought and today are continuing to fight racketeers in labor and mangement just as they fought and drove out Communists and communism from positions of influence in the American labor movement. But note the fact that these men, only a few days ago, again drew the line between clean democratic unionism, and the Hoffa kind of unionism.

On August 18, 1958, the AFL–CIO, with but one dissenting vote, adopted the forceful statement forbidding affiliates to enter into agreements with the expelled Teamsters Union.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF AFL–CIO ORDER BARRING TEAMSTER LINKS

The constitution of the AFL–CIO states that one of the guiding principles of our organization is to protect the labor movement from any and all corrupt influences and from the undermining efforts of all who are opposed to the basic principles of democracy as a way of life, both inside and outside of the trade union movement. This provision was also a basic principle embodied in the merger agreement between the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, which agreement is in itself an integral part of our constitution.

The constitution, in addition, expressly enjoins affiliates of the federation from giving recognition to any organization which has been suspended or expelled from the AFL–CIO for violation of the constitution.

In keeping with these constitutional declarations, the AFL–CIO has, through the use of the democratic procedures laid down in its constitution, expelled certain unions for being under corrupt domination. One of these unions is the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, which has been shown to be under a leadership which is corrupt to a degree that goes far beyond anything which might have been contemplated when our constitution was promulgated and adopted in December 1955.

ALLIANCES OF AGREEMENT

The question which confronts this executive council is the fact that there are in existence alliances or agreements between AFL–CIO affiliates and the expelled and corruptly dominated International Brotherhood of Teamsters. In addition, there have been publicized proposals for further alliances between this corruptly dominated organization and the other affiliates of the AFL–CIO.

It is quite clear that the maintenance of an agreement between a corruptly dominated labor organization and an AFL–CIO affiliate which is of such a nature as to add to the prestige of the corrupt leadership, or would be of assistance to the leadership to retain control or lessen the desire of union members to rid themselves of such corrupt leadership, is in direct contradiction to both the spirit and the letter of our constitution.

It is obvious that if agreements of this nature are to be permitted to exist without action on the part of the AFL–CIO we are not doing our part to protect the labor movement from any and all corrupt influences. If disaffiliation from the AFL–CIO because of corrupt influences is to be of a token nature and disaffiliated unions are to be treated by some of our affiliates as if they were still affiliated to the AFL–CIO the high standards of honesty, integrity and trade union responsibilities promulgated by our constitution become mere empty phrases and constitute a fraud on all workers who look to a clean and decent trade union for the improvement of their standards and conditions.

AT THE LOCAL LEVEL

Obviously there are situations which arise in the day-to-day relationships between various workers which would call for understanding and cooperation based on elementary trade union principles between these workers at the local level. The executive council of the AFL-CIO has no desire to interfere with such relationships or understandings. We do not believe that the general membership of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters is corrupt. We do not believe that all of the local leadership of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters is corrupt, but we do know and it has been proven beyond any possibility of doubt that the top leadership of this international union was and continues to be corrupt.

Therefore, this executive council declares it to be the policy of the AFL–CIO that any alliance or agreement, formal or informal, between an affiliate of the AFL–CIO and the International Brotherhood of Teamsters be canceled. Further, that this above stated principle applies to any proposals for new alliances or agreements between the corrupt leadership of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and any AFL–CIO affiliate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have a statement by AFL–CIO President Meany and the AFL–CIO executive council, calling on Congress to enact the Kennedy-Ives antiracketeering bills.

I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD at this point, together with a statement by Walter Reuther, president of the industrial union department, AFL–CIO, likewise calling for the enactment of the Kennedy-Ives bill.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On the morning of Monday, August 18, AFL–CIO President George Meany sent the following wire to House Speaker RAYBURN, Majority Leader MCCORMACK, and Minority Leader MARTIN:

believes that the legitimate interest of the

"The executive council of the AFL–CIO public, the decent elements in the labor movement and in management will best be served by passing S. 3974 now. We are convinced that the enactment of this bill will help the labor movement in its determination to eliminate corruption in the labor movement and to clean its own house. Although the bill is not perfect, the good outweighs the bad and the passage of the bill without amendment is the only way to ensure enactment of this remedial legislation at this session of the Congress.

"We therefore endorse S. 3974 and urge Members of the House of Representatives to vote to suspend the rule and vote favorably for its passage."

STATEMENT ON LABOR LEGISLATION ADOPTED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE INDUSTRIAL UNION DEPARTMENT, AFL–CIO, JULY 24–25, 1958

JULY 31, 1958.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.:

In May 1958, the Senate passed S. 2888, the Kennedy-Douglas-Ives Welfare and Pension Fund Disclosure Act. Subsequently, in June 1958 the Senate passed S. 3974, the Kennedy-Ives Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1958. These bills were passed by unanimous and nearly unanimous votes. Together, they constitute two of the most important measures affecting the welfare of the Nation's wage earners to come before the Congress in recent years.

S. 2888 was approved by a unanimous Senate vote after more than 4 years of careful study, including exhaustive investigation and hearings. Similar bills also have been the subject of extensive consideration in the House.

S. 2888 provides for public disclosure of the financial operation of employee welfare and pension benefit plans, whether administered by unions, by employers, or jointly by labor and management. Its objectives have long had the active support of the industrial union department, AFL–CIO, and the AFL–CIO generally.

Despite the fact that S. 2888 was passed by the Senate more than 2 months ago, it is not yet law largely as a result of the opposition of the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, insurance companies, and other employer groups. These groups would apparently prefer to have no legislation to reveal the financial operation of employee welfare and pension benefit plans at all if this means, as the bill provides, that the public is to have a look at the operations of employer-administered funds, as well as those administered by labor alone or by labor and management jointly. These groups oppose the pending legislation notwithstanding the fact that these employer-administered plans cover more than 90 percent of all workers protected by welfare and pension benefit plans.

The enactment of a bill containing the essential features of S. 2888 before the end of the present session of the Congress is of utmost importance to millions of wage earners throughout the United States. We welcome the fact that the House Committee on Education and Labor has now voted out a bill incorporating some of these features. We hope that on the floor of the House or in conference between the House and Senate a bill will be agreed upon and enacted by the Congress substantially incorporating the provisions of S. 2888. We regard the enactment of such a measure as of prime importance to the wage earners of the Nation.

While a welfare and pension plan disclosure bill should receive first consideration in the House of Representatives, the problems dealt with in S. 3974, the Kennedy-Ives Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1958 are likewise of great importance from the standpoint of enhancing ethics and democracy in the labor and management field and correcting acknowledged abuse in the Taft-Hartley Act. We therefore call upon the leadership of the House of Representatives to take all necessary steps, after action has been taken on the welfare and pension plan bill, to assure final Congressional action on S. 3974 before the present session of the Congress comes to an end.

This bill deals with some of the major problems which have come to light in the labor and management field. It requires reports on union internal procedures and financial transactions, conflicts of interest involving union officers and employees, and antilabor arrangements participated in by employers and employer-middlemen. It deals with the administration of trusteeships and safeguards union democracy by requiring secret ballot elections. It calls upon unions and employers to police their own activities by adopting effective ethical practice codes and provides for a tripartite advisory committee to assist the Secretary of Labor in administering the act. It provides for urgently needed amendments to correct acknowledged antilabor provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act.

S. 3974 was in a far more satisfactory form when it was reported from the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee than when it was passed by the Senate. A number of these amendments were clearly unwise and unworkable. Some provisions were added which seemed to us clearly unfair and repressive. However, we agree with President Meany, of the AFL–CIO, that while S. 3974 was a better bill before the floor debate, it still retains enough substantive anticorruption sections to make it worthwhile.

It had been our hope that during the weeks intervening between the passage of the bill by the Senate and the adjournment of the Congress, the House would be able to take action to improve S. 3974. It now appears that if any action is to be taken on the bill this session, such action will have to be taken by the House directly, without reference to the committee.

This presents the question of whether the bill in its present form should be passed by the Congress. The National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, American Retail Federation, and other employer groups have bitterly denounced the bill and have called for its rejection by the Congress. Despite their attempt to camouflage the fact, these antilabor groups are opposing the bill because, for the first time, they and their Shefferman-type representatives would be required to make public disclosure of their antilabor activities. The honest labor movement represented by the AFL–CIO stands ready and willing to make public disclosure of its operations. Employers and their representatives should be no less willing.

While there are provisions in the bill which we would like to see improved or eliminated, they do not, in our opinion, outweigh the worthwhile features of the bill. On balance, the good in the bill outweighs the bad. The industrial union department calls upon Members of the Congress of both parties to meet their responsibility by passing the Kennedy-Ives bill before the current Congressional session comes to an end.

The American labor movement is dedicated to human service and is determined to fight without compromise the forces of communism, crime, and corruption. Despite our belief that certain provisions of the Kennedy-Ives bill, S. 3974, are unwise, unworkable, and unfair, the bill in balance will strengthen the efforts of the decent elements in management guilty of corrupt, collusive, more effectively with corruption and with those who would betray their sacred trust by exploiting the labor movement for personal gain, and would help to expose those in the American labor movement to deal and unethical practices.

The leadership of the industrial union department is disturbed by the efforts being made by organized employer groups and certain legislators to block passage of this legislation by the House of Representatives. These employer groups want to avoid the need for public accounting of their activities and financial transactions in the field of labor-management relations as the law, if passed, would require of both labor and management.

Efforts on the part of certain legislators with obvious antilabor bias suggest that they are more interested in exploiting the existence of corruption and racketeering than passing legislation to deal effectively with, and punish such abuses.

On behalf of the leadership and membership of the industrial union department, I urge that the matter of corrective legislation in the field of labor-management relations be raised above partisan, political considerations, and I call upon you to use your good offices to bring about the passage of S. 3974, the Kennedy-Ives Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1958, and S. 2888, the Kennedy-Douglas-Ives Welfare and Pension Fund Disclosure Act, or the substitute Teller bill by the House of Representatives so that this legislation can become law without further delay.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER P. REUTHER,
President, Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is, I think significant, that 149 Democrats voted to take up and vote on the bill, while only 41 Republicans did so.

It is easy to understand and sympathize with the sponsors of the bill, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], in their statements issued after the House voted 198 to 190 against taking up their bill. I ask that their statements be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator KENNEDY. Only Jimmie Hoffa can rejoice at his continued good luck. Honest union members and the general public can only regard this as a tragedy, that politics has prevented the recommendations of the McClellan committee from being carried out this year.

Constructive labor reform legislation will definitely be brought forward again next year. In the meantime, those who defeated this bill will bear a heavy responsibility for the labor racketeering that will continue unchecked.

Senator IVES. I am not surprised at the outcome; I was anticipating it. It is going to be very hard to get a bill now; the extremists on management's side have won, and are now going to demand such an amended bill that they will never get it through both Houses. The result will be stalemate.

The Kennedy-Ives bill was a good bill; it would have put Hoffa out of business, for example, but a lot of the House Members were misled by false propaganda from the NAM, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the American Retail Federation, the Teamsters, and the United Mine Workers. Can you imagine a more unholy alliance than that. They represent the extremists in both camps. When you get the evil in labor working with the uninformed in management, you've got a bad combination. It is an open invitation to all criminals to make the most of their opportunities in the labor-management field.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, because I think it proves reactionary Republican responsibility for killing the Kennedy-Ives bill, I quote from the Washington Post's August 19, 1958, report:

Senator KARL MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, said the House action will be of definite assistance to the GOP and mean difficulty for the Democrats in the coming Congressional campaign.

Who killed cock robin?

Republicans did the job, Mr. President, assisted by a small minority of Democrats.

Why?

PREFERRED DEAD BILL, LIVE ISSUE

Because, as the junior Senator from Arizona made clear when the bill was before the Senate, it would have killed the only issue the Republicans had.

Because the reactionary majority of Republicans prefer a dead bill and a live issue to a live law and a dead issue, the majority was willing, for supposed political advantage in the 1958 elections, to kill the bill and give the Beck-Hoffa-Dio-Shefferman type of racketeering a reprieve of 1 and perhaps 2 years.

I have here, Mr. President, a curious package which should be brought to the attention of the Food and Drug Administration or the Federal Trade Commission as a horrible example of mislabeling.

On the cover, it is boldly titled in capital letters, "The Labor Bosses—America's Third Party."

Then down in the lower right-hand corner in smaller type is the source: "Staff of the Senate Republican policy committee, July, 1958."

Inside, at the bottom of the table of contents, is this note:

Neither the members of the Republican policy committee nor the Republican Senators are responsible for the statements herein contained, except such as they are willing to endorse and make their own.

At this point, let me list the names of the members of the Senate Republican policy committee, so that citizens may inquire of them whether or not they support, endorse, and underwrite this book:

SENATE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE

STYLES BRIDGES (chairman), LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, MILTON R. YOUNG, WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, JOHN W. BRICKER, ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, EDWARD MARTIN, H. ALEXANDER SMITH, EDWARD J. THYE, JOHN J. WILLIAMS, KARL E. MUNDT, FRANK CARLSON, CHARLES E. POTTER.

I do not believe this hit-and-run campaigning is going to work. I believe the responsibility is going to be tied right back to the Senate Republican policy committee, to the Republican National Committee, and to every Republican candidate who attempts to run against George Meany or Walter Reuther and organized labor instead of against the Democratic Party and its candidates.

It will not be very hard to tie this particular slander against the decent majority of American labor back to the Republican Party. Meade Alcorn, chairman of the Republican National Committee, in his partisan sheet headed "Chairman's Fact Memo No. 28, August 4, 1958," calls attention to the volume, thereby putting the Republican National Committee in the position of being responsible for the statements contained in the volume.

Mr. President, the gyrations, gymnastics, and contortions of the Republicans in seeking to avoid comparison of Republican performance with Democratic performance are themselves a confession. It reminds me of the doctor who, when asked to treat a patient for a set of allergies, explained that he would rather throw the patient into a fit, saying, "I'm not much good on allergies, but I'm hell on fits."

We Democrats are not going to let the Republican candidates in the 1958 Congressional elections get away with their attempt to change the subject to avoid measurement and comparison of the Republican and Democratic performances as shown by the record of the Eisenhower-Nixon administration and the 85th Congress.

They will not be allowed to get away with their attempts to run against Walter Reuther, who does not live in their State or district and is not a candidate for any political office.

They are going to have to run against Democratic candidates and the Democratic record. We are going to see to that.

In passing, let me say, Mr. President, that we Democrats are proud of labor leaders of the type of George Meany, Walter Reuther, George Harrison, Joe Keenan, Jim Carey, David McDonald, Al Hayes, and many others who, on the basis of our platform, pledges, and performance, have supported, and, I believe, will continue to support, Democratic candidates as well as, in some instances that are deserved, individual liberal Republican candidates. I wonder, Mr. President, how many times, on how many platforms, the Republican Party will invite or even allow Republican Dave Beck and Republican James Hoffa to speak in behalf of Republican candidates during the 1958 campaign. It makes a whale of a difference, Mr. President, whether a labor union official's conduct and record will stand up under scrutiny as did that of George Meany and Walter Reuther under examination by the McClellan committee investigating improper activities in the labor or management field.

Mr. President, let us look at the record, the record of the Republican Eisenhower-Nixon administration since January 1953, and the record of the Democratic and Republican Parties in the 85th Congress, for which we are now about to make an accounting to the American people.

LOOK AT RECORD

The Republican Eisenhower-Nixon administration, in less than 6 years in office, has brought America to the worst recession since World War II at home, and to mortal danger of war and worldwide defeat abroad. It has done this by its failure to give the Nation leadership, a failure resulting in a surrender to Old Guard conservative domestic policies and stale, useless foreign policies. As a result, the United States is now faced with:

First. More than 5 million unemployed.

Second. The highest prices in history.

Third. The loss of American influence and prestige everywhere in the world.

Fourth. The daily danger of war in the Middle East.

Fifth. A Communist dictatorship that has caught up to us in many areas in scientific skill and is speeding ahead at a faster rate of progress in power development.

Sixth. An inadequate Military Establishment to meet this Red threat and to keep our vast commitments.

Seventh. Corruption and influence seeking in high places of Government.

Eighth. A farm slump that has driven 4 million people off the farm in 5 years, lowered farm prices, reduced farm income, and increased farm indebtedness.

Ninth. Race relations made worse instead of better.

These GOP failures and many more are documented.

First, let us briefly sketch the true indictment of the Republican Eisenhower-Nixon administration.

GOP'S BIG BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION BRINGS ON RECESSION

President Eisenhower turned the Nation's economic policies over to big-business men like Treasury Secretary George Humphrey and Commerce Secretary Sinclair Weeks. They sowed the seeds of the present recession by:

First. Raising interest rates, thus making it harder for people to borrow money and harder for businesses to expand.

Second. Slowing down the rate of economic growth on the theory that too much prosperity would be inflationary.

Third. Driving small-business men out of business.

Fourth. Reserving tax cuts for corporations and rich taxpayers.

Fifth. Allowing steel and auto producers and food processors to raise their prices, thus making it harder for consumers to buy their products.

The workers, consumers, and small-business men—whose investment and spending is essential to prosperity—were neglected. This quickly brought on the present recession. It was not an accident. Read what the New York Journal of Commerce said on July 15, 1957:

> The evidence now points strongly to the conclusion that both the administration and the Federal Reserve authorities believe that a moderate recession now would be a small price to pay for the avoidance of another boom-and-bust later on.

GOP LETS REDS RACE AHEAD IN POWER, SCIENCE, MISSILE DEVELOPMENT

The Republican administration and its paid Madison Avenue publicity agents have told the Nation all was well while hiding from it the true facts of Soviet growth. As a result, the United States has suffered numerous blows to her prestige as the world's greatest country. The Russians were allowed to:

First. Beat America to the punch with an earth satellite.

Second. Open up hydroelectric projects bigger than our biggest, Grand Coulee Dam.

Third. Speed ahead in development of intercontinental ballistics missiles.

Fourth. Expand their economy at the rate of 6 to 7 percent a year, while our rate of growth slowed to 2.7 percent a year.

Do not merely take my word for it. Here is what the New York Times reported last April 29:

> Allen W. Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, said today that rapid Soviet economic progress posed the most serious peacetime challenge the United States had ever faced. * * * While the Soviet Union has been making spectacular progress the United States has been losing ground * * * Mr. Dulles warned.

GOP WEAKENS NATIONAL DEFENSE

The men who run the administration's defense program have thought it more important to economize than to give America the defensive capacity necessary to stop aggression. Despite constant Democratic demands for more arms, the administration:

First. Cut the Air Force budget $5 billion its very first year in office.

Second. Cut back vital research and development funds by hundreds of millions of dollars, including a $146 million cut just a few weeks before sputnik.

Third. Let inflation reduce the amount of arms the defense dollar could buy.

It was well summarized by Lt. Gen. James Gavin, former Army research and development chief in Life magazine on August 4, 1958, when he said:

> While Russia even now has an intercontinental ballistic missile capability, several years will have passed before we have an ICBM capability of any significance. In short, we are now entering a missile lag period in which the Soviets will have a steadily increasing ICBM striking capability which we will be unable to match for several years. We are in mortal danger.

AMERICA'S FRIENDS, NEUTRALS TURN AGAINST HER UNDER THE GOP

American foreign policy is in deep trouble. Our position of world leadership has been weakened by inept and faltering direction. Every friend lost for America is a victory for the Communists, and the Eisenhower-Dulles foreign policy has lost friends throughout the world by:

First. Identifying itself with backward, discredited rulers in the Middle East and Asia, while the Soviets have portrayed themselves as friends of Arab and Asian peoples.

Second. Neglecting the problems of our South American neighbors to the point where official American representatives are stoned and booed on trips there.

Third. Posing as a nation that is heedless of the value of human life by continuing the testing of large hydrogen bombs.

Again, let me document these charges by quoting a responsible, nonpartisan authority, President A. Whitney Griswold, of Yale University, who said, last June 8:

> This has been a disillusioning year in the history of our country. Humiliating evidence of the low esteem in which our national aims and aspirations are held abroad pours in daily from all over the world. We expect what comes to us from unfriendly nations, but when * * * friendly nations regretfully add their contributions, wormwood is mixed with the gall.

GOP BREEDS CORRUPTION IN HIGH PLACES

Sherman Adams, Bernard Goldfine, and the vicuna coat are the symbols of special privilege and influence seeking that has infested this Republican administration from the highest level. Besides the individual instances of corruption which are now public knowledge, the public is paying the price of other deals as regulatory agencies bow to the industries they are supposed to regulate and defense contracts go to favored big business firms and GOP contributors.

Even Time magazine agreed, saying, on June 30:

> President Eisenhower (has failed) to stick to his oft-proclaimed deep sense of public ethics * * * to accommodate Sherman Adams and Bernard Goldfine, the Eisenhower administration had compromised a basic standard.

IKE HAS ABANDONED THE LEADERSHIP FUNCTION OF THE PRESIDENCY

The reason why these things have come about is because President Eisenhower has abandoned the leadership of the office of President. He is simply serving out his term, without the energy or the interest to provide America with the leadership it needs. Into this vacuum have stepped the old guard policies, which Eisenhower promised the people would never return:

First. Government spending programs are at the mercy of the Bureau of the Budget, which ruthlessly cuts requests of the administration's own departments and often refuses to spend funds appropriated by the Congress.

Second. Tax and fiscal policies are in the hands of men on leave from big banks and big business, who believe prosperity must trickle down and that the real threat to the economy is overemployment, according to the frank admission of the First National City Bank of New York in one of its newsletters.

Third. Foreign policy is monopolized by John Foster Dulles, of whom the Washington Post has said:

> It is one thing for foreign policy to be in a rut because there is no better course; it is quite another for it to be kept there deliberately because Mr. Dulles created the rut. (August 2, 1958.)

The day-to-day running of the Government, including key appointments to important agencies, is in the hands of Sherman Adams. It was summed up well by Walter Lippmann when he wrote:

> At present there is nobody who is unmistakably in command, nobody who is speaking clearly, nobody who is really working seriously to bring order, plan, purpose, and control into what is in fact a drift into disorder. (September 12, 1957.)

There are many more chapters to recount, in the story of this failure of GOP leadership—and the price the American people are being compelled to pay as a result.

Each chapter is a tragic story in itself.

The story of the farm crusade of the Eisenhower-Nixon-Benson administration which is steadily destroying farming as a way of life in America, while increasing surpluses 700 percent and costing the taxpayers 7 times as much to run the agricultural program under Benson as it did when the Democrats left office in 1952.

The story of the GOP foot-dragging on public resource development, while Russia surpasses the United States in the production of hydroelectric power, a race the Reds regard as key in the competition for world supremacy.

The story of the neglect of the Nation's housing problems, despite the fact that over 15 million Americans live in substandard housing or slums and that nearly one-quarter of all housing in the United States is classified as substandard or slum housing.

The story of sacrificing vital medical research and hospital construction at the altar of the balanced budget in the GOP's traditional indifference toward the Nation's health needs, as a part of the Eisenhower-Nixon administration's fiscal 1959 budget which the New York Times said "set in motion the most far-reaching retrenchments in welfare programs ever made."

The shameful story of lipservice to meeting the educational crisis while Republican votes undermined any effective action, leaving us with a mounting shortage of teachers, classrooms, and scholarships while the Russians add spectacular successes in missiles and satellites in science and technology.

The story of the GOP record in giving the Nation the most rapid peacetime inflation in the Nation's history.

The story of increasing failures for small business while big business profits soar.

The story of the amazing buildup of the heir-apparent to the Republican throne, who now is belatedly but jubilantly claimed to be nearing maturity.

The story of the Eisenhower-Nixon administration's backdown on its civil rights bill in 1957, and its failure to enforce the 1957 law Congress gave them; along with the failure to exercise constructive leadership toward school integration which resulted in the Little Rock crisis.

These are but some of the stories that need to be told and retold to the American people during the fall months and I intend to help tell them in documented detail.

Along with these stories of the collapse of Republican leadership can be contrasted the record of Democratic accomplishment—plus the promise and hope of greater achievement ahead in the 86th Congress when we return here with new and greater majorities.

For the sake of the American people, we must have solid Democratic control of Congress for the remaining 2 years of the tottering Eisenhower-Nixon administration.

We need it to provide a responsible check upon the administration.

We need it to push for more vigorous action in those areas such as housing, health, agriculture, power, and social security where the Congress can help determine national policy, even against a reluctant, veto-threatening administration.

We need it to prevent the GOP Old Guard from seizing control of Congress and sabotaging even its own administration's measures, as it did in 1953 and 1954.

But we need it most to forge a more constructive record of accomplishment to pave the way for a Democratic President in 1960.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent the following additional routine business was transacted:

ADDITIONAL BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

An additional bill and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, as follows:

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 4329. A bill to amend the act of June 5, 1948, relating to the Meat Inspection Service of the Department of Agriculture and to permit recognition of the meat inspection services of the various States in those instances in which the Secretary determines that such recognition will maintain the high standards of the service; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE:

S. J. Res. 203. Joint resolution to provide for the withdrawal of the United States forces in Lebanon; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

DISCLOSURE OF FOREIGN INVESTMENTS AFFECTING THE AMERICAN ECONOMY—THE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE INVESTIGATION OF THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, one of the grave dangers to the economic well-being of this Nation is the degree of foreign control of American investments.

The American people should know about our own economy, as every other major nation knows about its own economy, to what extent other nations or the nationals of other nations control American investments, and just where the danger point lies

THE DANGER POINT

This control comes about through numbered accounts and other forms of cover frequently concealing, for reasons contrary to the national interest, the true ownership of corporate stock.

At what point might such foreign investors be able to depress our economy through manipulation?

I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The resolution (S. Res. 387), submitted by Mr. MALONE, was received, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INVESTOR DISCLOSURE RESOLUTION

Whereas the economic health of this Nation must be preserved if this country is to successfully defend itself against aggression, and if the freedoms necessary for the continuing orderly processes of Government are to be preserved;

Whereas it is recognized that the economic and political conspiracy, including communism, has as one of its main objectives the destruction of the economic well-being of this Nation;

Whereas one of the least understood and, for that reason, effective weapons used against this Nation in the economic warfare which is being waged against us is the gradual acquisition of control over important segments of American industry by foreign interests;

Whereas the use of numbered accounts or other forms of cover frequently conceal for

reasons contrary to the national interest the true ownership of corporate stock; and

Whereas reasonable prudence in the national interest requires that immediate steps be taken to counter this threat to our security: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the national security demands full disclosure of the direct and beneficial ownership of shares of stock or securities of American industry, and an effective limitation on the extent to which such ownership may be acquired by foreign interests or persons.

It is further the sense of the Senate that the Federal Reserve Board, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Department of Justice, and the Department of State should explore this threat to the national security jointly, should take concerted action in their respective spheres to counter it, and should make suitable and prompt recommendations to the Congress for additional legislation if such is needed.

SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the Senate Finance Committee, by resolution, is undertaking to make a complete study of the financial condition of the United States including, first, the revenue, bonded indebtedness, and interest rates on all public obligations, including contingent liabilities; second, policies and procedures employed in the management of the public debt and the effect thereof on credit, interest rates, and the Nation's economy and welfare; and, third, factors which influence the availability and distribution of credit and interest rates thereon as they apply to public and private debt.

This is the first full-dress examination of our fiscal and monetary policies since the one conducted by the Aldrich Monetary Commission in 1908.

The immediate occasion for this study is the existing credit and interest situation and, more important, inflation which has started again with its ominous threat to fiscal solvency, sound money, and individual welfare.

Legislative matters relating to Federal revenue and debt, tariff and trade, and social security and pensions are under the jurisdiction of this committee. In the discharge of its direct responsibilities with respect to these subjects, the committee has become convinced that serious conditions exist in the areas to be studied, and that these conditions have exceedingly dangerous potentialities.

It is the purpose of the committee to explore these areas, examine the conditions, determine the cause, and, so far as possible, find the remedies.

To make such a study complete, the committee must examine fiscal and monetary policies, mark the distinctions between them, and study their relationships, one to the other.

FREE ECONOMY CANNOT STAND SECRET CONTROLS

Mr. President, in a free economy there must be no artificial controls. Particularly, there must be no hidden artificial controls. A free economy must be operated on principles established by law.

To maintain such principles, there must be a full disclosure of investments or control of stock or shares in corporations which might result in manipulation and defeat of the principles of law established by Congress.

ACTION OF PRESIDENT IN SENDING TROOPS INTO LEBANON

Mr. MORSE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 391), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the President made commitments to the Government of Lebanon of a kind which under the Constitution traditionally have been, and ought to be, embodied in treaties; and

Whereas the President sent United States forces into Lebanon without requesting the sanction of Congress, under circumstances such that his request for such sanction would have been appropriate; and

Whereas the President has given assurances to other governments, relating to the so-called Baghdad Pact, of a kind which under the Constitution traditionally have been, and ought to be, embodied in treaties: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate, reserving its right to agree or disagree with the wisdom of the foregoing actions, deplores such disregard by the President of proper procedure under the Constitution.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF WITHHOLDING INCOME TAX—WITHHOLDING TAX LAW MAKES EMPLOYEE INFERIOR CITIZEN

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which would repeal the withholding of income tax at the source of wages.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4328) to repeal the withholding of income tax at source on wages, introduced by Mr. MALONE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the bill printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, effective with respect to wages paid after the date of the enactment of this act, chapter 24 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (collection of income tax at source of wages) is repealed.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the bill would repeal the withholding of income tax at source on wages (chapter 24 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954).

Existing law—section 3401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954—defines the term "wages," for purposes of the withholding tax, as meaning all remuneration for services performed by an employee for his employer, with certain exceptions listed specifically in the law.

Under existing law (section 3402 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) tax is withheld on all wages at the rate of 18 percent after taking into account the number of exemptions to which the employee is entitled.

Mr. President, an employee is entitled to receive his pay intact. The withholding tax law treats him like an inferior citizen, not capable of handling his own business or not to be trusted to make out his income tax like an American citizen.

RECOGNITION OF MEAT INSPECTION SERVICES OF THE VARIOUS STATES IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to permit recognition of the meat inspection services of the various States in instances in which the Secretary of Agriculture determines that such recognition will maintain the high standards of the service.

Mr. President, this measure is being introduced in the closing hours of the session for the purpose of bringing it before interested groups for consideration before the next Congress. Its objective is to eliminate overlapping and duplication of inspection services, and to encourage improvement of State inspection standards to the point where States can qualify to be accepted by the Secretary of Agriculture for Federal inspection purposes.

The Department of Agriculture has approved the measure and so has the Bureau of the Budget. I am hopeful, as is the junior Senator from California, that calling this proposal to the attention of all concerned now will expedite action on it in the new Congress, when it will be reintroduced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4329) to amend the act of June 5, 1948, relating to the Meat Inspection Service of the Department of Agriculture and to permit recognition of the meat inspection services of the various States in those instances in which the Secretary determines that such recognition will maintain the high standards of the service, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS RELATING TO SMALL BUSINESS EQUITY CAPITAL AND LONG-TERM LOAN ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed as a Senate document certain questions and answers relating to the small business equity capital and long-term loan bill, recently passed by Congress, and signed by the President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO SUBMIT REPORTS SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may file two reports heretofore approved by the committee, subsequent to the sine die adjournment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has been requested by the Vice President to announce the appointment by him of the following Senators as members of the United States delegation to the Second International Conference on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, sponsored by the United Nations, to be held in Geneva, Switzerland, September 1 through September 13, 1958: The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has been requested by the Vice President to announce the appointment by him, pursuant to Public Law 614 of this session of Congress, of the following Senators to the Hudson-Champlain Celebration Commission:

Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont.

Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, of Rhode Island.

Senator PAT MCNAMARA, of Michigan.

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has been requested by the Vice President to announce the appointment by him of the following Senators as members of the United States Delegation to the 10th session of the Biennial General Conference of UNESCO, to be held in Paris, November 4 to December 5:

Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has been requested by the Vice President to announce the appointment by him pursuant to Public Law 689 of the 84th Congress, of the following Senators to be members of the Congressional delegation to attend the Fourth Annual North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentary Conference to be held in Paris November 17–22:

Senator THEODORE F. GREEN, of Rhode Island, chairman.

Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire.

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee.

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, of California.

Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, of Washington.

Senator ROMAN L. HRUSKA, of Nebraska.

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York.

Two additional Senators from the majority party will be named at a later date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has been requested by the Vice President to announce the appointment by him of Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, of Florida, to serve as an adviser to the United States delegation at the 13th session of the contracting parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade which will convene in Geneva, Switzerland, on October 16, 1958.

In accordance with Public Law 689, 84th Congress, the Vice President has approved the appointment of Senator HERMAN TALMADGE, of Georgia, as an additional member of the Congressional delegation previously announced to attend the Fourth Annual North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentary Conference, which will be held in Paris from November 17 to 22.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 9521. An act to amend paragraph (k) of section 403 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H. R. 13262. An act to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 13354. An act to amend the act of June 10, 1938, relating to participation by the United States in the International Criminal Police Organization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 13760. An act to provide for the denial of passports to persons knowingly engaged in activities intended to further the international Communist movement; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, August 23, 1958, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 3276. An act for the relief of Carl Ebert and his wife, Gertrude Ebert;

S. 3287. An act for the relief of Vivian D. Giesey;

S. 3818. An act for the relief of Vicenta Garcia y Puente;

S. 4249. An act to authorize a program for the conservation, restoration, and management of the rare Hawaiian nene goose; and

S. J. Res. 135. Joint resolution providing for the construction of demonstration plants for the production, from saline or brackish waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 123, I move that the Senate stand adjourned sine die.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 11 minutes a. m., Sunday, August 24, 1958) the Senate adjourned sine die.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 23, 1958:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Joseph C. Satterthwaite, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

John Nichol Irwin II, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Hugh M. Milton II, of New Mexico, to be Under Secretary of the Army.

OFFICE OF DEFENSE AND CIVILIAN MOBILIZATION

To be Assistant Directors of the Office of Defense and Civilian Mobilization

J. Roy Price, of New York.

Kenneth T. Downs, of the District of Columbia.

BOARD OF PAROLE

Edward J. Donovan, of New York, to be a member of the Board of Parole for the term expiring September 30, 1962.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Paul Kearney, of Oregon, to be United States marshal for the district of Oregon for a term of 4 years.

IN THE ARMY

The officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, to the rank indicated, under the provisions of the Reserve Officer Personnel Act of 1954, Public Law 773, 83d Congress:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. William H. Harrison, O292346.
Brig. Gen. John P. Homfeld, O253221.
Brig. Gen. John W. Kaine, O360270.
Brig. Gen. John W. McConnell, O1048490.
Brig. Gen. Chauncey D. Merrill, O112486.
Brig. Gen. William T. Rice, O320906.
Brig. Gen. Otis M. Whitney, O279172.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Charles H. Browne, Jr., O387461, Artillery.
Col. Claude F. Clayton, O322985, Armor.
Col. Eugene G. Cushing, O286447, Infantry.
Col. Richard E. Fisher, O343436, Corps of Engineers.
Col. John W. Libcke, O233642, Armor.
Col. Ernest L. Massad, O302186, Artillery.
Col. Robert P. Miller, O256068, Infantry.
Col. Herbert R. Morss, Jr., O293333, Artillery.
Col. Lewis C. Pattillo, O244386, Corps of Engineers.
Col. Snyder L. Peebles, O238690, Infantry.
Col. William H. Prentice, O385130, Corps of Engineers.
Col. Paul R. Teilh, O361063, Infantry.

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Aloysius Maximius Brumbaugh, O225777.
Brig. Gen. Richard Cook, O107835.
Brig. Gen. James Calvin Frank, O289883.
Brig. Gen. Stuart deJong Menist, O337970.
Brig. Gen. James Clarence Mott, O176119.
Brig. Gen. Henry George Nulton, O205635.
Brig. Gen. Almerin Cartwright O'Hara, O328935.
Brig. Gen. William Childs Purnell, O183312.
Brig. Gen. Maxwell Cook Snyder, O242582.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Frank Aloysius Alameda, O300304.
Col. Robert Daniel Chariton, O235009.
Col. Charles Leon Davis, O335351.
Col. Martin Henry Foery, O370696.
Col. Edward Malcolm Friend, Jr., O310219.
Col. Warren Crumley Giles, O349122.
Col. Harold Friend Harding O263728.
Col. Joseph Edward Heinrich, O255083.
Col. Richard Henry Hopkins, O245902.
Col. Raymond Forrest McNally, Jr., O294487.
Col. Benjamin Franklin Merritt, O244836.
Col. Richard Henry Neddersen, O349427.
Col. Philip William Smyth, O381934.
Col. Frederick Robert Stofft, O273771.
Col. Walter Thomas Stone, O293049.
Col. William Walter Watts, O917499.
Col. Mahlon Stewart Weed, O231252.
Col. Robert Gentry White, O171250.
Col. Collin P. Williams, O305510.
Col. Weston H. Willis, O289949.

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, to the rank indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 593 (a):

To be major generals

Col. James Francis Berry, O1046356.
Col. Charlie Fitch Camp, O396661.
Col. George Maguire Haskett, O414493.

The nominations of Paul W. Albert and 3,083 other officers for promotion or appoint-

ment in the Regular Army, were confirmed today, and may be found in the Senate Proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 13, 1958, under the caption, "Nominations," beginning with the name of Paul W. Albert, appearing on page 17341, and ending with the name of Turner L. Nelson, which occurs on page 17353.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The nominations of Eugene E. Moring and 171 other officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force, which were received by the Senate on August 15, 1958, were confirmed today, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Eugene E. Moring on page 17803, and ending with the name of Edward R. Noe, which is shown on page 17804.

The following-named officers of the staff corps of the Navy, as indicated, for temporary promotion to the grade indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

MEDICAL CORPS

To be rear admirals

Allan S. Chrisman
Calvin B. Galloway
Frank P. Kreuz, Jr.

SUPPLY CORPS

Edward F. Metzger
Howard F. Kuehl
Joseph M. Lyle

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Eugene J. Peltier
Henry G. Clark

DENTAL CORPS

Curtiss W. Schantz

IN THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The nominations of Donald R. Bautts and 668 other officers for appointment in the Navy and Marine Corps, which were received by the Senate on August 6, 1958, were confirmed today, and may be found in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Donald R. Bautts, which is shown on page 16395 and ending with the name of Ronald M. Thompson, which occurs on page 16397.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

To be major generals

Greene, Wallace M., Jr.
Hayes, Charles H.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade indicated:

To be major generals

McAlister, Francis M.
Munn, John C.

To be brigadier generals

Salmon, Ronald D.
Larson, August
Hudson, Lewis C.
Mangrum, Richard C.
Wieseman, Frederick L.
Shell, George R. E.
Brunelli, Austin R.
Krulak, Victor H.
Cloud, George H.

The nominations of Benjamin B. Manchester 3d, and 113 other officers, for temporary appointment in the Marine Corps, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on August 8, 1958, and may be found in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Benjamin B. Manchester 3d, on page 16679, and ending with the name of John S. Hudson, which appears on same page.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 122, agreed to August 23, 1958, the Vice President, on August 25, 1958, signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 25. An act relating to effective dates of increases in compensation granted to wage board employees;

S. 165. An act for the relief of Arthur LeRoy Brown;

S. 1438. An act to amend section 544 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the bonds of United States marshals;

S. 1764. An act to amend the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act;

S. 1864. An act to authorize an increase in the membership of the Board of Appeals of the Patent Office; to provide increased salaries for certain officers and employees of the Patent Office; and for other purposes;

S. 1903. An act to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, relating to travel expenses of civilian officers and employees assigned to duty posts outside the continental United States;

S. 1985. An act to authorize the preparation of plans and specifications for the construction of a building for a National Air Museum for the Smithsonian Institution, and all other work incidental thereto;

S. 2006. An act to relieve the Surgeons General of the Army and Navy of certain responsibilities outside the Department of Defense;

S. 2020. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and the Social Security Act;

S. 2039. An act to clarify the requirements with respect to the performance of labor imposed as a condition for the holding of mining claims on Federal lands pending the issuance of patents therefor;

S. 2114. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), as amended, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to acquire land for field sites, to undertake construction and improvement of buildings, and for other activities;

S. 2117. An act directing the Secretary of the Army to transfer certain buildings to the Crow Creek Sioux Indian Tribe;

S. 2146. An act for the relief of William F. Peltier;

S. 2469. An act for the relief of Dr. Brant Bonner;

S. 2719. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and eradicate the predatory dogfish sharks, to control and depredations of this species on the fisheries of the Pacific coast, and for other purposes;

S. 2836. An act for the relief of the town of Portsmouth, R. I.;

S. 3028. An act for the relief of Laszlo Cseri, Margarethe Hadjisky, Maria Micell, and Francesco Riso;

S. 3142. An act to amend the Federal property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to extend the authority to lease out Federal building sites until needed for construction purposes and the act of June 24, 1948 (62 Stat. 644), and for other purposes;

S. 3295. An act to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 in order to increase the authorization for the fisheries loan fund established under such act;

S. 3321. An act for the relief of George E. Ketchum;

S. 3335. An act to provide for a National Cultural Center which will be constructed, with funds raised by voluntary contributions, on a site made available in the District of Columbia;

S. 3379. An act to provide for adjustments in the annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system;

S. 3420. An act to extend and amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954;

S. 3503. An act for the relief of Marie Inette Konomos;

S. 3680. An act to provide for participation of the United States in the World Science-Pan Pacific Exposition to be held at Seattle, Wash., in 1961, and for other purposes;

S. 3683. An act to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas;

S. 3712. An act to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of the Rama Road in Nicaragua;

S. 3728. An act to incorporate the Big Brothers of America;

S. 3741. An act to facilitate administration and management by the Secretary of Agriculture of certain lands of the United States within national forests;

S. 3754. An act to provide for the exchange of lands between the United States and the Navaho Tribe, and for other purposes;

S. 3915. An act for the relief of Chiyoko Yoshimoto;

S. 3942. An act for the relief of certain distressed aliens;

S. 3944. An act to authorize the negotiation of a compact between the State of Minnesota and the Province of Manitoba, Canada, for the development of a highway to provide access to the northwest angle in such State;

S. 4032. An act for the relief of Mercede Svaldi;

S. 4039. An act to authorize the expenditure of funds through grants for support of scientific research, and for other purposes;

S. 4085. An act to amend the act of May 17, 1954 (68 Stat. 98), providing for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of old St. Louis, Mo., and for other purposes;

S. 4088. An act to approve a repayment contract negotiated with the Heart Mountain Irrigation District, Wyoming, and to authorize its execution;

S. 4096. An act to amend section 4201 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the annual rate of compensation of members of the Board of Parole;

S. 4113. An act for the relief of Harold Pangelinan;

S. 4214. An act for the relief of Mary F. C. Leute, the widow of Joseph Henry Leute;

H. R. 1803. An act for the relief of Mrs. Boyd Dinehart and Richard Reams;

H. R. 3193. An act for the relief of Toley's Charter Boats, Inc., Toley Engelbretsen, and Harvey Homlar;

H. R. 4059. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Carmen Scoppettuolo;

H. R. 7544. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever," approved February 28, 1929, by including therein the name of Roger P. Ames;

H. R. 8759. An act for the relief of W. G. Hollomon and Mrs. W. G. Hollomon;

H. R. 9020. An act to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11382. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to authorize the conversion or exchange, under certain conditions, of term insurance issued under sec-

tion 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11456. An act to authorize the exchange of certain real property heretofore conveyed to the city of El Paso, Tex., by the United States, for other real property of equal value, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11749. An act to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 6 months, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12212. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Department of the Navy;

H. R. 12281. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide an administrative site for Yosemite National Park, Calif., on lands adjacent to the park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13191. An act to require the Commissioner of Education to encourage, foster, and assist in the establishment of clubs for boys and girls especially interested in science;

H. R. 13192. An act making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13254. An act to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the use in food of additives which have not been adequately tested to establish their safety;

H. R. 13489. An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13666. An act to amend title 32 of the United States Code to permit the appointment of the adjutant general of Puerto Rico as provided by the laws of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;

H. R. 13840. An act to encourage expansion of teaching in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies;

H. R. 13856. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 546. Joint resolution designating the week of November 21–27, 1958, as National Farm-City Week;

H. J. Res. 658. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to invite the countries of the Free World to participate in the California International Trade Fair and Industrial Exposition to be held in Los Angeles, Calif., from April 1 to 12, 1959;

H. J. Res. 675. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 704. Establishing that the 1st session of the 86th Congress convene at noon on Wednesday, January 7, 1959.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The Secretary of the Senate presented to the President of the United States on August 25, 1958, the following enrolled bills:

S. 25. An act relating to effective dates of increases in compensation granted to wage board employees;

S. 165. An act for the relief of Arthur LeRoy Brown;

S. 1438. An act to amend section 544 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the bonds of United States marshals;

S. 1764. An act to amend the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act;

S. 1864. An act to authorize an increase in the membership of the Board of Appeals of the Patent Office; to provide increased salaries for certain officers and employees of the Patent Office; and for other purposes;

S. 1903. An act to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, relating to travel expenses of civilian officers and employees assigned to duty posts outside the continental United States;

S. 1985. An act to authorize the preparation of plans and specifications for the construction of a building for a National Air Museum for the Smithsonian Institution, and all other work incidental thereto;

S. 2006. An act to relieve the Surgeons General of the Army and Navy of certain responsibilities outside the Department of Defense;

S. 2020. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and the Social Security Act;

S. 2039. An act to clarify the requirements with respect to the performance of labor imposed as a condition for the holding of mining claims on Federal lands pending the issuance of patents therefor;

S. 2114. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), as amended, to incoporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to acquire land for filed sites, to undertake construction and improvement of buildings, and for other activities;

S. 2117. An act directing the Secretary of the Army to transfer certain buildings to the Crow Creek Sioux Indian Tribe;

S. 2146. An act for the relief of William F. Peltier;

S. 2469. An act for the relief of Dr. Brant Bonner;

S. 2719. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and eradicate the predatory dogfish sharks, to control the depredations of this species on the fisheries of the Pacific coast, and for other purposes;

S. 2836. An act for the relief of the town of Portsmouth, R. I.;

S. 3142. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to extend the authority to lease out Federal building sites until needed for construction purposes and the act of June 24, 1948 (62 Stat. 644), and for other purposes;

S. 3028. An act for the relief of Laszlo Cseri, Margarethe Hadjisky, Maria Miceli, and Francesco Riso;

S. 3295. An act to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 in order to increase the authorization for the fisheries loan fund established under such act;

S. 3321. An act for the relief of George E. Ketchum;

S. 3335. An act to provide for a National Cultural Center which will be constructed, with funds raised by voluntary contributions, on a site made available in the District of Columbia;

S. 3379. An act to provide for adjustments in the annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system;

S. 3420. An act to extend and amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954;

S. 3503. An act for the relief of Marie Inette Konomos;

S. 3680. An act to provide for participation of the United States in the World Science-Pan Pacific Exposition to be held at Seattle, Wash., in 1961, and for other purposes;

S. 3683. An act to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas;

S. 3712. An act to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of the Rama Road in Nicaragua;

S. 3728. An act to incorporate the Big Brothers of America;

S. 3741. An act to facilitate administration and management by the Secretary of Agriculture of certain lands of the United States within national forests;

S. 3754. An act to provide for the exchange of lands between the United States and the Navaho Tribe, and for other purposes;

S. 3915. An act for the relief of Chiyoko Yoshimoto;

S. 3942. An act for the relief of certain distressed aliens;

S. 3944. An act to authorize the negotiation of a compact between the State of Minnesota and the Province of Manitoba, Canada, for the development of a highway to provide access to the northwest angle in such State;

S. 4032. An act for the relief of Mercede Svaldi;

S. 4039. An act to authorize the expenditure of funds through grants for support of scientific research, and for other purposes;

S. 4085. An act to amend the act of May 17, 1954 (68 Stat. 98), providing for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of old St. Louis, Mo., and for other purposes;

S. 4088. An act to approve a repayment contract negotiated with the Heart Mountain Irrigation District, Wyo., and to authorize its execution;

S. 4096. An act to amend section 4201 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the annual rate of compensation of members of the Board of Parole;

S. 4113. An act for the relief of Harold Pangelinan; and

S. 4214. An act for the relief of Mary F. C. Leute, the widow of Joseph Henry Leute.

APPROVAL OF SENATE BILLS AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to sine die adjournment of the Senate, notified the Secretary of the Senate that, on the following dates, he had approved and signed the following bills:

On August 20, 1958:

S. 1110. An act for the relief of Sono Hoshi;

S. 2239. An act for the relief of Wadiha Salime Hamade;

S. 3827. An act to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942, as amended; and

S. 4002. An act to authorize the Gray Reef Dam and Reservoir as a part of the Glendo unit of the Missouri River Basin project.

On August 21, 1958:

S. 493. An act for the relief of Irene Montoya;

S. 2069. An act to amend section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended, in order to promote the development of coal on the public domain;

S. 3259. An act to further amend the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 896), as amended by the act of October 25, 1951 (65 Stat. 657), as the same are amended, to provide for an increase in the authorization for funds to be granted for the construction of hospital facilities in the District of Columbia;

S. 3651. An act to make equity capital and long-term credit more readily available for small-business concerns, and for other purposes;

S. 3817. An act to provide a program for the discovery of the mineral reserves of the United States, its Territories, and possessions by encouraging exploration for minerals, and for other purposes;

S. 4009. An act to amend the act authorizing the Washoe reclamation project, Nevada and California, in order to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for such project; and

S. 4153. An act to authorize the delivery of sewage from Virginia into the sewerage system of the District of Columbia and the treatment of such sewage, and for other purposes.

On August 23, 1958:

S. 13. An act for the relief of Hsiu-Kwang Wu and Hsiu-Huang Wu;

S. 92. An act for the relief of Robert Karla;

S. 160. An act for the relief of Georgios Ioannou;

S. 375. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for the validity and perfection of certain security interests in motor vehicles;

S. 532. An act to revise and modernize the fish and game laws of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 784. An act for the relief of Dwight S. Sharer;

S. 1798. An act to amend section 4426 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, with respect to certain small vessels operated by cooperatives or associations in transporting merchandise of members on a nonprofit basis to or from places within the inland waters of southeastern Alaska and Prince Rupert, British Columbia, or to or from places within said inland waters and places within the inland waters of the State of Washington;

S. 2052. An act for the relief of Heinz Farmer;

S. 2935. An act for the relief of Mary Louise Shields Wilkinson;

S. 2943. An act for the relief of Letitia Olteanu;

S. 2983. An act for the relief of Bernabe Miranda and Manuel Miranda;

S. 2989. An act for the relief of Salvador Miranda;

S. 3010. An act for the relief of Jose Mararac;

S. 3031. An act for the relief of Joseph Daniel Maeda Betterley (Toshikazu Maeda);

S. 3051. An act to amend the act terminating Federal supervision over the Klamath Indian Tribe by providing in the alternative for private or Federal acquisition on the part of the tribal forest that must be sold, and for other purposes;

S. 3130. An act for the relief of Georgios Papakonstantinou;

S. 3131. An act for the relief of Amile Hatem and Linda Hatem;

S. 3192. An act for the relief of Edeltraud Maria Theresia Collom;

S. 3199. An act to amend section 2324 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to change the period for doing annual assessment work on unpatented mineral claims so that it will run from September 1 of one year to September 1 of the succeeding year, and to make such change effective with respect to the assessment work year commencing in 1959;

S. 3270, An act for the relief of Nick Tsalikis;

S. 3305. An act for the relief of Adamantia Papavasiliou;

S. 3330. An act for the relief of Leopoldo Rodriguez-Meza and Adela Rodriguez Gonzales;

S. 3354. An act for the relief of Fuad E. Kattuah;

S. 3401. An act for the relief of Cho Hack Youn;

S. 3402. An act for the relief of Nessime Kadoch;

S. 3404. An act for the relief of Doulatram Chattulane Chavez;

S. 3421. An act for the relief of Alexander Nagy;

S. 3468. An act to provide for the construction and improvement of certain roads on the Navaho and Hopi Indian Reservations;

S. 3598. An act for the relief of Feiga Chirinsky Roseman;

S. 3615. An act for the relief of Wendy Levine;

S. 3641. An act for the relief of Gertrude Yang Koo;

S. 3665. An act for the relief of Choe Kum Bok; and

S. 3880. An act to continue the Civil Aeronautics Board as an agency of the United States, to create a Federal Aviation Agency, to provide for the regulation and promotion of civil aviation in such manner as to best foster its development and safety, and to provide for the safe and efficient use of the airspace by both civil and military aircraft, and for other purposes.

REPORT ENTITLED "PROGRESS REPORT ON SCIENCE PROGRAMS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT" (S. REPT. NO. 2498) SUBMITTED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of August 12, 1958.

Mr. HUMPHREY, from the Committee on Government Operations, on September 9, 1958, submitted a report entitled "Progress Report on Science Programs of the Federal Government," which was printed.

APPROVAL OF SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to sine die adjournment of the Senate, notified the Secretary of the Senate that, on the following dates, he had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolutions:

On August 25, 1958:

S. 607. An act to provide retirement, clerical assistants, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 3333. An act to facilitate the insurance of loans under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, and the act of August 28, 1937, as amended (relating to the conservation of water resources), and for other purposes; and

S. 3986. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an agreement for relocating portions of the Natchez Trace Parkway, Miss., and for other purposes.

August 26, 1958:

S. 377. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act and the Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to periods of limitation applicable to actions or claims, including those by or against the United States, for recovery of charges for the transportation of persons or property, and for other purposes;

S. 400. An act for the relief of Paul Thury;

S. 540. An act for the relief of the Board of National Mission of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America;

S. 1542. An act for the relief of Lori Biagi;

S. 2004. An act for the relief of George and Emma Clifford;

S. 2043. An act for the relief of Genoveffa Migliozzi;

S. 2262. An act for the relief of Hasan Muhammad Tiro;

S. 2629. An act for the relief of John J. Spriggs;

S. 2850. An act for the relief of Maria Pontillo;

S. 2936. An act for the relief of Feofania Bankevitz;

S. 3055. An act for the relief of Ronald H. Denison.

S. 3316. An act for the relief of Kiyoshi Ueda.

S. 3509. An act for the relief of Wong Wing Bon.

S. 3676. An act for the relief of Maria Michela Leo Di Gioia.

S. 3739. An act for the relief of Hermine Elmon Papazian;

S. 3743. An act for the relief of Cynthia Elizabeth Jefferson (Mimi Kurosaka) and Sylvia Elise Jefferson (Junko Tano);

S. 3789. An act for the relief of Donald J. Marion;

S. 4020. An act for the relief of Kunio Inouye (Sparkman).

S. 4059. An act to amend Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1958 in order to change the name of the office established under such plan; and

S. 4081. An act for the relief of Marianne (Sachiko) Fuller.

On August 27, 1958:

S. 761. An act for the relief of Charles C. and George C. Finn;

S. 1258. An act for the relief of M. Sgt. Robert A. Espe;

S. 1801. An act for the relief of Guerdon Plumley;

S. 2517. An act to amend sections 2275 and 2276 of the Revised Statutes with respect to certain lands granted to States and Territories for public purposes;

S. 2530. An act to designate the beneficiary of the equitable title to land purchased by the United States and added to the Rocky Boy's Indian Reservation, Mont.;

S. 2592. An act to amend the law relating to the execution of contracts with Indian tribes;

S. 2955. An act for the relief of Kazuko Young;

S. 3004. An act for the relief of Joanna Strutynska;

S. 3195. An act to authorize certain retired personnel of the United States Government to accept and wear decorations, presents, and other things tendered them by certain foreign countries;

S. 3203. An act relating to minerals on the Wind River Indian Reservation in Wyoming, and for other purposes;

S. 3300. An act for the relief of Jean Andre Paris;

S. 3308. An act for the relief of Itzhak Aronovici;

S. 3357. An act for the relief of Arturo Ernesto Audrain y Campos;

S. 3445. An act for the relief of Teruko K. Jackson;

S. 3547. An act for the relief of Andrejs Pablo Mierkalns;

S. 3572. An act to authorize land exchanges for purposes of the George Washington Memorial Parkway in Montgomery County, Md., and for other purposes;

S. 3607. An act for the relief of Harvey L. Forden;

S. 3723. An act to amend Public Law 522, 84th Congress (relating to the conveyance of certain lands to the city of Henderson, Nev.);

S. 3801. An act for the relief of Klara Leitner and her daughter, Sylvia Leitner;

S. 3873. An act to amend section 201 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the interchange of inspection services between executive agencies, and the furnishing of such services by one executive agency to another, without reimbursement or transfer of funds;

S. 3894. An act for the relief of Joseph H. Lym, doing business as the Lym Engineering Co.;

S. 4169. An act to amend the act of June 10, 1938, relating to participation by the United States in the International Criminal Police Organization;

S. 4287. An act to amend the act of July 27, 1956, relating to detention of mail for temporary periods in certain cases; and

S. J. Res. 190. Joint resolution to approve the report of the Department of the Interior on Red Willow Dam and Reservoir in Nebraska.

On August 28, 1958:

S. 166. An act to amend the laws granting education and training benefits to certain veterans so as to extend, with respect to certain individuals, the period during which such benefits may be offered;

S. 765. An act to increase the authorization for the appropriation of funds to complete the International Peace Garden, North Dakota;

S. 2001. An act for the relief of AlaLu Duncan Dillard;

S. 2057. An act for the relief of Diana Elaine Greig;

S. 2216. An act for the relief of John C. Walsh;

S. 2594. An act to transfer certain property and functions of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes;

S. 2888. An act to provide for registration, reporting, and disclosure of employee welfare and pension benefit plans;

S. 2922. An act to authorize per capita payments to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation, and for other purposes;

S. 3139. An act to repeal the act of July 2, 1956, concerning the conveyance of certain property of the United States to the village of Carey, Ohio;

S. 3219. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Graham Bonnalie;

S. 3221. An act for the relief of Erika Margaretha Zintl Pearce;

S. 3224. An act to improve opportunities for small-business concerns to obtain a fair proportion of Government purchases and contracts, to facilitate procurement of property and service by the Government, and for other purposes;

S. 3448. An act to authorize the acquisition and disposition of certain private lands and the establishment of the size of farm units on the Seedskadee reclamation project, Wyoming, and for other purposes;

S. 3534. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey approximately 181 acres of land at Fort Crowder Military Reservation to the city of Neosho, Mo.;

S. 3564. An act to accord coverage under the Civil Service Retirement Act to certain temporary rural carriers;

S. 3640. An act for the relief of Daniel (Nathaniel) Rosenzweig;

S. 3682. An act to authorize the sale or exchange of certain lands for the United States situated in Pima County, Ariz., and for other purposes;

S. 3768. An act for the relief of Hing Man Chau;

S. 3776. An act to extend the time for the collection of tolls to amortize the cost, including reasonable interest and financing cost, of the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Miami, Mo.;

S. 3826. An act for the relief of Concettina Iannacchino;

S. 3882. An act to amend the act of July 1, 1948, chapter 791 (24 U. S. C. 279a), providing for the procurement and supply of Government headstones and markers;

S. 3921. An act for the relief of Peter Tillner;

S. 3966. An act to amend Public Law 85-422;

S. 4004. An act to encourage and authorize details and transfers of Federal employees for service with international organizations;

S. 4021. An act to establish the United States Study Commission on the Savannah, Altamaha, Saint Marys, Apalachicola-Chattahoochee, and Perdido-Escambia River Basins, and intervening areas;

S. 4053. An act to extend the boundaries of the Siskiyou National Forest in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes;

S. 4071. An act to provide more effective price, production, adjustment, and marketing programs for various agricultural commodities;

S. 4167. An act to authorize the lease of Papago tribal land to the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes;

S. 4191. An act to maintain existing minimum postage rates on certain publications mailed for delivery within the county of publication;

S. 4196. An act to amend the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933 (47 Stat. 1425), as amended, to authorize incorporation of contract terms by reference in short-form documents;

S. 4273. An act to provide for cooperation with the European Atomic Energy Community;

S. J. Res. 178. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim February 8–14, 1959, as National Children's Dental Health Week; and

S. J. Res. 201. Joint resolution to authorize the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to confer a medal on Rear Adm. Hyman George Rickover, United States Navy.

On September 2, 1958:

S. 25. An act relating to effective dates of increases in compensation granted to wage board employees;

S. 552. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., of West New York, N. J.;

S. 1438. An act to amend section 544 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the bonds of United States marshals;

S. 1764. An act to amend the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act;

S. 1903. An act to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, relating to travel expenses of civilian officers and employees assigned to duty posts outside the continental United States;

S. 2006. An act to relieve the Surgeons General of the Army and Navy of certain responsibilities outside of the Department of Defense;

S. 2039. An act to clarify the requirements with respect to the performance of labor imposed as a condition for the holding of mining claims on Federal lands pending the issuance of patents therefor;

S. 2114. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449) as amended, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to acquire land for field sites, to undertake construction and improvement of buildings, and for other activities.

S. 2117. An act directing the Secretary of the Army to transfer certain buildings to the Crow Creek Sioux Indian Tribe;

S. 2469. An act for the relief of Dr. Brant Bonner;

S. 2719. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and eradicate the predatory dogfish sharks, to control the depredations of this species on the fisheries of the Pacific coast, and for other purposes;

S. 3028. An act for the relief of Laszlo Cseri, Dorothy Margarethe Hadjisky, Maria Miceli, and Francesco Riso;

S. 3142. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to extend the authority to lease out Federal building sites until needed for construction purposes and the act of June 24, 1948 (62 Stat. 644), and for other purposes;

S. 3276. An act for the relief of Carl Ebert and his wife, Gertrude Ebert;

S. 3287. An act for the relief of Vivian D. Giesey;

S. 3295. An act to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 in order to increase the authorization for the fisheries loan fund established under such act;

S. 3335. An act to provide for a National Cultural Center which will be constructed, with funds raised by voluntary contributions, on a site made available in the District of Columbia;

S. 3379. An act to provide for adjustments in the annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system;

S. 3503. An act for the relief of Marie Inette Konomos;

S. 3680. An act to provide for participation of the United States in the World Science-Pan Pacific Exposition to be held at Seattle, Wash., in 1961, and for other purposes;

S. 3712. An act to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of the Rama Road in Nicaragua;

S. 3728. An act to incorporate the Big Brothers of America;

S. 3741. An act to facilitate administration and management by the Secretary of Agriculture of certain lands of the United States within national forests;

S. 3754. An act to provide for the exchange of lands between the United States and the Navaho Tribe, and for other purposes;

S. 3818. An act for the relief of Vicenta Garcia y Puente;

S. 3915. An act for the relief of Chiyoko Yoshimoto;

S. 3942. An act for the relief of certain distressed aliens;

S. 3944. An act to authorize the negotiation of a compact between the State of Minnesota and the Province of Manitoba, Canada, for the development of a highway to provide access to the northwest angle in such State;

S. 4032. An act for the relief of Mercede Svaldi;

S. 4088. An act to approve a repayment contract negotiated with the Heart Mountain Irrigation District, Wyoming, and to authorize its execution;

S. 4113. An act for the relief of Harold Pangelinan;

S. 4249. An act to authorize a program for the conservation, restoration, and management of the rare Hawaiian Nene goose; and

S. J. Res. 135. Joint resolution providing for the construction of demonstration plants for the production, from saline or brackish waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses.

On September 6, 1958:

S. 165. An act for the relief of Arthur LeRoy Brown;

S. 1864. An act to authorize an increase in the membership of the Board of Appeals of the Patent Office; to provide increased salaries for certain officers and employees of the Patent Office; and for other purposes;

S. 1985. An act to authorize the preparation of plans and specifications for the construction of a building for a National Air Museum for the Smithsonian Institution, and all other work incidental thereto;

S. 2020. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and the Social Security Act;

S. 2146. An act for the relief of William F. Peltier;

S. 2836. An act for the relief of the town of Portsmouth, R. I.;

S. 3321. An act for the relief of George E. Ketchum;

S. 3420. An act to extend and amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

S. 4039. An act to authorize the expenditure of funds through grants for support of scientific research, and for other purposes;

S. 4085. An act to amend the act of May 17, 1954 (68 Stat. 98), providing for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of old St. Louis, Mo., and for other purposes;

S. 4096. An act to amend section 4201 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the annual rate of compensation of members of the Board of Parole; and

S. 4214. An act for the relief of Mary F. C. Leute, the widow of Joseph Henry Leute.

SENATE BILLS DISAPPROVED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to since die adjournment of

the Senate, notified the Secretary of the Senate that, on the following dates, he had disapproved bills of the Senate of the following titles, together with his reasons for such actions:

RELIEF OF THE CHAMBERLAIN WATER CO., OF CHAMBERLAIN, S. DAK.

S. 228. I am withholding my approval from S. 228, which would authorize the payment of $3,116.40 to the Chamberlain Water Co., of Chamberlain, S. Dak. This sum would be paid to compensate the company for relocation costs occasioned by the Government's acquisition of its former location for use in connection with the Fort Randall Dam and Reservoir project.

Public Law 500, approved July 3, 1958, makes provision for paying these removal expenses and the Secretary of the Army reports that the claim is now being processed. The present enactment, therefore, is unnecessary.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 27, 1958.*

MARY K. RYAN AND WILLIAM A. BOUTWELL

S. 489. I am withholding my approval of S. 489, for the relief of Mary K. Ryan and William A. Boutwell.

The bill would permit the two named taxpayers to file claims for refund of overpayment of income taxes for the taxable years 1949 and 1950, based on excludable cost-of-living allowances, notwithstanding that the statute of limitations has barred the filing of such claims.

The two taxpayers named in the bill filed joint income-tax returns from Alaska for the years 1949 and 1950. On these returns the taxpayers included as income certain "territorial cost-of-living allowances." The Internal Revenue Service had ruled, in 1948, that such allowances were includible in gross income. Subsequently, however, in October 1953, the Internal Revenue Service ruled that such allowances were excludable. In late March 1954, some 5 months after the publication of this second ruling, one of the taxpayers named in the bill filed claims for refund for the years 1949, 1950, and 1951. Refund was granted for the year 1951, but the 3-year period of limitations prescribed by the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 barred refund for the years 1949 and 1950.

While it is true that, at the time the second ruling of the Internal Revenue Service was published, refund for the year 1949 already was barred by the statute of limitations, the taxpayers did have from October 1953 until March 15, 1954, in which to file a timely claim for 1950. The record on this bill affords no explanation for the delay in filing such a claim until after March 15, 1954, but it does disclose that the taxpayer who filed for the refund learned of the revised ruling in November 1953. As for the taxable year 1949, bills introduced in the 84th and 85th Congresses would have provided general relief from the application of the statute of limitations to refunds of income tax paid on the cost-of-living allowances here in question. Such legislation, however, has never been enacted.

Congress has determined it to be sound policy to include in the revenue system a statute of limitations which, after a period of time, bars taxpayers from obtaining refunds of tax overpayments and bars the Government from collecting additional taxes. Such a provision is essential to finality in tax administration. The basic justification for a statute of limitations is that, after the passing of a reasonable period of time, witnesses may have died, records may have been destroyed or lost, and problems of proof and administration of tax claims become too burdensome and unfair for both taxpayers and the Government. The basic purposes underlying the statute of limitations continue in force even in cases where, after payment of a tax, the interpretation of the law is changed by a judicial decision or by a modification in regulations and rulings.

Several thousand taxpayers received "territorial cost-of-living allowances" during the period of the Internal Revenue Service ruling that such allowances were not excludable from gross income. This bill, by singling out two of these taxpayers for special relief from the statute of limitations, would unjustly discriminate against other taxpayers similarly situated.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 28, 1958.*

GEORGE P. E. CAESAR, JR.

S. 571. I am withholding my approval from S. 571, for the relief of George P. E. Caesar, Jr.

The bill would provide that, notwithstanding any period of limitations or lapse of time, claims, exclusive of interest, for credit or refund of overpayments of income taxes for the taxable years 1951 and 1952 based on exemption from taxation of certain earned income received for personal services rendered outside of the United States may be filed within 1 year after the date of enactment by George P. E. Caesar, Jr., of Aldie, Va., on behalf of himself and Claudia V. Caesar (deceased).

The records of the Treasury Department show that timely joint income tax returns were filed on behalf of the taxpayer and his wife for 1951 and 1952 but that no claims for credit or refund for those years were filed prior to the expiration of the statutory period for filing such claims on March 15, 1955, and March 15, 1956, respectively.

During the years 1951 and 1952 the taxpayer earned certain income for personal services rendered outside of the United States, and the taxpayer believes that these earnings should have been excluded from his income under section 116 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939. The taxpayer also believes that his failure to file timely claims for refund should be waived because of personal difficulties resulting from the death of his wife and also because an employee who prepared his returns for 1951 and 1952 did not inform him of the necessity for filing claims for refund within the period prescribed by law. The records of the Treasury Department show that the death of the taxpayer's spouse occurred on October 15, 1952, which date was 2 years and 5 months prior to the expiration of the period of limitations for filing a claim for 1951 and was 3 years and 5 months prior to the expiration of the period of limitations for filing a claim for 1952.

The circumstances of this case are not sufficiently unique to warrant special legislative relief. The statutory period of limitations, which Congress has included in the revenue system as a matter of sound policy, is essential in order to achieve finality in tax administration. Granting special relief in this case, where a refund was not claimed in the time and manner prescribed by law, would constitute a discrimination against other taxpayers similarly situated and would create an undesirable precedent.

Under the circumstances, therefore, I am constrained to withhold my approval of the bill.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 2, 1958.*

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR MAKING GRANTS UNDER FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

S. 3502. I am withholding approval of S. 3502, "To amend the Federal Airport Act in order to extend the time for making grants under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes."

The main purpose of the bill is to expand and continue the present Federal program of aid to States and local communities for the construction and improvement of public airports. Under the bill, the currently authorized program of $63 million a year through fiscal year 1959, would be increased to $100 million a year and extended 4 years through fiscal year 1963. Total Government expenditures would be increased by $437 million.

Civil airports have always been regarded as primarily a local responsibility, and have been built, operated, and maintained by States and local communities. During the period when the aviation industry was growing to maturity, it was appropriate for the Federal Government to assist local communities to develop airport facilities. Through various programs, including the grant program authorized by the Federal Airport Act, well over $1 billion has been allocated by the Government to the construction and improvement of local civil airports. In addition, over 500 military airport facilities have been declared surplus and turned over to the cities, counties, and States for airport use. These contributions, along with subsidies to airlines, aeronautical research, and the establishment and maintenance of the Federal airways system, have greatly aided—in fact, have made possible—the tremendous growth of civil aviation in our generation.

Now, however, I am convinced that the time has come for the Federal Government to begin an orderly withdrawal from the airport grant program. This conclusion is based, first, on the hard fact that the Government must now devote the resources it can make available for the promotion of civil aviation to

programs which cannot be assumed by others, and second, on the conviction that others should begin to assume the full responsibility for the cost of construction and improvement of civil airports.

Over the past two decades, more and more airports have progressed to the point of self-sufficiency. Aviation generally has achieved a state of maturity in which the users should be expected to pay an increasing share of airport costs. With the continued growth of aviation and the application of sound management principles, the progress toward airport self-sufficiency should continue.

I recognize that there will doubtless be a transitional period during which the Federal Government will be required to provide aid to urgent airport projects which are essential to an adequate national aviation facilities system and which cannot be completed in any other way. However, this bill does not provide for a transitional program. Rather, it sharply increases the level of the existing program. It does not provide for aid to the most urgent airport projects, but continues the current allocation formula which is not related to broad national aeronautical needs.

The existing program continues through June 30, 1959, so no community will be hurt by the withholding of approval of this legislation. At the next session of the Congress, the administration will recommend a transitional program to provide aid for the construction of urgent airport projects that are essential to an adequate national aviation facilities system.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 2, 1958.*

AREA REDEVELOPMENT BILL

S. 3683. I am withholding my approval from S. 3683, the area redevelopment bill.

Every year for the past 3 years I have strongly urged the adoption of a program of Federal assistance to communities of substantial and persistent unemployment for the purpose of assisting those communities to develop a sounder and more secure economic base. I regret that no action along these lines has been taken by the Congress until this year and, needless to add, I am greatly disappointed that I find myself unable to approve the present bill.

My disapproval need cause no unnecessary delay in initiating a sound area assistance program. Even the unsound program contemplated by S. 3683 could not be of immediate help to any community because the Congress, before adjournment, failed to provide any money to carry out the bill's purposes. Until the next session of the Congress, the needs of areas of severe and persistent unemployment can be met in part through the new program of loans to State and local development companies under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 which I recently approved.

The repeated recommendations of the administration recognized that the major responsibility for planning and financing the economic redevelopment of communities of chronic unemployment must remain with local citizens if Federal programs are to be effective. The present bill departs from this principle, and would greatly diminish local responsibility. In doing so, and in including other undesirable features, it defeats any reasonable chance of giving effective help to the communities really in need.

S. 3683 provides for less local participation in the costs of local development projects than is proper or necessary to stimulate and assure the continuing interest and support of local governmental and private interests. The administration recommended loans, for periods of 25 years, in amounts not exceeding 35 percent of the cost of redevelopment projects. S. 3683, on the other hand, provides for loans for such projects for periods of 40 years, at artificially low interest rates, in amounts up to 65 percent of the total cost of a project.

S. 3683 proposes in addition a program of Federal grants for public works in redevelopment areas under which it would be possible to have no local participation whatever. Moreover, the criteria for making these grants are so loosely drawn that, without indiscriminate use of funds, administration of these provisions would be almost impossible. This is a field in which, if the Federal Government participates at all, it should be able to rely upon local judgments backed by significant local contributions.

S. 3683 is also defective in my judgment because its assistance in certain instances, would be available in areas in which unemployment is traceable essentially to temporary conditions. Federal assistance to communities where unemployment is not clearly chronic would necessarily mean the assumption of responsibility by the Government for the direct support of local economies—an assumption of responsibility that would have the most profound consequences.

I also believe it would be a grave mistake to establish, as this bill would, an area assistance program in the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Such a program should be lodged, not with an agency concerned with residential housing and related matters, but rather with the Department of Commerce which has primary responsibility for business and industrial development and a long experience in extending to local areas technical aid for economic development.

S. 3683 also contemplates a Federal redevelopment assistance, including loans, in rural areas. There is serious question as to whether Federal loans for the construction of industrial buildings in rural areas would be a proper or effective approach, much less a permanent one, to the problems of surplus labor in essentially agricultural communities.

It is my intention next January when the Congress reconvenes to request the Congress to enact area assistance legislation more soundly conceived to carry out the purposes which I have repeatedly stressed as being in the national interest. It is my hope that Congress at that time will move with all possible speed to enact such an area assistance program.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 6, 1958.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, AUGUST 23, 1958

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Jude 25: *To the only wise God, our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and forever.*

Almighty God, our Father, we are again humbly uniting our minds and hearts in the fellowship of prayer to worship and adore Thy great and holy name.

We pray that Thou wilt bestow the benediction of Thy peace and the diadem of Thy praise upon our President, our Speaker, the chosen Representatives of our Republic, and all who have served during this 85th Congress in whatever capacity.

May we have within our hearts the joyous testimony that we have sought to fulfill the duties and responsibilities of our high vocation with a pure and steadfast devotion.

Grant that we may leave this Chamber, commending and committing one another to Thy love and care and with the assurance that where Thou dost guide Thou wilt also provide.

May the Lord bless us and keep us; may the Lord make His face to shine upon us and be gracious unto us; may the Lord lift upon us the light of His countenance and give us peace.

Hear us in the name of the Christ, our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 13580. An act to increase the public debt limit.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3683. An act to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 7450) entitled "An act to make the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act Amendments of 1957 applicable to retired former members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police force, the White House Police force, and the United States Secret Service; and to their widows, widowers, and children;" disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints

Mr. BIBLE, Mr. PROXMIRE, and Mr. BEALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3420) entitled "An act to extend and amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954."

INCREASING THE PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 13580) to increase the public debt limit, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 10, strike out "$285,000,000,000" and insert "$283,000,000,000."

Page 2, strike out lines 4 to 9, inclusive.

Page 2, strike out lines 10 to 13, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman will take time to explain what happened in the other body on this measure.

Mr. MILLS. Yes; I will be glad to.

As the gentleman from Iowa and Members of the House will recall, in the form in which H. R. 13580 passed the House of Representatives, the purpose of the bill was to raise the existing permanent debt limit of the United States from $275 billion to $285 billion and, in addition, provide that the limit be temporarily raised to $288 billion through June 30, 1960. The increases contained in the House-passed bill were those which were recommended by the administration, through the Secretary of the Treasury.

The Senate amended this bill in two material respects. First, the Senate version of the bill provides that the existing permanent debt limit be raised from $275 billion to $283 billion, as compared with the increase in the permanent limit under the House bill from $275 billion to $285 billion. Second, the Senate-passed bill provides that the temporary increase under existing law of $5 billion shall continue through June 30, 1959.

The result of the Senate amendments in substance is that the overall debt limit, permanent and temporary, will be the $288 billion which the Secretary of the Treasury requested, and this $288 billion will continue through June 30, 1959. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the Senate has amended the bill so as to provide a ceiling in the amount requested by the administration, but this is accomplished through continuing the present $5 billion temporary increase and adding an $8 billion permanent increase, whereas under the House bill the permanent increase would have been $10 billion, with an additional temporary increase of $3 billion. Under the House bill, the overall ceiling of $288 billion would have continued through June 30, 1960, whereas under the Senate version the overall ceiling, temporary and permanent, will continue through June 30, 1959.

The net effect of the Senate amendment is merely to require the Secretary of the Treasury, in my opinion, to visit Capitol Hill about 30 to 60 days earlier next year than he would have under the House version.

Mr. GROSS. I doubt if the gentleman from Arkansas has spoken a greater truth in his life than that last statement, and of course, the gentleman is always truthful.

There is no rider attached to this bill of any kind; is there?

Mr. MILLS. There is no rider and there is no amendment, other than those I described above, added to the bill during the consideration of it by the other body.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so to inquire of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means; first: There is no question in the gentleman's mind, is there, that no matter whether we accept the House version or the Senate version, we will have to come back next year and reconsider the debt limit again and without question provide a further increase for the fiscal year 1960, if present spending plans continue?

Mr. MILLS. I regret I must agree with my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, in his statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have joined my esteemed friend and distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas, to request that the House concur in the Senate amendments to the bill, H. R. 13580, providing an increase in the public debt limit.

It will be recalled that as this legislation passed the House the present permanent debt limit of $275 billion would have been increased to a permanent limit of $285 billion, with provision for an additional temporary increase of $3 billion through June 30, 1960. In an appearance before the Committee on Ways and Means in behalf of the administration, the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury pointed out the need for the $10 billion permanent increase in the debt limit was occasioned by the fact that he could not foresee our being able to come within the permanent limit of $275 billion by the end of the current fiscal year or even by the end of the succeeding fiscal year. The additional $3 billion temporary increase provided in the House bill was to afford to the Department of the Treasury the latitude necessary to the efficient management of our Nation's fiscal affairs.

The Senate in acting on this legislation provided for an $8 billion increase in the permament debt limit to $283 billion. The temporary increase presently in effect through June 30, 1959, would be continued as contained in present law.

It is my judgment, Mr. Speaker, that the House-passed version of this legislation deals more realistically with the fiscal problems confronting our Nation. This observation is particularly true in view of recent legislation which has been passed by the House calling for the expenditure of additional billions that had not been included in budget estimates. However, the closeness of the adjournment of this second session of the 85th Congress necessitates our acting expeditiously on this legislative measure. It is in the interest of expediting its consideration that I have concurred in the Senate modification.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 13489) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SCHENCK. Is it possible to object to the consideration of the conference report?

The SPEAKER. It is not. Under the order of the House, granted by unanimous consent on yesterday, this is a privileged matter.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report?

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the conference report.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2699)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13489) "making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and

for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 11 and 13.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8 and 14, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$230,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$4,401,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$785,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"AIR NATIONAL GUARD

"For an additional amount for 'Air National Guard,' $9,000,000: *Provided*, That funds appropriated under this head in this Act shall be available only for construction as authorized by law."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 3, 4, 7, 10, and 12.

HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
CLARENCE CANNON,
CHARLES R. JONAS,
MELVIN R. LAIRD,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
CARL HAYDEN,
LISTER HILL,
JOHN STENNIS,
HARRY F. BYRD,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
STYLES BRIDGES,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13489) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Amendment No. 1: Military construction, Army: Appropriates $230,000,000 instead of $214,564,000 as proposed by the House and $327,847,000 as proposed by the Senate. The committee of conference has approved the funding program as proposed by the House with the deletions thereto proposed by the Senate and the following additional projects:

Fort Lee, Va. (academic building)	$3,410,000
Fort Huachuca, Ariz. (technical building)	5,500,000
Army Map Services, Md. (cartographic engineering building)	1,913,000
Carlisle Barracks, Pa. (land acquisition)	354,000
Fort McClellan, Ala. (station hospital)	3,331,000
Fort Bliss, Tex. (laboratory and classroom buildings)	7,928,000
Minor new construction	955,000

Amendment No. 2: Army Reserve Forces: Reported in disagreement. The committee of conference is in agreement that $6,250,000 shall be appropriated for the Army Reserve Forces and that these funds shall be available for the construction program of the Army Reserve components without special regard to the detailed list of projects set forth in Senate report numbered 2362. The conferees are in agreement that of this amount $5,250,000 shall be for National Guard facilities and $1,000,000 for Army Reserve facilities.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Amendment No. 3: Military Construction, Navy: Reported in disagreement. The committee of conference has approved the funding program as proposed by the House with the deletions thereto as proposed by the Senate and the following additional projects:

Naval Station, Newport, R. I. (barracks, heating plant expansion, and messhall)	$2,650,000
Naval Base, Norfolk, Va. (dredging base approaches)	2,546,000
Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Meridian, Miss. (hangar)	2,796,000
Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Yuma, Ariz. (runway, taxiway, and land acquisition)	8,946,000
Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, Calif. (rehabilitation of barracks, messhall, and bachelor officers' quarters)	817,000
Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, S. C. (barracks)	1,501,000

The conferees have deleted the $11,000 proposed by the Senate for land acquisition at NAAS, Whiting Field, Florida, because of information obtained from the Navy that these specific funds are not required for the purchase of this land. The Navy is directed to acquire this land with presently available funds and authority without delay.

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate are in disagreement as to the inclusion in the funding program of $5,500,000 for the Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California, as proposed by the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Amendment No. 5: Military Construction, Air Force: Provides that of the funds appropriated for Military Construction, Air Force $4,401,000 shall be used only for the construction of a solar furnace at Holloman Air Force Base, New Mexico, instead of $9,034,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments No. 6: Military Construction, Air Force: Appropriates $785,000,000 instead of $687,350,000 as proposed by the House and $974,995,000 as proposed by the Senate. The committee of conference has approved the funding program as proposed by the House with the deletions thereto as proposed by the Senate and the following additional projects:

Holloman AFB, N. Mex. (solar furnace)	$4,401,000
Andrews AFB, Md. (parallel runway)	10,389,000
Lockbourne AFB, Ohio (runway)	11,115,000
Pease AFB, N. H. (water supply)	683,000
Cannon AFB, N. Mex. (NCO Club)	$198,000
Sundance AFS, Wyo. (family housing)	505,000
Ballistic missiles (TITAN program)	70,000,000
Andersen AFB, Guam (alert hangar)	1,100,000

The committee of conference has restored $70,000,000 of the $90,000,000 deleted by the House for the TITAN ballistic missile program. The Air Force is directed to notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate, not less than 30 days prior to the award, of any contracts relating to the construction of facilities under this missile program. This notification should include information relative to the specific items involved, the estimated cost thereof, and other pertinent data.

The committee of conference has deleted the $1,464,000 proposed by the Senate for the Memphis General Depot, Tennessee. This action was taken because the hospital recently declared excess to the needs of the Veterans' Administration, available and equipped to house this activity at this location. The Air Force is directed to make use of this facility.

The committee of conference has denied the $2,010,000 proposed by the Senate for the construction of a hospital at Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota. The Department of the Air Force is directed to satisfy its hospital requirements at this installation by the use of the existing Federal facilities in the area and non-Federal hospital facilities.

The availability of all funds for the construction of the dam near Pease AFB, New Hampshire, is contingent on the withdrawal of any suits now pending in connection with the development of the Pease Air Force Base water supply. It is the expectation of the conferees that upon withdrawal of the said suits construction of the dam will be immediately commenced.

Amendment No. 7: Military Construction, Air Force: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 8 and 9: Military Construction, Air Force Reserve Forces: Appropriates $9,600,000 for the Air National Guard as proposed by the Senate instead of $14,150,000 as proposed by the House for the Air Force Reserve forces and amends the language proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 10: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 11: Changes section number.

Amendment No. 12: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 13: Deletes language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14: Changes section number.

HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
CLARENCE CANNON,
CHARLES R. JONAS,
MELVIN R. LAIRD,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, the total in the military construction bill as reached by the conference committee is $1.3 billion. This is approximately $376 million less than the budget estimates, is an increase of $135 million above the House bill and $366 million below the Senate bill. The conferees have agreed on an appropriation of $6,250,000 for the construction of National Guard armory facilities instead of $28,330,000 as pro-

posed by the Senate. These funds are not tied down to any specific projects but are to be allocated to authorized projects in a priority to be determined by the proper defense officials. The increases agreed to by the conferees above the House bill are, generally speaking, for high-priority projects where additional information was made available to the Senate which was not available at the time of the House hearings. A specific example of this is the funds for the Titan ballistic missile program presently scheduled for obligation some 4 months earlier than was contemplated in the House hearings. The managers on the part of the House are in complete agreement on this conference report and on the amendments to be offered. I urge its adoption without change.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. BOLAND. I notice the conference report contains a plethora of new buildings for the National Guard. Can the gentleman tell me what the situation was, recommended by the other body?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The conference report allows $6,250,000 for facilities for the Reserve components of the Army. These funds are not tied down to any specific project, but it is left to the military as to where the improvements shall be made.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Am I correct in my understanding that the conferees bring in a report which provides additional money for the construction of National Guard armories, but the use of that money will depend upon the decision of the Adjutant General who will decide which of the new ones will get armories?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The answer is "Yes."

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If I am correct, the Senate amended the bill so as to add an item for the construction of an Institute of Technology at Wright-Patterson Airbase near Dayton, Ohio, which has been recommended for some time by the Air Force. If I read the report correctly—and it is very difficult for any Member to know what it does contain—that item was stricken from the bill?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. In what amendment is that contained, or did the Senate strike it out?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is amendment No. 6.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Amendment No. 6.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Amendment No. 6. The Senate receded on that particular item.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Can the gentleman give us any reason why?

Mr. SHEPPARD. In the first place the Senate did not insist on it. In the final analysis, it is not considered necessary to be constructed in this particular period of time. We figured that a year hence they could do the same thing if it was necessary to do so, meanwhile a study can be made as to the possible use of existing Government facilities as set forth in the House report.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. As a matter of record, may I ask the gentleman, as chairman of the subcommittee, will this item be considered by the subcommittee at the next session of the Congress?

Mr. SHEPPARD. If it is contained in the program which comes up in the budget, the answer is obviously "Yes."

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It was in the budget originally?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And if it comes up, further consideration will be given to it this coming year?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to inquire as to the exact amount of construction money in the armory program.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is an additional $6,250,000.

Mr. BAILEY. Will you be kind enough to tell me how much there will be available?

Mr. SHEPPARD. They will have available $54,354,000.

Mr. BAILEY. What action did the conference committee take on the Reserve components?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is what we have been discussing, the Reserve components.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Are there any items in this bill not previously considered by the House?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes; there are three items.

Mr. GROSS. The reason I ask the question is that I read in the morning paper that the independent offices appropriation bill which was passed in the House yesterday afternoon contained $100,000 to pay pensions to former Presidents.

I did not know when that bill came before the House yesterday afternoon that that item had been authorized in the bill we passed for the so-called Presidential pension on Thursday, and on Friday the House passed the bill containing $100,000 to implement it.

I am sorry the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee is not present on the House floor—at least I do not see him. I would like to know what hearings were held; I would like to know upon what basis they arrived at the $100,000 figure. We have two former Presidents who I am sure will not benefit by the bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I do not know that I can respond to the gentleman's question, for that is not a matter with which I deal.

Mr. GROSS. I regret very much that it was not explained when it was before the House, that the bill contained this $100,000.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa that when the independent offices appropriation bill came back for our complete and 100-percent surrender, I carefully stated, and I believe you can check my words in the RECORD, that the bill was exactly like it was when it passed the House, not once but twice, with the exception of two items. The items were: One, minus the amount of $600 million for the civil-service fund, and two, the item for $100,000 to implement the Presidential pension bill.

In reply to the second half of the gentleman's question, how we arrived at that figure, may I say that the legislation authorized $175,000. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and myself, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] took a look at it, and we cut it practically half in two and came up with the figure of $100,000 rather than $175,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman saying that $175,000 was provided in the bill that passed the House last Thursday?

Mr. THOMAS. It authorized a total of $175,000 when you add up the different items; no, I am in error, it was $170,000.

Mr. GROSS. An authorization of $170,000 with only two former Presidents living? That represents some of the fastest footwork I have seen on the part of the Appropriations Committee since I have been here.

Mr. THOMAS. Read it; that is what is authorized.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I wonder if the gentleman could give the House a breakdown of this $100,000.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; $10,000 to the two widows of former Presidents; $25,000 each to two former Presidents; $50,000 clerk-hire allowance to each, which adds up to a total of $170,000. We cut it in half, not knowing how much would be needed. I think that is a fair compromise.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me 1 minute?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I call the gentleman's attention to page 19175 of the RECORD. On that page the gentleman from Texas who just left the floor explained that $100,000 in detail.

On the same page the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] explained it in detail. I think that ought to be in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Was that in the statement filed by the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. In the statement that he filed?

Mr. TABER. No. It was in what he said on the floor yesterday. Frankly, I was against what they had in the bill, but it was authorized, and there was nothing to do but provide within reason for its operation. Frankly, the committee thought that the $170,000 was too much and they cut that down to $100,000.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, in the hearings devoted to this bill on military construction, there was less than one full page of testimony regarding the duties, program, and objectives of the Air Force Institute of Technology. I hold in my hand this morning, Mr. Speaker, the commandant's report for 1957 and 1958, which in itself is 35 pages long. Certainly, the committee did not receive all of the information it should have received in its consideration of this very important institute that is essential not only to the United States Air Force but to the entire Department of Defense.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would say to the gentleman, in response to his inquiry, that there were no reservations placed on the military by the subcommittee handling this particular appropriation. They could have made any presentation they wanted to. They had all the time to go into it. If they saw fit themselves to curtail the statement to the degree the gentleman has indicated, of course, the committee had no responsibility for that presentation.

Mr. SCHENCK. If the gentleman will yield further, may I say, without casting any aspersions or reflection upon the personnel of this very fine and able subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, I am informed by Air Force officers that because of the lateness of the hour and the approaching noon hour, they were unable to present their entire case.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I ask the gentleman at this time what particular member of the Air Force gave him that information? I think it is strictly within keeping of good ethics at this time that the committee have this information as to the individual who gave the gentleman that information, for this subcommittee has never prevented the Air Force from saying anything they liked on this subject.

Mr. SCHENCK. Responsible officers of the United States Air Force.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We have a lot of responsible officers. Who is the man?

Mr. SCHENCK. They are interested in this program. I do not feel at this time at liberty to give their names.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have no further comment.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand that the sites for the armories are spelled out in the bill, is that correct?

Mr. SHEPPARD. No.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They are not spelled out. There is opportunity for other communities such as my city of Lowell to secure an armory?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is correct.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman is satisfied that the housing units are not needed at various Army posts?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is correct. They are not so essential at this time as to be constructed with appropriated funds.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MORRIS. I wish to express deep regret that an item in the sum of $2,544,000 for Fort Sill, Okla., is not included in this report. I certainly fervently hope that the committee will give consideration to this item just as soon as possible in the next session for the reason I feel it is definitely needed.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I can assure the gentleman from Oklahoma that he may make any presentation he sees fit and we will consider it.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I would like to ask the gentleman, does this bill and this conference report include the San Jacinto item?

Mr. SHEPPARD. No. There is nothing in here for that item.

Mr. JOHANSEN. That is not in this bill?

Mr. SHEPPARD. No.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Is it true that the appropriation for West Point, which I believe totaled roughly $500,000, has been stricken from this bill?

Mr. SHEPPARD. No; that is not correct. The committee has approved funds for construction of barracks and sewage disposal facilities, but has denied the request of funds for Camp Buckner.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I understand there is an item in disagreement between the House and the Senate conferees concerning the amount of money for the relief of the subsidence problem at Long Beach, and I would like to state what I understand to be the case, and if it is not so, I would like to have the chairman of the committee of conference explain it to me. As I understand, the House provided a half a million for this project; that the Senate inserted $5 million plus the half million; that the House conferees disagreed with the Senate proposal, and that the conference report comes back to us now with the understanding that $500,000 is all that the House conferees will agree to. Because it is a vital problem in California, I would like to know from the chairman of the committee why it would not accept the $5 million.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The answer is automatic. In other words, the chairman and the members of our committee have been conversant with this particular subsidence project for the past 10 years, and we have been endeavoring to have some kind of a solution worked out on the local level. Now, there has been an approach to correct the situation based on the activities of the California Legislature and the activities of the city of Long Beach. I refer, of course, to the official family of Long Beach. However, when the Navy came before our subcommittee, their appropriation request was for $500,000 to hold their position and protect all present projects relating to encroachment by the ocean. That was enough money insofar as the Navy was concerned. Then, along came the authorization bill in which there was entered an additional $5.5 million, from an authorization point of view, and when the bill came to the Senate, a Member of the Senate placed the $5.5 million in the appropriation bill for construction, with the reservation, of course, that that money be turned over to the Secretary of the Navy to be used at his discretion, if and when. Your conferees rejected that procedure upon two premises: First, the $500,000, in accordance with the Navy, would take care of the requirements for the coming year; second, they were diametrically opposed to turning funds over to any Secretary for appropriation purposes. That is the answer so far as your conferees on the House side are concerned.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Let me ask the gentleman, then, this question. If you are opposed to authorizing the Secretary to spend $5 million, if in the course of the next year we find that that $500,000 is not enough, is the committee agreeable at this time to state that they will appropriate additional funds?

Mr. SHEPPARD. We will be most happy to, if it is justified. May I say this to the gentleman from California, there is a process of operation in existence with reference to military branches today known as the reprograming in their present funds category. If an emergency comes along, there is no restriction on the part of the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, or the Marine Corps coming back to this committee of the House or the committee of the Senate and asking for reprograming of the funds that they have now, so they are fully protected. If something happens between now and the next presentation before the Committee on Appropriations that requires additional sums, of course, if they justify it, they will get it. But, I want to tell the gentleman that if they come before this committee that has jurisdiction of the matter and there is no justification, no money. That is all there is to it.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Has the Secretary asked for more than $500,000 than the budget requested?

Mr. SHEPPARD. No; he did not.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Is the committee satisfied, from the testimony they received from representatives, let us say, of the Department of Defense, that $500,000 will take care of what they need for the next fiscal year?

Mr. SHEPPARD. We are just as satisfied with that as any other presentation that they made.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I am further informed that if, in the next fiscal year, an emergency arises, the committee is agreeable to providing money in a supplemental appropriation above the half million dollars.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If properly justified, beyond any question of doubt; and I want to say that applies not merely to this particular item, but to any other request of comparable character.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 300, nays 1, not voting 129, as follows:

[Roll No. 193]

YEAS—300

Abbitt	Brownson	Donohue
Abernethy	Broyhill	Dooley
Adair	Budge	Dorn, N. Y.
Addonizio	Burleson	Dorn, S. C.
Albert	Bush	Dowdy
Alexander	Byrd	Dwyer
Alger	Byrne, Ill.	Eberharter
Allen, Calif.	Byrne, Pa.	Edmondson
Allen, Ill.	Byrnes, Wis.	Elliott
Anderson, Mont.	Canfield	Everett
Andrews	Carnahan	Fallon
Arends	Carrigg	Fascell
Ashmore	Cederberg	Feighan
Aspinall	Celler	Fenton
Ayres	Chamberlain	Flood
Bailey	Chelf	Flynt
Baker	Chenoweth	Fogarty
Baldwin	Chiperfield	Forand
Barrett	Church	Ford
Bass, Tenn.	Clark	Forrester
Bates	Coad	Fountain
Becker	Cooley	Frazier
Beckworth	Corbett	Fulton
Bennett, Fla.	Cramer	Garmatz
Bennett, Mich.	Cretella	Gary
Blatnik	Cunningham, Iowa	Gavin
Boland	Curtin	Granahan
Bolling	Curtis, Mass.	Grant
Bolton	Curtis, Mo.	Gray
Bonner	Dague	Green, Oreg.
Bosch	Davis, Ga.	Green, Pa.
Bow	Dawson, Utah	Gregory
Boyle	Delaney	Griffin
Bray	Dennison	Gross
Breeding	Dent	Gubser
Brooks, Tex.	Denton	Hagen
Brown, Ga.	Devereux	Haley
Brown, Mo.	Dingell	Halleck
Brown, Ohio	Dixon	Harden
Harris	Meader	Saund
Harrison, Va.	Merrow	Saylor
Haskell	Metcalf	Schwengel
Hays, Ark.	Michel	Scott, N. C.
Hays, Ohio	Miller, Md.	Scrivner
Hemphill	Miller, Nebr.	Scudder
Heselton	Mills	Seely-Brown
Hiestand	Minshall	Selden
Hoeven	Montoya	Shelley
Holifield	Morano	Sheppard
Holland	Morris	Sieminski
Holmes	Moss	Sikes
Holt	Moulder	Simpson, Ill.
Horan	Multer	Simpson, Pa.
Huddleston	Murray	Sisk
Hull	Natcher	Smith, Calif.
Hyde	Nicholson	Smith, Kans.
Ikard	Nimtz	Smith, Va.
Jarman	Nix	Spence
Johansen	Norblad	Springer
Jonas	Norrell	Staggers
Jones, Ala.	O'Brien, Ill.	Stauffer
Jones, Mo.	O'Brien, N. Y.	Steed
Judd	O'Hara, Ill.	Sullivan
Karsten	O'Hara, Minn.	Taber
Kearns	O'Konski	Talle
Keating	Ostertag	Teller
Kee	Passman	Tewes
Kelly, N. Y.	Patman	Thomas
Kilday	Patterson	Thompson, N. J.
Kilgore	Pelly	Thompson, Tex.
King	Perkins	Thomson, Wyo.
Kirwan	Pfost	Thornberry
Kitchin	Philbin	Trimble
Kluczynski	Pillion	Tuck
Knox	Poage	Udall
Knutson	Poff	Ullman
Krueger	Polk	Utt
Lafore	Porter	Van Pelt
Laird	Price	Vorys
Lane	Quie	Vursell
Lankford	Rabaut	Walter
Lennon	Rains	Watts
Lesinski	Ray	Weaver
Libonati	Reece, Tenn.	Westland
Lipscomb	Rees, Kans.	Wharton
Loser	Reuss	Whitener
McCarthy	Rhodes, Ariz.	Whitten
McDonough	Rhodes, Pa.	Wier
McFall	Richlman	Wigglesworth
McGovern	Riley	Williams, Miss.
McIntosh	Roberts	Willis
Machrowicz	Robsion, Ky.	Wilson, Calif.
Mack, Ill.	Rodino	Wilson, Ind.
Mack, Wash.	Rogers, Colo.	Withrow
Madden	Rogers, Fla.	Wolverton
Magnuson	Rogers, Mass.	Wright
Mahon	Rogers, Tex.	Yates
Mailliard	Roosevelt	Younger
Marshall	Rutherford	Zablocki
Martin	St. George	
May		

NAYS—1

Schenck

NOT VOTING—129

Andersen, H. Carl	Doyle	Kilburn
Anfuso	Durham	Landrum
Ashley	Engle	Latham
Auchincloss	Evins	LeCompte
Avery	Farbstein	McCormack
Barden	Fino	McCulloch
Baring	Fisher	McGregor
Bass, N. H.	Frelinghuysen	McIntire
Baumhart	Friedel	McMillan
Beamer	Gathings	Macdonald
Belcher	George	Mason
Bentley	Glenn	Matthews
Berry	Gordon	Miller, Calif.
Betts	Griffiths	Miller, N. Y.
Blitch	Gwinn	Mitchell
Boggs	Hale	Moore
Boykin	Hardy	Morgan
Brooks, La.	Harrison, Nebr.	Morrison
Broomfield	Harvey	Mumma
Buckley	Healey	Neal
Burdick	Hébert	O'Neill
Cannon	Henderson	Osmers
Christopher	Herlong	Pilcher
Clevenger	Hess	Powell
Coffin	Hill	Preston
Collier	Hillings	Prouty
Colmer	Hoffman	Radwan
Coudert	Holtzman	Reed
Cunningham, Nebr.	Hosmer	Rivers
Davis, Tenn.	Jackson	Robeson, Va.
Dawson, Ill.	James	Robison, N. Y.
Delay	Jenkins	Rooney
Derounian	Jennings	Sadlak
Dies	Jensen	Santangelo
Diggs	Johnson	Scherer
Dollinger	Kean	Scott, Pa.
	Kearney	Sheehan
	Keogh	Shuford
Siler	Tollefson	Williams, N. Y.
Smith, Miss.	Vanik	Winstead
Taylor	Van Zandt	Young
Teague, Calif.	Vinson	Zelenko
Teague, Tex.	Wainwright	
Thompson, La.	Widnall	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Auchincloss.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Scherer.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. McGregor.

Mr. Winstead with Mr. Clevenger.

Mr. Preston with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Pilcher with Mr. George.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Hess.

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Baumhart.

Mr. Brooks of Louisiana with Mr. Beamer.

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Kean.

Mrs. Blitch with Mr. Kilburn.

Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Widnall.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Sadlak.

Mr. Santangelo with Mr. Collier.

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Broomfield.

Mr. Anfuso with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Moore.

Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Prouty.

Mr. Healey with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Cunningham of Nebraska.

Mr. Holtzman with Mr. Harvey.

Mr. Friedel with Mr. Henderson.

Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. Engle with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.

Mr. Doyle with Mr. Van Zandt.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Rooney with Mr. Reed of New York

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Derounian.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Mason.

Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Glenn.

Mr. Evins with Mr. Bentley.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Berry.

Mr. Dies with Mr. Betts.

Mr. Dawson of Illinois with Mr. Sheehan.

Mr. Johnson of Wisconsin with Mr. Hale.

Mr. Jennings with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Gross.

Mr. Vanik with Mr. Mumma.

Mr. Young with Mr. Neal.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. McIntire.

Mr. Matthews with Mr. Siler.

Mr. Fisher with Mr. Teague of California.

Mr. Durham with Mr. Jackson.

Mr. Christopher with Mr. Avery.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Wainwright.

Mr. Herlong with Mr. Tollefson.

Mr. Hardy with Mr. Coudert.

Mr. Robeson of Virginia with Mr. Radwan.

Mr. Smith of Mississippi with Mr. Scott of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Gordon with Mr. Hillings.

Mr. Delay with Mr. James.

Mr. Coffin with Mr. Jensen.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Kearney.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 2: Page 3, line 10, insert:

"MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY RESERVE FORCES

"For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the reserve components, including the Army National Guard of the United States, and contributions therefor, as authorized by chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, as amended, and as may be authorized by law during the second session of the 85th Congress, without regard to section 4774 (d) of title 10, United States Code, and section 3734,

Revised Statutes, as amended, and land and interest therein may be acquired, constructed, and prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title by the Attorney General as required by section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; and hire of passenger motor vehicles; to remain available until expended, $28,330,000."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SHEPPARD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 2, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "$6,250,000."

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, the adoption of this amendment will make $54.5 million available in the current fiscal year for the construction of Army National Guard and Army Reserve Forces armories. This sum will not be sufficient to build all of the armories that are needed to house the National Guard adequately, but it will permit a substantial reduction in the backlog of authorized projects.

While I went along with the conference report, and in fact strongly support all other provisions of it, I want the RECORD to show that I did so reluctantly so far as this amendment is concerned and only after making every reasonable effort to secure approval of the sum provided in the Senate bill or at least 50 percent of it.

I did not advocate increasing the total appropriation but felt that the additional funds needed to provide long overdue housing for our National Guard units could have been obtained by deleting an equivalent sum from some less pressing projects.

Mr. Speaker, I have participated in a sufficient number of these conferences to realize that there always comes a time when further argument is fruitless and a compromise must be made if the legislative process is to function. The $6,250,000 added by this amendment was just such a compromise. Some of the conferees, including myself, insisted upon a substantially higher figure; others insisted upon nothing. The compromise we bring you in this amendment represents the composite view of the conferees and was the best compromise possible under the circumstances.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 3: Page 4, line 18, strike out "$274,741,000" and insert "$351,343,000."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SHEPPARD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 3, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "$295,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 4: Page 4, line 18, insert ": *Provided*, That no more than $500,000 of the amount provided in the funding program for "Operational and Training Facilities, Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, Calif." shall be utilized for protective works until the Secretary of the Navy determines in his judgment that sufficient action has been taken or arrangements made to arrest further subsidence of the shipyard."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 7: Page 6, line 10, insert ", of which $683,000 is for the construction of a dam for the purpose of increasing the water supply for Pease Air Force Base together with the unexpended portion of funds heretofore made available for that purpose."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 10. Page 10, line 14, strike out section 612.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SHEPPARD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 612. No part of the funds provided in this act shall be used for purchase of land or land easements in excess of 110 per centum of the value as determined by the Corps of Engineers or the Bureau of Yards and Docks, except: (a) where there is a determination of value by a Federal court, (b) purchases negotiated by the Attorney General or his designee, and (c) where the estimated value is less than $25,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 12. On page 10, line 23, insert the following:

"GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 613. Such appropriations of the Department of Defense, available for obligation during the current fiscal year, as may be designated by the Secretary of Defense shall be available for the purposes of section 1 of the act approved April 3, 1958 (72 Stat. 78): *Provided*, That any such appropriations so utilized shall be accounted for under the limitation established by section 4 of said act."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SHEPPARD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 614. Such appropriations of the Department of Defense, available for obligation during the current fiscal year, as may be designated by the Secretary of Defense shall be available for the purposes of section 1 of the act approved April 3, 1958 (72 Stat. 78): *Provided*, That any such appropriations so utilized shall be accounted for under the limitation established by section 4 of said act."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

EXTENDING RENEGOTIATION ACT OF 1951 FOR 6 MONTHS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 11749) to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 6 months, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 1, preceding "National" insert "the."

Page 2, line 2, after "Administration," " insert "Section 103 (b) of such act is amended by inserting 'the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration,' after 'the Administrator of General Services.' "

Page 2, line 3, strike out "amendment" and insert "amendments."

Page 2, strike out all after line 10 over to and including line 3 on page 3.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the chairman of the committee be kind enough to tell the House the action taken on the part of the Senate with respect to the amendment having to do with the court of appeals?

Mr. MILLS. Let me refer to the fact that the Senate adopted two amendments. The first is a technical amendment with respect to section 2 of the bill. As it passed the House, section 2 provided that contracts entered into by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration would be subject to renegotiation. There was an imperfection in the language on this section and the Senate amendment merely perfects the language to carry out the original intention of the House.

The second amendment adopted by the Senate is a substantive amendment and deletes from the bill as it passed the House section 3. The Senate took this action, so I am informed, because the Senate Finance Committee had not had an opportunity in the short time left for

legislating to give adequate consideration to that section of the bill.

It further developed that the language in section 3 of the House bill, perhaps, was not as perfect as it should have been to carry out the intent to allow appeals from the Tax Court to the circuit court of appeals. The Finance Committee in its report said:

> There was insufficient time for adequate consideration of this section of the bill, thus it was stricken with the understanding that this subject would be given thorough consideration in connection with the next extension of the act.

Mr. Speaker, I want it to be clear that in taking this action on agreeing to this Senate amendment, we on this side do so without prejudice to the amendment and solely because of the fact that the other body did not have an opportunity to give adequate consideration to it. Of course, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania knows, and as stated in the House report, the Committee on Ways and Means is going to make a study of the entire subject of renegotiation in the next session of the Congress. At that time I am sure the subject involved in section 3 will be considered. In the event that the committee should again decide to report legislation further extending the Renegotiation Act and include therein the right to appeal from the Tax Court to the Circuit Court of Appeals, the committee could provide for that appeal to be available with respect to cases now pending in the Tax Court. In that event there would be no loss to anyone of the opportunity to appeal through failure of the Congress to adopt section 3 at this time.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have joined with the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means in asking that the House concur in the Senate amendments to legislation extending for 6 months the Renegotiation Act of 1951. The Senate amendments with respect to substantive changes deleted section 3 of the House-passed bill. This section was intended to provide judicial review of decisions of the Tax Court in renegotiation cases. The Senate Finance Committee report indicates that the Senate action in deleting this provision is without prejudice to the proposal of appellate review and in fact assures that thorough consideration will be given to this matter in connection with the next extension of the act. It is with that understanding that I have agreed to accept the Senate amendment deleting the review provision. It will be my hope that the inclusion of review procedure under the act will be made in such a manner as to protect the appeal rights of those cases that may be disposed of between the present time and the enactment into law of the next piece of legislation dealing with this subject.

The House action on this bill in agreeing to the Senate amendments represents the last legislation to be brought to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means during the 85th Congress. It is appropriate, therefore, that I should acknowledge the truly outstanding work that has been done by my esteemed friend and distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]. During his period of service on the Committee on Ways and Means he has consistently served with great distinction and demonstrated outstanding ability and thorough knowledge of the subject matter under consideration. Despite his past record of very significant achievement I believe it fair to state that he has surpassed his previous attainments in the service he has rendered since becoming chairman in January of this year. Mr. Mills has been fair and understanding. He has been patient in exasperating times and courageous in difficult times. In short, Mr. Speaker, WILBUR MILLS has done what all of us knew he would do—he has established himself as a great chairman of a great committee. It is my hope that he succeeds in getting well-deserved rest during the adjournment period.

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 13247) to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama whether I can believe the evidence before my eyes that the House conferees did not insist on including in the conference report the antidiscrimination amendment which was passed by the House, both as to title II and title III. It seems to me that the amendment, which read that there should be no discrimination upon the basis of race, color, religion, national origin or sex, should certainly have been included in the conference report; and I am wondering if the gentleman could possibly explain why the House conferees did not make a strong and hearty and successful effort for its inclusion and whether it would not have been possible to have kept the amendment in. I consider it a great loss to the bill and a step backward in the cause of education.

Mr. ELLIOTT. May I say to the gentlewoman from Illinois with reference to that item the House adopted the Senate language which did not contain the amendment to which the gentlewoman refers; the decision was reached, also, in light, I might say, of the discussion that the amendment in this bill was unneeded and would actually have no effect one way or the other.

Mrs. CHURCH. I withdraw my reservation of objection to consideration of the report, Mr. Speaker, although I shall continue my objection to the acceptance of the Senate position in this matter.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman what are the grounds upon which he thinks that this amendment was not necessary, in view particularly of the fact that obviously in matters of this kind there is wide discretion. I would like to have him specifically explain, if I may, why the amendment is not necessary, because I think I may say to the gentleman on behalf of myself and the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] and others that we feel this is a very necessary amendment. If necessary, of course, we will introduce legislation early in the next year to amend the act to include it. But, at this time, before acting on any motion to accept the conference report, I think it needs to be explained why the gentleman feels the House provision is not necessary.

Mr. ELLIOTT. May I say to the gentleman that he knows, I think, and I think the majority of the Members of the House know that such language in legislation passed by the House is not necessary. We pass several hundred bills a year here, and every now and then the House selects a particular bill and attempts to add language of that kind. But, in this case it was felt by a large majority—maybe not unanimously but by a large majority—of the conferees that the language had no particular place in this bill, and we adopted the Senate language dealing with this matter in question, and the amendment which the gentlewoman refers to is not in the bill.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would say to the gentleman that I feel that that is not, frankly, a satisfactory answer to the question, because obviously when the House voted for the amendment, it must have felt it was necessary or it would not have accepted the amendment.

If I remember correctly—and I ask the gentleman whether this is not correct—is not this amendment included in other acts and was it not taken from other acts specifically word for word?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Certainly in partial answer to the gentleman from California's inquiry I think I might call to his attention a letter to me dated August 19, 1958, from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in response to a letter which I had written the Department requesting its comment on the amendment in question. The letter from

the Department to me, reads in pertinent part as follows:

It is our belief that the quoted language is simply declaratory of the inherent meaning of other provisions of the bill. The action of the House of Representatives in adding this declaratory language to H. R. 13247 does not, in our opinion, alter the basis on which loans and fellowships would be awarded. It seems clear to us that the basis for the award of loans and fellowships would be the same without, as with, the antidiscrimination provisions.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I was one of the conferees who held out as long as I could in order to keep this amendment in the bill. I concur in what the gentleman has said that an integral part of such legislation is that there shall be no discrimination because of race, color, sex, or any other discrimination. But we felt that it would be a strong part of the bill. Yet we found that the conferees on the other side were adamant because we had assurances from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that there would be no discrimination in administration of the act; and there has been no discrimination in the administration of other acts. So that rather than lose the whole bill we accepted a compromise, as you have to accept compromises, with the other body.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I understand from what the gentleman has said that it is the understanding of the conferees that the Department is bound not to discriminate because of race, color, creed, or sex; and with that understanding, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and of course I do not intend to object, I take this time to congratulate and to thank the distinguished gentleman from Alabama for the job that the House conferees have done on this bill. The House position has been sustained in most important particulars. The gentleman who has been the architect of this measure is to be commended by the House not only for the job done in conference, but for the very fine bill which bears his name. This is unquestionably one of the landmarks in American statutory law. It may well be the greatest single achievement of the 85th Congress—a Congress which has been commended across the country for its monumental record. The gentleman from Alabama will be long remembered for his handiwork. This bill, more than any other, will meet the Communist threat. This bill means that the talent of our children will be conserved and developed. In my opinion, the course we take here is essential to the survival of democracy in the atomic age. I hope the bill will be passed and sent to the President by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], very much. And I want to take this opportunity to thank him for the great aid and assistance that he has provided leading to the passage of this bill.

The gentleman has been most helpful. He has shown himself to have a genuine and abiding interest in America's schools and in the opportunities which they provide for America's young folks. The gentleman from Oklahoma has wrought mightily, and wrought well, in aiding this bill to achieve the place which it now occupies.

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Alabama if he can explain to the House the reason for the increase in the item for research and experimentation in TV and radio from $2 million as provided in the House bill to $15 million.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I shall be happy to answer the gentleman's question. The House had cut very severely the estimates which had been furnished. The House said that $8 million would be sufficient over a period of 4 years to do the job. The Senate had brought in a figure of $35 million. After much discussion, the conference committee came to the conclusion unanimously that in order to do the job properly it might require about $18 million over a 4-year period. That is the figure we agreed upon in the conference report.

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, apparently, the needle is getting in too far and we are getting too close to the truth on this legislation to suit the proponents of all-out Federal aid to education, and they have to resort to parliamentary maneuvers to shut off debate.

As I was saying before I was cut off by the quorum call, I too was extremely interested in the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] and commend him for his forthrightness in bringing this situation into true focus. This is particularly significant viewed in the fact that he was the spokesman for 80 of his liberal Democratic colleagues on January 30, 1957, when he placed in the RECORD the proposed program for the Democrats in the House of Representatives in the 85th Congress. Mind you, this was on January 30, 1957, before sputnik or anything else to which they attempt to tie this bill. That program set forth very definitely the position in favor of general Federal aid to education in all events.

The time-honored technique of seizing upon a situation to accomplish the purpose which they are for in any event has again been used. I regret to see that it appears that this will again be successful. My colleagues who have opposed Federal aid to education previously, but are voting for this bill, I am sure mean what they say when they refer to it as a temporary measure and insist that its scope should not be broadened. In answer to this, I merely challenge anyone to show where any program such as this has ever been undertaken by the Federal Government and has ever been discontinued.

That this is only a foot in the door and must be expanded is obvious from the infinitesimal number of people that it will assist and funds it will provide. I do not intend to review my remarks made in the Committee of the Whole when the bill was originally under discussion in the House, but I think everyone realizes that is the fact. This is strictly a foot-in-the-door proposition of the worst sort. It involves many things more dangerous than Federal aid to school construction. It provides for a little Federal aid to our school system, across the board—elementary, high school, and colleges. It provides for a little Federal aid for construction, for equipment, for supervision, and to the student. All of these programs will be expanded, and we know that there will be an immediate effort in that direction. With it comes all of the evils of Federal control of the school system.

The worst thing is that the technique of when a situation does not develop, you create one, has really been employed. This is given the fancy title of the National Defense Education Act, but as was so well pointed out on the floor of the House during debate, there is nothing pertaining to national defense in this act.

I quote an editorial of August 15, 1958, from the Casper Tribune-Herald, one of the fine newspapers in Wyoming:

THE WAY TO DEFICITS

The Senate has passed a broad Federal aid to education bill designed, so the news report of the action goes, to help meet the challenge flashed by Soviet scientific advances. No wonder people become confused.

Soviet scientific advances were not achieved by a newly developed crop of geniuses out of the Soviet educational system, but by older Soviet scientists, the counterparts of our own. A difficulty is that the American people are encouraged to think of Russia as backward and the Russians as incompetent—and this country, somehow, superior in everything.

It is the lot of no nation to outperform all others in all things, and it might be well to adjust to the fact before, say, the Chinese come up with a real shocker.

Still, aid to education rides the propaganda line. In Senate-approved form it represents a new cost to taxpayers of $1.3 billion; or converted into deficit and debt, as it will be, a cumulative cost much greater. The House scaled its own bill to something more than $900 million by eliminating Federal scholarships.

The Senate holds to scholarships, all 23,000 of them, in the fields of science, mathematics, and foreign languages. The latter crept in as an afterthought, possibly because Government found too many of the representatives it sent abroad unable to speak the languages of the countries to which they were sent.

However, the Senate made a concession, against stiff opposition, in that it scaled the value of scholarships to $250 a year and authorized loans of up to $750 a year to needy scholarship winners.

Opponents argued that reducing the amount of the scholarships would defeat the purpose of encouraging students to study harder and take tougher courses. If that seems to make educational incentive a matter of subsidy rather than opportunity, the idea is no more crackpot than that basic to the aid bill itself.

For that matter, Senator PAT MCNAMARA of Michigan fairly well spelled out the situation with an amendment that would have added a $2 billion school construction program to the authorization on the ground that the scholarship-loan plan offered no help for primary and secondary schools.

The Senate shied away from the proposal primarily, it seems, because it opened the way to a school integration fight with attempts to bar Federal funds from segregated schools, a sure kiss of death.

As matters stand, the Senate passed its bill by overwhelming majority—nearly 2½ to 1—and a new Federal aid venture is assured on the scale of a billion dollars that Government doesn't have and can't get, and indeed, doesn't dare to ask.

Here is fiscal irresponsibility at its worst.

Mr. Speaker, some good things which I would like to support are included in this bill. There are separate bills pending on them before this body. If this conference report, which I am going to vote against, is voted down, they can be passed and will have my full support. I particularly refer to vocational education.

If this bill passes, it will be a great victory for those who are in favor of Federal support of our schools and Federal control of our schools, but it will be indeed a dark day for America and for American education.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, if I understood the gentleman from Alabama correctly, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare claims there has been no discrimination; is that correct?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That sums up what was said about it. As the gentleman knows, this is not a new program. This procedure, as the gentleman well knows, is not new. There are many other programs now being carried on of like character. There is the program under Public Laws 815 and 874. May I say that we held long hearing on this matter, and so far as it was brought to our attention, there was no evidence of any discrimination with respect to the handling of those programs.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to have the gentleman's statement, because the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] and others who have questioned the gentleman on this subject should be aware now that there is no intention next year to provide antidiscriminatory legislation. I think the point ought to be made clear and complete at this time, that in voting for the conference report you are voting for a bill without any antidiscrimination provisions; you will be voting for a bill on which the House conferees have retreated completely on the issue of discrimination. Furthermore, you will be voting for a law in which, according to the interpretation of the gentleman from Alabama, there will be full and complete integration as provided by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Thus any college practicing segregation would not be eligible to participate.

Mr. DIXON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the conference committee took all the scholarships out of the bill; is that not right?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is correct. May I say to the gentleman from Utah we brought back exactly what the House passed in that respect except for three changes. Those changes are:

We lowered the interest rate from 4 percent to 3 percent.

Secondly, we provide in the case of people who teach that if they teach 5 years one-half of their loans will be forgiven. That provision was not in the House bill but it was in the Senate bill. Upon discussion we came to the conclusion in the light of the use of that provision by 11 States that it was perhaps a good provision and one that we could try out for a period of 4 years.

Mr. DIXON. That will help us to recruit the best scholars for our depleted teaching staff. It also will induce students to teach, so they serve the country just the same as ROTC students who get aid, or those who go to Annapolis or West Point. Is not that true?

Mr. ELLIOTT. We thought it would be a good trial run, so to speak, to try to get some of the additional teachers that the country so badly needs at this time. Let me say to my friend, may we proceed with the consideration of the conference report and continue our discussion after the statement is read?

Mr. DIXON. I just want to say that I think that the cancellation of 10 percent of the loan each year for the first 5 years in which the recipient of the loan teaches is a magnificent addition to our bill. The committee did a splendid job in preserving the House bill almost intact in making junior colleges eligible, in appropriating $20 million a year for area vocational schools, in making loans interest free until 1 year after graduation, and in eliminating the 23,000 scholarships from the Senate version.

At long last we are beginning to quit grumbling about our schools and to give them help that is long overdue. It is better to light a candle than to curse in the darkness. August 23 (today) will go down in history as the beginning of a new educational awakening in America.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman very much. The gentleman has been most helpful in working out this legislation. His knowledge and experience; his suggestions, his friendliness at each step of the way have been inspiring and helpful. The gentleman came to the House of Representatives as a great educator. Here he has proven himself a statesman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama that the statement be read in lieu of the report?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2688)

[To accompany H. R. 13247]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13247) to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs; and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That this Act, divided into titles and sections according to the following table of contents, may be cited as the 'National Defense Education Act of 1958'.

"TABLE OF CONTENTS

"Title I—General provisions

"Sec. 101. Findings and declaration of policy.
"Sec. 102. Federal control of education prohibited.
"Sec. 103. Definitions.

"Title II—Loans to students in institutions of higher education

"Sec. 201. Appropriations authorized.
"Sec. 202. Allotments to States.
"Sec. 203. Payment of Federal capital contributions.
"Sec. 204. Conditions of agreements.
"Sec. 205. Terms of loans.
"Sec. 206. Distributions of assets from student loan funds.
"Sec. 207. Loans to institutions.
"Sec. 208. Payments to cover reductions in amounts of loans.
"Sec. 209. Administrative provisions.

"Title III—Financial assistance for strengthening science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction

"Sec. 301. Appropriations authorized.
"Sec. 302. Allotments to States.
"Sec. 303. State plans.
"Sec. 304. Payments to States.
"Sec. 305. Loans to nonprofit private schools.

"Title IV—National defense fellowships

"Sec. 401. Appropriations authorized.
"Sec. 402. Number of fellowships.
"Sec. 403. Award of fellowships and approval of institutions.
"Sec. 404. Fellowship stipends.
"Sec. 405. Fellowship conditions.

"Title V—Guidance, counseling, and testing; identification and encouragement of able students

"Part A—State Programs

"Sec. 501. Appropriations authorized.
"Sec. 502. Allotments to States.
"Sec. 503. State plans.
"Sec. 504. Payments to States.

"Part B—Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes

"Sec. 511. Authorization.

"Title VI—Language development

"Part A—Centers and Research and Studies

"Sec. 601. Language and area centers.
"Sec. 602. Research and studies.
"Sec. 603. Appropriations authorized.

"Part B—Language Institutes

"Sec. 611. Authorization.

"Title VII—Research and experimentation in more effective utilization of television, radio, motion pictures, and related media for educational purposes

"Part A—Research and Experimentation

"Sec. 701. Functions of the Commissioner.
"Sec. 702. Grants-in-aid; contracts.

"Part B—Dissemination of Information on New Educational Media

"Sec. 731. Functions of the Commissioner.

"Part C—General Provisions

"Sec. 761. Establishment of the advisory committee.
"Sec. 762. Special personnel.
"Sec. 763. Appropriations authorized.

"Title VIII—Area vocational education programs

"Sec. 801. Statement of findings and purpose.
"Sec. 802. Amendment to Vocational Education Act of 1946.

"Title IX—Science information service

"Sec. 901. Functions of the service.
"Sec. 902. Science information council.
"Sec. 903. Authority for certain grants and contracts.
"Sec. 904. Appropriations authorized.

Title X—Miscellaneous provisions

"Sec. 1001. Administration.
"Sec. 1002. Advisory committees.
"Sec. 1003. Exemption from conflict-of-interest laws of members of advisory committees or information council.
"Sec. 1004. Administration of State plans.
"Sec. 1005. Judicial review.
"Sec. 1006. Method of payment.
"Sec. 1007. Administrative appropriations authorized.
"Sec. 1008. Allotments to Territories and possessions.
"Sec. 1009. Improvement of statistical services of State educational agencies.

"TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"Findings and declaration of policy

"SEC. 101. The Congress hereby finds and declares that the security of the Nation requires the fullest development of the mental resources and technical skills of its young men and women. The present emergency demands that additional and more adequate educational opportunities be made available. The defense of this Nation depends upon the mastery of modern techniques developed from complex scientific principles. It depends as well upon the discovery and development of new principles, new techniques, and new knowledge.

"We must increase our efforts to identify and educate more of the talent of our Nation. This requires programs that will give assurance that no student of ability will be denied an opportunity for higher education because of financial need; will correct as rapidly as possible the existing imbalances in our educational programs which have led to an insufficient proportion of our population educated in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages and trained in technology.

"The Congress reaffirms the principle and declares that the States and local communities have and must retain control over and primary responsibility for public education. The national interest requires, however, that the Federal Government give assistance to education for programs which are important to our defense.

"To meet the present educational emergency requires additional effort at all levels of government. It is therefore the purpose of this Act to provide substantial assistance in various forms to individuals, and to States and their subdivisions, in order to insure trained manpower of sufficient quality and quantity to meet the national defense needs of the United States.

"Federal control of education prohibited

"SEC. 102. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system.

"Definitions

"SEC. 103. As used in this Act—

"(a) The term 'State' means a State, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone, Guam, or the Virgin Islands, except that as used in section 302 and 502, such term does not include Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, Guam, or the Virgin Islands.

"(b) The term 'institution of higher education' means an educational institution in any State which (1) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate, (2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education, (3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, (4) is a public or other nonprofit institution, and (5) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association or, if not so accredited, is an institution whose credits are accepted, on transfer, by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited. For purposes of title II, such term includes any private business school or technical institution which meets the provisions of clauses (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5). For purposes of this subsection, the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered.

"(c) The term 'Commissioner' means the Commissioner of Education.

"(d) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(e) The term 'State educational agency' means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, or, if there is no such officer or agency, an officer or agency designated by the Governor or by State law.

"(f) The term 'school-age population' means that part of the population which is between the ages of five and seventeen, both inclusive, and such school-age population for the several States shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the population between such ages for the most recent year for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce.

"(g) The term 'elementary school' means a school which provides elementary education, as determined under State law.

"(h) The term 'secondary school' means a school which provides secondary education, as determined under State law, except that it does not include any education provided beyond grade 12. For the purposes of sections 301 through 304, the term 'secondary school' may include a public junior college, as determined under State law.

"(i) The term 'public' as applied to any school or institution does not include a school or institution of any agency of the United States.

"(j) The term 'nonprofit,' as applied to a school or institution, means a school or institution owned and operated by one or more nonprofit corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, and, for purposes of part A of title V, includes a school of any agency of the United States.

"(k) The term 'local educational agency' means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision in a State.

"TITLE II—LOANS TO STUDENTS IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

"Appropriations authorized

"SEC. 201. For the purpose of enabling the Commissioner to stimulate and assist in the establishment at institutions of higher education of funds for the making of low-interest loans to students in need thereof to pursue their courses of study in such institutions, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated $47,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, $75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, $82,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, $90,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years as may be necessary to enable students who have received a loan for any school year ending prior to July 1, 1962, to continue or complete their education. Sums appropriated under this section for any fiscal year shall be available, in accordance with agreement between the Commissioner and institutions of higher education, for payment of Federal capital contributions which, together with contributions from the institutions, shall be used for establishment and maintenance of student loan funds.

"Allotments to States

"SEC. 202. (a) From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 201 for any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1962, the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount so appropriated as the number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education in such State bears to the total number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education in all of the States. The number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education for purposes of this section shall be determined by the Commissioner for the most recent year for which satisfactory data are available to him.

"(b) Sums appropriated pursuant to section 201 for any fiscal year ending after June 30, 1962, shall be allotted among the States in such manner as the Commissioner determines to be necessary to carry out the purpose for which such amounts are appropriated.

"Payment of Federal capital contributions

"SEC. 203. (a) The Commissioner shall from time to time set dates by which institutions of higher education in a State must file applications for Federal capital contributions from the allotment of such State. In the event the total requested in such applications, which are made by institutions with which he has agreements under this title and which meet the requirements established in regulations of the Commissioner, exceeds the amount of the allotment of such State available for such purpose, the Federal capital contribution from such allotment to each such institution shall bear the same ratio to the amount requested in its application as the amount of such allotment available for such purpose bears to the total requested in all such applications. In the event the total requested in such applications which are made by institutions in a State is less than the amount of the allotment of such State available for such purpose, the Commissioner may reallot the remaining amount from time to time, on such date or dates as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under section 202 for such year. The Federal capital contribution to an institution shall be paid to it from time to time in such installments as the Commissioner determines will not result in unnecessary accumulations in the student loan fund established under its agreement under this title.

"(b) In no case may the total of such Federal capital contributions to any institution of higher education for any fiscal year exceed $250,000.

"Conditions of agreements

"SEC. 204. An agreement with any institution of higher education for Federal capital contributions by the Commissioner under this title shall—

"(1) provide for establishment of a student loan fund by such institution;

"(2) provide for deposit in such fund of (A) the Federal capital contributions, (B) an amount, equal to not less than one-ninth of such Federal capital contributions, contributed by such institution, (C) collections of principal and interest on student loans made from such fund, and (D) any other earnings of the fund;

"(3) provide that such student loan fund shall be used only for loans to students in accordance with such agreement, for capital distributions as provided in this title, and for costs of litigation arising in connection with the collection of any loan from the fund or interest on such loan;

"(4) provide that in the selection of students to receive loans from such student loan fund special consideration shall be given to (A) students with a superior academic background who express a desire to teach in elementary or secondary schools, and (B) students whose academic background indicates a superior capacity or preparation in science, mathematics, engineering, or a modern foreign language; and

"(5) include such other provisions as may be necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States and promote the purposes of this title and as are agreed to by the Commissioner and the institution.

"Terms of loans

"SEC. 205. (a) The total of the loans for any fiscal year to any student made by institutions of higher education from loan funds established pursuant to agreements under this title may not exceed $1,000, and the total for all years to any student from such funds may not exceed $5,000.

"(b) Loans from any such loan fund to any student by any institution of higher education shall be made on such terms and conditions as the institution may determine; subject, however, to such conditions, limitations, and requirements as the Commissioner may prescribe (by regulation or in the agreement with the institution) with a view to preventing impairment of the capital of the student loan fund to the maximum extent practicable in the light of the objective of enabling the student to complete his course of study; and except that—

"(1) such a loan shall be made only to a student who (A) is in need of the amount of the loan to pursue a course of study at such institution, and (B) is capable, in the opinion of the institution, of maintaining good standing in such course of study, and (C) has been accepted for enrollment as a full-time student at such institution or, in the case of a student already attending such institution, is in good standing and in full-time attendance there either as an undergraduate or graduate student;

"(2) such a loan shall be evidenced by a note or other written agreement which provides for repayment of the principal amount, together with interest thereon, in equal annual installments, or, if the borrower so requests, in graduated periodic installments (determined in accordance with such schedules as may be approved by the Commissioner), over a period beginning one year after the date on which the borrower ceases to pursue a full-time course of study at an institution of higher education and ending eleven years after such date, except that (A) interest shall not accrue on any such loan, and periodic installments need not be paid, during any period (i) during which the borrower is pursuing a full-time course of study at an institution of higher education, or (ii) not in excess of three years, during which the borrower is a member of the Armed Forces of the United States, (B) any such period shall not be included in determining the ten-year period during which the repayment must be completed, (C) such ten-year period may also be extended for good cause determined in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner, and (D) the borrower may at his option accelerate repayment of the whole or any part of such loan;

"(3) not to exceed 50 per centum of any such loan (plus interest) shall be canceled for service as a full-time teacher in a public elementary or secondary school in a State, at the rate of 10 per centum of the amount of such loan plus interest thereon, which was unpaid on the first day of such service, for each complete academic year of such service;

"(4) such a loan shall bear interest, on the unpaid balance of the loan, at the rate of 3 per centum per annum except that no interest shall accrue before the date on which repayment of the loan is to begin;

"(5) such a loan shall be made without security and without endorsement, except that, if the borrower is a minor and the note or other evidence of obligation executed by him would not, under the applicable law, create a binding obligation, either security or endorsement may be required;

"(6) the liability to repay any such loan shall be canceled upon the death of the borrower, or if he becomes permanently and totally disabled as determined in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner;

"(7) such a loan by an institution for any year shall be made in such installments as may be provided in regulations of the Commissioner or the agreement with the institution under this title and, upon notice to the Commissioner by the institution that any recipient of a loan is failing to maintain satisfactory standing, any or all further installments of his loan shall be withheld, as may be appropriate; and

"(8) no note or other evidence of such a loan may be transferred or assigned by the institution of higher education making the loan except, upon the transfer of the borrower to another institution of higher education participating in the program under this title (or, if not participating, is eligible to do so and is approved by the Commissioner for such purpose), to such institution.

"(c) An agreement under this title for payment of Federal capital contributions shall include provisions designed to make loans from the student loan fund established pursuant to such agreement reasonably available (to the extent of the available funds in such fund) to all eligible students in such institution in need thereof.

"Distributions of assets from student loan funds

"SEC. 206. (a) After June 30, 1966, and not later than September 30, 1966, there shall be a capital distribution of the balance of the student loan fund established under this title by each institution of higher education as follows:

"(1) The Commissioner shall first be paid an amount which bears the same ratio to the balance in such fund at the close of June 30, 1966, as the total amount of the Federal capital contributions to such fund by the Commissioner under this title bears to the sum of such Federal capital contributions and the institution's capital contributions to such fund.

"(2) The remainder of such balance shall be paid to the institution.

"(b) After September 30, 1966, each institution with which the Commissioner has made an agreement under this title shall pay to the Commissioner, not less often than quarterly, the same proportionate share of amounts received by the institution after June 30, 1966, in payment of principal or interest on student loans made from the student loan fund established pursuant to such agreement (which amount shall be determined after deduction of any costs of litigation incurred in collection of the principal or interest on loans from the fund and not already reimbursed from the student loan fund or such payments of principal or interest) as was determined for the Commissioner under subsection (a).

"(c) Upon a finding by the institution or the Commissioner prior to July 1, 1966, that the liquid assets of a student loan fund established pursuant to an agreement under this title exceed the amount required for loans or otherwise in the foreseeable future, and upon notice to such institution or to the Commissioner, as the case may be, there shall be, subject to such limitations as may be included in regulations of the Commissioner or in such agreement, a capital distribution from such fund. Such capital distribution shall be made as follows:

"(1) The Commissioner shall first be paid an amount which bears the same ratio to the total to be distributed as the Federal capital contributions by the Commissioner to the student loan fund prior to such distribution bear to the sum of such Federal capital contributions and the capital contributions to the fund made by the institution.

"(2) The remainder of the capital distribution shall be paid to the institution.

"Loans to institutions

"SEC. 207. (a) Upon application by any institution of higher education with which he has made an agreement under this title, the Commissioner may make a loan to such institution for the purpose of helping to finance the institution's capital contributions to a student loan fund established pursuant to such agreement. Any such loan may be made only if such institution shows it is unable to secure such funds from non-Federal sources upon terms and conditions which the Commissioner determines to be reasonable and consistent with the purposes of this title. Loans made to institutions under this section shall bear interest at a rate which the Commissioner determines to be adequate to cover (1) the cost of the funds to the Treasury as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average yields of outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having maturities comparable to the maturities of loans made by the Commissioner under this section, (2) the cost of administering this section, and (3) probable losses.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section, but not to exceed a total of $25,000,000.

"(c) Loans made by the Commissioner under this section shall mature within such period as may be determined by the Commissioner to be appropriate in each case, but not exceeding fifteen years.

"Payments to cover reductions in amounts of loans

"SEC. 208. In addition to the payments otherwise authorized to be made pursuant to this title, the Commissioner shall pay to the appropriate institution, at such time or times as he determines, an amount which bears the same ratio to the interest which has been prevented from accruing and the portion of the principal which has been cancelled on student loans pursuant to paragraph (3) of section 205 (b) (and not previously paid pursuant to this subsection) as the total amount of the institution's capital contributions to such fund under this title bears to the sum of such institution's capital contributions and the Federal capital contributions to such fund.

"Administrative provisions

"SEC. 209. (a) The Commissioner, in addition to the other powers conferred upon him by this title, shall have power to agree to modifications of agreements or loans made under this title and to compromise, waive, or release any right, title, claim, or demand, however arising or acquired under this title.

"(b) Financial transactions of the Commissioner pursuant to this title, and vouchers approved by him in connection with such financial transactions, shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government; except that all such transactions shall be subject to audit by the General Accounting Office at such times and in such manner as the Comptroller General may by regulation prescribe.

"TITLE III—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR STRENGTHENING SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

"Appropriations authorized

"SEC. 301. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $70,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, for (1) making payments to State educational agencies under this title for the acquisition of equipment (suitable for use in providing education in science, mathematics, or modern foreign language) and for minor remodeling described in paragraph (1) of section 303 (a), and (2) making loans authorized in section 305. There are also authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, for making payments to State educational agencies under this title to carry out the programs described in paragraph (5) of section 303 (a).

"Allotments to States

"SEC. 302. (a) (1) From the sums appropriated pursuant to the first sentence of section 301 for any fiscal year the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2 per centum thereof, as he may determine for allotment as provided in section 1008, and shall reserve 12 per centum for loans authorized in section 305. From the remainder of such sums the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of such remainder as the product of—

"(A) the school-age population of the State, and

"(B) the State's allotment ratio (as determined under paragraph (2)),

bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States.

"(2) The 'allotment ratio' for any State shall be 100 per centum less the product of (A) 50 per centum and (B) the quotient obtained by dividing the income per child of school age for the State by the income per child of school age for the continental United States, except that the allotment ratio shall in no case be less than 33⅓ per centum or more than 66⅔ per centum. The allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Commissioner as soon as possible after enactment of this Act, and again between July 1 and August 31 of the year 1959, on the basis of the average of the incomes per child of school age for the States and for the continental United States for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. The first such promulgation shall be conclusive for each of the two fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1958, and ending June 30, 1960, and the second shall be conclusive for each of the two fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1960, and ending June 30, 1962.

"(3) For the purposes of this title—

"(A) The term 'child of school age' means a member of the population between the ages of five and seventeen, both inclusive.

"(B) The term 'continental United States' does not include Alaska.

"(C) The term 'income per child of school age' for any State or for the continental United States means the total personal income for the State and the continental United States, respectively, divided by the number of children of school age in such State and in the continental United States, respectively.

"(4) A State's allotment under this subsection shall remain available for payment pursuant to section 304 (a) for projects in such State until the end of the fiscal year following the year for which the allotment is made.

"(b) From the sums appropriated pursuant to the second sentence of section 301 for any fiscal year the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2 per centum thereof, as he may determine for allotment as provided in section 1008. From the remainder of such sums the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of such remainder as the school-age population of such State bears to the total of the school-age populations of all of the States. The amount allotted to any State under the preceding sentence for any fiscal year which is less than $20,000 shall be increased to $20,000, the total thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing the amount allotted to each of the remaining States under the preceding sentence, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of any of such remaining States from being thereby reduced to less than $20,000.

"State plans

"SEC. 303. (a) Any State which desires to receive payments under this title shall submit to the Commissioner, through its State educational agency, a State plan which meets the requirements of section 1004 (a) and—

"(1) sets forth a program under which funds paid to the State from its allotment under section 302 (a) will be expended solely for projects approved by the State educational agency for (A) acquisition of laboratory and other special equipment, including audio-visual materials and equipment and printed materials (other than textbooks), suitable for use in providing education in science, mathematics, or modern foreign language, in public elementary or secondary schools, or both, and (B) minor remodeling of laboratory or other space used for such materials or equipment;

"(2) sets forth principles for determining the priority of such projects in the State for assistance under this title and provides for undertaking such projects insofar as financial resources available therefor make possible, in the order determined by the application of such principles;

"(3) provides an opportunity for a hearing before the State educational agency to any applicant for a project under this title;

"(4) provides for the establishment of standards on a State level for laboratory and other special equipment acquired with assistance furnished under this title;

"(5) sets forth a program under which funds paid to the State from its allotment under section 302 (b) will be expended solely for (A) expansion or improvement of supervisory or related services in public elementary and secondary schools in the fields of science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages, and (B) administration of the State plan.

"(b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (a).

"Payments to States

"SEC. 304. (a) From a State's allotment for a fiscal year under section 302 (a), the Commissioner shall, from time to time during the period such allotment is available for payment as provided in paragraph (4) of section 302 (a), pay to such State an amount equal to one-half of the expenditures for projects for acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling referred to in paragraph (1) of section 303 (a) which are carried out under its State plan approved under section 303 (b); except that no State shall receive payments under this subsection for any period in excess of its allotments for such period under section 302 (a).

"(b) From a State's allotment under section 302 (b) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, the Commissioner shall from time to time pay to such State an amount equal to the amount expended by such State for such year to carry out the program referred to in paragraph (5) of section 303 (a) under its State plan approved under section 303 (b). From a State's allotment under section 302 (b) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, such payments shall equal one-half of the amount so expended under its State plan approved under section 303 (b); except that no State shall receive payments under this subsection for any fiscal year in excess of its allotment under section 302 (b) for that fiscal year.

"Loans to nonprofit private schools

"SEC. 305. (a) The Commissioner shall allot, out of funds reserved for each fiscal year for the purposes of this section under the provisions of section 302 (a), to each State for loans under the provisions of this section an amount which bears the same ratio to such funds as the number of persons in such State enrolled in private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools bears to the total of such numbers for all States.

"(b) From the sums allotted to each State under the provisions of this section the Commissioner is authorized to make loans to private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools in such State for the purposes for which payments to State educational agencies are authorized under the first sentence of section 301. Any such loan—

"(1) shall be made upon application containing such information as may be deemed necessary by the Commissioner;

"(2) shall be subject to such conditions as may be necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States;

"(3) shall bear interest at the rate arrived at by adding one-quarter of 1 percent per annum to the rate which the Secretary of the Treasury determines to be equal to the current average yield on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the date the application for the loan is approved and by adjusting the result so obtained to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percent; and

"(4) shall mature and be repayable on such date as may be agreed to by the Commissioner and the borrower, but such date shall not be more than 10 years after the date on which such loan was made.

"TITLE IV—NATIONAL DEFENSE FELLOWSHIPS

"Appropriations authorized

"SEC. 401. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

"Number of fellowships

"SEC. 402. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, the Commissioner is authorized to award one thousand fellowships under the provisions of this title, and during each of the three succeeding fiscal years he is authorized to award one thousand five hundred such fellowships. Such fellowships shall be for periods of study not in excess of three academic years.

"Award of fellowships and approval of institutions

"SEC. 403. (a) The Commissioner shall award fellowships under this title to individuals accepted for study in graduate programs approved by him under this section. The Commissioner shall approve a graduate program of an institution of higher education

only upon application by the institution and only upon his finding:

"(1) that such program is a new program or an existing program which has been expanded,

"(2) that such new program or expansion of an existing program will substantially further the objective of increasing the facilities available in the Nation for the graduate training of college or university level teachers and of promoting a wider geographical distribution of such facilities throughout the Nation, and

"(3) that in the acceptance of persons for study in such programs preference will be given to persons interested in teaching in institutions of higher education.

"(b) The total of the fellowships awarded under this title for pursuing a course of study in a graduate program at any institution of higher education may not exceed a limit established by the Commissioner in the light of the objective referred to in subsection (a) (2).

"Fellowship stipends

"SEC. 404. (a) Each person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of this title shall receive a stipend of $2,000 for the first academic year of study after the baccalaureate degree, $2,200 for the second such year, and $2,400 for the third such year, plus an additional amount of $400 for each such year on account of each of his dependents.

"(b) In addition to the amounts paid to persons pursuant to subsection (a) there shall be paid to the institution of higher education at which each such person is pursuing his course of study such amount, not more than $2,500 per academic year, as is determined by the Commissioner to constitute that portion of the cost of the new graduate program or of the expansion in an existing graduate program in which such person is pursuing his course of study, which is reasonably attributable to him.

"Fellowship conditions

"SEC. 405. A person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of this title shall continue to receive the payments provided in section 404 only during such periods as the Commissioner finds that he is maintaining satisfactory proficiency in, and devoting essentially full time to, study or research in the field in which such fellowship was awarded, in an institution of higher education, and is not engaging in gainful employment other than part-time employment by such institution in teaching, research, or similar activities, approved by the Commissioner.

"TITLE V—GUIDANCE, COUNSELING, AND TESTING; IDENTIFICATION AND ENCOURAGEMENT OF ABLE STUDENTS

"Part A—State programs

"Appropriations Authorized

"SEC. 501. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, for making grants to State educational agencies under this part to assist them to establish and maintain programs of testing and guidance and counseling.

"Allotments to States

"SEC. 502. From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 501 for any fiscal year the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2 per centum thereof, as he may determine for allotment as provided in section 1008. From the remainder of such sums the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of such remainder as the school-age population of such State bears to the total of the school-age populations of all of the States. The amount allotted to any State under the preceding sentence for any fiscal year which is less than $20,000 shall be increased to $20,000, the total of increases thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing the amount allotted to each of the remaining States under the preceding sentence, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of any such remaining States from being thereby reduced to less than $20,000.

"State Plans

"SEC. 503. (a) Any State which desires to receive payments under this part shall submit to the Commissioner, through its State educational agency, a State plan which meets the requirements of section 1004 (a) and sets forth—

"(1) a program for testing students in the public secondary schools, and if authorized by law in other secondary schools, of such State to identify students with outstanding aptitudes and ability, and the means of testing which will be utilized in carrying out such program; and

"(2) a program of guidance and counseling in the public secondary schools of such State (A) to advise students of courses of study best suited to their ability, aptitudes, and skills, and (B) to encourage students with outstanding aptitude and ability to complete their secondary school education, take the necessary courses for admission to institutions of higher education, and enter such institutions.

"(b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (a).

"Payments to States

"SEC. 504. (a) Payment under this part shall be made to those State educational agencies which administer plans approved under section 503. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, such payments shall equal the amount expended by the State in carrying out its State plan, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, such payments shall equal one-half of the amount so expended; except that no State educational agency shall receive payment under this part for any fiscal year in excess of that State's allotment for that fiscal year as determined under section 502.

"(b) In any State which has a State plan approved under section 503 and in which the State educational agency is not authorized by law to make payments to cover the cost of testing students in any one or more secondary schools in such State to determine student abilities and aptitudes, the Commissioner shall arrange for the testing of such students and shall pay the cost thereof for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and one-half of the cost thereof for any of the three succeeding fiscal years out of such State's allotment. Testing of students pursuant to this subsection shall, so far as practicable, be comparable to, and be done at the same grade levels and under the same conditions as in the case of, testing of students in public schools under the State plan.

"Part B—Counseling and guidance training institutes

"Authorization

"SEC. 511. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $6,250,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and $7,250,000 for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, to enable the Commissioner to arrange, by contracts with institutions of higher education, for the operation by them of short-term or regular session institutes for the provision of training to improve the qualifications of personnel engaged in counseling and guidance of students in secondary schools, or teachers in such schools preparing to engage in such counseling and guidance. Each individual, engaged, or preparing to engage, in counseling and guidance in a public secondary school, who attends an institute operated under the provisions of this part shall be eligible (after application therefor) to receive a stipend at the rate of $75 per week for the period of his attendance at such institute, and each such individual with one or more dependents shall receive an additional stipend at the rate of $15 per week for each such dependent for the period of such attendance.

"TITLE VI—LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

"Part A—Centers and research and studies

"Language and Area Centers

"SEC. 601. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to arrange through contracts with institutions of higher education for the establishment and operation by them, during the period beginning July 1, 1958, and ending with the close of June 30, 1962, of centers for the teaching of any modern foreign language with respect to which the Commissioner determines (1) that individuals trained in such language are needed by the Federal Government or by business, industry, or education in the United States, and (2) that adequate instruction in such language is not readily available in the United States. Any such contract may provide for instruction not only in such modern foreign language but also in other fields needed to provide a full understanding of the areas, regions, or countries in which such language is commonly used, to the extent adequate instruction in such fields is not readily available, including fields such as history, political science, linguistics, economics, sociology, geography, and anthropology. Any such contract may cover not more than 50 per centum of the cost of the establishment and operation of the center with respect to which it is made, including the cost of grants to the staff for travel in the foreign areas, regions, or countries with which the subject matter of the field or fields in which they are or will be working is concerned and the cost of travel of foreign scholars to such centers to teach or assist in teaching therein and the cost of their return and shall be made on such conditions as the Commissioner finds necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

"(b) The Commissioner is also authorized, during the period beginning July 1, 1958, and ending with the close of June 30, 1962, to pay stipends to individuals undergoing advanced training in any modern foreign language (with respect to which he makes the determination under clause (1) of subsection (a)), and other fields needed for a full understanding of the area, region, or country in which such language is commonly used, at any short-term or regular session of any institution of higher education, including allowances for dependents and for travel to and from their places of residence, but only upon reasonable assurance that the recipients of such stipends will, on completion of their training, be available for teaching a modern foreign language in an institution of higher education or for such other service of a public nature as may be permitted in regulations of the Commissioner.

"Research and studies

"SEC. 602. The Commissioner is authorized, directly or by contract, to make studies and surveys to determine the need for increased or improved instruction in modern foreign languages and other fields needed to provide a full understanding of the areas, regions, or countries in which such languages are commonly used, to conduct research on more effective methods of teaching such languages and in such other fields, and to develop specialized materials for use in such training, or in training teachers of such languages or in such fields.

"Appropriations authorized

"SEC. 603. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this part, not to exceed $8,000,000 in any one fiscal year.

"Part B—Language institutes

"Authorization

"SEC. 611. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $7,250,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years, to enable the Commissioner to arrange, through contracts with institutions of higher education, for the operation by them of short-term or regular session institutes for advanced training, particularly in the use of new teaching methods and instructional materials, for individuals who are engaged in or preparing to engage in the teaching, or supervising or training teachers, of any modern foreign language in elementary or secondary schools. Each individual (engaged, or preparing to engage, in the teaching, or supervising or training teachers, of any modern foreign language in a public elementary or secondary school) who attends an institute operated under the provisions of this part shall be eligible (after application therefor) to receive a stipend at the rate of $75 per week for the period of his attendance at such institute, and each such individual with one or more dependents shall receive an additional stipend at the rate of $15 per week for each such dependent for the period of such attendance.

"TITLE VII—RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION IN MORE EFFECTIVE UTILIZATION OF TELEVISION, RADIO, MOTION PICTURES, AND RELATED MEDIA FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

"Part A—Research and experimentation

"Functions of the Commissioner

"SEC. 701. In carrying out the provisions of this part the Commissioner, in cooperation with the Advisory Committee on New Educational Media (established by section 761), shall (through grants or contracts) conduct, assist, and foster research and experimentation in the development and evaluation of projects involving television, radio, motion pictures, and related media of communication which may prove of value to State or local educational agencies in the operation of their public elementary or secondary schools, and to institutions of higher education, including the development of new and more effective techniques and methods—

"(1) for utilizing and adapting motion pictures, video tapes and other audio-visual aids, film strips, slides and other visual aids, recordings (including magnetic tapes) and other auditory aids, and radio or television program scripts for such purposes;

"(2) for training teachers to utilize such media with maximum effectiveness; and

"(3) for presenting academic subject matter through such media.

"Grants-in-Aid; Contracts

"SEC. 702. In carrying out the provisions of section 701, the Commissioner—

"(1) may make grants-in-aid, approved by the Advisory Committee on New Educational Media, to public or nonprofit private agencies, organizations, and individuals for projects of research or experimentation referred to in section 701;

"(2) may enter into contracts, approved by the Advisory Committee on New Educational Media, with public or private agencies, organizations, groups, and individuals for projects of research or experimentation referred to in section 701; and

"(3) shall promote the coordination of programs conducted or financed by him under this title with similar programs conducted by other agencies, institutions, foundations, organizations, or individuals.

"Part B—Dissemination of information on new educational media

"Functions of the Commissioner

"SEC. 731. In order to disseminate information concerning new educational media (including the results of research and experimentation conducted under part A of this title) to State or local educational agencies, for use in their public elementary or secondary schools, and to institutions of higher education, the Commissioner—

"(1) shall make studies and surveys to determine the need for increased or improved utilization of television, radio, motion pictures, and related media of communication by State or local educational agencies and institutions of higher education for educational purposes;

"(2) shall prepare and publish catalogs, reviews, bibliographies, abstracts, analyses of research and experimentation, and such other materials as are generally useful in the encouragement and more effective use of television, radio, motion pictures, and related media of communication for educational purposes;

"(3) may, upon request, provide advice, counsel, technical assistance, and demonstrations to State or local educational agencies and institutions of higher education undertaking to utilize such media of communication to increase the quality or depth or broaden the scope of their educational programs;

"(4) shall prepare and publish an annual report setting forth (A) projects carried out under this title and the cost of each such project, and (B) developments in the utilization and adaptation of media of communication for educational purposes; and

"(5) may enter into contracts with public or private agencies, organizations, groups, or individuals to carry out the provisions of this part.

"Part C—General provisions

"Establishment of the Advisory Committee

"SEC. 761. (a) There is hereby established in the Office of Education an Advisory Committee on New Educational Media (hereafter in this title referred to as the "Advisory Committee"). The Advisory Committee shall consist of the Commissioner, who shall be chairman, a representative of the National Science Foundation and twelve persons appointed, without regard to the civil-service laws, by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. Three of such appointed members shall be individuals identified with the sciences, liberal arts, or modern foreign languages in institutions of higher education; three shall be individuals actually engaged in teaching or in the supervision of teaching in elementary or secondary schools; three shall be individuals of demonstrated ability in the utilization or adaptation of television, radio, motion pictures, and related media of communication for educational purposes; and three shall be individuals representative of the lay public who have demonstrated an interest in the problems of communication media.

"(b) The Advisory Committee shall—

"(1) advise, consult with, and make recommendations to the Commissioner on matters relating to the utilization or adaptation of television, radio, motion pictures, or related media of communication for educational purposes, and on matters of basic policy arising in the administration of this title;

"(2) review all applications for grants-in-aid under part A of this title for projects of research or experimentation and certify approval to the Commissioner of any such projects which it believes are appropriate for carrying out the provisions of this title; and

"(3) review all proposals by the Commissioner to enter into contracts under this title and certify approval to the Commissioner of any such contracts which it believes are appropriate to carry out the provisions of this title.

"(c) The Commissioner may utilize the services of any member or members of the Advisory Committee in connection with matters relating to the provisions of this title, for such periods, in addition to conference periods, as he may determine.

"(d) Members of the Advisory Committee shall, while serving on business of the Advisory Committee or at the request of the Commissioner under subsection (c) of this section, receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, not to exceed $50 per day, and shall also be entitled to receive an allowance for actual and necessary travel and subsistence expenses while so serving away from their places of residence.

"Special Personnel

"SEC. 762. The Commissioner may secure from time to time and for such periods as he deems advisable, without regard to the civil-service laws, the assistance and advice of persons in the United States and from abroad who are experts in the utilization and adaptation of television, radio, motion pictures, and other related media of communication for educational purposes.

"Appropriations Authorized

"SEC. 763. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and the sum of $5,000,000 for each of the three succeeding fiscal years for carrying out the provisions of this title.

"TITLE VIII—AREA VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

"Statement of Findings and Purpose

"SEC. 801. The Congress hereby finds that the excellent programs of vocational education, which States have established and are carrying on with the assistance provided by the Federal Government under the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act and the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (the George-Barden Act), need extension to provide vocational education to residents of areas inadequately served and also to meet national defense requirements for personnel equipped to render skilled assistance in fields particularly affected by scientific and technological developments. It is therefore the purpose of this title to provide assistance to the States so that they may improve their vocational education programs through area vocational education programs approved by State boards of vocational education as providing vocational and related technical training and retraining for youths, adults, and older persons, including related instruction for apprentices, designed to fit them for useful employment as technicians or skilled workers in scientific or technical fields.

"Amendment to Vocational Education Act of 1946

"SEC. 802. The Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U. S. C. 151–15m, 15o–15q, 15aa–15jj) is amended by adding after title II the following new title:

"'TITLE III—AREA VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

"'Authorization of Appropriations

"'SEC. 301. There is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years the sum of $15,000,000 for area vocational education programs, to be apportioned for expenditure in the States as provided in section 302.

"'Allotments to States

"'SEC. 302. (a) From the sums appropriated for any fiscal year pursuant to section 301, each State shall be entitled to an allotment of an amount bearing the same ratio

to such sums as the total of the amounts apportioned under title I of this Act, the Act of March 18, 1950 (20 U. S. C. 31–33), and section 9 of the Act of August 1, 1956 (20 U. S. C. 34), to such State for such year bears to the total of the amounts so apportioned to all the States for such year.

"'(b) The amount of any allotment to a State under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the State certifies to the Commissioner will not be required for carrying out area vocational education programs (under the part of the State plan meeting the requirements of section 305) shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsection (a) for such year. Any amount so reallotted to a State shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a).

"'Payments to States

"'SEC. 303. (a) Any amount paid to a State from its allotment under section 302 for any fiscal year shall be paid on condition:

"'(1) that there shall be spent for such year an equal amount in State or local funds, or both, for area vocational education programs operated under the provisions of this title;

"'(2) that funds appropriated under this title will not be used to reduce the amount of State or local funds, or both, being spent for vocational education programs operated under provisions of the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act and titles I and II of this Act and reported to the Commissioner, but such State or local funds, or both, in excess of the amount necessary for dollar for dollar matching of funds allotted to a State under provisions of the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act and titles I and II of this Act may be used to match funds appropriated under this title;

"'(3) that funds appropriated under section 301 of this title shall be used exclusively for the training of individuals designed to fit them for useful employment as highly skilled technicians in recognized occupations requiring scientific knowledge, as determined by the State board for such State, in fields necessary for the national defense.

"'(b) The Commissioner shall, prior to the beginning of each calendar quarter or other period prescribed by him, estimate the amount to be paid to each State for area vocational education programs under this title for such period; and shall pay to the State, from the allotment available therefor, the amount so estimated by him for such period, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum (not previously adjusted under this subsection) by which he finds that his estimate of the amount to be paid to the State for any prior period for such purpose under this title was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to the State for such prior period under this title for such purpose. Such payments shall be made in such installments as the Commissioner may determine.

"'Use of Funds

"'SEC. 304. (a) Funds paid to a State under this title for area vocational education programs may be used, in carrying out such programs (under the part of the State plan meeting the requirements of section 305), for—

"'(1) maintenance of adequate programs of administration, supervision, and teacher-training;

"'(2) salaries and necessary travel expenses of State or local school personnel, including teachers, coordinators, supervisors, vocational guidance counselors, teacher-trainers, directors, administrators, and others;

"'(3) travel expenses of members of advisory committees or State boards;

"'(4) purchase, rental, or other acquisition, and maintenance and repair, of instructional equipment;

"'(5) purchase of instructional supplies and teaching aids;

"'(6) necessary costs of transportation of students;

"'(7) securing necessary educational information and data as a basis for the proper development of area vocational education programs and programs of vocational guidance;

"'(8) training and work-experience training programs for out-of-school youths;

"'(9) related instruction for apprentices; and

"'(10) determining the need for, and planning and developing, area vocational education programs.

"'(b) Any equipment and teaching aids purchased with funds appropriated to carry out the provisions of this title shall become the property of the State.

"'Additional State Plan Requirements

"'SEC. 305. (a) To be eligible to participate in this title the State plan must be amended to include a new part which—

"'(1) designates the State board as the sole agency for administration of such part of the plan (or for the supervision of the administration thereof by State or local educational agencies);

"'(2) provides minimum qualifications for teachers, teacher-trainers, supervisors, directors and others having responsibilities under the plan;

"'(3) shows the plans, policies, and methods to be followed in carrying out such part of the State plan;

"'(4) provides such accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal methods and procedures as are necessary for the proper and efficient administration of such part of the State plan; and

"'(5) provides that the State board will make such reports to the Commissioner, in such form and containing such information, as are reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his functions under this title.

"'(b) The Commissioner shall approve a part of any plan for purposes of this title if he finds that it fulfills the conditions specified in subsection (a) of this section.

"'(c) Whenever the Commissioner after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State board finds that—

"'(1) the part of the State plan approved under subsection (b) has been so changed that it no longer complies with any provision required by subsection (a) of this section to be included in such part; or

"'(2) in the administration of such part of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision;

the Commissioner shall notify such State board that no further payments will be made to the State from its allotments under section 302 (or, in his discretion, that further payments will not be made to the State for projects under or portions of such part of the State plan affected by such failure) until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure. Until he is so satisfied the Commissioner shall make no further payments to such State from its allotments under section 302 (or shall limit payments to projects under or portions of such part of the State plan in which there is no such failure).

"'(d) (1) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's action under subsection (c) of this section, such State may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located. The summons and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States. The Commissioner shall forthwith certify and file in the court the transcript of the proceedings and the record on which he based his action.

"'(2) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, unless substantially contrary to the weight of the evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the transcript and record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive unless substantially contrary to the weight of the evidence.

"'(3) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

"'Appropriations for Administration

"'SEC. 306. There are hereby authorized to be included for each fiscal year in the appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare such sums as are necessary to administer the provisions of this title.

"'Definitions

"'SEC. 307. For purposes of this title—

"'(a) The term "State" includes Alaska, Hawaii, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, and Guam.

"'(b) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education.

"'(c) The terms "State plan" and "State board" shall have the meaning which said terms have in the Act approved February 23, 1917 (39 Stat. 929, ch. 114).

"'(d) The term "area vocational education program" means a program consisting of one or more less-than-college-grade courses conducted under public supervision and control and on an organized, systematic class basis, which is designed to fit individuals for useful employment as technicians or skilled workers in recognized occupations requiring scientific or technical knowledge, and which is made available to residents of the State or an area thereof designated and approved by the State board, who either have completed junior high school or, regardless of their school credits, are at least sixteen years of age and can reasonably be expected to profit by the instruction offered.'

"TITLE IX—SCIENCE INFORMATION SERVICE

"Functions of the Service

SEC. 901. The National Science Foundation shall establish a Science Information Service. The Foundation, through such Service, shall (1) provide, or arrange for the provision of, indexing, abstracting, translating, and other services leading to a more effective dissemination of scientific information, and (2) undertake programs to develop new or improved methods, including mechanized systems, for making scientific information available.

"Science Information Council

"SEC. 902. (a) The National Science Foundation shall establish, in the Foundation, a Science Information Council (hereafter in this title referred to as the "Council") consisting of the Librarian of Congress, the director of the National Library of Medicine, the director of the Department of Agriculture library, and the head of the Science Information Service, each of whom shall be ex officio members, and fifteen members appointed by the Director of the National Science Foundation. The Council shall annually elect one of the appointed members to serve as chairman until the next election. Six of the appointed members shall be leaders in the fields of fundamental science, six shall be leaders in the fields

of librarianship and scientific documentation, and three shall be outstanding representatives of the lay public who have demonstrated interest in the problems of communication. Each appointed member of such Council shall hold office for a term of four years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term, and (2) of the members first appointed, four shall hold office for a term of three years, four shall hold office for a term of two years, and three shall hold office for a term of one year, as designated by the Director of the National Science Foundation at the time of appointment. No appointed member of the Council shall be eligible for reappointment until a year has elapsed since the end of his preceding term.

"(b) It shall be the duty of the Council to advise, to consult with, and to make recommendations to, the head of the Science Information Service. The Council shall meet at least twice each year, and at such other times as the majority thereof deems appropriate.

"(c) Persons appointed to the Council shall, while serving on business of the Council, receive compensation at rates fixed by the National Science Foundation, but not to exceed $50 per day, and shall also be entitled to receive an allowance for actual and necessary travel and subsistence expenses while so serving away from their places of residence.

"Authority for Certain Grants and Contracts

"SEC. 903. In carrying out its functions under this title, the National Science Foundation shall have the same power and authority it has under the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to carry out its functions under that Act.

"Appropriations Authorized

"SEC. 904. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

"TITLE X—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

"Administration

"SEC. 1001. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to delegate any of his functions under this Act, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

"(b) In administering the titles of this Act for which he is responsible, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (41 U. S. C., sec. 5), of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution, in accordance with agreements between the Secretary and the head thereof.

"(c) The Commissioner shall include in his annual report to the Congress a full report of the activities of the Office of Education under this Act, including recommendations for needed revisions in the provisions thereof.

"(d) The Secretary shall advise and consult with the heads of departments and agencies of the Federal Government responsible for the administration of scholarship, fellowship, or other educational programs with a view to securing full information concerning all specialized scholarship, fellowship, or other educational programs administered by or under any such department or agency and to developing policies and procedures which will strengthen the educational programs and objectives of the institutions of higher education utilized for such purposes by any such department or agency.

"(e) Any agency of the Federal Government shall exercise its functions under any other law in such manner as will assist in carrying out the objectives of this Act. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as superseding or limiting the authority of any any such agency under any other law.

"(f) No part of any funds appropriated or otherwise made available for expenditure under authority of this Act shall be used to make payments or loans to any individual unless such individual (1) has executed and filed with the Commissioner an affidavit that he does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods, and (2) has taken and subscribed to an oath or affirmation in the following form: 'I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies, foreign and domestic.' The provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable with respect to such affidavits.

"Advisory Committees

"SEC. 1002. (a) The Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, may appoint an advisory committee, or advisory committees, to advise and consult with him with respect to the administration of the provisions of this Act for which he is responsible. Any such committee shall have twelve members as follows:

"(1) Four members who are recognized scholars in any of the following fields: engineering, mathematics, or science;

"(2) Four members who are recognized scholars in any of the fields of the humanities; and

"(3) Four members from such fields of endeavor as the Commissioner deems appropriate.

Members of an advisory committee appointed under this section, while attending conferences or meetings of the committee, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $50 per diem, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"Exemption From Conflict-of-Interest Laws of Members of Advisory Committees or Information Council

"SEC. 1003. (a) Any member of an advisory committee or information council appointed under this Act is hereby exempted, with respect to such appointment, from the operation of sections 281, 283, 284, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99), except as otherwise specified in subsection (b) of this section.

"(b) The exemption granted by subsection (a) shall not extend—

"(1) to the receipt or payment of salary in connection with the appointee's Government service from any source other than the private employer of the appointee at the time of his appointment, or

"(2) during the period of such appointment, and the further period of two years after the termination thereof, to the prosecution or participation in the prosecution, by any person so appointed, of any claim against the Government involving any matter concerning which the appointee had any responsibility arising out of his appointment during the period of such appointment.

"Administration of State Plans

"SEC. 1004. (a) No State plan submitted under one of the titles of this Act shall be approved by the Commissioner which does not—

"(1) provide, in the case of a plan submitted under title III or under title V, or section 1009 of this title, that the State educational agency will be the sole agency for administering the plan;

"(2) provide that such commission or agency will make such reports to the Commissioner, in such form and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his duties under such title or section; and

"(3) provide for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State under such title or section.

"(b) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this Act, or any modification thereof without first affording the agency administering the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

"(c) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the agency administering a State plan approved under one of the titles of this Act, finds that—

"(1) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of this Act governing its original approval, or

"(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision, the Commissioner shall notify such State agency, in the case of a plan submitted under title III or V or section 1009 of this title, that no further payments will be made to the State under such title or section (or, in his discretion, further payments to the State will be limited to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure),

until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, the Commissioner shall make no further payments to such State under such title or section, as the case may be (or shall limit payments to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure).

"Judicial Review

"SEC. 1005. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under this Act, or with respect to his final action under section 1004 (c), such State may, within sixty days after notice of such action, file in the United States district court for the district in which the capital of the State is located, a petition to review such action. The petition for review shall (1) contain a concise statement of the facts upon which the appeal is based and (2) designate that part of the Commissioner's decision sought to be reviewed.

"(b) Notification of the filing of the petition for review shall be given by the clerk of the court by mailing a copy of the petition to the Commissioner.

"(c) No costs or docket fees shall be charged or imposed with respect to any judicial review proceedings, or appeal therefrom, taken under this Act.

"(d) Upon receipt of the petition for review the Commissioner shall, within twenty days thereafter, certify and file in the court the record on review, consisting of the complete transcript of the proceedings before the Commissioner. No party to such review shall be required, by rule of court or otherwise, to print the contents of such record filed in the court.

"(e) The court after review may dismiss the petition or deny the relief prayed for, or may suspend, modify, or set aside, in whole or in part, the action of the Commissioner, or may compel action unlawfully withheld. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review as provided in section 1291 and 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code.

"Method of Payment

"SEC. 1006. Payments under this Act to any individual or to any State or Federal agency, institution of higher education, or any other

organization, pursuant to a grant, loan, or contract, may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, and, in the case of grants or loans, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

"Administrative Appropriations Authorized

"SEC. 1007. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each fiscal year thereafter, such sums as may be necessary for the cost of administering the provisions of this Act, including the administrative expenses of State commissions.

"Allotments to Territories and Posessions

"SEC. 1008. The amounts reserved by the Commissioner under sections 302 and 502 shall be allotted by the Commissioner among Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, Guam, and the Virgin Islands, according to their respective needs for the type of assistance furnished under the part or title in which the section appears.

"Improvement of Statistical Services of State Educational Agencies

"SEC. 1009. (a) For the purpose of assisting the States to improve and strengthen the adequacy and reliability of educational statistics provided by State and local reports and records and the methods and techniques for collecting and processing educational data and disseminating information about the condition and progress of education in the States, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years, for grants to States under this section, such sums as the Congress may determine.

"(b) Grants under this section by the Commissioner shall be equal to one-half of the cost of State educational agency programs to carry out the purposes of this section, including (1) improving the collection, analysis, and reporting of statistical data supplied by local educational units, (2) the development of accounting and reporting manuals to serve as guides for local educational units, (3) the conduct of conferences and training for personnel of local educational units and of periodic reviews and evaluation of the program for records and reports, (4) improving methods for obtaining, from other State agencies within the State, educational data not collected by the State educational agency, or (5) expediting the processing and reporting of statistical data through installation and operation of mechanical equipment. The total of the payments to any State under this section for any fiscal year may not exceed $50,000.

"(c) Payments with respect to any program of a State educational agency under this section may be made (1) only to the extent it is a new program or an addition to or expansion of an existing program, and (2) only if the State plan approved under subsection (d) includes such program.

"(d) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan for purposes of this section if such plan meets the requirements of section 1004 (a) and sets forth the programs proposed to be carried out under the plan and the general policies to be followed in doing so."

And the Senate agree to the same.

GRAHAM A. BARDEN,
CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
CARL ELLIOTT,
LEE METCALF,
CARROLL D. KEARNS,
H. G. HASKELL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

LISTER HILL,
PAT MCNAMARA,
RALPH YARBOROUGH,
H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
GORDON ALLOTT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13247) to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs; and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute. The committee of conference agreed upon a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment. The differences between the House bill and the substitute agreed upon in conference are noted in the following outline, except for minor, technical, and conforming changes.

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

The provisions of this title in the conference substitute are substantially the same as those in the House bill, except that changes have been made in the findings and declaration of policy to make it consistent with the agreement reached by the conferees.

TITLE II—LOANS TO STUDENTS IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

The provisions of the House bill enable the Commissioner to stimulate and assist in the establishment at institutions of higher education of funds for the making of low-interest loans to students in need thereof to pursue their courses of study, and to make loans to institutions to enable them to establish the funds where necessary. The Senate provision for loans differed substantially. The conference substitute adopts the House bill, with several changes which are generally of minor importance. These changes are the following:

(1) The Senate amendment required no matching of Federal funds. The requirement in the House bill of 20 percent matching by colleges of Federal funds is reduced in the conference substitute to 10 percent matching.

(2) The House bill provided that interest on student loans would be at the rate of 2 percent per year while the student was in school and for one year thereafter. Thereafter the loan would bear interest at the rate of 4 percent per year. The Senate amendment, in its loan title, provided for interest at the rate of 2 percent per year, beginning one year after the student finished school. The conference substitute provides for interest at the rate of 3 percent per year, beginning one year after the borrower ceases to be a full-time student at an institution of higher education.

(3) The Senate amendment provided that the loan would be canceled for service as a full-time teacher in an elementary or secondary school at the rate of 20 per centum of the unpaid balance of the loan (plus interest thereon) for each academic year of such service. The conference substitute provides for the cancellation of one-half of the loan for teaching over a five-year period in public elementary or secondary schools.

(4) Under the House bill loans would be repaid in equal annual installments. The conference substitute adopts a provision of the Senate amendment making it explicit that repayments may be made in installments which are graduated.

(5) The conference substitute also adopts a provision, taken from the Senate amendment, suspending payments on principal, and interest accruals, while the borrower is in the Armed Forces (but not for more than three years).

(6) The House bill provided that loans shall be made without discrimination based upon race, color, religion, national origin, or sex. The conference substitute omits this provision.

(7) The conference substitute incorporates a provision of the Senate amendment that in making loans special consideration shall be given to persons whose academic background indicates a superior capacity or preparation in science, mathematics, engineering, or modern foreign language, and primarily to persons with a superior academic background who express a desire to teach in elementary or secondary schools.

TITLE III—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR STRENGTHENING SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

The House bill authorized the appropriation of $60,000,000 for fiscal 1959 and each of the three succeeding fiscal years for making payments to State educational agencies for the acquisition of equipment suitable for use in providing education in science, mathematics, or modern foreign language and for minor remodeling of the laboratory or other space used for such material and equipment. The bill also authorized the appropriation of $5,000,000 for making payments to the States for expansion or improvement of supervisory or related services in the fields of science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages, and the administration of the State plan.

The Senate amendment follows the House bill with two exceptions.

First, the authorization of appropriations in the Senate amendment for laboratory equipment and minor remodeling was $70,000,000 per year.

Secondly, the Senate amendment provided that 12 percent of the sums appropriated for laboratory equipment and minor remodeling would be used for making loans to private nonprofit schools. The sums available for loans would be allotted among the States on the basis of the relative numbers of children enrolled in private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools in the respective States. The loans would be made for the same purposes that the grants could be made under the title. The loans would bear interest at one-quarter of 1 percent per year above the rate equal to the current average yield on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States (adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percent), and shall mature not later than 10 years after the loan is made.

The conference substitute is substantially the same as the Senate amendment.

TITLE IV—NATIONAL DEFENSE FELLOWSHIPS

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment provided for the award of 1,000 fellowships for fiscal 1959, and 1,500 such fellowships for each of the next three fiscal years, for periods of study not in excess of three academic years. The only difference between the two versions was a provision in the House bill that the fellowships be awarded without discrimination based upon race, color, religion, national origin, or sex. The substitute agreed upon in conference adopts the language of the Senate amendment.

TITLE V—GUIDANCE, COUNSELING, AND TESTING; IDENTIFICATION AND ENCOURAGEMENT OF ABLE STUDENTS

Part A—State programs

Both versions provide substantially similar programs of Federal assistance in the establishment and maintenance of programs of testing and guidance and counseling. The Senate amendment differs from the House bill in providing that where a State participating in the program is not authorized to use State funds for testing students in private nonprofit secondary schools to determine aptitude and ability, the Commissioner may arrange for testing such students, and would pay the cost thereof for

fiscal 1959, and one-half the cost thereof for any of the three succeeding fiscal years, out of the State's allotment. This testing program would be comparable to that carried out in the public schools. The conference substitute is substantially the same as the Senate bill.

Part B—Institutes in guidance and counseling

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment provided for the establishment of institutes in guidance and counseling, although in somewhat different language. The differences of substance between the two versions are as follows:

(1) The House bill authorized the appropriation of $6,000,000 for fiscal 1959, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, while the Senate amendment authorized the appropriation of $6,250,000 for fiscal 1959, and $7,250,000 for each of the three succeeding fiscal years.

(2) The House bill, unlike the Senate amendment, contained a provision providing that the institutes would place emphasis upon the counseling and guidance of gifted students.

(3) Under the House bill a person employed by a public school system who is engaged in guidance and counseling on a full or part-time basis would receive a stipend at the rate of $75 per week, plus $15 a week for each dependent, except that no one would receive more than his last rate of salary during the preceding academic year. The Senate amendment provided for payments of stipends and allowances for dependents to personnel and teachers engaged in, or preparing to engage in, counseling and guidance in public secondary schools, but no maximum permissible amount was provided for such stipends and allowances.

The conference substitute adopts the language of the Senate amendment, except that the provisions of the House bill limiting the amount of stipends to $75 a week and of dependents' allowances to $15 per dependent per week are included in the substitute.

TITLE VI—LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

The House bill and Senate amendment both authorized the Commissioner to contract for the operation by institutions of higher education during fiscal 1959 through fiscal 1962 of short-term or regular session institutes for advanced training, particularly in the use of new teaching methods and instructional materials, for individuals who are engaged in or preparing to engage in the teaching, or supervising or training teachers of any modern foreign language in schools at the elementary or secondary level. No specific authorization of appropriations is provided for such institutes in the House bill, but for carrying out all of title IV of the House bill (relating to language development), section 404 authorizes an appropriation of not to exceed $4,500,000 for each of the four fiscal years of the program. The Senate amendment for each of the four fiscal years of the program authorizes the appropriation of $7,250,000 for such institutes.

Both versions would also provide for the payment of stipends and dependents' allowances to persons attending the institutes. The House bill also provided for travel to and from their places of residence of individuals attending such institutes and their dependents. The Senate version has no similar provision.

The substitute agreed upon in conference adopts the Senate version, except that it provides that a person attending a language institute shall be eligible (after application) therefor to receive a stipend at the rate of $75 per week for the period of his attendance at such institute, and each such person with one or more dependents shall receive an additional stipend of $15 per week for each such dependent.

The House bill and the Senate amendment both provided for language and area centers and for research and studies in language instruction. The conference substitute is the same as the House bill, except that the appropriation of $8,000,000 is authorized, instead of $4,500,000, as provided in the House bill for all language development.

TITLE VII—RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION IN MORE EFFECTIVE UTILIZATION OF TELEVISION, RADIO, MOTION PICTURES, AND RELATED MEDIA FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

The House bill authorized an appropriation of $2 million a year for 4 years to enable the Commissioner of Education, through grants or contracts, to undertake functions detailed in paragraphs (1) through (5) of section 701 of the House bill, to enable him to provide (upon request) advice, counsel, and technical assistance to State or local educational agencies or institutions of higher education undertaking to utilize television, radio, motion pictures, and related communications media in providing education.

The Senate amendment authorized an appropriation of $5 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and $10 million for each of the three succeeding years to carry out research and experimentation (directly or through grant or contract) with respect to adaptation and utilization of television, radio, motion pictures, and related communications media for educational purposes and to disseminate information with respect to new educational media.

The Senate amendment also established in the Office of Education an Advisory Committee on New Educational Media, and permitted the Commissioner of Education to secure (without regard to the civil-service laws) the assistance and advice of persons who are expert in the adaptation and utilization of television, radio, motion pictures, and other related media of communication for educational purposes.

The conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment, except that (1) it would authorize the appropriation of $3 million for fiscal 1959 and $5 million for each of the next three fiscal years, and (2) it permits the Commissioner to carry out research and experimentation only through grants and contracts.

TITLE VIII—AREA VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

The Senate amendment included a title relating to area vocational programs which had no counterpart in the House bill. This title was designed to provide assistance to the States so that they could improve and expand their vocational education programs through area vocational education programs; approved by State boards as providing vocational and related technical training and retraining for youths, adults, and older persons, including related instruction for apprentices, designed to fit them for useful employment as technicians or skilled workers in scientific and technical fields.

The title amends the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (the George-Barden Act) by adding the following new title:

TITLE III—AREA VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Section 301—Authorization of appropriations

This section authorizes appropriation of $20 million for fiscal 1959 and each of the three succeeding fiscal years.

Section 302—Allotments to States

The amounts appropriated are to be allotted to the States in the same ratio as the total amounts allotted under title I of the Vocational Education Act of 1946, the Act of March 18, 1950, and section 9 of the Act of August 1, 1956.

The amounts allotted to a State, but not required by it (according to its certification), would be available for reallotment to other States.

Section 303—Payments to States

The payments shall be made on the condition that the State will match the grants on a 50–50 basis and that the amounts granted will not be used to reduce State or local funds used for vocational education programs under the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts, although State and local funds under those laws in excess of what is needed for 50–50 matching could be used to match the new Federal funds.

This section provides payments to the States on the basis of estimates, with necessary adjustments for overpayments or underpayments in previous periods, on a quarterly basis or any other period prescribed by the Commissioner. The payments could be made in installments determined by the Commissioner.

The section also provides that funds appropriated for this program will be used exclusively for training of individuals designed to fit them for useful employment as highly skilled technicians or semiprofessional personnel in recognized occupations requiring scientific knowledge in fields necessary for the national defense.

Section 304—Use of funds

Amounts allotted under this title could be used for administration, supervision, and teacher-training expenses; for salaries and travel expenses for school personnel; for travel expenses for advisory committees; for purchase and rental of instructional equipment (and maintenance and repair thereof) and purchase of instructional supplies and teaching aids; for transportation of students; for securing necessary educational information for development of programs; for training and work experience for out-of-school youth; for related instruction for apprentices; and for determining the need for and planning of the programs.

Any equipment obtained by the use of the allotted funds would become State property.

Section 305—Additional State plan requirements

In order for a State to qualify for assistance under this title, its State plan must be amended to—

(1) designate the State board as the sole agency for the plan's administration or provide for the supervision of its administration by State or local educational agencies;

(2) set up minimum qualifications for persons having responsibilities under the plan;

(3) outline specific plans, policies and methods for carrying out the State plan;

(4) provide for proper accounting and budgeting methods and provide for the making of necessary reports to the Commissioner.

Any plan meeting these requirements would be approved by the Commissioner.

If the Commissioner subsequently finds the State has failed to comply substantially with the above requirements in administration of the plan or because of a change in State plan, he shall, upon notifying the State board, stop further payments or limit such payments to parts of the plan not affected by such failure until such time as the State has complied with the requirements. Such action may only be taken after notice and opportunity for hearing has been accorded the State board.

The State may appeal the Commissioner's decision to the United States court of appeals. The summons and the notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States. The findings of fact of the Commissioner are conclusive unless substantially contrary to the weight of evidence; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner for further evidence to be taken. The court would have jurisdiction to affirm or set aside the decision in

whole or in part. The judgment of the court of appeals would be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Section 306—Appropriations for administration

This section authorizes the inclusion in the appropriations of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of such sums as shall be necessary to administer this new title of the George-Barden Act.

Section 307—Definitions

This section provides definitions of the terms listed below to be used for the purposes of the new title.

(1) The term "State" includes Alaska, Hawaii, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, and Guam.

(2) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education.

(3) The terms "State plan" and "State board" have the same meaning which said terms have in the act approved February 23, 1917 (39 Stat. 929, ch. 114).

(4) The term "area vocational education program" means a program consisting of one or more less-than-college grade courses conducted under public supervision and control and on an organized, systematic class basis, which is designed to fit individuals for useful employment as technicians or skilled workers in recognized occupations requiring scientific or technical knowledge, and which is made available to residents of the State or an area thereof designated and approved by the State board, who either have completed junior high school or, regardless of their school credits, are at least 16 years of age and can reasonably be expected to profit by the instruction offered.

The conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment, except that (1) the appropriations authorized are reduced to $15,000,000 a year, and (2) the provision in the Senate amendment limiting the types of training for which the funds may be used is modified to delete the reference therein to "semiprofessional personnel" and to give the State boards of vocational education the function of determining what are "recognized occupations requiring scientific knowledge."

Courses in public colleges or public junior colleges, which are not offered toward a baccalaureate degree and meet other criteria of "less-than-college-grade" courses, could be included by the State Board under this program just as they are today under the Smith-Hughes and George Barden Acts.

TITLE IX—SCIENCE INFORMATION SERVICE

Under this provision of the Senate amendment the National Science Foundation would be required to establish a Science Information Service. The Foundation, through the Service, would provide for indexing, abstracting, translating and other services leading to a more effective dissemination of scientific information. It would also undertake to develop improved methods for making scientific information available.

The Senate amendment provided for the establishment of a Science Information Council by the National Science Foundation within the Foundation to advise, consult with, and make recommendations to, the head of the Science Information Service. The Council would consist of the Librarian of Congress, the Director of the National Library of Medicine, the Director of the Department of Agriculture Library, and the Head of the Science Information Service, as ex officio members. Fifteen additional members would be appointed by the Director of the National Science Foundation. Six of the appointed members would be experts in the fields of science, six leaders in librarianship and scientific documentation; and three representatives of the lay public interested in the fields of communication. The appointments are for a term of 4 years, except that in order to provide for staggered terms, 4 of the members first appointed will serve for a term of 3 years, 4 for a term of 2 years, and 3 for a term of 1 year. If a member is appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term, the appointment shall be only for the remainder of such term. No member may be reappointed until after 1 year has elapsed since the end of his preceding term. The Council is to meet at least twice a year or more often if necessary.

The National Science Foundation would have the same power and authority under this title that it has under the National Science Foundation Act of 1950. Under the Senate amendment, all the grants under the title were required to be approved by the National Science Board.

The title authorized the appropriation, starting with the fiscal year which ends June 30, 1959, of such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the title.

The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference substitute adopts this Senate provision with the single exception that the provision which required grants to be approved by the National Science Board was deleted as unnecessary in light of certain recent enactments.

TITLE X—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

The Senate amendment authorized the delegation by the Commissioner to any officer or employee of the Office of Education of any of his functions under this act, other than the making of regulations. The conference substitute accepts this provision.

Under the Senate amendment no one could receive a grant or loan from funds made available under the act until he executes and files a noncommunist affidavit and has taken an oath of allegiance to the United States. The conference substitute adopts the provisions of the Senate amendment.

The substitute adopted by the conferees does not include provisions which were in the House bill authorizing the Commissioner to accept gifts, grants, bequests, or devises for carrying out the provisions of the act. There were no comparable provisions in the Senate amendment.

GRAHAM A. BARDEN,
CLEVELAND M. BAILEY,
CARL ELLIOTT,
LEE METCALF,
CARROLL D. KEARNS,
H. G. HASKELL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to say to the House that we brought back, with some very important amendments the House bill. We maintained the position of the House with reference to the loan provisions of this bill. The House, by its action, had given the conferees a mandate to bring back a loan program instead of a scholarship program or, to say it another way, the House insisted that our scholarships be made loans. We maintained that position.

We did make moneywise two large additions to the bill. One was in the field of vocational education. The Senate had a provision for some aid to area vocational schools.

We brought back, Mr. Speaker, a bill that had $60 million for area vocational schools. That $60 million is for aid to our area vocational schools so that they may train highly skilled technical people in this field. I would like to say this. After discussing this matter in four long conferences, the conference committee came to the conclusion that something should be done in that field. We did not accept the Senate provision outright, but instead we made the amount involved $15 million a year for 4 years. It is a fine addition to our bill. Our vocational education people are doing an excellent job. They have enough know-how and experience in this field to do a good job with this money. I know they will.

I received a telegram just this morning from Mr. Carlton Kelly, head of the trade school at Decatur, Ala. It is a school of the type that this bill is designed to aid. That telegram told me that school had already trained 850 people who were doing highly skilled technical work on the Jupiter missile at the Redstone Arsenal in the District of the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. JONES, and it further said that that particular school needed a great deal more money to equip itself to do most effectively that kind of work. We also have a quotation from one of the people most interested in this matter saying that our vocational schools in this highly technical age must be shored up with better equipment in order to do the job of training technologists below the engineering grade. Well, this is an item that cost $60 million and which added $60 million to our bill.

We also added $40 million, or rather $10 million a year for 4 years, to our equipment title, with the result that we have for allocation to the States $70 million a year for equipment in this bill. This money will, of course, be matched by the States.

We accepted the Senate provisions, as I pointed out a little while ago, with reference to experimentation in the field of television and educational films as a teaching aid. We also added another $10 million to the bill.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, to the Members of the House that the only significant change we made in the loan title was to provide the forgiveness feature which I have mentioned, and to provide for lowering the interest from 4 percent to 3 percent, and to reduce the college contributions to the loan funds from 20 percent, as provided in the House bill, to 10 percent.

The Senate bill had no provision for matching of the loan funds. We felt that the matching was an important element in the program. We insisted that some matching be provided. The 10-percent agreement was the result.

We provided for more flexibility in the repayment terms in connection with the loan program. We provided for postponement of payments on the loans for up to a period of 3 years to cover military service of the person who may have the loan.

Those were the principal changes made.

Something was said in the debate the other day that in the opinion of some of the Members, this bill was not closely enough tied to our national defense. I may say we added an amendment to the loan provision which reads like this and which ties it to the national defense. I deem, as closely as we can reasonably

afford to tie a loan provision of this kind. I quote now from the bill:

> In the selection of students to receive the loans, special consideration shall be given to (a) students with a superior academic background, who express a desire to teach in elementary or secondary schools, and (b) students whose academic background indicates a superior capacity or preparation in science, mathematics, engineering, or a modern foreign language.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the distinguished gentleman and to remind the House once more that this legislation is the product of almost innumerable formal hearings—absolutely innumerable informal hearings. More than 200 witnesses were heard. Personally, I think that without the patience and the understanding and complete knowledge that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] has, we would not have the opportunity to have this great legislation before us.

I subscribe to it almost thoroughly. I regret, however, that in the section which the gentleman just mentioned there is such undue emphasis, in my opinion, on mathematics, science, and modern foreign languages, for I believe very strongly that the humanities are every bit as important to the national defense as are these specific subjects. This does not mean that the issue had not been discussed fully in the subcommittee and again in the full committee and in the debate. However, I consider that it is regrettable, even though supportable as a national defense measure, that this emphasis is here. I do not know how many physicists it would take to understand as much about the mind of Mr. Khrushchev, for instance, as would a student of Russian language and Russian history. We have in a sense departed from the concept of education. I recognize, however, that despite this emphasis we do have shortages in this field which we know of positively, and that we do need that emphasis to some degree on science, mathematics and modern foreign languages. I hope at some time, in the wisdom of this body, in the future that this emphasis will no longer be necessary. Through this bill there is an emphasis which runs through the entire measure. There are national defense issues. After all, this is a national defense act. It is predicated on a known need. But there are special considerations given all the way through the act to equipment, to teaching, and to institutions and other matters relating directly to the emphasis, which the gentleman has referred to, and to which I have rather serious reservations. Notwithstanding those reservations, this is magnificent and historic legislation.

I might remind the House that this is the first time in 90 years since the Morrell Act, that a bill has undertaken broad assistance to education. It is not the fault of the gentleman from Alabama that this was not done 10 years ago. If he had been listened to then as he is being listened to today, perhaps we would not need the emphasis which I find slightly distasteful.

The gentleman has done nothing short of magnificent service in sending to the Members of this body and the other body and to the youngsters who are about to enter college this legislation. I cannot commend him too highly for it.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks. I realize what the gentleman's position is. I will say that as a member of the subcommittee studying this matter, and as a member of the full Committee on Education and Labor, he has been most helpful and diligent in getting this bill to the floor of the House in such a form that it is receiving the general acceptance which it has had.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I would like to preface my question by joining in the universal tributes that have been paid today and before to the gentleman for his work on this legislation, which I think in the years to come will be recognized as a landmark in the development and strength of our country so that it can meet all requirements.

I would like for the chairman of the subcommittee handling this bill to explain the graduate fellowship section which is carried in the bill and which developed from the conference. I understand the gentleman made some reference to it a minute ago, but I would like to have it explained in more detail.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I think one of the finest parts of the bill is the title providing 5,500 fellowships over a period of 4 years to be awarded to people who are working for a doctor's degree with preference given to those who intend to teach in the colleges of the country. It is a very fine program and it is predicated also, may I say to my friend from Mississippi, upon an expansion of existing facilities for graduate instruction. When we pass this bill we can be assured that if these fellowships are used, existing graduate facilities all over the country will have to be expanded at least sufficiently to take care of these fellowships.

And, Mr. Speaker, may I take this occasion to express to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH] my sincere appreciation for the kind interest which he has shown in perfecting this bill, and especially with respect to the graduate title about which he has just inquired.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. DENTON. Is the State of Indiana included or excluded?

Mr. ELLIOTT. It is absolutely included just like all the other States.

Mr. DENTON. I am very much pleased, because when the other body had offered an amendment excluding Indiana I was deluged with telegrams from educators, parent-teachers associations, and many citizens. The newspapers were full of letters to the editor all to the same effect: Why should Indiana paying the same amount of taxes as any other State be excluded from the operation of this bill?

I am glad Indiana is being treated the same as the other States of the Union. If this bill passes I hope the State of Indiana will cooperate to see that our citizens get the benefit of the legislation.

In conclusion I want to congratulate the subcommittee and the full committee for the work they have done on this bill. I think this will turn out to be the most important legislation probably enacted in this Congress. I think we can all be proud of it if this legislation becomes law.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], and am very happy, as I am sure are the members of the full Committee on Education and Labor with his prediction that this legislation will prove to be most important and significant in its results.

I share with him and with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], great pride in the fact that the first amendment which the House conferees agreed to was an amendment to provide the full benefits of this bill to Indiana. Both gentlemen had been most solicitous that Indiana be restored, insofar as this bill is concerned, into full and complete equality of consideration with the other States.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill we have been working on for a long time, recommended by the subcommittee and the full committee and also by the Commissioner of Education. I want to congratulate the committee on the bill they reported out. It is a good, fair compromise and a bill which in my judgment makes a notable step in increasing educational opportunities and facilities to the youth of America.

While I cannot say exactly how the White House feels about this conference bill, I am sure it will meet with approval because it must be recognized as a forward step and one that the American people will be very much gratified we took. It will materially aid in making our country a better educated Nation and will provide great opportunities for many of our young people who otherwise do not have the price of education.

I commend the gentleman from Alabama for the fine work he has done on this legislation. His committee and he himself have worked without concern for politics but for the purpose of making a better America. I hope the conference report will be adopted.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. In the definition of "institution of higher education" are business colleges included, such a business college, for instance, as issue degrees, or certificates upon completion of 1, 2, 3, or 4 years of study?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Does the gentleman mean nonprofit business colleges?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. ELLIOTT. There is within the definition, if the gentleman will read

the report, an inclusion of certain business schools provided they meet the requirements set out in the report. Those requirements would have to be measured as against any specific situation.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. While my question was directed to nonprofit business colleges, would a college that is operating for profit be eligible to obtain loans and to make loans to students who might attend that school?

Mr. ELLIOTT. It would not, I believe, if it were the ordinary case. The business schools were most aggressive in representing their interests in this matter. Their representatives presented testimony before the subcommittee, and they were heard with interest.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to clarify the point raised by the gentleman from Colorado. There are about seven schools, degree-granting institutions that carry on a special course in business administration, accounting, and so forth, that might possibly qualify under this bill. But the ordinary independent business school that does not grant degrees will not participate.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Is it not true a part of the duty and responsibility of the State commissioner of education is to determine who is eligible and who is not, or is that all done by the United States Commissioner of Education?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I will say with respect to the business schools—I have not been able to find the exact page in the report here—the report sets out five specific requirements.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I cannot find the precise spot either, but the requirements are that the work given at those institutions must lead to a baccalaureate degree.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. They must be nonprofit institutions, which would include business colleges, any college or university, but not some 90 percent of them which do not give baccalaureate degrees, and which do not operate on a nonprofit basis.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The criteria are the profitmaking and the degrees.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I take it that any school that is operating for profit cannot under any circumstances obtain a grant from the Commissioner of the State and from the Department here in Washington?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. That is my understanding.

Mr. ELLIOTT. May I refer the gentleman to page 4 of the conference report, paragraph (b), which sets out the five qualifications that a business school must have in order to qualify.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this occasion as a great day in the House of Congress when we are taking this far-reaching step in thinking about education in this great country of ours. As one who introduced the President's bill, the administration bill, it is a great pleasure for me to tell this body that 80 percent of the content of that bill is included in the bill which we brought back in conference. Then, too, I want to congratulate the Committee on Education and Labor, after receiving many slaps in the face at times, as being very forward in living up to its obligation under the chairmanship of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN]. I do not think any Member of this body can go out and make any political claims on this bill. It was done in the best judgment of the committee, Mr. Speaker. All of the members of the subcommittee rallied to the occasion. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT], and also to send word over to the White House that we have the best bill we can get and we are sending it to the President of the United States for approval.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman.

May I say that one of the most important things about this bill, the thing that will make it strong, and give it a chance to work with good success has been the fact it grew up so largely with bipartisan or nonpartisan support on both sides of the aisle. As the gentleman has just stated, there was nothing partisan in the handling of the bill in the subcommittee or in the Committee on Education and Labor, and I certainly hope there will not be on the floor of the House.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. I would like to add my bit and say a nice word to the members of the conference who came out with a rather fine bill. As a new Member, I gained a new respect for the Congress and Congressmen and Congresswomen. Like many others, I did not know too much about the committee system of operation. I have great respect for it and I feel that a great many more Americans ought to know the amount of work that has to be put into legislation before it is ready for final action.

I want to compliment the chairman of the subcommittee and the members of the committee who have worked so hard, because this is a new departure in governmental operations.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania who has made a great record here in his first term and who has contributed much to this legislation.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take a few minutes to cover a phase of this program that to my mind is of very great importance.

Without taking away from the need for the scientists, grammarians and linguists as well as mathematicians, I believe we must expand our facilities for the trades and crafts that make the actual building and construction of our defenses possible.

With this in mind I want to join in the support of the conference report 2688 on the scholarship-aid bill. This bill was reported from the Committee on Education and Labor on which I am privileged to serve.

It was reported unanimously and I sincerely believe we can vote on this conference report in the affirmative today.

It is gratifying to know that the conferees have included vocational education. The importance of vocational education covers in part the following necessary fields of endeavor:

First. Automotive trades. America's economy depends upon its transportation system. The modern auto mechanic is a technician who keeps the wheels turning and understands the operation and maintenance of motor vehicles of all types.

Second. Brick masonry. In a day of cement and glass blocks, quick-rising housing developments, and industrial projects, the brickmason must combine manipulative skill with sound judgment and related technical information.

Third. Cabinet and pattern making. The cabinetmaker combines skill and precision to turn out articles of furniture that reflect artistry by their beauty of line and perfection of handiwork. The pattern maker's product is the link between the designer and the casting. He is an artisan whose work requires the knowledge of several trades—woodworking, foundry methods, and machine-shop practice.

Fourth. Carpentry. Carpenters are builders; theirs is the responsibility of making the architect's design a reality. Perfection of construction will mean increased enjoyment for those who work or dwell within the walls of the structure. It may mean the start of a new kind of living.

Fifth. Drafting. Suspension bridges that leap rivers, skyscrapers that rise to city skylines, and the turbine that throbs with power were first put onto paper by the draftsman with fine penciled lines. Whether it be dramatic designs for industry or functional patterns for modern living, the draftsman's design furnished the blueprint for production.

Sixth. Electricity. Electricity lights the world, moves power machines, and transmits voices and pictures through the medium of telephone, radio, and television. Technicians in the field of electricity hold within their knowledge one of the most powerful and useful discoveries of mankind.

Seventh. Machine-shop practice. Mass production, mechanization, and automation are prime factors in our high standard of living. The machinist and the tool and die maker, working to tolerances of one ten-thousandths of an inch, play a vital role in all of America's industrial progress.

Eighth. Printing. When John Gutenberg invented movable type he opened the doors of learning to each individual. With the printed word has come the ability to transmit the knowledge of the world to each generation.

Ninth. Welding. The electric arc and the acetylene flame in the deft hands of the skilled welder join two pieces of metal as one. Welding a broken machine casting, the structural steel skeleton of a ship or skyscraper, and a network of pipelines across the country make possible many of our technological achievements.

This is a convincing and compelling list of needed jobs to be performed in our economy. While it is true that we need higher education, there is just as important a reason for having vocational education.

Without the skilled tradesmen, our economy cannot exist. Many of our skilled technicians are the graduates of private and public vocational schools.

The old days of the apprentice tradesman are fast disappearing and nothing can take the place of this program except a Government aided program for vocational education.

Mr. Speaker, I want to pay my respects at this time to the chairman of the subcommittee, the Honorable CARL ELLIOTT, the gentleman from Alabama, whose unselfish and understanding character has made passage of this act possible.

His calm and sober judgment of both men and issues saved this bill on many occasions when tempers and disagreements threatened to bury the bill in committee.

Every member of the Committee of Labor and Education, I am sure, believes as I do; that without CARL ELLIOTT's positive hand and patient leadership this great step forward in the field of education would have died aborning.

I consider it a privilege to have been permitted to help work out the details and to have served with Mr. ELLIOTT and the whole Committee on Education and Labor.

Another great force that was added to the unselfish group working for the passage of this bill was the NEA and all of its officers and members.

From the beginning they contributed at every turn, with their statistical facts and wealth of logic and knowledge in the field of education.

We know this is a beginning and that the future will bring greater strides in our never ending search for higher education.

The following statement by the NEA is worthy of inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

A STATEMENT FROM THE NEA TO REPRESENTATIVE DENT OF PENNSYLVANIA

With the report of the conferees at hand, it now seems likely that the National Defense Education Act of 1958 will become law.

It may be helpful for us to recall that things began to happen early in July when 6,000 teachers and administrators who were delegates to the NEA's annual convention voted unanimously to push this bill when it became apparent that chances were dim for the more comprehensive Murray-Metcalf bill involving Federal funds for school construction and teachers' salaries.

The immediate NEA push for the bill goes back to a late session speech by former NEA president John Lester Buford at the NEA convention in Cleveland. "Time is running out," he said. "The future of our country will be won or lost in the classrooms. Anything which is more important to the perpetuation of democracy than is education should take precedence over it. Anything less important should follow it."

As the convention gave Dr. Buford a standing ovation, another former NEA president, Corma Mowrey, introduced a resolution, calling on NEA members everywhere to launch an all-out campaign to pass a Federal support to education bill. In State after State, delegation leaders jumped to their feet to second the resolution.

I find myself in substantial agreement with majority leader LYNDON JOHNSON who said, during Senate debate on the bill, "I hope this bill is only the forerunner of better things to come * * * I know of nothing which has higher priority than the education of our children and their preparation for the needs of the modern world."

Similarly, I agree with one of my colleagues who said that it was "the work of the National Education Association and the many expressions of support from teachers all over the country which helped to get this bill off the ground."

Dr. J. L. McCaskill, executive secretary of the NEA legislative commission, made a good point when he pointed out that the two Houses of Congress, by clear-cut majorities, affirmed the belief that education, "is not just an investment in people, it is an investment in the future of the United States of America. It is a vote of confidence by the Congress of the United States in the schools and teachers of the country."

As reported by the conferees, this is a good bill; it includes concessions from both sides and is a significant milestone in the history of American education and our Nation.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will not take much of the committee's time or of the gentleman's time. But, coming as I do from a metropolitan area of some 7 million population, I just want to say that this bill is going to be tremendously helpful, and it is one of the finest pieces of legislation which this Congress has produced. And it may be the one piece of legislation which will have the most lasting effect upon the lives of these young people that will be allowed to participate. I sincerely compliment the gentleman and his committee for this fine piece of legislation.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman very much. He is very kind and encouraging. I share with him the belief that this legislation will do much for the boys and girls of America.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. It has been a pleasure to participate in the preparation of this legislation. It so happens that the Subcommittee on General Education, of which I happen to be the chairman, was assigned, along with the special committee headed by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, in the preparation of this legislation. The gentleman from Alabama will bear me out that we spent about 5½ months in the preparation of this legislation. The bill as first presented to the subcommittee consisted of 16 titles. Today I believe it has been refined and brought down to the point where it has about 10 titles, I believe.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is right. We cut off many of them and may I say it was a most delightful pleasure to work with the gentleman and with the members of his subcommittee on this legislation. We worked together long and faithfully.

Mr. BAILEY. Now, let me say this, that the part that my subcommittee had to deal with was the part affecting our elementary and secondary schools which falls under the purview of my subcommittee. One part of the bill which I think has received very little discussion this morning, and that will probably mean more to America in the matter of defense than anything else, is title IV, in which we provide Federal matching moneys to be matched by the States and the local school districts, which will provide sufficient funds during the 4-year period to rebuild every laboratory in every one of the 27,000 high schools of this Nation; not only to rebuild them but to rehabilitate existing laboratories for teaching chemistry and physics and biology and other things in which we are weak. That is, in my estimation, the most valuable part of your legislation, may I say to the gentleman from Alabama.

Now, may I say to you that we have taken practically all of the bugs out of this legislation. It is good, wholesome, safe legislation which has as its basic objective the preservation of America and American ideals and the proper training of our boys and girls. I want to compliment the gentleman from Alabama and say to him that I was more than pleased to offer the time and the efforts that I put in in assisting in this legislation. I sincerely hope that the House will adopt this without any further debate.

Mr. ELLIOTT. May I sincerely thank my distinguished friend who served with me as cochairman of our subcommittees which worked on this legislation. Everybody in this House knows of the gentleman's deep interest in education.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I take this time to pay my respects and compliments to the gentleman with whom I differ completely on this bill, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] who spoke just a few moments ago. I want to commend the gentleman from New Jersey for being frank and forthright with this House as to his views. I know that he expresses the views of a substantial element in this House and outside this Congress. He is not interested in specific specialized Federal aid to education; he is in favor of general Federal aid to education. He is not in sympathy or interested primarily in temporary Federal aid to education; he is in favor of permanent Federal aid to education. It is an excellent example of what I have been telling this House throughout the debate on this issue, and I commend him for his frankness, and I commend him for putting the House and the Congress and the President on notice as to what may be expected. In other words, the supporters of this leg-

islation are indicating their determination to play with the fire of massive transfer of support of education by the Federal Government, but so far as I am concerned, there is no demonstrated evidence that there is any capacity to control that fire once they start playing with it.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I would say that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN] is substantially correct in his analysis of my feelings. However, I would say further that there is something which I consider equally important which was not adopted this year, and that is Federal aid for classroom construction.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Is that for next year?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman did not say anything about the imperative need for this legislation which I emphasized in my earlier remarks.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the chairman of this committee for the great work he has done. I, too, was very much interested in the progress of science in America. Before sputnik I introduced a bill along these lines. I am certainly glad that they have brought in this kind of legislation. This bill takes care of various points that are so necessary in order to bring American standards up in the field of science.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. He has been most interested in the subject matter of this legislation, and has brought the results of his individual research and of his broad knowledge in the field to the attention of the subcommittee in a most thorough and helpful way.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to my distinguished colleague and friend from Alabama.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to make a speech. I simply want to say, as one Alabamian to another that I am very proud of the bill and the good record my esteemed colleague has made. I should like to point out for the RECORD that the chairman of the committee who handled this bill in the other body happens to be another esteemed and distinguished Alabamian. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] and the members of his committee on what I think will be one of the outstanding pieces of legislation of this whole session. I should like to say further that it must give a really good feeling to get a bill passed.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman very much. His interest in this legislation and his encouragement have been most helpful and are deeply appreciated.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. The gentleman already knows of my support of this legislation. I want to refer specifically to the scholarships at the graduate level.

Mr. ELLIOTT. We call them fellowships.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Fellowships; it is my understanding that if a graduate student is going to continue teaching his application is given priority; is that correct?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is correct.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Does it matter in which field he decides he is going to teach?

Mr. ELLIOTT. There is no restriction with respect to that.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman from Connecticut for his interest and support.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Will the gentleman inform the House what is the estimated annual cost of this bill under the conference report?

Mr. ELLIOTT. The estimated cost for 4 years is $887 million of which I think $266 million will be paid back. That would make the cost approximately $621 million.

Mr. CRAMER. As I understand it, the estimated annual cost is approximately $165 million?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I figure it at $155¼ million; I think that is about correct, after giving credit for the moneys to be repaid.

Mr. CRAMER. Of this amount under title I, this having been considered as a bill involving scholarship loans, as I understand it approximately $45 million is for that purpose out of the approximate $150 million, is that correct?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Forty-seven and one-half million dollars, I will say to the gentleman, is the cost of the loan provision for the first year.

Mr. CRAMER. The thing that disturbs me, and I wish the gentleman could satisfy my concern about it, is this. I introduced a loan scholarship bill myself, although I prefer a guaranteed loan program, frankly. Why is this bill so overbalanced so that under the program less than one-third of the money goes into what the bill is supposed to accomplish, scholarships for these students on a loan basis in order that they may better equip themselves supposedly to serve defense purposes? Two-thirds of the money does not go into this program at all, so far as scholarships are concerned.

That was the fundamental program in which the administration was interested and that is the program in which I am interested. It is this additional $100 million that is going into other fringe aspects that disturbs me.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I believe the administration's bill covered all these other aspects mentioned except vocational education.

Mr. CRAMER. Can the gentleman advise us as to the thinking of his committee concerning these aspects other than the scholarship and loan program?

Mr. ELLIOTT. We felt that when we looked at the whole broad spectrum of education we could most cheaply and most quickly do the most good by attacking existing problems at these points, namely, the loans which the gentleman has mentioned and for which there is some $300 million, the fellowships, for which there is $82,500,000, the equipment for which there is $280 million. With respect to equipment may I say it was the desire of the committee to do something down in the grades so as to start this process of training people in the sciences and technologies; there is a real good reason for each title in the bill.

I will say to the gentleman that I feel really, truly, and strongly that each of these titles has its place in this bill and will serve a very worthy purpose in doing what we want to do for America, namely, to answer the Soviet threat to gain supremacy over us in science.

Mr. CRAMER. I agree with the gentleman, and I want to serve that objective, but will the gentleman give some assurance to the House that by voting for this conference report we are not leading up to a program of classroom construction next session?

Mr. ELLIOTT. There is no connection between the items in this bill and classroom construction, none whatsoever. There is no construction authorized in this bill except some very minor remodeling for the placing of equipment, in other words, moving a door, making a hole in a wall to get laboratory equipment in, and things of that sort. What the future may hold with respect to proposals for school construction, I will say to the gentleman, I know no more than he.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, a good many Members have asked me whether I feel this conference report retained the essential features of the amendment I offered and which was adopted by the House when we were considering this bill.

Let me say right at the outset that it does. I think the House conferees did do an extraordinarily good job, and I commend them for it, beginning of course, with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. May I say to the gentleman from Minnesota that the House conferees, of whom I am one, felt that in the face of the vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota we had to insist on taking scholarships out of the conference report.

Mr. JUDD. I greatly appreciate that fact—and I have been most grateful when several of the members of the Committee on Education and Labor, of both parties, tell me that even though they opposed my amendment in defending their committee bill, they personally believed my amendment makes it a better bill.

Naturally, no two persons will agree as to the merits of all of the titles of so comprehensive a bill. I have grave doubts about the wisdom and effectiveness of some of them, and I am sure some of the conferees also have qualms about some of them. There are potential dangers in some of the provisions. On the other hand, look at the dangers we face in going on as we have been—slowly falling behind. We have to weigh the possible dangers in passing this bill against the undeniable shortcomings and inadequacies in the field of education that will continue if we do nothing.

The scholarship title, to which there was the greatest objection, is not in the conference report. That means that all the assistance provided in the bill is available to students on the same basis namely, as loans. We will not have the situation where one student with a free grant will be working alongside another student just as able and in just as great need, but who has had to take a loan and will repay it. Furthermore, elimination of title II avoids the setting up of a whole new mechanism of commissions which, outside the college themselves that know the students best, would pass upon the applications for scholarships on the basis of the results of tests and also, inevitably, of pressures from friends of the applicants, and so on.

It is the colleges that are the most interested in their students, are closest to them, and have the most professional skill in evaluating them, they should be the ones to select the students to receive the loans.

One of the objections raised by those who opposed the elimination of the scholarship title was their belief that this bill should have prizes and rewards in it in order to provide an additional incentive to students to get them to want to go to college and to develop their capacities to the utmost, and especially to take the tough courses in science, mathematics, and so on. Mr. Speaker, the conferees have done a splendid job in transfering this incentive element to the loan provision. I am grateful that they adopted my suggestion that in the selection of individuals to whom loans are to be given, special consideration should be given to superior students who have demonstrated that they have special aptitudes or preparation in the fields of science, engineering, mathematics, and languages. Of course, it cannot and should not be an ironclad rule; but this provision does offer a real incentive to our boys and girls to work hard in high school. They will know that the best assurance they will have a chance to get loans on easy terms to enable them to go to college and get the best possible education, is the record they make and the capacities they demonstrate in high school.

Furthermore, I think the conferees have improved the House bill by the provision which will increase the incentive for more and more qualified individuals to go into teaching, through authorizing cancellation of the loan at the rate of 10 percent a year that they spend in teaching, up to 5 years. Some have expressed a fear that this is an indirect way of keeping the free-scholarship idea; that it will give a scholarship character to the loan title. I do not agree with that view. When a scholarship is given to an individual, that is the end of it. He has no obligations to make a particular return to the Government or to education or to society. But a loan can be canceled, up to half of it, only in return for value received. There is a quid pro quo. It gives a student an additional incentive to go into the all-important field of teaching, when he knows that he can reduce by a half the amount that he has to pay back by teaching for 5 years. By that time he is more likely to stay in teaching.

Mr. Speaker, in summary, this conference report makes sure that no qualified American boy or girl will be denied a college education for lack of funds. Secondly, not one boy or girl who would have had educational opportunity under the original bill will be denied that opportunity under the provisions of this report. In fact, a larger number of deserving and needy youth will have that opportunity under this report because as the loans are paid back the money can be used over again for the younger brothers or for the qualified among neighbor's children.

So, Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for this report. I do not expect that it will prove to be perfect—I am sure that some bugs will be found in it. Some of the nine titles will not work as well as others. Some may prove unsound or ineffective. We will have to deal with such a situation if and when we come to it. But, on the whole, this is really a monumental piece of legislation. It unquestionably represents a landmark in the history of American education. I hope it will prove of very great benefit to our country at this time in our history and I vote for it in that faith.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. HASKELL].

Mr. HASKELL. Mr. Speaker, I will not take the full time allotted to me, but I would like to say yesterday morning there was a conference with the President and Dr. Killian. The President was very enthusiastic about this measure as it finally came out of conference. It was a privilege for me to have served as one of the conferees. This was my first opportunity to serve on a conference committee and so my judgment may not be as good as some of its old hands, but I feel that the House prevailed. I think it prevailed in almost every instance with possibly two changes which I believe have been explained to you here today. One change was in the provision where the teachers have the opportunity to have forgiveness of up to 50 percent of their loan. This hits at the heart of our problem here in the United States. We lack teachers not only in quantity but we lack teachers in quality. This provision goes importantly to that problem.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close the debate with just a few reminders. The Soviet Union today has one of the most dangerous weapons in the whole world—the atheistic, scientific trained mind—and it has them in plentiful supply. If the United States is to compete with the Soviet Union, we have to do a better job than we are doing now. The Soviet colleges and universities graduated twice as many engineers and scientists as we did in 1956.

They have more than double the number of science students in their higher educational institutions this year than we have.

Tuition in colleges is free—they pay students salaries—(stipends they have named them)—there are bonuses in addition for those with high scholastic marks, particularly in science.

But it is what Russia is doing at the secondary school level (where every nation should spawn its future scientists) that Russia becomes the greatest threat to America and the West.

Their accent on education filters through to the lowest base, their 10-year secondary school, it is perhaps the toughest grammar school and high school system in the world.

And that is where they are now establishing a lead over the United States that is going to take an almost superhuman effort for us to overcome.

History teaches that the Battle of Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton. It occurs to me that it might be that the battle for survival for the West might be lost in the schools of America.

The Communists' whole educational system is intensely competitive and the idea of a classless society is wiped out immediately when one begins to fathom what goes on inside the U. S. S. R.

These youngsters, between the ages 7 to 17, go to classes 6 days a week, nearly 10 months a year. Homework varies from 2½ to 6 hours per day.

School attendance through these ages is now mandatory in most urban centers, and they hope to widen compulsory 10-year schooling in rural areas by 1960. Schools in most agricultural sections stop at the 7th grade, which is high school freshman year in our system.

The comparison of what we are not doing in America in the field of science and mathematics education at the high school level is not merely serious, but shocking.

I, too, am stunned by figures produced by the United States Office of Education and by studies made by the National Science Foundation on the precipitant decline percentagewise in high school instruction in mathematics and science.

These subjects are electives in most United States high schools.

There are no electives in the Soviet 10-year schools.

Twenty four percent of our high schools offer no geometry. Twenty three percent of our high schools offer no physics or chemistry.

In 1900, algebra was studied by 56 percent of high-school students. In 1955, the figure was less than 25 percent.

Twenty seven percent of our public high-school students carried geometry in 1900. In 1955, only 11 percent.

The number of pupils taking geometry has declined in the past 20 years although student population has increased.

In physics the figure dropped from 19 percent in 1900 to 4 percent in 1953.

Is it a small wonder, then, that we graduated only 228 new physics teachers in 1956 to staff our 28,000 high schools? And while we graduated 2,121 general science teachers this same year—many of whom had majors in physics—the total production of physics teachers fell woefully short of the necessary goal.

And a large number of these never entered the teaching profession. They joined the growing ranks of science teachers who have heeded the better-paid calling of industry and Government.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASKELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I think the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD, provided the means that makes this bill most acceptable to all of us. He recognized the need of the students who would qualify because of need; not because of a scholarship. I think the House and the Congress and the conferees have recognized the wisdom of the Judd amendment and have adopted it, and it makes the bill much more acceptable to us than it was otherwise.

Another point that I think is very important. The declared policy of Congress repeated in the conference report and I quote "that the Congress reaffirms the principle and declares that the States and local communities have and must retain control over the primary responsibility for public education" end of quote, which I think is vitally important. If we do not adhere to this policy declared in this conference report in all future legislation on education, we will be promoting a socialistic form of education under Federal control which we do not want in this country. I compliment the conferees for including that declared policy of Congress in their report. As a member of the House Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration I found during the hearings that if we did not provide some help to needy students who are qualified to pursue scientific courses we would not be able to compete with Russia in the production of engineers, chemists, biologists and in many other sciences.

In response to a questionnaire to the people of my District I received 67 percent "yes" to 33 percent "no" for Federal aid for students to pursue a scientific course.

I favor the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASKELL. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut who has done such a fine job on this bill. He was key man in the development of the loan provision, the most important section of this bill. He worked tirelessly to work his will, and the legislation has been greatly improved as a result.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I want to join in commending the chairman of our subcommittee [Mr. ELLIOTT] and the House conferees for the excellent job they did in bringing out a bill which on the whole is very acceptable. I would like to ask the gentleman to confirm my understanding, that the conferees retained an amendment that was adopted, including junior colleges in the section which deals with science.

Mr. HASKELL. They were included by the gentleman and, of course, the one who made this possible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Delaware has expired.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASKELL. I yield.

Mr. LAIRD. I notice there are funds made available for facilities in various schools. The gentleman from Michigan asked about the junior colleges. I would like to ask the gentleman from Delaware whether any funds are authorized for school facilities such as laboratories and science equipment for private and parochial schools in this bill?

Mr. HASKELL. No. That is only through a loan.

Mr. LAIRD. But none of the grant funds authorized in this legislation are available to any private and parochial schools?

Mr. HASKELL. No.

Mr. LAIRD. Did the conferees give consideration to grants for private and parochial schools in view of security or defense needs of our Nation?

Mr. HASKELL. Yes, they did.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASKELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. A few years ago a committee investigated tax-exempt foundations. We found definitely that the powerful influence of a few large tax-exempt foundations had been to a large measure responsible for the swing in public schools and colleges away from pure science into the area of social science.

Now, in reviewing, there are 10 tax-exempt foundations that have an annual income of something more than a billion dollars a year. But a small percentage of that income is given for scholarships in the field of pure science about which we are concerned today. I was wondering if this committee gave consideration to some means of trying to influence the tax-exempt foundations to give more scholarships in the field of pure science rather than continuing their emphasis on the social sciences.

Mr. HASKELL. We did not feel that this should be a part of our work on this legislation.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. They have available for the very purpose we seek to accomplish in this bill more money than the Federal Government is making available. I think it would be very helpful if the foundations would make that money available for the inducement of students to take training in pure science.

Mr. HASKELL. I wish finally to congratulate the subcommittee, the full committee, and the conferees. They have done a magnificent job in bringing this legislation to passage after a year and a half of the hardest kind of work. I think the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] beyond anybody else deserves a tremendous amount of credit for this legislation. It was a magnificent job well done.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman very much. It has been a pleasure to work with the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. HASKELL] on this worthwhile legislation. He has been most diligent and cooperative throughout the long committee hearings, and throughout the conference. He has been most helpful in pursuing a bipartisan or nonpartisan approach on this bill. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I was very much interested in the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON]. I could not help but recall that it was in January of 1957, long before sputnik the first, that the same gentleman published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Democratic legislative program for 1957.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on the national defense education bills of 1958 and to praise the outstanding leadership of my distinguished collegue from Alabama, the Honorable CARL ELLIOTT, for his untiring efforts as chairman of the Labor and Education Subcommittee in bringing this bill to the House floor.

For a long period of time the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] has labored through study and research to make this bill possible for our final consideration here today. He has been courageous, farsighted, patient, and understanding. He has been able to muster bipartisan support for this worthy and needed legislation.

The conference report on this bill is fair and meritorious. The managers on the part of the House in bringing out this conference report have done a splendid job and have brought to us a compromise bill which deserves the approval and support of the House.

I predict that the National Defense Education Act of 1958 will be regarded as one of the principal pieces of legislation that have been passed by the 85th Congress, and history will record the significance of this advanced legislative program. It will do much to afford this country an opportunity to shore up its defenses through providing technical

and scientific personnel that will be required in the fast-developing defense requirements which lie ahead.

The provisions of this bill are not only clear, concise, and adequate to fulfill its mission, but are also of superior legislative quality.

For this outstanding contribution to our Nation's defense and welfare, we owe a deep debt of gratitude to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] and his subcommittee colleagues who have labored so long to make it possible for us to vote for and approve this forward-looking measure here today.

Mr. Speaker, the passage of the Elliott bill is a great historic occasion in the life of this legislative body, and I am confident that the renown of its author will be most pleasing and satisfying to the citizens of Alabama as well as of the Nation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the chairman of the Subcommittee on General Education for the great work he performed in starting America back to her leadership in science and technology.

I was also glad to see that this education bill contains a good deal of the subject matter that was in the Holland bill. I have, Mr. Speaker, long before sputnik was launched, been warning the American public that we were engaged today in a struggle that is not a mere military struggle, limited to the fields of Europe and Asia Minor, but in a military, political, economic, and technological race between the two giants of the entire world—United States and Russia. The key to that race is supremacy in scientific and technological manpower.

In 1956 I pointed this out in the Congress of the United States when I introduced H. R. 11200. The Holland bill was written after much correspondence and personal meetings with the deans of engineering schools throughout the country. Practically everything that was freely discussed at the many meetings I had with the deans is contained in this bill we are passing today.

Our first great problem was to quit wasting our precious manpower by failing to enable many bright high school students to continue to college. Many of these boys and girls could not secure the financial help to pay for their college education.

The second big problem was to get qualified teachers to teach mathematics, physics, and other kindred subjects so necessary in the science field.

My bill granted scholarships to those with ability. It also increased the salaries of the professors and teachers in amounts comparable to those paid in private industry. It encouraged graduates to go into teaching by providing them fellowships after teaching 3 years in secondary schools. It also gave appropriations for research and laboratory expansion.

I again introduced this bill in 1957, and it was considered with many others in the Subcommittee of Health and Science of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

The bill that has been passed today does not give free scholarships, but does set up a loan fund so that every needy student can borrow the money on very easy terms.

Forty-seven and a half million dollars will be available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959; $75 million for the year 1960; $82,500,000 for the year 1961; $90 million for 1962, and for other years until these students have completed their education.

They will not have to start paying it back until they are out of school over a year; however, if they will teach school for not less than 5 years, 50 percent of the loan shall be forgiven. If they wish to continue their education toward a fellowship and do graduate work for 3 years, the cost of the graduate work will be paid by the Federal Government, and the student shall receive $2,000 for the first year, $2,200 for the second year, $2,400 for the third year, plus an additional amount of $400 each year for each dependent they may have.

Mr. Speaker, I am merely covering the science part of this bill, but there are many other items and subjects so needed to bring our educational system up to date in this automation age. This bill recognizes the need for technicians, skilled workers in the technical field, and has set up a very fine vocational education program in cooperation with the States, with the training of individuals designed to fit them for useful employment as highly skilled technicians in recognized occupations requiring a scientific knowledge. It also recognizes the fact that each State shall have in their school systems guidance counseling to assist the child and to encourage able students.

Mr. Speaker, having served on the Education Committee for many years in the Senate of Pennsylvania, I am happy to be a member of the Education and Labor Committee of the Congress of the United States at the time when they recognize the need for the reforms that are in this bill, and above all, that education is a part of the defense of our country. I know that in the 30th district of Pennsylvania that I represent, we have many bright students who will avail themselves of this opportunity to secure education on a scale much higher than has been afforded in the years gone by.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I commend the conferees on the splendid job they have done on this education bill.

However, I am disturbed about the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] in which he expressed his regrets about the emphasis on the exact sciences and what he feels to be a neglect of the so-called humanities. It seems to me this bill strikes a fairly good balance.

But the observation of the gentleman from New Jersey reflects fallacious thinking, which I fear is too widespread in this country. That is, that one can be an educated person in the complete sense without a thorough background in the basic exact sciences. I don't want to underrate the "humanities." An educated person should be familiar with all of science, the exact and the humanities.

The fortunate fact about the Founding Fathers of this great Nation was that they were educated men in the full sense of the word. They were learned in the arts, in history, in politics, and the sciences. Franklin was a practical engineer, Jefferson was an architect, Washington was a civil engineer. This more than anything else, gave them the judgment and ability to conceive a form of government and to draft a Constitution which are still the newest and most enlightened accomplishments in their field that man has ever done. It is going to take men and women of the same breadth of knowledge and understanding to preserve this Government and the Constitution against the ideologies which are nothing but dressed-up copies of that which history proves have been tried and found wanting.

I hope the passage of this bill will reawaken our people to the fact that a knowledge of basic science is a sine qua non for the educated man.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, it will be a privilege and pleasure to vote "yea" for the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

Long has been the need for a shot in the arm of the educational system of this Nation. In West Virginia, as in just about every State in the Union, schools are undermanned and underdeveloped, and the net result: On graduation day our youth come up short. Long and loud has been the cry for help, and at last, yes—after being prodded and pushed—and scared, something has been done.

The National Defense Education Act of 1958 gives renewed hope to the teacher, new goals to the student, and new horizons to these United States.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I join in the well-deserved encomiums heaped upon the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, Congressman ELLIOTT, and the members of his Subcommittee on Special Education, who handled this national defense education bill, and the membership of the House.

This is the culmination of a long and hard and sincere effort on the part of many of us to assist young and able American students attain a college education, particularly in the fields of science, engineering and mathematics. Now that this bill is about to receive final House action, we can move ahead in the field of education knowing that in the future we will no longer have to listen to statistics which show that one-half of the bright high-school students in the United States are not entering college because of lack of financial assistance.

I am particularly pleased that this national defense education bill incorporates the Federal loan feature of the bill I have been filing since coming to this House in the 83d Congress.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is said that greatness has about it the qualities of leadership, organization and the theoretical, the latter to kindle the hopes and dreams of men to overcome difficulties in which they find themselves or to help men reach the goals set by their dreams. Leadership and organization do their job when man is in abundance in fulfillment of his best wishes. Leadership, organization and

the theoretical serve best when they bring out the best in man, so it seems.

This bill is a step in that direction, Mr. Speaker. All the money, all the equipment, all the teachers, classrooms, students, dormitories, textbooks, libraries, and programs will avail nothing if we lose our aim as citizens to preserve liberty and to promote prosperity for more and more people from generation to generation, so that with that liberty and with that prosperity the Creator's gifts to man for good shall flower in the joy and happiness meant for each of us in our journey through life.

And if we lose our sense of direction in these things, Mr. Speaker, we lose all.

I hope that this bill and the bills that will follow it, will allow greater and greater consideration for younger and younger students. We seem to be stuck with the word college and the word university in a manner that would indicate youth incapable of faster growth or quicker absorption in matters of the mind, the heart, of character and good judgment.

What was college for our grandfathers could and certainly should be easier going for our children. And with more and more college trained parents around the dinner table, certainly more and more children grow and mature sooner, or should.

In the days and in the years ahead, I hope for those who legislate in these matters that more and more attention is directed at and success attained with solid assistance to the secondary schools of America; for in our secondary schools those bright virtues for betterment are established where college becomes a hope and a vivid dream for life's fulfillment and not alone a must for social standing or athletic prowess.

Our views mellow and alter with age. How touching to read recently of the grant of a million dollars by an American foundation to restore the spires of Oxford, threatened with ruin by smoke, fumes, and grime. The million dollars is a tribute to the beacon that Oxford has been for over 600 years and the contribution it has made to man's life and thought. America is young, so very young by Oxford, by European, by oriental, Asiatic, or other standards.

But when we think of the human family on earth today, we are as young as our hearts and as old as our fears, all of us, north, south, east, or west, no matter on what continent or in what hemisphere we reside. And above us? It is said there is God's plan. And that our task is rightfully to divine and to live it.

Can we learn too soon? Especially if we divine that God's plan for us is to make haste in harmony lest the disclosure of His mysteries dismay us from generation to generation?

Are the words "college" and "universities" to remain labels to blunt analysis and ready evidence of youth's faster and and faster grasp and swifter appreciation of the need for betterment before war swallows youth in its maw, made bloody by ignorance, poverty, folly, and vainglory at least once every generation since that great Man of Galilee walked this earth?

In recorded history, we are 200 generations. We have lived and recorded 4,000 years. Who is to say how soon we are to lift the lamp of learning to dispel the darkness in front of us, if any?

I trust this bill is improved year after year with a fuller flowering of assistance to our secondary schools.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the editor and publisher of the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader, Mr. John A. Kennedy, who is one of the world's recognized authorities on education in the Soviet Union, has said that the most dangerous weapon in the world is Russia's scientifically trained, atheistic mind.

Testifying before our House Education Subcommittee, Mr. Kennedy told us, after extensive firsthand observation of the Soviet school system that the real threat from Russia is not her jet planes or tanks, but her classrooms, libraries, and laboratories.

In other words, what Mr. Kennedy told us in a most compelling manner is that America must either meet the challenge of Soviet education or lose the race between totalitarianism and our free way of life. Mr. Kennedy made these remarks before the Russians launched their sputnik and before many of the rest of us were awakened to the tremendous challenge posted by the all-out educational effort of the Soviet Union.

I am not going to review here the tremendous investment of time, money, and manpower that the Russians have put into education. What I would like to emphasize is that Americans have always believed that education is a central theme in our entire national life.

We have recognized from the very first that education ought to be primarily a local matter. The home, the local school board, the local community have historically been given the direction of our public school programs. This is as it should be, and I am pleased that the legislation now before us makes it impossible for the Federal Government to use this program to dictate local school policy. The opening section of this bill expresses the conviction of all of us that control of education must be preserved in local hands.

From the very first, however, we have called upon our Federal Government to give assistance to the schools. Federal support for education is a clearly different matter from Federal control.

As early as 1785, one of the two great ordinances for the Northwest Territory set aside the 16th section of every township in the public domain for educational purposes. The Founding Fathers, most notably Thomas Jefferson, believed that democracy was not possible without strong public support for education. Even the conservative Alexander Hamilton, Washington's great Secretary of the Treasury, said that one of the most important responsibilities of the Federal Government was the promotion of learning.

In our own day, it is becoming increasingly clear that local property owners cannot finance the cost of a constantly expanding educational program. The demands of the modern world have greatly increased the cost of modern education, just as the cost of all other worthwhile commodities has increased.

Certainly, a nation that insists on annual improvements in its automobiles and that is willing to pay 3 or 4 times the amount for an automobile today that we paid 15 years ago ought to be willing to face realistically the need for improved education.

Furthermore, a literal explosion of school-age population is upon us. Classrooms that are already jammed will be filled to overflowing in the immediate years ahead. The full force of the elementary and secondary school-age population is about to hit the colleges, and we are told that by 1970 present college enrollments, now approximately 3 million students, will be doubled and possibly tripled.

The problem that confronts us is further compounded by an imminent shortage of qualified teachers on every level of education. Good teaching is now and always has been the heart of good education. We must recognize, far more than we have in the past, the central role that good teachers play in the building of a better America. We cannot afford any longer the notion held in some quarters that teaching is simply a stepping stone to a more adequately paying job or profession. With the exception of the clergy, there is no more honored profession than teaching. Teachers ought to be compensated accordingly.

Aside from adequate financial remuneration, the teacher and the scholar are entitled to the highest respect of the community. Surely, we ought to have reached a stage of maturity now where things of the mind are not objects of ridicule and scorn.

There is a peculiar thread running through our heritage that historians call anti-intellectualism. It is the strange twist that leads us to make heroes of those showing proficiency on the gridiron but to overlook the solid achievements of the conscientious scholar and the capable teacher. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that anti-intellectualism is a luxury America cannot afford in the nuclear age.

Now, what can be said of the legislation before us? It can be said first and foremost that it represents at least one significant answer to the educational challenge of communism.

Secondly, it can be said that this legislation is squarely in the American tradition in that it preserves local control while extending a helping hand from our National Government.

Third, it can be said that this is a program that places the emphasis on educational excellence. It seeks to encourage and underwrite scholarly attainment.

Mr. Speaker, during the long and painstaking hearings which our subcommittee conducted on this legislation, I did everything I possibly could to develop a bill that would be broadly based. It seems to me that it is just as essential for us to develop good teachers, ministers, journalists, and agriculturalists as it is

for us to develop good scientists. When I hear people talking about accelerating the sciences, I cannot help but think that we need to accelerate also our understanding of those forces that will decide whether the creations of science will mean our salvation or our destruction.

It is my hope that this legislation will be broadly administered within the American tradition of educating the whole man. There is now and always has been an urgent need for liberal education that enables the student to understand not only his own specialty, but the complex world in which he lives.

This legislation seeks to build a better America in the following ways:

STUDENT LOANS

Approximately half of the top ranking 10 percent of America's high-school graduates drop their education at the high school level. Most of these brilliant youngsters fail to go on to college because of the cost of education. Inflation has hit the colleges as well as the marketplace. It has priced a college education out of the reach of thousands of young people.

The student-loan program makes available during the next 4 years some $435 million that can be extended to institutions of higher learning to be loaned by them to worthy, needy students who wish to continue their education beyond the high school. Under this plan, the college would be required to put up 10 percent of the loan fund, but if it is unable to borrow the money at a reasonable interest from local sources, the program authorizes a loan to the college from the Federal Treasury.

The program provides that no one college shall be granted in excess of $250,000 to be used for student loans.

Students borrowing under this program can borrow up to $1,000 a year and the total for all years to any one student from such funds may not exceed $5,000. The student will pay no interest on the loan until 1 year following graduation. At that point, he begins repayment on the loan and must complete payment during the next 10 years. The interest during this 10-year period is set at 3 percent.

In view of the urgent need for qualified teachers, it is provided that not to exceed 50 percent of any such loan plus interest shall be canceled for service as a full-time teacher in a public elementary or secondary school. This forgiveness principle provides that the loan will be canceled at the rate of 10 percent of the amount of such loan, plus interest thereon, which was unpaid on the first day of such teaching service for each completed acedemic year of such service.

In addition to this student-loan program which comprises approximately half of the $900 million envisioned by the total program for the next 4 years, the legislation before us has a number of other highly significant titles.

There is a provision for $300 million to be granted to the States for the purchase of equipment to be used in the teaching of science, mathematics, and foreign language.

There is a provision of $57 million for institutes in the States designed to train teachers in the field of guidance and counseling and foreign language.

There is a provision of $82½ million for graduate school fellowships.

In this program, $60 million has been established for strengthening guidance counseling and testing programs in the elementary and secondary schools of the Nation.

In view of the critical shortage of persons capable of speaking many foreign languages that are necessary to our understanding and negotiations with other countries, $32 million has been established in this program to set up language development and research centers across the country.

In view of the exciting new educational mediums, such as television, movies, and other audio-visual methods, $18 million has been programed for research and experimentation in these new devices.

A very important section of the bill provides for stepping up our vocational education programs. For this purpose, $60 million is provided in the legislation.

One of the great handicaps that confronted our committee as we set out to appraise the current situation in American education was the amazing lack of accurate educational statistics. The bill now before us provides $6½ million to establish an improved educational statistics program in the Office of Education.

During the coming 4 years, the total cost of all these programs will be $887 million. Of this amount, $266 million will be repaid through the student-loan program.

One other section of the bill that will be of considerable interest to our private elementary and secondary schools provides for loans of $8½ million to such schools to provide science equipment.

The traditional separation of church and state in the United States has made it seem ill-advised for Congress to provide for direct grants to private schools, even considering the tremendous contribution to our national strength that these private schools make. The framers of this bill have made it possible for these institutions to borrow money through this program to strengthen their science laboratories.

Mr. Speaker, my own State of South Dakota is very much interested in good education. My fellow South Dakotans have from the very first invested a considerable share of their income in the schools. A distinguished South Dakotan, General Beadle, is memorialized in Statuary Hall in the United States Capitol because of the pride that South Dakotans take in his successful efforts to safeguard our school lands.

In spite of the very heavy responsibility that local property owners have taken for education in South Dakota, we are confronted by a serious educational dilemma. Many of our school districts have reached the maximum mill levy permitted by law, and yet, those school districts are unable to secure sufficient revenues to keep their best teachers and maintain the most desirable classroom facilities and equipment.

I can testify from personal experience as a homeowner that the property tax has virtually reached the breaking point as a source of educational revenue in our State. For that reason, I am sure that my fellow South Dakotans will approve of the efforts I have made as a members of the educational subcommittee that developed the legislation now before us. It will be of tremendous benefit, not only to our students and teachers, but to hard-pressed South Dakota property owners.

These are the amounts that South Dakota will receive annually from the national defense education bill that we are now discussing:

College loans, $216,718.

Science and foreign language teaching equipment, $353,977.

Administration of science and language programs by the State department of education, $21,198.

Loans to provide schools with scientific equipment, $27,653.

Strengthening guidance, counseling, and testing programs in our elementary and secondary schools, $64,224.

Expanded vocational education program, $113,169.

The total of these categories for South Dakota each year for the next 4 years is $796,939.

In addition to these programs, individual students will, of course, benefit from the other phases of this program, including graduate fellowships, experimentation with new audio-visual education aids, guidance and counseling institutes, and language institutes. These last four programs will be administered directly by the institutions of higher learning.

Mr. Speaker, the great historian, H. G. Wells, once said:

> Human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe.

This statement was made many years ago, but it speaks with even more compelling force to our own day. The challenge that our schools and our Nation face today is a total one—a challenge in the fields of politics, economics, morality, science, and the arts.

I strongly urge the passage of this program that represents such a vital investement in the minds of our boys and girls. I am convinced that dollars spent to improve young minds will be returned to the Federal Treasury many times. Above and beyond that, those dollars will be an investment in the cultural, intellectual, and spiritual enrichment of the American people.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT]. More than any other single individual in Congress, he is responsible for the passage of this legislation. He has lived with this bill for the entire session. The hearings that he presided over were thorough. We heard educators, scientists, businessmen, and Government officials representing all shades of opinion. In the conference on this bill I know my colleagues will be glad to hear that the gentleman from Alabama was steadfast in his support of the House bill. Just as he stalwartly supported the scholarship program in the bill that came to the floor of the House from the Committee on

Education and Labor, when that was stricken from the bill by the House amendment, Congressman ELLIOTT stayed by the majority decision regardless of his personal convictions.

But tremendous as his efforts were, the gentleman from Alabama could not have carried this fight alone. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is nationally known as a friend of education. As a cochairman of the combined subcommittees handling this bill, he made a tremendous contribution. The bipartisan effort that went into the drafting of this legislation was also a contributing factor in its final successful passage here today. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT], and the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. HASKELL] were especially helpful at all stages of consideration and this final bill is the better for their efforts.

Last October when sputnik aroused the Nation to a new challenge our educational system was facing, Secretary Folsom went to work on a plan to meet that challenge. He recognized the shortage of scientists and our failure to make full use of the gifts and talents of thousands of our most intelligent boys and girls who were not going on to college. The plan that emerged was for a national program of testing and guidance to discover our gifted children at an early stage in their progress through the elementary schools, to encourage them to take the more difficult subjects of science and mathematics in high school, and to assure them if they did so that there would be an opportunity for them to go on to college whether they had the means to do so or not. As a special incentive for extra effort a limited number, 10,000, scholarships were to be provided for needy students.

This was also the purpose of Congressman ELLIOTT'S original bill, although there were some additional programs in his bill. One of the most important was a student-loan provision with an additional incentive for teachers by a plan for canceling 20 percent of the loan each year that the student was engaged in teaching.

When the House amended the committee bill and deleted all provisions for scholarships, the emphasis of the bill was changed somewhat. There were still the grant-in-aid provisions for testing, to discover the gifted student, there were still provisions for guidance and counseling to make sure that these sometimes latent talents were stimulated by courses that brought out hidden gifts and aroused the intelligence of these students. Additional encouragement will come from the titles providing for assistance to schools to strengthen the teaching of science and mathematics and languages. Not only will the local schools be assisted in acquiring the necessary equipment to modernize their laboratories, but under other titles the teachers of these courses will be given the opportunity to attend institutes to learn the latest methods of teaching these subjects and to keep up with the newest developments in the fast-moving fields of science. Better equipment and newer methods of teaching both will help encourage the talented youngsters we need in science and engineering.

The titles on graduate fellowships and the forgiveness provisions, which in the conference report is forgiveness of 50 percent of the loan if the student teaches for 5 years, will aid in the training and recruiting of better and more inspiring teachers.

But where, heretofore at the end of the trail, there was a possibility that the student who was gifted and who worked hard and took the more difficult courses in high school might win a scholarship, now that hope of reward is gone. There are no scholarships for the high-school graduate. There still remain, however, the opportunity for every student to get a loan and continue his education. Although the loss of the scholarship title has removed a very powerful incentive, there are still incentives in this bill for the serious student and the loan fund guarantees such a student an opportunity to go on and develop his gift.

This is a very significant bill. In this post-sputnik era, when we have moved from the cold war into the battle of brains, this bill will help us meet the almost insatiable demand for talent our complex modern civilization has created.

But it must be recognized that this bill is only the beginning of the Federal Government's contribution for education. It doesn't begin to meet the biggest and most crying need in the country, that of additional classrooms. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], who is chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor that has jurisdiction over the school construction bills, has assured me that the highest priority will be given to legislation calculated to relieve the national shortage of 140,000 classrooms.

The passage of this bill today and the adoption of the revisions of the so-called impact bill, which make permanent the Federal payment for children whose parents both live and work on Federal property, demonstrate that this Congress has recognized the Federal responsibility for education. We meet that responsibility by financial assistance to the local school districts. Supervision of the curriculum and control of the educational policies must remain with the local officials.

That financial assistance in the bill before us is but a step along the road we must follow if we are to meet the challenge of the times and achieve the standard of excellence that we have a right to expect. We should spend at least a billion dollars a year for 5 years to catch up with our needs for classrooms.

As the school population, now overcrowding the elementary schools, moves into college and with the stimulus of such bills as this legislation, we are going to have to do something about our already overcrowded facilities for higher education. Early in the next Congress hearings and studies should be made to ascertain the Federal responsibility for grants-in-aid to give financial assistance for operation of colleges and construction of facilities for education beyond the high school.

The bill before us, the bill we are going to pass today, has a forgiveness feature that will encourage the recruiting of better teachers and give those who want to teach an opportunity to get better training. Perhaps over the distance the most valuable feature of this bill will be the encouragement it will give to the establishment of sound graduate programs for the granting of doctor's degrees.

From 1900 to 1955 the population of America nearly doubled but the number of college graduates multiplied 11 times and the number of doctoral degrees 22 times. We require 10 times as many college teachers as we did 50 years ago. This trend must continue if we are to be able to compete in the space age. Yet only 164 institutions out of a national total of 1,856 confer doctoral degrees based on graduate instruction. Of these, only 27 are equipped to confer 100 or more such degrees.

The committee report on this bill declares:

> The expressed aim of the program is, to further the objective of increasing the facilities available in the Nation for the graduate training of college or university level teachers and of promoting a wider geographical distribution of such facilities throughout the Nation.

This bill is a start, an important start, but it is just a beginning.

Our experience with Public Law 874 has demonstrated that we can give financial assistance to local school districts for the payment of teachers' salaries without interfering with the local supervision and local control of the educational process. This program of grants-in-aid for teachers' salaries should be expanded to help all districts pay a professional wage so that more and abler teachers will be attracted to the profession.

So, today, we may take satisfaction and pride that good work has been done and that we have embarked upon a series of programs that will meet our national needs. But if the end we seek is to be achieved and the use of talent we desire is to be effected we must continue to develop our educational system by further help for construction, for teachers' salaries, for expanded graduate education facilities. That is the challenge for the next Congress.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 194]

Andersen, Minn.	Avery	Beamer
Anfuso	Barden	Belcher
Ashley	Baring	Bentley
Auchincloss	Bass, N. H.	Berry
	Baumhart	Betts

Blitch	Hardy	Moore
Boykin	Harrison, Nebr.	Morrison
Brooks, La.	Harvey	Mumma
Broomfield	Healey	Neal
Buckley	Hébert	O'Neill
Burdick	Henderson	Osmers
Christopher	Herlong	Pilcher
Clevenger	Hess	Powell
Coffin	Hill	Preston
Collier	Hillings	Prouty
Colmer	Hoffman	Radwan
Coudert	Holtzman	Reed
Cunningham, Nebr.	Horan	Rivers
Davis, Tenn.	Hosmer	Robeson, Va.
Dellay	Jackson	Sadlak
Derounian	James	Santangelo
Dies	Jenkins	Scherer
Diggs	Jennings	Scott, Pa.
Dollinger	Jensen	Sheehan
Dooley	Johnson, Wis.	Shuford
Doyle	Kean	Sikes
Durham	Kearney	Siler
Engle	Keogh	Smith, Kans.
Evins	Kilburn	Taylor
Farbstein	Landrum	Teague, Calif.
Fino	Latham	Teague, Tex.
Fisher	LeCompte	Thompson, La.
Frelinghuysen	McCormack	Tollefson
Friedel	McCulloch	Vanik
George	McGregor	Van Zandt
Glenn	McIntire	Vinson
Gordon	Macdonald	Wainwright
Gray	Magnuson	Widnall
Green, Oreg.	Mason	Williams, N. Y.
Griffiths	Matthews	Willis
Gubser	Michel	Winstead
Gwinn	Miller, Calif	Young
Hale	Miller, N. Y.	Zelenko
	Mitchell	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). On this rollcall, 301 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, before the quorum call, the gentleman from Alabama had yielded to me. Do I lose the floor because the quorum call interrupted the proceedings?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes; when the previous question is ordered, the gentleman loses the floor.

Mr. THOMPSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FULTON) there were—ayes 123, noes 44.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and seventy-one Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 212, nays 85, not voting 131, as follows:

[Roll No. 195]

YEAS—212

Addonizio	Garmatz	Natcher
Albert	Gary	Nix
Allen Calif.	Granahan	Norblad
Anderson, Mont.	Grant	Norrell
	Gray	O'Brien, Ill.
Andrews	Green, Oreg.	O'Brien, N. Y.
Aspinall	Green, Pa.	O'Hara, Ill.
Ayres	Gregory	O'Konski
Bailey	Griffin	Ostertag
Baker	Gubser	Patman
Baldwin	Hagen	Patterson
Barrett	Harris	Perkins
Bass,Tenn.	Haskell	Pfost
Beckworth	Hays, Ark.	Philbin
Bennett, Fla.	Hays, Ohio	Pillion
Bennett, Mich.	Heselton	Poage
Blatnik	Holifield	Polk
Boland	Holland	Porter
Bolling	Holmes	Price
Bonner	Holt	Quie
Bosch	Huddleston	Rabaut
Boyle	Hull	Rains
Breeding	Hyde	Ray
Brooks, Tex.	Ikard	Rees, Kans.
Brown, Ga.	Jarman	Reuss
Brown, Mo.	Jonas	Rhodes, Pa.
Broyhill	Jones, Ala.	Riehlman
Byrd	Jones, Mo.	Roberts
Byrne, Pa.	Judd	Robsion, Ky.
Canfield	Karsten	Rodino
Carnahan	Kearns	Rogers, Colo.
Carrigg	Keating	Rogers, Fla.
Cederberg	Kee	Rogers, Mass.
Celler	Kelly, N. Y.	Roosevelt
Chamberlain	Kilday	St. George
Chelf	King	Saund
Chenoweth	Kirwan	Schenck
Clark	Kluczynski	Schwengel
Coad	Knox	Seely-Brown
Cooley	Knutson	Selden
Corbett	Lafore	Shelley
Cramer	Lane	Sieminski
Cretella	Lankford	Sisk
Cunningham, Iowa	Lennon	Smith, Miss.
	Lesinski	Spence
Curtin	Libonati	Staggers
Curtis, Mass.	Loser	Steed
Curtis, Mo.	McCarthy	Sullivan
Dawson, Ill.	McDonough	Talle
Dawson, Utah	McFall	Teller
Delaney	McGovern	Tewes
Dent	McIntosh	Thomas
Denton	Machrowicz	Thompson, N. J.
Devereux	Mack, Ill.	Thompson, Tex.
Dingell	Madden	Thornberry
Dixon	Magnuson	Trimble
Donohue	Mahon	Udall
Dorn, N. Y.	Mailliard	Ullman
Dwyer	Martin	Walter
Eberharter	May	Watts
Edmondson	Meader	Wharton
Elliott	Merrow	Wier
Everett	Metcalf	Wigglesworth
Fascell	Miller, Md.	Wilson, Calif.
Fenton	Mills	Withrow
Flood	Montoya	Wolverton
Fogarty	Morano	Wright
Forand	Morgan	Yates
Ford	Morris	Younger
Fountain	Moss	Zablocki
Frazier	Moulder	
Fulton	Multer	

NAYS—85

Abbitt	Davis, Ga.	Marshall
Abernethy	Dennison	Miller, Nebr.
Adair	Dorn, S. C.	Minshall
Alexander	Dowdy	Murray
Alger	Fallon	Nicholson
Allen, Ill.	Feighan	Nimtz
Arends	Flynt	O'Hara, Minn.
Ashmore	Forrester	Passman
Bates	Gavin	Pelly
Becker	Gross	Poff
Bolton	Haley	Reece, Tenn.
Bow	Halleck	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bray	Harden	Riley
Brown, Ohio	Harrison, Va.	Robison, N. Y.
Brownson	Hemphill	Rogers, Tex.
Budge	Hiestand	Rutherford
Burleson	Hoeven	Saylor
Bush	Johansen	Scott, N. C.
Byrne, Ill.	Kilgore	Scrivner
Byrnes, Wis.	Kitchin	Scudder
Cannon	Krueger	Simpson, Ill.
Chiperfield	Laird	Smith, Calif.
Church	Lipscomb	Smith, Va.
Dague	Mack, Wash.	Springer
Stauffer	Van Pelt	Whitten
Taber	Vorys	Williams, Miss.
Thomson, Wyo.	Weaver	Wilson, Ind.
Tuck	Westland	
Utt	Whitener	

NOT VOTING—131

Andersen, H. Carl	Gathings	Mitchell
	George	Moore
Anfuso	Glenn	Morrison
Ashley	Gordon	Mumma
Auchincloss	Griffiths	Neal
Avery	Gwinn	O'Neill
Barden	Hale	Osmers
Baring	Hardy	Pilcher
Bass, N. H.	Harrison, Nebr.	Powell
Baumhart	Harvey	Preston
Beamer	Healey	Prouty
Belcher	Hébert	Radwan
Bentley	Henderson	Reed
Berry	Herlong	Rivers
Betts	Hess	Robeson, Va.
Blitch	Hill	Rooney
Boggs	Hillings	Sadlak
Boykin	Hoffman	Santangelo
Brooks, La.	Holtzman	Scherer
Broomfield	Horan	Scott, Pa.
Buckley	Hosmer	Sheehan
Burdick	Jackson	Sheppard
Clevenger	James	Shuford
Coffin	Jenkins	Sikes
Collier	Jennings	Siler
Colmer	Jensen	Simpson, Pa.
Coudert	Johnson	Smith, Kans.
Cunningham, Nebr.	Kean	Taylor
	Kearney	Teague, Calif.
Davis, Tenn.	Keogh	Teague, Tex.
Dellay	Kilburn	Thompson, La.
Derounian	Landrum	Tollefson
Dies	Latham	Vanik
Diggs	LeCompte	Van Zandt
Dollinger	McCormack	Vinson
Dooley	McCulloch	Vursell
Doyle	McGregor	Wainwright
Durham	McIntire	Widnall
Engle	McMillan	Williams, N. Y.
Evins	Macdonald	Willis
Farbstein	Mason	Winstead
Fino	Matthews	Young
Fisher	Michel	Zelenko
Frelinghuysen	Miller, Calif.	
Friedel	Miller, N. Y.	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Glenn for, with Mr. Henderson against.

Mr. Kean for, with Mr. Harvey against.

Mr. Scott of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Beamer against.

Mr. Rooney for, with Mr. Mason against.

Mr. Sadlak for, with Mr. Burdick against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Jenkins against.

Mr. Osmers for, with Mr. Clevenger against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Colmer against.

Mr. Boggs for, with Mr. Winstead against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Landrum against.

Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Berry against.

Mr. Anfuso for, with Mr. McGregor against.

Mr. Frelinghuysen for, with Mr. Derounian against.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana for, with Mr. Williams of New York against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Scherer against.

Mr. Dollinger for, with Mr. LeCompte against.

Mr. Holtzman for, with Mr. Gwinn against.

Mr. Bass of New Hampshire for, with Mr. Reed against.

Mr. Friedel for, with Mr. Robeson of Virgina against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. James against.

Mr. Zelenko for, with Mr. McCulloch against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Willis with Mr. Dooley.

Mr. Engle with Mr. George.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Broomfield.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.

Mr. Doyle with Mr. Avery.

Mr. Santangelo with Mr. Baumhart.

Mr. Healey with Mr. Bentley.

Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. Brooks of Louisiana with Mr. Horan.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Harrison of Nebraska.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Fino.
Mrs. Blitch with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. McIntire.
Mr. Preston with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Johnson with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Jennings with Mr. Van Zandt.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Wainwright.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Vanik with Mr. Hale.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Betts.
Mr. Young with Mr. Hess.
Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Jensen.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Durham with Mr. Moore.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Neal.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Sheehan.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Siler.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Mumma.
Mr. Matthews with Mr. Smith of Kansas.
Mr. Dellay with Mr. Teague of California.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Vursell.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Tollefson.
Mr. Coffin with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Hillings.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1684. An act for the relief of William Franklin Rollins;

H. R. 1803. An act for the relief of Mrs. Boyd Dinehart and Richard Reams;

H. R. 4073. An act for the relief of Peter James O'Brien;

H. R. 7544. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever," approved February 28, 1929, by including therein the name of Roger P. Ames;

H. R. 8759. An act for the relief of W. G. Hollomon and Mrs. W. G. Hollomon;

H. R. 9258. An act for the relief of Mrs. Minnie Perreira;

H. R. 11456. An act to authorize the exchange of certain real property heretofore conveyed to the city of El Paso, Tex., by the United States, for other real property of equal value, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12281. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide an administrative site for Yosemite National Park, Calif., on lands adjacent to the park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13666. An act to amend title 32 of the United States Code to permit the appointment of the Adjutant General of Puerto Rico as provided by the laws of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;

H. R. 13840. An act to encourage expansion of teaching in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies; and

H. J. Res. 658. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to invite the countries of the Free World to participate in the California International Trade Fair and Industrial Exposition to be held in Los Angeles, Calif., from April 1 to 12, 1959.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 13254. An act to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the use in food of additives which have not been adequately tested to establish their safety.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2020. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Insurance Act, and the Social Security Act; and

S. 2765. An act to provide for the promotion of certain persons who participated in the defense of the Philippines;

S. 3545. An act for the relief of John F. Sheehan; and

S. J. Res. 179. Joint resolution to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by the Dickinson Dam in the State of North Dakota as "Edward Arthur Patterson Lake."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1764. An act to amend the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act;

S. 2006. An act to relieve the Surgeons General of the Army and Navy of certain responsibilities outside the Department of Defense;

S. 2719. An act to provide for the payment of bounties on dogfish sharks to control the depredations of this species on the fisheries of the Pacific coast; and

S. 3680. An act to provide for participation of the United States in the World Science-Pan Pacific Exposition to be held at Seattle, Wash., in 1961, and for other purposes.

VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION ACT

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 12226) to amend the Virgin Islands Corporation Act (63 Stat. 350), and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2701)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12226) to amend the Virgin Islands Corporation Act (63 Stat. 350), and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, and 4, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the language inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following: "sale of any property valued at $500 or more shall be made only after public advertisement and by sealed competitive bids or public auction: *Provided further*, That in either such case the Government of the Virgin Islands shall have the right to purchase the property at a price not greater than that offered by the highest responsible bidder and that, in the case of sales of property valued at less than $500, it shall have a right to purchase at a price not greater than that offered by responsible prospective purchasers."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 5.

LEO W. O'BRIEN,
WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
B. F. SISK,
A. L. MILLER,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HENRY M. JACKSON,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12226) amending the Virgin Islands Corporation Act (63 Stat. 350), and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to the amendments to the text of the bill:

The principal question at issue in connection with the Senate amendments to H. R. 12226 was the method of sale of assets of the Virgin Islands Corporation. The House language had left discretion to the Directors of the Corporation to use negotiated sales, competitive bidding, or public auction as they saw fit. This was recommended by spokesmen for the Department of the Interior in the belief that negotiated sales frequently produce a better bargain for the Government than competitive bidding or public auction does. The Senate amendment required a public auction in all cases. Agreement was reached by the conferees that sales of assets valued at $500 or more shall be by public auction or competitive bidding and that sales of assets valued at less than that amount may be by such method as the judgment of the Directors dictates. In either case, "fair and reasonable value" must be realized and, as provided by the Senate amendment, the Virgin Islands Government will have a first refusal.

The only other matter of consequence for resolution was the Senate's insertion of an amendment explicitly referring to the use of power revenues to assist in repayment of the cost of the desalting works. The conferees have agreed to recommend omission of the amendment. It is observed that, as far as repayment is concerned, another portion of the bill requires that this be accomplished by the sale of water under contracts calling for payments sufficient to cover all operating expenses, to amortize the investment, and to pay interest thereon. The great bulk of the sale will be to the Virgin Islands Government.

The other Senate amendments, to which the House conferees agreed, are perfecting in nature.

LEO W. O'BRIEN,
WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
B. F. SISK,
A. L. MILLER,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 12226) to amend the Virgin Islands Corporation Act (63 Stat. 350) and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after all legislative business and special orders heretofore entered into I may address the House for 15 minutes today and that my colleagues the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] may have permission to extend their remarks following mine; further, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleagues and myself have permission to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

GOSHEN VENEER CO.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6282) for the relief of the former shareholders and debenture note holders of the Goshen Veneer Co., an Indiana corporation, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2696)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6282) for the relief of the former shareholders and debenture noteholders of the Goshen Veneer Co., an Indiana corporation, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment and agree to the same.

THOMAS J. LANE,
HAROLD D. DONOHUE,
RICHARD H. POFF,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
JOHN M. BUTLER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6282) for the relief of the former shareholders and debenture note holders of the Goshen Veneer Co., an Indiana corporation, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

As the bill passed the House it provided for the payment of $75,000 to certain shareholders and debenture noteholders of the Goshen Veneer Co., an Indiana corporation, as recommended by the Court of Claims. The Senate amended the bill to provide for an appropriation of $295,154.47. Therefore, the Senate conferees concurred in the House action.

THOMAS J. LANE,
HAROLD D. DONOHUE,
RICHARD H. POFF,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does this apply to only one company?

Mr. LANE. This is just the Goshen Veneer Co. The Commitee on the Judiciary which passed the bill recommended the payment of $75,000, but the Senate inserted $295,154.47. Your committee has insisted on the $75,000, so the Senate has agreed to that amount.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING CONVERSION OF TERM INSURANCE ISSUED UNDER SECTION 621

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 11382) to authorize the conversion or exchange, under certain conditions, of term insurance issued under section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments, with an amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, after line 15, insert:

"SEC. 3. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 619 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, insurance may be granted under section 602 (c) (2) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to any individual who has had active service (as defined in such act) between October 8, 1940, and April 24, 1951, both dates inclusive, upon application made in writing within 1 year after the effective date of this act, and subject to the limitations provided in such section, and to the other provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

"(b) Notwithstanding any time limitation for filing application for insurance contained in section 620 or section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, any person heretofore eligible to apply for insurance under such sections shall, upon application made in writing within 1 year after the effective date of this act, be granted insurance thereunder, subject to the other limitations specified in such sections, except that where application for insurance under the provisions of section 621 of the act is made more than 120 days after separation from active service the applicant shall be required to submit evidence satisfactory to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of good health at the time of such application. Insurance granted pursuant to this subsection under section 621 (as amended by sections 1 and 2 of this act) shall be on the limited convertible term or permanent plans of insurance and the premiums shall be based on table X–18 and interest at the rate of 2½ percent with an additional amount for administrative costs as determined by the Administrator. The Administrator is authorized to transfer annually an amount representing such administrative cost from the revolving fund to the general fund receipts in the Treasury.

"(c) All premiums paid and other income received on account of national service life insurance granted under the authority contained in subsection (a) shall be segregated in the national service life insurance fund and, together with interest earned thereon, shall be available for the payment of liabilities under such insurance.

"Notwithstanding the provisions of section 606 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall determine annually the administrative costs which in his judgment are properly allocable to such insurance and shall thereupon transfer the amount of such costs from any surplus otherwise available for dividends on such insurance from the national service life insurance fund to the national service life insurance appropriation."

Page 3, line 16, strike out "3" and insert "4."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize the conversion or exchange, under certain conditions, of term insurance issued under section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act and to provide a 1-year period during which certain veterans may be granted national service life insurance, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I hope the gentleman will explain the provisions of the bill. This bill is very much needed, and I wish we had the same provisions on the insurance for the servicemen of World War I.

Mr. ASPINALL. This bill was passed by the House unanimously. As passed by the House, it would permit any veteran policyholder of service between April 25, 1951, and December 31, 1956, to do three things:

First. To maintain his present term policy at the Commissioners' standard ordinary premium rates.

Second. Exchange his present policy for a limited convertible term policy with lower premiums based on the new X–18 table. Such policy may not be renewed after age 50 or 2 years after the effective date of this legislation.

Third. Convert to a permanent-type policy with premiums based on the X–18 table.

May I repeat that the bill was reported out unanimously and was passed unanimously by this body. Then it went to the other body and the other body amended the bill to authorize the issuance of national service life insurance for any person who served during the period October 8, 1940, to April 24, 1951, regardless of whether or not they had ever had such insurance.

This matter, that is the amendment by the other body, has been brought before our body on various occasions heretofore and has always been rejected by us. That which is involved in the amendment should be studied by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs before it is brought up for consideration by the

House. It will be studied in the future if there is any reason to study it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I shall not object. This is a very much needed bill. As I said before, I wish we had something better for those who carry World War I insurance, because it is costing them more for their premiums year after year.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman if there are any extraneous amendments, in addition to that for veterans insurance?

Mr. ASPINALL. This is the only amendment.

Mr. TABER. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendments, with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ASPINALL moves to recede and concur in the Senate amendments, with the following amendment: In lieu of the amendments of the Senate to the text of the bill, strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert the following: "That effective as of January 1, 1959, section 723 of title 38, United States Code, is amended as follows:

"(1) Subsection (b) is redesignated as subsection (c).

"(2) Insert the following new subsection immediately after subsection (a):

"'(b) Any term insurance heretofore issued under section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, may be converted to a permanent plan of insurance or exchanged for a policy of limited convertible 5-year level premium term insurance issued under this subsection. Insurance issued under this subsection shall be issued upon the same terms and conditions as are contained in the standard policies of national service life insurance except (1) after September 1, 1960, limited convertible term insurance may not be issued or renewed on the term plan after the insured's fiftieth birthday; (2) the premium rates for such limited convertible term or permanent plan insurance shall be based on table X–18 (1950–54 Intercompany Table of Mortality) and interest at the rate of 2½ percent per annum; (3) all settlements on policies involving annuities on insurance issued under this subsection shall be calculated on the basis of the Annuity Table for 1949, and interest at the rate of 2½ percent per annum; (4) all cash, loan, paid-up, and extended values, and, except as otherwise provided in this subsection, all other calculations in connection with insurance issued under this subsection shall be based on table X–18 (1950–54 Intercompany Table of Mortality) and interest at the rate of 2½ percent per annum; (5) insurance and any total disability provision added thereto issued under this subsection shall be on a nonparticipating basis and all premiums and other collections therefor shall be credited directly to the revolving fund referred to in subsection (a) and payments on such insurance and any total disability provision added thereto shall be made directly from such fund.'

"(3) The second sentence of the subsection redesignated by paragraph (1) as subsection (c) is amended to read as follows: 'The rate of interest on such obligations shall be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury at a rate equal to the rate of interest, computed as of the end of the month preceding the date of issue of such obligations, borne by all marketable interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt that are not due or callable until after the expiration of 5 years from the date of original issue; except that where such average rate is not a multiple of one-eighth of 1 percent, the rate of interest of such obligations shall be the multiple of one-eighth of 1 percent nearest such average rate.'"

In lieu of the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill, amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to authorize the conversion or exchange, under certain conditions, of term insurance issued under section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, and for other purposes."

Mr. ASPINALL (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the amendment which I have offered provides for the adoption of the House version of the bill and is set forth as an amendment to the Title 38, Veterans' Benefits, effective January 1, 1959.

The bill, as passed by the House and as presented today, would permit any veteran policyholder of service between April 25, 1951, and December 31, 1956, to:

First. Maintain his present term policy at the Commissioner's standard ordinary premium rates.

Second. Exchange his present policy for a limited convertible term policy with lower premiums based on the new X–18 table. Such policy may not be renewed after age 50 or 2 years after the effective date of this legislation.

Third. Convert to a permanent-type policy with premiums based on the X–18 table.

There are approximately 700,000 policies in force with this type of insurance available to individuals who served during the period April 25, 1951, and December 31, 1956. At that time Public Law 881 of the 84th Congress terminated the authority to issue insurance. The total face value of these policies is approximately $6,350 million, and the average face value is $9,130.

The Senate amendment would authorize the issuance of national service life insurance for any person who served during the period October 8, 1940, to April 24, 1951, regardless of whether or not they had ever had such insurance. This assumes, of course, that they could pass the necessary physical examination. It would differ from World War II insurance in that these policyholders, if the Senate amendments should prevail, would have to pay the administrative cost estimated at less than $4 per year per policy.

Since the enactment of Public Law 23 on April 25, 1951, which provided for servicemen's indemnity in the amount of $10,000, and terminated the right to purchase insurance, the Subcommittee on Insurance of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the 82d, 83d, 84th, and 85th Congresses has unanimously rejected proposals to open up the insurance program as sought by the Senate amendment. In each of these Congresses there have been hearings in the House committee on legislation of this type, and as I have indicated, on each occasion the proposal has been rejected.

When what is now Public Law 881 of the 84th Congress, the Survivor Benefits Act, was enacted, effort was made in the Committee on Finance of the other body, to provide for a reopening of this insurance program along the lines sought by the present Senate amendment. That was rejected. Further, under the provisions of that act, as I have indicated earlier, the right to any sort of new insurance was terminated effective December 31, 1956.

Thus it will be seen, from a review of these acts of the Congress, that Congress has rather definitely indicated that it did not wish to reopen this question. Approximately 1 million applications for insurance are expected if the Senate amendment should prevail. An operation of this magnitude should be considered in detail.

The provisions of the House bill are important and, in effect, put the Korean insurance program on a permanent basis. It is important and highly desirable that the provisions of this bill as passed by the House be enacted into law. I hope, therefore, that the Senate will accept our amendment and postpone until the 86th Congress any further consideration concerning the reopening of the insurance program for veterans of World War II.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the action which I am requesting today is in accord with the wishes and direction of the chairman of the full committee.

TO FACILITATE ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 675) to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 4, strike out lines 3, 4, and 5, and insert:

"SEC. 10. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Lena F. Shelton, the widow of a United States citizen, shall be deemed to be within the purview of section 101 (a) (27) (A) of that act, and the provisions of section 205 of the said act shall not be applicable in this case."

Page 4, after line 20, insert:

"SEC. 14. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kinji House shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee."

Page 4, line 21, strike out "14" and insert "15."

Page 4, line 22, strike out "and."

Page 4, line 22, after "12" insert "and 14."

Amend the title so as to read: "A joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain briefly the purpose of the joint resolution?

Mr. WALTER. This joint resolution was amended in the Senate by deleting a name and adding a name that had been on another resolution.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BORIS F. NAVRATIL

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3571) for the relief of Boris F. Navratil, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Boris F. Navratil shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 16, 1949."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask this question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the Immigration and Nationality Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary. Have the gentleman and the committee given any consideration to the bill S. 4109, which has been passed by the Senate, and the bill H. R. 13362, introduced by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], for the relief of Dr. Herbert H. Schafer and his wife, Irma Niemeyer Schafer?

Mr. WALTER. I assure the gentleman from Georgia that the subcommittee gave unusual attention to this proposed legislation because of the pressure put on the members of the subcommittee by various persons interested in this bill. I only regret that we could not find any merit in this case. This doctor is an exchange visitor. He came to the United States at public expense and, of course, owes it to his government and to his countrymen to return and perform the duties in France that he has been brought to the United States to learn. This is in accordance with the existing law and he has recognized his duty by accepting his exchange visitor's status.

May I also say to my friend from Georgia that if this bill is passed, that is, if the House should act on the Senate bill, the President unquestionably would veto it, as he has done invariably on similar occasions, and the man in whom the gentleman is interested would find himself deported from the United States within the next few weeks. It would certainly seem to me that if the gentleman is interested in seeing that this man remains in the United States for an additional length of time, he should not press for the enactment of this legislation. This exchange visitor may be permitted to remain here a little longer only because the bill has already passed the Senate. He would remain here only by courtesy of the Attorney General.

Mr. FORRESTER. The gentleman is thoroughly familiar with the fact that this man is a specialist in the cure of congenital and rheumatic heart disease and is badly needed at the University of Georgia. As I understand what the gentleman from Pennsylvania is saying, this man is an exchange student, if the Senate bill is passed and the President vetoes it he will be deported, and the University of Georgia then would not have the benefit of his services? That he would be deported? That passage of this legislation would be harmful instead of being helpful?

Mr. WALTER. There is no question about it. After all, the German quota is wide open, and this man, a French citizen, was born in Germany. If it were not for the fact that he is an exchange visitor he could very easily obtain an immigrant visa. As the law stands now, he is under obligation to depart and remain outside of the United States for 2 years.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. BRANT BONNER

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2469) for the relief of Dr. Brant Bonner.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Dr. Brant Bonner, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 404 (b) of the Nationality Act of 1940, may be naturalized by taking, prior to 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, an oath as prescribed by section 337 of such act. From and after naturalization under this act, the said Dr. Brant Bonner shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIE INETTE KONOMOS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3503) for the relief of Marie Inette Konomos.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Marie Inette Konomos, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of John S. Konomos and Wilma I. Konomos, citizens of the United States: *Provided*, That no natural parent of the beneficiary, by virtue of such relationship, shall be accorded any right, status, or privilege under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MERCEDE SVALDI

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 4032) for the relief of Mercede Svaldi.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mercede Svaldi, may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of said act: *Provided further*, That exemption shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAROLD PANGELINAN

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 4113) for the relief of Harold Pangelinan.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (4) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Harold Pangelinan may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That if the said Harold Pangelinan is not entitled to medical care under the Dependents' Medical Care Act (70 Stat. 250), a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. This act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POSTAL STATIONS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 10495) to amend that part of the act of June 9, 1896 (29 Stat. 313), relating to the establishment of postal stations and branch post offices, so as to permit them to be established within 10 miles of the boundary of the adjoining city, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

After line 7, insert:

"SEC. 2. Section 215 of the Postal Rate Increase Act, 1958, is amended by striking out "205 (5)," in subsection (b) and by adding at the end of such section a new subsection as follows:

"'(g) The provisions of section 205 (5) of this title shall become effective on May 1, 1959.'"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Tennessee explain the Senate amendment?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, as is indicated by the title of the bill as passed by the House, this legislation would authorize the establishment of postal stations and branch post offices within 10 miles of the boundary of the adjoining city. The present limitation is 5 miles.

The Senate amendment would postpone until May 1959, the effective date of the increased rates on odd sizes and shapes of third-class mail. The postal rate increase bill raised these odd sizes and shapes from 3 cents to 6 cents. We have received considerable correspondence indicating that this increase has created a hardship, particularly in the seed industry which has already many printed catalogs that are in the odd-size category. This will give them an extended time in which to adjust the size of their catalogs before the higher rate goes into effect.

I might state that this amendment has also been cleared with the Post Office Department.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I have no objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], and other members of the conference for approving the Senate amendment to H. R. 10495.

The amendment will give those who use the mails to distribute odd-size catalogs until May 1, 1959, to adjust to the provisions of the new postal rate bill which recently became effective.

Many of the users of this category of the mail service had substantial investments in printed material before the new provisions went into effect and this simply provides a reasonable opportunity for adjustment in line with the rate treatment accorded newspapers.

It corrects a situation which ought to have been given consideration when the postal rate bill was considered by the House and Senate, and again I commend the House conferees for their approval of the amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIRST DAY OF MEETING OF 86TH CONGRESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 704) that the 86th Congress shall assemble at noon on Wednesday, January 7, 1959, and ask for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the 86th Congress shall assemble at noon on Wednesday, January 7, 1959.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. The Private Calendar will be called at this time. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

LASZLO CSERI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3028) for the relief of Laszlo Cseri.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Laszlo Cseri may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That if the beneficiary is not entitled to medical care under the Dependents' Medical Care Act (70 Stat. 250), a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act: *And provided further*, That the exemption granted herein shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, after the word "act" change the colon to a period and strike out all the remainder of the bill.

On page 2, after line 4, insert new sections 2 and 3 to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dorothy Margarethe Hadjisky, Maria Miceli, and Francesco Riso may be issued visas and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That suitable and proper bonds or undertakings, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

"SEC. 3. The exemptions provided for in this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Laszlo Cseri, Dorothy Margarethe Hadjisky, Maria Miceli, and Francesco Riso."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHIYOKO YOSHIMOTO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3915) for the relief of Chiyoko Yoshimoto.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Chiyoko Yoshimoto, the fiancée of Theodore T. Oyler, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Chiyoko Yoshimoto is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Theodore T. Oyler and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Chiyoko Yoshimoto, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Chiyoko Yoshimoto, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Chiyoko Yoshimoto as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY F. C. LEUTE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 4214) for the relief of Mary F. C. Leute, the widow of Joseph Henry Leute.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of section 5 of the act entitled "An act to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system," approved May 1, 1956 (70 Stat. 125), Joseph Henry Leute, a vice consul of the United States who died on August 5, 1909, while en route to a new assignment with the Foreign Service, shall be deemed to have been a participant under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system within the meaning of such section at the time of his death.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. The Consent Calendar will be called at this time. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

AMENDING TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 13226) to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide more flexibility in making additional appointments to bring the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and the United States Air Force Academy up to full strength.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of section 4343 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"Whenever it is estimated that the average number of cadets at the Academy during a school year will be below the authorized number, the Secretary of the Army may nominate qualified alternates and other qualified candidates who competed for nomination and are recommended and found qualified by the Academic Board, but not more than are estimated to be necessary to make the average annual strength of the Corps of Cadets equal the authorized strength of that corps."

SEC. 2. The first sentence of section 9343 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"Whenever it is estimated that the average number of cadets at the Academy during a school year will be below the authorized number, the Secretary of the Air Force may nominate qualified alternates and other qualified candidates who competed for nomination and are recommended and found qualified by the faculty, but not more than are estimated to be necessary to make the average annual strength of Air Force cadets equal the authorized strength of those cadets."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That section 4343 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'§ 4343. Cadets: appointment; to bring Corps to full strength.

"'Whenever it is estimated that the number of cadets at the Academy during a school year will be below the authorized number, the Secretary of the Army may nominate qualified alternates and other qualified candidates who competed for nomination and are recommended and found qualified by the Academic Board, but not more than are estimated to be necessary to make the strength of the Corps of Cadets at the end of the school year equal the authorized strength of that Corps. At least 85 percent of those nominated under this section shall be selected from qualified alternates nominated by the persons named in clauses (1)–(6) of section 4342 (a) of this title, and the remainder from qualified candidates holding competitive nominations under any other provision of the law. An appointment under this section is an additional appointment and is not in place of an appointment otherwise authorized by law.'

"SEC. 2. Section 9343 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'§ 9343. Cadets: appointment; to bring to full strength.

"'Whenever it is estimated that the number of cadets at the Academy during a school year will be below the authorized number, the Secretary of the Air Force may nominate qualified alternates and other qualified candidates who competed for nomination and are recommended and found qualified by the faculty, but not more than are estimated to be necessary to make the strength of Air Force cadets at the end of the school year equal the authorized strength of those cadets. At least 85 percent of those nominated under this section shall be selected from qualified alternates nominated by the persons named in clauses (1)–(6) of section 9342 (a) of this title, and the remainder from qualified candidates holding competitive nominations under any other provision of law. An appointment under this section is an additional appointment and is not in place of an appointment otherwise authorized by law.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 8E OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT (OF 1933)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 11056) to amend section 8e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (of 1933), as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide for the extension of the restrictions on imported commodities imposed by such section to all imported limes, grapefruit, lemons, mandarins, all types of oranges including temples, tangerines, murcotts, and tangelos, dried figs, fig paste, sliced dried figs, shelled walnuts, dates with pits, dates with pits removed, and products made entirely of dates.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, and Mr. FORD objected.

PROVIDING FOR EXCHANGE OF LANDS BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND NAVAJO TRIBE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3754) to provide for the exchange of lands between the United States and the Navajo Tribe, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman include in his request also to include a letter from the Department of the Interior to be inserted following his remarks?

Mr. DINGELL. I will, Mr. Speaker, and I so amend my unanimous consent request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I had previously asked that S. 3754 be passed over. The reason for my request was that the bill had a provision in subsection 1 (g) compensating owners of grazing permits on public land for the termination of their permits.

The law has consistently been that grazing permits are the barest kind of licenses and constitute no possessory interest in the Federal domain whatsoever. I have withdrawn my objections to this bill upon the express ackowledgment of the bill that subsection 1 (g) of S. 3754, now before us, does not constitute a recognition that grazing permits on public land are not a possessory interest but rather are mere licenses terminable at the will of the Government. Because of the special circumstances involved in S. 3754 I feel it is equitable that provision should be made for compensation of holders of these grazing permits in the McCracken Mesa area. I refer to my remarks appearing previously at page 19243 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on this same subject.

My views are prompted by a letter which I received from the United States Department of Interior over the signature of Mr. Hatfield Chilson, Under Secretary of the Interior setting forth substantially the same view and pointing out that S. 3754 does not constitute a general policy of compensating grazers on public land devoted to use not consistent with grazing activity. I ask unanimous consent that the letter referred to be incorporated into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., August 21, 1958.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: You have requested our comments regarding a question raised with

respect to subsection 1 (g) of S. 3754, a Senate amendment to the bill as introduced which relates to compensation to the holders of grazing permits whose activities are displaced by the transfer to the Navajo Tribe of Indians of the lands involved. The question raised, we are advised, is whether the Department regards subsection 1 (g) as comprehending a general policy of compensating grazers when public land is devoted to another use not consistent with grazing activity.

As you are aware, the United States is seeking to acquire title to lands of the Navajo Indians that will be inundated when waters are impounded behind the Glen Canyon Dam, now under construction. The Indian lands involved comprise the dam site and a substantial portion of the reservoir area of the Glen Canyon development. S. 3754 would provide for exchange of the Navajo Indian lands for other lands in the McCracken Mesa area which are now utilized for grazing purposes.

Ordinarily, the Government would not acquire dam site and reservoir lands by an exchange process. It would acquire those lands directly from the owner by a negotiated sale or by condemnation proceedings, or, if the lands to be inundated are public lands, it would, under the authority of the Federal reclamation laws, withdraw the lands from entry and thus—as is provided under the Taylor Grazing Act—terminate any outstanding grazing permits. The process of acquiring reservoir lands in the instant case by exchange is therefore an unusual one and comes about because of the Indian ownership of the lands required for the Glen Canyon project.

The Department wishes to make it entirely clear that, should the Congress adopt the language contained in subsection 1 (g) of S. 3754, now pending in the House, such action would be regarded as dealing only with the special circumstances existing in the case at hand, and that it does not regard the provision as establishing a general policy or precedent. In this connection, it should be noted that in our report on S. 3754 to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs we stated:

"On the other hand, while the displacement is, relatively speaking, small, nevertheless, the Congress may wish to consider the possibility of extending to the stockmen directly affected the principle of compensation now embodied in the provisions of title 43, United States Code, section 315q. While, as is well known, a grazing permit confers no right, title, interest, or estate in the public lands (43 U. S. C., sec. 315b), special equities justifying compensation might be thought to exist where, as here, the parties affected had no reason to anticipate they were establishing their activities in an area that would be affected by a reservoir project. Such action would place the burden of cost upon the reservoir project which will benefit from the exchange rather than upon the individuals now operating in the McCracken Mesa area."

As we have noted above, by the exchange process proposed in S. 3754, the McCracken Mesa lands, which are not physically affected by the Glen Canyon project, would, in effect, be devoted to reservoir purposes, a possibility which no user of the mesa area could have anticipated when establishing his use. This peculiar situation was considered as distinguishing the instant case from the usual circumstances in which public lands devoted to grazing purposes are—under the express terms of the Taylor Grazing Act—made subject to reclassification and devotion to any higher use for which those lands may be suited.

For the foregoing reasons, the Department of the Interior would regard adoption by the Congress of subsection 1 (g) as reflecting only the fact that the Congress in this instance considers special equities to exist by reason of the lack of physical relationship of the McCracken Mesa area to the Glen Canyon Reservoir. Such action would, in our view, be consistent with the principle of compensation embodied in the act of July 9, 1942 (56 Stat. 654; 43 U. S. C., section 315q) referred to in the quoted paragraph above.

Sincerely,

HATFIELD CHILSON,
Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, on page 19243 of yesterday's RECORD the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] made a statement in regard to S. 3754. As one of the proponents of this bill I concur in his views that subsection 1 (G) of this measure does not constitute a recognition that grazing permits on public lands are a possessory interest but rather are mere licenses terminable at the will of the Government.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Secretary of the Interior shall, in consideration of and as just compensation for the transfer made by section 2 of this act as well as for the use and occupancy of the lands therein described under terms of the right-of-way granted March 22, 1957, by the Secretary pursuant to the act of February 5, 1948 (62 Stat. 17), transfer to the Navajo Tribe so much of the block of public lands (exclusive of the minerals therein, but inclusive of all range improvements constructed thereon) described in subsection (c) of this section, as shall constitute a reasonably compact area equal in acreage to the lands transferred to the United States under section 2, and the lands so transferred shall constitute a part of the Navajo Reservation and shall be held by the United States in trust for the Navajo Tribe and shall be subject to all laws and regulations applicable to that reservation. The owners of range improvements of a permanent nature placed, under the authority of a permit from or agreement with the United States, on lands transferred pursuant to this section shall be compensated for the reasonable value of such improvements, as determined by the Secretary out of appropriations available for the construction of the Glen Canyon unit, Colorado River storage project. To the extent that the Secretary is unable to transfer, from the lands described in subsection (c), lands equal in acreage to the lands transferred to the United States under section 2, because of the existence of valid rights in other parties than the United States (other than the rights described in subsection (d) of this section), he shall transfer to the Navajo Tribe such other available public lands (exclusive of the minerals therein but inclusive of all range improvements thereon) in reasonable proximity to the Navajo Reservation and to the lands described in subsection (c) as the tribe, with the concurrence of the Secretary, may select and as may be necessary to transfer to the tribe equal acreage in exchange for the lands transferred under section 2, and those lands so transferred shall be treated in the same manner as other lands transferred pursuant to this section.

(b) Subject to valid, existing rights, in addition to other requirements under applicable laws and regulations, mineral activities affecting the land transferred pursuant to this section shall be subject to such regulations, which may include, among others, a requirement for the posting of bond or other undertaking, as the Secretary may prescribe for protection of the interests of the Indians. Patents issued with respect to mining claims on the lands transferred pursuant to this section shall be limited to the minerals only, and for a period of 10 years after the effective date of this act, none of the lands described in subsection (c) of this section shall be open to location and entry under the general mining laws.

(c) The block of public lands (which lies to the north and west of the portion of the present Navajo Reservation in San Juan County, Utah, and abuts the reservation's boundaries within the county) from which the transfer under this section is to be made, is described as follows:

SALT LAKE MERIDIAN

Township 38 south, range 23 east: Sections 26, 33, 34, and 35.

Township 38 south, range 24 east: Section 28; section 29, east half; sections 31, 33, 34, and 35.

Township 39 south, range 22 east: Sections 13, 24, 25, and 35, those portions lying east of Recapture Creek.

Township 39 south, range 23 east: Sections 1, 3, 4, and 5; sections 8 to 15, inclusive; section 17; sections 18 and 19, those portions lying east of Recapture Creek; sections 20 to 31, inclusive; sections 33, 34, and 35.

Township 39 south, range 24 east: Section 1; sections 3 to 15, inclusive; sections 17 to 24, inclusive, sections 26 and 27, those portions lying north and west of the present Navajo Indian Reservation; sections 28, 29, 30, 31, and 33; section 34, that portion lying north and west of the present Navajo Indian Reservation.

Township 39 south, range 25 east: Sections 5, 6, 7, 8, and 18.

Township 40 south, range 22 east: Section 1; sections 11, 12, 13, 23, 24, 25, and 26, those portions lying east of Recapture Creek and north of the present Navajo Indian Reservation.

Township 40 south, range 23 east: Section 1; sections 3 to 15, inclusive; sections 17 to 23, inclusive; section 26; sections 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 34, and 35, those portions lying north and west of the present Navajo Indian Reservation.

Township 40 south, range 24 east: Sections 3, 4, 5, those portions lying north and west of the present Navajo Indian Reservation; section 6, sections 7, 8, 18, and 19, those portions lying north and west of the present Navajo Indian Reservation.

(d) The transfer hereinabove provided for shall also be deemed to constitute full and complete satisfaction of any and all rights which are based solely upon Indian use and occupancy or possession claimed by or on behalf of any individual members of the Navajo Tribe in their individual capacities or any groups or identifiable bands thereof to any and all public lands in San Juan County, Utah, outside the exterior boundaries of the Navajo Indian Reservation as the same are described in:

(1) The act of March 1, 1933 (ch. 160, 47 Stat. 1418);

(2) Executive Order 324A of May 15, 1905;

(3) Executive Order of May 17, 1884; and all such rights to such lands are hereby extinguished from and after January 1, 1963. Subject to the provision of section 2 of this act, and subject to valid existing rights, all public lands of the United States within said exterior boundaries of said reservation are hereby declared to be held in trust for the benefit of the Navajo Tribe of Indians. The term "public lands" as used herein shall be deemed to include but in no way to be limited to lands and the mineral deposits which originally may have been excluded from said reservation by reason of settlement or occupancy or other valid rights then existing, but since relinquished, extinguished, or otherwise terminated. The tribe is hereby authorized to adopt such

rules and regulations as it deems appropriate, with the approval of the Secretary, for residence and use of the lands transferred pursuant to this section: *Provided*, That the tribal council shall give preference until January 1, 1963, in granting residence and use rights to: (1) those Navajos who, prior to the effective date of this act, have used or occupied the transferred lands and (2) those Navajos who, prior to the effective date of this act, have used or occupied other public lands in San Juan County, Utah.

(e) Upon application of the Navajo Tribe, the Secretary shall grant to the tribe, to be held in trust by the United States for use of tribal members grazing livestock upon the lands transferred under this section, a nonexclusive easement, of suitable width and location as he determines, for a livestock driveway across the public lands in sections 21, 22, 23, and 24, township 39 south, range 22 east, and in section 19, township 39 south, range 23 east, Salt Lake meridian, to connect with United States Highway No. 47. Use of said nonexclusive easement shall be in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary, and future uses and dispositions of the public lands affected shall be subject to said easement.

(f) The transfer of lands to the Navajo Tribe, as provided in this section, shall not affect the status of rights-of-way for public highways traversing such lands, which rights-of-way shall remain available for public use, including the movement of livestock thereon.

(g) The Secretary of the Interior shall compensate persons whose grazing permits, licenses or leases covering lands transferred to the Navajo Tribe pursuant to this section are canceled because of such transfer. Such compensation shall be determined in accordance with the standard prescribed by the act of July 9, 1942, as amended (43 U. S. C. 315q). Such compensation shall be paid from appropriations available for the construction of the Glen Canyon unit, Colorado River storage project.

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby transferred to the United States all the right, title, and interest of the Navajo Tribe in and to the lands (exclusive of the minerals therein) described in subsection (b) of this section. These lands shall no longer be "Indian country" within the meaning of title 18, United States Code, section 115, and they shall have the status of public lands withdrawn and being administered pursuant to the Federal reclamation laws and shall be subject to all laws and regulations governing the use and disposition of public lands in that status. The rights herein transferred shall not extend to the utilization of the lands hereinafter described under the heading "parcel B" for public recreational facilities without the approval of the Navajo Tribal Council. No permit, lease, license, or other right covering the exploration for or extraction of the minerals herein reserved to the tribe shall be granted or exercised by or on behalf of the tribe except under such conditions and with such restrictions, limitations, or stipulations as the Secretary deems appropriate, in connection with the Glen Canyon unit, to protect the interests of the United States and of its grantees, licensees, transferees, and permittees, and their heirs and assigns. Subject to the mineral rights herein reserved to the tribe as aforesaid, the Secretary may dispose of lots in townsites established on the lands transferred under this section, together with improvements thereon, under such terms and conditions as he determines to be appropriate, including provisions for payment for the furnishing of municipal facilities and services while such facilities and services are provided by the United States and for the establishment of liens in connection therewith, but no disposition shall be at less than the current fair market value, and he may dedicate portions of lands in such townsites, whether or not improved, for public purposes and transfer the land so dedicated to appropriate State or local public bodies and nonprofit corporations. He may also enter into contracts with State or local public bodies and nonprofit corporations whereby either party may undertake to render to the other such services in aid of the performance of activities and functions of a municipal, governmental, or public or quasi-public nature as will, in the Secretary's judgment, contribute substantially to the efficiency or the economy of the operations of the Department of the Interior in connection with the Glen Canyon unit.

(b) The lands which are transferred under this section are described as follows:

PARCEL A

The following tract of unsurveyed land situated in Arizona: Beginning on the easterly bank of the Colorado River at a point where said easterly bank is intersected by the south line of section 9, township 40 north, range 8 east, Gila and Salt River base and meridian; thence upstream along the said easterly bank of the Colorado River to a point where said bank intersects the east line of section 16, township 41 north, range 9 east, Gila and Salt River base and meridian; thence south along the east line of sections 16, 21, 28, and 33 of said township 41 north, range 9 east, to the south line of said section 33; thence west along the south line of said section 33 to the east line of section 4, township 40 north, range 9 east, Gila and Salt River base and meridian; thence south along the east line of sections 4 and 9 of said township 40 north, range 9 east, to the south line of said section 9; thence west along the south line of sections 9, 8, and 7 of said township 40 north, range 9 east, and along the south line of sections 12, 11, 10, and 9 of said township 40 north, range 8 east, Gila and Salt River base and meridian to the point of beginning.

PARCEL B

The following tract of land in part unsurveyed situated in Arizona and Utah: Beginning at a point where the east line of section 16, township 41 north, range 9 east, Gila and Salt River base and meridian intersects the north boundary of the Navajo Indian Reservation in Arizona; thence upstream in Arizona and Utah along the north boundary of the reservation to a point where said north boundary intersects a contour line the elevation of which is 3,720 mean sea level (United States Coast and Geodetic Survey datum), said point being at approximate river mile 72.7 on the San Juan River above its confluence with the Colorado River, and also being near the east line of township 40 south, range 15 east, Salt Lake base and meridian; thence generally southwesterly within the Navajo Indian Reservation along said contour line the elevation of which is 3,720, to the point where said contour line intersects the east line of section 16, township 41 north, range 9 east, Gila and Salt River base and meridian; thence north along said east line to the point of beginning.

(c) The Secretary and the tribe may enter into such agreements as are appropriate for the utilization, under permits or easements, of such tribal lands, in the vicinity of Rainbow Bridge National Monument, as may be necessary in connection with the carrying out of any measures undertaken to preclude impairment of the monument as provided by section 1 of the act of April 11, 1956 (70 Stat. 105).

(d) As used in this and in the preceding section of this act, the term "minerals" shall not be construed to include sand, gravel, or other building or construction materials.

SEC. 3. (a) The State of Utah may convey to the United States title to any State-owned lands within the area described in subsection (b) of this section or subsection (c) of section 1 of this act as base lands for indemnity selections under sections 2275 and 2276 of the Revised Statutes (43 U. S. C., secs. 851, 852). The Secretary of the Interior shall give priority to indemnity selection applications made pursuant to this subsection by the State of Utah. However, all conveyances made pursuant to this subsection, whether by the United States or by the State of Utah, shall contain a reservation of the minerals to the grantor. Lands conveyed to the United States under this section shall be subject to selection by the Secretary of the Interior, and transfer to the Navajo Tribe in the same manner as, and under the same terms and conditions as, lands described in subsection (c) of section 1 of this act. Notwithstanding a conveyance to the United States of State-owned lands in accordance with the provisions of this subsection, such conveyance shall not prevent the Navajo Tribe from asserting, in any manner that would have been available to the tribe if the conveyance had not been made, a claim of title, if any, to the lands conveyed by the State that the tribe asserts is superior to the title asserted by the State of Utah. If a claim of title so asserted by the Navajo Tribe determined to be superior to the title asserted by the State of Utah, and if the Navajo Tribe has selected such lands as a part of the transfer authorized by section 1 of this act, the Navajo Tribe shall be permitted to select other lands described in subsection (c) of section 1 in lieu thereof.

(b) The lands referred to in subsection (a) of this section and not described in subsection (c) of section 1 of this act are described as follows:

SALT LAKE MERIDIAN

Township 38 south, range 23 east: section 36.

Township 38 south, range 24 east: section 32.

Township 39 south, range 22 east: section 36.

Township 39 south, range 23 east: sections 2, 16, 32, and 36.

Township 39 south, range 24 east: sections 2, 16, and 32.

Township 40 south, range 22 east: section 2.

Township 40 south, range 23 east: sections 2, 16, and 36.

(c) The right of the State of Utah to make indemnity selections under the terms of this section shall expire 5 years after the date of approval of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PREPARATION OF REPORT ON PROPOSED PORT REYES NATIONAL SEASHORE RECREATIONAL AREA, MARIN COUNTY, CALIF.

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 634) calling for the preparation of a report on the proposed Port Reyes National Seashore Recreational Area, Marin County, Calif.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONVEYING CERTAIN LANDS ON HUNTLEY RECLAMATION PROJECT, YELLOWSTONE COUNTY, MONT., TO SCHOOL DISTRICT 24, HUNTLEY PROJECT SCHOOLS, YELLOWSTONE COUNTY, MONT.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1742) to amend the acts approved April 16 and July 27, 1906 (34 Stat. 116 and 519), so as to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands on the Huntley reclamation project, Yellowstone County, Mont., to school district No. 24, Huntley Project Schools, Yellowstone County, Mont.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NATIONAL PARK IN WHEELER PEAK-LEHMAN CAVES AREA OF THE SNAKE RANGE IN NEVADA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3587) to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing a national park in the Wheeler Peak-Lehman Caves area of the Snake Range in eastern Nevada.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CLARIFYING REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO PERFORMANCE OF LABOR IMPOSED FOR HOLDING OF MINING CLAIMS ON FEDERAL LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2039) to clarify the requirements with respect to the performance of labor imposed as a condition for the holding of mining claims on Federal lands pending the issuance of patents therefor.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2324 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (30 U. S. C. 28) is amended by inserting immediately after the third sentence thereof the following new sentence: "The term 'labor', as used in the preceding sentence, shall include, but not be limited to, geological, geochemical, or geophysical surveys made by credited technicians employing generally recognized equipment and methods, or other recognized means of determining the existence, extent of concentration, or accessibility of minerals on the claim."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this act shall be effective with respect to the assessment year commencing at 12 o'clock meridian on July 1, 1957, and all succeeding assessment years.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after enacting clause and insert "That the term 'labor', as used in the third sentence of section 2324 of the Revised Statutes (30 U. S. C. 28), shall include, without being limited to, geological, geochemical, and geophysical surveys conducted by qualified experts and verified by a detailed report filed in the county office in which the claim is located which sets forth (a) the location of the work performed in relation to the point of discovery and boundaries of the claim, (b) the nature, extent, and cost thereof, (c) the basic findings therefrom, and (d) the name, address, and professional background of the person or persons conducting the work. Such surveys, however, may not be applied as labor for more than 2 consecutive years or for more than a total of 5 years on any 1 mining claim, and each such survey shall be nonrepetitive of any previous survey on the same claim.

"SEC. 2. As used in this act,

"(a) The term 'geological surveys' means surveys on the ground for mineral deposits by the proper application of the principles and techniques of the science of geology as they relate to the search for and discovery of mineral deposits;

"(b) The term 'geochemical surveys' means surveys on the ground for mineral deposits by the proper application of the principles and techniques of the science of chemistry as they relate to the search for and discovery of mineral deposits;

"(c) The term 'geophysical surveys' means surveys on the ground for mineral deposits through the employment of generally recognized equipment and methods for measuring physical differences between rock types or discontinuities in geological formations:

"(d) The term 'qualified expert' means an individual qualified by education or experience to conduct geological, geochemical or geophysical surveys, as the case may be."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTING MINERALS, INCLUDING OIL AND GAS ON CERTAIN LANDS IN THE CROW INDIAN RESERVATION, MONT., TO CERTAIN INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 328) to grant minerals, including oil and gas, on certain lands in the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont., to certain Indians, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

ADMINISTRATION OF MISCELLANEOUS FEDERAL LANDS SITUATED IN NATIONAL FORESTS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3741) to facilitate administration and management by the Secretary of Agriculture of certain lands of the United States within national forests.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to facilitate the administration, management, and consolidation of the national forests, all lands of the United States within the exterior boundaries of national forests which were or hereafter are acquired for or in connection with the national forests or transferred to the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, for administration and protection substantially in accordance with national forest regulations, policies, and procedures, excepting (a) lands reserved from the public domain or acquired pursuant to laws authorizing the exchange of land or timber reserved from or part of the public domain, and (b) lands within the official limits of towns or cities, notwithstanding the provisions of any other act, are hereby made subject to the Weeks Act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961), as amended, and to all laws, rules, and regulations applicable to national forest lands acquired thereunder: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed as (1) affecting the status of lands administered by the Secretary of Agriculture under the act of June 24, 1954 (68 Stat. 270), and which are revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands, administered as national forest lands, or (2) changing the disposition of revenues from or authorizing the exchange of the lands, or the timber thereon, described in the act of February 11, 1920 (ch. 69, 41 Stat. 405), the act of September 22, 1922 (ch. 407, 42 Stat. 1019), and the act of June 4, 1936 (ch. 494, 49 Stat. 1460).

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADMINISTRATIVE FLEXIBILITY FOR CROP INSURANCE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 13262) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 508 (a) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U. S. C. 1508 (a)), as amended, is amended by amending the tenth sentence thereof to read as follows: "Insurance shall not be provided on any agricultural commodity in any county in which the Board determines that the income from such commodity constitutes an unimportant part of the total agricultural income of the county, except that insurance may be provided for producers on farms situated in a local producing area bordering on a county with a crop-insurance program."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "tenth" and insert "eleventh."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFERRING CERTAIN BUILDINGS TO THE CROW CREEK SIOUX INDIAN TRIBE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2117) directing the Secretary of the Army to

transfer certain buildings to the Crow Creek Sioux Indian Tribe.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to transfer to the Crow Creek Sioux Indian Tribe, without compensation, title to those buildings which were a part of the Government improvements and facilities acquired by the Corps of Engineers on the original site of the Crow Creek Agency at Fort Thompson, S. Dak., within the taking area of the Fort Randall Dam and Reservoir project, and which were released by the Corps of Engineers to the Crow Creek Sioux Indian Tribe.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Army shall reimburse the Crow Creek Sioux Indian Tribe in the amount of any money received by him from the said tribe as payment for the buildings referred to in the first section of this act: *Provided*, That such reimbursement shall not exceed the sum of $6,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDING CERTAIN PUBLIC DOMAIN LANDS IN NEVADA TO THE SUMMIT LAKE INDIAN RESERVATION

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3949) to add certain public domain lands in Nevada to the Summit Lake Indian Reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

APPROVING REPAYMENT CONTRACT NEGOTIATED WITH HEART MOUNTAIN IRRIGATION DISTRICT, WYOMING

The Clerk called the bill (S. 4088) to approve a repayment contract negotiated with the Heart Mountain Irrigation District, Wyoming, and to authorize its execution.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the contract negotiated pursuant to section 7 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 by the Secretary of the Interior with the Heart Mountain Irrigation District, which was approved as to form by the Department of the Interior on May 28, 1958, and approved by resolution of the Heart Mountain Irrigation District Board of Commissioners on March 20, 1958, is approved and execution thereof by the Secretary of the Interior on behalf of the United States is hereby authorized after the contract has been approved by the electors of the district.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HIGHWAY COMPACT BETWEEN MINNESOTA AND MANITOBA, CANADA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3944) authorizing the negotiation of a compact between the State of Minnesota and the Province of Manitoba, Canada, for the construction of a highway to provide access to the northwest angle in such State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WALTER. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs whether or not that great committee intends to report any passport legislation.

Mr. MORGAN. I will have a conference with the Speaker this afternoon. The committee has already reported a passport bill.

Mr. WALTER. I would like to call to the gentleman's attention an article that appeared in the New York Times several days ago.

[From the New York Times of August 18, 1958]

ROBESON, IN RUSSIA, CITES SOVIET AMITY

Moscow, August 17.—Paul Robeson called on the Soviet people today to fight for freedom. He did not specify what freedom or for whom, but he spoke and sang in general terms of man's right to be free.

"When I read in America about the sputnik," he told a concert audience here, "my thoughts went out to my friends, the peoples of the Soviet Union whose minds and hands have created this miracle, opening up to mankind the boundless expanse of the cosmos."

The American Negro singer is idolized in the Soviet Union for his voice as well as his leftwing views. He was introduced to a packed house of 12,000 persons at the Moscow Sports Palace as the Soviet Union's "great and dear friend" and as "a fighter for peace and friendship throughout the world."

It was Mr. Robeson's first concert appearance in the Soviet Union since he visited here 9 years ago. He has said he intends to make a singing tour of many Soviet cities before returning to the United States in October.

"The enforced 9-year separation grieved us, but we in the Soviet Union kept on fighting for restoration of your freedom and right to travel," the master of ceremonies said in an emotional speech at the start of the concert. He was alluding to the United States State Department's refusal until this year to give Mr. Robeson a passport.

"I am here because you helped my family and gave us strength," Mr. Robeson responded. "The fight for freedom goes on. A new world is coming."

His first song was My Motherland, a patriotic Russian song in which one line says: "I know no other land where people breathe so free." The recital included Negro spirituals, Russian folksongs, and John Brown's Body.

I am sure that few people get any comfort out of the knowledge that the Soviet Union participated in the activities on behalf of Mr. Robeson which resulted in his obtaining a passport. I predict that unless legislation is enacted that within the next few weeks literally hundreds of those people who are enemies of this great Republic of ours will be given passports, even if they only want them to demonstrate their ability to obtain them.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. May I advise the gentleman, in case I heard him correctly, that the House Committee on Foreign Affairs has reported out unanimously the passport legislation to which he refers. The difficulty is to get consideration on the floor of the House. I join the gentleman in urging the House not to leave here with our Government stripped bare of any authority in law to deny passports to these couriers and agents who are the essential means by which the Communist conspiracy is held together and operated. We should not go home until the Secretary of State has this authority in dealing with the applications of persons whose presence or activities abroad he can show in hearings, and in the courts if tested there, would be harmful to the security of the United States.

Mr. MORGAN. The Committee on Foreign Affairs on Tuesday ordered a bill reported.

The committee report was not completed until Thursday and not filed until Thursday afternoon. We had some conferences yesterday on when the bill could be called up, but the final decision has not yet been reached.

I myself favor the passport bill and hope it will be acted upon later today.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I want to join in the very strong statement made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Minnesota. It would be a crime and a shame for this Congress to adjourn without acting on this vital bill.

When the Supreme Court decision was handed down there were 65 passport applications pending from known Communists and fellow travelers; there are now over 300 such applications, and I predict that there soon will be over a thousand. If Congress adjourns without taking action in this field, these Communists, their sympathizers, fellow travelers, and their agents will be able to leave this country and go to foreign countries to get instruction in sabotage and other methods of destroying our Nation. They will be able to go freely and return freely bringing back with them their subversive tricks.

I sincerely hope that the passport bill will be brought up by unanimous consent before night falls. I cannot conceive of any Member of this body objecting to the very carefully worked out legislation which the Foreign Affairs Committee has reported out. They have considerably limited the recommendations made by the President in this field, but they have a bill which at least gives some authority to the Secretary of State to deny passports to the enemies of this country. I cannot conceive how anyone who has taken the oath we take as Members of Congress could oppose this legislation.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the State of Minnesota to negotiate and enter into a compact with the Province of Manitoba, Canada, for the development of a highway to provide access to the northwest angle in such State.

Such compact shall not be binding or obligatory upon the State of Minnesota unless and until it has been ratified by such State and by the Province of Manitoba and approved by the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEASE OUT FEDERAL BUILDING SITES UNTIL NEEDED

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3142) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to extend the authority to lease out Federal building sites until needed for construction purposes and the act of June 24, 1948 (62 Stat. 644), and for other purposes.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 210 (a) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U. S. C. 490 (a)), is further amended by—

(1) striking out, in paragraph (11), the word "and";

(2) striking out the period at the end of paragraph (12), and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and"; and

(3) adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(13) to enter into leases of Federal building sites and additions to sites, including improvements thereon, until they are needed for construction purposes, at their fair rental value and upon such other terms and conditions as the Administrator deems in the public interest pursuant to the provisions of section 203 (e) hereof. Such leases may be negotiated without public advertising for bids if the lessee is the former owner from whom the property was acquired by the United States or his tenant in possession, and the lease is negotiated incident to or in connection with the acquisition of the property. Rentals received under leases executed pursuant to this paragraph may be deposited into the Buildings Management Fund established by subsection (f) of this section."

SEC. 2. The Act of June 24, 1948, ch. 626 (62 Stat. 644) is amended by deleting the last sentence thereof in its entirety, and substituting in lieu thereof the following: "The rentals received pursuant to this Act may be deposited in the Buildings Management Fund, established pursuant to section 210 (f) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377), as amended."

SEC. 3. Section 210 (f) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377), as amended, is further amended by—

(1) inserting in the first sentence thereof, immediately after the words "buildings management operations and related services," the words ", including demolition and improvement with respect to Federal building sites authorized to be leased pursuant to section 210 (a) of this act."; and

(2) deleting from the third proviso thereof the words "shall not be available for expenses of carrying out the provisions of the Act of June 24, 1958 (62 Stat. 644), or section 5 of the Act of May 25, 1926, as amended (40 U. S. C. 345), and shall not be credited with receipts from operations under said provisions of law, or," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "shall not be credited."

SEC. 4. The third paragraph of section 5 of the Public Buildings Act of 1926 (44 Stat. 630), as amended by section 402 of the Public Buildings Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 199; 40 U. S. C. 345) is hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAND CONVEYANCE TO SUMTER COUNTY, FLA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 10614) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property in the State of Florida to Sumter County, Fla.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

AMENDING LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER], to submit a consent request.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 12728) to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, with respect to the payment of compensation in cases where third persons are liable, with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, my colleague from Minnesota will advise me that the situation is that this bill is not on the Suspension Calendar?

Mr. WIER. It is not.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. It has never been placed on the Suspension Calendar?

Mr. WIER. That is correct.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I withhold my objection, but still reserve it.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the gentleman to withhold his objection for the reason that this will probably be my last opportunity to speak on the floor of this House.

From the time I first came here, 32 years ago, I have been greatly interested in all that pertains to the welfare of our railroad workers. Throughout my entire service I have indicated that interest. One of the most pleasing feelings that I have as I leave this body and certainly a feeling of compensation, relates to the part that I have been able to have in improving the welfare of our railroad workers in their retirement, and, in times of disability and unemployment. Also in providing benefits to their dependents.

I regret that the situation is such at this time, from what I understand, that objection will continue to be made to the particular bill now before us which carries a Senate amendment that includes a railroad retirement bill and railroad unemployment amendments very much in the same form in which the bill was reported favorably by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House.

Personally, I think it is a good bill and should be adopted. I regret that with the objection being made by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA], and if persisted in, will mean the defeat of the bill. It will bring great disappointment to the beneficiaries under the Railroad Retirement Act and I wish it were possible, even in these closing days, that this very worthwhile legislation could have had a vote on its merits by the Members of this Congress and not be defeated by one objection. I am certain it would have been adopted.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for one in my position to adequately express his feelings on this occasion. As Members of the House know, and, as I have already mentioned, throughout my years of service one of my primary concerns has been the railroad retirement system.

In my many years of service in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce nothing has given me more satisfaction than to participate in the decisions which have resulted in the railroad retirement system. From the very beginning, we have nurtured this program until we find today an outstanding example of social insurance of a specialized character. In many ways the railroad retirement system has blazed the trail. Very often we have added new concepts to the railroad retirement system which have been adopted by other systems to the general advantage of our working men and women.

The bill which embodies amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act and Railroad Unemployment Act, which we now have before us as a Senate amendment to the Longshoremen's Act is a good bill. It has passed the Senate by an overwhelming majority, I think with only 2 votes against it and 80 in its favor. It provides a badly needed 10 percent increase in retirement benefits for all beneficiaries. Because of the constantly increasing cost of living, this increase is long overdue and badly needed. In addition to the 10 percent increase in benefits, other minor liberalizations are contained in the bill. A spouse's annuity is provided on a reduced basis at age 62. A person retired by reason of disability is permitted to earn as much as $1,200 in any calendar year before his annuity is affected; and other minor benefit increases.

The unemployment insurance section of the bill that has also been agreed to by the Senate and with which a majority of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce are in accord, will provide badly needed adjustments in this field. The railroad industry has an especially serious problem because of the number of long-time employees who have become unemployed. Men with as much as 30 and 35 years of service are being laid off. For this

reason, our bill provides extended periods of benefits for persons with 10 to 15 years of service and an even longer period of benefits for people employed more than 15 years. These extended unemployment benefits are both just and necessary. The rapid displacement of long-term railroad employees requires that these increases be provided. It is for this reason that the amendments are desired.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I want to assure this House that the bill before it is a fair bill and one which ought to be adopted overwhelmingly. I know of no better way for me to close my Congressional career than to urge upon you the principle that I have supported from the day that I first began my service—a sound and healthy railroad retirement system is a great bulwark in assuring the continued strength of our great rail transportation system and makes for the safety of the traveling public by continuity of service by railroad employees. Railroad men and women are among our finest citizens. They are good citizens and faithful employees. They are entitled to have their problems sympathetically and justly attended to. The House will have an opportunity today to take action on this very serious problem if no objection is made to the request that has been made by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER]. I hope that the objection will not be pressed and the legislation permitted to come before the House for a vote. It would be most unfortunate if one objection to consider the bill should, as under the rules is possible, prevent what I believe is the favorable opinion of at least two-thirds of the Members of this House. I do hope the objection will not be pressed.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am disappointed because it looks as if the railroad retirement bill will not come up for consideration. As I have said before here in the House, I do not believe anyone uses the railroads more than I do. I know the work these men do, I know the dangers they undergo through faulty equipment, and even in improper directions. I wish tremendously that this bill could have been passed. There is no more deserving group, and with the exception of the airplane pilots, no civilian group at the present time in the United States is in greater danger.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that there would not be an objection to the consideration under suspension of the rules of H. R. 12728 as amended by the Senate. The amendment contains the railroad retirement provisions which have had hearings during both sessions of this Congress by both the Senate and House committees and were approved by both Senate and House committees.

The passage of H. R. 12728 as amended which provides for modest but much needed help for more than 700,000 retired railroad men and women in the United States. The modest benefits provided in this legislation is urgently needed I can assure you. The opposition by railroad executives, in my opinion, comes with very poor grace. Just weeks ago these same railroad executives were appealing to the employees to help them because they claimed they were in dire need of constructive help. The employees through their representatives made an all-out appeal to the Congress and the result was that the railroad companies will receive material help through the Smathers-Harris bill. In their gratitude, the railroad executives are now bitterly opposing this much needed betterment of the Railroad Retirement Act.

Certainly the Smathers-Harris program will be in full operation by the time that this legislation will take effect; namely, July 1, 1959. The railroads will, therefore, be in a much stronger position at that time. The stock market indicates that the railroads are in a much stronger position right now than they were 90 days ago. Certainly the 10 percent increase is modest enough and is in reality only token recognition to the urgent need for improved benefits. Railroad employees cannot be blamed for the condition the carriers permitted themselves to deteriorate to and should not be further punished by having substandard railroad retirement benefits forced upon them.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me? The RECORD ought to show just what the situation is here.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the situation with which we are faced here today is that there was a railroad retirement bill introduced in the House. The bill was amended and reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It now rests on the calendar.

As I understand it, a similar bill was introduced in the other body, and reported by the committee. The other body took the bill up yesterday, I believe, and in an effort to get it considered, it was attached as an amendment to another bill referred to as the longshoremen's bill, is that correct?

Mr. WIER. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. The longshoremen's bill is a bill that came out of the Committee on Education and Labor, as I understand it. Consequently, the longshoremen's bill comes to the House with the railroad retirement bill which is similar to the bill reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It is attached to another bill which comes from another committee. This is an unusual situation that we find ourselves in at this moment. I think the RECORD should show what we have here at this moment and what the situation is. As a matter of fact, the railroad retirement bill is taken away from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and given to the jurisdiction of another committee. The House should understand this most unusual procedure we find ourselves in as an attempt is made to bring about the consideration of this important legislation.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, is it possible under the rules of the House to separate these two bills and consider them separately at this time

The SPEAKER. Not without unanimous consent.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that they be considered separately.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Minnesota yield for that purpose?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make another motion and to seek unanimous consent whereby this bill is sent to conference.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. WIER. That is the last motion I can make on the railroad retirement bill.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. That is the last objection I can make, too.

Mr. Speaker, as has already been indicated, a most unusual situation exists and because of the statements of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] and others, I feel that the RECORD should be made clear.

As the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] has indicated, railroad retirement and unemployment legislation is referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Amendments to the Longshoremens' Act are referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER] has asked unanimous consent to consider H. R. 12728 which was a bill to amend the Longshoremen's Act and when that bill was before the Senate it was amended by adding an amendment which included the Railroad Retirement Act, railroad unemployment amendments and other provisions.

Frankly, I do not see how anyone in the House can possibly know what is in this bill, regardless of statements made to the contrary. The amended bill was passed in the Senate only yesterday. We have no way of knowing whether there will be any time to debate the effects of this bill—either on the Longshoremen's Act or upon the Railroad Retirement Act. Both of these acts are very technical and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has for years spent many days in consideration of bills affecting the Railroad Retirement Act. For example, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce had hearings in both 1957 and 1958 upon bills affecting the Railroad Retirement

Act. A short time ago, by a majority vote of the committee, a bill was reported out of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to the floor of the House and placed on the calendar. It has never been listed for a suspension. At the time this bill was reported out, I was one of those who joined in filing minority views, which appear in the report accompanying H. R. 4353. I mailed to every Member of the House a copy of these views.

When any law is passed increasing retirement taxes, it imposes a further tax not only upon the rail carriers but upon the employees as well. As a matter of fact, railroads have opposed the imposition of further taxes this year and I have had many letters from employees of the railroads, likewise, opposing the increase in their taxes for retirement purposes. I am informed that the latest estimates by the Railroad Retirement Board indicate that total railroad retirement taxes presently paid by the employees and the employers are $575 million a year. The Board estimates that the taxes paid by both, as provided in the proposed measure, would amount to $689 million for 1959 or $114 million more than will be paid in 1958. Of that amount, the railroads' additional taxes would amount to 50 percent or $57 million. In addition, unemployment taxes paid by the carriers—and it should be remembered that the employees pay no unemployment taxes—will for 1958 amount to $115 million. For the year 1959, they will amount to $179 million or $64 million more in 1959 than in 1958. In other words, if this railroad retirement and unemployment insurance proposal would become law, the total railroad payroll taxes would next year be more than $120 million above those the railroads will pay this year.

Everyone recognizes that a majority of the class I railroads in this country are in very serious financial condition. The recent hearings before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce show that for the first 5 months of 1958 the net income of those carriers was only $72 million. Thus, the additional annual cost of the retirement and unemployment insurance proposal would be considerably greater than the net earnings for the first 5 months of this year. The record shows that 42 railroads operated at a deficit during the first 5 months of 1958. Certainly, the imposition of the very great additional payroll taxes provided in the proposal would drive some of these carriers into bankruptcy. Railroad earnings are off; railroad costs are up; railroad traffic has declined. Further, the maintenance program of the railroads by reason of the decline in earnings has been seriously impaired. Capital improvements—expenditures for additions and betterments—in 1958 will total barely half of the 1957 total. The financial situation of the railroads presents a dismal picture.

Railroad employment has declined to the place where the number of class I railroad employees for May 1958 was the lowest in this century. Increased operating costs in the form of payroll taxes will require additional layoffs, to the detriment of the railroad employees.

I have as deep and human an interest in the railroad employees as any Member of this House. Over the years, I have supported many of the proposals made by the railroad employees to improve the railroad retirement and unemployment insurance law. I have opposed legislative proposals which would endanger the soundness of the fund. I know it is easy for some to speak only of their love and interest for the railroad employees, but as responsible Members of this body we have to consider what is the practical situation not only for the railroad employees but for the rail carriers and the public interest as well. For example, if burdensome additional taxes were to be imposed upon the railroads, which would throw some of the railroads into bankruptcy, it could trigger off a depression which would be disastrous to this country.

Here we are in the last hours of the 85th Congress being asked to pass on this legislation, of which it is almost impossible to know the effects of the Senate amendments and the additional cost to the employees and employers. Passage of this bill at this time and under these circumstances would be legislative irresponsibility and against the public interest and the best interests of both the railroad employees and employers.

ADDITIONAL APPOINTMENTS AT THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY AND THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the action taken during the call of the Consent Calendar on Calendar No. 497 (H. R. 13226) be vacated and that the bill be restored to the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 7166) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

The Clerk read as follows:

PART I—AMENDMENTS TO THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT OF 1937

SECTION 1. (a) Section 3 (c) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "If the 'monthly compensation' computed under this subsection is not a multiple of $1, it shall be rounded to the next lower multiple of $1."

(b) Section 3 (e) of such act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"For purposes of this subsection the Board shall have the same authority to determine a 'period of disability' within the meaning of section 216 (i) of the Social Security Act, with respect to any employee who will have filed application therefor and (i) have completed 10 years of service or (ii) have been awarded an annuity, as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would have to determine such a period under such section 216 (i) if the employee met the requirements of clauses (A) and (B) of paragraph (3) of such section, considering for purposes of such determination that all his service as an employee after 1936 constitutes 'employment' within the meaning of title II of the Social Security Act and determining his quarters of coverage for such purposes by presuming his compensation in a calendar year to have been paid in equal proportions with respect to all months in which he will have been in service as an employee in such calendar year: *Provided*, That an application for an annuity filed with the Board on the basis of disability shall be deemed to be an application to determine such a period of disability, and such an application filed with the Board on or before the date of the enactment of this paragraph shall, for purposes of this subsection and section 216 (i) (4) of the Social Security Act, be deemed filed after December 1954 and before July 1958: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Board shall have the authority to make such determination on the basis of the records in its possession or evidence otherwise obtained by it, and a determination by the Board with respect to any employee concerning such a 'period of disability' shall be deemed a final decision of the Board determining the rights of persons under this act for purposes of section 11 of this act. An application filed with the Board pursuant to this paragraph shall be deemed filed as of the same date also with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the purpose of determining a 'period of disability' under section 216 (i) of the Social Security Act."

(c) Section 3 (f) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(f) (1) Annuities under section 2 (a) which will have become due an individual but will not have been paid at the time of such individual's death shall be payable to the person, if any, who is determined by the Board to be such individual's widow or widower and to have been living with such individual at the time of such individual's death and who will not have died before receiving payment of such annuities. If there be no such widow or widower, such annuities shall be payable to any person or persons, equitably entitled thereto, to the extent and in the proportions that he or they shall have paid the expenses of burial of such individual, and to the extent that he or they will not have been reimbursed under section 5 (f) (1) for having paid such expenses. If there be no person or persons so entitled, or if the total of such annuities excedes the amount payable under this paragraph to such persons or persons, such total, or the remainder thereof, as the case may be, shall be paid to the children, grandchildren, parents, or brothers and sisters of the deceased individual in the same manner as if such unpaid annuities were a lump sum payable under section 5 (f) (2).

"(2) Insurance annuities under section 5 which will have become due a survivor of an employee but will not have been paid at the time of such survivor's death shall be payable to the person, if any, who is determined by the Board to be such employee's widow or widower and to have been living with such employee at the time of the employee's death and who will not have died before receiving payment of such annuities. If there be no such widow or widower, such annuities shall be payable to the children, grandchildren, parents, or brothers and sisters of the deceased employee in the same manner as if such unpaid annuities were a lump sum payable under section 5 (f) (2).

"(3) Annuities under section 2 (e) which will have become due a spouse of an individual but which will not have been paid at the time of such spouse's death shall be

payable to the individual from whose employment such spouse's annuity derived and who will not have died before receiving payment of such annuities. If there be no such individual, such annuities shall be paid as provided in the last two sentences of paragraph (1) of this subsection as if such annuities were annuities due under section 2 (a) to an individual but unpaid at the time of such individual's death.

"(4) Applications for accrued and unpaid annuities provided for in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of this subsection shall be filed prior to the expiration of 2 years after the death of the person to whom such annuities were originally due.

"(5) For the purposes of this subsection and paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 5 (f) of this act, a widow or widower of an individual shall be deemed to have been living with the individual at the time of the individual's death if the applicable conditions set forth in section 216 (h) (2) or (3) of the Social Security Act are fulfilled.

"(6) If there is no person to whom all or any part of the annuity payments described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) can be made, such payments or part thereof shall escheat to the credit of the railroad retirement account."

(d) Section 3 (h) of such act is amended by striking out "$2.50" and inserting in lieu thereof "$5."

(e) Section 3 of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(i) If the amount of any annuity computed under this section, or under section 2 or section 5, is not a multiple of $0.10, it shall be raised to the next higher multiple of $0.10."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 5 (f) (1) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is amended—

(1) by striking out the first three sentences and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Upon the death, after the month in which this act is enacted, of a completely or partially insured employee who will have died leaving no widow, widower, child, or parent who would on proper application therefor be entitled to receive an annuity under this section for the month in which such death occurred, a lump sum of 10 times the employee's basic amount shall be paid to the person, if any, who is determined by the Board to be the widow or widower of the deceased employee and to have been living with such employee at the time of such employee's death and who will not have died before receiving payment of such lump sum. If there be no such widow or widower, such lump sum shall be paid to any person or persons, equitably entitled thereto, to the extent and in the proportions that he or they shall have paid the expenses of burial of such deceased employee.";

(2) by striking out "widow, widower, child, or parent" in the fourth sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "widow or widower"; and

(3) by striking out all of the fourth sentence beginning with "a payment to any then surviving widow" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "a payment equal to the amount by which such lump sum exceeds such annuities so accrued after such deductions shall then nevertheless be made under this paragraph to the person (or, if more than one, in equal shares to the persons) first named in the following order of preference: the widow, widower, child, or parent of the employee then entitled to a survivor annuity under this section."

(b) Section 5 (f) (2) of such act is amended by striking out "to the person or persons in the order provided in paragraph (1) of this subsection, or in the absence of such person or persons, to his or her estate, a lump sum" and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "to the following person (or, if more than one, in equal shares to the persons) whose relationship to the deceased employee will have been determined by the Board and who will not have died before receiving payment of the lump sum provided for in this paragraph:

"(i) the widow or widower of the deceased employee who was living with such employee at the time of such employee's death; or

"(ii) if there be no such widow or widower, to any child or children of such employee; or

"(iii) if there be no such widow, widower, or child, to any grandchild or grandchildren of such employee; or

"(iv) if there be no such widow, widower, child, or grandchild, to any parent or parents of such employee; or

"(v) if there be no such widow, widower, child, grandchild, or parent, to any brother or sister of such employee; or

"(vi) if there be no such widow, widower, child, grandchild, parent, brother, or sister, to the estate of such employee,

a lump sum."

(c) The first sentence of section 5 (h) of such act is amended by striking out "prior to" and inserting in lieu thereof "after."

(d) Section 5 (i) (3) of such act is amended (1) by inserting "and" after the semicolon in subparagraph (i); (2) by striking out all of subparagraph (ii) after "title II of the Social Security Act" and inserting in lieu thereof a period; and (3) by striking out subparagraphs (iii) and (iv).

(e) Section 5 (k) (3) of such act is amended—

(1) by inserting in the first sentence after "service" the following: ", of determinations under section 3 (e) of this act, or section 216 (i) of the Social Security Act, of periods of disability within the meaning of such section 216 (i),";

(2) by inserting in the first sentence after "this section" the following: ", section 3 (e) of this act,"; and

(3) by inserting in the second sentence after "therein" the following: "(except in the case of a determination of disability under section 216 (i) of the Social Security Act."

(f) Section 5 (l) (6) of such act is amended by striking out the parenthetical phrases in the first and second sentences and by inserting at the end thereof the following sentence: "Wages, as defined in this paragraph, shall be credited for the purposes of this section in the manner and to the extent credited for corresponding purposes of title II of the Social Security Act."

(g) Section 5 (l) (7) (ii) of such act is amended by striking out "40 or more quarters of coverage" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "either will have had 40 or more quarters of coverage or would be fully insured under title II of the Social Security Act if his service as an employee after December 31, 1936, were included in the term 'employment' as defined in that act."

(h) Section 5 (l) (8) of such act is amended (1) by striking out "will have had (i)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(i) will have had", (2) by inserting "either will have had" after "(ii)", and (3) by inserting before the final period a comma and the following: "or would be currently insured under title II of the Social Security Act if his service as an employee after December 31, 1936, were included in the term 'employment' as defined in that act."

(i) Section 5 (l) (9) of such act is amended—

(1) by striking out "quarter in which he will have died" each place it appears in clauses (A) and (B) and by inserting in lieu thereof "employee's closing date";

(2) by striking out the last proviso; and

(3) by inserting after the first sentence the following new sentence: "An employee's 'closing date' shall mean (A) the first day of the first calendar year in which such employee both had attained age 65 and was completely insured; or (B) the first day of the calendar year in which such employee died; or (C) the first day of the calendar year following the year in which such employee died, whichever would produce the highest 'average monthly remuneration' as defined in the preceding sentence. If the amount of the 'average monthly remuneration' as computed under this paragraph is not a multiple of $1, it shall be rounded to the next lower multiple of $1."

SEC. 3. Section 10 (b) 4 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is amended by inserting after the third sentence the following new sentence: "For purposes of its administration of this act or the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, or both, the Board may hereafter place, without regard to the numerical limitations contained in section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, 4 positions in grade GS–16 of the general schedule established by that act, 4 positions in grade GS–17 of such schedule, and 1 position in grade GS–18 of such schedule.

SEC. 4. Section 13 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is amended (1) by inserting "(a)" after "SEC. 13."; (2) by inserting ", or both" before the final period, and (3) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) All fines and penalties imposed by a court pursuant to this act shall be paid to the court and be remitted from time to time by order of the judge to the Treasury of the United States to be credited to the Railroad Retirement Account."

SEC. 5. (a) The amendments made by sections 1 (a), 1 (d), 1 (e), and 2 (i) shall be effective with respect to annuities awarded under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 on or after the date of the enactment of this act.

(b) The amendments made by sections 2 (g) and 2 (h) shall be effective (1) with respect to deaths occurring on or after the date of the enactment of this act and (2) with respect to any death occurring before such date if none of the survivors of the deceased individual became entitled before such date to monthly benefits, by reason of the individual's death, under title II of the Social Security Act.

(c) The amendments made by section 1 (b) shall be effective with respect to determinations of periods of disability, within the meaning of section 216 (i) of the Social Security Act, made on or after the date of the enactment of this act.

(d) The amendments made by sections 1 (c), 2 (a), and 2 (b) shall be effective with respect to deaths occurring in months after the month in which this act is enacted.

(e) The amendments made by sections 2 (c), 2 (d), and 2 (f) shall be effective with respect to annuities accruing for months after the month in which this act is enacted.

(f) The amendments made by sections 2 (e) and 3 shall be effective on the date of the enactment of this act.

(g) The amendment made by clause (3) of section 4 shall be effective with respect to offenses committed on or after the date of the enactment of this act; and the other amendments made by section 4 shall be effective with respect to fines and penalties imposed on or after such date.

PART II—AMENDMENTS TO THE RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

SEC. 201. (a) (1) The second proviso in section 1 (k) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by striking out "second" and inserting in lieu thereof "first", and by striking out "first" and inserting in lieu thereof "second."

(2) The second paragraph of such section 1 (k) is amended by striking out "one dollar" and inserting in lieu thereof "three dollars."

(b) Section 1 (q) of such act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "in the unemployment trust fund."

SEC. 202. Section 4 (a-1) (ii) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by striking out all that follows "sickness compensation law" and precedes the first proviso and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "other than this act, or any other social-insurance payments under any law."

SEC. 203. Section 8 (a) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following: "and in determining such balance as of September 30 of any year, the balance to the credit of the railroad unemployment insurance administration fund as of the close of business on such date shall be deemed to be a part of the balance to the credit of such account."

SEC. 204. (a) Section 904 (a) of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting after "the railroad unemployment insurance account" the following: "or the railroad unemployment insurance administration fund."

(b) Section 904 (e) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "and the railroad unemployment insurance account" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", the railroad unemployment insurance account, and the railroad unemployment insurance administration fund".

(c) Section 904 (f) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "fund as the Railroad Retirement Board" and all that follows and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "railroad unemployment insurance account for the payment of benefits, and out of the railroad unemployment insurance administration fund for the payment of administrative expenses, as the Railroad Retirement Board may duly certify, not exceeding the amount standing to the credit of such account or such fund, as the case may be, at the time of such payment."

SEC. 205. Section 11 (a) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by striking out the first sentence and the first two words of the second sentence, and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The Secretary of the Treasury shall maintain in the unemployment trust fund established pursuant to section 904 of the Social Security Act an account to be known as the railroad unemployment insurance administration fund. This unemployment insurance administration fund".

SEC. 206. The second paragraph of section 12 (l) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by striking out "Classification Act of 1923, except that the Board may fix the salary of a Director of Unemployment Insurance at $10,000 per annum" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Classification Act of 1949, as amended."

SEC. 207. (a) The amendments made by section 201 (a) shall be effective with respect to registration periods in benefit years after the benefit year ending on June 30, 1958.

(b) The amendments made by section 202 shall be effective with respect to days in benefit years after the benefit year ending on June 30, 1958.

(c) The remaining amendments made by this part shall be effective, except as otherwise indicated therein, on the date of the enactment of this act.

PART III—AMENDMENTS TO THE SOCIAL-SECURITY ACT

SEC. 301. Section 202 (t) of the Social Security Act is amended by changing the period at the end of paragraph (4) thereof to a comma and inserting thereafter the word "or" and the following:

"(E) the individual on whose employment such benefit is based had been in service covered by the Railroad Retirement Act which was treated as employment covered by this act pursuant to the provisions of section 5 (k) (1) of the Railroad Retirement Act."

SEC. 302. The amendments made by section 301 of this act shall apply with respect to monthly benefits under section 202 of the Social Security Act for months after December 1956, and with respect to lump-sum death payments under such section 202 in the case of deaths occurring after December 1956.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and the Social Security Act."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MORANO. I just heard it said that no further effort can be made to bring up the railroad retirement bill. As I understand, that bill, reported from the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, is on the calendar. After we pass a resolution in both Houses to adjourn sine die, can we then bring that bill up under suspension?

The SPEAKER. That would be a matter in the discretion of the Chair.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the amendments proposed by the bill (H. R. 7166) are technical and are designed principally to simplify and improve administration of the Railroad Retirement and Railroad Unemployment Insurance Acts. They would also correct certain inequities and anomalies, eliminate references to obsolete laws, and insure that the provisions conform with comparable provisions in the Social Security Act. This latter change is especially important because of the provision in the Railroad Retirement Act guaranteeing that monthly benefits shall not be less than would be payable under the Social Security Act.

This bill would not affect the cost of benefits under the systems in any significant amount. Actually, through the simplification and improvement of operations, administrative costs would be lowered.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

I. AMENDMENTS TO THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

Part I of the bill would amend the Railroad Retirement Act by making the following changes:

First. Computation of the monthly compensation, average monthly remuneration, and the amounts of retirement and survivor annuities would be simplified—sections 1 (a), 1 (e), and 2 (i).

Second. Payments of small annuities in the form of commuted lump sums would be made on the same basis for retirement as for survivor annuities—section 1 (d).

Third. Calculation of the average monthly remuneration would be simplified by using closing dates consistent with those provided in the Social Security Act—section 2 (i).

Fourth. The provision for maximum family benefits to survivors would be applied to the benefits remaining after work deductions have been made as in the Social Security Act—section 2 (c).

Fifth. The provision for deductions from benefits of lump-sum payments under the 1935 Social Security Act and of certain unpaid taxes would be eliminated—section 2 (d).

Sixth. The provision for crediting wages and self-employment income toward survivor benefits would be made consistent with the present language of the Social Security Act—section 2 (f).

Seventh. An employee insured under the Railroad Retirement Act would have an insured status no less favorable than under the Social Security Act—sections 2 (g) and 2 (h).

Eighth. The Board would have the authority to make disability-freeze determinations for career railroad employees with 10 or more years of service—sections 1 (b), 2 (e) (1), 2 (e) (2), and 2 (e) (3).

Ninth. Changes would be made in the order of payment of annuities to retired employees, spouses, and survivors which are due but unpaid at death—section 1 (c).

Tenth. Changes would be made in the order of payment of insurance lump-sum and residual payments—sections 2 (a) and 2 (b).

Eleventh. The penalties for false or fraudulent reports to the Board would be made consistent with similar provisions under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act and would be deposited in the railroad retirement account—section 4.

Twelfth. The Board would be authorized to establish nine positions in grades GS-16 to GS-18—section 3.

A brief explanation of these matters follows:

First. Simplification of computations: The method of computing benefits would be simplified by rounding to the next lower multiple of $1 the monthly compensation used in the computation of retirement benefits and the average monthly remuneration used in the computation of survivors insurance benefits. The amount of a retirement or survivor annuity which is not a multiple of $0.10 would be raised to the next higher multiple of $0.10. These changes would greatly simplify the calculations of the averages of earnings on which amounts of benefits are based. They would also make possible the preparation of relatively simple annuity tables based on the averages and other figures, thus eliminating the actual computation of annuities in hundreds of thousands of future benefit claims, and thereby speeding up their handling. The amendments would have a trivial effect on the amounts of annuities, either individually or in the aggregate, since the reduction of the monthly compensation and average monthly remuneration to the next lower multiple of $1 would be made up, substantially, by raising the retirement or survivor annuity to the next higher multiple of $0.10.

Second. Lump-sum payments of small retirement annuities: Under present law, a retirement annuity must be less than $2.50 before it may be paid in a single sum equal to its commuted value. However, a survivor annuity of up to $5 may be commuted. Under the bill, the same limit—$5—would apply in the commutation for both the retirement and survivor annuities. Actually, the provision would have little application, since only in extremely special cases would annuities in such small amounts be payable.

Third. Closing dates: Under present law, the closing date (that is, the date after which earnings are not counted) in the calculation of average monthly, remuneration is the first day of the calendar quarter in which the employee died or in which he reached age 65 and was completely insured. Under this bill, the closing date would always be the first day of the calendar year as under the Social Security Act. Conformity with the provisions of the Social Security Act would substantially simplify the computation of survivor benefits under the regular railroad formulas.

Fourth. Application of maximum survivor benefit provision after work deductions: Under the Railroad Retirement Act, the maximum survivor benefit provision is now applied before making deductions under the work clause. Under the Social Security Act, the family maximum is applied after the application of work-clause deductions. This change would create consistency with the Social Security Act and would also simplify application of the maximum provisions. At present, the social security minimum guaranty provision sometimes applies only because of this lack of consistency. The provision for calculating the minimum survivor annuity before making work deductions would not be affected. The principal effect of this change, therefore, would be to improve administration of the survivor benefit provisions by eliminating the confusion resulting from the conflicting treatment of work deductions in maximum benefit cases.

Fifth. Deductions from benefits of lump-sum payments and unpaid taxes: The bill would eliminate present provisions of the act which require deductions from monthly annuities of certain obsolete types of payments, such as lump-sum payments under the Social Security Act and of unpaid taxes for 1939 of employees over age 65. This change would agree with similar amendments in the Social Security Act, which were made because little or no basis for such deductions existed.

Sixth. Crediting of wages and self-employment income: The provisions for crediting social-security wages and self-employment income in the computation of railroad survivor benefits would be made consistent with the corresponding provisions of the Social Security Act as amended in 1954 by the removal of language made unnecessary as a result of such amendments.

Seventh. Insured status of employees: Under present law, there are some employees who are only partially insured at death under the Railroad Retirement Act but who, by reason of the new start provisions of the Social Security Act, would have died fully insured if their employment had been covered by that act. The amendment would provide for such employees to have a completely insured status under the Railroad Retirement Act, which is comparable to a fully insured status under the Social Security Act. This provision would be important, for practical purposes, only for employees whose total railroad service does not include at least 10 years of such service after 1936.

Eighth. Disability freeze determinations: The bill would transfer to the Railroad Retirement Board the authority to make "disability freeze" determinations under the Social Security Act with respect to career railroad workers, whose benefits or whose survivor's benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act might be affected by such a determination under the "overall social-security minimum" provision of the Railroad Retirement Act. This change would rectify the condition whereby the Social Security Administration was given the exclusive authority to make "freeze" determinations in the Social Security Amendments of 1954 with respect to career railroad workers whose rights to benefits otherwise were exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Railroad Retirement Board. This provision would, accordingly, avoid undesirable conflict on questions of jurisdiction and adjudication and further the general purpose of the bill to effect more efficient, quicker, and cheaper administration.

The condition to be corrected by the bill arose from the inclusion of the provision in the Social Security Amendments of 1954 (providing for these determinations of "freeze periods") to amend section 5 (k) (1) of the Railroad Retirement Act so as to give the Social Security Administration the right to use railroad service as employment qualifying a person for a "freeze period" and giving exclusive jurisdiction over the determination of such a period to the Social Security Administration. These provisions would be modified by the bill to permit the Railroad Retirement Board, as well as the Social Security Administration, when railroad service is used as qualifying a person for a "disability freeze" determination, to make the determination in the career railroadman's case, that is, in cases in which the railroadman had full 10 years' service before becoming disabled and possibly qualifying for the "freeze."

The career railroad employee with 10 years of railroad service who is totally and permanently disabled for all employment and would be qualified for a "period of disability" or the "freeze," would always, regardless of his age, be eligible also for a full disability annuity under the Railroad Retirement Act because the statutory definitions of the qualifying disability for both purposes are identical as a practical matter. The bill, consequently, would give the Railroad Retirement Board the same authority as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would otherwise have to make determinations as to a "period of disability" for the men with 10 years' railroad service. This determination would not be conclusive, under the bill, on the Social Security Administration, but for all practical purposes it would have no effect on employee benefits under the Social Security Act at any time unless the employee had already acquired sufficient service subject to that act to qualify him for benefits thereunder. The bill would not affect the jurisdiction of the Social Security Administration to make the "disability determination" for the employee, however, even though he had 10 or more years of railroad service, and even though he had already obtained the determination from the Railroad Retirement Board.

The essence of this disability freeze provision is to give the board the same authority as the Social Security Administration has to make determinations in these cases. The effect, insofar as the railroad retirement system is concerned, would be in the application of the so-called overall social security minimum provision of the Railroad Retirement Act under which benefits payable to an employee and his family cannot be less than the benefits or additional benefits that would be payable under the Social Security Act if his railroad service after 1936 were employment subject to the Social Security Act. The effect would be principally on the benefits to the survivors of railroad employees because survivor benefits are generally payable under the so-called social-security minimum, whereas the employee's own benefit, and that of his spouse, usually are not. As indicated, the only employees who would be affected by this change are career railroad employees, most of whom would have no service under the social security system and, therefore, no relationship whatever with that system. The determinations made by the board would be made at the time of the application of these career railroadmen for disability benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act. The Railroad Retirement Board would have all relevant evidence as to the condition of the employee as of the pertinent time, acquired for purposes of the application to the board for a disability annuity under the railroad retirement system. And since the bill would provide also that the application of such employee to the Railroad Retirement Board for the freeze would be regarded as filed with the Social Security Administration as of the same date, the employee would be spared the burden and effort of filing another application. The disability freeze provisions of the bill would add to efficiency and economy of administration, and would promote the interests of the disabled worker and his family without at the same time adversely affecting the jurisdictional authority of either agency concerned.

Ninth. Annuities due but unpaid at death: The bill attempts to simplify the treatment of annuities due but unpaid at death of the beneficiary by modifying the order of precedence in which survivors may receive them. A retirement annuity which is due but unpaid at death would be paid to the employee's widow (or widower) if she was living with the employee at the time of his death. If there were no such surviving widow (or widower) the payment would be made,

on a prorata basis, to the persons who paid the employee's burial expenses. Any excess over the amount of the burial expenses would be paid to children, grandchildren, parents, or brothers and sisters of the deceased employee, in the order named.

Payment of accrued survivor annuities would be paid in the same order as for accrued retirement annuities. However, no payments would be paid to persons who paid the burial expenses of the employee because of the difficulty of establishing the facts concerning payment of such expenses of an employee who had been dead for some time. Thus, the order of payment of accrued survivor annuities would be widow, widower, children, grandchildren, parents, and brothers and sisters.

Accrued annuities due a deceased spouse would be paid, first, to the employee himself, and next in the order specified for accrued retirement annuities.

Tenth. Insurance and residual lump-sum benefits: Payment of the regular insurance lump-sum benefit would be limited to the employee's widow (or widower) who has been living with the employee at the time of his death and who will not have died before receiving such lump sum, or to persons who paid the employee's burial expenses. No one else could receive the regular insurance lump sum. This change would eliminate payment of many small amounts to other relatives of the deceased employee (i. e., adult children, nondependent parents, etc.) which would generally become part of the residual benefit. The deferred insurance lump sum would still be paid to the widow or widower, child or parent of the employee; this payment is made when survivor annuities in the year following the death of the employee are less than the full amount of insurance lump sum.

The residual lump-sum benefit would be paid to a designated beneficiary as under present law, or if no beneficiary has been designated, in the order provided in section 2 (b) of the bill.

Eleventh. Penalties for false reports: This proposal is to require that fines and penalties, if any, collected for false and fraudulent reports be deposited in the railroad retirement account, and, in general, would conform to the corresponding provisions in the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

Twelfth. Establishment of supergrades: The Board would be authorized to place nine positions in grades GS–16 to GS–18. These would include 4 positions in grade GS–16, 4 in grade GS–17, and 1 in grade GS–18. This provision would enable the Board to compensate adequately persons in important and key positions which are vital to its operations.

II. AMENDMENTS TO THE RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

Part II of the bill would also make a number of changes in the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act:

First. Compensation for a working day, which includes part of 2 consecutive calendar days, would be considered compensation for the first day, instead of compensation for the second day as at present, and would result in no substantive change—section 201 (a) (1).

Second. The amount of earnings which may be considered as "subsidiary remuneration," and therefore not affecting payment of benefits, would be increased from $1 to $3 a day—section 201 (a) (2).

Third. The railroad unemployment insurance administration fund would be included in the "unemployment trust fund" in order to earn interest the same as the railroad unemployment insurance account—sections 201 (b), 204, and 205.

Fourth. For the purpose of determining the contribution rate for any calendar year, the balance in the railroad unemployment insurance administration fund as of September 30 of the next preceding calendar year would be considered part of the balance in the railroad unemployment insurance account—section 203.

Fifth. The disqualification with respect to any day for which an employee receives other social insurance payments would be changed to apply to such payments under any law instead of being restricted to State or Federal laws—section 202.

Sixth. The provision referring to the Classification Act of 1923, would be changed to agree with existing civil service law, and the provision for hiring a Director of Unemployment Insurance at $10,000 per annum would be stricken—section 206.

A brief explanation of these matters follows:

First. Compensation for overlapping shift: At the present time, compensation for a night shift which includes parts of 2 calendar days is defined by law as earned on the second of the 2 days. However, the general practice in the railroad industry is to consider that such remuneration is earned on the first of the 2 days. The change proposed would modify the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act so as to make it conform with the practice in the industry. This would eliminate misunderstanding which has caused difficulties and delays in obtaining information and deciding claims, and would not result in any substantive change.

Second. Subsidiary remuneration: Under the present law, an employee who earns not more than $1 a day for part-time or subsidiary work may receive unemployment or sickness benefits for that day if otherwise eligible. The bill recognizes the changes in pay scales which have occurred over the last 20 years, and would increase the amount of subsidiary remuneration permited for part-time work to $3 per day.

Third. Inclusion of administration funds in trust fund: The unemployment trust fund was established by section 904 of the Social Security Act as a joint fund in which State unemployment insurance contributions are deposited. The railroad unemployment insurance account is now part of this fund but the railroad unemployment administration fund is not. The bill would amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and where necessary the Social Security Act, so that the administration fund would be included in the unemployment trust fund. This would require the Secretary of the Treasury to credit the railroad administration fund with a proportionate part of the interest earnings of the unemployment trust fund. Such interest is not now paid although funds collected under the Railroad Retirement Act and not immediately needed for administration do draw interest. This difference in treatment of money collected under the two laws should be eliminated.

Fourth. Determination of contribution rates: At the present time, the unemployment contribution rate for a calendar year is determined from the balance in the railroad unemployment insurance account in accordance with a table in section 8 (a) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. The change proposed would include the balance in the railroad unemployment insurance administration fund as part of the balance in the account for this purpose. In other words, the determination would be based on all the money available for the system where now the administration fund is excluded.

Fifth. Disqualification for other payments: At the present time, an employee who is entitled to social insurance payments under the law of any State or of the United States may be disqualified for unemployment or sickness payments if he receives the other payments for the same days. This has proven to be a discrimination against United States employees as compared with employees in foreign countries. The bill would remove this discrimination by changing the disqualification to apply to other social insurance payments under any law.

Sixth. Reference to civil-service laws: The bill would bring the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act up to date by eliminating a reference to civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, and replacing it with a reference to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The section would also remove the statement that the Board may fix the salary of a Director of Unemployment Insurance at $10,000 a year.

III. AMENDMENTS TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

The restriction on payment of social-security benefits, which is applicable with certain exceptions to noncitizens of the United States who become eligible for benefits generally under the so-called new start provisions of that act, would be modified to exclude persons whose benefits are based in whole or in part on railroad employment through transfer of this credit to the social-security system. This transfer occurs where the employee does not have 10 years of service creditable under the Railroad Retirement Act. This amendment would affect principally Canadian residents employed by American railroads conducting a minor part of their operations in Canada and Canadian railroads operating into the United States. These persons are not those who come to this country solely to obtain advantage of the currently liberal eligible provision of the Social Security Act for persons at or near retirement age and return to their native land to enjoy the benefits, and against

whom the restriction is obviously directed. Rather, they acquire the credits through the demands of, and in the course of, their regular railroad employment instead of by special design to obtain social-security benefits.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to ask this question of my distinguished chairman: Is it not a fact that these technical amendments are those which have been recommended by the Railroad Retirement Board?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, that is true; the Railroad Retirement Board and the Social Security Administration itself.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. And the Social Security Administration.

Mr. HARRIS. These amendments are necessary to permit better coordination between the railroad retirement system and the social-security system insofar as railroad employees are concerned. It is agreed by everyone, and there is no objection. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

RETIREMENT FROM CONGRESS OF HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago we heard our distinguished colleague from New Jersey, during consideration of the Railroad Retirement Act, say that would be the last time, perhaps, he would have the opportunity to speak on the floor of this House. Of course, what he meant was that he was voluntarily retiring from the Congress at the end of this year. So, as we come to the close of this session of Congress, along with so many of my colleagues I wish to say to CHARLIE, "Good-bye, farewell to a friend."

CHARLIE WOLVERTON has served 32 years in this Congress, 32 years of distinguished service. He has been, with most of his service, a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce where he has rendered such outstanding service to the people of his own District, his State and to the people of America.

So, Mr. Speaker, as we come to the close of this session, I wish to say goodbye and farewell to our friend and colleague, CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, or as he is known affectionately to many of us, Mr. CHARLIE.

CHARLES ANDERSON WOLVERTON is retiring from the House at the end of this Congress after a distinguished service which started with his election to the 70th Congress and reelection for 15 succeeding terms. Of these 32 years as a faithful and effective representative of the people of the First District of New Jersey, CHARLES WOLVERTON also has served 28 years as an outstanding and effective member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It has been my privilege to have been a member of this committee since 1943, during which time CHARLES WOLVERTON has been either the ranking member of the minority, or has been chairman of the committee. I feel, accordingly, that I am well able to pay tribute to his record of participation in, and sponsorship of, noteworthy legislation which the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has considered, reported, and seen enacted on behalf of the public interest and welfare of the people of the United States.

Mr. WOLVERTON'S service with the committee early encompassed such significant legislation as the Securities Act of 1933 and subsequent laws pertaining to securities and securities markets for the protection of the investing public; the Federal Power Act of 1935; the Federal Communications Act; the Natural Gas Act; the Civil Aeronautics Act; the various Railroad Retirement Acts and Unemployment Insurance Act; and the Transportation Act of 1940.

CHARLES WOLVERTON has always been keenly interested in and participated actively in the various measures for providing and strengthening protection to railroad workers in their old age and in periods of unemployment. At the same time as an ardent student of transportation, he has sponsored numerous measures for making more effective our surface common carrier transportation systems, railroad, motor, water, pipeline, and freight forwarders. He early brought his rich experience and analytical mind to the problems of the growing air transport industry, and has been active not only in the promoting of worthwhile legislation, but as a delegate to the first International Civil Air Organization meeting in Chicago in 1944, member of the Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Air Policy, delegate to many of the conferences on air bilateral and international agreements, and practical observer in the field of practically all of the American and competing foreign air routes.

In communications, also, CHARLES WOLVERTON has left his imprint, not only in the form of legislation, but in active inquiry into the developments in the radio and television field, with particular interest in the speeding of color television, and in the comity of international utilization of the radio wave spectrum.

CHARLES WOLVERTON has had a continuing interest in the field of petroleum, and the adequacy of the supplies of petroleum for the needs of our economy and of our national defense. He participated in the studies of the Cole committee, in the initiation of the Connally hot oil legislation and interstate oil compact, and in studies of the United States interest in the development of an effective Mexican oil industry, greater supplies from the Western Hemisphere and Latin American countries, dependence upon Middle East and Far East sources for the needs of the United States and of Europe. His consideration of the importance of petroleum to the country has led him into the collateral fields of liquid fuels from shale and coal, with studies of such developments in the United States, Sweden, South Africa, and elsewhere.

CHARLES WOLVERTON'S inquiring mind and constant desire to serve the people and the Nation has led him into many fields. He was a member of the Colmer committee engaged in the study of our relationships from Russia and with Europe, and as a member of the Herter committee, had charge of the studies of the Benelux countries and France in the formulation of our program for the economic aid of Europe.

There is one subject, however, which perhaps has been the closest to Mr. WOLVERTON'S heart, and that is the subject of health and of science. CHARLES WOLVERTON is justifiably proud of his contribution to the creation of the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health, to assisting hospital and medical research construction, and to a better understanding of the major diseases of mankind. Mr. WOLVERTON'S holding of a series of hearings in the fall of 1953, at the time he was chairman, into the causes, prevention, and cure of our major diseases, conducted through different panel discussions in which the outstanding medical authorities of the Nation participated, will always rank as a milestone in the history of the committee. The method of conducting these discussions, the information made available to the public, and the avenues of further inquiry and study opened up for further pursuit on behalf of the public, have been most significant. CHARLES WOLVERTON'S interest has been unflagging, and his efforts to improve the availability of health care to the people led him into a survey of programs and activities in most of the countries of the world, on which he has reported to the country in a comprehensive treatise.

I believe that CHARLES WOLVERTON'S activities in the field of health legislation are perhaps most truly representative of the man to whom we say goodby today. Here is a man of genuine good will and a deep desire to serve his fellow man. In this service he has given of himself unsparingly.

I am confident that Mr. WOLVERTON upon his retirement will not lack in many outlets for his boundless energy and good will, and will find challenging things to do for the public welfare.

I am proud to be able to say to him today: "Goodby, Mr. CHARLIE, you are leaving a job well done. May God give to you the strength in years ahead to continue to render service to your community, to your State, and to the American people as a whole."

We call you CHARLIE affectionately. We on the committee know him as CHARLIE. He is retiring voluntarily after so many years of outstanding and distinguished service, and I must say personally that I regret to see him go.

He has been chairman during the years of Republican control of the committee of which I have the honor and the privilege now of serving as chairman. His service on that committee through many, many difficult and controversial problems, has been outstanding.

His wise counsel and advice to me, as I have tried to serve as chairman of the committee during this Congress, has been invaluable. I do not know of any Member with whom I have had the privilege and pleasure of associating, with whom I have worked together hand-in-hand, arm-in-arm, on many, many important problems and questions, whom I regret more to see leave the Congress than CHARLIE WOLVERTON.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman in the remarks he has made about our friend, CHARLIE WOLVERTON. I think in his retirement from Congress this body is losing a great Member and a great soul. A little bit ago I heard his remarks about a bill for the benefit of railroad workers, and it recalls to my mind what he has been throughout the years for the railroad workers. In his retirement the railroad workers are losing a great champion. In his work as a lawmaker for all of the people he has been without an equal. I regret to see him leave.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I am sure, has spoken the sentiments and the feelings of all members of our committee. Certainly he has spoken my feelings about our distinguished friend and colleague, Mr. WOLVERTON. All of us hate to see Mr. WOLVERTON leave the Congress. We know that in doing so however, that he will be able to enjoy some of the things that have been denied him because of his having been tied down to his work in the Congress. It is my understanding that he plans to do a lot of traveling which is the hobby that he likes best. So, to Mr. WOLVERTON, I say, "The very best of luck to you, Mr. CHARLIE; I hope that you and Mrs. Wolverton may enjoy many, many pleasant travels together in the years to come. You deserve nothing less than the fullest measure of happiness in your well earned retirement."

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. I should like to concur in what our chairman has said about the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON]. I do not have the words to express my admiration and feelings for him as a man. I have appreciated his kindness and his courtesy and willingness to cooperate with all the members of the committee regardless of their political affiliation for the good of the people of the country.

When Mr. WOLVERTON leaves the Congress the common people, the working people of this country, are going to lose a friend, a man who has dedicated his life to helping them. I say to him, Godspeed.

We have a saying back home that I think surely applies to Mr. WOLVERTON. It goes like this:

He believes in gentlemanliness—
Chivalrous, honest, courageous,
Clean-minded, God-fearing manliness.

He believes in Man—
The masterpiece of God's creation,
The finest of all fine things in this world.

He believes in God—
The Infinite Architect of the Universe,
The Compassionate Ruler of Destiny.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I certainly cannot let this opportunity pass without saying a few words about my very good friend CHARLES WOLVERTON. I wish I had time to say everything that is in my heart about him, but we would not be adjourned until way after Christmas if I did that.

I have learned to love CHARLIE WOLVERTON, I have learned to know him, I have learned to appreciate a man who has contributed a great deal to our generation and to our country.

It was my honor to attend a birthday celebration of his a few years back. At that time I had not known CHARLIE as long as I have now. I said then that although there was never a perfect man, CHARLIE WOLVERTON was a man who did not need what he did not have. I think those of you who have had the good fortune to know CHARLIE and to work with him will join in those sentiments.

CHARLIE, we know that you are going to be back with us here from time to time and we are looking forward to visiting with you in your retirement and getting your good counsel as we go along.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, some on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce are more fortunate than others in that they, like our distinguished chairman, have had the privilege of serving on that committee longer with Mr. WOLVERTON than we who joined the committee a year or two ago. One of the great privileges I have had in this Congress has been to sit on a committee for the first time with the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

It struck me as rather significant that in what he described as his final speech in this House he should have fought as best he could to do one thing more for a large segment of our population. This great committee on which Mr. WOLVERTON has served for so many years has had a tremendous impact upon the population of this country. It has handled legislation affecting millions of people. I am very sure that as Mr. WOLVERTON takes his ease in the years ahead he will be made happy by the fact that millions of people in this country who do not know him personally as we do will for generations to come feel the effect of his kindly hand upon their shoulders.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join in these tributes to our friend CHARLIE WOLVERTON. I have had the pleasure of serving with him in the Congress for the entire period I have been here, since he has been here a great deal longer than I. I have served with him and under him in the committee, where he has been my chairman and the senior ranking member of the committee.

I do not know of any more industrious and able Member of the Congress than CHARLIE WOLVERTON. I, too, am greatly interested in the problems of the railroad workers. I have supported legislation and I have opposed some of the legislation that has been proposed by some of the brotherhood leaders because I felt it would do damage to the soundness of the fund under the Railroad Retirement Act. I do want to say there is no finer friend of the railroad worker than CHARLIE WOLVERTON. I regret he is leaving the Congress because I know it will be difficult to replace him.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in these tributes to our beloved friend, a man with whom I have been closely associated and whose great friendship I have enjoyed for 32 years. CHARLIE WOLVERTON does not have an enemy in the world because everyone knows that they are sure of equal treatment and of justice from him. That lovely smile and gracious spirit of his are a true mirror of the man. The fact that CHARLIE WOLVERTON has been elected from the great State of New Jersey for 32 years is in itself a significant fact. It is an indication of the high esteem in which he is held by the people of his State. No man has ever been elected to the Congress from the State of New Jersey for that length of time. CHARLIE WOLVERTON can be justly proud of that fact. Few people realize how in his quiet and friendly way Mr. WOLVERTON has had a great influence not only in his committee, but also with respect to important legislation having to do with really great problems that confront America. Mr. WOLVERTON is without a doubt one of the best legal minds in this country, and the Congress of the United States will be suffering a great loss when he leaves this Chamber. CHARLIE WOLVERTON is a great American and a great legislator. He has been a very dear personal friend to me and I do hope that in the days ahead the greatest measure of prosperity and happiness will be his.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest privileges that I have enjoyed in my service in the House of Representatives is the privilege of serving under Mr. WOLVERTON on the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. A more kindly gentleman I have never met in all my experience. He has fought the good fight and has finished this course and he is certainly entitled to the fruits of his labors.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO].

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a privilege to say a few words on this occasion concerning the dean of our New Jersey State delegation who is retiring from service in this great legislative body. There is no finer gentleman in the House of Representatives and there is no one who has done a better job than CHARLIE WOLVERTON has done in the interest of his people. I want to commend him, as one who has sat on the other side of the aisle, for his deep and abiding interest in the constituency that he has served so well over such a long period of time. I know that I echo the sentiments of my colleagues on this side of the aisle—for all of us hold him in high regard and feel for him a warm and deep affection. As he goes from the House of Representatives, many of his friends here will be saddened, but we take joy in the knowledge that CHARLIE WOLVERTON will enjoy his retirement for many, many years to come. We wish all the best to CHARLIE and his family. May long life and happiness be his.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, CHARLIE WOLVERTON means a lot to me personally. One way of knowing a man is to work with him and associate with him, but to really know a man you have to travel with him and be together with him day after day.

So, CHARLIE, we love you and we are going to miss you. We know that you and your beloved wife are going to enjoy the retirement and rest which you richly deserve. May God bless you, and may you have all the health and happiness and joy during the remaining years of your life.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD, with reference to the retirement of our colleague from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, CHARLEY WOLVERTON has been an asset to the House ever since he became a Member many years ago.

He has shown intelligence on all occasions. Mr. WOLVERTON has been a patriot and a statesman during his years here. His nice and pleasing personality will be missed by us all and we wish for him pleasant ways in the coming years.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to our good friend CHARLES WOLVERTON, who is retiring from Congress on his own volition. I became acquainted with CHARLIE WOLVERTON when I first came to Congress. He took time to assist me and offer many valuable suggestions which have been most helpful. Congressman WOLVERTON has an outstanding legislative record. He is one of the hard-working Members of Congress. I have always appreciated his views and his opinion with respect to the many problems of legislation that have come to the attention of Congress through the years. CHARLES WOLVERTON is sincere. He is honest. He is truly a good man. He has all the qualities that make up a Christian gentleman.

I join in wishing Mr. and Mrs. Wolverton the very best that life can hold for them.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, when he was introduced at any gathering of the New Jersey delegation, especially when he was introduced as our dean, the Honorable CHARLES WOLVERTON always made it a point to make certain that everyone in the room mattered most.

That means that CHARLIE, with a chuckle, made you feel that you mattered, not he; that you were to leave the room the better for having heard him, that it was your presence that enabled him to be heard. You were to be the gainer.

And what happened? CHARLES WOLVERTON always drew top applause.

Like the Honorable Ed Hart, CHARLES WOLVERTON will long live in our memories as a brave and gallant dean of the New Jersey delegation.

Ever whimsical, courteous, tolerant and kind, ever mindful of unity in the affairs of our country, Mr. CHARLES WOLVERTON brought great distinction to our State. New Jersey is richer for the services of Mr. WOLVERTON in the House of Representatives.

May all that is good always be yours, CHARLIE, health, happiness, love and the esteem of your family, friends, and countrymen.

For in that rests God's blessing.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret the voluntary retirement of my genial, and very able friend and colleague, the esteemed gentleman from New Jersey, Congressman CHARLES WOLVERTON. Every time the House loses an outstanding, experienced Member, the Nation is the poorer, since it takes years to develop an effective Congressional leader.

CHARLIE WOLVERTON'S service in the House has been of highest rank. He brought great gifts to our councils—outstanding ability, a trained legal mind, a fine sense of fairness and justice, and a deeply sympathetic understanding of the problems of the people.

More than that he exemplified always that probity, kindness, industry, and willingness to give of himself in the performance of his duties, and amiable qualities of mind and heart, that won for him the respect, admiration, and love of all his colleagues.

CHARLIE WOLVERTON is a great public servant, an outstanding Congressman, and a great American, dedicated to his work, unselfish in his objectives, lofty in his concepts, loyal to his friends, and conspicuously devoted to his District, State, and Nation.

I greatly prize his friendship and wish for him in his retirement, together with his family, peace of mind, success in his endeavors, happiness, and the Lord's choicest blessings.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to CHARLIE WOLVERTON. I was indeed sorry to learn that he had decided to retire from Congress, and I told him that I thought it was a great loss, not alone to his District, but to the entire Nation.

I had the great pleasure of serving on the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee with Mr. WOLVERTON. I was very much impressed with his intimate knowledge of the many types of legislation handled by that important committee. It was a great privilege to serve on the committee with him.

Some years ago I had the pleasure of addressing a group of real estate men in his District. I shall never forget the gracious introduction that CHARLIE gave me. I have never received anything like it, before or since.

I wish CHARLIE WOLVERTON much happiness in the years ahead. I hope that he enjoys the retirement which he so richly deserves. I am sure that he will continue his interest in national affairs, and that he will always be found serving his fellow man.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I would like to join with the many other Members of Congress in paying tribute to one of the most able men in the Congress who is retiring from this body, the Honorable CHARLES A. WOLVERTON.

Few men have proven themselves more capable in the consideration and enactment of legislation than has our colleague during the past 32 years of his service.

An able lawyer by profession, he has rendered invaluable service in helping to form legislation, and has rendered outstanding service as a member of various investigating committees of the Congress.

He was an intelligent stabilizing influence, so much needed, as a member of the Committee on Legislative Oversight, in the Federal Communications Commission investigation, and also in the Goldfine case.

At the end of 32 years of service, he has decided to voluntarily retire. He will be remembered as a genial, Christian gentleman, and will take with him the hope of all of the Members that he will have many years in which to enjoy his retirement.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I pay this tribute to my very dear friend, CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, who is retiring from the House of Representatives at the close of this 85th Congress after a faithful service of 32 years.

It has been my privilege and pleasure to work closely with this outstanding gentleman on many, many problems affecting the Philadelphia-Camden area. He is a conscientious and indefatigable worker and no task is too great or too small for him. He always took great pride in helping the Federal workers in the Philadelphia metropolitan area and they will long remember him as a champion of their rights.

I personally have known Congressman WOLVERTON for the past 12 years and consider him a very close friend. He possesses those rare qualities that are found only in statesmen.

I am sure I am not alone when I say that he will be greatly missed because he has a multitude of friends. We all wish him the very best the future may bring.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in paying

tribute to the Honorable CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, of New Jersey, former chairman of one of the great committees of this Congress.

I know of no individual who has worked any harder or with greater zeal in behalf of his people than has CHARLIE WOLVERTON.

He has been especially interested in railroad retirement workers and his activities will be recorded in the history of this great legislative body. CHARLIE, we wish you and yours the best of everything.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in explanation of the bill H. R. 7166.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I think these technical amendments are much needed and will help to make the retirement system more efficient and less costly.

However, one responsibility bears heavily on this Congress and that is to pass a retirement system before adjournment. We have helped the farmer, the businessman, our civil service employees, social security recipients, and practically every other segment of society—except our railroad workers and their dependents. Our job is not completed until this has been accomplished. We cannot treat this group as though they were second-class citizens.

I believe every Member of this House wants to be fair; therefore, I urge each and every Member to remain here until a railroad retirement bill is passed.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken, and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, there is a similar bill on the Speaker's desk (S. 2020) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. I ask unanimous consent to substitute the Senate bill S. 2020.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

PART I—AMENDMENTS TO THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT OF 1937

SECTION 1. (a) Section 3 (c) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "If the 'monthly compensation' computed under this subsection is not a multiple of $1, it shall be rounded to the next lower multiple of $1."

(b) Section 3 (e) of such act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"For the purposes of this subsection, the Board shall have the same authority to determine a 'period of disability' within the meaning of section 216 (i) of the Social Security Act, with respect to any employee who will have filed application therefor and (i) have completed 10 years of service or (ii) have been awarded an annuity, as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would have to determine such a period under section 216 (i) if the employee met the requirements of clauses (A) and (B) of paragraph (3) of such section, considering for purposes of such determination that all his service as an employee after 1936 constitutes 'employment' within the meaning of title II of the Social Security Act and determining his quarters of coverage for such purposes by presuming his compensation in a calendar year to have been paid in equal proportions with respect to all months in which he will have been in service as an employee in such calendar year: *Provided*, That an application for an annuity filed with the Board on the basis of disability shall be deemed to be an application to determine such a period of disability, and such an application filed with the Board on or before the date of the enactment of this paragraph shall, for purposes of this subsection and section 216 (i) (4) of the Social Security Act, be deemed filed after December 1954 and before July 1958: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Board shall have the authority to make such determination on the basis of the records in its possession or evidence otherwise obtained by it, and a determination by the Board with respect to any employee concerning such a 'period of disability' shall be deemed a final decision of the Board determining the rights of persons under this act for purposes of section 11 of this act. An application filed with the Board pursuant to this paragraph shall be deemed filed as of the same date also with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the purpose of determining a 'period of disability' under section 216 (i) of the Social Security Act."

(c) Section 3 (f) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(f) (1) Annuities under section 2 (a) which will have become due an individual but will not have been paid at the time of such individual's death shall be payable to the person, if any, who is determined by the Board to be such individual's widow or widower and to have been living with such individual at the time of such individual's death and who will not have died before receiving payment of such annuities. If there be no such widow or widower, such annuities shall be payable to any person or persons, equitably entitled thereto, to the extent and in the proportions that he or they shall have paid the expenses of burial of such individual, and to the extent that he or they will not have been reimbursed under section 5 (f) (1) for having paid such expenses. If there be no person or persons so entitled, or if the total of such annuities exceeds the amount payable under this paragraph to such person or persons, such total, or the remainder thereof, as the case may be, shall be paid to the children, grandchildren, parents, or brothers and sisters of the deceased individual in the same manner as if such unpaid annuities were a lump sum payable under section 5 (f) (2).

"(2) Insurance annuities under section 5 which will have become due a survivor of an employee but will not have been paid at the time of such survivor's death shall be payable to the person, if any, who is determined by the Board to be such employee's widow or widower and to have been living with such employee at the time of the employee's death and who will not have died before receiving payment of such annuities. If there be no such widow or widower, such annuities shall be payable to the children, grandchildren, parents, or brothers and sisters of the deceased employee in the same manner as if such unpaid annuities were a lump sum payable under section 5 (f) (2).

"(3) Annuities under section 2 (e) which will have become due a spouse of an individual but which will not have been paid at the time of such spouse's death shall be payable to the individual from whose employment such spouse's annuity derived and who will not have died before receiving payment of such annuities. If there be no such individual, such annuities shall be paid as provided in the last two sentences of paragraph (1) of this subsection as if such annuities were annuities due under section 2 (a) to an individual but unpaid at the time of such individual's death.

"(4) Applications for accrued and unpaid annuities provided for in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of this subsection shall be filed prior to the expiration of 2 years after the death of the person to whom such annuities were originally due.

"(5) For the purposes of this subsection and paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 5 (f) of this act, a widow or widower of an individual shall be deemed to have been living with the individual at the time of the individual's death if the applicable conditions set forth in section 216 (h) (2) or (3) of the Social Security Act are fulfilled.

"(6) If there is no person to whom all or any part of the annuity payments described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) can be made, such payments or part thereof shall escheat to the credit of the Railroad Retirement Account."

(d) Section 3 (h) of such act is amended by striking out "$2.50" and inserting in lieu thereof "$5."

(e) Section 3 of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(i) If the amount of any annuity computed under this section, or under section 2 or section 5, is not a multiple of $0.10, it shall be raised to the next higher multiple of $0.10."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 5 (f) (1) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is amended—

(1) by striking out the first three sentences and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Upon the death, after the month in which this act is enacted, of a completely or partially insured employee who will have died leaving no widow, widower, child, or parent who would on proper application therefor be entitled to receive an annuity under this section for the month in which such death occurred, a lump sum of 10 times the employee's basic amount shall be paid to the person, if any, who is determined by the Board to be the widow or widower of the deceased employee and to have been living with such employee at the time of such employee's death and who will not have died before receiving payment of such lump sum. If there be no such widow or widower, such lump sum shall be paid to any person or persons, equitably entitled thereto, to the extent and in the proportions that he or they shall have paid the expenses of burial of such deceased employee.";

(2) by striking out "widow, widower, child, or parent" in the fourth sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "widow or widower"; and

(3) by striking out all of the fourth sentence beginning with "a payment to any then surviving widow" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "a payment equal to the amount by which such lump sum exceeds such annuities so accrued after such deductions shall then nevertheless be made under this paragraph to the person (or, if more than one, in equal shares to the persons) first named in the following order of preference: the widow, widower, child, or parent of the employee then entitled to a survivor annuity under this section."

(b) Section 5 (f) (2) of such act is amended by striking out "to the person or

persons in the order provided in paragraph (1) of this subsection, or in the absence of such person or persons, to his or her estate, a lump sum" and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "to the following person (or, if more than one, in equal shares to the persons) whose relationship to the deceased employee will have been determined by the Board and who will not have died before receiving payment of the lump sum provided for in this paragraph:

"(i) the widow or widower of the deceased employee who was living with such employee at the time of such employee's death; or

"(ii) if there be no such widow or widower, to any child or children of such employee; or

"(iii) if there be no such widow, widower, or child, to any grandchild or grandchildren of such employee; or

"(iv) if there be no such widow, widower, child, or grandchild, to any parent or parents of such employee; or

"(v) if there be no such widow, widower, child, grandchild, or parent, to any brother or sister of such employee; or

"(vi) if there be no such widow, widower, child, grandchild, parent, brother, or sister, to the estate of such employee,

a lump sum."

(c) The first sentence of section 5 (h) of such act is amended by striking out "prior to" and inserting in lieu thereof "after."

(d) Section 5 (i) (3) of such act is amended (1) by inserting "and" after the semicolon in subparagraph (i); (2) by striking out all of subparagraph (ii) after "title II of the Social Security Act" and inserting in lieu thereof a period; and (3) by striking out subparagraphs (iii) and (iv).

(e) Section 5 (k) (3) of such act is amended—

(1) by inserting in the first sentence after "service" the following: ", of determinations under section 3 (e) of this act, or section 216 (i) of the Social Security Act, of periods of disability within the meaning of such section 216 (i),";

(2) by inserting in the first sentence after "this section" the following: ", section 3 (e) of this act,"; and

(3) by inserting in the second sentence after "therein" the following: "(except in the case of a determination of disability under section 216 (i) of the Social Security Act."

(f) Section 5 (l) (6) of such act is amended by striking out the parenthetical phrases in the first and second sentences and by inserting at the end thereof the following sentence: "Wages, as defined in this paragraph, shall be credited for the purposes of this section in the manner and to the extent credited for corresponding purposes of title II of the Social Security Act."

(g) Section 5 (l) (7) (ii) of such act is amended by striking out "forty or more quarters of coverage" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "either will have had forty or more quarters of coverage or would be fully insured under title II of the Social Security Act if his service as an employee after December 31, 1936, were included in the term 'employment' as defined in that act."

(h) Section 5 (l) (8) of such act is amended (1) by striking out "will have had (i)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(i) will have had", (2) by inserting "either will have had" after "(ii)", and (3) by inserting before the final period a comma and the following: "or would be currently insured under title II of the Social Security Act if his service as an employee after December 31, 1936, were included in the term 'employment' as defined in that act."

(i) Section 5 (l) (9) of such act is amended—

(1) by striking out "quarter in which he will have died" each place it appears in clauses (A) and (B) and by inserting in lieu thereof "employee's closing date";

(2) by striking out the last proviso; and

(3) by inserting after the first sentence the following new sentence: "An employee's 'closing date' shall mean (A) the first day of the first calendar year in which such employee both had attained age 65 and was completely insured; or (B) the first day of the calendar year in which such employee died; or (C) the first day of the calendar year following the year in which such employee died, whichever would produce the highest 'average monthly remuneration' as defined in the preceding sentence. If the amount of the 'average monthly remuneration' as computed under this paragraph is not a multiple of $1, it shall be rounded to the next lower multiple of $1."

SEC. 3. Section 10 (b) (4) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is amended by inserting after the third sentence the following new sentence: "For purposes of its administration of this act or the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, or both, the Board may hereafter place, without regard to the numerical limitations contained in section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, 4 positions in grade GS–16 of the general schedule established by that act, 4 positions in grade GS–17 of such schedule, and 1 position in grade GS–18 of such schedule.

SEC. 4. Section 13 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is amended (1) by inserting "(a)" after "Sec. 13."; (2) by inserting ", or both" before the final period, and (3) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) All fines and penalties imposed by a court pursuant to this act shall be paid to the court and be remitted from time to time by order of the judge to the Treasury of the United States to be credited to the Railroad Retirement Account."

SEC. 5. (a) The amendments made by sections 1 (a), 1 (d), 1 (e), and 2 (i) shall be effective with respect to annuities awarded under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 on or after the date of the enactment of this act.

(b) The amendments made by sections 2 (g) and 2 (h) shall be effective (1) with respect to deaths occurring on or after the date of the enactment of this act and (2) with respect to any death occurring before such date if none of the survivors of the decreased individual became entitled before such date to monthly benefits, by reason of the individual's death, under title II of the Social Security Act.

(c) The amendments made by section 1 (b) shall be effective with respect to determinations of periods of disability, within the meaning of section 216 (i) of the Social Security Act, made on or after the date of the enactment of this act.

(d) The amendments made by sections 1 (c), 2 (a), and 2 (b) shall be effective with respect to deaths occurring in months after the month in which this act is enacted.

(e) The amendments made by sections 2 (c), 2 (d), and 2 (f) shall be effective with respect to annuities accruing for months after the month in which this act is enacted.

(f) The amendments made by sections 2 (e) and 3 shall be effective on the date of the enactment of this act.

(g) The amendment made by clause (3) of section 4 shall be effective with respect to offenses committed on or after the date of the enactment of this act; and the other amendments made by section 4 shall be effective with respect to fines and penalties imposed on or after such date.

PART II—AMENDMENTS TO THE RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

SEC. 201. (a) (1) The second proviso in section 1 (k) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by striking out "second" and inserting in lieu thereof "first", and by striking out "first" and inserting in lieu thereof "second."

(2) The second paragraph of such section 1 (k) is amended by striking out "one dollar" and inserting in lieu thereof "three dollars."

(b) Section 1 (q) of such act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "in the unemployment trust fund."

SEC. 202. Section 4 (a–1) (ii) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by striking out all that follows "sickness compensation law" and precedes the first proviso and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "other than this act, or any other social-insurance payments under any law."

SEC. 203. Section 8 (a) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following: "and in determining such balance as of September 30 of any year, the balance to the credit of the railroad unemployment insurance administration fund as of the close of business on such date shall be deemed to be a part of the balance to the credit of such account."

SEC. 204. (a) Section 904 (a) of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting after "the railroad unemployment insurance account" the following: "or the railroad unemployment insurance administration fund."

(b) Section 904 (e) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "and the railroad unemployment insurance account" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", the railroad unemployment insurance account, and the railroad unemployment insurance administration fund."

(c) Section 904 (f) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "fund as the Railroad Retirement Board" and all that follows and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "railroad unemployment insurance account for the payment of benefits, and out of the railroad unemployment insurance administration fund for the payment of administrative expenses, as the Railroad Retirement Board may duly certify, not exceeding the amount standing to the credit of such account or such fund, as the case may be, at the time of such payment."

SEC. 205. (a) Section 11 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by striking out the first sentence and the first two words of the second sentence, and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The Secretary of the Treasury shall maintain in the unemployment trust fund established pursuant to section 904 of the Social Security Act an account to be known as the railroad unemployment insurance administration fund. This unemployment insurance administration fund."

SEC. 206. The second paragraph of section 12 (l) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is amended by striking out "Classification Act of 1923, except that the Board may fix the salary of a director of unemployment insurance at $10,000 per annum" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Classification Act of 1949, as amended."

SEC. 207. (a) The amendments made by section 201 (a) shall be effective with respect to registration periods in benefit years after the benefit year ending on June 30, 1958.

(b) The amendments made by section 202 shall be effective with respect to days in benefit years after the benefit year ending on June 30, 1958.

(c) The remaining amendments made by this part shall be effective, except as otherwise indicated therein, on the date of the enactment of this act.

PART III—AMENDMENTS TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

SEC. 301. Section 202 (t) of the Social Security Act is amended by changing the period at the end of paragraph (4) thereof to

a comma and inserting thereafter the word "or" and the following:

"(E) the individual on whose employment such benefit is based had been in service covered by the Railroad Retirement Act which was treated as employment covered by this act pursuant to the provisions of section 5 (k) (1) of the Railroad Retirement Act."

SEC. 302. The amendments made by section 301 of this act shall apply with respect to monthly benefits under section 202 of the Social Security Act for months after December 1956, and with respect to lump-sum death payments under such section 202 in the case of deaths occurring after December 1956.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

FOOD ADDITIVES

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 13254) to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the use in food of additives which have not been adequately tested to establish their safety, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 21, after "act" insert ", the Poultry Products Inspection Act (21 U. S. C. 451 and the following)."

Page 15, line 3, after "to" insert "the Poultry Products Inspection Act (21 U. S. C. 451 and the following) or."

Page 15, after line 5, insert:

"SEC. 8. The annual rate of basic compensation of the Commissioner of Food and Drugs shall be $20,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS]?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman make a short explanation of the bill and the amendments?

Mr. HARRIS. This is referred to as the food additives bill, which passed the House a few days ago.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The amendments are germane to the bill?

Mr. HARRIS. They are.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 13254 is the so-called food additives bill which passed the House several weeks ago.

The Senate accepted the House bill in its entirety, and added several amendments, the effect of which is as follows:

First. Language added on page 2, line 21, and page 15, line 3, would exempt from the scope of the legislation substances already approved under the provisions of the Poultry Products Inspection Act. These exemptions would be in addition to those already contained in the bill as passed by the House for substances approved under the provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the Meat Inspection Act of March 4, 1907. This amendment is requested by the poultry industry and concurred in by the Departments of Agriculture and Health, Education, and Welfare.

Second. A new section 8 added by the Senate would increase the annual rate of compensation of the Commissioner of Food and Drugs from $17,500 to $20,000. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has suggested that in light of the scope and complexity of the program administered by the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, his salary should be increased as provided in this amendment.

Third. A new section 9 added by the Senate would amend section 208 (g) of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, to authorize the employment of key executive and administrative personnel in the Public Health Service, particularly in the National Institutes of Health, at a higher rate of compensation.

Section 208 (g) now authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish and fix the compensation, within the Public Health Service, for not more than 85 positions—of which not less than 73 shall be for the National Institutes of Health—in the professional and scientific service, to effectuate the research and development activities which require the services of specially qualified scientific or professional personnel. The rate of compensation for these positions is to be not less than $12,500 per annum and not more than $19,000 per annum, and these positions are subject to the approval of the Civil Service Commission. The Senate amendment would add "executive service" and "administrative personnel" to the "professional and scientific service" and the "specially qualified scientific or professional personnel."

This legislation, if enacted, would enable the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide adequate compensation for key executive and administrative personnel in the National Institutes of Health such as, for example, the Executive Officer of the National Institutes of Health, the executive officers of several of the larger institutes, and the officers in charge of research planning and scientific information. The amendment would not increase the total number of positions now authorized pursuant to section 208 (g) and would not modify the maximum salary limitations under that section.

This amendment has the approval of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Since the food additive bill, H. R. 13254, passed the House, I have received an inquiry as to how this legislation affects the packaging industry. Of course, packaging ordinarily is not intended or reasonably expected to become a part of food and therefore would not come under the bill. The term "otherwise affecting the characteristics of any food" refers to an effect not generally recognized as safe among experts qualified by scientific training and experience to evaluate the safety of food additives; but innocuous effects of packaging, such as protection from dirt, retarding moisture loss, preserving shape, providing convenience in use, handling, and storage, and the like, would not be covered.

AMENDING HOUSE RESOLUTION 149, 85TH CONGRESS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution, House Resolution 679, by direction of the Committee on Rules, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That House resolution 149, 85th Congress, as amended, is amended by inserting after "North American Continent," the following: "and elsewhere in connection with any study or investigation of ocean steamship conferences and the dual rate system."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out lines 1, 2, 3, 4, and down to and including the word "system" in line 5, and insert "That H. Res. 149, 85th Congress, as amended, is further amended by striking out the 1st sentence in paragraph 2 thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'For such purposes the said committee or any subcommittee thereof as authorized by the chairman is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories and possessions, within the North American Continent, or elsewhere when in connection with any study or investigation of ocean steamship conferences and the dual rate system, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary: *Provided, however*, That in no event shall the chairman designate more than 5 committee members and 2 staff members to proceed outside the United States on any one study or investigation of ocean steamship conferences and the dual rate system."

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time in order to inquire if this is not the resolution which would permit the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to travel abroad and to investigate certain activities in which the committee is interested.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I might make a brief explanation of what the resolution is.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I wish the gentleman would.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr .Speaker, as is well known, all legislative committees have the right to investigate matters within their jurisdiction, but only those which have a special resolution may travel outside of the continental United States.

A recent decision of the Supreme Court has caused some trouble among the steamship lines with respect to what is known as dual-rate contracts. It is going to be necessary to have some conferences between officials of various shipowning corporations, and it is going to be advisable for some members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee to attend those conferences. If they take place in the United States this resolution will not be necessary, but if they do not, it may be necessary.

In order that there may be no chance of criticism the resolution provides that the subcommittee that attends to this matter shall not exceed 5 members and 2 staff assistants.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And the resolution was reported, as I recall, unanimously by the Committee on Rules?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. It was supported unanimously by the Committee on Rules.

I know of no objection to it.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 4248) to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by creating a Coal Research and Development Commission, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the so-called coal bill?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, this is the coal research bill. It was based upon the study of more than 1 year by a special committee of the Interior Committee and then practically unanimous action of the Interior Committee.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Is this the bill that calls for $2 million appropriation the first year, $10 million the second year, and no one knows what for the years ahead?

Mr. EDMONDSON. The only determined cost in the bill is $2 million for the first year, with a maximum of $10 million for the second year.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. We had a minerals bill up here a day or two ago. This is not unlike that bill, as I understand. It provides for some kind of research, getting a little more coal, a little subsidy, or something.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, this is an effort to meet the basic problem of a great industry, the coal industry, that is in acute distress at this time.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I must object. This is a too important and far-reaching bill to pass by unanimous consent. It should come up under a rule or at least by suspending the rules.

Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

FEEDING THE FLAMES OF INFLATION—THE FREE SPENDERS—CONFUSING THE CAUSE OF INFLATION—THE LIBERAL NATIONAL PLANNERS

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, few subjects have been discussed more widely, complicated as much or so thoroughly trampled underfoot, resulting in intended confusion, by do-gooders as that of inflation. The subject is highlighted again today with the announced most recent increase in the cost of living.

In recent years, there has been a veritable mushrooming of economists of the self-styled liberal stripe who explain that inflation really has nothing to do with income or prices, but rather concerns total production and consumption of goods.

It should be understandable to just about everyone that recommendations based upon such unusual reasoning certainly should not be considered seriously unless subject to proof.

Nevertheless, these economists and would-be economists who dictate Democrat monetary and fiscal policy, sing this same tune in loud notes of *C* above high C.

The prescription they recommend as a cure for all our economic ills is not so involved as the theories behind it. Simply stated, it is: "Greater Government spending and sharply reduced taxes."

This, they believe, places more money in circulation, thereby increasing purchasing power and eventually, production.

Under this theory, of course, purchasing power should run ahead of production. To assume that the balance could be on the other side, is considered by them hearsay.

Of course, this philosophy does not allow for the inevitable bankruptcy of Government, nor does it take into account that which everyone except those of the far left recognize as true inflation—higher wages result in higher prices and inflation with no accompanying increase in production.

In the First District of Florida, as everywhere else in the United States, the people are more realistic.

The figures the people deal in are not imaginary. Many of these people perhaps do not have degrees in economics from our larger universities, but they have to confront such subjects in everyday true-life purchasing problems.

They know a dollar buys just so much; if it buys less, they suffer.

When their incomes are fixed and prices rise, they are caught in a real, rather than a theoretical, squeeze.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the definitions and conclusions espoused by these economic zanies calling for increased expenditures and cuts in taxes are certainly not ones I subscribe to, nor are they those of the American people.

I have found in the past that it is useless to even discuss this problem with those of the left, because they are masters of evasion rather than of economics, and are expert in vaguery rather than in fiscal and monetary matters.

It is unfortunate that these advisers to the Democratic Party are heeded at all.

Their rise, through the present majority in Congress, to such a position of influence in our Government, well could be catastrophic.

So let us examine for a moment some pronouncements and affiliations of a few of these proponents of socialistic economic theory.

The most swollen economic brain and also a leader in the party of the left, perhaps, is that of Leon Keyserling, who mouths his theories through such organizations as the Conference on Economic Progress, the Democratic Advisory Council, and the Americans for Democratic Action.

Even more vocal and of far greater power in liberal Democrat ranks, however, is one who has no grounding in the field of economics but has in Marxism and atheism.

He is Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers Union and strong man in the AFL–CIO.

Almost without exception, the recommendations of these two in the field of economics have been carried out to the letter by the majority Members in this body and on the other side of the Capitol.

There can be no question but that Reuther is one of the guiding lights of and greatest contributors to the Americans for Democratic Action. As a result, the edicts of this professedly anti-Communist group which coincidentally supports most legislation espoused by the Communist Party, are his own or bear his rubber stamp.

On July 6, 1958, Americans for Democratic Action strongly urged that Government institute a temporary tax cut of at least $8 billion in income taxes and excises and added, in the most serious tone imaginable, that Uncle Sam then would be in a better position to—and should—launch a gigantic spending program.

This greater spending of less money, Americans for Democratic Action insisted, should be devoted to socialistic programs for construction of schools, housing, hospitals, public projects and further ruin of natural resources and our social security system.

Americans for Democratic Action also said the Government should at the same time forcibly cut prices.

As the voices of Reuther and Keyserling are heard so often through Americans for Democratic Action, the Democratic Advisory Council, and the Conference on Economic Progress, so are

they heeded in many circles in the labor hierarchy.

Hardly a week passes that these same recommendations are not made through the columns of AFL–CIO News, official organ of the giant labor federation, and the UAW Solidarity, the tabloid which expounds Reuther's views.

By strange coincidence, no doubt, similar expressions may be found issuing from another quarter.

The loudly wept plea for a cut in income taxes and greater spending on "a program on a grand scale for development of public waterpower, flood control, and conservation projects, as well as the building of highways, schools, housing, and other public works" are common in leftwing newspapers and periodicals.

The quote I have just cited, for instance, was taken from the main political resolution of the 16th annual convention of the Communist Party, U. S. A., in New York, February 9–12, 1957.

Not all economists make these same recommendations, but there is enough variance in their views and approaches to accomplish complete confusion.

In the January-February issue of the Harvard Business Review, for instance, are two articles on the subject. The first, Is Management Creating a Class Society? by Benjamin Selekman, states that the solution to our inflationary problems is for management to understand and grant just about all the demands labor bosses make:

> It would be salutary if busines sexecutives conceived of unions as marketing agencies made up of men and women engaged in a common craft or industry who look to their salesmen (the Reuthers and the MacDonalds) to get for them the maximum price for their only commodity—skill—obtainable in the market—

Selekman wrote.

> Right or wrong, I am convinced that there is no way of stopping employees from expecting—indeed from demanding—a wage increase when the cost of living is going up. * * * They believe in and want a rising standard of living.

The other article in the Review was was written by G. L. Bach, who takes the position that there are so many confusing definitions and descriptions of inflation that it is difficult for most people to understand what it is.

Bach also takes to task some of the theorists who argue that inflation increases production.

As examples, he cites several European countries and the United States through the mildly inflationary period from 1952 to 1955. His study reveals that the largest increase in production and employment occurred in West Germany, which had no inflation whatsoever.

In Sweden, which had moderate inflation, production was lowest.

Italy, with fewer price increases than either Sweden or the United Kingdom, increased production more than either.

The United States, with no inflation, had greater increase of output than inflationary Sweden, but less than noninflationary Germany and the mildly inflationary Netherlands.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, it is time we stopped trying to confuse the people with so much double talk about a subject which is, in reality, and when translated into purchasing power and Government spending, very simple.

Everyone who has been in business or who has managed a household budget is aware of what happens to an economy when expenses and spending exceed income.

Stripped of the polysyllabic words and hazy reasoning in which most economists glory, that is exactly what has been recommended for us by the Reuthers, Keyserlings and others on the left side of the fence.

The problems created by our leftwing economists must be attributed at least in part to their ability to talk glibly and juggle statistics with all the dexterity of a sideshow plate tosser.

They can be particularly convincing when talking to those who are unfamiliar with the economic facts of life. Unfortunately more and more, ordinary citizens succumb to these arguments, convinced that the same frugality necessary to successful operation of the household somehow does not apply on the governmental level.

They have been told, and many of them believe, that Uncle Sam has a bottomless well from which he may draw money by the bucketful. It does not occur to them that these dollars are their own or that their children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren already have been doomed to pay for the follies of the last Democrat era.

They are unaware, also, that these same wild spending policies are being forced upon us today by the liberal Democrats in Congress who carry out the bids of Reuther and Keyserling.

At the 52d annual American Life convention in Chicago, October 7 to 11, 1957, Malcolm Bryan, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, ably put it in these words:

> It is well for us to remember, however, that the prescription (for economic well-being) involves issues of great significance to the American people. We are dealing with something a good deal more important than a clever effort to sell us a wooden nutmeg. The principal advocates of creeping inflation exhibit indefatigable energy, possess national—even international—platforms, have great skill in economic debate and are duly accredited purveyors of economic wisdom to the public mind. Their opinions thus begin to carry convictions in quarters where a natural and healthy intellectual skepticism would normally demand more rigorous proofs.

The horror of such practitioners being at large also rests in their ability to take sound Government statistics and twist them to their purposes.

They have, in the past several years, used mobile periods in a self-serving manner upon which to base their economics arguments. Thus, a dollar, which was worth a dollar in 1932, according to their arguments, still was worth a dollar in 1947, and today is worth very little less than that amount.

Actually, this sort of reasoning is as false as all other arguments of its proponents.

Franz Pick, in his book, The United States Dollar—Requiem for a Dead Half, does not go back to 1932 for a dollar value but bases his conclusions on purchasing power in 1940, when the New Deal had been spending full blast for 7 years.

"Whenever a currency loses more than half of its value in less than a generation, the unit is doomed," he wrote. "The United States dollar, in 17 years of unprecedented expansion of the American economy, has declined to less than half its 1940 buying power. This erosion cannot be halted."

Although I do not agree with Mr. Pick that this insidious destruction of the American unit of currency by Reuther, Keyserling and company cannot be halted, I am firmly convinced, and I think every American should be aware, that stabilizing our dollar, perhaps, is going to be the greatest and one of the most far-reaching battles of our history.

If we lose this fight, we shall have lost all. For just so surely as our major cities could be destroyed by nuclear weapons, just so certainly can the economic welfare of our Nation be ruined by inflation.

On Pick's basis of calculation, it is wrong for anyone to accept many of the figures presently offered as accurate. Consequently, reports which state that bank deposits at the close of 1957 were $231.7 billion represent double the amount actually held, and should be $114.6 billion. And, when anyone tells us that the amount of money in circulation at the end of last year was $31.8 billion, we should know that in reality it is only half that amount in 1940 dollars, he points out.

In 1940, we had a gold reserve of $22 billion. Today, it supposedly is $22.9 billion, a figure which would indicate an increase of $900 million in gold over a period of the last 17 years. Actually, today's gold reserves, based upon the 1940 value of the dollar, is but $11.2 billion, representing a loss of $11.7 billion.

As the gold and dollar supply has dwindled, so have all other articles upon which we are able to place a monetary value.

In short, we are headed toward the complete destruction of capital, a goal Karl Marx sought so eagerly.

The party which brought about this economic decline in the first place continues to work to accomplish complete financial destruction with a dedication bordering on the fanatic.

If we use Mr. Pick's yardstick—that the American dollar was worth 100 cents in 1940, which it wasn't—we may determine a proportionate value at the end of the New Deal-Fair Deal era rather simply by comparing the purchasing power of the dollar for wholesalers and consumers.

By 1953, the 100-cent, 1940 consumer dollar had slipped to 52.1 cents in value. The wholesale dollar had plunged to 46.3 cents. Combined, this would show a decine in the value of the American dollar by approximtaely 50 percent in 13 years, far less than the generation referred to by Mr. Pick.

Of course, Mr. Pick is one of the economists who recommend inflation in order to maintain high production and full employment. Consequently, in the opinion of some sound thinkers, many of his

conclusions are false, but no one can argue with his assessment of the dollar.

Certainly, though, most of us would disagree with his proposals for bringing about such a healthy state.

Many economists go Pick one better, assuming our American dollar was worth 100 cents as late as 1947 to 1949.

By this same reasoning, one could say that today the dollar is worth 100 cents, and could continue to make similarly reckless evaluations each time the purchasing power declines.

A more realistic appraisal would concern purchasing power of the dollar when Franklin D. Roosevelt assumed office and what it amounted to when free-spending Harry left the throne.

I am sure no one here would like to be bored or embarrassed, as the case may be, with a revision of the statistics I have cited on the basis of the purchasing power of the 1933 dollar. Suffice it to say Mr. Pick's studies are closer than most in this respect.

But if we rely on figures alone, regardless of dollar values, we find that Democrats increased spending during the Roosevelt-Truman era by 1,291 percent, and gave us only one balanced budget during that period.

By contrast, during 1947 and 1948, the only 2 years in which Republicans controlled Congress, the Nation experienced treasury surpluses.

Our cost-of-living index rose from 58.4 in 1933 to 113.5 in 1952 and our per capita national debt from $156 to $1,650.

It perhaps would be well to bring all these economic statistics into sharp focus so that they may be seen in true perspective by those who form our fiscal and monetary policies.

Individually, they already know that if they spend more than they make, they go into debt. They are aware that if a bank puts out more money than it takes in, it must close its doors.

They should, but apparently do not, know, however, that a government which spends more than its revenue also faces bankruptcy, but only after a painful course in which the taxpayer finds that his dollar buys ever less.

During this process, it is true, some may benefit. Principally, and notably, such beneficiaries are labor leaders who are able to spellbind their memberships with the argument that each year they are getting greater and greater pay and fringe benefits.

Actually, they are not, because the greater pay is in inflated dollars, which are worth less. So the labor leader benefits only by perpetuating himself in office through false and misleading arguments.

The working man is being blindly misled.

The other beneficiaries, as I have mentioned, are those whose principal desire—either consciously or unconsciously—is the disruption of our economy.

So Walter Reuther and Keyserling tell the liberals in the Democrat Party to support practically every piece of legislation which calls for greater spending.

And those whose political careers are so intimately entwined with the campaign contributions of Reuther's subservient horde, obey.

Sometimes, the legislation introduced by those in this wild-eyed group is utterly fantastic in the extent to which it would go to spend money.

One member of the liberal group on the other side of the aisle, during this session of Congress, proposed the expenditure of more than $114 billion in the next 10 years on aid to education. This, I might point out, is approximately 45 percent more than it takes to operate our entire Government—including the Department of Defense, our missile and satellite development, our entire foreign aid grants and loans, and all our agricultural subsidies—for a full year.

On the other side of the Capitol, the junior Senator from Wisconsin, elected to succeed the late Joe McCarthy in a campaign financed almost exclusively by funds from Reuther's helplessly enslaved union members, has consistently appealed through his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for economy in Government. At the same time, he was introducing legislation which would cost the taxpayer more than $24 billion additional for welfare state programs.

In this body, believe it or not, a bill was introduced to put the Government in the small loan business and calling for the lending of up to $1,000 to any and everyone who has a gross income of more than $2,000 annually, regardless of his credit. The sponsor of this measure told the Congress:

> The plan would: First circulate $10 billion within the economy at once.

He did not say how much more would have to be circulated after the period he describes as "at once" to match the inflationary spiral thus set in motion.

The Congressional Quarterly, whose editor, Nelson Poynter is a devoted follower of the New Deal-Fair Deal philosophy, has published a breakdown of House and Senate votes during the first session of the 85th Congress.

Mr. Poynter often has been challenged for allegedly misrepresenting such things in order to cast Republicans in a bad light, but never of doing the same thing to his fellow Democrats.

Nevertheless, the Quarterly shows that Republicans in this body supported 53 percent of the economy measures brought before Congress, while the Democrats supported only 29 percent of them.

As low as the Democrat average is even according to Mr. Poynter, it nevertheless includes the votes of supposedly conservative southern members of the Democrat Party.

On the basis of a survey of legislation introduced and made in May of this year with the addition of a few measures such as those I have cited, it is safe to say that legislation introduced in the Senate and this body by the not-so-frugal majority would, if enacted, increase our already enormous expenditures by $314 billion.

I can understand that such a figure is staggering to the point of being incomprehensible. For that reason, I shall put it another way.

Were all these bills introduced by Democrats who would have their constituents believe they are economically-minded enacted, the amounts would be the equivalent of the following:

Fourteen thousand, two hundred and seventy-two dollars for each of the 22 million children under 5 years of age in America.

Three thousand, three hundred and seventy-six dollars for each one of the 93 million persons who filed income tax returns in 1957.

Seven thousand, one hundred and thirty-six dollars for each of America's 44 million families.

One thousand, eight hundred and fifteen dollars for ever man, woman and child in the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, it is such wild-spending economic practices as these which have so drastically slashed the value of our dollar and which, if not halted, will reduce us to a completely bankrupt and inflation-rocked Nation within a few short years.

It is this theory that has so permeated the policies of the majority in Congress that in one day, Black Monday, August 18, 1958, under suspension of Rules of the House, were introduced liberal-inspired, free-spender-backed legislation that would, if not voted down by Republicans exercising fiscal responsibility, have cost the taxpayers of this country an estimated additional $5 billion.

It is this theory that caused this Democrat-controlled Congress to become the highest, most lavish spending Congress in the history of this great Republic—after professing just last year to be concerned about spending—overspending by billions the President's budget recommendations.

It is this wild theory that brought to the floor under Democrat sponsorship the following five bills as examples in the last 2 weeks of the 85th Congress calling for additional billions in Federal expenditures, which were defeated only by Republicans who refused to follow the New Deal, free spending line:

First. The farm bill, $2.5 billion.

Second. Public housing bill, $2.3 billion.

Third. Community facilities bill, $2 billion.

Fourth. Minerals subsidization, $500 million.

Fifth. Food stamp plan, $1 billion.

Thus, in the dying days of the session, and often under gag rules, the New Deal, left wing leaders have forced votes on every conceivable new Federal program, knowing full well that already the estimates of red ink spending for fiscal 1959 had reached $8 billion to $10 billion, exhibiting no spending conscience, and reckless disregard for the taxpaying public, the future generations, balanced budgets, further increases in national indebtedness and fiscal responsibility—let alone those who must live on fixed incomes who are the silent sufferers from the inflated dollar policy of this Democrat-controlled Congress. Only the Republicans stood firm against the spending of this additional $8.3 billion.

But the Reuthers and other labor bosses, the Keyserlings and those to the left of the center in Congress continue to shriek for higher Government spend-

ing, greater wage increases and fewer taxes.

And when the price index goes up and the value of the dollar goes down, they accuse industry of unnecessarily raising prices to consumers and ask for cost-of-living adjustments.

Reuther must know by now that his program has hurt the American automobile market and boomed sales of less expensive European cars.

Keyserling must be aware that the same thing is happening in other industries.

David MacDonald, of the United Steel Workers, should know that it is happening in the steel industry.

If they do not know these things, others do. In this connection, I refer these gentlemen, and those Members of this body who follow their economic theories, to an article written by Frank B. Hutchinson which appeared in the August 10, 1958, editions of the St. Petersburg Independent. It said, in part:

An inquiry by this column into steel purchases by steel users in this area brought forth some startling and sobering information.

Steel users in this area are turning more and more to foreign mills for their structural steel, reinforcement steel, nails, wire and bolts.

Before the recent price increases by American mills, local users were importing about 50 percent of the steel used for reinforcing concrete, between 25 percent and 50 percent of the structural steel and a big share of nails, wire, bolts and small steel items.

One big steel purchaser in this area told this column, "We would be buying all of our steel from Europe right now if it were not for the allotment system used by our domestic mills."

And what is the allotment system? This is a system of supplying steel in times of shortages on a basis of purchases in prior years. It is in a sense a threat of reprisal against those who import steel.

But even this strong persuader is not holding the business in the face of lower prices on foreign steel. And it is only natural to assume that the new higher prices charged by domestic mills will drive more users to the foreign producers.

Foreign mills are underselling American producers by big margins, and these lower prices are killing our exports even more certainly than they are hurting the domestic market.

Here is an example: On one important and standard steel item used in construction here, the price is $6 per cwt in Pittsburgh with a freight charge of $1.50, bringing the total to $7.50 delivered to St. Petersburg. This same item can be bought (and is being bought) for $4 in Germany and shipped here for fifty cents, making a delivered price of $4.50 compared with the $7.50 for Pittsburgh steel.

A Belgium mill has offered this same item delivered to Port Tampa, freight and duty paid, for $3.65 per hundred.

A relatively heavy user of steel in this area told this column that the cheaper foreign steel now being imported is up to American standards in every respect. "Now", he said "we can buy most anything we want from Europe and get low prices, good delivery and open-account credit. European mills now make structural steel to American standards and to American quality."

The seriousness of our situation is emphasized by the fact that even France with its known cartel operations, recognized poor management and unproductive labor, is selling steel in the United States in quantity, at a profit.

Not only is the price lower but the transportation costs are lower also for any area near water and are not out of line even for inland areas. Ocean freight on steel from Europe is 50 cents per hundred and the rail freight is 75 cents per hundred even from Birmingham to St. Petersburg.

Some fabricators on Florida's East Coast are now buying all steel from Europe and the same is true of some construction firms.

What is happening to steel is happening to automobiles and all our other markets where designing, self-serving, Marxist labor bosses force price increases on the consumer.

And it is happening in Government, because these same voices are joined by those of the Keyserlings, the theoretical economists and the legislators who heed both.

As I said earlier, I disagree with Mr. Pick's conclusion that our dollar cannot be saved.

But I realize fully that if we are to do it, we must ignore the Keyserlings.

We must legislate sensibly, we must exercise fiscal responsibility and recognize and encourage local and State responsibility rather than Federal domination.

We must halt price spirals at the source.

And most of all, we must cut short the political career of the most powerful man in the Democratic party today—Walter Reuther, who wrote from Moscow, directing his colleagues here to "carry on the fight for a Soviet America," and who has said he doesn't believe in God.

For he believes even less in our economic welfare or our national security.

It is my hope that the American people will culminate his bloody and lawless career at the polls in November by repudiating those public officials who work for him and otherwise do his bidding.

Then we all may join each other in ending inflation and rebuilding the dollar which he, Keyserling and the crackpot economists have torn down.

THE HONORABLE RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, THE HONORABLE JOHN W. HESELTON, AND THE HONORABLE DONALD W. NICHOLSON.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, one is always saddened when a good friend, an old friend, a true friend departs. Today those of us in the Massachusetts delegation are saddened by the loss of three old associates who are voluntarily retiring with this session of the Congress.

RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, a worthy son of a distinguished colonial family, is retiring after 30 years of brilliant and outstanding service in Congress. During the greater part of this time he was a valuable and efficient member of the House Appropriations Committee. In this service he saved the taxpayers many billions of dollars.

For 30 years DICK and I have been warm personal friends. We lived, in the days before his marriage, at the Racquet Club; and the friendship formed in his early days here was never interrupted or jarred—indeed our friendship grew stronger with each passing year. To know DICK WIGGLESWORTH was to have a profound respect for his ability, honesty, and sincerity of purpose, his rugged courage, and devotion to the welfare of his country. No more devoted or self-sacrificing man ever served in Congress than he.

Graduating from Harvard College and Harvard Law School, he has dedicated his fine talents like so many of his forebears to the public service. As a battery and battalion commander in World War I, an assistant secretary to W. Cameron Forbes, an outstanding Governor General of the Philippines, as a member of the legal staff of the Treasury Department working with the Debt Commission, as assistant to the agent general for reparation payments in Berlin, as Paris representative and general counsel for the organizations created under the Dawes plan, he rendered able service.

This outstanding war service, service in foreign affairs abroad, as well as his long legislative career have equipped him with a full knowledge of our national problems.

Certainly, his background would make him available for many important positions.

JOHN W. HESELTON, like so many of the sons and daughters of Maine, came to Massachusetts to enrich its industrial, professional, educational, and civic life.

Educated in Massachusetts schools, he served in the Army, as a town official, and an honored district attorney. Appointed to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, he contributed to the strength and wisdom of that great committee. His service here won him a host of friends who will sincerely regret when the next session begins that he will not answer to the roll call.

DONALD W. NICHOLSON came here after a long and outstanding service in both branches of the State legislature. His Boston experience, as well as his native ability, made him an influential and able Congressman from the very start. Solid as the Plymouth Rock, which symbolizes his District, he voted courageously for his convictions and what he believed was sound government. He believed in economy and fought vigorously the trend of higher spending. He will be badly missed.

Not only the Massachusetts delegation remaining, but the entire Congress regrets the departure of three popular and beloved Members. We all wish them the fullest measure of health, success, and happiness in the days ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I join with the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] in paying tribute to three retiring Members of the Massachusetts delegation: Congressmen RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, DONALD W. NICHOLSON, and JOHN W. HESELTON. All 3 have served in this body for a combined total of 58 years, and all 3 could have returned to the 86th Congress, because all 3 have

the trust and the affection and the high esteem of all of the people in their districts.

Their record shows that they have represented Massachusetts for a total of 29 consecutive terms, and a combined total of 58 years. Surely, this indicates the trust and faith which the people of their respective districts have in these three effective and productive Congressmen. Certainly, this demonstrates the confidence which Massachusetts has in their integrity and intelligence. Indeed, their tenure was one of service as well as sacrifice.

It is with sincere sadness and genuine sorrow that I bid them farewell. They will be sorely missed not only by the entire Massachusetts delegation, but also by every Member of Congress. I earnestly hope that their successors will be as great public servants as are these departing Members.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH was born in Boston in April of 1891. He was educated at Harvard College and received his law degree from the same institution.

Serving in France during World War I, he attained the rank of captain and became the commanding officer of an artillery battalion.

Later, he became legal adviser to the Secretary of the Treasury and was in charge of railway payments and foreign loans. From 1924 to 1927, he was assistant to the agent general for reparation payments.

On November 6, 1928, the voters of the 13th District of Massachusetts elected him to Congress where he has served for 16 consecutive terms and, if he so chose, he could return for the 17th in January of next year.

Mr. NICHOLSON was born in Wareham, Mass. In 1925, he was elected to the Massachusetts House of Representatives, and later served in the Massachusetts Senate from 1926 to 1947. I first knew Congressman NICHOLSON while I was a member of the Massachusetts House of Representatives. It was there that I gained firsthand knowledge of his fairness, his thorough knowledge of politics, and his true and real concern for the taxpaying public.

As you can see, I was extremely happy to join my good friend in Congress in 1952, where he has again demonstrated those wonderful qualities and standards for which he stood and was well known in the Cape Cod district of our Commonwealth. It has been a distinct privilege to have served with him for the last 6 years, and I am sorry to see him retire.

Mr. HESELTON was born on March 17, 1900. He was educated at Amherst College and Harvard Law School. During World War I, he served in the United States Army.

From 1932 to 1935, he was a selectman in Deerfield, Mass., and later became president of the Massachusetts Selectmen's Association. In 1939, he was elected the district attorney for the northwestern district in Massachusetts and in 1942 was reelected.

He quickly achieved the reputation as a skilled and articulate prosecutor. He was recognized as an outstanding lawyer and prosecutor in our area.

Mr. HESELTON represented the First Congressional District of Massachusetts which borders my District. I know from personal experiences that he enjoyed the reputation of being an able, intelligent, courteous, and effective Congressman. I consider it a distinct honor to have served with such an excellent man.

His independence of thought, word, and action won him many friends in the Congress as well as at home. His seven consecutive terms in this House attest to that fact. When he first came to the Congress, he won by 1,000 votes. After that his pluralities skyrocketed, indicating the kind of respect and esteem the people had for him.

I know that the people of the First District will sincerely regret that he chose to retire because he was a truly fine Congressman and a real gentleman. He will be missed by all.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the distinguished minority leader in the recognition of the loss of three distinguished sons of Massachusetts who have chosen to leave this House this year, the Honorable RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, the Honorable DONALD W. NICHOLSON, and the Honorable JOHN W. HESELTON. These three men are diverse in nature, but, nevertheless, all possess those uncommon attributes that have made them great and distinguished Members of this body.

I think in these closing hours of this session it is particularly fitting that we pause for a moment and offer to them and to their families our heartiest congratulations, our best wishes, and our felicitations for the years ahead.

I met RICHARD WIGGLESWORTH first of these three men, although I knew his name and I knew his fame long before I knew the man himself. Here in the Congress he has always been recognized as a hard, as a diligent, and as a constructive worker, and particularly in his committee, in the arduous job of studying the question of the Nation's defenses. And in this particular respect he has done a magnificent job.

Only a few months ago, Mr. Speaker, when he announced his retirement, the accolades which we read in the newspapers concerning him were a great tribute and a deserved tribute to the great work which he has performed here in Washington through the years.

DONALD W. NICHOLSON, a so-called son of Cape Cod, although he lives just west of the canal that separates the cape from the mainland, is a rugged individual. He is as rugged as that rocky coast whence he comes; a man of strong conviction and a man who, once he has made up his mind as to the right thing to do, is as immovable as the Plymouth Rock which is to be found not far from his home. But as strong as he is in his convictions, he has about him that quality which has endeared him to all the Members of the House who have known him. He has gone far in public life. As president of the Massachusetts Senate he was dearly beloved by all who knew him.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes I believe that DON NICHOLSON was perhaps a little happier back there in Massachusetts where he directed the Senate of Massachusetts. I know his heart has longed to go back to those places and those people who meant so much to him down through the years. I know that I personally shall miss him greatly, as will all the Members of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that in my tenure here in the Congress I have heard such a great tribute paid to any man as was paid to DON NICHOLSON when he had his cranberry bill before this Congress a year ago. More people were interested in the fact that it was DON NICHOLSON'S bill rather than the contents of the bill itself.

Our third Member who is departing, Mr. Speaker, is JOHN HESELTON. I have always had a tremendous respect for JOHN HESELTON. And as I shall recall him in the future, I will have more in mind the courage which he displayed in exercising the independent judgment that was his. I know that JOHN, in all of these matters, as divergent as his views might have been, always spoke his mind without fear or favor, with only one thought in mind, and that was to do that which study and which his own mind dictated.

So, Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the distinguished minority leader in saying farewell to these distinguished Members from Massachusetts. I trust that the road ahead for them will be pleasant. I hope that the opportunity will be afforded both to them and to their lovely families to have a respite from the arduous tasks which confronted them here in Congress and perhaps to make up for those sacrifices which they had to make in public life and do the things their jobs here precluded them from doing. They all have from me and my family our personal best wishes.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry to see DICK WIGGLESWORTH and JOHN HESELTON leave. My contacts have been more with DICK WIGGLESWORTH than with any of the others. He has been on the Committee on Appropriations with me almost all of his service.

I do not think anyone on that committee has established himself in a better position in the hearts and minds of the other members of the committee than he has. He was the best examiner of witnesses before the Appropriations Committee I have seen. He was a tremendous power in conferences with the other body. He has a very keen sense of the things that were of the most interest to and were the most valuable to the people of the United States. He has saved billions of dollars in the course of his service on the different subcommittees.

His crowning service has been as the chairman and later the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations. There he has met the tremendous load that membership on that committee entails, not only as the

ranking minority member but during the 83d Congress as its chairman. He has made a magnificent record and is going to be very difficult to replace. I wish him the best of everything in the days to come.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with all who have spoken and who will speak about these men who are leaving us, those Massachusetts stalwarts that we can ill afford to lose.

JOHN HESELTON I have known through his work on the committee. We worked very closely at certain intervals over the nursing problem and the health problem of the country. His deep sense of responsibility to the people of this country was outstanding in everything that he did and said. I feel deeply his going.

"Mr. Cape Cod." I was up there in his own District and had the privilege of speaking to a meeting that took place one night when the winds blew and the heavens opened, but nothing stopped his constituents from being there. He was so loved, he was so respected, that I came back feeling very happy that so many people should speak and act as they did towards Mr. NICHOLSON.

DICK WIGGLESWORTH is quite another thing with me because I have known him since his school days. He was a very close friend of my twin brothers-in-law. His name was a byword in our family. Then when he went down to Kentucky and did what the boys call cradle snatching we all took our hats off to him and to her because we knew what a very fine husband she would have. I am not going to repeat all the things that this very distinguished Member of this body has done in his long career of service. But, I hope in recognition of his fine qualities and his great capacity that he may be of still further service to the country that he loves so deeply. I will not say farewell. I shall only say, au revoir, auf Wiedersehen to these men. We hope to see them back here many times. We would like to feel that they are at the other end of the telephone. Surely, a letter will bring them close to us so that we can counsel with them on those matters that they know so well. To their families, I wish every joy of what is really a reunion because a man or woman who serves in this body has little time for family. I wish them joy, Godspeed and may Heaven bless them and theirs.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, JOHN W. HESELTON, and DONALD W. NICHOLSON are three Republican Congressmen who have served the people of their respective districts with a high standard of ability and integrity in the United States House of Representatives.

They brought strength and dignity to the Massachusetts delegation.

Although as a Democrat, I found myself to be on the opposite side of many issues I acquired a deepening respect as time went on, for the wide range of their knowledge, and for the faithful and conscientious manner with which they represented their constituents.

It was always a source of pride to me when they brought their talent and their prestige to the support of those measures that concerned all the people of Massachusetts.

I realize how much I am indebted to them for the facts and the reasoning that opened my eyes to the merits of the minority's viewpoint on important issues. As I know that the House as a whole depended on the quiet, thorough, and constructive contributions that they made to the committees of which they were members, and where so much of the enduring work of Congress is accomplished.

WIGGLESWORTH on Appropriations.

HESELTON on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

NICHOLSON on Education and Labor.

One does not observe men of their seasoned ability and judgment leave these key assignments, forever, without feeling that the loss of their services will be the Nation's loss.

Some Members are called from this Chamber by death.

Others by defeat.

But these three distinguished Representatives, out of consideration for the obligations they owe to their families, have decided reluctantly, and after serious soul searching, to retire from our National Legislature.

I know that it must have been a difficult decision to make.

In all three cases, they had grown to love this House, and its work, and the feeling of fulfillment that comes with the shaping of those laws that are responsible for the security and the progress of our free society.

They gave themselves unsparingly and with a devotion to their duties that was a great service to the Nation during a difficult period in our history.

As this is the last day of the 85th Congress, and the curtain closes on the Congressional careers of our three distinguished colleagues, it is with a feeling of regret that I speak of their voluntary departure from our ranks.

To those people whom we know and trust and admire, it is hard for us to face the inevitable time when they take leave of us and we say, "Goodby and good luck."

For then all our subconscious respect and regard for them struggles for open expression in words that never do justice to our true emotions.

As RICHARD WIGGLESWORTH, JOHN HESELTON, and DONALD NICHOLSON have decided not to seek reelections which were theirs for the asking, we want to thank them for their splendid services to the Nation, to Congress, to their constituents, and to us, their grateful colleagues.

I do not know how the Massachusetts Congressional delegation is going to get along without them.

But of this I am certain; that the friendships they made on both sides of the aisle will enrich their lives with happy memories, and frequent reunions in the years to come.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Ohio delegation, as well as myself, I have asked for these moments to join with the Members of the Massachusetts delegation, and the other Members of this House, to say farewell and Godspeed to the three Members from Massachusetts who are leaving Congress at the end of this session, RICHARD WIGGLESWORTH, JOHN HESELTON, and DON NICHOLSON. We know them so well we call them DICK, NICK, and JOHN. Each of them in his own peculiar way has made many great contributions to the welfare and for the benefit of their beloved country, as well as having given splendid representation of their own constituents.

DICK WIGGLESWORTH, as a member of the great Committee on Appropriations, has been one of the hardest working Members of the Congress for many years. He has contributed much to the fiscal soundness security of this country. One of the monuments to him which will stand as long as the Republic survives will be the outstanding work he has done in behalf of modern budgeting and accounting in the fiscal affairs of our National Government.

DON NICHOLSON, or "NICK," as we know him, served on the Committee on Rules, of which, I am a member. He is all granite; all hard rock; all hard head, all common sense, and all courage. He has stood only for that which he believed was right, and that is also the way he always voted in committee, on the floor of the House.

When JOHN HESELTON leaves, there will be another great void in this House. He has served well on the important Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I had the experience, in one Republican National Convention, of being on the opposite side of a political fight from JOHN, in which we were engaged as leaders of the two opposing groups. I never went up against an adversary who was more intelligent, more hard hitting, or more fair and honorable than JOHN HESELTON.

These three Members will leave the Congress knowing that they take with them the affection and the respect of all of us who have served with them. For each and every one of them, and their families, we wish only the best in the days to come.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Certainly I want to join in paying tribute to our three friends from Massachusetts who are joining with me in the graduating class of retirement this year.

I consider RICHARD WIGGLESWORTH, JOHN HESELTON and DONALD NICHOLSON my close personal friends. When you look into the background of each of these gentlemen you find they came here with a vast wealth of experience either in business, law, or other fields, that they had a rich experience before coming to Congress. With such backgrounds it is only natural that they should become

the outstanding Members of the House they were.

I always remember the first time I heard Mr. WIGGLESWORTH when he was presenting facts on appropriation bills. I felt that he knew what he was talking about. I found he was always well informed and was certainly a very able and valuable member on the Appropriations Committee.

As to JOHN HESELTON, it has been my privilege to serve with him on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce during his time here in the Congress. He is a conscientious, able, and industrious individual who has served with great credit and distinction on that committee.

As far as DON NICHOLSON is concerned, he is one with whom I enjoy visiting. I admire his logic and good common sense. The contribution he has made to the proceedings of this House has been a splendid one.

Mr. Speaker, let me say to each of these departing colleagues that I extend to them and to their families my very cordial best wishes for a happy existence, of many years' happy retirement, and the hope that I may join them from time to time in some social function.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I join with our distinguished minority leader in what he has had to say about our three distinguished colleagues who are voluntarily resigning from this body. We are all going to miss them.

I have had the privilege of knowing DICK WIGGLESWORTH for the past 12 years since I have been a member of the Appropriations Committee, and I want to reiterate what I think former Speaker MARTIN said, that certainly in all the years he has served on the Appropriations Committee, the taxpayers of this country can say that he has saved them literally millions and millions of dollars. I think that is a wonderful record to have established, and I know the taxpayers of the country are going to miss him.

JOHN HESELTON I count as one of the most valuable Members. JOHN HESELTON is responsible for much of the health legislation this country is noted for today, because of the leadership that he has shown in sponsoring health legislation as a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I certainly am going to miss him.

And there I see old NICK sitting there, Congressman NICHOLSON. I certainly am going to miss him because he comes from a neighboring State. I have found NICK to be one of the most valued Members of this Congress. He is certainly one of the most experienced legislators I have ever associated with.

There is one experience I shall never forget, and that is that in the 83d Congress when we had bills on the floor in which I was interested DON NICHOLSON happened to be in the chair. I found him to be one of the best presiding officers I have worked under in the House of Representatives.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I cannot let this occasion go by without joining the minority leader and my colleagues in paying tribute to these three fine Congressmen from the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and expressing my regret that they have decided not to seek reelection.

I have known RICHARD WIGGLESWORTH for many years, and JOHN HESELTON ever since I came to the Congress.

DONALD NICHOLSON is, in a sense, almost my Congressman, because he represents the district in Massachusetts from which my mother's family all came.

All three of these gentlemen have been a help to me personally.

Their fairness, their knowledge of the subject, the fact that they never spoke unless they had something of real importance to say, are certainly things that we can all profit by. I think that I have.

Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that we have lost their services entirely because I know very well that men of their attainments will always put themselves at the disposal of their country. I am equally sure that their country is going to need their services.

So, to them and to their families, I would like to say, "Thank you for the time you have spent here. May you prosper on the road ahead and may you go on, as I believe you will, from strength to strength in the service of our country."

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am very much honored and proud to join my distinguished friend, the minority leader, and other colleagues, in paying tribute to our three great sons of Massachusetts who are leaving the Congress at the end of this session.

It is very true that a great democratic Government like ours depends for its success upon the dedicated service of talented and patriotic public servants.

In that sense, like every other Member of the House, I deeply regret the voluntary retirement from this great body of JOHN HESELTON, DICK WIGGLESWORTH, and DON NICHOLSON—men of probity, ability, and achievement. In another sense, because of my very close friendship with each one of these outstanding Members of the House, I am personally and deeply touched by the fact that they have decided of their own volition to leave us at the end of this session. We will miss them immeasurably.

JOHN HESELTON has had a most distinguished public career. Admirably trained for the public service, gifted lawyer, and for years a most able prosecutor of his county, during his tenure in this House he has made an enviable record. He has been a tower of strength in this House.

Possessed of great ability, a sharp, penetrating legal mind, and an understanding of humane values, kindly and courageous, his service here has marked him as one of our most valuable Members. His gracious wife, Libby, is one of the most remarkable and capable personal assistants to a Member that I have known during my service in Congress. Like her brilliant husband, she has endeared herself to all of us.

We will certainly miss JOHN and Libby in the next session, and I earnestly hope that they will continue to keep in touch with us, and that all their future days may be bright and happy.

DICK WIGGLESWORTH is another cherished colleague, whom we will greatly miss. He has been my personal friend since my college days, when he was an outstanding young lawyer, and an outstanding coach and strategist of the Harvard football team, of which I was a member.

His training for Congress was superb. Widely recognized as a brilliant, accomplished lawyer, his service here has been noteworthy and distinguished. Able, diligent, and painstaking, and possessed of special talents in financial and fiscal matters, DICK WIGGLESWORTH has gained renown as one of the best minds and hardest workers of our great Appropriations Committee and the Congress.

His charming wife has been a true inspiration to him and is highly regarded by all of our membership.

We will surely miss DICK and Mrs. Wigglesworth in our midst, and hope that they will be very successful and happy in their new post of diplomatic responsibility, which is already beckoning, and will afford DICK an additional opportunity to serve the Nation ably and faithfully in another important field of high public duty.

I have been particularly close to DONALD NICHOLSON, or NICK, as he is affectionately known to us in the House. He is in truth the leading and most distinguished citizen of beautiful, historic Cape Cod, and his charming and lovely wife, Ethel, a loyal helpmate, and a devoted mother, is loved and esteemed by everyone who knows her.

Before he came to Congress, NICK had carved for himself an illustrious niche in the service of our great Commonwealth of Massachusetts, where for years he served as a powerful leader of our great general courts, with outstanding distinction. Trained and long experienced in public affairs, he brought to the Congress not only special aptitude and the great ability to cope with the daily problems of his lofty office, but a stanch, unwavering Americanism and deep convictions on public questions that always remain unshaken. NICK is a Bunker Hill American whose undiluted patriotism illuminated this Chamber.

Most diligent in the performance of his duties, I doubt that he has missed hardly a rollcall or a quorum call in the time that he has been in Congress. Popular in the House, beloved and respected by our Members, he was effective in getting things done for his District, and many of us will never forget the amazing favorable results, which he achieved in passing legislation through the House in behalf of the cranberry growers of Cape Cod. His achievements here were many

and meaningful for his constituency, State and Nation.

NICK, like our other departing colleagues, has the deep affection, respect and admiration of the House. It was my privilege to sit near him in many of our daily sessions, and he and Mrs. Nicholson are very dear indeed to my heart.

I am sorry to see them leaving Washington, and I hope and pray that they may have every measure of success, prosperity, and happiness in the future.

To all of these beloved colleagues, I extend my hearty congratulations upon the completion of their outstanding service in the House. To them and to their wives and families, deeply regretting their departure as I do, I express my sincere appreciation for their warm and magnificent friendship and wish for them in the years ahead the choicest and richest blessings that the good Lord may bestow upon them.

The inspiring legacy of able, devoted, effective service which these great Americans from Massachusetts have inscribed in the annals of this great legislative body will long remain with us as exemplary of the Nations proudest traditions.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, it has been a privilege to serve in the House of Representatives and to come to know and work with the three fine gentlemen from Massachusetts who are retiring this year from Congress. Certainly no one could say that in voting or in viewpoint there was any great similarity between the three except that in common they are men of great conscientiousness, ability, and character. I think rugged individualism is what they typify and that is the characteristic of its people and leaders which has made the United States great.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the State of Massachusetts cannot fully fill their places because the knowledge and value of experience is too necessary to the task of fully carrying out the responsibilities of the office of Representative in Congress. No persons are indispensable, but the voluntary retirement of RICHARD WIGGLESWORTH, DONALD NICHOLSON, and JOHN HESELTON is as severe a loss to the Nation and their State as one could contemplate under these circumstances.

I can say that in contact in voting and debating issues as we do during these sessions I personally have gained because of association with all three men. Like others here today who hope to return next year, I wish them well and hope to be here and that in the future they will often exercise their prerogative and come back to this Chamber and sit with us.

However, Mr. Speaker, wherever any 1 of the 3 goes, wherever any one of them is to be found, I am sure he will be engaged in a constructive occupation. Old Congressmen are not like generals, their interest and public service continues. They do not even fade.

I join in saying to DICK, NICK, and JOHN, "Well done and good luck."

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep and sincere regret that the decision of JOHN W. HESELTON not to be a candidate for reelection will take from the House a man of rare ability and strong character.

It has been my privilege to meet and associate with many men in my 50 years and more of public life. In many instances they have been men of great ability and honesty of purpose, but, with all the sincerity that I possess I must admit that I have never met a man of stronger character, stronger convictions as to what constituted right and wrong, more firmly dedicated to what was right, or more unswerving in condemnation of what was wrong. His life and conduct has been one of uprightness and complete dedication to right and justice. Never have I known him to deviate in the slightest degree from what was right. He has always been kind and considerate in his judgment and attitude toward others. I shall miss association with him more than he will realize. I regret most sincerely that the House after the close of this session will lose the ability and good influence that has marked the 14 years of service in that body of JOHN HESELTON.

With a wide background of education and experience before he came to Congress, he was well equipped to render outstanding service. As a graduate of Harvard Law School, he was well grounded in the basic and fundamental principles of the law. This knowledge was time and again shown to great advantage in his work in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as well as on the floor of the House. Added to this ability he was a prodigious and untiring worker. Frequently I was astounded at the great amount of research work he did in connection with the important matters before the great committee of which he was a member. There were times, I am sure, that he must have used a good portion of the night to dig deep in his effort to gain all available facts that would have a bearing on the issues that would be considered the following day in committee or on the floor of the House.

At all times he was zealous in protecting and advancing the interests of the District which he considered it an honor to represent. He was also always keen in every effort to promote the welfare of our Nation and its people.

Furthermore, it has seemed to me that he gained much in his experience as a public prosecutor that enabled him to understand the motives, right and wrong, that influenced his fellow men in their conduct, and thus he gained an understanding of human nature that enabled him to have a kindly feeling toward all with whom he associated.

It is these elements—ability, character, and kindness—that mark JOHN HESELTON as an outstanding man in public life, one who cannot be easily replaced. Whatever may be his course in the years to come, it is my hope, my fervent wish and prayer, that happiness, health, and success will be his in great measure, and that God's richest blessing will ever rest upon him and his good wife.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, it was with regret that I learned of the announcement of our esteemed colleague, JOHN W. HESELTON, that he was retiring at the end of this session of the Congress. I have known and been closely associated with JOHN since he came to the Congress 14 years ago.

We are losing too many of our colleagues by their decision to retire voluntarily. Those of us on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and who have served with and worked with JOHN so closely during these years regret that he will not be with us after this Congress.

JOHN has been a most active member of the committee and of the Congress. He is one of the most able Members of this Congress, sincere and always an advocate of what he believes to be in the best interest of the American people.

I have observed his effective work. I have enjoyed the association with him during these years. I know it was with reluctance that he made his decision but he can always point with pride to the fact that he has rendered outstanding public service during his years in this great body.

So, Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with other Members of the House and especially the Massachusetts delegation in expressing admiration and esteem for JOHN. I am glad that it has been my privilege to be associated with him during these years as I have observed the conscientious service he has rendered in the consideration and enactment of legislation for the public welfare and strength of our country. We will miss JOHN. His going is a distinct loss. His departure means that another friend, diligent coworker, and a dedicated public servant will no longer be with us as we continue with the problems and responsibilities that mean so much to our people.

So, to JOHN and his lovely wife will go our best wishes as they leave us and it is our earnest hope and prayer that they will have many years of good health and happiness and I know that JOHN will continue with the same interest and challenge for the public good throughout the years to come which he has demonstrated in his service in the Congress.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in the fine tribute we are paying today to three Members of the House from the State of Massachusetts who have announced their intention to retire.

RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH came to this Congress after performing outstanding service for his Nation in war as well as in peace. He served on the battlefields of France during World War I. He performed many diplomatic missions after that war in connection with reparations. He was an outstanding lawyer, active in the affairs of his community. Since first coming to the Congress 30 years ago he has distinguished himself as a leader and a scholar, a man who

combines a determination to get things done with a willingness to make sure that they are done right.

The taxpayers of this country owe him a debt of gratitude for watching after their interests which can never be repaid. While he has favored whatever expenditures were necessary to protect the security and welfare of this country, he has never hesitated to voice his objections and use his great influence to eliminate the waste and extravagance he has uncovered. DICK WIGGLESWORTH has been a great credit to this body. We will miss him sorely, and we wish him a long and fruitful retirement.

JOHN W. HESELTON has been a Member of Congress since 1944. I have always counted him as one of my warmest friends. He is marked by a judiciousness of character which has won him the respect and admiration of all his colleagues. He is a man of intellect and integrity, honored for his fairness and devotion to duty. JOHN'S career has been a record of accomplishment and service. His outstanding work in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has won the notice of us all. We wish him well as he prepares to leave us, with the sure knowledge that JOHN HESELTON will always stand ready to serve his country.

DONALD W. NICHOLSON is beloved by all on both sides of the aisle. His shrewd conservatism has been a constructive guide to the consideration of many of the vital measures which come before this body. I have never heard his name spoken without some remark of praise for his nobleness of character. In his legislative career, which has included unanimous election as president of the Massachusetts Senate, he has distinguished himself as an exponent of the highest principles and convictions. This body will sorely miss him. I am grateful for this opportunity to express my gratitude for his long and faithful service.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join our distinguished minority leader in paying tribute to the three Members from Massachusetts who are retiring from Congress. Certainly the State of Massachusetts, as well as the entire country, is suffering a great loss when DICK WIGGLESWORTH, JOHN HESELTON, and DONALD NICHOLSON retire from the House.

When I first came to the House, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH was one of the outstanding Members, as he has continued to be. I soon learned of the high esteem in which he was held, and of his great ability. I have greatly enjoyed the opportunity to be associated with him, and his friendship has meant a great deal to me. I recall his letter of welcome after my election to Congress after an absence of one term. He has rendered untiring and unselfish service on the Appropriations Committee, and I have used his figures and comments on appropriation bills many times.

I had the great pleasure of serving on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee with JOHN HESELTON. JOHN took a keen interest in every activity of the committee, and all of the witnesses who appeared before the committee had great respect for him. He made a most valuable contribution to the work of this great committee, and I know he will be missed in the next Congress.

Mr. NICHOLSON and I served together on the House Rules Committee and I soon learned to admire his sterling qualities. He was independent and fearless in his attitude on all legislation. I greatly enjoyed my association with him, both in the committee, and on the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to see these three distinguished Members retire from the House and leave public life. Certainly we need men of their type in public office, and they leave an enviable record behind them.

I want to wish all three much happiness in the years ahead, and success in whatever they undertake.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in the House in paying tribute to our retiring Congressmen from Massachusetts, the Honorable RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, the Honorable DONALD W. NICHOLSON, and the Honorable JOHN W. HESELTON.

While they are diverse in nature they all possess those uncommon attributes that make them distinguished public servants. In the closing hours of this Congress, it is appropriate that we pause to express to them our personal congratulations for their contributions to our country and to offer our felicitations and best wishes to them and their fine families for the years ahead.

I knew the name and fame of DICK WIGGLESWORTH long before I knew the man himself. When he announced his retirement a few months ago, the accolades he received accurately reflected the long and outstanding service he rendered to his constituency and the Nation he served so well. Noted for his quiet persuasiveness, he will best be remembered as a hard, diligent, and constructive worker in those fields pertaining to our national defense.

DONALD NICHOLSON, known as a son of Cape Cod although he lives just west of the canal that separates the cape from the mainland, is as rugged as the rocky coast from whence he comes. He is a man of deep convictions and as immovable in those convictions as the famed Plymouth Rock once he has determined what he considers to be the proper course of action. However, behind his firmness for the right, he possesses a lovable nature that has endeared him to his colleagues.

JOHN HESELTON is a man I learned quickly to respect. Independent in his views, all who knew him realized his conclusions were his own, born of study and expressed with decision. It is not long after serving in the Congress that we evaluate those characteristics of the Members. I shall remember JOHN for his courage; for his decision to take the road he believed best without regard for his personal welfare.

We shall miss these valued Members whose total service exceeds half a century. As they go forth to what I hope will be an easier life, I trust that God will bless all of them in the years ahead, and that they can, in some measure, make up for the sacrifices both to them—and their wonderful families—that the demands of public service precluded in years gone by.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, the decision of JOHN HESELTON, the gentleman from Massachusetts, not to return to Congress is a sad blow to his many friends who have such great respect for his ability and his analytical mind. JOHN is a hard worker and a great one for digging up facts. His arguments are always based on actuality, his decisions always reached after hard study, and his determination commanded the respect of all. We need men of his caliber in the Congress, and his going leaves a void that will be hard to fill. He retires with the knowledge of work well done, of service of the highest order to the people he represents, and the respect and affection of his many friends.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to see DONALD NICHOLSON, the gentleman from Massachusetts, retire from Congress and it will be a long time before we see the likes of him again. Quiet and unassuming but with a spirit of self-assurance he contributes much to the discussion of the problems of the day. By his dry humor he devastates his adversaries; with his typically austere New England character he has constantly and consistently protested extravagance and waste in Government and in this respect has been an example and inspiration to us all. He has many friends and I know of no enemies because of his readiness to see the other fellow's point of view and again his humor warms the heart of all.

I sincerely wish him well and may good health, prosperity, and serenity always attend him.

Mr. Speaker, after anyone has served as long and faithfully in the House of Representatives as the gentleman from Massachusetts, DICK WIGGLESWORTH, has, he has earned a rest, but just the same we hate to see him leave. I do not believe there is any Member who has served the Nation in a more diligent and self-effacing manner. Hard working, modest, but persistent in his search for facts, punctilious in his relations with others, never a demagog, he leaves a record of achievement and a host of friendships which will endure throughout the years. His colleagues on the great Committee on Appropriations on which he served recognize the loss of his wise counsel and his courtesy. His place in the Congress will be hard to fill.

As I have already said, however, he has earned his rest and I know it is the fond hope of all of us that the days to come may be filled with the best of God's rich blessings for him and his family.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to join my colleagues in paying tribute to one of the kindest, most thoughtful, hard-working, and patriotic Members who has ever served in the Congress of the United States.

DICK WIGGLESWORTH played the game of politics the way he did at Harvard when he was one of the outstanding football players of the Ivy League and the United States. His courtesies, his

thoughtfulness, for all of us, his devotion to the facts and figures of all those facilities of appropriations that came before him, are legend. He was a man who took his work home and studied under the lights. We will miss him as an able Member of Congress but all of us will welcome his return as a visitor among us.

We wish DICK, Mrs. Wigglesworth, and all of his family every pleasure, every comfort, and every good prospect for the future.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, since his election to Congress on November 6, 1928, the Honorable RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, of Massachusetts, has proven his ability as an able representative of the people of the 13th District. His constituents have shown their confidence in him by repeatedly returning him to Washington as their representative.

I am especially happy to have the privilege of paying tribute to this distinguished gentleman for it has been my pleasure to serve with him as a member of the House Committee on Appropriations for a number of years. His untiring efforts in behalf of economy and judicious spending have gained for him the respect not only of the members of the committee but of the Congress as a whole. We on the committee will sorely miss the guidance and able leadership provided by Congressman WIGGLESWORTH. His decision not to seek reelection is deplored by his many friends throughout the Nation.

It is my hope that Congressman WIGGLESWORTH will in the years ahead enjoy the rest to which he is entitled and that he will have continued success and happiness in all that he undertakes.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my other colleagues in paying respect to the retiring Members of the Massachusetts delegation in the Congress, the Honorable RICHARD WIGGLESWORTH, the Honorable DONALD W. NICHOLSON, and the Honorable JOHN W. HESELTON.

It has been my privilege to serve with these gentlemen for many years. Their records as Members of Congress, as public servants, have been ones that are worthy of observation and praise. I want to extend to them in their retirement every good wish and the sincere hope that they will have many years to enjoy the fruits of their labors.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN].

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, Congress is losing three distinguished Members from our group. Certainly, as a fellow New Englander, I have had the privilege of knowing each of them well. Each in his own right has made a name for himself. Each in his own way has set an example for all of us to follow. And, I can say that all of us are better Congressmen for having known and worked here in the Congress with these three distinguished sons of New England.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE].

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, while this 85th Congress has contributed many bright pages to the history of legislative progress in this country, its conclusion is touched with a real sense of personal sadness to all of us, but particularly to the Massachusetts delegation, and the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts as it is losing the able representation here of three of its most noted sons—Congressman WIGGLESWORTH, of the 13th Massachusetts District; Congressman HESELTON, of the 1st Massachusetts District; and Congressman NICHOLSON, of the 9th Massachusetts District.

The combined patriotic and dedicated service of these three distinguished gentlemen amounts to 55 years of legislative toil and triumph.

Dean of these three is RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH who is completing 30 years of as diligent and devoted legislative service as any man who has ever had the privilege of membership in this body. DICK has sat here through the years of the greatest transition period the Congress has ever experienced and he has seen this Congress grow into the responsibility of the most important legislative body in the world and he has played a prominent and significant part in that growth. Firm of purpose, steadfast in principle, steeped in intimate knowledge through exhaustive study, unyielding in rooted conviction, fiercely patriotic, and of gracious personality, RICHARD WIGGLESWORTH has reached a height of respect and authority in this Chamber that few men have achieved in the past or will in the future.

I have had the extreme privilege and enjoyment of being located in the Old House Office Building next door to my colleague and friend, JOHN HESELTON, for 10 years. His cooperating neighborliness and courtesy have been a continuous and unfailing inspiration to me during this entire period. There has never been a more conscientious and more thorough student of legislation here than JOHN HESELTON. Serious in his demeanor, meticulous in accuracy, passionately determined to be right in his pronouncements, exhaustive in study and research to be right, JOHN HESELTON for 14 dedicated years has willingly exerted the foundation capacities of his mind, his heart, and his health toward legislative progress and accomplishment for the welfare of the people of America and the State of Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, 11 years ago, a unique gentleman, DONALD W. NICHOLSON, walked silently into this Hall from the salubrious climate of the world famous "cape" area of Massachusetts. Behind him already was one of the most distinguished careers, in his home locality and State legislature, of public service in the history of our great Commonwealth. In the chambers of the legislature of the Old Bay State, BILL NICHOLSON had carved a name and reputation for himself that will live forever in the annals of that deliberative body.

I have, Mr. Speaker, described this gentleman as unique and I have purposely used this term in its technical dictionary meaning. BILL NICHOLSON is the only one of his kind and there will never be another just like him. In the State of Massachusetts, the integrity and the word of BILL NICHOLSON was and is equivalent in private and public life, to trust in the Almighty. He is unique in his possession and use of a humorous sense reflecting his profound knowledge of the length and breadth of human nature and its dependence upon divine providence.

No man in this body knows more about the most fascinating science in the world, politics. With the inspired skill of the gifted artist, BILL NICHOLSON has time and time again, in this Hall, with one brief comment, revealed the full and vital significance of an important piece of legislation. Like a vein of New England granite, he is unflinching and immovable in his legislative convictions, while respecting the conflicting opinions of others. The superlative keenness of his intellect, contributed here, is founded upon the most intense study of and fullest participation in consideration of basic legislative issues during the fruitful years of his youthful and mature career. His perpetual pleasantness springs from the depths of an extraordinarily understanding and charitable heart. His political principles derive from an almost unsuspected dedication to patriotic purpose of sincerity and earnestness that may be matched but will never be surpassed by any person who serves in this House. Few men will ever be missed from this Hall as we shall all miss the beloved person and personality of BILL NICHOLSON.

To these three distinguished sons of Massachusetts, their gracious wives and families, we bid a sad adieu with an earnest prayer that good health and increasing success will accompany them through many, many more long years of the good life they all so richly merit.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished former Speaker of the House and the Massachusetts delegation in expressing my own personal regret over the retirement of three distinguished sons of Massachusetts. The loss of these three outstanding Members of the House is not only a loss to Massachusetts, it is a loss to the Congress and the country.

The great Bay State in the course of its history has sent a long list of eminent men to Congress. I doubt that any State has contributed more to the leadership of the Congress or the country than the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

True to the character and tradition of that great State, the service of DICK WIGGLESWORTH, JOHN HESELTON, and BILL NICHOLSON in the Halls of the House of Representatives over the past several years has been outstanding. All of these colleagues are held in the highest esteem on this side of the aisle, both as legislators and as men.

All of them are men of the highest character and caliber. DICK WIGGLESWORTH is recognized by both Democrats and Republicans as one of the ablest men on the Committee on Appropriations where his leadership has been well known for many decades. Both as a

person and a legislator he has characterized the very finest qualities consistent with New England tradition.

JOHN HESELTON, of course, has been an eminent member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and in the work of the committee and in the House generally, his leadership is well known. He is indeed one of the outstanding Members of this House.

Last but not least I cannot let this occasion pass without paying a personal word of tribute to my dear friend, BILL NICHOLSON. It was my good fortune not long after I came here to meet Congressman NICHOLSON. He came here from his own State as an experienced and successful legislator. I have never in my whole life met a more sincere, down-to-earth, human person. He is one of the most modest men I have ever known. Indeed, his modesty and humility are overshadowed only by his ability and his character. Every Member of the House of Representatives knows "NICK" and to know him is to love him.

To all three of these colleagues and friends whose service will long be remembered here, I join every Member of the House in wishing each of them many, many years of good health and happiness.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the great State of Massachusetts has a long history of sending to Congress men and women whom it is proper to call characters in the best sense of that term. They are outstanding, colorful, and, as the gentleman from Oklahoma has said, truly unique individuals. We have two such men at the head of the Massachusetts delegation—our beloved former Speaker and now minority leader [Mr. MARTIN], and the able and distinguished majority leader [Mr. MCCORMACK]. That certainly should be enough distinction for any State delegation. But Massachusetts has many other outstanding men among its members and especially the three able and unusual Congressmen DICK WIGGLESWORTH, JOHN HESELTON, and DONALD NICHOLSON, who are leaving us today.

My own parents on both sides came originally from New England, and I see an extraordinary resemblance between certain characteristics of my mother and the characteristics of these men, particularly the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. NICHOLSON. My mother was born and brought up in Connecticut just across the border from NICK's District in Massachusetts. As youngsters we who grew up in the breezy ways of the Midwest never quite understood why her speech was, as the Scripture adviseth, "Yea, yea—nay, nay" and no more. When we came home with a tall story she would say, "It isn't so," and that was the end of it. Later when I visited her part of our country and especially after I got to know NICK, I understood why she just could not be any different. That is the way they grow them in that part of southeastern New England. But along with the taciturnity is firm dependability, strong convictions, generous hearts, and good humor behind the apparently gruff exterior. We shall miss you, NICK.

Of course, DICK WIGGLESWORTH is a supercharacter all his own. Anybody who has ever sat in this Chamber and has heard him discuss a complicated appropriation bill with that incredible mastery of figures and of detail and at the same time never losing sight of the overall picture—the trees and the forest in their proper relationship—must have boundless admiration for this man's mind, for his indefatigable capacity to work, for his ability to dig out not merely facts but the essential facts, and his penetrating understanding of them. I was privileged to be with him on a trip through the Middle East and Asia. When we were meeting with some leader of a country and the pleasantries and generalities were over, DICK would ask a few questions that would go right to the heart of the matter; questions about the country's budgetary situation, about its financial foundations, about its plans—what they wanted or what they believed it would be beneficial for the United States to extend to them in aid, both the kind of aid and the amount of aid in each category. He can get right to the essentials better than anyone I know.

DICK is no glad-hander. He does not try to impress people. He is the sort of man who grows on you. He has such a wonderful dry sense of humor—altogether such a delightful person, with all the warmth and love of a true and loyal friend behind his retiring, unassuming exterior. The longer one knows DICK WIGGLESWORTH the greater personal regard and affection one has for him.

JOHN HESELTON belongs to my class in Congress here. He has one of the finest minds that it has been my privilege to know in this body in which there are plenty of first-rate intellects. And with it goes a rarer quality, a wonderful heart of courage. JOHN HESELTON has been willing on numberless occasions to stand almost alone and sometimes entirely alone in following his convictions, even in that most difficult kind of situation where he was standing against almost all his close friends of his own committee. I must say in further tribute to him that in most of those instances I believe that history has proved his position to be nearer right than that of the majority.

JOHN's conscientiousness, his devotion to duty are beyond praise.

Our Congress can ill afford at any time to lose even one man of this caliber. For 3 such men to retire at one time is a severe blow indeed. But it is their decision and we know they considered it long and well before making it. They are not leaving for any small reasons.

We can only be grateful that we have had the privilege of working so long and intimately with them and as they go into retirement, or more likely, into new fields of service to their country, with them go our genuine affection and good wishes for many happy and useful years ahead.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation for being privileged to pay my respects to three wonderful sons of the great State of Massachusetts. JOHN HESELTON I have not had the pleasure of knowing too intimately, because of our respective branches of operation in the House. To the degree I have worked with the gentleman, I have always found him a man who is considerate; a most courteous gentleman, and one who has a very wide understanding.

My friend DON NICHOLSON, commonly known to us as NICK, I have had a more intimate relationship with, and as one of my colleagues previously mentioned, NICK is an outstanding character within himself. He is a lovable gentleman, quiet in his approaches to subject matters of interest. He has always had a very enviable attitude insofar as his integrity of details is concerned.

Occasionally, when one is feeling rather low, NICK has always something to discuss; not overly frivolous, but definitely refreshing.

Referring to RICHARD WIGGLESWORTH, whom we are all privileged to call "DICK," I have had the pleasure and honor of working with him side by side on appropriations for many, many years. He is a wonderful gentleman, and certainly our companionships on subcommittee operations have been among my most valuable assets, because my general temperament is that of impetuosity. DICK is very delightful. He has a very interesting manner of indicating to a witness by the use of his lead pencil the specific type of information he was soliciting.

He has so many lovable characteristics that frankly I regret very much that he has found it necessary to retire. I am going to miss him so much as a working companion and as a personal friend. I feel that he has contributed as much as or more than any man I know to the general welfare of not only his own Congressional District and his State, but of the United States as a whole. He is a great gentleman, whose integrity is unquestioned, whose loyalty to the purpose of his interests has never deviated, and a friend who is more than worthwhile.

I say to the great State of Massachusetts that through the retirement of these 3 gentlemen you have lost 3 very splendid Representatives.

While we of the great West are geographically separated in our interests from the East, there has never been a time in which DICK WIGGLESWORTH, NICK, and Mr. HESELTON, to my knowledge, have not always reviewed the joint interests and weighed them against the benefit of the entire Nation irrespective of geographical location.

And I hope the great Master will grant to these three gentlemen and their respective families the utmost of good health, happiness, and success in the retirement they have so well earned.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would be most remiss if I did not express my very deep feeling both from the heart and from the head concerning the three gen-

tlemen who have been discussed here so eloquently today. In various ways over the past 10 years it has been my opportunity to work with each of them both in this Chamber and in committee. In addition, it has been my privilege to spend time with them socially.

Their departure by voluntary retirement will be a very great personal loss, but I can say with the deepest conviction that this body, the Congress as a whole, their State, and the Nation will be the losers.

I would like to say at the outset a special word concerning DICK WIGGLESWORTH. I have been a member of the Committee on Appropriations for 8 years. Six of those years I spent on two subcommittees with DICK WIGGLESWORTH. Two of those years he was chairman of the Military Subcommittee on Appropriations, and 2 of those years he was chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee. I was a member of both these subcommittees at that time. He was also ranking minority member of those 2 subcommittees for 4 additional years while I was still privileged to be a member of the 2 subcommittees.

It has been a great privilege for me to serve with him throughout this period. As chairman he was constructive, he was courteous to the members whether they were of the minority or the majority. He was a terrifically able individual, and in the examination of witnesses he set a high standard in every respect. I hope and trust that if I am here in the years ahead I can in some small way measure up to the criterion he has established. His relationships with the staff, his treatment of the witnesses, to me was the right way to approach the problems that the subcommittees had before them.

These two subcommittees will not be the same without DICK WIGGLESWORTH, and I doubt if in any way we can replace him as a personality, or replace his ability. It will put a far greater burden on each of us who may be here in the coming sessions. I am certain and positive that in succeeding sessions of the Congress in these two subcommittees those who will be there will often wonder if the committee work could not be done better if DICK were by their side.

One could add words, phrases, and sentences extolling the virtues of DICK WIGGLESWORTH but for myself may I say in conclusion he has been a wonderful colleague and a close personal friend who will be missed more than I can express.

JOHN HESELTON has been a friend of mine for 10 years. We worked together in 1952 long and hard prior to the Republican Convention on behalf of the President's nomination. In addition, I felt a comradeship because in many, many instances we have voted similarly. The House will miss a most able legislator and I will miss a friend with whom I have counseled many times.

I have had an opportunity to know DON NICHOLSON quite well because our offices for the past 4 years have been right next to each other. NICK stops in not once but many times a day to chat with my staff and with me. I think my staff will miss his departure more than the departure of anybody from the Congress because they think he is a top-notcher. I have admired NICK in a good many ways and will miss him greatly.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to reiterate and reemphasize my own personal feelings that the country, the State of Massachusetts, the Congress, and myself will lose much by the voluntary retirement of DICK WIGGLESWORTH, JOHN HESELTON, and DON NICHOLSON. To them and their wonderful wives and families I wish the most and best in future health, happiness, and success.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I think it is ever so appropriate that the very distinguished minority leader, and former Speaker of the House, JOE MARTIN, should lead off in this tribute to our distinguished colleagues from Massachusetts who plan to leave this body shortly.

Mr. Speaker, it was Daniel Webster who once shouted, "Have faith in Massachusetts."

America has this faith and it is largely because of men such as we honor here today.

When I visit the Boston area, in which my parents lived for almost 40 years, I boast of my associations in the House with DICK WIGGLESWORTH.

When I drive through the beautiful Berkshires in western Massachusetts, my boast is that JOHN HESELTON and I usually vote alike.

When Mrs. Canfield and I each year spend several summer weeks at Chatham on Cape Cod, I find the use of the name DON NICHOLSON means almost "open sesame."

I have measured these men in the House of Representatives, and humbly, I think, I am able to do that after 35 years of service on the Hill, and I salute them as truly great.

I wish our colleagues all happiness in their retirement. May they come back so we can hold rendezvous often.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I am sure all of us have been dismayed in recent months at the announcement of the retirement of so many of our colleagues. Their going will leave some pretty large gaps to be filled in the House of Representatives. I dislike seeing them go, but at the same time, we can understand their reasons and sympathize with them and can only wish them well as they retire from this body. Many words of commendation and appreciation have been spoken of our three colleagues from Massachusetts who are in the group that are retiring. Suffice it to say at this moment that I concur in all of those fine things that have been said. These men have been great Members of this body. They have come to the top. They have proven themselves. They have been a great credit to their Districts, their State, and to the Nation. As I said before, we shall all miss them; particularly shall I miss their friendship and presence here and the association with them that has been so pleasant through the years.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Masachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry not to have been here earlier. I did not know that these eulogies were taking place. I was over in the Senate, and I think I may have been helpful in securing over there an appropriation that is very valuable and very much needed.

Mr. Speaker, there are no two of us alike in the Massachusetts delegation, as you know. We are individualists; all of us. But, these three men are men of great integrity, great ability, and great capacity. I am sure the membership of the House will miss them for their very fine qualities, all different but of great importance to us here in the Congress and to us in the country.

We will miss RICHARD WIGGLESWORTH and DON NICHOLSON—"NICK" as we called him—and JOHN HESELTON. I would like to say one thing about JOHN HESELTON, and I wonder if the Members of the House realize it, and that is his endless kindnesses. I know of things he has done for people without any thought that he would ever be repaid for them in any way whatsoever; a kindness that goes very deep and one that is very precious for those who have it and precious for the people who are the recipients of his kindnesses.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 689, 84th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the United States group of the North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentary Conference, the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. HAYS of Ohio; Mr. MCCARTHY, of Minnesota; Mr. SMITH of Mississippi; Mr. SELDEN, of Alabama; Mr. DOLLINGER, of New York; Mr. CANFIELD, of New Jersey; Mr. CORBETT, of Pennsylvania; Mr. BETTS, of Ohio; and Mr. LECOMPTE, of Iowa.

DENIAL OF PASSPORTS

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 13760) to provide for the denial of passports to persons knowingly engaged in activities intended to further the international Communist movement.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of July 3, 1926 (44 Stat. 887), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 5. The Congress finds that the international Communist movement of which the Communist Party of the United States of America is an integral part, seeks everywhere to thwart United States policy, to influence foreign governments and peoples against the United States, and by every means, including force and violence, to weaken the United States and ultimately to bring it under Communist domination; that

the activities of the international Communist movement constitute a clear, present, and continuing danger to the security of the United States; that a United States passport requests other countries not only to permit the holder to pass freely and safely, but also to give all lawful aid and protection to the holder, and thereby facilitates the travel of such holder to and in foreign countries; and that in view of the history of the use of United States passports by supporters of the international Communist movement to further the purposes of that movement, the issuance of passports to any person described in section 6 (b) is harmful to the security of the United States and therefore passports should be denied to such persons.

"SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary of State is authorized to deny passports to persons as to whom it is determined upon reasonable grounds that their activities or presence abroad or their possession of a passport would under the findings made in section 5 be harmful to the security of the United States.

"(b) In determining whether a person is within subsection (a) of this section the Secretary shall take into account the findings in section 5 and shall consider as material, among other matters, whether the applicant is a person who, whether or not a member or former member of, or affiliated with, the Communist Party, knowingly engages or has engaged, since 1948, in activities intended to further the international Communist movement.

"(c) If the information is such as to warrant the conclusion that a person is within subsection (b) of this section, such person shall nevertheless have the right to establish by clear and convincing evidence that his activities or presence abroad or posesssion of a passport would not be harmful to the security of the United States.

"SEC. 7. The Secretary of State may require, as a prerequisite to the issuance of a passport, that the applicant subscribe to and submit a written statement duly verified by his oath or affirmation whether he is presently, or has been since 1948 a member of the Communist Party or a supporter of the international Communist movement, and to state the circumstances of any such membership or to state his activities in support of the international Communist movement.

"SEC. 8. The District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia shall have jurisdiction to review any final determination of the Secretary of State under section 6 (a) of this act."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 8, after the semicolon, insert "that travel by couriers and agents is a major and essential means by which the international Communist movement is promoted and directed."

Page 2, line 19, strike out "(b)."

Page 2, line 22, strike out line 22 down to line 16 on page 3 and insert:

"SEC. 6. The Secretary of State is authorized to deny a passport to any person who is a member or former member of, or affiliated with, the Communist Party, or who knowingly engages or has engaged, since 1948, in activities intended to further the international Communist movement, as to whom it is determined that his or her activities or presence abroad would under the findings made in section 5 be harmful to the security of the United States."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, strike out lines 9 to 12 and insert:

"SEC. 8. No application for a passport may be denied under section 6 of this act except after opportunity for a hearing. A denial of a passport pursuant to section 6 of this act shall be subject to judicial review in the district courts of the United States."

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAYS of Ohio to the committee amendment: Page 4, line 16, after the word "review" insert "on the record."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that I need to restate the danger to the United States arising from the international Communist conspiracy. The facts speak for themselves. The Free World is today threatened by the Communist bloc on all fronts. There is an active campaign of subversion and conspiracy in the Middle and Far East. The recent events in the Middle East clearly point out the dangers of this campaign of subversion to the Free World. This, of course, is not a new development. There have been repeated instances of Communist attempts to subvert legitimate government by conspiratorial means. While some of these subversive attempts have been successful, fortunately others have failed. Nevertheless, subversion remains a constant threat.

On the economic front the Communists have undertaken a major offensive in the field of trade and aid. Communist trade agents and Communist technicians are fanning out through the world. Aid programs are being undertaken in Europe, in the Middle East, and in the Far East. The Communist economic tentacles have even stretched into Latin America.

The threat is not limited to economic and political subversion. It also is apparent on the military side. The Communist legions are pointed toward the Free World in central Europe, in the Middle East, and the Far East. Our allies and our American servicemen are under constant alert to prevent a surprise attack. Yet, the most insidious, and perhaps the most dangerous, of these three forms of attack is that of political subversion.

We have exerted considerable effort in this country to protect ourselves from political subversion and to assist our allies in resisting that form of subversion. The Federal Bureau of Investigation is constantly alert to the possibilities. Congress has enacted the Communist Control Act. Up to a few months ago the Secretary of State was able to deny the issuance of passports to Communist subversive agents going abroad to engage in activities harmful to this Nation.

The United States Supreme Court on June 16, 1958 handed down the decisions of Kent against Dulles and Dayton against Dulles, Docket Nos. 481 and 621, which held in effect that there is no law in being at the present time which authorizes the Secretary of State to deny passports to persons wishing to go overseas to engage in activities harmful to the United States, such as espionage, subversion of foreign governments, and propaganda.

It is a well-known fact that international travel is one of the principal means whereby the international Communist conspiracy is promoted. Its couriers travel from foreign capital to foreign capital, carrying with them in their minds the orders and directives of the Politburo and of Peiping. In this way detection is avoided and personal contacts between members of the conspiracy can be promoted. Furthermore, there have been repeated instances where affiliates of the Communist movement travel abroad in order to engage in activities harmful to the security of the United States, such as inciting revolt against friendly governments, engaging in untruthful propaganda against the United States, and giving aid and comfort to our enemies even while we were engaged in active hostilities with those enemies.

H. R. 13760, which I introduced, is intended to fill the gap that has resulted from the Supreme Court's decisions of June 16.

Section 5 of this bill clearly sets forth a Congressional finding that the international Communist movement is dedicated to weakening and ultimately dominating the United States; that it constitutes a clear, present, and continuing danger to the security of the United States; and that its agents and supporters use passports to promote the objectives of international communism. For these reasons the bill provides that passports may be denied, and I repeat, may be denied, by the Secretary of State to three categories of persons:

First. A member or former member of the Communist Party.

Second. An individual who is affiliated with the Communist Party.

Third. An individual who knowingly engages or has engaged since 1948 in activities intended to further the international Communist movement.

In all three categories, however, the Secretary of State is required to make an affirmative showing that the activities or presence of the person abroad would be harmful to the security of the United States.

In spite of what may be said to the contrary, this legislation provides firm safeguards for the rights of the individuals. Section 8 of the bill contains a positive provision for an administrative hearing. In addition, there is a provision for judicial review in the district courts of the United States. These provisions are intended to insure that no Secretary of State arbitrarily infringes on the rights of citizens and to insure that the requirements of due process of law shall be met.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 13670 is being brought before the House with an amendment. That amendment is to insert the words "on the record" in the

provision dealing with judicial review. I agreed to this amendment because, in my opinion, it would not place unreasonable restrictions on the Secretary of State. It is my understanding that the words "on the record" will mean that the courts shall review the transcript of the hearing and procedural documents in the case. It is not my intention to preclude the use of confidential information and confidential informants.

Let me assure you that this legislation was carefully and thoroughly considered by the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. At least 10 different bills were on the committee calendar, and the measure which we reported underwent a detailed and searching analysis which resulted in the amendments attached thereto. Furthermore, the bill now under consideration—H. R. 13760—was reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs without a dissenting vote.

President Eisenhower has urged the passage of legislation that will effectively close the loophole left by the Supreme Court's decisions of June 16, 1958. You will recall that in his message of July 7 of this year he stated:

> I wish to emphasize the urgency of the legislation I have recommended. Each day and week that passes without it exposes us to great danger. I hope the Congress will move promptly toward its enactment.

In the short period of time since the President sent his urgent message to Congress, the number of applicants for passports who the State Department believes would fall into the category covered by this legislation has increased from 60 to 386.

If this legislation fails to pass before Congress adjourns, there are indications that the number of applicants will continue to increase and that it will be necessary, under the Supreme Court's decisions of June 16, for the Department of State to issue passports to those persons before Congress reconvenes in January.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize that H. R. 13760, the bill the committee has reported, is much more restricted than the legislation originally requested by the Administration. Yet, it grants the necessary authority to the Secretary of State and, at the same time, provides adequate safeguards for the rights of the individual. I therefore urge its passage.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, I urge immediate passage of H. R. 13670, the bill unanimously ordered reported by the Foreign Affairs Committee, which permits the Secretary of State to prohibit travel by Communist agents, saboteurs, and spies. Without this legislation there is a serious loophole in our security laws. Under the recent Supreme Court decisions there would be no means whereby the Secretary of State could deny passports to individuals who are traveling abroad to further the nefarious purposes of the international Communist movement.

The United States is spending billions of dollars for its defense and further billions of dollars for foreign aid. We have millions of our boys under arms sworn to protect the security of the United States. On the other hand, if this legislation is not enacted, we are faced with a situation in which persons may go abroad to subvert and thwart the foreign policy of the United States and to stir up trouble against nations friendly to us. It is a necessity.

The bill grants authority to the Secretary of State to plug this loophole. At the same time, it insures maximum protection for the rights of our citizens under the Constitution. It provides for both administrative hearings and judicial review of those hearings and of passport denials by the Secretary of State.

The bill which is before the House was perfected after a thoroughgoing analysis by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. We tried to strike the best compromise between the rights of the individual and the security of the United States. I do not think that anyone can criticize it as an infringement of individual rights since we were most careful to prescribe procedural safeguards.

The bill itself is in the form of an amendment to the Passport Act of 1926. The first section makes Congressional findings with respect to the danger of the international Communist movement to the security of our homeland. It emphasizes the fact that the Communists use couriers as a principal means of carrying directives and orders of the party. These couriers frequently carry their messages in their minds in order to prevent detection. The granting of authority to deny passports to such couriers is essential to our security system. Section 5 makes specific reference to the use of travel by the international Communist conspiracy.

Section 6 is the operative section, granting the authority to the Secretary of State to deny passports. The persons who are subject to such denial are Communist members, affiliates of the Communist Party, and persons knowingly engaged in activities intended to further the international Communist movement. In all cases, however, the Secretary of State must also find that the activities or presence abroad of the individuals concerned would be harmful to the security of the United States. This is a double-barrelled finding and will insure that innocent persons will not be subject to having a passport denied on capricious grounds.

Section 7 of the bill authorizes the Secretary of State to require the applicant for a passport to sign an affidavit concerning membership in the Communist Party and support of the international Communist movement.

Section 8 provides for an administrative hearing of any proposed denial of a passport. Further, it provides for judicial review of the hearing and denial of a passport.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation—I would have preferred the measure without some of the amendments—is in the best interests of the United States and I urge every Member of the House to give it his wholehearted support.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, this action of the House is mighty gratifying to me. Yesterday evening, toward the close of the session, during a special order obtained by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN], cosponsor with me of this legislation, we were discussing this bill and its chances for passage. I ventured the hope that action would be taken, even at this late date, because of the extreme urgency of this legislation. Now my hope has proven justified.

The last-minute agreed amendment to add the words "on the record" to the requirement for judicial review, in my judgment adds nothing and detracts nothing from present procedures approved in the case of Dayton against Dulles. All of section 8, providing for an opportunity for hearing and judicial review on the record in case of denial of a passport, merely restates and makes mandatory the present practice. I think it is helpful and reassuring however, to provide this in the law.

Yesterday, I expressed the hope that the hours and days I have spent on this legislation would not prove to be a mere lost labor of love. The House is now proving that my hope was not in vain. Passage of this bill will provide a very important weapon for us in the cold war with communism and will provide a very satisfying end to my committee labors here in the House.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, the bill H. R. 13760 authorizes the denial by the Secretary of State of passports to members, former members, and affiliates of the Communist Party and to persons who since 1948 have knowingly engaged in activities intended to further the international Communist movement. It must be shown, however, that the activities or presence of such persons abroad would be harmful to the security of the United States.

This legislation is intended to permit the denial of passports to Communist agents and supporters traveling abroad with the purpose of injuring the United States. The bill requires that any denial of a passport shall be subject to administrative and judicial review.

The need for this legislation arises from the decision by the Supreme Court in the cases of Kent against Dulles and Dayton against Dulles on June 16, 1958, in which the Court found that there was not in existence any legislation authorizing the Secretary of State to deny passports to Communists or Communist supporters. Following that decision, the President forwarded a message to Congress on July 7, 1958, in which he stated:

> I wish to emphasize the urgency of the legislation I have recommended. Each day and week that passes without it exposes us to great danger. I hope the Congress will move promptly toward its enactment.

At the same time draft legislation was received. The Committee on Foreign Affairs, however, did not take action on the legislation proposed by the executive branch since its implications were too

broad. There was serious question as to whether its passage would not have meant a complete grant of discretionary authority for the denial of passports. There was even some question as to whether passports could have been denied to anyone who criticized the foreign policy of the United States. In addition, the committee had no less than 10 different bills before it dealing with the passport problem. After careful consideration and thoroughgoing analysis, the committee reported H. R. 13760 with amendments. The committee paid special attention to the problems of administrative hearings, judicial review, and burden of proof. The amendments before the House are the result of that consideration.

The aim of the bill is obvious. It is to permit the denial of passports to Communists and those engaging in Communist activities whose presence or activities abroad would be harmful to the United States. It goes no further. I do not think that there are any in this body who can disagree with this objective. There may be disagreement as to how the objective is to be reached, but the goal is clear. The United States is in mortal danger from the international Communist movement which is attacking the United States on the economic, the political, and the military fronts. Political subversion is one of the Communist movement's principal weapons and it is toward this aspect of the Communist strategy that the bill is directed.

The bill is in the form of an amendment to the act of July 3, 1926—the Passport Act. It adds new sections to that act. The new section 5 reiterates previous Congressional findings of fact with respect to the dangers arising from the international Communist movement and to the clear and present danger of that movement's activities to the United States. It finds that international communism uses travel by its agents and couriers as one of the principal means of promoting its subversive intent.

Section 6 of the bill permits the denial of passports to four classes of persons: Communist Party members, former members, affiliates of the Communist Party, and those who since 1948 have knowingly engaged in activities intended to further the international Communist movement. With respect to each of these classes, however, the Secretary must first determine that the individual's activities of presence abroad would be harmful to the security of the United States before he can deny a passport.

Section 7 of the bill permits the Secretary of State to require of all passport applicants a written statement, under oath, as to whether he is or has been a member of the Communist Party or a supporter of the international Communist movement. The purpose of these questions being asked is not to ascertain the individual's associations or beliefs but to determine whether he has previously engaged in activities harmful to the security of the United States and whether it is likely that he will engage in such activities overseas.

Section 8 of the bill contains procedural safeguards for the individual. It provides for an administrative hearing prior to final denial of the passport by the Secretary of State, and it provides for a review by the district courts of the United States of both the hearing and the final denial.

I would like to point out in this connection that our committee report states:

> The Secretary of State should be very circumspect and cautious in his conduct in concluding that an American citizen should be deprived of a passport. It must be remembered that with American citizenship goes the right to travel and before that right under our laws is circumscribed, very substantial grounds therefor must exist.

Many on the committee have been seriously concerned with the constitutional aspects of passport legislation. We have, therefore, given the matter our most earnest consideration, and I may truthfully say that the present bill represents our considered judgment as to the best means whereby we can resolve the conflict between individual rights and the security of our Nation.

In view of the danger to the Nation arising from Communist activities, I believe that this legislation is in the interest of the United States and I, therefore, urge its passage.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, since June 16 when the Supreme Court ruled in the cases of Kent against Dulles and Dayton against Dulles that present law would not allow the denial of a passport to a United States citizen who knowingly engages or has engaged in activities intended to further the international Communist movement I have been concerned over the effects of the ruling on our national security. It was obvious to me that there would be a tremendous increase in applications by persons with records of subversion for the privilege of traveling abroad under the diplomatic protection of the very Government they seek to overthrow. I felt keenly that Communists would swarm out of their holes like rats from a flooded sewer to seek the benefits of a Government which they despise with all their hearts. I was sure that the wholesale granting of passports to subversives would make it easier for them to carry money abroad with which to finance the spread of communism and to step up the already alarming program of subversion now being carried on in friendly democratic countries. I could visualize the new ease with which a Communist could secure his instructions from international communistic leaders and, under the courier system used by them, carry the instructions back to this country for the purpose of further sabotaging our free system of government.

In a recent conversation with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] I learned that my fears were well founded. He informed me that on June 16 the State Department had only 62 applications pending from known subversives. The Court's decision brought the pigs out of their stys and today I understand there are 386 applications. It is expected that in a short period of time there will be over a thousand. Without the passage of H. R. 13760 the State Department can do nothing to stop this serious situation. It will be forced to give to our enemies the right and protections of this Government while they commit acts and receive instructions which are for the purpose of destroying the very Government giving those rights.

After my conversation with the gentleman from Ohio I determined to do what I could to assist in the passage of this needed bill. I spent hours in the cloakrooms and on the House floor arousing the interest of other Members who had not had the benefit of discussing the matter with the gentleman from Ohio. I hope that those hours have played a part in bringing H. R. 13760 to the floor of the House for a vote.

I sincerely hope the membership will overwhelmingly approve this legislation. If it does not I must, in all good conscience vote against any resolution to adjourn. I could not go back to my Congressional District knowing that I had voted to adjourn while Communists could roam at will throughout the world with official United States sanction to further their aims of destroying democracy.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the bill is not completely satisfactory. However, I shall, with reluctance, accept it. Permit me to express my views on passports in general and on my passport bill, H. R. 13652, in particular.

In the inevitable categorization which reduces each one of us to liberals or conservatives or reactionaries, I have most often been called a liberal. The bills which I have introduced have generally been characterized as liberal bills, and the causes I have espoused have generally been designated liberal causes. However, my appearance today is in behalf of a bill and a cause which, like many others I have supported, cannot simply be termed liberal. For what my bill—the right-to-travel bill—does is in the best sense of the word conservative. It is concerned not with new ideas of government, but rather with preserving a well-established principle—a principle which began to emerge as long ago as 1215 in the 42d article of the Magna Carta. The preservation of a principle which has been developed over a period of over 700 years would not appear to be a widely liberal proposition. It is perhaps a classic of conservatism.

That principle is, of course, the right of a citizen to travel abroad. Without belaboring the historical development of this right, I think it only necessary to point out that the Supreme Court in Kent against Dulles stated with vigor that "we deal here with a constitutional right of the citizen," and that "the right to travel is a part of the liberty of which the citizen cannot be deprived without the due process of law of the fifth amendment." Indeed, the Solicitor General of the United States, speaking for the respondent in that case, readily

conceded the existence of such a right when he said in his brief:

> On that point, there is no controversy between the parties. * * * We do not challenge, but readily accept, the existence of a general natural or constitutional right to depart or enter the country as an aspect of the liberty subject to the protections of the Constitution.

In view of the complete disregard shown this basic right in the administration of the passport program during recent years, and in view of the provisions of many of the bills now before this committee, I, for one, have some regret that the Court did not find it necessary to decide the constitutional issue in the Kent case. But that case brought to a head something which many of us have felt for sometime; that is, that the problem is not how to get away with preventing people from going abroad, but rather how do we protect the constitutional right of Americans to travel.

Consistency with the purposes and ideals of this country calls for an affirmative rather than a restrictive approach to the travel problem. This bill provides just such an approach. Thus, you will note the declaration of principles in section 2 of the bill, which reads as follows:

> The Congress finds that freedom of movement is basic in the scheme of American institutions and includes both travel within the country as well as travel abroad; that the right to travel abroad is a part of the liberty of which citizens and nationals of the United States or persons entitled to the protection of the United States cannot be deprived without due process of law under the fifth amendment to the Constitution; that such right should not be restricted but is subject to the war power granted to the President and the Congress of the United States under the Constitution and also is subject to the exercise of the inherent power of the State to prosecute persons for the commission of crimes. It is also the sense of the Congress that at the present time the crucial function of a passport is control over entry or exit; and that no tests of beliefs or associations shall be supplied to issuance of passports.

Section 3 of the bill puts teeth in these principles by requiring the Secretary of State to issue a passport within 30 days after application unless the applicant may be denied a passport under the specific provisions of the bill.

This brings me to the question which I think is uppermost in all of your minds. What limitations, if any, may be imposed on the right to travel? I recognize the fact that even a constitutional right is not absolute, and where there is a conflict between a right and a legitimate interest of society, this right must, in some cases, be circumscribed. How a society answers the questions of how and when, in the last analysis, determines the kind of society it is to be.

There is no clear answer as to what limitations may be constitutionally imposed on a citizen's right to travel. The legal decision would have to be made by weighing the competing interests involved. However, this committee is in the happy position of being able to make a decision, not solely on the basis of constitutional legality, although this, too, must be observed. This committee may invoke the more important standards of desirability and wisdom.

In my bill I propose only three limitations on the right to travel. The first of these is effective only after a declaration of war. The President may then issue regulations governing the movement of persons into and out of the United States.

Secondly, when United States forces are engaged in hostilities, other than a declared war, the President may govern the movement of persons in designated combat areas.

Third, and finally, the bill provides that at any time, the Secretary of State may deny a passport to any person under indictment, information, or sentence for the commission of a felony.

These are the only restrictions I would place on travel and this is essentially what the practice of the State Department was in 1926 when the basic passport statute was recodified and which, under the Kent decision, appears to be the limit of the Secretary of State's power today, at least, as far as beliefs and associations are concerned.

But what then, you ask, about Communists, fellow travelers, and malcontents who may go abroad to spread hostile or malicious criticism of the United States and its policy? Is it not in the best interest of the United States to prevent this kind of activity? While I loathe and detest Communists, I believe that regardless of how reprehensible their views, confining even these people within the borders of the United States is not the answer.

First of all, we must remember that the activities on the basis of which travel is most often forbidden is conduct which is lawful under United States law, even though you and I may consider it wrongful conduct. Paul Robeson said "We treat Negroes badly; Russia will treat them better."

Secondly, the danger to American security which would result if we were to take down our travel barriers, has been vastly exaggerated. The professional and effective spy, like Colonel Abel, obviously does not have to rely on Miss Frances Knight's good graces to get into or out of the United States. Furthermore, considering the immunity enjoyed by diplomatic officials, diplomatic pouch, and private mails, it is ridiculous to believe that vital secrets once obtained can be retained within the borders of the United States by restricting the travel of certain individuals. Khrushchev's stooges are too clever to declare their nefarious purposes in a passport application.

What, then, do we accomplish by restrictive legislation of the kind that is generally being proposed? In the main, we deny exit to people who, because of current attitudes or past associations, may provide favorable propaganda abroad for the Soviet Union. Again, I say this is patently unrealistic. Communist sympathizers need not leave the United States to accomplish a propaganda purpose. Tape recordings and films made here and transported abroad, statements made here which are reported abroad, releases to the foreign Communist press are all available and effective means of communication. And how much greater is the propaganda value when there is appended a brief editorial comment that the writer has been confined within the United States because of his disagreement with the official attitude of the United States Government? For then we have an indictment of the United States not by the misrepresentations of some fellow traveler, but more damning by the repressive action of the United States Government itself. Considered in the context of our commitment to a program of free travel and our condemnation of the Russians for prohibiting travel by those who disagree with the Marxist line, the effect on our international stature of restrictions of this kind can only be most injurious. This is something which you, as foreign affairs experts, must appreciate even more vividly than I.

A graphic illustration of what I am talking about is the Paul Robeson case. As long as he could not get a passport, Robeson's restriction made good propaganda. Since he has gotten a passport, the Reds have lost an effective argument which appealed to millions around the world. And Paul Robeson, traveling abroad, has either refrained from critical remarks against the United States or if he has made them, they have been conspicuous by their ineffectiveness. He certainly cannot say nasty things.

Another example is that of Dr. Martin E. Kamen, professor of radiation physics and biochemistry at Washington University in St. Louis. He was three times refused a passport after he had been chosen to be a visiting professor in Australia and after he had been invited to scientific conferences in France and England. The State Department said he had dined with a Soviet vice consul at a public restaurant, and two Army intelligence agents at a nearby table had recorded their conversation about the possibility of treating radioactively a Russian consular official who was suffering from leukemia. The Atomic Energy Commission saw no objection to Dr. Kamen's leaving the country. Dr. Kamen's passport was granted in July, 1955, 8 years after he first applied for it. Three years later, in August, 1958, we still have heard nothing critical about Dr. Kamen's behavior abroad.

A third example of how foolish we have made ourselves appear to the rest of the world, and for no good reason, is the Arthur Miller case. In 1954, the Pulitzer Prize winning author of Death of a Salesman was not allowed to go to Brussels to see a performance of his own play, The Crucible. Finally, in June 1955, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit upset the State Department's denial of the passport because it was based on insufficient reasons. Mr. Miller subsequently went to Europe and the foundations of the Republic have not crumbled. In his case the State Department said his visit abroad would not be in the best interests of the United States. Rather bold reason. Frankly it was

punishment rather than concern for his future conduct.

However, let us assume that an American goes abroad and says and does things which may be of propaganda value to the Russians. Why is this great Nation so paralyzed with mortal terror over the possibility that a handful of malcontents may say the same unpleasant and untrue things about us that the Kremlin already says in sixty languages beamed to all parts of the world every day of the week? If you desire to punish, then invoke the criminal law—do not deny a passport. If you want to punish a Communist then indict him for violation of some act—say the Smith Act. Refusal of passport never should be a matter of sanction.

Gentlemen, there is an old Latin maxim, "cessante ratione, cessat ipsa lex," the reason for the law having ceased, the law itself ceases. If there ever was a reason in peacetime for preventing the travel of Americans who were not under criminal prosecution or sentence, our experience with the passport denials of recent years shows that the best reasons advanced by the State Department have, when tested, proved meaningless.

There is another side to this problem. Up to now I have been talking about the denial of passports to individuals. However, there is also the question of geographical limitations which affect all Americans traveling abroad. Thus, the State Department has, during recent years, prohibited travel to Red China, Bulgaria, Hungary, Albania, North Korea, North Viet-Nam, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, and Syria. This affects all citizens and not just those of doubtful loyalty. Its effect is to seal off from the eyes of our people large areas of the world. This policy directly contravenes the very basic right upon which any democracy must be based—the right of its people to see for themselves and to learn so that they can make intelligent decisions.

Now, the argument is made that the Secretary of State must have the authority to prevent travel to certain areas for the personal protection of the traveler. If that, in fact, is the purpose of such bans, is it not suffcient to warn prospective travelers that in certain designated areas the United States may not be able to give its usual protection? I believe that this is preferable to limiting a constitutional right for the purposes of foreign policy. Section 5 of my bill provides for warning passport applicants but prohibits forbidding travel to those areas.

I hold the right of an American to find out for himself more important than prohibitions on travel like that which the State Department imposed on Egypt, Israel, Jordan, and Syria in 1956, two days after all parties to the hostilities had formally agreed to a cease-fire. How ludicrous to issue a bar after the trouble was over and the shooting had stopped. This prohibition, I might add, continued until April 1, 1957, a period during which no other country in the world found that the safety of its nationals required such a law, and I include Britain and France, two of the belligerents. There was complete peace during those 6 months. The countries involved complained that their tourist trade had been greatly hampered and curtailed.

The argument is often made that warning American nationals that they cannot be protected in certain areas is not enough. It is argued that if, in fact, American nationals are abused in a foreign country, the United States is put in an untenable and embarrassing position. I dispute this conclusion. First of all as to the American national, the United States has absolved itself of any duty to come to his assistance by its prior warning. Secondly, as to the effect on the prestige of the United States in the eyes of the world community, it is not the United States which loses stature, but it is rather the nation which has defied fundamental human principles in its abuse of innocent travelers.

I come now to section 6 of this bill which deals with procedural due process. Briefly, it would make the Administrative Procedure Act without exceptions applicable to all passport proceedings. Since the bill allows the denial of passports in peacetime only to those under prosecution or sentence, the procedural difficulties which we have experienced in this field become moot.

Gentlemen, the problem which you have before you today is in no sense a partisan one. Both Democrats and Republicans have espoused the basic principles upon which this bill is predicated. Briefly, it would make the Administrative Procedure Act without exceptions applicable to all passport proceedings. Since the bill allows the denial of passports in peacetime only to those under prosecution or sentence, the procedural difficulties which we have experienced in this field become moot.

Gentlemen, the problem which you have before you today is in no sense a partisan one. Both Democrats and Republicans have espoused the basic principles upon which this bill is predicated. In 1951, President Truman, remonstrating against the refusal of a totalitarian government to allow its citizens to go abroad, said, "We shall never be able to remove suspicion and fear as potential causes of war until communication is permitted to flow, free and open, across international boundaries." And 5 years later, in July 1955, President Eisenhower called upon the nations of the world to "lower the barriers which now impede the opportunities of people to travel anywhere in the world."

It is high time for Congress to put an end to a contradictory policy which has been a continuous source of embarrassment abroad. I think that it is also time for us to lay aside our paralyzing fears and to reaffirm our faith in the strength of democratic process by acting favorably on right to travel legislation.

Unfortunately there has been established in our country a climate of fear and suspicion of freedom—indeed a widespread fear that our Bill of Rights is dangerous—that freedom is over-extended and its restriction is desirable. I believe our greatest national danger is that of the paralysis of fear gripping us. On the one hand we make a great to-do of the strength of our democratic institutions, of our foundation of government of law, and of our great development of industrial, social and spiritual power under these principles, and on the other hand, internally we seem to cringe, not before the thought of the impact of a hydrogen bomb, but before the thought of the impact of ideas.

Courage to travel to the moon, yes—as we seem to be doing—but courage in the market place of ideas—no.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, when this bill was brought before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, on August 14, 1958, I felt strongly that it should not be acted upon by the committee until witnesses had been heard and there was ample opportunity for study and, if the committee after deliberation so decided, for amendment. The lateness of the session to me seemed no justification for bringing to the floor of the House without the proper committee processing any bill, especially one in a field so close to the constitutional rights and freedoms of Americans. Furthermore, the chance of enactment this late in the session of any legislation preventing the granting of passports to those knowingly engaged in an international Communist conspiracy would have been minimized by rushing the bill through committee with scant consideration.

I think my colleagues now will agree with me that the continuance of our hearings on August 15 and 18, 1958, served a very useful purpose. For one thing, they gave us on the committee the benefit of listening to the viewpoints of Congressmen CELLER and KEATING, one the chairman and the other the ranking minority member of the Judiciary Committee, and of Congressmen UDALL, ROOSEVELT, and DINGELL.

Many amendments were presented, discussed at length; some rejected and some adopted. Every member of the committee participated in the discussion. There was very little left of the original draft of the bill when the committee had completed its work. There was a common desire to compromise differences to the end that the committee could come up with a bill that would stand the best chance of passing, that would operate to keep passports from the possession of Communist conspirators, that would safeguard the rights of Americans, and that would stand up in the Supreme Court if a constitutional question were raised. The committee worked hard, earnestly, and with sincerity.

My additional supplemental views, as stated on page 11 of the report, follow:

ADDITIONAL SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS

In refraining from signing the report, which I have had brief time to examine, I am not necessarily taking issue with my colleagues on the committee. It is merely that I wish in my own language to state my position.

I would not place in the hands of any person provenly party to an international Communist conspiracy an American passport to facilitate the workings of his nefarious designs. In this I think the committee is in unanimous agreement.

Nor would I place in the hands of any individual the arbitrary power to determine who should or who should not be granted passports. In this, also, I think the committee is in unanimous agreement.

The tests of the bill are (1) whether it meets the desired objective of keeping passports from proven parties to an international Communist conspiracy, (2) whether at the same time it protects loyal Americans from injustices that can result when charges emanate from undisclosed sources and full opportunity for answering is not accorded, and (3) whether the language of the bill raises a constitutional question.

The committee wrote in the provision that prior to the denial of the passport the applicant must be accorded the opportunity of a hearing and the denial of passport is subject to judicial review.

The language is not as definite as I would like it. The word "hearing" undefined, might cover a proceeding wherein the applicant is called in, informed of accusations or suspicions without the disclosure of the identity of those from whom they came or opportunity to defend in the sense recognized in American courts of justice. I would like, too, to have had the matter of judicial review expressly stated to include all matters of relevancy, both in fact and in law.

I am giving my support to the bill as now amended. I think the House should understand, however, that this is a stopgap legislation until the 86th Congress can take over. It is intended only to meet the immediate situation set forth in the President's message of July 7, 1958, in which he stated that each day and week that passes—without such legislation—exposes us to great danger. It reflects the wish of the committee and of the House to meet any danger which the President of the United States regards as menacing our country.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have permission to extend their remarks immediately prior to the passage of the bill H. R. 13760.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 6 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 13192. An act making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. THYE, and Mr. DIRKSEN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1959

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 13192) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we might have some information from the gentleman as to what the other body did in connection with this bill.

Mr. PASSMAN. It is my understanding that the other body followed the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and put back $440 million, that is, increased the House bill by $440 million.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if I might ask the gentleman, is it the purpose of the conferees on the part of the House to insist upon the House version of this bill?

Mr. PASSMAN. It is always the purpose of the conferees on appropriations bills to insist on the House version.

Mr. GROSS. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PASSMAN, GARY, ROONEY, NATCHER, DENTON, ALEXANDER, ANDREWS, CANNON, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, FORD, and MILLER of Maryland.

HON. GEORGE SHUFORD

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, when Congress convenes in January, our beloved colleague, GEORGE SHUFORD, will not be with us. He is voluntarily retiring to the "Hills of Home." He is going back to the majestic mountains, the lofty peaks, and lovely lakes of his native State. He is going home to live with his loved ones and friends.

Wonderful and mysterious are the vicissitudes of human life; frail and precarious are our very best holds on human happiness. Here in this Hall many of our colleagues have grown grey with age. The grim reaper has taken away many of our friends and has swept them from the shores of sound to the great realm of silence and upon others the heavy hand of affliction has fallen.

GEORGE SHUFORD will take with him into retirement the love and affection of his colleagues who have enjoyed his friendship during the time that he has served here so faithfully. GEORGE SHUFORD, by his sterling character, his courteous and courtly manner, has endeared himself to all of us. He is a dedicated and devoted public servant. He has lived magnificently and his life has been a blessing to the people he has so well and ably represented. I extend to him every good wish for his personal welfare and happiness.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join with my fellow members of the North Carolina delegation in saying hail and, regretfully, farewell to our good companion and colleague, GEORGE SHUFORD. I have known GEORGE for many years—dating back to his university days at Chapel Hill, and through the years our friendship has deepened and has become especially meaningful since he joined the North Carolina delegation here in the Halls of Congress as the able Representative of the 12th District.

While all of us realize that his health is of primary importance, we nevertheless regret that he will not be with us in the 86th Congress. We will miss his companionship, his keen sense of humor, and his never-failing cooperation in enterprises and activities of common interest to our State and to the Nation. He has made an indelible impression on all who have associated with him here—both old friends and new. We wish for him and confidently expect a full return to health and strength back in the beautiful mountain country where he lives, and we know that he will continue in the path of dedicated service to the people of his State and to the country which he has served so effectively as he returns to private life and to the practice of law.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, as the 85th Congress comes to a conclusion I am confident that many of my colleagues have the same feeling of regret that I experience in the realization that the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, Hon. GEORGE A. SHUFORD is retiring from the Congress.

GEORGE SHUFORD has been a valuable Member of this body. Above all, he has been a most capable representative of the people of North Carolina during the three terms that he had served them in Washington. No man has been more diligent than he in presenting the best philosophy of government in every official and private act that he has done. This diligence and fidelity has been characteristic of GEORGE SHUFORD throughout his life. As an attorney, soldier, State legislator, trial judge, and Congressman he has fully measured up to the highest standards.

It has been my privilege to know and be associated with Judge SHUFORD for many years. My first intimate acquaintanceship with him came through my work as district prosecuting attorney while he was serving as one of the judges of the superior court of North Carolina.

Through that association I came to appreciate him as a Christian gentleman and painstaking jurist. His kindliness to and consideration of the humblest citizen in the courts was one of his outstanding qualities then. When I came to Washington in 1957 as a new Member of the North Carolina delegation he was among the first to tender his cooperation and good wishes. Time cannot erase from my heart and mind the sentiments of profound appreciation I have for this good man and his fine works.

As he was successfully waging a campaign for renomination in the Democratic primary this year he was stricken with the illness which has caused him to surrender his position in Congress. His countless friends in North Carolina and the Nation were saddened that such a wonderful man should be the victim of such an experience. But, Mr. Speaker, I know that our distinguished colleague has accepted this vicissitude with the same philosophical attitude that has been his throughout his lifetime. His deep Christian faith has sustained him and I express the confidence that through that faith he will find the means of rendering great service to our Nation and the kingdom of God for many years to come.

So, Mr. Speaker, as our splendid friend goes into retirement in the mountains of western North Carolina, which he loves so much, I want to add my words of appreciation to those expressed by our other colleagues for the life and works of our lovable friend, GEORGE SHUFORD.

Mr. SCOTT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it is with sincere and deep regret that I learn of the retirement of Judge GEORGE A. SHUFORD from Congress. I shall always be grateful to him for his helpfulness to me during my first term in the House. His advice and suggestions from time to time have been most helpful to me. I have not yet found him in error. He is one of the most genial and genuine gentlemen I have ever known. His simple, frank, modest, and friendly manner is not assumed; it is a result and bespeaks the man beneath. He is one of the few men of whom I have heard no critical word spoken. If others have disagreed with his views, they have not questioned his sincerity and high purpose. The people of the 12th Congressional District have been most fortunate to be represented by a man of Judge SHUFORD'S quality. He has enjoyed as well as deserved the respect and admiration of his fellow Members of Congress and has made many notable contributions to his District and to the Nation. I join other members of the North Carolina delegation and his many friends here in the House in wishing Judge SHUFORD good health and happiness and the very best of all that life has to offer.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I had a deep sense of sadness when my distinguished colleague and close friend, Judge GEORGE SHUFORD, announced his intention to retire from the Congress at the end of this year. While his decision to retire is regretted by all of those who have enjoyed close association with him here, I am sure it is wise from the standpoint of his personal welfare.

In his retirement, the House will lose the services of a great American who has continuously had the interest of his State and Nation at heart since serving as a soldier on the battlefields of France. He has served his people and his country with distinction in positions of responsibility and leadership for many years and has earned a well deserved rest from his arduous duties. As a public servant his every act has reflected a keen intelligence and an humble but great capacity for fair and just consideration of the rights of all with whom he dealt.

As an individual, he has endeared himself to all of his colleagues by his sincerity and loyalty, and especially to me has he been a close and valued friend. The counseling and advice he has given to me in many matters since I entered the Congress have been invaluable. I hope that after his retirement our paths will cross often and that he will find the time to visit with his many friends in future sessions of the House.

The judge and his charming wife will go back home to the beautiful mountains of western North Carolina and I wish for both of them continued happiness, good luck, and God's richest blessings.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to a good friend and highly respected colleague, Judge GEORGE A. SHUFORD, who is retiring as a Member of the House of Representatives at the close of the 85th Congress. I deeply regret the necessity for his decision to leave his service with us.

Judge SHUFORD comes from the Blue Ridge and Great Smoky Mountains section of North Carolina. Surely the grandeur and strength of these great mountains molded the character and the dedicated life of their native son.

GEORGE SHUFORD brought to the Congress a vast and rich experience of public service. He served in the North Carolina State Legislature, and there I had the privilege of observing his legislative ability and his wisdom. He moved on to a position of honor and eminence as a judge of the North Carolina Superior Court where he gained great respect for his keen sense of justice and fairness.

As a Member of this body since January 1953, Judge SHUFORD has been forceful in representing his constituency and courageous in advocating his convictions for the general welfare of our Nation.

In the recent North Carolina primary Judge SHUFORD had four opponents. He waged a successful campaign against the opposition in spite of illness that developed. Since that time, Judge SHUFORD'S health has not permitted his resumption of duty in the way he thought his people should be represented. Recognizing his vast obligation to be an effective and active representative, he voluntarily withdrew as a nominee for United States Representative from the 12th District of North Carolina.

We shall greatly miss the help and leadership that Judge SHUFORD has given us in the House. I personally wish for him improved health and many years of happiness back in his native hills of North Carolina.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I join with the members of the North Carolina delegation in their words of praise and in extending Godspeed and best wishes to our beloved colleague and friend, the Honorable GEORGE A. SHUFORD, Representative of the 12th District of North Carolina.

GEORGE SHUFORD was one of the first Members of Congress whom I met after my election to this body, and we became friends at our first meeting. We live in adjoining States. I had many times visited in his home District and his home city, and there were many items of mutual interest to us.

He attended and graduated from the University of Georgia, the same University which in later years I attended and from which I graduated.

In addition to being a member of the bar and a distinguished jurist in North Carolina, he was also a duly admitted member of the bar in my own State of Georgia.

GEORGE SHUFORD has served his District, his State and his Nation with ability, with honor and with proven dedication.

I regret that Congressman SHUFORD has felt it necessary on account of his health to retire from Congress. I am equally sure that the citizens of the District which he so ably represented likewise regret his decision, but I also know that they understand.

He was respected, admired and beloved in western North Carolina and this has been attested to by his election on three different occasions to the House of Representatives. Only recently he was renominated by an overwhelming majority of the combined votes of several opponents to again represent his District for a fourth consecutive term.

GEORGE SHUFORD voluntarily retires from his service in the House of Representatives and with his devoted wife returns to the hills of home. With him go our best wishes for many, many years of happiness. We shall look forward to seeing him often and we wish him Godspeed in all his endeavors.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in bidding GEORGE SHUFORD au revoir. I do not say goodby because I expect, and certainly hope, that our paths will cross frequently in the days and years that lie ahead.

It has been a genuine privilege, as well as a pleasure, to serve in Congress with GEORGE for these last 6 years. Our personal and official association has always been most pleasant and, to me certainly, profitable. Our Districts adjoin in North Carolina and we have cooperated in many activities of interest to them. It has always given me a great deal of pleasure and satisfaction to work with GEORGE on these projects in which our people were interested.

GEORGE SHUFORD was a distinguished citizen of our State before he came to

Congress. His training and experience had fully equipped him to discharge the duties and responsibilities of membership in this body. In the discharge of those duties he lived up to the expectations of his friends and fully justified their faith in him. As he voluntarily retires from Congress he leaves behind a host of friends who respect him for his great abilities, admire him for the courage he has displayed, and rejoice over the fact that his health is improving.

I wish to be numbered among his many friends, here and elsewhere, who wish for GEORGE SHUFORD long life, good health, and a full measure of happiness and contentment in the years ahead. Under the loving care of his devoted wife and family, and among the host of lifetime friends who await his return to the "Land of the Sky," I sincerely hope and trust that all this will come to pass.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of sadness that I join my colleagues in paying tribute to Congressman SHUFORD on the occasion of his pending retirement.

I have never had a closer friend and have never known a kinder or more considerate person than Judge SHUFORD. In our association he has always been like an older brother to me. I am proud that I have had the pleasure and privilege of knowing him so well, for it makes me feel that I can share with his many friends the happy memories of our association here in the House.

Shakespeare said, "The apparel oft proclaims the man." A similar statement could be made, with equal truth, about the life a person leads and would certainly apply to Judge SHUFORD. To me the life he has led in the House proclaims the man of integrity and loyalty—a conscientious Representative, a real public servant, never selfish and never indifferent to the problems of others. Never have I found him too busy to lend an ear to any problem I might have or a helping hand for any aid I might need.

In his position of influence and distinction he has been eager in service, constant in labor—fighting a hard fight to accomplish for his people the things he believed to be right and in their interest. He has been a constructive advocate of international goodwill and world peace, foe of war and by the same token friend of humanity. He exemplifies the ideals for which our Government stands and our society in this present day world has a great need for men of his caliber.

Judge SHUFORD has won the admiration of his colleagues by his resourcefulness, his courage, the nobility of his vision, the determination and enthusiasm of his service in the House of Representatives since his election to the 83d Congress.

I have never known a man of greater stature. As you all know he won renomination in the Democratic primary over three other candidates which is equal to election in his District. While Judge SHUFORD could doubtless have remained in Congress and ably represented his constituents indefinitely he decided to retire even though assured of reelection because he felt that possibly he would be unable to render maximum service to his constituents. This to me is the acid test of sincerity, loyalty, and devotion to his country, which truly bespeaks the character of our beloved friend and colleague, GEORGE SHUFORD.

Like most of us, during the heat of a campaign or the busy, hectic days of legislative duty, Judge SHUFORD has envisioned quiet and restful hours in his beloved North Carolina mountains.

It is with a sense of great loss that I, and I am sure all the North Carolina delegation and other Members of Congress, see him retire from the Congress, but in the realization of his dream we wish the Honorable GEORGE A. SHUFORD good health, happiness, and good fortune in his future undertakings.

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound regret and sorrow that I have learned of the voluntary retirement of our good friend and colleague, the Honorable GEORGE SHUFORD of the great State of North Carolina. It was my pleasure and privilege to serve with Judge SHUFORD, as he was known to our fellow members of the Interior Committee. He was a hard worker in committee, ever alert to the interests of his District and his opinions and judgment were highly respected by everyone. The House has been honored by his distinguished presence and he has served his constituency and his native State in the finest tradition.

I am informed that he will return to his native Asheville to be with old friends and his fine family and we can only extend our best wishes for good health and many happy years there. We shall all look forward to his future visits and the renewal of good friendships in Washington.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure and good fortune to know the many able men sent by the great State of North Carolina to the Congress during the past 33 years. Both in the House and Senate; they have left their mark and been outstanding. GEORGE A. SHUFORD from the 12th District of North Carolina has measured up to the high quality, leadership, and statesmanship of his predecessors both from his District and the State. Before coming to the House of Representatives he had demonstrated to his District and the State those qualities that make one proud to have GEORGE as a friend, and as a friend he is ever true and loyal. His love and devotion to his family is one of his most beautiful characteristics. I have enjoyed his wholesomeness and ready wit. GEORGE will be missed by his many friends here in the House. I do hope and pray he will enjoy the rest he deserves and soon be returned to his former good health. My best wishes to you GEORGE; a fighting soldier and true Christian.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, during my 15 years service in the House I have never known a finer member than GEORGE SHUFORD. He possesses what I conceive to be the finest qualifications that a public official can have. He is as honest as the day is long. He is able and courageous. He is devoted to duty and has always been mindful to the oath he took to uphold the Constitution and laws of this land.

The voluntary retirement from the House of Representatives of the United States Congress by GEORGE SHUFORD is a great loss to his native State of North Carolina and to this Nation.

I wish for him the best of everything in the years ahead when he enjoys a well-earned rest from a lifetime of useful service to his country.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, the majestic mountains of North Carolina produced and nurtured a tower of strength in the person of GEORGE ADAMS SHUFORD, able attorney, soldier, State legislator, trial judge, and distinguished Congressman. The Nation, the State of North Carolina, the 12th District of North Carolina, and the Congress has benefited by his membership and devoted service in this body. Since his election to the Congress, Judge SHUFORD has been a strong, vigorous, and capable leader who has rightfully earned the respect of all his colleagues by proving himself to be as unwavering in his devotion to duty as those great old mountains he calls home.

Judge SHUFORD has been an outstanding Member of this body. His intelligence, his legal capacity, his great love for his country, and his warm personal regard for people especially fitted him for public service. The fact that he was overwhelmingly renominated for another term in the Congress is ample proof of the great respect his constituents have for him. They recognize his great ability, his zeal to render the best service possible, and they value his strength of character. The 12th District of North Carolina could depend upon his steadying influence. Undoubtedly, Judge SHUFORD could have remained the Representative of the 12th District as long as he desired. However, because of his firm conviction that a public servant must be physically strong in order to effectively represent his constituency, the Judge considers it his duty to retire.

It has been my good fortune and pleasure to have been closely associated with Judge SHUFORD since he and I first came to Washington as Members of the 83d Congress. We have served together on both the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and the Veterans' Affairs Committee. From that association, I have gained very much by getting to know Judge SHUFORD. Those who labored with him in these committees soon learned that he could not be swayed by emotional and illogical appeals. Judge SHUFORD was recognized for his astuteness in carefully evaluating the facts, for his minutely sifting and casting aside extraneous matter, and his uncanny ability to come to grips with the issue under consideration. Upon the basis of such analysis, Judge SHUFORD would firmly take a sound position from which he never faltered.

It is especially difficult to express farewell to Judge SHUFORD. I sincerely regret that circumstances are such that he deems it advisable to retire from active public service. In so doing, he can enjoy the satisfaction that comes to a man for having done a good job, for he

has served his country and his State with distinction. We extend to Judge SHUFORD and his charming wife our sincere best wishes for many years of happiness and contentment together in their beloved mountains of North Carolina.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I learned that my good friend, Congressman GEORGE SHUFORD, was retiring from the Congress after the close of this session. My father, Dwight L. Rogers, who represented the Sixth District of Florida for many years, counted Judge SHUFORD as one of his close friends, and it has meant a great deal to me to continue this warm friendship. His advice and counsel have indeed been invaluable.

Judge SHUFORD represents the 12th District of North Carolina which embraces the beautiful, mountainous section of the State and which many residents of the Sixth District of Florida count as their second home. He has rendered an invaluable service to his District and served it ably and well. His fine service will be greatly missed by all of the residents of his District, as well as the entire State of North Carolina.

I join with all of his many friends here in wishing for him a full return to health and many good wishes to him and his fine family for continued happiness.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I want to join many of my colleagues in paying tribute to one of the finest Congressmen it has been my privilege to know and work with since I have been in the House of Representatives, the Honorable GEORGE A. SHUFORD.

Although Congressman SHUFORD's period of service in the Congress has been a relatively short one, he has earned the respect and admiration of his colleagues by his hard work, intense patriotism, and untiring efforts to promote the interest not only of his native State and District but of the Nation as a whole. His fine legal background fitted him admirably for representation in the United States Congress, where he has served with both dignity and integrity. He has been a most effective member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

As Congressman SHUFORD leaves the Congress to return to the private practice of law, he carries with him the respect and best wishes of all who know him. It is my hope that he will enjoy continued success and happiness in the years ahead. When the 86th Congress convenes in January, he will be sorely missed by all.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, with this 85th Congress in its final hours, we near the breach of many rewarding associations. Apart from the decisions to be made by the people on election day, these close relationships of daily legislative work will be severed, in numerous cases, by voluntary individual decisions.

There comes poignantly to mind the withdrawal from public life of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable GEORGE ADAMS SHUFORD of North Carolina. For considerations of health, Judge SHUFORD has found it necessary to withdraw his candidacy for reelection—a decision learned with sincere regret by his many friends and admirers in this House and in the 12th Congressional District of North Carolina, which he has served so conscientiously and ably.

I need not recall to his colleagues how this beloved, kindhearted man so admirably combines the human qualities of warmth and genuine friendliness with a canny capacity for getting things done. Those of us who have been privileged to work with him have been enriched by the experience. His retirement is a great loss to the Nation and his native State.

As Judge SHUFORD returns to his beautiful mountain-cradled community of Asheville, the prayer and wish of his friends in this House is that his health soon will be fully restored, and that his wise counsel will remain available in the years ahead.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest men and most dedicated public servants I know, your friend and my friend, GEORGE SHUFORD, for reasons of health, will not be back with us in the 86th Congress.

I knew of GEORGE's unfortunate and untimely illness which struck him down temporarily just a few days before he was given a splendid vote of confidence in the recent Democratic primary in the 12th Congressional District of North Carolina. Nonetheless, I was shocked beyond words when I heard of his resignation as the Democratic nominee to Congress in the coming November general election in the 12th Congressional District of North Carolina. I was especially saddened by his decision because I knew of the rapid progress he had made on the road to recovery. Like you and his many other friends here, I had hoped he would decide to stay with us. In fact, he looked wonderful on the floor of the House just yesterday.

Unquestionably, had GEORGE SHUFORD chosen to remain in the race as a candidate for reelection to the 86th Congress, he would have been returned to us by the people of his District. However, because of his own personal fears that he might not be able to continue to serve the people of his District as fully, completely, and effectively as he would like, he chose to let his people send another in his place. He wanted no question to be in their minds about the health of their Representative in the Congress. This unselfish attitude characterizes the kind of man he is.

My colleague, HUGH ALEXANDER, and I will probably miss GEORGE more than any other Member of the Congress, although he was a very close and devoted friend of many with whom he has served. We three have been together for some time in the school of public service. We are fraternity brothers so to speak since we were in the North Carolina Legislature together. Though GEORGE was subsequently elevated to the high office of superior court judge of North Carolina, where he served with great honor, ability, and distinction, we three came to Congress together. Our wives are close friends. No couple that ever came to Washington more beautifully and thoroughly built themselves into the work and lives and hearts of those with whom they associated than the SHUFORDS.

No Member of the Congress is held in higher esteem by his colleagues than is GEORGE SHUFORD. In fact, whether or not one always agreed with him, he had the type of confidence and respect of his colleagues without which a Member of Congress might just as well not be here. He has demonstrated great legislative ability throughout his career in the Congress. He has come to be known as one of the most outstanding Members of this body. He was serious and, at the same time, good humored. He has reflected great credit upon himself, his family, and the people of our State and Nation. It has not been his nature to be spectacular. He has not been a blowhard in the cave of winds, but he has been a master of person-to-person conversation in the cloakrooms and around the committee tables, over the telephone, and wherever he has moved here in Washington. He got things done without a lot of lost motion. His keen insight and judgment, his tolerant and sympathetic understanding, his genuine friendliness and gentleness, his cordial, captivating and relaxing smile, his soft words of wisdom, his devotion to duty, his love for his family and his people back home are the hallmarks of a great person and a noble public servant.

Mr. Speaker, in these troubled times when the world is faced with seemingly impossible differences between men and nations; when uncertainty, confusion and indecision characterize the attitudes of statesmen and diplomats in all of the world's capitals, including our own; when the evil which possesses man is manifesting itself more visibly; when the spirit of hate, jealousy, greed, and lust for power still dominates so many human hearts; when selfishness seems to have gripped the entire human race; when castles of wisdom and sympathetic understanding are so desperately needed, our country suffers a great loss when such a man as GEORGE SHUFORD, though one man he is, retires from public service. This able and distinguished Member of the 83d, the 84th, and 85th Congresses of the United States, affectionately referred to by me as GEORGE, known and loved as GEORGE or "Judge" by his associates and vast numbers of people who knew him only by reputation, never lost the common touch. He never forgot that he was the servant of all—the most humble, the rich and the poor, the high and the low—educated and uneducated alike. This, to me, made him the kind of public servant America needs more of.

The poet, Kipling, might well have been speaking of men like GEORGE SHUFORD when he said:

If you can talk with crowds and keep your virtue,
Or walk with kings—nor lose the common touch,
If neither foes nor loving friends can hurt you,
If all men count with you, but none too much;
If you can fill the unforgiving minute
With 60 seconds' worth of distance run,
Yours is the earth and everything that's in it,
And—which is more—you'll be a man, my son.

GEORGE SHUFORD will not be back with us in January. All of us will miss him greatly. I think I can assure him that when he leaves this great House of Representatives and returns to private life at his home in the beautiful mountains of western North Carolina, he will carry with him the respect, admiration, and devotion of every Member of this body.

I, therefore, want to join my colleagues from North Carolina and others in this, the greatest deliberative body on earth, in paying this sincere tribute to a great man, GEORGE SHUFORD, and in expressing the hope that he and his lovely and loving wife, Daphne, and their loved ones will enjoy during the years that lie ahead an abundance of the greatest things in life—good health, happiness, and friends.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I would like to join with many other Members of Congress in paying high tribute to one of the closest friends I have ever had, in or out of Congress, the Honorable GEORGE SHUFORD, of Asheville, N. C.

Many deserving words have been said by our colleagues in describing GEORGE'S outstanding record of service to our State and Nation as an able attorney, a conscientious State legislator, a distinguished jurist and a courageous and wise Representative of his people in the Congress. To all these things I wholeheartedly subscribe and they are well known to all that know the Judge.

But above all this is GEORGE SHUFORD, the man. He is a kind, devoted, and loving husband and father; always true and loyal to his friends; a man of keen perception and wise judgment; a man possessing an understanding heart and the highest sense of integrity.

Everyone during his lifetime meets and gets to know thousands of people, many of whom become cherished friends. But there is a special category set aside for a few people that he feels as close to as members of his family. GEORGE and his lovely wife, Daphne, are in my special category. In my book, GEORGE is a 100 percent solid American, and I look forward to our continued close friendship through the years.

AMENDING CHAPTER 223 OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. WALTER submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 11477) to amend chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for the admission of certain evidence, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2702)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11477) to amend chapter 223 of title 28, United States Code, to provide for the admission of certain evidence, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

At the end of subsection (a) strike the period and insert the following: "*Provided, That such delay is to be considered as an element in determining the voluntary or involuntary nature of such statements or confessions.*"

And the Senate agree to the same.

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
EDWIN E. WILLIS,
KENNETH B. KEATING,
WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11477) to amend chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for the admission of certain evidence, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amended the House version by inserting in section 3501 (a) the word "reasonable" before the word "delay." The purpose of such an amendment was to make it clear that the proposed legislation did not intend to approve unreasonable delay in taking arrested persons before a commissioner or other officer empowered to commit persons charged with offenses against the laws of the United States.

The bill, as it passed the House, provided for a statuory rule of evidence for the admissibility of statements and confessions in criminal proceedings in the courts of the United States. While the House version did not contain the word "reasonable" in referring to delay, it still provided that statements and confessions otherwise admissible should be admitted into evidence and not be excluded solely because of delay in bringing the arrested person before the committing magistrate.

The amendment as agreed to by the conferees of both Houses is to make it clear and definite that the existing rule of evidence governing the admissibility of statements and confessions shall not be disturbed by the enactment of this legislation. The proviso as contained in this amendment is to that effect, that under all the circumstances, if the statement or confession is found to be involuntary, it shall be excluded. Thus the question of delay will always be a factor to be considered by the court in deciding whether or not the statement or confession is voluntary and therefore admissible in evidence.

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
EDWIN E. WILLIS,
KENNETH B. KEATING,
WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill, H. R. 11477, to amend chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for the admission of certain evidence, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the conference report.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the amendments recommended by the conferees do not alter the central objective of the bill passed by the House. That objective was to restore the constitutional test of voluntariness as the basis for determining the admissibility of confessions. The conference amendments make it clear by express language that voluntariness is now to be the test in these cases.

I want to say frankly that in my opinion no amendments at all were necessary to the House bill. I think we passed a good bill—one that preserved fair procedures without allowing a game to be made of law enforcement. It was a balanced measure designed to correct the public peril created by the Mallory decision but which at the same time contained new and explicit protections for arrested persons.

The conferees had the difficult task of reconciling the House measure with the quite different bill adopted by the Senate through the insertion of one word "reasonable." The description of what we mean by this word incorporated in the last clause of the bill represents more a clarification than a concession.

Approval of this legislation will cancel the mathematical equation devised by the Supreme Court between the promptness of arraignment and the admissibility of evidence. It will express in no uncertain terms our objection to this kind of mechanical jurisprudence.

The Mallory decision distorted the intention of Congress in approving, and the intention of the original Supreme Court Advisory Committee in recommending, adoption of rule 5. It was never intended that rule 5 operate as a rule of evidence. The bill corrects this misinterpretation.

The bill will eliminate the monumental confusion the Mallory decision has caused. It will answer the pleas of numerous civil, legal, fraternal, and law-enforcement groups all over the country for Congressional action. And it will remove the unreasonable obstructions to justice which now exist.

The need for this corrective legislation is critical. I am gratified that the conferees were able to reach agreement and hope there will be prompt approval in both bodies.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the conferees, I am happy that a majority conferees' report has been made to the House and I am hopeful of unanimous House approval of the Mallory bill (H. R. 11477) as reported.

In the Mallory case, the court permitted a confessed Negro rapist to go scot free by ruling that his confession was not admissible in evidence, although voluntarily made, because he was held for 7½ hours between his arrest and his arraignment.

This situation demanded Congressional action in that it is essential that confessed criminals should not be permitted to avoid conviction on this sham basis alone.

The Senate added the word, "reasonable" modifying "delay," to the House version and, of course, this had the effect of codifying into law the judicial rule of evidence laid down in the Mallory decision which was highly objectionable.

As a House conferee, and believing that this decision must be reversed, I refused to agree to the Senate version because the will of the House had been clearly expressed by an overwhelming vote in opposition to the Mallory decision.

The conferees agreed on a compromise which, in my opinion, reaffirms the House position which, in effect, provides

that delay between arrest and arraignment should be one element in determining whether a confession is voluntary or involuntary. The House position is being sustained in the conferees' report because the test will still be whether the confession is voluntary or not, and the period of delay will only be one element in determining this question. This has consistently been the position of the House; it has consistently been my position, and I believe it should be the position of the Supreme Court in the future.

I hope the enactment of this bill will result in more sensible and constructive decisions on the part of the Federal courts in the future.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on the conference report just adopted.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

A REPORT TO YOU

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the events of the past 2 years opened like Pandora's box and smacked the whole world in the face.

A new era was born. Manmade moons and intercontinental missiles drew our eyes skyward, and polar submarines sent our minds probing the deep.

And Congress burst its working seams to grasp the load thrust upon its shoulders. This 85th Congress faced the onslaught at first with the normal amount of prodding and fretting, then swung in with the big stick when it really got into action.

A Government agency was born to handle our space business. A new State made the 49th. Congress' assembly line of legislation slowed down recession, boosted foreign policy, strengthened defense, and held hands with the administration at the right time and the right place.

Bipartisanship helped to step up the record of the 85th Congress to one of the best any Congress ever made. Now its Members scatter to the four points to test the effects of their handiwork and seek and study the needs of the people and the country which the next Congress will struggle to fulfill.

There is unrest in many parts of the world and much uneasiness in this Nation. High prices, scarcity of jobs, shortage of schools, and the farmers' dilemma still rear their threatening heads about us and much work is yet to be done when the new Congress convenes next January.

The 85th Congress has a good record, and right now is the best time to review it and the part your Congressman had in its making.

A review of the accomplishments of this Congress and the world situation will be inserted in the RECORD at a later date.

EDWARD ARTHUR PATTERSON LAKE

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S. J. Res. 179) to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by the Dickinson Dam in the State of North Dakota as "Edward Arthur Patterson Lake."

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

THE WELFARE OF AGRICULTURE TRANSCENDS POLITICS

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to addres the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am gratified that some progress has been made in recent years, and especially in recent months, to work out some sound solutions to our farm problems.

The welfare of agriculture transcends politics. All of our people are vitally concerned that our farm families shall fully share in the national prosperity. We want, and we need, an agriculture that is prosperous—that is dynamic—an agriculture that is free.

The big task of the past few years so far as agriculture is concerned has been—and remains—to fit farm programs to changing needs.

We cannot turn back the technological revolution in agriculture. It is a plain fact that an average farmer produces in 1 hour today what he produced in 2 hours in 1940—and as much as he produced in 3 hours in 1910. Think of the impact of this fact and the problems resulting therefrom as well as resulting benefits.

I repeat, we cannot turn back that technological revolution. No thinking person wants to turn back. On the contrary, the people will want it to continue. We must not fear it. We must use it. We must built better markets to match our productivity. We must find and create new and expanded markets for our farm commodities here at home and across the seas as well, with freedom-loving people everywhere.

The approach of this administration to this basic question is sound. A careful study will show that it is paying good dividends.

The solution to our surplus is not ever more stringent acreage controls. We have seen the Corn Belt suffer a long time from the scarcity approach—the idea that the way to get fair prices and fair income is to cut back acreage allotments more and more. Yes, Mr. Speaker; farmers in Iowa, in Illinois, and in other States of the Corn Belt have watched while acreage diverted from wheat and cotton in other areas has gone into oats, soybeans, barley, and sorghums. They have watched while the corn-producing area has been spread out and diluted.

Twenty years ago, the commercial corn area included 566 counties in 12 States. Now it includes more than 900 counties in 26 States.

Acreage controls have failed to bring agricultural production into line. The corn program has not worked. Farmers have rebelled against it. That is why a year ago last December 62 percent of the corn farmers who voted in the referendum favored the elimination of corn-acreage allotments. That is why in 1957, only about one-seventh of the corn production in the commercial corn area was eligible for the full price support.

New legislation now makes it possible for corn producers to free themselves from these outmoded, antiquated controls and to become eligible for price support on a more realistic, more workable basis. The same legislation provides a sounder basis for livestock producers, for cotton and rice growers, and for agriculture in general.

I believe—and I feel sure my constituents in Iowa also believe—that the new farm bill is a sounder approach to an old and very difficult problem.

Mr. Speaker, agriculture is now a bright spot in our national economy picture. So far this year, both prices received by farmers and net income realized by farmers have been higher than in any similar period since 1953.

Crop yields this year may break all records. Yet, prices are staying up.

I think this reflects the confidence that farmers and the public generally have in the administration's farm program. Bountiful crops along with better price are what farmers most desire, and in Iowa farmers have both. Hog and cattle producers in my District are doing very much better than they were a few years ago.

Let me cite some national figures that prove the fact that the economic position of the farmer is improved materially.

During the first 6 months of 1958, prices received by farmers averaged 8 percent higher than they did in the same period of 1957, and realized net income averaged 22 percent above the first half of 1957.

Total net income per farm in the first half of 1958 was running higher than in 1953.

Farmers sold $13.8 billion worth of crops, livestock, and livestock products in the first half of 1958—a new gross farm-income record. Not only was this 11 percent more money than farmers received in the same months of 1957—it was nearly 5 percent above the previous record set in the first half of 1952—and that, I remind you, was in the midst of the big commodity demand created by

the war in Korea. This is highly significant progress. It is one of the dividends of a sound and dedicated approach toward some of the very difficult problems of the farm economy.

Markets are agriculture's prime need. What has been accomplished under this administration in opening up foreign markets—especially through the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act—has been most impressive.

Look at the record of farm exports over the past few years. In fiscal 1953, total farm exports were valued at only $2.8 billion. From that low point—the lowest incidentally since 1945—the value of our farm exports has risen year by year until it hit the all-time high of $4.7 billion in fiscal year 1957. In the fiscal year just passed, farm exports were estimated at about $4.1 billion—the second highest on record.

In fiscal 1957, when exports reached an alltime high of $4.7 billion, we exported the production equivalent of 60 million acres. Products equal to the output of one-fifth of our cropland were sold, bartered, donated, or otherwise moved to foreign customers.

About two-fifths of these exports were shipped under Government programs. The most important of these programs is the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, popularly known as Public Law 480.

Thus, Government programs and aggressive marketing have put extra dollars into the pockets of farmers in every section of the Nation and record exports have helped ease the burden of surpluses.

But what is just as important, these programs and these record exports are an important element in the Free World's fight against communism. In addition to our sales for dollars, our sales for foreign currencies, and our exchanges for barter, about 60 million people in 80 countries are receiving much-needed food donated by the United States. No amount of propaganda can fully obscure the meaning of that gesture of good will.

Yes, this administration has put forth telling efforts to reduce surplus holdings which in the main were amassed under laws carried over from the previous administration. Over the span of the last 5 years, commodities which cost CCC $14 billion have been moved out of the national inventory and into useful consumption.

Ten billion dollars of the total was accounted for by corn, wheat, dairy products, and cotton. Had those commodities still been in storage this year, we would not have seen the marked price betterment which has occurred. Disposals during the fiscal year just ended amounted to $3¼ billion.

Here is another way to describe the success of these disposal programs:

From a peak of 8 billion 930 million dollars in the spring of 1956, the CCC investment dropped to 7 billion 160 million by May of this year.

Another accomplishment of great interest to Iowa in view of the coming corn harvest is the expansion of storage facilities. Farmers, industry and Government have done the largest storage job in history. With help from the United States Department of Agriculture in determining areas of greatest storage need, the commercial storage industry increased its capacity by more than 600 million bushels from 1954 until late in 1957. Commercial increases have, fortunately, continued this year at an even faster rate.

Farmers have also added materially to their own on-farm storage space. During recent years, about 350 million bushels of new capacity has been added under the USDA's special farm facility loan program. These facilities are vital to the sound operation of the price support program.

We have used the Soil Bank, too, to reduce the surpluses. But for operations of the Soil Bank this year, surpluses would have been increased by the products from 27 million acres of farmland which were taken out of production.

In Iowa alone, 1,021,000 acres were withdrawn from 1958 production. Soil Bank commitments to owners of the 38,926 Iowa farms involved total $49,901,000.

I have reviewed in detail some of the major farm accomplishments of this administration. Now I want to cite some brief but significant highlights of many other accomplishments.

Some of our opponents like to paint the farmer as a man who has been forgotten by this administration. Nothing could be farther from the truth. In no other administration have farmers and farm problems received so much careful study and help as has been the case since 1953.

Let me cite chapter and verse. Since 1953 the Rural Electrification Administration has helped nearly 1,000 rural electric systems and almost 600 rural telephone systems.

Appropriations for agricultural research have been almost doubled.

Family type farms received loans totaling $178 million in fiscal 1958—compared with $130 million in 1953. Farm ownership loans went from less than $30 million in 1953 to more than $50 million in fiscal year 1958.

The school-lunch program in fiscal 1958 served nearly twice as many complete meals as it did in 1951.

Soil-conservation appropriations have increased every year since 1953. Appropriations for the current fiscal year are $128 million as against $70 million in 1953—an increase of 83 percent.

Approximately $600,000 has been extended in disaster and drought aid since 1953.

More than half a billion pounds of meat, costing $225 million, were bought in times of market glut to bolster cattle and hog prices. The products were distributed through school lunch and other outlets.

That's a sizable list of accomplishments. But there's an even larger list of new accomplishments—things done for the first time—under this administration.

A new Animal Disease Laboratory at Plum Island now studies foreign animal diseases for control purposes. Another new laboratory located at Ames in my own State will wage an unremitting battle against native diseases.

An accelerated campaign against brucellosis has raised the number of States reaching modified-certified-free status from 3 in 1954 to 13 in 1958.

Operation Outdoors was set up to expand recreational facilities in the national forests. Timber cut in the national forests is the highest on record. For the first time in 1957 the Forest Service planted a billion trees in 1 year's time. Forest fires in 1957 hit an alltime low.

The importance of water has received new recognition. The first Soil and Water Conservation Advisory Committee was established. The Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, providing aid to small watersheds was enacted in 1954. Requests for aid have been received from more than 900 watersheds.

A Great Plains conservation program was put into operation.

A rural development program was started and is now operating in 30 States.

A special milk program was started in 1954 and operated last year in 75,000 schools.

A bipartisan National Agricultural Advisory Commission was established in 1953 to assist in reviewing and developing farm policies and programs.

The Farm Credit Administration was made an independent agency and the agricultural credit system was made more responsive to farmers' needs.

The Agricultural Marketing Service was established in the Department's reorganization of 1953 to give greater emphasis to the solution of marketing and distribution problems.

The internal revenue law was amended to permit farmers and ranchers to make tax deductions for the costs of installing certain conservation practices.

Refunding of Federal taxes on gasoline used in tractors and other farm machinery saves farmers $60 million a year.

This is a very brief listing of a remarkable record of farm achievements under this administration. What was sound in the old programs has been improved and expanded. Much that was needed in new programs has been provided. I repeat, it is a remarkable record, indeed.

And the truth is, Mr. Speaker, that the insistence of this administration upon sound programs and policies has paid off in the progress of American agriculture.

Our agriculture is strong—and that is a good thing for the Nation. Our agriculture is the most basic part of the American economy.

I say our agriculture is strong, productive, full of vigor, ready and able to meet the challenge of the future, whatever that challenge might be.

Farm assets are an alltime record high—$188 billion as of January 1958.

Owner equities are also record high after a rise of 7 percent during 1957. They stand at more than $168 billion.

Farm ownership is record high, and the proportion of tenants is lower than ever before.

Farm foreclosures are near the alltime record low.

The standard of living on farms is at an alltime peak.

Farm people own more electrical appliances, automobiles, and have more conveniences than ever before.

Mr. Speaker, this is the record made under very difficult and trying circumstances. These are the facts. Speaking for myself, I am more than happy to have had a part in bringing about these solid achievements.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, members of postal and Federal employee organizations are vitally interested in the action taken by my subcommittee during this past session of Congress on matters relating to union recognition and improved labor-management relations in Government.

At my urging, a subcommittee was appointed to consider H. R. 6 and related legislation. Upon being named chairman of this subcommittee, I scheduled hearings at the earliest possible opportunity. This effort to expedite action was taken at a time when the committee and all Members were deeply engaged in other major legislation, including postal pay and postal rate adjustments, classified pay increases, and retirement annuity increases.

Complete hearings were held at which representatives of all major employee organizations as well as representatives of departments and agencies testified and presented their views. Hearings were held on 12 different days in March, April, July, and August at which time 73 witnesses testified. All witnesses for the administration voiced objection to the provisions of H. R. 6. The primary objection of nearly all department and agency representatives who testified was that legislation of this nature will so encroach upon the administrative functions and responsibility of those charged with the administration of the department that they can no longer be held responsible. Serious doubt was expressed as to the propriety of compulsory arbitration. It was contended that a provision for mandatory punitive action against administrative officials on the basis of decisions by a board of arbitration under a chairman designated by the Civil Service Commission would violate all standards of good administration.

So far as I am personally concerned, the Civil Service Commission should be given greater responsibilities with regard to labor-management matters. Furthermore, the Commission should be strengthened by the selection of well-qualified people to serve in the important post of commissioner. In my judgment, the policy of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee for many years has been to strengthen the Civil Service Commission in every way possible.

At the completion of these hearings I convened several executive sessions at which every effort was made to work out a bill, based on H. R. 6, which would meet the administration's objections. Because of the administration's strong opposition, it was impossible for the subcommittee to work out such a bill.

In an effort to meet administration objections, I prepared and introduced two separate bills at the request of the subcommittee.

H. R. 12848, which was introduced on June 9, 1958, provided for a more equitable system for the settlement of appeals from adverse personnel actions in the classified civil service. The primary purpose of this bill was to provide nonveterans with appeal rights equal to those enjoyed by veterans. The administration advised that reports on H. R. 12848 could not be submitted in this Congress, thus precluding subcommittee action on this bill.

H. R. 13319, which was introduced on July 8, 1958, provided for an equitable system for the prompt and just settlement of grievances of Federal employees. During the 3 days of hearings on July 24, 25, and August 1, 1958, administration witnesses testified that this legislation was not necessary.

In the face of administration opposition, the subcommittee was unable to take final action on either of these two bills which would have corrected the major deficiencies brought out in the hearings.

In spite of the fact that the subcommittee could not report out a proper bill, its effect upon the administration in getting administrative action has been very successful. The letter by Mr. Siciliano to the department and agency heads and the Civil Service Commission proposing proper grievance procedures is, in itself, I believe proof that the subcommittee has achieved an overwhelming success even without legislation.

I am confident that as a result of the comprehensive study made by my subcommittee it will be possible early in the next Congress to take action which will result in the enactment of legislation designed to improve labor-management relations in the Federal Government.

REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF THE FOURTH DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a report to my constituents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, with the ending of the 85th Congress, I have prepared a report to the people of my District on my votes and efforts in the United States House of Representatives.

I believe that it is the duty of a Representative in Congress to give an account of his actions to the people who elected him to this high office. The report which I am about to render describes my position and my votes on all of the major legislative issues considered by the 85th Congress.

SERVICE TO THE PEOPLE

Since my first election to Congress, I have regarded service to my constituents as my first responsibility. I have tried to fulfill it to the best of my ability.

No complaint, request, or letter received in my office has gone unanswered. During my tenure in Congress, I acted upon and replied to over 100,000 individual inquiries and requests from the residents of the Fourth District who had problems with social security, veterans' and other benefits, immigration cases, and many other aspects of Federal legislation.

My District office has been at the service of our people, and forwarded their problems to me while I was attending Congressional sessions in Washington. My Washington staff has been equally dedicated to the task of serving the interests of the residents of the Fourth District.

Through regular newsletters, periodic visits to the District during Congressional sessions, radio and television reports, I have tried to give a full account of my actions in Congress.

This report implements my policy in that regard. It consists of three parts. In the first part, I will briefly review the accomplishments of the 85th Congress. In the second part, I will comment about the record of our present administration. And in the last part, I will include my legislative record as the Representative of the Fourth District of Wisconsin.

PART I. RECORD OF THE 85TH CONGRESS

The 85th Congress was, without doubt, one of the hardest-working Congresses in our Nation's history.

I make this statement not only because of the large number of bills enacted into law, but also because of the complexity of problems which confronted our national legislature during the past 2 years.

TWO OVERRIDING ISSUES

Two major issues overshadowed many other important problems considered by the 85th Congress.

On the one hand, the open demonstration of Communist scientific achievement, embodied in the 3 sputniks, served as a rude awakening to the Free World. With 3 powerful rockets, the Soviets thrust 4,228 pounds of steel and delicate machinery into the outer space. Our 3 small satellites, taken together, weighed 64 pounds.

The military implications of this Soviet achievement were grave indeed. They showed that the Communists have probably succeeded in developing an effective, operational intercontinental missile, capable of carrying atomic warheads to distant lands. This is the point which primarily concerned the Congress.

On the other hand, we experienced a very real recession in our country—a recession which brought a rapid rise in unemployment, together with a continuing increase in the cost of living.

NATIONAL SECURITY

The 85th Congress took a long, hard look at our national defense, and the

way in which our Nation has been facing up to the Communist challenge. It became apparent that we were not doing too well. We have been falling behind in some important respects. Our Congress took several steps to remedy that situation.

Legislation reorganizing the Defense Department was approved. Our defenses were strengthened, and their effectiveness improved, through a series of new or expanded programs tailored to meet the realities of our day. Specific authority was provided for more extensive research, and for faster construction of missile bases, detection and warning systems, nuclear-powered guided-missile warships, and other equipment.

At the same time, Congress renewed our collective security arrangements, extended our foreign trade policy, and turned its attention to improvements in our educational system, realizing that, in the long run, education will play an increasingly important role in determining our future position in the world vis-a-vis Soviet Russia.

COMMUNIST THREAT CONTINUES

Congressional actions in this field showed clear recognition of the fact that, in spite of our hopes and efforts to promote disarmament and to achieve lasting peace, we have no alternative at present but to continue building up our defenses—both at home and abroad.

If anything, Soviet rocket and missile achievements make our overseas bases and allies even more important to our own security.

It should be clear to everyone that the Communist threat has not disappeared. Their plans for world domination are real, very real. Behind the false front of friendly smiles and gestures, the Communists continue improving their war machine and have recently launched a new campaign of economic penetration and subversion.

It costs the United States over $40 billion a year to meet this threat.

COMBATING RECESSION

The Democrat-controlled 85th Congress moved forcefully to meet another threat—the threat of a deepening economic recession at home.

Federal spending on defense, highways, and other programs was speeded up to stimulate employment. The emergency housing bill was approved, and a $4 billion increase provided in FHA mortgage insurance authorization. Federal unemployment compensation was extended to jobless workers who exhaust their State benefits. Overdue salary adjustments were enacted for the military, for postal and other Government employees. The Congress also took action on other measures intended to stimulate economic recovery.

As I have already indicated, I prepared a list of all major legislative issues considered by the 85th Congress. Bills dealing with the recession, as well as bills relating to national defense, international affairs, veterans and servicemen, social security, health and welfare, and other fields are included in that list. Before proceeding to examine them, however, I want to comment on the record of the present Republican administration.

PART II. RECORD OF REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION

In contrast with the achievements of the 85th Congress, the record of our present Republican administration has been disappointing, both with respect to international relations and with respect to our domestic affairs. I shall touch upon each one of them in turn.

UNITED STATES PRESTIGE SUFFERS

On the international scene, United States prestige has continued to decline. The hesitant, bungling administration of our foreign policy—which rests in the hands of the President and of his Secretary of State—has confused and alienated many of our friends. At the same time, it has played into the hands of the Communists, who have been making headway in penetrating the underdeveloped countries of the world.

The rise of Communist influence in the Middle East; the anti-American demonstrations in many parts of the world; and the stoning of our Vice President in South America, give ample proof of what has been going on.

The Republican misadministration of our defense and foreign policy was further exposed by the appearance of the Soviet sputniks. In spite of the fact that the President has at his disposal some 20 agencies engaged in intelligence activities, the Communist achievement came as a big surprise. We should have been prepared for it, but we were not. We were lagging behind, but our Chief Executive did nothing about it until public and Congressional pressure forced him to act.

RECESSION AT HOME

The administration's response to the recession at home, and the resulting high level of unemployment, was equally unsatisfactory.

While production fell off, and unemployment increased, the administration decided to adopt a wait-and-see policy. Prompt Congressional action, which I have already described, helped to remedy the situation. Programs approved by the Congress aided in bolstering employment and public confidence, and in reviving economic activity.

CORRUPTION

The most disappointing aspect of the present administration has been the practice of a double standard of morality in government.

Everyone remembers, I am certain, the countless pledges of Republican office-seekers and officials, from the President down, to clean up Washington, to deal instantly and forcefully with any evidence of corruption, and to follow a code of meticulously clean and high ethical standards. The President promised his administration would be "clean as a hound's tooth."

We need only to recall the scandals of the last few years, and such names as Harold Talbott, Wesley Roberts, Adolphe Wenzell, Peter Strobel, Edmund Mansure, T. Coleman Andrews, Hugh Cross, Murray Chotiner, Robert MacLeaish, Robert Tripp Ross, and Richard Mack, to realize that those pledges meant very little.

In each case, the improper conduct was exposed either by the Congress or by the public. The pressure for a cleanup also came from the people and the Congress. The administration spent little effort on its own to clean up its ranks.

The recent Adams-Goldfine affair has followed the same pattern. It has given us a tragic demonstration of what happens when promises are not backed by action, and when one standard is applied to the conduct of public officials in power, and another to the rest of the people.

PART III. MY LEGISLATIVE RECORD IN CONGRESS

The table appearing at the end of this part contains a detailed account of my position on all major bills considered by the 85th Congress, and describes their status.

In addition, I am including in this report a brief summary of my past legislative actions, and a listing which shows to what extent the Fourth District, and the Milwaukee County as a whole, participated in federally sponsored and supported programs during my tenure in Congress.

FEDERAL TAX MONEY RETURNING TO MILWAUKEE

During my five terms in Congress, I considered it my responsibility to see to it that the Fourth District may receive a fair share of Federal tax dollars. I worked for adequate appropriations for programs which are of direct interest and benefit to the people of the Fourth District.

POST OFFICE IMPROVEMENTS

During my service in Congress, Milwaukee area postal facilities were greatly improved and enlarged. Cudahy and Hales Corners received new post offices. New buildings were secured for 7 postal stations, 2 branch offices, a large postal garage, and a parcel-post annex. These new postal facilities include over a quarter of a million square feet of space. Their worth has been estimated at $3,335,000. These improvements were needed to provide prompt, efficient postal service to the people of the Milwaukee area.

FEDERAL AID FOR HOSPITALS

Nine hospital projects were aided by $3 million in Federal funds. Of this amount, $1,042,149 went to St. Luke's hospital; $806,874 to the Trinity Memorial Hospital; $500,000 to the West Allis Memorial Hospital; $100,000 to the St. Francis Hospital; and the remainder to five other hospital projects.

HIGHWAY AND STREET IMPROVEMENTS

Federal tax money spent on highway and street improvements, like other federally aided construction projects, helps to increase employment in our community, and lessens local and State taxes for this purpose. I have consistently worked for adequate appropriations for this program. Thirty-five million four hundred fifty-five thousand four hundred thirty-nine dollars in Federal funds were returned to Milwaukee and helped to pay the cost of 110 highway and street improvement projects during my tenure in Congress.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

Effective participation of our area in the national defense is vital to the safety of all our people. Military armories, antiaircraft and missile defense, Reserve training facilities, and other military construction in the Milwaukee area—either completed or in process—cost the Federal Government $15,409,683.

AIRPORT EXPANSION AND IMPROVEMENTS

Over $4 million was spent by the Federal Government in improving and expanding our local airport facilities. Additional $1,015,100 is programed for Milwaukee airports for fiscal year 1959. Past and programed improvements at the Gen. Billy Mitchell Field account for $4,235,916 of this total.

MILWAUKEE HARBOR

The Milwaukee Harbor is one of the best, most modern harbors on the Great Lakes, and it plays an important part in the economic life of our community. Federal aids to the extent of $130,000 have been provided for Milwaukee Harbor improvements. Additional $125,000 is planned for the outer harbor project, and $202,000 for channels.

FEDERAL BUILDINGS

Improvements to Federal buildings in Milwaukee, operated by the General Services Administration, cost $720,407. They included such projects as additional Federal court facilities, interim airconditioning for the courts, installation of elevators, fire-alarm system, and various alterations.

GREENDALE

In 1951, the Federal Government proposed to sell Greendale to a single buyer for a very low price. I objected to that arrangement, and insisted that the homes in Greendale be sold to individual families for a fair price. The Government realized $5,291,825 from the sale of Greendale under my plan—or $2,006,825 more than it would have received under the original proposal.

I am proud of the fact that I was able to save the taxpayers $2 million on the sale of Greendale. That amount of money could pay the salary of a Senator or a Congressman for almost half a century.

NEW VETERANS' HOSPITAL

The Veterans' Administration Center at Wood, Wis., has inadequate hospital facilities. The 1,600 aged veterans are living in ancient decrepit buildings—some dating back to the 1870's. In 1953, I first introduced my bill to provide for a new Veterans' Administration Hospital at Wood, and since that time I have been working for the construction of such a hospital. In 1956—after 3 years of effort—such a project was approved by Congress. Detailed plans for a new, 1,250-bed hospital, should be completed this year, with construction beginning next year, the Government will invest an estimated $35 million.

To provide improved medical and domiciliary care for the veterans of Wisconsin and the Midwest area, the Government will invest an estimated $35 million.

SUMMARY OF LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS

CONSUMERS

Working in Congress for the interests of the average consumer, I opposed the Tidelands oil bill, as well as the proposed exemption of natural-gas producers from Federal regulation, which could result in higher gas prices to Milwaukee area residents. I voted against the "Chicago Water Steal," supported the recommendations of the two Hoover Commissions for increasing economy and efficiency in Government, sponsored and voted for tax relief for the average taxpayer.

In 1953, I proposed the establishment of a "watchdog" committee in Congress to counterbalance producers' lobbies, and protect the housewife. This proposal, to establish a Joint Committee on Consumer Interests, is presently before the House Rules Committee.

WORKING PEOPLE

Every fair and equitable bill to protect the interests of our working men and women has received my active support.

I voted for amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act, to increase minimum wage and to extend coverage; for liberalization of social security; for school construction aid; civil rights; and the St. Lawrence Seaway.

As early as 1954, I was one of the original cosponsors of the Unemployment Compensation Standards bill, intended to strengthen our unemployment compensation system, improve the benefits, and extend coverage. I supported and voted for the unemployment compensation bill approved this session of Congress, which extended Federal payments for jobless workers who exhaust their State benefits. In addition, I worked for the extension of unemployment compensation to all ex-servicemen.

I also supported legislation to safeguard welfare and pension plans, to eliminate racketeering in labor-management compensation to all ex-servicemen. cratic principles and practices in union organizations.

OLDER CITIZENS

In 1953, by introducing my bill H. R. 3554, I became one of the original sponsors of the total-disability program under the social-security law. At the same time, I proposed lowering the retirement age for women to age 60, and called for an increase, from $75 to $100 a month, in the limit on earnings of persons receiving social-security benefits.

Three years later, in 1956, these three proposals were approved by the Congress in a modified form. The proposals are the law today, and they benefit countless disabled and aged persons.

My bills to end age-discrimination in employment (H. R. 10979), and to establish a Bureau of Older Persons in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to help solve the many problems faced by our elder citizens (H. R. 11057), are presently pending before the Congress.

SMALL BUSINESS

Small business is vital to the preservation of competition in our economy, and to our present and future prosperity.

To help small business, I cosponsored H. R. 11, the Equality of Opportunity bill, to fight price discrimination which throttles competition. I worked for legislation to provide tax relief to small business, voted to place the Small Business Administration on permanent basis, and urged the elimination of "red tape."

VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN

I am proud of my record of supporting equitable legislation on behalf of our servicemen and veterans.

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Far East, I started an investigation into the fate of American servicemen who fell into the hands of the Communists during the Korean war. On the basis of my subcommittee's findings, the House of Representatives approved the Zablocki resolution (H. Res. 292) which called upon the President to make the return of those 450 men the foremost objective of United States foreign policy. I shall continue in my efforts to obtain a full accounting, and the release, of these men.

GOOD GOVERNMENT

Elsewhere in this report I mentioned my efforts in supporting Government reorganization, and working for economy and efficiency in Government. At this point, I want to mention three of my bills which I feel merit particular attention.

UNIFORM APPEALS AND GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES

At present, roughly 50 percent of Government employees have no legal appeal rights, or legal assurance of obtaining fair treatment of their grievances. Since 1956, I have been working to remedy this situation. My bill, H. R. 1031, would provide uniform appeals and grievance rights to all Government workers, without in any way impairing veterans' rights or veterans' preference in obtaining Federal employment.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

Our Government's intelligence activities, conducted by some 20 different offices and agencies, are handled in a slipshod manner from the Congressional standpoint. To remedy this, as early as 1953, I have in every Congress introduced legislation which would establish a Congressional "watchdog" committee to oversee Federal intelligence activities. The second Hoover Commission, in 1956, endorsed such a plan.

FOREIGN SERVICE ACADEMY

Since 1951, I have been trying to obtain Congressional action on my bill (H. R. 1282) calling for the establishment of a United States Academy of Foreign Service, in which our young men and women could receive thorough and advanced training for Government work in the international field. We need people with such training very badly.

In 1955, the American press reported that 74 percent of weekly newpaper editors favored the establishment of such an academy.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

I have been able to work for the strengthening and improvement of our foreign policy, through my assignment to the important Committee on Foreign

Affairs. During my membership on this committee I have served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Western Europe, and presently as chairman of the Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific.

I have supported the trade agreements program and the mutual security program. I believe these programs represent the cheapest insurance that our Nation can obtain against the disaster of a total Communist attack.

In the past, I proposed and Congress adopted, several changes in our foreign policy programs—which helped to eliminate waste and to increase the effectiveness of our international undertakings.

In 1951, I supported strict restrictions on trade with the Communist bloc. My 1952 amendments to the Mutual Security Act gave Congress continuing supervision over foreign currencies generated under this program. In 1957, I led House opposition to the President's Middle East resolution, because it failed to attack the basic problems of that area. The Communists exploited our failure to solve these problems. Recent developments in the Middle East, and the extension of Communist influence in that region, seem to support my position.

Mr. Speaker, as in the past, it is my intention to send this report to my constituents. After the adjournment of Congress, I look forward to meeting with the people of my District to discuss this RECORD and the accomplishments of the 85th Congress.

The legislative voting record which contains, in addition to my votes, the position I have taken on all major bills, will be made available to those who it will be my privilege to meet personally during the many hours I intend to spend in my District office, or upon written request. The record can be obtained by calling at my Milwaukee office: 1227 West Lincoln Avenue, or by writing to me, in care of House of Representatives, Washington 25, D. C.

Voting record of Congressman CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, 85th Cong.

Stand	Issue	Status
	NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNAL SECURITY	
Voted for	Defense Department appropriations: $34,000,000,000 in 1957, $38,000,000,000 in 1958	Became law.
Voted for	Revision of the special doctor-dentist draft law	Became law.
Voted for	$1,200,000,000 program of military construction, in United States and abroad	Became law.
Voted for	$44,700,000 research program by National Advisory Commission for Aeronautics	Became law.
Voted for	Reorganization of the Department of Defense	Became law.
Voted for	$54,600,000 for missile bases, detection and warning systems	Became law.
Voted for	$100,500,000 for construction of nuclear-powered, guided-missile warships, amphibious landing craft, and service ships	Became law.
Voted for	$35,000,000 for construction of reactor for atomic-powered destroyer	Became law.
Voted for	$18,800,000 aid to States for civil defense, radiological detection	Became law.
Voted for	$386,000,000 for Atomic Energy Commission construction	Became law.
	INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS	
Voted for	Continuation of the mutual security program, to strengthen the collective Free World defense against communism	Became law.
Voted for	Extension of the trade agreements program	Became law.
Voted for	Establishment of international plan for peaceful exploration of space for the benefit of all mankind	Became law.
Voted for	United States membership in the International Atomic Energy Agency	Became law.
Voted for	Exchange of mutually essential atomic information with our allies	Became law.
Voted for	Resolution denouncing Communist execution of leaders of the 1956 revolt in Hungary	Adopted.
Voted for	Revision of our immigration laws, special visas for orphans	Became law.
Voted for	Enabling 30,000 escapees from the 1956 Hungarian revolution to adjust their status to become permanent residents of the United States	Became law.
Opposed	Resolution giving President standing authority to use United States Armed Forces in the Middle East, which failed to deal with the basic problems of that area.	Became law.
Opposed	Postponement of interest payments on the British loan	Became law.
Voted for	Zablocki resolution demanding accounting for and release of the 450 American servicemen held prisoners of war by the Communists	Adopted.
Favored	Review and revision of the Status of Forces Agreement	Died in committee.
Proposed	Establishment of U. S. Academy of Foreign Service	Died in committee.
	GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION	
Voted for	Establishment of National Aeronautics and Space Agency	Became law.
Voted for	Establishment of Airways Modernization Board to promote safer navigation system for civilian and military planes	Became law.
Voted for	Establishment of overall civilian agency to coordinate and oversee civilian and military air traffic	Became law.
Voted for	Admission of Alaska to the Union as a State	Became law.
Voted for	Submitting Federal budget estimates on annual accrued expenditure basis	Became law.
Voted for	Salary increases for postal and other Government employees	Became law.
Opposed	Bill to establish rules of interpretation for Federal courts, involving the doctrine of Federal preemption (H. R. 3)	Killed in Senate.
Favored	Strengthening the anti-corrupt-practices law for Federal elections	Killed in committee.
Voted for	Extension and simplification of Government reorganization procedures	Became law.
Proposed	Establishment of Congressional "watchdog" committee on Central Intelligence	Killed in committee.
Proposed	Uniform appeals and grievance procedures for Federal employees	Killed in committee.
Voted for	Training of selected Government employees in outside institutions	Became law.
Favored	Pension for former Presidents	Became law.
	NATIONAL ECONOMY	
Voted for	Ending the issuance of rapid tax writeoff certificates	Became law.
Voted for	Extension of 52-percent corporate income-tax rate and certain excise taxes; repeal of the 3-percent tax on transportation of property	Became law.
Voted for	Reduction of cabaret tax from 20 percent to 10 percent	Killed in committee.
Voted for	Emergency $1,800,000,000 Housing Act to stimulate homebuilding	Became law.
Voted for	$4,000,000,000 increase in FHA mortgage insurance authorization	Became law.
Voted for	Stepped-up highway construction program to promote employment	Became law.
Voted for	Federal unemployment compensation benefits for jobless workers who exhaust their State benefits	Became law.
Voted for	Area Redevelopment Act, to aid areas of chronic unemployment	Killed by House.
Voted for	Community Facilities Act, to provide loans to local governments for planning and construction of needed public facilities	Killed by House.
Voted for	Permanent status for the Small Business Administration, increase in its lending authority to $625,000,000, lower interest rates	Became law.
Voted for	Postal rate increase to overcome $600,000,000 a year postal deficit	Became law.
Voted for	Extension of Federal Airport Act to June 20, 1963	Became law.
Voted for	Legislation requiring price labeling of new automobiles	Became law.
Opposed	Higher interest rates on U. S. Government bonds	Became law.
Voted for	Congressional investigation of "tight-money" policy	Defeated.
Proposed	Thorough investigation of cost-of-living increases, inflation, and its causes	Died in committee.
Proposed	Establishment of a Congressional "watchdog" committee to look after the interests of the average consumer	Died in committee.
Proposed and voted for.	Legislation to strengthen and improve the unemployment compensation system	Became law.
Voted for	Temporary increase in public debt limit	Became law.
Voted for	Public works bill	Became law.
	VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN	
Voted for	Salary increases for members of Armed Forces to encourage career service	Became law.
Voted for	Increase in rates of compensation for disabled veterans	Became law.
Voted for	Improved pensions for widows of Spanish War veterans	Became law.
Voted for	Liberalization of requirements for veterans' widows' benefits	Became law.
Voted for	Disability pensions for veterans hospitalized by tuberculosis	Killed in Senate.
Voted for	Expeditious payment of death gratuities to survivors of members of our Armed Forces	Became law.
Voted for	Consolidation and simplification of laws on veterans' benefits	Became law.
Voted for	Unemployment compensation benefits for all ex-servicemen	Killed in Senate.
Voted for	Reemployment rights for National Guard men	Became law.
Worked for	New 1,260-bed veterans' hospital at Wood, Wis	Approved.

Voting record of Congressman CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, 85th Cong.—Continued

Stand	Issue	Status
	SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH AND WELFARE	
Voted for	The Housing Acts of 1957 and 1958	Killed in House.
Voted for	Registration and disclosure of financial status of employee welfare and pension plans	Became law.
Voted for	Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act, requiring unions to report income and expenditures, providing for strengthened democratic processes in union elections, and other reforms (Kennedy-Ives bill).	Defeated in House.
Voted for	Distribution of surplus food in nonprofit children's summer camps	Became law.
Voted for	3-year extension of the school milk program	Became law.
Voted for	National Defense Education Act of 1958	Became law.
Voted for	Strengthening the law against mailing of indecent literature	Became law.
Voted for	3-year extension of the Hospital Construction (Hill-Burton) Act	Became law.
Voted for	Extension of time for disabled persons to file for social security	Became law.
Proposed	Ban on age discrimination in hiring by Government contractors	Died in committee.
Proposed	Establishment of Bureau of Older Persons to promote solution of problems facing elder citizens	Died in committee.
Voted for	Improved annuities to retired/disabled United States civil-service workers	Became law.
Voted for	Social Security Act amendments of 1958	Became law.
	AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES	
Voted for	Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act for sale of surplus farm commodities abroad	Became law.
Voted for	Resolution barring reduction of price supports for 1958 below 1957	Vetoed.
Voted for	Authority for Federal Trade Commission to prevent monopolistic practices in meat industry jointly with Agriculture Department	Became law.
Voted for	Compulsory inspection of poultry in interstate commerce	Became law.
Voted for	Establishment of humane methods in the slaughter of meat animals	Became law.
Voted for	4-year extension of the national soil conservation program	Became law.
Opposed	Exemption of natural gas producers from Federal regulation	Killed in committee.
Voted for	Limited extension of the soil bank program	Became law.
Voted for	Flood control, navigation improvement, and beach control projects	Became law.
Voted for	The Agricultural Act of 1958	Became law.

Rollcall record	Total roll and quorum calls	Rollcalls	Not voting [1]	Quorum calls	Absent on quorum calls [2]
1st session	220	100	15	120	14
2d session	195	93	1	102	0

[1] Pairs generally arranged.

[2] Absence on quorum call does not necessarily mean a legislative day's absence.

BLANKET PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS UNTIL LAST EDITION OF RECORD

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House shall have the privilege, until the last edition authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing is published, to extend and revise their own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on more than one subject, if they so desire, and may also include therein such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such extensions of remarks; but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred, or to any speech delivered, subsequent to the adjournment of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares a recess, the Members not to be called back before 8 o'clock, and the bells to be rung 15 minutes before the expiration of the recess.

(Thereupon, at 6 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m., the House stood in recess.)

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 8 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3193. An act for the relief of Toley's Charter Boats, Inc., Toley Engebretson, and Harvey Homlar;

H. R. 12212. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Department of the Navy; and

H. R. 13861. An act to repeal certain provisions of law relating to messengers for the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 13856. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 165. An act for the relief of Arthur LeRoy Brown.

S. 2039. An act to clarify the requirements with respect to the performance of labor imposed as a condition for the holding of mining claims on Federal lands pending the issuance of patents therefor.

S. 2146. An act for the relief of William F. Peltier.

S. 2836. An act for the relief of the town of Portsmouth, R. I.; and

S. 3028. An act for the relief of Laszlo Cseri.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11382) entitled "An act to authorize the conversion or exchange, under certain conditions, of term insurance issued under section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4059) entitled "An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Carmen Scoppettuolo."

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer appointed the Senator from Vermont, Mr. AIKEN, the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. PASTORE, the Senator from Michigan, Mr. MCNAMARA, and the Senator from New York, Mr. JAVITS, members on the part of the Senate to the Hudson-Champlain Celebration Commission.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer appointed the Senator from Iowa, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. PASTORE, as members of the United States delegation to the Second International Conference on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, sponsored by the United Nations, to be held in Geneva, Switzerland, September 1 through September 13, 1958.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION ACT, 1959

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table, the bill H. R. 13856, with the Senate amendments thereto, and concur in Senate amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 12; and concur in Senate amendment numbered 8 with the following amendments:

Strike out "$53,300,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$40,000,000."

Strike out "$8,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$6,000,000."

Strike out "$25,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$19,000,000."

Strike out "$1,800,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,350,000."

Strike out "$5,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,750,000."

Strike out "$7,200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$5,400,000."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object under the present circumstances, I would like to take this time to say that I am interested in a bill, as most every other Member in this Congress is, that should be brought before the Congress in some way. I refer to the Railroad Retirement bill, a bill that has been studied by the appropriate committees of Congress, reported favorably by the committees of both Houses of Congress and passed by the Senate. May I say if that bill is not brought up tonight, and I am fortunate enough to be reelected to the Congress, I am serving notice on the House that come next January 7, if that is the date Congress convenes, I am going to drop an appropriate bill in the hopper and put in a discharge petition at the same time asking that it be brought up immediately, because it has been given every consideration and every hearing during this session of Congress. In all fairness this legislation should be passed by this House now. Every segment of our people has been assisted and befriended with the exception of the railroad workers—a proud, patriotic, loyal, hard-working group of Americans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD and that the membership generally may have the same privilege on the bill H. R 13856.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, the other body has added eight items to the independent offices bill at it was passed by the House yesterday. All of the items were in the bill as reported by the Senate committee. These last 8 items are as follows: $100,000 for the White House Conference on Aging, and this is a highly important first step; $54 million for the railroads for the increase in mail transportation payments authorized by the Interstate Commerce Commission; $53,300,000 to implement the School Act, plus $750,000 for administrative expenses; $50,000 for a water study commission for South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida, and $50,000 for a similar study for Texas; $1,802,000 for inpatient care in the Veterans' Administration; some language merging 2 appropriations in the Bureau of Employment Security in the Department of Labor; and language authorizing $2,500 of present funds for a medal for Admiral Rickover.

Appropriations provided in this bill total $6,090,156,900. This is $96,752,000 over the amount approved by the House, $13,300,000 less than the amount passed by the Senate, and $81,113,600 under the budget estimates. Most of the new items are made necessary because of the enactment of recent legislation. In those cases where the President has not yet signed the authorizing legislation the appropriation is contingent upon such approval.

The House is concurring in each item that has been added except the one in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for defense educational activities under the Office of Education. An appropriation of $40 million is recommended for that item instead of $53,300,000 as contained in the Senate bill, and amounts earmarked for special programs have been adjusted in proportion to the new total.

BIG BROTHERS OF AMERICA

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3728) to incorporate the Big Brothers of America.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following persons: Charles G. Berwind, Philadelphia, Pa.; Mark Willcox, Jr., Philadelphia, Pa.; Earle S. Thompson, New York, N. Y.; Archie O. Dawson, New York, N. Y.; Isadore A. Wyner, New York, N. Y.; and their successors, are hereby created and declared to be a body corporate of the District of Columbia, where its legal domicile shall be, by the name of the Big Brothers of America (hereinafter referred to as the corporation) and by such name shall be known and have perpetual succession and the powers, limitations, and restrictions herein contained.

COMPLETION OF ORGANIZATION

SEC. 2. A majority of the persons named in the first section of this act are authorized to complete the organization of the corporation by the adoption of a constitution and bylaws, not inconsistent with this act, and the doing of such other acts (including the selection of officers and employees in accordance with such constitution and bylaws) as may be necessary for such purpose.

PURPOSES OF THE CORPORATION

SEC. 3. The purposes of the corporation shall be to aid and assist boys throughout the United States of America and Canada in the solution of their social and economic problems, and assist in their health, educational and character development; to promote the use of the techniques of such assistance developed by the corporation, by other lay and professional agencies and workers, to receive, invest, and disburse funds and to hold property for the purposes of the corporation.

CORPORATE POWERS

SEC. 4. The corporation shall have power—

(1) to have succession by its corporate name;

(2) to sue and be sued, complain, and defend in any court of competent jurisdiction;

(3) to adopt, use, and alter a corporate seal;

(4) to choose such officers, managers, agents, and employees as the business of the corporation may require;

(5) to adopt, amend, and alter a constitution and bylaws, not inconsistent with the laws of the United States or any State in which the corporation is to operate, for the management of its property and the regulation of its affairs;

(6) to contract and be contracted with;

(7) to take by lease, gift, purchase, grant, devise, or bequest from any private corporation, association, partnership, firm, or individual and to hold any property, real, personal, or mixed, necessary or convenient for attaining the objects and carrying into effect the purposes of the corporation, subject, however, to applicable provisions of laws of any State (A) governing the amount or kind of property which may be held by, or (B) otherwise limiting or controlling the ownership of property by, a corporation operating in such State;

(8) to transfer, convey, lease, sublease, encumber, and otherwise alienate real, personal, or mixed property; and

(9) to borrow money for the purpose of the corporation, issue bonds therefor, and secure the same by mortgage, deed of trust, pledge, or otherwise, subject in every case to all applicable provisions of Federal and State laws.

PRINCIPAL OFFICE: SCOPE OF ACTIVITIES: DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AGENT

SEC. 5. (a) The principal office of the corporation shall be located in Philadelphia, Pa., or in such other place as may be later determined by the board of directors, but the activities of the corporation shall not be confined to that place, but may be conducted throughout the various States, Territories, and possessions of the United States and in Canada to the extent permitted by Canadian laws.

(b) The corporation shall have in the District of Columbia at all times a designated agent authorized to accept service of process for the corporation; and notice to or service upon such agent, or mailed to the business address of such agent, shall be deemed notice to or service upon the corporation.

MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 6. Eligibility for membership in the corporation and the rights, privileges, and designations of classes of members shall, except as provided in this act, be determined as the constitution and bylaws of the corporation may provide. Each member of the corporation shall have the right to one vote on each matter submitted to a vote at all meetings of the members of the corporation.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS: COMPOSITION, RESPONSIBILITIES

SEC. 7. (a) Upon the enactment of this Act the membership of the initial board of directors of the corporation shall consist of the present members of the board of directors of the Big Brothers of America, Incorporated, the corporation described in section 16 of this Act, or such of them as may then be living and are qualified members of said board of directors, to wit:

Justice Tom Clark, Washington, D. C. (honorary);

Honorable Stuart Garson, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada (honorary);

Honorable Luther W. Youngdahl, Washington, D. C. (honorary);

Charles G. Berwind, Philadelphia, Pa.;

Henry J. Benisch, Brooklyn, N. Y.;

DeVere Bobier, Flint, Mich.;

J. Carroll Brown, Lansing, Mich.;

Fielding T. Childress, St. Louis, Mo.;

Guy de Puyjalon, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada;

Robert E. Curry, New York City, N. Y.;

Jere Gillette, Detroit, Mich.;

Benjamin van D. Hedges, New York City, N. Y.;

Hon. Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., Washington, D. C.;

Dr. Kenneth D. Johnson, New York City, N. Y.;

Charles B. Levinson, Cincinnati, Ohio;

Walter H. Levy, Providence, R. I.;

Richard Loud, Boston, Mass.;

George O. Ludcke, Jr., Minneapolis, Minn.;
Charles E. McMartin, Saginaw, Mich.;
John McShain, Philadelphia, Pa.;
John E. Mangrum, Dallas, Tex.;
George Miller, Los Angeles, Calif.;
Nicholas C. Mueller, Baltimore, Md.;
Herbert Myerberg, Baltimore, Md.;
Thomas J. Potts, Columbus, Ohio;
Norfleet H. Rand, St. Louis, Mo.;
G. Ruhland Rebmann, Jr., Philadelphia, Pa.;
James B. Reese, Los Angeles, Calif.;
Sanford Reider, Cleveland, Ohio;
Thomas A. Rogers, Denver, Colo.;
Robert N. Rosenthal, Cincinnati, Ohio;
Canon John Samuel, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada;
Maurice Schwarz, Jr., Los Angeles, Calif.;
Isadore M. Scott, Philadelphia, Pa.;
Milton Seaman, New York City, N. Y.;
Nathaniel Sharf, Boston, Mass.;
J. C. Standish, Cleveland, Ohio;
Donald W. Thornburgh, Philadelphia, Pa.;
Robert L. Walston, Houston, Tex.;
J. Austin White, Cincinnati, Ohio;
Meredith Willson, Los Angeles, Calif.;
Paul Wilson, Detroit, Mich.; and
E. N. Zeigler, Florence, S. C.

(b) Thereafter the board of directors of the corporation shall consist of such number as may be prescribed in the constitution of the corporation, and the members of such board shall be selected in such manner (including the filling of vacancies), and shall serve for such terms, as may be prescribed in the constitution and bylaws of the corporation.

(c) The board of directors shall be the managing body of the corporation and shall have such powers, duties, and responsibilities as may be prescribed in the constitution and bylaws of the corporation.

OFFICERS: ELECTION AND DUTIES OF OFFICERS

SEC. 8. (a) The officers of the corporation shall be a chairman of the board of directors, a president, one or more vice presidents (as may be prescribed in the constitution and bylaws of the corporation), a secretary, and a treasurer.

(b) The officers of the corporation shall be elected in such manner and for such terms and with such duties as may be prescribed in the constitution and bylaws of the corporation.

USE OF INCOME: LOANS TO OFFICERS, DIRECTORS, OR EMPLOYEES

SEC. 9. (a) No part of the income or assets of the corporation shall inure to any of its members, directors, or officers as such, or be distributable to any of them during the life of the corporation or upon its dissolution or final liquidation. Nothing in this subsection, however, shall be construed to prevent the payment of compensation to officers of the corporation in amounts approved by the board of directors of the corporation.

(b) The corporation shall not make loans to its officers, directors, or employees. Any director who votes for or assents to the making of a loan or advance to an officer, director, or employee of the corporation, and any officer who participates in the making of such a loan or advance, shall be jointly and severally liable to the corporation for the amount of such loan until the repayment thereof.

NONPOLITICAL NATURE OF CORPORATION

SEC. 10. The corporation, and its officers and directors as such, shall not contribute to or otherwise support or assist any political party or candidate for public office.

LIABILITY ACTS OF OFFICERS AND AGENTS

SEC. 11. The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents when acting within the scope of their authority.

PROHIBITION AGAINST ISSUANCE OF STOCK OR PAYMENT OF DIVIDENDS

SEC. 12. The corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock or to declare or pay any dividends.

BOOKS AND RECORDS: INSPECTION

SEC. 13. The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall keep minutes of the proceedings of its members, board of directors, and committees having any authority under the board of directors; and it shall also keep at its principal office a record of the names and addresses of its members entitled to vote. All books and records of the corporation may be inspected by any member entitled to vote, or his agent or attorney, for any proper purpose, at any reasonable time.

AUDIT OF FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS

SEC. 14. (a) The financial transactions shall be audited annually by an independent certified public accountant in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the corporation are normally kept. All books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things or property belonging to or in use by the corporation and necessary to facilitate the audit shall be made available to the person or persons conducting the audit; and full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians shall be afforded to such person or persons.

(b) A report of such audit shall be made by the corporation to the Congress not later than 6 months following the close of each year for which the audit is made. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit and shall include a verification by the person or persons conducting the audit of statements of (1) assets and liabilities, (2) capital and surplus or deficit, (3) surplus or deficit analysis, (4) income and expense, and (5) sources and application of funds. Such report shall not be printed as a public document.

EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO NAME, EMBLEMS, SEALS, AND BADGES

SEC. 15. The corporation and its subordinate divisions shall have the sole and exclusive right to use the name, the Big Brothers of America. The corporation shall have the exclusive and sole right to use or to allow or refuse the use of such emblems, seals, and badges as have heretofore been used by the predecessor New York corporation, Big Brothers of America, Inc., described in section 16 of this title and the right to which may be transferred to the corporation.

TRANSFER OF ASSETS

SEC. 16. The corporation may acquire the the assets of the Big Brothers of America, Inc., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of New York, upon discharging or satisfactorily providing for the payment and discharge of all of the liability of such corporation and upon complying with all laws of the State of New York applicable thereto.

USE OF ASSETS ON DISSOLUTION OR LIQUIDATION

SEC. 17. Upon dissolution or final liquidation of the corporation, after discharge or satisfaction of all outstanding obligations and liabilities, the remaining assets, if any, of the corporation shall be distributed in accordance with the determination of the board of directors of the corporation and in compliance with the constitution and bylaws of the corporation and all Federal and State laws applicable thereto.

RESERVATION OF RIGHT TO AMEND OR REPEAL CHARTER

SEC. 18. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL FARM-CITY WEEK

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 546) designating the week of November 21–27, 1958, as National Farm-City Week.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman please explain this resolution?

Mr. WALTER. This is the resolution that the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], prevailed upon the Committee on the Judiciary to approve unanimously at a meeting, I think, in June.

Mr. KEATING. I am sure that it will help both the farm and the city people, and I am sure it is a fine piece of legislation.

Mr. WALTER. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I am sure that it has the endorsement of two very good farmers in the persons of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the week of November 21–27, 1958, be designated as National Farm-City Week, in recognition of the contribution American farm families have made to our civilization and in order to promote better public understanding of the needs, problems, and opportunities of our country's agriculture and farm people, and to honor men and women who have contributed to agricultural achievements and progress.

To this end the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the Department of Agriculture, the land-grant colleges, the Agricultural Extension Service, and all other appropriate agencies and officials of the Government to cooperate with National, State, and local farm organizations and other groups in the several States and counties in preparing and carrying out programs for the appropriate observation of National Farm-City Week, including plans for public meetings, discussions, exhibits, pageants, and press, radio, and television features with a special emphasis on notable achievements by rural groups and individuals, local, State, and National, and on the all-around enrichment of American country living through adequate cultural, spiritual, educational, recreational, and health facilities for both rural youth and rural adults.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HON. OTTO KRUEGER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, OTTO KRUEGER, Representative at Large from the State of North Dakota, is one of the finest gentlemen I have ever known. He is voluntarily retiring from Congress at the end of this year.

Mr. Speaker, there is something unique about OTTO KRUEGER. He was born in Russia of German parents and came to the United States in 1910 and as soon as possible thereafter he became a naturalized citizen. He is an individual, therefore, who really appreciates America and Americanism.

He is a graduate of the North Dakota public schools and served as a private in World War I, seeing service in Belgium and France. He was elected 10 times as county auditor of his home county. Thereafter he became State treasurer of North Dakota, insurance commissioner of North Dakota, State budget director of North Dakota, and he is now completing 6 years as a Representative in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. KRUEGER has served with distinction as a member of the very important Committee on Appropriations of the House, and during the past few years he has been a valuable member of the Committee on Agriculture. He has been most loyal in his attendance at committee meetings and has contributed much to the deliberations of that committee.

In closing, may I say that OTTO KRUEGER is the type of American who stays a wholesome American. He is a rugged individualist who believes in the Constitution and the rights of the States. Anyone who has come up this hard way and has become a naturalized citizen appreciates perhaps more than those of us who were born here the great benefits of being a citizen of this great land.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that OTTO KRUEGER is retiring from Congress. He is the kind of man we need in these legislative halls during these troublesome days. We wish him well as he returns to his home in North Dakota to live among his many friends and his loved ones. I know we all wish for him all that is good in the days that lie ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished minority leader, Mr. MARTIN.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN], in expressing appreciation of the splendid services of our good friend, OTTO KRUEGER. He has been a great legislator. He has served with distinction and great ability. We all regret that he is voluntarily retiring. OTTO, we wish you every success in the days ahead. You carry with you to your North Dakota the warm friendship of legions of friends who have admired your fine service.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND].

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to join with the gentleman from Iowa and others in paying respects to OTTO KRUEGER, who is leaving us. I hate to see him leave. He is a man who is strong in his convictions. He votes as he thinks. He allows only that influence which is based upon reason and is an example to a great many others. I am sorry to see him leave and wish for him only the finest of things in the future.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman from Iowa for paying this tribute to a well-deserved Member of this body. I join him in everything he has said and everything the gentleman from Massachusetts and the other gentlemen have said about OTTO KRUEGER. OTTO KRUEGER is a man who wears well. He is genial and lovable in all of his associations. He is a hard worker. He has been faithful in his attendance in this body. America and the State of North Dakota will both lose much by his decision to retire. I regret to see him leave.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Iowa is making this statement on behalf of my friend, OTTO KRUEGER, who has served with me on the Committee on Agriculture and on the Subcommittee on Wheat for a long time. He is a most conscientious, industrious, and attentive Member of this House. We will miss him. He is a great legislator and a fine American.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I feel particularly close to the gentleman from North Dakota. He has been a member of my Subcommittee on Family Farms and the Subcommittee on Rice. He said when we started our deliberations he knew nothing about them, but I think that was a masterful understatement. He has been a loyal member of those committees. He has helped us in every possible way. He has always been available for meetings. He has gone places when we needed to go places on our committee away from Washington, and at great inconvenience to himself.

I thought there should be some way to enjoin him from leaving the Congress but apparently there is nothing of the kind available to us, so I think we shall simply have to call on him in private life to come to us and help us as he has during the years he has been here. Of OTTO I want to say this: He is the kind of man who does things for people. He is the kind who is on call particularly if people are a little bit unfortunate and really need help.

The mark that he has left here in the Congress will remain long after OTTO has gone on to the comparative ease of private life which he seeks. We do not begrudge it to him at all, but we shall most certainly miss him.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, you have just heard the gentleman from Iowa describe what is in my opinion a very personified demonstration of the opportunity that exists in this great Republic, so that a man who is diligent, who is honest, who is not afraid of work, and has competence and speaks the voice of his competence, can rise to great heights, because being a Member of the House of Representatives of the United States is a responsible position, one which very few ever reach. He has demonstrated what it means. He has been a very fine example of what can be done in this great land of opportunity.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, all year long I have sat next to OTTO KRUEGER in the Committee on Agriculture. During the long sessions, when we were thirsty, because the pitcher of ice water was always in front of me I would turn to OTTO and say, "Nun, mein lieber Freund, wollen sie Schnapps oder kaltes Wasser?" He always replied, "Schnapps," but all that I ever gave him was cold water.

I have taken to heart the great services of this man, who was an interpreter during the war. His services there were invaluable. It is wonderful to have a man who knows a foreign language we need so badly to know, a man whom our country can trust right to the end of the road. That is the kind of man we have in OTTO KRUEGER, and that is the kind of service he rendered during the war. I certainly wish that every blessing may follow him.

"Bis auf wiedersehen. Leben sie wohl und brauchen sie nichts."

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am sorry that our good friend OTTO KRUEGER is retiring. He, I believe, is the first member of the Republican 83d Club to retire voluntarily. As a contemporary of his, I am sorry to see him go.

I have also been the minority whip of the region from which Mr. KRUEGER comes, and I may say that all the way he has been cooperative in every way he could possibly be. He is a fine man, a good legislator, a good friend. I am sorry to see him go.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that OTTO KRUEGER, coming from a farming area, has won the admiration of those of us who represent city districts. To me he typifies the finest thinking in America. I for one see his going with the deepest of regret. In the years to come I hope OTTO KRUEGER will come back here and see the great things that he stood for in this Chamber still carried on in the future.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to commend my colleague from Iowa for calling our attention to retirement of OTTO KRUEGER. He has been a good and conscientious legislator. I wish him every success in his retirement.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH].

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my other colleagues in wishing OTTO KRUEGER the best of everything as he retires from this body. I have been authorized by the California delegation, at least on this side of the aisle, to say we all regret his retirement. OTTO KRUEGER to me represents the typical rugged individualist, a man who appreciates the good things of this life and of this Nation. He has served in public office for 38 years. We regret seeing him leave because we know we are going to miss him. We are going to miss the counsel and wisdom of a man who is fundamentally honest and who can be depended upon in everything that he does or says. I regret to see him leave.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BASS].

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] and other friends of OTTO KRUEGER in wishing for him the best of everything for him as he leaves the House of Representatives. I have had the privilege of serving with him on the House Committee on Agriculture and as a member of the subcommittee on family farms. He is a rugged individualist. He is a man of firm decisions, a man of wisdom. When you think of a man who has lived the life that OTTO KRUEGER has lived, if such a man could be described as being a lovable man—OTTO KRUEGER is such a man. I have learned to love him and have enjoyed his association. I wish him many more years of happiness and success as he leaves this great body.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE].

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, OTTO KRUEGER, our friend who has made his own decision to leave this body, is a great legislator. He has voted his convictions on what he thought was in the best interest of the people of North Dakota and of the Nation. Over and above that, OTTO KRUEGER is a great man. He is a man of great heart—he is a man of fine qualities both of heart and mind. Those of us who have come to know him intimately appreciate those qualities. I am sure he will continue to serve his people in some capacity wherever he may be. We all regret to see him leave this body.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, in recent days we have been speaking in this Chamber of the character and service of those of our colleagues who are retiring this year from this body. I have spoken of a number of them. I have spoken from the heart because they are people whom I respect and love and admire.

All of us who have known OTTO KRUEGER are sorry to see him leave this body. He has been a stalwart champion of the things in which he believes, and I happen to think that the things in which he believes have been good for the country. I am sorry to see him go. I just wish he were going to be with us here in the next Congress, because I am certain that if he had elected to stay here he would have been returned. However, he has chosen to retire and I wish him Godspeed with many happy years to come.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON].

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, although I realize the time is short, I would like to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to a distinguished colleage, a distinguished representative of his State OTTO KRUEGER of North Dakota.

OTTO comes from a neighboring State. I have relied on him heavily as one of the elder heads for guidance in many problems that were common to our area. I think it has been well said that he fought with determination for what he believed to be right. He is the kind of Representative we need. I truly hate to see him leave.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on the life, character, and public service of Mr. KRUEGER.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the Congress will miss the solid good humor of our colleague OTTO KRUEGER, who leaves voluntarily to return to his home in North Dakota. OTTO KRUEGER is a wonderful person, who perhaps most aptly fits the description "salt of the earth." OTTO has a gentle disposition and a ready wit, but he is a man of firmness of character and of deep integrity. The world has been made better through the service of men like OTTO KRUEGER, who searches patiently for the right answer to problems and then faces up to them with the courage of his very deep convictions. It was my pleasure to enter the 83d Congress with OTTO, and it is with deep regret that I join his many, many friends in wishing him health and happiness in his well-earned retirement.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in the House in paying tribute to our retiring Congressman from North Dakota, the Honorable OTTO KRUEGER. In him, we have the heartening spectacle, Mr. Speaker, of a patriotic and devoted public servant, who is not a native of this country but who has made this country very much his own. Born in Russia of German parents, September 7, 1890, OTTO KRUEGER came to the United States in 1910 and found his way to Fessenden, N. Dak., where he went through grade and high school, followed by a course of business training. A private in the 91st Infantry Division in World War I, KRUEGER returned at the close of the war to his adopted State where he became auditor of Wells County, being elected for no less than 10 consecutive terms and serving 20 years, from 1920 to 1940— a remarkable record and a splendid tribute, both to his ability and the confidence his fellow citizens had in his integrity. This long tour of public duty was followed, successively, by KRUEGER'S election and appointment as State treasurer, insurance commissioner, and State budget director. In addition, he held such posts as clerk of the Fessenden School District for 18 years; secretary-treasurer of the Wells County Chapter of the American Red Cross for 10 years; commander and adjutant of the local post of the American Legion and department vice commander of the North Dakota American Legion.

All of these positions, many of them highly responsible and exacting, well fitted our friend to take his place among us, which he did on January 20, 1952, as Representative at Large from North Dakota; and he was returned by the people of the State in the two following elections. As a North Dakota farmer, his interests naturally focused upon agriculture and its vexations and multifarious problems. His colleagues on the Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on Family Farms, and elsewhere have paid stirring tribute to KRUEGER'S worth in the legislative fields wherein he specialized. As he turns his face once more to the Northwest country, our gratitude, our esteem, and our friendship go with him. In closing, I should like to make the words of my colleague, Mr. PELLY, my own when he said, the other day, on the floor of this House:

> In the years to come I hope OTTO KRUEGER will come back here and see the great things that he stood for in this Chamber still carried on in the future.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in paying respect to one of the retiring Members of this Congress, the Honorable OTTO KRUEGER, of North Dakota.

I will always consider it a privilege to have served with Congressman KRUEGER. He has done an excellent job and he is certainly entitled to all of the pleasures which retirement will bring him. Our prayers and best wishes are with him.

MR. AND MRS. CARMEN SCOPPETTUOLO

Mr. LANE submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4059) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Carmen Scoppettuolo:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2703)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4059) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Carmen Scoppettuolo having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and

do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment.

THOMAS J. LANE,
JOSEPH M. MONTOYA,
RICHARD H. POFF,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN A. CARROLL,
THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4059) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Carmen Scoppettuolo, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report: The bill as passed the House would appropriate the sum of $1,540 to Mr. and Mrs. Carmen Scoppettuolo for expenses incurred by them in making a visiting to the United States Military Cemetery at St. Laurent, France. The Senate reduced the sum to $300, and at the conference the Senate conferees concurred in the House action.

THOMAS J. LANE,
JOSEPH M. MONTOYA,
RICHARD H. POFF,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4059) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Carmen Scoppettuolo.

The Clerk read the conference report.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the conference report?

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to pay Mr. and Mrs. Carmen Scoppettuolo, of Belleville, N. J., $1,540 in full settlement of all their claims against the United States for the expenses they incurred in making a visit to the United States Military Cemetery, St. Laurent, France, when the Department of the Army had erroneously informed them that their son was buried there.

The House approved a bill of $1,540 for their expenses. The Senate in its wisdom cut this down to $300. In conference they receded and approved the amount allowed by the House bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, Minnesota is a neighbor of the great State of North Dakota, and we in Minnesota think a lot of our neighboring State. Minnesota feels partly responsible for North Dakota, because so many of her people went there. One of the other Members of the Congressional delegation from North Dakota, the Honorable USHER L. BURDICK, is retiring from Congress.

USHER BURDICK was born in Minnesota. He migrated to North Dakota but came back to Minnesota to play football on the famous football team of 1904. In addition to playing football he acquired an education.

He went back to North Dakota, his native State, and from that day forward has been a stalwart citizen of the State of North Dakota, paying much attention to the political life of that great State.

USHER BURDICK was a man with a great heart. He had a feeling for his fellow man. There was no man who came to USHER BURDICK who needed help that USHER BURDICK ever turned away. That same thing was true in North Dakota in the pioneer days. Probably this Congress and succeeding Congresses will never see again a person of the pioneer spirit and pioneer stock that USHER BURDICK has brought to this Chamber.

Time and time again many of us have seen USHER get up on the floor of this House and fight for the little fellow, the fellow who was having a difficult time of it, the fellow USHER BURDICK thought ought to have a place in this great democracy of ours.

I am sure many Members of this Congress join with me in wishing for USHER BURDICK the happiness that we all hope he may have. We know that his health has not been too good recently but we do hope that he regains that health. He is a hearty man, he is a fighter, and as far as he is concerned he will fight to the utmost to regain his health.

I am sure he will always bear in mind the many friends he has in this Chamber. The House of Representatives was very dear to USHER BURDICK. When I came to Congress one of the first men that I met here was USHER BURDICK. He extended a hand of friendship to me. He did what he could to make my life pleasant here. He was always friendly, he was always courteous, he was always trying to help. That is typical of him. He was always trying to help everybody everywhere.

He was a great American, he is a great American. He was a great Member of this Chamber and one who has great respect for the House of Representatives, and will do everything he can to further the cause of democracy in this country. I am sure we all wish him the utmost of happiness during his retirement in North Dakota and a steady regaining of health.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I came to know USHER BURDICK very, very well. He was a great member of the Minnesota football team, and he was a great American at all times, doing his duty as his heart, as his mind prompted in the performance of his duty. He had a great love for his fellow man. He did perform many kindnesses, many deeds far beyond which most of us see fit to perform, in order to assist his fellow man.

USHER BURDICK was also one of the best if not the best read man in the American Congress. He had a faculty in reading. He had a photographic mind which enabled him to read a book a page at a time. He made it a habit of reading a book every day. I dare say within the past half century there has been no Member of Congress who has been as widely read or who has read as many books as has USHER BURDICK.

He had a great mind, he had a great heart, and everyone who came to know USHER BURDICK loved the fine quality that made up this sturdy citizen of the great West, a great man who came here to fight for the things which he thought was in the best interest of not only the people of his State but of the people of America.

As USHER BURDICK goes back home to seek years of enjoyment, we all hope he will have happiness and a great deal of satisfaction. I am sure he will return to the people who have loved him in the past and will love him in the future in the same manner.

Mr. MARSHALL. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee.

I would also like at this point to say that USHER BURDICK was not only a well-read man but he was also the author of a number of books on western life. All of those books are well worth reading, because they give a fine insight into the primary life in North Dakota.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, he probably has the greatest collection of Indian literature and folklore in America. He has donated his collection to the University of North Dakota. He has rendered a great service to the people of North Dakota and to the people of this Nation.

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield at this time to our distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I will miss USHER BURDICK. He is a rugged individual, a great American, a statesman of good order. He is loved by the Members of this House. I wish for him a return to good health and many years to enjoy it.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to one of the best friends that USHER BURDICK had in the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am very anxious to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished friend from Minnesota and my distinguished friend from Tennessee concerning their references to a dear and loyal friend, Congressman USHER BURDICK.

I think that the remarks that have been made here so pertinently and eloquently by the gentlemen who have preceded me relative to his wonderful, lovable nature, his high character, the splendid, outstanding quality of his service, great talents, his staunch Americanism, his unfailing friendliness and kindness to those in need of his help, and his rugged loyalty to the fundamental principles of this Nation, all mark USHER BURDICK as one of the most distinguished men who have ever served in this body. I am pleased and proud, indeed, as his close friend, to join in the sincere and glowing tributes that are being paid him, and I compliment and heartily congratulate him upon his outstanding service as one of the very greatest Congressmen that we have known in the Nation.

I wish for him in his voluntary retirement every measure of good health and success and well-being and happiness with his family that the good Lord may bestow upon him.

USHER BURDICK was one of the greatest Americans and finest gentlemen that this historic Chamber has ever known.

There was never a worthy cause to which he did not give his heart, his well-stored mind, and his eloquent tongue.

There was never a call of need from an individual or the people to which he did not respond with all the great ability of his alert mind and all the generosity of his wholesome, sympathetic nature.

His mind was razor sharp and speedily went to the heart of a problem. He was a brilliant, experienced lawyer, and his service on the House Judiciary Committee was noteworthy as well as rewarding to the House, to the Nation, and to very many individual citizens suffering injustice and inequity.

USHER BURDICK was a man of indomitable will and unflinching purpose—endowed with the strength and courage of a lion, yet with a heart flowing over with kindness, feeling, and sympathy for the poor, the weak, and the oppressed.

His career has been illustrious and distinguished. He has served unselfishly in high stations and has always adhered to highest standards of probity. He has unswervingly followed the ideals of Americanism and justice which he set out for himself many years ago when he was an all-American football player at Minnesota.

True and loyal to principles and to friends, to the cause of country and the cause of those inarticulate souls unable to speak adequately for themselves, the name and service of USHER BURDICK will long be remembered in the Congress, in the Nation, and by the good, patriotic people of North Dakota for whom he gave his last full measure of devotion. His constituents, State, and Nation are deeply indebted to USHER BURDICK.

He was my dear friend in the Congress, and I hold him in deepest affection. He is loved and admired by many in and out of the Congress. He is indeed a man of strength, patriotism, and loyalty, and we shall not soon look up to his like again.

In his retirement I hope and pray he will enjoy good health, long life, and every blessing of peace and happiness with his family and friends.

Gifted author and historian, brilliant statesman and patriot, unstinted humanitarian, man of strength, character, humor, and wisdom, USHER BURDICK will take his place in this hallowed Chamber in the ranks of American immortals. God love him.

Mr. MARSHALL. I thank my colleague from Massachusetts.

I yield at this time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER].

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, I would feel remiss in my duty if I neglected to speak a word of praise of USHER BURDICK here this evening. I met him when I first came to Washington. He gave me good advice. He helped me on many occasions. I always admired the man for his firmness of purpose, his staunch convictions, and the way he always took his stand regardless of any opposition that he should encounter to his theories. More than any other one thing, I admired him because he was a staunch friend of the American farmer; a man who was true to his convictions at all times. USHER BURDICK lived a long time and has seen many things, and in his retirement from this Chamber I know he will be missed by all of us here. But, I know that I will miss USHER BURDICK very much. He could be counted on for a speech or a vote in favor of agriculture in the United States. He was a man to be trusted. He ran true to form all the time. He was staunch, he was fearless, he was honest. I wish him the best of everything in his retirement, and I hope that the good Lord will give him many more years and much enjoyment with his family and his people in his home State who undoubtedly are very proud of USHER BURDICK.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, one of the great privileges of service in this House is the opportunity to meet the men and women who represent the American people here. Of all those whom I have met during my service here none has impressed me more than the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] who is about to retire along with my other friend from North Dakota [Mr. KRUEGER].

He is a man who stands out among other men who are outstanding. He is a man of the frontier, a rugged individualist, a man of great energy, great physical, moral, and mental courage. At the same time, he is a great scholar, one of the most scholarly men I have even known, a man who, as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE] has pointed out, has read literally thousands of books, who is an author of distinction, a great speaker and debater. He is really a man of many talents. The Congress can ill afford to lose men of the character, integrity and independence of judgment such as Congressman BURDICK. I join the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota in wishing him well.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that out in North Dakota, Congressman BURDICK will be reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I want to say that the expressions of friendship here are merely a part of the feeling that many of us have for him, that warm-hearted feeling we have for him. I know all of us are going to miss him in the next session of Congress.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, USHER BURDICK was a man of great courage. He left some remarkable records, one of which was as a phenomenal football end. Another record was his pioneer work.

Mr. Speaker, he accumulated a wonderful library of genealogy. He had a remarkable library of Indian lore and Indian history.

I think my colleagues would be interested in a story they tell about him. I used to talk with him a great deal while he was here. He devisd a way of breaking bronchos that is still used up in North Dakota, as I understand, and here it is: He would get a companion on a horse, leading the broncho. Then USHER would ride his own horse out into a lake until the water was 3½ or 4 feet deep. Then he would gradually slide off his horse, over his companion's horse and onto the broncho. In order for a broncho to buck, he has to get his head down between his legs. Every time the broncho would try to get his head down between his legs, his nose would go under water so that he would almost drown, and he would bring his head up again. That is the way USHER BURDICK broke his bronchos. He was really a wonderfully ingenious person.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all members may extend their remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in the 10 years that I have served in this House, I found no Member who was more principled, frank, honest, and courageous than the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK]. I endorse all the fine words that have been said here in his honor.

USHER BURDICK was truly a spokesman and a fighter for the less fortunate and for the common people of America. He was an able legislator and has made a big contribution to the progress of his State and his country.

My sincere wishes go to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] for the restoration of good health and for many pleasant, interesting, and happy years of retired life.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, among the Members who are voluntarily retiring from the Congress is the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota, USHER BURDICK.

Few will be missed as much and none more than this most capable and amiable man.

For 20 years, USHER BURDICK has given the fullness of his mind, his heart, and his health in patriotic service to the people of the United States and North Dakota.

In legislative probity, he had a mind like a surgeon's knife and, as witnessed here on innumerable occasions, with a brief comment he could lay bare the full significance of a major bill. It was a byword around here that if you wanted a full attendance in the Hall just spread a rumor that USHER was going to speak. All of us here have been benefited by working within the atmosphere of his recognized practical wisdom, philosophic outlook, gentle heart, kindly wit, and genial personality.

Few men serving in this body have contributed as much as he toward that spirit of bipartisan goodwill within which the most constructive legislation of foundation good is enacted.

For this contribution alone, his name will be written high on the annals of our national legislative history.

In his departure from our midst, may every blessing follow him through many more years of the good life he eminently merits from his long and sacrificing legislative toil in the best interests of his fellow Americans.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, when USHER L. BURDICK came to Washington as Congressman at Large from North Dakota in 1935, he brought in his person the clear and invigorating spirit of the West.

As a fledgling Member in 1942, I was immediately attracted by his frank and honest comment on the serious issues of that time, and his saving grace of humor which helped to break many a tense deadlock.

Later, as I worked side by side with him on the Judiciary Committee, my respect developed into a lasting friendship that I count as one of my happiest experiences as a Member of Congress.

For USHER is a man of his word.

He insists on carrying his share of the load.

As an easterner from a somewhat populous area, I was fascinated by the reminiscences of his boyhood in the Dakota Territory, where he grew up in the neighborhood of the Sioux and learned their language. And from the way he spoke, I knew that he shared their love of the open country, where a man has room to grow.

He liked the taste of his early schooling, and went on to graduate from the State normal school at Mayville, N. Dak. Then he and his young bride entered the University of Minnesota, where USHER played on the championship football teams of 1903 and 1904.

After graduation, he started the practice of law.

With his boundless energy and enthusiasm, and his genuine liking for people, he branched out into public life, becoming, in turn, State representative, speaker of the house, lieutenant governor, assistant United States district attorney, and Congressman at Large. Ever since the beginning of 1935, with the exception of one term, he has served all the people of North Dakota with devotion and distinction.

Congressman at Large takes in a lot of territory, and it takes a big man to represent a whole State in the United States House of Representatives.

But that is the way USHER BURDICK wanted it; the more people he could help, the greater was his joy in serving.

When a man gives the best of his life to others, the time comes when he must pause and rest.

USHER BURDICK bids farewell to the Halls of Congress and to his many friends in the Nation's Capital.

As he goes home to North Dakota, he does not need to pack his memories. They are rich, and full, and will accompany him forever, reliving the stirring events of which he was a part, and recalling the many grateful colleagues who served with him in Congress.

Goodby, USHER, and God bless you.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, like every other Member of the House, I am very sorry to learn of the voluntary retirement of my colleague, that stalwart and steadfast figure, USHER L. BURDICK, of North Dakota. First appearing in this Chamber in 1935, he has been from the first an outstanding figure in our midst and it is hard to believe that when next we meet he will not be amongst us. Born in Owatonna, Minn., February 21, 1879, he moved with his parents to the Dakota Territory when he was but 3 years of age. There he grew up among the Sioux Indians, and was graduated from the State normal school in Mayville, N. Dak., in 1900. From 1900 to 1902 he was deputy superintendent of schools in Benson County. Earning his way through the University of Minnesota by teaching in a business college, he received his law degree and was admitted to the bar in 1904, and commenced practice in Munich, N. Dak. From 1907 to 1911 has was a member of the North Dakota House of Representatives. He served as speaker in 1909, being the youngest to hold such an office in the United States at that time. Removing to Williston in 1910, he continued his practice of law. That same year he was elected lieutenant governor of his State; was State's attorney of Williams County from 1913 to 1915; and was assistant United States district attorney for North Dakota during the years 1929–32. An unsuccessful candidate for the Republican nomination to the 73d Congress, he was elected to the 74th and the four succeeding Congresses. After a 6-year absence from the national scene, Mr. BURDICK was returned as a Member of the 81st Congress, and has been a Member of this House ever since.

Always an independent Republican, he thought, acted, and spoke for himself—and no man ever doubted where he stood on any issue.

In 1955 there was issued the first Congressional anthology of poems selected by Senators and Representatives. Mr. BURDICK's selection, characteristically enough, was Rudyard Kipling's famous If, and as we salute our departing friend, I desire to quote the poem in full as a portrait of our revered and esteemed colleague about to return to the great West from whence he came:

If you can keep your head when all about you
  Are losing theirs and blaming it on you,
If you can trust yourself when all men doubt you,
  But make allowance for their doubting too;
If you can wait and not be tired by waiting,
  Or being lied about, don't deal in lies,
Or being hated, don't give way to hating,
  And yet don't look too good, nor talk too wise:
If you can dream—and not make dreams your master;
  If you can think—and not make thoughts your aim;
If you can meet with triumph and disaster
  And treat those two imposters just the same;
If you can bear to hear the truth you've spoken
  Twisted by knaves to make a trap for fools,
Or watch the things you gave your life to, broken,
  And stoop and build 'em up with worn-out tools:
If you can make one heap of all your winnings
  And risk it on one turn of pitch-and-toss,
And lose, and start again at your beginnings
  And never breathe a word about your loss;
If you can force your heart and nerve and sinew
  To serve your turn long after they are gone,
And so hold on when there is nothing in you
  Except the will which says to them: "Hold on!"
If you can talk with crowds and keep your virtue,
  Or walk with kings—nor lose the common touch,
If neither foes nor loving friends can hurt you,
  If all men count with you, but none too much;
If you can fill the unforgiving minute
  With 60 seconds' worth of distance run,
Yours is the earth and everything that's in it,
  And—which is more—you'll be a man, my son!

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, never again will this historic Chamber see the likes of the Honorable USHER L. BURDICK, who to our great regret voluntarily is retiring to private life. Other outstanding statesmen will come to make mighty contribution to the continuance of the House as the greatest legislative body in the world. But there never again will be an USHER BURDICK. He was the product of an era that has closed.

In 1903 and 1904, when the Minnesota football eleven mowed down all opposition in the Big Ten, USHER BURDICK at right end was a star of brightest light and his name was famous wherever deeds of athletic prowess gave thrill to worshiping fans.

At 28 he was a member of the legislature of North Dakota, at 30 was the youngest speaker of a State legislative body in the Nation, and at 32 was lieutenant governor of his State. He served 10 terms in the House, always fearlessly independent, always fighting for the little fellow and what he thought would make this a better and a brighter country for everybody. He was never broken to party harness. Indeed any kind of a harness that might seek to restrain him from causes he deemed righteous was hateful to him. None of that for USHER BURDICK.

He spoke the Sioux Indian language as easily as his native tongue. He wrote many books on western history. His letter to his constituents was widely quoted in newspapers throughout the Nation because of his way of putting into his writings exactly what was in his mind and probably, also in the minds of the folks at home. When he spoke from the well of the House everybody listened.

As football end, as lawyer, as statesman, as orator, as writer, and as friend, USHER BURDICK in my book was among the champions of champions.

To USHER BURDICK I owe a great debt of gratitude for what his smile and his friendship have meant to me from the day I entered this Chamber. In his going the Congress loses a giant of integrity, of straight thinking, and of colorful dedication to the grassroot philosophies that have made America supreme among the nations and, adhered to, will keep her so.

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am speaking in behalf of the beloved dean of the Democratic Illinois delegation, TOM O'BRIEN. TOM O'BRIEN himself

is not speaking because he feels deeply the stab of ingratitude that some Members of the other body are plunging into the back of TOM O'BRIEN and the Chicago of his birth and affection.

TOM O'BRIEN has been in this body for 27 years, and only one bill has borne his name. That was the bill for Chicago, and TOM O'BRIEN did not introduce that bill until he had been asked to do so by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. CHURCH), speaking for all the Republican Members of Chicagoland.

You have found that we are a pretty closely bound family, those of us who come from Chicago, and when we are doing something for Chicago we do not raise a question of politics and we follow the leadership of TOM O'BRIEN and MARGUERITE CHURCH. We have made a lot of sacrifices. Many a time those in the other body have called upon our beloved dean for help, and many a time he has given it. Then today he was told that they were putting in his back and in the back of Chicago the dagger of ingratitude. We are going back to Chicago with no love for the Members of the other body for giving that blow to TOM O'BRIEN and to men, women, and children of Chicago. We are going back, but TOM O'BRIEN will return, I can assure those who now are wielding the dagger, and he will not forget.

That is the reason I am speaking for him now. He loves TOM GORDON, and wished me to say for him what is in his heart.

Mr. Speaker, you know the affection we in Chicago have for one another. TOM GORDON is about to leave the Congress, the TOM GORDON who did so much for Chicago as city treasurer of Chicago and who in his quiet, efficient, self-effacing way was, I think, the greatest treasurer of any city in the United States; the TOM GORDON who took a newspaper and as its manager made it the Polish newspaper in English with the largest circulation in the world. Then TOM GORDON came to the Congress and went on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, always self-effacing, always efficient, always doing a tremendously good job but never reaching out for credit.

Mr. Speaker, I have known TOM GORDON for many, many years. There was great ability in TOM GORDON, but he never paraded his accomplishments. That is his nature. When he became chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs everybody remarked upon his fairness, his intelligence, his profound grasp of all the matters that go into the making of foreign policy. Now TOM GORDON is leaving us. TOM O'BRIEN wanted me to speak for him and invite my colleagues on the Committee on Foreign Affairs of seniority, the Members from Illinois, and the other Members of the House to pay their tributes to a great American, a great Chicagoan, and a great chairman of a great committee of this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I cannot let these closing hours of the 85th Congress pass by without a personal expression about my dear friend and colleague who is leaving this Congress, the Honorable THOMAS S. GORDON, of Illinois. As most of you know, he is leaving reluctantly because of ill health. He has been a Member of this body since the 79th Congress. I have served with him on the Committee on Foreign Affairs since I came to this body in 1949.

Perhaps his most outstanding characteristics are his gentleness and consideration for his colleagues. As chairman of the committee during this last Congress, he presided over some of the most important deliberations that have come before our committee.

We come from similar districts in the Midwest. On many issues that came before this Congress we saw eye to eye and on the few occasions where we did differ, I have never found any sign of bitterness on the part of TOM GORDON. Certainly the district which he has represented all these years has had a faithful and devoted public servant. It is my own judgment that his present ill health has been caused in large measure by the unstinted devotion and service which he performed for his constituents. No request was too small; no interest was to obscure to escape his undivided attention.

My wife and I have on many occasions enjoyed the company of Mr. and Mrs. GORDON. As TOM and Cele leave this city we shall miss them and their graciousness. On behalf of my wife and myself, I wish TOM GORDON and his wife, Cele, many years of happiness as they leave for a well deserved rest. May God grant the choicest blessings to you and yours, Mr. Chairman, Mr. GORDON.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ].

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate and thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] who I know is a very devoted and close friend of our colleague, TOM GORDON, for taking this time to pay tribute to TOM GORDON for his devoted service to his country. TOM GORDON will not be remembered in this country for any outstanding orations, but he will be remembered for a long time for the acts which he performed while he was a Member of Congress. Truly, I know of very, very few Members of this Congress who have been more effective than TOM GORDON in the field of foreign affairs in the Congress of the United States. He is possessed of many great qualities. He is modest, but he knows that reason must prevail and through his good sense he has been able to do many, many good things for the benefit of his country. He could have been and should have been chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in this session of the Congress, but he realized that his health would not permit him to serve his country to the fullest extent that that high office requires and he relinquished that position to others. However, I think as time goes on we will know more and more of the many instances when TOM GORDON's good judgment and reasoning did much good for the benefit of our country. I sincerely hope that TOM GORDON will soon regain his health and be able to serve his country in whatever capacity he deems best.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Michigan. I agree with him that when the history of these times is written, the name of TOM GORDON will be very high on the honor roll.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, acting chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words in tribute to the outstanding public service of my dear friend, colleague, and committee chairman, THOMAS S. GORDON, whose prolonged convalescence after major surgery has made necessary his retirement from the Congress.

The next Congress will be the poorer because of the absence of our friend and colleague, THOMAS S. GORDON. My admiration and respect for this man has increased each year that has gone by. His loyalty and devotion to his duties have been outstanding and I have never known anyone who has been so attentive to committee business and has devoted his energies so untiringly to his constituents and to the American people. He is outstanding in his friendliness, kindliness, and courtesy. I have never known him to utter a word in anger. His conduct of committee meetings was outstanding for the fair and generous way in which he conducted himself.

TOM GORDON was never too busy to extend a helping hand no matter who requested it. His sympathetic understanding of our problems is symbolic of true generosity of his heart.

It was with the deepest regret that I heard he had decided to retire from the Congress. I know he will continue to give the benefit of his wisdom and his advice to us and to his people.

I can truthfully say that I have learned much under the chairmanship of TOM GORDON. I hope that I can follow his example and that I will be able to fulfill my duties as well as he has filled his. The most that can be said of anyone is that he loved his fellow man, and that is indeed true of TOM GORDON.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I can only remark that although we suffer loss in the retirement of TOM GORDON from the committee, we are enriched by our new acting chairman.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding, but even more for having taken this time to express the feelings in which we all share regarding Mr. GORDON, of Illinois, one of our most illustrious citizens. Mr. GORDON is a man who has earned his way to fame and recognition in this great Congress through hard work, quiet study, moderate approach, large heartedness, and magnanimity of spirit that has shown itself on every occasion and to everyone who had the privilege of working with him.

I took signal pride when I knew that Mr. GORDON was succeeding to the chair-

manship of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Even though I had had the privilege of knowing him for some years, I had no idea as to quite what spirit of understanding he would breathe into our consultations; with what equanimity he would preside over our occasional disputes; nor with what gentleness of spirit he would calm tenseness of feeling arising over the very serious subjects of our discussions.

The Congress is losing a great Member in the retirement of Mr. GORDON. The Foreign Affairs Committee, however, takes great pride in the spirit and ability of his successor; but to those of us who were friends of Mr. GORDON through the years, it would be difficult to replace him as a man, as a leader, as a true son of Chicago, who has brought great credit to that city.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank my distinguished colleague from Illinois for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is a very harsh judge of its membership. I think it is a great credit to TOM GORDON that this House and its Members have shown to him the affection and high regard that they have displayed. He is a credit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, one of the greatest committees of this House. He is a credit to the people of his District, he was a credit to the people of Chicago and the Polish-American people from whom he sprung. He is a fine man, a gentle soul, humane man, a man who is characterized by his understanding. He is much beloved by all of us, here and by his people at home. We shall miss him when he leaves us.

The Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives is much poorer for his leaving us. I wish to join our colleagues and friends in this body in paying tribute to one of our fine Members and in wishing him well, and in expressing the hope that he will have a long, happy, prosperous life, an opportunity to do the many things he never had time to do while here.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the other friends of TOM GORDON in paying a deserved tribute to a great Member of the Congress. I had the pleasure and privilege of serving on the Committee on Foreign Affairs under the chairmanship of Mr. GORDON. He was able, devoted, and eminently fair in his leadership of this committee.

Mrs. Carnahan and I have enjoyed the delightful companionship and friendship of Mr. and Mrs. Gordon, and we are going to miss them. TOM GORDON will be remembered as a warm personal friend by so many of his colleagues here.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, may I thank the gentleman very much for taking this time and giving us the opportunity of saying some of the things that we have felt for many years about TOM GORDON.

TOM GORDON and I knew each other in a different way from what most of you have known him. In the first place, in a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I found him one day dreadfully bored. We talked about a few things and among others we thought about the organization of the committee. We thought we would not get bored if there were some small subcommittees formed. So we mapped out a little bit what the subcommittees would do. Then we just quietly talked a little bit, and in 1945 we succeeded in having the subcommittees, particularly the geographic ones, formed.

Then I had the great pleasure with KARL MUNDT of traveling with TOM GORDON, and it was quite an experience. We went to Warsaw. TOM, and Joe Ryder of Connecticut, who was then in Congress, had lists this long of Poles they wanted to find out whether they were living or dead. TOM found everyone of them living. The comfort and the joy he brought to his own people at home and those people in Warsaw is something one does not forget.

His heart was too big for him and finally it balked a little bit. But all down through the years being with TOM GORDON has been a very real experience. Every one of us on the Foreign Affairs Committee has felt the warmth of his personality. Sometimes he seemed a little timid. You would give him a little poke and say, "Come on, come on, TOM, say it," and with real strength he would then do it.

There were few, perhaps, who had the common interest he and I had. We both had sons who had injured themselves. We compared notes a good many times and were perhaps a comfort to each other in many of the difficult times that we had.

So it is with a great deal of joy that I add my little word to the many that have been said here in his praise and in his honor, and I hope sincerely that he will be with us many times, that he will come here to Washington. I know we may talk with him on the telephone and write him and ask him what to do.

For my beloved colleague, TOM GORDON, and all his loved ones, I hope for happiness as the years pass lightly over their heads, God keeping them.

Again to my distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] I want to say another thank you for these minutes that have given us this opportunity.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORANO].

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my distinguished colleague from Illinois and the many other Members of the House who have praised TOM GORDON. All the high praise that has been heaped upon TOM today is fully merited and deserved. He is a kind man; he is a gentleman; he is a devout man; he is a splendid family man. He was always firm in his convictions, courageous in his debates, yet always fair. We are going to miss TOM GORDON in this Congress. It was a pleasure and an honor and a privilege for me to serve with him on the Committee on Foreign Affairs and also to serve with him when he was its chairman. I have traveled with him and I have always found that he was a steadying influence on my actions and my thoughts and my feelings. He is a personal friend of mine and I am going to miss him. I hope he will return, and meanwhile, in his retirement, I hope that he has good health and many years of well deserved enjoyment.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join the Illinois delegation in this tribute to a great American, a great Congressman, and a real friend of mine, TOM GORDON. TOM is a man of many fine qualities. He is a man of great ability. It was with deep regret that I learned that because of his health, TOM GORDON was finding it necessary to retire. This Congress is losing one of its outstanding and most beloved Members. I wish him great happiness in the years to come.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BYRNE].

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois and I represent adjoining districts in the city of Chicago, and our esteemed friend, TOM GORDON, comes from another section of the city of Chicago. When I was assistant corporation counsel in the city of Chicago, many years ago, I knew TOM GORDON well. I got to know him better when I was an assistant State's attorney of Cook County. He preceded me in the Congress of the United States and served a number of terms before I arrived here. He served during that tenure of office with great honor and distinction. In our great city, along the sidewalks of Chicago, we are represented by many nationalities; people from far distant countries. We get along fine with all nationalities, creeds, and colors. I think in TOM GORDON we see the exemplification of a fine leader of the Polish race.

Mr. Speaker, I join with the other friends of TOM GORDON in wishing him well. I am privileged to be a friend of his over a long period of time, and I extend to him my felicitations and best wishes that through the years that are to come he may have the best of health and he may have a much deserved rest.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE].

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Illinois delegation, it is my proud pleasure to address a few remarks in this 11th hour on the self-retirement of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, our beloved colleague from Illinois, THOMAS GORDON. In THOMAS GORDON we see a healthful parallel between the 85th Congress and our departing friend.

This Congress is probably the least partisan peacetime Congress in the

memory of the United States, and probably the most quietly productive in legislative achievement recorded as we approach the end of the legislative calendar.

This, the 85th Congress, has been undramatic, unbitter and in strictly headline terms it may not have made any national issues; but at no time has this Congress sought to nor has it divided our Nation. It has operated with none of the violent controversy and debate that sometimes characterizes and punctuates legislative assemblies.

It is not too hard to look in retrospect to see where, too often, controversy and bitterness ofttimes have left too many issues more clouded and more unsolved than when the Congressmen approached them.

When we go to the other aspect of the parallel, when we view the activities of our colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs within that framework—yes, a beautiful framework—we see that he was one of the least partisan chairmen in our memory, and probably one of the most quietly productive chairmen in legislative achievement. Yes, he was quiet. He was unassuming, he was unbitter, and he never involved himself in mere search for headlines. He was not a headline hunter. He never sought to create national issues, and at no time did he try to divide the Nation. He operated without the benefit of violent controversy that oftentimes we see in too many places.

Mr. Speaker, as he leaves to go into his much-needed retirement, occasioned by ill health, I am reminded of that definition of a gentleman enunciated by Cardinal Newman who said:

> He is tender toward the distant. He is merciful toward the absurd. He seems in fact to be receiving when he is conferring, and he never indulges in controversy with better, perhaps, but less-trained minds.

It is almost the definition of a gentleman to say he is one who never inflicts pain. He is like a chair who is constantly giving comfort and consolation.

As a member of the Illinois delegation I know we shall miss Congressman GORDON. As the distinguished majority whip and other speakers have said, you cannot lose a man of this integrity and this intensity of purpose without suffering a grievous loss.

Mr. Speaker, I salute our colleague, and to him and his lovely family I wish years of good fortune and good health.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. LIBONATI].

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I have had a very intimate acquaintanceship with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON] because he ran for Congress in my District. This is what impressed me about him in 1942 when I was running for the first time for the Senate of the State of Illinois and he was running for Congress. THOMAS GORDON was an American. He was in an Italian-controlled District and was of Polish antecedents. He was a man of genial disposition, sweetness of character, and kindness in every move and every attitude. He was a man who liked people, and naturally, people of Italian extraction are very anxious to have friendly men and friendly leaders. He personified that type of person.

He received probably a greater plurality than any man who ever ran before him for that office on the near West Side. Sometimes, I might say, they were a little too enthusiastic. Nevertheless, TOM GORDON was an important man in that community.

There is a peculiar thing about men; the mental attitudes of men and their training, in the case of TOM GORDON, did not derive from the so-called schools of higher education.

TOM GORDON at an early age, after graduating from high school, had to seek employment and train himself for the sacrifices he had to make to support his family. Thus we have a typical character in American life, one coming from the common people, from foreign antecedents, who by his own development progressed to the point where he is at the head of one of the important committees of the Congress, dealing with the complexities of foreign policy. He has had the training that is necessary to cope with the responsibilities of a chairmanship. TOM GORDON took his place there with strength of purpose and a fine balance of judgment, and, with the cooperation of his fellow members, gave leadership to that committee, until he resigned.

I think as a man his true character was in his simplicity and sense of direction, that was his alone. He never sought importance. He lived to serve his fellow countrymen in the capacities in which he trained himself and in which he was trained by the eminent men in this Congress who preceded him.

I think it is a great loss to our community and to the country at large to have men who are similarly trained leave public life. Unfortunately, the Harvester of Them All decrees what men shall do, and their health determines their status. The most important thing for TOM GORDON is to regain and enjoy his health, which he lost by reason of the worries and tensions he experienced here.

I am very proud that at one time a portion of his District was in what is my present District.

The people of Illinois and, naturally, my leader, TOM O'BRIEN, are very proud to have us speak of TOM GORDON upon his departure from the House of Representatives at this time.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there are many Members here who would yet like to pay their tributes to TOM GORDON, but as we have taken up a considerable period of time, I ask unanimous consent that all Members wishing to do so may extend their remarks in this and succeeding issues of the RECORD about our colleague, TOM GORDON.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SAUND. Mr. Speaker, I shall always remember TOM GORDON as a dear friend and a beloved chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee. As I joined the Foreign Affairs Committee I did so with diffidence, knowing how little voice in the deliberations of a committee a freshman can expect. Yet after 2 years of service under the leadership of TOM GORDON I can state this: At no time did I feel that I was a freshman. The chairman was always gentle, kind, considerate, and ever obliging. Last winter he appointed me as a one-man subcommittee to tour the countries of the Far East. He demonstrated his sincere faith in me. He offered his help and guidance in my mission. On my return when I reported on my assignment he gave me a pat on the back which I shall never forget. TOM GORDON was a great chairman and a true leader. My wishes go with him so he may enjoy his retirement with his lovely wife and fine family.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of deep regret that our distinguished colleague and affectionate friend, TOM GORDON, is forced to leave the Congress because of ill health. It will be a great loss to the Nation and to this body not to have him here. He has been an outstanding legislator, an inspiring leader, and throughout his life a true Christian gentleman.

As chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, TOM GORDON won the respect and admiration of all the members. He was completely devoted to his work and exerted always a fair and nonpartisan attitude having in mind what was best for his country. For all that he has done, the people of Illinois, the Congress, the people of the United States owe him a great debt of gratitude.

I want to join those who admired and loved him in extending to him and Mrs. Gordon our best wishes for good health and many years of happiness.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry to see my valued friend and our esteemed colleague, Congressman THOMAS GORDON, leaving the Congress. His public career has been marked with great devotion to duty. Able and diligent in his work, genuinely interested in serving the people faithfully, efficiently, and well, Congressman GORDON has been an extremely valuable Member of the House. During his incumbency as chairman of our great Foreign Affairs Committee, he has made notable contributions of which we are all very well aware. His constituency and the Nation—yes, and the Free World—are thankful to him for his conscientious efforts and constructive accomplishments.

TOM GORDON is a man of amiable personal traits and no one who ever knew him could fail to be impressed by his quiet modesty and sincere humility. He has made a great record here in the House that will have a deep and lasting impression on our membership, and I know that I speak for the entire House when I commend and congratulate him upon his many years of unselfish service.

In his voluntary retirement, I wish for him and his family all the blessings of good health, success, and happiness, and I hope he will return to Washington frequently to visit with us.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I deeply regret that the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Com-

mittee of the House of Representatives, the Honorable THOMAS S. GORDON, of Illinois, is retiring from Congress this year.

This decision must have been as difficult for TOM to make as it has been for the rest of us to accept. The members of the Foreign Affairs Committee will all miss TOM GORDON because they, like the members of the Illinois delegation, know full well what a dedicated public servant he has been. He has made a great record as a Member of Congress and as chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee. He has led this committee in some of our most turbulent times in the field of foreign affairs. His contribution will be long remembered. I join with my colleague and with the other Members of the House of Representatives in wishing our friend much happiness and success in the years ahead.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the end of the 85th Congress brings with it the fact that an unusually large number of Members of the House of Representatives are retiring from service. To those of us who have worked with the Honorable THOMAS GORDON, a great Democrat from Chicago, it is sad to learn that he will not be among us when the 86th Congress convenes in January.

TOM GORDON came to Washington as a Member of the 78th Congress and has been returned by the voters in his District to each succeeding Congress. His varied experience in business and local government prepared him for his outstanding service in the House of Representatives. At the time of his retirement he was chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee in which position his leadership and ability have endeared him to the other members of the committee as well as to the House as a whole.

Even though I am saddened over the retirement of my friend, TOM GORDON, I join with his colleagues in wishing him a future filled with good health, enjoyment, and success.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues from Illinois in paying respect to one of their delegation, the Honorable TOM GORDON, who is voluntarily retiring from this legislative hall.

Congressman GORDON has done an outstanding job, not only for his constituency, for his committee, but for the country and Nation as well.

Congressman GORDON, we wish you and yours all the happiness in the world in the years ahead.

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD on the retirement from the House of Representatives of my colleague, the Honorable CLAIR ENGLE, and that all members of the California delegation and such other Members of the House as may desire to do so may be given the same permission; further, that all such remarks appear in the permanent RECORD as of the last issue of this session.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to call attention to a noteworthy chapter in the distinguished career of my colleague, Representative CLAIR ENGLE, of California. I refer to the conservation chapter, by virtue of which the gentleman from California has assured himself a place in the hearts of conservation-minded citizens as well as a place in the history of resource legislation.

In its authoritative conservation report covering the actions of Congress, the National Wildlife Federation called the conservation record of the 84th Congress generally good. In a recent interview Charles H. Callison, conservation director of the federation, summarized the work of the 85th Congress by saying it was a memorable "do-a-lot" Congress, "noteworthy for having enacted more important conservation legislation than any other in recent history."

To back up his appraisal Callison listed such enactments as:

The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission;

Legislation to curb military land grabs and require compliance with State game and fish laws on military reservations;

An increase in the duck stamp to $3, with earmarking of revenues to save vital waterfowl marshes;

Strengthening amendments to the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act;

Legislation authorizing research into the fish and wildlife effects of chemical pesticides; and

Control of billboard advertising on the Interstate Highway System.

Callison also said this Congress was generous and realistic in making appropriations to the resource-management agencies providing funds to implement soil, water, forestry, wildlife, national park and pollution-control programs.

Mr. Speaker, many of us are proud of having had a hand in writing the outstanding conservation record of the 85th Congress and its predecessor body, the 84th. I was the original author of the pesticides research bill and cosponsor of several of the others listed by the National Wildlife Federation. But my purpose here is to review the outstanding role played by Representative CLAIR ENGLE, who is leaving the membership of the House in order to run for the Senate.

As chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, CLAIR ENGLE launched and directed a searching investigation of military land excesses and abuses of conservation laws on military areas. He wrote, and led the fight for, the corrective law known as the Engle Act (Public Law 85-337). This important measure requires Congressional approval of any military withdrawal or reservation from the public domain in excess of 5,000 acres. It encourages multiple use of military lands for recreation, grazing, forestry and other public purposes where feasible. It requires compliance with State game and fish laws. For a more detailed account of this Engle crusade see the article in the July 1958 issue of the Reader's Digest by Charles Stevenson.

CLAIR ENGLE cosponsored the outdoor recreation resources review bill. He guided it out of committee with his usual fine skill and handled it successfully on the House floor. The Commission created by this bill is charged with the responsibility of making an inventory of present facilities and for projecting outdoor recreation needs—for hunting, camping, fishing, hiking, boating and similar healthful pursuits—to the years 1976 and 2000 A. D.

Mr. ENGLE was one of the earliest sponsors in the 84th Congress, and again in the 85th Congress, of legislation to earmark duck-stamp receipts for wetlands acquisition and to prevent the dribbling-away of sportsmen's money for other purposes. This principle has been enacted in the Duck Stamp Act, one of the major accomplishments of this Congress in wildlife conservation.

CLAIR ENGLE was cosponsor also of our bill to earmark a portion of national forest receipts to finance a long overdue program of recreational and wildlife improvements in the forests. This proposal never became law, but by focusing attention on the need it helped prod the Department of Agriculture into launching its Operation Outdoors program. Thus, the same objectives are being reached through direct appropriations initiated, incidentally, by this Congress.

In the 84th Congress Mr. ENGLE cosponsored a bill which, perfected in his committee, became Public Law 167, the so-called multiple-use mining law. This law has served to eliminate bogus mining claims and to prevent other abuses that were piling up under the 1872 mining law on the public lands. Briefly, this important act permits prospecting and all necessary mining operations, but it protects the surface resources and permits multiple use of the surface of mining claims for recreation, grazing, timber, and wildlife management, and other public purposes.

Careful search of the records would reveal many other instances of Mr. ENGLE's alertness to protect the public interest by the wise use of natural resources. He pushed through the Small Irrigation Projects Act of 1956 and he wrote into that law a proviso that such small projects receiving Federal aid shall be subject to fish and wildlife review under the Coordination Act. This is consistent with his multiple-use philosophy.

Representative ENGLE has consistently supported the sound and comprehensive development of water resources as well as public lands, forests, minerals, and other resources upon which the wheels of agriculture and industry turn, without forgetting or neglecting the human values inherent in wildlife, in parks, and in wilderness. None of this is surprising because CLAIR ENGLE works hard and plays hard, and when he wants to relax he grabs a rifle and camping equipment and heads for the big game ranges or the wilderness country of the high Sierras.

Mr. ENGLE has supported measures to control and abate air and water pollution, two problems of particular importance in his own State. He joined actively in the fight to save appropriations for the Federal water-pollution-control program, funds which had to be won last year on the floor of the House over the

stubborn and puzzling opposition of the minority.

Californians know better than we do of some of Mr. ENGLE's accomplishments that directly benefit his own State. How he steered the Trinity project to a successful conclusion is merely one example. Another is the investigation by his committee of the critical and at times disastrous forest-fire problems in southern California. An eight-point program of prevention and control resulted from his committee's investigation and study.

Mr. Speaker, every American has a vital stake in the conservation of the natural resources upon which his personal welfare depends and the security of our great Nation hinges. Americans owe CLAIR ENGLE a debt of gratitude for his leadership. The House is losing a great conservationist. The Senate will gain one.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of mixed emotions that I arise to pay tribute to one of California's most illustrious sons, Congressman CLAIR ENGLE. I have a deep sense of loss and a feeling of regret that his great service and leadership is ending in the House of Representatives. On the other hand, I am happy that he is seeking to broaden the scope of his work on behalf of our great State. I wish CLAIR every success in his present venture and a long career of continuing service to our State and Nation. I shall feel a deep personal loss as he gives up the chairmanship of the great Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which I am a member. When I arrived here as a freshman in January of 1955, CLAIR ENGLE went out of his way to help me, and it was his aid and assistance that enabled me to secure a spot on that fine committee, which has jurisdiction over so many matters of importance to California and particularly to my own District. He has continued his aid and assistance to me throughout the past 4 years, and I shall miss deeply that close personal relationship which has been so rewarding to me and to my District. I can say, without fear of contradiction, that there is no one in the Congress of the United States better versed on the subject of conservation and water development than Congressman ENGLE.

Because of my love and admiration for CLAIR and his wonderful wife, Lou, I shall miss their presence in the House deeply. However, I feel certain that they will be back on the Washington scene next January in a new capacity, and I wish for them all the success and happiness possible in the years to come.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable CLAIR ENGLE from California, has stood foursquare in protecting the rights of all Federal employees. He recognizes them as the loyal, hard-working group that they are.

During his 16 years in Congress, CLAIR ENGLE has continuously tried to better their working conditions to bring them into line with our high American standard of living.

CLAIR ENGLE has an outstanding record in support of the objectives of postal and Federal employees. He came to Congress in September of 1943 and from that day to this has had a consistent record of support for measures in the interest of more than a quarter of a million postal and Federal employees in our State. He has not only voted for pay increases when he had the opportunity to do so, but he has had the courage to sign discharge petitions, making it possible for the House to vote on salary increases whenever such discharge petitions were filed.

CLAIR ENGLE has favored and voted in support of bills to liberalize the Hatch Act, to provide promotion and salary credit to World War II veterans, to provide unemployment insurance for Federal employees, and to permit accumulation of annual leave, and has voted against riders preventing the filling of vacancies in the Federal service which tend to hamstring those agencies and cause a loss of efficiency greater than the saving in manpower.

CLAIR ENGLE has supported legislation granting increases in the annuities of those retired under the Civil Service Retirement Act, as well as measures improving and liberalizing the Retirement Act generally.

Only recently CLAIR ENGLE joined with me in the introduction of a bill to correct the inequities of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955. I have on occasion been complimented for the stand I have taken on legislation in the interest of postal and Federal employees. I am happy that as a result of my service on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service I had the opportunity to learn something of the problems of these worthy people and as a result of that knowledge have been able in some measure to improve their lot. But, Mr. Speaker, I think it only fair to call the attention of the House to the fact that CLAIR ENGLE has stood shoulder to shoulder with me in my efforts to obtain justice for the employees of our Federal Government.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege and pleasure to work closely with CLAIR ENGLE ever since I came to Congress. As his service in the House and as chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee draws to a close I want to pay tribute to him for his distinguished service and as an outstanding committee chairman and wish him success in his campaign for the United States Senate.

This Nation is better off today for having had CLAIR ENGLE as chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee during the 84th and 85th Congresses. His able and energetic leadership has produced outstanding committee records during both these Congresses. Committee output does not just happen. It takes energy, initiative, cooperation, and, above all, leadership. Three hundred and sixty-five new public laws out of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in the 84th and 85th Congresses, including many of major significance, stand as an indication of our chairman's ability and leadership.

"Action" is the word that most nearly sums up CLAIR ENGLE. He has been called Congressman Fireball, Wildcat in Washington, and other such terms. One Member said of him, "CLAIR is like a mountain quail—when he lights he starts running." It is true that his energy seems inexhaustible. In addition to his ability and energy, he also is colorful and speaks in vivid metaphors which gives him one of the most picturesque vocabularies I have ever heard.

CLAIR ENGLE has done an outstanding job of serving his own District and his own State, having more than 65 laws to his credit. Yet, as chairman of the committee, his primary concern has been for our national needs and this is reflected in the legislation he has sponsored and has guided through the committee and through the House.

CLAIR ENGLE has a record of outstanding accomplishment in all fields of legislation, but especially in the fields of water resources development, conservation, and mining, which are under the jurisdiction of the committee he chairmanned.

For instance, in the field of water resources development, he is recognized as an outstanding authority. In addition to project legislation, he is author of the Small Reclamation Projects Act, the Distribution Systems Act, and is sponsoring legislation involving a new Federal-State relationship for developing municipal and industrial water projects. He has been a champion of State water rights, sponsoring legislation to retain in the States control over their water resources. He authored the original Saline Water Research Act and the amendment thereto, and cosponsored the recent Saline Water Demonstration Plant Act. With respect to his own State, CLAIR ENGLE has long recognized that California's future is tied directly to its ability to acquire adequate supplies of water, and he has made this one of his primary objectives. He has been instrumental in getting authorization and funds for the construction in California of reclamation projects totaling over $500 million and at the same time joined actively in the fight for adequate flood control and rivers and harbors development.

In the field of conservation, CLAIR ENGLE directed a searching investigation of military land excesses and abuses of conservation laws on military reservations and areas, and authored and led the fight for corrective legislation which was enacted in the 85th Congress. He cosponsored the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission Act and got it through the committee and through the House. CLAIR ENGLE sponsored the multiple-use mining law which was perfected in his committee and passed in the 84th Congress. He has been in the forefront of sponsoring and pressing for legislation and administrative action which would insure the survival of the domestic mining industry.

Those of us who have worked closely with CLAIR during his service in the House and as committee chairman and have learned to respect his judgment and leadership will miss him very much. The House is losing a dependable leader; however, the Senate will gain one, and we look forward to working with him as a Member of that body, where we know he will continue to do an outstanding job.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 11 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. J. Res. 546. Joint resolution designating the week of November 21–27, 1958, as National Farm-City Week; and

H. J. Res. 704. Joint resolution establishing that the 1st session of the 86th Congress convene at noon on Wednesday, January 7, 1959.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8 to the bill (H. R. 13856) entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3321. An act for the relief of George E. Ketchum.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 122. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Presiding Officers to sign duly enrolled bills and joint resolutions after sine die adjournment.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13489) entitled "An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to Senate amendments numbered 2, 3, 10, and 12 to the above entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from amendment numbered 4.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer appointed the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. GREEN (chairman), the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. BRIDGES, the Senator from Tennessee, Mr. KEFAUVER, the Senator from California, Mr. KUCHEL, the Senator from Washington, Mr. JACKSON, the Senator from Nebraska, Mr. HRUSKA, and the Senator from New York, Mr. JAVITS, members of the Congressional delegation to attend the Fourth Annual North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentary Conference to be held in Paris, November 17–22.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer had appointed the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the Senator from Minnesota, [Mr. HUMPHREY], members of the United States delegation to the 10th session of the Biennial General Conference of UNESCO, to be held in Paris, November 4 to December 5.

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1959

Mr. PASSMAN submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 13192) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2704)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13192) "making appropriations for Mutual Security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 5, 6, and 7, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$750,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$400,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 3, 8, 9, and 10.

OTTO E. PASSMAN,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
HUGH ALEXANDER,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN TABER,
RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH (except as to amendment No. 4),
GERALD R. FORD, Jr. (except as to amendment No. 4),
EDWARD T. MILLER (except as to amendment No. 4),
Managers on the Part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
LISTER HILL,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL (with reservations),
EDWARD J. THYE,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN (with reservations),
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13192) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

MUTUAL SECURITY

Funds appropriated to the President

Military Assistance

Amendment No. 1: Changes citation as proposed by the Senate.

Defense Support

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $750 million instead of $700 million as proposed by the House and $790 million as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3: Reported in disagreement.

Development Loan Fund

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $400 million instead of $300 million as proposed by the House and $580 million as proposed by the Senate.

Special Assistance

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $200 million as proposed by the Senate instead of $185 million as proposed by the House.

President's Special Authority and Contingency Fund

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $155 million as proposed by the Senate instead of $100 million as proposed by the House.

Corporations

Limitation on administrative expenses.

Development Loan Fund

Amendment No. 7: Limits administrative expenses of the Development Loan Fund to not to exceed $1,250,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1 million as proposed by the House.

General Provisions

Amendments Nos. 8, 9, and 10: Reported in disagreement.

The amounts contained in the bill agreed to by the conferees were too small in the view of some of the conferees, especially in the Development Loan Fund. It is understood that if additional funds are needed next January for the purposes contained in this bill, the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate will give earnest consideration to the recommendations of the Executive in view of the importance of maintaining our friendly relations with countries with whom we have undertakings.

OTTO E. PASSMAN,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
HUGH ALEXANDER,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH (except as to amendment No. 4),
GERALD R. FORD, Jr. (except as to amendment No. 4),
EDWARD T. MILLER (except as to amendment No. 4),
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 13192) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I think this is the best report that the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations of the Committee on Appropriations has ever brought before this body. The conference has been a rather successful one for the taxpayer of the United States.

The budget request was for a total of $3,950,092,500.

The conference bill calls for $3,298,092,500, a reduction of $652 million under the budget request.

When the bill left the House the new money provided was in the amount of $3,078,092,500.

The Senate added $440 million to this sum.

It was apparently generally assumed when we went over for the conference that the House was ready to accede to the $440 million increase. The other conferees found out shortly after we arrived, however, that we were not going to agree to the amount added by the other body. Then they thought they had us in position for a $300 million increase over the House bill; but we had other ideas about that, too. We have finally returned to the House with a saving of $220 million from the total approved late today by the other body.

I think we must recognize, regardless of our personal feelings, that our Government has made commitments and incurred obligations throughout the world, whether with or without sound foundations or justification. We must, of course, provide the means to carry out the commitments which have been made.

Therefore, I am going to support this conference report. I had hoped, Mr. Speaker, that there would be unanimous agreement in the House that we had done a creditable job and that our committee would perhaps be commended for engaging in a very difficult conference and bringing this bill back in the amount we are asking you to approve.

Upon return from the conference, however, I have learned that there may be a motion to recommit the bill. I hope no such motion is made, but if it is done I trust that it would not prevail. The bill now presented is a good bill, effecting substantial savings, and providing funds in sufficient amount to meet the commitments which our Government has made throughout the world. Whether we like those commitments or not, they have been made, and it is our obligation to fulfill them, while endeavoring to effect greater savings in the future.

Adding all of the obligated amounts and the sums unobligated from prior years to this bill as presented in the conference report, the total available for all commitments, new and old money, is $8,498,084,500.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that the House shall now support the committee and support the conferees.

Mr. BOSCH and Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi rose.

Mr. PASSMAN. I must yield first to the distinguished gentleman from New York, and then if it is agreeable to him I shall yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. BOSCH. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman——

Mr. PASSMAN. I yielded to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. BOSCH. I am very sorry, but I am from New York also.

Mr. PASSMAN. I will yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and yield to you later.

Mr. TABER. I think I will yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOSCH].

Mr. BOSCH. Thank you very much.

I would like to put the question to the chairman of the committee, and might I say that I am very gratified with the result of the conference that was had.

I would like to put this question: Could the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana tell us how much money in this bill will go to Tito or Yugoslavia, Poland, and other satellite nations?

Mr. PASSMAN. To be perfectly frank with the gentleman, some of these items are so secret I do not know myself. It all depends on the amount the President wishes them to have. The gentleman understands that this is in the hands of the President. This involves a lot of tax funds, and you have been supporting it for years on that basis.

Mr. BOSCH. I have not been supporting it for years.

Mr. PASSMAN. The Congress.

Mr. BOSCH. I have been opposed to it. I feel the time has come for us to sort of stand up to some of these nations that have just about taken us for everything that we are worth and are delivering nothing to us.

Mr. PASSMAN. There is nothing earmarked for Yugoslavia.

Mr. BOSCH. That is left entirely to the Executive?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes. That is my understanding.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEARNS. I think you have done a wonderful job, but where are we going to get this money?

Mr. TABER. From the same place we are going to get the money for all these other things that we have been passing here that we should not have passed. We will borrow it, I expect, which is one of the curses of the whole situation. We have to do that somehow or other between now and the next time we meet.

When we go home we are going to find our people not happy with these new burdens we have placed on the Treasury. We are going to find that they are very much disturbed by that situation and they are very much disturbed by the inflation that is caused by these enormous appropriations. We have to find some way that we can handle these things for less money or else we will have to raise taxes. That is all there is to it. That is the situation the country is in.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in this bill that is committed to any particular nation, except $50 million out of the defense support item which is earmarked for Spain. That is the only item that we have that is earmarked at all. The rest of it is dependent entirely upon what the Executive thinks is necessary for the maintenance of our position in the world and what is necessary to help keep the Russian group from crowding into our borders and making trouble for us.

Those who wanted a low figure in this bill are very happy tonight because this is a low figure. The trade that was made with the Senate conferees produced the lowest comparative amount that has been appropriated in a long time. That is the exact figure.

No one should vote against this conference report because anyone who feels that he may be uneasy about it and that he is opposed to the whole thing, those who wish a low amount, should be very well satisfied with the results.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is about all I want to say, except this: You heard what was read in the conference report when it was stated that the President might come in and ask for an item and the Congress would give it earnest consideration. I would ask the chairman of the subcommittee if that is not the way he understood it.

Mr. PASSMAN. Absolutely, that is my understanding. The report speaks for itself.

Mr. TABER. And anything that relates to the needs of the country has always, in my day, received the most earnest consideration on the part of the membership of the House.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I am sure that the gentleman from New York is well aware of the fact that this retiring Congress cannot in any way bind a succeeding Congress, and therefore any commitment made in behalf of this legislation will not bear any fruit in the 86th Congress. There may be a few of us who supported this find ourselves left back home with the taxpayers next January.

Mr. TABER. Well, I do not know, but I believe that whatever Congress is elected from time to time, no matter which party they may belong to, will do what it should to meet the responsibilities that we have to our people, to maintain the freedoms of our people and of our allies across the seas.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I commend the committee for having saved $220 million of the Senate increase. On the other hand, the cold, hard fact is that the managers on the part of the House surrendered to the extent of $220 million above the bill as approved by the House. I am sure the gentleman from New York was absolutely correct when he said that when we go home the people are going to ask about this reckless spending Congress, and I, for one, will find it difficult to explain why this appropriation was increased $220 million. I am opposed to

this conference report. It is time to stop spoon-feeding foreigners all over the world.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman from Iowa will have no reason to be disturbed about any feeling on the part of the public that he has not done his part in trying to keep down expenditures, and I do not believe that he will be questioned too much along this line. I think that we should agree to this conference report.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to state for the RECORD that I signed this conference report with reluctance. I agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] that this is a low figure. The total is $652 million below the original request from the President of the United States. In my opinion, it is inadequate. In my opinion, we are taking chances which we ought not to take under existing world conditions.

Mr. PASSMAN. I also reluctantly signed the conference report, but for different reasons.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana and his committee are to be commended upon the savings that they have effected for this Government, not in this conference report but in the initial bill that was reported to the House. They have split this conference report on a 50–50 basis between the House and the Senate.

Even so, that, in my opinion, is no victory.

The distinguished gentleman from the State of Louisiana—and goodness knows, there is no Member of this House who has been more energetic, more devoted, to the interests of economy and the cutting down of this foreign aid program than he has—stated to this House but a few minutes ago that the figure which has been agreed upon by the conference committee is the absolute minimum which we can accept for the defense and security of this country, or words to that effect.

Those are exactly the same words that he used when the bill was initially before the House, when the committee figures were $220 million below the figures that he attempts to justify tonight.

The President of the United States will tell the people of the United States, undoubtedly, that the Congress has spent in this Congress $3,298,092,500 on foreign aid, that that is all that we are giving away to these foreign countries. He will not tell them that the unexpended balance remaining in this international WPA amounts to $8,278,084,500. With the addition of the $220 million that is provided over and above the House figures, there will be available for expenditure for foreign aid $8,498,084,500. Please do not go back and tell the people that you are only spending $3 billion; tell them the truth; tell them you are spending $8,498,084,500 on foreign aid. And you are charging that to the American taxpayers.

Yes, it is my intention to offer a motion to recommit, if I can be recognized, to do so, with instructions to the House conferees to stand by the House figure.

I would like to ask my distinguished friend from Louisiana whether in the 13 years that this program has been in existence the Senate has failed to raise the House figure in one single year.

Mr. PASSMAN. I do not recall any instance where the Senate reduced this particular bill. But I should like to direct the attention of the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, that the Members of the other body are also elected officials. You cannot just go over there, hit them over the head and say, "Either take this or you will not get any bill at all." If the gentleman has any method by which he can cause the Senate to recede on all these figures, I certainly hope he becomes a member of this committee. We would welcome counsel and advice on some plan which we might use to force the Senate to recede 100 percent on all the figures they add to the House bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, let me say, if I were on the committee, I would vote exactly the same as the gentleman from Louisiana, except for one thing: I would not vote to raise it a nickel. I would stay there until torment froze over. In view of what the gentleman has said on the floor when this bill was up for consideration initially, it is sad for me to see him reverse his position and agree to an additional $220 million of lagniappe for these foreign countries.

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman has an open mind. My wishes are not always going to prevail.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I would remind the House that just a few hours ago this House voted to increase the ceiling on the national debt from $275 billion to $288 billion. That is more than the combined national debt of all the countries on the face of this earth. With that national debt, we are contributing out of our tax monies to all but some 20 of the countries on the face of this earth, and I think it is time that we used some degree of prudence in determining how much money we are going to throw away in these foreign countries.

Mr. PASSMAN. Let me say to the gentleman that our personal views may be the same, but I do not represent PASSMAN on this committee; I represent this House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my friend from Mississippi and other Members of this House that I am just as much opposed to this foreign-aid program as he is. I voted against the authorization bill and voted against the appropriation bill. But I am for this conference report because you must recognize certain facts of life. I commend our chairman for having saved $650 million below the amount requested by the budget.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, when our forefathers formed this Government they made the legislative branch a bicameral body. We have two bodies of equal dignity. Therefore, neither body can dictate the legislation which is enacted.

Our distinguished chairman, and I have worked with him for many years, has done a magnificent job on this bill. We went over to the other body. We had hoped that we would reach an agreement in a very short while, but we fought for hours. We recognized the equal dignity of the two bodies and we reached a 50–50 compromise agreement. I think it is a good agreement. I again commend our chairman for the excellent job he has done, and urge the House to accept this conference report.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I shall take just 1 minute, not on the conference report, but because the Members of the House would perhaps like to know how much money they have appropriated in this session.

The estimates received from the President for this session for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, were $73,272,658,573.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. That figure, however, does not include the permanent appropriations of over $8,300,000,000.

Mr. CANNON. In answer to the gentleman's suggestion, let me say that our revenues for this fiscal year are $67 billion. We are spending this year $79 billion. That $79 billion includes the $8 billion of permanent appropriations.

Of course, as everyone is aware, the larger part, practically all of the permanent appropriation, is for interest on the national debt. We are providing now approximately $8 billion a year merely as interest on the national debt. But the $79 billion we are spending this year includes the amount referred to by the gentleman from New York.

Expenditures and appropriations are two different things. This is the spendingest administration we have had in time of peace in the history of the United States. The President has sent up requests for more money than was ever requested before in time of peace, and this Congress in response to the request by the President is appropriating more than ever before. It has been a record-breaking session. But we have saved a little out of the President's estimates.

Out of these estimates we have appropriated only $72,653,476,248. That is $619,183,325 less than the President asked us to appropriate.

Let me say that in this $72 billion we have appropriated this session, there are millions of dollars which need not have been spent. A half dozen men could sit down around a table with blue pencils and cut out of these appropriations millions of dollars without in anyway materially interfering with the economy of

the country or the operations of the Government.

If every chairman of every subcommittee had been as efficient and as sensible and as economical as the gentleman from Louisiana, it would not have been necessary for us to pass the bill raising the ceiling on the public debt.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The thing about this situation that disturbs me very much is that there have been items in public debt transactions which made money available to different agencies of the Government to the tune of about $3 billion that were not even given a recommendation from the budget. That has to be added to all of the other amounts of money that the Congress has appropriated. Those things were not budgeted at all or at least all of them were not budgeted at all.

Mr. CANNON. In response to what the gentleman says, let me say that at a critical time in our history, when our revenues were declining and are continuing to decline, we have pushed our expenditures up. At a time when we are menaced from abroad in a more dangerous way than ever before and in complete disregard of the fact that it is as important a military precaution to keep the country solvent, we have spent money more recklessly than ever before.

So, Mr. Speaker, I include a tabulation of the appropriation bills for the session and ask unanimous consent to insert the usual annual résumé of estimates and appropriations at the conclusion of the conference report.

	Estimates	Final appropriations	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Agriculture	$3,320,888,539	$3,191,875,539	−$129,013,000
Commerce	982,721,000	971,214,000	−11,507,000
Defense	38,786,970,000	39,602,827,000	+815,857,000
District of Columbia	27,660,600	22,860,600	−4,800,000
General Government	15,814,870	15,679,870	−135,000
Interior	414,484,600	459,675,950	+45,191,350
Labor-HEW	2,975,437,181	3,142,606,981	+167,169,800
Legislative	123,846,669	123,297,387	−549,282
Military construction	1,730,653,000	1,353,850,000	−376,803,000
Public works	1,077,356,000	1,118,128,835	+40,772,835
State, etc.	589,285,011	577,904,113	−11,380,898
Treasury-Post Office	4,121,909,000	4,108,108,000	−13,861,000
Supplemental, 1959	4,081,154,221	3,697,305,478	−383,848,743
Deficiency and Supplemental, 1958	4,903,055,882	4,879,893,095	−23,162,787
Independent offices	6,171,270,500	6,090,156,900	−81,113,600
Mutual security	3,950,092,500	3,298,092,500	−652,000,000
Grand total	73,272,659,573	72,653,476,248	−619,183,325

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BOW. I am opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BOW moves to recommit the conference report on the bill H. R. 13192 to the conference committee for further study.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi) there were—ayes 38, noes 186.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has just counted more than a quorum.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 3: Page 2, line 8, *Provided*, That not less than $50,000,000 thereof, shall be available for Spain exclusive of technical cooperation."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 8: Page 7, line 1, insert:

"SEC. 106. The appropriations and authority with respect thereto in this act shall be available from July 1, 1958, for the purposes provided in such appropriations and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1958, and the date of enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms hereof."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 9: Page 7, line 8, insert:

"SEC. 107. None of the funds provided by this act nor any of the counterpart funds generated as a result of assistance under this act or any prior act shall be used to pay pensions, annuities, retirement pay or adjusted service compensation for any persons heretofore or hereafter serving in the armed forces of any recipient country."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 10. On page 7, line 14, insert the following:

"SEC. 108. Not to exceed 50 percent of the foreign currencies heretofore generated in any country under section 402 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, may, notwithstanding prior provisions of law, hereafter be used in accordance with the provisions of that section: *Provided*, That quarterly reports of the use of foreign currencies pursuant to this section shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

ANNUAL RÉSUMÉ OF APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, there are two disquieting articles on the front page of this morning's paper. One reports the enactment of the bill raising the ceiling on the national debt. The other reports the increase in the cost of living, setting the 21st new high in 23 months. It is highly appropriate that the two accounts appear side by side and with boxcar headings as the increase in the cost of living is due entirely to the increase in the national debt.

And they are disquieting because at a time when the national revenues are decreasing and the national income is falling—at a time when the country is in

the greatest danger of invasion from abroad in its history, and national solvency is an essential factor in national defense—Congress is appropriating more money than was ever before appropriated by any Congress since the administration of George Washington, and for purposes which have no relation to national defense.

The net effect of this decrease in revenues and the simultaneous increase in expenditures is a $12 billion deficit for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959.

The only way to meet this deficit is to increase Government borrowing and Government debt. With income falling, and expenditures rising, the cost of living steadily rises. With the menu of the breakfast table deteriorating—and with Russia at our door—the purchasing power of the dollar steadily declines and the housewife reports price increases every time she returns from the corner grocery store. Under such circumstances the increase of appropriations by Congress for expenditures we could do without borders on insanity.

Of course all hope of tax reduction has been abandoned. Both parties and practically every Member of the House and Senate promised reduction in taxes. But instead of reducing taxes the first business of the next Congress will be to increase taxes to pay for these huge appropriations.

We are on the high road to disaster and catastrophe—to printing press money and debased national credit. The dollar which in 1933 was worth $1.07 is today worth a little less than 48 cents. If you bought a Government bond in 1933 and sold it today you would have lost more than half of it. And the decline continues. That is the reason why everybody is rushing into the exchange and buying stocks already quoted at far above their productive value. That accounts for the precipitous increase in the price of land while the income from land is declining. They are trying to get rid of United States dollars as they become every day more and more worthless.

If this administration had recommended and this Congress had appropriated less money for things it could get along without, it would not have been necessary to raise the ceiling on the national debt and there would be a substantial amount in the Treasury to start methodical payments on the debt. If Congress had taken that course, the purchasing power of the dollar would be growing and the cost of living would be falling and there would be more and better food and clothing and the other necessities of life for every family in America.

In substantiation I am submitting herewith several tabulations summarizing the work of the 85th Congress on appropriation bills processed through the Committee on Appropriations. Comparisons are made with the budget estimates of appropriations submitted by the President. Am also including related facts and tabulations.

The first tabulation, after the summary, follows the usual form by appropriation bills for the second session, separated as to supplemental bills for fiscal 1958 and the bills for the current fiscal year 1959.

The second table, in abbreviated form, reflects the $5 billion cut made by Congress in the President's budget requests in the first session. For reasons explainable, the record of cutting the President's requests in appropriation bills this year does not match the magnificent record of last year, when we cut over $5 billion from the budget, but neither does it detract from that record. The net result summarized below for the 2 years is that we reduced the budget demands of the President processed in the appropriation bills through the Committee on Appropriations by $5,667,562,304. That is the record. That is what we cut in the appropriation bills. We could have cut more without harm to legitimate and essential functions of Government. But the administration insisted, as it has been doing right along in its successive recordbreaking budgets, and the Congress has agreed to spend more money than ought to be spent. But the cut of $5,667,562,304 in the President's requests means just that much less has to be turned over to the tax collectors.

When the Congress substantially reduced the President's budget last year, we were accused of making phony cuts. They said we would have to restore substantial amounts of the cut. They said we did not mean business when we cut over $5 billion. But they were wrong. As a matter of fact, we found it necessary to restore only about 5 percent—and even this small amount was largely due to inability of anybody either here or in the executive branch, to accurately forecast requirements for certain mandatory items. About 95 percent of the cut prevailed, as we knew it would. We cut the fat but not the muscle. We could have cut more, and should have, but we nevertheless made a respectable savings below the President's spending proposals.

Comparison of estimates and appropriations, 85th Cong.

[Note—Excludes permanents]

	Estimates	Law	Increase (+) or decrease (−), appropriations compared with estimates
85th Cong., 1st sess	$64,638,110,610	$59,589,731,631	−$5,048,378,979
85th Cong., 2d sess	73,272,659,573	72,653,476,248	−619,183,325
Reduction, 85th Cong			−5,667,562,304

Comparison of budget estimates and appropriations, 85th Cong., 2d sess.

Department or establishment	Estimates considered by House	Reported to House	Passed House	Estimates considered by Senate	Reported to Senate	Passed Senate	Public Law	Increase (+) or decrease (−), appropriation compared with estimates
I. Fiscal year 1959 acts:								
Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration	$3,320,888,539	$3,216,988,539	$3,216,988,539	$3,320,888,539	$3,207,973,039	$3,207,973,039	$3,191,875,539	−$129,013,000
Loan authorizations (REA and FHA)	(381,000,000)	(569,500,000)	(569,500,000)	(381,000,000)	(594,000,000)	(594,000,000)	(594,000,000)	(+213,000,000)
Department of Commerce and related agencies:								
Department of Commerce	858,099,000	799,664,000	832,416,000	858,099,000	890,044,000	890,044,000	851,754,000	−6,345,000
Panama Canal	41,647,000	38,916,000	38,916,000	41,647,000	39,867,000	39,867,000	39,350,000	−2,297,000
Independent agencies	82,975,000	78,560,000	78,560,000	82,975,000	82,975,000	82,975,000	80,110,000	−2,865,000
Total	982,721,000	917,140,000	949,892,000	982,721,000	1,012,886,000	1,012,886,000	971,214,000	−11,507,000
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	536,400,000	536,050,000	536,050,000	536,400,000	536,050,000	535,985,000	536,017,000	−383,000
Interservice activities	734,000,000	796,900,000	796,900,000	774,000,000	836,900,000	836,900,000	836,900,000	+62,900,000
Department of the Army	8,755,800,000	8,617,626,000	8,716,626,000	8,953,535,000	9,074,170,000	9,076,862,000	8,992,859,000	+39,324,000
Department of the Navy	10,714,247,000	11,042,210,000	11,042,210,000	10,870,181,000	11,424,073,000	11,427,527,000	11,359,427,000	+489,246,000
Department of the Air Force	17,456,500,000	17,317,775,000	17,317,775,000	17,652,854,000	18,161,618,000	18,165,718,000	17,877,624,000	+224,770,000
Total	38,196,947,000	38,310,561,000	38,409,561,000	38,786,970,000	40,032,811,000	40,042,992,000	39,602,827,000	+815,857,000

Comparison of budget estimates and appropriations, 85th Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

Department or establishment	Estimates considered by House	Reported to House	Passed House	Estimates considered by Senate	Reported to Senate	Passed Senate	Public Law	Increase (+) or decrease (−), appropriation compared with estimates
I. Fiscal year 1959 acts—Continued								
District of Columbia	($215,153,500)	($203,276,100)	($203,276,100)	($215,153,500)	($206,211,814)	($206,211,814)	($204,033,460)	(−$11,120,040)
Federal payment	27,660,600	22,860,600	22,860,600	27,660,600	24,360,600	24,360,600	22,860,600	−4,800,000
General Government matters	15,814,870	15,558,870	15,558,870	15,814,870	14,954,870	14,954,870	15,679,870	−135,000
Independent offices:								
H. R. 13856	5,927,060,500	5,993,404,900	5,993,404,900	6,171,270,500	6,103,456,900	6,103,456,900	6,090,156,900	−81,113,600
H. R. 11574—Vetoed	(5,922,343,500)	(6,549,920,900)	(6,549,920,900)	(5,927,060,500)	(6,137,248,900)	(6,108,242,900)	(6,582,304,900)	(+655,244,400)
Department of the Interior and related agencies:								
Department of the Interior	287,543,900	286,498,900	286,498,900	287,543,900	340,093,250	341,070,250	320,454,250	+32,910,350
Forest Service	116,129,000	116,980,000	116,980,000	116,129,000	139,180,000	139,180,000	129,555,000	+13,426,000
Related agencies	10,811,700	9,666,700	9,666,700	10,811,700	9,666,700	9,666,700	9,666,700	−1,145,000
Total	414,484,600	413,145,600	413,145,600	414,484,600	488,939,950	489,916,950	459,675,950	+45,191,350
Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare:								
Department of Labor	408,032,600	382,446,800	388,540,200	408,032,600	389,693,000	389,693,000	388,741,700	−19,290,900
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	2,550,724,581	2,565,080,581	2,565,080,581	2,552,424,581	2,796,594,581	2,797,594,581	2,735,815,281	+183,390,700
Related agencies	14,980,000	14,334,800	14,334,800	14,980,000	18,095,000	18,095,000	18,050,000	+3,070,000
Total	2,973,737,181	2,961,862,181	2,967,955,581	2,975,437,181	3,204,382,581	3,205,382,581	3,142,606,981	+167,169,800
Legislative branch	97,910,499	96,942,113	96,942,113	123,846,669	123,320,419	123,320,419	123,297,387	−549,282
Military construction	1,730,653,000	1,218,815,000	1,218,815,000	1,730,653,000	1,714,815,000	1,720,115,000	1,353,850,000	−376,803,000
Mutual security	3,950,092,500	3,078,092,500	3,078,092,500	3,950,092,500	3,518,092,500	3,518,092,500	3,298,092,500	−652,000,000
Public works:								
Civil functions, Army	759,525,000	779,714,000	782,424,000	759,525,000	847,071,500	847,521,500	813,857,500	+54,332,500
Department of the Interior:								
Bureau of Reclamation	269,101,000	245,739,200	246,739,200	269,101,000	263,730,335	263,730,335	255,577,335	−13,523,665
Power administrations	31,880,000	31,814,000	31,814,000	31,880,000	31,814,000	31,814,000	31,814,000	−66,000
Tennessee Valley Authority	16,850,000	16,850,000	16,850,000	16,850,000	16,850,000	16,850,000	16,850,000	
Total	1,077,356,000	1,074,117,200	1,077,827,200	1,077,356,000	1,159,465,835	1,159,915,835	1,118,128,835	+40,772,835
Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies:								
Department of State	199,990,151	192,859,353	192,859,353	199,990,151	205,955,853	205,955,853	197,103,353	−2,886,798
Department of Justice	230,190,000	229,410,000	229,410,000	230,190,000	230,317,000	230,317,000	230,317,000	+127,000
The Judiciary	41,402,860	40,703,260	40,703,260	41,472,860	40,873,260	40,873,260	40,833,260	−649,600
United States Information Agency	110,032,000	101,750,000	101,750,000	110,032,000	104,750,000	104,750,000	103,250,000	−6,782,000
Funds appropriated to the President	7,600,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	7,600,000	6,821,000	6,821,000	6,410,500	−1,189,500
Total	589,215,011	570,722,613	570,722,613	589,285,011	588,717,113	588,717,113	577,904,113	−11,380,898
Treasury-Post Office:								
Treasury Department	699,367,000	697,127,000	704,627,000	699,367,000	704,627,000	704,627,000	704,627,000	+5,260,000
Post Office Department	3,421,121,000	3,402,000,000	3,402,000,000	3,421,121,000	3,402,000,000	3,402,000,000	3,402,000,000	−19,121,000
Tax Court of the United States	1,481,000	1,481,000	1,481,000	1,481,000	1,481,000	1,481,000	1,481,000	
Total	4,121,969,000	4,100,608,000	4,108,108,000	4,121,969,000	4,108,108,000	4,108,108,000	4,108,108,000	−13,861,000
Supplemental, 1959	3,226,315,440	3,131,094,797	3,131,844,797	4,081,154,221	3,594,944,978	3,866,382,978	3,697,305,478	−383,848,743
Subtotal, fiscal year 1959	66,652,825,740	65,121,913,913	65,271,719,313	68,389,603,691	68,897,228,785	69,186,574,785	67,773,583,153	−596,020,538
II. Deficiency and Supplemental Acts, fiscal year 1958 and prior:								
Department of Defense supplemental, 1958	1,260,000,000	1,260,000,000	1,260,000,000	1,260,000,000	1,260,000,000	1,260,000,000	1,260,000,000	
Department of Labor supplemental, 1958	43,400,000	43,400,000	43,400,000	43,400,000	43,400,000	43,400,000	43,400,000	
Second supplemental, 1958	2,871,465,844	2,837,882,907	2,857,882,907	2,874,144,080	2,865,963,718	2,869,406,463	2,861,008,793	−15,135,287
Urgent deficiency, 1958	32,411,802	28,761,802	28,761,802	34,811,802	34,684,302	34,684,302	29,784,302	−5,027,500
Department of Labor additional supplemental, 1958	665,700,000	665,700,000	665,700,000	690,700,000	685,700,000	685,700,000	685,700,000	−5,000,000
Subtotal, fiscal year 1958 and prior years	4,872,977,646	4,835,744,709	4,855,744,709	4,903,055,882	4,889,748,020	4,893,190,765	4,879,893,095	−23,162,787
III. Grand total, session	71,525,803,386	69,957,658,622	70,127,464,022	73,272,659,573	73,786,976,805	74,079,765,550	72,653,476,248	−619,183,325
Permanent appropriations (estimate, subject to revision)							8,333,373,526	
Grand totals:								
Regular annual, supplemental, deficiency, and permanent appropriations							80,986,849,774	
Loan authorizations (REA and FHA)	(381,000,000)	(509,500,000)	(509,500,000)	(381,000,000)	(594,000,000)	(594,000,000)	(594,000,000)	(+213,000,000)

Comparison of estimates and appropriations, 85th Cong., 1st sess.

	Estimates	Law	Increase (+) or decrease (−), appropriation compared with estimates
1. Fiscal year 1958 bills:			
Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration	$3,965,446,617	$3,666,543,757	−$298,902,860
Atomic Energy Commission	2,491,625,000	2,323,632,500	−167,992,500
Commerce and related agencies	871,513,000	597,790,225	−273,722,775
Defense	36,128,000,000	33,759,850,000	−2,368,150,000
District of Columbia	(209,504,800)	(195,676,480)	(−13,828,320)
Federal Payment	25,504,450	22,504,450	−3,000,000
General government matters	20,921,870	16,010,370	−4,911,500
Independent offices	5,923,195,000	5,373,877,800	−549,317,200
Interior and related agencies	515,189,700	456,189,600	−59,000,100
Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare	2,981,277,581	2,871,182,781	−110,094,800
Legislative	108,271,443	104,844,660	−3,426,783
Mutual Security	3,386,860,000	2,768,760,000	−618,100,000
Public works	876,453,000	858,094,323	−18,358,677
State, Justice, and Judiciary and related agencies	665,649,802	562,891,293	−102,758,509
Treasury-Post Office	3,965,291,000	3,884,927,000	−80,364,000
The Supplemental, 1958	1,973,767,827	1,734,011,947	−239,755,880
Post Office Supplemental, 1958	149,500,000	133,000,000	−16,500,000
Subtotal, fiscal year 1958	64,048,466,290	59,134,110,706	−4,914,355,584
2. Deficiency and supplemental acts, fiscal year 1957 and prior	589,644,320	455,620,925	−134,023,395
Grand total, session	64,638,110,610	59,589,731,631	−5,048,378,979
3. Permanent appropriations (estimate)		8,346,000,000	
Total appropriations		67,935,731,631	

APPROPRIATIONS SUMMARY FOR THE SESSION

As shown by the first tabulation, budget estimates of appropriations submitted to the House during the session just concluded, and considered in bills from the Committee on Appropriations, totaled $71,525,803,386. These requests do not include approximately $8,333,000,000 in permanent appropriations—these do not require annual appropriation action since they are made automatically under existing law.

Against this total, the Committee on Appropriations recommended $69,957,658,622, a net reduction of $1,568,144,764. There were a number of substantial decreases but these were partially offset by increases found necessary in some critical defense items such as Polaris submarine missile systems, ballistic missiles, and defense airlift capability.

The President failed to include adequate provision in his budget for the civil-service retirement fund and the effect was to show lower budget totals. In the original bill, the Congress inserted that item, in amount of $589 million, but the President insisted on his position and vetoed the independent offices appropriation bill. The revised bill omits the $589 million.

The House approved a total of $70,127,464,022, a net cut of $1,398,339,364 below the President's estimates considered.

Budget estimates considered by the Senate totaled $73,272,659,573. Substantial estimates were sent directly there. Bills passed by that body aggregated $74,079,765,550 or $3,952,301,528 above House totals and $807,105,977 above budget estimates.

Final amounts approved total $72,653,476,248, or $1,426,289,302 below Senate totals but $2,526,012,2226 above House totals. The final amounts represent a net saving of $619,183,325 below the President's requests considered in appropriation bills. As I shall explain shortly, these totals do not take account of other forms of appropriations and obligating authority processed outside the traditional appropriations procedure.

THE PRESIDENT'S 1959 FISCAL BUDGET

Mr. Speaker, the 1959 budget of the President, submitted to the present session of Congress last January 13 and amended from time to time since, was the biggest peacetime budget ever. It exceeded the record-breaking fiscal 1958 peacetime budget. It exceeded all peacetime budgets.

It was an astronomical budget, and it pointed in only one direction—upward.

It proposed more inflation and we are reaping the hardships of it.

It proposed higher and higher appropriations.

It proposed higher and higher spending. And as we now know, the spending figures, like those in recent budgets, were too low.

It proposed to hike the mortgage against present and future generations by increasing the already staggering public debt—a debt that now costs almost $8 billion a year just for interest.

It again proposed extension of Korean wartime tax rates, though the war ended over 5 years ago.

It proposed new programs not heretofore financed by the Government.

It proposed new taxes not heretofore imposed.

It proposed, as we now know, overly optimistic estimates of Treasury tax collections. It whistled in the dark.

In short, Mr. Speaker, it held no hope for retrenchment, no hope for economy, no hope for reversing the fires of consuming inflation eroding the savings, the bonds, the insurance policies, and the fixed incomes of millions of Americans.

All fiscal recommendations start with the President. Under the law, it is his responsibility to prepare the budget recommendations. That law is clear and specific. He is directed by the law to make such revenue, appropriation, and spending recommendations as in his judgment are necessary. And only such recommendations as he thinks appropriate. So, he is in complete command of the budget. He is not told what he must recommend. He does not have to recommend new programs. He does not have to recommend more and more appropriations, more and more spending, bigger and bigger deficits, extension of wartime tax rates. But he did all these things in the budget submitted. He acknowledged in his State of the Union message that:

> We could make no more tragic mistake than merely to concentrate on military strength.
>
> We must apply stern tests of priority of other expenditures, both military and civilian.

It was hoped that this meant a reversal of the succession of recordbreaking budgets he had been submitting, especially after the Congress had cut his recordbreaking 1958 fiscal budget by more than $5 billion. Furthermore, there are those who recall—though doubtless some would prefer to forget—the 1952 campaign promise of a $60 billion budget.

The President's budget figures, especially for nonmilitary expenditures, were higher. They did not seem to have passed the stern tests the President advocated. To show the distressing dimensions of this fiscal failure, the President's January recommendations for new authority to obligate the Treasury for the fiscal year 1959 compare with corresponding totals for earlier years in this fashion:

[In billions]

1959 over 1954—the first year of the present administration	+$12.0
1959 over 1955—the low point in totals for the last 6 years	+17.7
1959 over 1956—the first year showing a surplus in the last 6 years	+11.6
1959 over 1957 (the last completed fiscal year at time of submission)	+2.0
1959 over 1958 (as of time of submission)	+4.1

Mr. Speaker, these official figures unmistakably show the trend of Presidential recommendations—upward and upward.

DEFICITS FOR 1958 AND 1959

Mr. Speaker, the fiscal situation is alarming. It will get worse—much worse. And the alarming thing is that nobody is

alarmed. Propositions to spend money we do not have for things we can do without are coming from all directions without any regard for the fact the Treasury is empty. The Government is spending and proposing to spend as though gold grew like mushrooms in the Treasury cellar and banknotes budded like leaves on the trees in springtime.

The floodtide of national revenues of the last few years is receding. To keep in balance, to keep the Government accounts in the black, spending ought also to recede. But the floodtide of expenditures of recent years is still rising and the crest is nowhere in sight. As the tabulation of official figures below shows, in fiscal 1958 the budget slipped back by $4.4 billion compared to fiscal 1957. The preliminary estimates for the current fiscal year 1959 show that the budget will slip $9.2 billion below fiscal 1958. This total slippage of $13.6 billion between 1957 and 1959 is the result of $4 billion loss of revenue and $9.6 billion increase in spending. Taking in less but spending more. Going in two directions at once—both leading to devastating inflation and national bankruptcy. The inevitable result is larger and larger borrowings, a crushing public debt saddled on generations yet unborn. Imagine, Mr. Speaker, a deficit of $12 billion in the current year—by far the largest in peacetime history. When and how can it be paid?

Here is the deficit analysis. This table shows conclusively that, while loss of revenue is material, higher and higher spending is the principal cause.

Analysis of deficits, fiscal years 1958 and 1959

[In billions of dollars]

	1957 actual	Fiscal year 1958		1958 actual change from—		Fiscal year 1959		1959 revised rough estimates compared with—	
		January estimate	Actual	1957	January estimate	Original budget estimate	Revised rough estimate [1]	1958 actual	Original 1959 budget estimates
Receipts	71.0	72.4	69.1	−1.9	−3.3	74.4	67.0	−2.1	−7.4
Expenditures	69.4	72.8	71.9	+2.5	−.9	73.9	79.0	+7.1	+5.1
Surplus, deficit, or change	+1.6	−.4	−2.8	−4.4	−2.4	+.5	−12.0	−9.2	−12.5

[1] Official executive estimates supplied when debt ceiling increase was requested.

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES—6 YEARS

Mr. Speaker, the President's budget of last January painted a rosy picture of the condition of the Treasury. It reflected a nominal deficit of $0.4 billion in fiscal 1958 and a small but shining surplus of $0.5 billion in fiscal 1959. Of course, continuation of Korean war tax rates had to be recommended to show even that small amount. We hoped 1959 would show a surplus, but that the balance was precarious was not in doubt. In the light of unreliability of forecasts in recent budgets, the budget for 1959 appears larger than otherwise apparent from official totals. The President originally estimated fiscal 1956 spending at $62.4 billion but wound up spending $66.5—$4.1 billion more. His original fiscal 1957 budget indicated spending of $65.9 billion but the year closed with actual spending of $69.4 billion without the highway trust fund and $70.3 billion with it—overruns of $3.5 billion or $4.4 billion, depending on how you want to figure it.

For fiscal 1958, the original budget called for spending $71.8 billion—$73.6 billion including the highway trust fund. The final figures are $71.9 billion without the highway item and $73.5 with it. The revenue estimates proved far too optimistic, however, with result the deficit reached $2.8 billion for fiscal 1958.

For fiscal 1959, the President's January estimate of spending was $73.9 billion—$76.4 billion including the highway item. But recent official estimates tentatively place spending in 1959 at $79 billion not counting the highway fund—that is about $5 billion over the estimate of 8 months ago and $7 billion more than spent last year. And revenues are officially estimated to decline about $2 billion below last year and to fall short of the estimate of 8 months ago by over $7 billion.

It stands as an indisputable fact that the deficits piled up and being piled up are the result of bigger and bigger budgets and failure to control spending. They are not primarily due to lack of revenue because revenues have been rising in recent years and we have had wartime tax rates for the 5 years since the war closed. These deficits, as I have shown, are mainly the result of spending more and more at the insistence of the administration.

DEFENSE AND NONDEFENSE SPENDING

May I here, Mr. Speaker, dispel the widely held but wholly mistaken belief that the rise in Federal spending is for building and maintaining military capability to protect us from the Communist menace. You hear it said and you note in the daily press statements that we cannot avoid bigger and bigger budgets because of Soviet advances and the Soviet threat. Nothing could be further from the facts. We must, of course, spend whatever is necessary to preserve our freedom. We must maintain our defenses at all necessary costs no matter how high. But even here, the question is not how much we spend. It is what we spend it for. Our economic situation is so critical that we cannot afford the luxury of adherence to business as usual. Entrenched concepts must be discarded. And so must useless weapons and systems.

But, Mr. Speaker, spending for nondefense agencies and programs accounts for more of the successive increases in recent years than the defense items. They cannot dispose of this ever-increasing spending trend under guise of defense and sputniks for the simple reason that nondefense spending has outdistanced defense spending. The facts are just the opposite from what many people think.

For example, it would naturally be assumed that the first budget surplus, in fiscal 1956, under the present administration meant that spending had finally been brought under control. They had promised to do that. And the only real way to get control is to stop the rise. But, unfortunately, that was not, and 3 fiscal years later still is not the situation. In the 1959 budget sent up 8 months ago, the President proposed to spend $9.9 billion more than in 1956—and $5.4 billion, or over half of that increase, was for nondefense items. These figures are now obsolete—they will be much higher because overall 1959 spending is now predicted to be about $5 billion above the original budget estimate.

Further in this respect—and these are the official figures—in the fiscal year 1958 closed 2 months ago, they spent $5.7 billion more than in the first year of the present administration, fiscal 1954. But the revealing analysis of this particular figure is that nondefense items increased by $8.6 billion while defense items decreased in that span by $2.9 billion, the net result being the $5.7 billion increase.

So, Mr. Speaker, let everyone keep these facts in mind. They are the warning signals. The Treasury is empty. These huge increases were met with borrowed money. When the Treasury is full—when we are taking in more than we are paying out, systematic reduction of the staggering debt ought to have first call on the surplus. Anything left over could go to other purposes. But when our revenues are falling and we are in the red, that of all time is when the people, the administration, and the Congress ought to dedicate themselves to a stubborn determination to hold the line on spending money we do not have for things we can do without.

Mr. Speaker, in support of these facts, I include a tabulation of official figures on defense and nondefense spending for the past several years. It shows:

[In billions]

1959 spending will exceed the war year of 1953 by	$4.7
1959 spanding will exceed the first year of the present administration (1954 fiscal) by	11.2
1959 spending will exceed fiscal 1956 (the first budget surplus year) by	12.5
1959 spending wil exceed the year just closed (fiscal 1958) by	7.1

Details on fiscal 1959 spending as between defense and nondefense are not yet available, but based on the actual trend through fiscal 1958, beyond peradventure of a doubt, nondefense spending will continue to mount. The time to call a halt is now.

Net budget expenditures

[In billions]

	Major national security programs		All other programs		Total net expenditures	
	Defense—military	Total	Budget basis	Including highway trust fund	Budget basis	Including highway trust fund
1. Fiscal 1953 (war year)	$43.6	$51.8	$22.5	$22.5	$74.3	$74.3
2. Fiscal 1954	40.3	47.9	19.9	19.9	67.8	67.8
3. Fiscal 1955	35.5	42.1	22.5	22.5	64.6	64.6
4. Fiscal 1956	35.8	41.8	24.7	24.7	66.5	66.5
5. Fiscal 1957	38.4	44.4	25.0	25.9	69.4	70.3
6. Fiscal 1958	39.0	45.0	26.9	28.5	71.9	73.5
7. Fiscal 1959 (rough estimate) [1]					[1] 79.0	
Comparisons:						
(a) 1958 compared with last war year (1953)	−4.6	−6.8	+4.4	+6.0	−2.4	−.8
(b) 1958 compared with 1st year of present administration (1954)	−1.3	−2.9	+7.0	+8.6	+4.1	+5.7
(c) 1958 compared with 1st year showing surplus under present administration (1956)	+3.2	+3.2	+2.2	+3.8	+5.4	+7.0
(d) 1959 rough estimate compared with—						
(1) 1953					+4.7	
(2) 1954					+11.2	
(3) 1956					+12.5	
(4) 1958					+7.1	

[1] Supplied as tentative estimate by executive branch in connection with debt ceiling increase legislation (breakdown not available).

THE 6-YEAR DEFICIT RECORD

Mr. Speaker, I am including tabulations at this point on the deficit record for the last 6 fiscal years, corresponding with the tenure of the present administration. They show the facts. They cannot be hidden. And they are cause for alarm. They show that in 6 peacetime fiscal years the Government will have operated in the red to the tune of $18.9 billion based on latest official estimates. And as I indicated earlier, most of this fiscal debacle stems directly from failure to control spending and particularly nondefense spending.

Net budget receipts, expenditures, and deficit (−) or surplus (+) 6 fiscal years, actual 1954–58, and tentative estimate, 1959

[In billions]

	Actual, 5 fiscal years, 1954–58	Tentative estimate, 1959	Total estimated, 6 years
1. Net budget receipts	$333.3	$67.0	$400.3
2. Net budget expenditures	340.2	79.0	419.2
3. Deficit	−6.9	−12.0	−18.9

NOTE.—Excludes highway trust fund because figures for 1959 not presently available.

Net budget receipts, expenditures, and deficit (−), or surplus (+), 5 fiscal years, 1954–58

[In billions]

	Actual, 1954	Actual, 1955	Actual, 1956	Actual, 1957		Actual, 1958		5-year totals	
				Budget basis	Including highway trust fund	Budget basis	Including highway trust fund	Budget basis	Including highway trust fund
1. Receipts (net)	$64.7	$60.4	$68.1	$71.0	$72.5	$69.1	$71.2	$333.3	$336.9
2. Expenditures (net):									
(a) Major national security	47.9	42.1	41.8	44.4	44.4	45.0	45.0	221.2	221.2
(b) All other items	19.9	22.5	24.7	25.0	25.9	26.9	28.5	119.0	121.5
Total	67.8	64.6	66.5	69.4	70.3	71.9	73.5	340.2	342.7
3. Deficit (−) or surplus (+)	−3.1	−4.2	+1.6	+1.6	+2.2	[1] −2.8	−2.3	[2] −6.9	−5.8

[1] Original budget estimate, $1,800,000,000 surplus; revised estimate last January was $400,000,000 deficit.

[2] Tentative executive branch forecasts, subject to revision, indicate that this figure will reach $18,000,000,000 or $19,000,000,000 deficit during fiscal year 1959.

THE PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. Speaker, with all this deficit spending comes the inevitable increase in our public debt. When the Government lives beyond its means there is only one thing to do—borrow the money and increase the debt. And with it goes the added burden of interest. Only 20 years ago we ran the whole Government on what we spend today just for interest—nearly $8 billion. It costs more every year for two reasons. In the first place, the debt has grown in size. And in the second place, when the Government refinances it is paying higher interest rates. On some of it, we are now paying 4 percent.

In December 1955 the debt reached its highest point in history. But it is going to set a new high this year. The tentative estimate is that it will go to nearly $285 billion by next June. The President has made 5 straight requests to raise the old ceiling of $275 billion—twice to $281 billion, once to $278 billion, then to $280 billion, and now to $288 billion. Most distressing of all, this last request is to raise the ceiling permanently, accompanied by a further "temporary" increase. Who can deny that this temporary ceiling will not have to be made permanent, and even raised further, in light of the deficit spending? The restraining influence of a debt ceiling has gone glimmering.

I am including a tabulation showing concisely the bleak result of failure to control spending, failure to live within income. It shows that since this administration took office, the Federal public debt increased by $10.2 billion down to June, 1958, and that by next June, the official prediction is that it will have increased by $17.5 billion. And to repeat, because it needs to be repeated, most of this is due to borrowing money to spend on nondefense items.

This record, Mr. Speaker, is in sharp contrast to the 4 peacetime years 1947–50, when the debt was reduced from $269.4 billion in July 1946 down to $257.4 billion in July 1950—a cut of $12 billion.

And furthermore, Mr. Speaker, this record of failure to retrench is miles away from the assurances President Eisenhower gave in 1952:

> Our children deserve a little better of us than to keep hanging bigger and better debts about their necks.

Today, the Federal debt represents a mortgage of $1,587.63 against every man, woman, and child in America. Every

American family knows the result. Every American family feels the result. The dollar today is worth only 48 cents—and deficit spending will make it worth even less next year. The official cost-of-living index has registered increases in some 21 of the last 23 months. It reaches a new high-water mark every 30 days.

I include a historical tabulation showing the trends over a period of years.

Consumer Price Index and purchasing power of the dollar

	Consumer Price Index (1947–49=100)	Purchasing power of the dollar [1] (calendar year 1939=100)
Year:		
1933	55.3	107.4
1939	59.4	100.0
1940	59.9	99.2
1941	62.9	94.4
1942	69.7	85.2
1943	74.0	80.3
1944	75.2	79.0
1945	76.9	77.2
1946	83.4	71.2
1947	95.5	62.2
1948	102.8	57.8
1949	101.8	58.3
1950	102.8	57.8
1951	111.0	53.5
1952	113.5	52.3
1953	114.4	51.9
1954	114.8	51.7
1955	114.5	51.9
1956	116.2	51.1
1957	120.2	49.4
Recent months:		
1956—January	114.6	51.8
April	114.9	51.7
July	117.0	50.8
October	117.7	50.5
1957—January	118.2	50.3
April	119.3	49.8
July	120.8	49.2
August	121.0	49.1
September	121.1	49.1
October	121.1	49.1
November	121.6	48.8
December	121.6	48.8
1958—January	122.3	48.6
February	122.5	48.5
March	123.3	48.2
April	123.5	48.1
May	123.6	48.1
June	123.7	48.0

[1] As measured by the BLS Consumer Price Index.

When will we stop this headlong rush to national bankruptcy? When will we ever make any payments on this monstrous debt? Generations yet unborn will inherit it unless we change course and lock the doors to the Treasury and keep the spenders away.

The public debt

[In billions]

	Beginning of year
1. Actual increase, 5 fiscal years—	
Fiscal 1954 (July 1953)	$266.1
Fiscal 1955 (July 1954)	271.3
Fiscal 1956 (July 1955)	274.4
Fiscal 1957 (July 1956)	272.8
Fiscal 1958 (July 1957)	270.5
Fiscal 1959 (July 1958)	276.3
Actual increase, 5 years (July 1953 to July 1958)	+$10.2
2. Estimated increase during fiscal 1959 (from $276.3 to $283.6—tentative, subject to revision) 283.6	+7.3
3. Total estimated increase, 6 years (tentative, subject to revision)	+17.5

NOTE.—Old statutory limit of $275 billion raised as follows:
For fiscal 1955 by $6,000,000,000.
For fiscal 1956 by $6,000,000,000.
For fiscal 1957 by $3,000,000,000.
For fiscal 1958 by $5,000,000,000.
For fiscal 1959 by $8,000,000,000 (permanently to $283,000,000,000).
For fiscal 1959 by $5,000,000,000 (temporary).

BYPASSING ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW

Mr. Speaker, I regret to say that, contrary to a widely held but mistaken impression, the tabulations of the appropriations bills of the session do not disclose the full magnitude of the President's annual budgetary recommendations or the resulting action of the Congress. These customary session-end tabulations are necessarily confined to budget recommendations processed in the bills from the Committee on Appropriations. They do not include the billions of dollars flowing through the side doors and back doors of the Treasury which have been breached by devices ingeniously designed to circumvent the time-tested annual Congressional review of demands on the Treasury.

Of all the legislative prerogatives, the powers to tax and appropriate are perhaps the most vital. Not a wheel of Government can turn without the motivation of an appropriation by the Congress. And the act of appropriation is essentially a nullity until money to fulfill it is in the Treasury. So, every function, every action of the Government is dependent on the two cardinal powers of taxation and appropriation. The Constitution wisely committed these powers to the exclusive province of the House of Representatives. It was the plan, the purpose, and the expectation that the immediate representatives of the people, those closest to them, would have the key voice in these matters. The framers purposed these powers for the House in order to assure full, frequent and effective accountability to the direct representatives of the people as to the public business and the public funds. It is the Members of the House, not the Senate, not the spending departments, who bear the first responsibility for unpopular or excessive taxes and extravagant appropriations. And this fundamental and all-important principle of our form of government has from the beginning been jealously envied, assaulted from all sides, and often disputed beyond the Hall of the House of Representatives. There has never been a time when the departments of Government were not ready, willing, and eager, to assume the say as to how much and how fast, and for what purposes, tax funds should be removed from the Treasury and committed to proposals to make the country blossom and bloom as the rose. They are always at work devising ways and means to get money from the Treasury for one or another purpose without consideration or regard for adverse consequences on the pocketbooks of the people.

And the precedents are heavy with the record of attempts by the Senate to preempt the exclusive powers of the House of Representatives to originate tax and appropriation legislation. They have never willingly conceded that the makers of the Constitution were somewhat explicit about the question as to who should draw the money bills. And some have gone further and sought to deduce a distinction in the Constitution between taxing legislation and appropriation legislation. No such differentiation is there, for what would be the purpose of raising taxes that were not to be spent? The Government was not established to make money. Taxation fulfills the purpose of appropriation, not the other way around. If there is no need for appropriation, then there is no need for taxation. The two questions are inseparable and, in a constitutional sense, are as one.

The executive branch and the Congress for some years have lodged more and more budgetary determinations outside the traditional annual appropriations process. Substantial amounts of the budget are passed upon or set in legislative bills. The spenders and the special pleaders are getting in the act. There is a race, and the tempo is increasing, to see how much and in how many different ways and under how many different guises money can be extracted from the Treasury. And, unfortunately, the spenders and the special pleaders are having considerable success. Spending propositions are coming from all directions. They assume several forms, but they all have one purpose, and that is to get money from the Treasury without having to pass the acid test of annual Congressional scrutiny.

Basic authorization laws for the most part—and of necessity—are broad in scope and grant to the executive branch wide latitude. They are the vehicles for initially setting the policies as to what the Government shall undertake and support. But once placed on the books, they usually remain there. Seldom are they repealed or curtailed. They become entrenched and a part of the permanent law. But the one continuing procedure for Congressional control of the activities of Government within the framework of such statutes is the annual program review and the provision of funds. Through annual check, this opportunity to periodically reassess the financial needs and requirements in light of ever-changing conditions and the wishes of the people is a primary responsibility of the House.

The result of these practices bypassing the annual reviews, is that action on executive budgetary recommendations is diffused. How can the House, the Senate, the press, or the people, expect to know what is happening to the pocketbooks of the taxpayers under such diffused and inaccurate practices? If the Members and the people are to clearly know what is going on, all the budgetary actions ought to go through 1 procedure, 1 system, under the same set of rules. There should be only one door—the front door—through which money is removed from the Treasury. Under present practices, the House certainly does not see the whole picture at any given point or time.

These end runs and bypasses of the regular appropriating processes have reached alarming proportions in the present session. The Senate has originated a number of bills carrying billions of dollars of authority permitting withdrawal of money from the Treasury by the back door without ever once having to come through the front door appropriation procedure. And the legislative committees of the House have insisted on concurring in this shortcircuiting. The most effective, and therefore popular device is the so-called public debt transaction which is nothing more or less than an appropriation because it permits withdrawal of money from the Treasury

without further legislative action. Another form is the contract authority which to all intents and purposes is an appropriation because a contract, once made, must be honored. The subsequent act of appropriation is essentially foreordained.

Mr. Speaker, the dimensions of these back-door assaults on the Treasury can be readily grasped if you realize, for example, that in fiscal 1957, while the Congress, was reducing budget requests for appropriations in the appropriation bills by $257 million, it was at the same time, in other bills, increasing the President's requests for other forms of spending authority by $1.7 billion—or 7 times more than the savings on appropriation bills. And in this session, as of August 22, the Senate originated and sent to the House several bills containing over $9 billion of spending and obligating authority directly bypassing the regular annual appropriations review. The House refused to concur in several of these, and cut the total appreciably, but some prevailed. The striking features of the following tabulation are the number of bills carrying appropriations which originated in the Senate and the fact that the total of these Senate bills exceed the President's requests by nearly $5,500,000,000. This would have wiped out many times over the reductions made on the appropriations bills.

The table follows:

Authority to obligate the Government carried in legislative bills, 2d sess., 85th Cong. (public debt transactions and contract authorities)

Bill	Subject	Budget request	House	Senate	Final	Plus or minus, compared with budget request (based on latest action)
Public Law 85-364 (S. 3418)	Emergency housing		$1,850,000,000	$1,850,000,000	$1,850,000,000	+$1,850,000,000
Public Law 85-424 (S. 3149)	Export-Import Bank lending authority	$2,000,000,000	2,000,000,000	2,000,000,000	2,000,000,000	
Public Law 85-690 (S. 3651)	Small-business investments			250,000,000	(28,000,000)	(+28,000,000)
S. 3497	Communities facilities			900,000,000		
S. 3683	Depressed areas			300,000,000		
S. 4036	Minerals stabilization			350,000,000		
S. 3502	Airport grants		437,000,000	512,000,000	437,000,000	+437,000,000
S. 4035	Housing Act, 1958	[1] 1,500,000,000		[1] 2,475,000,000		−1,500,000,000
S. 3468	Navaho-Hopi Rehabilitation Act		20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	+20,000,000
Public Law 85-381 (H. R. 9821)	Highway Act of 1958		209,000,000	269,000,000	235,000,000	+235,000,000
S. 4162	Writeoff of losses under Defense Production Act, borrowing authority (thus making funds available for future expenditure).	[2] 300,000,000		[2] 300,000,000		
H. R. 13014	Direct veterans' loans		[3] 150,000,000			+150,000,000
H. R. 13247	Education bill (title III, sec. 307)		([4])			
Total		3,800,000,000	4,666,000,000	9,226,000,000	4,542,000,000	+1,192,000,000

[1] In addition, guaranteed loans, budget, $100 million; Senate, $250 million.
[2] Approximate, as explained in committee report; on floor.
[3] As reported. (NOTE.—This item is duplicated in title IX of S. 4035, Housing Act of 1958.)
[4] As reported, bill had a public-debt item, but this was deleted by committee amendment on the floor.

NOTE.—As of August 22, 1958.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time the House got this vital business of appropriations back on the track. The House must insist—and without exception—on its exclusive constitutional prerogatives. The alternative is to open the way to virtual destruction of a privilege—indeed, a responsibility—as old as the House itself. And you can rest assured that if the practice is not stopped, and stopped now, it will grow.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the House should give immediate attention to such revision of the rules as will conclusively define once and for all, in harmony with the constitutional meaning and the intent of the present system, what is encompassed by the terms. It is imperative to reinforcing effective control of the purse strings because all of these end-run devices, and especially the public debt transaction scheme, tend to perpetuate—indeed, encourage perpetuation—of programs and expenditures that might not otherwise stand the acid test of annual Congressional scrutiny. They are tailormade for that purpose. And it is the taxpayer who foots the bill.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read:

AUGUST 23, 1958.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In view of the fact that I am about to retire from the Congress, I hereby submit my resignation as a member of the House Committee on Appropriations to take effect forthwith.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer House Resolution 695:

House Resolution 695

Resolved, That EDWIN H. MAY, JR., of Connecticut, be and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Appropriations.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE HONORABLE HENRY J. LATHAM, THE HONORABLE WILLIAM R. WILLIAMS, THE HONORABLE FREDERIC R. COUDERT, THE HONORABLE EDMUND P. RADWAN, THE HONORABLE RALPH W. GWINN, AND THE HONORABLE BERNARD W. KEARNEY

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, New York State has been especially unfortunate in the loss of Members who are retiring from the Congress at the end of this session.

HENRY J. LATHAM has been with us for a long time and has done a good job as a member of the Committee on Rules.

WILLIAM WILLIAMS has been a member of the Committee on Agriculture for a long time and has made a very fine impression.

FREDERICK COUDERT has been a member of the Committee on Appropriations and is one of the most able men in the House.

ED RADWAN has been a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and has done a very good job until he was overcome by illness from which we all hope he will recover.

RALPH GWINN was a member of the Committee on Education and Labor. He is the ranking member at this time. He has devoted himself ably to his work.

BERNARD KEARNEY was a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities and of the Veterans Committee; and, as a veteran of long standing, he had had a very considerable influence upon veterans' legislation that has been passed here in the last 15 years.

We are all sorry to see them go, and I wish to pay this little tribute to them at this time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join with my other colleagues in this deserved tribute to the gentlemen from New York who are retiring this year.

FRITZ COUDERT came here with me in the 80th Congress. He has proved himself a legislator of exceptional talents and has performed in an outstanding manner on the Committee on Appropriations.

HENRY LATHAM has assumed a position of leadership as a member of the powerful and important Rules Committee. He has always been willing to lend his wise counsel to others who so frequently have sought his advice.

PAT KEARNEY in his diligent work on the Veterans' Affairs Committee and the

Committee on Un-American Activities has made significant contributions to the work of the Congress. His fine legal mind and distinguished military background have marked him as an outstanding Member.

RALPH GWINN has had a unique impact on the work of the Congress. He is a devoted conservative who is an articulate and eloquent advocate of the causes in which he so sincerely believes. RALPH has always evidenced a gracious willingness to listen to and consider the views of those with whom he might disagree, truly the mark of a noble character.

BILL WILLIAMS, who has served with such faithfulness and devotion in a quiet and effective way, has been another to whom many of us have turned for advice, particularly on matters affecting the interests of our farmers. He has always rendered wise counsel cheerfully and generously. Our hearts have been saddened by the unusual personal troubles which BILL has suffered during the past year. We all hope the future will be brighter, as he so richly deserves.

ED RADWAN whose diligent service in the House, especially in the field of foreign affairs, was interrupted by serious illness, will also be sorely missed. His popularity in his District has been attested by unusually large votes of confidence. It is the hope and prayer of all of us that he will soon be restored to full health and vigor and will once again be enabled to make his valuable contributions in public service.

To all of these fine retiring New York Members go our gratitude for their devoted service and for their many manifestations of firm friendship.

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I join in the comments made by the distinguished gentleman from New York who is paying tribute to those of our Members who are leaving at the end of this session. I particularly want to pay my homage and respect to one of my closest and dearest friends, the distinguished Member HENRY J. LATHAM. Mr. LATHAM and I run in a parallel area in the county of Queens. He has served with distinction in this body for a period of 14 years. I feel that I would be remiss if I did not pay my respects to these Members who have contributed so much in the halls of the Congress. HENRY LATHAM, who came to Congress actually from the battlefield, if you please, in that he was on the high seas serving as the commander of a ship in battle when he was elected from his District, demonstrated his ability first on a minor committee and then on the Committee on Rules. He believed in true American principles and in the individual rights of an American citizen and has demonstrated more than anyone else what this country means to us. I am very happy to join with my distinguished chairman in saying Godspeed and good weather to all of you.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to join the gentleman in paying tribute to these Members who are leaving, and I wish that I could mention each one of them. But, particularly I want to pay my respects to my friend, DICK WIGGLESWORTH, who is leaving the Congress at this session. DICK and I served together on the Foreign Aid Committee. It has had numerous names during its existence, but we served together on that committee since its existence. It has always been a pleasure to work with him. In my judgment, he is one of the ablest and most meticulous Members of the Congress. I have been delighted to serve with the gentleman. He has always been a gentleman, and it is with great regret that I see him leaving the Congress.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would certainly like to associate my views with the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] in paying tribute to all of the Members who are leaving, particularly DICK WIGGLESWORTH. We served on the same Committee on Appropriations for many years, and I can say that we disagree often, but we do so without being disagreeable. I regret very much that he is leaving our committee. We are going to miss him, and I certainly hope that in his retirement he will enjoy himself and rest, and come back and see us often.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, all of the gentlemen whose names have been mentioned are very distinguished. They will all be missed. But, I desire to say just a word about one whom I have been very closely associated with, BILL WILLIAMS. I do not know how many of you know the tremendous burden that BILL has carried during recent years. His difficulties would have floored a lesser man, and yet he functioned here as a Member of this body carrying that tremendous load. I respect him and I admire him. His example would be a splendid one for anyone to follow, particularly anyone who devotes his life, as BILL has, to public service. I wish him well and I wish him the repose that a good, hard-working public servant deserves, particularly one who has carried the load that BILL has.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to eulogize a great person in Congress, and that is RALPH GWINN. RALPH GWINN is leaving us. I think he is one of the greatest Americans who ever served in this body. Yes, he is an ultraconservative, and there are not too many persons left like RALPH GWINN. I shall have to take his place on the Committee on Labor.

Mr. Speaker, I think RALPH GWINN over the years has been one of the greatest Americans this country has ever elected to office. The House will miss him and will regret his leaving. God bless him in his future endeavors.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I want to join our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] in paying tribute to our several colleagues from the State of New York who are retiring at the close of this session.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the New York delegation in paying tribute to Gen. PAT KEARNEY, a great Congressman.

General PAT, as he is affectionately known, has a great record as a military genius, as a public official, and as a great American.

General PAT, we wish you and yours every pleasure possible.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues, and especially the delegation from New York, in paying tribute to one of my personal friends, the Honorable HENRY J. LATHAM, who is voluntarily retiring from this legislative body.

Congressman LATHAM has done an outstanding job and is one whose record for his constituency and his country merits every consideration from all of us. Future generations will record his activities as being worthy of entry into the archives of this great Nation.

Judge HENRY, our best wishes to you and yours always.

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, it was with mixed feelings that I learned HENRY LATHAM had decided to be a judge and would not run again for reelection to the Congress—happy for him who had achieved this additional honor, but with a sense of personal loss at his going. All United States citizens, his colleagues in the House and his friends and constituents will be the losers when his services as a United States Representative are finished.

His has always been a steady, capable, intelligent, and conservative hand, helping to guide, as a member of the Committee on Rules, the legislation coming from the other committees of the House. His work on that committee will be keenly missed.

Every Member of Congress appreciates his colleagues who are keen and attentive; smiling but serious in their duties, able to speak succinctly when they can contribute to the debate, silent at other times. Such a one is HENRY LATHAM, and that is why we in Congress shall feel his absence.

HENRY is my friend. Our friendship started in the New York State Assembly where we met when both of us were elected for the first time in 1940. I left the assembly for the United States Navy in 1942 shortly before HENRY also left for naval service. We ran into each other a year later in Cristobal when he skippered a ship into port. The first time I joined him aboard at mess, I noted how devoted his crew were to him. Their loyalty was given expression when they presented him with a wristwatch upon his detachment—a rare wartime gesture. This quality of maintaining loyalty and

steadfastness is one of HENRY'S most outstanding characteristics.

Just as the war was ending, he was elected to Congress. Six years later our paths coincided once again when I was fortunate enough to be elected to serve with him in the House of Representatives.

I am sure, now that he is leaving, that all of his colleagues join me in wishing HENRY LATHAM all happiness, health, and good fortune in his new judicial duties.

HON. MARTIN DIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TRIMBLE). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY].

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I regret that our friend and colleague, MARTIN DIES, will not be with us in the next Congress. His own health, coupled with the almost fatal injury of his son, Martin, Jr., has necessitated his absence during much of this session, and we have missed his contributions to our deliberations, which cannot be equaled, as we will miss them, and as our Nation will miss them in the future.

MARTIN DIES was born in Colorado, Mitchell County, Tex., November 5, 1900, and his parents moved with him to Beaumont, Tex., in 1902. After graduation from the public schools, he attended Wesley College, in Greenville, Tex., and Cluster Springs Academy, in Cluster Springs, Va. He was graduated from the University of Texas, at Austin, in 1919, and from the law department of National University, Washington, D. C. in 1920. MARTIN was admitted to the bar in 1920, and began practice in Marshall, Tex. He moved to Orange, Tex., in 1922, and continued his practice of law. He was a member of the faculty of East Texas Law School at Beaumont in 1930. He was elected to the 72d and six succeeding Congresses from the 2d Congressional District of Texas, serving from March 1931, to January 3, 1945. He did not seek reelection in 1944, but resumed his practice of law, as a resident of Lufkin, Tex., where he still resides, and where he will be one of my most renowned constituents. Mr. DIES was elected as a Member at Large from Texas to the 83d Congress, and to the two succeeding Congresses. He has ably and faithfully served the people of Texas and this Nation for 20 years in the National Congress.

MARTIN DIES was my Congressman, before I was grown, when I lived in the Second Congressional District, and then it was a personal honor and privilege to serve with him during most of the time I have been honored to serve the people of the Seventh Congressional District in this great body.

Mr. DIES was the first chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and he well served our Nation in exposing the activities and dangers of the Communist conspiracy. He set that committee on the course which is still carrying out the purpose of preserving our liberties from the alien philosophy which has invaded our country and would destroy us.

MARTIN DIES is one of the most able of the men who have served in the United States Congress. When word would come that he was to speak on this floor, his colleagues came for the privilege of hearing him, and the galleries would fill. As an orator, he has no equal; he will be sorely missed by myself and his other colleagues, and by the American people, and it will be a long time before one will arrive to fill his place.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH].

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman on the statement he has made about our colleague, MARTIN DIES. It is undeniable that he did a great job of work as the first chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities and in many other fields of endeavor while he has been here. He like his father, who served before him in Congress, has made a worthwhile contribution to the welfare of this Nation.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, our friend, MARTIN DIES, came from my district. The district I now represent, the Second District of Texas, is the one in which he was raised, and his father represented that district before he did.

He was well liked there and made many friends at home and here in Congress. I had the pleasure of serving with him as I came to Congress. My relationship with MARTIN DIES has always been a pleasant one. I want to add my good wishes to those of his many friends here that his future life may be pleasant and his health may be restored. I understand that his son is very likely to be elected to the State senate.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I, too, join my colleagues in saying this word about our colleague who has voluntarily decided to sever his service here. MARTIN DIES brought to this Chamber a flavor of the old South. His was the type of oratory which characterized this body for many years in past generations. All of us will miss him. I am sure all of us will wish him well as he pursues life's labors in another vein.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE].

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with others of MARTIN DIES' colleagues and pay tribute to his long and colorful service in the Congress of the United States. His service here extended over a long period of time. I think it is well to recall that he was early to recognize the menace of communism in the world and in the United States. The service of MARTIN DIES will long be remembered. I should like to add my words in appreciation of his service.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. IKARD].

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, I compliment my colleague from Texas on taking this time to speak of the retirement of our distinguished colleague [Mr. DIES] and to join the others here in paying tribute to his service and point out, as others have, the great contribution he has made. I wish for him many years of happiness in his retirement.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman and the other Members of Congress who are paying tribute to a man who has had a distinguished career in the Congress of the United States, a man who has given much of his life to his country, a man who has left his imprint on those of us who knew him. I know we in the Congress will miss him, and I know the country will miss his wise counsel and the great contributions he has made.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I join my distinguished colleague from Texas in honoring one of the greatest men it has ever been my pleasure to know anywhere.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, with the retirement of MARTIN DIES, the Congress loses one of its outstanding Members, a Member who has contributed much to the history of our Nation since as a young but distinguished lawyer he first came to this body back in 1931. Perhaps he is best known to the Nation as the author of the resolution to establish the Special Committee To Investigate Un-American Activities, but those who have served here with him know the impact of his keen intellect and great energy was felt in many other legislative fields of great importance to the Nation.

He came to the House well grounded in the law and with a rich background of education and experience for the important role he was to play in the critical years that faced the country on that day in December 1931, when he was sworn in as a Member of this body. His distinguished father, the Honorable Martin Dies, Sr., had served as a Member of Congress from the Second District of Texas from 1908 to 1919.

MARTIN DIES served with great distinction as a Member of this House from December 7, 1931, to January 3, 1945, when he voluntary retired from Congress to practice law in Lufkin, Tex. During his service in this House, he was a member of the following committees: Immigration and Naturalization; Patents; Coinage, Weights, and Measures; Elections; and Rules. He served as chairman of the Special Committee To Investigate Un-American Activities from the creation of that committee until his retirement from Congress. He was author of several immigration bills and of the Silver Purchase Act.

In November 1952, Mr. DIES was elected to the 83d Congress as Member at Large from the State of Texas. He was reelected to the 84th Congress and to the 85th Congress.

Mr. DIES became a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in the 84th Congress. He was a very valuable and effective member of the committee and one with whom it was a distinct honor and a great pleasure to serve. His fine legal mind and great knowledge of national affairs contributed substantially to committee deliberations on the many important legislative problems considered during his tenure on the committee. He was especially effective in obtaining information from witnesses and clarifying difficult issues.

Not only the committee, but the House as well, will miss MARTIN DIES. He is a man of extraordinary ability and one who loves his country well. We know that he will continue to contribute his outstanding talents and great abilities to the service of our country and to the high ideals of public service he exemplified so well in his service here.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to join with the members of the Texas delegation in commending Congressman MARTIN DIES. I wish for him the best of health and happiness in his retirement.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I know the entire membership of the House of Representatives feels that we will be losing a great man in MARTIN DIES. One of the finest things I thought MARTIN did, aside from his great legislative work here, was the interest he took in the page boys, the young gentlemen who do such a fine job. I know if MARTIN were here this evening he would want to pay tribute to these young men.

I would like to take this time to praise the outstanding work of the boys who work on the Republican phones. These boys have always done their best to help any and every Congressman.

For their outstanding work I would like at this point to compliment Bill Avery, Jr., Bob Pons, Bob Shipe, Pete Wallison, Reuben Smith, and Martin Green.

Again I say, the work of these boys is invaluable to the operation of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our colleague, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the fact that MARTIN DIES will not be with us in the next Congress certainly causes us sorrow and also to the country because he is a great man. I wish to join my colleagues from the Texas delegation and others in paying tribute to this man. He has been a great member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, which he founded. He has been a great Member of the House. He is a great Member and a very fine friend to many of us who have known him in the House of Representatives. I wish him the greatest of luck and all the happiness in the world for him and his family in the years to come.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER].

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that made a great impression on me when I became a Member of this body was that from reading the newspapers, you would be inclined to believe that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] whom we are now eulogizing was a devil with horns. To my amazement, when I came to the Congress and came to know him, I discovered that he was a brilliant, dedicated American, but a man who has been crucified in the court of public opinion to some extent because of the fact that he defended America with all his heart and with all his soul.

Mr. Speaker, it is a tragic thing—and it has not ended yet. I hope the time will come in this country when a man will not be criticized, when a man will not be crucified for standing up for America. I hope the time will come in this country when such a man will be given his proper place in the public esteem. Mr. Speaker, if this Government remains free, I cannot help but think MARTIN DIES will stand at the very top of the list for having warned this country of communism and its deadliness. MARTIN DIES, wherever he may be, I am sure, has the affection of the Members of the House and the affection of the people of America and the affection of this country boy—TIC FORRESTER—and the affection of all the people who love America. I say, thank God for men like MARTIN DIES. God bless him and Godspeed and all good wishes to him.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I am sure all Members of the House join me in wishing MARTIN DIES the best of everything in his retirement and in his return to the practice of law.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken may have permission to revise and extend their remarks and also that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in paying tribute tonight to our friend, MARTIN DIES, who is voluntarily retiring at the end of this Congress.

It had not been my privilege to know MARTIN DIES personally until he returned to Congress when he was elected at large from Texas but I had known of him by the reputation he had made as Congressman from Texas previously and as chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee.

I appreciate the opportunity I have had to serve with him as a colleague and to know him as a friend. He has my best wishes as he enjoys his retirement. Mrs. Thornberry and I have enjoyed knowing his charming wife and look forward to seeing them both in Texas.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, America and the free world might be behind the Iron Curtain of Soviet Russia today had it not been for the timely warning of MARTIN DIES. He spoke from one end of this land to the other during and before World War II arousing patriotic Americans to the Communist menace. He went to the administration in power and pleaded for them to awaken to the danger. He spoke forcefully in Congress and exposed subversives with his great committee.

MARTIN DIES was looking ahead. He is a student of history. He had a keen insight into future developments. Congressman DIES was not motivated by political expediency. He was moved by a genuine love of freedom, a love of his native land and the generations to come. I have wished a thousand times that the leadership of our country in those tragic years had listened to this great American prophet. Had they done so the world today would be at peace. There would be no cold war or Communist threat. There would be no staggering defense budget and unbearable taxation of our people. There would be no Soviet East Germany or Iron Curtain across central Europe. Mr. Speaker, there would have been no Yalta and Potsdam. American troops would have crossed the Elbe, Patton would have entered Prague, and the peace of the world secured.

MARTIN DIES during my years in this Congress was a champion of economy and our free-enterprise system. His leadership inspired many of us to carry on against pressure and great odds.

MARTIN DIES is a Texan in the true traditions of that great State—independent, self-reliant, courageous, and patriotic to the core. He loves America. Travis, Bonham, Austin, and Houston are names that will live forever in American history. MARTIN DIES rates in the same company with these early heroes. I wish for him personally, his lovely wife, and splendid family the very best always. This Nation and this Congress have been elevated by his distinguished and forthright service. The people of South Carolina join me in wishing for him many, many more years of happy and fruitful life.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague from Texas on his timely and truthful remarks concerning our fellow Texan, Hon. MARTIN DIES.

When I came to Congress in 1939, Representative MARTIN DIES was working very diligently as the first chairman and originator of the House Un-American Activities Committee—known as the Dies committee—in which capacity he was undertaking to expose those whose purpose it was to destroy our country from within. He had been fighting, was then, and has continued to fight subversive influences in our country, irrespective of the front used. I am glad to say I always supported wholeheartedly the Dies committee. No one can question the value and importance of the work and efforts of Representative MARTIN DIES. His great ability, his keen insight and alertness, and his devotion to democracy, its institutions, and his country account for a splendid job of work that has greatly benefited America up to this day and will continue to benefit our country in the many decades to come.

Like his distinguished father, Hon. Martin Dies, the first member of the Dies family to serve in Congress, MARTIN, with whom we are serving, has had the

courage of his convictions. He is unafraid. He does not run from the unpopular side or from a position on an important issue that demands personal sacrifice.

MARTIN, as we affectionately refer to him, has not been privileged to be with us in recent weeks as Representative DOWDY indicated. His oldest son, Martin, Jr., was quite seriously injured in an automobile accident. For a long period of time it was a question as to whether he would live. The membership of the House and the many friends of the Dies family throughout Texas and the Nation are pleased that Martin, Jr., is making progress in recovering from his injuries.

The name Dies will never be dimmed in Congress, in Texas, or our Nation, but will live on as the name of a family that faced fearlessly all the issues that came before this Congress in some of the most critical periods of our Nation's history.

I know it is the hope of us all that God will bless and prosper most abundantly MARTIN, his wife, and the Dies family throughout their lives.

THE HONORABLE JAMES P. DEVEREUX

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, this is a sad as well as a joyful occasion in some ways, but I think we all share the sorrow due to the fact that so many of our fine Members will not be in the 86th Congress. I am not going to attempt to review the list, although in passing I cannot help but add to many of the things that have been said about DICK WIGGLESWORTH, of Massachusetts, because it has been my pleasure and my privilege to sit close to him for the last several years on the very arduous committee, and I shall certainly miss him.

I am rising at this time to tell you that the Maryland delegation is losing, as you probably all know, one of our most beloved Members through voluntary retirement. He is not seeking reelection. I for one very earnestly hope he will be successful in the new field he is entering.

In the retirement of JIM DEVEREUX I think we all feel that the House is losing one of its most devoted, most determined, and efficient Members, a man who has on more occasions than I need remind you, shown a devotion to duty and the country, and whose name was already enrolled in the list of our great heroes before he came to this body.

On behalf of the Maryland delegation, and I am sure of all the Members of this House we wish him well and Godspeed. I am sorry JIM will not be with us in the next Congress.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to one of the great generals of our times, as well as one of the most capable Members of this Congress, the Honorable JAMES P. DEVEREUX, who is voluntarily retiring to channel his activities in the field within his own State of Maryland.

The General, as he is affectionately known, has a great record as a soldier and as a public servant. JIM, we wish you every success in your new endeavors.

RÉSUMÉ OF APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Defense direct appropriations in the regular budget were $1,405,846,000 more than the President asked for, and most of these increases were not for the purpose of providing better defense, but for the purpose of spending more money and playing politics with national defense.

The supplemental bill was over $383 million above the budget estimate. The Agriculture Department bill was $129 million below the budget on direct appropriations, but $213 million above the budget on loan authorizations.

The amount of money that is shown in the table below that is available for expenditure does not include permanent appropriations of $8,333,373,526, so that the grand total of funds available will be at least $78,460,000,000.

TABLE I.—*Comparison of budget estimates and appropriations, 85th Cong., 2d sess.*

Department or establishment	Estimates considered by House	Reported to House	Passed House	Estimates considered by Senate	Reported to Senate	Passed Senate	Public Law	Increase (+) or decrease (−), appropriation compared with estimates
I. Fiscal year 1959 acts:								
Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration	$3,320,888,539	$3,216,988,539	$3,216,988,539	$3,320,888,539	$3,207,973,039	$3,207,973,039	$3,191,875,539	−$129,013,000
Loan authorizations (REA and FHA)	(381,000,000)	(569,500,000)	(569,500,000)	(381,000,000)	(594,000,000)	(594,000,000)	(594,000,000)	(+213,000,000)
Department of Commerce and related agencies:								
Department of Commerce	858,099,000	792,664,000	832,416,000	858,099,000	900,044,000	900,044,000	851,754,000	−6,345,000
Panama Canal	41,647,000	38,916,000	38,916,000	41,647,000	39,867,000	39,867,000	39,350,000	−2,297,000
Independent agencies	82,975,000	78,560,000	78,560,000	82,975,000	82,975,000	82,975,000	80,110,000	−2,865,000
Total	982,721,000	917,140,000	949,892,000	982,721,000	1,012,886,000	1,012,886,000	971,214,000	−11,507,000
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	536,400,000	536,050,000	536,050,000	536,400,000	536,050,000	535,985,000	536,017,000	−383,000
Interservice activities	734,000,000	796,900,000	796,900,000	774,000,000	836,900,000	836,900,000	836,900,000	+62,900,000
Department of the Army	8,755,800,000	8,617,626,000	8,716,626,000	8,953,535,000	9,074,170,000	9,076,862,000	8,992,859,000	+39,324,000
Department of the Navy	10,714,247,000	11,042,210,000	11,042,210,000	10,870,181,000	11,424,073,000	11,427,527,000	11,359,427,000	+489,246,000
Department of the Air Force	17,456,500,000	17,317,775,000	17,317,775,000	17,652,854,000	18,161,618,000	18,165,718,000	17,877,624,000	+224,770,000
Total	38,196,947,000	38,310,561,000	38,409,561,000	38,786,970,000	40,032,811,000	40,042,992,000	39,602,827,000	+815,857,000
District of Columbia	(215,153,500)	(203,276,100)	(203,276,100)	(215,153,500)	(206,211,814)	(206,211,814)	(204,033,460)	(−11,120,040)
Federal payment	27,660,600	22,860,600	22,860,600	27,660,600	24,360,600	24,360,600	22,860,600	−4,800,000
General Government matters	15,814,870	15,558,870	15,558,870	15,814,870	14,954,870	14,954,870	15,679,870	−135,000
Independent Offices:								
H. R. 13856	5,927,060,500	5,993,404,900	5,993,404,900	6,171,270,500	6,103,456,900	6,103,456,900	6,090,156,900	−81,113,600
H. R. 11574—Vetoed	(5,922,343,500)	(6,549,920,900)	(6,549,920,900)	(5,927,060,500)	(6,137,248,900)	(6,108,242,900)	(6,582,304,900)	(+655,244,400)
Department of the Interior and related agencies:								
Department of the Interior	287,543,900	286,498,900	286,498,900	287,543,900	340,098,250	341,070,250	320,454,250	+32,910,350
Forest Service	116,129,000	116,980,000	116,980,000	116,129,000	139,180,000	139,180,000	129,555,000	+13,426,000
Related agencies	10,811,700	9,666,700	9,666,700	10,811,700	9,666,700	9,666,700	9,666,700	−1,145,000
Total	414,484,600	413,145,600	413,145,600	414,484,600	488,939,950	489,916,950	459,675,950	+45,191,350
Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare:								
Department of Labor	408,032,800	382,446,800	388,540,200	408,032,800	389,603,000	389,603,000	388,741,700	−19,290,900
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	2,550,724,581	2,565,080,581	2,565,080,581	2,552,424,581	2,796,594,581	2,797,594,581	2,735,815,281	+183,390,700

TABLE I.—*Comparison of budget estimates and appropriations, 85th Cong., 2d sess.*—Continued

Department or establishment	Estimates considered by House	Reported to House	Passed House	Estimates considered by Senate	Reported to Senate	Passed Senate	Public Law	Increase (+) or decrease (−), appropriation compared with estimates
I. Fiscal year 1959 acts—Continued								
Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare—Continued								
Related agencies	$14,980,000	$14,334,800	14,334,800	$14,980,000	$18,095,000	$18,095,000	$18,050,000	+$3,070,000
Total	2,973,737,181	2,961,862,181	2,967,955,581	2,975,437,181	3,204,382,581	3,205,382,581	3,142,606,981	+167,160,800
Legislative branch	97,910,499	96,942,113	96,942,113	123,846,669	123,320,419	123,320,419	123,297,387	+549,282
Military construction	1,730,653,000	1,218,815,000	1,218,815,000	1,730,653,000	1,714,815,000	1,720,115,000	1,353,850,000	−376,803,000
Mutual security	3,950,092,500	3,078,092,500	3,078,092,500	3,950,092,500	3,518,092,500	3,518,092,500	3,298,092,500	−652,000,000
Public works:								
Civil functions, Army	759,525,000	779,714,000	782,424,000	759,525,000	847,071,500	847,521,500	813,887,500	+54,362,500
Department of the Interior:								
Bureau of Reclamation	269,101,000	245,739,200	246,739,200	269,101,000	263,730,335	263,730,335	255,577,335	−13,523,665
Power administrations	31,880,000	31,814,000	31,814,000	31,880,000	31,814,000	31,814,000	31,814,000	−66,000
Tennessee Valley Authority	16,850,000	16,850,000	16,850,000	16,850,000	16,850,000	16,850,000	16,850,000	
Total	1,077,356,000	1,074,117,200	1,077,827,200	1,077,356,000	1,159,465,835	1,159,915,835	1,118,128,835	+40,772,835
Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies:								
Department of State	199,990,151	192,859,353	192,859,353	199,990,151	205,955,853	205,955,853	197,103,353	−2,886,798
Department of Justice	230,190,000	229,410,000	229,410,000	230,190,000	230,317,000	230,317,000	230,317,000	+127,000
The Judiciary	41,402,860	40,703,260	40,703,260	41,472,860	40,873,260	40,873,260	40,823,260	−649,600
United States Information Agency	110,032,000	101,750,000	101,750,000	110,032,000	104,750,000	104,750,000	103,250,000	−6,782,000
Funds appropriated to the President	7,600,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	7,600,000	6,821,000	6,821,000	6,410,500	−1,189,500
Total	589,215,011	570,722,613	570,722,613	589,285,011	588,717,113	588,717,113	577,904,113	−11,380,898
Treasury-Post Office:								
Treasury Department	699,367,000	697,127,000	704,627,000	699,367,000	704,627,000	704,627,000	704,627,000	+5,260,000
Post Office Department	3,421,121,000	3,402,000,000	3,402,000,000	3,421,121,000	3,402,000,000	3,402,000,000	3,402,000,000	−19,121,000
Tax Court of the United States	1,481,000	1,481,000	1,481,000	1,481,000	1,481,000	1,481,000	1,481,000	
Total	4,121,969,000	4,100,608,000	4,108,108,000	4,121,969,000	4,108,108,000	4,108,108,000	4,108,108,000	−13,861,000
Supplemental, 1959	3,226,315,440	3,131,094,797	3,131,844,797	4,081,154,221	3,594,944,978	3,866,382,978	3,697,305,478	−383,848,743
Subtotal, fiscal year 1959	66,652,825,740	65,121,913,913	65,271,719,313	68,369,603,691	68,897,228,785	69,483,574,785	67,773,583,153	−596,020,538
II. Deficiency and Supplemental Acts, fiscal year 1958 and prior:								
Department of Defense supplemental, 1958	1,260,000,000	1,260,000,000	1,260,000,000	1,260,000,000	1,260,000,000	1,260,000,000	1,260,000,000	
Department of Labor supplemental, 1958	43,400,000	43,400,000	43,400,000	43,400,000	43,400,000	43,400,000	43,400,000	
Second supplemental, 1958	2,871,465,844	2,837,882,907	2,857,882,907	2,874,144,080	2,865,963,718	2,869,406,463	2,861,008,793	−13,135,287
Urgent deficiency, 1958	32,411,802	28,761,802	28,761,802	34,811,802	34,684,302	34,684,302	29,784,302	−5,027,500
Department of Labor additional supplemental, 1958	665,700,000	665,700,000	665,700,000	690,700,000	685,700,000	685,700,000	685,700,000	−5,000,000
Subtotal, fiscal year 1958 and prior years	4,872,977,646	4,835,744,709	4,855,744,709	4,903,055,882	4,889,748,020	4,893,190,765	4,879,893,095	−23,162,787
III. Grand total, session	71,525,803,386	69,957,658,622	70,127,464,022	73,272,659,573	73,786,976,805	74,376,765,550	72,623,476,248	−619,183,325
Permanent appropriations (estimate, subject to revision)							8,333,373,526	
Grand totals:								
Regular annual, supplemental, deficiency, and permanent appropriations							80,986,849,774	
Loan authorizations (REA and FHA)	(381,000,000)	(569,500,000)	(569,500,000)	(381,000,000)	(594,000,000)	(594,000,000)	(594,000,000)	(+213,000,000)

The following table shows the items that are available to draw out of the Treasury on what they call loan account, but what is really an appropriation although it is not labeled as such:

TABLE II.—*Authority to obligate the Government carried in legislative bills (public debt transactions and contract authorities)*

[85th Cong., 2d sess., as of Aug. 23, 1958]

Bill	Subject	Budget request	House	Senate	Final	Plus or minus, compared with budget request
Public Law 85-364 (S. 3418)	Emergency housing		$1,850,000,000	$1,850,000,000	$1,850,000,000	+$1,850,000,000
Public Law 85-424 (S. 3149)	Export-Import Bank lending authority	$2,000,000,000	2,000,000,000	2,000,000,000	2,000,000,000	
Public Law 85-699 (S. 3651)	Small-business investments			250,000,000	(28,000,000)	(+28,000,000)
S. 3497	Communities facilities			900,000,000		
S. 3683	Depressed areas			300,000,000		
S. 4036	Minerals stabilization			350,000,000		
S. 3502	Airport grants		437,000,000	512,000,000	437,000,000	+437,000,000
S. 4035	Housing Act, 1958 [1]	1,500,000,000		[2] 2,475,000,000		−1,500,000,000
S. 3468	Navaho-Hopi Rehabilitation Act		20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	+20,000,000
Public Law 85-381 (H. R. 9821)	Highway Act of 1958		209,000,000	269,000,000	235,000,000	+235,000,000
S. 4162	Writeoff of losses under Defense Production Act, borrowing authority (thus making funds available for future expenditure).[3]	300,000,000		[3] 300,000,000		
H. R. 13014	Direct veterans' loans		[4] 150,000,000			+150,000,000
Total		3,800,000,000	4,666,000,000	9,226,000,000	4,570,000,000	+1,220,000,000

[1] In addition, guaranteed loans, budget, $100 million; Senate, $250 million.
[2] Approximate, as explained in committee report.
[3] On floor.
[4] As reported. (NOTE.—This item is duplicated in title 9 of S. 4035, Housing Act of 1958.)

The net result of this table is the taking of funds out of the Treasury to the tune of $1,192 million without any budget estimate, and beyond what the President recommended. This low figure is only obtained by subtracting $1.5 billion from what was suggested by the President for public housing. The reason is that the House of Representatives failed to pass the Housing Act.

The way things have been done the last few years is very largely to operate withdrawals out of the Treasury in two ways, so as to utterly confuse everyone who tries to find out just what has happened.

I felt it necessary to submit this additional table this year because no one can tell where we are at without it. Actually, without the deduction of the amount that was recommended by the budget for the Housing Act of $1.5 billion, the total draft on the Treasury would be $2,692 million. The total draft on the Treasury as a result of the items contained in table I and the items contained in table II are:

Regular appropriations	$72,623,476,248
Authority to borrow money direct from the Treasury	1,192,000,000

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY PRESIDENT OF READINESS OF CONGRESS TO ADJOURN

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 696

Resolved, That a committee of 2 Members be appointed by the House to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the 2 Houses have completed their business of the session and are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee to notify the President the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. ALBERT, and the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. ARENDS.

AUTHORIZATION TO SPEAKER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS, APPOINT COMMISSIONS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the 2d session of the 85th Congress, the Speaker be authorized to accept resignations and to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZATION TO CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND TO THE SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the House, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PRINTING OF REVISED HOUSE MANUAL

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 697

Resolved, That a revised edition of the Rules and Manual of the House of Representatives for the 86th Congress be printed as a House document, and that 1,600 additional copies shall be printed and bound for the use of the House of Representatives, of which 700 copies shall be bound in leather with thumb index and delivered as may be directed by the Parliamentarian of the House for distribution to officers and Members of Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

REPORTS OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 698

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the House, reports of the Comptroller General of the United States made to the Congress pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841 et sec.), shall be printed during such adjournment as House documents of the second session of the 85th Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

PRINTING OF REPORTS FOLLOWING SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that reports filed with the clerk following the sine die adjournment by committees authorized by the House to conduct investigations may be printed by the Clerk as reports of the 85th Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING PRESIDING OFFICER TO SIGN DULY ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 122.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 122

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

Passed the Senate August 23, 1958.

Attest:

FELTON M. JOHNSTON, *Secretary*.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A TRIBUTE TO ALL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I hope that you will have a very happy vacation, if you are able to secure a vacation. I want to thank you for the expeditious way in which you have handled the procedure here in the House of Representatives.

I would like to say to my colleague, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, our leader, that I am very grateful to him for his help during this session of Congress. I would like to say also that I am grateful to him as a Republican for his leadership in the party for many, many years. He has fought and worked hard for us when the going has been extremely hard at times. I hope, Mr. Speaker, his ankle that is bothering him—he has shown great courage in being here today and the last few days—will soon be well.

I would like to thank the majority leader for his help in this difficult session, the Clerk of the House and his assistant, the Record Clerk and the bill clerk.

I would like to thank all of the people in the Capitol here, the reporters of debates, the reading clerks, the telephone boys, the page boys, the doorkeepers, the main telephone operators. I do not like this new telephone system and I hope it can be changed, and I doubt if the operators like it.

I wish all my colleagues a very happy summer and a good rest. We shall miss those who are not returning.

Mr. Speaker, I know the Members of the House will join with me in paying tribute to Henry Cabot Lodge, our Delegate to the United Nations, for the work he has done there since he became our representative. He has been courageous, superbly equipped with a background—an education in national and international affairs, with his legislative experience as a Senator in the United States Congress. He was a perfect selection by President Eisenhower as our United Nations member.

I believe the entire membership of the House want to pay tribute to him and to thank him for what he has accomplished. I am sure much of the current good reaction to President Eisenhower's speech in the United Nations was the result of what he did for President Eisenhower, not only recently but during his years in the United Nations. We are extremely proud of him.

I would like to express my deep gratitude to President Eisenhower also. His is not an easy task. He has been criticized and attacked and attacked, but

the fact is we are not at war and we are nearer a peaceful solution of the situation than we have been for a good many years. He has done a very remarkable job and I for one am extremely grateful to him.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I think one of the most gracious events in every Congress in which I have been privileged to be a Member is the thoughtfulness of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts at the end of the session in making the remarks she has made.

The gentlewoman from Massachusetts has covered everyone from the telephone operators and the staff here in the Capitol to the President of the United States in her remarks.

I think all of us join with her in wishing Godspeed to all of the staff and to all of the Members, to the members of the executive branch, and to the President of the United States, and I want to associate myself with the gentlewoman in this regard.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman very much. I am sure that one of these days he will be a member of the Supreme Court.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, when this Congress adjourns tonight it leaves unfinished the legislation to raise pension benefits for retired railroad workers and widows of rail workers.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] just told us that this administration has been the biggest spending administration in the peacetime history of this Nation.

Unfortunately the spending has been of little benefit to the average citizen. In raising interest rates this administration is spending over a billion dollars a year for the additional cost of interest on the national debt.

Indirect postal subsidies to giant publishers cost hundreds of millions of dollars in Federal spending.

Administration fiscal and economic policies have brought ever-increasing prices and much distress and suffering to our senior citizens.

Some relief was voted to Federal retirees and to beneficiaries of social security, but our retired railway workers have been ignored.

It will mean not only great disappointment for these people, but much suffering, too. I trust that it will be the first act of the next Congress to right this wrong that has been done to retired railroad workers and their families.

AN ANALYSIS OF LEGISLATIVE ACHIEVEMENT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on January 8, 1957, 28 Democratic Members of the House of Representatives issued a statement of program for the 85th Congress. This program carrying the signatures of approximately 80 Democratic Members of the House of Representatives was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 30, 1957.

As we are now nearing the end of the 85th Congress, after conferences with signers of that program, I am filing a report of the actions of this Congress in keeping with this program. This is the report:

In the field of foreign policy and national defense, the program stated that adequate defense forces should be maintained and that this objective could be best accomplished by maintaining a balance among the three branches of the armed services. It also stated that unless the world situation improved significantly, there should be no reduction of the personnel in the armed services. In keeping with this statement of policy, I report that in this session of Congress the following action was taken:

H. R. 7143: Continued to July 1, 1959, suspension of the 2,000,500 statutory limit on personnel strength of the Armed Forces—Public Law 85–63.

House Concurrent Resolution 333: Expressed the sense of Congress that the National Guard strength be maintained at 400,000 men—passed House, July 21, 1958.

H. R. 11470: Increased the pay for members of the Armed Forces by $577 million a year to encourage career service. Increase based in part on proficiency—Public Law 85–422.

H. R. 12541: Provided for the reorganization of the Department of Defense to strengthen the direction, authority, and control of the Secretary of Defense over the separate services. Prohibited merging of separate services and provided a method for Congressional review before functions delegated by law could be transferred—Public Law 85–599.

H. R. 9739: Authorized $54.6 million to expand and accelerate the construction of missile bases, detection and warning systems, and installations for the strategic dispersal of the Strategic Air Force—Public Law 85–325.

H. R. 13015: Authorized $1.6 billion program of construction projects at Armed Forces installations and bases here and abroad—House agreed to conference report August 6, 1958; Senate agreed to conference report August 7, 1958.

H. R. 8240: Authorized $1.2 billion program of construction at installations and bases of Armed Forces here and abroad—Public Law 85–241.

In the field of foreign policy, the program recommended support of the United Nations and international cooperation not only in the military and diplomatic fields, but also in economic and cultural areas. The program recommended particular efforts in the difficult area of colonial problems, the expansion of the point 4 program, the extension of a liberal trade policy, and statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. Since action in the field of foreign policy depends in large measure upon the initiative of the administration, we have not accomplished all of the objectives set forth on these programs. Insofar as the actions of the House of Representatives are concerned, we think the record of achievement is significant.

House Joint Resolution 117: Authorizes the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations of the Middle East—Public Law 85–7.

S. 2130: Authorizes a $3.3 billion mutual security program for fiscal year 1958 of military, economic, and technical assistance to friendly nations including $1.1 billion for loans, in lieu of grants, for a development fund established on a 2-year basis—Public Law 85–141.

H. R. 12181: Authorizes a $3.03 billion mutual security program for fiscal year 1959—Public Law 85–477.

H. R 8992: Authorizes the United States participation in the International Atomic Energy Agency and the appointment of representatives by the President—Public Law 85–177.

H. R. 4136: Extends operating authority of the Export-Import Bank for 5 years—Public Law 85–55).

S. 3149: Increases the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank by $2 billion—Public Law 85–424.

H. R. 12591: Extends until June 30, 1962, authority of the President to enter into reciprocal trade agreements—Public Law 85–686.

H. R. 10015: Continues to June 30, 1959, suspension of import duties on metal scrap—Public Law 85–453.

H. R. 7999: Provides for the admission of Alaska into the Union as a State—Public Law 85–508.

In the area of immigration legislation, much remains to be done. Favorable action has been taken on these three bills:

H. R. 11033: Facilitates retroactive adjustment of status of 30,000 escapees from the October 1956 Hungarian revolution to permit permanent residence in the United States—Public Law 85–559.

H. R. 11874: Records lawful admission for permanent residence of certain aliens who entered the United States before June 28, 1940—Public Law 85–616.

H. R. 13451: Simplifies procedure for nonimmigrant aliens to become permanent residents—passed House July 30, 1958, passed Senate August 11, 1958

Our program proposed a comprehensive civil-rights program and the improvement of Government service. In the advancement of this program, the following legislation was passed.

H. R. 6127: Authorizes the President to appoint a Civil Rights Commission, establishes a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice, and provides for injunctive actions to be brought by the Attorney General in voting rights cases—Public Law 85–315.

H. R. 2474: Provides pay increases for 500,000 postal employees effective September 1, 1957—Vetoed.

H. R. 5836: Postal bill—In addition to increasing postal rates H. R. 5836 provided pay increases for postal employees effective January 1958—Public Law 85–426.

H. R. 2462: Provides pay increase for classified civil-service, judicial, and legislative employees—Vetoed.

S. 734: Provides pay increases for Federal employees under the Classified Civil Service Act of 1949, employees in the legislative and judicial branches of the Government, in the medical division of the VA and officers of the Foreign Service—Public Law 85–462.

Our program recommended a comprehensive program for education, health, and housing. One fundamental part of this program providing Federal assistance for the construction of school buildings has not been realized. However, significant progress has been made.

H. R. 8679: Extends to June 30, 1959, aid to school districts affected by Federal activities—Public Law 85–267.

H. R. 11378: Authorizes a permanent program of assistance for construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities and continues the other aid to such impacted areas until June 30, 1961—Public Law 85–620.

H. R. 13247—S. 4237: National Defense Education Act of 1958—Authorizes a 4-year, $900 million program of student loans, fellowships, and other aid to improve teaching of mathematics, science, and languages—in conference.

H. R. 11414: Authorizes a $1 million program of grants-in-aid to public and nonprofit schools providing training for specialists, technicians, and administrators in the field of public health—Public Law 85–544.

H. R. 12628: Extends for 3 years, to June 30, 1962, the Hospital Survey and Construction—Hill-Burton Act—Public Law 85–664.

H. R. 8753; H. R. 8755; H. R. 8821: Facilities coverage under the Social Security Act of employees of various State and local governments—Public Laws 85–226; 227; 229.

H. R. 7238: Revises the formula for computing Federal social security grants to the State for medical and other assistance to provide for a more effective distribution—Public Law 85–110.

H. R. 13549, social security amendment of 1958: Provides increases of approximately 7 percent under the old-age insurance provisions of the Social Security Act; increases the amount of monthly earnings which an individual may receive before losing benefits under such act; increases the maximum earning base from $4,200 to $4,800; increases the social security tax on both employers and employees and on "self-employed" individuals; provides coverage for certain other workers and/or employees; and provides a new formula for Federal participation in public assistance—House agrees to Senate amendment August 19, 1958.

H. R. 10, Self-Employed Individual's Retirement Act: Allows tax deductions up to $2,500 a year for income put into voluntary pension plan by self-employed—Passed by House July 29, 1958.

H. R. 8888: Brings employees of various partially owned Federal instrumentalities, and others, under the protection of unemployment compensation—Passed by House August 16, 1957.

H. R. 4353—S. 1313: Increases benefits, and contributions, under the Railroad Retirement Act—Reported in House August 12, 1958, passage is anticipated.

S. 72: Increased annuities payable to retired or disabled United States Civil Service employees—Public Law 85–465.

H. R. 6659: Authorizes a $1.9 billion housing program; increases FNMA borrowing authority; lowers downpayments on FHA-insured homes; and authorizes $350 million for urban redevelopment and slum clearance for 1 year—Public Law 85–104.

S. 3418: Emergency $1.8 billion Housing Act to stimulate home-building; reducing downpayments on FHA-financed houses and extending guaranty and direct loan programs for veterans and increasing funds for FNMA mortgage purchases—Public Law 85–364.

Senate Joint Resolution 171: Increases by $4 billion authorization for FHA mortgage insurance—Public Law 85–442.

S. 3683: Authorizes $200 million in loans, $75 million in grants for a program of redevelopment aid for areas of unemployment—Passed by House, amended, August 15, 1958.

The tax program recommended was not fully accomplished, but significant progress was made in the field of technical revision, small business, and the reduction of some excise taxes.

H. R. 7125: Makes numerous technical changes in the excise tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code to correct inequities, clarify the law, and improve its administration—House agrees to conference report August 14, 1958; Senate agrees to conference report August 15, 1958.

H. R. 8381: Makes numerous technical changes in the income, estate, and gift tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code to eliminate unintended benefits and hardships and to correct ambiguities and errors—House agrees to conference report August 14, 1958; Senate agrees to conference report August 15, 1958.

H. R. 13382, Small Business Tax Revision Act of 1958: Establishes special rules for the treatment under the I. R. C. of gains or losses of small businesses—Passed by House July 21, 1958. Became part of H. R. 8381.

H. R. 12695: Extends to July 1, 1959, the 52-percent corporate income tax rate and schedule of excise taxes except for transportation of freight which was repealed—Public Law 85–475.

In fulfillment with the objectives of our program for business, industry, and labor, the following legislation was passed:

H. R. 7963; S. 637; S. 2504; S. 2920: Gives permanent status to the Small Business Administration; increases its lending authority, reduces interest rates and broadens its authority—Public Laws 85–4; 85–120; 85–335; 85–536.

H. R. 9020—S. 1356: Gives the Federal Trade Commission joint authority with the Agricultural Department to prevent monopolistic practices in the meat industry—passed by House August 12, 1958.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 68; 69: Urged the acceleration of Federal construction projects to stimulate the economy—adopted.

H. R. 8888: Brings employees of various partially owned Federal instrumentalities, and others, under the protection of unemployment compensation—passed by House August 16, 1957.

H. R. 12065: Provides, optionally to the States, for repayment in 5 years, up to 15 weeks additional Federal unemployment compensation for jobless whose State payments have expired—Public Law 85–441.

H. R. 13507—S. 2888—House Resolution 657, Welfare and Pensions Plans Disclosure Act: Disclosure of all welfare and pension plans maintained by employers, or by employee organizations—S. 2888 passed in lieu. Senate agrees to conference report August 16, 1958; House agrees to conference report August 19, 1958.

S. 3974, Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1958: This bill passed the Senate and failed to pass the House under suspension because of 77 percent Republican opposition.

The program of January proposed legislation to improve the farm program so as to assist the farmers to achieve parity of income. The achievement of this objective was blocked by Presidential veto and by the threat of Presidential veto. The following is a report on the efforts which were made in this Congress.

Senate Joint Resolution 162: Bars reduction of farm price supports for 1958 crop below those of 1957, and also bars cuts in acreage allotments for 2 years.—vetoed.

S. 3420: Extends until June 30, 1960, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act authorizing an additional $500 million for 1958 and $1½ billion each for 1959 and 1960—conference.

H. R. 1045: Extends for 4 years authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to administer the soil-conservation program on a national basis—Public Law 85–553.

S. 3342: Extends for 3 years to June 30, 1961, the special milk program in nonprofit schools, nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, and summer camps and authorizes $75 million for such expenditures—Public Law 85–478.

H. R. 12164: Permits distribution of surplus foods in nonprofit childrens' summer camps—Public Law 85–483.

The extension of the wool program was provided in S. 4071.

We proposed an expanded and stepped-up program of public works. In furtherance of this objective, the following action was taken.

H. R. 8643: Authorizes $600 million Niagara River power development by the New York Power Authority—Public Law 85–177.

S. 497: Authorized rivers and harbors, flood control, and beach erosion control projects totaling $1.57 billion—vetoed.

S. 3910. Authorized flood control, navigation improvements and beach control projects on rivers and harbors, totaling $1.5 billion—Public Law 85–500.

S. 1869—H. R. 4266: Authorizes TVA to finance expansion of facilities by issuance of up to $750 million of revenue bonds—reported in House August 1, 1958.

H. R. 9821: Authorizes $5.5 billion for apportionment among the States including $1.8 billion in additional funds for the regular Federal-aid and interstate superhighway programs, to create jobs and expedite work—Public Law 85–381.

Our program proposed the return to the historic resources development partnership between farmer cooperatives, public power districts, private enterprise, and the Federal Government. In keeping with this objective, the following two bills were passed:

S. 334: Promotes development of phosphate production on the public domain—Public Law 85–122.

S. 3817: Extends the program of exploration by private industry under contract with the Department of the Interior—Senate agrees to House amendments August 7, 1958.

In this area, it is not so much one of passing legislation as of keeping the administration from undermining existing programs in fields of resources, development, management, and use. The one program which was particularly challenged was one of rural electrification.

We recommended a comprehensive program in the field of atomic energy. Real progress was made in this field by the passage of the following bills:

H. R. 8996: Authorizes $382.6 million program for the Atomic Energy Commission to construct and develop nuclear facilities—Public Law 85–177.

H. R. 13121: Authorizes $386 million for the Atomic Energy Commission's construction, expansion, or acquisition of facilities, including a plutonium plant and civilian power reactors—Public Law 85–590.

H. R. 12716: Provides for the exchange of mutually essential atomic information and materials with our allies—Public Law 85–479.

In the field of veterans' legislation, the following constructive legislation was passed:

H. R. 52: Increases rates of compensation for service-connected disabilities and for dependency allowances—Public Law 85–168.

H. R. 4602: Extends direct home loan and loan guaranty programs for World War II veterans to July 25, 1959; increases maximum of such loans—vetoed.

H. R. 53: Consolidates laws administered by VA—Public Law 85–56.

H. R. 3658: Liberalizes eligibility standards for widows of veterans—Public Law 85–209.

H. R. 358: Increases monthly rates of pensions to widows of the Spanish American, Indian, Mexican, and Civil War veterans—Public Law 85–425.

H. R. 11630: Amends Social Security Act to extend benefits of unemployment compensation to all ex-servicemen—now available only to Korean veterans. Passed by Senate August 18, 1958.

Our program recommended action to make the Congress more effective and to provide for greater efficiency. In keeping with these objectives, the following action was taken.

H. R. 8002: Requires Federal budget estimates, in certain cases, to be submitted on an annual accrued expenditure basis—House agrees to Senate amendments August 14, 1958.

H. R. 6900: Directs the Comptroller General to make investigations to assist Appropriations Committee of Congress in consideration of budget items—reported in House June 13, 1957.

House Concurrent Resolution 175: Recommends 10-point code of ethics for all Government employees and officeholders—adopted.

H. R. 2767: Limits authority of Federal officers and agencies to withhold information and public documents—Public Law 85–619.

S. 2224: Fixes permanent policy of competitive bidding in disposal of surplus property, except on negotiated sales which are specifically provided for under other provisions of law—Public Law 85–486.

H. R. 12575: Created the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to develop a comprehensive program of research and development in aeronautical and space sciences and related matters. Transferred the function of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to the new agency—Public Law 85–568.

S. 3880: Establishes Federal Aviation Agency to regulate air traffic and safety, supplanting the Civil Aeronautics Administration—Senate agrees to conference report August 11, 1958; House agrees to conference report August 13, 1958.

As one who was active more or less as the executive secretary of the group of Democrats who advocated this program and who have worked hard through the two sessions of this Congress to advance the program, I am pleased to report that allowing for the fact that the exact percentage of achievement cannot be fixed, in my opinion a statement that we have accomplished about 90 percent of our program is not unrealistic. This achievement is all the more remarkable as we were operating under a very narrow majority and under the constant threat of Presidential veto.

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, one of the most grievous losses the House will sustain when it reconvenes next January will be that of our colleague from Minnesota, Representative EUGENE J. MCCARTHY.

The simple fact, Mr. Speaker, is that GENE MCCARTHY'S warm human qualities have won him a wide circle of friends who will regret his departure from the House as they lament the absence of his wise counsel and steady hand of leadership.

Mr. Speaker, in a democracy leadership is not thrust upon certain men. The truth is that it can neither be bought, borrowed, or derived by synthetic means. It is an innate quality which some men have, and they earn the title of leader each day anew by their work and wisdom. In my opinion, GENE MCCARTHY has been one of the unsung leaders of the House in recent years.

It was no accident that freshman Members, almost by instinct, found themselves drinking at his well, and enjoying his fountain of wit and distilled wisdom. Those of us who admired GENE MCCARTHY regard his voluntary retirement from the House with the same deep feelings that mark our hope for his advancement to the other body of the United States Congress.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to endorse the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON]. As a veteran of 16 years' service in the House, I have had a chance to observe many of my colleagues. I take this occasion to observe that I consider my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] one of the most valuable Members of the House. He has shown outstanding leadership in formulating a progressive program of legislation and in following through with legislative and floor support of these measures.

Many of us regret that he has decided to leave the House and make the race for a position in the other body of our legislative branch of Government. We believe that the people of Minnesota will reward his outstanding service in the House by electing him to the Senate. We know that his years of service in the House have equipped him in experience for new and broader service. We know that the friends he has made in the House will not only wish him Godspeed but that in the years to come they will remember his work in the House and will cooperate with him in the future for the good of his constituency and the Nation.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I take pride in joining in the tribute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY].

Plato anticipated that the just life would prevail in the state only "when philosophers become kings." We have not yet reached that state, I fear, but happily for the Republic, from time to time philosophers do become Congressmen. To this goodly company the gentleman from Minnesota clearly belongs.

Nor is Representative MCCARTHY just a thinker from the ivory tower. As remarkable as his talent for original thought is his ability to get things done. Others have mentioned his leadership during the 85th Congress in the successful fight for a civil-rights bill and for broadened social security. Equal achievements have been his in the field of foreign policy. At the start of the 85th Congress, some 80 Members on the Democratic side joined in a statement of program of which Representative MCCARTHY was in large part the author. The section of that program relating to foreign policy and national defense is worth recalling:

We favor the maintenance of adequate defense forces and believe that this can best be accomplished by maintaining balance among the three branches of the armed

services. We believe, also, that unless the world situation improves significantly, there should be no reduction of the personnel in the armed services. We will support legislation and appropriations necessary to accomplish these purposes.

We will continue to give strong and consistent support to the United Nations. We urge the administration to work through this agency whenever feasible, not only in the military and diplomatic fields but also in economic and cultural areas. * * * We favor an expanded point 4 program, and we are hopeful that the Eisenhower administration, after 4 years of hesitation and contradiction, will develop and present such a program to the Congress.

We favor the passage of legislation necessary to encourage and facilitate world trade, and we will propose legislation to meet the special problems of United States industries and workers affected by liberalization of trade policy.

We are for statehood for Alaska and for Hawaii.

How has the leadership of Representative McCARTHY responded to this challenge?

The lag and complacency in our military defense has been met head on. Time and again when the administration's request for support for the armed services was inadequate, Congressman McCARTHY took the lead in insisting upon, and getting, a more adequate balance in our Armed Forces.

When the administration attempted to bypass or to operate outside the United Nations, Representative McCARTHY spoke out in constructive criticism. When the administration used the great potential of the United Nations, as in the President's Middle East proposals to the General Assembly last week, he fully supported it.

Representative McCARTHY was among the first to recognize that an imaginative use of the point 4 program could start emerging people on the road toward democracy far better than more grandiose activities. It was largely as a result of his leadership that the administration's inadequate request for technical assistance funds this year was increased by $10 million, and that the increase stuck in both the authorization and the appropriation voted by Congress.

As a member of the House Committee on Ways and Means, Representative McCARTHY led the battle to secure an adequate extension of the reciprocal trade program. But for administration opposition, this extension would have been accompanied, as it should have been, by a program of trade adjustment to cushion the impact of expanding world trade on industries, communities, and workers hurt by increased imports.

This is the record of a man who gets things done. GENE McCARTHY has proved that it is possible to have vision without being a visionary; to espouse sound doctrine without becoming doctrinaire; to be at the same time a thinker and a doer. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join in saluting one of the great leaders of our time.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in the House in expressing my good wishes to the Honorable EUGENE J. McCARTHY, of Minnesota, upon his retirement from the United States Congress.

Congressman McCARTHY has served for 10 years as a Member of Congress and he will be greatly missed not only by the residents of the Fourth District of Minnesota but also by all his colleagues in the House. As a member of the important Ways and Means Committee he demonstrated his ability in the field of tax legislation. He was well qualified for membership on this committee by virtue of his former work as professor of social science and economics and education.

Even though he is retiring from the House of Representatives, EUGENE J. McCARTHY is not retiring from the field of public service. He has chosen to run for the Senate and I am sure I express the sentiment of other Members of the House in wishing for him every success in all his future endeavors.

GRAVE SITUATION IN VENEZUELA

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions, the gentleman from Oregon has professed to have great respect for the judgment of Catholic Church spokesmen in Latin America. He claimed that he welcomed the interest shown by religious leaders in Latin American conditions and developments.

Why, then, does the gentleman from Oregon remain silent about the analysis of Venezuelan conditions given in the official organ of the archdiocese of Caracas, La Religión? Why does he not draw attention to the report, circulated throughout the world by the National Catholic Welfare Conference News Service (August 8, 1958), which emphasizes the grave situation in Venezuela? The editor of the newspaper, La Religión, is Father Jesús Hernández Chappellín, a champion of human freedom, decency, and genuine social progress. The warning sounded by this gifted editor is one that may properly be heeded by the gentleman from Oregon.

The gentleman would also be well advised to study the report of Time magazine—August 11, 1958. Since the gentleman traveled to Venezuela at the expense of the Caracas Newspaper Association, he should know who his friends are. Time reports that "Communists exercise decisive power in the daily press" of Caracas. "A chief Communist weapon is smearing the United States and United States business," it is added.

How does it happen that those responsible for smearing the United States are most prominent in subsidizing travel for a Member of the United States House of Representatives? Would it not be wise for this gentleman, before it is too late, to study the facts? Would he not be well advised to note that Time magazine adds the following illuminating report:

> Newspapers trumpet wild charges, e. g., that the United States military advisory mission is plotting a coup, United States housewives on shopping trips have been heckled with shouts of "Yankee, go home," and on Caracas' new Armed Forces Avenue, crude painted signs urge "death to the imperialistic Yankees."

The gentleman from Oregon boasts about his popularity with these elements. In short, he brags about the hearty welcome he received from a clique in the press that is decisively controlled by Kremlin agents. May it not be taken for granted that the Communists know the type of individual they can manipulate, flatter, court, and exploit for their own ends? More than once in history it has happened that the puppet does not realize that he is being manipulated.

Two facts are now clear: Much of the Venezuelan press is dominated by Marxist-Leninist journalists and by Soviet sympathizers; and the gentleman from Oregon let himself be invited by these so-called reporters and newspaper people, with all expenses paid for himself, his wife, and Mrs. Rosita "Ricky" Bennett. "He who pays the piper calls the tune."

> SITUATION GRAVE—PAPER ATTACKS VENEZUELA CHIEF
>
> CARACAS, VENEZUELA.—The Caracas archdiocesan newspaper, La Religion, has taken sharp issue with the head of Venezuela's provisional government.
>
> The paper charged Adm. Wolfgang Larrazabal, president of the junta which rules the country, with making dangerous declarations which could lead to chaos.
>
> La Religion's editor, Father Jesus Hernandez Chappellin, quoted the junta chief as saying that "there are no revolutionaries in the armed forces. It is the civilian element which * * * plans the conspiracies."
>
> The priest then asked why, if this were true, the government had exiled a dozen top army officers.
>
> In his editorial Father Hernandez described the political situation in Venezuela as grave.
>
> Since the junta came to power following the ouster of the dictator, President Marcos Perez Jimenez, last January, Venezuela has seen a resurgence of Communist activity.

A REPORT TO WEST VIRGINIANS ON MY LEGISLATIVE STEWARDSHIP

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, in the Biblical parable of the pounds, a certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom. Before departing he left his money in the keeping of his servants. Upon his return the nobleman demanded an account of stewardship from those who had received the pounds and we are familiar with the rewards and punishments that were accorded on the basis of the services rendered.

As I approach the end of my 6th year in the House of Representatives I feel it incumbent upon me to give an account of my legislative stewardship.

This will complete my 12th year as a public servant, having been elected twice to the West Virginia House of Delegates and once to the West Virginia Senate before coming here for these 6 years. I do not expect to serve again in the House of Representatives, but I shall always remember the pleasant associations and the warm friendships that have been created here. I consider it an honor to have been chosen by my people to serve in this body and I have done my very best to live up to the trust that has been reposed in me. I have worked diligently and conscientiously, and I can go back to my people knowing full well that I have left nothing undone in my determination to give all that I have possessed in the way of ability, resourcefulness, and energy.

My statement must, of necessity, not be overly long. It will, however, report my position on various subjects and issues in such a way that my people will have a general understanding of the way I have voted and of my philosophy of representative government.

ATTENDANCE ON ROLL AND QUORUM CALLS

I pride myself upon having a good attendance record throughout my 12 years of service to the people of West Virginia. In giving an account of my stewardship of service I feel that it is appropriate for me to report my attendance record throughout all of the years I have been in public office. During my six years in the West Virginia House and Senate, I attended 1,563 of 1,600 roll and quorum calls. In my six years here in the House of Representatives I have attended 862 out of 963 roll and quorum calls. Throughout my 12 years, therefore, I have attended 2,425 of 2,563 rollcalls and quorum calls, an attendance record of 94.6 percent.

EDUCATION

In the field of education I have given my support to Federal aid for school construction so as to eliminate the growing shortage of classrooms. I am firmly convinced that an adequate education of the Nation's youth is absolutely vital to the security of our country. I maintain that there must be local control of the educational system, but, where the States are unable or unwilling to provide proper facilities for the training of our boys and girls, I submit that the Federal Government should take proper steps to see that the need is attended to. When I was a member of my State legislature several years ago I twice had the opportunity to vote for an increase in teachers salaries. My interest in the problems of teachers has continued. It was for this reason that I introduced H. R. 11775 early this year to provide equity to teachers in the deduction of professional training expenses in determining Federal income tax returns, and I am pleased to state that my action and that of others in the Congress contributed to the Treasury Department's issuance of T. D. 6291 effecting equitable tax treatment for teachers. I also authored a scholarship bill somewhat similar to the Elliott bill which I was pleased to support a few days ago on the Floor of the House in an effort to provide advanced educational opportunities for deserving and promising young students in the fields of mathematics, science, and foreign languages.

SMALL BUSINESS

Having been a small-business man myself, I well understand the problems of small business. I am convinced that the problems of small business must be given increased consideration in our scheme of things. I actively worked for removal of the excise tax on theater admissions and other excise taxes such as those on jewelry and communications. I very recently was pleased to speak out in behalf of the Small Business Investment Act. I voted for the measure which would make possible equity capital and long-term loans for small businesses. I have also introduced and supported legislation to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Anti-Price Discrimination Act and the protection which it affords to independent business—H. R. 1840, 1956.

I was active in bringing to the attention of the Congress the unfair excise tax on community antenna TV systems, and I feel that I was partially responsible for relief being given to the 100,000 owners of television sets located in areas where such systems are necessary for good reception.

SOCIAL SECURITY

It was my pleasure, while in the West Virginia House of Delegates in 1949, to support a bill providing for the coverage of officers and employees of the State and local government under the old-age and survivors insurance provisions of Title II of the Federal Social Security Act. I also introduced legislation in that year to increase DPA grants to the aged and needy.

When I first came to Congress in 1953, I introduced legislation to lower the eligibility age, under the old-age and survivors insurance program, to 60 years. I also introduced legislation to provide benefits to individuals who become disabled before reaching the normal retirement age. In each succeeding Congress I have reintroduced legislation to lower the age to 60 years. I have appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee upon different occasions to urge that the eligibility age be lowered, and I have spoken in support of such legislation on the floor of the House. I have fought for increased benefits for social-security recipients, and for the extended coverage of the program. I have supported increased Federal appropriations for the Federal-State matching program dealing with public assistance. I have also supported increased benefits for our retired Federal and railway workers and I have worked hard in behalf of increased salaries for our postal and other Federal employees. Moreover, I have opposed reductions in appropriations for unemployment compensation for Federal employees.

UNEMPLOYMENT

My State has been one of those States hardest hit by unemployment. I have worked to secure protection of domestic industries against unregulated imports of residual oil, glass, and pottery. I have supported legislation to provide for a coal research program, and legislation to aid our distressed areas. In April 1954 I promoted a conference on economic development which was held at Charleston, W. Va., and took with me from Washington to attend the conference representatives of the United States Department of Labor, the Small Business Administration, the United States Department of Commerce, and the United States Chamber of Commerce. Upon that occasion a program was devised to encourage the location and growth of industrial firms in West Virginia, and I presented the suggested program later to the Governor of West Virginia for his consideration. I have introduced legislation to extend payments of unemployment insurance over a longer period, and I was instrumental in January 1954 in urging the Federal Government to release surplus commodities for distribution to needy people in West Virginia. I have urged the Eisenhower administration to take action to relieve unemployment, and I have upon several occasions asked the Defense Department to give consideration to West Virginia in the location of military installations. It was my bill, cosponsored by Senator KILGORE in the other body, which made possible the sale and reactivation of the Institute, W. Va., synthetic rubber producing facility, which today provides employment for many individuals in the Institute area.

Beginning in early 1955 I worked to secure a new Federal building for Charleston, W. Va., and these efforts culminated in the approval of this project by the Congress in 1956.

ROADS

Although road programing, maintenance, and construction are matters which are handled on the State and local levels, coming under the supervision of the State Road Commission, I have been active in securing additional mileage for West Virginia in the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. In 1956 I arranged several conferences with officials in the Federal Bureau of Public Roads and the Department of Defense for the purpose of securing additional mileage for West Virginia in the Interstate System. I also arranged conferences with the Congressional delegations of States adjoining West Virginia in an effort to solicit their support for a north-south highway traversing West Virginia. These efforts in 1956 and continuing in 1957 contributed to the decision by the Federal Bureau of Public Roads, United States Department of Commerce, to allocate approximately 150 to 160 additional miles to West Virginia in the Interstate System. As a result, a north-south route generally following U. S. 21 in West Virginia has become a part of the Federal System.

I have also supported authorization and appropriation measures in the Congress to expand Federal highway programs.

VETERANS

I have supported legislation beneficial to veterans and their families. When I was a member of the West Virginia Legislature in 1949 I supported a resolution for submission to the voters of a $90 million veterans' bonus amendment.

Among the bills of interest to veterans which I have supported in Congress are these:

First. H. R. 9020—1954—to provide increases in the monthly rates of compensation payments to certain veterans and their dependents.

Second. H. R. 9888—1954—a bill to extend the period during which education and training benefits could be granted to certain veterans.

Third. H. R. 7886—1956—to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of, disability pension awards.

Fourth. H. R. 12038—1956—to provide increases in service-connected disability compensation and to increase dependency allowances.

Fifth. H. R. 12900, a bill which I introduced to provide pensions for widows and children of veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict on the same basis as pensions are provided for widows and children of World War I veterans.

Sixth. H. R. 11077—1958—a bill to grant a Federal charter of incorporation to Veterans of World War I.

I have opposed efforts to reduce appropriations for the Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights and I have recently objected to the cutbacks in VA hospital services. I am pleased to report that I have gone before committees and spoken on the House floor in behalf of veterans upon several occasions.

FARM LEGISLATION

I have been glad time and time again, during my service in the State legislature and in the Congress, to support legislation beneficial to our farming population. I voted for H. R. 8780 in 1956 to relieve farmers from the payment of excise taxes on gasoline and special fuels used on the farm for farming purposes. Only recently I addressed the House on thc subject of legislation to encourage construction of modern wholesale marketing facilities. Such facilities would have made possible increased sales of agricultural products and would have narrowed the spread between the price the farmer gets and the price the housewife pays for perishable agricultural products. My State of West Virginia has many small farms and, although my own Congressional District does not possess a large farming population, I have tried to be cognizant of the needs and problems of West Virginia farmers.

CONSERVATION AND FLOOD PREVENTION

I have vigorously objected to strip mining in our national forests and I have supported all appropriations for conservation of our soil, forest, and water resources. I have opposed cuts in appropriations for soil conservation and forest fire prevention, and I have consistently sought to secure adequate flood prevention projects for my own District. During the 1957 spring floods I visited the flooded areas in Logan, W. Va., in the company of Col. H. J. Skidmore, Huntington District Corps of Engineers, and I immediately introduced a resolution to authorize a study by the United States Army Engineers of the Guyandot River Basin. I later attended the hearings conducted by the Engineers in Logan and I have kept in close touch with subsequent developments. I was successful in securing in the House an appropriation of moneys to carry out this survey. I have also appeared before committees to urge appropriations of moneys for the Sutton and Summersville Dams, both of which projects would favorably affect my own District and provide employment.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

I have consistently supported appropriations for national defense, and I have urged that there be adequate appropriations for scientific research and for nuclear bomb shelters. I have maintained that we must evolve processes for the practical production of oil from coal or shale, and I have ardently supported any and all programs dedicated to our Nation's military preparedness. I have also advocated strong, decisive leadership in world affairs believing as I do that without firm, effective national leadership no preparedness program can be successful.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

As a Member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have been keenly interested in world problems and have participated in study missions in 29 foreign countries. I have steadfastly opposed admission of Red China to the United Nations. I have spoken out in opposition to summit conferences believing as I do that they have only been used for propaganda purposes by the leaders of Soviet Russia. I have advocated stronger ties with countries that have demonstrated their ability and intention to stand with us against the common enemy. I have supported NATO and the U. N., and I voted to share atomic secrets with our allies. I supported House Joint Resolution 159 in 1955, a resolution authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States to protect the security of Formosa and the Pescadores, and I supported House Resolution 123 in 1957, the resolution proclaiming the Eisenhower Middle East doctrine. I have supported an expanded Voice of America program and within the past week I voted for the resolution pertaining to a U. N. emergency police force.

I have supported the mutual-security appropriations over the years. I voted against the foreign-aid bill this year as a protest against the maladministration of the program. I am of the opinion that a foreign-aid program cannot be successfully substituted for a foreign policy. There must first be a realistic foreign policy to provide the framework within which a foreign-aid program can be effectively utilized. A foreign-aid program that is well planned and efficiently executed is one thing; a foreign-aid program that is ill conceived and poorly administered is quite another matter. I maintain that we should only assist countries which have shown the determination to assist us when the chips are down. We presently are participating in foreign-aid projects in more than 70 countries throughout the world. We should take a new look and scale down this monstrous program to fit the pattern of needs. I am for spending a dollar where it will be in the best interests of our own country so to do, but I am opposed to promiscuously scattering American tax dollars all over the world without any indication, in many instances, of their ever being returned or ever being utilized, even in an indirect way, for the security of the United States. I maintain that the program should be reduced rather than expanded. My vote was also a protest of the continued combination of economic assistance and military assistance in the same bill. The two should be brought before the Congress in separate legislative packages.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, I have recently conducted hearings on matters dealing with Latin America. The violent demonstrations that were conducted against the Vice President during a recent visit to Latin America substantiated my previously expressed views that our relationships with our sister republics have been deteriorating. Convinced as I am that America has fewer friends today than ever before, I have consistently demanded that we formulate a realistic and effective foreign policy and that we depend less and less upon American dollars, in the form of foreign aid, to procure friends.

CORRESPONDENCE

I am proud of the reputation that I have made for rendering personal attention to the correspondence received in my Congressional office. In my 6 years here, no letter has been received in my office from a West Virginian that has not been personally read by me. Moreover, I have read all letters going out of my office in reply to correspondence. This has required a tremendous amount of time on my part, but I have always felt that as a Member of the House I should give my personal attention to the personal problems of my constituents. No problem has been too unimportant to receive my attention and no correspondent, however old or young, however great or small, has ever found me inattentive to his or her correspondence. I have accorded the same interest to the correspondence of the schoolchild as I have accorded to the correspondence of the executive. I have spent many laborious hours in trying to be of service to my constituents in their personal problems and I have attempted at all times to be courteous, sympathetic, and understanding.

GENERAL

I have sought to maintain close contact with the people I represent. I have spoken at scores of reunions, homecomings, church gatherings, business meetings, and youth assemblies, and I have visited the homes of hundreds of my constituents and talked with them about their problems. I have at all times welcomed the expressions of opinions and views of my people, having sent out questionnaires upon more than one occasion in an effort to determine the sentiments of West Virginians. My purpose in Washington has been to serve, and my life while here has been completely dedicated to the fulfillment of that purpose. I have given no time to recreation or to vacationing in my 12 years of public service. I do not feel

that one can give as I have given indefinitely without rest, but to this point I have given unstintingly of my time and my strength in the service of my people. Hours that I would like to have been with my family I have given to my official duties. Moreover, I have endeavored to improve my educational status by attending school at night in order that I might be a more capable representative and a more able servant. These things I have done gladly because I have been proud of the great confidence and faith which my people have repeatedly shown in me. I have at all times sought to conduct myself in a manner becoming to the high offices I have held.

Mr. Speaker, this is a brief account of my stewardship. I have tried to be faithful to the public trust. I have no regrets.

THIS CONGRESS HAS DONE MORE FOR SMALL BUSINESS THAN ANY CONGRESS IN HISTORY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe this Congress has done more for small business than any Congress in history.

Certainly, this Congress has taken the initiative in finding out what the problems of small business are, and it has designed and enacted several important measures which will go a long way toward solving these problems. Let me summarize the seven new small-business measures which have been enacted in this Congress:

First. Public Law 85–699—The Small Business Investment Act of 1958: This is a revolutionary forward step which has been taken to help small-business concerns obtain, for the first time, the kind of financing they most need—that is, equity capital and long-term debt capital.

Second. Public Law 85–866—The Technical Amendments Act of 1958: This gives small business a variety of tax benefits and removes a half dozen unnecessary hardships which the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 imposed on small firms.

Third. Section 58 of Public Law 85–866—Antitrust Damages Act: This reduces taxes on damages collected for injuries under the antitrust laws, and strengthens antitrust law enforcement through private suits.

Fourth. Public Law 85–909—Amendments to the Packers and Stockyards Act: This closes a loophole in the antitrust laws by which big retail food chains and others escaped application of these laws.

Fifth. Public Law 85–536—The new Small Business Act: This gives the Small Business Administration bigger and better authorities for helping small business, and it gives small business, for the first time, a permanent agency in the Government.

Sixth. Public Law 85–800: This revises all of the laws governing Federal procurement and contracting methods, so as to make it easier for small firms to obtain Government contracts and easier for small firms to finance work on Government contracts.

Seventh. Public Law 85–475—Repeal of the 3-percent tax on freight shipped by common carrier: This reduces the marketing costs of goods shipped by common carrier and removes a competitive advantage which was enjoyed by big corporations operating their own trucking systems.

These seven new laws make up no small body of legislative achievement. And I believe that no one appreciates that fact any more than I do. The small-business problems and handicaps which these new laws help to remove are matters on which I have firsthand knowledge. They are matters which have been investigated and studied by the Select Committee on Small Business, of which I have been privileged to be the chairman in each Democratic Congress since our distinguished Speaker, Hon. SAM RAYBURN, first appointed this committee back in 1941. In fact, the Democratic majority of our Small Business Committee had specifically recommended six of these legislative steps and called them to the attention of the Congress and the country, although these steps do not go as far in some instances as we recommended.

I know, therefore, that the legislation which this Congress has passed deals with serious, practical problems facing the 4 million small-business concerns of this country, and it deals with these problems in a practical way. These measures are not legislative shadowboxing with imaginary problems.

Why were these seven new laws passed? What are the small-business problems which they were designed to meet? How are they important to small business?

HELPING SMALL FIRMS OBTAIN CAPITAL

First and foremost, I believe that the new Small Business Investment Act will prove to be one of the most important steps that Congress has ever taken to preserve free and independent enterprise.

Without doubt, one of the most serious handicaps to small-business concerns has been their inability to obtain capital. This is a problem which has been growing more and more acute. There was a time perhaps when small-business people could draw on the personal savings of their families and immediate friends for sufficient capital. But each year the amount of capital required to start and to operate an efficient business firm has been increasing. More machinery, more equipment, and more labor-saving devices of all kinds are necessary to meet competitive costs and to give efficient service.

This means that if small firms are to survive, some way had to be found whereby they can obtain capital, on an impersonal basis, just as the big corporations obtain their capital on an impersonal basis through the centralized stock and bond markets. Small firms cannot go to these markets. The costs of going to Wall Street for the amount of capital which a small firm needs, or going to any of the other big stock and bond markets, simply put these sources of capital beyond the reach of the small firm.

This, then, is the problem which the Small Business Investment Act is designed to meet. And this is the first time that there has been any Federal legislation, or any Federal program, that has attempted to help out with this problem. There have been numbers of Federal lending programs, yes. And these have been very helpful to small business, as well as financially successful from the standpoint of the Government. But these lending programs have not come to grips with the real problem, which is not the problem of obtaining commercial credit or bank-type loans, but the problem of obtaining equity capital and long-term debt capital.

BANK CREDIT IS NOT ENOUGH

This is the point which has been hard to put across: There is all the difference in the world between risk capital and loans of the kind which the local banks can make. A lot of people have thought that financing small business is a job which the local banks can take care of. But I believe that the investigations which our Small Business Committee made into this whole subject of small-business financing, and the hearings which we held, have now shown what the real problem is.

The fact is, the local banks can and do provide many essential services to small business. The local banks can and do make low-risk loans on a short-term basis to the extent that they have funds, and such loans meet a requirement of both small firms and big firms for credit to finance inventories, accounts receivable, and current operating costs and to meet all kinds of temporary needs.

But the funds which the commercial banks have to operate on are almost all depositors' funds. More than that, these funds are mostly demand deposits, which the depositors expect to be able to draw out at any moment. Commercial banks cannot, therefore, be expected to supply risk capital or make long-term loans. The representative of the American Bankers Association who testified before our committee put it this way:

> The banks, as this committee knows, are not set up, they are not capitalized, they are not organized for the purpose of providing equity capital, and they are certainly not organized for the purpose of providing long-term loans.

The question is, then, where can small firms go for capital? The big corporations raise equity capital through the stock markets, and they obtain long-term debt capital by issuing bonds and notes which they can sell to the insurance companies, the big banks, and the investment trusts. The small firm cannot go to these sources.

Furthermore, the big corporations can and do obtain a large percentage of whatever new capital they may need for expansion and modernization by, in effect, taxing the general public. It would be hard to count the numbers of times we have seen announcements over

the past 5 or 6 years that one big-business industry or another was raising prices because, they said, they needed more money to build new plants or buy equipment to expand capacity. Small-business concerns cannot raise capital in this way.

HELPING PRIVATE ENTERPRISE HELP ITSELF

The new Small Business Investment Act is not just another Government "loan" program. It is a way to help private enterprise help itself. Unlike the previous Government loan programs, this program is designed to encourage private enterprise to come in and do the job of financing small business. It is designed to encourage privately owned and operated investment companies to come in and fill the vacuum which now exists. The Government will help these new investment companies to get started, yes, and in a quite substantial way. To form one of these investment companies there must be at least 10 stockholders and they must raise at least $150,000 of private capital. With this they may then obtain another $150,000 of Government funds on a long-term basis. And they may then use this $300,000 of capital to invest in the stocks of small-business concerns, or to make long-term loans to them. Furthermore, the small-business concerns will acquire stock in the investment companies, so eventually the small-business people in each locality will own all or a substantial share of their local investment company, even if they do not start the company and own it from the beginning.

Is this a new socialistic enterprise? No, absolutely not. The new small-business investment companies will be set up to make profits for their stockholders. The new tax benefits which this Congress passed for small business include specific benefits to help these small-business investment companies become profitable and attractive to private investors. In fact, it is hoped that this program will be so profitable that private capital will eventually pay back all the Government funds and put the Government out of the picture completely.

HELPING SMALL BUSINESS HELP THE COUNTRY

Furthermore, the legislation has been designed so that redtape and Government interference will be at a minimum, even from the beginning. Small-business concerns obtaining financing through this program need have no dealings with the Government whatever. They will go directly to the local investment companies. If the local investment company thinks the small firm is a good risk or offers a good investment, it will invest in that concern or make it a loan; and if it does not think a small-business concern is a good proposition, it will not put money into that concern. In every case, the small-business investment company will be backing its judgments with a substantial portion of private money. But the local investment company will have money to loan and to invest, and it will be looking for good investment opportunities—that will be its business, and its only business.

So we will now have in this country exactly what small firms need—not a Government subsidy, but a chance to obtain capital on the basis of their own merits.

If this new program succeeds, as I believe it will, then it will solve one of the great weaknesses in our capitalistic system. The capitalistic system is, of course, the greatest system on earth. And we are determined that it will outlast and outperform all other systems.

Certainly, then, we could not afford to do nothing about the situation which has been growing up, where the small business—the kind of business that has been the strength and the source of competition in our capitalistic system—is denied access to the capital on which our system must operate.

If the new legislation succeeds, it will solve a chronic problem, not just a problem that arises when our Government is squeezing bank credit to make money tight. Yet it will also help small business avoid some of the disastrous consequences of a renewed credit squeeze—which now seems to be commencing—provided, of course, that SBA allows the new program to get under way promptly and vigorously. When small firms are better capitalized, they are not so easily pushed into bankruptcy by having their bank credit reduced or cut off, as great numbers were in the credit squeeze of 1953 and, again, in the prolonged squeeze of 1955 through 1957.

If the new legislation succeeds to the extent it should, then there will be a prosperous growth of small businesses all over this country. Local communities will not need to depend entirely on the great industrial and financial centers for prosperity. They will have more and stronger local businesses, more prosperous local merchants, and more prosperous local banks. People who wish to leave the farms, or are forced to leave the farm, will have more jobs to go to and more opportunities to start their own businesses. There will also be more jobs and more business opportunities and fewer unemployed people in the industrial centers. In short, there should be more productive activity and more prosperity for the whole Nation. I believe that in passing the Small Business Investment Act, this Congress has passed one of the most important small-business measures ever enacted.

HELPING SMALL BUSINESS WITH THE TAX BURDEN

Another important measure passed by this Congress—the Technical Amendments Act—removes a great many of the unnecessary hardships which have been imposed on small business by the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. And in other ways this act provides tax benefits for small business which will make small firms more attractive to private investors and make it easier for small firms to finance purchases of new machinery and equipment.

Small corporations with no more than 10 stockholders may elect to be excused from paying the corporate income tax; small firms—both incorporated and unincorporated—are allowed a speedup depreciation whereby they may write off 20 percent of the cost of new machinery and equipment in the first year; investors in small concerns who suffer a loss on their investments may take an ordinary-loss deduction rather than a capital-loss deduction; small concerns that suffer net operating losses may now carry these losses back and deduct them from income received in the 3 preceding years, instead of only the 2 preceding years; estate taxes may be postponed and paid in 10 annual installments where an estate consists largely of an interest in a closely held business; and finally, dividend payments which the new small-business investment companies receive from stock in small-business concerns are made 100-percent tax exempt. All of these measures are good.

The tax bill enacted by this Congress does not make all of the changes in the Federal tax laws which the Democrats on our Small Business Committee have recommended. It does not provide for a general reduction in small-business taxes and thus it will not make an equalization of the tax burden which should be made. I have reason to believe, however, that the bill which was finally enacted by this Congress contains the most benefits for small business that the administration could be persuaded to accept, and the most benefits which could have been put into a bill without having it vetoed by the President. Even so, the progress which has been made in this bill is good. It will help many small firms in substantial ways.

HELPING SMALL BUSINESS ENFORCE THE ANTITRUST LAWS

Effective antitrust laws and effective enforcement of the antitrust laws are essentials for small business. Without effective enforcement, the best of laws are, of course, of little use. Probably the most effective deterrent to violations of the antitrust laws has been that these laws have provided an incentive for private enforcement through private suits. Specifically, there is a provision which allows anyone who is injured by a violation of an antitrust law to sue and collect three times the amount of damages he has sustained. This incentive for small-business people who are injured by violations of these laws to bring private suits provides an important safeguard against the possibility that enforcement might be completely frustrated by political influence in the Federal enforcement agencies.

To encourage people who have been victimized by antitrust violations to bring suit, a real incentive is needed. People who start such a suit must risk heavy legal costs, a great deal of time, and possibly the ill will of some big corporation; and they must weigh all of this against the chances that the suit will be lost, or that the damages they collect will not be worth the cost and trouble. Winning a private antitrust suit is not an easy matter. To collect damages, the small-business man must not only prove to the court that the antitrust law has been violated, but he must prove the amount of the damages he has sustained, and, of course, he must prove that the violation was the cause of his damages.

Up until a few years ago the possibility of collecting three times the damages offered an effective incentive for bringing private suits. Under the practice of the Internal Revenue Service, only one-third of the money collected was subject

to Federal taxes. In other words, the man who had been damaged paid the tax on what his income would have been if he had not been damaged.

The Internal Revenue Service changed this practice, however, and was upheld in the change by a decision of the Supreme Court in 1955. Since that time the ruling has been that anyone winning an antitrust damage suit must pay Federal income taxes on the entire amount collected. And, what is more, the ruling has been that such damages must be treated as income received in the single year when they are collected, and taxes must be computed accordingly. This has meant, as a usual thing, that taxes would wipe out most of the damages which the small-business man might collect. And the result has been to discourage the bringing of private damage suits. This has been a great blow to private antitrust enforcement. It has discouraged private enforcement at a time when public enforcement was probably most needed to be supplemented by private enforcement.

Furthermore, the ruling that the damages must be treated as income in a single year has seemed most unfair and illogical. Everyone familiar with antitrust suits knows that the small-business man who has been injured by some illegal practice has not been a victim of that practice for just 1 year, but usually for many years. It is not unusual that the small-business man has been victimized over a period of 10 years, or even 20 years.

In section 58 of the Technical Amendments Act, this Congress has restored much of the incentive for bringing private antitrust suits. Specifically, the new law provides that damages collected need not be treated, for Federal tax purposes, as income received in just 1 year. They may now be treated as income received over the entire period when the injury is shown to have been sustained. This new incentive is not quite as much as was recommended by our Small Business Committee—or, at least, by the Democratic members of our Small Business Committee—but it is an important victory for small business. It is an important victory for the public, generally. It will result in better compliance with the antitrust laws.

HELPING SMALL BUSINESS BY CLOSING AN ANTITRUST LOOPHOLE

When this Congress amended the Packers and Stockyards Act, it took the initiative in closing a loophole in the antitrust laws which may well save many thousands of small-business firms from quick and unjust destruction.

In testimony before our Small Business Committee, small-business people operating grocery stores, dairy stores, and other types of businesses complained that they were being victimized by illegal price discriminations, and, according to an interpretation which had been made of the Packers and Stockyards Act, the big corporations that were carrying on these discriminations were beyond the reach of the antitrust enforcement agencies. Specifically, under the Packers and Stockyards Act, corporations engaged in the slaughter or meatpacking business are under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture for enforcement of the special laws pertaining to the livestock and meatpacking industries. And on this fact the law had been interpreted as exempting corporations from antitrust enforcement by the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission on the ground that some part of the corporation's business is in meatpacking, or that it owns some interest in a meatpacking firm. Small-business people called our committee's attention to a case where one national retail grocery chain had escaped enforcement of the Robinson-Patman Act by the Federal Trade Commission merely because it had purchased a few shares of stock in one of the big meatpacking companies. This meant that this national chain could make or receive illegal price discriminations on canned fruits and vegetables, dairy products, cereals, bread, soap, and the hundreds of other items that retail food stores sell, now including cosmetics and many drugstore items.

This meant also that this national chain and any other corporation owning stock in a meatpacking company could violate any of the other antitrust laws without fear of interference from the Federal antitrust agencies.

This Congress has closed that loophole and restored the protection of the antitrust laws to independent grocers, druggists, dairy firms, and other small businesses.

HELPING SMALL BUSINESS OBTAIN TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND INCREASED CREDIT

This Congress has strengthened the Small Business Act and made it a permanent statute. The Small Business Administration has been given increased authority and several new authorities to help small business.

The maximum loan which the SBA can make has been raised from $250,000 to $350,000; and the highest interest rate which the SBA can charge a small firm has been cut from 6 to 5½ percent.

And by no means the least in importance, SBA has been given a new authority for assisting and counseling small firms in the vital matters of obtaining up-to-date technical know-how and obtaining access to new inventions. The new Small Business Act gives SBA not only the authority, but a Congressional mandate to obtain for small business a proportionate share of the billions of dollars which the Federal agencies are handing out each year to encourage research and development. Furthermore, it has been given the authority and the duty to obtain for small firms access to the new inventions and the new industrial techniques being developed under Government financing, principally by the big corporations. The SBA is now required to assist small firms to pool their resources in establishing laboratories and other research facilities to participate in Government research and development contracts. And, if the SBA carries out the new law, it will catalog the new industrial inventions and techniques developed by other companies under Federal grants, then make these inventions and techniques known to small firms and assist them in obtaining the use of these inventions and techniques.

Finally, small business now has a permanent agency of the Government charged with duty of specializing in its problems and working for its welfare. By making the Small Business Administration a permanent agency of the Government, this Congress has, to a degree, given to small business the recognition that was long ago given to labor, to agriculture, to big business and to other economic groups.

HELPING SMALL BUSINESS OBTAIN GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

In passing Public Law 85–800—which revises all of the laws governing Federal purchasing and contracting methods—this Congress has taken a long step forward to help small firms obtain a better share of Government business. This is no small matter.

Indeed, the huge expenditures and contracts being made by the Department of Defense and the other Federal agencies account for a large percentage of all the production in this country. And the tendency of the Federal agencies to do business with the big corporations to the exclusion of small firms has long been a most serious matter.

To make it easier for the Government agencies to place contracts with small firms, the amount of a contract which can be placed without going through the advertised, competitive bid procedure has been raised from $1,000 (in some agencies $500) to $2,500. This will eliminate for many small firms the red-tape and all the expenses involved in going through the competitive bid procedure. And it will also eliminate, in these instances, the necessity for small firms to make deposits, along with their bids, in the form of certified checks.

And what is equally important, this legislation gives the Federal agencies permanent and clear authority to make advance payments and progress payments on Government work, so they can assist small firms in financing the Government contracts which they succeed in obtaining.

These things will not force the Government agencies to place more contracts with small firms; but at least they will make it easier for these agencies to place contracts with them and make it easier for small firms to finance these contracts.

REMOVING THE DISCRIMINATORY FREIGHT TAX

When this Congress passed the bill repealing the 3-percent tax on freight shipped by common carrier, it took the initiative in removing another important discrimination against small business. This discrimination worked in subtle ways, but was far-reaching in its consequences. Early last year our Small Business Committee made a report—at least the Democratic members of our committee made a report—in which we pointed out that the real effect of this tax was to raise the marketing costs of goods shipped by common carrier. Small manufacturers, who must usually ship this way, had to meet this added cost. For the most part, small distributors and small merchants—who usually

receive their goods by common carrier—were burdened with an increase in the cost of their supplies. Many of the big corporations, on the other hand, operate their own private trucking or other transportation systems, and their goods were not taxed. The practical consequence of the tax was, then, an unreasonable advantage enjoyed by firms large enough to have their own transportation systems, or large enough to receive supplies shipped over these private systems.

So, by repealing this tax, this Congress has removed one other unfair advantage to big business. It has made another important contribution toward restoring equality of opportunity for all business.

HELPING SMALL BUSINESS THROUGH SMALL-BUSINESS COMMITTEES

So much for the small-business legislation passed by this Congress. It is most impressive, and it will be most helpful to small business.

Beyond the things we can point to in the new laws that have been passed, there have also been, I think, many important contributions to small business in the investigations, the hearings, the reports, and the other work of our Small Business Committee. If this is true, then the credit is due to many Members of the House of Representatives, not just to the members of our committee. The House established our committee and provided the funds for its operations, and in many ways many Members of the House have contributed to our work. In our investigations and reports we have tried to discover and point out any general failures on the part of the administrative agencies which tend to injure small business, or to favor big business at the expense of a fair chance for small firms. We have had occasions, particularly, to bring to the attention of the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission instances where small firms are being injured or discriminated against by what appeared to be violations of the antimonopoly laws.

To give an example, I can point to our investigation of the dairy industry. According to the facts we brought to light, hundreds and thousands of local dairy firms across the Nation are being victimized by local price wars, below-cost selling, and other predatory practices being carried on by a few great corporations controlling nationwide chains of local dairies. And as the independent companies have been driven to the wall, they have been bought up by and merged into these nationwide chains. It was not difficult to imagine that, within a very short time, all of the local distribution business in dairy products of the whole Nation might be owned and controlled by 2 or 3 nationwide corporations. From the facts we unearthed and publicized, it appeared that the Department of Justice was remiss in enforcing the antitrust laws. However, shortly after our investigation brought this matter to light, this Department started grand jury proceedings. The question of whether the antitrust laws are being violated will now be determined; and if there are violations, they will presumably be restrained. This investigation, it is true, has resulted in no new legislation, but it may result in better enforcement of the laws already on the books.

THE DARK YEARS FOR SMALL BUSINESS

Now I do not suggest that the work of this Congress has solved all of the problems of small business, or that it has restored anything like full equality of opportunity for small business. It has not. There is much work yet to be done, and it is imperative, it seems to me, that the next Congress push this work with all the promptness and vigor that it can command. As for the things which this Congress has achieved for small business, I think we can fairly say that they are only important steps in the right direction, and that the future for small business has been made considerably brighter than it was when this Congress first met.

When this Congress first met, we had every reason to despair for any future for small business in this country. Small business had then just gone through several dark years.

During the years of this administration's highly advertised business boom, the profits of the giant corporations skyrocketed. These giant corporations raised prices, built new plants, new warehouses, and new retail outlets at a record pace, and they bought up and merged smaller firms at an equal pace. And, as big business prospered and expanded, small-business failures skyrocketed.

The number of small firms forced into bankruptcy increased month by month, and year by year, at a record-breaking pace. The fever of corporate mergers raged even to the point that the Wall Street financial journals expressed alarm. Thousands upon thousands of small- and medium-sized corporations were bought up, at bargain prices, and assimilated into the great corporate collectives that were blossoming with Republican prosperity.

At the beginning of this Congress our Small Business Committee made a thoughtful report in which we reviewed these trends and pointed out some of their causes. We looked at the rate of small-business failures, the rate of corporate mergers, and the rate of big-business expansion. We concluded—as we had to—that if these trends continued unchecked, the last small-business firm would disappear in a matter of 18 years. In brief, the rate at which a few giant $100 million corporations had increased their control over business in the previous 5 years suggested that only firms of this size would remain after 18 years.

Many things had happened and were happening.

BIG-BUSINESS CONTROL OF THE ANTITRUST LAWS

Our antitrust laws had fallen into almost complete disuse. In fact, we found that under the new administration one of the antitrust agencies, the Federal Trade Commission, had trained its big guns of antitrust on the very small business firms, letting the corporate giants go unguarded and uninhibited in the merry ways of building monopoly. The other antitrust agency, the Department of Justice, had taken to the practice of settling antitrust suits by consent decrees. These decrees mean that antitrust law violators promise to mend their ways. And these decrees, whatever the worth of their promises, denied the people who had been injured an opportunity to sue and recover damages.

Those parts of the antitrust laws which were especially designed to protect small business—such as the anti-discrimination law—had fallen into especially bad favor with the big-business administration. There was a period when the antitrust officials were openly suggesting that these laws no longer existed—or existed in name only—because of certain court decisions they could point to. So intense was the interest in reinterpreting the antitrust laws that the Attorney General of the United States set up a large committee, mostly of big-business lobbyists, to write a report which was to instruct the Federal courts in the new ways of interpreting the antitrust laws.

Then Attorney General Brownell directed a copy of this report to every Federal judge in the country, setting the first precedent in history when an Attorney General has been bold enough to lobby the courts. And that is not all. This Attorney General lent the great prestige of his office to a massive public-relations campaign to dignify that report and persuade the Federal judges that what the lobbyists had written was really a bible of antitrust law. Certainly neither this breakdown in antitrust enforcement nor this massive sabotage of the antitrust statutes promised anything good for small business.

BIG-BUSINESS CONTROL OF DEFENSE CONTRACTS AND RESEARCH GRANTS

In the Government procurement agencies—those agencies whose purchases and contracts account for a large percentage of American production—the treatment of small firms was no better. As soon as this administration had taken office the Department of Defense promptly installed a trickle-down system for small business. It had invented some fancy new names, such as the "Weapons System Concept," to describe a deliberate policy of shifting defense contracts to the big corporations. The proper place for small firms in defense production, according to the new theory, was knocking at the doors of big business asking for handouts of subcontracts. What happened, of course, was that the big corporations that got the prime contracts quite naturally skimmed the cream off the business. They farmed out subcontracts only in periods when their own plants were overloaded, they built new plants to handle the more profitable operations, and they subcontracted only low-profit work and work of a kind which had little commercial or military future. And, as the big manufacturers fattened on defense contracts, they used their surplus profits to branch out into the distribution fields, buying up strings of wholesale and retail outlets and building new outlets of their own.

Research and development of new products and industrial processes also became an enlarged item of Government expense. By 1957, the Department of Defense alone was granting $3 billion a year to private firms to subsidize research

and development of all kinds, and 96 percent of this money was going to big business. Financing private research and development in this disproportionate way would be bad enough under any circumstance. But add to this the fact that the Government allows private firms to patent and control the patents on developments made at Government expense, and we have a sure-fire system for concentrating the competitive strength of the Nation into a few giant corporations.

BIG-BUSINESS REWRITE OF THE TAX LAWS

And so, too, in the field of taxes small business was looking down the muzzle of the one cannon which is universally powerful to destroy. The Republican-controlled Congress of 1953–54 had completely overhauled the Federal tax laws—at the administration's request—and had loaded these laws with all kinds of business "incentives," which turned out to be big-business favoritism and double burdens on small business. The entire Internal Revenue Code was rewritten and rigged with so many big-business loopholes and favoritisms that we are not sure that we have found them all yet.

The excess-profits tax had been repealed—with much shouting that this would help small business—when only the big corporations were making excess profits. And removing this tax meant that the industries having the power to raise prices—the big-business industries—were given an incentive to raise prices, so as to take more excess profits which they could now keep. The splurge of big-business price increases that followed brought about, indirectly, the great credit squeeze which proved to be the almost fatal blow to small business.

LETTING "MONETARY CONTROLS" RUN THE GOVERNMENT

In our splendid capitalistic system all business firms operate on credit. Without credit business firms, big or small, cannot do business. And the policies of this administration were as sure to squeeze small business out of the credit picture as night is sure to follow day.

The administration had from the outset been firmly rooted to the idea of letting "monetary controls" run the Government. It had reached pretty far back in history for the idea. In fact, to find anything like a practical application of the idea, the clock had to be turned back to a 19th-century theory of the British Government. But by dusting off this idea and giving it an up-to-date public-relations treatment, it was made to seem a plausible solution to this administration's conflicting promises and ambitions. What were the promises?

First of all, this administration promised to "free" business of all kinds of controls and Government interferences. And, of course, this was a promise the big-business leaders meant to keep. Yet they promised with equal vigor that they would maintain a sound dollar and allow no inflation to occur under this administration.

Had some miracle come to pass so that both promises panned out, this would have been because big business flatly refused to raise prices after demanding and getting every incentive for raising prices.

But "monetary controls" seemed to offer a happy solution for everybody—everybody, that is, of great wealth. "Monetary controls" meant—first of all—higher interest rates. The administration's first action was to raise the interest rates and thus give the big bankers and money lenders a bigger share of the national income. As best I can estimate, the American people will pay $10 billion more in interest charges this year, 1958, than they paid in 1952.

But "monetary controls" were to be the cure-all for everything, big business was "freed" of all Government interferences—even interferences from antitrust laws.

Finally, "monetary controls" meant that the Government could go out and play golf and not worry about spending and taxes, reducing the national debt, or anything else.

Yes, "monetary controls" were going to offer an easy way of getting around all the hard problems of Government. All that was needed, according to this happy theory, was to raise interest rates a little here and a little there, to squeeze the credit supply at some times and loosen it at other times. These activities would, of course, run the prices of Government bonds up and down. But the big bankers and speculators had no objection to that.

BIG-BUSINESS INFLATION AND THE SMALL-BUSINESS CREDIT SQUEEZE

The promised miracle did not, however, come to pass. Instead of maintaining a sound dollar, "monetary controls" brought about increased prices. And, as would have been expected by anybody not lost in a 19th century dream world, these policies brought about increased prices even at a time when demand was falling and supplies were increasing.

Raising interest rates added increased costs on to the big-business industries, which raised prices and passed the cost increases on to consumers. And while they were about it, these industries began raising prices for the further purpose of fattening their profits. So, after having been stable for the last 18 months of the Truman administration, prices were on their way up again. The only answer to this, according to the administration's "monetary-controls" theory, was to make money tight by squeezing bank credit.

Putting a stop to increases in the money supply at a time when the volume of business and the need for money were increasing might not have proved so disastrous for small business if the matter had stopped there. Had only normal demands for bank credit continued, there would have been a sufficient supply to take care of most of the small-business needs. But the Treasury under Secretary Humphrey was busy raising interest rates on Government bonds and other securities, so corporate bond rates went up, with the result that the big corporations postponed much of their financing in the bond market, demanding more and more temporary credit from the commercial banks. And being the banks' biggest depositors and most influential customers, the big corporations got the bank credit, leaving the small firms to go without, or to struggle on much reduced amounts.

We now have the exact story of what the tight-money policies did to small business. We have the story in statistics compiled by the Federal Reserve System itself.

These Federal Reserve statistics show that between October 1955 and October 1957—the period when credit was made progressively tighter—the amount of bank credit extended to the smallest firms actually decreased. These were the firms having less than $50,000 of assets. In contrast, the amount of bank credit extended to firms having more than $100 million of assets increased by 66 percent. Furthermore, these Federal Reserve statistics show, as might be expected, that what happened all along the line was that the bigger the firm, the bigger its increase in bank credit.

Yet, in this 2-year period the volume of business in the Nation had expanded, prices had increased, and all classes of business firms needed more, not less credit.

At one time the big-money managers argued that the big corporations were getting the lion's share of the bank credit, only because it was the big-business industries that were making large expansions, and credit was merely going where it was needed. But when the Federal Reserve finally made its survey, its figures showed that big firms' getting the credit was not an industry matter at all. On the contrary, these figures on an industry-by-industry basis showed the same story for each industry: the biggest firms in the industry had gotten terrific increases in credit during the tight-money period, and the smallest firms in the industry had gotten less credit.

Have the effects of the tight-money policies now been wiped out? No; the results are still with us in many ways.

One result has been that many of those small firms that managed to survive the credit squeeze lost their independence. When small retailers and distributors could not get credit from their banks, they were forced to turn to the big manufacturers for credit. And many of those lucky enough to obtain credit from these big suppliers now find that new patterns have been established, their dependence continues, old suppliers who could not furnish credit have gone out of business, and they are tied to the big suppliers in many ways. This is partly the reason there are now 18,000 fewer manufacturing firms in the country than there were at the end of 1952. The smaller manufacturers who could not obtain enough credit to supply distributors and retailers lost their distributor and retailer outlets.

BIG-BUSINESS FAVORITISM MUST BE REPLACED WITH EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY

No, the policies of this administration have not been kind to small busi-

ness. They were not kind to small business in the period of the big-business boom, and they have not been kind to small business since the recession was finally precipitated in the fall of 1957.

It would be too much to review all of the ways in which the executive and regulatory agencies have functioned under this administration to favor big business at the expense of small-business competitors and distributors. It is enough to say that their many regulations and programs and their big business executives in key Government positions have not even shown an understanding of the problems of small business.

No one can say that the health of small business today is all that it ought to be. None of us can really think that all has been done which must be done to remove unfair hardships and bring about competitive equality for all business. I sincerely hope, as I know many of the Members do, that the next Congress will continue to improve upon the progress which this Congress has made. Certainly, we must know that this is vital to the welfare of the whole Nation—and vital to our political freedoms.

HON. SAM RAYBURN

Mr. ARENDS assumed the chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARENDS). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the fact that this has been one of the most tempestuous, most controversial, and most exhausting sessions in many years, I want to pay my tribute to the splendid manner in which our good Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], has presided over the House. He is a great parliamentarian. He has presided with fairness and with justice and in keeping with the dignity of this great House of Representatives as he always does. SAM RAYBURN is a great American. He is a good and valued friend.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that we all wish you a happy return to your Texas home, to the great wide open spaces, and that you will have a well earned rest. I know I express the hope of us all, on both sides of the aisle, that you will return next year well rested from your heavy labors and in fine physical condition.

May I also express my personal appreciation for the fine courtesies that have been so often extended to me by our friends on the Democratic side of the House. I appreciate their courtesies and their friendship.

I also want to express my deep appreciation to my own colleagues on this side of the House who have loyally supported me in my efforts through the years. It has been a comfort and a satisfaction to know always that I have so many loyal colleagues trying to sustain and to assist me in the duties I have to perform.

So, as we all go back to our homes and try to get a little rest, may I extend to all of you my best personal wishes for a very pleasant fall and a well earned respite from the arduous duties you have been performing so ably during this long session which is about to adjourn.

Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 699) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Resolved, That the thanks of the House are presented to the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives, for the able, impartial, and dignified manner in which he has presided over the deliberations and performed the arduous duties of the Chair during the present term of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that the resolution was agreed to unanimously, which is as it should be.

The Speaker resumed the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Mr. MARTIN and my colleagues in the House of Representatives, on both sides of the aisle:

I want to say to you that I shall never cease to hold in grateful memory the fine courtesies of which I have been the recipient at your hands. Your unfailing courtesy and your fine friendships have made a position that at best is both arduous and onerous more tolerable than it would otherwise have been.

I think you have heard me say many times that I love the House of Representatives. It has been most of my life, to have occupied the position which has been occupied, vice versa, by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

I want to say that there has never been an unpleasant moment between us. We have always had a definite understanding each with the other. When you have an understanding with JOE MARTIN you can go on and forget it, because there is not any element in his makeup that makes for deception or for deceit. The friendship that has grown up between him and me over the long years is one of the things that I shall cherish as long as life is in my body.

For the courtesies, let me repeat, of all of you, I shall to my last day be in your deep debt, be grateful to you. And in the moments that we wait for the other body to complete its work, as we have ours, let me say to you that I hope you will enjoy a deserved holiday.

I think this has been the hardest working session of Congress I have ever served in, with the possible exception of the first 100 days of the first session of the first Roosevelt administration, when so much was done. We on both sides of the aisle have made a record that we can take before our constituents and be proud of, because we have done our duty, in my opinion, to the very hilt.

And so I wish each and every one of you a happy holiday and that you may return here refreshed and more vigorous than most of us are at the moment.

The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 50 minutes a. m.), Sunday, August 24, 1958, the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 1 o'clock and 58 minutes a. m.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE APPOINTED TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, your committee appointed to join a committee of the Senate to inform the President that the Congress is ready to adjourn, and to ask him if he has any further communications to make to the Congress, has performed that duty. The President has directed us to say that he has no further communication to make to the Congress. And, Mr. Speaker, the President requests that your committee extend his best wishes to "Mr. SAM."

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 123. Concurrent resolution that the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Sunday, August 24, 1958, sine die.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13192) entitled "An act making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that a committee of two Senators have been appointed by the Presiding Officer to join a similar committee of the House of Representatives to notify the President of the United States that the two Houses have completed the business of the session and are ready to adjourn unless he has some further communication to make to them.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer had appointed the Senator from Georgia, Mr. TALMADGE, as an additional member of the Congressional delegation previously announced to attend the Fourth Annual North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentary Conference, which will be held in Paris from November 17 to November 22.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

The Speaker laid before the House the following Senate Concurrent Resolution (S. Con. Res. 123):

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Sunday,

August 24, 1958, and that when they adjourn on said day, they stand adjourned sine die.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BROOMFIELD (at the request of Mr. MARTIN) indefinitely, on account of official business.

Mr. KITCHIN for Monday, August 25, 1958, on account of request by chairman of Armed Services Committee to represent him at ceremonies in New York City for crew of *Nautilus*.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. TABER and to include two tables prepared by him.

Mr. KEATING.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin and to include a table.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 109. An act to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans, U. S. A., National Memorial, Inc.;

H. R. 469. An act to protect producers and consumers against misbranding and false advertising of the fiber content of textile fiber products, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1061. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments to settle certain claims for damage to, or loss of, property or personal injury or death, not cognizable under any other laws;

H. R. 1494. An act for the relief of the Southwest Research Institute;

H. R. 1684. An act for the relief of William Franklin Rollins;

H. R. 1695. An act for the relief of Harry N. Duff;

H. R. 3366. An act to validate overpayments of pay and allowances made to certain officers of the Army, Navy, Naval Reserve, and Air Force, while undergoing training at civilian hospitals, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3368. An act to amend section 1870 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the district courts to allow additional peremptory challenges in civil cases to multiple plaintiffs as well as mutlipel defendants;

H. R. 3571. An act for the relief of Boris F. Navratil;

H. R. 4073. An act for the relief of Peter James O'Brien;

H. R. 4642. An act to establish a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure;

H. R. 6282. An act for the relief of the former shareholders and debenture note holders of the Goshen Veneer Co., an Indiana corporation;

H. R. 7710. An act to provide for the lump-sum payment of all accumulated and current accrued annual leave of deceased employees;

H. R. 7860. An act to amend section 1 of the act of July 24, 1956 (70 Stat. 625), entitled "To provide that payments be made to certain members of the Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe of Indians as reimbursement for damages suffered as the result of the establishment of the Pine Ridge aerial gunnery range";

H. R. 8943. An act to amend titles 10, 14, and 32, United States Code, to codify recent military law, and to improve the code;

H. R. 9258. An act for the relief of Mrs. Minnie Perreira;

H. R. 9262. An act for the relief of the estate of A. A. Alexander;

H. R. 9370. An act to permit illustrations and films of United States and foreign obligations and securities under certain circumstances, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9700. An act to consolidate into one act all of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9817. An act relating to venue in tax refund suits by corporations;

H. R. 9950. An act for the relief of D. A. Whitaker and others;

H. R. 10473. An act for the relief of Hipolito C. DeBaca;

H. R. 10495. An act to amend that part of the act of June 9, 1896 (29 Stat. 313), relating to the establishment of postal stations and branch post offices, so as to permit them to be established within 10 miles of the boundary of the adjoining city;

H. R. 11668. An act to amend section 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, as amended;

H. R. 11889. An act to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Minnesota State Fair and Centennial Exposition to be held at Saint Paul, Minn., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12126. An act to provide further protection against the introduction and dissemination of livestock diseases, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12226. An act to amend the Virgin Islands Corporation Act (63 Stat. 350), and for other purposes;

H. R. 12808. An act to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 and 1958 by advancing the date for submission of the revised estimate of cost of computing the Interstate System and to extend the approval of such estimate for an additional year;

H. R. 12858. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13247. An act to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs; and for other purposes;

H. R. 13450. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13475. An act to authorize an exchange of lands at the Rochester Fish-Cultural Station, Indiana;

H. R. 13580. An act to increase the public debt limit;

H. R. 13678. An act to provide in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for a loan service of captioned films for the deaf;

H. R. 13861. An act to repeal certain provisions of law relating to messengers for the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives;

H. J. Res. 635. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 648. Joint resolution providing for a joint session of Congress for commemorating the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. In accordance with the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 123, the Chair declares the 2d session of the 85th Congress adjourned sine die.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock a. m., Sunday, August 24, 1958) the House adjourned sine die.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

2258. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Financial Management), transmitting a report of all claims for damage caused by naval vessels which have been paid during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, pursuant to section 7624 (b) of title 10, United States Code, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 49. A bill to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union; with amendment (Rept. No. 2700). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York: Committee of conference. H. R. 12226. A bill to amend the Virgin Islands Corporation Act (63 Stat. 350), and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2701). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WALTER: Committee of conference. H. R. 11477. A bill to amend chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for the admission of certain evidence, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2702). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LANE: Committee of conference. H. R. 4059. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Carmen Scoppettuolo (Rept. No. 2703). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. PASSMAN: Committee of conference. H. R. 13192. A bill making appropriations for Mutual Security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2704). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL (by request):

H. R. 13867. A bill to define the status of retired officers of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 13868. A bill to amend section 1332 of title 10 of the United States Code to permit the transfer on a limited basis of points

earned in 1 year to other years; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 13869. A bill to provide for the representation of indigent defendants in criminal cases in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. R. 13870. A bill to amend section 7 of the act of August 18, 1941, to provide that 75 percent of all moneys derived by the United States from certain recreational activities in connection with lands acquired for flood control and other purposes shall be paid to the State; to validate certain payment; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 13871. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 13872. A bill to provide pension for widows and children of veterans of World War II and of the Korean conflict on the same basis as pension is provided for widows and children of veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 13873. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that amounts expended to acquire subsurface coal to protect the taxpayer's residence from damage by removal of the coal shall be treated as casualty losses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 13874. A bill to provide for assistance to States in their efforts to promote, establish, and maintain safe workplaces and practices in industry, thereby reducing human suffering and financial loss and increasing production through safeguarding available manpower; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 13875. A bill to increase the monthly rates of pension payable to widows and children of World War I, World War II, and Korean conflict veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. Con. Res. 381. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States in its international relations should maintain its traditional policy in opposition to colonialism and Communist imperialism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting that the Organic Act of Guam be amended so as to provide that the legislature may override with finality, the veto of the Governor of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII:

Mr. COLLIER introduced a bill (H. R. 13876) for the relief of Mutsuko Miyaji, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

736. Mr. ROBISON of New York: Petition of Harold C. Bryant and others favoring passage of S. 582 and H. R. 4635; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

737. By Mr. MOULDER: Petition of the Missouri Department of the Veterans of World War I, U. S. A., Inc., urging passage of H. R. 2201; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

APPOINTMENTS AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85–614, and the order of the House of August 23, 1958, empowering him to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House, did, on August 25, 1958, appoint as members of the Hudson-Champlain Celebration Commission the following Members on the part of the House:

Mr. CELLER, of New York.
Mr. HOLTZMAN, of New York.
Mr. TAYLOR, of New York.
Mr. KEATING, of New York.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to a special order agreed to on August 23, 1958, the Clerk of the House, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the Congress, received a message from the Senate informing the House that the Senate had passed a bill and a concurrent resolution of the following titles:

H. R. 13191. An act to require the Commissioner of Education to encourage, foster, and assist in the establishment of clubs for boys and girls especially interested in science.

H. Con. Res. 226. Designating the seven-day period beginning March 16, 1958, as "National Library Week."

BILS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS ENROLLED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that on August 25, 1958, that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1803. An act for the relief of Mrs. Boyd Dinehart and Richard Reams;

H. R. 3193. An act for the relief of Toley's Charter Boats, Inc., Toley Engebretsen, and Harvey Homlar;

H. R. 4059. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Carmen Scoppettuolo;

H. R. 7544. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever," approved February 28, 1929, by including therein the name of Roger P. Ames;

H. R. 8759. An act for the relief of W. G. Holloman and Mrs. W. G. Holloman;

H. R. 9020. An act to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11382. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to authorize the conversion or exchange, under certain conditions, of term insurance issued under section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11456. An act to authorize the exchange of certain real property heretofore conveyed to the city of El Paso, Tex., by the United States, for other real property of equal value, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11749. An act to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 6 months, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12212. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Department of the Navy;

H. R. 12281. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide an administrative site for Yosemite National Park, Calif., on lands adjacent to the park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13191. An act to require the Commissioner of Education to encourage, foster, and assist in the establishment of clubs for boys and girls especially interested in science;

H. R. 13192. An act making appropriations for Mutual Security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13254. An act to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the use in food of additives which have not been adequately tested to establish their safety;

H. R. 13666. An act to amend title 32 of the United States Code to permit the appointment of the Adjutant General of Puerto Rico as provided by the laws of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;

H. R. 13840. An act to encourage expansion of teaching in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies;

H. R. 13489. An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13856. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 546. Joint resolution designating the week of November 21–27, 1958, as National Farm-City Week;

H. J. Res. 658. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to invite the countries of the Free World to participate in the California International Trade Fair and Industrial Exposition to be held in Los Angeles, Calif., from April 1 to 12, 1959;

H. J. Res. 675. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 704. Establishing that the first session of the 86th Congress convene at noon on Wednesday, January 7, 1959.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the authority granted the Speaker by Senate Concurrent Resolution 122, 85th Congress, he did on August 25, 1958, sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House as follows:

H. R. 1803. An act for the relief of Mrs. Boyd Dinehart and Richard Reams;

H. R. 3193. An act for the relief of Toley's Charter Boats, Inc., Toley Engebretsen, and Harvey Homlar;

H. R. 4059. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Carmen Scoppettuolo;

H. R. 7544. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever," approved February 28, 1929, by including therein the name of Roger P. Ames;

H. R. 8759. An act for the relief of W. G. Holloman and Mrs. W. G. Holloman;

H. R. 9020. An act to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11382. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to authorize the conversion or exchange, under certain conditions, of term insurance issued under section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11456. An act to authorize the exchange of certain real property heretofore conveyed to the city of El Paso, Tex., by the United States, for other real property of equal value, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11749. An act to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 6 months, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12212. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Department of the Navy;

H. R. 12281. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide an administrative site for Yosemite National Park, Calif., on lands adjacent to the park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13191. An act to require the Commissioner of Education to encourage, foster, and assist in the establishment of clubs for boys and girls especially interested in science;

H. R. 13192. An act making appropriations for Mutual Security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13254. An act to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the use in food of additives which have not been adequately tested to establish their safety;

H. R. 13489. An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13666. An act to amend title 32 of the United States Code to permit the appointment of the Adjutant General of Puerto Rico as provided by the laws of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;

H. R. 13840. An act to encourage expansion of teaching in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies;

H. R. 13856. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 546. Joint resolution designating the week of November 21–27, 1958, as National Farm-City Week;

H. J. Res. 658. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to invite the countries of the Free World to participate in the California International Trade Fair and Industrial Exposition to be held in Los Angeles, Calif., from April 1 to 12, 1959;

H. J. Res. 675. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 704. Joint resolution establishing that the 1st session of the 86th Congress convene at noon on Wednesday, January 7, 1959.

And enrolled bills of the Senate as follows:

S. 25. An act relating to effective dates of increases in compensation granted to wage board employees;

S. 165. An act for the relief of Arthur LeRoy Brown;

S. 1438. An act to amend section 544 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the bonds of the United States marshals;

S. 1764. An act to amend the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act;

S. 1864. An act to authorize an increase in the membership of the Board of Appeals of the Patent Office; to provide increased salaries for certain officers and employees of the Patent Office; and for other purposes;

S. 1903. An act to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, relating to travel expenses of civilian officers and employees assigned to duty posts outside the continental United States;

S. 1985. An act to authorize the preparation of plans and specifications for the construction of a building for a National Air Museum for the Smithsonian Institution, and all other work incidental thereto;

S. 2006. An act to relieve the Surgeons General of the Army and Navy of certain responsibilities outside the Department of Defense;

S. 2020. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and the Social Security Act;

S. 2039. An act to clarify the requirements with respect to the performance of labor imposed as a condition for the holding of mining claims on Federal lands pending the issuance of patents therefor;

S. 2114. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), as amended, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to acquire land for filed sites, to undertake construction and improvement of buildings and for other activities;

S. 2117. An act directing the Secretary of the Army to transfer certain buildings to the Crow Creek Sioux Indian Tribe;

S. 2146. An act for the relief of William P. Peltier;

S. 2469. An act for the relief of Dr. Brant Bonner;

S. 2719. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and eradicate the predatory dogfish sharks to control the depredations of this species on the fisheries of the Pacific coast, and for other purposes;

S. 2836. An act for the relief of the town of Portsmouth, R. I.;

S. 3028. An act for the relief of Laszlo Cseri, Margarethe Hadjisky, Maria Miceli, and Francesco Riso;

S. 3142. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to extend the authority to lease out Federal building sites until needed for construction purposes and the act of June 24, 1948 (62 Stat. 644), and for other purposes;

S. 3295. An act to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 in order to increase the authorization for the fisheries loan fund established under such act;

S. 3321. An act for the relief of George E. Ketchum;

S. 3335. An act to provide for a National Cultural Center which will be constructed with funds raised by voluntary contributions, on a site made available in the District of Columbia;

S. 3379. An act to provide for adjustments in the annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system;

S. 3420. An act to extend and amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954;

S. 3503. An act for the relief of Marie Inette Konomos;

S. 3680. An act to provide for participation of the United States in the World Science-Pan Pacific Exposition to be held at Seattle, Wash., in 1961, and for other purposes;

S. 3683. An act to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas;

S. 3712. An act to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of the Rama Road in Nicaragua;

S. 3728. An act to incorporate the Big Brothers of America;

S. 3741. An act to facilitate administration and management by the Secretary of Agriculture of certain lands of the United States within national forests;

S. 3754. An act to provide for the exchange of lands between the United States and the Navaho Tribe, and for other purposes;

S. 3915. An act for the relief of Chiyoko Yoshimoto;

S. 3942. An act for the relief of certain distressed aliens;

S. 3944. An act to authorize the negotiation of a compact between the State of Minnesota and the Province of Manitoba, Canada, for the development of a highway to provide access to the northwest angle in such State;

S. 4032. An act for the relief of Mercede Svaldi.

S. 4039. An act to authorize the expenditure of funds through grants for support of scientific research, and for other purposes;

S. 4085. An act to amend the act of May 17, 1954 (68 Stat. 98), providing for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of old St. Louis, Mo., and for other purposes;

S. 4088. An act to approve a repayment contract negotiated with the Heart Mountain Irrigation District, Wyoming, and to authorize its execution;

S. 4096. An act to amend section 4201 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the annual rate of compensation of members of the Board of Parole;

S. 4113. An act for the relief of Harold Pangelinan; and

S. 4214. An act for the relief of Mary P. C. Leute, the widow of Joseph Henry Leute.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the Congress, reported that, on the following dates, that committee had presented to the President for his approval bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On August 23, 1958:

H. R. 7720. An act for the relief of Viola Belger;

H. R. 8381. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to correct unintended benefits and hardships and to make technical amendments, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9147. An act to provide for the disposal of certain Federal property in the Boulder City area, to provide assistance in the establishment of a municipality incorporated under the laws of Nevada, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11009. An act to provide for the establishment of Grand Portage National Monument in the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12207. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Alto Ross and children and for E. B. Ard and his daughter, Mrs. Joan Ard Nichols;

H. R. 12216. An act to designate the dam and reservoir to be constructed on the Cumberland River near Carthage, Tennessee, as the "Cordell Hull Dam and Reservoir" and to establish the United States Study Commission on the Neches, Trinity, Brazos, Colorado, Guadalupe-San Antonio, Nueces, and San Jacinto River Basins, and intervening areas;

H. R. 12303. An act to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands;

H. R. 12670. An act to provide for additional payments to the Indians of the Crow Creek Sioux Reservation, S. Dak., whose lands have been acquired for the Fort Randall Dam and Reservoir project, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12883. An act to provide for certain improvements relating to the Capitol Power Plant and its distribution systems;

H. R. 13549. An act to increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve the actuarial status of the trust funds of such system, and otherwise improve such system; to amend the public assistance and maternal and child health and welfare provisions of the Social Security Act and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 653. Resolution for the relief of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 659. Resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

On August 25, 1958:

H. R. 109. An act to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans, U. S. A., National Memorial, Inc.;

H. R. 469. An act to protect producers and consumers against misbranding and false advertising of the fiber content of textile fiber products, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1061. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments to settle certain claims for damage to, or loss of, property or personal injury or death, not cognizable under any other law;

H. R. 1494. An act for the relief of the Southwest Research Institute;

H. R. 1684. An act for the relief of William Franklin Rollins;

H. R. 1695. An act for the relief of Harry N. Duff;

H. R. 3366. An act to validate overpayments of pay and allowances made to certain officers of the Army, Navy, Naval Reserve, and Air Force, while undergoing training at civilian hospitals, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3368. An act to amend section 1870 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the district courts to allow additional peremptory challenges in civil cases to multiple plaintiffs as well as multiple defendants;

H. R. 3571. An act for the relief of Boris P. Navratil;

H. R. 4073. An act for the relief of Peter James O'Brien;

H. R. 4642. An act to establish a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure;

H. R. 6282. An act for the relief of the former shareholders and debenture noteholders of the Goshen Veneer Co., an Indiana corporation;

H. R. 7710. An act to provide for the lump-sum payment of all accumulated and current accrued annual leave of deceased employees;

H. R. 7860. An act to amend section 1 of the act of July 24, 1956 (70 Stat. 625), entitled "To provide that payments be made to certain members of the Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe of Indians as reimbursement for damages suffered as the result of the establishment of the Pine Ridge aerial gunnery range;

H. R. 8943. An act to amend titles 10, 14, and 32, United States Code, to codify recent military law, and to improve the code;

H. R. 9258. An act for the relief of Mrs. Minnie Perreira;

H. R. 9262. An act for the relief of the estate of A. A. Alexander;

H. R. 9370. An act to permit illustrations and films of United States and foreign obligations and securities under certain circumstances, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9817, An act relating to venue in tax refund suits by corporations.

H. R. 9950. An act for the relief of D. A. Whitaker and others;

H. R. 10473. An act for the relief of Hipolito C. DeBacn;

H. R. 10495. An act to amend that part of the act of June 9, 1896 (29 Stat. 313), relating to the establishment of postal stations and branch post offices, so as to permit them to be established within 10 miles of the boundary of the adjoining city;

H. R. 11668. An act to amend section 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, as amended;

H. R. 11889. An act to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Minnesota State Fair and Centennial Exposition to be held at St. Paul, Minn., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12126. An act to provide further protection against the introduction and dissemination of livestock diseases, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12226. An act to amend the Virgin Corporation Act (63 Stat. 350), and for other purposes;

H. R. 12808. An act to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Acts of 1956 and 1958 by advancing the date for submission of the revised estimate of cost of completing the Interstate System and to extend the approval of such estimate for an additional year;

H. R. 12858. An act taking appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13247. An act to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs; and for other purposes;

H. R. 13450. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13475. An act to authorize an exchange of lands at the Rochester Fish-Cultural Station, Indiana;

H. R. 13580. An act to increase the public debt limit;

H. R. 13678. An act to provide in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for a loan service of captioned films for the deaf;

H. R. 13861. An act to repeal certain provisions of law relating to messengers for the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives;

H. J. Res. 635. Resolution for the relief of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 648. Resolution providing for a joint session of Congress for commemorating the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

On August 26, 1958:

H. R. 1803. An act for the relief of Mrs. Boyd Dinehart and Richard Reams;

H. R. 3193. An act for the relief of Toley's Charter Boats, Inc., Toley Engelbretsen, and Harvey Homlar;

H. R. 4059. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Carmen Scoppettuolo;

H. R. 7544. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever," approved February 28, 1929, by including therein the name of Roger P. Ames;

H. R. 8759. An act for the relief of W. G. Hollomon and Mrs. W. G. Hollomon;

H. R. 9020. An act to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9700. An act to consolidate into one act all of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11382. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to authorize the conversion or exchange, under certain conditions, of term insurance issued under section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11456. An act to authorize the exchange of certain real property heretofore conveyed to the city of El Paso, Tex., by the United States, for other real property of equal value, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11749. An act to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 6 months, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12212. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Department of the Navy;

H. R. 12281. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide an administrative site for Yosemite National Park, Calif., on lands adjacent to the park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13191. An act to require the Commissioner of Education to encourage, foster, and assist in the establishment of clubs for boys and girls especially trained in science;

H. R. 13192. An act making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13254. An act to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the use in food of additives which have not been adequately tested to establish their safety;

H. R. 13489. An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13666. An act to amend title 32 of the United States Code to permit the appointment of the Adjutant General of Puerto Rico as provided by the laws of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;

H. R. 13840. An act to encourage expansion of teaching in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies;

H. R. 13856. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 546. Resolution designating the week of November 21–27, 1958, as National Farm-City Week;

H. J. Res. 656. Resolution authorizing and requesting the President to invite the countries of the Free World to participate in the California International Trade Fair and Industrial Exposition, to be held in Los Angeles, Calif., from April 1 to 12, 1959;

H. J. Res. 675. Resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 704. Resolution establishing that the first session of the 86th Congress convene at noon on Wednesday, January 7, 1959.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the Congress, notified the Clerk of the House that, on the following dates, he had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On August 20, 1958:

H. R. 1293. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Stefano;

H. R. 1691. An act for the relief of Margherita Conca;

H. R. 2319. An act for the relief of Mrs. Louise Nanton;

H. R. 2747. An act for the relief of John H. Parker;

H. R. 6667. An act for the relief of Maria Fierro Calogero;

H. R. 7004. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the dutiable status of handles, wholly or in chief value of wood, imported to be used in the manufacture of paint rollers;

H. R. 7282. An act for the relief of Iwan Okopny;

H. R. 7306. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide that notice of an action with respect to real property pending before a United States district

court must be recorded in certain instances in order to provide constructive notice of such action;

H. R. 7564. An act to provide that the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii shall meet annually, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9232. An act to amend Public Law 481, 84th Congress (70 Stat. 104);

H. R. 9304. An act to amend section 12 of the act approved September 1, 1916, as amended;

H. R. 10139. An act for the relief of Wallace Y. Daniels;

H. R. 11357. An act for the relief of Miss Terez Csencsits;

H. R. 11800. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey a certain parcel of land and buildings thereon to the city of Clifton, N. J.

H. R. 11954. An act to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act and Public Laws 640 and 643 of the 83d Congress, as amended, relating to general obligation bonds of the Territory of Hawaii.

H. R. 12569. An act to amend section 31 of the Organic Act of Guam, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12591. An act to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12903. An act for the relief of Wolfgang Stresemann;

H. R. 13015. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13378. An act to facilitate the naturalization of adopted children and spouses of certain United States citizens performing religious duties abroad;

H. J. Res. 721. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the several States to negotiate and enter into compacts for the purpose of promoting highway traffic safety;

H. J. Res. 619. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 627. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 660. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens.

On August 21, 1958:

H. R. 781. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to make retired pay for nonregular service available to certain persons who performed active duty during the Korean conflict;

H. R. 2759. An act for the relief of Josephine Shelby;

H. R. 3778. An act to amend the act of May 29, 1930, with respect to the stream valley parks in Maryland;

H. R. 5104. An act to preserve Gloria Dei (Old Swedes') Church national historic site by authorizing the acquisition of abutting properties, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6353. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margarete Briest, nee Eggers;

H. R. 6357. An act for the relief of Albert Guido;

H. R. 7124. An act for the relief of Lester R. Loomis;

H. R. 7149. An act to provide for the periodic transfer to the Hawaiian home-development fund of certain excess funds in the Hawaiian home administration account;

H. R. 7403. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain land for the Deshler-Morris House, Independence National Historical Park;

H. R. 7793. An act for the relief of Bernardine M. A. de la Motte;

H. R. 7826. An act for the relief of Israel Baird Poskanzer;

H. R. 8476. An act to amend the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, to extend the period of tax exemption of original lessees from 5 to 7 years;

H. R. 8482. An act to authorize the Commissioner of Public Lands of the Territory of Hawaii to exchange certain public lands for private lands of equal value required for public highway purposes;

H. R. 8673. An act to amend section 69 of the Hawaiian Organic Act;

H. R. 9419. An act to authorize and direct the transfer and conveyance of certain property in the Virgin Islands to the government of the Virgin Islands;

H. R. 9461. An act to amend the joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, as amended by the act of August 23, 1954, to permit the granting of patents in fee simple to certain occupiers of public lands;

H. R. 9501. An act to approve joint resolution 28 enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii in the regular session of 1957, relating to the conditions and terms of right of purchase leases;

H. R. 9502. An act to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended;

H. R. 9543. An act to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act relating to the transfer of title of ceded land by the President;

H. R. 9721. An act to amend section 1482 of title 10 of the United States Code to provide for the payment of transportation expenses of certain survivors of deceased servicemen to attend group burials in national cemeteries;

H. R. 12060. An act for the relief of Michael J. Conlin;

H. R. 12224. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to acreage allotments for peanuts;

H. R. 12840. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938;

H. R. 12944. An act for the relief of Mrs. Kunigunde Beldie;

H. R. 13170. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for a permanent professor of physical education at the United States Military Academy;

H. R. 13371. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make certain payments out of the vessel operations revolving fund;

H. R. 13374. An act to provide for the retention of deferment or exemption upon change of membership in a Reserve component, Army National Guard or Air National Guard; and

H. R. 13451. An act to amend section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes.

On August 22, 1958:

H. R. 12738. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

On August 23, 1958:

H. R. 13. An act to amend sections 323, 331, 334, 335, 336, 337, 363, and 376 of, and to add a new section to, the Bankruptcy Act approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto;

H. R. 1168. An act to clarify the application of section 507 of the Classification Act of 1949 with respect to the preservation of the rates of basic compensation of certain officers or employees in cases involving downgrading actions;

H. R. 2592. An act for the relief of Lucy Rolandone;

H. R. 3140. An act for the relief of Erika Gorenstein Nathanson;

H. R. 3820. An act to amend sections 490 and 645 of title 14, United States Code, relative to the settlement of claims of military and civilian personnel of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4635. An act to provide for settlement and entry of public lands in Alaska containing coal, oil, or gas under section 10 of the act of May 14, 1898, as amended;

H. R. 4804. An act for the relief of Newington School District, New Hampshire;

H. R. 6701. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Tennessee River Basin water-pollution-control compact;

H. R. 7260. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, section 3651, so as to permit confinement in jail-type institutions or treatment institutions for a period not exceeding 6 months, in connection with the grant of probation on a one-count indictment;

H. R. 7330. An act for the relief of Demetrius Daskalakis;

H. R. 7725. An act for the relief of Shizuko Sese Sheveland;

H. R. 7779. An act to authorize free transit at the Panama Canal for vessels operated by State nautical schools;

H. R. 8407. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret N. Meister;

H. R. 8478. An act amending the Hawaiian Home Commission Act to permit the establishment of a post office on Hawaiian homelands, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8905. An act for the relief of Hubert D. Thatcher, Robert R. Redston, Andrew E. Johnson, William L. Barber, Alex Kamoff, and William S. Denisewich;

H. R. 9022. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretaries of the military departments to settle certain claims in the amount of $5,000, or less, and to partially pay certain claims which are certified to Congress;

H. R. 9783. An act for the relief of Mrs. Henry Oscar (Olga McCurdy) Ramsey;

H. R. 10515. An act for the relief of Harley D. Rucker;

H. R. 11123. An act providing for the extension of certain authorized functions of the Secretary of the Interior to areas other than the United States, its Territories, and possessions;

H. R. 11236. An act for the relief of Arthur G. Williams;

H. R. 13021. An act to amend section 41 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to provide a system of safety rules, regulations, and safety inspection and training, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13151. An act for the relief of Everett A. Ross;

H. R. 13455. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended;

H. J. Res. 595. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 620. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 636. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 652. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens.

On August 25, 1958:

H. R. 4142. An act to amend the act creating the City of Clinton Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near Clinton, Iowa, and at or near Fulton, Ill., in order to make certain changes in the authority of such commission, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6382. An act to subject naval ship construction to the act of June 30, 1936 (49 Stat. 2036), as amended;

H. R. 7866. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, relating to the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals;

H. R. 8002. An act to provide for improved methods of stating budget estimates and estimates for deficiency and supplemental appropriations;

H. R. 9627. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in Alaska to the city of Ketchikan, Alaska;

H. R. 9673. An act to restore retired pay to those retired officers of the Armed Forces

dropped from the rolls after December 31, 1954, and before the date of enactment of this act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9740. An act to convey certain land to the Makah Tribe of Indians;

H. R. 10173. An act to provide for the transfer of title to certain land at Sand Island, T. H., to the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11133. An act to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for the payment of travel and transportation cost for persons selected for appointment to certain positions in the continental United States and Alaska, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12967. An act to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 with respect to the frequency of review of minimum-wage rates established for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands;

H. R. 13404. An act to amend section 404 (c) (1) of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 to grant longevity credit for service performed in the Panama Canal Zone postal service; and

H. J. Res. 424. Joint resolution to improve the administration of justice by authorizing the Judicial Conference of the United States to establish institutes and joint councils on sentencing, to provide additional methods of sentencing, and for other purposes.

On August 26, 1958:

H. R. 1329. An act for the relief of Massman-Patti-Tanner and Mitchell;

H. R. 2062. An act for the relief of John F. Smith;

H. R. 2338. An act for the relief of the Security Feed & Seed Co.;

H. R. 3904. An act for the relief of Nunik Firjanian and Florence Thomasi;

H. R. 6589. An act for the relief of Elizabeth C. Garner and Charles P. Garner;

H. R. 7198. An act for the relief of Col. Russell King Alspach;

H. R. 8134. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Department of the Air Force, Mobile Air Materiel Area;

H. R. 8732. An act for the relief of Ella H. Natafalusy;

H. R. 8868. An act to remove the present $1,000 limitation which prevents the settlement of certain claims arising out of the crash of an aircraft belonging to the United States at Worcester, Mass., on July 18, 1957;

H. R. 9160. An act for the relief of Genoveva Rioseco Caswell;

H. R. 9197. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sumpter Smith;

H. R. 9851. An act for the relief of Tsuyako Ikeda;

H. R. 12204. An act for the relief of Peter A. Beklemishev, Michael Linden, and Serge Oulassuk;

H. R. 12256. An act for the relief of Alphonse E. Jakubauskas;

H. R. 12942. An act for the relief of Walter H. Berry;

H. R. 13558. An act to incorporate the Military Order of the Purple Heart of the United States of America, of combat wounded veterans who have been awarded the Purple Heart; and

H. J. Res. 634. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens.

On August 27, 1958:

H. R. 1244. An act to provide for the development by the Secretary of the Interior of Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1633. An act for the relief of Jane Froman, Gypsy Markoff, and Jean Rosen;

H. R. 3630. An act to amend the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 to provide that an additional aid and attendance allowance of $150 per month shall be paid to certain severely service-connected disabled veterans during periods in which they are not hospitalized at Government expense;

H. R. 5351. An act for the relief of Harlee M. Hansley;

H. R. 6448. An act for the relief of Cathryn A. Glesener;

H. R. 7570. An act to amend section 403 of the Social Security Amendments of 1954 to provide social security coverage for certain employees of tax-exempt organizations which erroneously but in good faith failed to file the required waiver certificate in time to provide such coverage;

H. R. 8308. An act to establish the use of humane methods of slaughter of livestock as a policy of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8599. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to provide that the exception from "wages" made by section 209 (i) of such act shall not be applicable to payments to employees of a State or a political subdivision thereof for periods of absence from work on account of sickness;

H. R. 8606. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to annuities of survivors of employees who are elected as Members of Congress;

H. R. 8688. An act for the relief of Monroe Woolley;

H. R. 10360. An act to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended;

H. R. 10733. An act for the relief of Magnolia Airport, Inc.;

H. R. 10813. An act for the relief of Maj. Anthony R. Parrish;

H. R. 11239. An act for the relief of James F. Moran;

H. R. 11346. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Massachusetts and Vermont among the States which are permitted to divide their retirement systems into two parts so as to obtain social-security coverage, under State agreement, for only those State and local employees who desire such coverage, and to permit individuals who have decided against such coverage to change their decision within a year after the division of the system;

H. R. 12364. An act for the relief of Mrs. Viola Barksdale;

H. R. 12365. An act for the relief of the estate of Suck Pil Ra;

H. R. 12494. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture in selling or agreeing to the sale of lands to the State of North Carolina to permit the State to sell or exchange such lands for private purposes;

H. R. 12624. An act for the relief of Palmer-Bee Co.;

H. R. 12776. An act to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 23 of the United States Code, entitled "Highways";

H. R. 12876. An act to extend title VII of the Public Health Service Act (relating to health research facilities) for 3 years, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13450. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13518. An act to incorporate the Blinded Veterans Association;

H. R. 13688. An act to provide airmail and special delivery postage stamps for Members of the House of Representatives on the basis of regular sessions of Congress, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 585. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to conduct studies and render a report on service to Santa Clara, San Benito, Santa Cruz, and Monterey Counties from the Central Valley project, California;

H. J. Res. 635. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 648. Joint resolution providing for a joint session of Congress for commemorating the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln; and

H. J. Res. 653. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

On August 28, 1958:

H. R. 376. An act to prohibit trading in onion futures on commodity exchanges;

H. R. 4544. An act for the relief of Louis S. Levenson;

H. R. 4991. An act for the relief of Waldo E. Miller;

H. R. 5411. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a widow or former wife divorced who loses mother's insurance benefits by remarriage may again become entitled if her husband dies within 1 year of such remarriage, to provide that interstate instrumentalities may secure coverage for policemen and firemen in positions under a retirement system of the instrumentality;

H. R. 5865. An act to amend section 80 of the Hawaiian Organic Act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6175. An act for the relief of Virginia Hell.

H. R. 6239. An act to amend sections 1461 and 1462 of title 18 of the United States Code;

H. R. 6595. An act for the relief of Markus H. Teitel;

H. R. 6788. An act to authorize the abbreviation of the record on the review or enforcement of orders of administrative agencies by the courts of appeals and the review of enforcement of such orders on the original papers and to make uniform the law relating to the record on review or enforcement of such orders, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6894. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 as it relates to unmanufactured mica and mica films and splittings;

H. R. 7685. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eldrey L. Whaley;

H. R. 7706. An act to entitle members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps retired after 30 years' service to retired pay equal to 75 percent of the monthly basic pay authorized for the highest enlisted, warrant, or commissioned grade in which they served satisfactorily during World War I, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7738. An act for the relief of the State of New York;

H. R. 7746. An act for the relief of Elmer L. Conrad and others;

H. R. 8014. An act for the relief of Miss Edith Dorn;

H. R. 8160. An act authorizing a survey of the Tensaw River, Ala., in the interest of navigation and allied purposes;

H. R. 8249. An act to provide for the adjustment by the Secretary of the Army of the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands within the Fort Custer Military Reservation, Mich.;

H. R. 8481. An act to amend title IV of the Agricultural Act of 1956 to provide that the provisions of such title shall apply in Hawaii;

H. R. 8543. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to authorize, in certain cases, the issuance of licenses to noncitizens for radio stations on aircraft and for the operation thereof;

H. R. 8652. An act to rescind the authorization for the Waldo Lake Tunnel and regulating works, Willamette River, Oreg.;

H. R. 9239. An act to provide for the construction of an irrigation distribution system and drainage works for restricted Indian lands within the Coachella Valley County Water District in Riverside County, Calif., and for other purposes;

H. R. 9371. An act to provide for the relief of certain members and former members of the Army and the Air Force, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9407. An act to provide additional opportunity for certain Government employees to obtain career-conditional and career appointments in the competitive civil service;

H. R. 9445. An act to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act and to approve amendments of the Hawaiian land laws with respect to leases and other dispositions of land;

H. R. 9500. An act to permit certain sales and exchanges of public lands of the Territory of Hawaii to certain persons who suffered a substantial loss of real property by reason of the tidal wave of March 9, 1957;

H. R. 9932. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land of the United States to the State Board of Education of the State of Florida;

H. R. 10045. An act to provide for the sale of all of the real property acquired by the Secretary of Commerce for the construction of the Burke Airport, Va.

H. R. 10587. An act for the relief of Homer G. Preston;

H. R. 11125. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the city of Valparaiso, Fla.;

H. R. 11299. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Tarsi Priori;

H. R. 11630. An act to amend title XV of the Social Security Act to extend the unemployment insurance system to ex-servicemen, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11697. An act to amend the act of June 29, 1888, relating to the prevention of obstructive and injurious deposits in the harbor of New York, to extend the application of that act to the harbor of Hampton Roads;

H. R. 12216. An act to designate the dam and reservoir to be constructed on the Cumberland River near Carthage, Tenn., as the "Cordell Hull Dam and Reservoir" and to establish the United States Study Commission on the Neches, Trinity, Brazos, Colorado, Gaudalupe-San Antonio, Nueces, and San Jacinto River basins, and intervening areas;

H. R. 12217. An act to amend paragraph (2) of subdivision (c) of section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended;

H. R. 12303. An act to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands;

H. I. 12489. An act to extend the time for making certain reports under the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956;

H. R. 12632. An act authorizing Gus A. Guerra, his heirs, legal representatives and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.;

H. R. 12655. An act for the relief of S. Jackson and Son, Inc.;

H. R. 12867. An act for the relief of Clayton T. Wells;

H. R. 12894. An act to authorize the making, amendment, and modification of contracts to facilitate the national defense;

H. R. 13132. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955;

H. R. 13192. An act making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13342. An act to provide for a survey of Parish Line Canal, La.;

H. R. 13406. An act to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended;

H. R. 13489. An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13500. An act to provide for the disposal of federally owned property of the Hanson, Company, and Houma Canals, La., and for other purposes;

H. R. 13531. An act to amend the act of June 29, 1938, as amended, to increase the insurance coverage required to be carried by cabs for hire in the District of Columbia for the protection of passengers and others, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13549. An act to increase benefits under the Federal Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance System, to improve the actuarial status of the trust funds of such system, and otherwise improve such system; to amend the public assistance and maternal and child health and welfare provisions of the Social Security Act; and for other purposes;

H. R. 13856. An act, making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13861. An act to repeal certain provisions of law relating to messengers for the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives;

H. J. Res. 630. Joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to use certain real property in the District of Columbia for the proposed Southwest Freeway and for the redevelopment of the southwest area in the District of Columbia;

H. J. Res. 654. Joint resolution requiring the Secretary of Commerce to submit certain recommendations for legislation for the purpose of assisting Congress to determine whether or not to reimburse States for certain highways on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; and

H. J. Res. 704. Joint resolution establishing that the 1st session of the 86th Congress convene at noon on Wednesday, January 7, 1959.

On September 2, 1958:

H. R. 109. An act to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans, U. S. A., National Memorial, Inc.;

H. R. 469. An act to protect producers and consumers against misbranding and false advertising of the fiber content of textile fiber products, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1493. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Charles A. Holshouser;

H. R. 1684. An act for the relief of William Franklin Rollins;

H. R. 1803. An act for the relief of Mrs. Boyd Dinehart and Richard Reams;

H. R. 2265. An act for the relief of Clifford Oesterlei;

H. R. 2269. An act for the relief of Truck & Axle Manufacturing Co.;

H. R. 3366. An act to validate overpayments of pay and allowances made to certain officers of the Army, Navy, Naval Reserve, and Air Force, while undergoing training at civilian hospitals, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3571. An act for the relief of Boris F. Navratil;

H. R. 4642. An act to establish a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure;

H. R. 5497. An act to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act;

H. R. 5584. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maude L. Smith;

H. R. 6238. An act to amend section 1292 of title 28 of the United States Code relating to appeals from interlocutory orders;

H. R. 6282. An act for the relief of the former shareholders and debenture note holders of the Goshen Veneer Co., an Indiana corporation;

H. R. 7125. An act to make technical changes in the Federal excise tax laws, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7178. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph D. Metzgar;

H. R. 7337. An act for the relief of James McGuire;

H. R. 7374. An act for the relief of Angelo Sardo;

H. R. 7544. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever," approved February 28, 1929, by including therein the name of Roger P. Ames;

H. R. 7710. An act to provide for the lumpsum of all accumulated and current accrued annual leave of deceased employees;

H. R. 7720. An act for the relief of Viola Beiger;

H. R. 7860. An act to amend section 1 of the act of July 24, 1956 (70 Stat. 625), entitled "To provide that payments be made to certain members of the Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe of Indians as reimbursement for damages suffered as the result of the establishment of the Pine Ridge aerial gunnery range";

H. R. 8381. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to correct unintended benefits and hardships and to make technical amendments, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8735. An act to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the District of Columbia teachers retirement and annuity fund, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8943. An act to amend titles 10, 14, and 32, United States Code, to codify recent military law, and to improve the code;

H. R. 9020. An act to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9147. An act to provide for the disposal of certain Federal property in the Boulder City area, to provide assistance in the establishment of a municipality incorporated under the laws of Nevada, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9258. An act for the relief of Mrs. Minnie Perreira;

H. R. 9262. An act for the relief of the estate of A. A. Alexander;

H. R. 9370. An act to permit illustrations and films of United States and foreign obligations and securities under certain circumstances, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9700. An act to consolidate into one act all the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9817. An act relating to venue in tax refund suits by corporations;

H. R. 9822. An act to provide for holding a White House Conference on Aging to be called by the President of the United States in January 1961, to be planned and conducted by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare with the assistance and cooperation of other departments and agencies represented on the Federal Council on Aging; to assist the several States in conducting similar conferences on aging prior to the White House Conference on Aging; and for related purposes;

H. R. 9833. An act to amend section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920;

H. R. 10473. An act for the relief of Hipolito C. DeBaca;

H. R. 10495. An act to amend that part of the act of June 9, 1896 (29 Stat. 313), relating to the establishment of postal stations and branch post offices, so as to permit them to be established within 10 miles of the boundary of the adjoining city;

H. R. 10993. An act for the relief of Kiiko Nemoto;

H. R. 11009. An act to provide for the establishment of Grand Portage National Monument in the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11078. An act to promote boating safety on the navigable waters of the United States, its Territories, and the District of Columbia; to provide coordination and cooperation with the States in the interest of uniformity of boating laws; and for other purposes;

H. R. 11200. An act for the relief of the estate of L. L. McCandless, deceased;

H. R. 11382. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to authorize the conversion or exchange, under certain conditions, of term insurance issued under section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11456. An act to authorize the exchange of certain real property heretofore conveyed to the city of El Paso, Tex., by the United States, for other real property of equal value, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11668. An act to amend section 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, as amended;

H. R. 11889. An act to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Minnesota State Fair and Centennial Exposition to be held at St. Paul, Minn., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12126. An act to provide further protection against the introduction and dissemination of livestock diseases, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12144. An act for the relief of Paul E. Nolan;

H. R. 12154. An act for the relief of Ernest T. Stephens;

H. R. 12207. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Alto Ross and children, and for E. B. Ard and his daughter, Mrs. Joan Ard Nichols;

H. R. 12212. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Department of the Navy;

H. R. 12226. An act to amend the Virgin Islands Corporation Act (63 Stat. 350), and for other purposes;

H. R. 12281. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide an administrative site for Yosemite National Park, Calif., on lands adjacent to the park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12662. An act to provide for the acquisition of lands by the United States required for the reservoir created by the construction of Oahe Dam on the Missouri River and for rehabilitation of the Indians of the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation in South Dakota and North Dakota, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12663. An act to provide for additional payments to the Indians of the Lower Brule Sioux Reservation, S. Dak., whose lands have been acquired for the Fort Randall Dam and Reservoir project, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12670. An act to provide for additional payments to the Indians of the Crow Creek Sioux Reservation, S. Dak., whose lands have been acquired for the Fort Randall Dam and Reservoir project, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12808. An act to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Acts of 1956 and 1958 by advancing the date for submission of the revised estimate of cost of completing the Interstate System and to extend the approval of such estimate for an additional year;

H. R. 12858. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12863. An act to provide for certain improvements relating to the Capitol Power Plant and its distribution systems;

H. R. 12906. An act for the relief of Anneliese Ottolenghi;

H. R. 13191. An act to require the Commissioner of Education to encourage, foster, and assist in the establishment of clubs for boys and girls especially interested in science;

H. R. 13247. An act to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs; and for other purposes;

H. R. 13437. An act for the relief of Bernard H. English and John E. Hayden;

H. R. 13475. An act to authorize an exchange of lands at the Rochester Fish-Cultural Station, Indiana;

H. R. 13559. An act to amend the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act of 1956 to permit the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make payments with respect to special restorative training, or specialized courses of vocational training, for younger persons than those with respect to whom the Administrator may now make such payments, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13580. An act to increase the public debt limit;

H. R. 13666. An act to amend title 32 of the United States Code to permit the appointment of the Adjutant General of Puerto Rico as provided by the laws of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;

H. R. 13678. An act to provide in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for a loan service of captioned films for the deaf;

H. J. Res. 546. Joint resolution designating the week of November 21–27, 1958, as National Farm-City Week;

H. J. Res. 557. Joint resolution to amend the act of September 7, 1957 (71 Stat. 626), providing for the establishment of a Civil War Centennial Commission;

H. J. Res. 658. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to invite the countries of the free world to participate in the California International Trade Fair and Industrial Exposition to be held in Los Angeles, Calif., from April 1 to 12, 1959;

H. J. Res. 659. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 661. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 675. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens, and for other purposes.

On September 6, 1958:

H. R. 4059. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Carmen Scoppettuolo;

H. R. 11749. An act to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 6 months, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13254. An act to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the use in food of additives which have not been adequately tested to establish their safety; and

H. R. 13840. An act to encourage expansion of teaching in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies.

HOUSE BILLS DISAPPROVED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The message further announced that the President had disapproved the following bills of the House; his reasons for such actions are as follows:

On August 27, 1958:

VICKSBURG NATIONAL MILITARY PARK

H. R. 7466. I am withholding my approval of H. R. 7466, to provide for the establishment of a facility of the Vicksburg National Military Park.

This legislation would establish an undesirable precedent. It would authorize the acquisition and establishment of a small tract of land as a "facility" of the Vicksburg National Military Park, notwithstanding the considerable distance of the property from the park. This property would be acquired to commemorate Fort Pemberton, Miss., as the place where the Union Yazoo expedition was turned back by Confederate forces on March 11, 1863.

I am informed that the proposed "facility" to commemorate Fort Pemberton is more than 100 miles from the park proper. For this reason it is difficult to conceive of such area as a "facility" of the park. In fact, this method of commemorating a segment or lesser phase of a particular historic theme might well lead to further efforts to establish other outlying areas as "facilities" of individual parks and monuments, particularly where the separate establishment and designation of such areas may be unwarranted.

In any event, the historic significance of Fort Pemberton in connection with the Vicksburg campaign is of insufficient importance to warrant establishment of the area as a national monument, according to recommendations of the Department of the Interior in its report to the Congress. Also, it should be noted that the Vicksburg campaign has been commemorated appropriately by the Federal Government by virtue of the establishment of the Vicksburg National Military Park. I find no sound basis for the acquisition and recognition of an indecisive feature of the campaign as a facility of the park.

I recognize and appreciate, however, that there is considerable local historical interest in this area and it may well be the subject of State or local action for its preservation. This solution would seem to be in the best public interest.

On August 28, 1958:

MALOWNEY REAL ESTATE COMPANY, INC.

H. R. 1339. I am withholding my approval from H. R. 1339, entitled "For the relief of the Malowney Real Estate Company, Incorporated."

The bill would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay $14,425.26 to the Malowney Real Estate Co., Inc., of Springfield, Ohio, in full settlement of its claims against the United States for income taxes erroneously collected for the years 1944 and 1945.

On May 28, 1948, deficiencies aggregating more than $35,000 were assessed against this taxpayer by the Internal Revenue Service. No payments on the assessed deficiencies were made by the taxpayer until partial payments aggregating $16,524.72 were made in 1950.

On June 30, 1952, more than 4 years after assessment of the deficiencies and more than 2 years after the partial payments of the assessment, the taxpayer filed a claim for refund. A reexamination of the taxpayer's records by the Internal Revenue Service disclosed that the original assessment was excessive and, accordingly, the unpaid balance of the assessment was abated. Refund of any portion of the partial payments that had been made was denied, however, because the statute of limitations precluded refund of taxes paid more than 2 years prior to filing a claim therefor.

The record on this bill does not disclose any special circumstance justifying the taxpayer's failure to file a timely claim. The statutory period of limitations, which the Congress has included in the revenue system as a matter of sound policy, is essential in order to achieve finality in tax administration. Granting special relief in this case, where a refund was not claimed in the time and manner prescribed by law, would constitute a discrimination against other taxpayers similarly situated and would create an undesirable precedent.

Under the circumstances, therefore, I am constrained to withhold my approval of the bill.

On August 28, 1958:

MRS. FRANK C. GREGG

H. R. 1829. I am withholding my approval from H. R. 1829, for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Frank C. Gregg.

The effect of this bill would be to accord to the beneficiary a form of tax treatment that Mrs. Gregg, as a stockholder in a corporation liquidated pursuant to a plan of complete liquidation, might have elected to receive. Such election, under existing law, must be made by four-fifths of the corporation's voting stock interest within 30 days after adoption of the liquidation plan. Mrs. Gregg, who held less than a four-fifths voting stock interest, did not make an election within the specified 30-day period.

In support of this claim for special relief, the taxpayer's representative relies upon the fact that he was unable to obtain certain forms prescribed for making the election. It appears, however, that a letter notifying the Commissioner of the unavailability of such forms and the desire to make an election would have been sufficient.

The taxpayer's representative also relies upon the fact that Mrs. Gregg became seriously ill 25 days after the adoption of the plan of liquidation. A timely election was not made, however, by any of the other shareholders in the corporation who would also have had to have made such an election for Mrs. Gregg, or any of them, to have received the tax treatment in question. Mrs. Gregg's sickness had no bearing upon their failure to do so. Accordingly, even if she had made a timely election, Mrs. Gregg would not have been entitled to the tax treatment this bill would now accord her estate.

This legislation would, therefore, confer benefits on Mrs. Gregg's estate which none of the other shareholders in the corporation are entitled by law to receive.

Because such special relief would constitute an inequitable discrimination against other taxpayers similarly situated, I am constrained to withhold my approval from the bill.

On August 28, 1958:

BONIFACIO SANTOS

H. R. 6773. I am withholding my approval from H. R. 6773, for the relief of Bonifacio Santos.

This bill would authorize the payment of $1,500 in reimbursement for a contribution made by Mr. Santos in 1944 to the Philippine guerrilla forces fighting the Japanese.

The beneficiary states that in 1944 he made a contribution of 3,000 Japanese occupation pesos to the Philippine guerrilla forces. He supports his claim with an affidavit from an American officer who recalls receiving the money, and also a receipt for the money, dated in 1944 and signed by the same officer.

After the war, a general program was established in the Philippine Islands for the payment of such claims based upon aid or services furnished the guerrillas in their fight against the Japanese. Despite the widespread publicity attendant upon this program, as evidenced by the hundreds of thousands of claims submitted, no administrative claim was ever filed by the beneficiary. He states he was unaware of his right to do so.

Awards under the general claims program were uniformly paid according to the so-called Ballantyne scale for currency conversion. Under that scale, the present case would have resulted in an award to the beneficiary of $16.67. This bill, in contrast, proposes an award of $1,500.

Approval of H. R. 6773 would be both discriminatory and inequitable. The record on this bill furnishes no valid basis for distinguishing the beneficiary from thousands of others whose claims were rejected because they were not filed until after the termination of the general program. Furthermore, it would be entirely without justification to pay to this beneficiary a sum 90 times larger than he could have received had he been paid under the general claims program.

For the foregoing reasons, I have considered it necessary to withhold my approval from H. R. 6773.

On August 28, 1958:

MR. AND MRS. JOHN R. HADNOT

H. R. 9180. I am withholding my approval of H. R. 9180, a bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John R. Hadnot for the reason that its major purposes are accomplished by the enactment of the Social Security Amendments of 1958, coupled with the provisions of existing law which authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to waive the repayment of incorrect social security payments.

The son of the beneficiaries, his wife, and 2 minor children were involved in a tragic automobile accident on July 4, 1956. All perished together except for 1 child under 18 who survived for about 1½ hours without regaining consciousness.

The beneficiaries, Mr. and Mrs. Hadnot, on December 14, 1956, filed a claim under the Social Security Act for dependent parents' benefits. After they had received monthly benefits totaling $814 each, it was determined that these payments, entirely without fault of the beneficiaries, had been improperly made because of the brief survival of the beneficiaries' grandson. As required by law, the benefit payments were suspended and the beneficiaries were notified that the payments already received had been incorrectly made.

The Social Security Amendments of 1958, approved this day, contain a general provision permitting surviving dependent parents of insured workers to receive monthly benefits even when the decedent was also survived by a spouse or child eligible for such benefits. Mr. and Mrs. Hadnot can, by filing application, avail themselves of this general provision and become entitled prospectively to benefits. With respect to the payments already made to them, incorrectly, there is every reason to believe that they will receive sympathetic and equitable consideration under the waiver provision of existing law.

The only remaining question is whether this bill should be approved so that Mr. and Mrs. Hadnot may receive retroactive payments for the month since April 1957. To provide such payments would be to grant preferential treatment and thus to discriminate against other individuals who might be similarly situated. Except in cases of the most compelling equity, such special treatment should be avoided.

On August 28, 1958:

MR. MARION S. SYMMS

H. R. 9765. I am withholding approval of H. R. 9765, for the relief of Mr. Marion S. Symms.

The bill would provide that, notwithstanding any statutory period of limitation, refund or credit shall be made or allowed to Marion S. Symms, Augusta, Ga., of any overpayments of income tax for the year 1952, if claim therefor is filed within 6 months after the date of enactment.

The records of the Treasury Department show that Mr. Symms filed a timely income-tax return for 1952 in which he reported as income certain disability payments received by him. At the time the taxpayer filed his return for 1952, the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit had held that such disability payments were excludable from gross income, although the Internal Revenue Service had ruled to the contrary.

On April 1, 1957, the United States Supreme Court decided that disability payments of the type received by the taxpayer were excludable from gross income. On November 6, 1957, more than 4½ years after the taxpayer's return for 1952 was filed, the taxpayer filed a claim for refund based upon the excludability of the disability pay received by him in 1952. This claim was rejected because it was filed after the expiration of the 3-year period of limitations prescribed by law for the filing of such claims.

The statutory period of limitations, which the Congress has included in the revenue system as a matter of sound policy, is essential in order to achieve finality in tax administration. Moreover, a substantial number of taxpayers paid income tax on disability payments received by them during the period of the Internal Revenue Service ruling that such disability payments were includible in income. To grant special relief in this case, therefore, where a refund was not claimed in the time and manner prescribed by law, would constitute a discrimination against other similarly situated taxpayers and would create an undesirable precedent.

Under the circumstances, therefore, I am constrained to withhold my approval of the bill.

On August 28, 1958:

MISS MARY M. BROWNE

H. R. 9993. I am withholding my approval from H. R. 9993, for the relief of Miss Mary M. Browne.

The bill would provide that, notwithstanding any statutory period of limitation, refund or credit shall be made or allowed to the beneficiary of any overpayment of income tax for the year 1951, if claim therefor is filed within 1 year after the date of enactment.

The taxpayer, in filing her income-tax return for 1951 and paying the amount shown on the return, failed to take credit for a previous partial payment of income

tax which the taxpayer had made for 1951. The Internal Revenue Service did not match the taxpayer's prepayment documents with her return for 1951 and was not aware of the taxpayer's error. In March 1955, an agent of the Internal Revenue Service discovered the possibility of the erroneous overpayment when he assisted the taxpayer in preparing her income-tax return for 1954. At that time the 3-year statutory period of limitation had not expired, and the agent advised the taxpayer to file a claim for refund. The taxpayer, however, did not file her claim until about 2 months later, at which time the statutory period had expired, and the claim could not under the law be allowed. The record on this bill affords no explanation for the taxpayer's failure to file a timely claim for refund.

The statutory period of limitations, which the Congress has included in the revenue system as a matter of sound policy, is essential in order to achieve finality in tax administration. Granting special relief in this case would constitute a discrimination against other taxpayers similarly situated and would create an undesirable precedent.

For these reasons I am constrained to withhold my approval from the bill.

On August 28, 1958:

NORTH COUNTIES HYDRO-ELECTRIC CO.

H. R. 10419. I am withholding my approval from H. R. 10419, for the relief of North Counties Hydro-Electric Co.

The bill provides that—

notwithstanding any statute of limitation, lapse of time, or any prior court decision of this claim by any court of the United States, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of North Counties Hydro-Electric Co., of Illinois, against the United States for damages to its powerplant and dam at Dayton, Ill., sustained as the result of a dam built by the United States on the Illinois River, at Starved Rock near Ottawa, Ill.

The North Counties Hydro-Electric Co. owns a hydroelectric power development on the Fox River near Dayton, Ill. On two occasions, once in 1943 and again in 1952, the company suffered damages to its facilities from ice jams and flooding in the river. It twice brought suit against the United States in the Court of Claims alleging that the ice jam and flooding were caused by the erection by the United States of the Starved Rock Dam, which is located on the Illinois River at a point approximately 14 miles below the corporation's properties. In each instance the decision of the Court of Claims went against the company.

The matters covered by this bill have been fully considered on their merits and decided adversely to the corporation. The company has had its day in court on two occasions and the Court of Claims should not now be required to consider the same matter again.

On September 2, 1958:

SOUTHWEST RESEARCH INSTITUTE

H. R. 1494. I am withholding my approval from H. R. 1494, for the relief of the Southwest Research Institute.

This bill would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to the Southwest Research Institute such sum, not exceeding $8,200.84, as the Housing and Home Finance Administrator may approve. This payment would be for services rendered by the beneficiary in excess of its written contract with the Government.

Approval of this legislation could well encourage others to perform unauthorized work and expect payment therefor from the Government. Furthermore, under this bill this organization would receive preferential treatment which has in the past been denied other research contractors who performed work in excess of their contract obligations.

On September 2, 1958:

HARRY N. DUFF

H. R. 1695. I am withholding my approval from H. R. 1695, for the relief of Harry N. Duff.

This bill would confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims, notwithstanding the applicable statute of limitations, to adjudicate the claim of Harry N. Duff arising out of the failure of the then War Department to retire him, in 1946, for physical disability incurred as an incident of his military service.

The beneficiary of this bill had a long history of spinal trouble and arthritis while serving as an officer in the Army during World War II. He contends that these disabilities were suffered or aggravated as a result of injuries incurred in the service. Although early medical records do not support this contention, in 1945 an Army retiring board found the beneficiary permanently incapacitated for active duty as an incident of the service and recommended his retirement.

Reviewing the case in accordance with applicable regulations, the Office of the Surgeon General of the Army disagreed with the findings of the retiring board and requested it to reconsider the case. Upon reconsideration, the retiring board reaffirmed its previous findings, whereupon the Office of the Surgeon General recommended to the Secretary of War that the findings of the board be disapproved. The recommendation of that office was based on its opinion that a spinal defect and arthritis clearly had existed prior to entry on active duty and had not been aggravated permanently by such service. The findings of the board were disapproved by the Secretary of War, and the beneficiary was thereupon released from active duty in 1946, without entitlement to retired pay. In 1949, however, he was awarded disability compensation by the Veterans' Administration on account of service-aggravation of a congenital defect.

The beneficiary appealed the decision in his case to the statutory Army Disability Review Board. In 1947 this Board affirmed the decision of the Secretary of War and, subsequently, reaffirmed its decision upon a request for reconsideration. In 1955 the Army Board for Correction of Military Records found no error or injustice in the determinations which had been made in the beneficiary's case. He also brought an action in the Court of Claims in 1955, which was dismissed as barred by the statute of limitations.

Traditionally, eligibility for retirement on account of physical disability has been determined by the military services in accordance with general provisions of law. Appellate review of these determinations has been provided within the executive branch by means of statutory boards such as the Disability Review Board and the Board for Correction of Military Records.

In recent years the Court of Claims has been petitioned in various cases to award disability retirement to individuals who have been found not entitled to such pay by the Secretary of the military department concerned. In consistently denying these petitions, the court has stated, in effect, that, under the statutory procedures for determining and reviewing entitlement to retirement, it has jurisdiction only in cases where it can be shown that the cognizant military Secretary has acted arbitrarily, capriciously, or plainly contrary to law.

I believe that this rule which the Court of Claims has adopted is a sound one. It conforms to an important principle underlying judicial review of administrative decisions; namely, that the courts will not substitute their judgment for that of the experienced officials who have been given adjudicative responsibility by law. For this reason and since there is no evidence in this case that the Secretary of War acted arbitrarily, capriciously, or contrary to law, I can see no justification for special legislation which would require the Court of Claims to grant the beneficiary a de novo hearing.

Approval of this bill would discriminate against the many hundreds of individuals who have had their claims for disability retirement denied without benefit of judicial review. It would also establish an undesirable precedent leading to other exceptions to the orderly procedure which is now provided for under general law and which currently governs the hundreds of similar cases that are adjudicated each year.

On September 2, 1958:

TOLEY'S CHARTER BOATS, INC., ETC.

H. R. 3193. I am withholding my approval from H. R. 3193, entitled "For the relief of Toley's Charter Boats, Inc., Toley Engebretsen, and Harvey Homlar."

The bill would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the sum of $37.65 to Toley's Charter Boats, Inc., of Salerno, Fla., and the sum of $3,227.10 to Toley Engebretsen and Harvey Homlar, of Salerno, Fla., in full settlement of all claims of the named persons for a refund of taxes paid pursuant to section 3469 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, relating to tax on the transportation of persons.

The records of the Treasury Department show that the amounts which this bill would refund to the claimants were paid as transportation taxes with respect to fees charged for the charter of fishing boats by the claimants at various times between January 1945 and November 1951. On March 31, 1953, the District Court for the Northern District of Florida held that the transportation tax was not applicable to amounts paid for fishing parties in situations similar to the one involved in this bill. On the date of this decision, the claimants could have

filed timely claims for refund of taxes paid after March 1949. However, the claimants did not file claims for refund until November 15, 1955, which date was more than 2½ years after the district court's decision. These claims for refund were rejected because they were filed after the expiration of the 4-year period of limitations prescribed by law for filing such claims.

It is true that, at the time the district court reversed the Internal Revenue Service's interpretation of the statute, refund of taxes paid for a large portion of the period here involved was barred by the statute of limitations. However, Congress has determined it to be a sound policy to include in the revenue system a statute of limitations which, after a period of time, bars taxpayers from obtaining refunds of tax overpayments and bars the Government from collecting additional taxes. Such a provision is essential to finality in tax administration.

The basic justification for the statute of limitations is that, after the passing of a reasonable period of time, witnesses may have died, records may have been destroyed or lost, and problems of proof and administration of tax claims become too burdensome and unfair for both taxpayers and the Government. The basic purposes underlying the statute of limitations continue in force even in cases where a taxpayer, after having paid a tax, discovers that the interpretation of the law has been changed by a judicial decision or by a modification in regulations and rulings.

There are no special circumstances in this case to justify singling out the named taxpayers for special relief from the statute of limitations. The bill, therefore, would unfairly discriminate against other taxpayers similarly situated and would create an undesirable precedent.

On September 2, 1958:

SECTION 1870 OF TITLE 28, U. S. C.

H. R. 3368. I am withholding my approval from H. R. 3368, to amend section 1870 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the district courts to allow additional peremptory challenges in civil cases to multiple plaintiffs as well as multiple defendants, for reasons wholly unrelated to the original title and purpose of the bill.

Section 1 of the bill amends existing law (28 U. S. C. 1870) so as to extend to multiple plaintiffs in civil cases the same three peremptory challenges which are available under the present statute to multiple defendants. I favor this change in the law and would approve the bill if it were limited to this provision.

Section 2 of the bill amends the Declaration of Taking Act (46 Stat. 1421; 40 U. S. C. 258a). That act provides a procedure under which the Government may acquire immediate possession of property taken prior to a trial before a Federal district court at which a final determination as to just compensation for the property will be made. If, after trial, the court determines that the funds advanced by the Government are less than the amount which the owner should receive, the Government is required to pay the balance due plus 6 percent interest.

Section 2 of H. R. 3368 would modify the procedure by providing that the judge of a district could could, upon the application of any interested party, determine that the amount of the Government's advance payment was determined fraudulently or in bad faith and require the Government to pay an additional amount as fixed by the court prior to trial. Prior to such additional payment, the Government would not be entitled to the income from the property.

These additional steps appear to be unnecessary and unwarranted since, under the present statute, the rights of property owners to receive just compensation as guaranteed by the fifth amendment to the Constitution when property is taken for public use are fully protected. If, for any reason, the payments advanced by the Government are less than a court judgment of just compensation, the owner is still assured of fair treatment because the Government is required to pay the additional amount plus interest at 6 percent.

In the circumstances, and since neither the responsible Congressional committees nor the affected executive agencies had their normal opportunity to consider this basic change in procedure, I believe more thorough consideration of section 2 is warranted.

On September 2, 1958:

PETER JAMES O'BRIEN

H. R. 4073. I am withholding my approval from H. R. 4073, for the relief of Peter James O'Brien.

This bill would pay to Peter James O'Brien the sum of $10,000 as compensation for the death of his son, who was killed in military service in 1947.

The son of the beneficiary of this bill was being taken on an indoctrination flight in a naval aircraft on the same day on which he entered active duty as a member of the Naval Reserve. As the plane in which he was riding was waiting to take off, another Navy aircraft coming in for a landing crashed into it, injuring the son so seriously that he died several days later.

The beneficiary has twice filed applications for death compensation with the Veterans' Administration. Although the death of his son was deemed to be service-connected, the Veterans' Administration has denied awards in both instances because the father was unable to establish dependency as required by the governing statutes. It also appears that, for the same reason, the beneficiary's claim for benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act was denied. He apparently has never filed a claim for 6 months' death gratuity or for regular monthly benefits under the Social Security Act which also conditions entitlement upon a showing of dependency.

A suit was instituted on behalf of the beneficiary to recover damages on account of the death of his son under the provisions of the Federal Tort Claims Act. Both the lower and appellate courts held that recovery was barred on the grounds that the death occurred as an incident of military service. These rulings were based on the decision in *Feres* v. *United States* (340 U. S. 135, 1950). In that case, the United States Supreme Court held that a claim for damages based on the death of a serviceman occurring as an incident of his service is not cognizable under the Federal Tort Claims Act.

The Federal Government has provided a comprehensive and orderly system of benefits for survivors of members of the Armed Forces who die in service in line of duty, including deaths due to negligence of fellow servicemen. In the present case the serviceman's father is eligible for various benefits upon a showing of dependency.

To make the award proposed by the bill would be discriminatory and establish a most undesirable precedent with respect to other cases involving service-connected deaths. If the bill were approved, it would be difficult to deny similar awards to the survivors of other servicemen who die under a wide variety of circumstances. To follow such a course would, in my opinion, jeopardize the entire structure of benefits for survivors of servicemen and veterans.

On September 2, 1958:

COOPER TIRE & RUBBER CO.

H. R. 7499. I am withholding my approval from H. R. 7499, for the relief of the Cooper Tire & Rubber Co.

This bill would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to the Cooper Tire & Rubber Co. of Findlay, Ohio, the sum of $616,911.88 in full satisfaction of the claim of the corporation against the United States arising out of losses, due to increases in costs, incurred in performing seven contracts with the Department of the Army for the manufacture of rubber tires, tubes, and camelback.

The contractor previously made application for relief under title II of the First War Powers Act. This application was denied by the then Secretary of War, along with the claims of two other rubber manufacturers based on the same grounds.

The record indicates that the company made a net profit of over $64,000 on the 35 Government contracts which were awarded to it during 1950, 1951, and 1952, the years in question, despite the fact that as to 7 of them it sustained losses. From the Government's standpoint, it would be inequitable to grant relief to the company with respect to the 7 contracts on which it sustained losses, without giving consideration to the 28 on which it made profits. The granting of relief in this case would also be discriminatory against many other contractors who sustained losses under fixed price contracts during the early part of the Korean conflict.

On September 2, 1958:

MR. AND MRS. ROBERT B. HALL

H. R. 8184. I am withholding my approval from H. R. 8184, for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Robert B. Hall.

The bill would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the sum of $1,300 to Mr. and Mrs. Robert B. Hall, Los Angeles, Calif., in full settlement of their claims against the United States for re-

fund of an overpayment of their Federal income-tax liability for the calendar year 1950.

The records of the Treasury Department show that the taxpayers filed a timely joint income-tax return for 1950 and that, on March 1, 1955, the taxpayers filed an untimely claim for refund in the amount of $1,303.50. The claim for refund alleged that no part of the proceeds from the sale in 1950 of certain inherited property was includible in gross income and also that the taxpayers failed to take certain deductions for the year 1950. This claim for refund was filed almost 1 year after the expiration of the 3-year period of limitations prescribed by law for filing such claims and, therefore, the claim was rejected.

The amount of the taxpayer's overpayment for the year 1950 has never been verified by the Internal Revenue Service. Such verification would require a determination of the fair market value of certain property at the time it was inherited by Mr. Hall, and would also require a determination as to the validity of certain deductions claimed by the taxpayers.

The taxpayers believe that the statute of limitations should be waived in their case because Mr. Hall was stationed in Germany as an officer in the Armed Forces from January 1950 to May 1953, and because Mr. Hall received inexpert advice concerning his 1950 tax return. These circumstances do not seem to justify the taxpayers' failure to file a claim for refund until March 1, 1955.

The statutory period of limitations, which Congress has included in the revenue system as a matter of sound policy, is essential for finality in tax administration. Granting special relief in this case would discriminate against other taxpayers similarly situated and would create an undesirable precedent.

Under the circumstances, therefore, I am constrained to withhold my approval of the bill.

On September 2, 1958:

MR. AND MRS. W. G. HOLLOMON

H. R. 8759. I am withholding my approval from H. R. 8759, for the relief of W. G. Hollomon and Mrs. W. G. Hollomon.

This bill would provide for the payment to Mr. and Mrs. W. G. Hollomon from Treasury funds of $3,189.15 in settlement of their claims against the United States for personal injuries and related damages suffered by them on September 2, 1956, when two United States soldiers committed armed robbery at the Hollomon's general store in Brooklyn, Ga. The store also comprised a United States post office, of which Mr. Hollomon was the postmaster. Mr. Hollomon was shot and wounded by one of the soldiers. The two servicemen were then on leave from Fort Benning, Ga., and were dressed in civilian clothes. The gun with which Mr. Hollomon was shot had not been issued to the soldiers by the Army but had been purchased by one of them.

It is obvious that the two soldiers were not acting in line of duty, and in these circumstances no legal liability could be imposed upon the United States for their conduct. I appreciate, of course, that in its exercise of its legislative discretion as to private relief measures pertaining to the wrongful conduct of Federal employees, the Congress need not and, in appropriate circumstances, should not be limited by strict concepts of legal liability. But I believe that any deviation from those concepts would be unwise except in cases in which there are overriding equitable considerations or facts which clearly suggest some moral obligation on the part of the United States.

I do not believe that such facts or considerations exist here. The only fact which is urged in support of legislative grace is that the two individuals who inflicted the harm were soldiers of the United States Army. I do not conceive that this is a consideration which suggests any moral obligation on the part of the United States. To accept the assumption that the United States has a moral obligation to underwrite the purely personal, particularly criminal, conduct of any of its missions of employees and servicemen, in situations of this kind, would constitute a most undesirable precedent. Therefore, to single out these claimants for favored treatment would, I believe, be an unwarranted expenditure of public funds.

For the foregoing reasons, I have been constrained to withhold approval of the bill.

On September 2, 1958:

D. A. WHITAKER

H. R. 9950. I have withheld my approval from H. R. 9950, for the relief of D. A. Whitaker and others.

The bill (H. R. 9950) provides that, notwithstanding any statute of limitations or lapse of time, jurisdiction is conferred upon the court of claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of D. A. Whitaker and other named employees of the Radford Arsenal, Department of the Army, "for basic and overtime compensation and shift differential pay as governed by the provisions of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended," for services performed since 1945 at the Radford Arsenal, Radford, Va.

These claims relate to employment as fire fighters or fire-fighter guards between February 15, 1946, and February 16, 1952. The employees worked a 2-platoon system which required that they be on duty every other day for 24 hours, for which they received basic compensation each week for 40 hours and overtime pay for 16 additional hours. The claims involve the rights to overtime pay for the second 8-hour shift worked in one day and for shift differential pay for that work, and also for right to compensation for the third 8-hour shift during the period when the employees were said to be "on call duty."

By the act of March 3, 1863 (12 Stat. 767), and by repeated enactments thereafter, it has been provided that claims not filed in the Court of Claims within 6 years from the time the claims accrued shall be barred. These claims pertain to work performed in some cases more than 12 years ago. The claims were not asserted in timely fashion by the claimants and it is no longer feasible or even possible to obtain the records essential to an adequate presentation of the facts to the court. This is the very kind of situation which proves the wisdom of a statute of limitation. Without it in such cases it is doubtful whether it is possible to have efficient and orderly administration of the affairs of government.

If I were to approve this bill, I could not in all fairness refuse to approve other bills setting aside the statute of limitations on old claims for overtime or other compensation for either individuals or groups of Federal personnel who delayed is presenting their claims.

For the foregoing reasons, I have withheld my approval of the bill.

On September 2, 1958:

DUNCAN MOORE

H. R. 11156. I am withholding my approval from H. R. 11156, for the relief of Duncan Moore and his wife, Marjorie Moore.

The bill would provide that, notwithstanding any statutory period of limitation, refund or credit shall be made or allowed to Duncan Moore and his wife, Marjorie Moore, South Bend, Ind., of any overpayment of income taxes made by them for the taxable year 1949, if claim therefor is filed within 1 year after the date of enactment.

The records of the Internal Revenue Service show that on March 14, 1953, the taxpayers filed a timely claim for refund of income tax for 1949 based upon the exclusion from gross income of certain disability payments under section 22 (b) (5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939. This claim was disallowed by the Service on March 19, 1954, and the taxpayers did not contest the disallowance of their claim by filing suit in court within the 2-year period prescribed by law.

In 1957 the Supreme Court of the United States decided that disability payments of the type involved in this case were excludable from gross income. At this time the statute of limitations barred refunds to Mr. and Mrs. Moore and to a substantial number of other taxpayers similarly situated.

I have signed into law the Technical Amendments Act of 1958, which contains general legislation designed to grant nondiscriminatory relief to all taxpayers in the same situation as Mr. and Mrs. Moore. Since general relief is now available, this private relief bill is no longer necessary.

On September 6, 1958:

TITLE 10, U. S. C.

H. R. 1061. I have withheld my approval from H. R. 1061, to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments to settle certain claims for damages to, or loss of, property or personal injury or death, not cognizable under any other law.

As indicated in its title the purpose of the bill is to confer upon the Secretaries of the military departments authority to settle, in an amount not in excess of $1,000, certain claims for damages caused by civilian employees of military departments or by members of the Armed

Forces incident to the use and operation of Government vehicles, or incident to the use of other property of the United States on a Government installation.

It is with reluctance that I have withheld my approval, for I am in hearty accord with the laudable purpose of this legislation. At the present time the Secretary of the Navy has authority similar to, though more limited than, that which this legislation would afford to the Secretaries of all three military departments. The proposed extension of this authority for administrative consideration of deserving claims against the Government, for which no legal remedies are provided, would substantially reduce the demands for special private relief legislation.

The bill authorizes the promulgation of regulations by the Secretaries of the military departments for the conduct of the contemplated program. Such regulations would not become effective until the expiration of 60 days after they have been filed with the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and of the Senate of the United States. Further, it provides that the Congress may, within the 60 days, "amend or disapprove any such regulation by a concurrent resolution embodying the amendment or statement of disapproval."

I am advised that the provision of the bill which would authorize the Congress to amend or disapprove regulations prescribed by the military Secretaries is of doubtful constitutionality. If the function of promulgating the contemplated regulations is considered an Executive function, it may be exercised solely by the Executive. If this function is considered to be legislative, then the President should play his constitutional role of specific approval or disapproval. In requiring officials of the executive branch, other than the President, to put proposed regulations before the Congress and in providing for amendment or disapproval of these by the Congress in a manner not subject to review by the President, these provisions raise serious constitutional questions.

I earnestly hope that these objectionable provisions can be eliminated and this legislation reenacted promptly at the next session of the Congress.

APPOINTMENT MADE AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

COMMEMORATING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN

The SPEAKER, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85–775, and the order of the House of August 23, 1958, empowering him to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House, did, on September 5, 1958, appoint as members of the committee on arrangements for the joint session of the Congress to be held on Thursday, February 12, 1959, commemorating the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, the following members on the part of the House: Mr. MACK, of Illinois; Mr. DENTON, of Indiana; Mr. SCHWENGEL, of Iowa; and Mr. NIMTZ, of Indiana.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Congresswoman Coya Knutson's Report, 85th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

ATTENDANCE RECORD

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, my attendance record for the 85th Congress is an above-average 88 percent plus on rollcall votes, which total 193 votes for the Congress—100 votes for the 1st session and 93 for the 2d session.

The legislative climate of the Congress was most peculiar. In 1957 there was a cry for economy. However, in 1958, the farm depression and the recession of other areas, plus the sputnik dramatization, changed the legislative atmosphere.

LEGISLATIVE ACHIEVEMENTS

Student loan bill: My student loan bill was passed as title II principle of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. In addition, I introduced a Paul Bunyan education bill, providing one-fourth as much as annual defense costs to bring our educational system up to date. Its long-range purpose is to serve as alternative to defense spending.

Two ASC committees per county: Now public law, the bill to permit Otter Tail and Polk Counties to retain two ASC committees because of their size.

Disaster loan credit law permits small business to make certain emergency loans in disaster areas where farmer-suppliers have been caught with unpaid balances on supplies and services resulting from previous year's disaster and total crop losses. Losses such as those due to excessive rainfall in summer 1957 in certain counties of the Ninth District are covered by this law.

Lake of the Woods water damage claims bill: My bill that passed and became law was designed for direct authorization to the Treasury so that immediate payments could be made by the Secretary of Treasury.

Lost River and Ruffy Brook: The first authorization was passed in my second year in Congress. It was vetoed. It was again vetoed in this year's rivers and harbors bill. We managed to keep it in the second omnibus rivers and harbors bill which was signed by the President this year. $128,000 appropriations were voted to start construction.

Red Lake $100 per capita payments: Authorized to be paid out of proceeds from the Red Lake sawmill owned by the Red Lake Indians. I regret that the amendments in the bill were not first approved by the Indian citizens of the Red Lake Reservation because there is no tribal government at present.

Cystic fibrosis, dread children's disease: My bill to authorize funds for research stimulated an appropriation of $1,082,000 directly to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for research. This is the first Federal appropriation specifically earmarked for a relatively unknown but the third most fatal children's disease.

AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE ACTIVITY

Omnibus family farm legislation: The first omnibus family farm bill, based on the parity income principle, to come out of the House Agriculture Committee, was reported to the floor this year by a 2 to 1 majority. However, lack of favorable city publicity build-up and its new principles which were relatively unknown, caused the House to kill the rule on this far-sighted proposal. This move set in motion specific legislation for the family farm.

Family farm subcommittee hearing was held in Fergus Falls last November. It was very helpful in development of the omnibus family farm bill. It was a milestone in securing grassroots testimony and statements of fact and experience of family farmers.

Farm support price freeze bill, to keep 1957 farm level prices as a stopgap measure, was passed by the Congress last March, but vetoed by the President.

I introduced a total of 45 bills, 24 of them agriculture bills. The agriculture bills were:

House Joint Resolution 55, production and utilization of food and fiber.

H. R. 4961, school lunch: Two half pints milk daily per schoolchild.

H. R. 4962, wheat marketing quota amendment.

H. R. 4963, potato grade labeling.

H. R. 5204, family farm parity income.

H. R. 5992, auxiliary credit resources for family-type farm.

H. R. 6319, extend crop insurance in disaster areas.

H. R. 6320, democratically elected farmer committeemen.

H. R. 6321, price reporting and research for forest products.

H. R. 6684, permit grazing land in conservation reserve.

H. R. 6752, price support level and acreage allotment in 1957, no less than those in effect in 1956.

H. R. 6840, supplemental direct assistance to extremely low income family farms.

H. R. 6841, full parity family farm income protection.

H. R. 6950, potatoes and other nonbasics participate in acreage reserve program.

H. R. 7382, food-fiber stamp plan.

H. R. 8508, two county ASC committees.

H. R. 9205, agricultural commodities hardship import limitation.

H. R. 9674, dairy products marketing.

H. R. 10116, feed grains: income parity and meet disasters, and so forth.

H. R. 10390, extend and expand special milk programs and brucellosis eradication program.

H. R. 10444, loan program for bonafide fur farmers.

H. R. 10619, small business farm supplier disaster loans.

H. R. 10620, aid suppliers on loans in disaster areas.

H. R. 13608, permit soil bank harvest in disaster areas.

Miscellaneous bills:

H. R. 3065, 50-cent piece Minnesota Centennial commemorative.

H. R. 4109, promote production concentrated iron ore and steel.

H. R. 4399, return trust lands to White Earth Reservation.

H. R. 5203, increase monthly rates for veterans disabilities.

H. R. 5479, student loans.

H. R. 5669, establish Federal Agency for Handicapped.

H. R. 6685, Humanitarian and Old Age Rights Act.

H. R. 6897, Veterans' Administration—medical service.

H. R. 7098, increase compensation postal employees.

H. R. 7297, amend Federal-Aid Highway Act, provide addition to system.

H. R. 7741, extend Hospital Survey and Construction Act.

H. R. 8161, revive and reenact Rainy River Construction Act.

H. R. 9861, postal employees pay increase.

H. R. 10805, Lake of the Woods high water damage claims payment.

House Concurrent Resolution 284, authorize Maria Sanford statue in Capitol.

House Concurrent Resolution 296, memorialize Maria Sanford.

H. R. 11937, increase reserve officers' benefits.

H. R. 11960, omnibus education bill, including "dollars for scholars."

H. R. 12331, direct Surgeon General to expend funds for cystic fibrosis research.

House Joint Resolution 656, permit negotiations with Canada on international park.

H. R. 13454, $100 per capita, Red Lake Indians, provide for tribal approval.

PROJECTS

I have requested the Corps of Engineers to conduct a survey for all possible means of adequate drainage to take care of heavy rains such as the devastating floods of 1957 in certain counties of the Ninth District. I also requested appropriations of $150,000 to continue the restudy of the whole Red River Valley water control problem.

The completion of Tamarac Wildlife Refuge in Becker County was authorized after my testimony before the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission. It will open portions of the refuge each year to duck hunting by local hunters where for years its three best lakes were almost entirely monopolized by private Twin City gun clubs. In the 29-year fight to complete this valuable heritage for our people, many incidents transpired such as the use of guards in Minneapolis police uniforms to keep local duck hunters out of these favorable hunting grounds. Twenty-five percent of refuge earnings will replace taxes. Posterity will cherish the joys of this natural habitat, and our children's children will have a place to hunt.

Moorhead and Bemidji Post Office Buildings are now a reality. Direct appropriations provided for immediate land acquisition and construction where previously they were included in the uncertain and expensive lease-purchase program.

World War I Vets now have a charter as 1 of the 15 national veterans' organizations in our country. The charter was authorized this year.

CONGRESS' RECORD

Alaska statehood is one of the joys of this Congress. Ever since 1916, attempts were made to give statehood to Alaska. It was passed by the House in 1950 but failed in the Senate. We hope that our 49th State will soon be followed by our 50th State—Hawaii.

Social security improvements consist of 7 percent primary insurance benefits increase across-the-board—with a $3 minimum increase; increase in the wage base from $4,200 to $4,800; increase in the employer and employee contributions of one-fourth of 1 percent each, with an increase in the contributions of the self-employed by three-eighths of 1 percent above rates now scheduled; increased authorizations for maternal and child health, crippled children services and child welfare services.

Labor legislation: Legislation passed to safeguard the welfare and pension funds of rank-and-file working people from the grasping of selfish or crooked labor and employer administrators of the plans.

Small business: Three major accomplishments for small business this session: SBA made permanent; H. R. 8381 included small business tax revision; S. 3651, the bill to provide long-term credit for small business, sets up a $250 million revolving fund for small business investment. The first is Public Law 85-536; second two both on President's desk for signature at this time.

Postal pay increase took effect this year. Last year, the bill came to the House floor by means of a discharge petition and was passed. The President vetoed that bill. This year the conference report on another House bill passed last year in the House and this year in the Senate—was given perfunctory approval—381-0—in the House.

Three percent freight excise tax, a wartime tax, was repealed.

Duck stamp increased to $3, but with the provision that the Secretary of the Interior is directed to use the total proceeds in land acquisition, instead of using it for large Post-Office printing bills and Fish and Wildlife Service operating expenses as in the past.

Deferred grazing program for areas hit by drought disaster, gives aid to drought-stricken farmers and ranchers until pastures are reestablished. This legislation was necessary to combat the greatest dust-bowl erosion in the history of our country. My own bill would supplement this legislation by permitting harvesting fodder or grazing Soil Bank acres in cases of "act of God" disasters such as excessive rainfall, drought, or other natural disaster.

My hot lunch appropriation amendment to increase the funds by $45 million was defeated, but secured surprisingly large support when I offered it on the floor. Over 50 percent of our children cannot now participate in this important health-building, surplus farm commodity distributing program. The amendment was designed to further both programs.

REA is threatened along with family farming by this administration. Legislation is still in committee to return authority for administration of REA to the REA Administrator—removing it from the Secretary of Agriculture who is attempting to turn REA over to big bankers. This would destroy REA.

Mid-East: When the Mid-East policy resolution was passed last year, I voted against it. Its emphasis was on the military. It did nothing about the solution of the Arab-Israeli conflict, resettlement of refugees, or nationalization of oil resources. We need a broad program for economic stabilization. The conservative magazine U. S. News & World Report stated "the present crisis is 10 times more dangerous than the Korean crisis."

Study of Southeastern River Basins Will Prove of Great Value in Future Development of Water Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRIS FAIRCLOTH BLITCH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, the Senate concurred August 19 in the House amendment to S. 4021 and cleared for the President legislation to establish a United States Study Commission on the Savannah, Altamaha, St. Marys, Apalachicola-Chattahoochee, and Perdido-Escambia River Basins. The Commission is authorized to prepare integrated and cooperative investigations, studies, and surveys of land and water resources of these river basins and intervening areas.

Authorities tell us that an effective program of water management, with good soil stewardship, can yield greater dividends in human welfare than any other action. Here is a broad field for our endeavor. The objective of this legislation, permitting careful planning for use of land and water resources of the area comprising the major basins in the Southeastern States, is certainly desirable. Similar studies have in the past provided a valuable basis for water resources planning in other parts of the country.

Urban and rural residents should be conscious of the importance of soil and water in their everyday living and in

their future. Soil and water play a vital role in the physical, economic, social, and religious life of the individual, the community, the Nation, and the world. This fact needs to be stressed so that the importance of soil and water is integrated into every phase of education—both urban and rural. Stewardship demands that we prepare, conserve, replenish, and protect our soil and water resources.

Mr. Speaker, the Altamaha and St. Marys Rivers flow through my Congressional District. Intervening river basins similarly included under S. 4021 for studies within my District are those of the Satilla, Suwanee, Little Alapaha, and Withlacoochee. Residents of the communities within these basins share my extreme satisfaction that our rivers in southeastern Georgia are to be considered in preparing plans for proper utilization of land and water resources there.

Many flood-control, hydroelectric-power, navigation, watershed-protection, water-pollution-control, and other water and land resources development projects have been constructed, are under construction, authorized, and being planned in this vast area. The Study Commission would review all existing and proposed projects with a view to fully coordinating the purposes of those projects in existence, under construction, authorized, and those being planned and those to be planned so that there will be as a result the best utilization of those resources of the area.

The management of soil and water resources must be the concern of everyone who loves his Nation. The responsibility of this management rests with the people who own and operate the land. These are the farmers and ranchers. Upon them we must depend to save and to improve what we have left in soil and water resources.

Comprehensive water-resource development plans have been prepared in the past for certain areas, and found to be of great value in the formulation and selection of projects for construction. For this reason, I was happy to introduce a companion bill to S. 4021 in the House of Representatives. Then, as now, I am convinced that the proposed study for the southeastern basins will prove to be of great value in the future development of the water and related resources of this important region.

Hon. F. Jay Nimtz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL WILSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the Indiana Republican delegation is proud of our junior Congressman, F. JAY NIMTZ. In the short period of 2 years he has shown himself to be of true Congressional material.

I have watched JAY go about his work in this body. He has shown an alertness and a determination to follow the dictates of his constituency and of his own conscience in a manner of which we can all be proud.

As this session draws to a close, I want to go on record as complimenting the people of his District for having sent a man like JAY NIMTZ to the Congress. He has served them well.

I am certain that, in the years to come, he will prove one of the most valuable men in this entire body.

A Former Chairman Interviewed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I have had numerous talks with John R. Murdock, former Congressman from Arizona, and former chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. He has mentioned many times his continued interest in western reclamation. He speaks of Murdock's Arizona water plan and his—Murdock's—Little Colorado River project as though he has thought out and written detailed studies such as these titles indicate. Knowing his keen interest in such matters our association on this great committee, and looking ahead to my responsibility with this same committee, I sought some answers from him. It is late in this session but I want to put my former chairman on record, hence this method of dialog. I am asking the questions and Chairman Murdock is giving the answers:

Question. You have frequently spoken of your proposal (Murdock's), Little Colorado River project. What is it?

Answer. It is my plan to make available for use in that drainage area several times the volume of water falling on that watershed than has thus far been used.

Question. Is that your (Murdock's) water plan for Arizona?

Answer. It is a part, and only a part, of my total plan suggested for Arizona's future water supply.

Question. Has your total plan, or any part of it, been written or published? I know you have discussed phases of it informally with me.

Answer. No. It has not been published to any extent. Only 4 books of basic research by 37 topnotch scientists of the country by my authority, and that of Chairman MILLER in 1952 and 1953, as committee prints. They underlie but do not fully reveal my considered water plan for Arizona.

Question. Is your plan, which you call Murdock's Little Colorado plan the same, or about the same, as your Arizona's water plan?

Answer. No; it is only a part, a sma'l fractional part, of my total Arizona water plan.

Question. Although we have talked it over some, I am not clear as to your views on these two ideas. Have they been published?

Answer. No. I have what might be called a book in manuscript form but not published.

Question. Why not? If you have found some fruitful ideas, especially for Arizona, why not publish them?

Answer. I appreciate that question. It presupposes I have some fruitful ideas. I believe I have, and I have no natural unwillingness to express them. However, you probably remember that on 18th of April, 1951, while hearing witnesses on an Arizona water bill—and against my vehement protests—our committee voted to close those hearings, thus throwing the matter into litigation. That vote forcing it into the Supreme Court, together with my defeat for relection in 1952, rather effectively closed my mouth for the past 8 years.

Question. The fact that Arizona and California are in litigation over the Colorado River does not prevent your expressing views, does it?

Answer. In a way it does. As chairman of this important House committee I then had influence and used it. But now I am merely a "man on the street." My views while a Member of Congress for 16 years were fully expressed on this subject in hundreds of thousands of spoken and written words. These words are now down in imperishable print in the RECORD. But today if I expressed a word that might seem to differ with what I said then, such would be magnified and distorted by lawyers while this expensive and interminable trial drags on.

Question. Have any of your views on the subject changed since your big fight of 8 years ago?

Answer. Well, of all the many thousands of words I have placed in the RECORD there is not one I would swallow. However, I did lack information at times. After 8 years of private study following years of official study I feel I have now more information as a basis. My Little Colorado River proposal is almost entirely new. It is true that my bill 7 years ago provided for the Coconino Dam as a silt control dam. That was one feature to which no Californian objected. I might add that this Little Colorado plan of mine seems somewhat less involved in the Arizona versus California controversy.

Question. What, briefly, is your Little Colorado River proposal?

Answer. As an engineering construction it is to seal off the Little Colorado River contribution of water, sand, silt, and total flow from the main Colorado River for an indefinite future—except, of course, those uncontrollable big floods which come once or twice in a generation. Big floods will come every few years and overflow the highest dams and fill any number of reservoirs, of which a half dozen may eventually be needed in the lower 60 miles of this tributary.

Question. That sounds very much like trying to plug up this canyon tributary at its mouth and keep all its contribution in Arizona for Arizona. Is that it?

Answer. That is exactly it. No words of mine could better explain the general physical effects and purpose of it.

Question. It would take a lot of time to ask the questions uppermost in my mind, such as: Is your proposed Little Colorado plan physically possible? Is it economically feasible? Is it legally permissible? And what does the law of the river say on the last point?

Answer. Naturally I say yes to the first questions. As to the last the basic part of the law of the river (the Colorado River compact of 1922) makes no reference by name to any river or particular State of the Colorado Basin. The Congressional enactment (Boulder Canyon Project Act of 1928) does not assign the Little Colorado tributary exclusively to Arizona, as I feel it did intend to assign the Gila River to Arizona. However, both are almost exclusively Arizona rivers. Water lawyers from southern California point out that the compact of 1922 includes all tributaries, and they have so stressed and emphasized Colorado River system water as to include every drop of moisture on or in the whole watershed. Califor-

nia water lawyers, of course, will contend that their clients have a claim on the waters of this tributary watershed.

Question. From your experience do you think they will ever consent to Arizona's monopolizing it?

Answer. They might when they get their eyes open. When it is computed accurately how much power, or how little power, the water from the Little Colorado watershed now produces and it is shown how much damage is done by sand and silt to the huge investments down there, they might say to Arizona "Plug it up in your Coconino Canyons and keep it all forever." It is conceivable that a man dying from thirst on the desert would reflect and reject a cup of water if he knew it contained poison.

Question. Are we to understand that by some such development as in your plan you believe many times the volume of useful water can be had from that watershed over what has been had?

Answer. I do believe it. And that is the desired purpose of my plan.

Question. Is your Little Colorado plan exclusively for the benefit of Navaho and Hopi Indians?

Answer. No, not exclusively for Navaho and Hopi Indians. I would expect this plan to utilize the 50,000 acre-feet annually of compact main stream water let down at Lee Ferry to help stabilize the fluctuating natural supply in the "pipeline." I would divert some water from this pipeline to the Verde River for Greater Phoenix and central Arizona on an exchange of water principle.

Question. This sounds like a costly and fantastic scheme to me. How would it compare in cost to the central Arizona project?

Answer. In my judgment it would cost less than the Reclamation Bureau's estimate of the central Arizona project.

Question. Have you written anything on your Little Colorado River plan explaining it more in detail and stating its purpose?

Answer. I will hand you herewith three manuscripts, one entitled "An Alternate Murdock Plan for Furnishing Water to the Western Portion of the Navaho Indian Reservation"; the other entitled "Greater Phoenix Must Tap the Highlands," and "Murdock's Little Colorado Project Explained." These discuss more fully two phases of my water plan for Arizona through a long future.

Question. What would you like for me to do with these?

Answer. Whatever you think they merit, but date and mark them for your files. I would not extend them now in the RECORD. You will probably be chairman of this great committee in the 86th Congress as I was in the 82d Congress. Arizona needs legislation and many proposals will come before you. I submit these for study by any interested persons—for approval, rejection or modification according to their merits. I do not wish to commit you.

I appreciate your interest in my thinking on this important matter and thank you for all past favors. I know the ties of interest of our two great neighboring States and value their cooperation on such vital questions. I wish you well.

White House Conference on Aging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as one of the Members of Congress who has long been interested in the special problems which face our senior citizens today, I wish to applaud the action of the 85th Congress which, in its closing days, passed the bill, H. R. 9822, which calls for a White House Conference on Aging to be called by the President of the United States before December 31, 1958. The Conference will be planned and conducted by the very competent Special Staff on Aging of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It will afford an opportunity to all States and local communities interested in the problem to present their ideas, recommendations, and suggestions for the consideration of the Congress of the United States, if additional legislation is deemed necessary. Another important function of the Conference is the opportunity it presents for these people to exchange experiences, at a grassroots level, and, by this means, to learn of new ways of meeting the special problems which have arisen in their own area.

We are all very well aware of the fact that the problems which face older men and women today are as new as the assemblyline machines which have shortened their worklife. Modern medical science has discovered means of keeping people alive long past the proverbial span of threescore and ten, but too often this has not always been a blessing. A sick and weary old man or woman may be removed to a hospital, partially cured, and given a few more months or years, only to return to an empty room or to find that his or her place in the State home has been filled and that a fresh start must be made in unfamiliar surroundings. We must find better ways to improve the health, the opportunity for participation in the life of the community, and the chance for a job for the millions of older Americans who are, today, too often cast aside with the pittance and isolated in their infirmity.

The White House conference method recognizes the many-sided problems which face our older people. For, as Senator PURTELL said in advocating this proposal in the Senate:

> The problems of the aging touch all aspects of life and only very limited study has been given to them. It seems almost inevitable therefore that a bill such as that for the White House Conference on Aging should be proposed, and I think we may learn from the experience with the Conference on Education what we may gain from such a Conference on Aging.

The fact that we have had experience with the good results to be obtained by such conferences, not only in the field of education but also through the regular White House Conferences on Children and Youth, is, to my mind, one of the strongest arguments for this legislation.

During the hearings conducted this year on the problems of older people, it became increasingly clear that there is a very wide interest on the part of States and local communities in finding better ways to meet these problems. My own State of New Jersey, has demonstrated its concern by the appointment of an old-age study commission whose recent report pulled together the background facts underlying the employment, the income, and the health problems of the older people of our State. I feel certain that New Jersey will want to participate in the Conference and that our representatives will not only learn a great deal there but that they will make their own special contribution from our experience in this area.

Certainly it is time that the Congress recognized its special obligation to our older men and women to assist in finding better answers for all of the complex of problems which face them. For, as President Eisenhower has said, "Our Nation now must learn to take advantage of the full potential of old citizens—their skills, their wisdom, and their experience. We need those traits fully as much as we need the energy and boldness of youth."

Eleventh Anniversary of Indian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter which I addressed to His Excellency, Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru, the Prime Minister of India, on the occasion of the 11th anniversary of Indian independence. The letter follows:

AUGUST 20, 1958.

His Excellency, Mr. JAWAHARLAL NEHRU,
The Prime Minister of India,
New Delhi, India.

MY DEAR MR. PRIME MINISTER: Celebration this month by the people of India of the 11th anniversary of their existence as a free and equal member of the family of nations evokes the deepest sentiments of friendship and solidarity in the hearts of all liberty-loving peoples. As one who has long admired the heroic struggles of the Indian people toward political, economic, and social self-realization, I cannot forgo this occasion for conveying to your people and your government the heartiest congratulations and good wishes—both on my own behalf and on behalf of the millions of like-minded Americans.

The recent history of India, with its multitude of cultural, religious, social, and ethnic strains—all properly demanding accommodation in the great national effort to secure peace, prosperity, and the fulfillment of the individual—truly recapitulates the eternal struggle of all mankind to raise itself through successive stages to ever higher levels of achievement.

To Americans, the struggles of India recall like struggles of our own people and government—first, for national independence; later, for economic competence; and, even now, for a peace and understanding with all nations that will be consistent with human dignity and freedom. To the achievement of national independence in 1947, India has added redoubtable progress during the past decade toward economic and social objectives. I have in mind India's great progress in rehabilitating Hindu refugees from Pakistan; the strengthening of its industrial development; the increase of foreign business and the virtual doubling of the output of major industries; the forthcoming operation of an atomic reactor for peaceful uses in agriculture and biology. Last, but not least, I am drawn to comment on India's modern

constitution, modeled in part on that of the United States—a guaranty that the Indian people have dedicated themselves irrevocably to the cause of political freedom.

By these achievements, the Indian people and their government have dealt a crushing blow to the all-too-prevalent cynicism of the mid-20th century. Their recent history and accomplishments, like those of other, smaller new nations such as Israel and Ghana, are a living refutation of the dominance in the modern world of hatred and greed—a glowing affirmation of the reality of the unending upward struggle that human beings put forth each age, each century, each day; of the never-to-be-forgotten truth that the minds and hearts of men and women everywhere can and do give direction to their destinies.

May the coming years bring ever greater accomplishments to India and all her people.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

Small Boat Regulations of the Coast Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement which I prepared relating to the enforcement of Coast Guard regulations issued pursuant to Public Law 519 of the 84th Congress.

I am hopeful that the Coast Guard will see fit to grant a further postponement of these regulations in order to provide sufficient time for small boating interests, not only in the State of Florida, but elsewhere, to comply with them. An extension until April 1, 1959, in my opinion, will not affect safety, and would be reasonable under the circumstances.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR SMATHERS

The National Boat Association, the Florida Boatsmen Association, other organizations of a similar nature, together with numerous individual boatowners from Key West, Fla., to Pensacola, Fla., have continuously brought to my attention regulations issued by the Coast Guard pursuant to Public Law 519, 84th Congress, complaining that they are unreasonable and compliance with them does not add to safety in boating. On the contrary, it is stated that they have the purpose of ultimately causing the industry to expend millions of dollars which it is not in a position to presently undergo.

Since the passage of Public Law 519, I have been in touch with the Commandant of the Coast Guard urging that any regulations adopted pursuant thereto take into consideration the peculiarities of each locality and each branch of the boating industry. I have also requested the Coast Guard to insure that any regulations issued pursuant to this law be made clear and understandable.

Today I make particular reference to Coast Guard Regulation 249, which has been temporarily suspended until October 1, 1958. If this regulation were promptly enforced heavy expenditures will be placed on many of the small-boat owners. One particular letter which I received reads in part as follows:

"As a member of a family who have built, owned and operated fishing boats since the middle of the last century—we are disturbed and concerned about the regulations of the Coast Guard under Public Law 519, 84th Congress. From long experience in the safe operation of boats, we feel that these regulations impose unreasonable restrictions and that the alterations are too expensive. Such restrictions and costly changes could soon run us out of business."

It is my impression that while Public Law 519 did not become effective until June 1, 1958, many boatowners, on a voluntary basis, had their boats inspected prior to this date. I am advised that in some specific instances an additional period of time has been allowed—until October 1, 1958—with which to comply with Coast Guard Regulation 249.

It is obvious that there is no compulsion to place this regulation into effect at any particular time, and I can readily understand how the boatowner is reluctant to complain because he does not know the consequences and at the same time cannot comply with the regulation because of the cost involved. I am informed that some of the tackle and equipment provided in this regulation is not now available, and for this reason cannot be obtained.

In view of these circumstances, I am hopeful that the Coast Guard will provide an additional administrative extension of time for boatowners to comply with this regulation, and I am hopeful therefore that the Commandant of the Coast Guard will see fit to reasonably administer Public Law 519, and provide that the regulations issued pursuant thereto will not go into effect until April 1, 1959. This will give the boatowners a reasonable opportunity to cooperate, and at the same time not affect safety, which is the objective sought to be achieved by the enactment of Public Law 519.

Activities of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service During the 85th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM MURRAY
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I submit a statement summarizing the activities of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service during the 85th Congress, including the first and second sessions. I realize that some of the bills which the committee has acted on are at the White House awaiting the President's signature and it is possible that other bills may be acted on by the Senate and become Public Laws after we adjourn. However, I wanted to submit this statement so that the House Members would have an opportunity to review the activities of our committee and in order that the principal achievements would be available for their use during the recess.

The 85th Congress was the most productive Congress in the history of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House of Representatives. Major legislation was considered, reported, and enacted into law in all areas subject to jurisdiction of the committee; that is, postal operations, postal rates, postal salaries, classified and other employee salaries, civil-service operations, census activities, and the Federal archives.

MAJOR LEGISLATION

The highlights of the committee work in the 85th Congress were the enactment of first, the most comprehensive revision of the postal rate structure in history, coupled with a Postal Policy Act reaffirming and clarifying legislative jurisdiction and policy with respect to postal rates and fees; second, a 10-percent, retroactive, salary increase for over 500,000 postal field service employees; third, a 10-percent, retroactive, salary increase for over 1 million employees in the classified service, the Foreign Service, the Veterans' Administration Department of Medicine and Surgery, the judicial branch, and the legislative branch; fourth, a 10-percent increase in the annuities of 245,000 retired employees and over 80,000 survivors of former employees, coupled with a special provision granting survivor annuities, for the first time, to the several thousand surviving widows of former employees and annuitants who died before February 29, 1948; fifth, the first comprehensive, government wide program to improve the training of Federal personnel; sixth, legislation, implementing the treaty with the Republic of Panama, providing for equal treatment of Panamanian employees of the United States Government in respect to compensation, position tenure, training opportunities, retirement rights, conditions of employment, and other employee benefits; seventh, revision, clarification, and modernization of the entire body of the census laws contained in title 13 of the United States Code as enacted into positive law; and eighth, legislation to reestablish an effective program to protect the security of the United States in respect to the employment of Federal personnel, made necessary as a result of the decision of the Supreme Court in Cole against Young—a decision which has rendered the existing security program, established by Public Law 733, 81st Congress, largely ineffectual and has permitted the restoration to Federal positions—with back pay—of 100 individuals previously separated as Communists, fellow travelers, or otherwise known security risks.

POSTAL RATE ADJUSTMENTS

Postal rate adjustments under title II of Public Law 85–426, when fully effective, will increase postal revenues by $550 million annually, thus materially reducing the tremendous postal deficit. These adjustments maintain the proper relationships between the rates applicable to first-, second-, and third-class mail matter and the various subclassifications of mail in such classes. The increase from 3 to 4 cents in the first-class letter rate is the first adjustment in this rate since 1932. The increase is in accordance with the historic policy of the Congress that the first-class mail rate shall be

fixed at a level which will return postal revenues to fully compensate for the cost of handling such mail, including appropriate consideration of the preferential treatment and service accorded such mail matter. It is to be noted, also, that the 4-cent first-class letter rate, compared to the new 3-cent individual piece rate for third-class mail matter, maintains the existing differential between the postal rates on such mail matter.

POSTAL POLICY ACT OF 1958

The Postal Policy Act of 1958—title I, Public Law 85-426—reaffirms the Congressional function, under the Constitution, of forming postal policy and sets forth a declaration of such policy directed toward providing a more stable basis for the postal-rate structure and the improvement of postal service. The declaration prescribes general principles, standards, and related requirements to carry out the policy. With respect to postal rates and revenues, the policy provides that the total loss on mail carried free or at reduced rates represents public service to be paid for from the general fund of the Treasury and authorizes appropriations to reimburse the postal service for losses on such service. These services and the losses for which appropriations are authorized are spelled out.

POSTAL EMPLOYEES SALARY INCREASE

Postal field service employees in all levels were granted a permanent 7½ percent salary increase by Public Law 85-426. Those in levels 1 through 6 were granted an additional 2½ percent increase, and those in level 7 were granted an additional 1½ percent increase, to be effective for 3 years. Comparable increases were granted rural carriers and fourth-class postmasters. All increases were retroactive for approximately 5½ months. The 2½ percent temporary increase was extended through all levels by Public Law 85-462.

CLASSIFIED AND RELATED SALARY INCREASES

Public Law 85-462 grants a 10-percent retroactive salary increase to 1,021,072 employees in the classified service, the Foreign Service, the Veterans' Administration Department of Medicine and Surgery, the judicial branch, and the legislative branch. Total annual value of the increase is $542 million. The effect of this legislation is to grant salary increases to classified and other annual-rate salaried employees of the Federal Government substantially equal to the increases granted postal field service employees by Public Law 85-426. These increases bring Federal employees' salaries abreast of the continued rise in costs of living and will constitute a valuable aid to management in the recruitment and retention of qualified personnel needed for the conduct of critical defense and other essential Government programs.

RETIREMENT ANNUITY INCREASES

Public Law 85-465 further liberalizes annuities of former Federal employees who retired prior to October 1, 1956. Each annuity is increased by 10 percent but not more than $500. Each survivor annuity is increased by 10 percent but not more than $250 per annum. Survivor annuities are provided, for the first time, for the widows or widowers of former employees or retired employees who died before February 29, 1948, with a maximum of $750, thus placing these survivors on a basis substantially equal to survivors of former employees or annuitants who died on or after February 29, 1948. The increases will end June 30, 1960, unless appropriations to cover the cost are made in succeeding years.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' TRAINING PROGRAM

Public Law 85-507, the Government Employees' Training Act, represents an important milestone in the promotion of efficiency and economy in the operation of the Government. It contains a declaration of Congressional policy emphasizing the need for improved training of Federal employees in order that they may perform their official duties with the greatest possible effectiveness. It provides a comprehensive, governmentwide program for the training of Federal personnel both within and outside the Government. Overall responsibility for administration and guidance of the program, and for the operation of all departments and agencies thereunder, is imposed on the Civil Service Commission, subject to the supervision and control of the President. Necessary standards and related requirements to be observed in the conduct of the training program are set forth in the law, coupled with authorization for Presidential and Civil Service Commission regulations needed to implement the legislative policy.

STRENGTHENED PERSONNEL POLICY IN THE CANAL ZONE

Public Law 85-550 implements a memorandum of understandings attached to the treaty of January 25, 1955, between the Governments of the United States and the Republic of Panama. The memorandum contained certain general agreements relating to Panamanian personnel employed by the United States which required legislative implementation. Public Law 85-550 provides such implementation. It proscribes discrimination against Panamanian citizens employed by the United States in respect to salary and wage scales, conditions of employment, opportunities for training and promotion, a merit system comparable with the civil-service merit system, retirement benefits, appeals procedures to protect employment rights, and other benefits. The operation of the program will be in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President of the United States.

CLARIFICATION OF CENSUS LAWS

Public Law 85-207 will contribute to efficiency and economy in all census activities by simplifying and clarifying the existing census law, correcting inconsistencies and omissions therein, and providing for the conduct of census activities on a uniform, modern, and practicable basis. This legislation is based on recent experience and the need for the collection of more complete, accurate, and useful census data in the 1960 census and later censuses than would have been possible under existing law. The inconsistencies, omissions, and loose ends in census laws enacted in past years became apparent when title 13 of the United States Code, entitled "Census," was enacted into positive law by Public Law 740, 83d Congress. Basic census authority is not extended, no new program is authorized, and no existing program is eliminated. Improved, modern procedures will be provided to facilitate essential census activities, with overall economies and improved census results.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES SECURITY PROGRAM

S. 1411, as reported by the committee and passed by an overwhelming vote of the House of Representatives, will reestablish an effective security program with respect to all civilian officers and employees of the Government, which was rendered largely ineffectual by the decision of the Supreme Court in Cole against Young. As a result of this decision, there is no adequate provision of law authorizing prompt separation of employees who are found to be disloyal or security risks if they are employed in many departments and agencies. As pointed out in the committee report on this legislation, more than 100 such individuals, previously separated under Public Law 733, 81st Congress, were restored to the public payroll and received back pay for the period of their separation. One hundred of such individuals still are on the Federal payroll. The committee bill authorizes the head of each department and agency to suspend or separate any employee with respect to whom he develops sufficient evidence that there is doubt of loyalty or that the individual's continued employment will adversely affect the national security. Each position in the Federal Government is defined as a position affecting the national security. The department or agency head, in his discretion, need not suspend an employee under this legislation until a hearing is granted, if such procedure is deemed consistent with the national interest. The bill also stipulates that any proposed suspension or separation for other than reasons of loyalty or danger to the national security shall be subject to procedural requirements of the Lloyd-La Follette Act of 1912 or the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, whichever is applicable. Any employee suspended or separated as a loyalty or security risk is granted an appeal to the Civil Service Commission, and the decision of the Commission on the truth of the charges is final and conclusive. The amendments made to Public Law 733 by this act will be effective only through June 30, 1959.

COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

The full Committee on Post Office and Civil Service held 49 days of hearings, including 21 days of hearings on postal rate adjustments and postal policy, 20 days of hearings on postal and other Federal employees pay, 4 days of hearings on the Federal employees security program, and 4 days of hearings on the subjects of Federal employees' training, discontinuance of the Postal Savings System, reimbursement of postal losses on public service items, and retirement and clerical assistants for former Presidents. The committee considered some 151 bills during these hearings.

Legislative subcommittees, appointed to consider specific legislation, conducted a total of 59 days of hearings on some 220 pending bills, including 4 days of hearings on retirement annuity increases and 2 days of hearings on legislation to provide for a Federal employees' training program. The Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization conducted 25 days of hearings in carrying out its program of elimination of duplication and overlapping of functions, nonessential jobs, and unjustified increases in high-salaried positions, directed toward reducing the overall total of Federal positions to the minimum number required in defense and other essential programs.

STUDIES, INVESTIGATIONS, AND SPECIAL REPORTS

Major studies and investigations of matters in the committee jurisdiction were conducted, in accordance with a continuing committee policy, by the committee and by special subcommittees appointed at the committee's organization meeting to consider matters arising in the three major areas of committee jurisdiction—that is, postal operations, manpower utilization in the Federal Government, and the Federal civil service. It is to be noted that the major program of the Subcommittee on the Federal Civil Service, relating to the strengthening of personnel administration in the overseas programs of the Government, carried over from the 84th Congress. Legislation to implement the subcommittee recommendations was introduced in the 85th Congress. Such recommendations would be placed in effect by H. R. 3527, to provide and adjust certain allowances, expenses, and other fringe employment benefits for certain Government employees stationed overseas. H. R. 6141, to provide health and medical services for civilian employees in Government service overseas and their dependents, and H. R. 12225, to govern the salaries and personnel practices for teachers, certain school officers, and other employees of the dependents' schools of the Department of Defense in foreign countries. H. R. 3527 and H. R. 6141 were considered by the committee but final action thereon was deferred for further study in view of the lapse of time and the complexity and breadth of the legislation. H. R. 12225, based on an official request of the Department of Defense is under active consideration by a legislative subcommittee, which held hearings but deferred final action pending the development of additional information and evidence which has been requested from the departments and agencies concerned.

SPECIAL STUDIES

Under authority of House Resolution 139 and in accordance with the direct instructions of the chairman of the full committee, the staff made a number of special surveys involving personnel administration and manpower utilization in a number of military installations and major commands. These surveys were in the nature of management engineering studies covering all phases of organization and administration.

AIR FORCE

In November of the 2d session of the 84th Congress, surveys of personnel administration and manpower utilization were made in subordinate commands of the Army and Air Force. The situations in the subordinate commands indicated that the large portion of their difficulties and the problems arose from orders and instructions issued from command headquarters. As a matter of followup on these surveys of the 84th Congress, members of the committee staff surveyed the headquarters office of the Strategic Air Command, Offutt Air Force Base, Nebr., the headquarters office of the Air Defense Command, Colorado Springs, Colo., and the headquarters office of the Air Materiel Command, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, in April and May of 1957.

It was found that recommendations and suggestions made as a result of the surveys conducted in the 84th Congress had been adopted by these major commands and that considerable progress had been made toward straightening out and improving both the administration of their civilian personnel and the utilization of both military and civilians. On these visits the committee staff worked with the commanding officers and their staff in an effort to bring about full coordination throughout the chain of command and an improvement in administration and staffing problems. The recommendations and suggestions were made verbally to the commanding officers and their deputies. No formalized report on these surveys was prepared.

As a followup of these visits to the major commands, the staff again visited the headquarters office of the Strategic Air Command at Offutt Air Force Base in December 1957. On this visit a survey of activities resulting from suggestions and recommendations made on the prior visit was conducted. It was found that all recommendations and suggestions had been adopted and that certain improvements had been added. A system of personnel administration centrally controlled and sufficiently delegated to local needs had been adopted with major improvements which resulted in increased morale, better production, and a reduction in overall position requirements. Staffing standards and patterns had been developed and adopted which, in this command alone, resulted in a staff reduction of some 1,200 positions. These positions, while not removed from the overall number of positions, were made available for transfer to commands in areas where they could be better utilized. As a result of the cooperative effort between the committee and the Air Force, the Air Force was enabled to perform more work and better work with the same number of personnel.

On-site followup visits were not made at the headquarters of the Air Defense Command or the Air Materiel Command. However, reports from these two commands indicated that they had also taken major steps toward improving personnel administration and the utilization of manpower.

ARMY

In the fall of 1956, the committee received a considerable volume of correspondence indicating that a serious situation existed at the Research and Engineering Command of the Office of the Quartermaster General, Department of the Army, insofar as personnel administration and utilization were concerned. In November of that year, the committee staff conducted a detailed survey of operations and administration at the Research and Engineering Command at Natick, Mass. Certain recommendations and suggestions were made to the command, and a detailed report was prepared. Copies of this report were furnished to the Office of the Quartermaster General and to the members of the committee.

The staff of the committee, working in close cooperation with the Office of the Quartermaster General, continued to follow up on the recommendations and suggestions made as a result of the 1956 survey. In April and May of 1958 the staff made a survey of the Natick, Mass., installation. This survey indicated that practically all the problems encountered in the 1956 survey had been solved, employee morale had risen to a very high level, the services of scientists and engineers were being fully utilized, productivity had increased and the operations of the command had become stabilized and progressive. A staff report of this entire operation was prepared indicating the major improvements that had been achieved as a result of the cooperative efforts of the committee and the Office of the Quartermaster General.

NAVY

The committee received reliable information that excessive overtime without full justification was being authorized in the various offices of the Comptroller of the Department of the Navy. As a check on this matter, the Department of the Navy was requested to furnish a detailed listing of overtime authorized over a period of 4 months with an indication as to whether it was paid overtime or compensatory overtime. The Department furnished the committee with this information.

The report indicated that in only three Bureaus was the overtime excessive. The attention of the Comptroller of the Navy was directed toward this matter, and he was urged to take such action as is necessary to correct it. It is the intention of the committee to make a recheck on overtime in the Department of the Navy during the next Congress.

Numerous complaints from employees and former employees of the Bureau of Naval Personnel indicated that many changes in organization were taking place with resulting upgrading of positions and overstaffing of offices. The Chief of Naval Personnel was directed to furnish the committee with a complete tabulation of all positions in the Bureau in grades GS–7 and above for civilians and warrant officers and above for the military. Complete organizational charts were also requested.

An analysis of this data indicated that certain sections, branches, and offices of

the Bureau had been expanded without a corresponding change in the responsibilities or functions. It also indicated material upgrading in certain areas. The committee requested the Civil Service Commission and the Bureau of the Budget to cover these areas in their normal audit surveys. Upon receipt of information from these two agencies, the committee intends to proceed further in the matter.

LEGISLATION REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

During the 85th Congress, 711 House bills and 22 Senate bills were referred to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. The committee recommended action on 322 House bills and 17 Senate bills.

Railroad Retirement Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I regret that because of an objection, we cannot consider the railroad retirement bill. The deficit in this fund is $170 million, and I had hoped to vote for a bill to cure the situation of having this fund operated on a deficiency basis. When representatives of the beneficiaries discussed this legislation with me after the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee held hearings, I told the union leaders I was sympathetic to adjusting benefits but the most important responsibility I felt was to maintain the integrity of the fund.

As I understand the railroad retirement legislation and its provisions as the Senate attached the bill as an amendment to the longshoremen's bill, it increased benefits but at the same time restored the fund to an actuarially sound basis. I would think the House would have passed this retirement bill if it could have come to the floor. Certainly as I understand its provisions I would have voted for it and as I say I regret what happened.

Report to the People of the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin—XII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report to the people of the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin on my voting and attendance record for the 2d session of the 85th Congress.

The report includes all rollcall votes and all quorum calls. Its purpose is to collect in one place and in concise form information which is scattered through some 18,000 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The descriptions of the bills and the amendments or motions in the report are for purposes of identification only; no attempt is made to describe the legislation completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved. This word of caution is advisable in view of the fact that the descriptions used are, for the most part, taken from the official titles of the bills which, unfortunately, do not always reflect the nature or true purpose of the legislation. Upon request, I will be pleased to furnish more complete information concerning any particular bill, as well as a summary of the issues involved and the reasons for my vote.

The furnishing of this report continues a service I began in the 1st session of the 80th Congress. This is the 12th report of my voting and attendance record. These 12 reports show how I voted on 1,625 questions in the House of Representatives. Based on quorum calls and the record votes, they also show an attendance record of 95 percent.

Roll-call No.	Date 1958	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1	Jan. 7	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 9737, authorizing the Secretary of the Air Force to establish and develop certain installations for the national security and to confer certain authority on the Secretary of Defense:	
2	Jan. 15	On passage. (Passed 374 to 0)	Yea.
3	Jan. 21	Quorum call	Present.
4	Jan. 22	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 9955, providing for a temporary increase in the public debt limit from $275,000,000,000 to $280,000,000,000:	
5	Jan. 23	On motion to recommit with instructions to limit increase to $278,000,000,000. (Rejected, 115 to 275)	Yea.
6	Jan. 23	On passage. (Passed, 328 to 71)	Nay.
		H. R. 10146, making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense:	
7	Jan. 23	On passage. (Passed 388 to 0)	Yea.
		H. R. 2151, suspending for 3 years the import duty on certain coarse wools:	
8	Feb. 4	On passage. (Passed 250 to 129)	Nay.
9	Feb. 10	Quorum call	Absent.
10	Feb. 18	Quorum call	Absent.
		H. J. Res. 2, providing for the transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir and payment to Crow Indian Tribe in connection therewith:	
11	Feb. 19	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 152 to 197)	Not voting.[1]
12	Feb. 25	Quorum call	Present.
13	Feb. 26	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 10881, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1958:	
14	Feb. 26	On amendment providing an additional $10 million each for Glen Canyon project and the Trinity River reclamation projects. (Passed 200 to 184.)	Nay.
15	Mar. 4	Quorum call	Present.
16	Mar. 5	Quorum call	Present.
17	Mar. 6	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 8002, providing for revised methods of stating budget estimates:	
18	Mar. 6	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 119 to 275)	Yea.
19	Mar. 6	On passage. (Passed 311 to 86)	Nay.
		S. 497, authorizing Rivers and Harbors projects:	
20	Mar. 11	On motion to recommit with instructions to include only projects which had been approved by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget. (Rejected 167 to 234.)	Yea.
21	Mar. 11	On passage. (Passed 321 to 81)	Nay.
		S. Con. Res. 69, urging acceleration of military construction programs:	
22	Mar. 19	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 375 to 20)	Nay.
		S. Con. Res. 68, urging acceleration of civilian construction programs:	
23	Mar. 19	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 379 to 16)	Nay.
24	Mar. 19	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 3262, authorizing support by the Armed Forces of the Olympic winter games and authorizing appropriation of $4,000,000:	
25	Mar. 19	On motion to suspend the rules and pass. (Rejected 257 to 139, a two-thirds majority being required)	Nay.
26	Mar. 20	Quorum call	Present.
		S. J. Res. 162, preventing temporarily any reduction in agricultural support prices or acreage allotments:	
27	Mar. 20	On motion to recommit, with instructions to make resolution applicable only to dairy products. (Rejected 173 to 211)	Yea.
28	Mar. 20	On passage. (Passed 210 to 172)	Yea.
		H. Res. 507, providing for the consideration of H. R. 11470, providing revised pay schedules for members of the Armed Forces:	
29	Mar. 25	On adoption of resolution. (Adopted 382 to 5)	Yea.
		H. R. 11470, providing revised pay schedules for members of the Armed Forces:	
30	Mar. 25	On passage. (Passed 366 to 22)	Yea.
31	Mar. 26	Quorum call	Present.
32	Mar. 27	Quorum call	Present.
33	Mar. 27	Quorum call	Present.

[1] Absent. If present, would have voted "yea."

Roll-call No.	Date 1958	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		H. R. 8290, authorizing the erection of a national monument symbolizing the ideals of democracy (Freedom Shrine):	
34	Mar. 27	On motion to recommit. (Passed 195 to 169)	Nay.
		H. R. 5822, relating to reinvestment by air carriers of gains derived from the sale or other disposition of flight equipment:	
35	Mar. 28	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 276 to 63)	Yea.
36	Mar. 28	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 3262, authorizing support by the Armed Forces of the Olympic winter games and authorizing appropriation of $4,000,000:	
37	Mar. 28	On passage. (Passed 218 to 102)	Nay.
		H. R. 10589, making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for fiscal year 1959:	
38	Apr. 1	On amendment providing $750,000 for expenses of the Civil Rights Commission. (Passed 273 to 98)	Nay.
		H. R. 9821, authorizing additional appropriations for highway construction and revising the Federal-State matching formula from 50-50 basis to 66⅔-33⅓ basis:	
39	Apr. 3	On motion to recommit the conference report. (Rejected 109 to 222)	Yea.
40	Apr. 3	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 300 to 28)	Nay.
41	Apr. 16	Quorum call	Present.
42	Apr. 22	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 465, providing for the consideration of H. R. 912, amending the Navy ration statutes so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine:	
43	Apr. 22	On adoption of resolution. (Adopted 232 to 130)	Nay.
		H. R. 912, amending the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine:	
44	Apr. 22	On amendment providing the Navy shall not buy margarine so long as surplus butter is available through the Commodity Credit Corporation except for use in certain overseas areas. (Adopted 207 to 161)	Yea.
		H. Res. 551, providing for the consideration of H. R. 11451, authorizing the construction of 2 superliner passenger vessels:	
45	Apr. 29	On motion to suspend the rules and adopt resolution. (Adopted 343 to 31)	Nay.
46	Apr. 29	Quorum call	Absent.
		H. R. 11451, authorizing the construction by the United States of 2 superliner passenger vessels:	
47	Apr. 29	On passage. (Passed 289 to 94)	Nay.
48	Apr. 30	Quorum call	Present.
49	May 1	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 12065, authorizing Federal unemployment benefits for individuals who exhaust their benefit rights under existing unemployment compensation or are not covered by State systems:	
50	May 1	On amendment substituting bill providing for loans to States for payment of extended benefits. (Adopted 223 to 165)	Yea.
51	May 1	On passage. (Passed 372 to 17)	Yea.
52	May 6	Quorum call	Present.
53	May 12	Quorum call	Present.
54	May 12	Quorum call	Present.
55	May 12	Quorum call	Present.
56	May 13	Quorum call	Present.
57	May 13	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 12181, authorizing the mutual security program:	
58	May 14	On passage. (Passed 259 to 134)	Yea.
59	May 15	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 12428, making appropriations for the Department of State, and Justice, and the Judiciary:	
60	May 15	On passage. (Passed 320 to 51)	Yea.
61	May 21	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 7999, providing for the admission of Alaska into the Union:	
62	May 21	On motion that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the bill. (Adopted 217 to 172)	Nay.
63	May 21	Quorum call	Present.
64	May 21	Quorum call	Present.
65	May 21	Quorum call	Present.
66	May 21	Quorum call	Absent.
		H. R. 5836, readjusting postal rates and establishing a Congressional policy for the determination of postal rates:	
67	May 22	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 381 to 0)	Not voting.[1]
68	May 22	Quorum call	Absent.
69	May 22	Quorum call	Absent.
70	May 22	Quorum call	Absent.
71	May 22	Quorum call	Absent.
72	May 23	Quorum call	Absent.
73	May 26	Quorum call	Absent.
74	May 26	Quorum call	Absent.
75	May 26	Quorum call	Absent.
76	May 27	Quorum call	Present.
77	May 27	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 7999, providing for the admission of Alaska into the Union:	
78	May 28	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 174 to 199)	Yea.
79	May 28	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 7999, providing for the admission of Alaska into the Union:	
80	May 28	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 172 to 202)	Yea.
81	May 28	On passage. (Passed 210 to 166)	Nay.
82	June 2	Quorum call	Present.
83	June 3	Quorum call	Present.
84	June 4	Quorum call	Present.
85	June 4	Quorum call	Present.
86	June 4	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 12738, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1959:	
87	June 5	On amendment increasing appropriation by $99,000,000 and requiring that the Army strength be maintained at 900,000. (Passed 225 to 159)	Nay.
88	June 5	On passage. (Passed 390 to 0)	Yea.
89	June 9	Quorum call	Present.
90	June 9	Quorum call	Present.
91	June 10	Quorum call	Present.
92	June 10	Quorum call	Present.
93	June 11	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 12591, extending the Trade Agreements Act for 5 years:	
94	June 11	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 146 to 268)	Yea.
95	June 11	On passage. (Passed 317 to 98)	Nay.
96	June 11	Quorum call	Present.
97	June 11	Quorum call	Present.
98	June 12	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 12541, providing for reorganization of the Department of Defense:	
99	June 12	On motion to recommit with instructions to bring bill in line with President's recommendations. (Rejected 192 to 211)	Yea.
100	June 12	On passage. (Passed 402 to 1)	Yea.
101	June 17	Quorum call	Present.
102	June 18	S. 3910, authorizing rivers and harbors projects: On motion to suspend rules and pass with an amendment substituting text of bill containing only projects reported on by Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Budget. (Passed 374 to 17.)	Yea.
103	June 19	H. R. 12858, making appropriations for civil functions of the Army, certain agencies of the Interior Department and the Tennessee Valley Authority (Public Works appropriation) for the fiscal year 1959: On passage. (Passed 362 to 18)	Nay.
104	June 19	H. R. 12716, amending the Atomic Energy Act to permit greater exchange of information and material with military allies of the United States: On passage. (Passed 345 to 12)	Yea.
105	June 25	H. R. 11077, incorporating the Veterans of World War I: On passage. (Passed 389 to 2)	Yea.
106	June 26	Quorum call	Present.
107	June 26	H. Res. 609, providing for the consideration of H. R. 12954, the omnibus farm bill of 1958: On adoption. (Rejected 171 to 214)	Nay.

[1] Absent. If present, would have voted "yea."

Roll-call No.	Date 1958	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		S. 1832, authorizing appointment of an Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs:	
108	June 26	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Rejected 224 to 145, a ⅔ majority being required)	Yea.
		H. R. 12695, providing a 1-year extension of existing corporate taxes and certain excise taxes and repealing the transportation tax on property:	
109	June 27	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 367 to 9)	Yea.
		H. R. 12181, authorizing the mutual security program:	
110	June 27	On motion to recommit the conference report. (Rejected 134 to 238)	Nay.
		H. R. 12832, amending the Interstate Commerce Act so as to strengthen and improve the national transportation system:	
111	June 27	On passage. (Passed 348 to 2)	Yea.
		S. 3342, continuing the special school milk program for 3 years:	
112	June 30	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 328 to 1)	Yea.
113	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
114	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
115	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
116	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
117	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 11477, clarifying the admissibility of statements and confessions as evidence in Federal courts:	
118	July 2	On passage. (Passed 294 to 79)	Yea.
		H. R. 13192, making appropriations for the mutual security program for the fiscal year 1959:	
119	July 2	On motion to recommit with instructions to add $75 million to funds allocated for defense support. (Rejected 166 to 214)	Nay.
120	July 2	On passage. (Passed 253 to 126)	Yea.
121	July 9	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 13015, authorizing certain construction at military installations:	
122	July 10	On motion to recommit with instructions to make permissive, rather than mandatory, the sale of San Jacinto Depot, Tex., property. (Rejected 179 to 202)	Yea.
123	July 10	On passage. (Passed 379 to 2)	Yea.
		S. 495, authorizing the acquisition of additional property in the District of Columbia for the United States Capitol Grounds:	
124	July 10	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Rejected 232 to 150, a ⅔ majority being required)	Nay.
		S. 1411, relating to the suspension of employment of Federal civilian personnel on security grounds:	
125	July 10	On passage. (Passed 296 to 46)	Yea.
126	July 14	Quorum call	Present.
127	July 15	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 597, providing for the consideration of H. R. 3, establishing rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws:	
128	July 15	On adoption. (Adopted 268 to 114)	Yea.
129	July 15	Quorum call	Present.
130	July 16	Quorum call	Present.
131	July 16	Quorum call	Present.
132	July 17	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 3, establishing rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws:	
133	July 17	On amendment specifying that no subversive activities law already passed by Congress should be construed as invalidating State anti-subversive laws. (Adopted 249–147)	Yea.
134	July 17	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 161 to 236)	Nay.
135	July 17	On passage. (Passed 241 to 155)	Yea.
136	July 18	Quorum call	Present.
137	July 21	Quorum call	Present.
138	July 22	Quorum call	Present.
139	July 22	Quorum call	Present.
140	July 23	Quorum call	Present.
141	July 24	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 485, resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4504, authorizing $25,000,000 for mortgage insurance on marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities:	
142	July 24	On adoption of the resolution. (Rejected 164 to 211)	Nay.
143	July 28	Quorum call	Present.
144	July 30	Quorum call	Present.
145	July 30	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 649, resolution providing for the consideration of S. 607, providing retirement, clerical assistants, office space, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents:	
146	July 30	On adoption of resolution. (Adopted 234 to 120)	Nay.
147	July 31	Quorum call	Present.
148	July 31	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 13549, providing increased social security benefits and social security tax increases to improve financial soundness of social security trust fund:	
149	July 31	On passage. (Passed 374 to 2)	Yea.
		H. Res. 659, resolution citing Robert Lehrer for contempt of Congress:	
150	July 31	On adoption of resolution. (Adopted 363 to 0)	Yea.
151	Aug 1	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 650, resolution providing for the consideration of S. 3497, authorizing $2,000,000,000 in loans to municipalities for community facilities:	
152	Aug. 1	On adoption of resolution. (Rejected 173 to 187)	Nay.
153	Aug. 4	Quorum call	Present.
154	Aug. 5	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 13015, authorizing certain construction at military installations:	
155	Aug. 6	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 256 to 135)	Nay.
		H. R. 13580, increasing the public debt limit to $288,000,000,000:	
156	Aug. 6	On passage. (Passed 286 to 109)	Yea.
		S. 4071, providing for price, production adjustment and marketing programs for various agricultural commodities:	
157	Aug. 6	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Rejected 210 to 186, a ⅔ majority being required)	Nay.
158	Aug. 7	Quorum call	Present
		H. Res. 675, resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 13247, authorizing $1,070,000,000 for Federal scholarships, loans and aid to the States for educational purposes:	
159	Aug. 7	On adoption. (Adopted 266 to 108)	Nay.
160	Aug. 8	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 13247, authorizing $1,070,000,000 for Federal Scholarships, loans and aid to the States for educational purposes:	
161	Aug. 8	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 140 to 233)	Yea.
162	Aug. 12	Quorum call	Present.
163	Aug. 12	Quorum call	Present.
164	Aug. 13	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 2266, providing that wage rates for employees of Portsmouth, N. H., Naval Shipyard shall be the same as rates established at Boston Shipyard:	
165	Aug. 13	On motion to pass bill over veto of President. (Rejected 202 to 180, a two-thirds majority being required)	Nay.
		H. Res. 684, citing Bernard Goldfine for contempt of Congress:	
166	Aug. 13	On resolution. (Adopted 369 to 8)	Yea.
		H. Res. 686, citing Carl Braden for contempt of Congress:	
167	Aug. 13	On resolution. (Adopted 365 to 1)	Yea.
168	Aug. 14	Quorum call	Present.
169	Aug. 15	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 682, providing for the consideration of S. 3683, authorizing loans, grants, and other financial assistance to depressed areas (Area Redevelopment Act):	
170	Aug. 15	On resolution. (Adopted 216 to 150)	Nay.
171	Aug. 15	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 3683, authorizing loans, grants, and other financial assistance to depressed areas (Area Redevelopment Act):	
172	Aug. 15	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 170 to 188)	Yea.
173	Aug. 18	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 4035, authorizing $1,225,000,000 additional Federal housing program:	
174	Aug. 18	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Rejected 261 to 134, a two-thirds majority being required)	Nay.
		S. 3974, the labor-management reporting and disclosure act:	
175	Aug. 18	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Rejected 190 to 198, a ⅔ majority being required)	Nay.
176	Aug. 18	Quorum call	Present.

Roll-call No.	Date 1958	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		H. R. 13607, providing for the establishment of a food stamp plan for the distribution of $1,000,000,000 in surplus food commodities a year:	
177	Aug. 18	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Rejected 196 to 187, a ⅔ majority being required)	Nay.
178	Aug. 19	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 691, providing for House disagreement to Senate amendments to H. R. 13247, authorizing $1,070,000,000 for Federal scholarships, loans, and aids to the States for educational purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate:	
179	Aug. 19	On adoption of resolution. (Adopted 259 to 110)	Nay.
180	Aug. 19	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 689, providing for consideration of S. 4036, subsidizing the copper, lead, zinc, acid-grade fluorspar, and tungsten industries:	
181	Aug. 19	On adoption of resolution. (Adopted 198 to 165)	Yea.
182	Aug. 19	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 13450, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1959:	
183	Aug. 20	On motion to accept Senate amendment prohibiting appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration unless specifically authorized by Congress in annual authorizing legislation. (Rejected 126 to 236)	Nay.
184	Aug. 20	On motion adding $10,000,000 for construction of additional radio facilities for U. S. Information Agency. (Adopted 190 to 172)	Nay.
185	Aug. 20	Quorum call	Present.
186	Aug. 21	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 4036, subsidizing the copper, lead, zinc, acid-grade fluorspar, and tungsten industries:	
187	Aug. 21	On motion to strike enacting clause. (Rejected 171 to 174)	Yea.
188	Aug. 21	On passage. (Rejected 159 to 182)	Nay.
		S. Con. Res. 109, expressing the sense of Congress for the establishment of the United Nations Police Force:	
189	Aug. 21	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Adopted 299 to 20)	Yea.
190	Aug. 22	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 3335, donating land and providing for construction in the District of Columbia of a National Cultural Center:	
191	Aug. 22	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 261 to 55)	Nay.
		H. R. 13343, authorizing the appropriation of $500,000 for the Pan American games in Chicago, Ill.:	
192	Aug. 22	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 244 to 64)	Nay.
		H. R. 13489, making appropriations for military construction:	
193	Aug. 23	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 300 to 1)	Yea.
194	Aug. 23	Quorum call	Present.
		H. R. 13247, authorizing loans and aid to the States for educational purposes:	
195	Aug. 23	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 212 to 85)	Nay.

Report to the Second Congressional District of South Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert a résumé of legislation in this session of Congress which goes to my constituents in the Second Congressional District of South Dakota. The newsletter is as follows:

At the close of each session during the past 8 years, I have made a report to the people of the Second Congressional District of South Dakota, summarizing the action of Congress in an attempt to give you a thumbnail analysis of the way I have cast your vote for you in the Congress of the United States.

During the sessions I send out a weekly report to all the newspapers; once a month I get out a newsletter; I have had a weekly radio broadcast; and during the recess, I hold meetings and maintained a traveling office in every county, in an effort to see and visit with as many people and groups as possible.

In this report I want to emphasize that there are two sides to every issue coming before Congress. Some are based on political philosophies, some are based upon economic conditions, some upon area needs, and some upon group pressures. I hope it will always be possible for honest and sincere men and women to differ in their conclusions on public questions. My purpose has been to carefully examine and weigh legislation, balancing the benefits to all, against the immediate benefit to the few. I have dodged no votes; my record is in the upper 5 percent of those answering roll calls; I have carefully explained my position; I have not been a rubber stamp; I owe no allegiance to anyone or any group except the 165,000 people in western South Dakota. It is those people to whom this report is addressed.

BUSY SESSION

This has been a hard session. Although it has enacted some productive legislation, it has been the most reckless, irresponsible, expensive session in peacetime history. Founded upon sputnik hysteria, every spending bill was given a label of national defense or national recovery. I cast your vote against most of them because I believe our survival lies in remaining the most powerfully armed Nation in the world, and, as such, speaking softly but firmly from a position of strength and carrying this "big stick" to back it up. In addition, however, to me it is absolutely essential that we remain strong economically, because the military strength of any nation is only so strong as the economy behind it. If we spend ourselves into bankruptcy, we have lost everything and when this happens, the Free World goes down the drain with us.

History has proven that more nations, down through the years, have been destroyed by inflation than by invading armies. Inflation will destroy more nations in the future than the most terrible bomb that can ever be invented. High taxes, high government spending, and deficit financing create inflation.

Lenin said, "You can compel the democracies to bankrupt themselves." I have cast your vote against most of this spending because national bankruptcy is accomplished through inflation. When the value of a nation's money is gone, it is bankrupt. Yes, this has been a difficult session.

AGRICULTURE—FARM BILL

It has been almost impossible to get a satisfactory farm bill through this session. This is true because of the diversity of interest, pressure from the various regions of the Nation increase their income by increasing production of the various farm commodities, and because the several farm organizations are not in agreement upon any legislation.

In addition to this overall problem is the situation we find in the House Agriculture Committee. That committee is composed of 37 members, 22 of whom are Democrats and 15 Republicans. Of the 22 Democrats, 14 are from southern States; all Republican members are from northern States, 9 from the Middle West.

Because of the committee composition, it is natural that emphasis is placed on legislation dealing with cotton, rice, tobacco, and peanuts, plus legislative loopholes permitting Northern crops to be grown on diverted acres in the South. It was this situation that created the "log jam" in the present session. A compromise was worked out affecting cotton, corn, and feed grains, plus an extension of the National Wool Act, Public Law 480, providing for foreign disposal, and the school lunch program. The feed grain section was not what we in the North would like to have had, but it was that or nothing, and on several occasions it looked like nothing.

There is a philosophy that farm prices are made in Washington. This may be true of legislatively controlled crops, but it is not true of production and income. Mother nature has smiled upon South Dakota and the Middle West, and while acres and prices may be reduced, farm income will probably be 25 percent higher than in 1957. Fears that were fanned for a recession have proven to be mostly a tempest in the teapot.

INVESTMENTS IN FUTURE

While increased spending without increased production is inflationary, spending which improves our natural resources and increases production, is not. Appropriations have been increased to improve our national parks and national monuments. Appropriations for the Interstate Highway System were boosted. South Dakota benefits materially from this as it puts our tourist attractions on the main thoroughfare of the Nation.

LABOR LEGISLATION

The so-called labor reform bill was a sad disappointment to those of us who have been attempting to get reform in labor legislation. We were hopeful of getting legislation to insure honest elections in labor unions, to protect welfare and trust funds, to eliminate secondary boycotts and sympathy strikes, and place the larger unions under antitrust and antimonopoly laws to protect the working man.

The labor leaders wrote the bill on the Senate floor. It came to the House where the Speaker held it 41 days before referring it to the Labor Committee for consideration. The committee then voted against holding any hearings. It came to the House floor under the "gag" of suspension of the rules, which prohibits any amendments and permits only 40 minutes of debate. A bill, virtually written by labor bosses, rammed through Congress without 1 hour of House committee hearings and under a procedure which limited debate to 5 seconds per Mem-

ber, was killed by a vote of 190 for, to 198 against. They received only 14 votes besides the 176 Members labor money elected. Protective legislation will be written when the people demand it—that time must be soon.

INTERNATIONAL

Congress gave to the President the authority requested by him for reorganization of the Defense Department, putting the Secretary of Defense in direct command of the Armed Forces and giving him explicit authority to assign weapons to services as he sees fit and giving the Joint Chiefs of Staff direct operational authority.

Without my vote, Congress passed a 4-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act, permitting a 20-percent further tariff cut, and the mutual security authorization of about $3¼ billion. I am fearful of the further slashing of protective tariff rates, and with about $8 billion already appropriated and unspent for mutual security, it hardly seemed wise to further increase "red ink" spending at this time.

MISCELLANEOUS

Unemployment compensation was extended for 16 weeks on a loan basis to States. By 6 votes we killed an all-things-to-all-people "dole" amendment costing $1.5 billion to pay all unemployed, regardless of need. Set up a new agency to cope with problems of space. Created a new star and a new State from the Territory of Alaska. Passed a $5.5 billion highway construction bill. A $524 million Federal civilian pay raise. One-cent increase in postage rates. A $1.5 billion rivers and harbors construction authorization. Federal aid through grants and loans for college education, which a majority seemed to feel was better than reducing taxes, permitting parents to keep their money to educate their own children. Increase pay to military personnel as an inducement for capable people to remain in the service. Provided relief to railroads through Government loans instead of getting at the source of the present problem, which is excessive Government regulation. Made permanent the Small Business Administration. Increased the national debt in spite of my vote. I felt Congress should be brought to realize what their reckless spending is doing, and apparently the only way to accomplish this is to return a few checks marked "insufficient funds." Several other grant-in-aid laws were passed and other laws in which the Federal Government further usurps the power over the State and local governments. All economists predict that the Federal deficit will exceed $10 billion by June 30, 1959. As I indicated at the outset, this has been the most expensive Congress in peacetime history. The voters of the Nation can do something about it this fall.

Sincerely yours,

E. Y. BERRY.

Rear Adm. Edward C. Stephan, United States Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY J. LATHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed emotions that we learn that Adm. Edward C. Stephan is leaving his assignment as Chief of Legislative Liaison and moving to the important command in charge of our South Atlantic naval forces. We are sorry to see him go but wish him every happiness and success in his new assignment.

The Members of Congress have come to know Admiral Stephan as a fine friend and a great aid in conducting their legislative duties. He was never too busy to lend a hand to assist with the many difficult problems pertaining to the Navy, which daily presented themselves.

He was an outstanding combat officer, holder of the Navy Cross, the Silver Star Medal, the Gold Star in lieu of the second Silver Star Medal, and the Gold Star in lieu of the third Silver Star Medal for outstanding service in the Pacific as a submarine skipper.

He is a great American, a naval officer who has lived and fought in the finest tradition of the service and we wish him Godspeed.

Dedication of Memorial Park Monument, Brooklyn, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, at the invitation of Mayor John M. Coyne, the very able, distinguished, and civic-minded mayor of Brooklyn, Ohio, it was my privilege to speak at the dedication of the Memorial Park Monument. Under leave granted, I insert my address in the RECORD:

It is a great honor to participate in the formal dedication of this fitting Memorial Park Monument which shall stand henceforth as a symbol of our esteem for and indebtedness to all those who served our beloved country in time of need. This monument shall stand as a timeless reminder that the chains of human slavery rest infinitely heavier upon the shoulders of free men than the wearing of a soldier's gear in defense of our priceless liberties and freedoms. The American Legion and all those good citizens who cooperated in making this memorial possible are to be congratulated for a job well done.

The birth of our Nation marked the most significant step in man's long struggle upward toward a system of government which recognizes the dignity of man as the highest value which can be secured for any people under any form of government. History is replete with many dark chapters of man's inhumanity to man and the degradation visited upon whole civilizations by despotic rulers who saw in other men nothing more than the opportunity for exploitation. The ambitions of these despots led to military campaigns and great human sacrifice as the empires of their dreams were fulfilled. Since recorded history the common man has struggled against the schemes of the tyrant, sometimes successfully and many times unsuccessfully. But always the struggle of the common man has pressed forward toward the forming of a society in which all men would be equal and in which the God-given right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness would be a reality. It was this great ideal, forged upon the anvil of long trial and great sacrifice, which inspired our Founding Fathers to proclaim the Declaration of Independence. Their inspiring charter of high purpose and intent lifted up the hopes of all mankind for a better life, for a better world. That historic document stands today as the only acceptable foundation for the forming of both our domestic and foreign policies. It expresses in clear and unmistakable language the basic human rights that must be enjoyed by all our people and our fervent hopes that these same rights be enjoyed by the people of all nations of the world.

National devotion to these timeless principles has made us a peace-loving nation, a nation which has never coveted either the territory or possessions of any other nation or people, a nation which has sought only justice and security for our own people. It is to our everlasting credit that it can be said with honesty we have never committed any unprovoked acts against any other nation and have been drawn into war only as a matter of absolute necessity and in our own self-defense.

This is what has made our country down through its history a haven for the persecuted and the victims of tyranny and dictatorship which cause war and human misery. The United States of America has stood not only as a symbol of peace among nations, but as a land of opportunity for the individual to find peace and tranquility in which to live. That is why we have always stood ready to defend the rights of small nations—those who, by sheer numbers, were threatened by large and aggressive empires on the march. That is why we have helped other nations gain their independence and to hold it against external threats after winning it.

Twice in the lifetime of many of us gathered here today the youth of our Nation has been called upon to defend our priceless values of individual liberty and human freedom. Twice in that lifetime we have been drawn into worldwide conflicts because the basic liberties and freedoms of our people were threatened by tyranny on the march. Twice more within the lifetime of all here present our youth have been called upon to repulse the aggressive tide of Russian communism which seeks to enslave the entire world.

In 1950 the Russian Communists instigated a war in Korea. Their objective was to drive the United States out of all of Asia and thereby to consolidate this huge land mass and many millions of people into their new empire. In retrospect one can now see that had the Russians been successful in this effort, their next step would have been to drive the United States forces for freedom out of Japan and from there the Russian conquest of the rest of the Eurasian land mass would have been only a matter of time. Had they been successful in this maneuver, it would then have been possible for them to concentrate their forces for the conquest of all of Europe and Africa. It should be obvious to all that such circumstances would place the United States and the entire Western Hemisphere dangerously close to isolation. It is no secret that the Russian plan for world conquest calls for whittling down the overall strength of the Free World, leading to our isolation. If they are ever successful in this phase of their plan, they will then launch an all-out attack against the United States.

This Russian maneuver in Korea was defeated. All of us know this Russian defeat was a costly one in which many of our heroic men paid the supreme sacrifice. It is true that we were joined in this defense of freedom by many other nations, but the burden of defense was borne in the main by our own boys.

Within the last several months the world has witnessed another Russian effort to implement their plan for world conquest. This effort occurred in the Near East which is the Russian gateway to Africa and all of

South Asia. This time the Kremlin changed its tactics from open armed aggression such as they used in Korea, to the tactics of internal subversion of a free, democratic, and independent country. The small country of Lebanon was the target of this new Russian intrigue. The Kremlin had already secured a foothold in Syria and was using Colonel Nasser of Egypt as an instrument to consolidate all of the Near and Middle East into an anti-Western bloc while at the same time preparing the emerging Arab bloc for massive infiltration and eventual takeover by the Russians. Little Lebanon, with its firm adherence to the principles of democracy and Western orientation, stood as a roadblock to this scheme. These are the hard, cold facts which are in back of the crisis in Lebanon. The legal Government of Lebanon called upon the Government of the United States to protect its freedom and national integrity. This was the challenge which faced President Eisenhower. In these circumstances President Eisenhower could make only one decision. He made the decision to respond to the appeal of the legitimate Government of Lebanon. If he had failed to take this decision, it would not be long before the entire Near and Middle East would be integrated into the Russian power bloc which would open to the Russians the gateway to Africa and all of South Asia, and deny free countries access to the strategic Suez Canal. This would have placed the free nations of Western Europe in an untenable position and thereby the United States, because of our membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

After fighting two world wars, one of them on global fronts, after being called to defend the cause of freedom in Korea and Lebanon, the temptation exists to become disillusioned and cynical about the world around us. But we Americans will become neither disillusioned nor cynical. We know from the lessons of our childhood that it is the destiny of our country ever to remain the citadel of freedom. Each generation of Americans must keep this rendezvous with destiny.

We can learn a great deal about the defense of our liberties and the prevention of war from a study of the mistakes, defaults, and unwarranted timidity of the free nations in the period between the world wars. The League of Nations had been established to secure peace and to provide a basis for pacific settlements of differences between nations. In the early years of the League the twin tyrannies of nazism and communism rose up and began to make threats against smaller nations. The League in turn expressed its concern through spirited debates and appeals to reason.

It was not long before Hitler convinced himself, and, unfortunately, many others, that democracy was decadent and unwilling to defend its own interests. He began nibbling away at the territories of other nations and engaging in a form of economic and propaganda warfare which threatened the peace. The League of Nations debated some more but refused to heed the advice of some realistic statesmen, among them Eamon DeValera of Ireland, who called for sanctions against the dictators backed up by the collective action of free countries. Consequently, the Russian dictators became convinced that Hitler would destroy all the democracies, so they joined up with him in an effort to divide the spoils. The result was World War II.

The lessons of history teach us that we cannot preserve the peace by attempting to placate the tyrant. The more we attempt to placate the dictator, the greater will become his appetite for more and more concessions. In turn, the more concessions he wrings from the timid and wavering statesmen, the more confident he becomes that he can take anything he wants by force or intrigue without serious fears of sanctions or reprisal. All this leads to a deterioration of the forces which sustain peace until there is no course open but war—a war of survival for all those things which civilized mankind treasures as much as life itself.

We will never prevent the outbreak of world war III unless we are prepared to make the smaller sacrifices necessary to stop the dictator before he gets his war machine into full gear. This means we must stand up to the loud threats of the Russians, we must encourage other and smaller nations to stand with us in a common determination to prevent war. We must be prepared to defeat every aggression of the Russians, whether it be by direct armed intervention or indirectly by intrigue or internal subversion. If we do this and stand firmly by the friends of freedom throughout the world, we will prevent another war. If we fail in this responsibility, we will fail the cause of peace and justice.

Daniel Webster, in his generation, when faced with tasks no less trying than ours, inspired his contemporaries with these words: "God grants liberty only to those who love it and are always ready to guard and defend it." We Americans at this point in history, standing as the most powerful Nation in the world, have accepted the challenge of destiny and our role as defenders of liberty and human freedom.

This magnificent monument to the heroism of all those who stood in defense of our historic role will be a guiding star for our younger generations into whose hands the course of human events has placed the sacred torch of freedom. As I look upon this monument, I am reminded of the immortal words of John McCrea, a young soldier in the British army, written during the course of World War I:

To you from failing hands we throw
The torch; be yours to hold it high.
If ye break faith with us who die
We shall not sleep, though poppies grow
In Flanders fields.

These immortal words stand as a challenge to us in our time. We must not break faith with those who fought and died in defense of the priceless values of our American way of life. We owe this to them, to ourselves, and to future generations of Americans. We must preserve and extend the blessings of human freedom. This is the real challenge of our times.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of August 23, 1958:

WASHINGTON REPORT
(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

AUGUST 23, 1958.

Legislative measures are being considered so rapidly it is difficult to list them, much less describe. The basic study and debate of new legislation has been replaced by conference reports, the compromises of the differences of earlier House and Senate bills, respectively.

The defeat of the omnibus housing bill and the alleged labor reform bill was surprising to many and clearly showed that, though hurried, the House could act responsibly. The Housing bill of 1958 (supplementary to the earlier $1.85 billion March emergency housing bill) provided something for everyone, totaling $2,900 million (a reduction from the $4,412 million Senate bill). There were funds for housing the elderly, for Government purchase of mortgages, college housing, college classrooms, and laboratories, and reactivated public housing. Downpayments on homes were reduced ($1,355 from $1,980 on $20,000 home for example). Even the Housing Administrator admitted this bill wasn't necessary, that the housing industry could do well without it. Surprisingly, proponents still stressed the recession reason, forgetting the known facts on the construction industry's health. The bill failed to pass. (Significant possibly could be the hurried consideration, only 40 minutes debate and no amendments permitted. For the second time this year on housing legislation, the printed bill wasn't ready.)

The Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1958 (S. 3974, known as Kennedy-Ives bill), allegedly to correct labor leaders' misuses of labor's power and funds, also violence, graft, and corruption disclosed by the McClellan committee hearings, we found to be a whitewash which evaded the needed corrective action and sought to transfer blame to management. Employers, under criminal penalty, could not communicate with workers, while picketing, secret ballot, and secondary boycotts were left untouched. In fact, none of the six basic needs were covered: (1) Unions subject to antitrust law; (2) preservation of State jurisdiction; (3) prohibition of compulsory unionism; (4) judicial review of Federal wage setting; (5) prohibition of secondary boycotts; (6) establishment of secret ballot for union members. The bill was the week's or year's political football. Even as the House Labor Committee voted against considering the bill at all (22-7, all the Democrats voting against), the Chicago and Detroit papers were heralding the Rayburn-Reuther agreement, wherein Speaker RAYBURN agreed to bring the bill directly to the House floor under suspension of the rules (see HOFFMAN of Michigan: "The Sellout and the Payoff," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 18, 1958, pp. 18267-18268). Sure enough, it happened as forecasted. Now Reuther couldn't lose—he'd win either way—the House either passing a "nothing" bill (see KEARNS of Pennsylvania, p. 18266; BARDEN of North Carolina, pp. 18266-18267)—or rejecting it, and those Members opposing it subjected to the accusation of being against labor reform. The House rejected the bill (198-190, under suspension two-thirds majority needed for passage), a coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats joining together—137 Republicans and 61 Democrats (for the bill—149 Democrats and 41 Republicans). The President, as well as many Members (Members not supported by labor) condemned the bill and the political maneuvering.

The social security bill (August 2 newsletter) was improved by the Senate and on return to the House passed handily. The President echoed my earlier criticism of title V, Federal grants to States, threatening a veto. The Senate cut the amount $288 million. My satisfaction was lessened by Senate failure to meet the challenge of attempting to make it actuarily sound.

Additional money for the USIA (United States Information Agency) produced some lively and caustic criticism of the personnel and accomplishments of the USIA. We all know we Americans must "sell our product", United States ideals and principles. We can mirror America to the world or wage a prop-

aganda campaign in the cold war. It seems to me we fail to accomplish either one. Rather we seem to try to mastermind others, forgetting others must work out their problems their way, nor can our pouring out dollars solve every problem.

The minerals subsidy bill ($454 million) gave us a choice of subsidizing copper, lead, zinc, fluorspar and tungsten or raising the tariff to protect these resources from imports—an interesting commentary on present day philosophy. Many reciprocal trade supporters think it necessary and proper to subsidize United States industry—where will this odd reasoning take us? Fortunately, the bill was defeated.

Other items of interest: The recommendation for establishment of a U. N. police force passed; the Federal aid for scholarship passed (more loans added with some repayment forgiven), the Presidential pension bill passed (Senate added $50,000 yearly clerical help, besides $25,000 pension). Defeated were H. R. 3 to preserve States rights against Federal preemption (by Senate); Supreme Court curbing of jurisdiction (by Senate).

The 85th Congress was a spendthrift Congress. Now the taxpayers must pay, the currency will be devaluated, and the debt passed on to our children. Yet many will praise this Congress. O tempora! O mores!

National Defense and United States Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on August 3, 1958, I delivered an address at the annual Department of Texas State Encampment of the American Legion, at Fort Worth, Tex. Since that date I have been urged many times to have what I said printed in the RECORD.

I now ask unanimous consent that the address I made on the occasion to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

(Speech delivered by United States Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH at annual Texas Department Encampment of American Legion at Fort Worth, Tex., August 3, 1958)

Mr. Chairman, with me there has always been the feeling that in some special way—peculiar to his breed—the veteran, perhaps more than other citizens, is the custodian of America's freedoms, her integrity, her security. To have fought for one's country widens and deepens one's stake in her survival. It provides, it seems to me an element of personal involvement afforded in no other way. It may very well be that veterans like ourselves get a little weary hearing it said from public platforms on Flag Day that we offered our last full measure of devotion for our country, and, indeed, that many gave it.

There is, on the other hand, the opposite avenue of approach.

This runs toward the gratuitous tendency to preach the veteran a lesson. He is now reminded obliquely, unnecessarily and—it seems to me—offensively, that—I quote: "Military service in time of war or peace is an obligation of citizenship and should not be considered inherently a basis for future Government benefits." You see on Memorial Day the theme is the veterans' sacrifice. But on that other day when the veterans' items are meticulously reviewed in a $73 billion budget, there is the not so nice talk about this or that so-called veterans' pressure group.

Now in my vocabulary integrity is a very big word.

It happens to be my point of view that there is a sound and inseparable relationship between a nation's obligations to its veterans and a nation's obligations to its traditions which the veterans fought to preserve. If the American Legion holds a strong place in the inventory of institutions I respect, it is because you have established a policy, a line of conduct, a program of commitment and you have persistently and consistently hewed to your announced line. It is this pattern of conduct I should like to see the United States adopt in its national defense policy and in its foreign policy.

The mind that will laud and eulogize and memorialize the veteran on Monday and complain about veteran benefits on Friday is apt to apply the same slipshod method of thinking to its commitments around the world and its capacity to support those commitments. The American Legion which has known World Wars I and II and Korea at first hand, knows the axiomatic relationship between a national commitment, which in essence is a challenge, and the power of the force to back it up. All I am saying is that we cannot make diplomatic commitments, political commitments, economic commitments around the world, and, having made them, keep ourselves militarily in a state of helplessness to carry them out.

If this is not precisely the line upon which we are now traveling as a nation it is certainly the line to which we are tending with perilous closeness.

It is very doubtful if we can at this hour sustain with force those things we have promised to do or those commitments we are pledged to fulfill. And the world we live in is obviously and spectacularly a world of force and not of peace. If we live at all in this hour as a free and a powerful nation—the last hope of a free mankind—it is because we have, whatever our limitations, such strength in being as the potential enemy is bound to respect. The Congress knows, the American Legion knows, the neutral nations know, and—above all the enemy watching over the Kremlin wall knows—it is this strength in being, not on the drawing boards and in budget figures, that has kept the peace of the world, such as it is.

But even this strength in being so vital to our survival is—as I speak to you—threatened with dangerously overwhelming competition. The United States strength that right now holds the enemy in check, may not be relatively as great in 1960, 1961, 1962, and 1963. The experts in military potentials see an approaching peril. The world may in this period arrive at the frightful posture in international military might which will give the balance of power—definitely—to the Soviet Union. In these critical years it is not unlikely that the Kremlin will achieve dominance over the United States in nuclear striking power.

Our weakest military position as against the Soviet Union is in the area of missiles. In some quarters this is described as "pitiable." If we consider that our strength in foreign policy is only as strong as our national defense we can evaluate the magnitude of our plight should this state of affairs fail to be corrected. The Soviet Union has already scored up a total of more than a thousand tests of ballistic missiles that range from 500 to 1,400 miles. These distances are significant. If we can grant the Soviet Union this kind of reliable missile success it means that the Kremlin is now in a position to put our overseas bases out of commission. With our overseas bases out of commission, we are like an amputee fighting with one of his legs cut off.

Moreover the Soviet Union already has behind its program a number of tested intercontinental ballistic missiles. We have just proven our first one.

Luckily we are not, as of now, missile-naked.

But even what we have is still in some categories subject to doubt and misgiving. During the dangerous years from 1960 through 1963 we will continue to have some hundreds of intermediate range missiles in position in Europe. Here on this soil we will have 40 of the subsonic Snark missiles and we will have some four wings of the Titan missile. We will have nine wings of the Atlas missile.

Atlas and Titan pack the punch.

It is estimated that by 1960 we shall have 30 Atlas and Titan missiles ready for duty, should that dreadful need arise. When I say ready I mean for the real purpose that motivates our moral position—that is as a deterrent to world war III. Thus 60 Atlas and Titan missiles in 1960; 70 a year later, and 130 by 1962. Also it is expected that by 1962 we will have in being the Navy's submarine-born Polaris missiles. After that—I hope soon after we may have operational the solid-fueled Minuteman missile.

But what about Russia?

Our experts estimate that the Soviet Union should be equipped with a thousand or 2,000 medium range missiles during the critical years from 1960 to 1963. It is expected they will have ready their first 100 intercontinental missiles by 1959 with a regular production line of 500 a year by 1960. Where we will be producing tens and hundreds the Soviet Union will be ahead of us with missiles in the hundreds and the thousands. Khrushchev has already shouted it to the world that Russia's operational intercontinental ballistic missile—the ICBM—is capable as of now of landing its nuclear warhead at any target selected, and, presumably in the United States, worthy of such catastrophic destruction as their big bomb can mete out.

We may have been once the foremost nuclear power in the world—but that's hardly the story today.

I cite some of these military horror statistics because I know we are free of any danger of hysteria as a nation and are on the contrary much more prone to over-complacency.

That's been our story since the end of World War II.

We believed the Soviet Union had no production capacity industrially compared to our own—and we were wrong.

We believed that the Soviet Union had none of the mechanical know-how that we had, and we were wrong.

We believed that the Soviet Union was backward educationally—compared to the United States—and we were wrong.

We were sure that in the sciences we were so far ahead of the Soviet Union—and especially the nuclear sciences—that it wasn't even funny, and we were woefully wrong. We had Sputnik I and Sputnik II pushed in our faces, and I doubt that, apart from a little surprise, we have yet awakened to the enormity of the threat that confronts us.

We have to remember as I speak that the Soviet Union has an underseas armada of upward of 600 submarines, some of them so modern I doubt we fully understand some of their devices. When I say 600 submarines, it means just 100 percent more than all the

rest of the submarines in the world put together. They can use these submarines to attack American cities within 600 miles from either the Atlantic or the Pacific seas with nuclear explosives. They can do it from under water and they can do it free of the capacity of our radar devices to detect them and ferret them out.

It is anybody's guess which is more deadly: The Soviet ICBM or the Soviet submarine, nuclear equipped. Add to all this Russia's 175 mechanized, atomic-equipped divisions. Add an air force of 5,000 planes, mostly modern jets. Russia already has an atomic-powered surface ship, an icebreaker, and is readying for launching an atomic-powered transport plane, both the first in the world.

Of course, we have the Strategic Air Command and its inordinate capacity to wreak devastating and eternal havoc on the attacking enemy. And we have allies who are indispensable to our security.

But it would be tragic foolhardiness, suicidal to the point of 30 million American dead, and vast mountains of big-city rubble, to face the gravity of these facts with any national attitude of optimism. It is even worse to dress up the ugliness of the truth with the artificial estimates that struggle to put a brighter sheen on the dark face of things. The Gaither report and the Rockefeller report testify further to the need for strengthening our defense. The Gaither report urged a jump from $38 billion to $46 billion in our defense budget. The more recent Rockefeller report advised a $3 billion increase. This report speaks of the rapidly deteriorating position of the United States as against Russia in military strength.

On the economic, the political, and the propaganda front the Soviet Union has also made enormous strides. The Communist bloc promised altogether $1.5 billion in credits to 10 underdeveloped countries. Where usually we charge 5-percent interest on our loans, the Soviet Union generally charges 2 percent. The conditions are, of course, hardly identical and, of course, the Soviet Union pushes itself in politically right behind its rubles while shouting from the rooftops that its aid is free of all strings. But we are not comparing Soviet slavery nor the deprivations of its people to give the state its military preeminence, with the status of Western morals. In a cold evaluation of brute facts we have but to consider that the Soviet Union is ahead and that we had better take stock of the situation.

We have fallen behind in research and development. We have been lulled into a sense of false security by the illusion we were the great military power, the great nuclear power, and would remain so. The sad fact is that today we are using only second-rate missile power—while the Soviet Union is using first rate missile power propulsion that has placed over 1 ton of equipment into world orbits. Caught up in a false cloud of optimism and wishful thinking we have been passed by the ruthless dictators of the Kremlin, whose avowed aims and complete lack of moral principles makes this situation at once a dire, dangerous, and disgraceful one for the United States to have fallen into.

And, moreover, the situation promises to get much worse—the superiority of Russia's military might over that of the United States much more pronounced, before it gets any better. To allow Russia military superiority is to invite disaster.

With the opiates of optimism and a false feeling of invincibility we have been outstripped in technical education, in missile research, fuel research, missile production, in a word we are running a very poor second in the weapons of war which are now the primary and basic weapons. Our reliance on conventional aircraft for our main military punch is as ridiculous as would have been trying to fight World War II with the aircraft of World War I.

I agree with my fellow Senator from Texas, who is the chairman of the Military Preparedness Subcommittee, that the grim sense of urgency so plainly demanded in our Defense Establishment and defense development and preparedness programs is lacking. The Secretary of Defense is giving us sugar-coated phrases of assurance, when what is needed is missiles. It may be that success in the soap business is 90 percent smooth talk, eloquent assurances, skillful advertising, and a little sweet perfume to enhance the product; but in the life and death business of defense and war, it is just the plain, brute, military strength that counts—and we have been soft-soaped into a position of outright inferiority in military strength, we rely on military means of survival that are obsolete compared to those possessed by the would be world rulers in the Kremlin.

This situation has arisen first off because we are given to desires for peace, and Russia is given to desires for conquest. That is why we got lulled into the sense of false security that has placed us in such grave peril, and such a sorry military inferiority. That was bad enough. But how much worse is it to have allowed this military superiority of the Soviet over the United States to have steadily and rapidly increased—and it is still steadily and rapidly increasing.

The Republican Party's shortsighted insistance on a balanced budget, as against the Democratic Party's unheeded insistance on a favorably balanced military posture—which was the main plank of the Democratic platform in 1952, has brought us to the brink of disaster and the great military inferiority inevitable under such inept policies. And at the same time the lack of clear-cut foreign policies of definite direction and stability, the lack of foreign policies sufficient to meet the challenges of the times, have added to military inferiority the bonus of diplomatic inaptitude.

The President of the United States, surrounded on all sides by the Republican braintrust of advisers with the wrong information, the wrong attitudes, and the wrong answers, has been a classic example of a great and able man fettered by a weak and feeble organization that is just simply out of step with our times.

The State Department has succeeded in becoming thoroughly ineffective in the Middle East, and thoroughly damaging to our traditional good relations with our South American good neighbors. The Republican braintrusters on finance managed to produce another depression from their bag of tricks, as well as to see that the Government pays twice as much interest on the national debt, as previously. The idea of us little folk paying the big bankers more in Government interest, and cutting corners on defense till we're cut right into a poor second in military preparedness, that kind of idea really seems to appeal to the Republican braintrusters. Well the time has come for less soft soap selling and more hard fact facing. The time has come to foster dynamic and realistic foreign policy, not Foster Dulles. The time has come to revise American superiority and dynamism, not to perpetuate inferiority and ineffectualism.

I feel sorry for the President, with such a braintrust thrust upon him to fumble our Nation's welfare into jeopardy on every front. At home an industrial recession created by the financial braintrust, an agricultural program nightmare, at home and abroad military inferiority for lack of money, and abroad diplomatic mistakes and perils, and problems which require creative dynamism where negative pessimism is furnished up by the braintrust. One thing you can say for it is that its a pretty well rounded picture—however sad it may be. The Republican braintrust hasn't missed any field, they've messed them all up about equally well.

Out of all this dilemma one happy fact emerges. That is that the President is his own military braintrust. He came to the Democratic Congress this year and said he had to have a military reorganization bill to make the military more effective. The Republican braintrust told him there would be all kind of opposition to that in the Congress, but when it came to the floor in the Senate not one Senator voted against it. The President is getting his military reorganization bill, and he says he's happy about it. I have high hope that that is the one field where the braintrust can't mess him up, and that he will quickly impliment the military reorganization program in a way that will reshow the world he is still the expert in that field.

And now that he's got a clear field to put through military reorganization to attain maximum effectiveness and efficiency with what we have, militarily—let's hope that the President won't let any minor wonders of the Republican braintrust cripple our research and development programs further in these perilous times where we face the disheartening fact that Russia has simply passed us by in weapon development and production. The braintrust is holding the budget, but the American people and their security are left holding the bag. I have high hopes that "an agonizing reappraisal" of the wonders the braintrust has wrought will cause the President to do two things:

1. Personally direct an all out effort to not only come up with an effectively reorganized Defense Department, but also one equipped with weapons as effective or more effective than Russia's, just as quickly as is possible with no effort left unspared to attain that goal.

2. Secondly, I hope that the President may see that the best thing he can do for America is to become a trust-buster and break up the Republican braintrust and get some new dynamic people in to straighten out foreign policy, and financial policy, and farm policy, because the American people won't have a chance to break up that pathetic braintrust themselves until 1960.

That the President himself, in spite of the Republican braintrust rather than because of its poorly advised advisors, may take the powers he asked for and has been given and effectively reorganize defense, and at the same time reorganize his advisors so that some properly informed people with proper attitudes and proper answers can straighten out the sorry state of our foreign policies, financial policies, and farm policies, is the best we can possibly hope for, and the least we should definitely insist on and demand.

If enough good Americans make it plain to the President that is what they want and expect him to do, we won't have to wait until 1960 to get back on the road to reason.

And let us make no mistake about it, that is where America must get and get now—back on the road to reason.

America must regain, what the American Legion has maintained—sound establishment policies and lines of conduct; and sound programs of commitment, persistently and consistently hewed to.

The American Legion can render no greater service in this hour of our country's need, than to be the "minutemen" of today—to alert the Nation to inferiorities and perils that perplex us, and to propose dynamic and sound remedies and answers to the challenges that face America today.

I have great hope, and faith, and confidence that the American Legion will perform that service so valuable to the country, and I am sure that the Department of Texas will be in the forefront of those who seek to protect their Nation's freedoms and welfare, as Texans always have been.

I salute you, Legionnaires. We who have served our country in war, surely must serve her in peace, with all the clear-sighted vision, and determination, and leadership that we can give. We must guide our Nation on the road of reason, on the road of a dynamic and vigorous national defense and United States foreign policy, and of sensible domestic policies, for only such a road of reason can prove to be the path of peace, and prosperity, and perpetuation of the things America and the American Legion stand for. God speed us on that path.

Our Outstanding Citizens: John M. Phillips and Harriet Duff Phillips of Pittsburgh

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, we in Pittsburgh, Pa., have been fortunate in having two outstanding civic-minded citizens in the renowned husband and wife team of John M. Phillips and Harriet Duff Phillips of Carrick in the city of Pittsburgh in my Congressional District. We are proud of their great record of community accomplishment during their lifetimes, and the fine heritage they have passed on to us in our generation, on the National, State, and local levels.

JOHN M. PHILLIPS: INDUSTRIALIST AND CONSERVATIONIST

Two generations of mill and mine operators knew Mr. Phillips in his everyday job as president of one of the important industrial plants of the city. Sportsmen and conservationists throughout America knew and were grateful to him for his lifelong work in conserving wildlife, forests, and waters.

So well known was he nationally as the father of the basic game code of Pennsylvania—which became the model for other States—and as an outstanding conservationist that most people had forgotten or never knew that Mr. Phillips invented and produced much of the equipment that was standard in coal mines all over the world. Until shortly before his death he was president of Phillips Mine and Mill Supply Co.

Those who knew him only in recent years considered him the grand old man of conservation in Pennsylvania. A smaller group, familiar with his lifetime dedication to saving the natural heritage of America, would extend that title to cover the country.

LAST OF RESTORATIONISTS

He was the last of the restorationists—that group of hunter-naturalists, numbering among them Theodore Roosevelt—who toward the end of the last century awoke America to the fact that she was destroying her natural resources, and who then set to work to bring them back. Through their efforts, conservation laws began to become a matter of national policy and of concern to the States.

Mr. Phillips' interest in restoration and conservation ranged over the United States, Canada, and Mexico. He had a hand in almost every Federal game law until 10 years ago. He persuaded Canada to set aside her first game preserve, a mountain territory of about 500,000 acres which he explored in British Columbia.

Although dozens of his conservation articles and hundreds of wildlife photographs were published in national magazines and newspapers, he never personally took a cent for them.

EARLY BOY SCOUT LEADER

He helped organize the Boy Scouts of America, seeing in them the conservationists of the future. The first Boy Scout troop in Pennsylvania and one of the first two in the United States met in his living room beneath heads of mounted jaguar, bear, mountain sheep, and goat—trophies of his many hunting expeditions.

He was a member of the National Advisory Council of the Boy Scouts and thousands of boys and young men knew him by his scouting title, Chief Silver Tip. He received the highest awards of scouting and was one of the few Americans to hold the top English honor, the Silver Wolf, presented to him by Sir Robert Baden Powell, founder of scouting.

Latest of his numerous honors from the Boy Scouts was the presentation of the Hornaday Conservation Award by the National Council, BSA, May 4, 1953.

Mr. Phillips, however, was best known as the creator of the Pennsylvania game system, which won world recognition. This system of sportsmen-owned refuges, surrounded by public shooting grounds, he always said, "offers citizens of Pennsylvania the greatest hunting club in the world which they can join by paying only $3.15 a year—the price of a hunting license."

BEGAN EFFORT IN 1890

Pennsylvania was a shot-out State when Mr. Phillips began his efforts in 1890 to bring back game. He could afford hunting trips and took them from Alaska to South America. But the men who worked in the mines and mills of this district could not. He wanted to make hunting close to home available to all so that they would understand and learn to love the outdoors.

He assisted in organizing the Pennsylvania Game Commission as a nonsalaried, nonpartisan body and in 1905 became a member, later serving as its president.

Under his leadership, Pennsylvania's conservation laws became models for the Nation. Although an industrial State, Pennsylvania became the leading game area of the country. He fought hunters and politicians for the passage of the Resident Hunters License Law which gave the commission operating funds and eventually made possible the State's acquisition of almost a million acres of game refuges surrounded by public shooting grounds.

The first land bought for this purpose—in Elk County—was marked on August 1, 1948, when a huge boulder bearing an appropriate bronze plaque was dedicated in his honor. Leading citizens of the State joined in paying tribute to his achievements at the dedicatory ceremonies.

HONORS CAME FAST

In 1950, 1951, and 1952 he was honored as an outstanding citizen and the State's greatest conservationist by resolutions of the Senate.

Mr. Phillips fathered the buck law which built up the State's deer herd but of recent years fought to have it repealed and an any-deer season established to reduce the herd, which he said had grown too large for its own good.

With his own attorney he fought through the Supreme Court of the United States to uphold his alien gun law, which he had passed when foreign-born residents resisted the game laws with arms.

Long before floods and windstorms forced the Government to take action, Mr. Phillips was warning of floods and duststorms and encouraging the planting of trees. He distributed thousands of trees to youngsters at his own expense and offered prizes to Boy Scouts and game wardens who planted the most. He had the national Scout organization set aside a week for nut planting and himself planted thousands throughout the State.

PIONEER OF PYMATUNING

He was a tireless worker and pioneer in the fight to clear the streams of the State and Nation and led the battle to flood instead of drain the great marshlands which have become the site of Pymatuning Lake. A monument commemorating his activities was erected there. He bitterly opposed motorboats on the lake, which he hoped to make one of the great wild waterfowl flyways of America.

He was one of the group who helped to save Cook Forest, and only last June 19 became party to a suit against the State to halt the cutting of trees in the popular forest park.

Mr. Phillips' devotion to the soil and forests of America was deeply rooted in his family tradition. He was the oldest son of a family that had lived in Pittsburgh almost since the founding of the Republic. His grandfather, James Phillips, a blacksmith, came to America from the north of Ireland in 1795.

ATTENDED PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Born in Pittsburgh February 15, 1861, the son of James and Anna Provost Phillips, John M. Phillips attended the city's public schools, was graduated from Pittsburgh High School, and, after studying engineering, became superintendent of the bolt works and forging plants of the Lewis, Oliver & Phillips Co. He later became manager of its mine equipment department.

In 1889 he and his uncle, John Phillips, bought the mine supply department of Oliver & Phillips Iron and Steel Co., establishing a partnership under the name of the Phillips Mine Supply Co. In 1900 the company was reorganized

and incorporated as the Phillips Mine and Mill Supply Co., and Mr. Phillips was elected president, a post he held until shortly before his death.

COAUTHORED HUNTING BOOK

In 1906 Mr. Phillips teamed up with William T. Hornaday in writing Campfires in the Canadian Rockies, a chronicle of their adventurous hunting experiences in that region. He was also one of the first photographers of wild life, and in 1922 was given an award by the American Museum of Natural History for the best animal photograph taken anywhere in the world.

His trophies of the hunting and fishing field were numerous, among them being a group of jaguars, presented to Carnegie Museum, which was the first known exhibit in the world showing these animals in their native habitat.

Although he was always active in community affairs, and it was through his work that his Carrick neighbors obtained the park that now bears his name, he held political office only once. During the late Mayor Charles H. Kline's administration he was a member of city council for a few months.

KEPT MANY PETS

Mr. Phillips' family agree that there was no more ideal combination of urban and rural living than existed in the old Phillips house which stands at 2336 Brownsville Road.

His two sons learned their A B C's with the aid of a small green snake their father coiled and uncoiled to form the letters. At one time or another, his children had a kangaroo in the cellar, pheasants in the guest bathroom, and a countless procession of furry animals in the spacious back yard.

Although busy herself as a leader in the community, Mrs. Phillips, the former Harriet Templeton Duff, enjoyed all of the animal visitors and worked their care into the routine of running a large household.

MANY AFFILIATIONS

Mr. Phillips was a member of the Duquesne Club, Boone and Crockett Club, the Engineers' Society of Western Pennsylvania, Rotary Club, an honorary member of the Camp Fire Club of America, founder of the Lewis and Clark Big Game Club, a director of the American Bison Society, a founder of the American Game Protective Association, honorary president of the Pittsburgh Zoological Society, and a member of many other scientific and conservation societies.

He was honored with the gold medal of the Permanent Wild Life Protection Fund and in 1924 was chosen as recipient of the National Outdoor Prize award. At President Coolidge's Conservation conference in the same year, he was named by the President as chairman of the Committee on Conservation of Game and Fur Bearing Animals.

He was a director of the South Side Hospital, a 32d degree Mason, a Knight Templar and a Shriner. He was a member of the Baldwin Community Church. On his death on September 8, 1953, he left his wife and 3 daughters, Mrs. Joseph Shuman, Mrs. Robert C. Lutz and Mrs. Alexander S. Chalfant, and 2 sons, John M. Phillips, Jr., and James M. Phillips, and 13 grandchildren.

HARRIETT DUFF PHILLIPS

Mrs. John M. Phillips was for more than 40 years one of the truly outstanding figures in Pittsburgh life, and a militant fighter for the rights of others.

BORN IN CARRICK

A native of Carrick, and a resident of Pittsburgh all her life, Mrs. Phillips had a keen insight into the human problems of the city, and devoted most of her adult life to an unselfish campaign to solve those problems.

As one of the best-known club women in the nation, she led the fight which brought about the present pre-marriage medical examinations in Pennsylvania, and almost singlehandedly brought into being the legislation which gave Allegheny County an effective juvenile court, separated from the destructive pressures of politics.

Mrs. Phillips, the former Harriet Templeton Duff, was the daughter of the late Dr. John Milton Duff and Jane Kirk Duff. Her father, an outstanding medical man, founded the South Side Hospital and was co-founder of the medical department of the University of Pittsburgh.

FATHER WAS HONORED

In appreciation for this latter service, Dr. Duff was given the honor of delivering the address of welcome to the first class of the new medical school, and presented the first lecture.

Mrs. Phillips was educated in Pittsburgh schools. She was graduated from Central High School, and 3 years later received a bachelor of arts degree from Pennsylvania College for Women, Chatham.

Her alma mater conferred a singular honor upon her in 1939 when she was awarded a doctor of humanities degree—the first time in its history that PCW had given an honorary degree to one of its graduates.

Mrs. Phillips also received an honorary degree from Beaver College, Jenkintown, Pa.

MARRIED IN 1906

In 1906 she married John M. Phillips and embarked on a dual career—that of a diligent mother who found time, while raising five children, to take an active part in her community's life.

Proof that such a combination is workable came in 1944 when she was named "American Mother of the Year" by the Golden Rule Foundation in New York.

Due largely to the influence of her father and other medical and religious men among her forebears, Harriet Duff soon developed an interest in the needs of others, and quickly set about fulfilling them in her own dynamic way.

BRASHEAR FOUNDER

Among her early projects, undertaken in 1916, was the founding of the Brashear Settlement Association on the Southside, and, in the same period, of the Carrick Mothers' Club. Both are still in existence, and still growing.

The mothers' club was an innovation in its time, offering the services of a baby clinic and instructions for mothers and a recreation center (now Phillips Park), for children of the community.

Spurred on by knowledge of the needs of South Side Hospital, Mrs. Phillips set up the Phoebe Brashear Tea Room in a dwelling opposite the hospital, and operated the forerunner of the modern hospital snack bar.

When grateful doctors and friends of patients made the tearoom a success, she turned it over to the hospital.

ON SCHOOL BOARD

In the early thirties Mrs. Phillips entered public life on a larger scale when she became a member of the Pittsburgh Board of Education—a post she held with distinction for 14 years.

It was her sincere conviction that women ought to hold executive positions in public life, and during her years with the school board she fought for administrative positions for women in the schools.

From 1934 to 1938 she was president of the Pennsylvania Federation of Women's Clubs, and in that post was a dominant influence in marshalling the votes of women to effect civil improvements.

FAVORED STERILIZATIONS

Mrs. Phillips gained national recognition during her term of office in the federation by championing the cause of maternal health and planned parenthood clinics, and by advocating compulsory sterilization of those unfit for parenthood.

For many years she had been an honorary member of the board of the Planned Parenthood Clinic of Pittsburgh, in which she was a pioneer.

She had long been noted for work in the interracial field, and was made honorary president for life of the Harriet Tubman Guild, a Negro woman's organization which cares for convalescents. She was also an active supporter of Hill City.

She was a member of the Twentieth Century Guild, Pittsburgh Chapter, and of the League of Pen Women, Women's City Club, and a member of the board of the General Federation of Women's Clubs.

Following a pattern for service begun in World War I, when she served as superintendent of an emergency hospital during the influenza epidemic, Mrs. Phillips in World War II headed the Army and Navy nurse recruiting program here for the Red Cross.

She also served as a member of the Pennsylvania State Board of Public Assistance during the administration of Gov. EDWARD MARTIN.

HEADED CHEST DRIVE

Although she had frequently said she would retire gradually from her many and varied activities, Mrs. Phillips found it hard to say no to requests for her time and knowledge. Thus it was that in her final months she served as chairman of a campaign to raise $1 million for a new nurses' residence at South Side Hospital. She had expected soon to be able to announce success in attaining the goal.

For the last several years she has devoted much of her time to Winchester-

Thurston School for Girls, which she served as executive vice president.

While she sought no recognition for her work, Mrs. Phillips probably received more honors and tributes than any other woman in the State. Perhaps most cherished of all these was the designation conferred upon her by the governor in 1949—Distinguished Daughters of Pennsylvania.

For a number of years, Mrs. Phillips had considered as one of her most rewarding activities the Thursday Noon Club for young business women, which she conducted in her church, the First Presbyterian.

Both Mr. and Mrs. Phillips were honored by the board of education in December 1956, when it decided to name a proposed new school on the Southside the Phillips School. The new school, to be situated at South 20th and Sarah Streets, is the first to be named for a husband and wife.

The 56th Annual Hungarian Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, each year for the last 56 years Americans of Hungarian descent in Cleveland have celebrated an Annual Hungarian Day. This occasion has become an outstanding event in the civic life of Cleveland. It was my pleasure to address the 56th Annual Hungarian Day celebration in Cleveland, and I took this occasion to examine two pertinent developments which I believe will be of interest to Members of Congress. By leave previously obtained, I insert in the RECORD my address on the 56th Annual Hungarian Day:

I am happy to be here with you and to take part in this 56th Annual Hungarian Day. I am always happy to be able to join with Americans of Hungarian origin because I know the great contribution the sons and daughters of Hungary have made to the building of the United States and to the cause of liberty and freedom throughout the world.

On this occasion I would like to talk to you about two developments of recent months in which I know you have a keen interest. Every thinking American is inspired by the Hungarian freedom revolution of October 1956. Everyone gathered here today can take justifiable pride in that heroic struggle for freedom because among other things, it reminded all the people of the world of the historic role the Hungarian nation has played in man's age-long struggle for liberty and freedom against the forces of tyranny and despotism.

The Hungarian freedom revolution to get back national independence for Hungary did not end in complete victory for reasons which are well known to you and to me. However, that freedom revolution must never be considered in any sense a failure. While all the world knows about the brutal acts of aggression committed by the Russians in their reoccupation of the Hungarian nation, the lessons of that revolution, I am confident, will eventually guide the cause of freedom to ultimate victory over the forces of Russian despotism.

One of the most significant factors of the Hungarian revolution was that it showed that after 11 years of Communist efforts at indoctrination, the youth of Hungary faced the Russian tanks with their bare hands in an effort to drive the alien occupier from their native soil.

During the time when the freedom fighters were chasing the Russians from Hungary, I sent a telegram to President Eisenhower in which I requested him, first, to take the initiative in bringing about an immediate emergency meeting of the United Nations General Assembly and second, to extend recognition to the revolutionary group who were firmly in control of the affairs of the country.

Unfortunately, President Eisenhower, for whatever reasons, failed to seize the initiative and a few days later the Red army reinvaded Hungary and took away from the people the hard won independence which they had enjoyed for those 5 historic days.

With the Russian reinvasion of Hungary, the Free World was faced with the immediate and urgent problem of providing a safe haven for those who had stood in defense of freedom in their homeland.

Under these circumstances, President Eisenhower authorized the admission of about 28,000 Hungarian refugees under a parolee status. The consequence was that these numbers of Hungarian exiles were in the United States under an uncertain status of parolee.

After a careful study of the situation I became convinced that new legislation was necessary in order to clarify the status of the Hungarian patriots in the United States.

I believe that they were entitled to full rights of asylum, which includes the right to become a permanent resident and citizen in the United States.

I, therefore, introduced a bill in Congress providing for the necessary remedial action.

As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality, I vigorously pushed this matter until favorable action was taken by the House on May 5.

Following this, I conferred with Members of the Senate seeking their support for this righteous cause.

The Senate of the United States responded and on July 15 these Hungarian patriots were in a position to become citizens of the United States.

The only disappointment that I experienced in this long fight to secure justice for the Hungarian freedom fighters occurred when President Eisenhower, upon signing the bill July 25, took no steps to exploit this significant action by the Congress in furthering the cause of human freedom.

It is important that the United States officially remind all the people of the world that it stands ready to reward all those who will stand up and fight for our cause in the common struggle against Russian imperialism.

I felt this offered an unusual opportunity for the President to remind all the people of the world of the great contribution made by the entire Hungarian nation to the inevitable defeat of Russian imperialism.

I know that you share with me a keen disappointment that this golden opportunity was passed up and allowed to go by default.

The second matter I should like to discuss with you concerns certain developments which took place at the 47th Conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Union at Rio de Janeiro only last month.

I was a member of the American delegation to that Conference.

Reluctant as I am during sessions of Congress to be absent from the committees and the floor of the House. I felt it my duty to accept the designation as a delegate to this important international meeting. I could not refuse the challenge to meet in a world forum with the Russians and their designated stooges who represent themselves as parliamentarians from once free and democratic nations which are now reduced to the slavery of communism.

Among those Russian stooges were certain Hungarians who made extreme efforts at identifying themselves as representatives of the Hungarian people and as parliamentarians.

There was an important resolution pending before the Conference on the subject of representative assemblies in non-self-governing territories.

This resolution, while expressing the right of the people in the non-self-governing territories to have representative assemblies of their own choosing, it completely neglected the tragic position of the many once free and independent nations of central and eastern Europe which today are completely non-self-governing, deprived of governments representative of the will of the people and reduced to a status much worse than that of a colony.

I prepared an amendment to that resolution which then became an official objective of the entire United States delegation to that Conference.

That resolution called upon the Inter-Parliamentary Union, made up of representatives from 45 countries, to recognize the captive nations of central and eastern Europe as non-self-governing nations and therefore entitled to equal concern by this Inter-Parliamentary Union.

I was honored to have the opportunity to introduce this amendment and to speak before the Conference urging its adoption.

I am sure that you will be encouraged in your efforts to hear that I cited the heroic role of the Hungarian nation in their fight for freedom in 1956, as an outstanding example of why the Conference should regard that nation and all the other nations of central and eastern Europe as non-self-governing nations.

In this same connection, I reminded all those present, including the Russian group and their hand-picked appointees to the captive nations, that so long as these nations were deprived of the essential substance of national independence, which is the right to govern their own affairs, free from alien control or direction, they will continue to exercise the only opportunities open to them to dissent, that is, by internal revolts and freedom revolutions.

This observation met with the hearty approval of the delegates from the free countries who were in attendance.

As expected, the Russians and their collaborators demonstrated in their usual noisy manner and engaged in an effort to confuse and distort the basic issue.

Their efforts to defeat the amendment failed.

The Conference decided that the amendment of the United States delegation which I had the honor to offer, would be kept active and taken up again at the spring meeting of the Conference which will be held in Nice, France.

This provides a splendid opportunity for all of us to work in furtherance of this amendment.

Its final adoption by the Inter-Parliamentary Union will serve as a formal recognition that the captive countries of central and eastern Europe are non-self-governing nations.

The progress made to date in bringing about the adoption of this amendment is a hard blow against the intensive Russian campaign which attempts to portray those

nations as not only self governing, but made up of happy people who support the Communist regimes imposed by the Kremlin.

Obviously the Russians will make an all out effort to defeat this amendment when it comes before the spring meeting of the Inter-Parliamentary Union.

You may be assured that I will continue the fight for the noble cause of Hungary and all the other nations enslaved by the Russians.

It has been a real pleasure for me to join with you today and to take part in your annual festivities.

In closing, I express my firm convictions that no power on earth can prevent the coming victory of freedom and justice and the opening of a new world era in which all nations will live at peace with one another.

Requests Firing of Comptroller General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LeROY H. ANDERSON
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I have today written the following letter to President Eisenhower asking him to fire the Comptroller General of the United States, Mr. Joseph Campbell for the dishonesty in his letter No. B-134138. This letter was intended to contribute to the destruction of the rural electrification and rural telephone programs. The letter:

AUGUST 23, 1958.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have thoroughly studied Comptroller General Joseph Campbell's ruling of July 21, 1958 in letter No. B-134138, reversing more than 20 years of policy as enunciated by the Congress and carried out by administrations of both parties.

It is evident that not only is the position of the Comptroller General in error, but he has endeavored to buttress his faulty position by rewriting the legislative history of REA legislation. This is grossly dishonest, and I am sure you will not condone dishonesty in your appointees.

Accordingly, I suggest that the proper course of action is for you to remove Mr. Campbell from the position of Comptroller General, and appoint in his place someone who will perform the duties of that office with fairness and integrity.

Sincerely yours,

LEROY ANDERSON,
Member of Congress.

At another point in the RECORD I am having printed pertinent excerpts from a brief by the NRECA which points out the fallacies and dishonest omissions of the Comptroller General's letter. In still another extension today I am calling the attention of the Congress to the now apparent master plan of this administration for the destruction of REA and RTA. The following editorial by NRECA manager Clyde Ellis makes clear how the action of the Comptroller General fits into this master plan:

AND THEY ALL WENT DOWN AGAIN

(By Clyde T. Ellis)

REA has been delivered a knockout punch by the Comptroller General of the United States. Reversing 22 years of precedent, he has issued a ruling to the effect that loans cannot be made to rural electric systems to serve anyone whom others say they will serve, whether such persons are presently being served or not.

The Comptroller's ruling was issued in a nine-page letter to Secretary of Agriculture Benson. It was scheduled for release to the press July 28. Before it got there, we received a copy of it and the war was on.

In this column last month, we outlined the master plan to destroy REA. This plan entails destruction of the rural electrification, rural telephone, and Federal wholesale power programs. It is a master plan designed and sponsored by masterminds of the financial world who, through their use of people's savings in insurance companies, trust companies, and banks, also control and manipulate the power trust monopoly. They use public officials wherever they can. Among others, they use the Comptroller General and former Atomic Energy Commissioner, Joseph Campbell, and they are also using President Eisenhower, Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams, Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson, and Secretary of Agriculture Benson, to put over the master plan. They use them whether these officials are aware of it or not.

Just as Secretary Benson's secret order usurping the REA Administrator's authority to make loans by transferring this authority to his office demoted REA and the Administrator and all of its employees, the Comptroller General's ruling demotes Secretary Benson, the REA Administrator, and all REA employees still further by usurping and restricting their authorities and responsibilities.

POWERS OF CONGRESS ALSO USURPED

The Comptroller General, a creature of the Congress appointed by the President, has also usurped the declared will and intent of the Congress. The Congress clearly and implicitly stated in the Rural Electrification Act of 1936:

I would further emphasize that we must always keep in mind that the primary function of law is the resolution of differences and settlement of disputes, actual or anticipated, between human beings. Until we know what these differences or disputes will be and how and between whom they may arise, we are in an Alice-in-Wonderland world. Efforts to declare or establish detailed rules at his time can be at best only fumbling in the dark and at the worst prove actual impediments to the rational development of outer space. Before seeking adequate solutions we must know the nature of the technical problems we are facing, the human conflicts that are to be resolved, and the environment in which solutions will operate. As we come to know these things, we can then proceed step by step on the pragmatic basis of actual experience to build an enduring and effective structure of rules and principles which will adequately reflect real interests and sensible solutions.

Before turning to specific issues, let me make several general observations.

The basic pattern of our existing foreign policy with respect to space is no different from that which we have with respect to international relations here on the earth. In conformity with our undertakings under article I of the United Nations Charter, it is our purpose to insure that—in space as on the earth—international peace and security are maintained and that international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace are adjusted or settled in conformity with the principles of justice and international law.

We are in favor of international cooperation in solving international problems. At the same time, we are dedicated to the maintenance of the legitimate national interests of the United States and we hold firm to our inherent right of individual and collective self-defense against armed attack, which is fully recognized under article 51 of the United Nations Charter.

The most immediate problem in the field of space foreign policy is how to insure that outer space is used for peaceful purposes only.

You are doubtless well aware that the United States Government has already taken an initiative in this field. The United States recognized the importance of determining now what steps can be taken to assure that missiles and other outer-space vehicles, already in the development stage, will be utilized solely for peaceful purposes.

This recognition stemmed from the fact that today these military space instruments are in the early stages of development.

"In the event such action will not be undertaken and you so advise, we will be required to report the matter to the Congress."

THE ODD CIRCUMSTANCES

Traditionally, the Comptroller General has stepped in only when called upon to do so by some agency of the Government—either Congress or the executive branch. He does not tell us who called upon him this time, but it seems clear from the sweeping implication of his ruling that it is made at the behest of a power company operating in the area and the masterminds of the master plan. Whether these masterminds contacted the Comptroller General directly, or through Sherman Adams, is not known and is unimportant. What is important is that a large segment of those affected by the ruling haven't had a chance to speak.

IS THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL UNTOUCHABLE?

He has been so considered traditionally. This has been based on the supposition that he is not subject to being influenced from the outside, or by the executive branch, or by Congress. However, he abandons this position by basing his judgments on influence and not the law and attempts to usurp the powers of both the executive branch and the Congress. It is obviously time for the executive branch, Congress, and us to wake up and do something about this. The influences behind the Comptroller General's ruling and his connection with them should be investigated immediately. If they turn out to be what they appear to be, the Comptroller General, in the opinion of this writer, should be removed from office at once. This knockout blow to REA has to be parried. If not, the rural electrification program may take the count of 10.

Our National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, people are asking, "Will America be able to shoot a rocket from the earth to the moon?"—estimated distance 240,000 miles. Yes, probably. It is probable, however, that the national debt, now far out in astronomical space, may get there first. The Congress which has just adjourned was the heaviest and most extravagant spending Congress in history. Our national debt, now $275 billion plus, is larger than the national debts of all other nations combined.

Importance of Air Conditioning and Refrigeration to Modern Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following remarks regarding the importance of air conditioning and refrigeration to modern living in America:

I wonder how many of us are aware of the tremendously important part played by mechanical refrigeration in what we call our American way of life.

I confess that until recently I had accepted it as a matter of course—we have household refrigerators in our homes, some of us have air conditioning in our homes, and our offices here on the Hill are air-conditioned, as are some of the buildings of the executive department in downtown Washington. Most of us buy our fresh produce and some prepared foods in markets and grocery stores where they are held in refrigerated cases up to the time that we pick them up to put them in our shopping baskets; and all of us buy some of the frozen foods that are offered by these stores.

But this is the extent of our day-to-day contract with the many types of equipment that have been developed to utilize what the industry calls the refrigeration cycle, an application of the principle of physics which says that a liquid, upon evaporation, absorbs heat.

Recently, however, I received a copy of a brochure entitled Air Conditioning and Refrigeration; Essential to Our Nation's Health, Productivity, Defense, and upon looking it over carefully I find that many, if not most, of the things we accept today as normal living are produced, processed, shipped or otherwise affected by either air conditioning or refrigeration, and I was interested to learn that products of the air conditioning and refrigeration industry in our country affect even our national defense.

I would like to quote, briefly, from the foreword to the booklet, which gives a summary of its contents:

The years through which we are living have been called by many names—the age of automation, the atomic era, the age of flight * * * and many others.

Wonder drugs, jet propulsion, manmade satellites, electronic brains, marvelous plastics that can be made into a wide range of products—from a lady's most sheer and delicate garments to massive castings that shape automobile bodies—all these are a part of our age; it could be termed the specific era of any one of them, and it has been.

And yet none of these developments would have been possible without the modern miracle of mechanical refrigeration and its offspring, air conditioning.

Few industries in America have a more vital role in the protection of our Nation's health and well-being than the air-conditioning and refrigeration industry—and few affect the lives of so many Americans.

Our great progress in electronics, in optics, in nuclear power, in close-tolerance precision production, in aircraft and missile production and control, and many other industries and arts upon which our national welfare depends—in peace and in maintaining a ready defense—would be impossible without controlled conditions of climate in the spaces where these products are developed, tested, manufactured, and operated.

More than three-fifths of the food we eat is dependent upon refrigeration for reaching our tables in a healthful and palatable state. Refrigeration not only follows our food supply from the producers through all phases of transportation, storage, and distribution; it is essential to the production of the pharmaceuticals and biological products which maintain our Nation's health.

The publication was issued by the Air Conditioning and Refrigeration Institute, which is the trade association of the industry producing the equipment that makes all these things possible. The booklet does not advertise the products of any manufacturer, but points out that there are some 600 plants and factories in all parts of the Nation producing either the parts or the end products of the industry, which accounts for the direct employment of more than a half-million people, and which produced equipment valued at more than $600 million at the factory in 1957.

I am happy to have received the booklet from the institute, and to have taken the time to read it. It was most interesting and educational; it made me aware of the dependence our Nation has come to have on the refrigeration cycle.

World Tape Pals, Inc., and World Tapes for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement I have prepared on the excellent work being done to improve understanding between peoples of the world, through the organization known as World Tape Pals, Inc., and a companion organization, World Tapes for Education.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LANGER

World Tape Pals, Inc., was organized 5 years ago by Harry Matthews, a Dallas, Tex., printer, who became deeply interested in making personal contacts with people overseas through the medium of recording tape. After President Eisenhower's announcement of the people-to-people program, in September 1956, World Tape Pals became a constituent part of the program through its membership in the hobbies committee of the people-to-people program. Matthews is president of the tape recordings subcommittee of the hobbies committee.

World Tape Pals has 2,500 members in 59 countries. American members living in the United States pay a $3 annual membership fee to World Tape Pals, but foreign correspondents, as well as handicapped Americans, pay no fees. Through the medium of WTP in Dallas, foreign members are matched with domestic members for the exchange of tapes which reflect the common interests of the exchangees.

The WTP membership roster, in the hands of all members, makes it possible for foreign members to seek out tape correspondents who have similar interests, since considerable information about the listed members is included. For example, under Germany, which lists 32 members, appears the name "Helmut Ernst Kuhn, Leintalstrasse 60, Heidenheim/Brenz. Electrical engineer, married. Languages spoken, German; also English (please speak slowly). Interest, interested in building up a collection of all kinds of music from the United States, Central America, Indians, Negro spirituals, original hillbilly, songs of the colored people of the world and their instruments, cowboy songs, etc. I learned of World Tape Pals through Voice of America broadcast."

This type of information, listed for all of the members, permits the speedy selection of tape correspondents and the exchange of tapes and information.

There are 12 Louisianians listed in the roster. One of them, Mrs. Bessie H. Doehring, a school teacher in Shreveport, called my attention to the program. She has been active in exchanging tapes with schools in other countries through World Tapes for Education and reports that her students find the exchange extremely stimulating.

World Tapes for Education sponsors educational tape exchanges between students and educators. It encourages the exchange of educational tapes between members of youth groups such as 4–H, Boy and Girl Scouts, YMCA, YWCA, parent-teacher associations, and groups overseas.

I would like to quote from a letter Mrs. Doehring received from a teacher in Germany with whom she had exchanged tapes.

"We enjoyed the recordings of your pupils and learned a lot about your school, town, and country. The children were so excited to hear real American children's voices and want to continue the exchanges and learn more about your way of life."

Mrs. Doehring reports that she and her students have heard children in Sweden, Germany, Canada, Brazil, Australia, and England by exchange tapes, and she is preparing to send tapes in answer to requests from Japan, New Zealand, and Fiji.

Tapes mailed to overseas members are often heard by large groups of students or members of clubs with varied interests. Several members of the tape exchange subcommittee distributed tapes of President Eisenhower's people-to-people address to correspondents overseas for group use. One of these tapes was received by Jurgen Mendel, a Munich student. He played the tape to other students in his school and sent dubbings to other parts of Germany. In turn, Mendel recorded tapes of his own, including German folk songs, for distribution among members in the United States. Mendel wrote that he is "trying to do his share in building a warless world and to help promote worldwide understanding."

Mr. Matthews himself takes the view that "world peace is simply a matter of understanding," and he feels that if masses of Americans and other peoples overseas are able to communicate directly with each other in people-to-people work, the likelihood of world conflict will be greatly reduced. Mr. Matthews, Mrs. Doehring, and others who cooperate in this program deserve our thanks for their untiring efforts to promote better understanding between nations.

Through these recorded messages the average citizen in other countries is made aware of our way of life and becomes acquainted with some of our citizens. We, in turn, learn to appreciate the cultures, aspirations, and problems of those whose way of life is different from ours. Especially valuable is the correspondence between the

school children of this country and their contemporaries in other nations.

Many Americans are now taking part in the people-to-people program through the medium of their hobbies. It is encouraging to those of us who are daily faced with the problems of our relations with other nations to know that so many of our citizens, on their own initiative, are doing their bit to promote understanding and peace between all the peoples of the world.

A Tribute to Hon. Sam Rayburn, of Texas, and Hon. Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, in these closing moments of a Congress most of us are filled with nostalgia and a feeling of friendship one for the other which blurs the often sharp edge of politics and partisanship.

It is fitting, as the curtain is poised for the termination of the 85th Congress, that we pay tribute to those who no longer will serve here and to wish them well.

I should like to utilize this time to pay my respects, to those who are retiring, to two men we—and the Nation—earnestly pray will be here for years to come. I refer to the distinguished Speaker of this House, SAM RAYBURN, and to the distinguished minority leader and former Speaker, JOE MARTIN.

Most of us are objective enough to know that the average Member of the House of Representatives is assigned to a place below the salt in the public mind. Seldom for him, unless he be a powerful leader, is there a place in the society columns, on the front page, or on the television screen. He wears neither a toga nor a halo.

Ignored as he may be as an individual, this average Representative has something which no one else has. He is a Member of the greatest legislative body in the world.

Collectively, then, we have something unique and precious to our country and the world.

Men who rise to the leadership of this great body perforce carry on enormous responsibility.

We hear frequent references in this Chamber to the people of the United States as taxpayers. They are, but they are far more than that. They are parents, too. They are husbands and wives, sons and daughters, employees and employers, rich and poor, proud and humble, hewers of wood and planters of the soil. But, above all, they are people. Collectively, they stand for something almost indefinable—call it American for lack of a better word.

In this House, with our strength and weaknesses, with our wisdom and lack thereof, with our occasional flashes of temper and humor, we have a perfect legislative mirror of the people of this country, a mirror which is adjusted every 2 years.

Because of these things, it is symbolic to me that the two top leaders of this House, our Speaker and our former Speaker, came here from small communities, one in Texas and one in Massachusetts. They bespeak the opportunity which might come to any American. They symbolize all the men and women we affectionately call folks.

Several years ago, a great university in my State, Syracuse University, did a very significant thing. That university conferred honorary degrees—simultaneously—upon SAM RAYBURN and JOE MARTIN.

That action, to my mind, was most fitting because, through most of the troubled years of this century, these two men have had a greater impact upon our times and our future than even the great Presidents with whom they worked.

During the years of peace and war, depression and inflation, these two men, often working as a bipartisan team, have kept our Nation on an even keel, curbing extremism and making sure that the Government of the United States remained a Government reflecting the desires and needs of the millions of folks who find their most direct representation here.

Mr. Speaker, I shall be content if my obituary consists of this single sentence: "He served with and under two great Americans, SAM RAYBURN and JOE MARTIN."

Congress on Better Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell my colleagues in the House about another congress that will be in session in early October here in Washington. Its name is the Congress on Better Living, and it is a 3-day conference of women homemakers from all over the country—brought to our Capital by McCall's magazine to express the wants and needs of America's 50 million families.

The congress will approach the broad subject of better living from the standpoint of the American home as the hub of family activities. It will seek to determine the true function of the home and what American families really want and need most in their homes of today and tomorrow as a result of new living patterns.

For 3 days this fall, 100 articulate and knowledgeable young women from every State in the Union will discuss the way they live, the houses they live in and would like to live in, and the things they live with and would like to have.

In a period of frequent buyer-resistance, this year's Congress on Better Living will again become a valuable channel of communication between the Nation's women and their families, and the people who build, equip and furnish homes—truly a significant contribution to America's economy.

The C & O Canal Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in the defense of two outstanding Members of the Congress. Neither of these gentlemen need to be defended, but they have been the victims of some unwarranted, unjustified and warped insinuations and inuendoes apparently intended to convey the thought that in a recent committee meeting of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the gentleman referred to, the Honorable WAYNE ASPINALL, Democrat of Colorado, and the Honorable LEROY ANDERSON, Democrat of Montana, engaged in actions that resulted in adjournment of the committee. The matter to be considered was a bill concerning the C & O Canal, to wit, S. 77 and a similar House bill, H. R. 1145. The bills were for the purpose of establishing the Chesapeake and Ohio National History Park. As most of the Members know, this bill has been highly controversial and has received much newspaper attention here in the District. It appeared that the bill might suffer the same fate as many other bills during the closing days of the Congress—that is, die for want of final action by the committee. The controversial nature of the legislation is indicated by the fact that several days were devoted to hearings on the measure by the Public Lands Subcommittee, the chairman of which is the gracious Congresswoman from Idaho, Mrs. GRACIE PFOST. In an effort to treat the matter with all fairness, Mrs. PFOST held hearings on June 30, July 1, July 15, August 13, August 14, August 15, and August 18. The controversial matters, despite the lengthy hearings, had not been resolved, but a request was made of the acting chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Colorado, the Honorable WAYNE ASPINALL, to hold a full Interior Committee meeting for August 20 at 10 a. m., for the purpose of acting on the bills one way or the other. The request for such meeting was signed by 13 Republicans and 4 Democrats. The Republicans were JOHN P. SAYLOR, KEITH THOMSON, A. L. MILLER, WILLIAM A. DAWSON, JOHN J. RHODES, JOHN PILLION, JAMES B. UTT, J. ERNEST WHARTON, JACK WESTLAND, HAROLD COLLIER, E. Y. BERRY, PHIL WEAVER, and J. EDGAR CHENOWETH. The Democrats were GRACIE PFOST, BERNIE SISK, LEROY ANDERSON, and the gentleman from Texas, WALTER ROGERS, who is now addressing the House.

I was not a member of the Public Lands Subcommittee, and had not en-

tered into the controversy in any way; however, I agreed to be present for the full committee meeting, although I had three other places at which I needed to be in attendance, as well as my office. Nevertheless, I went to the committee room of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shortly after 10 o'clock on the morning of August 20 in keeping with the word that I had given that I would be there. When I arrived, there were 7 Republicans present and 7 Democrats, including myself.

Although only 4 Democrats had agreed to attend the meeting, there were 7 present, including the gentleman from Colorado, the Honorable WAYNE ASPINALL, and the gentleman from Montana, the Honorable LEROY ANDERSON. I reached the committee room about 5 minutes after 10 o'clock and was told by the gentleman from Montana that he had other business and would probably need to leave at the very latest by 10:20. I was advised by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], that he had another appointment of long standing and must depart the committee at 10:20, but would be back about 10:35. He asked me to assume the chairmanship during his absence, which I agreed to do, although I needed to be other places. It was several minutes after 10:20 before either Mr. ANDERSON or Mr. ASPINALL left the committee room and I assumed the chairmanship. Prior to the departure of Mr. ASPINALL, the acting chairman, I asked him if he had any particular desire as to how long we should wait for a sufficient number of members to appear to make a quorum. He stated to me that he had no choice in the matter but wanted to be entirely fair, and that the decision as to that particular matter was in my hands as long as I occupied the chair. I waited until 10:30 before calling the meeting to order for the consideration of S. 77 and H. R. 1145. At that time a point of order was made by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY] that a quorum was not present. Whereupon, as chairman, I counted 14 members being present, which was not a quorum. I then hesitated a sufficient length of time for any member who so desired to ask for a rollcall.

After almost a minute of hesitation, a request was made by Mr. SAYLOR for a rollcall. This request was honored and the roll was called by the clerk. At the conclusion of the first rollcall, a request was made that the names of those who had failed to respond on the first rollcall be called again. Whereupon the clerk proceeded to call the names of those who had failed to respond on the first rollcall. Upon the conclusion of the call, the clerk handed to the chairman the list reflecting that the following persons were present, to wit: Mr. ROGERS, acting chairman; Mrs. PFOST, Mr. HALEY, Mr. CHRISTOPHER, Mr. SISK, Mr. MILLER, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. WHARTON, Mr. BERRY, Mr. DAWSON, Mr. PILLION, Mr. RHODES, Mr. CHENOWETH, Mr. THOMSON.

Those failing to respond to the call of the roll were as follows: Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. BARING, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. POWELL, Mr. SHUFORD, Mr. ULLMAN, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. UDALL, Mr. UTT, Mr. WESTLAND.

At 10:35 there were only 14 members in the committee room, and I, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS], stated that the Committee would stand adjourned until the further order of the Chair. I then departed the committee room and ran into the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], who was returning to the committee room in accordance with his previous statement to me. I told him exactly what had transpired and then went to another meeting. It is well to point out here that had we waited for Mr. ASPINALL to return to the committee room, there would still have been a lack of a quorum. Although only 4 Democrats had agreed to attend the meeting, I point out that there were 7 Democrats present at approximately 10 o'clock who remained until after 10:20. Although 13 Republicans had agreed to attend the meeting, the greatest number who appeared at any time during the period was 9.

I have made this statement because the Washington Post, in its issue of Thursday, August 21, carried both a news story and an editorial which were not completely factual, which were permeated with inuendoes, and which were obviously intended to cast some reflection on the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. ANDERSON]. I do not know whether or not the news story and the editorial were deliberately couched in such language or whether they were the result of misinformation, but in either event, they were most unbecoming and, in my opinion, unfair to two fine gentlemen.

It has been my good fortune to have served on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for 6 years with the Honorable WAYNE ASPINALL, and I can say without reservation that he is a gentleman in every sense of the word and a man who has been imminently fair to all members of the committee without regard to party affiliation. He has, in fact, gone far beyond the need in many instances to be of aid and assistance to members of the committee who were not of the same political party. The character and integrity of this man are beyond question and without a shadow of suspicion. It would become the Washington Post to publicly apologize for their ill-advised attempt to reflect upon him.

It has also been my good fortune to have served on this same committee with the Honorable LEROY ANDERSON, of Montana, since he came to Congress. The same can be said of the character and integrity of Mr. ANDERSON as I have said of Mr. ASPINALL. I am deeply concerned that the actions of either of these men should be questioned by those who were not acquainted with the facts. And, I can say that anyone who does question the actions of either of these gentlemen on this occasion does so in error.

Whether or not this error is preconceived on the part of those who desire to so conduct themselves, is a matter upon which I shall not pass. It is a question that can be answered only by those who insinuate the charges.

It would seem to me that if an attempt is made to lay the blame on some individual or group for failing to make a quorum possible for a committee meeting, it would require a dangerous stretch of the imagination, if not the adoption of a completely false premise, to try to lay that blame on the shoulders of those who appeared and presented themselves for the committee meeting at the agreed time, and wasted approximately 25 minutes in an effort to be fair.

I might also point out that I was the one who adjourned the meeting and for which I am certainly willing to take full responsibility.

I feel sure that if the Washington Post is as interested in correcting a wrong as it is in casting loose charges about, public apologies to both of these gentlemen will appear in an early issue of that newspaper.

Truth Must Prevail for Krebiozen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the story of Krebiozen is a sad one, and by their unfounded opposition, several past officials of the American Medical Association have been guilty of heinous actions against a great scientist, in the medical profession, Dr. Andrew C. Ivy, who presently holds the high position of distinguished professor of physiology and head of the department of clinical science of the University of Illinois College of Medicine. Because of the actions of these men, Dr. Ivy lost his position as vice president of the University of Illinois, as well as his membership in the Chicago Medical Society.

A true scientist is a man who seeks the truth, and Dr. Andrew C. Ivy exemplifies that type of man. In his experimentations with 250 other physicians, all members of the AMA, he has proved that there is biological activity in the use of this drug.

Dr. Stevan Durovic and his brother, Marko Durovic have spent large sums of their own and their friends' money in Argentina in the development of the discovery of Krebiozen, as well as thousands of dollars to the Krebiozen Foundation, to place the drug at the disposal of cancer victims, terminal cases, who were doomed to die.

Personally, I am well acquainted with the whole story in view of the fact that I acted as vice chairman of the committee and the commission, duly appointed by the Illinois legislature, to conduct an inquiry to determine whether or not there was a conspiracy to prevent freedom of research at the University of Illinois, a tax-supported institution. A great deal of testimony given by many expert witnesses at those hearings proved beyond a doubt that

false reports were released to the public by medical stooges of the AMA to destroy public confidence in the scientific findings conducted by Dr. Ivy and his fellow medics. This subject was in controversy for a period of 5 years, and still continues today in spite of the reports that have been released showing favorable results in certain phases of cancer study listed in the reports made by those individual doctors on their own cases.

Material has been inserted by me in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 29, 1958, June 12, 1958, July 25, 1958, and August 5, 1958. The subject matter and testimony, together with conclusions thereon, were masterfully presented in the two books written by Mr. Herbert Bailey, K-Krebiozen, Key to Cancer? published in 1955, and A Matter of Life or Death recently published by G. P. Putnam's Sons, a concern that is very selective on printing any books, and especially those touching on scientific subjects, as to their value and veracity.

I am very pleased to note that the very distinguished Senator, PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, being a person of substantial reliability in dealing with matters of public import, has advanced proposals for controlled tests for Krebiozen. He has every reason to be concerned in view of the fact that he has studied this question thoroughly. It is to his credit that he deals with the subject with a highly constructive sense of justice. He avers that mistakes were made by both the AMA and the scientists interested in the Krebiozen study, and yet he does not lose the mental grasp that there is a high sense of public obligation to be considered and, therefore feels that in view of the favorable reports of the doctors working with Krebiozen, the merits of the drug should be inquired into officially on a purely scientific basis, to determine its medicinal value for public approval.

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS is a man of important stature in America. His background is one of high intellectual training as a professor in our colleges and universities. He shows no disposition to dilly-dally with words, but gets at the meat of the problem and presents a complete picture of the controversy and its shortcomings.

His stand should be considered by the AMA as a warning that if they persist in their present attitude to belittle and devaluate the results and published findings in the experiments presently being conducted, that there is no question that the public health services and the national institutes of health will be drawn into the picture through Congressional enactment in the nature of a thorough investigation of this subject.

I stand firmly behind Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS in his position in this matter and, unless something is done to remedy the present unfortunate standoff situation preventing an authentic test of Krebiozen, I will proceed in the 86th Congress, God granting my presence, to introduce a resolution to investigate those elements that are preventing the carrying out of such a test, on the grounds that the public interest demand such action. It is fundamental that a conspiracy to prevent scientific research is in itself within the Congressional prerogative to protect the welfare of the people of the United States.

No organization can defy or deny the right of justice to be meted out to honest men and their works, especially in this case, directly affecting thousands of unfortunates, who die every year with great suffering and at great cost to their families, or the charitable institutions which are established throughout the land for this cause.

I am warning the American Medical Association at this time, as I did before in the Illinois State Assembly, to pay heed to Dr. Ivy's appeal for fair play and give Dr. Andrew C. Ivy a fair chance to prove what he contends is of benefit to mankind.

The Chicago Daily Tribune article touching on the Krebiozen proposal, by Senator DOUGLAS, appearing in that paper's issue of August 23, 1958, follows:

SENATOR DOUGLAS PROPOSES TEST FOR KREBIOZEN

WASHINGTON, August 22.—A secret scientific test of the merits of Krebiozen as a cure for cancer was proposed in the Senate Friday by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois.

DOUGLAS said in a Senate speech that the public is bewildered by the conflicting statements regarding the preparation. Dr. Andrew C. Ivy has reported Krebiozen to be helpful, DOUGLAS said, while the American Medical Association has denounced it and the National Research Council has found on the basis of the AMA report that there is no evidence of curative or palliative effects from use of the drug.

DOUGLAS called for tests to be conducted by the United States Public Health Service and the National Institutes of Health. Under DOUGLAS' plan the Institutes would conduct a sample test upon 200 more or less terminal cancer cases of patients who had applied to the Institutes for help.

ONE HUNDRED WOULD GET KREBIOZEN

Of these, 100 cases would be treated with Krebiozen while the other 100 would be given mineral oil instead.

The Institutes and Ivy would choose an outstanding biostatistician who would help design the tests and would be the only person knowing which patients had received Krebiozen treatment.

The lists of those who had and had not received the treatment would be placed in a sealed envelope in a safe, to be opened later by the biostatistician and two advisers, Dr. Ivy and a representative of the medical profession chosen by the Public Health Service. The advisers would not know the identity of the patients.

WOULD REVIEW HISTORIES

At the conclusion of the test-treatment period, the case histories of all 200 in the test would be submitted to Ivy, and he would be asked to identify the 100 cases in which Krebiozen had been administered. DOUGLAS said Ivy would naturally select those showing the most improvement or pain alleviation.

The sealed envelope would then be taken from the safe and the lists would be compared with Ivy's list. A comparative study would be made of the cases of the patients who did and did not receive Krebiozen.

The degree of agreement or disagreement between Ivy's list and the other lists would then be announced.

WOULD PUBLISH FINDINGS

Finally, if Ivy requested it, the Public Health Service would examine records compiled by Ivy of other cases treated with Krebiozen, appraise the results, and publish the findings.

DOUGLAS said the organized medical profession disparaged the discoveries of Pasteur, Lister, and others, and sought to defame the discoverers.

Area Redevelopment Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following:

On August 15 the House passed S. 3683, an act to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas, known by its short title as the Area Redevelopment Act.

At first glance these three simple words do not impress you as meaning a great deal, however, when realizing that this act provides for the expenditure of $279,500,000 for area redevelopment to alleviate substantial and persistent unemployment, it then becomes very clear that the Government of the United States has taken a major and decisive step in an effort to aid and assist the depressed areas of the country with a determined program to reverse the headlong flight toward a devastating national depression.

As I voted favorably on the bill I was aware that this was one of the most important pieces of legislation to come before the Congress in this session. It represents a great deal of time and work on the part of many Members of the House and the Senate who have taken a direct and personal hand in its preparation.

I have on my desk a copy of the committee report, weighing nearly 4 pounds, having 1,349 pages, entitled "Legislation To Relieve Unemployment," which contains the testimony taken by the House Banking and Currency Committee concerning the 55 various bills—including my own H. R. 7462—introduced during the 85th Congress, dealing with the matter of unemployment and underemployment in the various States, under the able chairmanship of the Honorable BRENT SPENCE, of Kentucky.

The table of contents of this document shows that during the 5 weeks between April 14 and May 22, 1958, this committee took testimony from 89 witnesses, among whose number were 11 of our State governors, 7 city mayors, including Mayor Miriani of Detroit, a large number of Members of Congress, many representatives of the executive side, including Cabinet members, numerous spokesmen for industry, labor and agriculture, all these being led by former President Harry S. Truman, who's testimony covers the first 38 pages which sets the theme on the statement that, "if your neighbor is out of work, that is a reces-

sion, if you are out of work, that is a depression."

The testimony and information contained in this document is one of the most comprehensive and up-to-date studies available concerning the economic situation in the various States as well as the country as a whole.

This testimony was given in great part by witnesses whose responsibility it is, or has been in the recent past, to administer our high public offices ranging from the Presidency on down.

These men are in a position to know the facts and they have made them known to the Congress through these hearings. I was highly gratified to see this corrective legislation pass this House.

The major problem in the States today is unemployment or underemployment and this is emphasized in virtually every statement made in the report. The story is the same in every industrial center; industry is cutting down, shutting down, moving out, amalgamating, or going out of business entirely. Many of our people are beginning to have doubts, some have reached or passed the point of desperation.

The State and local governments have done all that they can do to relieve the situation, but there is a limit to their ability and some have reached it. Federal aid must come soon or the effects of a paralyzing and uncontrollable depression will be upon us and then it could very well be too late for many of us.

In reading over the report I found a number of statements concerning the various causes of the present depression. Not all were in agreement with each other, but one point they all agreed on was the very great need for enough high-powered dollars, in the right places, which could put industry back on its feet—put people back to work, thereby regenerate our channels of trade and commerce.

I was drawn, with particular interest, to the testimony given by my own mayor, Mr. Louis C. Miriani, who reported that as of April 14 the figure of unemployment in Detroit had reached 265,000 which represents 17½ percent of the labor force in that city. On May 8, the date of his testimony, it had reached 275,000 or about 1 out of every 5 workers. This makes the Detroit metropolitan area the hardest hit industrial center in the country.

Of the total of unemployed, 45 percent comprise those in the automotive industry, 28 percent from other manufacturing plants, and 12 percent from the construction industries.

Today Detroit has 11,000 families, averaging 4 persons to a family, who are directly dependent upon welfare aid for the food they eat and other bare necessities of life, 70 percent of them seeking welfare for the first time, with a backlog of 5,000 cases which we are processing at the rate of 300 per day.

Detroit also has long lines of those still worse off—those who cannot even qualify for welfare aid—getting their meager meals in soup lines, which are reminiscent of the early 1930's.

In the budget for the fiscal year 1958–59 Detroit has had to finance a deficit of $8 million, borrowed to offset the current welfare deficit. We have provided $16 million to meet welfare costs for the current year, a figure which will be wholly inadequate if present trends continue as they have been going.

We have instituted very drastic economies, including a savings of $2,800,000 in the 1957–58 budget and $6 million from the 1958–59 budget. All city employees have been denied cost-of-living adjustments to which they are entitled in an effort to relieve the welfare situation. We have bonded and taxed ourselves right up to the statutory limits, but now we are just about to the limit of our financial ability to cope with the problem any longer.

The assistance necessary to correct this situation is provided under the provision of the Area Redevelopment Act in that it will establish:

First. A new office of the Area Redevelopment Administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, under the direction of a Commissioner of Area Redevelopment; an advisory board composed of 12 members representing the major departments of the Federal Government who advise the Commissioner and assist him in coordinating the programs and policies of the administration; a National Public Advisory Committee composed of 25 members representing labor, management, agriculture, and the general public, who will also advise the Commissioner on national policy.

Second. Through the use of a formula as prescribed in the act, the Commissioner will designate areas of the country as industrial or rural redevelopment areas through information secured from other Federal agencies, but basically from reports of unemployment from over the entire country. From this information he will determine the extent of redevelopment assistance necessary to establish or reestablish the economic balance to put the area equal in income with the country as a whole. Needless to say, Detroit will certainly qualify under the formula and it is hoped that this assistance will be extended very shortly.

Third. A revolving fund of $200 million from which the Commissioner is authorized to purchase evidences of indebtedness and to make loans—including immediate participations therein—to aid in financing any project within a redevelopment area for the purchase or development of land and facilities—including machinery and equipment—for industrial usage, for the construction of new factory buildings, for rehabilitation of abandoned or unoccupied factory buildings, or for the alteration, conversion, or enlargement of any existing buildings for industrial use. Financial assistance extended shall be on such terms and conditions as the Commissioner determines, subject to the limitation of $100 million for use in industrial redevelopment and $100 million for use in rural redevelopment during any one period of time in the fiscal year.

Fourth. An appropriation of $75 million annually from which the Commissioner is authorized to make grants to any State, or political subdivision, Indian tribes, or public organizations or associations representing any redevelopment area, or part of a redevelopment area, for land acquisition or development for public facility usage, and the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of public facilities within a redevelopment area, provided it will tend to improve the opportunities in such areas for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities. The one primary restriction on these grants is that they cannot be extended if through them there is created a public utility which will directly or indirectly compete with an already existing private utility within the redevelopment area.

Fifth. An appropriation of $4,500,000 annually from which the Commissioner is authorized to provide information and technical assistance to areas which he has designated as redevelopment areas under the act. These will usually take the form of studies evaluating the needs of, and developing potentialities for, economic growth of such areas.

Sixth. A program of training or retraining for unemployed persons residing in redevelopment areas through the Departments of Labor and Health, Educations and Welfare to be coordinated with existing State agencies, and where it is found necessary, private educational institutions will be engaged by contract to provide the necessary instruction to accomplish these programs.

Seventh. A prevailing rate of wage and hours as determined by the Secretary of Labor will be paid to all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on projects undertaken by public applicants assisted under the provisions of this act.

This act sets up a Commissioner of Area Redevelopment as a sort of emergency squad leader with a fund of $279,500,000 which will enable him to meet any local emergency situation before it gets out of hand and at the same time permit Congress the time necessary to devise further legislative assistance to a particular area if an unusual situation should develop which is not regularly provided for, or which might become too large for the Commissioner to handle under the limitations of the act as written.

One further provision I had in my bill—H. R. 7462—which is very similar to the Senate bill as now passed, would have been the establishment of a retraining subsistence payment to unemployed persons residing within a redevelopment area who are not entitled to unemployment compensation benefits or who have exhausted these benefits. These payments could be made for a period of 13 weeks and be equal to the amount of the average weekly unemployment compensation payment payable in that State, under certification from the Secretary of Labor that the recipient is undergoing training for a new job.

I should like to say in closing that this is a good piece of legislation, designed to help the Nation help itself. It is a

very good beginning step toward a more sane and liberal economic policy by the National Government in that it recognizes that the time to act is not when there is very little left to save, but when a preventive "shot in the arm" could prevent a depressed area from developing. "An ounce of prevention then is worth $279,500,000 now."

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, early in the session I took the floor on the question of reciprocal trades. I made some observations on the adverse effects the present administration of these agreements were having upon many of the industries in my district.

I noted particularly the conditions in the glass, ceramic, rubber, aluminum, and coal industries. I said then that no nation could expect to remain strong economically in a trading world by supplying the raw materials, the machinery, the finances, and the know-how to competing nations. I repeat this today and want to call to the attention of Congress the latest report on trade balances:

UNITED STATES EXPORTS DECLINE IN MONTH

WASHINGTON.—The Census Bureau estimated that United States exports dropped 14 percent in June to $1,406,000,000.

This preliminary estimate compared with a May total of $1,638,000,000. It was 21 percent below June 1957 exports of $1,786,000,000.

Census said military shipments dropped $33 million between May and June.

At the same time, the Bureau reported United States imports in May total $1,063,000,000, about the same as in April.

The May figure was 4 percent less than imports in May 1957, and compared with April imports of $1,057,200,000.

Six of the 11 major commodity groups registered increases from April to May.

Import hikes were recorded for airplanes, iron ore, lead and nickel ingots, crude petroleum, uncut diamonds, meats, and wood and paper.

There were declines in imports of manganese, copper, furs, textiles, chemicals and manufactures.

You will note that there is a continuing drop in exports of the kind of goods and materials that mean man-hours of labor and payrolls.

Our economy cannot exist on an agrarian diet. We are tuned to a high-cost high-wage, and high-income existence. When man-hours and payrolls fall off we can expect increasingly more serious recessions and far longer durations.

I sincerely believe now, as I did early in my career as a Member of Congress, that reciprocal trade agreements, truly reciprocal, are beneficial and necessary. I also believe that these agreements must be based upon sound economics and business methods.

If we do this we not only help ourselves, but we also help our friendly neighbors to become self-sufficient without depending upon the largess and handouts of a paternal United States.

What the 85th Congress Has Not Done—We Must Weigh These Failures With Its Accomplishments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, as the 85th Congress adjourns, many people will be reflecting on what has been done in the field of legislation—and this approach is commendable—but it leaves half the story untold; that is, what has not been done; where it has failed the people.

I think this consideration is particularly significant this session, and this story, too, must be told, for it is equally the responsibility of the party in control of Congress to be held accountable for its failures as it is to be able to claim credit for its accomplishments—although many of those accomplishments are the direct result of Republican support or are conformation of the President's program.

I thus direct the attention of the people of this country, by subject matter, at the sorry record of failures, many of them inexcusable in my opinion, of the 85th Democrat Congress.

FIRST, SUPREME COURT DECISION

First. States rights bill (H. R. 3), designed to preserve State statutes in areas and on subjects on which Congress has legislated, or will legislate, which the Supreme Court in the Nelson case decided were preempted by such Federal statutes even though there was no evidence of the intention on the part of Congress to so preempt State statutes. State sedition laws were thus stricken down solely because the Smith act was enacted by Congress. Passed the House, defeated in the Senate.

Second. Preemption, Nelson case, designed solely to counteract the Nelson decision, and offered as a substitute in the Senate in consideration of H. R. 3; defeated in the Senate.

Third. Yates case, Smith Act bill, which passed the House overwhelmingly, would have defined "organize" in order that, as the result of the Supreme Court's ruling in the Yates case, Communists could no longer organize cells and groups dedicated to the overthrow of the Government of the United States: Passed the House, never acted on in the Senate other than as a section of the Jenner-Butler bill which was sidetracked by amendments and finally recommitted to the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Fourth. Passport, Kent case, which divested the State Department of executive authority to deny passports and visas to security risks, principally known Communist sympathizers; House passed, defeated in Senate.

Fifth. Watkins case, in which the Supreme Court gave every witness before Congressional investigating committees the right of silence based on the committee exceeding its scope of authority; Jenner-Butler bill killed in Senate.

Sixth. Habeas corpus bill, which has as its purpose the elimination of dilatory pleas in cases where the parties file appeals to Federal courts on State actions under State statutes for the purpose of delaying State matters, or for the purpose of trying to test State statutes under the Federal Constitution which results in collateral attacks on State statutes that are not justified and result in undue delay; passed the House unanimously, killed in Senate by never being taken up.

HOUSING BILL

The House rightly refused to accept the $2.5 billion housing bill and the House leadership failed to bring up a bill consistent with the administration's recommendations although there remained adequate time to work out a compromise, thus leaving many needed housing provisions without adequate authorization until the next session of Congress.

ANTIRACKETEERING LABOR LEGISLATION

The Senate passed the watered-down Kennedy-Ives labor bill which was held on the Speaker's desk for 40 days, thus denying the House Education and Labor Committee adequate time in which to fill the loopholes and strengthen this bill into a real, effective antiracketeering labor bill in order to carry out the recommendations of the McClellan committee. This was a shameful display of irresponsible leadership which could easily have been avoided if the Democrat leadership had desired to avoid it—but apparently the labor hold on the majority was too strong to result in adequate antiracketeering labor legislation—unfortunately for the people of the country. This matter deserved priority attention and I believe Congress failed the people in not enacting effective legislation in this field—Congress failed utterly and miserably in bringing the Kennedy-Ives bill up under suspension of the rules, thus denying debate and amendments so sorely needed.

PRESIDENTIAL DISABILITY CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

The President, backed by the Republicans in Congress, particularly on the Judiciary Committee, asked for a constitutional amendment to clarify the question of succession in the event of the disability of the President, but the majority Democrat leadership refused to pass any legislation designed to clarify this situation—despite the demand of the people that something be done.

LEASE PURCHASE OR SUBSTITUTE FEDERAL BUILDING PROGRAM

The first sensible, nationwide, private-enterprise and Federal Government partnership program for providing adequate Federal facilities in the districts throughout the country was scuttled by

the Democrat majority in the refusal of the House, despite favorable Senate action, to extend the Lease-Purchase Federal Building Act, which provided for private financing of the multi-billion-dollar backlog of public building needs in local communities. Substitutes for this program were presented but no action was taken on them.

Thus, Congress adjourned without extending the proven effective lease-purchase program or providing for a substitute therefor.

In post office construction, the Appropriations Committee in conference refused to provide funds for the nationwide post office modernization and replacement program, after killing the administration's efforts to get such a program under way through the increased postal-rates method. Thus, the program is slowed down to a walk unless the 86th Congress measures up to its responsibility of providing adequate funds or financing method for needed post office projects in the districts.

AID FOR SMALL BUSINESS

It is true that some steps were taken in the direction of aiding small business in this Congress, but the basic act which would have been of major aid to this suffering segment of our economy was not even considered by either body of Congress. The administration and the Republicans on the Select Committee on Small Business, as well as myself, backed a sound proposal to meet this problem, the Republicans introducing bills to accomplish this end, but the Democrat-controlled Congress refused to consider the matter.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

Although statehood for Alaska was voted in adequate time to also consider statehood for Hawaii, Democrat leadership refused to bring the matter before the House or the Senate for consideration, as recommended by the President.

FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONSHIPS

Despite the President's leadership, and the acceptance thereof by the governor's conference, resulting recommendations of the latter group for returning certain programs to the States together with taxing authority to cover the expenses therefor, the Congress refused to even consider such recommendations and the worthwhile program of recognizing State responsibility in State fields was completely stymied.

HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

These are just some of the more significant examples of failures of the 85th Congress—they could be multiplied manyfold. The administration recommended in excess of 30 Hoover Commission recommendations but this Democrat-controlled Congress passed only one—clearly showing disinterest in economy measures under Democrat Congressional control.

ETHICS IN POLITICS

Despite the exposés of the Harris committee, and the obvious need for legislation setting up a code of ethics for those dealing with independent agencies of the Government, this Congress adjourned without considering legislation, although many bills were introduced, including one by myself, providing for a very rigid code of ethics for anyone dealing with such agencies. Obviously, the objective was to create a political issue rather than accomplish the purposes for which the committee was organized, that is to investigate any influence with such agencies and to recommend legislation to outlaw the exertion of such influence, if any, in the future.

In a separate category are many accomplishments of this Congress which were recommended by the administration; programs which the Democrat majority will undoubtedly claim as their own, but I believe it essential to point out that these programs gained their impetus as the result of the recommendations of the President, and the stanch support of the Republicans in Congress. Some examples of this type of legislation are as follows:

First. Defense reorganization which was effective only because the majority of the Republicans insisted on effective reorganization despite strong Democrat opposition.

Second. Mutual security.

Third. Reciprocal trade.

Fourth. Defense scholarships.

Fifth. Excise tax extension.

Sixth. Jencks FBI files case legislation.

Seventh. Constructive farm legislation ending rigid price supports and crop allotments.

Eighth. Social-security increases.

Ninth. Postal-rate increases.

Tenth. Surplus disposal.

Eleventh. Welfare labor fund disclosure.

Twelfth. Revised "porkless" rivers and harbors authorization bill.

Thirteenth. Alaska statehood.

Fourteenth. Defense, interstate highway acceleration program.

Fifteenth. Creation of Outer Space Agency.

Sixteenth. Unemployment compensation benefits increase.

Seventeenth. Creation of consolidated Civilian Aviation Agency.

Thus, it is easily demonstrated that the major accomplishments of this Congress resulted from and gained their principal impetus from the favorable and strong recommendations of the President, backed by strong majority support among the Republican Members of the House.

T. O. Kraabel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN HAGEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great deal of gratification that I heard the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, Mrs. ROGERS, extol the virtues of T. O. Kraabel, who is retiring as director of the national rehabilitation commission of the American Legion.

I wish to join in the splendid tribute to T. O. Kraabel furnished by Mrs. ROGERS, who is one of the friends of the veterans in the Congress. I have a very personal reason for this, because T. O. Kraabel is a cousin of mine and for several years worked in my father's bank at Lawton, N. Dak., and lived in our home.

T. O. Kraabel comes from a distinguished North Dakota family. His father was an outstanding businessman and at one time served as Lieutenant Governor of North Dakota, and his brothers and sisters all enjoyed distinguished careers.

We are all aware of the excellent service which the American Legion has furnished in the growth and development of this country since World War I, with particular emphasis on the provision of programs for men in our armed services and those who are veterans. One of the outstanding aspects of Legion activity has been the services of its national rehabilitation commission. This agency of the Legion has been under T. O. Kraabel's direction since early in 1941 and has made outstanding progress under his direction in furnishing assistance to veterans with problems stemming from their service to our country. Commencing with my entrance to Congress in 1953, this was impressed upon me as a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House through the medium of the frequent appearances of Mr. Kraabel before our committee urging those kinds of veterans programs which were wholly beneficial and wholly justifiable. I am certain that the veterans of this country are grateful for the services of Mr. Kraabel and join with all of his friends and relatives in wishing him well in whatever career he chooses to adopt following his retirement from his current job.

Hon. John A. Burns of Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs of the House Interior Committee I have had excellent opportunity to observe the work and accomplishments of the Delegate from Hawaii during the 85th Congress.

His list of solid gains for Hawaii, demonstrated by the number and importance of his bills passed by Congress, most of them already signed into law, is most remarkable for a man who is denied a vote in Congress. In fact, it would be remarkable for a voting Member of the House supported by two Senators.

JOHN BURNS has won countless votes in both Houses. He has served his people well.

The Delegate, in my considered judgment has advanced the cause of statehood for Hawaii by at least a decade, making it imminent. Add this to the bills he has shepherded through Congress and you have overwhelming proof of the great caliber of his service.

Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith a summary of the approved legislation for Hawaii bearing the name and stamp of JOHN BURNS.

The summary follows:

Legislative accomplishments of Hon. JOHN A. BURNS, 85th Cong.

Bill	Purpose	Disposition
H. R. 4189 Jan. 31, 1957	For the adoption of 10,000 eligible orphans under 12 years of age, and to grant permanent residence to orphans admitted to the United States.	Incorporated in S. 2702, signed by President Sept. 11, 1957. Public Law 85-316.
H. R. 4675 Feb. 11, 1957	To provide that certain employees under the jurisdiction of the commissioner of public lands and those under the jurisdiction of the board of harbor commissioners of the Territory of Hawaii shall be subject to the civil service laws of the Territory of Hawaii.	Aug. 14, 1958. Public Law 85-650.
H. R. 5809 Mar. 11, 1957	To provide for a U. S. S. *Arizona* Memorial at Pearl Harbor, T. H.	Mar. 15, 1958. Public Law 85-344.
H. R. 5865 Mar. 12, 1957	To amend the Hawaiian Organic Act to permit the Territorial legislature to provide for the election of members of a certain board of trustees.	Aug. 14, 1958. Passed Senate. (Pending approval by President.)
H. R. 7149 May 2, 1957	To provide for the periodic transfer to the Hawaiian home-development fund of certain excess funds in the Hawaiian home administration account.	Aug. 21, 1958. Approved by President. Public Law 85-708.
H. R. 7564 May 15, 1957	To provide that the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii shall meet annually, and for other purposes.	Aug. 20, 1958. Approved by President. Public Law 85-690.
H. R. 8476 July 1, 1957	To amend the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, to extend the period of tax exemption of original lessees from 5 to 7 years.	Aug. 21, 1958. Approved by President. Public Law 85-710.
H. R. 8478 July 1, 1957	To amend sec. 207 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, to permit the establishment of a post office on Hawaiian homelands.	Aug. 11, 1958. Passed Senate (pending approval by President).
H. R. 8481 July 1, 1957	To amend title IV of the Agricultural Act of 1956 to provide that the provisions of such title shall apply in Hawaii.	Aug. 18, 1958. Passed Senate. (Pending approval by President.)
H. R. 8482 July 1, 1957	To authorize the commissioner of public lands of the Territory of Hawaii to exchange certain public lands for private lands of equal value required for public highway purposes.	Aug. 21, 1958. Approved by President. Public Law 85-713.
H. R. 8673 July 12, 1957	To amend sec. 69 of the Hawaiian Organic Act	Aug. 21, 1958. Approved by President. Public Law 85-714.
H. R. 9051 Aug. 2, 1957	To amend Public Law 874, 81st Cong., relating to Federal assistance for the operation of schools in federally affected areas, as such laws affects the Territory of Hawaii.	Incorporated in H. R. 11378, signed by President Aug. 12, 1958. Public Law 85-620.
H. R. 9232 Aug. 13, 1957	To amend sec. 73 (I) of the Hawaiian Organic Act to authorize the commissioner of public lands to amend existing land patents in hardship cases by removing the restrictions contained therein which have run for 10 or more years.	Aug. 20, 1958. Approved by President. Public Law 85-694.
H. R. 9445 Aug. 26, 1957	To amend the Hawaiian Organic Act, and to approve amendments of the Hawaiian land laws, with respect to leases and other dispositions of land.	Aug. 14, 1958. Passed Senate. (Pending approval by President.)
H. R. 9461 Aug. 27, 1957	To amend the joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, as amended by the act of Aug. 23, 1954, to permit the granting of patents in fee simple to certain occupiers of public lands.	Aug. 21, 1958. Approved by President. Public Law 85-720.
H. R. 9500 Aug. 28, 1957	To permit certain sales and exchanges of public lands of the Territory of Hawaii to persons whose lands or property were destroyed by a tidal wave of Mar. 9, 1957.	Aug. 14, 1958. Passed Senate (pending approval by President).
H. R. 9501 Aug. 28, 1957	To approve H. J. Res. 28 enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii in the regular session of 1957, relating to the conditions and terms of right of purchase leases.	Aug. 21, 1958. Approved by President. Public Law 85-711.
H. R. 9502 Aug. 28, 1957	To authorize certain exchanges of public lands of the Territory of Hawaii	Aug. 21, 1958. Approved by President. Public Law 85-718.
H. R. 9543 Aug. 29, 1957	To provide for the conveyance of certain real property used by the University of Hawaii to the board of regents of such university, for the use and benefit of such university.	Aug. 21, 1958. Approved by President. Public Law 85-719.
H. R. 10173 Jan. 21, 1958	To provide for the transfer of title to certain land at Sand Island, T. H., to the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes.	Aug. 14, 1958. Passed Senate (pending approval by President).
H. R. 10347 Jan. 29, 1958	To amend sec. 73 (q) of the Hawaiian Organic Act; to approve and ratify H. J. Res. 32, Session Laws of Hawaii, 1957, authorizing the issuance of $14,000,000 in aviation revenue bonds; to authorize certain land exchanges at Honolulu, Oahu, T. H., for the development of the Honolulu airport complex; and for other purposes.	July 18, 1958. Approved by President. Public Law 85-534.
H. R. 10423 Feb. 3, 1958	To grant the status of public lands to certain reef lands and vesting authority in the commissioner of public lands of the Territory of Hawaii in respect of reef lands having the status of public lands.	Aug. 18, 1958. Approved by President. Public Law 85-677.
H. R. 11584 Mar. 24, 1958	To authorize a program for the conservation, restoration, and management of the rare Hawaiian Nene goose.	Aug. 21, 1958. S. 4249, Senate comp. bill, passed in lieu (pending approval by President).
H. R. 11954 Apr. 16, 1958	Relating to general obligation bonds of the Territory of Hawaii, to amend Public Law 720 of the 84th Cong. (70 Stat. 552, ch. 606); to amend Public Laws 640 and 643 of the 83d Cong. (8 Stat. 782, ch. 889, and 68 Stat. 785, ch. 892); and to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act to delete the annual limitation on indebtedness that may be incurred by the Territory of Hawaii.	Aug. 20, 1958. Approved by President. Public Law 85-691.
H. R. 13015	To authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes	Burns amendment to exclude family housing units on Fort DeRussy, Honolulu. Aug. 26, 1958. Approved by President. Public Law 85-685.
H. R. 8755	Social security, retirement systems, divide	Burns amendment to add Hawaii to law extending social security coverage to policemen and firemen covered by local retirement systems, if they so desire. Aug. 30, 1957. Approved by President. Public Law 85-226.
H. R. 12858	Public works appropriations, 1959	Honolulu Harbor, $1,000,000; Hanapepe River, $407,000; Kawaihae Harbor, $1,352,000; 6 surveys, totaling $83,000; Nawiliwili Harbor, $400,000.

Mrs. Knutson Cites Need for Additional Cystic Fibrosis Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday our distinguished colleague, Mrs. COYA KNUTSON of the Ninth Minnesota District, addressed the St. Paul-Minneapolis Chapter of the National Cystic Fibrosis Research Foundation at Minneapolis.

Because of the timely nature of Mrs. KNUTSON's remarks, it is a privilege for me to insert in the RECORD her speech, along with her introduction by Mr. Ben McCabe, regional director of the National Cystic Fibrosis Research Foundation. I urge that every Member of the House give this excellent speech his thorough study. The speech follows the introduction:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY MR. BEN MCCABE, REGIONAL DIRECTOR, NATIONAL CYSTIC FIBROSIS RESEARCH FOUNDATION

It is a real pleasure for me to have the great honor of introducing our distinguished speaker this evening.

I am reminded of a story. Two high-school girl graduates were discussing whether they would go to a college for women or to a coeducational institution. One of them made the decisive argument. She said: "Most men see so much better than they think." That cinched their decision to attend a coed school.

So after that brilliant observation on the character of us men, I hope you will pardon me if I stumble or stutter in my introduction of a beautiful woman.

COYA KNUTSON is a smalltown woman. That is a common distinction in Minnesota, a smalltown State. But she comes from the northwestern part of the State which is all small towns, and Oklee, her home, is one of the smaller ones.

It is a great advantage to have had the experience of living in a small town.

We, here in the cities, pick with care the area where we are going to live. We insulate ourselves to a considerable degree from the other half or three-quarters of the population. Their problems may go unnoticed by us.

But that is impossible in a small town. You are a neighbor to everyone, not only at home but of the surrounding area, including other towns. Anyone's problem is everyone's worry. Folks are quick to rush a hundred miles to help a family in distress.

A sick child is the heartfelt concern of everyone, but particularly of the women. And even more particularly of a woman such as COYA KNUTSON—a woman of great ability, energy, and tenderness.

We parents of children suffering from cystic fibrosis are particularly fortunate that COYA KNUTSON'S great talents have now been given to the Nation and to our Nation's children.

Another smalltown woman, Mrs. John Michels, of Breckenridge, wrote to COYA KNUTSON about the plight of another neighboring family, the Ed Andersons. The Andersons have one child afflicted with cystic fibrosis and had lost two other children to it.

I don't expect COYA KNUTSON had ever heard of cystic fibrosis, but the terrible story of the Anderson family was enough to arouse her to action.

She got the facts about cystic fibrosis.

She told Congress and the Nation about this No. 2 killer of America's children.

She got action from Congress and the National Institutes of Health.

Through her fine efforts, research work to find a cure for cystic fibrosis will be advanced tenfold.

Thousands of citizens have been made aware of their neighbors' terrible plight.

And she has given new and inspiring hope to the thousands of cystic fibrosis children and their parents.

We men, particularly, have felt that politics was a man's world.

But how fortunate it is for us of the cystic fibrosis family that that opinion is wrong.

By this one instance alone COYA KNUTSON has proven that modern politics needs the character that women alone can give.

In this world of the hydrogen bomb, of international tensions keeping us on the brink of war year after year, of sputniks and rockets to the moon, we and the whole world need, as never before, just a little more tenderness, a little more concern for our neighbor and enough gumption to get up and do something about it.

We are grateful to COYA KNUTSON for the hope she has kindled in us. We gather this evening to honor and thank her for her work on cystic fibrosis.

I am honored to present Minnesota's Congresswoman COYA KNUTSON.

SPEECH BY CONGRESSWOMAN COYA KNUTSON, NINTH DISTRICT, MINNESOTA, BEFORE THE ST. PAUL-MINNEAPOLIS CHAPTER OF THE NATIONAL CYSTIC FIBROSIS RESEARCH FOUNDATION, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., AUGUST 22, 1958

Mr. President, members of the St. Paul-Minneapolis chapter, I am grateful for the opportunity of being with you tonight. Some time ago the Washington, D. C., chapter of your organization made me an honorary member of their group. I am proud of that membership; and I am pleased, now, to meet more of the fine people who are working so devotedly in the cause of cystic fibrosis.

I stand before you humbly. There is nothing I can tell you about cystic fibrosis. I do not need to remind you of the 7,000 new cases each year. I do not need to point out the tragically high death rate. You know these things, because you are parents and friends of CF children. You have faced the anxious days and nights. You have watched the suffering of your little ones. You don't need me to tell you what a terrible problem CF is.

What, then, can I offer you tonight?

I am told that your slogan is "Where there's help, there's hope."

For some months I have been trying earnestly to do what I can to help. Now I believe that I can, in good conscience, bring you word that there is hope. Wouldn't you say that the possibility of over $1 million being spent on CF research during the coming year is cause for hope?

Let me give you a little of the background on all this. A few months ago I received a letter from one of my constituents. In the letter my constituent told me about a little boy she knew. "He is 5 years old," the letter said. "His doctors have recently given his parents hope that he might live to be 15. His parents have lost two other babies, victims of cystic fibrosis, too. The boy sleeps in a kind of oxygen tent at night, and 4 times a day he is put under the tent for relief and rest. His drugs amount to $100 a month."

I was shocked. I had never heard of cystic fibrosis, yet it seemed to be a major medical problem. I called the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress for facts and figures, and what I learned made me realize that we had to have immediate action. I learned about the dreadful symptoms which are so familiar to all of you. I learned about the high incidence. I compared the figures I received with nephrosis, leukemia, and paralytic polio and found that cystic fibrosis is far more common than any of them, and that it ranks high among the child killers of our era.

What could I do, I wondered, to help this little Minnesota boy and the thousands of others like him? What aid and comfort could I offer to parents who faced years of anxiety and financial strain?

I felt that I had a deep and lasting obligation to do something. When I first went into politics, it was at the local level. I had seen conditions here in Minnesota that I didn't like, and I wanted to do what I could to help correct them. I saw farmers struggling to support their families on incomes that were far too low. I saw overcrowded schools and overworked teachers. I saw adults and children struck down by illnesses that blighted their lives and the lives of their families.

I talked to these people who were my friends and neighbors. I talked and I listened. I listened with a woman's heart, and a woman's intuitive understanding of problems that affect the current of daily life in a home. I listened to hardworking farm women who were hoarding their egg money, trying to make it cover an impossible number of expenses. I listened to mothers who bitterly resented the inadequate schools provided for their children. I listened to other mothers who were weighted down by family illnesses that drained them emotionally and financially.

But the voices came from an ever-widening circle. I began to realize that these problems were not peculiar to Minnesota alone. All across the country families were struggling against these same obstacles. State laws aimed at correcting economic and educational and medical deficiencies are fine, as far as they go—but they cannot go far enough.

Only national laws could strike at the bases of these problems, I realized. And many of the people who were most in need of help could not speak out, seeking that help for themselves. So perhaps, I reasoned, I could speak for them. That was when I sought a seat in the Congress.

My years in Washington have been rewarding beyond anything I had dreamed they would be. I have seen some of the economic measures I have introduced begin to make their effect felt in an improved standard of living for our people. I have seen the beginnings of a movement toward expanded educational facilities.

And now, with the challenge of cystic fibrosis before me, I knew that I could see the beginning of a concentrated march toward victory over at least one of the dreaded illnesses that plagued our people.

I asked representatives of the National Institutes of Health and the National Cystic Fibrosis Research Foundation to meet with me and give me their advice about what contribution I might make in the battle against cystic fibrosis. They told me about the wonderful advances CF research had made in the past 5 years, and they pointed out the need for additional research. Research costs money, and I knew that the Congress must be persuaded to provide that money. So I decided to tell every Member of Congress just how important research money for cystic fibrosis might be to the lives of our children.

On March 20, 1958, I addressed my colleagues on the floor of the House. "We must declare war," I told them. "We must declare war on cystic fibrosis." Some of you have read that speech and later speeches I made. In addition I wrote every Member of the House and Senate asking support for an expanded CF research program. I was happy to find that some of my colleagues were already becoming deeply aware of this need, and that others, learning of it for the first time, were eager to help in any [illegible] they could Phone calls began to come [illegible] from many of the other House and Senate offices, requests for further information about CF; questions about the number of known cases; offers to help me in my newly declared war by supporting any CF bill I might place before the House, or by introducing similar bills to increase the overall impact of the attack on this disease.

The parents wanted to help, to. As word of my interest in cystic fibrosis filtered out over the country, letters began to pour over my desk—more than 3,000 of them, from nearly every State in the Union. Do you know that is the first time I have ever received 3,000 letters in favor of something and not a single one opposing it.

A good many of those letters came from Minnesota—some of them from people who are in this room right now. The rest were from parents like you. Parents who watch every moment that ticks by on the clock because they know that time may be running out for the children they love. One mother wrote me, "We have been living from day to day, not knowing and not daring to look any further into the future."

I want to tell you how much the letters you wrote to me and to other Members of the House and Senate have helped us in understanding your problem. Reading that mother's letter, I began to care in a very personal way about her child. I wanted her son to have a chance at the future, a chance to grow up.

I began to meet some of the CF parents personally—members of the Washington chapter. With such a flood of letters and inquiries coming into my office, my staff was just deluged with the work that needed to be done. I wanted to be sure that each and every letter and card received the attention it deserved, and that every inquiry was answered promptly and accurately. So I asked members of the Washington chapter to assist my staff. It was wonderful the way they responded. They took home great boxes of envelopes and returned them, neatly addressed and ready for my letters, in just a few days. They found the answers for me when I received questions too technical for my new and limited understanding of cystic fibrosis. One officer of the chapter has spent several full working days actually in my office, tending to the details that were getting ahead of my staff; and I continue to call on her frequently for information and help of all kinds. This kind of dedication, I knew, deserved the best effort I could make on behalf of CF.

Most of you know that I introduced a bill calling for special funds for CF. I knew that the only way to offer real help to these children was by attacking the problem at its base, by providing the means for research into the nature and causes of this disease, as well as research into means of controlling the lung infections and other complications.

In the meantime others on Capitol Hill were taking action on the CF problem also. When the House considered the need of the National Institutes of Health for funds for the coming year, very specific questions were asked about CF research in progress

there, and the House report contained a directive that the research be accelerated during the coming year. The Senate went even further, designating $1 million to be used for CF during the coming year. In its final form the overall funds provided in the appropriations bill were reduced by approximately one-fourth of those requested by the Senate. However, this will not mean that only three-quarters of a million dollars will be available under that bill for CF research. Because of a special House amendment added in the conference committee, one of the institutes can channel another $332,000 to CF if it can be used productively within the year.

That makes a total of over $1 million for CF.

Do you agree with me that this gives us cause to hope that one day cystic fibrosis will cease to menace our children?

I'm sure you want to know how this money is to be administered. It is one thing to have a great deal of money, and another thing to know how to use it wisely. Just what are the National Institutes of Health, and how do they function? The National Institutes are a compound research organization under the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Each Institute is dedicated to research in a specific disease, or to a group of related diseases. For example, there is a National Cancer Institute and a National Heart Institute. The main headquarters are in a fine group of hospital buildings in Bethesda, Md., just outside of Washington, but research arms of these Institutes exist all across the country.

The National Institutes—or NIH, as it is usually called—has had a CF study project for some years now. During the past 4 years, 50 CF cases have been under observation. Many of the patients have been from the Washington, D. C., area but others have come from distant States.

There is a popular misconception that only people who are going to die go to NIH. This is very far from the truth. Because it is entirely a study and research organization, NIH prefers to work with patients who have a reasonable chance of survival, so that the study may be continued over a longer period of time and a greater amount learned that will be of help to that patient and others. New drugs and new therapies are tried, but these patients are not guinea pigs. The welfare of the individual patient is always the first concern, and no experiments are undertaken which might endanger him. The patients feel this concern in the doctors and technicians who work with them. Senator LISTER HILL recently had this to say about NIH personnel:

"I know of no group of men and women in all the world who are more selfless, who are more dedicated, or who give more of themselves to a noble cause than these men and women."

Such is the environment in which the proposed CF research is to be conducted.

The cystic fibrosis cases are handled through the joint efforts of two of the Institutes: The Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (because of the importance of the infectious lung conditions) and the Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases (because it is known that some basic metabolic defect is present in these children). In addition, these two Institutes plan to work closely with the Institute of Neurology and Blindness, which has the greatest contact with newborn infants, in an effort to improve diagnostic techniques and pinpoint more accurately the true incidence of this disease. Research emphasis in the past has centered on body chemistry and on antibiotic therapy. These interests will be continued and additional projects will be begun. Not only will the project at Bethesda center be expanded, but extramural grants will be given which will enable study groups in other medical centers to enlarge their projects and begin new ones. There seems also to be hope that a major medical conference on cystic fibrosis will be scheduled during the year.

So it surely sounds as if the ball is rolling at last. Cystic fibrosis—this I promise you—is no longer an unknown disease on Capitol Hill. The welfare of your CF children is a matter of first importance to your Government, and a concentrated effort to overcome this tragic disease is going to be made.

Where do we go from here? Can we rest easy now, and stop all our efforts on behalf of CF? Is the National Cystic Fibrosis Research Foundation superfluous now?

No, indeed. Most emphatically no.

There is still a tremendous job to be done—and you of the NCFRF are the people who must do it. CF may be known on Capitol Hill, now, but it still is not known to the man in the street. Every one of you has had the experience of mentioning cystic fibrosis, only to be met with blank stares. Many of you have encountered a lack of understanding not only among your townpeople but even, in some cases, among members of the medical profession itself.

The only way to build public understanding of the magnitude of this problem is through a concentrated educational effort. Your foundation makes available to you a variety of educational material—pamphlets, brochures, your movie. Put these materials to work. Buttonhole everyone in Minneapolis and St. Paul, until you are sure that cystic fibrosis is a household word, just as polio became a household word some years ago. You saw the results there. Public indignation about the tragedy of polio became so great that its research needs were given outstanding support—and now, with the Salk vaccine, polio has almost ceased to threaten our people.

It isn't enough that money has been appropriated this year for CF research. Public interest in CF must be so great that the Congress will continue to appropriate large sums each year until the final answer is found. Make sure the public knows about this need—and make sure that the Congress knows that the public wants and expects continued action.

That covers the educational function of your foundation. Now what of its fundraising efforts? Is it useless for Mrs. Smith to raise $25 at a bake sale, or for Mrs. Jones to contribute $100 from a bridge benefit?

Once again I say, emphatically, "No."

Your fund-raising efforts continue to be highly important for two reasons. One is the simple fact that there cannot be too much money to devote to this disease until its causes and cure are found. The other is that privately supported research and research supported by Government do not conflict with each other; they supplement and complement each other. The Senate report on the need for research funds put it this way:

"In recommending funds for medical research and training, the committee is acting to fill the gap left after account is taken of all sources of private support. The committee believes that citizens should support the efforts of private groups, and that governmental support of medical research is not in lieu of, but in support of, private effort."

That means you. You are the citizens the committee has charged with the responsibility for the support of private groups. So I say to you, strengthen your national foundation. Work together in every way that you can. Never let your attention be diverted from the central fact that CF children—your own children and children like them all across the country—need the best cooperative efforts of us all if they are to have their chance at the future.

I am going to keep right on fighting for CF. You have probably heard that I hope to keep on occupying that seat of mine in the House of Representatives for a good long time. And as long as I am there, I shall keep in touch with what is going on in the field of CF. I shall do what I can to keep interest alive and unflagging. I shall do what I can to help—so that you and your children may have hope.

Result of Poll on Labor-Management Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I circulated to residents of my District a questionnaire dealing with labor-management problems. The results, which were widely publicized, were placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 11220. Subsequent to the distribution of my questionnaire, I received a letter from the president of Local 559, UAW–CIO, of Flint, Mich., asking that I set forth my answers to 14 questions so that members of local 559 might know my position with respect to them.

I have always been vitally interested in the problems of the working people of my District. As a former factory worker in the Fisher Body plant in Lansing, I feel I appreciate and understand those problems. I welcomed the opportunity to express my opinion on the 14 questions, and would like to make my response a matter of public record at this time:

1. Would you favor the establishment of a Congressional committee to study the effect of automation and technological improvements upon our economy in order that recommendations could be made regarding distribution of jobs among all job seekers, thereby eliminating the need for unemployment benefits?

Answer. I favor a thorough study of the effects of automation whether by the Department of Labor or a Congressional committee. As you know, the matter has already been a concern of a Congressional committee. On May 22, the Secretary of Labor appeared before the Banking and Currency Committee at which time, I, myself, questioned him on this very subject. I definitely believe all aspects of the problem should be the subject of continuous, but not delaying, research.

2. Do you favor repeal of the 10-percent automobile excise tax and a 10-percent reduction in corporation profits?

Answer. I advocated repeal of the automotive excise tax when I was a candidate for Congress and introduced legislation to accomplish this, H. R. 3022, in January 1957. I regret that Congress has just rejected my proposal. I have already urged reconsideration of price and profits in view of the recession. On February 17, 1958, I wrote to major auto manufacturers urging that their prices be reduced if possible. I have also written to the President suggesting that he use his influence to urge price reductions nationally to stimulate the economy.

3. Would you favor the establishment of a 5-man committee, 2 from management, 2 from labor, and 1 impartial chairman, to determine how pension and welfare funds should be invested?

Answer. To me, the investment of such funds is not a Federal problem. Public reports relating to these funds should be sufficient guaranty of proper investment. However, I have no objection to the manner suggested in your question.

4. Should corporations be made to file reports regarding their pricing policies?

Answer. No. I firmly believe that our competitive system, that has worked so effectively to give us the highest living standard of all the world, can be the most effective means of determining price policies.

5. Would you favor legislation which would make collusion between a union official and a corporation official a Federal offense with equal punishment to both?

Answer. Yes.

6. Do you favor election of corporation officials by secret ballot by stockholders based upon one vote for each stockholder regardless of number of shares held?

Answer. No. It would not only be unfair but tends to be socialistic. Those with greater investment should have greater control.

7. Should misuse of corporation funds be made a Federal offense?

Answer. Certain misuses of corporation funds are now Federal offenses. Other misuses certainly are State offenses. Where State laws are not adequate, Federal legislation should be considered.

8. In view of present economic conditions, do you favor: (a) placing a maximum of $50,000 per year on corporation officials' salaries? (b) elimination of bonuses paid to corporations officials out of profits? (c) elimination of price increases at this time?

Answer. (a) No. The principle would be socialistic. I do not favor either wage or price controls at the present time. It is public knowledge that at least one former union official has a retirement income of $50,000 per year. To me, such decisions are the prerogative of both the unions and corporations under our free enterprise system.

(b) No. Under proper circumstances I believe corporate officials can legitimately receive bonuses as well as employees.

(c) Yes, unless increasing costs make price increases absolutely necessary. My published letters to the auto manufacturers and the President express my attitude in this regard.

9. To avoid possible labor strife at this time do you believe management leaders should be urged to restrict profits to 10 percent of their investment?

Answer. Every conceivable effort should be made to avoid labor strife both on the part of management and labor. In view of current economic conditions, all profits should be reduced to a minimum as well as labor demands. While I hesitate to specify an exact amount, I am in accord with the principle of reducing profits, and likewise prices, as much as possible.

10. Do you object to the enormous contributions to political parties and candidates made by corporation executives?

Answer. If you will specify the "enormous contributions" to which you refer, I shall be pleased to comment as to each. As a general policy I favor the financial support of one's political beliefs within reasonable limitations. I favor personally small contributions from individuals. I do not favor "enormous contributions" from any source.

11. Do you believe the policies adopted by management leaders represent the thinking of the majority of the stockholders?

Answer. Yes. If such policies don't reflect the stockholders' thinking, there is soon new management.

12. If you were working in a factory, would you voluntarily join the union?—(a) and when you worked at the Fisher Body did you belong to the Union?

Answer. If I were working in a factory today, union membership in most cases would be compulsory. I am aware of the importance of unions and favor their general purposes. I would not hesitate to join a union voluntarily if its policies were in accord with my own belief, and such membership would be a benefit to me and my fellow workers.

(a) When I worked at Fisher Body, I was a teen-ager and was never asked to join the union. I left my job to go to college. On my first full-time job after graduation in the accounting offices of the Washington Gas Light Co., Washington, D. C., I joined District of Columbia Gasworkers Union.

13. Do you favor a Federal right-to-work law?

Answer. No. I do not believe there is need for such Federal legislation at the present time.

14. If you were employed, could you support your family in the American tradition on the present unemployment benefits?

Answer. Absolutely not.

Baseball Hall of Fame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, it is particularly appropriate that Congressional action recognizing baseball's Hall of Fame should follow so closely the observance of Interfaith Night at Griffith Stadium, here in the Nation's Capital. This night, which has become an annual occasion in Washington, provides an opportunity to reflect on baseball's roles as the great equalizer, the great destroyer of prejudices, the great stimulant for brotherhood in action.

Highlights of Interfaith Night included a victory for the Senators, Vice President NIXON throwing out the first ball, and the presentation of interfaith awards to Rocky Marciano, George Jessel, Daniel W. Bell, and Attorney General Rogers. These citations were fitting tributes to the fine work each of these men has done to further the cause of common understanding between the races, religions, and creeds of this Nation.

Clearly, the manner in which baseball has smashed the barriers of bigotry and prejudice make it fully deserving of salutes such as Interfaith Night. It is equally true that these attributes, plus the fine influence of the game on our youth, the enjoyment it has afforded millions of fans both here and abroad, and the manner in which it epitomizes the highest ideals of sportsmanship and fair play, make the sport's Hall of Fame fully deserving of Congressional recognition and applause. They emphasize the need for encouraging, in every way possible, the export overseas of our national pastime.

We, in New York State, are exceedingly proud that baseball first came into being in New York State and that the game's Valhalla is located in Cooperstown, N. Y. No lover of baseball who has ever visited this wonderful shrine can come away with anything but a feeling of awe and a sense of the great records and traditions which the giants of the game have built. A visit to the Hall of Fame is a treat no sports lover should be denied. For many, it is one of life's most unforgettable moments. I urge every Member of Congress who has not made a pilgrimage to Cooperstown to do so at his earliest opportunity.

Because the Hall of Fame enshrines the mementos of baseball's immortals and preserves the priceless memories of our national pastime, it is fitting that Congress pay the tribute embodied in House Concurrent Resolution 213. I commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY] for initiating this fine measure, and urge that it receive the overwhelming support of this body.

REA Needs More Supervision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, I recently had a communication from Mr. Clyde Ellis, the public power lobbyist, soliciting my support for the Price REA bill, H. R. 11762. Ellis says this bill "simply declares that the REA Administrators' power to make individual loans should not be interfered with by anyone."

From our experience in California it seems high time that there be a lot more interference in the loans of the REA Administrator. REA needs more supervision, not less.

During the hearings before House Interior Committee on my bill H. R. 6997 which would authorize partnership development of the Trinity River two very shocking situations were revealed. Both of these situations involve the Sacramento Municipal Utilities District, commonly known as SMUD.

The SMUD service area is 653 square miles and comprises the major portion of Sacramento County and a small sector of Placer County. Its principal city is Sacramento, the California State capital. Its location in the heart of California is at the crossroads of transcontinental and Pacific coast railroad lines, airlines, and highways.

During 1955, over 700 new commercial and industrial customers were added, and new residences started (homes, duplexes, and apartments) totaled over 8,000.

The Sacramento area is the marketing center for the great Sacramento Valley agricultural basin and food processing is one of its principal industries. Campbell Soup Co., Libby, McNeill & Libby, California Packing Corp., and Bercut Richards Packing Co. are among the larger food-processing plants in and around Sacramento.

Industrially, the area boasts a wide variety of large operations such as Southern Pacific Railroad's second largest shops; Pacific Fruit Express Co.; Procter & Gamble Manufacturing Co.; American Can Co.; Continental Can Co.; Aerojet-General Corp.; the Air Materiel Command for the west at McClellan Air Force Base; a training base, Mather Air Force Base; the Sacramento Signal Depot; and a number of lumber concerns.

In short, SMUD's service area of 653 square miles lies in the heart of a typical commercial and industrial area and its customers and operations are typical of any utility serving any built-up metropolitan area—except, of course, it pays no taxes.

But here the similarity ends. For this same SMUD has been singled out for special and preferred treatment by the Federal Government. It has a very large loan from the Rural Electrification Administration and a 40-year contract for Government power.

Let us take the REA loan first. Out of the 14 million people who live in California, only 400,000 live in the SMUD area. Of the 158,693 square miles of land area in California SMUD serve 653 square miles—one twenty-fifth of 1 percent of the State's area. Yet the same SMUD has received over $23 million of the total of some $27 million of REA loan funds in California. We have already pointed out that the SMUD service area includes business and industrial and built-up rural areas in the heart of California. Certainly there are no distant or hard to reach farms in this entire area.

The data which I have acquired from the Department of Agriculture here in Washington points out that even as far back as 1935 53.9 percent of the farms in California were electrified and that by 1957 this percentage has risen to 96.9 percent.

As a matter of fact, the 53.9 percent in 1935 was way ahead of the national average of that time and they were supplied not by REA but by private utilities. The 96.9 percent in 1957 were for all practical purposes all supplied by private utilities. REA has had no room to go in California simply because the area has always been ahead of the national average in rural electrification. Only a handful of farms in all of California are supplied by REA.

Nevertheless, we find the situation of the $23 million loan to SMUD at 2 percent interest. This is an out-and-out subsidy to SMUD because it costs the Federal Government closer to 3½ percent to borrow money from its citizens.

For the most part the city of Sacramento and surrounding area is about as rural as St. Louis and if SMUD is eligible for an REA loan, then I think every utility in the country which serves outside the corporate limits of cities is entitled to REA financing.

Doesn't it seem to you that the REA Administrator's power to make loans, at least loans of this type, should be subjected to closer scrutiny instead of less scrutiny as suggested by Mr. Ellis?

Now we come to the second special treatment accorded to SMUD, and this is, if possible, even more shocking than the first. This district now has a contract with the Department of the Interior for the purchase of over two-thirds of the firm power of the Central Valley project. When Congress authorized this project—and almost $800 million has been appropriated for it—it specified that the revenues from power were to be used to financially aid and assist the water features of the project The way it is turning out, the power features of the Central Valley project are financially aiding and assisting the Sacramento Municipal Utilities District.

According to testmony before the House committee, SMUD now pays a little less than 4.5 mills per kilowatt-hour for its power from the Government, it pays no taxes, and it has a $23 million 2 percent REA loan. Did I hear somebody talk about "give away" or "hands in the Federal cash register?"

As you know, the House Interior Committee did not take formal action this year on my bill to authorize partnership development of the Trinity power facilities. Action was prevented by forces within the committee which opposed this legislation and who were in a position to prevent committee action on this proposal.

Just what would be the effects of my bill? In the first place, it would save about $60 million of taxpayers' money because the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. would build the power facilities. At a time when we are facing a $12 billion deficit and people from all over the United States are screaming for more Federal funds for more Federal projects, isn't it about time that we relieve the Federal Government of this burden whenever there are citizens who are willing to do a part of this job and under a proper State regulation.

In my Congressional District we have the Russian River project, the Middle Creek and the Eel River projects where Federal funds are required. Don't you think it might be well to let the power company build the power facilities at Trinity—save the $60 million and let some of it go to build the worthy projects throughout the country?

Earlier in this statement, I referred to the fact that Congress directed when it authorized the Central Valley project that power revenues were to assist the water features. Under a joint development the Trinity power facilities would do just this to the tune of some $175 million over the payout period, whereas under all Federal development, the Trinity power facilities would become a drag and a drain on the water features of the Central Valley project.

Add to these advantages the payment of over $140 million in Federal, State, and local taxes and you can readily understand my anxiety and interest in promoting joint development.

And who were these forces opposing Trinity partnership? Primarily it was those whose main interest is to get even greater Federal handouts for SMUD from the Federal Government—however they might try to disguise their purpose.

Power from Federal Trinity plants would cost somewhere between 7.3 and 8.9 mills per kilowatt-hour according to testimony before the House committee and most of it or a good part of it, would go to SMUD at less than 5 mills per kilowatt-hour. So that is another subsidy or Federal advantage accorded to SMUD, which could amount to around $3 million per year.

So a Trinity partnership controversy is not the one of public versus private power but it is a question of further Federal subsidies to SMUD or benefits through joint development to all of the people of California and taxpayers of the Nation.

Of course SMUD hired a high powered engineer to present their case before the committee in opposition to Trinity partnership. Committee members tell me that his testimony had little if any effect on the committee members because even he had to admit that even using his figures and even allowing some increase in SMUD rates Federal Trinity power would still be sold at less than its cost of production.

The opponents of partnership are trying to hoodwink Congress into thinking that partnership represents some sort of a giveaway or some sort of handout to the private utilities. Actually, it is no such thing and cannot be under the strict regulations to which all California utilities are subjected.

Andrija Artukovic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert the following letter which I addressed today to Hon. J. M. Swing, Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 23, 1958.

Re Andrija Artukovic.

Hon. J. M. SWING,
Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL SWING: I have your letter of August 20 with reference to the above-entitled matter. To say that I am amazed at the misstatement of facts is to put it mildly. It appears to me that a bureau of the Federal Government should make every effort to convey the truth to those people who make inquiry on various matters. Your statement that the above-named subject entered the United States with documents fraudulently obtained is contrary to the known facts of your office.

Rev. Dr. Louis Ivandic, born in Croatia, and now a professor in Canada, declared under oath: "I know by my personal knowledge that Andrija Artukovic made an application in Fribourg, Switzerland, to change officially the the name, Andrija Artukovic, to Alois Anich, because his life was in danger. I know that his application for permission of the use of

Anich was forwarded from Fribourg to Bern, Switzerland. I can testify to the fact that Inspector Frederick Schoenenberger was sent by the Federal authorities in Bern to Fribourg to conduct an examination for the application of Andrija Artukovic. I know and can testify that Andrija Artukovic had a hearing before Inspector Schoenenberger, and that Federal and State authorities, both in Bern and in Fribourg, Switzerland, had full knowledge about the identity of Alois Anich as of Andrija Artukovic.

"I further testify that after the hearing of Andrija Artukovic I saw Inspector Schoenenberger personally and had a discussion about the case. The inspector showed me the Croatian diplomatic passport which Mr. Artukovic presented him during the hearings and went to Bern to present it to the authorities in Bern. I know that later Inspector Schoenenberger returned to Fribourg and returned the diplomatic passport to Artukovic's wife. I know that the Swiss authorities issued a certificate of identity under the name of Alois Anich after the hearing of Andrija Artukovic."

Artukovic, therefore, had henceforth the legal right to use the name Alois Anich. He lived under that name during his year's residence in Ireland and, when a child was born to him and his wife there, he officially recorded the boy's name as Radoslav Anich. He applied for and obtained a visitor visa to the United States of America in the name of Alois Anich, exhibiting an Irish certificate of identity issued to him on the expiration of his Swiss certificate.

Artukovic entered the United States of America in July 1948 with Irish identity certificate and visitor visa in the name of Anich, and no inquiry at entry was made as to whether he had been known by any other name. Six months later, on January 25, 1949, in applying for further extension of temporary stay, in the form of application prescribed by the Service, he clearly and plainly set forth his names as Andrija Artukovic and Alois Anich. The Service raised no objection, and extended his temporary stay. On three successive occasions he gave the same information officially.

The Immigration Service knew in 1949 that Mr. Artukovic and Alois Anich were one and the same person, and no effort was made to deport him until April of 1952, and then only under pressure from the Tito Communist agents, aided and abetted by Drew Pearson.

While I disagree with the deportation proceedings, this letter is directed against the shameful misrepresentations made in your form letter to American citizens who make inquiry regarding Andrija Artukovic, and I sincerely trust that in response to future inquiries you will discontinue making such a misstatement of fact.

Sincerely,

JAMES B. UTT,
Member of Congress.

Teacher Training for Mentally Retarded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in order to support H. R. 13757 which was introduced by Congressman JOHN FOGARTY. It encourages and provides for the expansion of teaching in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies.

There has been a tremendous need for legislation in this field. Today, in this country, there are approximately 1 million mentally retarded children of school age, and only 15 percent of these children are properly and adequately served. The importance of this legislation is self-evident, yet only in the past 10 years has it been given the recognition it truly merits. The action by this Congress is a step in the proper direction.

I have always had a deep and sincere interest in this type of legislation. As a result, I filed a bill, H. R. 5401, which would have helped in this area. I was delighted to see that H. R. 13757 has incorporated many of the features of the bill that I filed.

The people of my area and my State have a deep interest in this matter. Organizations to assist the mentally retarded have been active throughout Massachusetts and particularly in my home county of Hampden. All will be pleased with the action of this Congress in granting relief in this humanitarian field.

Bond Financing of Federal Expenditures as a Device To Bypass Appropriation Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MILLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to call to the attention of Congress an analysis I have prepared pointing out the repeated attempts that have been made during the 85th Congress to finance both old and new Federal spending programs by means other than the traditional appropriation process. This analysis also indicates the extent to which the TVA bond bill, S. 1869, would bypass the House Appropriations Committee and the appropriation procedure that Congress evolved to maintain continuance control over Federal spending. The analysis follows:

Repeated attempts have been made during the 85th Congress to finance both old and new Federal spending programs by means other than the traditional appropriation process. These efforts have been directed at giving Federal agencies the authority to obtain funds by direct Treasury borrowings or by issuing their own bonds. In each instance the effect has been to bypass the House Appropriations Committee and the appropriation procedure that Congress has evolved to maintain continuous control over Federal spending. Since it is through appropriations that the Congress maintains this supervision, the matter is of first significance.

Numerous pieces of legislation were introduced in this Congress containing devices raising this issue. These involved mineral subsidies, housing, small business investments, public works loans, aid to depressed area, and TVA. Because this entire subject is attracting increasing attention, it might be well to see how the appropriation process differs from Treasury and other bond financing methods.

THE APPROPRIATION PROCESS

The method of financing anticipated by the Constitution was by the appropriation of money from the general funds in the United States Treasury. These funds which belong to the people cannot be drawn upon and spent without both an authorization and appropriation by Congress. In general terms, the appropriation procedure is as follows: The executive branch prepares an annual budget outlining its spending needs and, along with supplementary estimates as they arise, sends these requests for funds to Congress where they are processed initially by the House Committee on Appropriations.

As the first step, the House Appropriations Committee holds hearings in executive sessions and prepares bills and reports on the sums and items it believes should be allowed. These are then acted upon by the full House. The bill then goes to the Senate where the entire proceeding is repeated. When the House and Senate have agreed on the amounts and items in the many bills appropriating money, the bills then go to the White House for the President's signature. Not until they have cleared all these steps can public funds be drawn from the Treasury and spent.

As part of this procedure agencies of the Government must come before the House and Senate Appropriations Committees each year to explain and justify their proposed programs in the light of what they have been doing and what they would like to do. Agency heads are eternally confronted with the knowledge that if the committee is displeased with past performance, or does not believe future plans are in the public interest, it can recommend reduced appropriations.

The appropriation process, therefore, helps prevent waste of public funds and insures that the policies and programs conform to the intent of Congress, expressing the wish of the people. This is the most effective means Congress has to compel responsibility in the executive. Since no other agency of Government performs these functions, the Appropriations Committee fills a most vital role in making certain that Government is responsive to the people's will.

AVOIDING APPROPRIATION CONTROLS

Experience shows that every agency would like to be free from this close control and supervision. Each tries to justify such freedom on the plea it needs flexibility to be efficient. By "flexibility" the agencies mean exemption from dependence on appropriations; exemption from scrutiny, examination, review, and control by the Appropriations Committee.

Executive agencies have been unceasing in their efforts to obtain permanent appropriations in some form. Back in

1893, for instance, the House Appropriations Committee noted:

> It serves executive convenience to escape the annual discussions to procure appropriation estimates and it lessens public scrutiny * * * but it takes from the country and from Congress the habit of providing yearly for these obligations.

About 40 years later the same committee argued that no one Congress has the right to bind succeeding Congresses "by enactment of laws" permitting Federal expenditures "without annual examination, approval, and supervision" of Congress. After criticizing certain agencies for their power to "obtain permanent appropriations or to defeat legislation to curb such practices," the Appropriations Committee stated:

> Congress has no desire to impair existing rights but is seeking, rather, to reestablish its own right and duty to pass annually upon all appropriations.

In recent years, the borrowing device—either from the Treasury or directly from the public—has evolved as the Agencies' most sought-after method to gain freedom from appropriation controls. Under it, the Agency obtains funds from the Treasury within the limit set forth in the authorizing legislation. Thus, the Appropriations Committees are not called upon to make any review or take any action in connection with the financing. The Agency need not return to Congress unless and until it seeks additional borrowing authority. Its funding in most instances is handled by the Treasury Department and its borrowings are included within the public debt.

This borrowing technique is taken a step further in the case of the TVA bond financing proposal. This piece of legislation differs from the Treasury bond financing device in two most important respects. Under pending legislation TVA itself—not the Treasury—would be authorized to issue and sell the bonds directly to the public, and the TVA bonds would be outside the public debt limit. Under S. 1869, the TVA bond bill that is pending in the House, this Agency would be authorized to issue and sell $750 million in bonds to finance the construction and acquisition of facilities to produce and sell electric power. Once the bill passed, TVA would be free to borrow the $750 million without regard to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees or to the overall fiscal condition of the Federal Government. As long as the money lasted, TVA would not have to come back to Congress for more and, according to most estimates, this would be from 6 to 10 years.

Proponents of S. 1869 contend it contains adequate Congressional control. But compare these controls with those of the appropriation process. Under S. 1869 the Agency can spend any or all of the $750 million unless Congress, by a concurrent resolution says "no." This means that both the House and the Senate must take specific action to say "no." If one says "no" and one says "yes," or if one says "no" and the other fails to act, the Agency can spend the money. Furthermore, there is no Congressional procedure that clearly sets forth which committee of Congress would initiate action on the concurrent resolution and, of course, if the resolution is not initiated in the first instance, there would be no action. Contrast this diffusion of responsibility with the definiteness of the entire appropriation procedure.

APPROPRIATION CONTROL AND FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

The question in reality is whether the appropriation procedure has lost its usefulness, whether it is in the public interest for an agency to be freed from these controls. If the proposal is good for TVA, it would seem that it should be good for all agencies of Government. But, historically the evidence seems to show that the Nation has run into fiscal difficulties whenever it tried to abandon, weaken, or do without control of spending through the appropriation process.

Originally, control of appropriations was vested in the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives. In 1865, as a result of the growth in Federal spending and the increased workload on the committee, the function was given to the newly established Appropriations Committee.

For some years thereafter that committee of the House of Representatives exercised leadership in initiating, controlling, and reviewing use of the appropriations made available to the executive branch. Around the turn of the century, the appropriation function was dispersed to the various legislative committees, but following World War I, when the lack of control resulted in an utterly confusing situation, the House Appropriations Committee was once again given full jurisdiction over all appropriations.

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 assigned to the House Committee on Appropriations a single function, "appropriation of the revenue for the support of the Government." As spelled out in the rules of the House of Representatives, a part of this function is the disposition of funds resulting from the sale of Government property or services, for example, revenues from the sale of TVA power.

Chairman CANNON of the House Committee on Appropriations has clearly stated the dangers inherent in legislation allowing agencies to finance themselves by borrowing. He said:

> An appropriation originating in this illegitimate manner is not subject to review as it is when it originates as a regular appropriation in the House. Over here the appropriation must be annually, and in that annual review, in those annual hearings, they must give an accounting. But * * * under the public debt transaction device agencies are not required to come in for an annual appropriation. They just go ahead year after year taking the money out of the Treasury without any accounting, and the result is that we are on the way to spending billions of dollars. In the constitutional process serious consideration by the House would reveal the true merits of the proposition and annually reevaluate these merits. We must insist on return to the old law under which the House alone originates appropriations (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 24, 1958, p. 14981).

FREEDOM AND THE PUBLIC PURSE

In addition, there is the basic question of the dependence of people's freedom on control of the public purse. In the operations of the Federal Government, control of the purse has been both a symbol and the instrument of legislative, or the people's, authority over the Executive. As noted in the report of the minority of the House Public Works Committee on S. 1869:

> The right of the House of Representatives to exercise control over the expenditure of funds by an executive department, a right it exercises in the first instance through its Committee on Appropriations, must be zealously guarded. Control over the public purse was one of the first rights achieved by the people in their centuries-long fight for liberty and freedom.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—Activity Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, and House Resolution 99, as amended, 85th Congress, I should like to submit a statement of the activity of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for the 85th Congress, 2d session.

The committee had 218 House bills, 12 Senate bills, 1 House joint resolution, 1 House concurrent resolution, 1 Senate concurrent resolution and 1 Senate joint resolution referred to it during the 2d session of the 85th Congress. During both sessions the committee had referred to it a total of 631 House bills, 36 Senate bills, 14 joint resolutions, and 5 House resolutions.

During the 2d session public hearings were held by subcommittees on bills to create a Federal Aviation Agency, provide assistance to surface common carriers—including ratemaking, agricultural exemptions, loan guaranties, abandonment of service, and redefinition of private carrier by motor vehicle. The Subcommittee on Transportation and Communications also conducted public hearings on bills relating to civil air penalties; permanent certification of air cargo carriers; statute of limitations on Government shipments; radio-telephone exemptions on certain vessels, and bills to extend the Federal Airport Act.

The Subcommittee on Health and Science held public hearings on various bills to amend the Public Health Service Act, to provide Federal assistance to schools of public health; to extend the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act and the Health Research Facilities Construction Act. In addition, the subcommittee received testimony on legislative proposals to establish a National Milk Sanitation Act; to change the definition of "chemical preservative" in the Food and Drug Act and, during this session, completed extensive hearings on bills

providing for adequate pretesting of chemical food additives.

Bills to establish a Federal Fair Trade Act; to require price labeling on new automobiles; to prohibit switchblade knives in interstate commerce; and miscellaneous bills to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act were considered by the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance in public hearings.

Thirty-one bills and two joint resolutions were reported from the committee this year.

In the field of aviation, a bill to create an independent Federal Aviation Agency, and to provide for the safe and efficient use of the airspace by both civil and military aircraft, was enacted. Legislation is now awaiting Presidential approval to extend the Federal Airport Act through fiscal year 1963 at an increased level of $100 million annually. Also awaiting the President's signature is a bill to give former owners preference rights in buying back land acquired by the Secretary of Commerce for an airport at Burke, Va. By Public Law 503, the Secretary of Commerce is permitted to lease property upon public airports at Anchorage and Fairbanks, Alaska. Provisions similar to those contained in S. 1380, authorizing the imposition of civil penalties for violation of the security provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, were contained in S. 3880, the Federal Aviation Act of 1958. Also enacted into law was a bill to clarify language in Public Law 762, 81st Congress, which authorized an additional public airport for the District of Columbia. The purpose of the legislation is to remove a possible limitation on the amount authorized to be appropriated for such airport.

On August 22, a committee report was filed on H. R. 4305, a bill to provide for reimbursement for damage to the Ryan-Hemet Airport, Calif.

The most important transportation bill considered by the committee, and enacted into law, was a proposal to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to strengthen and improve our Nation's common carrier surface transportation system so that it may better fulfill its role in meeting the transportation needs of the Nation's expanding economy, and the requirements of national defense. The act authorizes the Interstate Commerce Commission to guarantee certain loans of common carriers by railroad. Another section gives authority to the Interstate Commerce Commission to remove discriminations against interstate commerce, primarily by making adjustments in intrastate rates of carriers by railroad subject to the Commission's jurisdiction. The law also provides a method and procedures to make it possible for carriers by railroad subject to the Interstate Commerce Act to discontinue or change in whole or in part the operation or service of trains or ferries operated by such carriers, notwithstanding otherwise applicable State laws. Another important feature of the act deals with exemption from regulation of motor carrier transportation of certain agricultural commodities. Finally, the bill as enacted prohibits certain operations in the transportation of property by motor vehicle without first obtaining appropriate operating authority.

Two Senate bills, one to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to provide a uniform Statute of Limitations on actions involving transportation of property and passengers applicable to the United States Government, as well as to other shipments (S. 377); and the other to facilitate the financing of certain motor carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act (S. 375) and now at the White House for final approval.

Two bills to amend the Railroad Retirement Act were favorably reported from the committee.

The purpose of H. R. 4353 is, generally, to strengthen and place on a sound self-supporting basis the railroad retirement system and the railroad unemployment insurance system. As to the railroad retirement system this objective is accomplished by first eliminating the present long-range acturial deficit in the railroad retirement account; second providing a much-needed 7-percent increase in retirement and survivor benefits; third, eliminating certain inequities in the system; and fourth, providing for the adequate financing of the system. As to the railroad unemployment insurance system this objective is accomplished by first, providing for a much-needed increase in the daily benefit rate for unemployed workers; second, providing for extended benefit periods for those workers who have exhausted their rights to normal benefits now provided under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; third, eliminating certain inequities in the system; and fourth, providing for adequate financing of this system.

The other bill on this subject (H. R. 7166), making technical and administrative amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act, is designed principally to simplify and improve administration of these acts. It would correct certain inequities, eliminate references to obsolete laws, and insure that the provisions conform with comparable provisions in the Social Security Act.

The Interstate Commerce Commission, under the provisions of Public Law 85–375 (S. 1386), is authorized to prescribe rules, standards, and instructions for the installation, inspection, maintenance and repair of power or train breaks.

Several communications bills were considered by the committee in the second session, and extensive public hearings were held on the general subject of subscription television.

Legislation authorizing the Federal Communications Commission to issue licenses to noncitizens for the operation of aircraft radio stations in the case of persons holding United States pilot certificates was approved by both Houses. A proposed amendment to section 382 of the Communications Act to enlarge the exemption provisions requiring radio-telephones on certain vessels was reported from the committee and approved by the House. Senate Joint Resolution 106, to establish a commission to investigate the allocation, management, and control of radio and television frequencies, passed the Senate, was reported from this committee, but was not considered by the House. S. 2119, to expedite the use of television channels set aside for educational purposes, likewise passed the Senate, was referred to and reported from this committee, but did not receive consideration by the House.

Midway in the second session, the President approved S. 86, to provide for a research program in the field of weather modification to be conducted by the National Science Foundation—Public Law 85–510.

Several important public-health measures were enacted during the past session. Included among them were bills to extend the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act and Medical Research Facilities Construction Act; to authorize Federal grants to schools of public health, and to authorize loans in lieu of grants under the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act. The outstanding achievement in food and drug legislation was realized when both Houses approved a bill to protect the health of consumers by requiring manufacturers of food additives and food processors to pretest any potentially unsafe substances which are to be added to food; and to advance food technology by permitting the use of food additives at safe levels (H. R. 13254).

Another amendment to the Food and Drug Act (H. R. 9521) to provide that the term "chemical preservative" shall not include any pesticide chemicals when used in or on any raw agricultural commodity which is the produce of the soil, passed the House.

A Senate bill (S. 4039) authorizing the expenditure of funds through grants for support of scientific research cleared Houses of Congress.

A proposal to amend the National Science Foundation Act (S. 3268) authorizing the National Science Board to delegate specific authority to its executive committee and to the Director to approve grants for contracts between meetings of the board, was amended in the House and returned to the Senate.

At the request of the Department of Commerce, a bill was introduced to amend the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards giving authority to acquire land for field sites, and for other purposes. The Senate bill (S. 2114) is now awaiting the President's approval.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare sponsored legislation clarifying the functions and authority of the Public Health Service with respect to sanitation facilities for Indians (S. 3694). The bill was reported from the committee, but not considered by the House.

A bill to regulate the interstate distribution of lobsters, H. R. 2445, was recently reported to the House.

The committee reported the following bills which were initially considered by its Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance:

S. 3500: Automobile Information Disclosure Act. The bill was signed on July 7, and is now Public Law 85–506.

H. R. 12850: To prohibit switchblade knives in interstate commerce. This bill also received Presidential approval and is now Public Law 85-623.

H. R. 11668: To amend section 39 of Trading With the Enemy Act to transfer funds to satisfy unpaid awards made under the War Claims Act. The bill has cleared both Houses and is now on the President's desk for final disposition.

H. R. 11234: Federal Trade Commission jurisdiction over unfair trade practices by meatpackers. The Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance and the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House conducted joint hearings on this subject in June and July of 1957. Five bills were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, while two other bills were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. Following the joint hearings it was agreed that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce would assume responsibility for the reporting of legislation on this subject.

In considering the bills, the committee took cognizance of the fact that the House Committee on Agriculture likewise considered the problem of how the jurisdiction with regard to unfair practices engaged in by meatpackers should be divided between the Secretary of Agriculture and the Federal Trade Commission. As a result of its consideration of the problem, the Agriculture Committee reported a bill (H. R. 9020), which was cleared for floor action by the House Rules Committee. H. R. 9020 subsequently passed the House and Senate, amended to include language similar to that contained in H. R. 11234.

In the closing days of the session, a Senate-House conference committee agreed on a bill to protect producers and consumers against misbranding and false advertising of the fiber content of textile fiber products—H. R. 469, Texile Fiber Products Identification Act. The bill is now on the President's desk at the White House.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRAFFIC SAFETY

During the 1957 fall recess of the Congress, the Special Subcommittee on Traffic Safety held three public hearings at Nashville, Tenn., Little Rock, Ark., and Montgomery, Ala., for the purpose of studying enforcement methods in connection with traffic safety problems. The subcommittee heard witnesses representing law enforcement agencies, State and municipal executive officials.

During the second session, the subcommittee held six sets of public hearings, first, House Joint Resolution 221—BEAMER—interstate compacts for adoption of a uniform traffic code; second, H. R. 9368—SCHENCK—hydrocarbons given off by automobiles; third, H. R. 12804—ROBERTS—driver education training; fourth, a proposal by the broadcasting industry for broadcasting of weather and road conditions, washed out bridges, and other hazards on the Nation's highways; fifth, a panel discussion on basic research needs in the field of traffic safety; and sixth, a presentation by winners of National Teen-Age Road-e-o contests of their opinions of the value of driver education training if incorporated in the curriculums of all high schools of the Nation.

House Joint Resolution 221 was favorably reported from the subcommittee, the full committee, and passed the House and the Senate. It was signed by the President on August 20 and is now Public Law 85-684.

H. R. 12804 was favorably reported from the subcommittee but was not acted on by the full committee.

The subcommittee plans further hearings on the relationship of alcohol to traffic accidents, vehicle design, human factors contributing to accidents, enforcement, and legislation.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT

On February 10, 1958, Hon. MORGAN M. MOULDER resigned as chairman of the subcommittee, and the next day I was appointed to that position.

After holding public hearings during the first 3 months of this year the subcommittee filed an interim report relating to the Federal Communications Commission on April 4, 1958—House Report No. 1602, 85th Congress, 2d session. The report contained the following legislative recommendations:

First. Code of ethics should be prescribed by the Commission to establish standards of conduct for members and employees; second, honorarium provision in section 4 of the act should be eliminated; third, ex parte contacts with members of the Commission and of its staff should be prohibited with respect to adjudicatory matters; ex parte communications not authorized by law should be disclosed in the public record and notice given to the parties; and, fourth, act should provide that the President may remove any member of the Commission for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause.

The legislative recommendations above outlined were embodied in the bill, H. R. 11886, which I introduced on April 14, 1958, and which was referred to our committee.

The special subcommittee ordered the bill reported to the full committee without amendment.

From January 27 through January 30, 1958, the subcommittee held public hearings relative to a general survey of the work of six Federal regulatory commissions. Witnesses included Chairmen of the Civil Aeronautics Board, Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Trade Commission, Federal Power Commission, Federal Communications Commission, and Securities and Exchange Commission.

There followed a series of public hearings bearing on the conduct of FCC Commissioners, with particular emphasis on the question of ex parte contacts with the Commission

Following the Easter recess, subcommittee hearings were conducted dealing with communications patents, and allegations that the Commission's practices were conducive to the fostering of monopoly.

Extensive public hearings were held during the period covered by this report on the actions of the Federal Trade Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission with respect to companies in which Bernard Goldfine was known to have an interest.

The subcommittee conducted public hearings at Boston, Mass., and Washington, D. C., pertaining to the Securities and Exchange Commission and the East Boston Co. and its controlled subsidiary, the Boston Port Development Co.

Incidental to these hearings were the contempt proceedings against Bernard Goldfine. On August 13, 1958, the House by a vote of 369 to 8 adopted House Resolution 684 under which the Speaker of the House certified the Committee Report—House Report No. 2580—to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia.

During the adjournment, the subcommittee will continue investigation and study of the commissions and agencies within its jurisdiction.

The detailed activity report follows:

ACTIVITY REPORT OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, 85TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION—BILLS REPORTED

The committee has considered and reported favorably the following bills:

H. R. 7757: Amend Communications Act to exempt certain vessels from radio-telephone requirement.

Report No. 2281 by Mr. HARRIS, July 25, 1958.

Passed House, July 29, 1958.

H. R. 8543: To permit radio licenses for alien aircraft pilots.

Report No. 1885, by Mr. MACK (Illinois), June 16, 1958.

Passed House, June 26, 1958.

H. R. 8742: Statute of limitations on shipments under the Interstate Commerce Act.

Report No. 2346, by Mr. FLYNT, August 1, 1958.

S. 377 passed House, amended, in lieu, August 5, 1958.

H. R. 9521: Redefinition of "chemical preservative" under Food and Drug Act.

Report No. 2119, by Mr. WILLIAMS (Mississippi), July 7, 1958.

Passed House, August 20, 1958.

H. R. 10045: Provide for sale of land acquired for Burke Airport, Va.

Report No. 1955, by Mr. ROBERTS, June 24, 1958.

Passed House, August 5, 1958.

H. R. 11234: Federal Trade Commission jurisdiction over meat packers.

Report No. 1507, by Mr. MACK (Illinois), March 17, 1958.

Two hour, open rule, granted on H. R. 9020 (similar bill, reported from House Agriculture Committee).

H. R. 11414: Federal aid to schools of public health.

Report No. 1593, by Mr. WILLIAMS (Mississippi), April 2, 1958.

Approved July 22, 1958, Public Law 85-544.

H. R. 11668: Amend Trading With the Enemy Act to transfer funds for payment of certain claims.

Report No. 1590, by Mr. MACK (Illinois), April 1, 1958.

Passed House, April 21, 1958.

H. R. 12311: Remove limitation on authorization for construction of Chantilly Airport, Virginia.

Report No. 1886, by Mr. HARRIS, June 16, 1958.

Approved July 11, 1958, Public Law 85-511.

H. R. 12628: 5-year extension of Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act.

Report No. 1952, by Mr. WILLIAMS (Mississippi), June 24, 1958.

Approved August 14, 1958, Public Law 85-664.

H. R. 12694: Authorize loans instead of grants under Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act.

Report No. 1954, by Mr. WILLIAMS (Mississippi), June 24, 1958.

Approved August 1, 1958, Public Law 85–569.

H. R. 12832: Transportation Act of 1958.

Report No. 1922, by Mr. HARRIS, June 18, 1958. S. 3778 approved August 12, 1958.

Public Law 85–625.

H. R. 12850: To prohibit switchblade knives in interstate commerce.

Report No. 1945, by Mr. MACK (Illinois), June 23, 1958.

Approved August 12, 1958. Public Law 85–623.

H. R. 12876: Extend Medical Research Facilities Construction Act for 3 years.

Report No. 2315, by Mr. HARRIS, July 30, 1958.

Passed House August 5, 1958.

H. R. 13254: Provide for pretesting of chemical food additives.

Report No. 2284, by Mr. WILLIAMS (Mississippi), July 28, 1958.

Passed House August 15, 1958.

House Joint Resolution 221: Interstate compacts on traffic safety.

Report No. 2037, by Mr. ROBERTS, June 26, 1958.

Approved August 20, 1958, Public Law 85–684.

S. 86: Providing for research in weather modification.

Report No. 1695, by Mr. RHODES (Pennsylvania), May 7, 1958.

Approved July 11, 1958, Public Law 85–510.

S. 375: Amend Interstate Commerce Act relating to lien recording requirements on motor vehicles.

Report No. 2354, by Mr. HARRIS, August 2, 1958.

Passed House, amended, August 4, 1958.

S. 1366: Leasing of airport space in Alaska.

Report No. 1943, by Mr. HARRIS, June 23, 1958.

Approved July 3, 1958, Public Law 85–503.

S. 1380: Aviation civil penalties for security violations.

Report No. 1995, by Mr. HARRIS, June 25, 1958.

Similar provisions in S. 3880.

S. 3500: Automobile price labeling.

Report No. 1958, by Mr. MACK (Illinois), June 24, 1958.

Approved July 7, 1958, Public Law 85–506.

S. 3880: Federal Aviation Agency.

Report No. 2360, by Mr. HARRIS, August 2, 1958.

Passed House, amended, August 4, 1958.

Senate Joint Resolution 106: Establish a Commission to investigate allocation of radio and television frequencies.

Report No. 2355, by Mr. HARRIS, August 2, 1958.

H. R. 4353: Amendments to Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

Report No. 2562, by Mr. HARRIS, August 12, 1958.

S. 3502: Extending time for making grants under the Federal Airport Act, and for other purposes.

Report No. 2539, by Mr. HARRIS, August 11, 1958.

Passed House, amended, August 18, 1958.

S. 2119: Television Broadcasting for Educational Purposes.

Report No. 2636, by Mr. HARRIS, August 15, 1958.

S. 4039: Authorizing the expenditure of funds through grants for support of scientific research.

Report No. 2640, by Mr. WILLIAMS (Mississippi), August 15, 1958.

Passed House, amended, August 22, 1958.

H. R. 7166: Technical and administrative amendments to Railroad Retirement Act, Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and Social Security Act.

Report No. 2641, by Mr. HARRIS, August 15, 1958.

S. 3020 passed House, in lieu, August 23, 1958.

S. 2114: Amendments to the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards.

Report No. 2635, by Mr. WILLIAMS (Mississippi), August 15, 1958.

Passed House August 22, 1958.

S. 3694: Indian sanitation facilities.

House Report 2637, by Mr. WILLIAMS (Mississippi), August 15, 1958.

H. R. 2445: Regulate interstate transportation of lobsters.

House Report 2652, by Mr. HARRIS, August 15, 1958.

H. R. 11257: Amending the National Science Foundation Act of 1950.

Report No. 2642, by Mr. HARRIS, August 15, 1958. S. 3268 passed House, amended, in lieu, August 20, 1958.

H. R. 4305: Ryan-Hemet Airport, California. To provide for reimbursement for damage to such airport in accordance with Federal Airport Act.

Report No. 2693 by Mr. MOSS, August 22, 1958.

Unity of the Polish People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a very eloquent statement on the unity of the Polish people recently published in the New York Times.

The author is an old friend of mine, Mr. Stefan Pomierski, now residing at Glen Cove, N. Y., a prominent leader of the Polish cause in this country, and an able, loyal American citizen who has for years devoted himself to laudable charity and to civic and patriotic endeavor.

Mr. Pomierski's article emphasizes the undying determination of the Polish people to regain their freedom. Centuries of oppression have never been able to quench the indomitable spirit of this great and worthy people. Whether the oppressors are Nazis or Communists the courageous Poles still bravely fight for the restoration of their liberties, and for liberation from religious persecution, economical slavery, and political tyranny.

America must not turn its back upon these valiant people Our duty is clear. We must do everything in our power to help them throw off the shackles of Communist bondage and breathe again the air of freedom, which is so much a part of Poland's historic tradition.

This Nation and the Free World must realize sooner or later that so long as Communist oppressors and tyrants are permitted to enslave millions of freedom-loving people throughout the world, there will be no chance for a real, lasting peace. Already great damage has been done to the cause of freedom.

Murder, pillage, rapine, and bloodshed have been visited upon much of the earth in the mad quest of Marxist communism to achieve world domination. The hearts of many people, who trusted in America and its ideals, have been broken, just as were the promises we made to guarantee self-determination to all nations. Disillusionment has replaced faith in all too many places. The hour is late, indeed, but unless we act now to retain the faith and trust, which the small nations have had in the high purposes of America, I feel that the way will be open for the Communists to still further expand by force and infiltration their scope of influence and control over additional millions of helpless people.

Western civilization is at the crossroads. The fate of all our great moral, spiritual, and political values is hanging in the balance. If we delay, or if we cringe and cower before the threats and blandishments of Soviet communism, we might just as well make up our minds that the materialistic flood of communism will in time inundate the Free World.

Where is the American courage of yesteryear? Where is the invincible determination to fight to preserve our free institutions? Where is our will to pay back insult, ridicule, and scorn in its own coin? How can true Americans stand by in idle and inert contemplation and indecision while organized Soviet Government mobs besiege the Embassy of our Nation and make shameful, illegal attacks upon the buildings housing our diplomatic force and send daily reports of this outrage throughout the world for propaganda purposes?

And what about the imprisonment of our military forces in Communist East Germany while hardly a mutter of protest was heard from this great Government? And, there are other similar instances just as revolting, the worst of which was the brazen capture and imprisonment by Cuban rebels of members of our own Armed Forces. What a travesty.

As a result of these incidents, the American people and the general population of the world are getting the impression, and understandably so, that our diplomatic leaders are afraid of the Russians—afraid that they may make nuclear war upon us—and, for that reason, these leaders are bending over backward not to displease them even as the Nation is insulted and reviled. Actually, overwhelming American public opinion would have severed diplomatic relations with the Soviet long ago and served notice upon the Kremlin leaders that this Nation would no longer tolerate their sneers, insults, and conspiracies against our security and freedom.

Courageous Americans do not fear the Russians or anyone else. We do not fear their sputniks, their world propaganda, nor the quislings in this country who are trying to terrorize the American people with stories of nuclear destruction unless we do the bidding of Russia in international councils and allow it to have its way throughout the world.

The Soviet is the one who has most reason to fear, if it piles insult upon insult, and brazenly goads and challenges this great Nation. We have the most powerful military force on the face of the earth. We have the strongest, most productive economic system. We possess most destructive air power.

We are building missiles and rockets that before long will be able, literally, if necessary, to cover the earth with nuclear warheads. These are facts, not illusions or boasts.

I hope and pray that it will never be necessary for us, or for any nation, to resort to violence. I would deplore it. But there is something worse than war, so far as the American people are concerned, and that is slavery, tyranny, and the loss of precious liberty. Our homes, our security, our way of life, and personal liberties are at stake in this conflict. Rather than to lose these precious God-given possessions, it would be better that every American should unflinchingly face death in a flaming nuclear cauldron in defense of the Nation and the cause of human freedom. This Nation is prepared to guard and defend its heritage at any cost.

Courage alone will not solve our problems of peace or war. Forceful leadership and united, loyal support of all those devoted to freedom will be required. But one thing is very clear: without courage and the will to sacrifice bitterly and fight savagely, if the occasion demands it, the ideal of freedom will be in jeopardy.

UNITY OF POLISH PEOPLE

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Your editorial of August 12 entitled "Cardinal and Commissar" reminds the writer of a situation which occurred about 50 years ago in the city and county seat of Lubawa, Poland, at that time known as Loebau, West Prussia, Germany.

Several Roman Catholic priests were then sentenced to prison for teaching catechism in the Polish language. A menacing Prussian cavalry regiment failed to stop an orderly demonstration of thousands of people led by my late father, Dr. Francis Pomierski, president of the city council, in protest of the unjust sentences imposed by a royal Prussian court upon these priests.

Today, in spite of the evil forces of the Red Kremlin, under the yoke of which they are suffering, the Polish people, imbued with an ardent love of God and liberty, will continue their fight for freedom. They will walk through this critical period also with strength and unity in their hearts and minds and souls.

K. STEFAN POMIERSKI.

REA Service in Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the following statement and tables.

There being no objection, the statement and tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD

The REA rural electric and telephone program is one of the most important federally sponsored programs now operating in Montana. REA has brought the conveniences associated with electricity and phone services to thousands of rural families in the entire Nation. The REA program is particularly active in Montana.

In the past 20 years Montanans have witnessed a vast transformation in the mode of rural living due largely to electricity—electricity brought to farms and communities at reasonable rates.

This could have been done only with the cooperation of the Federal Government. The job of bringing electricity to the isolated areas of this Nation has been a tremendous one and the accomplishments have been great. This job could not have been accomplished without the fine cooperation between the many independent rural electric cooperatives and the Rural Electrification Administration here in Washington, D. C.

Farm electrification advanced very slowly in the United States during the period after 1882, when the first central generating system went into service, until 1935 when the Rural Electrification Administration was created. In 1944 Congress extended for an indefinite period of time the life of this lending agency.

It is quite important that we distinguish between the REA and the individual rural-electrification cooperative. The REA is an arm of the Federal Government empowered to make loans to qualified borrowers, with preference to nonprofit and cooperative organizations and to public bodies. The REA is not in the power business. It does not operate rural-electric facilities and makes no grants or subsidies. Its loans are repaid from the operating revenues of the locally owned, locally managed cooperative, the other partner in this program of rural electrification. The REA serves principally as a banker to the local system and contributes technical advice. The rural cooperative constructs the power lines and other electric facilities to serve persons in rural areas who are without central-station electric service. The loans the cooperatives receive bear a 2-percent interest rate and are repaid over a maximum period of 35 years.

Few farmers were connected to central-station power prior to World War I. The early twenties saw a short-lived spurt in which the progress made in electrical engineering was reflected by a small increase in the number of farms served. However, only 10.9 percent of all farms in the United States were receiving central-station electric service by 1935. Few power lines had been built beyond the immediate vicinities of cities and towns.

Farmers and farm organizations, chafing at the slow rate of progress, increased their demands for Government action in the field of rural electrification. The result was the establishment of REA, with an action program designed primarily to make electric service available to those farm people who were without electricity.

Approximately 95 percent of the Nation's farms are now electrified. At the beginning of the REA program only 5.5 percent of the farms were served with electric current. Of all the farms in this country that now receive electricity approximately 54 percent of these are served by REA-financed facilities.

Many of the remaining unelectrified farms are situated in isolated areas, or in areas of relatively low farm income. Consequently, the most difficult part of the rural electrification job remains to be completed. However, the REA program has succeeded in establishing a pattern which eventually can provide virtually every unserved farm in the country with electric service.

Membership in rural electric cooperatives is not confined to farmers. It is open to all people in a rural area who can be reached and who want electric service. More than three-fourths of all consumers on REA-financed cooperative lines are farms. But also included are many thousands of rural nonfarm dwellings, schools, churches, stores, community buildings, and similar facilities. REA borrowers also serve thousands of rural industries and other commercial enterprises. Many of these rural industries themselves are operating on a cooperative plan.

Rural electric cooperatives have proved the most effective instrument for carrying out the REA program because of their advantages as a method of making reasonable cost electric service available to farmers in rural areas. These advantages include:

First, REA-financed cooperatives operate on a nonprofit basis. This enables them to provide electric service at cost to their members.

Second, directors of REA-financed cooperatives are elected because of their known interest in making electric service available to rural people at reasonable rates. They serve without compensation and keep operating expense at the lowest possible level consistent with good service.

Third, members of REA-financed cooperatives also are interested in electric service at reasonable cost. For example, they help reduce operating expense by voluntarily reporting potential causes of service interruptions, such as tree limbs touching the lines. Most of them read their own meters, and many make out their own bills.

Fourth, previous experience of farmers with other types of cooperatives helps them to organize and operate rural electric cooperatives on a sound basis with a minimum of effort and expense.

Lines constructed by REA borrowers are built to serve entire areas, including less densely settled sections as well as those of greater population. This is known as area coverage. The test is no longer whether an individual line or section will be self-supporting, but whether the entire system as a whole is feasible. This policy has become increasingly important as the rural electrification job has progressed. Only through area coverage can electric service be extended to many of the more isolated farms, and to others which are remotely situated in pocketed areas far removed from any established source of power.

In every region in the United States rural electric cooperatives have demonstrated that farm electrification, far from constituting an additional cash drain on low-farm incomes, actually brings about a higher real-farm income and better farm living. It brings more business into rural communities. It encourages new local enterprises which come about when low-cost power is available. It stimulates private business, both locally and nationally. Surveys indicate that for every dollar invested in rural power facilities the farmer invests an additional $4.50 in wiring, plumbing, and electrical appliances.

The use of electric power in farm production and processing is constantly expanding. To date about 400 farm uses for electricity have been reported. Electric power on the farm is an economic necessity which can pay its way with handsome profits for the farmer. Guidance is given consumers on REA-financed lines as to which uses are the most efficient and the most profitable in these times of power shortages.

As of June 30, 1957, approximately 90 percent or 28,800 Montana farms have electricity. The first REA loan in Montana was approved in May 1936, and the first REA-financed line was placed in operation on December 5, 1937, by the Lower Yellowstone Rural Electric Association at Sidney, Mont.

As of June 30, 1958, REA had approved $59.8 million in loans in the State to 25 borrowers, all of them cooperatives. The loans will enable these borrowers to finance the construction of line and other rural-electric facilities to serve these rural consumers. Most of these facilities already are in operation and additional lines are being built.

As of March 31, 1958, rural-electric cooperatives were serving 41,500 farms and other rural consumers and the State's borrowers were operating 28,600 miles of line.

The average monthly consumption on REA-financed lines in this State increased

from 238 kilowatt-hours per farm in 1949 to 528 kilowatt-hours in 1958.

This increase reflects greater use of electrical equipment to save time and labor in performing farm and household tasks to help bring about a more comfortable rural living.

REA's latest debt-service summary shows that Montana borrowers have paid $4,487,938 interest on their Government loans, and repaid $7,021,798 of the principal on their Government loans. In addition, they had paid $3,678,013 ahead of schedule.

No payments are overdue.

This is a great record for a great program in a great State. It is my hope that the day is not too far distant when every farm in Montana is electrified.

If the rural areas of Montana are to continue to enjoy the benefits of electric power purchased at reasonable rates there are several things which we must do:

First, we must be assured of an adequate supply of cheap electric power. This is the basis of the entire program. We must fight for equal rights in the purchase of wholesale power from such great projects as Hungry Horse, Canyon Ferry, and Fort Peck. Public power and private power development must keep pace with one another.

Second, the preservation of the preference clause as it was written into the Reclamation Act of 1906 is essential to the continued success of the program. The preference clause is not discriminatory in any sense; to the contrary it injects an element of competition in the business of selling electricity.

It is essential that each electric cooperative in Montana and the Nation maintain control of its own electric business. Those of you here in Montana have worked hard to enjoy the benefits of electric service and you must make sure that it is not taken away.

The REA program in Montana is paying off with adequate and dependable service, with an orderly and economical construction pattern. We want to continue this pattern of progress. Increased interest rates will place an obstruction in the path of this development.

It has been a distinct pleasure to work with Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Congressmen LEE METCALF, and LEROY ANDERSON in the various interests that affect Montana and we will continue to act in the interests of Montana's rural electric and telephone cooperatives.

The following tabulations inserted at the conclusion of my statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are (1) a complete tabulation of gross loans, repayments, consumers served, and location of all the REA electric cooperatives in Montana, and (2) a tabulation concerning REA rural telephone cooperative loans in Montana.

REA electric cooperative program in Montana

Borrower	Amount of gross loans, fiscal years						Total	Repayments						Total
	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958		1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	
Ravalli County Electric Cooperative, Inc., Corvallis, Mont.	$195,000					$281,000	$476,000	$17,572	$17,572	$18,091	$34,299	$28,951	$33,647	$140,132
Sun River Electric Cooperative, Inc., Fairfield, Mont.			$415,000			610,000	1,025,000	77,261	83,958	254,012	91,838	94,706	94,875	696,650
Lower Yellowstone Rural Electric Association, Inc., Sidney, Mont.	385,000						385,000	29,907	85,500	51,624	51,623	67,689	72,661	359,004
Yellowstone Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc., Huntley, Mont.	270,000			$330,000		609,000	1,229,000	84,177	42,781	119,868	54,868	60,384	60,383	422,461
Vigilante Electric Cooperative, Inc., Dillon, Mont.		$440,000		340,000			1,280,000	67,450	65,151	118,309	91,996	110,578	97,595	551,139
Missoula Electric Cooperative, Inc., Missoula, Mont.		450,000		327,000			777,000	15,357	27,720	36,958	47,007	50,873	50,873	228,788
Flathead Electric Cooperative, Inc., Kalispell, Mont.	780,000				$755,000		1,535,000	32,460	33,342	33,343	67,328	87,651	87,651	341,775
Fergus Electric Cooperative, Inc., Lewistown, Mont.	145,000	225,000	180,000				550,000	82,786	239,142	98,083	106,675	115,824	120,590	763,100
Park Electric Cooperative, Inc., Livingston, Mont.	250,000		205,000				845,000	70,610	40,165	40,164	99,831	44,834	33,624	338,228
Mid-Yellowstone Electric Cooperative, Inc., Hysham, Mont.		185,000		192,000			377,000	20,125	21,427	25,543	65,747	25,746	50,748	209,336
Beartooth Electric Cooperative, Inc., Red Lodge, Mont.						242,000	242,000	52,042	47,697	53,031	53,031	53,031	68,031	326,863
Big Horn County Electric Cooperative, Inc., Lodge Grass, Mont.	380,000			180,000	204,000		764,000	31,266	41,953	49,619	54,354	54,354	79,252	310,798
Big Flat Electric Cooperative, Inc., Malta, Mont.		280,000				595,000	875,000	19,903	21,652	56,632	21,652	71,783	29,533	221,215
Sheridan County Electric Cooperative, Inc., Medicine Lake, Mont.		75,000			1,526,000		1,601,000	41,724	51,956	78,661	121,573	121,573	231,574	647,061
Northern Electric Cooperative, Inc., Opheim, Mont.	270,000		108,000		874,000		1,252,000	93,487	64,937	62,936	69,295	71,412	77,596	439,663
Valley County Electric Cooperative, Inc., Glasgow, Mont.					319,000		319,000	18,686	33,110	35,861	28,936	41,929	41,928	200,450
McCone County Electric Cooperative, Inc., Circle, Mont.		1,120,000	400,000	50,000		770,000	2,340,000	45,341	35,973	86,649	128,442	179,935	319,207	795,547
Goldenwest Electric Cooperative, Inc., Wibaux, Mont.						317,000	317,000	20,154	45,840	50,841	50,037	49,958	37,470	263,900
Glacier Electric Cooperative, Inc., Cut Bank, Mont.		1,180,000					1,180,000	32,088	41,712	41,712	79,841	79,839	79,839	355,031
Marias River Electric Cooperative, Inc., Shelby, Mont.					358,000		358,000	58,454	74,279	78,941	84,344	90,746	305,746	693,010
Hill County Electric Cooperative, Inc., Havre, Mont.	650,000				403,000		1,053,000	17,819	133,225	102,625	117,773	126,014	131,193	628,649
Tongue River Electric Cooperative, Inc., Ashland, Mont.		75,000	465,000		719,000	341,000	1,600,600	3,210	19,513	44,012	89,966	96,086	90,208	342,995
Southeast Electric Cooperative, Inc., Ekalaka, Mont.	170,000	433,000	68,000		363,000		1,034,000	0	4,428	158,950	73,470	43,469	55,191	335,508
Lincoln Electric Cooperative, Inc., Eureka, Mont.	395,000		530,000				925,000	150	37,823	34,650	77,677	75,535	63,049	288,893
Elmo Electric Cooperative Association, Inc., Proctor, Mont.								32,816	28,048	13,895	11,366	12,106	37,761	140,992
Total	3,890,000	4,463,000	2,451,000	1,939,000	5,521,000	3,765,000	22,039,000	962,905	1,343,934	1,745,129	1,764,699	1,854,956	2,350,225	10,041,248

REA electric cooperative program in Montana

Borrower	Consumers served as of June 30						Location of facilities by counties
	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	
Ravalli County Electric Cooperative, Inc., Corvallis, Mont.	1,005	942	978	974	975	998	Ravalli.
Sun River Electric Cooperative, Inc., Fairfield, Mont.	2,293	2,334	2,337	2,374	2,395	2,392	Cascade, Chouteau, Judith Basin, Lewis and Clark, Pondera, Teton, Toole.
Lower Yellowstone Rural Electric Association, Inc., Sidney, Mont.	1,397	1,506	1,512	1,569	1,575	1,597	Dawson, Richland, Roosevelt in Montana, McKenzie in North Dakota.
Yellowstone Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc., Huntley, Mont.	2,305	2,364	2,457	2,531	2,603	2,695	Big Horn, Carbon, Musselshell, Stillwater, Yellowstone.
Vigilante Electric Cooperative, Inc., Dillon, Mont.	1,836	1,926	1,935	1,950	1,999	2,073	Beaverhead, Broadwater, Deer Lodge, Gallatin, Jefferson, Lewis and Clark, Madison, Silver Bow in Montana; Clark in Idaho.
Missoula Electric Cooperative, Inc., Missoula, Mont.	1,053	1,153	1,163	1,211	1,248	1,503	Granite, Mineral, Missoula, Powell, Ravalli.
Flathead Electric Cooperative, Inc., Kalispell, Mont.	1,958	2,539	2,124	2,085	2,272	2,318	Flathead, Lincoln.
Fergus Electric Cooperative, Inc., Lewistown, Mont.	2,413	2,562	2,636	2,685	2,722	2,803	Cascade, Chouteau, Fergus, Golden Valley, Judith Basin, Musselshell, Petroleum, Stillwater, Wheatland.
Park Electric Cooperative, Inc., Livingston, Mont.	1,164	1,198	1,158	1,155	1,187	1,230	Gallatin, Park, Sweetgrass.
Mid-Yellowstone Electric Cooperative, Inc., Hysham, Mont.	691	717	778	886	916	958	Big Horn, Custer, Rosebud, Treasure.
Beartooth Electric Cooperative, Inc., Red Lodge, Mont.	1,646	1,664	1,696	1,784	1,805	1,833	Carbon, Stillwater, Sweetgrass in Montana, Park in Wyoming.
Big Horn County Electric Cooperative, Inc., Lodge Grass, Mont.	1,262	1,286	1,327	1,388	1,410	1,439	Big Horn in Montana, Sheridan in Wyoming.
Big Flat Electric Cooperative, Inc., Malta, Mont.	677	763	871	887	897	908	Blaine, Phillips, Valley.
Sheridan County Electric Cooperative, Inc., Medicine Lake, Mont.	1,947	1,990	2,040	2,069	2,074	2,088	Daniels, Roosevelt, Sheridan in Montana; Divide in North Dakota.
Northern Electric Cooperative, Inc., Opheim, Mont.	1,052	1,025	1,050	1,039	1,045	1,025	Daniels, Roosevelt, Valley.
Valley County Electric Cooperative, Inc., Glasgow, Mont.	781	776	807	884	888	924	Phillips, Roosevelt, Valley.
McCone County Electric Cooperative, Inc., Circle, Mont.	2,174	2,294	2,626	2,792	2,848	2,915	Dawson, Garfield, McCone, Petroleum, Prairie, Richland, Roosevelt, Rosebud.
Goldenwest Electric Cooperative, Inc., Wibaux, Mont.	718	736	732	749	736	741	Dawson, Fallon, Wibeaux in Montana; Golden Valley, Slope in North Dakota.
Glacier Electric Cooperative, Inc., Cut Bank, Mont.	2,623	2,753	2,980	3,258	3,424	3,408	Flathead, Glacier.
Marias River Electric Cooperative, Inc., Shelby, Mont.	2,314	2,400	2,511	2,641	2,746	2,780	Liberty, Pondera, Toole.
Hill County Electric Cooperative, Inc., Havre, Mont.	1,622	1,715	1,786	1,826	1,865	1,922	Blaine, Chouteau, Hill, Liberty.
Tongue River Electric Cooperative, Inc., Ashland, Mont.	846	936	1,249	1,291	1,351	1,551	Big Horn, Custer, Dawson, Powder River, Prairie, Rosebud.
Southeast Electric Cooperative, Inc., Ekalaka, Mont.	705	1,019	1,043	1,113	1,103	1,187	Carter, Fallon in Montana; Harding in South Dakota.
Lincoln Electric Cooperative, Inc., Eureka, Mont.	566	1,017	1,040	1,107	1,110	1,138	Flathead, Lincoln.
Elmo Electric Cooperative Association, Inc., Proctor, Mont.	190	190	190	190	190	162	Lake, Sanders.
Total	35,238	37,805	39,026	40,438	41,384	42,588	

REA rural telephone loans in Montana, fiscal years 1950 through 1958

Borrower	Total net loans	Total funds advanced	Miles of line			Subscribers			Location of facilities by counties
			To be retained	To be added	Total	To receive improved service	To receive initial service	Total	
Valley Rural Telephone Cooperative Association, Glasgow, Mont	$504,000	$432,374	----------	397	397	34	729	763	Phillips, Roosevelt, Valley.
Northeastern Montana Telephone Cooperative Association,[1] Scobey.	1,987,000	1,937,751	51	3,149	3,200	487	2,135	2,622	Daniels, Roosevelt, Sheridan, Valley in Montana; Divide in North Dakota.
Mid-Rivers Telephone Cooperative, Circle, Mont.	2,220,000	1,690,113	----------	2,538	2,538	224	2,161	2,385	Dawson, Garfield, McCone, Prairie, Richland.
Three Rivers Rural Telephone Co-Op, Fairfield, Mont.	2,023,000	1,383,000	1	1,739	1,740	321	2,136	2,457	Cascade, Chouteau, Judith Basin, Lewis and Clark, Pondera, Teton.
Northern Telephone Association, Shelby Mont.	891,000	821,184	----------	939	939	111	943	1,054	Glacier, Liberty, Pondera, Toole.
Triangle Telephone Association, Havre, Mont.	1,625,000	1,469,859	44	2,074	2,118	522	1,517	2,039	Blaine, Chouteau, Fergus, Hill, Liberty.
Blackfoot Telephone Cooperative Association, Missoula, Mont.	536,000	450,000	8	403	411	72	573	645	Lake, Missoula, Powell.
Range Telephone Cooperative, Forsyth, Mont.	245,000	234,772	33	329	362	51	264	315	Custer, Powder River, Rosebud.
Project Telephone Co., Worden, Mont.	280,000	176,363	27	82	109	351	285	636	Yellowstone.
Total	10,311,000	8,595,416	164	11,650	11,814	2,173	10,743	12,916	

[1] This system has recently changed its name to Nemont Telephone Cooperative, Inc.

Invitation to Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COYA KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following invitation to the Honorable SAM RAYBURN to visit Minnesota this fall:

INVITATION TO MINNESOTA

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It is no new thing to address the Speaker. It is, however, quite uncommon to suggest a new address for the Speaker. I'm sincerely asking you to come and spend the fall—or as much of the time remaining as you can—in my home State. With all my heart, I want your new address to be Minnesota.

My understanding is that first-grade teachers in the Lone Star State have specific instruction in regard to the first written word to be taught. It is not to be "dog" or "cat" or "mama" or "papa." It is to be "T-E-X-A-S."

Minnesota first graders volunteer to write 10-paged brochures on the beauties of marvelous Minnesota. Of course, our Minnesota youngsters and all of us know, also, how to spell Texas, and appreciate your love for your great State.

Since this is the case, it is not difficult to invite you, Mr. Speaker, to come to Minnesota. However, to make my invitation somewhat different from other invitations, I have chosen to use the rhythm of Longfellow's Song of Hiawatha. That "beat" was not original with Longfellow. He borrowed it from the Finnish national epic—the Kalevala—a work beloved by many of our fine Minnesotans of Finnish ancestry.

Come and see us, Mr. Speaker. Spend your summer here beside us.
Visit our primeval beauty in the Land of Lakes ten thousand.
Share the simple joys we treasure in the Land of Sky Blue Waters.
Join us in our bounteous fishing. Come, oh come, to Minn-e-so-ta.

Bass are luring near the shores. Trout hide in our lakes and rivers.
Wall-eyes wait your lure to catch them nigh the bogs of wild cranberries.
Northern pike and giant "musky" challenge you to give them battle.
Join us, join us, Mr. Speaker, in our paradise of fishing.

Breathe the scent of Norway pine trees, and the tang of fishpan frying.
Hear the loon cry at the dawning. Hear the breezes sigh at sunset.
Sense the beat of outboard chugging. Feel the cool dip of the paddle.
Join us in a quiet haven or where rapids course white water.

Minn-e-so-ta wants you, needs you. Say the word and come to see us.
The fulfillment is greater than whatever I can promise.
Let us share the peace primeval. Let us drop the cares that vex us.
We would sure be glad to have you—Mr. Speaker, SAM of Texas.

Congresswoman COYA KNUTSON,
Ninth District, Minnesota.

MY PERSONAL TRIBUTE TO OUR DEAR "MR. SAM"

MR. SAM

(To tune of the Eyes of Texas)

All throughout this hard-fought ses-sion,
You have stood the test.
All throughout this hard-fought ses-sion,
You've given us your best.
You have brought about good order.
You broke the legislative jam.
The hearts of all the House beat for you.
So * * * thank you, Mr. SAM.

(To tune of the Yellow Rose of Texas)

(Verse)

There's a man who comes from Texas,
Where they raise 'em saddle-high.
We're proud—the ones who know him—
Proud enough to tell him why.
Of all the many Speakers
Who held the Speaker's chair,
This Texan's stay is longest.
And we're glad to have him there.

(Chorus)

He's the noblest work of Texas,
A credit to his State.
You may call Sam Houston "here";
But, this man's just as great.
You may talk about Jim Bowie.
Be thankful talk is free.
Still, our Mr. SAM, of Bonham,
He will top them all—to me.

The Honorable Edward Martin of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. BARRETT
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement about a dedicated servant of our country, the Honorable EDWARD MARTIN of Pennsylvania.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR BARRETT

Mr. President, I have had the pleasure of serving with many fine men in the Congress since I was first sworn in as a Member of the House of Representatives 16 years ago come next January. None were more devoted to their State or dedicated servants of our country than our lovable friend and colleague, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. MARTIN. He will be sadly missed in these historic Chambers. He has had a long and distinguished record in the service of his country. A volunteer in the Spanish-American War with service in Manila Bay; a great record as an officer in the American Expeditionary Forces in World War I, and a general officer in World War II. Any man could well be proud of that record but, in addition, ED MARTIN has an equally great record as Governor of Pennsylvania and as a United States Senator. Judged by any standard he is a great American and it is a great privilege to be counted among his friends. I wish for him and his gracious wife many happy days in the years that lie ahead.

Congressman Tom O'Brien

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, TOM O'BRIEN has effectively served in the Congress many years, but he appears to me to be just as keen, energetic, and wise as ever. There is a timelessness about this lovable, devoted son of Chicago and Illinois that belies his years of service and gives him the vibrant quality of youth.

It is not enough to call him the dean of his great and able delegation. He holds that title by right, to be sure, but it does not fully embrace his close relationship to the delegation or the House.

To us, TOM O'BRIEN means something more than a senior in rank or a formalized title. He reaches deep into our hearts and captures our imagination, weaves into our affections and compels our confidence and admiration.

There is an indefinable aspect to TOM O'BRIEN'S greatness; it has to be apprehended rather than described, because it is embodied in the sum total of personal traits, habits, loyalties, and special talents which constitute the ethos, modus operandi, and thought and action patterns of this natural leader of men.

TOM O'BRIEN is poured into no rigid psychological mold. The malleability of his mental operations and practical judgments, always vocal, sometimes blunt, but never insensible to humane values or empirical conclusions, gives rise to a commanding personality able to exercise his mastery over situations, yet compelling the affection and devotion of all those who come under the magic spell of his magnetic, amiable personality.

The schoolmen perhaps could best characterize him as the model of faith and defender of truth. His colleagues know him as a solid, substantial, dependable leader and a loyal friend and supporter.

Bereft of frills and fancies, TOM O'BRIEN is modern and at the same time mid-Victorian; sporting, yet in personal habits often Spartan; socially aware of the new world in which we live, yet not willing to accept the existentialistic postulate that there is an easy, effortless road to human happiness.

TOM O'BRIEN carriers in his generous, unselfish nature no residue of juvenile frustration, no Freudian complexes, no compulsive emotions, no mean, irrelevant prejudices rattling around in the closets of his subconscious.

If he must be classified in the philosophical sense, he is to be construed as an Aristotelian realist, not seeking rockets or spaceships, but with his feet planted squarely on the ground watching the stars for portents of greater light, but judging the world around him with the uncanny eagerness and accuracy of a great man seeking to do good.

Devoted service such as his, steeped in high faith, warm courage, and patriotic zeal, is certainly not expendable in this House. If errata appear, they are shielded by the solid walls of loyalty to causes to which he is at any time irrevocably committed. If there has been human fallibility in this illustrious public career as the long experience of mankind so abundantly indicates, surely it is not perceptible to those of us who have been privileged to see this human dynamo in action.

The fragmentation of his principles, his philosophy, and notable achievements in the Congress and in his personal and public life reveals in pregnant meaning just a few simple words which form the code by which this great leader lives: God and country, party, family, and friends, with the emphasis on the first, and with the sacred concept of loyalty, permeating every motive, every thought, every objective.

The contributions of TOM O'BRIEN are not measurable by finite standards. But they will live and fructify here as fine examples of what conscientious, able, loyal public service is, and how urgently indeed America needs today men of the stamp of TOM O'BRIEN.

The years will only serve to make these values shine with greater luminescence and furnish the inspiration for others to carry on the bitter fight that must be fought if in our generation we are to preserve and sustain the glories, benefits, and blessings of free representative government.

You have many friends here who love and wish you well, TOM O'BRIEN. Everyone in the House is looking forward to your service here for many years to come.

Foreign Aid Dollars Used Against United States Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, mutual security dollars have been made available to Poland through the instrumentality of the Export-Import Bank. About $4 million of this money has been used to purchase coal mining machinery. Poland is thereby capable of producing

coal in increased amounts and more economically and to this extent that country is enabled by such United States dollar advances to reduce the overseas markets for American coal. Being a Representative from a mining State, I can only object to this practice most strenuously.

Labor Union Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMMET F. BYRNE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. BYRNE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there is little doubt that labor union problems are of great concern to the people of America today. There is no other single group of men and women upon whom rests such a vast and varied responsibility to supply the Nation's everyday living needs. To a great degree, these men and women constitute a vital task force to maintain the individual security of Americans in all walks of life.

Many of us—and I am one—recall the days when living was just existence for the rank and file laborer. Life was truly bleak. They were expected to live frugally and work in unhealthy surroundings under hazardous conditions for long hours.

In the twenties, a new dawn appeared because some men were dedicated to correcting injustices and inequities. These men had ability, courage, leadership, and integrity. History gives us confidence that time will produce a man capable of rising to meet the needs of the era. A quick glance back indicates that this is true. I hope such is always the case. During the twenties such men did emerge on the American labor scene. Their efforts were fruitful and thousands of men, women, and children were given encouragement and opportunity. Parents could hope for and plan the future, provide the necessities of life for their children, and look ahead with hope for their children. They could take precautions in the event of illnesses or inability to work and look forward to a time of retirement with some sense of security. The men who made this possible were pioneers, the type of leaders who have contributed so much in the development of America.

When I think of such leaders, I recall the great Samuel Gompers, who did so much for the cause of organized labor. Mr. Gompers died in 1924. My late father, who died in 1929, was for 31 years a member of Local No. 9, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. It was in that period that the format was laid and the foundation constructed for the many benefits secured by the laboring man up to the present day. Labor has moved steadily forward.

Few men or women begrudge the gains that benefited the members of organized labor and their families during the score and 15 years just passed. Let us consider the plight of some of these men and women today. There are very obvious reasons to ponder whether the stake, security, and rights of the labor man are in danger. The conduct of certain unscrupulous labor leaders raises a very serious question. Are many rank and file members being exploited, intimidated, and coerced? Are vast sums, accumulated through the years, being safeguarded as trust funds, or are they being used for the individual benefit of fatcats, perpetuating themselves in power by force and criminal acts?

For months we have seen, read, or heard the evidence of misconduct. It is apparent that certain segments of labor have gone off the course envisioned by Samuel Gompers, a respectable leader of another era, and certain respected leaders of the present day.

In the 85th Congress we have realized the advisability and necessity of labor legislation. The Kennedy-Ives bill was passed by the Senate and sent to the House. For 40 days the Speaker sat on the bill before referring it to the Committee on Education and Labor. Finally, the committee voted 22 to 7 not to report the Kennedy-Ives bill. It then took up the bill sponsored by CARROLL KEARNS, of Pennsylvania. They voted 16 to 13 not to report this bill. Finally, on Monday, August 18, the Kennedy-Ives bill was brought up under suspension of rules, limiting debate to 40 minutes, and no amendments permitted except committee amendments. Under this procedure a two-thirds vote was required rather than a majority. This, in the closing week of the session, was politics in the raw.

The Kennedy-Ives bill failed to have my support because I do not believe it contained adequate and necessary steps to correct the problem.

"Right To Work" Laws—Misnamed and Misunderstood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, the opposing views between organized labor unions and industrial management groups seem once again to have met in an impasse concerning their individual rights which are currently under discussion, and a matter of legislative action, in the issues represented in the title of "right to work" laws.

The conflicts between these two opposing sides have been long and sometimes bloody. Grave wrongs have been committed in the past, on both sides, and it is my earnest prayer that these will remain in the past.

The unalterable fact that must be recognized by both sides is they are each directly dependent on the other for their own well-being and that improvement in the position of one will indirectly improve the position of the other.

In 1938 the Congress enacted the Fair Labor Standards Act—Wagner Act—which gave a bill of rights to labor in which was defined, under law, its rights and privileges through the protection of Federal courts.

This law brought reason and right to an area of our economy which had been in discord within itself for many years. The results of the Wagner Act allowed the United States, during World War II, the one ultimate weapon which no other nation in the world had—its gigantic ability to produce the overwhelming amount of equipment and supplies necessary to win it. All this under a joint agreement between management and labor for no strikes during the big fight. The greatest surprise to many people was that it worked.

At the close of World War II there followed an adjustment period in which the union groups felt that they had done their duty during the war and were then entitled to adjustments that had been put off during the war years. These efforts on the part of labor were met with opposition from the management side on the grounds that the time was not right and the demands too extensive. Labor's only weapon, the strike, was put into play to the extent that the country was almost paralyzed in its transportation and other key industries. It was plain to see that the wartime romance was over and a parting of the ways was pending.

By 1947 the situation had gone from bad to worse, with demands being made that the Congress take some corrective measures. What was done was the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947—Taft-Hartley law. This was a bill that was fought down the line by organized labor; but it was passed into law even over President Truman's veto and is now the law of the land. The union side has consistently maintained that the law is heavily weighted on the side of management, with repeated efforts to repeal it or to drastically amend it.

The Taft-Hartley Act figures in the question of the right-to-work laws in that it provides any State law which either outlawed or more severely restricted a union's security program would supersede Federal law. This was an open invitation to industrial management groups to seek more restrictive laws in each of the 48 States.

Following the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act there was organized in each State spontaneous right-to-work committees under various sponsoring titles, none of which were directly associated with the industrial management groups, though it is commonly believed they are supported by them.

The first successes of these committees came in the industrially underdeveloped States of the south and southwest United States. This section of the country was the easiest to influence in this direction because of its agri-

cultural nature and the fact that it is not strongly organized by union groups.

A large degree of the credit for getting these laws on the statute books of these States must go to promises of industrial development in the future which would result from the passage of these laws, and the catch phrase used when presented to the voters, or State legislatures.

Everybody is in favor of a law that would guarantee a job. But very few people stopped to look beyond the title until the law was put into practice and they saw how it worked. By that time it was too late to stop it in many States; but four States have had the courage to admit they were wrong and have repealed it entirely.

At this point I think it would be a good idea to examine this "right" and see just how it does work and whom it will affect.

WHAT ARE RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS?

Right-to-work laws are misnamed and misunderstood statutes which forbid enforcement of contract agreements between employers and labor unions which provide that employees must become members of the representing union as a qualification of employment with the company.

Under the Taft-Hartley Act, a union, once certified by the National Labor Relations Board as representing a majority of employees of an industrial unit, must represent all employees of that unit, regardless of membership or nonmembership in that union. Any resulting benefits from collective bargaining between the union and management will be extended to the nonmember employees equally as with the union-member employees.

Under union-security contracts this unequal condition between member and nonmember employees is eliminated by requiring the payment of a sum of money equal to that of monthly dues for membership in the representing union; however, if an employee does not wish to join the union his name will not appear in its membership records and he cannot be compelled to attend its meetings or be bound by any of the union's discipline policies. The failure of the employee to pay this monthly fee for the representative services received from the union, whether he be a member or nonmember, will result in release from his position for failing to meet one of the qualifications of his employment.

HOW DO SUCH LAWS WORK?

Under these State statutes these contracts requiring the employee to support their union are unenforceable in any State court. As a direct result the union is deprived of its internal security; and the employer has the opportunity to hire persons who can be influenced not to join the union. In time, enough nonunion members could be hired to permit the challenge of certification of the presently recognized union. If the employees were not organized under a second union, a defeat of the prime union would result in there being no union at all. This has long been recognized as one of the easiest ways in which to break the bargaining power of a union.

WHOM DO THESE LAWS AFFECT?

You. These laws will, in time, affect every citizen in any State having such laws. They have the direct result of weakening and eventually destroying the bargaining power of the laborer's union. Consequently, a working man's security of employment, and social position as well as income will be affected. This condition will directly affect his buying power, and reliability as a citizen of the community. Such conditions will in turn affect every merchant, service agency, and social group, who count this man as a customer or contributor, as well as the well-being of the entire Nation.

WHICH STATES HAVE THESE LAWS?

The States having right-to-work laws in effect to date are: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Iowa, Nebraska, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, North Dakota, South Dakota, Texas, Virginia, Arizona, Nevada, Utah, Indiana.

States which have repealed laws: Delaware, 1949; Louisiana, 1956; Maine, 1948; New Hampshire, 1949.

States which have rejected constitutional amendments on right-to-work laws are: California, 1944; New Mexico, 1948.

States which have defeated initiative petitions on right-to-work laws are Maine, 1948; Massachusetts, 1948; Washington, 1956.

State legislatures which have rejected or defeated proposals on right-to-work laws are: California, 1953; Colorado, 1953, 1955, 1957; Connecticut, 1955, 1957; Delaware, 1957; Idaho, 1955, 1957; Kentucky, 1954; Kansas, 1955; Maryland, 1955, 1957; Massachusetts, 1955; Michigan, 1955; Minnesota, 1955; Missouri, 1955; Ohio, 1955; Oklahoma, 1953; Oregon, 1953; West Virginia, 1955; Wisconsin, 1955; Wyoming, 1953, 1957.

WHY DID THESE STATES ENACT RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS?

Of the 18 States which now have these laws on their statute books only one—Indiana—is an important industrial center. Without exception these States, in varying degrees, are lacking in industrial development in that they are not suited either geographically, economically or populationwise to the support of an industrial center.

These facts have been ignored with promises that the greatly expanding industries of the North would surely come their way if these States were to insure that, through enactment of these laws, there would not be a "strong union" group to deal with; and as a result, the main drawing point, there would be a ready reservoir of cheap labor.

None of the States which have enacted these laws have had any great influx of industrial development as "suggested" and some of them have had the law in operation for 10 years or more.

The industrial management groups are naturally interested in cheap labor, if not from selfishness, then from the point of competition; but they want it where their present plants are located but it can be had only if the bargaining power of the unions can be weakened or eventually destroyed.

WHO ARE THE PEOPLE AND ORGANIZATIONS IN FAVOR OF THESE LAWS?

An answer to this question is most complex. The real backers of this movement seem to remain anonymous and unknown; however, two principal big business organizations that have admitted their position in "endorsing the national right-to-work law" which, they say, applies also to State laws, are the National Association of Manufacturers and the National Chamber of Commerce. Both of these organizations are known to be spokesmen for industrial owner-management groups and have declared themselves greatly opposed to many forms of labor organizing.

WHO ARE THE PEOPLE AND ORGANIZATIONS AGAINST THESE LAWS?

The answer to this question is also difficult to present, principally because of the vastness of the legion who have spoken out against them. I have estimated it would take my staff a week to compile the names of all public figures who have taken an active part against these laws. It is obvious enough that wherever the people had a chance to vote on the issue, it has lost—in some States it has been defeated 2 and 3 times in the last 6 years. The following organizations have gone on record as being strongly opposed to these laws: National Council of Churches in America, National Catholic Welfare Conference, Conference of Bishops of the Methodist Church, National Council of Churches of Christ in America, Catholic Conference of the South, Rabbatical Council of America, Board of Sociology and Economic Relations of the Methodist Church in America. In addition, the late Senator Robert A. Taft stated that in no instance should union security programs be totally outlawed. Gov. Goodwin Knight, of California, Gov. Averell Harriman, of New York, and Gov. George Leader, of Pennsylvania, to mention only a few more of top State executives who recognize inherent dangers in such laws.

MY POSITION ON THE QUESTION OF RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS

I feel they are greatly misrepresented and too frequently misunderstood by the average citizen, and, whether intentional or not, exist as a direct threat to the stability and security of the organized labor movement.

My answer to the advocates of the so-called right-to-work movement is that no one has a right to expect to reap the harvest from another's labor and certainly none of us have the right to demand a job that we are not qualified for or that we refuse to qualify for on the grounds that to do so would violate an assumed right. The only right granted under these laws is that of attempting to wreck what honest and hard-working people have built.

War and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, in some of the recent political campaigns the Democratic Party has been referred to by certain individuals as being the war party. The issue of peace was used as a major appeal in 1952 when General Eisenhower, the Republican presidential candidate, promised to go to Korea to try to end the Korean war. The same appeal was used in 1954 and again in 1956, with somewhat less success, even in view of the fact that war clouds were hanging over the Middle East on election day in 1956. Republican campaign committees have spent large sums of money to advertise the casualties in so-called Democratic wars.

I have no doubt that the same course will be followed by some of the campaign orators this fall, especially in view of the fact that things are not going well on the domestic front. With Mr. Eisenhower's popularity at a low ebb, a large number of those individuals who have been recently sampled give the recession as the reason for their having shifted allegiance to the Democratic Party. Consequently, we can expect the administration high command to attempt to divert attention from its failures in the handling of the domestic economy and I am anticipating that it will use the same strategy as in the past of blaming the Democratic Party for the country's wars. It, of course, will say nothing of wars under the McKinley and Lincoln administrations. The supporters of the present administration will also conveniently overlook the votes of members of the Republican Party when the Congress declared war on Italy, Japan, and Germany in 1941. I think that it would be well to refresh the memories of our friends on the other side of the aisle by recapitulating the votes whereby the Congress declared war on those countries. On December 8, 1941, the United States House of Representatives adopted a resolution declaring war on Japan by a vote of 388 to 1. The United States Senate on the same day passed a resolution declaring war on Japan by a vote of 82 to 0. On December 11, the House of Representatives passed a resolution declaring war on Italy by a vote of 399 to 0, and the United States Senate took a similar position by a vote of 90 to 0. On December 11, 1941, the House of Representatives adopted a resolution declaring war on Germany by a vote of 393 to 0, and the Senate did likewise by a vote of 88 to 0.

Mr. Speaker, in the 6 recorded votes I have mentioned, there was 1 lone vote cast against a declaration of war, and that 1 vote was a Republicn vote. So it can be seen that the declarations of war on the three countries named were virtually unanimous and this is as they should have been. However, I think that it comes with rather poor grace that the Democratic Party is frequently accused of being a war party when, as a matter of fact, the Republican Members of the House and Senate supported the declarations wholeheartedly. We went to war and Republican Members of the Congress supported that step by their actions, their words, and their votes.

Were they sincerely supporting America's entry into World War II or did they lack the courage to vote against her entry? I am confident that they sincerely supported our participation. Then let us be done with this type of campaign oratory which seeks to depict one party as a party of war and another party as a party of peace.

The Democratic Party does not want war. There come times in the history of any nation when it cannot avoid war. Peace is not a thing that can be promised by any individual in an appeal to the voters of this country, particularly when we must deal with men like Khrushchev, men who are guided only by their insatiable greed for power. The peace of the world will continue to be endangered as long as we have nations led by men like Hitler and Stalin and Khrushchev and as long as a communistic ideology is backed up by nations as powerful as Russia and Red China. Those who promise peace in return for votes are selling their country short and are underestimating the intelligence of those to whom they make their appeal.

Mr. Speaker, we are all in favor of peace on both sides of the aisle and in both political parties. Peace should never be an issue. The only question is as to how peace might best be assured. I am in favor of keeping America strong, so strong that no nation will ever dare attack us.

"When a strong man armed keepeth his palace, his goods are in peace."

Retarded Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the action which the Congress has taken to aid the retarded children of the Nation by providing them with more specially trained teachers is a most significant step forward in our national social program.

The plight of these afflicted children and the very heavy burdens upon their parents and families have for long prompted my deepest interest, sympathy, and desire to promote Government assistance toward the solution of these difficult problems.

With his usual profound sympathy for the afflicted, the very able gentleman from Rhode Island, Mr. FOGARTY, has worked commendably and effectively in advancing and enacting this vital legislation. The committee is also entitled to our appreciation for their sustained, helpful efforts.

I have been in strong support of proposals to assist retarded children whose care, treatment, and special problems deserve the most solicitous attention of the Congress.

The bill moves in the right direction to be sure, but, in opinion, there is much more to be done to alleviate the conditions and problems of these children and their families.

A comprehensive, long-range program, well rounded and well financed, is required to grapple with this great social need. Congress must give further careful study to the means of providing additional governmental action that might be taken to tackle this problem in its entirety. Such a program must he broad and deep. It must deal with preventive as well as ameliorative possibilities in the realm of medical science and social action. We can no better serve humanity and the dictates of compassion than by moving to hold out the hand of assistance and encouragement and concrete help to these unfortunate afflicted children and their families.

I will not only support this meritorious legislation, but propose to continue my deep interest in this question in the time to come in order to render every possible measure of support to an advanced program that will deal more effectively with this very pressing, urgent problem.

My Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is my duty to the people of the Second District of Washington who elected me to represent them in Congress to compile and publish a record of my votes on important issues. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD a compilation of my votes on these issues.

Since the House of Representatives had more than 13,500 bills introduced during the 2 years of the 85th Congress, it is apparent that only a small percentage of them ever got to a vote. I have confined this record to those votes requiring a "yea" or "nay" answer. These, of course, include the topmost issues before the Congress during the past 2 years.

To simplify my voting record, I have placed these measures into categories according to the general fields they encompass. Some are difficult to classify as they are considered broad in scope, and I request the reader's pardon if the categories overlap.

BILLS AFFECTING GOVERNMENT OPERATION

Voted for H. R. 5836 to adjust postal rates to put post offices on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Voted for H. R. 8002 to provide improved accounting methods with estimated savings of billions as recommended by the Hoover Commission.

Voted for H. R. 12858 providing appropriations for public works.

Voted against H. R. 1937 authorizing construction of a stadium on Federal land in Washington, D. C.

Voted against H. R. 13343 to authorize an appropriation for Pan American games to be held in Chicago.

Voted for S. 3335 providing for construction of a National Culture Center in Washington, D. C.

Voted for S. 3910 providing authorization for rivers and harbors projects, including Sammamish River flood control, Whatcom Creek waterways, and Port Townsend small boat projects.

Voted for S. 2130 extending the Mutual Security Act to protect the security of the United States. Voted for H. R. 13192 providing appropriations for mutual security.

Voted for H. R. 7999 providing for Alaskan statehood, including my amendment to protect fish and wildlife in best interests of the Nation.

Voted for S. 1856 to assure safe, efficient navigation for civil and military aircraft.

Voted for H. R. 9821 authorizing $611 million extra in Federal funds for highways in fiscal 1959 and permitting the Treasury to spend additional funds already authorized during the year to help create new jobs.

Voted for S. 497 authorizing rivers and harbors, flood control, and beach erosion control projects totaling $1.5 million.

Voted for S. 846 to establish a National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.

Voted for H. R. 3 reaffirming States' rights to legislate in the fight against communism.

Voted to cite Bernard Goldfine for contempt of Congress.

BILLS AFFECTING LABOR

Voted for H. R. 2427 to increase pay for postal workers.

Voted for H. R. 2462 granting Federal employees a pay increase.

Voted for S. 72 to increase annuities payable to retired or disabled United States civil-service employees.

BILLS AFFECTING DEFENSE AND THE ARMED FORCES

Voted for House Joint Resolution 117 authorizing the President to order our military forces to the Middle East if invited to do so to prevent Communist aggression.

Voted for motion to restore $313 million to Defense Department appropriations, most of it for Air Force research.

Voted for H. R. 9739 authorizing $549 million for research and development of ballistic missiles, ballistic missiles detection systems, and further dispersal of the Strategic Air Command.

Voted for H. R. 11470 providing increased pay on basis of skills to officers and enlisted men of the Armed Forces to assure adequate, trained personnel for our defenses.

Voted for H. R. 12541 to promote the national defense through reorganization of the Defense Department as requested by the President.

Voted for H. R. 12738 appropriating $38 billion for the Armed Forces and other defense activities, including increased funds for the Army in order to finance a 900,000-man organization.

Voted for S. 3262 to promote foreign relations by authorizing the Armed Forces to participate in the eighth Olympic games.

Voted for H. R. 13015 authorizing military construction, including Capehart housing at Whidbey Island Naval Air Station.

Voted for H. R. 13489 appropriating funds for military construction, including $8.5 million for fiscal 1959 construction of a 10,000-foot runway at Whidbey Island Naval Air Station.

BILLS AFFECTING FARMERS AND AGRICULTURE

Voted for amendment to H. R. 912 which prohibits the Navy from serving oleomargarine as long as surplus butter is available.

Voted for amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 162 to keep the Federal Government from reducing price supports on dairy products.

Voted for extension of the agricultural trade and development program to aid in disposal of surplus agricultural products.

Voted for H. R. 5538 requiring Congressional approval to effect withdrawals of more than 5,000 acres of public land.

Voted for S. 3342 extending special milk program in schools, settlement houses, and summer camps.

Voted for H. R. 12164 to permit distribution of surplus foods in nonprofit children's camps.

BILLS AFFECTING ECONOMY, BUSINESS, AND TRADE

Voted for H. R. 7963 to establish the Small Business Administration, authorized by Republican-controlled 83d Congress, as a permanent agency.

Voted for amendment to H. R. 8240 to eliminate Defense Department competition with private businesses.

Voted for Senate Concurrent Resolutions 68 and 69 urging acceleration of Federal construction projects, both military and civil, for which funds have been appropriated, to stimulate the economy.

Voted for H. R. 12695 repealing 3-percent Federal tax on freight transportation.

Voted for H. R. 12832 amending the Interstate Commerce Act so as to strengthen and improve our national transportation system.

Voted for H. R. 8996 authorizing cooperative program of atomic-power development between Federal Government, cooperatives, public utilities districts, and private power companies.

Voted for H. R. 12591 extending the Trade Agreements Act.

Voted for H. R. 13382 to provide tax relief for small businesses.

Voted for S. 3418, the emergency Housing Act, to stimulate home building, reducing downpayments on FHA-financed housing, and extending the veterans' housing program.

Voted against S. 2229 providing Government guaranteed loans to air carriers and helicopter lines.

Voted for S. 2719 providing for payments of bounties for control of predators on salmon and halibut of Pacific coast and Alaska.

Voted for H. R. 9821 authorizing and appropriating funds for highway construction to create jobs and expedite work.

BILLS AFFECTING VETERANS, SOCIAL SECURITY, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

Voted for H. R. 1 to provide $1.5 billion in Federal aid for school construction.

Voted for civil-rights bill on final passage.

Voted for amendments in appropriations bill for Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Department of Labor to keep expenditures in line.

Voted for H. R. 12065 to provide up to 15 additional weeks of unemployment compensation for jobless whose State payments have expired.

Voted against bill to provide $14 million in initiation of unworkable Federal flood-insurance program.

Voted for H. R. 358 to increase monthly rates of pensions to widows of Spanish-American, Indian, Mexican, and Civil War veterans.

Voted for H. R. 1264 to provide disability pensions for veterans hospitalized by pulmonary tuberculosis.

Voted for H. R. 11630 to amend the Social Security Act to extend benefits of unemployment compensation, formerly available only to Korean veterans, to all ex-servicemen.

Voted for H. R. 11801 to increase veterans' burial allowance.

Voted for H. R. 13549 to increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system.

Voted for H. R. 12457 to prohibit the interstate sale of switchblade knives.

Voted for H. R. 12628, extending the Hill-Burton Act.

Voted for H. R. 11378 authorizing permanent program of assistance for construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities.

Voted against H. R. 72 which would have limited the number of relatives who could claim benefits of a legally incompetent veteran.

Voted against H. R. 6287, an amendment to cut funds for the Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is about as complete a voting record that is possible to compile. I have always voted for the things that I believe are right and for what is in the best interest of the people whom I represent. Not all of them will agree with each and every vote, but I hope all will approve of my voting record as a whole.

The Federal Trade Commission's Advertising Guides

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement about the Federal Trade Commission's advertising guides to curb fictitious pricing.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION'S ADVERTISING GUIDES

Last Friday the Federal Trade Commission announced it will adopt advertising guides to curb the vicious practice of fictitious pricing. This is a problem in which Senator MANSFIELD and I are keenly interested and which we have in the past explored for possible solution. We are gratified that the Commission is taking positive action to eliminate this burden to honest advertisers and the ultimate purchasers of consumer goods.

The Trade Commission is one of our regulatory agencies, established by Congress as an independent office, and charged with the duty of policing trade practices and protecting the ultimate consumer. It is unfortunate that west of the Mississippi the consuming public has only a vague acquaintance with the agency's mission and believes that somehow it is connected with administration of price-fixing fair trade laws passed by local authorities. Since fictitious pricing is a nationwide problem affecting all business and consumers adversely, the present action of the Commission will call attention to the fact that Congress does not intend the wage-earner, the small-income family, and persons on fixed low incomes, shall be at the mercy of unscrupulous advertisers taking unfair advantage of the consumer.

The deception of fictitious pricing is obvious in the statement of its most prevalent claim: "$50 regular price, now only $25," although the article offered for sale at the reduced price may never have been sold for more than the $25 quoted and, in many cases, has not sold for that price. The claim is an invitation to a spurious bargain. After 23 months of rising costs of living indexes, and 21 new record highs in that time, the fixed-income citizen cannot afford such bargains.

Senator MANSFIELD and I, pursuing our interest in the matter, inquired into the extent of fictitious pricing and its effects on business and the consumer in March of this year. We found the practice to be the outstanding curse of both buyer and seller, and we called it to the attention of the Committee on Appropriations, then considering appropriation of funds to the Federal Trade Commission. We pointed out that the Bureau of Consultation, within the Commission, has developed the legal weapons for fighting deceptive pricing, and by means of its advertising guides can protect consumers on a nationwide, industrywide basis. Other matters concerning the Trade Commission were under consideration then and a sufficient approximation of need could not be made by the committee. However, the Trade Commission is proceeding despite its present limitations of budget, and may be expected to return a creditable report of accomplishment in this field.

There is considerable danger in the announced intention of the Commission to proceed that the public may be thereby assured prices are being policed, when in fact the means of policing them are absent. Unless an allocation of funds is made to the Bureau of Consultation to administer its advertising guides program in a proper manner, supported, of course, by individual prosecution of violators, one more deception will have been added to an already vicious practice. It is expected that the Commission will make a sufficient presentation of this problem to the Bureau of the Budget and to Congress in order to increase funds available to the Commission and its Bureau of Consultation for the fight against deceptive pricing.

Mutual Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I strongly urge that the amendments of the Appropriations Committee to H. R. 13192 be adopted.

I have prepared a short statement with respect to the mutual security program. However, because of the great amount of work yet to be done by the Senate today, I request unanimous consent that my statement be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I would like to make a short statement in support of the mutual security program, so that my reasons for urging acceptance of the recommendations of the full committee will be perfectly clear.

The nations of the world that are not under Communist domination exist under a constant threat—directly or indirectly—from those nations which are already in Communist hands. We have long known that this international predatory movement, carefully directed from Moscow, is designed to deprive free nations of the ability to choose their own way of life. But, however constant that threat may be, its form and direction has varied as often as we of the Free World have devised a method of counterattack.

Where the free nations have strengthened their military defenses to meet this threat and thereby made armed attack both risky and expensive, the Communists have chosen other weapons. Therefore, in the last few years we have been participating, not just in a buildup between 2 military systems, but in a competition between 2 foreign economic policies.

The stakes in this deadly game may be life or death for our way of life.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the significance of the outcome of this global struggle. I fear, from letters which I have received, and from occasional news commentary, that somehow the importance of our struggle and the understanding of our various weapons has escaped many people in our country.

I fear the recent outbreaks in Latin America and the Middle East, which have been interpreted as setbacks for the United States, have been considered by some to be proof positive of the futility of a foreign-aid program. The prevalence of this feeling is reflected in the fact that the President's original budget estimates for the 1958 mutual-security program have been cut twice in succession—one irrevocably by the Authorization Act. And again by the recent action of the other body, which reduced the total to $872 million under the estimates.

These reductions do not square up with the enormity of the challenge facing us, nor with the traditional American courage and ingenuity in facing a task. Those who advocate our withdrawal behind the walls of our fortress are pessimists. Who unwittingly are lending credence to the Communist boast of invincibility. I often feel that we are in danger of losing our perspective concerning the relative importance of the various parts of our task. I take it for granted that we need to man our defenses—but beyond that, we must fight hard to wage peace around the world—and this job is infinitely cheaper and more constructive than short-sighted concentration solely on developing the weapons of destruction to fortify our own shores.

The appropriations we are considering today are a major part of our effort in this worldwide struggle—this war to keep the peace and to preserve the institutions of free democratic societies, by adding to their stability and well-being.

I have had the privilege of attending, during the past few years, numerous White House meetings at which the Congressional leadership was briefed on the international position of the United States. We have been advised time and time again of the dangerous progress being made by the Communists. I have visited the nations of Southeast Asia, where the situation is especially critical, and I have talked with their leaders. I have heard enough, and seen enough, to convince me beyond any reasonable doubt that the appropriations we are considering are a wise and, comparatively speaking, an inexpensive investment in our own security. These appropriations provide the peacetime weapons we need to meet the economic challenge we face. I would like to dwell on this problem for a few moments.

The United States has a foreign economic program with good reason. There is an astonishing disparity between the plane of living in the poorly developed nations of the world and in our own. In the past our people have been largely unaware of the disparity; but if it is true that we are unaware of their lagging economies and starvation existence, the Communists are not. The Soviet leaders are utilizing, and subsidizing the cost of, every conceivable device to bring word to isolated villagers that a better life is within their reach if they will bestir themselves to revolution and join in the predatory scheme of worldwide communism—a scheme which, if successful, would lay waste the world and subject us all to the whims of a tiny handful of ruthless and Godless men.

Mr. President, the great question before us seems to be the degree of our own responsibility. The experts with whom I have talked and every serious study which I have read confirms my belief of the need for much greater emphasis on effective United States financing of economic growth in the less-developed countries. This is not a spendthrift program. In the absence of greater progress, it seems unlikely that freely chosen governments which now exist in many countries can retain the support of their increasingly restive peoples. Our own security is directly involved in the fate of such countries, and this is what determines our degree of responsibility.

Accordingly, I am urging, as strongly as it is possible for me to do so, that the Senate agree to the increases which have been made by its Committee on Appropriations so that our Government will not be hamstrung in its operations abroad and will not be deprived of weapons absolutely essential in a fight which is going to continue for many years to come.

Federal Expenditures in Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement on Federal expenditures in Montana.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES IN MONTANA

The 85th Congress has made one of the finest and most accomplished legislative records in our history. Montana is sharing in these accomplishments. Federal expenditures in the Treasure State have increased again this year.

It is anticipated that Federal expenditures in Montana will be increased by $67,790,022 in the current fiscal year. In fiscal year 1958, ending June 30, $234,123,556 in Federal funds were channeled to the State. Appropriations totaling $301,913,578 have been programed for Montana for the 12-month period which began on July 1 of this year. These annual appropriations continue to be the largest single source of income to the State.

In the calendar year 1957 the Treasury Department collected $138,352,000 in income and excise taxes from Montana inhabitants. On the basis of these figures, Federal expenditures in Montana were at the rate of approximately $1.69 for every $1 collected in Montana in the past year. On the basis of estimates of expenditures in fiscal year 1959, the ratio will be better than 2 to 1.

The Agriculture Department continues to be the largest contributor to the State and the Defense Department and Commerce Department are the next largest contributors. The planned increase in Federal expenditures in Montana is due largely to the expanded and accelerated Interstate Highway program and the increased expenditures for military construction in connection with the Glasgow Air Force Base. The Air Force will spend an additional $22,965,000 at this new jet airbase during the current fiscal year.

This tabulation does not include the $2,538,000 appropriation to continue construction on the Helena Valley unit and the additional funds that will come to Montana when the increase in social-security benefits becomes effective.

In fiscal year 1958 the Small Business Administration approved 46 business loans totaling $2,629,000. During this same 12-month period 15 contracts were awarded to small firms under the joint set-aside program valued at $262,331.

It was a distinct pleasure to work with Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Congressmen LEE METCALF and LEROY ANDERSON in the 85th Congress. We worked together in all matters of importance to Montana. We held periodic conferences, working as a unit furthering the development and best interests of the Treasure State.

The following tabulation lists all major Federal departments and agencies who have programed funds in Montana and a list of major projects:

Federal expenditures in State of Montana by Federal departments and agencies

Department	Fiscal year 1958	Fiscal year 1959 (estimated)	Increase or decrease
Agriculture (Agricultural Research Service, Extension Service, Forest Service, Soil Conservation Service, Agricultural Conservation Program Service, Agricultural Marketing Service, Soil Bank program, Commodity Stabilization Service, Commodity Credit Corporation, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, REA, FHA, Office of General Council)	$94,014,961	$89,693,296	−$4,321,665
Defense (Army, Navy, Air Force)	40,852,000	68,891,000	+28,039,000
Commerce (Census Bureau, Weather Bureau, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Bureau of Public Roads, Civil Aeronautics Administration)	21,974,104	65,257,640	+43,283,536
Veterans' Administration (General administration, medical and hospital services, benefit payments)	18,769,000	18,769,000	
Interior (Department offices, Bonneville Power Administration, Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Bureau of Reclamation, Geological Survey, Bureau of Mines, National Park Service, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife)	28,477,157	30,121,559	+1,644,402
Post Office	8,014,000	9,017,000	+1,003,000
Health, Education, and Welfare (American Printing House for Blind, Office of Education, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Public Health Service, Social Security Administration)	9,127,151	9,906,019	+778,868
General Services Administration	8,382,981	5,595,000	−2,787,981
Labor (Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Wage and Hour Division, Bureau o Employment Security)	2,521,178	2,566,773	+45,595
Treasury	1,287,112	1,339,981	+52,869
Justice (Legal activities, administration, Immigration and Naturalization Service)	627,585	677,000	+49,415
Smal' Business Administration (Montana branch office)	23,745	23,745	
Interstate Commerce Commission	52,582	55,565	+2,983
Total	234,123,556	301,913,578	+67,790,022

LIST OF MAJOR PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS FUNDED IN FISCAL YEAR 1959

Forest Fire Research Laboratory, Missoula	$900,000
Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls (military construction)	1,888,000
Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow (military construction)	22,965,000
Additional facilities at aircraft control and warning station (radar) near six Montana cities	1,486,000
National Guard armories (one-unit) Chinook	64,000
National Guard armories (one-unit) Dillon	64,000
Army Reserve Training Center (two-unit) Billings	371,000
Army Reserve Maintenance Shop, Glasgow	17,000
Army Reserve assembly hall and maintenance shop, Helena	104,000
Helena Valley unit (construction)	2,538,000
Second powerplant, Fort Peck Dam	6,500,000
Clark Fork at Missoula, flood control planning	12,000
St. Regis River, flood control	41,000
Waste treatments works construction	512,475
Public Law 815 payments for school construction	440,000
Public Law 874 operational and maintenance payments to schools	630,000
Benton Lake wildlife refuge	$100,000
Lower Willow Creek watershed and flood control project	757,110
Air navigation and air traffic control facilities at 6 Montana airports—Great Falls, Missoula, Billings, Butte, Helena, and Cut Bank	1,554,000

Statement by Hon. Charles E. Potter, of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following statement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR POTTER

My State of Michigan is the center of the automobile industry. It will make a great contribution to our economy with the introduction of the 1959 models, which will shortly be unveiled to an expectant public. If they meet the response which the industry's stylists and engineers anticipate, many additional workers will again be drawing paychecks.

Furthermore, the demands of the automobile producers on supplying industries will enable other businesses, both large and small, including producers of steel, aluminum, other nonferrous metals, glass, and upholstery fabrics to recall laidoff workers. The service industries, including transportation and distribution, will also benefit from the increased activity in automobile production.

However—and this is unfortunate—one man alone will decide if this contribution to our economy will be made. One man alone will decide if thousands of additional workers will again draw paychecks in the State of Michigan.

That man is Walter Reuther. Walter Reuther seeks to control the entire political structure of the State of Michigan and is the most powerful labor boss in America today.

The senior Senator from Michigan certainly recognizes the need for strong unions with responsible leaders to provide for the orderly negotiation of wages, hours, and conditions of employment for the workers in mass production industries.

The United Automobile Workers and the management of the leading producers have developed grievance procedures with an impartial umpire paid jointly by the union and the employer. This has materially eliminated strife in the day-to-day conduct of industrial relations. It clearly shows what can be accomplished when a union concentrates its efforts in assisting members in connection with those activities customarily considered within the sphere of collective bargaining.

Although the economy is again advancing, one disturbing cloud still hangs over us. The auto workers in the plants of General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler, who are members of the United Automobile Workers, are working without a contract.

Contracts between the major automobile producers and the United Automobile Workers expired at the end of May. If the contracts had been extended, the members of the United Automobile Workers would have received a pay increase of 9 cents an hour. Some of the other unions have signed agreements with the auto manufacturers. Their members as well as the salaried workers have been enjoying this pay increase.

Lack of an agreement is costing the membership of the United Automobile Workers presently employed by the 3 leading producers $1,200,000 every week or $60 million a year. With the resumption of full production on the new models 9 cents an hour will represent $100 million a year to these workers.

Walter Reuther has consistently taken the position that our economy should be transformed into one in which the basic overall decisions are made by Government. Production and pricing policies for particular producers would be planned jointly by Government, management, and labor. This un-American concept accounts for the many difficulties which accompany any negotiations with Walter Reuther.

While he professes faith and confidence in a free enterprise economy, he has consistently advocated plans and programs which would destroy competitive capitalism. Planning in one form or another has been his principal interest.

The pattern of Walter Reuther's collective bargaining negotiations also is a familiar one. Rather than concentrate on the conclusion of an agreement which would insure industrial peace and provide confidence and security for the workers he represents, he has used the bargaining table as a platform to advance his own economic and political concepts, to concentrate his political power in the United States.

Only recently Walter Reuther was interviewed by Henry Brandon, Washington representative of the Sunday Times of London. The grandiose schemes which would transform his concept of the bargaining table to a death grip on the entire governmental structure are clearly revealed in this interview. I quote from Mr. Brandon's articles of June 22 and June 29. Mr. Reuther said:

"If the labor movement is to deal with problems such as unemployment, it must act economically at the bargaining table and it must act politically."

This statement clearly shows that Walter Reuther regards political action as a principal function of a labor leader.

And when I speak of Reuther's political power, I am not dreaming up a fantasy. A force of 1,580 men worked and will continue to work in Michigan political campaigns during 1958. Reuther's union calls workers off the job and pays them $20 a day, plus $5 a day expenses. This amounts to the staggering sum of $37,000 a day for political activity. These men are hired for one reason and one reason only: To impose Walter Reuther's will upon the voters, especially of Wayne County, Mich.

As a matter of fact, the State of Michigan has been almost entirely taken over by Reuther and his lieutenants. Through his henchman, August Scholle, president of the Michigan AFL–CIO Council, he dictates decisions to his hand-picked Governor of Michigan in Lansing. Scholle is the same labor boss who publicly stated, "We will never support a Republican."

If Reuther played a fair game, permitting the electorate to make up its own mind, perhaps this situation would not have come about.

But how does he operate?

I will give two cogent examples.

Last spring I was invited by the Federal credit union of the Ford Rouge plant to speak to its members. I accepted the invitation. Shortly afterward I received a telephone call from Detroit advising me that certain union bosses were displeased and that credit union members would be embarrassed if a Republican Senator appeared. They asked me not to come.

This obvious attempt to keep the rank-and-file from hearing an unbossed official caused so much criticism in the press that it proved embarrassing for the union tycoons. So, Paul Silver, president of UAW Local 351 in Detroit wrote to invite me to speak at a meeting. It wasn't even a courteous invitation. He seemed more interested in questioning the sincerity of my desire to meet face-to-face with rank-and-file union members than to help his union arrange a productive meeting.

However, I accepted immediately. The chairman introduced me with a 25-minute tirade against the Republican Party. Following my remarks August Scholle rose to mimic my speaking mannerisms and sarcastically attack my views.

The poor manners of union bosses neither frighten nor upset me, Mr. President. But I submit that this episode indicates how fearful union bosses are of allowing their memberships to hear the truth. Arrogance and ill-mannered ridicule is their only defense against sound argument.

More recently the Michigan AFL–CIO News carried a boldly headlined, three column attack on my voting record in the Senate. With deliberate intent to deceive the rank-and-file union members of the State of Michigan, they falsely stated that I voted to kill a proposal to raise pensions for older, blind, and disabled persons.

I wrote the editor by return mail, citing page references from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to correct misstatements throughout the article and requested that it be printed in fairness to his readers. Certainly they are entitled to make judgments on the basis of facts.

My letter was not printed, but a tiny one-inch correction, hidden in the corner of a subsequent issue appeared. The attack on me, according to this almost invisible admission, was due to a clerical error.

I mention these incidents, Mr. President, only to show that the union bosses who have captured the political machinery of the State of Michigan will stop at nothing to destroy anyone who refuses to become their political pawn.

The situation brought on by Reuther's juggernaut has become so notorious that it is referred to in other States as a "Michigan-type takeover."

It is built on misrepresentation and deceit. This is not surprising when we consider the backgrounds of some of Michigan's labor dictators.

Take Walter Reuther, for example.

While he was a student at Detroit City College, which is now Wayne State University, Walter Reuther was an associate editor of a publication called Revolt published by the League for Industrial Democracy. The masthead is revealing. It said:

"Revolt will wage an intelligent and spirited fight against war, capitalism, race prejudice, intellectual sham.

"Revolt will help rally students to the task of building a Socialist America."

Apparently, even in the distressed days of the depression, it was difficult to sell a magazine with such an objective, and the name was changed to the Student Outlook in February 1933. The change was announced in this fashion:

"With this issue Revolt becomes the Student Outlook. Students felt it was more important to sell our magazine and convince by its contents than to shout revolution and have no one listen. Persons who give us more than a glance will not mistake our colors."

Mr. President, Walter Reuther is still following this formula. He is no longer shouting revolution, but those who give his proposals careful consideration cannot mistake the direction in which they would take us.

In addition to being an editor of Revolt and the Student Outlook, Walter Reuther also contributed an article to the March 1933 issue entitled "Auto Workers Strike." This article clearly shows that Walter Reuther regarded the trade union movement primarily as a means of reorganizing society. In describing an automobile strike during this early period while he was still on the campus of Detroit City College, Walter Reuther said, and I quote:

"As in many other present-day strikes, the students also played their part. About 20 students from the College of the City of Detroit (both Communists and Socialists) marched in line with the Briggs' picketers, singing and carrying signs reading 'City College Students Unite With Strikers.'

"The tremendous effect this cooperation from the 'respectable young intellectuals' had in breaking down the antipathy of the bystanders and minimizing the Red scare can best be illustrated by the fact that during the first few critical hours of the strike when it was most difficult to get the workers to fall in line with the picketers, this group of students through their songs and general militant activity aided in swelling the numbers of the picket line from 50 to 400 in but a few hours. So effective was the work of the student group that it was not long before the company ordered the police to take the students off the picket line. The police surrounded the group and took them inside the plant for questioning. The school authorities were notified and a general attempt was made to intimidate the students. But the reply was a larger group of students on the line the next morning."

While Walter Reuther has denied any sympathy with Communists, this article which he wrote only 4 years before he led the sitdown strikes at Flint is revealing. Mr. President, I note the direct reference to Communists and the need to minimize the Red scare.

Then there is Emil Mazey, Reuther's chief lieutenant.

Emil Mazey is the man who openly castigated a duly elected judge of the courts of the State of Wisconsin and directed a boycott against his business because he dared to sentence a labor goon to a prison term for beating up a nonstriker. And, he is the man who publicly declared that the clergy of a Wisconsin town had no integrity—merely because they dared to speak out against the abuses of the labor bosses.

These are the men, Mr. President, who have captured the State of Michigan. These are the men who have the Governor of the State so hog-tied that he has refused to extradite a member of Reuther's union to stand fair trial in the Wisconsin courts. These are the men who are afraid to let a Republican Senator tell a straightforward story of his record in behalf of all of Michigan's people to the rank-and-file union members of the State. These are the men whose political activities were the subject of a University of Chicago study entitled "The CIO and the Democratic Party," a study which documents their brutal, strong-arm grab of the Democratic Party structure in Michigan.

Throughout my public life, Mr. President, it has been my conviction that a man's livelihood and social well-being are too sacred to be used as political pawns; that to play politics with the economic security of Michigan families is the unforgivable sin. This I have never done.

Now is the time, Mr. President, for the working people of Michigan to demand a halt to Walter Reuther's cynical perversion of the union movement.

Organized labor in Michigan must reaffirm its faith in the freedom and integrity and importance of the individual by demanding that Walter Reuther let each worker do his own political thinking.

Now is the time for every citizen of Michigan, regardless of his political party, to renounce and condemn those politically ambitious labor leaders who have killed off Michigan's jobs when the rest of the Nation was enjoying prosperity; who have driven small-business men and industrialists out of

the State because of their strong-arm tactics; and who use the State as a pawn in their bid for national power.

Now is the time for the working men and women of Michigan to reject the Socialist philosophy of Walter Reuther which regards a union member as too weak or too stupid to think for himself—and propounds that man attains his highest purpose under the heel of an all-powerful organization.

Mr. President, the only issues which should be considered in the present negotiations between management and labor in the automobile industry are the terms which can best contribute to the progress and welfare of all concerned. This, I am sure, is the desire of the rank-and-file members of the union.

These union members would be highly interested, if they had access to the London Sunday Times interview of their leader, to read his admission that his ultimate purpose is to mold the Democratic Party so that it would "adopt a good program at every convention—just as advanced as the Labor Party in Britain." The Labor Party, of course, is Socialist.

It has been my pleasure to work in Congress with hundreds of loyal, able Democrats. They are not Socialists. They resent this statement as much as I do. They can never reassert their views within the Democratic Party, however, until it is freed from Walter Reuther's grip.

In the same fashion, if agreements can be reached in the current collective bargaining negotiations without concern for Reuther's plans to take over the rest of the country as he has Michigan, I have no doubt that the coming year will be one of progress and prosperity for all our people.

Senator H. Alexander Smith of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, one of the great statesmen of modern times will retire with the 85th Congress He is New Jersey's very distinguished senior Senator, H. ALEXANDER SMITH.

Senator SMITH's remarkable record of service as a lawyer, educator, lecturer at Princeton, food administrator, party leader, Senator, and architect of the United Nations has been delineated in many recent tributes.

To me, this most characterful and scholarly gentleman of almost four decades of experience has made his greatest contribution as a man of peace. It was the Smith-Mundt Act which resulted in the exchange of people, especially young students, for a greater understanding among the community of nations. The Voice of America was a product of this act, this daily carrying to people everywhere the true meanings of freedom.

The Senator's speeches on the floor of the Senate have emphasized the importance of America taking a strong and positive position in its concern for human misery wherever it may be found. We are our brother's keepers, he would insist, and human misery is a breeding-ground for communism.

The Senator has made it a point to visit trouble spots all over the world and I know of no one in public life today who has a greater knowledge of the world picture. One cannot talk to him for 5 minutes without sensing his passionate desire to develop what he calls a "spirit of good will and togetherness" among the peoples of our world. I cannot believe for 1 minute that his remarkable talents for the promotion of such a spirit will go unused after he leaves the Senate.

I have a feeling that our great President who, I know, has a warm place in his heart for the senior Senator from New Jersey, may find in him an American ambassador of good-will-at-large, ideally equipped and ready to render a new and important service in the promotion of peace.

Former President Hoover recently wired Senator SMITH congratulating him on his devoted and able service to our country. Mr. Hoover, however, had one word of admonition and it was this: "But just do not quit work."

I do not believe President Eisenhower will want him to quit either.

Mayor Daley of Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on the closing day of the 85th Congress, which will take its place in history as one of the most productive and instructive Congresses since the beginning of our Government, I wish to direct my remarks to the city of Chicago and its dynamic mayor, the Honorable Richard J. Daley. I do this with the realization that the future functioning of our democracy depends in no small measure on the way our municipal governments are run. Their integrity and their efficiency in meeting the problems in an ever changing world, problems that fall more immediately and hardest on the big cities, furnish the answer to our continuing strength and progress.

This is not said to detract from the importance of village, county, and State governments. It is not intended to suggest that there is any fundamental difference between urban and rural populations or that one makes greater or less contribution to the functioning of our democracy and the welfare of our people. We all do our part whenever we are called to play it.

PROBLEMS OF BIG CITIES

But there are problems of Government in our big cities that many times in this and earlier Congress I have wished were better understood by my colleagues.

I appreciate, for one thing, that it is difficult for a Member from a small community to appreciate the housing problems of a big city, with its shifting residential districts, its constant fight against decay and resultant slums, its demand in a new day of automobiles for superhighways that necessitate the destruction of homes where people lived and have to be relocated, and its large influx of persons who have to be housed or left unattended to, can add to the hazards of all natures.

I regret that my colleagues who reported in this Congress a housing bill so necessary to our big cities had not a greater understanding. When we fight for the legislative climate in which our big cities can live and expand wholesomely and flourish, we are fighting for nothing less than the preservation of our democracy. When millions of persons, massed together within the municipal area of one city, are neglected, discontent will grow into resentment, and resentment with fanning can go to any lengths. The history of our world is the history of the rise and fall of great cities.

IMPORTANCE OF MAYOR'S OFFICE

In recent years, deplorably, there has been an inclination to overlook in the national picture the importance of municipal government in the big cities. Today one ambitious to be an occupant of the White House probably would regard the United States Senate and the office of governor the most likely stepping stone. Yet it was Grover Cleveland's election as mayor of Buffalo that started him on the road to the White House. His reforms in municipal government in the city of Buffalo arrested the interest of the Nation, stole the show from the personalities on the State and national level, made him successively governor of New York and President of the United States over the bitter opposition of powerful Tammany Hall.

At a little later period Johnson and Baker in Cleveland, Pingree in Detroit, Dunne in Chicago, Hunt in Cincinnati, Brand Whitlock in Toledo, and other mayors of American cities were names known to most Americans.

The fact is that a mayor of a big city is closer to the people than any other official. If he is an outstandingly good mayor his good deeds carry far. The roots of good government are in local government, and local government has its highest office in the chief executive of a big city.

Next to the Presidency of the United States the office of mayor of the city of Chicago is rated by political scholars as the most influential public office in the United States. This is determined not only by the size of Chicago, its territorial location, the diversity of its industries, and other such factors, but, equally important, the scope of authority vested in the chief executive. The mayor of New York has no such measure of authority.

DALEY'S 3 YEARS OF MIRACLES

In the 3 years of his administration Mayor Richard J. Daley has brought the office of chief executive of a big city back to its former place in the national interest. More has been written of him in national magazines and periodicals, all in admiration of the miracles he has wrought by hard work and dedication, than of any other mayor of an American city in the history of our Republic.

Mr. Speaker, when a great man comes into a great public office he envisions and plans for the future as he does the work of the present. Mayor Daley, while

making the Chicago of today first in all good things of the big cities of the world, is laying the plans for an even greater Chicago in 1980.

By unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the beginning of an article by Thomas Buck in the Chicago Tribune of August 23, 1958, as follows:

(By Thomas Buck)

A comprehensive plan for modernizing Chicago's Loop and its environs in the next 22 years at a cost of $1½ billion in public and private funds was made public Friday by Mayor Daley and the city's department of planning.

The proposals were described by the mayor and his planning aids as a bold and imaginative program designed to fulfill the city's downtown urban culture needs in the remainder of the 20th century.

Fancy sketches and scale models of the numerous suggestions—all prepared at points far removed from the city hall to insure utmost secrecy—were unveiled in the mayor's office before a large gathering of business and civic leaders.

In general, the plan reaffirms the planning framework set forth in 1909 by the famous Burnham plan, the proposal that produced the development of the Lake Michigan shoreland as Chicago's front yard, and ultimate construction of Congress Expressway, and numerous other downtown improvements.

Specifically, this modern plan recommends sites for Government buildings, and a Chicago undergraduate campus of the University of Illinois, and a transportation center, as well as designating areas for 50,000 apartments to lure persons back to the core of the city.

It also proposes three new islands just off the shoreline for recreational purposes, the improvement of Navy piers to meet the shipping needs arising from the next year's opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway, and a street pattern to ease congestion.

One major proposal calls for the separation of pedestrian and vehicular traffic by providing special pedestrian plazas below and above the present street level.

Of most immediate importance are recommendations dealing with Government building sites and the University of Illinois campus to replace the university's present facilities at Navy pier.

The Government center question jumped into the limelight recently in view of the Federal Government's intentions to build office buildings and a courthouse at a cost of $98 million.

District of Columbia Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I want to take this opportunity to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a list of the bills and resolutions in connection with which the House District Committee has taken action during the 2d session of the 85th Congress.

I should also like to insert a list of the District bills and resolutions which have passed the House during this session of Congress. Included is also a list of the bills and resolutions passed by both the House and Senate during the 2d session of the 85th Congress and which have gone to the President for his signature.

I should also like to insert in the RECORD, a list of the District bills which passed the House during the 85th Congress and remain pending before the Senate.

I want to thank the members of the District Committee, the Members of the House and the members of the Senate District Committee for their cooperation in securing the passage of the necessary legislation for the proper functioning of the District of Columbia government.

The Congress has been successful in solving a number of the problems confronting the District of Columbia by passing the necessary bridge bills, an authorization act increasing the Federal payment from $23 million to $32 million per annum, amendments to the District of Columbia Land Redevelopment Act, a bill giving the District Highway Commission permission to begin work on the Southwest Freeway, and also numerous other pieces of important legislation.

We hope that as soon as Congress reconvenes in January we will be able to do something for the retired policemen and their widows, also pass legislation approving an additional juvenile judge and 1 or 2 other pending bills which we were unable to pass during the 85th Congress.

I realize that Congress will be meeting again in 4 months' time and we can take action on this legislation soon after Congress reconvenes.

The House passed a bill increasing the retirement benefits for policemen and firemen August 7, 1957, and the Senate failed to take action on this bill until August 14, 1958, which did not give the house time to properly work out an agreement on the amendment which the Senate added to the House bill.

The House passed a bill providing for an additional juvenile judge in the District of Columbia, June 24, 1957, however, with the Senate amendments, the bill was held up in conference for several weeks and was stymied with a number of other bills in the last minute rush before the adjournment of Congress.

The list follows:

DISTRICT BILLS AND REGULATIONS IN CONNECTION WITH WHICH THE HOUSE DISTRICT COMMITTEE HAS TAKEN ACTION DURING THE 2D SESSION OF THE 85TH CONGRESS

H. Con. Res. 260. Bridge, Constitution Avenue, proceed with construction of.

H. Con. Res. 262. Bridge, Constitution Avenue, proceed with construction of.

H. J. Res. 563. Commissioners, District of Columbia borrow funds for capital improvement programs.

H. R. 573. Budget planning service, prohibit in District of Columbia.

H. J. Res. 582. Commissioners grant certain permits, Almas Temple Shrine Activities, Inc.

H. J. Res. 630. Southwest Freeway, southwest area, redevelopment of. Commissioners, District of Columbia authorized to use certain water frontage.

H. R. 2859. National Association of Colored Women's Clubs, exempt from taxation.

H. R. 3486. Simultaneous Death Act, apply in District of Columbia.

H. R. 4210. Workmen's compensation, establish in District of Columbia.

H. R. 5499. Life Insurance Act, amend.

H. R. 5545. Administrative procedures, prescribe for District of Columbia government.

H. R. 5892. Children born out of wedlock, amend act.

H. R. 6039. Commissioners granted additional power.

H. R. 6139. Unemployment Compensation Act, amend.

H. R. 6306. Bridges, two 4-lane, to be constructed to replace existing 14th Street Bridge.

H. R. 6811. Public School Food Services Act, amend.

H. R. 7035. Garnishment of wages—amend law modifying provisions.

H. R. 7300. Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, amend, cases of rezoning, licenses may be retained.

H. R. 7349. Bonds, execution of for compensation, criminal cases, amend law.

H. R. 7452. Holidays, officers and employees, District of Columbia Government, designation of for pay and leave purposes.

H. R. 7568. Inspectors and privates, Fire Department, service in grade of the same for purposes of longevity increases.

H. R. 7863. ABC Act, amend relative to tax stamps.

H. R. 7933. Municipal court, small claims and conciliation branch, increase jurisdiction amount to $100.

H. R. 8470. Communications made to minister or by him—prohibit examination in District of Columbia courts.

H. R. 8735. Annuities—increase for certain annuitants from District of Columbia teachers' retirement.

H. R. 8736. Salary increase, teachers, school officers, Board of Education employees.

H. R. 8884. Recreation Board, define duties, night differential pay certain employees.

H. R. 8898. Teachers, salary increase.

H. R. 8899. Annuities, increase for certain annuitants from District of Columbia teachers' retirement.

H. R. 9271. Sons of the American Revolution Society, permitted to use certain real estate as national headquarters.

H. R. 9285. Charter, St. Thomas' Literary Society, amend.

H. R. 9304. Police—Metropolitan, White House, Park, amend law relating to retirement deductions.

H. R. 10004. Buses, exclude from payment of certain fees when used to carry schoolchildren and Scouts for sightseeing purposes.

H. R. 10160. Fish and game laws, revise.

H. R. 10329. Sales of merchandise on Sunday, prohibit.

H. R. 10572. District of Columbia Teachers College, foreign students, attend on same basis as District of Columbia residents.

H. R. 10622. Hospital Center Act, amend, provide for an increase in the authorization for funds.

H. R. 10625. Unemployment Compensation Act, amend.

H. R. 11034. Sales of merchandise on Sunday, prohibit.

H. R. 11166. Civil Defense Office, amend act.

H. R. 11231. License tax, vehicles for hire, shall apply only to vehicles with seating capacity of nine.

H. R. 11246. Mileage tax, exempt certain common carriers of passengers from.

H. R. 11263. Tax, exempt spouses of elective officials from income tax, District of Columbia.

H. R. 11449. Unemployment Compensation Act, amend.

H. R. 11469. Indecent publications, provide for minimum sentence.

H. R. 11512. Business Corporation Act, amend.

H. R. 11529 ABC Act, amend, standup drinking.

H. R. 11640. Unemployment Compensation, Act, amend.

H. R. 11787. Unemployment Compensation Act, amend.

H. R. 12081. Commissioners, District of Columbia, granted additional authority with

respect to utilization and disposal of personal property.

H. R. 12162. Stadium, amend act providing for construction of.

H. R. 12171. Dangerous weapons, amend act.

H. R. 12191. Income and Franchise Tax Act, amend, refund of taxes.

H. R. 12238. National Union Insurance Co., of Washington, amend charter.

H. R. 12246. American War Mothers, Inc., exempt from taxation.

H. R. 12266. Teachers, salary increase.

H. R. 12332. School bus fares, regulate.

H. R. 12333. Commissioners buy bus tickets, sell to schoolchildren at reduced rate.

H. R. 12356. Bridge, vicinity of Constitution Avenue, amend act.

H. R. 12377. Commissioners, authorized to borrow funds for capital improvements.

H. R. 12408. Insurance coverage, taxicabs, increase.

H. R. 12409. Public Utilities Commission, prohibit installation of meters in taxicabs.

H. R. 12410. Taxicabs, no limitation of in District of Columbia.

H. R. 12411. Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of District of Columbia, amend act relating to exemption of certain vehicles insured under other laws.

H. R 12412. Public Utilities Commission, clarify certain authority or, relating to licensing certain passenger vehicles for hire.

H. R. 12413. Public Utilities Commission, regulate taxi fares for trips originating in District of Columbia to points outside District of Columbia.

H. R. 12506. Superintendent of Schools, Commissioners, salary increase.

H. R. 12643. Municipal court of appeals, judge, clerk, deputy clerk, administer oaths and affirmations, take acknowledgments.

H. R. 12963. Business Corporation Act, amend.

H. R. 12969. Sewage from Virginia, delivery authorized to enter District of Columbia system.

H. R. 13088. Police, Metropolitan, Park and White House, regulate salaries of.

H. R. 13132. Teachers, salary increase.

H. R. 13150. Childhood Education International Association, exempt property from taxation.

H. R. 13184. Survey and study of street lighting in the District of Columbia.

H. R. 13185. Salary increase, police and firemen.

H. R. 13218. Childrens center employees' children permitted to use District of Columbia owned vehicles for transportation to Laurel.

H. R. 13340. Insurance, life, amend District of Columbia act.

H. R. 13406. Redevelopment Act of 1945, amend.

H. R. 13468. Pharmacy license, provide for issuance to Diodata Villamena.

H. R. 13492. Criminal conduct, responsibility for, amend act.

H. R. 13493. Evidence, admission of in certain cases, provide for.

H. R. 13531. Insurance, taxicabs, increase coverage.

H. R. 13609. Children, placing of in family homes, amend act.

H. R. 13628. Income and Franchise Tax Act, amend.

H. R. 13630. Milk ordinance and code, recommendation of Public Health Service, shall be in effect in District of Columbia.

H. R. 13655. Sibley Memorial Hospital, amend Hospital Center Act relating to pregrant expenses.

H. R. 13723. Licensing of public adjusters, insurance.

H. R. 13774. Penalties, habitual criminals, increase.

H. R. 13825. Property, District of Columbia, amend act granting right of possession to surviving widows, widowers, minor children, so long as it is used for residence.

S. 105. National Association of Colored Women's Clubs, exempt certain property from taxation.

S. J. Res. 167. Heliport, Commissioners cause a study to be made of all factors involved in construction of.

S. 532. Fish and game laws, revise.

S. 969. Tests for drunken driving.

S. 1040. Life Insurance Act, amend.

S. 1041. Illustrations in District of Columbia annual report, allowance of.

S. 1706. Commissioners, District of Columbia, grant additional powers to.

S. 1708. Children, born out of wedlock, amend act.

S. 1764. School Food Services Act, amend.

S. 1841. Teachers, retired, Board of Education may employ.

S. 1846. Home rule, provide for in District of Columbia.

S. 1843. Recreation Board Act, amend, define duties, night differential pay for certain employees.

S. 1849. Needy persons, more effective administration of public assistance.

S. 1908. Hospital center, extend time and increase authorization for appropriations.

S. 2419. Unemployment Compensation Act, amend.

S. 2725. National Council of Negro Women, Inc., exempt from taxation.

S. 2728. Civil Defense Office, amend act establishing such office.

S. 3057. Salary increase, Superintendent of Schools.

S. 3058. Damages against the District of Columbia, amend act regulating the bringing of actions for.

S. 3059. Buildings, dangerous or unsafe, to amend act authorizing Commissioners to remove.

S. 3243. Foreign students, attend District of Columbia Teachers College on same basis as District of Columbia residents.

S. 3493. Unemployment Compensation Act, amend.

S. 3735. National Union Insurance Company of Washington, amend.

S. 3827. Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942, to amend.

S. 3941. Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act, amend.

S. 3970. Alley Dwelling Act, facilitate, the acquisition of real property.

DISTRICT BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS WHICH PASSED THE HOUSE DURING THE 2D SESSION OF THE 85TH CONGRESS

H. R. 573. Budget planning service, prohibit in District of Columbia.

H. J. Res. 582. Shrine Association meeting, Middle Atlantic, Commissioners grant certain permits to Almas Temple Shrine Activities, Inc.

H. J. Res. 630. Southwest Freeway, southwest area, redevelopment of, Commissioners, District of Columbia, authorized to use certain water frontage.

H. R. 3486. Simultaneous Death Act, apply in District of Columbia.

H. R. 6306. Bridges, two 4-lane, to be constructed to replace existing 14th Street Bridge.

H. R. 7300. Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, amend section 15.

H. R. 7349. Bonds, execution of for compensation, criminal cases, amend law.

H. R. 7452. Holidays for officers and employees of District of Columbia, provide for designation of.

H. R. 7863. A. R. C. Act, amend relative to tax stamps.

H. R. 8470. Communications made to minister or by him, prohibit examination in District of Columbia courts.

H. R. 8735. Annuities, increase for certain annuitants from District of Columbia teachers' retirement.

H. R. 9271. Sons of the American Revolution Society, permitted to use certain real estate as national headquarters.

H. R. 9304. Police, Metropolitan, White House, Park Police, amend law relating to retirement deductions.

H. R. 11246. Mileage tax, exempt certain common carriers of passengers from.

H. R. 12162. Stadium, amend act providing for construction of.

H. R. 12356. Bridge, vicinity of Constitution Avenue, amend act.

H. R. 12377. Commissioners, authorized to borrow funds for capital improvements.

H. R. 12643. Municipal court of appeals, judge, clerk, deputy clerk, administer oaths and affirmations, take acknowledgements.

H. R. 12963. Business Corporation Act, amend.

H. R. 13088. Police, Metropolitan, Park, and White House, regulate salaries of.

H. R. 13132. Teachers, salary increase.

H. R. 13218. Commissioners, authorized to utilize District-owned vehicles for transportation of children of employees of District of Columbia government from Children's Center to Laurel, Md.

H. R. 13406. Redevelopment Act of 1945, amend.

H. R. 13531. Insurance, taxicabs, increase coverage.

H. R. 13655. Sibley Memorial Hospital, amend Hospital Center Act relating to pregrant expenses.

S. 105. National Association of Colored Women's Clubs, exempt certain property from taxation.

S. 532. Fish and game laws, revise.

S. 969. Tests for drunken driving.

S. 1040. Life Insurance Act, amend.

S. 1706. Commissioners, District of Columbia, grant additional powers to.

S. 1708. Children, born out of wedlock, amend act.

S. 1764. School Food Services Act, amend.

S. 1841. Teachers, retired, board of education may employ retired teachers as substitute teachers.

S. 1843. Recreation Board Act, amend, define duties, night differential pay for certain employees.

S. 1908. Hospital center, extend time and increase authorization for appropriations.

S. 1913. Garnishments of wages, amend law modifying provisions.

S. 2419. Unemployment Compensation Act, amend.

S. 2725. National Council of Negro Women, Inc., exempt from taxation.

S. 3057. Salary increase, superintendent of schools.

S. 3243. Foreign students, attend District of Columbia Teachers College on same basis as District of Columbia residents.

S. 3259. Hospital Center Act, provide for an increase in authorization of funds.

S. 3735. National Union Insurance Company of Washington, amend.

S. 3827. Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942, to amend.

S. 4153. Sewage—from Virginia—authorize delivery into sewage system of District of Columbia and provide for treatment of.

DISTRICT BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS WHICH PASSED BOTH HOUSE AND SENATE DURING THE 2D SESSION OF THE 85TH CONGRESS AND HAVE GONE TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS SIGNATURE

H. J. Res. 582. Shrine Association meeting, Middle Atlantic, Commissioners grant certain permits to Almas Temple Shrine Activities, Inc.—Public Law 551.

H. R. 3486. Simultaneous Death Act, apply in District of Columbia.—Public Law 356.

H. R. 6306. Bridges, two 4-lane, to be constructed to replace existing 14th Street Bridge.—Public Law 501.

H. R. 7300. Alcoholic Beverage Control Act —amend section 15.—Public Law 422.

H. R. 7349. Bonds, execution of for compensation, criminal cases, amend law.—Public Law 537.

H. R. 7452. Holidays for officers and employees of District of Columbia, provide for designation of.—Public Law 533.

H. R. 7568. Inspectors and privates, fire department, service in grade of the same for purposes of longevity increases.—Public Law 521.

H. R. 7863. Alcoholic Beverage Control Act—amend relative to tax stamps.—Public Law 558.

H. R. 8735. Annuities—increase for certain annuitants from District of Columbia teachers' retirement.

H. R. 9271. Sons of the American Revolution Society—permitted to use certain real estate as national headquarters.—Private Law 369.

H. R. 9285. St. Thomas Literary Society—amend charter.—Public Law 541.

H. R. 9304. Police, Metropolitan, White House, Park Police—amend law relating to retirement deductions.—Public Law 693.

H. R. 12356. Bridge, vicinity of Constitution Avenue—amend act.—Public Law 446.

H. R. 12162. Stadium, amend act providing for construction of.—Public Law 561.

H. R. 12377. Commissioners, authorized to borrow funds for capital improvements.—Public Law 451.

H. R. 12643. Municipal Court of Appeals, judge, clerk, deputy clerk, administer oaths and affirmations, take acknowledgments.—Public Law 539.

H. R. 13088. Police, Metropolitan, Park, and White House, regulate salaries of.—Public Law 584.

H. R. 13132. Teachers, salary increase.

H. R. 13218. Commissioners, authorized to utilize District-owned vehicles for transportation of children of employees of District of Columbia Government from Children's Center to Laurel, Md.—Public Law 670.

H. R. 13531. Insurance, taxicabs, increase coverage.

H. J. Res. 630. Southwest Freeway, Southwest area, redevelopment of, Commissioners, District of Columbia, authorized to use certain water frontage.

H. R. 13406. Redevelopment Act of 1945, amend.

S. 105. National Association of Colored Women's Clubs, exempt certain property from taxation—Private Law 496.

S. 532. Fish and game laws, revise—Public Law 730.

S. 969. Tests for drunken driving—Public Law 338.

S. 1040. Life Insurance Act, amend—Public Law 334.

S. 1706. Commissioners, District of Columbia, grant additional powers to—Public Law 491.

S. 1708. Children, born out of wedlock—amend act—Public Law 382.

S. 1764. School Food Services Act—amend.

S. 1841. Teachers, retired—Board of Education may employ retired teachers as substitute teachers—Public Law 385.

S. 1843. Recreation Board Act, amend, define duties, night differential pay for certain employees—Public Law 383.

S. 1908. Hospital Center, extend time and increase authorization for appropriations—Public Law 328.

S. 2419. Unemployment Compensation Act, amend—Public Law 557.

S. 2725. National Council of Negro Women, Inc., exempt from taxation—Private Law 388.

S. 3057. Salary increase, Superintendent of Schools—Public Law 552.

S. 3243. Foreign students, attend District of Columbia Teachers College on same basis as District of Columbia residents—Public Law 284.

S. 3259. Hospital Center Act, provide for an increase in authorization of funds—Public Law 715.

S. 3735. National Union Insurance Company of Washington, amend—Public Law 519.

S. 3827. Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942, to amend—Public Law 692.

S. 4153. Sewage—from Virginia—authorize delivery into sewage system of District of Columbia and provide for treatment of—Public Law 703.

DISTRICT BILLS WHICH PASSED THE HOUSE DURING THE 85TH CONGRESS AND ARE PENDING BEFORE THE SENATE

H. R. 573. Budget Planning Service, prohibit in District of Columbia.

H. R. 4840. Metropolitan Police Relief Association, incorporate.

H. R 4874. Columbia Historical Society, amend act exempting certain property of.

H. R. 5893. Vehicles, privately owned, excuse from certain fees those loaned to Board of Education for driver training courses.

H. R. 6259. Revenue Act of 1937, amend relative to tax on marine insurance.

H. R. 7409. Oldest Inhabitants of District of Columbia, conveyed real property owned by District of Columbia.

H. R. 8470. Communications made to minister or by him, prohibit examination in District of Columbia court.

H. R. 11246. Mileage tax, exempt certain common carriers of passengers from.

H. R. 12963. Business Corporation Act, amend.

H. R. 13655. Sibley Memorial Hospital, amend Hospital Center Act relating to pregnant expenses.

The Polish-German Boundary Settlement in the Light of International Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, on May 16, 1957, the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. B. CARROLL REECE, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement which indicated support of the German view that the settlement of the Polish-German frontier by the Allied Powers, who assumed supreme authority in Germany at the end of the last world war, was not legally valid under international law. On January 28, 1958, in another insertion he included an article in support of this claim, by Dr. Herbert Kraus, whom the gentleman from Tennessee described as "one of Germany's foremost authorities."

The article was published, as a matter of fact, not in a review of international law, but in a paper which is the organ of a body—not represented at present in the German Bundestag—which is carrying out a notorious propaganda in favor of the revision of the territorial status established at the end of World War II, started by Hitlerite Germany's aggression against Poland.

I would like to discuss, in the first instance, the points of international law raised in the Honorable B. CARROLL REECE's original statement.

1. ARE ANY TERRITORIAL CHANGES PROHIBITED BY MODERN INTERNATIONAL LAW?

It seems to me that it is rather confusing and inexact to assert that all territorial changes are prohibited by modern international law. First of all, the said prohibition, which is far from being absolute, concerns, in any case, only the actions of aggressor states and does not prevent the powers acting in self-defense or in defense of other states, victims of aggression, from taking, after the aggressor's defeat, any measures proper for the guaranty of international peace and security. Should the opinion prevail that the provisions applying exclusively to aggressor states are relevant in this matter, the United States and other Allied Powers would be regarded as aggressors, an assertion reminiscent of Hitler's war propaganda about the allegedly defensive character of the war launched by Germany. It would obviously clash with well-established facts and the explicit terms of the Nuremberg judgment:

> The defendants planned, prepared, initiated, and waged wars of aggression, which were also wars in violation of international treaties, agreements, and assurances.

Let us now examine the principles of modern international law on the matter.

According to article X of the Covenant of the League of Nations, the guaranty of territorial integrity and political independence of member states protected only the victims of aggression. In fact, the said article reads as follows:

> The members of the League undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the League.

Such was also, by the way, the interpretation given to this clause of the covenant by many German commentators. I quote, in particular, the names of two prominent German professors who wrote a basic book on this subject, Prof. Dr. Walter Schücking and Prof. Dr. Hans Wehberg, Die Satzung des Völkerbundes, zweite und verbesserte Auflage, Berlin, 1924, page 461:

> The integrity of the territory and its political independence are not guaranteed as such, but only against aggression from outside.
>
> By aggression from outside should be understood any kind of war, aiming at a change by force of the possession of the territory.

Can an aggressor state which, moreover, withdrew from the League of Nations, shield itself under the guaranties promised by the covenants to victims of aggression? Can a state which launched a war violating the provisions of the Kellogg-Briand Pact seek protection from the pact's provisions which are designed to protect only victims of aggression? Moreover, the doctrine of nonrecognition of unlawful territorial expansion, as laid down by the United States Secretary of State Stimson, applies exclusively to expansions due to the violations of the Covenant of the League of Nations and the Kellogg-Briand Antiwar Pact. In fact, both in Stimson's note to Japan and China, dated January 7, 1927, and in the subsequent resolution of the Assembly of the League of Nations, dated March 11, 1932, it was stipulated that the United States and the members of the League of Nations do not intend to recognize any situation, treaty, or agreement which may be brought about by means contrary to the covenants and obligations of the Pact of Paris. It would be preposterous that an

aggressor state after having invaded other states, murdered millions of innocent beings and destroyed the whole fabric of social life of these states, could still claim after its defeat the benefits arising from the provisions many times violated by it. Such claims if granted would only encourage all future aggressors.

Stating that "a peace treaty imposed by a victorious aggressor has no legal validity," Prof. Sir Hersch Lauterpacht, in his treatise of international law, one of the most popular in the English-speaking world—International Law, Oppenheim-Lauterpacht, seventh edition, 1947, page 217—asserts that, in general, international law disregards the vitiating effect of duress except as regards wars, prohibited by international law.

We can find similar remarks in the lectures of G. G. Fitzmaurice, chief legal adviser to the British Foreign Office, at the Hague Academy of International Law—the juridical clauses of the peace treaties, Recueil des Cours de l'Académie de Droit International de la Haye, 1948, volume II, page 356. He states that—

> Any peace treaty the aggressor can impose de facto, as a result of the war, lacks any valid basis de jure, and, therefore, does not create any juridically binding obligations.

And he says at the same time that a peace settlement imposed on a vanquished aggressor necessarily contains some elements of compulsion.

An aggressor state automatically excludes itself from the community of nations and becomes an outlaw from the legal point of view. Professor Schwarzenberger, of the University College, London, in his book, International Law and Totalitarian Lawlessness—London, 1940, page 106—defines the position of an aggressor in similar terms:

> A state which consistently breaks its pledged word and contravenes fundamental rules of international customary law, automatically ceases to be a member of the international society. In effect, it outlaws itself.

Schwarzenberger brings to mind the statement made by Cordell Hull, the United States Secretary of State, in defense of the Lend-Lease Act warning the country that it faces a peril so deadly that the concept of neutrality and the niceties of international law must give way before the grim need of self-defense—The Times, January 17, 1941. Force cannot be banished altogether from international relations as it would mean that an aggressor would remain unpunished after his defeat. A Swiss professor, Dietrich Schindler, in his lectures at the Academy of International Law at The Hague in 1933—Contributions a l'étude des facteurs sociologiques et psychologiques du Droit International, Recueil des Cours de l'Académie de Droit International de la Haye, volume 46, 1933, page 251—examined the problem of the use of force from the sociological point of view and states:

> An objection of sociological nature dealing with the relationship between force and law: Such a treaty would in effect be based on the supposition that force can be separated from law. However, this supposition is not upheld by facts. On the contrary, force according to circumstances is necessary to prevent that law being violated.

All the conclusions which can be drawn from the foregoing remarks clearly appear in the legal position adopted by the victorious Allied Powers in relation to the postwar treatment of the German problem.

2. THE ALLIED POWERS ASSUMED SUPREME AUTHORITY WITH RESPECT TO GERMANY, INCLUDING THE RIGHT OF DISPOSING OF ITS TERRITORY

All those who assert that the Allied Powers had no right to dispose of German territory because the Hague regulations prohibit an occupying power to take such decisions, seem to disregard the legal effects of the unconditional surrender which made obsolete some traditional provisions of international law formerly governing the matter. Raising such claims of the immunity of the German territory amounts to accusing the Allied Powers of violating the international law. It is rather surprising, from the moral and legal points of view, that such claims can be raised by German lawyers, as Germany was the aggressor and proceeded during the war as an occupying power to annex large territories and to carry out acts of genocide and deportation of native populations on a large scale.

In order to make the legal position as viewed by the Allied statesmen quite clear, it is necessary to quote some basic declarations by the Allied Powers to this effect.

In chapter III of the Protocol of the Proceedings of the Crimea Conference, signed on February 11, 1945, article 12 (a) of the surrender terms for Germany was amended in the following manner:

> The United Kingdom, the United States, and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics shall possess supreme authority with respect to Germany. In the exercise of such authority they will take such steps, including the complete disarmament, demilitarization, and the dismemberment of Germany as they deem requisite for future peace and security.

Another document clearly stating the lines of the Allied policy toward defeated Germany in the declaration regarding the defeat of Germany and the assumption of supreme authority with respect to Germany of June 5, 1945—American Journal of International Law, Official Documents, volume XXXIX, 1945, page 171 and following pages:

> The unconditional surrender of Germany has therefore been effected, and Germany has become subject to such requirements as may now or hereafter be imposed upon her.
>
> There is no central government or authority in Germany capable of accepting responsibility for the maintenance of order, the administration of the country and compliance with the requirements of the victorious powers.
>
> The Governments of the United Kingdom, the United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the Provisional Government of the French Republic hereby assume supreme authority with respect to Germany.
>
> The Governments of the United Kingdom, the United States of America, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the Provisional Government of the French Republic, will hereafter determine the boundaries of Germany or any part thereof and the status of Germany or any area at present being part of German territory.

The first conclusion which may be drawn from the above-quoted documents is that the status of occupation as defined by the Hague regulations does not apply to the status of Germany after its unconditional surrender. One may say that there is a complete unanimity on this subject among western lawyers. The first prominent scholar who expressed such an opinion was Prof. Hans Kelsen, who devoted to this matter a particularly lucid comment in the American Journal of International Law—volume XXXIX, 1945, page 518 and following pages—The Legal Status of Germany According to the Declaration of Berlin. He stated, among other points:

> After Germany's unconditional surrender and especially after the abolition of the last German Government of Grand Admiral Doenitz, the status of belligerent occupation has become impossible.
>
> It can hardly be doubted that Germany, after the unconditional surrender of her armed forces, did not fulfill the conditions essential to belligerent occupation. * * * The existence of an independent government is an essential element of a state in the eyes of international law. By abolishing the last government of Germany, the victorious powers have destroyed the existence of Germany as a sovereign state. Since her unconditional surrender, at least since the abolishment of the Doenitz government, Germany has ceased to exist as a state in the sense of international law.

The eminent British lawyer, Sir Hersch Lauterpacht, concurs entirely with Kelsen in declining to consider the position of Germany after unconditional surrender as that of an occupied country in the meaning of the Hague regulations. He writes on this matter as follows:

> While an ordinary armistice—even if dictated by the victor—is still in the nature of an agreement signed by both sides and laying down exhaustively the rights and obligations arising thereunder, this is not the case with regard to an instrument of unconditional surrender. In the latter there is no legal limit set by the victor's freedom of action, save the implied obligation not to resume hostilities, if all his orders are complied with. These orders may include the total suppression of the government of the defeated state, as was the fact in relation to Germany.
>
> The legal basis of the authority exercised by the Allied Powers in Germany during that period lay, in full conformity with international law, in the unlimited power conferred upon them or subsequently assumed by them, in virtue of the unconditional surrender of the German forces. That surrender constituted, in essence, an armistice agreement. International law sets no limit—other than that determined by compelling considerations of humanity—to the discretion of the victor in determining conditions of the armistice. It is not necessary to seek additional support for that legal proposition in the fact that the war was initiated by Germany in violation of her international obligations and that in many respects, in particular, in the matter of the law of belligerent occupation, it was waged on her part in utter contempt of accepted rules of international law.

P. A. Mann in a lecture delivered at the Grotius Society in London—the Transactions of the Grotius Society, volume

33, 1948, page 128 and following pages—states similar views:

If the Allies had assumed only the role of belligerent occupants, they and the United Nations in whose interest they act could not achieve their war aims, which go far beyond military victory; indeed, they would have failed to fulfill their duty and historic mission. It is the unique character of the circumstances which required and sanctioned a unique solution, a new departure. It is submitted that it is more satisfactory and also in harmony with the spirit of international law as a living law to recognize the existence of a new experiment rather than to stretch the words of the Hague regulations that they sanction Allied practice in Germany.

Similar opinion is expressed by R. Y. Jennings, Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge, in his article, Government in Commission, published in the British Yearbook of International Law, in 1946—page 115 and following pages:

It is generally accepted law that an instrument of surrender executed by military authorities is a purely military instrument and cannot do more than regulate the surrender of the military force, unless, indeed, it is afterward ratified by the political authorities. It may be said when the representatives of the German high command executed this instrument there were no longer any German political or other authorities, and that the High Command, being the only German organization capable of exercising any authority in respect of Germany, the high command must therefore be regarded as having been competent to act not only on behalf of the German armed forces but also for Germany as a whole. Obviously, therefore, the title of the occupying power is an original title by subjugation, and the juridical significance of the instrument of unconditional surrender is that it provides the best possible evidence of the complete conquest which is an essential ingredient of title by subjugation.

To hold that when a State wages aggressive total war, contrary to its most solemn covenants, its occupation and control thereafter by members of the United Nations is in the last resort to be judged and limited by the ordinary laws of military occupation, would be to admit an anachronism of the most damaging kind. Municipal law does not deal with a criminal by applying the individualistic concepts of property.

Let us quote the opinion of a distinguished Swiss lawyer, Prof. P. Guggenheim—Traité de Droit International Public, volume II, Genève, 1954, pages 468–469:

Public international law of war recognizes other forms of occupation which are applied after the cessation of military operations, but prior to the official reestablishment of a state of formal peace. Contrary to occupation under the terms of armistice, those occupation statutes are based either on an agreement between the victorious and vanquished states, or on unconditional surrender. They are followed by interventions in the political and economic life of the occupied territory, interventions which might go beyond the measures authorized by the Hague relations concerning laws and customs of land warfare. The consequence of the unconditional surrender of Germany and Italy was their submission to the will of the victorious states. These states, however, renounced their right to annex the largest part of the land of the vanquished nations as valid under law.

Guggenheim contests the definition of the occupation arising from unconditional surrender as occupation sui generis because, as he states, such a definition:

Supposes the continuity of the legal order of the vanquished state. This continuity is refuted, as far as Germany is concerned, by Kelsen, Gros (La Condition juridique de l'Allemagne, Revue Générale de Droit International Public, 1946, 74 ff.) and Giuliano (La situazione attuale della Germania secondo il Diritto Internazionale, 1949).

All decisions of the Allied Governments regarding Germany are, therefore, based on the assumption that they were entitled to act not as belligerent occupants but as the rightful masters of Germany. If one disputes the right of the Allied governments to dispose of German territory, one has to refuse any legal validity to all the other actions of said governments going far beyond the rights arising from the Hague regulations.

Reference can be made in this matter to the very pertinent remarks of F. A. Mann:

But even if an interpretation of the Hague regulations, which is both broad and adapted to the particular circumstances, renders a large part of allied policy in Germany consistent with traditional law, there remains enough that cannot be fitted into its frame. The declaration of Berlin, supplemented by Proclamation No. 2, as well as the Potsdam agreement which, though it constitutes an agreement between the heads of government of three occupying powers, must be considered as a basic document of German law, provide for matters which admittedly are requisite not for completing the victory of Germany, but for future peace and security; it is difficult to believe that the desired decentralization of administration in Germany is necessitated by the interests of military control; to place the city of Königsberg and the territories east of the Oder-Neisse line under Soviet and Polish administration, respectively, far exceeds the limits which a mere belligerent occupant could act; no belligerent occupant could withdraw diplomatic missions or require German authorities and all persons in Germany to hand over all gold, silver, and platinum, or acquire the right to have placed at the unrestricted disposal of the allied representatives the entire German shipping and the whole of German inland transport system.

Assuming, therefore, that the Allied Powers were entitled to make all these decisions because of the subjugation of Germany, it is clear that the determination of Germany's future frontiers became their exclusive right and, moreover, that any negotiation on these issues with the vanquished state was not only unnecessary but also inconceivable from the legal point of view. Such are the conclusions reached, among others, by two prominent lawyers, Prof. Joseph L. Kunz, of Toledo University and Prof. Hans Kelsen.

Referring to this matter, Prof. Joseph L. Kunz writes as follows:

That the war with Germany in the Second World War has not come to an end by a treaty of peace is obvious. No such peace treaty has been signed and ratified. The political situation even makes such a peace treaty highly unlikely. * * * But, apart from all political and factual considerations, there arises the legal problem of whether such a peace treaty is even possible in law. For a peace treaty, as well as the ending of war by mere cessation of hostilities, presupposes the continued existence of the enemy state as a sovereign state in international law. If the German state of 1937 no longer exists, then ending the war by these methods is legally not possible; on the other hand, no "ending the war" is legally necessary, as the war automatically came to an end by conquest and subjugation. (Ending the War With Germany, American Journal of International Law, vol. XLVI, p. 116.)

Similar remarks are found in the article by Prof. H. Kelsen, mentioned above:

There can be little doubt that the status of belligerent occupation would not be compatible with the intention of the victorious powers to reorganize Germany politically as well as economically and to reduce her territory in favor of her neighbors. All this, of course, could be achieved by a treaty concluded with the legitimate government of Germany. Such a treaty, however, is—at least, for the time being—impossible, since no legitimate government of Germany exists. If later on the victorious powers allow a national government to be established, it will certainly not be advisable to burden this new and, let us hope, democratic government with the political responsibility for all the hard measures which it will be necessary to enforce upon Germany. It is well known that the political responsibility for the Treaty of Versailles was a main cause for the breakdown of the Weimar Republic and the rise of national socialism.

In another passage of his interesting article, Professor Kelsen stated:

The occupant powers declare that they will hereafter determine the boundaries of Germany or any part thereof and the status of Germany or of any area at present being part of German territory. The occupant powers intend to determine the future boundaries of Germany not by a peace treaty concluded with a German Government but by a unilateral act of the occupant powers. Only the territorial sovereign has the power to dispose of the territory.

It is unnecessary—and beyond the scope of these remarks—to examine the question whether there is any legal continuity between the new Federal German Republic and prewar Germany. This is, in general, denied by western lawyers, Joseph L. Kunz, the Contractual Agreements with the Federal Republic of Germany, American Journal of International Law, volume XLVII, page 106:

This truncated Germany is, as the Senate committee report on the agreement correctly states, a very different country, contains just 48 percent of the prewar German territory, the legal status of the Federal Republic under this agreement is, first, clearly not identical in international law with the prewar German Reich, it is, at the best, a new state, a successor state of the prewar German Reich which no longer exists in law.

It is unnecessary, because the Allied Powers, fulfilling their solemn previous declarations, determined the eastern frontier of Germany.

3. THE ALLIED POWERS DETERMINED GERMANY'S EASTERN FRONTIER

It is well known, and, indeed hardly necessary to mention, that many months before the Potsdam Conference the three principal Allied Powers showed their firm determination to push Germany's eastern frontier westward, and that they considered that Poland should receive substantial portions of the former German territory. I can add some official declarations to that quoted already in the extension of my remarks in the

House of Representatives on August 15, 1957.

In his last address to a joint session of the United States Congress dated March 1, 1945, the late President Roosevelt stated as follows:

> The limits of the western border (of Poland) will be permanently fixed in the final peace conference. We know roughly that it will include in the new strong Poland quite a large slice of what is now called Germany. And it was agreed that the new Poland will have a large and long coastline and many a new harbor. Also that East Prussia, most of it, will go to Poland and the corner will go to Russia. Also Danzig would be a lot better if it were Polish.

At the Yalta Conference no decision could be taken on Poland's new frontier, for two reasons. First of all, Germany had not yet surrendered; moreover, the Allied Powers could not reach any decision on the Polish Government which would be recognized by all of them. These two factors were stressed by Winston Churchill in his speech in the House of Commons on February 27, 1945:

> The western frontiers (of Poland), which will involve a substantial accession of German territory to Poland, cannot be fixed as part of the whole German settlement, until after the Allies have occupied German territory and after a fully representative Polish Government has been able to make its wishes known.

In the view of the Allied Powers both conditions were fulfilled at the time of the Potsdam Conference. The protocol of the proceedings of the Berlin Conference, dated August 2, 1945, states:

> In conformity with the agreement on Poland reached at the Crimea Conference the three heads of Government have sought the opinion of the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity in regard to the accession of territory in the north and west which Poland should receive. The President of the National Council of Poland and members of the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity have been received and have fully presented their view*

In consequence of that meeting, the three Allied Powers determined the western frontier of Poland stating only, that the final delimitation will await the peace settlement. What is the meaning of this formal reservation? Since the Allies reserved for themselves the right to determine Germany's frontiers, the only possible interpretation of these words can be that their joint decision must be included in the future general settlement of Germany's status and that the definite tracing of the frontier, which was only roughly described in the Potsdam agreement, should be formally inserted into the future peace treaty.

On the other hand, it is not true that in these days territorial questions are settled exclusively in peace treaties. It is interesting to note the modern international practice regarding armistices. According to Professor Lauterpacht the modern tendency of armistices is to assume the form and content of preliminaries of peace. Curiously enough, it was Germany who started this trend in international practice. In fact the said tendency of armistices is largely due to the way in which Germany treated vanquished states. The first precedent was established by Germany after France's defeat in 1870–71. Prof. M. Sibert, of Paris, observes, in this connection, as follows:

> Originally a simple suspense of hostilities destined to facilitate peace negotiations, the capitulation of the enemy is equivalent in many respects to preliminaries of peace. Perpetrated in 1870–71 by Germany against France, this evolution turned against Germany culminating in the armistice which the principal allied and associated powers imposed on her on November 11, 1918.

This tendency became still more marked in 1945 with the unconditional surrender because the establishment not only of the preliminaries of peace but also of a definite peace treaty was left entirely to the Allied Powers.

At the end of the last war many territorial provisions were inserted into the armistice agreements with Italy, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Finland. All these provisions were subsequently sanctioned by and inserted into peace treaties with the respective countries. There is no reason to suppose that Germany which bore the major responsibility for launching an aggressive war, would receive privileged treatment compared with her satellites and Italy, the latter an Allied cobelligerent at the end of the war. There was no need to specify the territorial arrangements in the armistice with Germany because, unlike the case of the German satellites and Italy which preserved their status of independent states—at least nominally—it was the Allied Powers who assumed supreme authority in Germany and officially declared that they would determine Germany's boundaries themselves.

The provisions of the Potsdam agreement show that by taking some irreversible measures the Allied Powers had in view a permanent and not only a temporary settlement. Moreover, they assigned certain German territories to Poland without the restrictions which they imposed on themselves with regard to other German territories. Let us review these provisions.

The territories east of a line running from the Baltic Sea immediately west of Swinemünde, and thence along the Oder River to the confluence of the western Neisse River and along the western Neisse to the Czechoslovak frontier, including that portion of East Prussia not placed under the administration of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in accordance with the understanding reached at this conference, and including the area of the former city of Danzig, shall be placed under the administration of the Polish state and for such purposes should not be considered as part of the Soviet Zone of occupation of Germany.

We find in these provisions a clear distinction between the status of occupation and that of administration. We know that the status of occupation of Germany was, as a matter of fact, not a status of belligerent occupation. Both have, however, one thing in common; namely, the time limit. They were conceived as temporary and provisional. The purposes of the Allied occupation in Germany were set out in part II of the Potsdam agreement—the principles to govern the treatment of Germany in the initial control period—the main purpose being:

> To prepare for the eventual reconstruction of German political life on a democratic basis and for eventual peaceful cooperation in international life by Germany.

It was stated further:

> During the period of occupation Germany shall be treated as a single economic unit. To this end common policies shall be established in regard to many economic and social problems.

The territories under either Polish or Soviet administration were obviously excluded from these provisions. In the above-mentioned declaration of June 5, 1945, it was clearly stated that Germany was to be divided into four zones of occupation to be allotted each to one of the four big powers. There was no mention of the territories placed under Polish or Soviet administration. This clearly shows that in the meaning of all these official statements these territories ceased to be considered as German territory. Moreover, the said territories were excluded from the control machinery established in Germany. We know that this control was to be assumed by a control council for the government of Germany, its relationship to the government of the zones of occupation being formulated in the following terms:

> In the period when Germany is carrying out basic requirements of unconditional surrender, supreme authority in Germany will be exercised, on instructions from their Governments, by the British, United States, Soviet, and French commanders in chief, each in his own zone of occupation, and also jointly in matters affecting Germany as a whole. The four commanders in chief will together constitute the Control Council. Each commander in chief will be assisted by a political adviser.
>
> The Control Council, whose decisions shall be unanimous, will ensure appropriate uniformity of action by the commanders in chief in their respective zones of occupation and will reach agreed decisions on the chief questions affecting Germany as a whole.

Let us observe, by the way, that the following method of action recommended to the Control Council could not apply, in any case, to the territories ceded to Poland and the Soviet Union since the German population of these territories had to be removed in accordance with the provisions of part XII of the Potsdam agreement:

> In the imposition and maintenance of economic controls estblished by the Control Council, a German administrative machinery shall be created and the German authorities shall be required to the fullest extent practicable to proclaim and assume administration of such controls. Thus it should be brought home to the German people that the responsibility for the administration of such controls and any breakdown in these controls will rest with themselves. Any German controls which may run counter to the objectives of occupation will be prohibited.

Since, therefore, it is evident that the title arising from the right of administration of territories assigned to Poland by the Potsdam agreement differed from the status of occupation of Germany by its permanent character, free from any outside interference. I wish to recall a precedent when on a similar

occasion a similar wording was adopted. During the Paris Peace Conference in 1919 the Supreme Council adopted on December 8, 1919, a Declaration Relating to the Provisional Frontiers of Poland. This declaration established a provisional eastern frontier of Poland without prejudice to the rights that Poland may be able to establish over the territories situated to the east of the said line; to the west of this line, that is, in the territory which, in any case, had to be assigned to Poland it was recognized that Poland had the right to proceed, according to the condition previously provided by the treaty with Poland of June 28, 1919, to organize a regular administration.

There is further clear evidence that the cession of the said territories to Poland was considered definitive in the provisions of part XII of the Potsdam agreement relating to the transfers of German populations, or elements thereof, remaining in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary. The wording of this clause proves peremptorily that the territories from which the German population had to be removed were considered Polish thenceforth.

The intentions of the allied governments to remove the German population from the territories which were to be assigned to Poland were disclosed long before the Potsdam meeting.

In the debate in the House of Commons on February 27, 1945, the Prime Minister, Sir Winston Churchill, spoke of the assigning to Poland a fruitful and developed land in the west from which a very large portion of the German population has already departed.

Winding up the debate, the Foreign Secretary, Sir Anthony Eden, spoke still more explicitly:

> The assumption in regard to the west is that the population shall be removed. This is the whole basis. In most cases, I can tell the honorable gentleman, they have gone already.

Many speakers in the course of this debate concurred with the views of the government.

Sir William Beveridge supported the proposal and stated:

> It may be said that these territorial adjustments conflict with the Atlantic Charter. I do not think that they really do. The Atlantic Charter implies that no peoples should be required to live in a state in which they do not wish to live. We cannot say that the Atlantic Charter rules out the kind of territorial adjustment, with transfer of population which is proposed here.

What were the reasons for the transfer of the German population from the territories assigned to Poland? Let us refer here to the United States Department of State publication, prepared by the special unit of the Division of European Affairs, National Socialism—Government Printing Office, Washington, 1943. The following appears on page 131 of the said publication:

> Notwithstanding all the specious protestations of the party's leaders, subsequent events have revealed the organized German minorities under Nazi control boring within foreign countries, undermining established governmental authority, weakening public morale, forwarding vital information to the German military authorities, and in general preparing the way for German military conquest and Gestapo rule.
>
> It may be recalled here that the German minorities formed a considerable part of the German pretext for the destruction of Czechoslovakia and for the opening of hostilities against Poland, and later against Yugoslavia as well. In the course of events in central and eastern Europe during the past years, claims and acts of the organized German minorities have in every case synchronized with claims and acts of the German Reich.

It is evident that by its actions Germany deprived itself of any right to invoke the Atlantic Charter in its favor. Such was the opinion expressed many times by Sir Winston Churchill. In his note to his colleagues of the Cabinet, dated January 14, 1944—see W. Churchill, The Second World War, volume IV, page 617—he wrote:

> By unconditional surrender I mean that the Germans have no right to any particular form of treatment. For instance, the Atlantic Charter would not apply to them as a matter of right.

He repeated this statement in his speech in the House of Commons on February 22, 1945.

There was no precedent in history that the removal of native population from a certain area would not mean the intention of the change of sovereignty. Such was, for instance, the case of huge transfers of population in Turkey and Greece after World War I. Let us observe, by the way, that these transfers put an end to a long period of Turkish-Greek enmity. During the First World War it was Germany who conceived far-reaching schemes for the removal of the entire Polish population from certain areas occupied by them and which were to be annexed by the German Reich. Still on the eve of Germany's defeat the German Crown Council decided on July 3, 1918, to annex a territory of 20 square kilometers with the important industrial center of Lodz and the towns of Plock, Kalisz, Kolo, and Konin, from big parts of which the entire Polish population had to be expelled. According to this plan established by General von Ludendorff:

> From this area, a sector comprising 8,000 square kilometers was to be immediately evacuated by the entire Polish population and settled by German colonists. It later appeared that according to calculation 300,000 families, that is about 1½ million German repatriates from Russia had to be settled there. It was hoped to destroy in this way the great Polish dream, and to frustrate once and forever the Polish aspirations to reunite Prussian, Polish speaking provinces, with the newly created Polish state.

But this was not enough for some representatives of pan-German circles. Their spokesman, Bartels, in a memorandum laid before the highest political and military authorities of the German Reich wrote:

> Sixteen millions of Poles should be displaced to the east. A forced emigration to Asiatic Russia.

In this manner the Prussian policy continued for many years, aiming at the extermination—ausrottung—of the Polish elements in the territories seized by Prussia in successive partitions of Poland. It had to be crowned by a spectacular act of elimination of the native population, on a scale unknown since the Dark Ages—for the Prussian policy of the colonization of Poland, R. W. Tims, Germanizing Prussian Poland, the H. K. T. Society and the Struggle for the Eastern Marches in the German Empire, New York, 1941.

The idea of the transfer of population was always in the minds of German statesmen in the period between the two world wars. In a memorandum, which German Foreign Minister von Neurath submitted to Vice Chancellor von Papen, on February 9, 1933, the following was observed:

> The possibility of an exchange of population is an essential safeguard that would ensure a practical solution of the minority question, or take off its edge. (Documents on German Foreign Policy, series C, vol. I, p. 39.)

It is well known that German occupants during World War II pursued an extremely ruthless and barbarous policy. On the one hand, the German Government was removing German population from the countries to which it did not raise any territorial claim, on the other it did not hesitate to exterminate physically, and expel, millions of Polish citizens, above all—but far beyond—in the territories illegally annexed by Germany in the course of military occupation.

Let us recall some figures which are too easily forgotten. During the German occupation of Poland, 5 million men, women, and children, including about 3 million Jews, were killed by Germans; they met their death in mass roundups and executions, as hostages, in torture chambers, concentration camps and prisons, many being killed and tortured for their part in the resistance movement, others in punitive expeditions staged as retaliatory measures by the enemy, resulting in the destruction of at least 300 villages, and the elimination of their inhabitants. Over 3 million able-bodied men, women, and children were deported for forced labor or military service in the German army. These figures are based on official statistics and are not an invention of propaganda services.

In his speech in the House of Commons on August 20, 1945, Mr. Ernest Bevin, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, gave the following figures relating to displaced persons in the British zone of occupation only:

> One million one hundred thousand displaced persons have been evacuated from the British zone, 1¼ million displaced persons are still housed in camps in our zone. By the autumn, it is hoped that only 645,000 will be left, of which 500,000 will be Poles. These figures give some idea of the vastness of the problem which has faced our military government in this zone. (Parliamentary Debates, Commons, vol. 413, p. 285.)

Let us quote now some passages from the report to the United States President by Justice Robert H. Jackson, chief counsel for the United States in the prosecution of Axis war criminals

(American Journal of International Law, vol. XXXIX, 1945, p. 185):

Our people saw in this succession of events the destruction of the minimum elements of trust which can hold the community of nations together in peace and progress. Then, in consummation of their plan, the Nazis swooped down upon the nations they have deceived and ruthlessly conquered them. They flagrantly violated the obligations which states, including their own, have undertaken by convention or tradition as a part of the rules of land warfare, and of the law of the sea. They wantonly destroyed cities like Rotterdam for no military purpose. They wiped out whole populations, as at Lidice, where no military purposes were to be served. They confiscated property of the Poles and gave it to party members. They transported in labor battalions great sectors of the civilian population of the conquered countries. They refused the ordinary protection of law to the populations which they enslaved. The feeling of outrage grew in this country, and it became more and more felt that these were crimes committed against us by a band of brigands who had seized the instrumentality of a state.

It is obvious that it was by these methods that the Germans in the course of World War II wished to create lebensraum for themselves in the areas subject to annexation in which the entire or a great part of the population, deprived of its leadership class, was either murdered, expelled, or reduced to serfdom.

All these facts are now often overlooked and if I refer to them, it is not for reviving feeling of enmity, but simply for explaining the background and reasons of the Potsdam decisions relating to the transfers of German population. They were conceived not as retaliatory measures, but as steps leading to the resumption of neighborly relations between Poland and Germany on a new basis. It is a matter of regret that the sense of guilt which appeared in some German circles after the war is completely missing in recent German official or semiofficial statements relating to the new Polish-German frontier. This feeling of guilt did, however, exist as it appears from an appeal issued to refugees in July 1945 by the oberburgermeister of Berlin, Dr. Arthur Werner—see New York Herald Tribune, July 30, 1945:

Twelve years of national socialism had led to the complete collapse of our country. You have been experiencing only a small part of what the Russians, Poles, Czechs, and other peoples, as well as anti-Fascist Germans had to suffer for years under Hitler.

If today some objections are being raised, allegedly from the legal point of view, as to the nature of the determination of the Polish-German frontier by the Potsdam Conference, one cannot help saying that such objections can be explained only by the persistence of the old ideas among some German lawyers, "Right is what agrees with German interests." It would be not quite superfluous in this connection, to recall in a few words, the views prevailing among German lawyers, for about a century.

4. GERMAN SCHOLARS DEFENDED BEFORE THE WAR PRINCIPLES OPPOSITE TO THOSE INVOKED BY THEM AFTER THE WAR

In the Honorable B. CARROLL REECE'S remarks we find many references to French, British, and other western lawyers but none to the German scholars, if one omits the remark made as long ago as in 1795 by the famous German philosopher, Emmanuel Kant: "Nature irresistibly wills that what is right shall ultimately prevail." Since Kant's days the German doctrine of international law has taken the view that right is what agrees with German interests. One can say that the Nazi doctrine of the German foreign law was prepared by previous generations of German lawyers. The well-known American scholar, Clyde Eagleton, states in his book, International Government—revised edition, New York, 1948, page 24—that "Hegel, the philosopher, Treitschke, the historian, and Jellinek, the jurist, constitute a triumvirate which dealt blows to international law from which it has not yet recovered."

In the 19th century, especially since the Franco-German War of 1870–71, German scholars such as, for instance, Adolf Lasson, considered international law as an expression of a certain relation of force. According to him, only a fear of war prevents a state from violating valid international agreements. He considered also that a victor state could impose any conditions on a vanquished state, and he derided those who through craftiness or lack of scruples try to prevent a victor state from acquisition of conquered territory. Unfortunately, the experience of the last war showed that Lasson's words were not forgotten by the German people.

Only he who has sufficient power to threaten his opponent in the same measure as he is being threatened himself, is entitled to anticipate the conclusion of lasting peace based on signed agreements.

Only in recent times has the right of conquest been questioned, precisely cunning and unscrupulousness are responsible for the theory of the sacred character of the legitimate borders of countries and states; this would identify conquest with theft and robbery.

The victor has power to do as he pleases with the vanquished as would have happened to him, if he had been vanquished—(Adolf Lasson, Prinzip und Zukunft des Völkerrechts, Berlin, 1871, pp. 58–62).

The theory of the supremacy of internal law over the international law prevailed in the studies of such prominent German lawyers as Jellinek, Bergbohm, Zorn, Wenzel. After World War No. 1 it was German lawyers who fought against the idea that law should rule international relations. In his preface to a very objective study of the Nazi doctrine of international law written by a Swiss lawyer, E. Bristler, the famous professor of Paris University, George Scelle noted:

Law is what is in conformity with the unfailing racial concept of the German community and what contributes to serve the interest and progress of that community. * * * National Socialist public foreign law considers international relations to be of secondary importance, and the international community as incapable to form a cohesive and efficient system. This contempt for, or minimalization of international solidarity is doubtlessly in harmony with the system of political and economic autarchy—(E. Bristler, Die Völkerrechtslehre des Nazionalsozialismus, Zürich, 1938, preface).

Bristler's work contains many references to the works of prominent German lawyers of the period according to whom the rules of international law applied to Germany only as long as it remained weak, while a strong Germany could discard all rules which might hamper its freedom of action or the pursuance of its national interests.

It is admitted almost naively and openly that a State, so long as it is still weak, like disarmed Germany, must accept—for the sake of expediency—international law as an instrument to restrain stronger states, and that it has therefore no interest in denying it—(E. Bristler, op. cit. p. 67).

German lawyers considered that the excessively legalistic approach to international life—Verrechtlichung des Völkerlebens—was a morbid inflation of law—Rechtsaufblähung. Such was the view, for instance, of Professor Koellreuter—Völkerrecht im ausgesprochenen Masse politisches Recht sei, and of Professor Waltz about whom Professor Schwarzenberger says:

Professor Waltz, in whose favor it can be said at least that he was an avowed National Socialist already during the Weimar Republic, gave the lead to his colleagues, in a public statement, prominently displayed in one of the leading German periodicals on international law: "A science of international law which fights for international justice, can never be content to analyze its material merely from a technical and positivist point of view; it must step forward itself and point the way toward the just solution of international problems"—(Prof. G. Schwarzenberger, International Law and Totalitarian Lawlessness, p. 21).

It was German interest only that provided the sole criterion of justice, and a theory was put forward that a state could discard any treaty by virtue of the clause rebus sic stantibus whenever the maintenance of the treaty hampered German freedom of action. In fact, German lawyers of the prewar period spoke ironically about Pactaservandaism, opposing, therefore, one of the basic principles proclaimed by the Covenant of the League of Nations.

Such theories were advanced by German lawyers not only for domestic consumption, but they were also loudly proclaimed before international audiences. Let us recall here the lectures delivered in 1938 at the Hague Academy of International Law by a well-known German professor, Karl Bilfinger—Les Bases Fondamentales de la Communauté des Etats, Recueil des Cours de l'Académie de la Haye, 1938, volume 2—in which he defended the dynamic conception of law furthering German territorial expansion in accordance with the notorious principle of lebensraum for the German nation:

Statics and dynamics considered from this angle may appear on the one side as in opposition to the right of secure possession of a limited space, and on the other side to the juridical recognition and the need of

lebensraum and the right of the nations to live. * * * The idea of the clause rebus sic stantibus is like an emanation and consequence of the right of the nations to live.

The concept, life is above the law, prevailed, therefore, not only in German prewar politics, a fact widely known, but also in the German doctrine of international law which provided legal and moral justification for many acts of patent violation of treaties and international customs, firmly established among civilized nations of the world.

This attitude of German scholars greatly contributed to the undermining of international law and international peace.

The ever-recurring arguments that life stands above law, that the existence of the state has preponderance over the benefits of the treaty. * * * The tendency to undermine international law, to create total arbitrariness of the states.

It seems unnecessary to deal longer with this attitude of German scholars as the matter has been thoroughly explored in many studies by American, British, and French scholars. If today we can witness the conversion of German lawyers to the more orthodox and liberal doctrine of international law, we should certainly welcome this new trend in German legal thought, provided the idea of justice is not interpreted in the old sense, right is what serves the interests of the German nation. As long as German lawyers continue to consider unjust anything contrary to German interests and as long as they try to shield Germany from painful but unavoidable consequences of transgressions of law committed in the course of the last war, such a conversion can be hardly considered as either complete or sincere.

In view of the preceding remarks we may come to the following conclusions. The Allied Powers had the right to dispose of German territory after the victorious war as Germany was an aggressor state. Moreover, the necessary safeguards had to be taken in order to prevent a further occurrence of such acts of violence committed against peaceful states. The Allied Powers determined the eastern frontier of Germany at Potsdam in accordance with their previous solemn declarations that they would do it, conferring on Poland the permanent title of state administration as opposed to the title of occupation (which was not a belligerent occupation in view of Germany's unconditional surrender), the main purpose of the latter being the reeducation of the German people on the remaining territory in the spirit of democracy and peaceful cooperation.

In interpreting a legal document one must examine the wishes of the contracting parties at a given historical moment. The famous Swiss lawyer, Prof. W. Burckhardt, in his article "The Clausula Rebus sic Stantibus"—Revue de Droit International et de Legislation Comparée, 1933, page 22—observed on this point:

The parties are bound because they wanted to bind themselves by mutual obligation and to the extent as desired by them. It is solely our [their] will which determines the existence and extent of obligations. * * * Therefore the manifestation of the will is under international law, as well as under civil law, a historical fact and not a principle.

The wishes of the parties to the Potsdam agreement as a historical fact appear clearly from the wording of this legal document. By allowing the transfer of the German population from the areas to which Poland received the title of permanent administration, free from any outside interference, the three great powers wished to take the edge off so far as the problem of minorities was concerned, a problem which has poisoned Polish-German relations for a quarter of a century. On the other hand, they did not wish to burden the future German state with the responsibility for the measures taken by the victorious powers in order to safeguard the future peace of the world.

It is perhaps worthwhile to recall here the words written by late Lord Birkenhead in connection with the settlement of the Polish-German frontier after the 1914–18 war:

"Danzig instead of being given to Poland outright was made a free city under the protection of the League of Nations, and tacked onto Poland by a strip of territory. Here was to be found a crop of troubles for the future peace of Europe. Half-measures at the time may offer a refuge from action but action must sooner or later be faced, and if the course be right there is seldom any advantages in postponing it. Thoughtful men have soberly considered that it would have been well to give Danzig and its hinterland outright to Poland. Germany could hardly have complained; she would have bowed to the fortune of war and an application of her own doctrine of vae victis—(Lord Birkenhead, Turning Points in History, London, 1930, p. 265).

There is no reason to doubt that, having this in view, the Allied Powers preferred to assign certain territories to Poland outright at Potsdam, instead of leaving this settlement to any future stage.

If, in the course of the first years following the Potsdam agreement, some doubts have arisen as regards the reasonableness of it, they were due not to the feeling that the German people were wronged, as they had to bear the whole responsibility for immense human sufferings during the war, but to the doubts as to the capacity of Poles to populate the territories recovered from Germany—compare, Mr. Bevin, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, speech in the House of Commons on August 20, 1945, Parliamentary Debates, Commons, volume 413, page 294—"The question of where the final delimitation of the frontier will rest will depend to a large extent on what the population is that returns to Poland." It is hardly necessary to mention, moreover, some declarations made by certain western statesmen at the beginning of the cold war, and closely connected with it, which although legally irrelevant, showed the fear that the Polish Nation would be absorbed by Russia and that the new frontier might in fact become a frontier between Soviet Russia and Germany. These fears are now obsolete. On the contrary, any wish to reopen the question of the Polish-German frontier would cement the Soviet bloc and increase the tension between Germany and her neighbors. Such a tension would hardly benefit the cause of democracy and freedom.

Benefactor of Kentucky and the Isthmus of Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, a former distinguished Member of the House and the only surviving member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, charged with the duty of building the Panama Canal; and who also served during several years of the construction period of that great enterprise as Civil Governor of the Canal Zone, is my good friend and fellow citizen, Maurice H. Thatcher, of Louisville and Washington.

During his Congressional tenure of five terms—1923–33—he accomplished much for the Louisville District which he represented, and much for Kentucky. The Mammoth Cave National Park; the improvement and permanent maintenance of the Abraham Lincoln National Historical Park—the birthplace of the Great Emancipator—the Zachary Taylor National Cemetery, the veterans' hospital at Lexington, Ky.; a splendid Federal building for Louisville; and two other Federal hospitals for the State; increased appropriations for books and apparatus for the blind of the schools of America; and effective labors for the creation of our domestic and foreign airmail activities, are some of the results achieved through his legislative efforts and—together with a number of other important achievements wrought by him while a Member of Congress—stand as monuments of his wise and effective endeavors.

Also, he brought about in 1931 the creation of the Eastern National Park-to-Park Highway, connecting the major national parks east of the Mississippi, and since then has served as president of the Eastern National Park-to-Park Highway Association, which he organized in that year. He has long labored to bring about the construction of a national parkway extending from the Great Smoky Mountains National Park by way the Mammoth Cave National Park, to connect with the Natchez Trace Parkway near Nashville, Tenn., and thus to provide a continuous national parkway beginning at Front Royal, Va., and ending at Natchez, Miss., of something like 1,500 miles. The Skyline Drive throughout the Shenandoah National Park; the Blue Ridge Parkway, connecting the Shenandoah and Great Smoky Mountains National Parks, are in service, and much of the Natchez Trace Parkway is completed; and the building of the suggested link between the Great Smoky Mountains National Park and the Natchez Trace

Parkway should certainly be completed without further delay. To this end, I introduced at this Congress, H. R. 5560, providing for a survey of this link by the National Parks Service for the purpose of determining the feasibility and desirability of such construction. While no final report has yet been made by the National Parks Service, I am very hopeful that during the next session—upon my reintroduction of the measure—final report will be made, the survey authorized, and the actual construction brought about. If this enterprise eventually succeeds—and it seems inevitable if a much-needed parkway system is to be established—much credit will be due Governor Thatcher for his long-sustained, patient, and wise efforts therefor.

Not only has Governor Thatcher proven himself to be a constructive legislator so far as his District and the Nation are concerned, but similarly he was, during his Congressional service, in substantial effect, Representative in Congress for the Panama Canal, and its employees, and the Isthmus of Panama. Thus, he was the author, in Congress, of the act establishing the official ferry across the Panama Canal at the Pacific entrance of the great waterway, and providing for the construction of the connecting roadway from the western terminus of the ferry to the western boundary of the Canal Zone—at a cost of $1 million for the work and 2 ferry boats—to connect with the Inter-American Highway, of which the ferry and roadway are links. The ferry and the roadway bear the official names of Thatcher Ferry and Thatcher Highway. Also, he was the author of the legislation for the creation, maintenance, and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory in Panama City—now one of the outstanding institutions of the world for the study and research covering the cause and prevention of tropical disease. Since the laboratory was completed, its work has been carried on by Congressional appropriations authorized by the Thatcher Act, and the results achieved through its operation have been of outstanding character, and inestimable benefit. It has earned a fame which extends throughout the world. As vice president and general counsel of the Gorgas Memorial Institute, the supervisory agency of the laboratory, for many years following his retirement from Congress, Governor Thatcher has rendered invaluable—and totally gratuitous—service for the great cause of health and sanitation.

Reverting to the subject of the indicated ferry and connecting highway, it is noteworthy that the ferry has served, in an indispensable manner, the Republic of Panama and the Canal Zone in their transportation needs and requirements. This is shown by the very heavy volume of passenger and vehicular traffic carried by them since they were established and put in operation, in September 1932. As evidence of this, the official figures compiled by the Panama Canal organization—which operates the ferry—show that for the 25-year period beginning with the opening of the ferry to traffic on September 1, 1932, to September 1, 1957, there crossed on the ferry 12,968,277 automobiles and 72,696,266 passengers. Adding thereto estimates for the ensuing year from September 1, 1957, to September 1, 1958, the figures of 700,000 vehicles, and 4,303,734 passengers, there will result on the first of next month, a grand total for the ferry's use of approximately 13,668,277 vehicles and 77 million passengers.

As bearing on the subject of Governor Thatcher's continuing services for the canal and the isthmus, it is appropriate to include as portions of these remarks two brief but very interesting illustrated articles which appeared, respectively, in the September 1957 issue of the magazine Panama—published by the Colon Free Zone of Panama—and the October 4, 1957, number of the Panama Canal Review—the official publication of the Panama Canal.

The article in the Panama magazine was written by Mrs. Amy McCormack, of Ancon, C. Z., a talented author, and a civic leader in all worthy isthmian movements. It carries pictures made during their isthmian residence of Governor and Mrs. Thatcher—the latter in native Pollera costume—and also a picture of their official residence in Ancon. Briefly but most charmingly, the story of the Thatchers with regard to the isthmus is told.

The item in the Panama Canal Review tells of the very heavy traffic the Thatcher Ferry has carried through the years, and is commemorative of its 25th birthday. With the article is included an illustration of 1 of the 2 steel ramps of the ferry, made necessary by the extreme tide range of about 23 feet prevailing in this section of the Pacific Ocean—at the entrance of the Canal—the ramps requiring windlassing up or down to be flush with the shore for the accommodation of passengers and vehicles.

The indicated articles follow:

[From Panama (Canal Zone) of September 1957]

THE THATCHERS—GOOD FRIENDS

(By Amy McCormack)

When former Canal Zone Gov. Maurice H. Thatcher, now a practicing attorney in Washington, D. C., returned briefly to the canal to attend the unveiling of a monument to Col. George W. Goethals, canal builder, residents of the Panamanian border town Arraijan decided to honor the former Governor. It was during Governor Thatcher's term that a road had been built from the west bank of the canal through the Canal Zone to the Panamanian border. Without the road residents of the border town and other areas beyond would have been cut off from access to the capital except by sea.

The road had received the name Thatcher Highway from its Canal Zone builders but the Arraijan residents sought to honor the ex-Govenor in their own behalf. They presented him with a plot of ground in their town as a token of their gratitude.

Thatcher was duly grateful but, inasmuch as his duties were confined to Washington, he suggested that his gift lot be used as a playground for the local youngsters. Since then he has been negotiating for playground equipment for installation in the Parque Infantil Maurice H. Thatcher. His own contribution thereto has been estimated at about $600.

Panama's President de la Guardia is reportedly interested in raising funds for the project which is expected to cost approximately $1,500. The town of Arraijan has appropriated over $1,000 for improving the site in the hope that other interior towns will emulate the playground project.

Governor Thatcher and his bride arrived here in 1910, bringing their own cook and butler. The large house assigned to them on Fourth of July Avenue became a center of hospitality. They beautified the big house with plants and flowers, especially rare orchids. Mrs. Thatcher set about learning Spanish. She would need it for entertaining her Panamanian friends, she declared.

Perhaps the fact that they were so recently married on arriving here played a part in the Governor's affection for the isthmus. Certainly no one leaving here after Panama Canal service has kept better informed on isthmian matters than he, nor labored so hard and effectively to serve the canal and the people of both the Canal Zone and Panama.

The Thatcher Ferry, the Thatcher Highway, the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, and the Thatcher Children's Park in Arraijan are constant visible reminders of his efforts. However, few realize the great and successful services he has rendered—freely and without charge—for canal construction and maintenance employees, in all brackets, with respect to Congressional legislation for annuity and retirement benefits, running into millions of dollars; and in obtaining, through court action, exemption from income taxes of the annuities involved, thereby saving the annuitants a vast six-figure total. All this has been without a cent of attorneys' fees.

Serving five terms in Congress after leaving the zone, Thatcher was able to keep isthmian problems before the Nation and see that they received prompt attention. Even now this sole surviving member of the Isthmian Canal Commission is as greatly interested and sympathetic as he was then. Frequently the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD relates Canal Zone and isthmian activities in which he has participated or been concerned, and canal subjects about which his views are stated.

The people of Kentucky call Governor Thatcher one of their great men. The people of the isthmus object. They say he belongs to them.

NOTE.—The authorities of Arraijan (now a town of about 3,000 inhabitants), also renamed the principal street for him, Calle Thatcher.

[From the Panama Canal Review of October 4, 1957]

THATCHER FERRY HAS A BIRTHDAY

Almost 13 million cars have crossed the canal via the Thatcher Ferry.

Figures of almost astronomical proportions enter the picture when one talks about the Thatcher Ferry, which made its first run across the canal 25 years ago last month.

Between September 1, 1932, and the ferry's 25th birthday on September 1, 1957, the Thatcher Ferry made a total of 1,120,862 single crossings, carried 12,968,277 vehicles, and hauled 72,696,266 passengers across the canal.

Opening of the Thatcher Ferry and Thatcher Highway was hailed with enthusiasm 25 years ago. Local papers announced that the new route cut travel time to the interior by at least an hour.

At first the two valiant little ferryboats, the *President Roosevelt* and the *Presidente Amador* (both of which were built by the mechanical—now industrial division) worked only from 6 a. m. to 9 p. m. but public demand was so great that on July 1, 1935, the ferry service was put on an around-the-clock basis.

By 1942, what with wartime traffic, the ferries were running almost continuously, and during that fiscal year chalked up their alltime high of 61,218 trips, on which they carried 992,198 vehicles and 5,943,845 passengers.

After the opening of Miraflores Bridge, ferry traffic fell off, but it has gradually

pulled up during the past few years. The ferries now average over 50,000 trips a year, and carry more than 600,000 vehicles and 4 million passengers in a 12-month period.

The two original ferries are still in service. They are relieved during overhaul periods by their larger sister, the *Presidente Porras* which had once, as the *Nassau*, been on the New York-New Jersey run.

Again, as in 1954, Governor and Mrs. Thatcher, in March 1956, were the guests of the Canal Zone Government at the celebration, in the zone, of the 50th anniversary of the opening to use of the world-famous Tivoli Hotel, in Ancon. Governor Thatcher was the guest of honor and principal speaker at the formal ceremonies conducted at the hotel—known as the Tivoli Guest House since the completion of the great luxury hotel, El Panamá, in the adjacent city of Panamá.

All of which is corroborative of what all informed persons know about Governor and Mrs. Thatcher, with special emphasis on the isthmian and Congressional achievements of the former.

This leads me to say, Mr. Speaker, what has heretofore been so well said by others, namely, that Maurice H. Thatcher has been, and is, not only a benefactor of his beloved Kentucky, but also of the Isthmus of Panama. I am sure that my colleagues will join me in the hope that many years of health, strength, and useful labors lie ahead of him and his loyal helpmate.

Report to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, this is my report to the people of the 16th Ohio District, Stark, Tuscarawas, and Wayne Counties.

The 450,000 people of that District have chosen me as their Representative in Congress at 4 successive elections. At the close of each Congress I have provided a report on my activities in their behalf. This is the duty of an elected Representative in our Republic. It is a duty I am glad to perform.

During these years there have been nearly 800 rollcall votes on controversial issues of our times. I have never evaded my responsibility of casting my vote for the people of my District. Not all may agree with me, nor anyone at all times. We live in a world where honest and sincere men and women differ on the solution to public questions. This is as it should be. The important thing is that I have voted my honest convictions on these issues and that I have been present to vote on more than 96 percent of them. I shall list my stand on some of the most important issues of this Congress at the close of my report.

ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE

My annual Congressional questionnaire, mailed to thousands of citizens throughout the District, has been of great help in measuring the opinion of the folks at home so that I can better represent them. I have just mailed a final report to the thousands who replied to this poll.

In return, I do my best to keep my people informed of developments in government that affect their lives and business. Regular reports are sent to the farmers, small-business men, and others. I send a weekly newsletter to all of the newspapers and radio stations in my area as well as to many interested individuals who have asked to be placed on the mailing list.

I require my staff to be prompt and courteous in serving the public. Each letter I receive is acknowledged within 48 hours. The volume of correspondence grows heavier each year.

SERVICE TO PEOPLE

Much of my mail consists of appeals for assistance in individual problems. As this Government expands its operations it has a growing impact on the daily lives of our citizens. Thousands of veterans, servicemen, new citizens, farmers, and businessmen, have written to me about their problems. I am glad to have been able to help them iron out their difficulties. The "thank you" letters I receive for this work are a wonderful reward.

In order to serve more effectively, I maintain an office in Canton which is open daily. Constituents can reach me in Washington or Canton on short notice.

Again, this year I have been able to assist two adopted orphans to be united with families in the United States even though the regular immigration processes would not permit their entry. Through the compassionate consideration of the Judiciary Committee, special legislation was enacted in their behalf.

Also, I am proud of the splendid record of the young men whom I have been honored to appoint to the Nation's Military Academies. One of these young men now stands in the top 5 percent of the first class at the Air Academy. Others who have graduated are serving the country with distinction. This year an outstanding young Negro of Canton has entered the Merchant Marine Academy. I am proud to have had the opportunity to appoint him. In this, as in every other respect, I am deeply aware that when the elections are over and the campaign is done, political partisanship must be disregarded. I serve the people of my District to the best of my ability without regard, and usually without knowledge, of their politics, religion, race or station in life.

AGRICULTURE

Farming is the most important activity in Wayne County and makes that county one of the richest agricultural areas of Ohio. Farming is the occupation of more than 7,000 families in Tuscarawas County and 13,000 in Stark County.

Federal Government interference in the affairs of farmers has not been of benefit to the farmers of my District. Their desire and my aim has been to reduce Government controls so that farmers would have a fair opportunity to produce for the market, to expand their farms if they desired, and so that young men and women could get a start in farming. This they can never do so long as unreasonable acreage and marketing controls deaden enterprise and stifle initiative.

In this session of Congress I have helped to stand off three vigorous attempts to impose even more rigorous controls on farming. I am pleased that at last we have enacted a law that may lead to the removal of controls on corn. In the 84th Congress I sponsored legislation to take controls off wheat grown for use on the farm. The new corn program will be another step in the direction of free farming.

Again, in this Congress I sponsored legislation to improve the situation of dairy farmers. I regret that the Committee on Agriculture did not report these bills favorably. I regret the serious division of opinion in the field of agricultural legislation, and I hope that it may be resolved in the next Congress.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

During this Congress I have continued my work on the Appropriations Committee and particularly on the subcommittees making appropriations for the State, Commerce, and Justice Departments and related agencies.

It has been my pleasure to help secure the funds needed for the important work of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Small Business Administration.

Our subcommittee spent many days reviewing the budgets and operations of each of these and many other agencies, and despite the trend toward greater spending in most Government departments, we were able to find places where savings could be made.

Several members of the Appropriations Committee will not seek reelection to the 86th Congress. My seniority will entitle me to the top position on the State, Justice, and Commerce Subcommittees in the next session.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, who has constantly worked for reduced Federal spending, I considered it my duty to vote against the increase in the national debt limitation.

INFLATION DANGERS

Using the economic turndown or the international situation as an excuse, advocates of bigger Government spending proposed more than $35 billion dollars worth of unnecessary legislation this year.

This threat has made our work far more difficult. It has occupied us with the task of defeating unwise and poorly considered legislation when we might better have been occupied with constructive matters. The worst of these measures were exposed and defeated, saving the taxpayers many billions.

Nevertheless, the majority in Congress recklessly appropriated more money than the President asked for, even though his budget was very large. This means a deficit in this fiscal year. It means that tax relief for overburdened Americans must

be postponed. It threatens the stability of the dollar and the purchasing power of everyone who has invested in social security, railroad retirement, pension plans, annuities, bonds or savings accounts. It strikes with greatest force at young people just starting life at low incomes with growing families.

The free spenders, the giveaway advocates, and the sponsors of new spending programs are directly responsible for this indefinite postponement of tax relief. Higher taxes and lower buying power are the price they make us pay for the new Government programs they would force upon us, supposedly for our benefit.

FOREIGN AID AND TRADE

Again this year, I found evidence of such waste and mismanagement in the giant foreign aid program that I had no choice but to oppose it.

I was one of the original sponsors of the program to give or barter American surplus in other areas of the world where people are in need. I regard this as a sound and sensible program. It was extended by this Congress.

The general foreign aid program is quite a different story. Literally billions have been spent without tangible evidence of any improvement in the lot of the foreign recipients or in their regard for us. Each failure of foreign policy is said to be evidence that more foreign aid is needed. Does no one believe that the aid program itself is a reason for failure?

Similarly, the reciprocal trade program as administered in the past 20 years has caused unwarranted hardship on our people. Advocates of reciprocal trade take the unreasonable position that they have the only solution to promoting interchange of goods between nations. They accept as inevitable the injury done to Americans who lose their jobs because of unreasonable competitive advantages given foreign nations. I fought vigorously for sensible changes in the program that would protect Americans. A majority voted to continue the program substantially unchanged.

UNSOLVED PROBLEMS

Major problems unsolved remain to be tackled by the next Congress.

High on the list will be labor-management legislation to restrain the labor bosses who have deceived union members and used union funds for improper personal enrichment. The honest laboring man has no defense against the practices of dishonest men who have seized power in certain unions. The McClellan hearings also revealed unscrupulous alliances between crooked labor bosses and crooked management which must be outlawed if the trade union movement is going to serve its members as they intend it to.

Agricultural legislation also will be an issue. Something must be done to free farmers from an unworkable wheat program opposed by a majority of them.

There will continue to be the fight for a balanced budget, against higher taxes, debt and inflation, and in this I will continue to take a leading role.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

On the positive side, this Congress has moved forward in several important areas of activity. The Small Business Administration was made a permanent agency of Government. Sound, though limited, tax revisions were made to help small business. A new small-business investment program was authorized.

Congress came to the aid of the vital railroad industry and repealed the wartime transportation tax which had become a burden on all parts of the transportation industry, and on commerce generally.

Defense Department reorganization advocated by the President to improve our military position and speed defense preparations was approved.

A new Federal Aviation Agency was established and great progress was made in the effort to increase the safety of air travel.

The airport construction program was continued.

The interstate highway program was enlarged and expedited, providing more employment and hastening the day when this 41,000-mile system of superhighways will be a reality.

Amendments to the GI and FHA programs helped to spur a new record-breaking activity in home building that will provide millions of Americans with an opportunity to own their homes.

Improvements in the Unemployment Compensation Act permitted extension of benefits to thousands of Americans who were out of work through no fault of their own.

Congress enacted the first major civil rights legislation in 83 years.

A number of improvements were made in veterans' legislation, including a 10 percent increase in disability compensation.

Social-security benefits were increased, and the tax schedule amended so that income of the fund will more nearly meet requirements of it.

VOTING RECORD

It is a tremendous honor and privilege to serve the 16th District of Ohio in the House of Representatives. For the information of the people who have so honored me, I include here a list of some major issues of the 85th Congress, with my vote on each.

Subject	Bow's vote	House action
1ST SESSION		
Airways Modernization Act	Yes	Approved.
Foreign aid	No	Do.
Civil Rights Act of 1957	Yes	Do.
Protect FBI files	Yes	Do.
Make Small Business Administration a permanent agency of Government.	Yes	Do.
Eisenhower Middle East doctrine.	Yes	Do.
2D SESSION		
Special milk program for children	Yes	Approved.
Farmers' "straitjacket" bill	No	Failed.
Alaska statehood	Yes	Approved.
Increase debt limit	No	Do.
Defense Department reorganization.	Yes	Do.
River and harbor and flood control (later vetoed by President).	No	Do.
Foreign aid ($3,900,000,000)	No	Do.
Increase social security	Yes	Do.
Extend reciprocal trade program to lower tariffs.	No	Do.

Kennedy-Ives Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, because there has been so much heat generated pro and con about the Kennedy-Ives bill, I thought it a good idea to set forth exactly what it did. Some people may argue that it did not go far enough, but I personally think it did a lot of things that needed to be done and I voted for it on the assumption that a cleanup in some areas of the labor-management field is vital and that a half a loaf is better than no bread at all.

The following is what the bill required of labor unions and what the bill required of management:

WHAT THE BILL REQUIRED OF LABOR UNIONS

First. It required comprehensive detailed disclosure of union financial data—to members, press, public, and law enforcement agencies.

Second. It required full reports by union officers on any personal conflict-of-interest transactions.

Third. It imposed criminal sanctions for embezzlement of union funds, false reporting, false entries in books, failure to report, or destruction of union books.

Fourth. It established right of suits by union members for recovery of funds embezzled or misappropriated by union officers.

Fifth. It prohibited loans by employers or unions to union officers.

Sixth. It required a secret ballot for all union officers or the convention delegates who select them.

Seventh. It required due notice of all union elections and real opportunity to nominate opposing candidates.

Eighth. It required that union officers be elected by secret ballot every 4 years by international unions, and every 3 years by local unions.

Ninth. It prohibited the use of union funds to support candidacy of any union officer.

Tenth. It prohibited persons convicted of felony serving as union officers.

Eleventh. It granted power to Secretary of Labor to institute court action to set improper elections aside and conduct a new election.

Twelfth. It limited union trusteeships to 18 months.

Thirteenth. It made mandatory annual reports to Secretary and union members on every trusteeship, the reasons for its establishment, continuance, and operation.

Fourteenth. It prohibited counting votes of delegates of trustee bodies unless delegates elected by secret ballot, and on transfer of funds from trusteed local union to international except normal dues and assessments.

Fifteenth. It granted power to Secretary of Labor to begin a court proceeding to break improper trusteeships.

Sixteenth. It prohibited picketing for extortion or to secure payoff from employer.

Seventeenth. It prohibited solicitation for payment of fictitious fees for unloading cargo from interstate carriers.

WHAT THE BILL REQUIRED OF MANAGEMENT

First. Required every employer who spends more than $5,000 in a fiscal year for activities intended to influence employees in the exercise of their rights to organize and bargain collectively to report annually to the Secretary of Labor.

Second. Required reports from every labor relations consultant who has an agreement with an employer to provide services intended to affect employees in the exercise of their rights to organize and bargain collectively.

It has been erroneously assumed by some employer groups that this section would have required employers to report on their efforts to promote good will and sound personnel practices. The requirement has nothing to do with such worthwhile activities. It did not even prohibit employers from trying to influence employees in the exercise of their bargaining rights. It simply required a report on those efforts designed to influence employees in their bargaining rights that involve expenditures of more than $5,000. Under this section only a very small fraction of American business would have any need to report at all. Only willful failure to report relevant material carried any penalty. The section would have in no way interfered with the employer's normal communication of freedom of speech in relation to his employees. Considering the fact that the bill required unions to disclose all of their expenditures of every kind, it is clear that the limited reporting requirement of employers was extremely modest. A full analysis of employer reporting requirements under S. 3974 appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 15, pages 17919–17920.

Rear Adm. Edward C. Stephan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a statement on the assignment of Rear Adm. Edward C. Stephan, as commander of the South Atlantic Forces.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as folows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SPARKMAN

Those of us who have gotten to know Rear Adm. Edward C. Stephan, were glad to learn that he has been assigned commander of the South Atlantic Forces. This is a newly created and most important post. It calls for a top flight, able Navy officer, and the fact that Admiral Stephan was chosen as the first commander is further credit to his ability and leadership.

We all wish Admiral Stephan well in his new assignment. He has, as we know, served in the capacity of Chief of Legislative Liaison of the Navy Department during the past 2 years. It is in this position that many of us came to know him and to respect him. He is to be complimented for the outstanding job he has done for the Navy and the country in this and other positions he has held.

Letter Regarding Transfers of Land to and From Indian Peoples

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the Bureau of Indian Affairs has adopted a policy of insisting that in transfers of lands to and from Indian peoples, the movement shall always be toward taxable status. It declines to approve purchase of land in fee status, and therefore taxable, to be held in trust for the Indian tribes.

Unfortunately, in some areas in the United States, Indians are excluded from the benefits of local governmental services and agencies. In these circumstances, the policy of requiring Indians to pay taxes on their lands appear to work an injustice.

I have written the Honorable Glenn L. Emmons, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, a letter of inquiry in regard to this subject which will be of interest in all States where Indian tribes are located. I ask unanimous consent to include it in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR
AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
August 15, 1958.

Hon. GLENN L. EMMONS,
Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COMMISSIONER EMMONS: Thank you for your letter of July 28, 1958, respecting the Flathead land-acquisition program, and the enclosed letter to the area director approving that program in part and disapproving it in part.

At the moment I wish to inquire respecting the disapproval of the purchase of fee-owned lands in Flathead Lake and Sanders Counties in trust to the extent it would result in exempting the lands from taxation. You state in your letter to the area director that while far more than the 4,710 acres proposed to be placed in trust will be placed on the tax roll by the sale or fee patenting of individual trust or restricted lands, still it is not the policy of the Department or the Bureau to permit the purchase in trust of lands that are held in fee status; and you disapprove the program as to such purchases, but indicate the tribes may purchase them if they are willing to take "fee", by which I understand you to mean "taxable," title.

The insistence of the Bureau and the Department upon land going into a locally-taxable status and not being withdrawn from that status has been one of the sorest points insistently asserted as grievances by Indians, both to me personally and to the committee of which I have the honor to be chairman. We have heard over and over again that the Bureau is intent upon depriving Indians of their lands through making them subject to taxes from which (even when the Indians can pay) they derive no benefits whatever. I realize that you, too, are concerned with this ever-swelling protest, as you made apparent in connection with your announcement of the recent moratorium on land sales. I am concerned, though, that the present ruling as to the program may be regarded by the Flathead people as indicating that the ultimate conclusion of the study being undertaken during the moratorium is pretty well prejudged.

I have been given to understand by the Flathead Tribes themselves—whom you propose to permit to undertake a program with their own funds only on condition that they pay taxes on any of the 4,710 acres which you approve as proper for them to acquire—that in actuality both the State of Montana and the counties concerned do not permit Indians to share in the benefits of the local taxes even when they pay such taxes—as all do with some taxes and many do with all local taxes. I know that you and your staff have been concerned with discrimination against Indians in the handling of State and county funds. And in the case of the Flathead Tribes, in January 1957, I was furnished by their attorneys with a letter of your Billings office plainly developing the local discrimination. As a result of that letter, and in connection with certain bills then undergoing active review before the committee, I took occasion to have my staff confer with Assistant Commissioner Gifford on this matter and was assured that your office was fully alert to these discriminations involving the Flatheads and other Montana tribes. I understood that such discriminations were looked upon by you with disfavor.

Accordingly, I would like some expression from you as to the present status of the matter of Indians' sharing in the benefits of the local real-estate taxes in Montana, which you propose as a matter of policy the Flatheads be required to pay on any of the fee-patent lands to be purchased. To what extent, if at all, have the discriminatory Montana statutes relating to Indians been modified or repealed? What steps has your office taken to see that these discriminations—whether or not provided for by State statute—are nullified? To what extent was the sharing or not sharing by Indians generally and the Flathead Tribes in particular in the benefits purchased from the local real-estate taxes and other taxes included in the real estate tax (such as the county poor tax in Montana) considered in the formulation of the policy referred to in your letter to the Area Director?

With answers to these questions at hand I feel that I may better evaluate the policy to which your office and the Department is currently adhering. I will also be able to consider the extent to which this policy accords when the plain policy expressed by Congress in Section 5 of the Indian Reorganization Act (25 U. S. C. 465) authorizing acquisition of lands for tribal use and providing that "title shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the Indian tribe or individual Indian for which the land is acquired, and such lands or rights shall be exempt from State and local taxation"; and for that matter with the policy of the Act of June 24, 1946, to which you refer, authorizing the expenditure of tribal funds for purposes designated by the Tribal Council and approved by the Secre-

tary but with the proviso that it shall be in accordance with the tribal constitution and charter—each of which was adopted under the Indian Reorganization Act itself.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senator.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address by me at the bicentennial celebration of Fort Bedford, Bedford, Pa., August 22, 1958.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF FORT BEDFORD, BEDFORD, PA., AUGUST 22, 1958

It is always a pleasure to take part in the celebration of an important anniversary, recalling the glories of our historic past.

It is good for America to hold assemblies such as this because they give us a better understanding of the toil, heroism, and sacrifice that built the foundation of our Nation's greatness.

In many public addresses, and on other occasions, I have emphasized how important it is for every one of us to learn more about our history. Any American who studies the record of our Nation's beginnings cannot fail to be inspired by the courage and self-reliance of the early pioneers—their love of liberty, their confidence in themselves, their deep and abiding faith in God.

A deeper understanding of our history generates patriotism. It stimulates a desire to have a part in government. It strengthens love of our country and devotion to its sacred ideals.

This bicentennial celebration of Fort Bedford is therefore an event of outstanding national importance. It calls upon us to assess our strength as a Nation. It is likewise a time to measure our shortcomings in order that we may be prepared to overcome any obstacle to greater achievement in the future.

The early history of Bedford is a thrilling chapter in the romance of advancing civilization on this continent. It tells of heroic soldiers, enterprising traders and trappers and sturdy, self-reliant, God-fearing pioneer settlers. We are proud of the many descendants of those early pioneers who are still carrying on the fight for the American ideals of freedom and constitutional government.

Two hundreds years ago Fort Bedford was the strong outpost of our western frontier. Here was heard the tramp of marching soldiers. In these hills Indian fighting went on year after year.

Garrett Pendergrass and his fellow settlers knew all the hardships and the perils of frontier life. Danger was an ever-present part of their daily lives. Back-breaking toil was their only assurance of survival.

Their most precious possession was freedom.

Faith in God strengthened and sustained them in their struggle to establish new homes where they could live as free men—free to carve out their own destiny and to build with their own hands a better future for themselves and their children.

Above all else, they wanted freedom to worship in the manner of their choice, in the faith which brought them closer to God, without fear of tyranny or persecution.

They cleared the forests and tilled the soil. They built schools and churches. They depended upon their own efforts, their own hard work, energy and thrift, to provide the necessities of life and the meager comforts available in those days.

They fought the French and the Indians. They fought the revolution to throw off the yoke of oppressive government. They established a Republic which recognized as God-given the right of every man to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

They created a government based on the fundamental principles of freedom of the individual, equal opportunity, and equal justice.

I am so glad that the patriotic people from Bedford to Pittsburgh are celebrating history this year. The people living along the Forbes Road have a great heritage. General Forbes' Road and Braddock's Road were carved through the wilderness by military men. They were not created for the purpose of conquest. They were built in order to establish and protect British supremacy at the junction of the Allegheny and Monongahela Rivers forming the Ohio. Here was the bridgehead to reach the rich valleys, plains, and mountains of the west.

No roads in all history have meant so much to civilization. These roads made it possible to develop the agricultural and industrial greatness of the United States.

In less than two centuries, the expansion of agriculture and industry and the development of our natural resources have been unparalleled in any similar area in all history. In addition we have attained cultural and religious heights never before reached.

Now let me ask a few questions.

Why have we made so much progress? Why are we now in a position where the Free World looks to us for leadership and help? Why is it that even those who criticize us and our form of government do not want to leave the United States?

Is it not because we uphold and defend the right of every man to say what he likes, to think as he likes and, under the law, to do what he likes?

Is it not that here the state is the servant and not the master of the people, and that public officials have power only as trustees for the people?

Is it not for the freedom of choice which we enjoy and the right to retain the rewards of our work and ingenuity?

Is it not because our form of government has sustained us in our sacred right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness?

I believe these are the reasons. To safeguard these precious rights all of us must bear an equal share of responsibility.

We will continue to be the greatest nation of all history if we carry out with loyalty, determination, and courage the principles supporting the American system of government.

These United States will remain great if we have proper education of our people, if we have a strong national defense supported by all our citizens, if we maintain a strong, stable, dynamic economy, if we are clean and constructive in our politics, if we are honorable in our international relations, and if we are faithful to the principles of our religious belief.

Today the greatest threat to peace and freedom in the world is communism.

Since the end of World War II the Communist dictators of Soviet Russia by subversion, treachery, and force, have gained control of one-third of the world. They have placed 700 million people in Europe and Asia under the iron rule of terror and tyranny.

They have prepared the plans and have stockpiled the weapons for world conquest and the enslavement of all free people.

Let us not play with communism. Where there is communism freedom dies. The state takes the place of God. Anyone trying to persuade us that we can accept communism and still be American does not appreciate the truth. Such people are dangerous. They should go to a country where that doctrine is practiced.

But we must keep in mind that we cannot defeat the communism by force alone. We need more than armies, more than weapons, more than wealth. Above all, we need the strength that comes from God.

We must remember that the greatest factor for victory is spiritual strength. We must turn with deeper devotion to the teachings of religion. We must place more emphasis on moral and spiritual values than on material gain.

We must have faith, faith in ourselves, faith in our country, and faith in God. A strong moral and spiritual America is the foundation of our national strength.

Are we safe and secure in our freedom? No; not if we are complacent. Not if we take our liberty for granted. Not if we talk about our rights and privileges and ignore our obligations.

We must drive out of our life the law evader and those who would rob the Public Treasury for political preference. We must be steadfast in our opposition to peace without honor, easy living without work, and all political proposals designed for selfish advantage.

Recessions and periods of prosperity come naturally in our free enterprise economy. Wage increases without corresponding increases in productivity are unsound and damaging to our country.

We are depending too much on government and that is one reason why government is costing us so much. In every country where the people depended upon government rather than their own efforts, misery and suffering was the result and eventually the loss of freedom.

In the growth and development of the United States we have had times of trial and crisis.

We have had financial depressions. We have had bloody conflict within our own borders. We have had wars to preserve American liberty from foreign aggression. We have experienced periods of reckless and extravagant living. We have had times when the spiritual side was at low ebb because we placed too much emphasis on material gain.

But, fortunately, from every period of crisis the great majority of our people has emerged strengthened in faith and in firm conviction that God rules in the affairs of men.

Faith in God, firmly established in an atmosphere of individual freedom, has been the most potent influence in the growth of America.

I recall the statement of a South American visitor who was asked to explain why the material prosperity of North America has so vastly outstripped that of South America.

This was his reply: "The people who came to South America were in search of gold. Those who settled in North America came here seeking God."

Not our material possessions, but our spiritual resources increased and strengthened through the years, are the real wealth of the United States.

God grant that America will remain forever strong in the faith of our fathers.

Today, as never before in our Nation's lifetime, we need militant men and women to go out on the highways and byways and preach the love of God and the gospel of Americanism.

Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, over a period of years I have been greatly disappointed that our Nation has not shown at all times that degree of appreciation to our neighbor to the south—Mexico—that, in my opinion, its friendly attitude toward us has deserved.

In a time of uncertainty such as that in which we are now living, it is important to have friends. While it may be important to gain new friends, we should never overlook old friends. Mexico through the years, and, in many instances, has shown its friendship to us. However, it seems to me there has been too evident a disposition upon our part to take its friendship for granted.

Mexico is a proud nation. Its people are proud. It has a right to be. Its culture extends over a period of centuries. Its achievements in recent years have been outstanding. Progress is evident in all of its activities. In education and in economic development it is pronounced. In matters of trade it is now one of our best customers. In international conferences it has never failed to support us. It is opposed to communism and its influence throughout Central and South America has been a direct and important factor in preventing the spread of communism in that section, and in strengthening the forces of freedom.

Today, as I look back over a period of years, during which I have been a Member of the House of Representatives, I take great pleasure in the fact that the committee of which I am a member, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as a result of a visit it made to Mexico, and, a study it made of the economic condition of that country, realized the greatness of its possibilities. A land rich in natural resources, particularly petroleum, it possesed the basic strength to build a strong economy.

It has only been about 10 years since our committee made its first visit to Mexico, but, the advancement that country has made in these intervening years has been perfectly marvelous. It justifies our highest expectations as set forth in the report I filed with the Congress as chairman of that committee. Each year has shown greater progress than the preceding year. And, there is very likelihood it will continue.

How has this desirable and happy result been achieved? There have been, of course, several factors that have contributed to it, but, in my opinion, the most outstanding of all has been petroleum. This natural resource nationalized and operated under the name Pemex, a completely owned and manged government corporation, directed by Senator Antonio J. Bermudez, has been most noteworthy.

To understand this phenominal success of Pemex it is necessary to know Senator Bermudez. I doubt if any less honest and courageous man could have accomplished what has been done. Senator Bermudez is a man of great ability; his character is like the Rock of Gibraltar; his honesty is unimpeachable; his courage unshakable, and, his love of country so great and boundless that it dominates his very life. I shall never forget his remarks to me as chairman of our committee when we were about to leave Mexico and return home. He said, "Mr. WOLVERTON, as you and your committee leave Mexico, I want to present to you something, not of great intrinsic value, but, yet, something that to me means more than money, something that lies so close to my heart its value cannot be expressed in anything that is tangible, I present to you this flag, the emblem of my country." I shall never forget the emotion with which he spoke and the lasting impression it made upon all of us. These few spoken words came from the heart of this great man. It gave us a clear understanding of what was in the innermost recesses of his heart.

His love of country, and, the desire to improve the living conditions of its people is a force that drives Senator Bermudez forward every day of his life. There is no opposition, there is no difficulty he is called upon to face, no discouragement of any kind or character that can deter him. He marches on with a courageous heart that knows no weakness—a strong man—a dedicated man—a man who never falters in his determination to reach the goal he has set.

It would be helpful, in my opinion, if they who fix our policy toward Mexico would take time to study the underlying spirit of men who, like Senator Bermudez, are guiding the nation in its forward march. Of course, their ways might not always be our ways, but that is not as important as knowing their motives and objectives are worthwhile. It is not our place to dictate how others shall live, or how they should do things so long as their fundamental principles are right and justice prevails. Our committee, after a close and friendly contact with the leading men in Mexico, including President Aleman, discerned that there was an honesty of purpose in their basic policies. It was a failure to recognize this that brought disagreements and misunderstandings in the past.

It is gratifying to realize that in these more recent years our national policy is undergoing some change, and that as a result we are more inclined to accept the same policy with respect to Mexico and other nations as recently expressed by President Eisenhower in his address to the United Nations concerning the Arabs when he said:

> Let me state the position of my country unmistakably. The peoples of the Arab nations of the Near East clearly possess the right of determining and expressing their own destiny. Other nations should not interfere so long as this expression is found in ways compatible with international peace and security.
>
> However, here as in other areas we have an opportunity to share in a great international task. That is the task of assisting the peoples of that area, under programs which they may desire, to make further progress toward the goals of human welfare they have set. Only on the basis of progressing economies can truly independent governments sustain themselves.
>
> This is a real challenge to the Arab people and to us all.

I have emphasized this thought because too often in the past our policymakers have been inclined to remember and not forget the happenings of the past that have brought some unhappy misunderstandings. President Miguel Aleman, whom it was the pleasure and privilege of our committee to meet when in Mexico, in time to come will be looked upon as one of the builders of a new and modern Mexico, even though at present there may be some in his own country who are critical of him. And, President Cortines, who now occupies that great office is likewise dedicated to the cause of Mexico. It is men like these who, with others like Senator Bermudez, are striving to lead their people upward and onward. They are entitled to our assistance and encouragement.

Mexico has already demonstrated its ability to succeed. It grows stronger with each passing year. We are fortunate to have this friend on our southern border as we have Canada a friend on our northern border. Friendships of this kind are far more valuable than those whose friendship must be bought by continual grants and advancements. Friendships that are mercenary give little promise of creating lasting friendships. Mexico is a friend because it wishes in its heart to be a friend. It is a friendship such as this that can be depended upon in any emergency. Our policy toward Mexico should be built upon confidence, good will, and cooperation. Its friendship toward us and our friendship toward it should entitle each to feel they are copartners, one with the other.

Vice Adm. John M. Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity of adding my voice to those which have sung the belated praises of Rear Admiral Rickover who is rightly termed the father of the nuclear submarine. My admiration of this admiral is unbounded. He has pioneered in his field in a manner that today's navigators will someday fully appreciate. Let it be clear that my regard for Admiral Rickover is of the highest order and my respect for his talent and vision unlimited.

Now I would like to enter this fray which has pitted factions within the Navy against other factions. Vice Adm. John M. Will, United States Navy, whose wife was selected for the honor of christening the twin-reactor nuclear submarine *Triton* at New London the other day, has been criticized by reference, since he

has not been associated with the nuclear power picture. He has even been dubbed an obscure admiral.

I would like to set the record straight and bring to your attention a few facts about Admiral Will which may give some clue to his critics why his wife was selected for the honor of christening the *Triton*.

Admiral Will served 18 years in the submarine service. This time was spent both as commanding officer as well as in shore assignment of command responsibility. He was commander of Submarine Division 6–2 early in World War II when the U. S. S. *Triton*, the third of her name and whose namesake was launched last week, was a potent member of the division. She was the first Pacific Fleet submarine to cruise against the Japanese. She made her first kill 1 day after Pearl Harbor. She went on to sink 12 more ships in 5 war patrols.

Admiral Will is now commander, Military Sea Transport Service, and is, of course, no longer with submarines. But I think it not only fitting but quite significant to bring forth this fact in connection with the selection of his wife to christen the *Triton*. Their son, Lt. John L. Will, United States Navy, a submariner for the past 2 years, is at the present time attending the Nuclear Power Training School at the submarine school in New London.

Vice Adm. John M. Will is very, very far from being an obscure admiral. He is considered not only by Navy personnel but by the Members of Congress who have had contacts with him in their official duties and by the people in the maritime industry, generally, as one of the ablest and most capable admirals in the United States Navy. It is not my desire to compare or contrast Admiral Will and Admiral Rickover. I admire both men and only seek to have justice done to both of these capable defenders of our country.

Lt. Col. Roger K. Lawless

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I cannot let this session of Congress adjourn without paying tribute to a man in the Army Liaison Office for the fine work he has rendered to me and my office, and I know I speak for the several other Congressmen who were privileged to have had the use of his services.

I am speaking of Lt. Col. Roger K. Lawless.

When I came back to Congress in January of 1956, many changes had taken place in the Army and its regulations. Colonel Lawless was assigned by the Army Legislative Liaison Service, under the able leadership of Maj. Gen. J. H. "Mike" Michaelis and Col. Sandy MacGrain, to be my adviser, so to speak, on Army matters. I can truthfully say that no matter what the situation was, no matter how ridiculous or infinitesimal, Colonel Lawless always responded with a timely solution.

I am sure that many of my colleagues who have been fortunate enough to have had his services all regret his leaving the Hill. We all wish him success and good fortune in his new assignment and travels.

FPC Accepts Producer Contentions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my statement on the Federal Power Commission's recent decision.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FPC ACCEPTS PRODUCER CONTENTIONS

The Federal Power Commission in March and April issued two decisions involving the prices which producers of natural gas may charge interstate pipeline companies. In both of these decisions the Commission rode roughshod over the recommendations of its staff and granted all that the producers requested. The Commission used these two proceedings where there were no customer or distributor intervenors which could appeal to the courts to indicate their adoption of certain policies and criteria for producer regulation which do not augur well for the natural gas consumers.

The first decision (opinion No. 309, issued March 31, 1958) involved applications of two producers, Seaboard Oil Co., and Charles B. Wrightsman, under section 7 (c) of the Natural Gas Act, to sell gas to United Gas Pipe Line Co. in Louisiana at a proposed initial price of 19.5 cents per thousand cubic feet. In that proceeding the FPC staff urged the Commission, and before that the presiding examiner, to condition the certificate so as to limit the initial price to 18 cents per thousand cubic feet.

Commissioner Connole wrote a vigorous dissent. Chairman Kuykendall and Commissioner Stueck concurred in the result. Thus, the decision represents principally the handiwork of Commissioners Digby and Kline, both of whom are from producing States, Louisiana and Wyoming.

While the Commission had imposed a condition limiting the initial contract price in the Signal Oil & Gas Co. case to 10 cents per thousand cubic feet and had successfully sustained its right to do so in the courts, volume 283, Federal Reporter, second series, page 771 (certiorari denied), it refused to take similar action in the instant proceeding holding that the circumstances were different. It also indicated that the Commission's staff had the burden of proof to show that the initial 19.5 cents price was too high. The Commission suggested that relief from the 19.5 cents rate might be obtained by a section 5 (a) proceeding. But when that argument was made by Signal Oil & Gas Co., the Commission rejected it, stating that it was an unnecessarily difficult and complex procedure and was to the disadvantage of the public interest.

The second decision (opinion No. 310, issued April 14, 1958) involved Commission action upon rate increases sought by 11 natural gas producers, which jointly sold natural gas from the West Edmond Field in Oklahoma to Cities Service Gas Co. The increase sought was 1 cent per thousand cubic feet above the then effective rate of 7½ cents per thousand cubic feet. These increases were suspended by the Commission but became effective subject to possible refund in May 1955 (Commissioner Connole dissented; Chairman Kuykendall, and Commissioner Digby concurred in the result).

After hearing, the presiding examiner dismissed the requested rate increases on the ground that the company had not sustained the burden of proof that the increased rates were just and reasonable. The companies had declined to place in evidence their cost of production figures and contented themselves with evidence of what gas was selling for in Oklahoma. This evidence was insufficient the Examiner found under the rule announced by the Commission in Union Oil Co., volume 16, Federal Power Commission, page 100, and other cases where rate increases were dismissed because the companies did not disclose their production costs.

Following a rather laborious and disparaging discussion of the rate base method of regulation for producers, the Commission rejected that method holding that it could not reasonably be used in the case. It accepted field price evidence as demonstrating the reasonableness of the increases claimed.

It is obvious that the Commission's decision in a case from which an appeal could not be taken was designed to furnish a precedent for the disposition of future cases which would be binding on the Commission's staff. A large number of producer rate increase cases were set for hearing in June and July.

The industry appraisal of the decision is reflected by an article in the April 14 issue of the Oil and Gas Journal, which states in part as follows:

"A majority of the Federal Power Commission is standing firm behind a belief that the proper yardstick for measuring independent producers' rates is the area field price, rather than original cost.

"The 4–1 decision emphasize the rift between the Commission and members of the staff who urged that producer prices should be set on the rate base formula."

Members of Congress and consumers groups who were pleased by the failure of this Congress to pass the Harris-O'Hara natural gas bill, may have congratulated themselves prematurely. It looks very much as if the Federal Power Commission, with one notable dissenter, is seeking to give the industry what it desires without new legislation.

Pension Increase to Retired Railroad Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope that the House will take favorable action on this legislation to grant a 10-percent pension increase to retired railroad workers. The Senate has already approved of this increase and I think it is incumbent upon this House to do so also.

We all know that the cost of living has increased since the last annuity increase was given to retired railroad workers. The bill to grant a 10-percent increase will come before the House today under unanimous consent procedure and I sincerely hope that there will be no objection to this pension raise. I am in favor of the bill and will vote for it.

Nuclear Ship "Savannah"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, several months ago, prior to the laying of the keel of the nuclear ship *Savannah*, the thought occurred to me that the agencies involved in the construction and safety requirements of this vessel should give consideration to the possibilities of the Communist-dominated governments propagandizing the fact that this is an atomic-powered vessel. As a result, I addressed letters to the various Government agencies which I estimated would have an interest in the thought that had occurred to me. A similar letter was also sent to the President of the United States. I am submitting for the RECORD a copy of the letter which was sent out and a list of the agencies to which it was forwarded.

I am also enclosing for the RECORD a letter which I have received from Rear Adm. J. A. Hirshfield, United States Coast Guard, which I consider to be the best reply I have received in answer to the questions posed in my letter.

This acknowledgment by Admiral Hirshfield indicates how this small but very effective arm of the United States defense services is alert and on the job.

The letters follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 3, 1958.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Now that the keel of the nuclear powered merchant ship *Savannah* has been laid, I feel it of extreme importance that the Government take steps to counter what will surely be a strong Communist propaganda barrage against the vessel's maiden and subsequent voyages.

The attack might well consist of warnings to longshoremen around the world not to work the ship because of the danger of radioactivity.

Another form, I feel certain, would be to imply that the ship might blow up without warning in the form of a nuclear burst. Port associations could be warned to refuse her entry on this account.

Normal overboard discharge from the nuclear vessel, the Reds might imply, could pollute and poison the waters of the harbor.

The eyes of the world will be on the *Savannah* when she embarks on her first voyage. I trust our Government agencies are paving her way with some of the above thoughts in mind.

I would appreciate your comments on the matter, and if material has already been assembled, I should be most happy to know about it and to obtain a sampling of the proposed advance publicity on this extremely important global mission of salesmanship for the United States.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN F. SHELLEY,
Member of Congress.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD,
Washington, D. C., August 22, 1958.

Hon. JOHN F. SHELLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SHELLEY: This will supplement our letter to you of June 26, 1958, in reply to your letter of June 3, 1958, on the problems that may be encountered in the operation of the first nuclear powered merchant ship, the nuclear ship *Savannah*. This matter has been given careful consideration and the following comments are offered for your information.

The administration and enforcement of safety standards for merchant vessels are statutory functions of the United States Coast Guard. Since the nuclear ship *Savannah* is being built and operated as a commercial merchant ship subject to the existing marine safety rules and regulations, the Coast Guard's primary interest in the vessel is to ascertain that the design and construction comply with the applicable requirements of the regulations. Upon satisfactory completion, a certificate of inspection for an ocean-going passenger vessel will be issued permitting it to go into commercial service.

As early as 1955, the possibilities of nuclear powered merchant ships began to be seriously considered. It became evident at that time that many new problems and changed conditions would be present since the existing Coast Guard regulations were promulgated primarily for conventionally powered ships. In short, there were no requirements covering nuclear power for merchant ship propulsion. This new source of power with its attendant hazard of harmful radiation brought new problems to the naval architect and marine engineer concerned with safety of life at sea.

Recognizing that the development in the peaceful application of nuclear power for merchant ship propulsion would require changes in the standards promulgated for conventional powerplants, the Coast Guard followed its past practice of developing marine safety standards by close liaison with the marine industry and related groups. Accordingly, an atomic energy panel (M-13), which had been organized under the sponsorship of the Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers, was requested to serve the Coast Guard as an industry advisory group in matters pertaining to the regulation of nuclear powered merchant ships. Currently the panel is developing safety considerations applicable to a pressurized water-cooled reactor similar in design to the nuclear system to be installed on the *Savannah*.

Because it is essential for merchant ships to be able to move freely between ports of the world, coordination of various safety requirements of foreign nations and international waterways is handled through the medium of international conferences. The next International Conference on Safety of Life at Sea is scheduled for 1960. The M-13 panel has been designated as the Nuclear Power Committee to assist the Coast Guard in the preparation of the United States nuclear proposals that may come before the conference. Work is underway by the panel to prepare our position on matters relating to nuclear safety considerations for merchant ships.

It was realized that the design of the first nuclear powered merchant ship would require close liaison between the Coast Guard, as the Government regulatory agency responsible for merchant marine safety and the Maritime Administration and Atomic Energy Commission, the agencies responsible for the construction and operation of the nuclear ship *Savannah*. This direct contact has led to a mutual understanding of the problems connected with the anticipated hazards of the nuclear powerplant and the ultimate development of safety regulations to make the operation of a nuclear ship consistent with the safety obtainable for conventional marine propulsion.

The activities of the M-13 panel are being augmented by the work of the technical committees sponsored by our engineering and standardization societies such as the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, American Standards Association, American Nuclear Society, and American Welding Society. The Coast Guard has established liaison membership on nuclear pressure vessel and piping committees and is actively participation in the development of the industry standards to be used in the design, construction, inspection, and testing of nuclear powerplants and nuclear components.

In evaluating the hazards of nuclear propulsion, consideration is being given to such possibilities as a sunken casualty in the open sea, sinkings and grounding in restricted waters, total containment of radioactive fission products, shielding and radiological safety, refueling, waste disposal, reactor controls, manning and training, standby and emergency components, inspection, overhaul and repair, and operational restrictions.

These categories form the basis of the precautions being taken in advance of the ship's completion to assure maximum safety in the operation of the *Savannah*. It will then be possible to present to the public proper assurances that the vessel could be operated with safety to crew and passengers in ports throughout the world.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. HIRSHFIELD,
Rear Admiral, Acting Commandant.

Congresswoman Bolton Reports on the 85th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in any attempt to paint the picture of the 85th Congress, first credit must go to President Eisenhower for his vision and his courage in presenting to the Congress a constructive and far-reaching program.

While naturally I like to give credit to our Republican President for asking for much of this major legislation, I know the executive branch is powerless without the Congress of the United States. Therefore, I feel that each of us in the House may feel he or she has been a part of whatever benefits may result from governmental activities of this year. My vote was cast for many of the measures I am reporting here. They represent a compromise, of course, in many cases. In some I think we spent far too much, in others too little.

It seems advantageous at this time when we are so near adjournment to summarize some of the achievements of the 85th Congress. Naturally none of this could have been accomplished without the cooperation of members of both parties.

Let us review first what has been done in the name of "the general welfare" of the people of the United States.

I. THE GENERAL WELFARE

SOCIAL SECURITY

To the 12 million people on the social security rolls the most important legislation of the session is the bill to provide a 7-percent increase in social security benefits. During this period of gradual, but steady, inflation, our senior citizens have been the hardest hit. The amendments provide an average increase of $5 a month in retirement income for this group. The total maximum benefits which may be paid to a family will be increased from $200 to $254 a month.

In addition to the social security increase, there has been legislation covering a 10-percent increase for retired Government employees.

CONFERENCE ON THE AGED

Congressional concern with the rapidly increasing problem of the senior citizen who is living longer on an ever-diminishing retirement income evidenced itself in the passage of a separate bill calling for a White House conference on the aged in 1960. To be preceded by State conferences and given leadership by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, this conference will be expected to bring to the President recommendations covering employment, housing, medical care, and community care of the elderly.

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

The 85th Congress has provided an unemployment program for returning, so-called peacetime veterans. Under this legislation wages earned in the Armed Forces will be counted in computing unemployment benefits exactly as if they had been earned in Federal civilian employment subject to State unemployment laws.

Because of the heavy unemployment compensation caused by the temporary recession which certain States were unable to meet, Congress provided for loans to States to cover up to 15 weeks (13 in Ohio) additional Federal unemployment compensation where State payments have expired.

PAY INCREASES

Recognizing the problems caused by higher living costs, the 85th Congress provided an increase of 10 percent for more than 1 million Federal employees, to be retroactive to January 1958.

A similar 10-percent increase was also given with the same retroactive clause, to our more than 500,000 postal employees.

The armed services as well were given a pay increase of $577 million a year by the Congress. It was so arranged that both men and women who are members of the Armed Forces will be paid at higher rates according to their proficiency. Both were done with the hope that encouragement would thus be given to join up and stay in.

POSTAL INCREASES

In order to bring in to the Treasury additional funds to help meet increased pay rates, a bill was passed increasing first-class mail rates from 3 to 4 cents, airmail from 6 to 7 cents. Second-class mail is to be increased progressively over a period of 3 years by 60 percent for advertising matter and 30 percent for reading matter. Third class will be raised from 1½ to 2½ cents on bulk minimum rates.

CHILDREN'S BENEFITS

Nothing this Congress has done has brought so many expressions to my Cleveland office as the continuation of the school milk program. Nonprofit schools, nursery schools, child care centers, settlement houses, and summer camps have been the beneficiaries heretofore. The recent legislation has extended this program for another 3 years and has authorized the expenditure of $75 million during each of the 3 years. Dairy farmers can rejoice that 1.75 billion half pints of their life-giving product last year nourished children in 71,238 schools and child care stations.

The 85th Congress has again extended Federal assistance to those school districts affected by Federal installations both military and otherwise.

HOUSING

The House acted unanimously to pass a $1.8 billion emergency housing legislation to stimulate the construction of 200,000 homes. We were taking into consideration not only the need for new homes but the desirability of providing 600,000 jobs during the next year.

This act reduces the downpayment on FHA-financed houses. It extends the guaranty and direct loan program for veterans. It also increases the authorization of mortgage purchases of the Federal National Mortgage Association.

Specifically, as passed by the Congress, the bill would authorize the Federal National Mortgage Association—known as Fannie May—to buy up to $1 billion worth of GI and FHA mortgages. The builder gets a commitment from Fannie May to invest in mortgages on homes he builds. He then takes this commitment to a savings and loan association bank or other member and obtains construction financing. After the homes are sold, Fannie May puts up the money for the mortgages.

The bill extends the GI home loan program until July 25, 1960, and lowers FHA downpayments to 3 percent of the first $13,500—instead of the first $10,000.

The House also increased by $4 billion the authorization for FHA mortgage insurance.

OMNIBUS HOUSING BILL

The omnibus housing bill—S. 4035—was brought before the House August 18 under "suspension of the rules" and it was defeated because it did not receive the required two-thirds vote. This bill, as brought out by the committee, would have authorized expenditures of more than $1.25 billion in a single year. Those expenditures would have been in addition to the $1.9 billion contained in the Emergency Housing Act enacted earlier this year, which I supported. The omnibus housing measure, as it came to the floor under a procedure which permitted no amendments, called for twice the expenditures the administration approved. In addition it would have established a completely new principle, removing all control of funds from the Congress. It provided for direct Federal lending of money borrowed from the Treasury; hence Congress would have abrogated its constitutional power of the purse through appropriations. Additionally this measure took the Federal Government into education via the back door by authorizing loans for building college classrooms, a provision which would not have housed a single additional citizen. Those of us who voted against this bill knew this provision should have been considered by the Committee on Education and Labor, and then, if found necessary, brought to the floor in a separate bill.

HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION

The Hill-Burton Hospital Survey Construction Act which has worked so well the past 12 years, was extended for an additional 3 years. This is one of the best examples of State-Federal relationships in that funds are made available by the Federal Government to the State for hospital construction. The program is administered entirely at the State level and it is the State agency which determines which projects are to be given grants and how much of the actual construction funds must be put up by the sponsor of the hospital.

VETERANS

One of the very constructive activities of the 85th Congress has been the codification of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, bringing them all into one act.

Pensions for widows of the Spanish-American, Indian, Mexican, and Civil Ware have been increased from $40–$57 to $65–$75.

The House also approved legislation granting a Federal charter to the Veterans of World War I. This veterans' organization was formed in Cleveland in 1949, and since then has grown to include approximately 80,000 members in more than 1,000 local chapters in 47 States. Membership is predicated upon honorable service in World War I between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918.

Incidentally, it is very gratifying to me that plans for two new Veterans' Administration hospitals for northern Ohio are progressing rapidly. Plans should be completed by October for a new neuropsychiatric hospital at Brecksville and funds for a new general, medical, and surgical hospital in the Cleveland area are expected to be included in the 1960 budget.

EDUCATION

On August 8, H. R. 13247, known as the National Defense Education Act of 1958, was passed by the House.

While I give full credit for an earnest attempt to solve some of our educational problems to my colleagues who voted for

this bill, I still remain in disagreement with them. It seems to me that it is a mistake for the Federal Government to move too heavily into the field of education.

As passed by the House this bill would have put the Federal Government into the business of education to the tune of about $1 billion. If I thought the $1 billion would achieve the purpose intended by this measure, I would be more favorably disposed. However, the entire educational experience of this country shows that the greatest progress has been made through the States and not by overall Federal controls. There is no question that he who pays the piper calls the tune, and Federal financing means Federal control of the school system everywhere.

It is noteworthy that this bill also does not get to the crux of what many educators think is our major problem—the fundamental primary school training. In passing, also let me note that this measure, while it was designed to help students get through college, makes no provision for additional pay for schoolteachers. Our educators complain more bitterly about the lack of good teachers than anything else. The only help to teachers offered here is 4 years' training for foreign language teachers, who presumably would be expected to teach at the same too-low pay scales.

Editorials from Cleveland newspapers point out that although the House-passed measure provides for college scholarships for students there are literally thousands of scholarships which go begging every year. It seems to me a mistaken theory that the mere appropriation of large sums of money from Washington can force people to do what they are apparently not disposed to do for themselves.

Our leading scientists seem to be in agreement that any program to stimulate scientific training should start in the elementary grades. This is where the child's initial interest in science or any other subject is first aroused. This measure starts from the top, in other words, at the college level and tries to take young people whose bents have already been formed and turn them into scientific channels. Neither educators nor scientists believe this feasible.

I want to point out that the Cleveland Plain Dealer also notes this measure certainly would result in drying up scores of private scholarship money. I think this would be disastrous. The Cleveland Press, a Scripps-Howard newspaper, terms this measure, "A part of the irresponsible push toward bigger Federal deficits, more power in Washington and less for the States and the people themselves."

NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER

Congress at long last approved the establishment of a National Cultural Center in Washington by adopting a Senate-passed measure. Earlier I had introduced similar legislation to accomplish this purpose. It has taken the lifetime of this Republic of ours to achieve this step in the enlightment and education of our people. George Washington, and several presidents after him, foresaw this need and President Eisenhower sent us a letter of endorsement. The National Cultural Center will be valuable not only to our own people but helpful in our relationships abroad. I am most happy this legislation has become law.

FOOD STAMP PLAN

This measure, which would have removed the distribution of Federal surplus foods from the hands of the States and placed it indirectly in the hands of the Federal Government, was defeated by the House. Brought up under suspension of the rules, it did not receive the required two-thirds vote. The bill was opposed by the Department of Agriculture partly because of its extreme costliness and partly because it would take away the jurisdiction of the States. Under the proposed measure needy families would buy orange stamps which they could exchange for food at retail outlets. They would be given blue stamps which they could exchange for surplus foods. Thus the standards of eligibility of economic needs of people would be taken from the States. Additionally costs would be huge, since arrangements would have to be made to supply more than 300,000 food retail outlets with surplus commodities. I concurred with those who opposed this measure.

II. THE DOMESTIC ECONOMY

Recognizing that certain areas in the United States—I regret to say Cleveland among them—have been hit by a business recession, the Congress has devoted much of its attention to various measures to increase the opportunity for American citizens to earn more money and overcome the recession. We have tried to provide those aids to business and industry which will permit them to offer larger employment.

SMALL BUSINESS

One such measure gave permanent status to the Small Business Administration, increased its lending authority and reduced interest rates to small business concerns. The Small Business Administration has already built a glowing record of service to small businesses in Ohio. Since its establishment, 356 business loans have been made to Ohio firms totaling $24,147,722. In addition, through May, 1958, small businesses in Ohio have completed 1,843 Government contracts for various supplies and services, in an amount of about $69,523,087. This was accomplished largely through the efforts of the SBA's Cleveland Regional Office which is headed by James G. Garwick. For small-business men with problems, Mr. Garwick or members of his staff are always available. The Cleveland office is located in the Standard Building, 1370 Ontario Street.

This Congress also passed legislation to make it possible for State development agencies, or investment agencies to set up for the purpose, to lend money to small business. It is expected to open the door for small businesses to obtain venture capital, equity capital, or long-term, 20-year loans from these agencies.

And, of course, the previously outlined increases in social security and extensions of unemployment benefits as well as salary increases in many quarters have also been of assistance to those affected by the recession.

HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

The 85th Congress also provided $5.5 billion for highway construction. When we enacted this legislation we had in mind speeding up a previously adopted program to create employment. Incidentally, the Highway Construction Act included an amendment to encourage the States to restrict billboards on interstate highways.

We also passed resolutions urging the executive departments to accelerate all Federal construction projects, both military and civilian, for which funds had been previously appropriated, to stimulate the economy.

The Emergency Housing Act, which I previously mentioned, was also another measure which played a prominent part in overcoming the temporary decline in business.

RAILROADS

Railroads annually have contributed to our economy approximately $5.5 billion in wages, $3 billion for purchase of material, supplies, and equipment, and more than $1 billion in taxes—Federal, State, and local. With the competition railroads have today from buses, airlines, pipelines, and so forth, the railroads are in great financial difficulty.

Recognizing the need to give relief to this great industry—so important to Cleveland—the Congress provided a Federal guaranty of up to $700 million in loans to railroads to finance new equipment, provide operating expenses, and meet other obligations. The same legislation also revised the interstate commerce regulations which were made during a time when railroads were considered to be a monopoly. This special aid to railroads is an aid to labor as well as to the railroads considering the $5.5 billion annual payroll of the railroads.

In a separate bill, the Congress repealed the 3-percent tax on freight which may offset the 20-percent drop in freight carloadings during the past year.

FLOOD CONTROL AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS

Of particular interest to Cleveland was the $1.5 billion harbor authorization bill. It contains authorization for $14 million additional improvements for Cleveland harbor to replace 2 railroad bridges and 1 highway bridge. It is important that this work on the Cleveland harbor be completed at an early date to make it ready for the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway in 1959 to deep-draft vessels.

RECIPROCAL TRADE

We extended the Reciprocal Trade Act for 4 years giving the President authority to cut tariffs up to 25 percent. Congress by adopting a concurrent resolution by a two-thirds vote may override the President if he does not heed the recommendation of the Tariff Commission—under peril-point action—to increase tariffs for the protection of American industry.

We should note here that foreign trade provides jobs for 4.5 million Americans. We know that many of the products manufactured in Cleveland

such as paint, enamel, automobile parts, and so forth, go into items for export. A recent Ohio industrial study by the United States Department of Commerce showed that approximately 30 percent of Ohio workers are in industries which depend upon foreign exports for profit margin.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT

A measure which I was unable to support was S. 3683, the so-called Area Redevelopment Act.

This legislation would set up a new Government agency—the Area Redevelopment Administration, headed by a Commissioner. The new agency would be given approximately $275 million in funds to make loans and finance projects in certain distressed areas.

Under the bill's definition of a distressed area, those sections suffering from unemployment due to the temporary business recession—such as Cleveland—would receive no benefits unless the present rate of unemployment increased and continued at an increasing rate for a year or longer. Because of this, to me the bill seemed to be discriminatory. No justification was demonstrated for singling out a special group among the unemployed for special benefits. All persons out of work, regardless of where they live, should be equally eligible for assistance under any Federal program.

In addition, this legislation would be of no immediate help even to the relatively few areas that would be eligible for assistance. The bill envisions a time-consuming process which includes the establishing of a new agency, the appointing of local processing committees, the soliciting of new industries to move into an area, the constructing of a new industrial building, and the retraining of workers. Even if this program were established on a workable basis, it could not possibly begin operation for a long period of time.

AGRICULTURE BILL

Congress finally agreed upon a compromise farm bill which had the support of Secretary of Agriculture Benson and the American Farm Bureau Federation. Final adoption of the measure can be regarded as a tribute to the skill, wisdom, and determination of Secretary Benson, who was most anxious to give the American farmer more freedom and self-determination. Despite all the partisan politics the farm question inevitably provokes, those of us who supported this legislation can justly feel we have done an excellent job for the American farmer.

Under this new law farmers may vote whether or not they want to continue the present corn acreage allotment with price supports between 75 and 90 percent of parity or whether they want unlimited acreage allotments with price supports of 65 percent of parity.

Cotton acreage allotments, which would have been cut without legislation, will be kept at present levels and price supports will be gradually reduced over a 4-year period.

The Wool Act was extended for 4 years and the program of donating surplus dairy products to veterans' hospitals and the armed services was continued.

LABOR LEGISLATION

The House voted down the Senate-passed Kennedy-Ives labor bill to curb labor racketeering. The record is clear that the House acted not necessarily in disapproval of the Senate measure but because of lack of any real opportunity to consider the legislation. Neither House committees nor Members were given any real chance to consider this important bill. Surely it was too much to expect that House Members could conscientiously decide upon such an important policy under a procedure which allowed only 20 minutes debate to a side, and no amendments.

The Democratic chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, the distinguished Hon. GRAHAM BARDEN of North Carolina, put in a few terse words the problem before us when he said:

> What disturbs me and rocks me is that we are called upon on the floor of this House to take a bill that is so vital, that is the most dangerous and the most far-reaching piece of legislation in the field of labor and management that has come to this floor since the Taft-Hartley bill, a bill of 48 pages; we are called upon to understand it and to do the wise thing and to keep faith with America in 40 minutes. I cannot refrain from saying that it is an insult to the House and no compliment to their intelligence to expect them to do this thing.

CONGRESS HELPS

As we approach the end of the 85th Congress, it is encouraging to note many signs that the measures we have taken are already becoming effective. It is with much satisfaction that we note reports that there is a big rise in construction activity and many factories are rehiring—Jones & Laughlin and other big Cleveland plants are reopening. There is a rise in steel production. As a result of pay increases, retail sales showed a great increase. All of this is healthy and should afford proof to the American people that both the executive and the legislative branches are deeply concerned with their individual welfare.

III. THE COMMON DEFENSE

As would be expected at this time the 85th Congress delved very deeply into all questions affecting our national defense.

Acting in cooperation with the executive branch and the military authorities, the 85th Congress took a series of actions to bolster the national security.

The Congress authorized the expenditures of $549 million to expand and accelerate construction of missile bases, detection and warning systems. We consider this of the utmost importance.

SPACE AGENCY

This Congress also established the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, a new civilian agency, headed by a Director and Deputy appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to operate under the control and direction of a policy board of seven members including the Secretaries of State and Defense and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. Developments of the last year, including the launching of the Russian sputnik, point to the urgency of establishing this new agency. We hope that the clarifying of responsibility in this legislation will accelerate our space program so vital to our defense.

GLENNAN NAMED

The President has named T. Keith Glennan, president of Case Institute of Technology, Administrator of the new National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Few persons anywhere in the world are so qualified as he to fill the new position. If I may be pardoned a personal reference here, I am glad to see Case Institute figure in the news. My father helped to found this great Cleveland institution.

ATOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

The Congress also authorized $35 million to be appropriated for construction of a reactor for an atomic-powered destroyer.

The 85th Congress also made provision for exchange of mutually essential atomic information and materials with our allies. It is important that the people know that the Congress will review any agreements to exchange military information or materials.

DEFENSE REORGANIZATION

President Eisenhower commended the Senate and House Armed Services Committees upon the defense reorganization measures which the 85th Congress passed. The bill consolidates full authority in a Secretary of Defense, gives the Secretary of Defense authority and flexibility to transfer funds from one function to another, and streamlines military command channels.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

The collision of military planes with commercial airliners pointed up the need for a single agency control of both military and civilian flights. This Congress promptly took action to establish a single Federal Aviation Agency. With all air traffic under one agency, we should have both safe and more efficient use of the airspace.

IV. FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Now let us take a look at our accomplishments in the area of foreign affairs. The activities of the Foreign Affairs Committee, on which I have served since 1941, have increased many fold in the last several years. The assumption of bilateral and multilateral treaty commitments to secure the defense of the Free World carries with it an enormous amount of legislative responsibilities. Chief among the legislation that must annually be considered by our committee is the mutual security program.

MUTUAL SECURITY

Under the leadership of the Foreign Affairs Committee the Mutual Security Act was continued in both 1957 and 1958. Now in its eighth year this program has played a key role in maintaining our Free World system of collective security. With the increased challenge presented by the growing Communist economic offensive, the program is being redirected to provide more assistance to the underdeveloped nations of the world. Through Special Assistance, the Development Loan Fund, and Technical Cooperation means are provided to affirmatively respond to the challenge.

HUNGARIAN RESOLUTION

Shocked by the brutal execution of Imre Nagy and the other Hungarian revolt leaders, the House unanimously voted its indignation at this act dictated by the Soviet Union. Our resolution stated that this Soviet reprisal shocked the conscience of decent mankind, and requested the President to express the sympathy of the American people for all Hungarians.

MIDDLE EAST RESOLUTION

At the urgent request of the administration the Congress authorized the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the Middle East in order to strengthen them against Communist aggression. After weeks of intensive study by the committee, the resolution, which provided that up to $200 million could be made available for this purpose, was approved overwhelmingly.

CREATION OF PERMANENT U. N. POLICE FORCE

Toward the latter part of the session the House approved House Resolution 367 which called for the creation of a permanent United Nations police force. In so doing the Congress recognized the valuable contribution to peace which has been made by the United Nations force in the Gaza Strip. From my inspection trip to the area last year I observed firsthand the tranquillity the U. N. forces brought to this area of great tension.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR AFRICA

In recognition of the growing importance of Africa in international affairs, the Congress enacted legislation providing for an additional Assistant Secretary of State for Africa. This act will make possible an expanded Bureau of African Affairs within the Department, and the strengthening of our consulates and embassies abroad. I have urged the passage of such legislation ever since my study mission to Africa in 1955, and believe that it will bring improved relationships with a vital part of tomorrow's world.

In nominating Joseph C. Satterthwaite to this post the administration has indeed chosen well.

STUDY MISSIONS ABROAD

As a ranking member of the Subcommittee on the Near East and Africa, I have undertaken two study missions to that area during this session of Congress. In March of 1957 I was named by President Eisenhower as an official delegate to the independence ceremonies of the new state of Ghana. The United States delegation was led by Vice President NIXON, and made official stops in Morocco, Ghana, and other African countries. The mission was enthusiastically received everywhere it went, and added to the large amount of good will which we already enjoyed throughout Africa.

Last fall I undertook at the committee's request a study mission to investigate the Arab refugee camps in the Middle East and inspect our installations in North Africa. Through the excellent cooperation of United Nations officials who maintain responsibility under which the some 900,000 refugees live, I was able to visit all the principal camps and talk with many people. My findings were submitted to the Foreign Affairs Committee in a formal report filed this year. These study missions are of invaluable help to our committee. They add to our knowledge of other peoples and countries, and give others a glimpse of what an American is. We hope such visits will bring better understanding between us and other nations.

V. A NEW STATE

The 85th Congress added the 49th star to the flag of the United States of America when we voted to admit Alaska into the Union.

The opinion of the Congress was somewhat divided, but the yeas won.

Mutual Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my statement relative to the mutual aid issue.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

In connection with the mutual aid issue, it is important for us to take note of the relationship between the United States and Turkey. This is particularly important in the light of our Government's most welcome decision to participate with the Organization for European Economic Cooperation and the European Payments used in helping to meet its growing economic problems.

Not long ago a distinguished correspondent for the New York Times, Mr. C. L. Sulzberger, had the following to say: "In certain respects the most important statesman Dulles will meet during his current leap to Europe is Adnan Menderes, the suave Premier of Turkey."

There is no doubt that the Turkish Republic is by far the strongest of our ever-diminishing allies in the Middle Eastern area. There is no doubt in my mind but that we must do what we can to strengthen Turkey, militarily and economically, so that it can have the internal resources to remain a bulwark for freedom in the Middle East and Europe. It would be tragic if we allowed the strength of Turkey to deteriorate and then moved in with a mass spending program when it is too late for any money to be of assistance to us. A dollar spent now before it is too late is worth many dollars spent later.

Turkey is today almost totally surrounded by hostile forces, including Bulgaria, Russia, the Syrian portion of the United Arab Republic and now perhaps Iraq. Only Iran remains friendly and, of course, we know of the deep tensions between Turkey and Greece. Turkey is, therefore, in a geographically weak position. We must do everything we can to bring about a settlement between Turkey and Greece on the Cyprus question so as to help strengthen that geographic weakness and reestablish the Greeks and Turks as Western allies in behalf of freedom and against Soviet totalitarianism.

Turkey's weakness, however, is more than geographic. It is primarily economic. We know that the Turkish army is as good an army as can be found in the world. The Turks have demonstrated their courage and bravery on many occasions, not the least of which was in Korea. Turkey has remained our most loyal ally in all of our diplomatic relationships. Turkey has supported us constantly in the United Nations, in the Atlantic Pact and in the Baghdad Pact. The present Turkish Government in fact is now under attack from within because it supported us in Lebanon. There is, of course, room for healthy difference of opinion within Turkey as there is room for such differences within the United States. This is the essence of the democratic society, but we must understand that internal differences can become internal chaos if they are accompanied by severe economic strains and dislocations.

For a number of years I have been urging our State Department to pay attention to the problem of Turkey. We cannot take our friends for granted. We have been, in my judgment, too much concerned with our criticisms of Turkey's internal economic organization and have allowed ourselves to be so lost in those concerns that we have forgotten our ultimate objective—the maintenance of Turkey as a firm, economically healthy and militarily strong ally.

I hold no brief for the way Turkey has managed its internal economic affairs. I am certain that they have not always acted prudently, even though I have not given this matter personal study. But I know that we in the United States have also frequently acted unwisely in our economic affairs and I know that frequently our economic decisions have been based on political considerations just as they are undoubtedly so based on many occasions within Turkey. Economics does not operate in a vacuum. Political considerations in a democracy are always present. I repeat, however, that we should never lose sight of our ultimate objective. Constructive criticism—yes; but also support.

It is reported that Turkey's foreign commercial debt is nearly $500 million today and that she has additional foreign debts of a similar amount. Turkey is today in the midst of a serious inflation. Its consumers are deprived of many needs. Its relationship with American businessmen has deteriorated because of the shortage of foreign exchange. This is an unhealthy and dangerous situation.

It has not generally been reported in the American press, but the European press has noted the fact that a number of weeks ago there was an attempted revolt in Turkey by some leaders of the army. I do not know the details of the revolt or the loyalties of those who attempted to overthrow the Government. I do know, however, that such instability in one of our strongest allies is unhealthy for the United States. I know, furthermore, that such instability is fostered and encouraged by economic deprivation and chaos.

We in Minnesota have a number of business concerns which engage in international trade. Two of our largest companies have made significant investments in Turkey and have attempted to open up plants for further economic development. In both cases the lack of foreign exchange has made it impossible for these companies to fulfill their plans. The United States Department of Commerce encourages foreign businessmen to invest in countries like Turkey and the administration has emphasized the importance of trade and not just aid. Yet, insofar as Turkey is concerned, the vast numbers of American business people who have invested in Turkey have found that the shortage of foreign exchange has made it impossible for them to fulfill their expectations.

It is this experience on the part of my constituents which has made me aware of

the problems in Turkey. I have personally discussed these problems with a number of American businessmen. I am fully persuaded that the United States has a responsibility to be of assistance to those American businessmen who have made investments in Turkey and thus, at the same time, improve Turkey's economic position. I intend to press for this because I am convinced that it is in our national interest.

I urge that the attitude of the State Department, the ICA, the Development Loan Fund, and the Export-Import Bank change and that these agencies of our Government all mobilize themselves so that we fulfill our responsibilities. Our attitude should be one of constructive assistance to a friend, a friend in need.

It is most heartening to note that our Government recently took an important step toward meeting the problem. The State Department is to be commended for that step. We are to provide a total of $234 million, together with an additional credit equivalent of $100 million, which will be extended by European countries to help Turkey get on its feet. This will all be done in cooperation with the International Monetary Fund, which has agreed to a purchase of foreign exchange for its resources amounting to the equivalent of $25 million, half in United States dollars and half in German marks.

Mr. President, it is my hope that the mutual-security program will continue to operate with the full understanding that one of our objectives is to help Turkey, our ally and friend.

Approval of a Forward-Looking Program on the Military and Peacetime Uses of Atomic Energy Is Among the Achievements of the 85th Congress

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the adjournment of the 85th Congress climaxes 2 years of intensive legislative activity by the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that resulted in the enactment of laws that vitally affect the military and peacetime use of the atom.

As ranking minority House member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I join with my colleagues on the committee in expressing the keen satisfaction derived from the beneficial results that have attended our efforts to advance the atoms-for-peace program proposed by President Eisenhower. Both from the standpoint of our national security and the peacetime usage of the atom, much progress has been made in enacting legislation vital to both programs and in clarifying the position of the United States with respect to its stewardship in this atomic age.

The following summary of major legislation sponsored by the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy during the first and second sessions of the 85th Congress shows the far-reaching effects of the various measures. The legislation reflects the time, attention, and positive action taken by Congress in further harnessing the atom for military and peacetime purposes and the attitude of this Nation with respect to sharing atomic information with friendly nations:

MAJOR ATOMIC ENERGY LEGISLATION, 85TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION—SUMMARY OF MAJOR PROVISIONS OF BILLS

AGREEMENTS FOR COOPERATION—COOPERATION WITH BERLIN

H. R. 5866 (H. Rept. 228), Public Law 85–14. S. 1549 (S. Rept. 191), 85th Congress, 1st session.

Amends the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 by the addition of a new section 125—Cooperation with Berlin.

Provides that the President may authorize the AEC to enter into an agreement for cooperation with the Federal Republic of Germany, on behalf of Berlin (United States, Great Britain, and French sectors over which the Berlin Senat exercises jurisdiction), and that the AEC may thereafter cooperate with Berlin under the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act, provided that the guaranties required by section 123 of the act shall be made by Berlin with the approval of the Allied Commandants.

H. R. 5866 (S. 1549) as "clean bills" were introduced on March 12 by Mr. COLE and Senator PASTORE and superseded H. R. 5320 which was introduced on February 26 by Mr. COLE.

Legislative history of H. R. 5866 (1957)

March 12: Introduced and referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

March 26: Reported in the House and committed to the Whole House on the State of the Union (H. Rept. 228). Called up by unanimous consent and passed.

March 27: Senate notified of House passage; bill read twice and referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

March 29: Joint Committee on Atomic Energy discharged from further consideration of H. R. 5866 and the bill was passed in lieu of S. 1549.

April 1: House notified of Senate passage. Bill examined and signed by the Speaker. Bill examined and signed by the Vice President.

April 2: H. R. 5866 presented to the President for approval.

April 12: Approved, Public Law 85–14, 85th Congress, 1st session.

APPROPRIATIONS—AUTHORIZATION REQUIREMENTS

S. 2243 (S. Rept. 437), Public Law 85–79. H. R. 7992 (H. Rept. 571), 85th Congress, 1st session.

To amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Amends section 261, Appropriations, of the Atomic Energy Act so as to require the AEC to submit more items in its reactor development program to the Congress through the Joint Committee for authorization prior to requesting appropriations for these projects.

Provides that for the purposes of section 261 a—any nonmilitary experimental reactor which is designed to produce more than 10,000 thermal kilowatts of heat (except for intermittent excursions) or which is designed to be used in the production of electric power shall be deemed to be a facility—and thus requires prior authorization before funds may be requested for the projects.

Requires prior authorization for appropriations necessary to carry out the reactor projects in the AEC cooperative programs with private industry and other persons. Provides that acts appropriating such sums may appropriate specific portions thereof to be accounted for upon the certification of the Commission only.

Amends the Atomic Energy Act by the addition of a new section—Section 58: Review—requiring the AEC to submit regulations establishing any fair price or guaranteed fair price period, or establishing any criteria for the waiver of any charge for the use of special nuclear material in the civilian atomic power program to the Joint Committee for a period of 45 days before such regulations become effective, providing, however, that the Joint Committee may by resolution waive the conditions of or all or any portions of such 45-day period.

Legislative history of S. 2243 (1957)

June 10: Introduced by Senator ANDERSON and referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

June 14: Reported, with amendments, in the Senate (S. Rept. 437).

June 19: Passed by voice vote in the Senate.

June 24: Called up in the House under suspension of rules and passed in lieu of H. R. 7992.

June 26: Examined and signed by the Vice President and the Speaker. Presented to the President.

July 3: Approved, Public Law 85–79, 85th Congress, 1st session.

Hearings: Executive hearings on Congressional review of atomic-power program were held on May 23 and June 10. Unclassified version of testimony published.

AEC SALARY BILLS

H. R. 8994 (H. Rept. 977), Public Law 85–287. S. 2672 (S. Rept. 790), 85th Congress, 1st session.

(NOTE.—Bills supersede H. R. 8003 (DURHAM).

Amends the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to increase the salaries of certain executives of the Atomic Energy Commission, and for other purposes.

Salary increases as follows:

Chairman: From $20,000 to $22,500.

Commissioners: From $18,000 to $22,000.

General manager's maximum salary: From $20,000 to $22,000.

Program division directors: From $16,000 to $19,000.

Director of Inspection Division: From $16,000 to $19,000.

General counsel: from $16,000 to $19,500.

Authorizes establishment of positions with specified maximum salaries as follows:

Deputy general manager, $20,500.

Assistant general managers (not to exceed 3), $20,000.

Executive management positions (not to exceed 6), $19,000.

Amends section 161 (d) of the Atomic Energy Act to establish the maximum salary of $19,000 for "scientific and technical personnel."

Legislative history of H. R. 8994

July 31, 1957: Introduced by Mr. DURHAM and referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

August 2, 1957: Reported in House (H. Rept. 977) and placed on Union Calendar.

August 26, 1957: Passed House.

August 27, 1957: Placed on Senate Calendar.

August 29, 1957: Passed Senate.

September 4, 1957: Approved, Public Law 85–287, 85th Congress, 1st session.

AUTHORIZATION LEGISLATION

H. R. 8996 (H. Rept. 978), Public Law 85–162. S. 2674 (S. Rept. 791), 85th Congress, 1st session.

(NOTE.—These bills supersede H. R. 5889 (DURHAM) and S. 1572 (ANDERSON).)

To authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Authorizes the appropriation of $220,230,000, in accordance with section 261a (1) of the act, for acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility

or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion. This amount includes 3 projects totaling $21 million which were added by the Joint Committee, as follows:

Project 58–b–8: Production reactor for special nuclear material; development, design, and engineering only, $3 million.

Project 58–e–14; Natural uranium graphite moderated gas-cooled power reactor prototype; development, design, and development only, $3 million.

Project 58–e–15: Plutonium recycle experimental reactor designed for the production of 15,000 electrical kilowatts equivalent, $15 million.

With respect to project 58–b–8 and 58–e–14, listed above, the law:

Directs the AEC to proceed with sufficient design work, together with appropriate engineering and development work, necessary for the Commission to begin construction as soon as practicable of the respective facilities.

Directs the AEC to submit reports to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on its designs, including cost estimates and schedules of construction for projects 58–b–8 and 58–e–14, not later than April 1, 1958.

With respect to project 58–e–15, listed above the law:

Directs the AEC to proceed with the design, engineering and construction under contract, as soon as practicable, of the prototype power reactor facilities authorized under the projects at installations operated by or on behalf of the Commission and that the electric energy generated shall be used by the Commission in connection with the operation of such installations.

Authorizes the Commission to obtain the participation of private, cooperative, or public power organizations to the fullest extent consistent with Commission direction of the project, ownership of the reactor, and utilization of the electric energy generated.

Provides that each prototype power reactor facility constructed under these authorized projects authorizations shall be operated by, or under contract with, the Commission and shall be dismantled at such time as it serves no further research or demonstration purpose.

Amends Public Law 141, 84th Congress, 1st session, and Public 506, 84th Congress, 2d session, to provide for increases in project authorizations for certain projects authorized in the 2 previous fiscal years, in the total amount of $30,535,000; and to rescind authorization for certain projects authorized in the 2 previous fiscal years, in the total amount of $129,847,000.

Authorizes the Commission to use its funds for certain purposes in connection with the anticipated move from the Commission headquarters building in Washington, D. C., to the new headquarters near Germantown, Md., in an amount not to exceed $75,000.

Authorizes funds for the cooperative power demonstration reactor program in accordance with section 261a (2) of the Atomic Energy Act as required under the provisions of Public Law 85–79 (85th Cong., 1st sess.), approved July 3, 1957. Provides for an authorization in the amount of $129,915,000 for use in a program not to exceed $149,915,000. The differential of $20 million represents types of assistance other than funds which may be provided by the Commission, including waiver of charges for the use of materials furnished by the Commission.

Provides that arrangements for projects sponsored under the second round of the Commission's power reactor demonstration program by cooperatives and publicly owned agencies shall be carried on by direct contract by the Commission and the equipment manufacturer with respect to the development, design, and construction of the reactor and related facilities, and by direct contract between the Commission and the cooperative or publicly owned organization with respect to the provision of a site and conventional turbogenerating facilities, and the operation of the entire plant.

Specifies that sale of steam by the Commission under contract with the cooperatives or publicly owned organization shall be at rates based upon the present cost of, or the projected cost of, comparable steam from a plant using conventional fuels at such locations.

Provides that the projects shall be operated under contract with the Commission for such period of time as the Commission determines to be advisable for research and development purposes but in no event to exceed 10 years. Upon the expiration of such period, the reactor and appurtenances shall be offered for sale to the cooperative or publicly owned agency at a price to reflect appropriate depreciation but not to include construction costs assignable to research and development. In the event the cooperative or publicly owned agency elects not to purchase the reactor and its appurtenances, the Commission shall dismantle them.

Provides that funds in the amount of $1,500,000 may be expended for additional general research and development in Commission laboratories to advance the technology of the fast breeder reactor concept.

Specifies that the date for approving proposals under the third round of the power demonstration reactor program shall not be later than December 31, 1958, and no funds authorized for the third round shall be expended on any other projects.

Provides that before the Commission enters into any arrangement or amendment thereto, the basis of which has not been previously submitted to the Joint Committee, the basis for the arrangement or amendment thereto which the Commission proposes to execute shall be submitted to the Joint Committee, and a period of 45 days shall elapse while Congress is in session, unless waived by the Joint Committee.

Under the new contractual arrangements established the total amounts estimated by the AEC for each project are expected to be expended as follows:

First round invitations:	
Research and development on fast breeder concept	$1,500,000
Consumers Public Power District of Nebraska	50,178,000
Second round invitations:	
Rural Cooperative Power Association, Elk River, Minn.	8,446,000
Wolverine Electric Cooperative, Hersey, Mich.	5,472,000
City of Piqua, Ohio	7,510,000
Chugach Electric Association, Anchorage, Alaska	15,809,000
Postconstruction research and development and operating expenses	11,000,000
Third round invitations:	
Research and development	30,000,000
Total	129,915,000

NOTE.—With the exception of $1,500,000 for research and development on fast breeder concept, these estimates are not listed as line items in the law but are contained in the reports.

Hearings: Parts I and II published.

Amends section 161 e. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to permit the renegotiation of commercial leases at AEC owned communities in order to avoid inequities or undue hardship prior to the sale of the Government-owned property.

Amends the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1954 by requiring the use of such renegotiated leases as the basis for appraisal of the commercial property to be sold. Provides that where such renegotiations are requested, sale proceedings shall not be initiated until the completion of the renegotiations.

Requires the AEC, the FHA, and the HHFA to report to the Joint Committee by January 31, 1958, with respect to the renegotiations, reappraisals, and sales proceedings authorized under sections 201 and 202 of this act.

Amends section 161 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 by the addition of a new subsection s. Authorizes the AEC, under such regulations and for such periods of time and at such prices as the AEC may prescribe, to sell or contract to sell to purchasers within Commissioned-owned communities or in the immediate vicinity of such communities specifically set forth utilities and related services if such utilities and related services are not available from another local source and the sale is in the interest of national defense or in the public interest.

Provides that the proceeds of such sales shall be credited to the appropriation currently available for the supply of that utility or service.

Legislative history of H. R. 8996

July 31, 1957: Introduced by Mr. DURHAM and referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

August 2, 1957: Reported in House (H. Rept. 978).

August 9, 1957: Passed House, amended. Rollcall vote of 382 to 14.

August 10, 1957: Ordered placed on Senate Calendar.

August 16, 1957: Passed by voice vote in Senate, amended by striking out all but enacting clause and substituting in lieu thereof the text of S. 2674, as amended. S. 2674 indefinitely postponed. Senate insists upon its amendments, requests conference and appoints conferees.

August 19, 1957: House notified of Senate action, disagrees with Senate amendments, agrees to conference, and appoints conferees.

August 20, 1957: Conference report filed (conference report No. 1204). (Text printed in RECORD.) House agrees to conference report. Senate agrees to conference report.

August 21, 1957: Approved, Public Law 85–162, 85th Congress, 1st session.

AUTHORIZATION—AEC PRINCIPAL OFFICE BUILDING

S. 1918 (S. Rept. 413), Public Law 85–107, 85th Congress, 1st session. H. R. 6978 (H. Rept. 539).

Amend Public Law 31, 84th Congress, to increase the authorization for appropriations to the AEC for the construction of a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia.

Authorizes an increase of $3,300,000 in appropriations for the construction of building.

In part, heard with authorizing legislation, April 10 and 17. Hearings on authorizing legislation published.

Legislative history of S. 1918

April 18, 1954: Introduced by Senator PASTORE and referred to Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

June 6, 1957: Reported by Senator ANDERSON (S. Rept. 413).

June 12, 1957: Passed over on Senate Calendar.

June 26, 1957: Passed in the Senate by voice vote.

June 27, 1957: House notified of Senate passage.

July 10, 1957: Passed in House in lieu of H. R. 6978.

July 11, 1957: Senate notified of House passage.

July 12, 1957: Examined and signed by Speaker and Vice President.

July 17, 1957: Approved, Public Law 85-107, 85th Congress, 1st session.

H. R. 6978

April 17, 1957: Introduced by Mr. DURHAM and referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

June 6, 1957: Reported by Mr. DURHAM (H. Rept. 539) and committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

July 10, 1957: S. 1918 passed in lieu of H. R. 6978.

INDEMNIFICATION AND LIMITATION OF LIABILITY

H. R. 7383 (H. Rept. 435), Public Law 85-256, 85th Congress, 1st session. S. 2051 (S. Rept. 296).

(NOTE.—These bills supersede H. R. 1981 (PRICE), S. 42 (ANDERSON), H. R. 888 (PRICE), S. 715 (ANDERSON), and H. R. 3798 (BARING).)

Amends the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 by the addition of a new section 170—Indemnification and limitation of liability, and makes appropriate amendments to other sections of the act dealing with findings definitions, and conditions attached to licenses for special nuclear materials.

Provides for a program of Government indemnification arising from nuclear incident damages which are in excess of the financial protection the licensee is required to maintain. This indemnification is limited to an aggregate not to exceed $500 million, including reasonable costs of investigating and settling claims and defending suits for damages, together with the amount of financial protection required of the licensee or contractor, for a single nuclear incident.

The amount of financial protection to be required of the licensee is set at the maximum amount of private insurance available from private sources, but the Commission may require a lesser amount to be determined on the basis of cost and terms of private insurance, the type, size and location of the facility, and other factors pertaining to the hazard, provided that for facilities designed for producing substantial amounts of electricity and having a rated capacity of 10,000 electrical kilowatts or more, the maximum amount of financial protection shall be required.

August 1, 1967, set as the terminal date of AEC's authority for the signing of an agreement for indemnification with those persons required to establish financial protection. Authorizes the Commission to enter into agreements for indemnification with its contractors during the same period of time. Permits the Commission to enter into an indemnity contract in advance of appropriations and without advertising.

Authorizes the Commission to collect an established fee of $30 per year per thousand kilowatts of thermal energy capacity for facilities licensed under section 103 of the act (reactors which have been proven to be of commercial value), and such nominal fees as it deems appropriate for other licenses, from persons with whom indemnification agreements are signed. Minimum fee set at $100 per year.

Requires the AEC to report to the Joint Committee by April 1, 1958, and every year thereafter on the operations of section 170.

Amends the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 by the addition of a new section:

"SEC. 29. Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards."

Provides for the establishment of an Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards with a maximum membership of 15 be appointed by the Commission for terms of 4 years each.

Requires the Committee on Reactor Safeguards to review safety studies and facility licenses referred to it by the Commission with regard to hazards of proposed or existing reactor facilities and the adequacy of proposed reactor safety standards; and to perform other duties as the Commission may request.

Requires the Committee on Reactor Safeguards to review each application for a facility license under section 103 or 104 b and any application under 104 c for a testing facility, and any application under section 104 a or 104 c specifically referred to it by the Commission and submit a report thereon. Such report shall be made a part of the record of application and made available to the public to the extent permitted under the security regulations of the Atomic Energy Act.

Requires the Commission to hold hearings, after 30 days' notice and publication in the Federal Register, on each application under sections 103 and 104 b.

(NOTE.—Provisions of section 29 designed to require public reports by the Committee on Reactor Safeguards as well as public hearings on applications to construct and operate most power and testing reactors, but to leave to the AEC flexibility as to procedures on applications for the construction and operation of certain types of reactors. General subject was discussed in study by JCAE staff entitled "A Study of AEC Procedures and Organization in the Licensing of Reactor Facilities," dated April 1957.)

Legislative history of H. R. 7383

May 9, 1957: Introduced and reported by Mr. PRICE (H. Rept. 435).

June 26, 1957: House Resolution 297 (H. Rept. 641) introduced and reported, granting a 2-hour open rule on H. R. 7383.

June 28, 1957: Scheduled for consideration on July 1.

July 1, 1957: Passed the House, amended.

July 2, 1957: Senate notified of House passage, H. R. 7383 placed on Senate Calendar.

August 16, 1957: Passed Senate, amended, and S. 2051 indefinitely postponed.

August 19, 1957: House notified of Senate passage; agrees to Senate amendments, clearing the bill for the President's approval.

September 2, 1957: Approved, Public Law 85-256, 85th Congress, 1st session.

INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1957

H. R. 8992 (H. Rept. 960), Public Law 85-177, 85th Congress, 1st session. S. 2673 (S. Rept. 778).

(NOTE.—These bills supersede H. R. 8251 (PRICE), H. R. 8254 (COLE), H. R. 8641 (COLE), and S. 2341 (PASTORE).)

To provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs of the International Atomic Energy Agency, and to make other provisions with respect to the participation of the United States in that Agency, and for other purposes.

Provides for the appointment by the President, by and with the consent of the Senate, of a representative and deputy representative of the United States to the International Atomic Energy Agency, who shall represent the United States on the Board of Governors of the Agency, and may represent the United States at the General Conference and serve ex officio as United States representatives on any organ of the Agency, and shall perform such other functions with respect to United States participation as the President may from time to time direct.

Authorizes the appointment or designation by the President, by and with the consent of the Senate, of a representative and alternates to attend special sessions of the General Conference.

Authorizes the President to make such other appointments as deemed necessary to represent the United States in the organs of the Agency, including the designation of any officer of the United States Government, whose appointment is subject to Senate confirmation, to act, without additional compensation, for temporary periods as the representative on the Board of Governors in the absence or disability of the United States representative or deputy representative, or in lieu of such representatives in connection with a specified subject matter.

Provides for compensation of persons appointed or designated under the provisions of the act.

Requires that United States participation in the Agency as set forth in its statute shall be consistent with and in furtherance of the purposes of the Agency and the policy set forth in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 with respect to the development, use, and control of atomic energy. Requires the President to report to the Congress not less than once each year on the activities of, and the United States participation in, the Agency.

Provides that United States representatives shall act and vote in accordance with the instructions of the President.

Authorizes the appropriation annually, out of funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to pay the United States share of expenses of the International Agency and for the salaries and expenses of the United States representatives and their staffs and other expenses authorized by law.

Provides for the employment by the Agency of a Federal employee for a period not to extend beyond the first 3 consecutive years of such employment without loss of civil service retirement and Federal employees' group life insurance benefits provided that the employee shall pay within 90 days of his separation from the Agency without prejudice all necessary deductions and Agency contributions for coverage under the Civil Service Retirement Act and the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act. Provides that if such employee applies for restoration to his Federal position within 90 days of separation from the Agency, he shall within 30 days be restored to such position or a position of like seniority, status, and pay.

Provides civil-service retirement and Federal employees group life insurance benefits for the same period of time and under the same conditions for a Presidential appointee or elected officer who leaves his position to enter, or who within 90 days of the termination of his position enters, the employ of the Agency.

Amends section 54 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. Provides that unless authorized by law the Commission shall be compensated for special nuclear material so distributed at not less than the Commission's published charges applicable to domestic distribution of such material, except that the Commission may distribute without charge only a quantity of such material which does not exceed in value $10,000 in the case of one nation or $50,000 in the case of any group of nations during any calendar year for research on peaceful uses and medical therapy.

Provides that the Commission may contribute to the International Atomic Energy Agency, or to any group of nations, only such amounts of special nuclear materials and for such periods of time as are authorized by Congress; provided, however, the Commission is authorized subject to provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, to distribute to the Agency 5,000 kilograms of contained U-235, together with the amounts of special nuclear material which will match in amount the sum of all quantities of special nuclear material made available by all other members of the Agency to July 1, 1960.

Provides that in the event of the adoption of an amendment to the statute of the Agency to which the Senate by formal vote refuses its advice and consent, all authority under this act relating to the participation

of the United States in the Agency shall terminate upon notification by the Senate to the President of its refusal to advise and consent, except the necessary authority to the prompt and orderly settlement of obligations and commitments to the Agency and other expenses required for a prompt and orderly termination of United States participation in the Agency, and provided that the United States representatives, officers, and employees shall retain, under regulations promulgated by the President, their authority under the act for period of time required to complete the settlement of matters arising out of United States participation in the Agency.

Hearings printed.

Legislative history of H. R. 8992

July 31, 1957: Introduced by Mr. PRICE and referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

July 31, 1957: Reported in House (H. Rept. No. 960) and committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

August 8, 1957: Considered by the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union under a 2-hour open rule (H. Res. 390). Passed the House, amended, by voice vote.

August 9, 1957: Ordered placed on Senate Calendar. Passed Senate, amended by striking all but the enacting clause and substituting in lieu thereof the text of S. 2673 as reported from the Joint Committee.

August 13, 1957: House disagrees to Senate amendments, requests conference, and appoints conferees.

August 14, 1957: Senate agrees to conference, appoints conferees.

August 19, 1957: Conference report (conference report No. 1200) filed. Senate agrees to conference report.

August 20, 1957: House agrees to conference report.

August 28, 1957: Approved, Public Law 85–177, 85th Congress, 1st session.

MAJOR ATOMIC ENERGY LEGISLATION, 85TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

1. Authorization legislation: The Atomic Energy Commission's authorization bill was signed by the President on August 4 (Public Law 85–590). The act authorizes $486,679,000 for AEC construction projects, including plan or facility acquisition, construction or expansion. The Joint Committee, after extensive hearings, reported clean bills which approved in toto AEC's request for authorization totaling $193.4 million, including $51 million for a gas-cooled, graphite-moderated, enriched uranium reactor. The committee added $145 million for a plutonium production reactor to be located at Hanford, Wash., provision for certain design and engineering studies for certain types of reactors, and $39 million for new physical research facilities.

2. Exchange of nuclear information and materials for military purposes: This law was signed by the President on July 2 (Public Law 85–479). The proposals to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to permit closer cooperation with Britain and other allies had been sent to the Joint Committee on January 27. After considerable modification, and the insertion of a new provision allowing Congress to veto any exchange agreements, the committee reported clean bills on June 5. The bill as signed by the President contained the following elements:

The following could be transferred or exchanged under the legislation:

A. To a nation or regional defense organization classified information as necessary to: planning, training, evaluating enemy capabilities, developing compatible delivery systems, and other military applications of atomic energy.

B. To a nation additional classified information:

1. Relative to military reactor design

2. To improve its atomic weapons development, design or fabrication (but only providing that nation has made substantial progress in developing atomic weapons).[1]

C. To a nation material and equipment, including:

1. Nuclear materials for:

(a) Military reactors

(b) Atomic weapons (provided that nation has made substantial progress in the development of atomic weapons).[1]

Transfers and exchanges of information and materials would be subject to the following limitations:

A. If the cooperating nation or regional defense organization is participating with the United States pursuant to an international arrangement by substantial and material contributions to mutual defense and security.

B. The exchange can take place only pursuant to an agreement: [2]

1. Approved by the President.

2. Performance of which the President has determined in writing will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

C. The President must also determine that the specific cooperation undertaken will promote and will not constitute an unreasonabe risk to the common defense and security.

D. In addition, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy shall be fully and currently informed.

3. Euratom legislation: Passed by the Senate and House, the Euratom legislation now awaits the signature of the President. The legislation was transmitted to the Congress on June 23 and has been the subject of JCAE hearings from July 22 to August 13. The Joint Committee reported clean bills on August 14 which contained the following main elements:

A. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 116) approving the generalized international agreement with Euratom.

B. Authorization for construction in the Euratom countries by 1963 1 million kilowatts of nuclear power capacity, except that 2 reactors may be selected to be in operation by 1965.

C. Authorization to make guaranteed contracts up to an overall maximum liability of $90 million for the purpose of guaranteeing nuclear fuel fabrication. Specific authorization must be obtained from Congress each time such a contract is entered into.

D. An initial authorization of $3 million for fiscal year 1959 for use in a cooperative program of research and development. The Commission may enter into contracts up to 5 years under the program, provided that the Community authorizes an equivalent amount for use in the cooperative program of research and development.

E. The authorization for sale or lease to Euratom 30,000 kilograms of U–235 for use in the reactors constructed under the joint program.

F. Authorization to purchase from Euratom special nuclear material from reactors constructed under the joint program up to 4,100 kilograms of plutonium.

4. Omnibus legislation: Signed by the President on August 19 (Public Law 85–681), this law amends various sections of the Atomic Enery Act of 1954, as amended, as requested by the Atomic Energy Commission, and revised by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Briefly, the bill amends the Atomic Energy Act in the following particulars:

Sections 1 and 2 amend section 53 of the act to authorize the Commission to issue licenses for the possession of special nuclear material within the United States for uses which do not fall expressly within the present provisions of section 53a, and to make a reasonable charge for such materials. Section 3 amends section 68 of the act to provide a general release of reservations of fissionable materials or source materials under acquired lands of the United States as well as public lands.

Section 4 of the bill amends section 123c of the act to provide that the Joint Committee may waive the normal 30-day waiting period for proposed international agreements for cooperation.

Section 5 of the bill amends section 145 of the act to authorize the Commission to grant security clearances prior to completion of investigation in the event of a state of war declared by the Congress or a national disaster due to enemy attack.

Section 6 of the bill amends section 161d of the act to authorize the Commission to adopt compensation rates on a retroactive basis as may be authorized by the Classification Act for other Government employees.

Section 7 of the bill amends section 161 of the act by adding a new subsection to authorize the Commission to establish a succession of authority within the Commission in the event of a national disaster due to enemy activities; a new subsection u to authorize the Commission to enter into contracts for reprocessing of materials under international agreements for cooperation; and a new subsection V to authorize the Commission to enter into long-term contracts in certain limited areas.

Section 8 amends section 166 of the act to authorize the Commission to dispose of contractor and subcontractor records in accordance with a records disposal schedule agreed upon by the Commission and the Government Accounting Office.

5. Indemnity for nuclear ship *Savannah*: Signed by the President on August 8 (Public Law 85–602), this bill was reported by the Joint Committee on July 22. It amends the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to extend the provisions of the AEC Indemnity Act to the nuclear ship *Savannah*, the United States first nuclear-powered merchant ship. The bill is limited to the construction and operation of that ship, and extends to it the same type of insurance and indemnity protection as approved by the Congress in Public Law 85–256 last year. The present Atomic Energy Act would cover the ship while it is within the United States. This bill provides indemnity protection during its operations outside of the continental limits of the United States. The bill authorizes the Atomic Energy Commission to enter into agreements for indemnification similar to those now being processed by the Commission for domestic atomic energy licenses, and also provides for limitation of liability similar to, and in the same amount, provided in present section 170 e of the Atomic Energy Act.

6. Indemnity assistance for educational institutions: This bill, which was approved by Congress on August 14, is now awaiting the President's signature. Hearings were held by the Joint Committee in July and clean bills were reported on August 14. The law, as passed by Congress, provides that with respect to any license for the conduct of educational activities issued pursuant to certain sections of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to a person found by the Commission to be a nonprofit educational institution, the Commission shall exempt such licensee from the financial protection requirement of subsection 170a. The bill also stipulates that the Commission shall agree to indemnify the licensee, and other persons indemnified, from public liability in excess of $250,000 arising from nuclear incidents. The aggregate indemnity for all persons indemnified in connection with each nuclear incident shall not exceed $500 million.

[1] Report on the bill states only nation presently qualifying is the United Kingdom.

[2] Provided there is no disapproving concurrent resolution by Congress.

Report to the People of the 15th District on the 85th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, with the ending of the 85th Congress I am submitting herewith a report on the major and significant legislation acted upon together with some reference to legislation which was not acted upon but which I believe should have been considered.

I believe that it is the duty and responsibility of a Representative in Congress to inform his constituents of the action of Congress.

Since my first election to Congress, I have regarded service to my constituents as my first responsibility. I have tried to fulfill it to the best of my ability.

All complaints, requests, or letters received by my office have had my personal attention and consideration.

My district office has been at the service of our people, and their problems have been forwarded to me while I was attending Congressional sessions in Washington. My Washington staff has been equally dedicated to the task of serving the interests of the residents of the 15th District.

Through regular newsletters and periodic visits to the District during Congressional sessions, I have tried to give a full account of my actions in Congress.

This report implements my policy in that regard.

RECORD OF THE 85TH CONGRESS

The 85th Congress was, without doubt, one of the hardest working in recent times.

I make this statement not only because of the large number of bills enacted into law, but also because of the complexity of problems which confronted Congress and the Nation at home and abroad during the past 2 years.

Two major issues overshadowed many other important problems considered by the 85th Congress.

On the one hand, the open demonstration of Communist scientific achievement, embodied in the three sputniks, served as a rude awakening to the free world. With three powerful rockets, the Soviets thrust 4,228 pounds of steel and delicate machinery into the outer space. Our three small satellites, taken together, weighed 64 pounds.

The military implications of this Soviet achievement were grave indeed. They showed that the Communists have probably succeeded in developing an effective, operational intercontinental missile, capable of carrying atomic warheads to distant lands. This is the point which primarily concerned the Congress.

On the other hand, we experienced a very real recession in our country—a recession which brought a rapid rise in unemployment, together with a continuing increase in the cost of living.

NATIONAL SECURITY

The 85th Congress took a long, hard look at our national defense, and the way in which our Nation has been facing up to the Communist challenge. It became apparent that we were not doing too well. We have been falling behind in some important respects. We took several steps to remedy that situation.

Legislation reorganizing the Defense Department was approved. Our defenses were strengthened, and their effectiveness improved, through a series of new or expanded programs tailored to meet the realities of our day. Specific authority was provided for more extensive research, and for faster construction of missile bases, detection and warning systems, nuclear-powered guided-missile warships, and other equipment.

At the same time, Congress renewed our collective security arrangements, extended our foreign trade policy, and turned its attention to improvements in our educational system, realizing that, in the long run, education will play an increasingly important role in determining our future position in the world vis-a-vis Soviet Russia.

COMMUNIST THREAT CONTINUES

Congressional actions in this field showed clear recognition of the fact that, in spite of our hopes and efforts to promote disarmament and to achieve lasting peace, we have no alternative at present but to continue building up our defenses—both at home and abroad.

If anything, Soviet rocket and missile achievements make our overseas bases and allies even more important to our own security.

It should be clear to everyone that the Communist threat has not disappeared. Their plans for world domination are real, very real. Behind the false front of friendly smiles and gestures, the Communists continue improving their war machine and have recently launched a new campaign of economic penetration and subversion.

It costs the United States over $40 billion a year to meet this threat.

Federal spending on defense, highways, and other programs was speeded up to stimulate employment. The emergency housing bill was approved, and a $4 billion increase provided in FHA mortgage insurance authorization. Federal unemployment compensation was extended to jobless workers who exhaust their State benefits. Overdue salary adjustments were enacted for the military, for postal and other Government employees. The Congress also took action on other measures to stimulate economic recovery.

Bills dealing with the recession, as well as bills relating to national defense, international affairs, veterans and servicemen, social security, health and welfare, and other fields are included in the following review of major legislation approved.

REVIEW OF MAJOR BILLS ACTED UPON BY THE 85TH CONGRESS

Notably the 85th Congress failed to pass an adequate labor reform bill for which the McClellan Labor Rackets Committee supplied ample evidence of its urgent need to protect both the rank and file dues-paying member of labor unions from unscrupulous, dishonest, and self-seeking labor leaders, and the public generally who need this protection.

The 85th Congress also failed to pass an adequate home financing and home construction bill which would have been a great stimulant to employment in the many trades and channels of commerce which are benefited by home construction. In my opinion, home ownership is one of the greatest deterrents to the spread of communism and juvenile delinquency as well as one of the greatest assets in the promotion of unity and stability of the American family.

The leadership of the 85th Congress must assume responsibility for the failure of these two important bills, both of which I voted for, but which nevertheless failed to pass.

On the plus side, the 85th Congress did pass and send to the President for his signature the following:

Approved funds for five experimental plants to convert sea water into fresh water which is vital to California's future agricultural and industrial expansion.

Statehood for Alaska, the first new State since 1912.

A Federal aviation agency to supervise and make safe the Nation's airways.

A new civilian-controlled National Aeronautics and Space Agency to promote exploration in outer space for defense and civilian benefits.

Highway construction authorized and apportionment of funds totaling $5.5 billion to relieve unemployment and improve and increase our national highways.

Federal guaranty of $500 million in loans to railroads to finance new equipment for improving our rail transportation for peacetime and in the event of war.

Loans to enable States to pay up to 15 additional weeks of unemployment compensation to jobless persons whose State payments have expired.

Repeal of 3 percent tax on transportation of freight.

Removal of the admissions excise tax on concerts and shows of nonprofit civic organizations and schools.

Established Small Business Administration as a permanent instead of a temporary agency.

A $1.5 billion harbors, rivers, and flood-control program including Los Angeles County flood control and California irrigation projects.

Compromise farm bill lowering price supports for cotton, corn, and rice to reduce cost to taxpayers.

Extension of program for sale of $2.2 billion in United States surplus products abroad.

Regulations for disclosure of data on employee pension and welfare funds to protect employees from loss and misuse.

Price labeling of new automobiles to protect the public.

Requirement for branding textiles to disclose fiber content.

Reorganization of the Defense Department for economy and efficiency.

A $39.6 billion Defense Department appropriation bill for fiscal 1959.

Authorization of $54 million to expand and expedite building of missile bases, detection, and warning system.

Four-year extension of the President's standby powers under Federal Civil Defense Act—to be prepared in event of enemy attack.

Raises in monthly pension rates of widows of Spanish-American, Civil, and American Indian wars.

Four-year program of $887 million in Federal aid to education to stimulate study and teaching of science, languages and other subjects to needy qualified students.

Freedom of information bill to limit withholding of public documents and news.

Increase in salaries of more than a million Federal classified employees and postal workers and provided for higher annuities to retired or disabled civil-service employees.

An increase in social-security old-age insurance benefits, higher tax rates based on first $4,800 of income and $197 additional in Federal contributions to State public assistance payments.

Revision of excise tax structure with some reduction. Numerous technical changes in income, gift tax, and estate provisions of Internal Revenue Code.

Provision of $260 million in tax relief for small business and a $250 million revolving fund for Small Business Administration.

Mutual Security Act appropriating more than $3 billion for military and economic aid to foreign countries.

Extended reciprocal trade agreements for 4 years and Export-Import Bank lending authority for 5 years. Both promote needed trade and employment in the United States.

Approved humane slaughter bill.

Mr. Speaker, if my vote against foreign aid and other authorization and appropriation bills which totaled $6 billion had prevailed, this would have equaled a saving of approximately $12,600,000 for the people of the 15th District.

The 85th Congress failed to pass:

Stronger penalties for subversion and specific provision making Communist Party membership a crime.

Constitutional amendment on equal rights for women.

Hawaii statehood.

Authority for State Department to deny passports to persons who knowingly have helped communism.

Procedures for Vice President to serve during disability of a President.

Revision of status of forces treaties affecting foreign trial of the United States armed services personnel.

It is a privilege and an honor to represent the people of the 15th District in the United States Congress. I am very grateful for the cooperation and responsive good will and loyalty I have received from the people of my district. Congress will convene again on January 7, 1959, and I trust that I may have the honor and privilege to continue to serve you as your Congressman.

Legislative Work of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, 85th Congress, 2d Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I wish to call the Senate's attention to the record made by the committee during the 85th Congress, and particularly during the 2d session.

It has been my honor to serve as chairman of this committee during both the 84th and 85th Congresses, and to have served as a member of it since it was constituted in its present form by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

I believe it can be said without contradiction that in no Congress since the creation of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has the committee made any greater record of accomplishment.

COMMITTEE ACTIVITY

Between the opening of the session on January 7 this year and adjournment in the early hours of August 24, there were approximately 145 week days, excluding holidays, during which the committee could meet for hearings or executive consideration of bills. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare or its subcommittees held meetings or hearings on 94 days during this period, or on almost 2 out of every 3 possible working days.

Twenty-four days over a period of nearly 8 weeks were devoted to hearings on education. Nineteen days were devoted to hearings on labor legislation. The committee and its subcommittees met in 38 executive sessions and had 5 days of conference with the House. Hearings were held on 79 different bills in the second session. Exhaustive hearings that had been held on several bills during the first session made it possible to report them without further hearings this year.

The committee placed on its agenda for consideration and action in executive session 43 different bills. It reported 30 bills, including 4 education bills, 8 health bills, 7 labor bills, 2 railroad retirement bills, 8 veterans bills, and 1 bill for the aging. It also reported 3 resolutions and 18 individual nominations, as well as hundreds of routine Public Health Service nominations. Nominations were approved for the Department of Labor, the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review, the National Labor Relations Board, the National Library of Medicine, the National Mediation Board, the National Science Foundation, the Railroad Retirement Board, and the Public Health Service.

EDUCATION

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION

For the first time since 1862, nearly a century ago, when the Morrell Act establishing the land-grant colleges was enacted, the Congress of the United States has this year approved legislation providing broad Federal assistance to the Nation's school system. This it has done by overwhelming majorities in both Houses.

The bill sent to the President reaffirms the principle that the States and local communities have and must retain control over and primary responsibility for public education. It specifically prohibits "any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curiculum program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution."

In reporting the national defense education bill to the Senate, the committee approved a coordinated 4-year program for strengthening the national defense through an interrelated set of proposals designed to assist State, local, and private effort to develop America's brainpower for defense, by stimulating students, teachers, parents, and school authorities to seek the highest possible attainment in thought and learning.

As reported by the committee, the bill included a provision for scholarship awards designed to stimulate and challenge high school students to do their best, and to stimulate parents to insist not only that their children work hard, but that their schools provide the proper courses of instruction. In addition, scholarship grants based on need were provided to aid scholarship winners to complete a 4-year college education.

An amendment to the bill adopted by the Senate reduced the scholarship award from a maximum of $1,000 to $250, and thus seriously damaged the philosophy of the bill. In addition, because the House had killed the scholarship provision in its version of the national defense education bill, the Senate amendment stripped the Senate conferees of their bargaining power in conference with the House. As finally approved by the Congress, the bill contained no scholarship provisions as such. It did, however, contain many fine provisions, of which I will mention some of the most important.

STUDENT LOANS

As approved by the Congress, the bill will authorize $295 million over a 4-year period for loans to highly qualified college students needing financial assistance. A student may receive a loan on the basis of ability and need, not to exceed $1,000 a year, or a total of $5,000. The loan must be repaid over a 10-year period, beginning 1 year after the borrower completes his higher education, at an interest rate of 3 percent. If the borrower then teaches in public elementary or secondary schools, as much as 50 percent of his loan will be canceled. The purpose of this forgiveness feature is to encourage more qualified college graduates to enter the teaching profession.

FELLOWSHIPS

Fellowship grants will be offered to 5,500 students during the 4-year period who advance into graduate school to obtain their doctoral degrees and thus better qualify themselves to be college instructors.

EQUIPMENT

The bill authorizes $280 million over the 4-year period, first, for making grants to State educational agencies for acquisition of laboratories and other equipment, including audiovisual materials and equipment, and printed material, other than textbooks, suitable for use in public elementary and secondary schools for instruction in science, mathematics, or modern foreign languages; and, second, for making loans to nonprofit elementary or secondary schools for the purchase of such science-teaching equipment.

Grants for laboratory equipment will be matched by the States on a dollar-for-dollar basis. Twelve percent of the appropriation for such equipment will be reserved for making loans to nonprofit schools; these loans are to be repaid over a period of up to 10 years. In addition, $20 million is authorized for grants to the States for administration of the program and for expanding or improving supervisory or related services in public schools in science, math, or foreign languages.

INSTITUTES

The bill provides for the establishment of two special types of teacher-training institutes to be conducted in colleges and universities mainly during the summer months. Primary emphasis will be on updating and reenforcing the teacher's knowledge of his subject. One of these institutes provides for counseling and guidance courses to train personnel engaged in counseling and guidance of secondary school students and for teachers preparing to engage in these services. The second type of institute authorized in the bill will specialize in advanced training in modern foreign languages for individuals engaged in, or preparing to engage in, teaching or supervising or training teachers in any modern foreign language in elementary and secondary schools.

COUNSELING

The bill provides for aptitude testing for children as they are entering high school, in order to identify particular talents and potentialities of each child. To assure that all of our children, and especially those most gifted intellectually, can be encouraged to develop their abilities to the maximum, guidance and counseling services will help high-school students along paths of study best suited to their individual capacities, and will give particular attention to urging that the ablest and most promising take the courses that will qualify them for admission to college.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

To help assure an adequate supply of technical personnel to assist scientists and engineers, the bill amends the Vocational Education Act to authorize the appropriation of $15 million a year to allow States and local areas to conduct less-than-college-grade courses designed to fit individuals for useful employment as technical and skilled workers in occupations requiring scientific or technical knowledge.

LANGUAGES

To help meet the defense and foreign relations needs of the Nation, language and area centers will be provided to give instruction in the languages and cultures of foreign peoples.

RESEARCH

There is also provision for research and experimentation in more effective utilization in television, radio, motion-picture, and related mediums for educational purposes. The Commissioner of Education, in cooperation with an advisory council on new educational mediums, will, through grants and contracts, conduct, assist, and foster such research and experimentation.

INFORMATION

The bill also creates within the National Science Foundation a Scientific Information Service, which will be responsible for providing for indexing, abstracting, and translating scientific papers from all over the world and disseminating scientific information to the Nation's researchers and scientists. The Foundation, through this service, will undertake programs to develop new and improved methods, including mechanized systems, for making scientific information available.

These are some of the outstanding features in the National Defense Education Act. This act is the culmination of 40 years of struggle to place an education bill on the statute books. Beginning 40 years ago with what was known as the Sterling-Towner bill, there has been a continuing effort to pass an education bill. Many committees and commissions have been established to study education bills, and there have been many recommendations. Yet for 40 years not a single broad education bill ever saw the light of day until the passage of the national defense education bill at this session of the Congress.

If the 85th Congress is remembered for nothing else—and certainly it will be remembered for its many magnificent accomplishments—it will stand in history as the first Congress to enact a law designed to stimulate and encourage quality in learning at all levels of our educational system. In so doing, the Congress has further enabled the Federal Government to meet its immediate and direct responsibility for the national defense and for the conduct of the Nation's foreign policy.

FEDERALLY IMPACTED AREAS

Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, provide for assistance to school districts in federally impacted areas. Under Public Law 815, payments are made to help build schools in districts burdened with substantial increases in their school memberships, due to Federal activities. Under Public Law 874, payments are made to school districts to help meet their operating and maintenance expenses where such districts are providing education for federally connected children.

The bill which the committee reported and which was enacted into law establishes on a permanent basis programs under both Public Law 815 and Public Law 874 which apply to so-called category A pupils, that is, children of persons who both reside and work on Federal property. The bill also extended programs under both these laws, insofar as they relate to other children in federally impacted areas, for a 3-year period until June 30, 1961. In addition, the bill made a number of other changes in the manner in which these laws are administered.

According to the Office of Education, funds under these laws go into 3,300 school districts which have almost one-fourth of the Nation's schoolchildren.

MENTALLY RETARDED CHILDREN

There are in the United States approximately 1 million mentally retarded children of school age of whom only about 15 percent at the present time are receiving the schooling they need.

During the first session of this Congress, the committee reported and the Senate passed a bill, S. 395, to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies.

On the last day of the second session, the Senate approved an almost identical bill, H. R. 13840, which the House had passed the day before. The bill provides for grants up to $1 million a year over a 10-year period to be made to special institutions for the training of highly qualified leadership personnel who in turn will train teachers in the education of the mentally retarded.

CAPTIONED FILMS FOR THE DEAF

Late in the first session of this Congress, the Senate passed a bill reported by this committee, S. 1889, providing in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, a loan service of captioned films for the deaf. Toward the end of the second session, the House passed an almost identical bill, H. R. 13678. The Senate then approved the House bill, which was sent to the President for his signature. The bill authorizes up to $250,000 a year for establishment of a service which will lend through State schools for the deaf and other appropriate agencies films bearing captions that the deaf and hard-of-hearing can read as they watch the film. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is also authorized to acquire films for this purpose The program will provide not only educational and informative subject matter on film for deaf persons, but also serve as recreational therapy. Deaf persons are deprived of the many advantages available to persons with normal hearing of radio, television, and motion pictures. The program for captioned films is expected to compensate for this lack in considerable measure.

THE NATION'S HEALTH

One of the major legislative areas under the jurisdiction of the committee is the Nation's health. The committee reported, and the Senate passed, a number of important health bills during this session.

HILL-BURTON EXTENSION

The first of these is H. R. 12628. This bill would extend for 5 years the life of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, which has proved so helpful in making available hospitals and other health facilities throughout our Nation, and particularly in those areas which were

completely lacking in such essentials for the provision of modern medical care. This bill has been enacted into law.

HEALTH RESEARCH FACILITIES

The second health bill reported by the committee which is of major importance to our people is H. R. 12876. This bill, which will do much to speed research into the causes and cures of diseases which cripple and kill mankind, extends by 3 years the life of that act under which the Federal Government makes available $30 million a year to be used on a matching basis to help construct and equip the laboratories and other facilities needed by those scientists who are dedicating their efforts to attempts to eradicate disease. This bill has become law.

FOOD ADDITIVES

The third bill, H. R. 13254, would bring about a major change in those laws administered by the Food and Drug Administration designed to protect the American people from the addition to food products of additives which might be injurious to health. Whereas, under present law, any processor is free to add to our foodstuffs any newly discovered chemical and can continue to use such an additive in foods until the Food and Drug Administration has been able to establish scientific proof that it is deleterious to health—which sometimes takes years—because of this bill, food processors will not be permitted to add such substances to food until they have been able to prove, scientifically, that they are safe. This bill has passed both Houses.

HILL-BURTON LOANS

Besides reporting legislation to extend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act for another 5 years, the committee reported a bill, which has become law, authorizing loans for the construction of hospitals and other facilities in accordance with the same procedures and subject to the same conditions as would be applicable for the making of grants under this program.

Enactment of this legislation enables religious organizations which have conscientious objections to the acceptance of grants from the Federal Government for hospital construction to secure loans for such purpose if they would otherwise qualify for grants. Loans can be made for periods up to 40 years and will bear an interest rate calculated by adding one-fourth of 1 percent per year to the rate which the Secretary of the Treasury determines to be equal to the current average yield on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States.

SCHOOLS OF PUBLIC HEALTH

The committee reported a bill, which has become law, authorizing the Surgeon General, United States Public Health Service, to make grants-in-aid for provision of training and service in the public-health field in public or nonprofit accredited schools of public health. The bill earmarked for this purpose up to $1 million of the funds Congress appropriates for grants under the Public Health Service Act to States and local communities.

LABOR

WELFARE PLANS

As a result of intensive investigations of employee welfare and pension plans by a special subcommittee of the committee during the latter part of the 83d and all of the 84th Congress, legislation was introduced in the 85th Congress designed to safeguard the integrity of billions of dollars' worth of employee welfare, health, and pension funds.

During the 1st session of the 85th Congress, the committee established a special legislative subcommittee to consider these bills. The subcommittee compiled a massive record of testimony during 1957 and, just before the close of the 1st session, reported to the full committee a bill, S. 2888, providing for reporting and disclosure of information about pension, health, and welfare funds, requiring administrators of all types of plans to make reports to their beneficiaries and to the Secretary of Labor, granting the Secretary of Labor broad investigatory and limited police power, and imposing stiff criminal penalties for embezzlement, insurance kickbacks, and falsification of reports.

This year the full committee reported S. 2888 to the Senate, which, after several days of debate, passed it unanimously. The House passed a similar though less stringent bill; a conference was held between the two Houses, and a bill finally was agreed to and sent to the White House.

As enacted by the Congress, the bill exempts from coverage plans covering 25 or fewer participants. Administrators of all other plans—whether employer, employee, or jointly managed—are required to make information concerning the plan available to their beneficiaries, and to file a report with the Secretary of Labor. The Secretary has two functions: First, to act as custodian and to make available to the public copies of the reports filed with him, and, second, to prescribe standard forms of reports which may be used by a plan administrator making a report.

Penalties of 6 months' imprisonment or $1,000 fine are provided for willful violation of the act. The bill makes it possible for a beneficiary to compel reporting by a plan administrator through a court proceeding under which an administrator refusing to report could be fined $50 a day for each day during which the report was not filed. A fine of $10,000 and/or 5 years imprisonment is imposed for falsification of a report.

While the bill as enacted is weaker in some respects than the bill reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and approved by the Senate, it does embody all the important principles contained in the Senate bill. It calls for compulsory coverage; it recognizes the role of public authority in supervising welfare and pension plans, and it provides criminal penalties for certain violations.

Although many members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare would have wished the bill to give stronger protection to the beneficiaries of welfare and pension plans, by passage of S. 2888 the Congress has laid the legislative foundation upon which subsequent Congresses may build.

I know that the committee members who, since 1954, have devoted months of effort to investigation and legislation related to employee pension and welfare plans are deeply gratified that their work has been brought to partial fruition in the present Congress; and I know, further, that millions of workingmen and women in all parts of the country will rest easier in the knowledge that Congress has made a beginning toward the establishment of adequate protection of the sums to which they are entitled in the event of illness, accident, or retirement.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT REPORTING AND DISCLOSURE

In April 1958 the select committee on improper activities in the labor and management field—the McClellan committee—as part of its interim report made five legislative recommendations to the Congress, as follows: First, to regulate and control pension, health, and welfare funds; second, to regulate and control union funds; third, to insure union democracy; fourth, to curb activities of middlemen in labor-management disputes; fifth, to clarify the no-man's land between State and Federal authority.

As indicated above, the Committeee on Labor and Public Welfare reported a bill, S. 2888, relating to employee welfare and pension funds, which was approved in modified form by both Houses. This carried out the first recommendation of the McClellan committee.

To accomplish the other four legislative recommendations, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare this session reported S. 3974, a bill which not only effectively carried out the McClellan recommendations but also in some cases went beyond those recommendations. In addition, the bill contained several amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act, the substance of which was either recommended by the administration or was designed to make more effective the administration of the National Labor Relations Act.

UNION FUNDS

To regulate and control union funds, the bill required full reporting and public disclosure of union internal processes and union financial operations. It provided criminal penalties for failure to make such reports and for false reports, as well as for false entries or the destruction of union records. It required full reporting and public disclosure of financial transactions and holdings, if any, by union officials which might give rise to conflicts of interest, including payments by labor relations consultants.

UNION DEMOCRACY

To insure union democracy, the bill required full reporting and public disclosure of trusteeships over subordinate unions, and it established criminal penalties for failure to file or for falsification of required reports relating to such trusteeships. It placed limitations on establishment of trusteeships, on the purposes for which they could be established, and on their duration. It provided Federal court proceedings to dis-

solve trusteeships when not in accordance with the limitations of the bill.

It provided that elections of constitutional officers of international unions be held every 5 years either by secret ballot of the members or by delegates elected by secret ballot, and elections of local union officers at least every 4 years by secret ballot. It protected the rights of union members to nominate and vote for union officers without restraint or coercion. It prohibited the use of union funds to promote individual candidacies in union elections.

MIDDLEMEN

To curb activities of middlemen in labor-management disputes, the bill required full reporting and public disclosure of any arrangement by an employer under which another person undertakes to influence or affect or to provide services which interfere with, restrain, or coerce, employees in the exercise of rights guaranteed by the National Labor Relations Act, as well as similar reports and disclosure by labor-relations consultants. It created criminal sanctions for failure to file or for falsifying reports required by employers and labor-relations consultants, and for payments by middlemen to union officials.

NO MAN'S LAND

To clarify the no man's land between State and Federal authority, the bill directed the National Labor Relations Board not to permit continuation of the no man's land area in which employees, unions, and employers covered by Federal law are left without remedies. It authorized a speeding up of NLRB procedures by clarifying the definition of "supervisors" and by permitting prehearing representation elections.

In these ways, the bill reported by the committee met and dealt with effectively the chief legislative recommendations of the McClellan committee.

During the lengthy debate in the Senate on this bill, it was amended in a number of respects, but basically it retained the provisions approved by the committee with respect to union finances, union democracy, middlemen, and no man's land.

Senator McCLELLAN, himself, stated: "If enacted, and properly administered, it will drive many unreformed ex-convicts, racketeers, gangsters, and crooked officials out of the union movement and strengthen the position of honest, decent unionism and its leaders." The minority leader, Senator KNOWLAND, said the bill marked "real progress."

In reporting S. 3974, the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act, the committee made a remarkable legislative accomplishment. Not once, during the 11 years since the Taft-Hartley Act was enacted in 1947, has the Senate been able to reach agreement on any significant changes in its provisions. In this session, the committee reported, and the Senate approved, a bill which not only provided for carrying out the recommendations of the McClellan committee with respect to union funds, union democracy, middleman activities, and the no-man's-land problem, but also amended the Taft-Hartley Act in a number of respects.

The bill passed the Senate by a vote of 88 to 1. Unfortunately, the House failed to pass the bill. Despite this, however, the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare can take deep satisfaction in having been able to report to the Senate, and then to persuade the Senate to approve, the first major labor legislation since the 80th Congress.

COAL MINE SAFETY

The committee reported a bill amending the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act which retains the present exemption of small 14-man mines from the provisions of the act, unless the conditions in any such exempt mine are such as to create an imminent danger of any of the 5 disasters enumerated in section 203 (a) of the act. If such conditions exist, the bill provides for the immediate closing down of such mine, subject to an appeals procedure.

The bill also added a new title to the act directing the Bureau of Mines to make a detailed and exhaustive study of mine safety for all mines covered by the act, and to report its findings and recommendations to the Congress and to the President by February 15, of next year.

This bill was not considered by the Senate prior to the adjournment of Congress.

SAFETY FOR LONGSHOREMEN

The Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act was passed in 1927 as a result of a Supreme Court decision holding that the States could not apply their workmen's compensation laws in an area exclusively maritime and that Congress could not lawfully delegate this authority. Although the act has been amended from time to time to improve its compensation features and bring it up to date, it has never been amended to authorize the establishment of an effective safety program.

The bill approved by the committee this year and enacted into law vests the Secretary of Labor with authority to establish and enforce safety regulations in longshoremen's and related employment, such as the ship repair industry.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT

In the 84th Congress, the committee approved a bill, which became law, increasing retirement benefits for railroad workers by 10 percent. At that time, the Congress did not vote any increase in taxes on employers and employees, either to make up the then-existing actuarial deficit in the railroad retirement fund, or to pay for the newly increased benefits. But the committee, in its report on the bill, did assume a solemn obligation to approve legislation in the 85th Congress providing increased taxes.

I am glad to say that the committee was able to meet that obligation by reporting a bill, S. 1313, in the present session. The Senate approved a modified version of S. 1313, but the House failed to act on it in the closing days of the session.

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The committee has jurisdiction over several types of veterans' legislation, including the GI bills of rights of World War II and the Korean conflict This session the committee reported a number of bills important to our veterans.

VETERANS' UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

The committee reported a bill providing unemployment compensation benefits to peacetime veterans, that is, veterans who entered active service in the Armed Forces after January 31, 1955. Compensation could amount to as much as $26 a week, and could be paid over a period of 21 weeks, if the veteran is unemployed for that length of time. The program in general would parallel the unemployment compensation system provided for veterans under the Korean GI bill.

The bill also extended the termination date of the Korean program so as to make it terminate at the same time as the one proposed for peacetime veterans. Both programs would terminate 5 years following the end of compulsory military service.

Subsequent to the reporting of this bill, a House-passed bill containing somewhat similar provisions was reported by the Senate Finance Committee and passed by the Senate. Peacetime veterans will, therefore, be entitled to unemployment compensation as a result of the efforts of this Congress.

OTHER VETERANS' BILLS

The committee reported a number of other bills important to veterans including the following:

RESTORATIVE TRAINING

An amendment to the War Orphans Educational Assistance Act to permit eligible handicapped orphans to enroll in a specialized course of restorative training designed to make possible their participation in the education program provided by the act, and to lower the age at which such restorative training could begin to 14 years.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

A proposal to afford vocational rehabilitation to certain veterans in need thereof to overcome a service-connected disability incurred in or aggravated by active service since January 31, 1955.

PHILIPPINE HOSPITAL

A bill modifying and extending the grants-in-aid program operated in the Republic of the Philippines for the hospitalization of certain veterans of the Armed Forces.

REFUNDS

A bill authorizing the Veterans' Administration to make refunds to approximately 8,000 World War II veterans on account of erroneous collection of life-insurance premiums.

GI BILLS

A bill extending to certain veterans and war orphans in Panama and the Philippines the provisions of the Korean GI bill and the War Orphans Educational Assistance Act.

OTHER IMPORTANT LEGISLATION

In addition, the committee reported to the Senate during the second session of Congress a number of other measures

designed to benefit the American people. I will mention only a few of them:

SCIENCE CLUBS

The Senate passed on the last night of the session a House bill, H. R. 13191, identical with a bill pending before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to stimulate interest among high-school students in the study of science. The bill authorizes the Commissioner of Education to expend up to $50,000 a year to encourage, foster, and assist in the establishment in localities throughout the Nation of clubs composed of boys and girls having a special interest in science. The Commissioner is instructed to carry out these functions with a view to the ultimate chartering by Congress of a corporation similar to the Future Farmers of America.

WAR-RISK HAZARDS

The committee approved a bill, which became law, to amend and make permanent the provisions of existing law extending workmen's compensation and war-risk hazard benefits to Federal employees and employees of contractors of the Federal Government working in overseas areas.

AGING

The committee also approved a bill providing for a White House Conference on Aging to be called by the President of the United States in January 1961. The bill provides for assisting the several States to conduct similar conferences prior to the White House Conference itself. The Conference will be planned and conducted by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare with the assistance and cooperation of other departments and agencies represented on the Federal Council on Aging. Both Houses of Congress passed the bill.

SENATOR IRVING IVES

Mr. President, I cannot let this occasion pass without expressing my deep appreciation to all the members of the committee who have worked so diligently and so faithfully to help bring about the accomplishments of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare during both sessions of this Congress.

Before the adjournment of Congress, I had the pleasure of paying tribute to the senior Senator from New Jersey, the Honorable H. ALEXANDER SMITH, a former chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member of the committee during the past 4 years, who is retiring at the end of this Congress. He and I worked in close association during the many years we served on the committee together.

I regret deeply the fact that another valuable member of the committee also is retiring at the end of this Congress. I refer to my friend and colleague, the senior Senator from New York, the Honorable IRVING M. IVES.

The service of IRVING IVES in the Senate has been marked by a singular dedication to the best interests of all the people, whom he has served so faithfully. There is no Member of the Senate who is more knowledgeable, wiser, or more able in the field of labor-management relations. IRVING IVES came to the Senate ranked as one of the foremost authorities in the Nation in this field, by virtue of the outstanding record he had established as a member of the New York State Assembly, as the assembly's minority leader, speaker, and majority leader, and as dean of the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations at Cornell University.

I have been privileged to serve for 12 years with IRVING IVES on the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, and I can personally attest to the many and valuable contributions he has made as a member of that committee. With his devotion and his long experience in the field of labor-management relations, IRVING IVES has been most effective in working for legislation to preserve the principle of free collective bargaining and to meet the difficult problems of working conditions, wages, and hours, workmen's compensation, social security, and other important areas affecting the people's welfare and our country's strength.

IRVING IVES further distinguished himself through his outstanding service as chairman of the United States delegation to the International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva and was the first American to receive the honor of being elected president of the conference. He has also contributed much to the work of the Senate, as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee and more recently as a member of the Appropriations Committee.

IRVING IVES' service in the Senate has reflected his untiring devotion to the national interest: He has been the statesman, the patriot, and the prophet. The people of New York and of the Nation can always be proud of his labors, his accomplishments, and his leadership in the Senate. Although he has announced his plans to retire from the Senate we know that he will continue to serve his State and the Nation and that we shall continue to have the benefit of his keen intellect, his vast experience and knowledge, and his inspiring leadership.

We shall all miss him greatly and we warmly wish for him a healthy and happy future and many more years of useful service to his fellow man.

Food Additives Bill, H. R. 13254

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON ALLOTT
OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my statement on H. R. 13254.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I want to go on record as favoring this legislation, the objectives of which are unquestionably desirable in eliminating the deficiencies in the present law with respect to the protection of the public health brought about by the widespread and increased use of chemicals in modern food-processing technology.

I am concerned that some of the procedures established under this act may prove unworkable, and would hope that our committee and the distinguished chairman will follow the development of this program closely with a view to making any legislative corrections that appear necessary to insure its workability to deal effectively and expeditiously with the vast number of substances which will require administrative approval.

A Report on the Conservation and Development of Maryland's Farmland, Soil, and Water Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my statement on soil conservation in Maryland.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The vitality and strength of American agriculture are a matter of the greatest importance to all of us, I know you will agree. Some well informed say that it is only the contrasting weakness of agriculture in such Communist nations as Russia and China which deter them and disrupt their long-time plans toward the subjection of the Free World in accordance with the precepts of Marx and Lenin and their later followers.

For these reasons, I would like to bring to your attention a brochure of fundamental note which has just come off the presses of a Baltimore printing firm in my home State of Maryland. Although it is primarily about Maryland farmers and Maryland agriculture, it carries a universal and fundamental message to which we should all pay heed in these days when people argue so much about such things as farm programs, price supports, surplus removal, and other such popular and political terms which tend to obscure the true nature of the course which our farm policy should take.

The brochure to which I refer, a handsomely done, magnificently illustrated, publication of 32 pages is entitled, "The First 20 Years, 1938–58, a Report on the Conservation and Development of Maryland's Farmland, Soil, and Water Resources." It has been published by the Maryland State Soil Conservation Committee with a foreword written by Dr. Gordon M. Cairns, dean of the College of Agriculture for the University of Maryland, and Dr. Wilson H. Elkins, president of the University of Maryland. It describes in considerable detail and in its many varied aspects the work accomplished by Maryland farmers through their own locally organized and locally run soil conservation districts during the past two decades. It outlines, further, the plans and aims of these same soil conservation districts, and of the Maryland farmers who direct their activities, for the next 20 years.

Fundamentally, this brochure deals with the food and population problems which have always, since the dawn of history, plagued the peoples and the governments of nearly all of the nations of the world. May I quote you some statements from the brochure which I think will throw some of

the true aspects of what our real farm policy should be into sharper focus.

"The thin skin of this planet, which we call the soil, is marvelously complex. We depend on it for nearly all the food we eat, and for the fibers we put to a thousand uses. It helps determine the kind of a water supply we have and even possesses an influence on the weather and climate.

"In each handful of the very top layer of this soil, there are millions of plant-like and animal-like organisms so tiny they can be seen only under a microscope. Like ourselves, they depend on a delicate balance of air, water, sunlight, and minerals to survive. Healthy, and in good chemical and physical balance, this teeming combination of inert material and living organisms we call topsoil will grow bumper crops to feed livestock and human beings. Damage or destroy it, and nature starts a whole train of disastrous consequences."

Lest anyone think that this topsoil of ours is exclusively the concern of farmers, let me set them right with the statement that, even in this beautifully blessed country of ours, the farmland, soil, and water resources are getting tighter. According to the Maryland State Soil Conservation Committee:

"The total land area of the United States is almost 2 billion acres, or a little over 12 acres for each man, woman, and child living in this country.

"Only about a fourth of this, however, or 480 million acres, is cropland or rotation pasture. Nearly half of the remainder is rangeland and permanent pasture which supplies some grazing for the dairy industry but is used mostly to help feed the great herds of cattle and sheep that go to market in Omaha, Chicago, and the other large livestock market centers. The rest is largely mountain, desert, marshland, highway, woodland, forest, park, or town and city.

"For the most part, it is the 480 million acres in crops and in crop-and-pasture rotations which determines our food supply. This is our good land, about 3 acres per person.

"By 1975, it is estimated that drainage and reclamation projects, plus clearing of new land, will increase our supply of cropland to about 508 million acres. But the population experts say that we may well have 228 million people in the United States by then. So we will have only a little more than 2 acres of cropland to feed each of us.

"When the year 2000 rolls around, if our population continues to grow at its present rate, 335 million people will crowd this country. But cropland will only edge up to about 528 million acres. There will be just a trifle over 1½ acres to feed each person then.

"This squeeze on the amount of good farmland doesn't necessarily mean that our children and grandchildren will face a scarcity of food. The ancient theory that population always tends to outrun its food supply seems not to have taken into account the marvelous and fast-growing productivity of modern agriculture. Between 1940 and 1950, for instance, United States farm output per farm worker jumped an amazing 50 percent. Today, 1 American farmworker produces enough to feed himself and 19 other people. By 1975, it is estimated he will be able to feed 35 or 40 city people.

"Nevertheless, our shrinking supply of cropland per person is going to put pressure on our food supply unless we husband our farmland soil resources wisely. Our high-protein diet leans heavily to animal products that require more acreage to produce than do the cereal-grain and root-crop diets of much of the world."

These figures and others in the brochure highlight how important soil and water are to both farmers and city people. In my own State of Maryland, farm people now make up less than 10 percent of the total population. Yet theirs is still the State's largest and most important basic industry and provides roughly half of the total food products that Maryland needs. Each year, the State's 32,500 farms produce and sell about $250 million worth of crop and animal products. By the time this has reached dinner tables, with all the additional processing, packaging, and store services that consumers now ask of the food industry, it has increased to a half-billion-dollar business or more. The value of land, buildings, and machinery on Maryland farms, each one of which requires, on the average, as great an outlay of capital as the neighborhood hardware store in town, is close to $1 billion.

Essentially this investment, and the $250 million business that derives from it each year, is based on the top 5 to 12 inches of soil on Maryland farms. Neither Maryland farmers nor Maryland city people can afford to let it slip away.

Soil erosion on farms may seem to affect city people only slowly and indirectly as far as their food supply is concerned and in its importance to our basic economy. But there is still another way that it reaches home every day and strikes at their prosperity and well-being.

"Soil washed off a farm field doesn't stop at the boundary fence. It has a habit of getting into streams and rivers, reservoirs, and harbors. We call it silt when it gets far away from home.

"Sometimes people shrug off silt as being inevitable. They think of it in terms of the delta which the Mississippi River has built up below New Orleans. Early explorers reported a delta at the mouth of the Mississippi long before the first colonist cleared a farm anywhere in the river's vast basin.

"Measurements show, though, that the older deposits of silt in the Mississippi Delta were laid down over thousands of years. They are sharply different from the top layer of manmade silt which has been deposited in ever-increasing volume in the past hundred years.

"Silting of streams, rivers, and harbors in my own State of Maryland was of little moment before early colonists cleared the land. Covered as the land was by vast forests, grassy glades, and marshland, there was little chance for soil to escape and become silt except when lightning started a great fire on some forested area, denuded the land of its protection, and permitted the soil to wash away until a new mantle of shrubs, grass, and forest trees could slowly heal the scars.

"All this changed when Maryland's upland fields were cleared and planted to tobacco and other cultivated crops which offer little cover to the soil from washing. The silt we have to deal with today in Maryland's rivers, streams, harbors, and reservoirs is the result of manmade erosion, not the longtime kind known as geologic erosion.

"Nowhere is this clearer than in the sedimentation studies which geologists have made in Baltimore Harbor. When Capt. John Smith first sailed up the Patapsco River in 1608, the limit of open tidewater was 7 miles further inland than it is today. Now, the head of navigation is only 1⅜ miles above the Hanover Street Bridge in Baltimore and a channel is kept there only by dredging. Yet as late as 1845, after considerable erosion had already occurred on the farmland drainage area which feeds the Patapsco, there was still as much as 17 feet of water beneath the bridge. Fifty years later, there was only 3½ feet; by 1924, only 6 inches. Dredging near the mouth of the Patapsco River about 1940 produced a bottle labeled only 35 years before, but which was buried under 5 feet of sediment.

"Engineers and geologists of the United States Soil Conservation Service estimate that the Patapsco River, which used to run clear, now carries about 600,000 cubic yards of silt a year into Baltimore Harbor. About 90 percent of this comes from the cultivated land in the Patapsco watershed. Just to keep the harbor channels themselves dredged free of Patapsco silt costs $100,000 a year. The soils men believe that over half of this silting could be prevented by the use of soil-conservation methods on all the farmland that drains into the Patapsco.

"The Sassafras River on the eastern shore offers even more startling evidence of the speed with which farmland erosion can close up streams. As recently as 1925, self-propelled barges hauled grain and fertilizer to and from Foxhole Wharf on the upper reaches of the Sassafras where it forms the boundary between Kent and Cecil Counties. The river had a 12- to 15-foot channel. Twenty years later, farmland silt left room for only 2 or 3 feet of water.

"Sedimentation of Baltimore's water supply reservoirs has provided some costly lessons also in the damaging by-products of soil erosion. The city's first water supply reservoir, Lake Roland on Jones Falls, built in 1862, had to be abandoned in 1916 because of silt. Baltimore's second reservoir, Loch Raven, on Gunpowder Falls, lost all but 15 percent of its half-billion gallon capacity from silting in the first 20 years of its life—this despite the fact that almost as much sediment as is deposited in Baltimore Harbor by the Patapsco River each year had been removed from it meanwhile. The present new Loch Raven Dam, and the reservoir farther upstream at Prettyboy Dam, are so huge (41 billion gallon total capacity) that erosion and silting has not seriously damaged them as yet. Nevertheless, nearly 10 million cubic yards of silt has poured into them in the past generation. Most of it has come from the road banks and cropland of an area no bigger than Baltimore County. It represents from 1 to 2 inches of the topsoil that used to produce crops on the watersheds which feed the 2 reservoirs.

"There is no way to measure the damage which silt has caused commercial and sport fishing and to the oyster beds of the Chesapeake, but biologists, and fish and wildlife experts say that it amounts to millions of dollars. The oysterman and the fisherman alike have a common interest with the farmer in preventing soil erosion. Silt and pollution are the twin enemies of their calling."

Water is the other side of the coin in this tremendously important problem my State and our Nation faces in this question of farmland conservation and development, which is so important to all of us.

"Enough rain falls on Maryland during most years to satisfy all the foreseeable future yearly needs of Maryland farms, industries, towns, and cities. Yet, farmers, city people, and industries alike need more water and are constantly reaching out for new sources. In the next 20 years it is estimated that water needs and water use will double.

"This seeming contradiction of water everywhere but not enough to drink is really no contradiction at all. To a Maryland farmer, water is scarce if it doesn't rain often enough and gently enough during the crop season to give his corn crop 14 inches of soil moisture on which to grow. To the Bethlehem Steel people at Sparrows Point, water is scarce when they have to buy treated water from the Baltimore sewage disposal plant because the level of the local wells from which they pump has fallen alarmingly. To the people of Baltimore, water is scarce if they have to look all the way to the Susquehanna River for their supply so there will be enough water during a dry summer to take a bath when they feel like it or wash their cars.

"One of the cheapest ways to improve our water supplies—and cut down on floods and silting at the same time—is for farmers to use soil conservation methods on their land so that the soil can hold more of the rain

where it falls. This kind of water gets into streams slowly and steadily instead of running off in a hurry and causing floods. Carefully measured experiments on a dozen small test watersheds in Maryland have shown that twice as much rain runs off an unprotected field than from one where the crops are grown with the benefit of simple soil conservation methods. What is more, silt samples taken from these watersheds show that 3 to 4 times as much soil gets away from the unprotected fields."

The State soil conservation committee's new publication describes in detail the methods used by Maryland farmers to conserve and develop their soil and water resources during the past 20 years. I will not take your time to describe these now because they are increasingly familiar to farmers everywhere. And for city people, and the men and women who carry these reports to them through the printed page and the airwaves, the brochure is available for reading and report.

I would like to tell you a little about the local Maryland soil conservation districts organized by farmers in the past 20 years which have made a wholesale attack on this soil and water conservation problem possible. There are such districts in every State and their operations are very similar.

"There is nothing particularly new about conservation. Most farmers have known about the need for conservation, and some of the methods used, back as far as their grandfathers' day or even farther. The trick has been to focus the tools of conservation on the needs of each particular farm and to find the know-how and wherewithal to put them into effect.

"It was not until soils specialists completed a statewide survey of Maryland's land resources in 1934 that the extent of erosion damage and drainage problems was fully appreciated. During 1934 and 1935, when the Federal Government was establishing work camps of CCC boys in various sections of the State as a depression relief measure, several erosion control demonstration projects were established in areas around these camps. Newly trained technical men from the United States Soil Conservation Service were assigned to these camps to work with nearby farmers in establishing soil-conservation methods and better drainage systems. For the first time, technical men and work crews concentrated on these soil and water problems on a direct, farm-by-farm basis.

"It soon became evident, however, that the work in these demonstration areas, as they were called, was too costly and too slow. Some way had to be found to spread the work farther and faster, with farmers doing more of it and the Government less.

"So Maryland farm leaders drafted a soil conservation law to put direction of the work into the hands of local organizations of farmers which would have the necessary legal standing to make contracts with private and public agencies for the purpose of securing technical help, materials, and heavy machinery that could be put at the disposal of individual farmers.

"The soil conservation districts law passed by the Maryland Assembly in 1937 was the result. It permits farmers to organize local districts by means of petition, public hearing, and a majority vote in favor by the farmers within the proposed district.

"Each district program is directed by a board of five supervisors chosen from among the outstanding farmers of the district. Two are appointed by the State soil conservation committee on the recommendation of local groups. Three others are later chosen by farmers of the district at a special public election. Their terms of office run for 3 years. None of these supervisors receive a salary. Usually, they are paid a small expense allowance, plus mileage allowance on their cars, when they are on district business. All of these men consider the responsibility an honor and a public obligation and many of them find it possible to spend a large amount of their time on district work without any compensation.

"Kent County farmers organized the first Maryland soil conservation district in 1938. Within 10 years, every county in the State except 1 had followed suit. In nearly all of these 23 districts, the local county agricultural agent of the University of Maryland Extension Service acts as secretary and adviser to the group. Also, in each district, the supervisors have invited the local representative of the Soil Conservation Service to attend board meetings in an advisory capacity.

"Districts have no taxing powers. Their major accomplishment has been to plan and carry out a concentrated attack on local soil and water problems. They have been able to bring farmers technical help, materials, and machinery not heretofore available to them as individuals. In nearly all cases, each of the agencies represented on the State soil conservation committee furnish special assistance to the districts. In addition, some districts have set up working agreements with other State and Federal agencies, with county highway departments, boards of county commissioners, with local tax ditch associations, fish and game agencies, and with private contractors of all kinds.

"Tackling the soil and water problems of Maryland farms is a job that has required a lot of heavy machinery, combined with the assistance of soils and engineering specialists. This combination was not ordinarily available to individual farmers at a cost they could afford before the districts were organized. The big motorized dragline shovels used in drainage work, for instance, cost upwards of $15,000 apiece and are difficult and expensive to rent for individual farm jobs. Nor is it much use to rent them unless you have an engineer and a soils man lay out the system properly in advance.

"Many districts have solved this problem by hiring private contractors to do the earth-moving work, but with the actual design and layout of the jobs handled by technical men assigned to the district. The amount of private contracting work of this nature done on farms has multiplied many times since the districts were organized.

"Other districts have found it expedient to rent or buy heavy machinery of their own and to work it under direction of the district's technical men. Where this is done, equipment superintendents are hired by the district to schedule all farm construction work carefully so that the machinery is busy most of the time. In this way, districts can cut down rental costs charged to farmers. The equipment superintendents are responsible for keeping all equipment in good working order.

"Some districts now own as much as $100,000 worth of heavy equipment. Most of it is new and modern. Much of it is already paid for from rental fees charged to farmers. Usually, fees range from $5 to $12 an hour, depending on the particular piece of equipment required. The price includes wages of a skilled operator for such machines as big draglines, graders and bulldozers.

"Equipped with machinery like this, and with engineers and soils men to direct how to use it best, the districts expect to get the major part of their heavy, earth-moving jobs finished within the next 10 years."

With the formation of districts, soil and water conservation work gained great momentum after farmers learned how to use this new tool of local government and self-help to further the development of their land resources. In the past 6 years, for instance, there has been an increase of almost 70 percent in the number of farms on which soil and water conservation programs have been started, the brochure states. Today, approximately half the farms in Maryland have made a start at such programs. And they have been paying most of the bill themselves, although the work that they do often benefits others almost as much as themselves.

But I beg of you that we do not become complacent just because things seem to be going along well in most instances in the conservation and development of our farmland soil and water resources. Our world is changing, and food is growing ever more important to large segments of it who are not so well blessed as ourselves. Food is not something we can take for granted. Very little of the world has ever done so and we will not continue to do so unless we pay close and continuing attention to the land and water resources which play so very great a part in our Nation's strength and self-sufficiency. I would like to quote you here the optimistic, yet watchful, words which a farmer of the Maryland State Soil Conservation Committee has written about the future of these things in the brochure which has just been published.

"Twenty years is a short time as farming goes. Yet the advances in farming during the past 20 years have been greater than in the entire 100 years before that. In the next 20 years, they will be greater still.

"Fewer farms will feed more and more town and city people. The amount of food one man at work on a farm can produce will probably double. Each farm will depend more on machinery and less on musclepower. We will have better crops, better livestock, and understand how to use our land better.

"In less than 20 years, at the present rate we are moving, most of our present farmland soil and water conservation goals in Maryland will have been met. Soil erosion control methods will be in effect on most farms. Drainage improvements now needed will have been fulfilled.

"But towns and cities will be spreading out to engulf more of Maryland's farmland as population grows and people in the cities call for more living space per family than they have now. Highways, airports, and parks will take more space. Factories will grow in size, numbers, and land needed—not merely in a simple arithmetic progression to keep pace with increasing population, but in geometric progression to keep pace with the expanding needs of each member of that expanding population.

"Farmers in Maryland, and nearly everywhere else, will be under pressure to use only their best land for crops and pasture, and to improve that to the fullest extent of their capabilities. Good land is the only land that will be worth farming.

"The pace of Maryland's agriculture will change. We will make use of the land more intensively, both in farming and in its many other uses. Even our woods and forests will be treated differently—developed and protected, farmed, and harvested like a crop.

"We will need to see that erosion is brought under control and that all potentially good wet-land farms are properly drained. But above and beyond that, we will need to tap and develop more local water supplies for use by farmers, towns, and industries in each locality. More ponds and wells will be needed to provide irrigation water for crops on thousands of acres of farmland where irrigation is not used today. On dozens of small streams we will be building the small dams that team up with soil-conservation methods on the land to stop the small floods upstream and make sure the big floods downstream never get a chance to start.

"There is a table on the back cover of this brochure which shows our goals for the next 20 years in protecting and developing Maryland's soil and water resources. These are the major goals as we see them today.

"I think it is reasonably certain, barring war or some other catastrophe, that they will be met and that the job of soil and water conservation as we know it today will

become one of maintenance, seeing to it that the gains already made don't slip away.

"I am equally sure, though, that these goals will change as farming changes and the pressure on the land increases."

Thank you for bearing with me, gentlemen, as I have outlined to you this vital matter of the preservation and development of our Nation's and my State's farmland soil and water resources. At the moment, here in the Capitol of the greatest of the free nations of the world, it may seem to be not so pressing as the many other problems we face.

But in the long run, there is nothing more important. The opportunity for farmers to develop these resources fully must and should be the keystone of our agricultural policy. I recommend to you as required reading this brochure, The First 20 Years.

Federal Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the 85th Congress leaves behind it a record of astronomical Federal appropriations. It followed the irresponsible pattern that for more than a score of years has been feeding a monstrous Federal bureaucracy, increasing the cost of living for rich and poor alike, and burdening the American taxpayer and his offspring with an ever greater national debt.

Each year vigorous protests are raised in the House and Senate when the enormous budget is proposed by the executive department; yet when Congress finally makes its decisions on appropriation bills there is usually very little difference between the amount requested and funds authorized. This policy prevails regardless of whether the White House and Congressional leadership are representative of the same political party. It persists largely because big budgets have become generally acceptable and expedient despite full knowledge of their inherent danger.

Both parties have been all too negligent with respect to the budget and the national debt. When Democratic administrations spent entirely too freely, Republican campaigners vehemently challenged such wasteful tactics and promised to slash expenditures and bring about a reduction in the national debt. A contrary course has been pursued, and I insist that it is time for Congress to take stock of the situation. Since both parties are guilty, the issue need not devolve into a political controversy.

Frequently spokesmen for the administration or Members of Congress appeal for bipartisan cooperation in matters of foreign affairs. I contend that the same approach is needed on the domestic scene if we are going to succeed in keeping expenditures down to honest and reasonable levels. I suggest that Republicans and Democrats alike look to next year with a new determination to set an example that future Congresses and future Presidents must follow if this country is ever going to get back on the road to fiscal solvency.

I summarily dismiss the hypothesis advanced by so-called liberals who would have our people believe that the national debt is an intangible factor in the business affairs of a country with abundant natural resources and prodigious capital wealth. The man who contracts unnecessary debts which he knowingly will not be able to liquidate in his lifetime is imprudent, unstable, irresponsible, immoral, and/or insane. He is not fit to manage the finances of his family. The sound economic laws that should govern a home are generally applicable to a political unit, whether it be a county, State, or Federal Government. Elected officials who disregard ethical standards in the handling of tax funds are not fit to serve in public office.

I submit that it is time we set up a guide of financial accountability to be followed religiously by both the White House and Congress. My recommendations include:

First. The President should let it be known now throughout Government departments and agencies that a substantial cut in the Federal budget is in store for next year, come what may. We recognize that a worsening of the international situation would bear heavily upon Federal monetary requirements, yet it is inconceivable that any circumstance short of war could reasonably offset advance planning for sizable reductions of Government expenditures.

Responsible Government officials, so apprised by the executive department, can begin immediately to make plans for decreased spending. In many cases this savings can be effectuated through normal attrition in office personnel. Regardless of the bureaucrats' traditional insistence that his agency is short of hired help, the Government building that does not have a large percentage of supernumeraries on its personnel roster is a rarity. The number of men and women who will retire or resign from the respective Government departments can be estimated with a fair degree of accuracy at the present time. If officials realize now that replacements will not be made available for a given percentage of this number, they will be able to make adequate arrangements for carrying on their workload satisfactorily—and perhaps more efficiently—with this reduction in force.

Another method of lessening the need for large expenditures is the elimination of executive department functions not specifically authorized by Congress. One such undertaking which immediately occurs to me is the invasion of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Public Health Service into the field of air pollution. On last July 25 this office mailed invitations to a national conferference on air pollution that will be held in Washington in November. I should like to quote the first paragraph of this invitation:

> Air pollution is becoming increasingly serious as population growth and industrial expansion add to the volume of pollutants discharged into the far-from-limitless ocean of air that surrounds us. Although the problem has recently received considerable attention from governmental bodies as well as from industries and voluntary organizations, there has been no opportunity for representatives of all these groups to meet together to assess their progress and to develop a coordinated plan for future action.

The last sentence of that quotation is untrue. The Air Pollution Control Association—a nonsubsidized, nonprofit organization whose membership includes scientists and engineers from Federal, State, and local governments as well as from private industry—last year celebrated its 50th anniversary. At this year's convention in Philadelphia, more than a thousand air sanitation experts and other interested parties gathered to hear scientific papers on progress and problems dealing with air pollution. I charge that the Public Health Service encroachment is unnecessary and wasteful, although it does provide an excellent and timely example of the type of bureaucratic expansion that should be and can be eliminated.

Another popular method of disposing unnecessarily of taxpayers' contributions to the Treasury is the practice of traveling throughout the country and over many parts of the world by Government employees. By notifying subordinates of the economy program to be inaugurated with the beginning of the next fiscal year, the President will permit substantial savings to accrue through planned reductions in traveling expenses.

Second. Congress must demand economy in Government, and every candidate for office should go on record that he will not accede to any appeals for another topheavy budgetary program. The candidate should be as interested in saving the taxpayer's money as he is in spending it. Otherwise he ignores an immutable law that continually lessens the buying power of the dollar and in effect ransacks the security of everyone who must rely—now or in the future—upon his insurance, his pension, social security, bank savings, and/or Government bonds.

Thrift and economy can be returned as an operating force in the Federal Government if Members of Congress seeking reelection and their opponents go out and sound the need for fiscal stability. I have found that my constituents appreciate a frank discussion of this kind, and I contend that any candidate is remiss in his duties and qualifications if he avoids mention of the perils that are unmistakably germinated in wanton extravagance.

Politicians frequently find a higher measure of popularity in promising everything to everybody, but no one who resorts to this low-level practice is deserving of consideration for office. Every aspirant to the House or Senate should be a leader among his fellow men, willing to look his voters squarely in the eye and explain just what the Government can do and cannot do in its contribution to the general welfare.

Popular platform chatter at election time assures every individual or group of voters of new benefits or more benefits to be made by the Federal Government without any provision for revenue. I saw and heard numerous examples of this political moon talk in the primary

campaign last spring. Let me explain parenthetically that I had no primary opposition, so there is no vindictiveness involved here. Similar listening and reading will be available to voters in other States in the coming weeks, and the broken record will get a heavy play as the final election draws near in November.

A realistic economy program would not deprive the Nation of any Federal service essential to the general welfare. We must provide the wherewithal to airproof and waterproof our entire defense structure. We must appropriate whatever funds are necessary to stimulate the economy and materially reduce the number of unemployed in the various States. My own notion is that Congress has for too long been too free with Federal funds for distribution around the world, even to the extent of neglecting our own people. Now is the time for the executive department and Members of Congress to give unequivocable notice to America's benefactors that the United States taxpayer cannot forever be saddled with debts resulting from grants to international panhandlers.

I urge my colleagues from both parties to speak out in support of economy in Government and in opposition to inflationary policies. Equally necessary is a summary expression from the White House to the effect that the economy long promised but never fulfilled will definitely be a part of the next budget.

The Land—The People—The Nation: A Report on Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, farmers of the Nation have suffered a loss of income of more than $20 billion in the first 5 years of Mr. Benson's tenure as Secretary of Agriculture.

When this administration came into power in 1953, Hon. Ezra Taft Benson took over a farm program under which for 11 consecutive years—1942–52, inclusive—our farmers had enjoyed their greatest prosperity in history. Farm prices in each of those 11 years were at or above 100 percent of parity. During these years our consumers bought food at fair and reasonable prices.

Mr. Benson, in 5 years, with the backing of the President, has reduced this program to a shambles.

As this 85th Congress draws to a close, it is my duty, as chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, to review for the Members, and to advise the country at large, concerning the work of this Congress in behalf of agriculture. Moreover, it is my obligation to bring into perspective for the Nation the circumstances of our farmers and their families who produce the food and fiber which sustain us.

Mr. Speaker, there were days, in times past, when it was difficult to distinguish a Democrat from a Republican in this House when legislation relating to the well-being of agriculture was debated and voted upon. Our farm people are Democrats and they are Republicans. Their well-being should have no reference to party politics. It is exceedingly painful to me that Mr. Benson has injected partisan politics, and has promoted political alinements, in our deliberations in the Congress on vital farm legislation, for in this situation it is the farmers who suffer.

Therefore, at the outset of this report, I want to commend those members of both parties who have proven themselves to be true and devoted friends of agriculture and who have placed the interests of our farm people above any possible partisan advantage.

THE BENSON STORY

I hope that from these remarks, Mr. Speaker, the Nation will take note of what has happened, and what is happening, on the farms of America under Mr. Benson and under this administration.

In 1957, our total population consumed 11 percent more farm-produced foods than in 1952, the year before Mr. Benson took office, yet our farmers received $600 million less for that larger volume of production for domestic consumption in 1957 than for the more limited volume in 1952. And, in contrast, consumers paid food processors and marketing middlemen $6.1 billion more in 1957 than in 1952 for hauling, processing, and handling the food between the farm gate and the retail counter.

Here are the figures on the deterioration of farm income under Mr. Benson, taken from the books of the Department of Agriculture:

Total realized net income of farmers

(After deducting agricultural production expenses from the total of cash income from farm marketings, Government payments to farmers, value of home consumption of farm-produced foods, and computed rental value of farm dwellings.)

FIVE PRE-BENSON YEARS

1948	$16,057,000,000
1949	13,789,000,000
1950	13,185,000,000
1951	15,158,000,000
1952	14,416,000,000
Total	72,605,000,000

FIVE BENSON YEARS

1953	$13,899,000,000
1954	12,201,000,000
1955	11,470,000,000
1956	12,111,000,000
1957	10,840,000,000
Total	60,521,000,000

The Department records show that during the last 5—Benson—years farmers produced and sold 11 percent more food and nonfood products than in the 5 preceding years, 1948–52, inclusive. Had our farmers been paid for the larger volume of food and nonfood products marketed in the last 5 years, at the same rate as in the 5 years immediately preceding Benson, their net income in these last 5 years would have been $80,591 million, or more than $20 billion above what they actually received under Mr. Benson. If farm prices, instead of declining, had increased in proportion to all other prices during these last 5 years, then the income of farmers would have been much greater than $80 billion. However, under Mr. Benson's constant pressure for lower farm prices, the income aggregated only $60,521 million.

Mr. Speaker, those who seek an excuse for the farm income debacle in the last 5 years often resort to a contention that prior to Mr. Benson's tenure farm prices were influenced and sustained by the demands of the post-World War II years and by the Korean conflict. It should be pointed out that the demand for food has been greater in these last 5 years than in any similar period in history, and consumers purchased during these 5 years 11 percent more products of our farms than during the 5 previous years. The difference between the Benson years and the prior years is that before Mr. Benson took office the farm program was in sympathetic hands and supplies were kept within reasonable balance with market outlets, while in these recent years Mr. Benson has been tearing down the program, telling both producers and consumers that farm prices are too high, with the result that farmers have suffered a loss in income of at least $20 billion.

Here is a brief summary of the last 5 years, comparing 1957 with 1952:

Farm prices: Down 16 percent.

Farm parity ratio: Down 18 percent.

Realized net farm income: Down 25 percent, lowest point since 1942.

Purchasing power of that farm income: Down 29 percent, lowest since 1940.

Farm debt: At a record high, above $20 billion.

Farm population: Declined from 24,283,000 in 1952 to 20,396,000 in 1957.

In 1957 the returns to farm workers for their labor and management reached a low of 69 cents an hour while the average wage of industrial workers climbed to a high of $2.07 an hour.

Moreover, farm surpluses have trebled, increasing from $2,452,000,000 in 1952 to more than $7 billion today; appropriations and authorizations to the Department of Agriculture, for all purposes, amounted to $6,794,000,000 for fiscal 1958, whereas all such appropriations and authorizations for all the 5 years immediately preceding Mr. Benson's tenure—including the Korean conflict—amounted to only $7,391,000,000; and employees in the Department of Agriculture have increased more than 17,000 since 1952, from 67,406 as of December 31, 1952, to 85,107 as of January 1, 1958.

Since Mr. Benson began to bring down farm prices 5 years ago, farm income has dropped about $1 billion a year, the cost of farm programs has increased by about $1 billion a year, farm debt has climbed about $1 billion a year—and farm people have been leaving the farms at the rate of about 1 million a year.

AGRICULTURE'S GOLDEN YEARS

Mr. Speaker, in a very few days we shall be back home, among the good people who sent us to Congress, and in our daily associations we shall be giving accounts of our stewardship. Our farmer friends will want to know why the

farm program which operated so well so long at so little expense is not now helping them—why farm income has constantly declined in the last 5 years. Consumers will want to know why prices at the grocery counters are so high.

I am going to tell the truth. I am going to tell my farmer friends and my consumer friends in the towns and cities about Mr. Benson, and about those who hold his hand. I shall tell them two true stories: One, the Benson story; the other, the story of the golden years of agriculture's rise from the great depression to a place of parity and equal economic stature with labor, industry, and business—to the time that Mr. Benson took over.

The story of agriculture's golden years is an account of the triumph of the parity principle—agriculture's magna carta. This is the story of 20 pre-Benson years.

Farm income multiplied sixfold, sevenfold, or eightfold in those two decades. As I have noted, for 11 consecutive years prior to 1953, the average prices paid to farmers were at or above 100 percent of parity. Rural people became able to buy the conveniences and comforts hitherto available only to our citizens in the cities. The blessings of electricity were taken to the rural areas. Farmers became financially able to mechanize their farms and to apply new sciences, to bring the blessings of food abundance at low cost to the consumers of the Nation. Now, with the means to do it, farmers devoted their energies to the restoration and conservation of the Nation's most precious resource, the soil. Prosperity on the farms created greater markets for industries in the cities, made jobs, and kept factory wheels turning.

The output per farm worker doubled in those 20 years, and now each farm worker feeds 20 persons. This new efficiency in agriculture made available to American families more and better food, for an expenditure of a smaller percentage of their total income than in any other period of history. Although in the last 5 years retail prices have increased as farm prices declined, even today the average hourly wage of industrial workers will buy twice as much food as in 1929.

COSTS

The Commodity Credit Corporation supported the prices of major storable crops for 20 years prior to 1953 and, at the end of these 2 decades, this program actually showed a 20-year profit of $13 million. For these 20 years the CCC programs for all crops, including a number of perishables, lost only $1,064 million, and CCC investments in surpluses on January 1, 1953 (inventory and loans) amounted to only $2,452 million.

In contrast, during the past 5 years, due primarily to the unsympathetic administration of the farm program, CCC deficits in farm price-support operations have amounted to 4 times as much as was lost in the preceding 20 years—slightly more than $1 billion in 20 years, compared with more than $4 billion in the last 5 years. Meanwhile, CCC investments in surpluses have increased threefold, from $2,452,000,000 in 1952 to more than $7 billion in the most recent report.

The following table summarizes the costs of the CCC farm price-support operations—first, for the 20 pre-Benson years, 1933 to 1952, inclusive, and second, for these 20 years plus the 5 Benson years, 1953 to 1957, inclusive:

Summary of CCC program results from Oct. 17, 1933 (realized gains and losses)

Program and commodity	Oct. 17, 1933, through Dec. 31, 1952	Oct. 17, 1933, through Dec. 31, 1957
PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM (CCC NONRECOURSE LOAN, PURCHASE, AND PAYMENT PROGRAMS)		
Basic commodities:		
Corn	[1] $53,166,802	[1] $673,020,646
Cornmeal		[1] 30,813,137
Cotton:		
Extra long staple		[1] 6,146,942
Upland	268,629,425	[1] 439,737,896
Export differential	[1] 41,361,218	[1] 41,361,218
Puerto Rican	[1] 130,198	[1] 130,198
Cotton-rubber barter	11,055,451	11,055,451
Peanuts	[1] 91,687,605	[1] 151,129,448
Rice	[1] 1,422,757	[1] 79,768,110
Tobacco	4,585,150	[1] 4,326,570
Wheat	[1] 83,490,156	[1] 510,721,419
Wheat flour		[1] 65,967,730
Total	13,011,290	[1] 1,992,067,863
Designated nonbasic commodities:		
Honey	[1] 873,405	[1] 868,646
Milk and butterfat:		
Butter	[1] 48,286,347	[1] 430,421,755
Butter oil		[1] 121,205,843
Cheese	[1] 25,021,168	[1] 302,514,035
Milk:		
Dried	[1] 58,215,868	[1] 518,832,477
Fluid		[1] 187,301,019
Whey		[1] 3,584,209
Subtotal	[1] 133,396,788	[1] 1,563,869,338
Potatoes, Irish	[1] 478,080,248	[1] 478,577,870
Tung oil	[1] 78,904	[1] 1,063,125
Wool	[1] 92,163,834	[1] 113,829,214
Total	[1] 702,719,774	[1] 2,158,198,193
Other nonbasic commodities:		
Barley	[1] 9,621,953	[1] 101,663,747
Beans, dry, edible	[1] 31,860,759	[1] 72,679,309
Castor beans	[1] 171,193	[1] 171,193
Cotton, American-Egyptian	[1] 273,760	28,827
Cottonseed and products	15,360,619	[1] 116,786,256
Eggs	[1] 189,704,186	[1] 189,698,695
Flax fiber	[1] 397,113	[1] 397,113
Flaxseed and linseed oil	[1] 66,065,232	[1] 166,034,288
Fruit, dried	[1] 14,882,320	[1] 14,882,320
Grain sorghum	[1] 35,804,103	[1] 183,384,438
Grapefruit juice	[1] 1,732,374	[1] 1,732,374
Hemp and hemp fiber	[1] 21,459,155	[1] 21,459,155
Hops	[1] 954,200	[1] 954,200
Naval stores	[1] 1,372,873	[1] 815,375
Oats	[1] 1,338,827	[1] 66,962,650
Olive oil		[1] 578,132
Peas, dry, edible	[1] 889,436	[1] 824,436
Pecans	[1] 3,751	[1] 3,751
Rye	[1] 159,455	[1] 17,448,925
Rye flour		7,080
Seeds	[1] 1,349,516	[1] 38,705,486
Soybeans	4,376,694	[1] 1,577,300
Sugar, Puerto Rican and Virgin Islands	23,830	23,830
Sugar beets	[1] 16,517,269	[1] 16,517,269
Sweetpotatoes	[1] 135,421	[1] 135,421
Turkeys	11,070	11,070
Vegetables, canned	11,942	11,942
Total	[1] 374,908,741	[1] 1,013,329,084
Exchange commodities		[1] 10,151,648
Total price support	[1] 1,064,617,225	[1] 5,173,746,788

[1] Denotes loss.

MORE TROUBLE AHEAD

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a melancholy record that Mr. Benson has compiled in the years he should have been the chief champion of our farm people before the Nation.

And it is with deep distress and regret that I must tell the House that, for agriculture, the worst seems yet ahead.

The handwriting is on the wall. Out of his great and dedicated drive for lower and lower farm prices, based upon an extraordinary theory that a poor price will make better income, Mr. Benson has set the stage for an even greater farm debacle within the next 2 years.

Record wheat and feed-grain crops in 1958, the weakening of production-adjustment programs, and further reduction in price supports which will encourage larger crop outputs as farmers seek to make up in volume what they lose in unit price—all these factors clearly foreshadow these distressing developments:

Farm surpluses will mount to a new record high.

Farm program costs will climb to new heights.

Meat animal prices and the income of feed and livestock producers will decline sharply. We may see hogs selling at $10 or $12 per hundredweight.

Farm debt will set a new high record.

Finally, unless an effective farm program is developed in the next Congress and put into operation, in spite of Mr. Benson's objections, farm income will establish a new postwar low, and the effects will be felt not only by our farm people but also by the Nation's total economy.

THE 85TH CONGRESS

Mr. Speaker, the 85th Congress strove, with earnestness and dedication, to arrest the 5-year deterioration of our agricultural economy, and to return our farmers to a parity position in our free-enterprise society, but our efforts were thwarted—they were scuttled—by the veto power of the President.

This Congress worked constantly in the shadows of Mr. Eisenhower's veto power wherever the interests of agriculture were to be served.

The President put this power at the disposal of Secretary Benson.

The deep concern of the Members of this House for the well-being of agriculture is vividly spread in the records of the Committee on Agriculture. These records show that Members of this body introduced in this Congress 897 bills intended to improve the conditions of our farms. Our committee, with its 19 subcommittees, conducted 543 hearings and study sessions. We received millions of words of testimony from farmers, spokesmen for farm organizations, Department of Agriculture officials, and from others interested in agricultural legislation. We developed sound and reasonable legislation which would be fair to farmers and consumers alike.

Early in this session the Congress passed Senate Joint Resolution 162 intended to prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from cutting the price-support levels in 1958 for dairy farmers, wheat producers and for several other crops, and also to forestall severe acreage reductions in 1959 for cotton and rice producers. This legislation was intended to prevent a loss this year of over one-half billion dollars to wheat, rice, dairy, and feed grain farmers. It proposed a

reasonable solution in 1959 to the acreage allotment problems of cotton and rice farmers.

The President vetoed this legislation. That was his constitutional right. However, in a message to the Congress he made clear that some 1 million cotton and rice farmers would suffer severe and devastating slashes in their acreage allotments, unless the Congress gave Mr. Benson broad new authority to reduce farm price supports. Thus a veto barrier was erected between farmers and their Government.

Senate Joint Resolution 162 had been written to "hold the line" against further harm to farmers, while the Congress worked on a new program intended to start agriculture again in the direction of a parity position in the economy. This program, treating agriculture's problems on a commodity-by-commodity basis, was embraced in H. R. 12954, drafted by the House Committee on Agriculture. This bill would have raised farm prices and income. Mr. Benson promptly condemned it as a "monstrosity," and again threats of veto were heard. The House rejected the bill.

It became increasingly evident that the President would let no general farm bill become law unless it gave to the Secretary broader authority to cut farm prices. Thus the Congress was confronted with the reality that it must give Mr. Benson further price-cutting powers or he would impose such short acreages upon cotton and rice crops as to mean ruin for many farmers and for many communities which depend on production of these crops for their economic existence.

It was in this situation that the top echelon of the American Farm Bureau Federation brought forward a proposition to kill the parity principle completely and thus destroy the very foundation of the farm program. Mr. Benson endorsed legislation embracing the Farm Bureau proposal. It would have provided price supports for major crops at 90 percent of the average market prices of the previous 3 years, thus removing farm prices entirely from any fair relationship to costs and prices in the rest of the economy and providing a price-support system for farmers at approximately 10 percent less than they could expect to get in the marketplaces anyway.

Mr. Speaker, I am impelled to say at this point that I do not believe the parity-killing proposition introduced by the headquarters officials and employees of the American Farm Bureau Federation in any way whatsoever represented the thinking and the will of the good farm people who are members of that great organization. That patriarch of agriculture, Edward A. O'Neal, late president of the Federation, was one of the principal architects of the program to bring farmers into a parity position in our free-enterprise economy. He personally welded the farm interest into a united front and was the great leader of agriculture in those golden years prior to the advent of Mr. Benson. I cannot believe the present members of that organization would deny and defame the philosophy of Ed O'Neal, destroy the advantages his dedicated life brought to agriculture, and work against their own interests by repealing the parity concept, on which all of agriculture's aspirations and hopes are founded.

The Senate passed S. 4071, embracing the Farm Bureau proposal to kill the parity principle for cotton, corn, rice, and feed grains. The Senate took this action when it seemed that this was the only way to gain enactment and White House approval of a bill to forestall devastating cotton and rice acreage cuts in 1959, which was the major objective of the sponsors of S. 4071.

But, Mr. Speaker, when this bill came to the House for its consideration, our Committee on Agriculture unanimously opposed the destruction of the parity principle. Democrats and Republicans stood solidly against this. We would have no bill at all if it would destroy parity. The committee won the confidence and support of this House on our position and we put parity back into the law with all its dignity and as the foundation on which this Congress will rebuild a farm program, fair to farmers and consumers alike, when we have in Washington a Secretary of Agriculture and an administration that is sympathetic to the principle and the cause that the farm families of this Nation have a right and ought to be equal partners in the rewards and the blessings of free enterprise and that they are entitled to a parity position in this Nation's growth and prosperity.

In urgency, and under near suffocating pressures, we finally passed a farm bill, in the closing days of this Congress. We prevented a merciless constriction of cotton and rice acreage, but in so doing—to avoid the ever-present threat of a veto—we pleased the President by giving Mr. Benson broader farm price-cutting authority in future years.

The bill is not what I wanted. The bill is not what any friend of agriculture wanted. It is an offspring of necessity and of the veto power. It protects producers from something worse in 1959 but, unless it is repealed or changed, it will create greater problems in the years ahead.

A BASIC OBJECTIVE VERSUS FOUR MYTHS

Mr. Speaker, the farm program, based on the parity principle, was erected out of an awareness in the Congress that agriculture is the only major element of our total economy that has no device, outside of the help of Government, to pattern its production to market needs; that farmers have no way of measuring what should be their individual contributions to a balanced national supply of food and fiber without Government help; that farmers have virtually no bargaining power in the commerce they conduct; that agriculture is the only major industry that does not set its prices to cover costs and reasonable profits but goes into the marketplace and asks: "What will you give me?"

Thus the farm program, from its beginning in the 1930's, sought to employ for agriculture the two basic requirements of any successful business in a free-enterprise economy:

First. To provide machinery whereby producers may adjust their production to market requirements; and

Second. To give the producers a voice in the price of their commodities as they deliver them into the markets.

It is astonishing to me, therefore, that the farm program, aspiring to make available to farmers, for use at their own election, these fundamental and time-tested requirements of all successful private business, has been assailed in some quarters as an impingement of freedom and as at odds with free enterprise.

National propaganda has been trained against the operation of an effective farm program.

Four great myths have been planted on the farms of America and have yielded a crop of confusion, uncertainty, and doubt, around the future of agriculture. Mistrust has been created among farmers themselves, in their own program.

First. Farmers are told that lower prices will solve their problems.

Second. Farmers are told that increased efficiency will solve their problems.

Third. Farmers are told that movement of people out of agriculture will solve their problems—that is, the problems of those who are left.

Fourth. Farmers and the Nation at large are told that the price-support program is responsible for surplus farm production.

The present Secretary of Agriculture—virtually from the day he took office in 1953—has repeatedly told his audiences, principally consumers, that the farmer is pricing himself out of his markets. We do not recall that at the same time the people who manufacture tractors, trucks, fertilizer, sell fuel and all the other requirements in the production of food and fiber, have said that their prices are too high. Indeed not, for the costs of things that farmers use in production have been increasing month by month, while farmers' profits have been going down year by year.

As to the second myth, relating to increased efficiency, recent experience indicates that the improved methods of production have not solved but have intensified the farm problem.

The improvement of efficiency in agriculture in the last few years has been unmatched in any other period of our history. Crop production per acre in 1957 was 40 percent above the 1935-39 average. Total man-hours of labor used for farm work declined by 34 percent in this 20-year period; yet, greater and greater abundance has come from the land. Output per man-hour of farm labor has increased 127 percent. The number of consumers supported by 1 farmworker has doubled, from 10 in the 1930's to more than 20 today.

Yet, for the 5 years 1953 through 1957, the rewards to the farmer and his family constantly declined.

The third myth is as cruel as it is fallacious. It seeks an answer to the farm problem by moving people out of agriculture. The theory seems to be that overall farm output would be reduced, and that total farm income would be divided among fewer farmers.

The fact is that we have experienced the greatest movement of people from our farms in the last few years that we have ever known; yet, total farm out-

put has increased to new record levels. In a discussion of this myth, the question might well be raised as to what would happen to farm income if the population attrition continues and another 1 million of the approximately 5 million farm families go out of agriculture. The annual realized net farm income of around $11,500,000,000, when divided among 5 million farms, shows an average per farm income of $2,300, for investment, management, and labor. Divide the same total net of agriculture by 4 million farms and the per-farm income still is only $2,875.

As to the final myth—that price supports are responsible for surplus farm production—we need only to point out that total farm output in 1957 was 6 percent higher than 5 years earlier in spite of a 25-percent decline in net farm income; but the combined production of the 6 basic crops subject to acreage allotments and price supports was 13 percent lower, not higher, in 1957 than in 1952. Farm output is too great for available market outlets primarily because the technological revolution in agriculture, in the absence of a sympathetically administered farm program, is increasing total output faster than commercial markets can absorb it.

These four myths are being employed today to divide and confuse farm people and the general public. This propaganda in spite of its falsity is used in the broad assault upon the farm program.

THE LAND—THE PEOPLE—THE NATION

Mr. Speaker, the land is the source of life itself. Its ownership by fewer and fewer individuals is a dangerous thing. All history testifies to the upheaval, the decline of nations and of peoples, where control of land was concentrated in the hands of a privileged few and the many were denied its access and possession.

In these and other of my remarks the Members of this great body no doubt will note not only criticism but also a certain bitterness on my part toward the policies of Secretary Benson.

Yes; I despise his settled course toward a low-price, low-income agriculture, because of the hardships and injustices already visited upon so many farm families of this broad and rich land of ours; but this bitterness I feel, and which sometimes overbrims and I cannot contain it, comes from a deep dread and fright that Mr. Benson is leading this beloved country of ours toward the dispossession of the many on the land in favor of the few who will survive these devil-take-the-hindmost policies he has invoked upon our farmers.

He has used his office and his time not as a chief spokesman and champion of agriculture but to sow the seeds of prejudice among city people against our farmers; he has alined one farm group, one crop, one region against another, to divide and confuse our farm people; he has turned the power of Government against the small farmer, condemning him as inefficient and unworthy of a place on the land.

When a Minnesota farm wife asked the Secretary: "What shall we do?" the Secretary replied: "Find other employment."

The unemployment lines and relief rolls in the cities now are packed with people who once enjoyed security and a good life on our farms. Mr. Benson's own records show that approximately 2 million persons left our farms in the brief span of 1 year, from 1956 to 1957.

Mr. Speaker, the American free-enterprise system was built upon a foundation of free and independent—and numerous—family-operated farms. I think the Nation needs to take a fresh free-enterprise look at the family farm.

FREE ENTERPRISE AND THE FAMILY FARM

There are today more independent units of enterprise in agriculture than in all other industry and business combined. Moreover, the assets of agriculture are virtually equal to the total productive values in all our manufacturing corporations. There still are almost 5 million separate and independent business enterprises operating in agriculture, while all other units of enterprise, in our industry and business, number about 4.2 million.

It will be a sad day for America, if giant corporate farmers supplant our family system in agriculture.

Free enterprise does not live on profits, interest, and rentals alone. It prospers by the incentive to every young man that, by devotion to his job and good management of his affairs, some day he may be his own boss—he may own his own farm or his own business.

It is my feeling and my fear that by the proportion we reduce the number of individual units of enterprise we weaken the American individual free-enterprise system; and it is my conviction that for agriculture we cannot afford to substitute a hired hand, corporate-managed system for the independent, free-enterprise family-farm operation.

It is astonishing to me that any American, especially an official of Government who is aware of history and of the world today, could be inclined to a philosophy guided solely by bigness in our agriculture.

Our continent was settled largely by people fleeing from the feudal estates, the baronial-operated farms, of Europe. Bigness did not produce efficiency and strength in a people in the feudal system. In our own time we have the example of the failure of collectivism on the farms of Russia, where the pride and productivity of family unit work and possession have been condemned and suppressed.

How then can we stand silent in America, in awe of bigness, while thousands of our farmers are being dispossessed because of policies of our Government that mitigate against them?

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, I implore all the Members of this House, I beseech all Americans, to examine the primary source of our strength.

We are the best-fed Nation on the face of the earth.

Our people spend a smaller proportion of their income on food than any other people on earth.

In Russia, agriculture requires the labor of fully one-half of the total population. One family on a farm hardly can feed itself and one other family in town. In America, each farm worker feeds 20 persons. Thus while half of Russia's total population works on farms, and still cannot meet the needs for food and fiber, in America the efficiency of our family farm system releases 90 percent of the Nation's total work force—for employment in factories, in mines, in shops, in transport, in all the other pursuits which, with the abundance of food and fiber from our farms—makes the United States standard of living the envy of the world.

The nature and productivity of our agriculture underlies the growth and strength of the greatest industrial establishment the world has ever known. Our agriculture produces not only an abundance—a cornucopia—of food, but supplies raw materials for our industry. The greater portion of our working force in industry and business is made up of men and women who in other nations, because of the poorness of their agriculture, are required to work on farms, if these nations are to feed themselves.

Mr. Speaker, we must protect the agricultural establishment that serves this nation so well. We cannot forfeit our farmers to an alien philosophy of concentrations and bigness.

We must have an effective farm program, to serve our farm families as our Government provides the minimum wage and collective bargaining powers to protect our labor force, and as our industry is protected by the many laws that soften the impacts of harsh and unrestrained competition.

Our farm program must enable farmers, as other businessmen, to adjust their production to their markets. It must give the producers a voice in the price of the things they sell, as is essential to any successful business.

We must begin in the next Congress to repair the damage that Mr. Benson has done—to build a new and effective farm program.

This Nation, committed to economic and political freedom under capitalism, cannot afford to permit more than one-half of its free-enterprise units and almost half of its free-enterprise assets to teeter constantly on the edge of insolvency.

It is unthinkable that urban people, from Mr. Benson's preachings, can be persuaded to a position of prejudice against our farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I have faith in the fairness and wisdom of the American people. I am supremely confident that the representatives of the urban populations will join those of us representing farm areas in this Congress to reject the Benson philosophy of low prices and fewer people in agriculture, and that they will help us to write legislation assuring to the farm families of this Nation a parity position in the rewards of enterprise, so they they, too, may enjoy full partnership in the blessings of this capitalistic system that has brought us abundance and unmatched strength and prosperity as a nation.

Final Report, 2d Session, 85th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it has been my custom to submit a final report of the work of the Congress to the residents of the 23d Congressional District. Such a report on the 2d session of the 85th Congress follows:

WASHINGTON REPORT BY WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

Near the end of each session of Congress, it has been my privilege to bring to the voters of the 23d Congressional District a final report of the preceding session's accomplishments. As we approach adjournment after 8 months in session, we find that 4,944 bills were introduced and 1,348 enacted into law. Many hours have been spent each day in committee and on the floor preparing and debating the legislation comprising this record, and each Congressman has been diligent in trying to do what he felt to be best for his district and country. Major legislation not passed at this session included a general tax cut, Federal aid for school construction, statehood for Hawaii, new law on succession when President is disabled, and a strong antiracketeering labor bill The following major pieces of legislation were enacted into law:

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Defense Reorganization Act of 1958 streamlines Department of Defense by transferring power of separate service Secretaries to Secretary of Defense. Will result in shortening of command channels, lessen feuding among services, and reduce duplication. Most of President's recommendations were adopted.

National Aeronautics and Space Act sets up civilian space agency which will control research into problems of flight within and outside earth's atmosphere. Cleveland's T. Keith Glennon will head it. Military projects stay under control of Pentagon.

Armed Forces salary increase bill adjusts method of computing pay for members of services; intended to encourage personnel to make careers in the military.

Defense appropriation for 1959 provides $39,602,827,000 for defense spending, a total of $815,857 more than President requested, our largest peacetime military appropriation.

Military construction appropriation authorizes nearly $1.7 billion in military construction during the current fiscal year, covering a multitude of projects in this country and abroad.

Federal scholarships law strengthens national defense by encouraging and assisting in expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mutual Security Act, commonly known as foreign aid. Of $3.2 billion voted, about one-half for economic aid, remainder for military. President originally asked for approximately $4 billion.

Reciprocal trade extends act for 4 years and enables President to cut tariffs 20 percent below present rates. Program is designed to insure continuance of liberal foreign trade. President won major victory on this one.

Atomic Energy Act permits greater exchange of information and material with our NATO allies; old law permitted sharing information with Britain only.

Euratom measure provides for United States cooperation with European Atomic Energy Community to advance peaceful application of atomic energy, provides United States support of 1 million kilowatts of atomic power in 6 West Europe nations.

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Small Business Administration law makes SBA permanent agency which should make it a more effective advocate of small business. Extends long-term credit to small businesses, and establishes a program to stimulate flow of private equity capital. Ceilings on individual loans are raised to $350,000.

Small business tax relief grants in form of fast writeoffs an estimated $260 million which will benefit retained earnings, loss carrybacks, and estate taxes.

Corporate and excise tax extension bill provides a 1-year extension of existing corporate normal tax rate and certain excise-tax rates, repeals 3-percent excise tax on freight transportation.

Social Security Act revision increases monthly retirement checks by 7 percent which will be covered by higher payroll taxes beginning in January.

Transportation Act provides much needed relief for railroads, amends Interstate Commerce Act by giving more freedom in ratemaking and in abandoning service on losing lines. Also provides a $500 million loan program.

Debt limit measure approved boosting debt ceiling from $275 billion to $283 billion.

Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act permits States to borrow necessary Federal funds to extend payment of unemployment compensation benefits.

Tax reduction: One bill amends Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to correct unintended benefits and hardships; another reduces excise taxes by $42 million annually. Also cut were some admission taxes; basic income taxes remained the same.

GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION

Alaska statehood authorization will make Alaska our 49th State after 42 years of effort as soon as formalities in Territory are concluded. However, 49-star flag cannot be flown until July 4, 1959.

Federal Aviation Agency Act creates an independent agency of Government to insure greater aviation safety headed by civilian administrator and directly responsible to President and Congress. Law centralizes civil control over air traffic.

A Hoover Commission recommendation, H. R. 8002, budgetary reform which tightens control over departmental spending.

PUBLIC WORKS

Highway construction legislation authorizes $3½ billion for this year and the same amount for next for construction of highways, $198 million of which will be Ohio's share each year, second largest amount allocated to any State, California being first.

Rivers and harbors omnibus bill provides $1.5 billion for improvement of rivers, harbors, and other waterways for navigation, flood control, etc. Included in this measure is a provision for improvements to Cleveland Harbor and replacement of Erie Railroad bridge over Cuyahoga River, Baltimore & Ohio Railroad bridge over Old River, and Willow Avenue Highway Bridge.

Federal Airport Act extends program for Federal aid for airport development through 1963 and increases amount of funds so allocated annually from $63 million to $100 million. Under act, following funds allocated for years 1957 through 1959: Cleveland-Hopkins Airport, $2,147,000; Cuyahoga County Airport, $654,500; and Lakefront Airport, $300,000.

Aeronautics research bill provides for construction of additional facilities of NACA, $8,892,000 of which would go to Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory in Cleveland.

Emergency housing bill to provide stimulant to residential housing; authorizes almost $2 billion in housing loan funds.

New post office buildings for Bay Village and Rocky River, improvements to Chagrin Falls Post Office.

GENERAL LEGISLATION

Postal pay and rate increase raises pay of postal workers by 10 percent and increases postage rates to decrease postal deficit by providing the Department with an additional estimated one-half billion dollars per year.

Federal employees salary increase gives a wage raise of 10 percent to all classified Government workers retroactive to January 1, 1958.

Veterans' benefits: One bill raises to $250 amount Government will pay for burial expenses of war veterans or of those with peacetime service drawing service-connected disability pay, another raises ceiling on disability pay for holders of World War II GI life insurance—new maximum $10 per month for each $1,000 of insurance instead of present $5.

First District Views on Key Issues and Summary of Congressional Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, shortly after I was elected to Congress, I prepared an opinion questionnaire which was mailed to every resident of the First District whose name is listed in a telephone directory.

The response to this questionnaire was very encouraging. More than 5,000 First District people took the time to express their views by this means—and many of them wrote additional comments on the margins and backs of the questionnaire blanks.

The questionnaire asked their views on 12 important issues before this session of Congress. As a result of the questionnaire, thousands of people took advantage of an opportunity to inform their Congressman of their thinking. And their Congressman certainly appreciated being informed of their opinions.

The reactions of First District people to this questionnaire were varied and interesting.

One man summed up his feelings quite well, I believe, when he wrote:

It is refreshing to be asked my opinion. My impression has been that elected officials more or less forget the voters after the election.

Another man replied:

This is a splendid idea, befitting a Government of the people and as was intended by the fathers of our country.

A woman who described herself as the mother of seven children, wrote to say that now she can "appreciate the numerous issues" which come before Congress every day.

She added:

I think this is a fine way to learn the opinions of the people. This is the first time I have ever received such a form.

The questionnaire results:

Questionnaire

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No answer
1. What do you think of our spending on national defense? Enough, 61.4 percent; too much, 16.7 percent; not enough, 15 percent			6.9
2. Do you favor continuance of the mutual security program of military and economic aid to friendly nations?	77.4	17.7	4.9
3. Do you favor extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act?	81.7	7.7	10.6
4. Do you favor passage of a scientific scholarship act which will provide for training of potential young scientists?	67.2	30.5	2.3
5. Do you favor Federal aid for school construction?	48.9	48.5	2.6
6. Do you favor increasing postal rates to reduce the deficit in the Post Office Department?	72.0	25.1	2.9
7. Do you favor tax reductions to stimulate business if it causes us to have an unbalanced budget?	18.6	80.2	1.2
8. Do you favor increased Government spending if necessary to stimulate business?	34.0	61.8	4.2
9. Do you favor legislation which would provide safeguards against misuse of labor union and corporate welfare funds?	95.1	3.9	1.0
10. Do you favor returning to the States some of the activities that are now carried on by the Federal Government?	74.6	17.1	8.3
11. Do you believe our present flexible price-support program is working?	39.5	51.5	9.0
12. If you answer "No" to question 11—			
(a) Do you favor increasing price supports?	20.5	67.1	12.4
(b) Do you favor an alternative program which would eliminate all price supports?	79.1	19.6	1.3
	Farmers		
11. Do you believe our present flexible price-support program is working?	28.1	68.7	3.1
12. If you answer "No" to question 11—			
(a) Do you favor increasing price supports?	43.0	57.0	0
(b) Do you favor an alternative program which would eliminate all price supports?	54.3	36.4	9.3

ACTION OF CONGRESS

At this point I believe it is valuable to list the actions of Congress which coincide with the views of the people who answered the First District questionnaire—as well as a general summary of decisions made by House and Senate on other specific pieces of legislation.

LABOR

The greatest block of First District people answering the questionnaire—95.1 percent—favored passage of legislation to provide safeguards against misuse of labor union and corporate welfare plans.

Congress passed what can be called a moderate plan to achieve this end—legislation requiring all administrators of pension and welfare plans to make available once a year a report on the operation of these programs. This report can be studied and examined by all persons concerned. In addition, this legislation requires the filing of two copies of such a report with the Secretary of Labor.

The best known article of labor legislation—the Kennedy-Ives bill—was rejected by a bipartisan majority in the House as a direct result of mismanagement and delay on the part of the House leadership.

This bill was fashioned in the Senate, after that body adopted a series of amendments which had not been recommended by the committee. When the bill came to the House, it should have been carefully studied by the House Committee on Education and Labor. Unfortunately, inaction and stalling in the House and an attempt to short-circuit democratic processes caused defeat for this bill.

The legislation arrived in the House in mid-June and was held in a state of suspended animation for 41 days before it was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. This Committee did not even schedule public hearings so that the bill could benefit from public discussion.

Suddenly the bill was routed to the floor under a parliamentary procedure which limits debate to a total of 40 minutes and precludes amendments. Thus this legislation was thrust before the House membership on an all-or-nothing basis, with a harsh gag rule placed on the membership. This was sad treatment for a bill which could have been one of the most valuable pieces of legislation passed in this Congress.

RECIPROCAL TRADE

The second largest group of people who answered the questionnaire—81.7 percent—supported extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Congress extended the trade agreements for 4 years and reserved the power to override any Presidential veto of the Tariff Commission.

AGRICULTURE

Any expression of agricultural policy in the questionnaire is important because the First District is one of the great farming regions of the United States. A total of 51.5 percent of all persons who answered the questionnaire believe that our present flexible price support program is not working. Thirty-nine and five-tenths percent feel that the flexible program is working.

Of those who believe the flexible program is not working, 79.1 percent believe that an alternative program is desirable—a program which would eliminate all price supports. Twenty and five-tenths percent of those who do not believe flexible supports are working favor an increase in price supports while in this same category 67.1 are opposed to higher supports.

It is enlightening to study the views of farmers who responded to the questionnaire.

Of the total number of farmers expressing their opinion, 68.7 percent believe that the flexible support program is not working. Of this group which feels the program is not successful, 54.3 percent support an alternative farm program, and 36.4 percent do not; 43.0 percent favor increased price supports and 57 percent do not.

Farm legislation passed by Congress provides for lower supports and a relaxation of controls for cotton and rice farmers—extending to them the opportunity—which they requested—to better meet the competition.

The farm bill also stipulates a referendum for corn farmers, giving them the option of voting for either the present program—ranging from 75 to 90 percent of parity—with ineffective controls on production, or a program of 65 percent of parity and no control on production.

The following farm programs were extended by Congress: The Wool Act, Public Law 480—the surplus disposal law which provides food for needy people at home and abroad and which enables our country to sell much of its overabundance of food for foreign currencies, the Armed Forces milk program, and the school milk program.

BIG GOVERNMENT

The questionnaire shows the prevailing philosophy of many First District people that Government must be prevented from encroaching on the liberties and destinies of the American people.

A full 74.6 percent of the people who answered the questionnaire support a return to the States of some of the activities now carried on by the Federal Government.

DEFENSE, INTERNATIONAL ISSUES

The people were explicit in their support of key national defense, international, and educational programs.

A total of 61.4 percent supported current spending on national defense. Congress approved essential defense appropriations and in addition supported the defense reorganization program to streamline chains of command and provide a more systematic, unified defense program at a saving of tax dollars and elimination of costly duplication.

Of those completing the questionnaire 77.4 percent endorsed continuation of the mutual security program of military and economic aid to friendly countries.

A Scientific Scholarship Act, to provide for the training of potential young scientists was approved by 67.2 percent of the people who returned the questionnaire.

Congress altered the scholarship provision and set up instead a loan program for students attending colleges.

Almost equally divided opinion existed in the questionnaire returns on the subject of Federal aid for school construction. This program was supported by 48.9 percent and was opposed by 48.5 percent. This legislation did not come up for consideration during 1958.

ECONOMIC, ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES

On a question relating to operation of the Post Office Department, 72 percent endorsed higher postal rates to offset the Department's deficit. Congress raised postal rates and granted an increase for post office employees.

A heavy majority of First District people registered opposition to increased Government spending to stimulate business—61.8 percent. Another economic question dealt with tax reduction. Eighty and two-tenths percent of those answering the questionnaire opposed tax reductions if they would result in an unbalanced budget.

Major steps taken by Congress include the Tax Rate Extension Act of 1958 which repeals the 3 percent Federal tax on freight transportation. This law extends for the period of 1 year the present corporation tax and other excise taxes.

The Transportation Act of 1958 allows the Interstate Commerce Commission to operate a program of guaranteed loans to aid the railroad industry—an essential measure to preserve the health of this vital industry.

The Congress extended unemployment insurance up to 13 weeks to those who had exhausted their benefits under the existing law. It also increased social-security benefits an average of 7 percent, as well as increasing to some States the Federal share of public-assistance payments.

A major accomplishment was scored by this Congress for small business. The Small Business Act of 1958 insured the place of the Small Business Administration as a permanent agency of the Federal Government. The National Investment Company Act which aids small-business investment companies and Small Business Tax Revision Act were also enacted.

ADDITIONAL MAJOR ACTIONS

Growing awareness of the need for a program for outer space was reflected in legislation to create a National Aeronautics and Space Administration to direct our country's progress in the field of space exploration. This act enables the civilian Administrator of the agency to draft a comprehensive space program.

Congress voted for the admission of Alaska as the 49th State—an addition which can add substantially to our national strength and well-being.

IN CONCLUSION

The above report on the First District questionnaire and the actions of Congress is intended as a service to people of the district.

Now that Congress has adjourned, I intend to continue the program of service to the people—the same service which has been extended to them from Washington.

As a convenience to the people, I have set up an office at Faribault.

The address of the office is: Room 228, Faribault Post Office Building, 28 Third Street NE., Faribault, Minn.

The telephone number is 4–6789.

This office will be open beginning September 1, with the hours from 9 a. m. to 5 p. m., Monday through Friday.

Congressman Dollinger's Annual Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the 85th Congress has achieved a remarkable record of legislative work done; it is considered the most productive Congress in a quarter of a century. It will go down in history as the Congress which squarely faced up to and constructively tackled overwhelming problems of a new era, the space age. It was called upon to legislate not only for the benefit of our Nation and the world of today, but to envision and grapple with problems of the new world of the future. I think it is safe to say that no previous Congress has had so many crises to deal with simultaneously, and it had the terrible responsibility of doing all in its power to assure humanity that there would be a world of the future.

Among other history-making acts, the 85th Congress set up a new Government agency to cope with the problems of space, and created a new star and a new State out of the Territory of Alaska.

Although the achievements of the 85th Congress are great, many vitally important measures were shelved or failed of passage. The accomplishments were due to a strong Democratic program and in spite of a sad lack of leadership on the part of our President. We remember his many splendid promises, to balance the budget, to lower taxes, to provide housing for the needy and low-income groups. Promises they were, and promises they remain, for he has not raised his voice to push the programs. Instead of the promised help, the American people are paying increased taxes, struggling to meet alltime high living costs; they lack adequate housing and educational facilities, just to mention a few areas of neglect.

The President has been accused of defaulting on his responsibilities in matters of foreign policy, which caused us to reach rockbottom in the estimation of the world. He has refused to take responsibility in the Little Rock crisis, and regarding post-sputnik problems, to such an extent that our people have become uneasy and have suffered loss of confidence in the strength of their leader and the security of their Nation. As to the recession, the President's policy seemed to be promise and procrastinate rather than proceed and provide.

The strategy of the Republican Party has not changed; the Republicans continue to indicate that they favor necessary and beneficial legislation, such as housing and civil rights, but when the vote is taken, their true colors are apparent. The long-standing coalition of Republicans with certain Southern Democrats, and the apathy and indifference of the President, are responsible for the defeat of numerous measures which we had hoped to pass.

MAJOR BILLS PASSED

Defense reorganization, extension of reciprocal trade, and foreign aid were vitally important to the United States, not only at home but abroad, as well as to many other free nations who must have our assistance if they are to survive and if peace is to be achieved.

The National Defense Education Act of 1958, although the first of its kind to be adopted, is, nevertheless, only a small gesture toward alleviating the grave educational crisis we face and is woefully inadequate. Educational needs of American youth must be considered our first line of nonmilitary defense, but Congress refused to meet effectively the challenge of Soviet scientific achievement. When passed, the bill had been stripped of all scholarships. I was in favor of providing scholarships to promote studies in science, mathematics, and other fields, as provided in the original bill.

In grappling with recession problems, Congress passed legislation providing for a limited extension of unemployment benefits, highway and emergency housing legislation, assistance to depressed communities, and aid to small business.

IMPORTANT LEGISLATION WHICH FAILED OF ENACTMENT

The slum-clearance and public housing bill was defeated, much to my dismay, and the municipal public works projects bill was also turned down.

Congress also failed to revise and liberalize our immigration laws. It failed to provide Federal aid for school building, and to increase the minimum wage. It balked at a general cut in taxes for individuals; it refused to consider statehood for Hawaii.

SOCIAL SECURITY

I was gratified that the Congress passed the social security amendments of 1958 to increase social security primary insurance benefits, as well as to remove some existing inequities and to liberalize the Social Security Act in many other respects.

The increase of 7 percent in the amount payable to the retired worker will be of some help to those millions of our elder citizens who have been suffering grave hardships, unable to exist on present social-security benefits, due to ever-increasing living costs. I urged the Committee on Ways and Means and the House to increase cash monthly benefits by at least 10 percent, as I felt that 7 percent was inadequate, but was unsuccessful in my efforts.

I introduced a bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that entitlement to State workmen's compensation benefits shall not prevent an individual from receiving full disability insurance bene-

fits under the Social Security Act. Congress repealed the section of the act, as provided in my bill, so that in the future, disabled workers will be entitled to receive both social-security benefits and benefits payable on account of disability under other Federal programs or a State workmen's compensation system. I was pleased that my effort was successful.

I also introduced a bill providing for the removal of the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving social security benefits, and stated during the debate in the House that the limitation upon a pensioner's earnings is a great handicap and unjustly penalizes him. However, no major changes were made in this regard although the provisions are slightly liberalized.

Another omission, which I greatly deplore, is a program of health benefits to cover the cost of certain hospital, nursing home, and surgical services for those receiving or entitled to old-age and survivors insurance benefits. This vitally needed protection should be provided those who cannot now obtain or afford private insurance and cannot meet the expense of illness and care.

PAY RAISES FOR POSTAL AND CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES

I fought hard before the committee and in the House for pay raises for our postal and classified Federal employees. I urged the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to give them the substantial salary increases they required in order to meet alltime high living costs, and stated that it would be unrealistic to grant employees a token increase which would not remedy the situation or remove hardships they were suffering. Although the increases granted by Congress were less than I had hoped for, they were the best that could be obtained, and were of some help to our faithful postal and classified employees who had been compelled to exist on a substandard, bare subsistence level.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The 85th Congress in 1957 passed the first general civil rights law in three-quarters of a century, but so far it has been proved virtually ineffective, and no real progress has been made under it.

This year, when civil rights legislation was again being considered by the Committee on the Judiciary, I pointed out that the need for strong, workable, effective civil rights legislation is greater than ever.

As well as numerous bills to end discrimination, I introduced a bill which would enlist the powers and influence of the Attorney General in a determined attack upon denials of civil rights. Among other things, the bill empowers the Attorney General to sue civilly to enjoin segregation in public schools. Although the country is committed to the principle of integration, there is no policy for carrying out integration. Congress has avoided its responsibility. The President has shrugged off any responsibility for dealing with the substance of the problem, although it is his duty to deal with it, for it is the gravest internal problem of our century.

The indifference of the President and the strength of the opponents of civil rights are apparent in the fact that the President waited many months before nominating an Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Justice Department's new Civil Rights Division, and the Senate waited more than 7 months before considering confirmation of the nomination.

CONCLUSION

Space limitations prevent my discussing in detail other problems of major concern to my constituents, or the numerous bills not heretofore discussed, which I introduced for the benefit and general welfare of the people. Tax relief, veterans' benefits, increase in minimum wage, immigration, housing, legislation to aid consumers in these days of record-breaking living costs, problems of our elder citizens with regard to employment and other necessary assistance, all received my earnest attention and efforts. I shall continue to be responsive to the needs of the people I represent and to work for passage of laws to benefit them as well as for the protection and well-being of all our people and the Nation.

BRONX CONGRESSIONAL OFFICE

My Congressional office at 938 Simpson Street, Bronx, is open daily. I invite my constituents to call there and discuss any requests or problems they may have. I am also happy to have them write me and allow me to have the benefit of their views regarding legislation. A warm welcome awaits those who call at my office, 1723 House Office Building, the Capitol, when they visit Washington.

Reclamation Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, during my five terms in Congress, I have become increasingly concerned over the many means employed to frustrate one of the principal objectives of the Federal reclamation laws; namely, that of providing irrigation water only for true family-size farms. I have also become increasingly concerned about the greater and greater subsidies being given large landowners, temporarily or permanently, through this frustration of the family-size farm principle.

These are not problems in the public-land projects, but they are very real and serious problems on those reclamation projects that include lands in private ownership. The Reclamation Act of 1902 was written in terms of similar treatment for homesteaders and for private landowners. We have stuck close to the principle in the first case. We have departed further and further from it in the second.

Illustrations of what I am concerned about are numerous. The most prominent is the delivery of interest-free, subsidized water to as many 160-acre farms as a man can buy for himself, his wife, and each of his children. Less well known are the cases where Congress has been induced to write complete exemptions from the 160-acre water delivery law for individual projects—Colorado-Big Thompson in Colorado, for instance, and Truckee storage in Nevada, and Owl Creek in Montana, among others. And still less well known is the administrative exemption in the case of the Imperial Irrigation District in California—for reasons unknown either to me or the Justice Department—while next door the Coachella district has no exemption. Finally, there is the Kings River case in California where year after year the Interior Department negotiates temporary contracts with no acreage limitation, again for reasons unknown and unexplained.

Where and when and how we got off the track is not my concern. But where and when and how we get back on the track is my concern. It is for this reason that I have introduced H. R. 13759. I introduced this bill, even though it was late in the session and there was no hope of action on it during the 85th Congress, so that it can be studied by all concerned and perfected this fall. I intend to reintroduce it in January and to call for full-dress consideration of it by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which I am a member. In view of the Supreme Court's recent decision in the Ivanhoe case, it seems to me that the time is ripe for this.

My bill is intended to do three principal things: First, put the emphasis on the family rather than the individual in administration of the excess-land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws; second, restate and reemphasize the recordable contract requirements of the Omnibus Adjustment Act of 1926; third, knock out any subsidy to families receiving water for more than 160 acres, whether the subsidy is by way of interest-free money or by way of net power revenues used to assist in irrigation repayment.

None of these is completely new. Rather, I have tried to combine the best features of familiar laws into a single solid program. The emphasis on family rather than individual comes straight from the reclamation homestead laws. I see no reason why, if this principle is good in public-land projects, we should think it necessary or desirable to multiply the permissible limit on the acreage in private ownership to which water can be delivered by 2, 3, 4, or 5, depending on how many children a man has. My recordable contract provision comes from section 46 of the Omnibus Adjustment Act of 1926. I would continue this in full force, modified only to accommodate it to the family instead of the individual. And the provision for interest payments is, in substance, what has become familiar through the Small Projects Act and other legislation. I have extended its principle only far enough to remove explicitly other forms of subsidy to the large landowner.

I am fully aware of the argument that, with modern farm machinery, 160 acres does not constitute a family size farm any more—that the farmer and his family can efficiently operate much more than this acreage. This, I think, puts the wrong slant on the family size farm principle. The principle does not go to the greatest acreage a farmer can operate with or without machinery, but to the acreage which it takes for him to earn a decent living for himself and his family.

In this connection, I point out that I am also aware that there will be situations in which 160 acres is not enough to provide a family living—in high mountain regions, for example—and that there are situations in which 160 acres is far more than enough for this purpose. I thought about adding to my bill provisions to permit flexible adjustments in the acreage to which water may be delivered without recordable contracts and without surcharges, but, in view of the reluctance of the Department of the Interior to accept a responsibility that it should gladly exercise in this regard, I have deferred this for consideration at a later time.

Titoism and Masters of Imposture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, a recently published book exposing the fraud which the Communist dictator, Tito, has been engaged in has just been brought to my attention. The title of the book is, "Titoism and Masters of Imposture." Its author is a young man named Joseph Kalvota who, at the time of the alleged break of Tito with the old Russian Cominform, was held in a Communist prison in Czechoslovakia and who today is in the United States serving as an instructor in political science and history at St. Joseph College, West Hartford, Conn.

Over and above his teaching activities Mr. Kalvota is acting chairman of the Czech Christian Democratic Movement and a candidate for a doctor's degree at Columbia University, New York City. The book, Titoism and Masters of Imposture, presents a very scholarly, factual, and interesting analysis of the political movements in Yugoslavia during World War II and the unhappy circumstances under which Tito seized total power in that country. It points out the undying devotion which Tito has to Russian communism, and why Tito has refused to criticize anything essential to the victory of communism, and the certainty that Tito and his henchmen will, under any circumstances, defend the Russians on any issue that has to do with the victory of world communism.

This book is filled with interesting, stimulating, and at all times factual chapters on the meaning of Titoism in the struggle of the cold war. The author points out that Titoism is, in fact, the major lullaby in the repertoire of the Russian rock-a-bye-baby songs with which they have been attempting to put the people of the Free World into a deep slumber. Tito is accurately portrayed as the agent of neutralism as well as a means by which Stalin distracted the Free World from the principal problem of Russian imperialism.

Members of Congress will be particularly interested in this new book because it quotes extensively from the various hearings and the Congressional floor debates on the Tito issue. In fairness to all, the author quotes the differing opinions expressed and then analyzes them in the cold reality of the Tito record of 1948 up to the present. This is a book which warrants the time and careful reading of all those who seek the truth and who are not afraid to face the political realities as they exist in our world today.

Some Facts and Figures on Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, in response to numerous inquiries I have brought together certain facts and figures setting forth concisely the conditions of our agriculture as they relate to the total economy and including some comparisons of the last 5 years with the previous 20 years prior to the time that Mr. Ezra Taft Benson became the Secretary of Agriculture.

With the permission of the House I am inserting this material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

FACTS AND FIGURES

CCC FARM PRICE SUPPORT LOSSES

As of January 1, 1953: $1,064,617,225.

As of January 1, 1958: $5,173,746,788.

(NOTE.—The losses in 5 years, from January 1953 through 1957, were 4 times the total of losses during the previous 20-year history of Commodity Credit Corporation price-support operations.)

Twenty-year loss (1933–52): $1,064,617,225.

Loss (1953 through 1957): $4,109,129,563.

CCC OPERATIONS IN BASIC CROPS ONLY (COTTON, WHEAT, TOBACCO, CORN, RICE, AND PEANUTS)

January 1, 1953 (at the end of 20 years): $13,011,290 profit.

January 1, 1957 (4 years later): $1,992,067,863 loss.

(NOTE.—In 5 years under Mr. Benson losses on the basic crops amounted to $2,005,079,153, compared to the $13 million profit in the previous 20 years. The Commodity Credit Corporation support program for cotton, over 20 years, showed a profit of over $268 million. But this profit has been wiped out, by a cotton program loss of over $700 million in 1956 and 1957.)

LOSSES ON DAIRY PRODUCTS

Up to Jan. 1, 1953	$131,523,383
Since Jan. 1, 1953, to Jan. 1, 1958	1,431,467,309
Dairy program total	1,562,990,692

(NOTE.—The price support for dairy farmers was the first to be reduced by Mr. Benson after he became Secretary, and Government losses in the dairy program in the last 5 years have been greater than all costs of all Commodity Credit Corporation price support programs for all crops during the previous 20 years.)

CCC INVESTMENTS

Total CCC investments (inventory and loans) as of Jan. 1, 1953	$2,452,000,000
Total CCC investments (inventory and loans) as of Jan. 1, 1958	7,200,000,000
Total increase in 5 years	4,748,000,000

CCC investments in major crops (inventory and loans)

Crop	Amount	Value
Cotton:		
Jan. 1, 1953 ... bales	1,097,000	$166,779,000
Jan. 1, 1958 ... do	5,020,000	912,041,000
Wheat:		
Jan. 1, 1953 ... bushels	267,847,000	1,031,545,000
Jan. 1, 1958 ... do	942,134,000	2,498,237,000
Corn:		
Jan. 1, 1953 ... do	368,349,000	587,274,000
Jan. 1, 1958 ... do	1,265,502,000	2,173,884,000
Rice:		
Jan. 1, 1953 hundredweight	168,000	878,000
Jan. 1, 1958 ... do	15,467,000	113,749,000
Peanuts:		
Jan. 1, 1953 ... pounds	192,528,000	22,644,000
Jan. 1, 1958 ... do	213,143,000	25,322,000
Tobacco:		
Jan. 1, 1953 ... do	544,067,000	230,373,000
Jan. 1, 1958 ... do	940,742,000	589,556,000
Dairy products:		
Jan. 1, 1953		8,445,000
Jan. 1, 1958		165,835,000

Farmers (1952 and 1957)

	1952	1957
Farmers' net income (billions)	$14.4	$10.8
Farmers' share of food dollar (cents)	47	40
Prices paid by farmers, index (percent of 1910–14 average)	287	296
Prices received by farmers, index (percent of 1910–14 average)	288	242
Parity ratio	100	82
Number of farms	5,421,000	4,856,000

COMPARISONS (1957)

Per capita income

People on farms, $967.

Nonfarm people, $2,082.

Hourly earnings

Farmworkers, $0.69.

Factory workers, $2.07.

Average of farm prices in 1957 down 16 percent from 1952.

Net farm income in 1957 was 25 percent below 1952.

CONTRAST

Hourly earnings industrial workers in 1957 up 24 percent since 1952. Corporation dividend payments in 1957 up 37 percent since 1952.

Farm prices (as percentage of parity)

	Percent
1942	105
1943	113
1944	108
1945	109
1946	113
1947	115
1948	110
1949	100
1950	101
1951	107
1952	100
1953	92
1954	89
1955	84
1956	82
1957	82

Cash receipts of farmers (not including Government payments)

1932	$4,748,000,000
1947	29,620,000,000
1948	30,227,000,000
1951	32,958,000,000
1952	32,632,000,000
1955	29,556,000,000
1956	30,539,000,000
1957	29,757,000,000

Net income of farmers (including Government payments)

1932	$1,928,000,000
1947	17,304,000,000
1948	16,057,000,000
1951	15,158,000,000
1952	14,416,000,000
1955	11,470,000,000
1956	12,111,000,000
1957	10,840,000,000

National income

1932	$43,049,000,000
1948	210,098,000,000
1951	253,304,000,000
1952	268,805,000,000
1955	302,493,000,000
1956	320,024,000,000
1957	333,856,000,000

CONSUMERS

During the quarter of a century the farm program has operated the consumer has gotten better food at an expenditure of a smaller part of his income. Although costs of hauling, processing, handling, and merchandising food have increased substantially in the last few years, the average wage paid to factory workers in the United States would buy in 1957 almost twice as much food as the average hour's pay in 1929.

Consumers—Quantities of foods purchased by 1 hour of factory labor

	In 1929	In 1957
Bread ..... loaves	6.4	11.0
Steak ..... pounds	1.2	2.2
Milk ..... pints delivered	7.8	14.6
Butter ..... pounds	1.0	2.8
Bacon ..... do	1.3	3.6
Eggs ..... dozens	1.1	3.6
Potatoes ..... pounds	17.7	36.3
Oranges ..... dozens	1.3	3.6

Source: Agricultural Marketing Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

The Lives of Five Great Senators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my statement on the book by Holmes Alexander on the lives of Clay, Webster, Calhoun, La Follette, and Taft.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LYNDON B. JOHNSON OF TEXAS

When we return to the next session, I hope we will have ready for unveiling the portraits of the five great Senators who were selected by the special committee headed by the junior Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY.

This will be an historic event. All of us realize the role that is played in Senate processes by the force of tradition. And it is well for the Senate that those traditions be of greatness and integrity.

The lives of the five men who made history—Clay, Webster, Calhoun, La Follette, and Taft have been fittingly memorialized in a book by one of the most perceptive observers of the Washington scene—Holmes Alexander.

I have known Holmes for many years. He has made a careful and detailed study of legislative traditions because of his deep interest in the processes of American democracy. The book reflects not only the research he has done on the lives of the five great Senators, but the research he has done on the whole history of the Senate.

It is a book which should be read by all Americans who desire to understand the workings of this body which is so important in their daily lives. I myself have gone through it with deep interest and I have found that it has broadened my understanding of the past.

Food Stamp Plan—Humane and Proper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has again closed its books without passing a food stamp plan; however, we came very close to success on August 18, 1958 when H. R. 13067, a bill to provide for a food stamp plan for the distribution of $1 billion worth of surplus food commodities a year to needy persons and families in the United States, as introduced by Congresswoman LEONOR SULLIVAN, was called up for a vote in the House under a motion to suspend the rules. This procedure is ordinarily reserved for noncontroversial legislation—no amendments are permitted, debate is limited to 20 minutes on each side, and a two-thirds majority vote is necessary to pass a bill. Since the Rules Committee refused to grant this proposal a rule, this was the only manner in which the food stamp bill could be brought up.

Congresswoman SULLIVAN'S bill was very similar to my own bill, H. R. 901, which I have introduced in the past 3 Congresses and which I fully intend to reintroduce again in the 86th Congress.

During the debate on the bill it was pointed out that the United States is presently contributing more than 2 billion pounds of surplus foods, at an annual cost of more than $300 million to 85 foreign countries, and that in certain instances this has meant the actual difference between life or death for many thousands of people.

It was further pointed out that, although this is to the eternal credit of the United States, we also have many in our own country who are in great need of our surplus food and that the present programs in use for delivering it to our own people are inadequate.

The failure of the Congress to enact an adequate distribution plan can be indirectly traced to basic ignorance of the situation. I hesitate to use such strong language, but this had been displayed so clearly in the fight against the food stamp plan through the years, that it can no longer be mistaken for anything else but ignorance.

There are some people in this country, some in very responsible positions, who would truly rather see American citizens live on near starvation diets than permit them 1 pound of the surplus foods that their Government is holding in its warehouses.

This attitude is based upon the mistaken belief that if those persons, who are forced to seek aid through a welfare agency, are given surplus foods, they would, by that action, disturb suppliers and business profits. The point is entirely missed as these people are not customers who will be drawn away from the retail food markets for they are not now in a position to become customers of any market.

This entire attitude, to me, is the height of individual and group stupidity. The greatest danger of this is that it has shown itself on the national level where it can, and has had indirect effect on the whole national economy, partly brought out in today's depression.

Let me repeat, the fight against the food stamp plan is nothing but ignorance. Anyone can read the debate in the RECORD, but let me quote in part one Member who opposed this legislation:

(1) We have had a good relief program. We have one working at this very time. Why this House should take this action this afternoon when our hearings disclose the fact that State after State has been doing an excellent job in providing surplus food for those who are out of employment and need extra surplus food, I don't know.

(2) It might have been had the stamp plan had its beginning and origination at the beginning of the depression, and we might have worked it out. It did help, but let us not forget for 46 months we had a food stamp plan and we absolutely abandoned it and abolished it.

(3) We have the hearings and you can read it for yourself. You will find that practically no one was even given an opportunity to testify against this stamp-plan program. The Department (Agriculture) testified against it and made a good record. They are 100 percent opposed to adopting a plan like this.

(4) It might have been, had we gone into the depression as some of our friends, not in the House, of course, thought we were headed for some time ago and who thought we would need this and that hundreds of people would be walking around in the streets hungry and barefooted and so forth. But that did not happen. Today while we have some unemployment in some sections we have plenty of food and we also have no serious unemployment. So I would say this afternoon what we should do is to give this particular stamp plan a whacking defeat and leave alone the system that the Federal Government in cooperation with the States are operating under at the present time in supplying food to those who are in need.

I object to everything he said. I was almost at a loss to know where to begin in trying to compare facts with his statements, but I will do so by taking them paragraph by paragraph as they come in the order above:

First. We do not have an adequate program at the present time. Under the present system less than 50 percent of

approximately 7 million people in the United States who are eligible to receive surplus food are neglected. The States are not doing an excellent job of providing surplus food. Thirty-two State governors are quoted in the hearings before the House Subcommittee on Consumers Study of the Agriculture Committee, pages 193 to 217, as being in favor of enactment of the food stamp plan, simply on the basis that the present system has been found to be wholly inadequate for distribution to individual family units.

Second. The Republican side of the House has consistently fought the food plan for the past 6 years, just as they did again this year. The major reason why we did not have the plan in operation at the beginning and origination of the depression, was their consistent vote against it. A food-stamp plan was in operation from 1939 to 1943, and was found to be a highly workable program. The program was deactivated in 1943, in the middle of World War II, not because it was no longer useful—we no longer had surplus food. That was the war period and we supplied our allies.

Third. Hearings before committees of the Congress of the United States are open to any citizen who wishes to be heard on the subject under investigation. A Member of Congress, certainly, should be aware that it is almost impossible for a committee to exclude testimony of any qualified witness who wishes to be heard. The correct interpretation to be drawn from reading these hearings is the fact that practically no one was directly opposed to the plan. The Department of Agriculture did indicate that they felt that the present system could be made to work better and that if the plan were enacted into law it would require the Department to take on additional responsibilities, and so forth, but in no way did that indicate a 100-percent opposition to the plan.

Fourth. Most Republicans still cling to the myth of the "mild recession." This seems to be based on the ostrichlike psychology that "if you do not admit it is true—it just cannot be true." The fact is very clearly established beyond any area of doubt. The United States is going through a depression and the only way out of it is through logical, planned, and far-seeing spending on programs that will put us back on our feet and money in our pockets—money that will buy the things we need to feed, clothe, house, and care for our families on an American standard of living that will not be affected every time our President takes a pill or eats a piece of pie. There are at the present time approximately 7 million Americans who are drawing relief benefits in some manner or other, with many more who cannot qualify for them, who are in desperate need of more and better food right now. We have many more than hundreds who are hungry, we have tens of thousands. They may not all be barefooted, but one more Republican administration will more than take care of that. The unemployment figure for July 1958 is 5,294,000 for the whole country—of this total 280,000 represents the Detroit metropolitan area. Some Congressmen may not think this is serious, but as far as I am concerned the basic welfare of American citizens is one of the most serious problems facing the country today.

Report on Kennedy-Ives Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, as a result of the defeat of the Kennedy-Ives labor bill in the House, the cry will go up nationwide that the Democratic-controlled Congress refused to pass any restrictive legislation that would help the workers and hurt the labor leaders.

We can expect to hear this claim from every Republican candidate, whether he is running for dogcatcher or governor of a State on the Republican ticket. The Republicans are running against labor this year, as is proved by the recent publication by the United States Senate Republican policy committee of a campaign book going into great detail to show how labor and labor leaders have supported the Democratic candidates for both the House and the Senate in past elections.

The Kennedy-Ives bill was publicly endorsed and strongly supported by the AFL–CIO, the United Steelworkers of America, the United Auto Workers, and numerous other labor organizations. It was publicly denounced and viciously fought by the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, Mitchell—who stated through Congressman JUDD, "It is a bad bill"—and, President Eisenhower, who stated the Kennedy-Ives bill was inadequate.

The bill would have required all labor unions to:

Give comprehensive detailed disclosure of union financial data to members, to the press, to the public and to law enforcement agencies.

Make full reports by union officers on any personal conflict-of-interest transactions.

Impose criminal sanctions for embezzlement of union funds, false reporting, false entries in books, failure to report or destruction of union books.

Establish the right of suits by union members for recovery of funds either embezzled or misappropriated by union officers.

Prohibit loans by employers or unions to union officers.

Assure secret ballots for all union officers or the convention delegates who select them.

Give due notice of all union elections and see that there is a real opportunity to nominate opposing candidates.

See that all union officers be elected by secret ballot every 4 years by international unions and every 3 years by local unions.

Prohibit persons convicted of a felony to serve as union officers.

Limit union trusteeships to 18 months.

Give the Secretary of Labor power to institute court action to set improper elections aside and conduct new elections.

Make annual reports to the Secretary of Labor and union members on every trusteeship, the reasons for its establishment, continuance, and operation.

Permit the Secretary of Labor to begin court proceedings to break improper trusteeships.

Forbid the counting of votes of delegates of trustee bodies unless delegates were elected by secret ballot, and forbid transfer of funds from trusteed local union to international, except normal dues and assessments.

Forbid picketing for extortion or to secure payoff from employer.

Forbid solicitation for payment of fictitious fees for unloading cargo from interstate carriers.

The bill would have required management to:

Report to the Secretary of Labor the name of every employer who spends more than $5,000 a year for activities intended to influence employees in exercise of their rights to organize and bargain collectively.

Have every labor relations consultant report on any agreement with an employer to provide services intended to affect employees in the exercise of their rights to organize and bargain collectively.

In no way bribe a representative of his employees—or have anyone else, acting in his behalf, whether acting as a technical agent or not—bribe an employee representative. You will no doubt recall the notorious Shefferman case in Chicago in which Shefferman acted for management in bribing union officials and representatives.

Knowing the provisions of the proposed legislation and the limitations it placed on all unions, it is more than encouraging to see that the progressive leaders of labor endorsed this bill and worked for it, for, despite all rumors to the contrary, these men are vitally interested in the welfare of the members of their unions and those who work for a living.

The restrictions placed upon management are certainly few. You would imagine that no self-respecting company or corporation would find itself hindered by complying with the requirements. Yet, the hue and cry that went up—with the NAM and the United States Chamber of Commerce weeping copious tears for the workers—makes you stop and wonder about our giants of industry and their intentions.

They want, apparently, financial reports filed by unions, but not by employers, on their own antiunion activities.

They want, apparently, to forbid union leaders to receive bribes, but not to prevent employers from paying them.

They insist, apparently, upon stricter ethical-practices codes for unions, but none for management.

What they really want, we find out, is a labor-management bill that applies only to labor.

Well, the reactionaries won, for the vote on the bill was 198 against and 190 for.

The Democrats voted 2½ to 1 for the bill.

The Republicans voted over 3 to 1 against the bill.

Remember those results when you hear in this fall's election campaign that the Democratic-controlled Congress refused to pass labor reform legislation.

Seventy percent of the Democrats were for it.

Seventy-seven percent of the Republicans were against it.

Pennsylvania Democrats voted 10 for, 3 against. Republicans voted 4 for, 12 against, 1 absent.

A Positive Approach to Education Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, one of the problems which has most concerned me during the past 2 years has been that of educating our youngsters. I have been as concerned with this problem as any other since coming to Congress. The Nation's legislative bodies have been more concerned than usual with the problems and issues involved; but I do not feel that we have taken the primary effective or constructive steps. Instead, we skirted around the edge of the problem and then, at the last moment, resorted to the old standby, a billion-dollar spending proposition. This seems to be the only solution Congress is willing to take and, of course, it is generally under the label of national defense.

Meanwhile, the problem remains. We have done very little to solve it as the tradition of our free educational system would deem feasible.

As I see the problem, Mr. Speaker, it is twofold. One aspect concerns the elementary and secondary school systems with emphasis upon the teaching of the younger folks. The other phase involves the development and encouragement of colleges and universities.

Although as a Nation we have more capable teachers than any other nation in the world, there is still a growing need for more and more qualified young men and women to teach in the elementary and secondary school systems of the country. The growth of the population has put new burdens on the teachers already in the profession and has demonstrated fully the need for more teachers. In view of these facts not enough young men and women are entering the profession.

If there is any single thing we as a Congress could do to help this situation with an incentive rather than subsidy approach, it should be attempted. It would appear to me pointless for the Federal Government to finance school buildings if there are not enough qualified persons to stand before the blackboards in them.

Teachers are unique in many ways. First, the commodity with which they deal is the changing world about them. It is their job to mold young minds, to keep them abreast of the moving world in which ideas and precepts vary almost from day to day. For this reason, teachers must themselves return constantly to the well of knowledge to replenish themselves, to reeducate themselves, and to fill out their knowledge to pass on to the young.

This same thing holds, at least in a degree, true for doctors and dentists as well. They, too, must attend special clinics and classes. But there is one major difference between the medical profession and teaching. Whereas doctors can write off the expenses of attending these special courses from their income taxes, teachers could not. It was not, in fact, until the spring of this year, and then only after considerable prodding on the part of myself and a group of other Congressmen and Senators, that the problem was really given adequate consideration.

When the problem was brought to my attention, I introduced H. R. 10900 to change this very unfair situation and give teachers the same footing in law as other professions enjoy. Although there has been no action taken on my bill, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue took cognizance of the problem after a good deal of Congressional pressure had been brought to bear. He issued a new ruling in which he granted teachers the same rights as other professions. However, I must point out here that this is only a ruling; that it can and possibly will be changed at the whim of this Commissioner or of some future holder of the position.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I must urge that Congress take action to give this Commissioner's ruling the legal force it would have gained under my bill, H. R. 10900.

In another area, too, I feel we should have taken positive action to attract young men to the teaching profession. I feel it would be a good drawing card if there were some special attraction about teaching. To this end, I introduced H. R. 9643 which would have provided teachers and those in college whose course of study would lead to the teaching profession, draft exempt status.

Combined, I think these bills would do much to draw more and better qualified young people into the teaching profession which so obviously needs new and good material. The need for better salaries is vitally important, though not a problem with which the Federal Government can deal.

COLLEGE FINANCING

The problem facing higher education, also, can be termed a two-phase one. One phase involves financing the schools themselves, the other the financing of a child's education by his or her parents. I have sponsored one major bill in this field and have repeatedly made suggestions concerning the other phase.

To help parents in their struggle to give their children an adequate educational background, I introduced H. R. 7566, which would permit the parents to deduct for income tax purposes all money spent educating their youngsters.

But tuition, as you know, cannot possibly pay the entire bill for educating a youth. Tuition alone doesn't even pay current expenses, much less provide adequate revenue for buildings and grounds at most schools. As a nation, therefore, we must concentrate on this phase of the development of our colleges and universities.

The best method I know of for doing this, for providing the kind of endowment necessary to maintain our privately financed colleges, and to help support our State universities, is through private grants from individuals or business firms.

I have repeatedly suggested that, instead of dipping into the Federal Treasury for the funds, we ought to take an enlightened stand and permit the private individuals and firms who are so inclined to do the financing. This could be aided through increasing the amount deductible by the individuals or firms from their income taxes.

This method would, I am sure, provide a much more rounded education for our young people. It would provide a much broader base for their future to be built upon. Furthermore, it would keep the educational system and our institutions of higher learning free from the meddlesome controls of the Federal Government.

All of these steps, Mr. Speaker, singly or in combination, provide a sound, basic approach to educational problems facing the country today. They are not spectacular; but I think it is time we abandoned the spectacular for the sound, sane approach to this vital problem.

Let us discard the idea that we are going to solve our difficulties in the field of education by the dictates of bureaucrats in Washington—or by pumping billions into Federal aid programs constantly sought by self-preserving pressure groups and their lobbyists.

Chicago Water Diversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my statement in opposition to H. R. 2, the Chicago water diversion bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I want to compliment very highly all of the members of the team—all of the Senators who battled on the floor, opposing H. R. 2. They are MCNAMARA, Democrat, of Michigan; LAUSCHE, Democrat, of Ohio; PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin; CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania; AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont; POTTER, Republican, of Michigan;

JAVITS, Republican, of New York; BRICKER, Republican, of Ohio; MARTIN, Republican, of Pennsylvania, and others who also helped.

Without the determination and hard work of these fine colleagues, it would have been impossible to block the steamroller which the Chicago organization had started.

IMPORTANCE OF FACTS AND EQUITIES

After listening to the arguments of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], there came to my mind the words of a great professor—he said: "Remember, boys, it is the facts that count, not the buffoonery, not the chicanery, not the personal effrontery, but the facts." And this professor further said: "Don't forget the equities when you argue a case before the court or a jury."

WHAT ARE THE ISSUES?

I have never forgotten this advice, and I am going to follow it in my remarks on the floor. I am not going to be diverted from telling the plain facts—from exposing the facts. I never believed in seeking to imitate Pagliacci tactics or ignore the intelligence of the jury.

Now, what are the issues? Chicago has created this situation by permitting its sewage-purification level to drop by a substantial percent. (This is proven by figures I have received from the Metropolitan Sanitary Distric of Greater Chicago itself.)

THE GENERAL ISSUE

The overall issue is whether the bill is not solely to save Chicago money rather than for any health or navigation purpose and why other lake States should be deprived by the Federal Government of one of their great natural resources solely to subsidize sewage dilution and flushing in Illinois.

THE SPECIFIC ISSUES

1. Should the bill in its present state be passed?

2. Should not the bill be amended so as not to interfere with the action pending before the United States Supreme Court to stop diversion of domestic pumpage now approaching 2,000 cubic feet per second?

3. Should not the bill be amended to agree with the argument of the proponents for an experimental diversion period of 1 year, not 3 years?

4. Should not the bill be amended to limit the maximum diversion at any one time to 3,500 feet per second instead of 5,000?

5. The Supreme Court having and retaining jurisdiction (see order of Court, December 17, 1956, U. S.), should not this bill be tabled?

6. Should not the bill be referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee (and its Subcommittee on Canada) because of the serious impairment it might cause in our friendly relations with Canada?

7. Should not the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs also consider the relationship of the proposed diversion from Lake Michigan as well as the proposed Canadian diversion from the Columbia River?

8. Should not the bill be amended to require the return of domestic pumpage after purification to the Great Lakes?

9. Has Canada waived any rights under the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 between the United States and Great Britain?

These are the issues before the Senate presented by specific motions and amendments.

THE BASIC QUESTION

But the basic question is simple:

Is the Federal Government responsible for clearing up a local sewage problem which Chicago neglect has created? If not, is it good national policy, or good foreign policy, or good constitutional law for the Federal Congress to attempt to take national resources (in this case, water) from some sovereign States for the benefit of another State? (Even the arid States of the West have proceeded through negotiation and compacts to obtain a fair share of available water, but have not sought Federal confiscation of the water of other States for their own benefit.)

THE FACTS

What is this matter all about?

First. The bill provides that the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Chicago increase by 1,000 cubic feet per second its take from Lake Michigan—this to be in addition to all domestic pumpage.

It has already been authorized to take 1,500 cubic feet, in addition to all domestic pumpage. It wants this right for a 3-year period, to begin with the enactment of this act.

It wants to be able in dry weather to take a flow of 5,000 cubic feet per second, and, in wet weather, take nothing, just so long as it doesn't exceed the annual average of 2,500 cubic feet per second.

Second. It will be noted that the bill provides that this requested additional diversion is in addition to all domestic pumpage. There is pending in the Supreme Court an action in relation to requiring the Sanitary District to return the domestic pumpage to the lake. This bill would do away with the issue before the Court of any return of domestic pumpage, and domestic pumpage means the purified liquid. In Milwaukee, it is purified up to 95 percent, and Milorganite is created and sold for fertilizer.

Third. There is pending before the Court the action restraining the district to the utilization of only 1,500 cubic feet per second. This is dated January 28, 1957. The original decree was dated April 21, 1930—and this 1957 decree, of course, left the matter open for application by the District for further relief. Instead of pursuing that course, it has appealed to the legislative branch. The application to Congress by this bill thus ignores the Court procedure, and raises several nice questions.

The first one is, What are the equities? (a) Why should Chicago, which has already diverted 3 streams which formerly flowed into the lake and has received permission by the Court for 1,500 cubic feet per second, in addition to domestic pumpage—why should it be allowed additional diversion? Let it be remembered that in addition there is the damage of the other interested parties.

(a) Then the lake level is down 7 feet now. To what is that due? There is a difference of opinion about it. But the engineers say that 1,000 cubic feet per second would reduce the lake level an inch. When you realize that water has been continuously taken and none given by Chicago, this dangerous lowering of the lakes should clearly show the necessity for no more diversion.

Remember, there will be no necessity again for an order such as the United States Supreme Court's temporary order which permitted the emergency diversion in 1956. Why will there be no such necessity? Because Congress is appropriating funds for building a reservoir dam for storage on the Mississippi River at Alton, Ill.

The winnowing of the facts—separating the wheat from the chaff—brought out the salient point—that is, that the bill would save Chicago money, but was not needed for either health or navigation purposes.

CHICAGO'S DECLINING PURIFICATION PERCENTAGE

The figures which I obtained, with the assistance of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, from the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago itself showed without a shadow of doubt that the comparatively high purification reached—in Chicago's plants in 1952—had dropped miserably in succeeding years. Why? Because Chicago had not spent the necessary money to build additions to its sewage plants to take care of the increasing flow of sewage. The purity of the effluent from the sewage-purification plants of Chicago dropped from a peak of 93.6 in 1952 to a low of 85.6 in 1957. The removal of the sewage solids from the liquid which was at one time (in 1952) as high as 91.1 percent had dropped by 1957 to 80.6 percent.

Mind you, these figures were supplied by the following officials: Mr. James Mercer, chief of information of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, with the approval of its chief engineer, Mr. H. R. Ramey. They were brought to Washington from Chicago by Mr. Gordon McCallum, Chief of the Division of Water Pollution of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, at the specific insistence of myself. Fortunately, they arrived in time to be of use. I am informed that the sanitary district had stopped making public its purification figures when they began to drop in 1953. (This part was confirmed by Mr. Herbert Naujoks in his testimony at the hearing.)

In comparison, it is well to note that Milwaukee's purification efficiency remains at a high of 95 percent.

As proof of the decline of Chicago's sewage treatment, I read into the RECORD the following summary of figures from the 24th Annual Report of Operations of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, supplied, as I have said, by that district:

Efficiency of sewage treatment, Chicago

(1) Year	(2) Million gallons per day (p. 119)	(3) Biochemical oxygen demand (thousand pounds per day)		(4) Percent biochemical oxygen demand removal [1]	(5) Solids (tons per day)		(6) Percent solids removal [2]
		Raw sewage (p. 120)	Final effluent (p. 122)		Raw sewage (p. 123)	Final effluent (p. 124)	
1952	1,112.8	1,179.5	75.0	93.6	786.3	67.9	91.1
1953	1,103.8	1,215.3	126.7	89.6	741.5	113.1	84.7
1954	1,170.6	1,236.2	146.5	88.1	781.2	133.7	82.9
1955	1,183.3	1,314.1	182.3	86.1	876.4	145.0	83.4
1956	1,149.6	1,349.0	191.5	85.8	937.5	164.6	88.2
1957	1,230.7	1,278.6	184.5	85.6	862.0	164.2	80.6

[1] $\frac{\text{Col. 3}-\text{col. 4}}{\text{Col. 3}} \times 100 = \text{percent.}$

[2] $\frac{\text{Col. 6}-\text{col. 7}}{\text{Col. 6}} \times 100 = \text{percent.}$

THE EQUITIES

Let me summarize the equities:

1. Chicago needs more and bigger sewage plants to handle the growing volume of its sewage.

2. The overloading of sewage plants has brought their 1952 high point of 93.6 percent biochemical oxygen demand removal down to 85.6 percent. And the same overloading has brought its solids removal level down from the 1952 level of 91.1 percent down to 80.6 percent in 1957.

3. Chicago has no health problem, and diversion is not related to its health. The hearing made this clear. The Supreme Court's special master in 1941 found that

even a low 54 percent purification level did not endanger health. How, then, can the present 85.6 percent purification level create a hazard? And Senator PROXMIRE demonstrated there was no Chicago health problem when he read from a health commission report on Chicago.

4. Neither Chicago nor the Illinois waterways have a navigation problem. The former temporary problem which the Supreme Court solved in 1956 by an emergency diversion will not recur because the Senate Public Works Committee approved an authorization and there was passed an appropriation for water retaining works above Alton, Ill.

5. Chicago is luring industry by low taxes and unmetered high water use (because it is not bearing its sewage responsibility), whereas other lake cities are metering the use of water and solving their own sewage problems. This is unfair and expensive to the other cities.

6. The Chicago diversion would deviate from a comprehensive and public spirited water policy for the entire Great Lakes.

7. The bill has always been brought up at the last minute in the expectation that it would slip through in the confusion—which is an admission that the bill lacks equity.

8. The Chicago diversion is before the United States Supreme Court in three original suits. And the lake States are preparing a petition to require the Chicago Sanitary District to purify and return to the lakes the ever-growing amount of domestic pumpage which Chicago is draining from Lake Michigan and the other Great Lakes States.

9. The bill provides for a 3-year diversion under the guise of needing only a 1-year-diversion. The proponents sought approval from Canada of a 3-year diversion and, when Canada objected, they attempted to create a public impression that Canada would have no objection to a 1-year diversion.

10. Even a 1-year diversion would begin to inch away the levels of the Great Lakes essential to profitable lake transportation, important to efficient harbor operation, and operation of utilities on the St. Lawrence.

11. Chicago, having created its own waste, should pay to dispose of it.

12. The prime purpose of the bill is to save Chicago money in its sewage operations.

13. The Chicago Sanitary District, established to do this job, has allowed purification to slump in the last several years with resulting odor in the Chicago River.

14. But, I repeat, there is no health problem involved.

15. And there is no problem of navigation which this bill would solve. The witness for the Army engineers admits this (1958 Senate hearing transcript, pp. 315, 317). The transportation argument is a pretense to attempt to bring diversion within Federal constitutional principle.

16. The bill would not end the Chicago diversion controversy, but only stir it up further. The other lake States expect to file a lawsuit attacking the constitutionality of the law if enacted on the ground that the Federal Government has no greater authority in the premises than to regulate and facilitate navigation.

17. The Great Lakes Riparian States have a legal ownership interest in the waters of the Great Lakes which they are entitled to protect.

18. This right is subject only to the Federal Government's limited jurisdiction over interstate navigation.

19. This bill might give Canada a trump card for diverting water from the Columbia River away from the United States, besides needlessly roiling our friendly relations with Canada at a most inopportune time.

20. The diversion would reduce the hydroelectric power production at and near Niagara, on both sides of the river, although these powerplants will be in position to use all available normal waterflow by the time the major effect of a temporary Chicago diversion would reach them. Consequently, their production would be substantially lessened.

21. A temporary 1-year diversion would have its maximum effect at the Niagara powerplant about 3 to 3½ years later, and the effect would continue for the ensuing 15 years.

22. (a) The United States Supreme Court decree of April 21, 1930, limiting diversion by Chicago to 1,500 cubic feet per second allowed an additional diversion of Chicago's domestic pumpage requirements; that is, the normal water-supply requirements of the growing city from Lake Michigan. This domestic pumpage has risen to between 1,800 and 2,000 cubic feet per second so that the authorized diversion is now 3,300 to 3,500 cubic feet per second and growing daily.

(b) One or the arguments of the city is that its population will soon have increased by half a million additional people, and that additional industry is also expected, so that Chicago will need greater sewage disposal. The sewer capacity of the city is 53,000 cubic feet per second. How much water does Chicago ultimately expect to get?

(c) A petition in the suit was filed in 1957 by Wisconsin, Minnesota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and New York asking the Supreme Court to order Chicago to cleanse and return its domestic pumpage to Lake Michigan. (I repeat, Milwaukee returns water 95 percent pure and makes milorganite fertilizer out of the balance.)

23. Presidential vetoes blocked similar bills in 1954 and 1956 because, as the President stated:

"(a) Existing diversions are adequate for navigation on the Illinois Waterways and Mississippi River.

"(b) All methods of control of lake levels and protection of property on the Great Lakes should be considered before arbitrarily proceeding with the proposed increased diversion.

"(c) The diversions should not be authorized without reference to negotiations with Canada.

"(d) The legitimate interests of other States affected by the diversion would be adversely affected."

To an equally important extent, the same objections can be and are made to this bill.

24. Other States and localities on or near the Great Lakes would be inclined to start diverting for their own benefit. In the mad scramble to divert, lake levels would be more seriously reduced. (Some Texans have even suggested a pipeline from the Great Lakes to Texas.)

25. The Supreme Court has jurisdiction of the matter in a pending case in which it has, four times since 1930, granted temporary relief by authorizing added diversion at Chicago.

26. Surface levels of Lake Michigan and tributary waters are seriously low, and seem destined to go lower.

27. The damage of diversion to lake transportation is illustrated by the theme of the Amherstburg celebration of the connecting channels in the seaway, Inches Key to Tonnage. It is estimated that a drop of 1 inch loses 1½ million tons of shipping. Shippers, better than Army engineers, can estimate the value of this shipping loss. And so, the shippers' figure should be accepted.

28. Chicago takes from, but does not contribute to, the water of Lake Michigan, although, in the natural state, three rivers, the Chicago, both north and south branches, and the Calumet and the Grand Calumet, flowed into and fed Lake Michigan before Chicago reversed their flow and diverted their waters into the Mississippi Basin.

29. The precedent of this bill would undermine confidence in the future reliability of the St. Lawrence Seaway, for, if Congress can do it once, it can reduce water levels again and again. The seaway could be inched away by successive inch-by-inch reductions in the lake levels. This trend is absurd in view of the time and money the United States has spent in building the seaway and dredging harbors which it is to serve, with oceangoing vessels as well as lake vessels.

30. No further study of the Chicago River is needed since its condition has been studied for over 58 years under varying water flows.

31. The study of the beneficial effect on sewage disposal of diverting an extra 1,000 cubic feet per second for 1 or 3 years would be useless, unless Chicago expected to make the diversion permanent if and when the study showed improving sewage conditions in the Chicago River. And, of course, permanent diversion would do permanent harm to the Great Lakes and riparian owners and States.

32. Diversion under the bill can increase when lake water level is low and decrease when it is high—providing only that the average does not exceed 1,000 extra cubic feet per second, or a maximum of 5,000 cubic feet per second at any one time. This would accentuate the effect during low water.

33. The argument about utilizing power capacity at Lockport on the Illinois Waterways system must presume permanent diversion to be a substantial point.

34. Congressman TOM O'BRIEN, of the Fifth Congressional District of Illinois, wrote to the White House under date of July 18, 1957, "The Department has now advised me, too, that unless and until the Canadian Government withdraws its objection, it will have no alternative but to recommend again that the legislation authorizing the experiment be vetoed." (Testimony in 1958 Senate Public Works hearing transcript, p. 92.) Incidentally, I notice him on the Senate floor actively working for this bill.

35. The Canadian Embassy under date of February 13, 1956, wrote to the Secretary of State that: "I am accordingly instructed to make clear that, in the view of the Canadian Government, the enactment of the proposed legislation would be prejudicial to the navigation and power interests of both countries." (Said transcript, p. 98.)

36. (a) Under date of July 28, 1958 (the opening day of the year's Senate hearing), the Department of State transmitted to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works copy of a Canadian aide memoire dated January 6, 1958. In it, the Canadian Government referred to "useful conversations between United States and Canadian officials * * * held in Ottawa on July 9, 1957," and stated that it assumed that "full consideration will be given" by the United States "to the economic harm which may be done to navigation and hydroelectric generation in both countries" by diversion. It added that, if it should agree to divert Canadian water into the Great Lakes Basin to compensate for a Chicago diversion, "it would be equitable that an equivalent amount of water should remain available for use in hydroelectric power generators by the Ontario interests at St. Marys Falls, Niagara Falls and in the international section of the St. Lawrence River until the effects of the proposed temporary diversion will have ceased to be felt in the Great Lakes system" (that is, for 15 or more years). The aide memoire specifically reserved "all rights under the provisions of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909." (Said transcript, pp. 160–163.) This is certainly a polite and diplomatic objection, and statement of a claim to compensation, if the Chicago diversion should nevertheless be authorized by Congress, as the Canadians had been told it would be.

(b) The Bureau of the Budget has written the Senate Public Works Committee that "No formal indication has been received from the Government of Canada that there will be

any change in its position on this leigslation. However, it is believed that the more limited authorization [of a 1-year diversion] would be less objectionable to Canada than the proposed 3-year diversion." Of course. But less objection is still an objection.

(c) The past and present cumulative diversion amounts to a substantially lower lake level. More than half the vessel load changes posted on Great Lakes docks are 1 inch only (ld.). Under the direction of its able Mayor Frank Zeidler and Port Director Ham Brockel, Milwaukee has spent many millions for dredging, and $10 million to improve its docks and deepen the draft of its channels. The city has every reason not to want its investment jeopardized by having inches constantly skimmed off the top of Lake Michigan, at the same time that it is spending great sums of money to deepen its harbor by digging inches off the bottom. "It is willing to accept God-made conditions, but the situation at Chicago is manmade."

37. Chicago did not voluntarily comply with the Supreme Court's decision; but had to be cited for contempt in order to force its compliance, according to Senator BRICKER who represented the other lake States in the contempt proceeding. (1958 Senate Public Works Committee transcript, p. 246.)

Canada has 3,772 miles of Great Lakes shoreline, and the United States frontage on the Great Lakes is 2,278 miles, whereas Illinois has a lakefront of only 57 miles. And yet Chicago wants a lion's share of the water, without returning it.

FAILURE OF PROOF

I. Supporters of this bill have failed in making a case.

The undisputed evidence shows the city has created the situation; has failed to remedy it by failing to extend its sanitary works.

II. This admission comes out of the mouth of the Chicago Sanitary District Chief Engineer.

WHAT DID CHICAGO'S OWN CHIEF ENGINEER SAY?

As evidence that the experts within the Chicago Sanitary District have long been concerned with the increasing deficiency of their system, I read into the RECORD 2 articles dated Wednesday, September 4, 1957: one from the Chicago Daily Tribune and the other from the Chicago Daily News. These articles reported the memorandum of the Chief Engineer of the Chicago Sanitary District, Mr. H. P. Ramey, dated January 21, 1957, in which he was reported to have said:

"Because of excellent public relations in recent years, the Sanitary District enjoys a good reputation and is generally credited with treating all its sewage to the highest degree practical, better than 90 percent removal of sewage solids.

"However this has not been the case for the past 3 years.

"Sewage treatment in the plant of the Sanitary District has declined from a general average of about 93 percent in 1951–52 to 87 percent or less in 1955–56."

This memorandum was hidden in the secret Grand Jury minutes in Chicago until obtained by the press.

III. I read an article from the Chicago Daily News of Wednesday, September 4, 1957, page 25, entitled "Sewage Treatment Here Is Criticized" (and the criticism was by Chicago Sanitary District's Chief Engineer H. P. Ramey) as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily News of September 4, 1957]

"SEWAGE TREATMENT HERE IS CRITICIZED—SANITARY DISTRICT ENGINEER CHARGES PUBLIC IS MISLED

"The sanitary district board is accused of misleading the public in a confidential memorandum written by its chief engineer. His report was under study Wednesday by the United States attorney's office.

"The memo from H. P. Ramey, dated last January 21, said the board had concealed from the public the decline in effectiveness of its west-southwest sewage treatment plant in Stickney.

"It was among records subpenaed by the Federal grand jury investigating alleged pollution of the sanitary and ship canal.

"Although grand jury records normally are secret, Anthony A. Olis, president of the sanitary district board, invited the press to look at them.

"Olis, aware that the records included Ramey's memo, urged newsmen to get both sides of the story by reading a reply to Ramey written by William A. Dundas, the district's general superintendent.

"Dundas' reply, which was attached to Ramey's memo in the records, rejected as illegal Ramey's suggested emergency solution to the sludge problem.

"It ignored an accusation by Ramey that an emergency existed because of certain indecisions since 1954 on construction to increase sludge treatment facilities.

"Dundas' report said that a new process, now being initiated, would reduce the amount of solid sludge produced by the plant.

"At the time Ramey wrote his memo, Congress was considering an increase in the amount of water Chicago could divert from Lake Michigan.

"Ramey pointed out that if the bill were passed (it wasn't) Army engineers would test the canal water as a matter of routine and learn the extent of the decline in sewage treatment here.

" 'Because of excellent public relations in recent years,' he wrote, 'the sanitary district enjoys a good reputation and is generally credited with treating all its sewage to the highest degree practicable, better than 90 percent removal of sewage solids.

" 'However, this has not been the case for the past 3 years.

" 'Sewage treatment in the plant of the sanitary district has declined from a general average of about 93 percent in 1951–52 to 87 percent or less in 1955–56.

" 'The lapse in sewage treatment has occurred at the west-southwest treatment plant, the plant which was cited in 1955 as one of the seven model wonders of civil engineering in the United States.

" 'An average of about 10 tons per day of solids went into the canal in 1955 in sludge discharged into the canal. And this figure was increased to more than 18 tons per day in 1956.

" 'Inability to dispose of the waste activated sludge at the west-southwest plant appears to be the major factor in this decline in sewage treatment.

" 'It would be unfortunate if this lapse in the degree of sewage treatment should not be corrected by the sanitary district before it is brought to the attention of Congress and the general public as one result of the tests to be made by the Army engineers.

" 'Sludge disposal facilities have been recognized as inadequate at the west-southwest plant for the last 3 years.

" 'Substantial items have been included in construction budgets for the years 1954, 1955, and 1956 and are repeated for 1957.

" 'Except for certain indecisions, much of this needed work could have been under construction by this time.'

"Ramey suggested that the solid sludge be dumped, as an emergency measure, into two rock quarries near Lemont. In his reply, however, Dundas said an injunction forbade the district from using the quarries."

IV. I read an article from the Chicago Daily Tribune entitled "United States Jury Told Sewage Plant Efficiency Off and Facilities Inadequate":

[From the Chicago Tribune of September 4, 1957]

"UNITED STATES JURY TOLD SEWAGE PLANT EFFICIENCY OFF—DISTRICT ENGINEER'S MEMO STUDIED

"A sharp increase in the amount of solids in the sludge discharged into the sanitary canal in 1956 was disclosed yesterday in records submitted by the sanitary district for study by a United States Federal grand jury.

"The papers were made accessible to reporters by United States Attorney Robert Tieken, provided that attorneys for the district gave their approval, which they did.

"MEMO TELLS STORY

"The development was revealed in a memo dated last January 21 from Horace P. Ramey, chief engineer, to President Anthony A. Olis and members of the board of trustees.

"Ramey said the district in recent years has had a good reputation and was credited with 'treating all sewage to the highest degree possible, or 90 percent removal of solids.' Actually, Ramey said, this was not the case.

" 'Sewage treatment in the plants of the sanitary district has declined from a general average of 93 percent in 1951–52 to 87 percent or less in 1955–56,' he reported.

" 'The lapse in sewage treatment has occurred at the west-southwest treatment plant, the plant which was cited in 1955 as one of the seven modern wonders of civil engineering in the United States.

" 'TEN TONS A DAY

" 'An average of about 10 tons per day of solids went into the canal in 1955 in sludge discharged into the canal, and this figure was increased to more than 18 tons per day in 1956.

" 'Inability to dispose of the waste activated sludge at the west-southwest plant appears to be the major factor in this decline in sewage treatment.'

"Ramey said it would be unfortunate if this were not corrected before it could be brought to the attention of Congress and the public through tests to be made by Army engineers. He pointed out the budgets for the last 3 years, and also the 1957 budget, included money for construction at the plant.

" 'INDECISION CITED

" 'Except for certain indecision, much of this needed work could have been under construction at this time,' Ramey said in the memo. He recommended the extension of pipelines to dispose of sewage into 2 abandoned quarries 2 miles northeast of Lemont.

"Also among the papers was a memo from William A. Dundas, general superintendent, to Olis and the board. It said Ramey's recommendation was 'negative' because the district was under injunction not to use the quarries for sewage disposal."

V. I read testimony of Herbert H. Naujoks, president and general counsel of the Great Lakes Harbors Association and a resident of Chicago.

"Mr. NAUJOKS. I also wish to point out that in the year 1941, when the communities along the Illinois Waterway and the canal complained of a health menace, because that was the problem that has been mentioned here so much today, that in 1941 the overall purification, that is, the biochemical oxygen demand reduction, was 54.2 percent. And yet the special master found, and the Supreme Court of the United States affirmed his findings, that there was no menace to health, that at times there was a nuisance created in the Illinois Waterway, but not a health menace.

"Now from 1941, when the overall purification was 54.2; in 1942, 55.5; in 1943, 51.6; in 1944 it was 49.8 percent; in 1945 it was 67.8 percent; 1946, 67.5 percent; 1947, 76.6 percent; 1948, 79.3 percent; 1949, 88.2 percent, and in 1951 they attained a purification efficiency of 92.5 percent.

"Now, Mr. Chairman, since 1951 those reports—we haven't had any published reports as to the percentage of purification attained, and in a newspaper report in August and September of 1957 there were items indicating that the purification had dropped from above 90 percent to 85 percent or below, showing that they are not complying even with the standard set up by the State of Illinois, that they should first attain an overall efficiency of all of the sewage of the Chicago district, that it be treated to the highest degree possible, which we contend is at least 92.5 percent, or 94 or better as is attained by a lot of other cities, along the Great Lakes.

"The idea that you have a great big problem has been harped upon so much, and I asked a number of very noted sanitary engineers as to whether it was not a fact that sewage disposal operations, just like any other operation, whether the efficiency could not be improved at a moderate cost if you had bigger operations, and they said absolutely. In other words, just like General Motors and Ford, and the big oil companies, they were able to stay in business over the years, where thousands of other automobile manufacturers dropped out of the picture, because of their larger and more efficient operations. So, too, the Chicago Sanitary District should be able to produce at least as high an efficiency as these other plants, or higher.

"Now they talk about all the money they have spent, hundreds of millions of dollars. It is true they spend that much. But the per capita cost of sewage operations is less in Chicago than it is in a great many other communities. In other words, they are not spending as much for their sewage operations as would seem to appear, because of the large amount of money involved.

"Chicago is a great city, a big city, and I live near Chicago, I am within the Chicago Sanitary District area, and they are taking in new cities, and more people all the time, but, of course, they are getting more taxes, too.

"Senator KERR. Are they enlarging their sanitary district?

"Mr. NAUJOKS. Oh, yes, they have been for the last 10 years.

"Senator KERR. I thought that they already had more in the sanitary district than they did people in Chicago.

"Mr. NAUJOKS. Oh, yes, it includes more than Chicago, yes, sir, not just the city of Chicago.

"It embraces a great deal of Cook County and probably beyond. That is correct, sir.

"So we believe that there is no justification for these bills, and we are definitely opposed to their adoption. I thank you.

"Senator LAUSCHE. Didn't the Supreme Court declare what the degree of cleanliness should be of the effluent?

"Mr. NAUJOKS. They didn't put it in the decree, but the Court adopted Special Master Hughes' findings and said it should be 85 or 90 percent or more. They didn't know exactly how the art (process of purifying) would improve over the years." (*Wisconsin et al.* v. *Illinois et al.* (278 U. S. 367 at p. 418 (1929)).)

VI. I read from opinion of the United States Supreme Court in 278th United States Reports 367 at pages 420–421:

"The sanitary district authorities, relying on the argument with reference to the health of its people, have much too long delayed the needed substitution of suitable sewage plants as a means of avoiding the diversion in the future. Therefore, they cannot now complain if an immediately heavy burden is placed upon the district because of their attitude and course. The situation requires the district to devise proper methods for providing sufficient money and to construct and put in operation with all reasonable expedition adequate plants for the disposition of the sewage through other means than the lake diversion."

The condition still exists, now as then, that Chicago has not spent enough to perfect its sewage treatment in actual operation. The bill's advocates have failed to show that this bill is the solution—

Just more water is not the solution.

More and better plants are, and other places to divert besides the river.

Other cities purify 95 percent and then can return the water out in the lake where its parity becomes 100 percent.

VII. And what does this bill do to us?

It increases the drainage of Lake Michigan already being carried on by Chicago—

1. What about our beaches and resorts?
2. What about our harbors?
3. What about our docks now too high above water?
4. What about the 1½ million tons per inch loss in freight revenue alone?
5. What about the power loss at Niagara, Barnhart Island, and nearby power plants?
6. What about lowered levels in St. Lawrence Seaway canals?
7. What about waterpower Canada asks to be given at United States expense as compensation for Chicago's drainage from lakes? (Aide memoire January 6, 1958.)
8. What about loss of funds spent building the seaway and dredging canals and harbors, when water levels are drained off the top?
9. What about the future of seaway?
10. What about diversions by other communities?
11. What about pipelines to interior cities which are planned if Chicago can get away with this?
12. And what about the long-range safety of the seaway on the high levels of which oceangoing steamship companies have planned and must continue to plan?

MILWAUKEE EXCELS IN MODERN PURIFICATION

And as proof of the high level of purity achieved and maintained by the great city of Milwaukee, I read into the RECORD from a telegram dated August 11, 1958, from Jacob F. Friedrick, chairman, Sewerage Commission of the City of Milwaukee and member of the Metropolitan Sewerage Commission of the Community of Milwaukee.

(Excerpt from telegram dated August 11, 1958, from Jacob F. Friedrick, chairman, Sewerage Commission of the City of Milwaukee; member, Metropolitan Sewerage Commission of the County of Milwaukee)

"Alvord, Burdick & Howson, consulting engineers for the Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District, in their report on intercepting sewers and sewage treatment, Milwaukee metropolitan area, 1956, summary and conclusions, issued the following statements:

" 'Prior to about 30 years ago all of the domestic sewage and industrial wastes of the Milwaukee area, as well as the entire storm water runoff discharged into the Milwaukee, Menomonee, and Kinnickinnic Rivers and the lake. As a result the rivers were grossly polluted, were often devoid of oxygen and malodorous for extended periods. At the present time approximately 175 million gallons of sewage daily (about 700,000 tons) is conducted to the Jones Island plant where the solids are separated from the liquid, converted to approximately 65,000 tons of milorganite fertilizer per year, and liquid so efficiently treated that it is returned to the lake substantially as clear as lake water and with approximately 95 percent of its polluting material removed. All of this has been accomplished with a total capital expenditure of some $55 million. There is no such thing as 100-percent sewage purification, and there are few if any treatment plants in this country that are consistently doing as good a treatment job as that at Milwaukee.' "

CANADA'S POSITION

The majority report of the public works committee completely overlooked the fact that Canada's position was expressed carefully in its aide memoire of January 6, 1958, confirmed by Mr. Smith, the Secretary of State for External Affairs in answer to a question in Parliament on August 2, 1958. And confirmed by J. H. Cleveland's telephone call to Mrs. Cato of my office.

UNITED STATES AIDE MEMOIRE LAST YEAR

Mr. President, I have received from the Department of State a copy of the aide memoire dated March 11, 1957, which the Department of State sent to the Canadian Ministry of External Affairs with respect to H. R. 2.

I note that the aide memoire refers to a past favor and then asks that the Canadian Government refrain from interposing an objection to H. R. 2.

The alleged favor which the Department of State thinks that it had done for Canada was to permit Canada to divert some water into the Great Lakes Basin.

Now, I read into the RECORD, so that all Senators may appreciate the importance of this note, the State Department aide memoire dated March 11, 1957, delivered to Canada and asking Canada in effect not to object to H. R. 2.

"AIDE MEMOIRE

"The Canadian Embassy's note No. 113 of February 13, 1956, protested against H. R. 3210, 84th Congress, 2d session, a proposal to increase the diversion from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway by 1,000 cubic feet per second for a period of 3 years. The President on August 9, 1956, withheld approval of this bill, at the same time instructing the Department of State 'to engage in discussions with the Canadian Government in an attempt to work out a solution to these problems as soon as all pertinent facts are available.' Thereafter a basic report on the effects of such a proposal on the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River was completed by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, and was made public in February 1957. Copies of the President's memorandum of disapproval and of the Corps of Engineers' report were forwarded to the Canadian Embassy as soon as they became available. Additional copies of each are enclosed. The Canadian Embassy is no doubt also aware that H. R. 2 and a number of identical bills have been introduced in the present session of Congress, similar to H. R. 3210, which was passed by Congress but disapproved by the President.

"A factor which has contributed to the persistence of such legislative proposals has been the rapid population growth in the Greater Chicago area and the resulting sanitary problem. The representative of the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry testified in connection with hearings on H. R. 3210 before a subcommittee of the United States Senate Committee on Public Works that the Chicago Sanitary District had spent approximately $320 million on filtration plants, which are among the most modern in the world. According to this testimony, these plants dispose effectively of 90 percent of the wastes of a population equivalent to some 8 million people, which leaves 10 percent of the treated wastes, the general equivalent of wastes of 800,000 people, going into the Chicago River and Illinois Waterway, plus the raw sewage resulting from storm floods. As a result, the sanitation situation in this area is one to cause increasing uneasiness. This testimony appears on page 103 of the record of hearings on H. R. 3210 before the United States Senate Committee on Public Works, a copy of which is enclosed.

"The proposed legislation, among its other aspects, would enable the United States Public Health Service to make new field studies

over a 3-year period in the Illinois Waterway in order to evaluate water quality conditions, changes in chemical and bacteriological content, the persistence of aquatic life, and other related subjects. The temporary increased flow would be an indispensable element to a fully effective Public Health Service investigation.

"Since an increased diversion out of Lake Michigan would have recognizable effects elsewhere in the Great Lakes Basin and in the St. Lawrence River, as is set forth in the Corps of Engineers' report, it has been suggested that it might be possible to increase the Long Lac-Ogoki diversions into Lake Superior by a comparable amount during a 3-year period to counteract these effects. This arrangement would allow the studies of the Corps of Engineers and Public Health Service to be completed without affecting navigation and hydroelectric interests. The Long Lac-Ogoki diversions were agreed to in 1940 as an accommodation to Canadian needs in spite of the effects, desirable or otherwise, which they might have elsewhere in the Great Lakes Basin. It is possible that the answer to the present problem may lie in some form of adjustment of this earlier happy instance of cooperation. Accordingly, it would be appreciated if the Canadian Government would examine this suggestion for consideration in further discussions.

"If for some reason such an arrangement is not feasible, it is hoped that the Canadian Government will consider the extent to which it may be in Canada's overall interest to refrain from interposing objection to H. R. 2 or similar legislation. In this regard, if the proposal for a 3-year diversion were to be carried out, it would then result in authoritative studies by both the United States Corps of Engineers and United States Public Health Service, which would make it possible for Canada to weigh more accurately any future proposal for further increased diversions in this area and to decide where Canada's best interests might lie.

"It would be appreciated if the Canadian authorities would give early consideration to the problems raised by the proposed legislation. If it is desired to have representatives of the Corps of Engineers or Public Health Service explain in greater detail either the present Corps of Engineers' report or the studies which would be carried out under the proposed legislation, the Department of State will be pleased to make available such representatives for this purpose. It is hoped that further discussions may be held on this subject as soon as may be convenient to the Canadian Government."

CANADIAN AIDE MEMOIRE

Those who attended the Public Works Committee hearing on H. R. 2, will recall a big point made by the supporters that Canada had objected to the two prior bills which the President had vetoed; but that it had not used the word "objection" in any communication with reference to H. R. 2. Proponents tried to draw the conclusion that Canada, therefore, no longer objected. They pointed to the mild language of the Canadian note of January 6, 1958. This mild language is explained by the pressure put upon Canada to softpedal its objection to H. R. 2.

However, the Canadians, nevertheless, did express, in the most diplomatic and polite language, their continuing objection to diversion of water from Lake Michigan at Chicago. And I read the Canadian note or aide memoire of January 6, 1958. The Canadian aide memoire reads as follows:

"AIDE MEMOIRE

"Useful conversations between United States and Canadian officials were held in Ottawa on July 9, 1957, on the subject of the sanitation problems which gave rise to proposed legislation for a 3-year temporary diversion of 1,000 cubic feet of water per second from the Great Lakes system at Chicago to the Mississippi system and on the subject of studies to be carried out under the proposed legislation.

"The Canadian Government understands that if such legislation is enacted these sanitation studies will not be limited to evaluating the effects of dilution but will also include consideration of all possible measures for dealing with waste disposal facilities at Chicago. Such measures would include:

"(a) complete separation of storm sewers from the domestic sewerage system or expansion of the existing treatment facilities to serve a total combined flow;

"(b) treatment of organic wastes in industrial plants before discharging these effluents into the sewerage system;

"(c) chlorination of effluent before discharge into the Illinois Waterway; and,

"(d) artificial aeration of the waterway.

"The treatment of sewage in the Chicago area is, of course, a matter entirely within the jurisdiction of the competent legislative bodies within the United States. It is understood that present treatment of waste represents a vast improvment over conditions which existed in former years and that under the present day uses of the water the waste is more a nuisance than a menace to the public health in the area.

"In considering the economics of alternative methods of improved waste disposal, it is assumed that full consideration will be given to the economic harm which may be done to navigation and hydroelectric generation in both countries by extended use of dilution methods.

"It is not possible to give a firm undertaking to provide flows of a particular volume through the existing Long Lac and Ogoki diversions to the Great Lakes Basin during the 3-year period envisaged by proposed United States legislation. However, if it were possible to offset part of the effects of the Chicago diversion by inflows from the Albany Basin in Canada, it would be equitable that an equivalent amount of water should remain available for use in hydroelectric power generation by the Ontario interests at St. Marys Falls, Niagara Falls, and in the international section of the St. Lawrence River until the effects of the proposed temporary diversion will have ceased to be felt in the Great Lakes system.

"All rights under the provisions of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 are specifically reserved.

A. E. R."

(Handed to the State Department 4:30 p. m. January 6, 1958, and reprinted August 2, 1958, in the appendix (p. 3041) of Hansard's Official Report of Canada's House of Commons Debates Saturday, August 2, 1958 (vol. 102, No. 63, 1st sess, 24th Parliament).)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 28, 1958.

The Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: In view of the forthcoming hearings on H. R. 2, a bill to authorize an additional diversion from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, it is thought that you will wish to have Canadian views on the subject as contained in an Aide Memoire of January 6, 1958. A copy of this document is therefore enclosed for the information of your committee.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary.

UNITED STATES DIVERSION DELEGATION TO OTTAWA

As a result of the American note, Canada submitted to the visit by American specialists on July 9, 1957. They went to Canada to explain why the Chicago sewage problem required international treatment.

I read from a memorandum, which I obtained from the Department of State, as to what was said at the July 9, 1957 meeting in Ottawa. The State Department's description of the meeting of the United States and Canadian groups reads as follows:

"MEMORANDUM—JULY 9, 1957, OTTAWA MEETING ON PROPOSED INCREASED DIVERSION OF LAKE MICHIGAN WATER AT CHICAGO

"Participants

"United States: Mr. Maurice Lebosquet, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Mr. E. W. Nelson, principal engineer, North Central Division, Chicago, Corps of Engineers; Mr. Harry Adams, United States Corps of Engineers; Mr. Adolph Dubs, United States Embassy, Ottawa.

"Canada: Mr. J. H. Cleveland, acting head American Division, Department of External Affairs (Chairman); Dr. A. P. Berry, general manager and chief engineer, Ontario Water Resources Commission; Mr. E. A. Cote, Assistant Deputy Minister, Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources; Mr. Otto Holden, Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario; Mr. T. M. Patterson, Chief, Water Resources Branch, Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources; Mr. J. R. Menzies, Department of National Health and Welfare; Mr. Rene Dupuis, Quebec Hydro; Mr. Maurice Heroux, Department of External Affairs; Mr. A. V. Delaporte, Ontario Water Resources Commission.

"Exchange of technical information

"At the outset of the meeting, it was made clear that the discussion was being held solely to exchange technical information on various matters relating to proposed legislation before Congress which would authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of Lake Michigan waters at Chicago by 1,000 cubic feet per second.

"Chicago sanitation problem and investigations

"The Canadian officials were informed that the proposed legislation, H. R. 2, arises out of the sanitation problem in the Chicago area and downstream from Chicago on the Illinois Waterway and further that, under the proposed legislation, investigations are expected to be conducted by the Federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW). These investigations would look into such matters as: (1) water quality, (2) flow patterns, and (3) biological problems. Additional means of attacking the sanitation problem might include: (1) an industrial waste control program, (2) chlorination, (3) aeration of the stream itself, and (4) increasing the capacity and improving the effectiveness of facilities to take care of storm-water overflows.

"A member of the Canadian group thereupon suggested that the additional diversion might prove inadequate and he later inquired whether the principal problem might not be a question of odor rather than health. Other members of the Canadian group raised the possibility of future large temporary increased diversions for navigation purposes at the time of low water levels in the Mississippi River.

"Long Lac-Ogoki diversion

"Members of the United States group dealt with the various aspects of the problem raised by the Canadians and then inquired as to the views of the Canadians with regard to a possible increase of the Long Lac-Ogoki diversions into Lake Superior by an amount sufficient to offset the temporary increased diversion at Chicago. In replying, a spokesman for the Canadian group stated that, under existing conditions, all available flow was already being diverted and that a compensatory increase was not possible. He noted that the average diversion in the water years

1943–44 to 1955–56 was around 4,950 cubic feet per second. The diversion might, of course, be increased by raising the level of dam structures and increasing the water storage areas, but such an undertaking was not considered to be economical in relation to the additional benefits to be derived.

"Effect on hydroelectric generation

"It is to be noted in this connection that during this meeting, as previously, the Canadian officials have consistently pointed out that the foreseeable effects of an increased diversion at Chicago necessarily occassion concern in Canada. Careful studies have shown them that there would be financial injury to hydroelectric generation facilities in both countries."

Two days after Mr. MacComber's note to the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] dated August 1, 1958, the Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. Smith, was asked on the floor of the Canadian Parliament a question about Canada's attitude toward the proposed Chicago diversion. I shall read his reply:

"WATER RESOURCES — CHICAGO DIVERSION — STATEMENT ON EFFECTS OF PROPOSED INCREASE

"On the orders of the day:

"Hon. Sidney E. Smith (Secretary of State for External Affairs):

"'Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to answer the question which was addressed to me on Wednesday, July 30, by the honorable member from Lambton West, dealing with water diversion at Chicago. My answer to his question, which was directed to three main points, is as follows:

"'1. The position taken by Canada with respect to a proposed additional diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second from Lake Michigan at Chicago is set forth in an aide memoire dated January 6, 1958. As the document is somewhat long, I ask leave to have it printed as an annex to Hansard.

"'2. To the extent that any additional diversion of water may take place at Chicago, the level of the lower lakes and connecting channels will be reduced as far as Montreal, and there will be a corresponding reduction in the availability of water for hydroelectric generation at Niagara, Barnhart, and Beauharnois. The effect, however, varies at different places and at different times over a period of years. I should be pleased to arrange for the honorable member to consult tables and graphs in order to determine precisely what effect a particular diversion would have at a specific time in a specific place.

"'3. Principles applicable to a diversion from Lake Michigan would not necessarily apply to boundary waters, as Lake Michigan is not a boundary water.'"[1] (Taken from Hansard, pp. 3009–3010.)

In the Hansard appendix there was printed in the issue for August 2, 1958, the Canadian aide memoire of January 6, 1958, which I have just read to you.

LEGAL ADVISER'S LETTER

That Canada does object, nevertheless, to the diversion is the opinion of the legal adviser of the Department of State, and this opinion is based on the official aide memoire from the Canadian Embassy.

The opinion dated July 29, 1958 (just 2 days before the date of the August 1, 1958, letter to the Senator from Oregon in Mr. MacComber's name), states on page 5:

"The proposed legislation authorizing an increased diversion from Lake Michigan at Chicago has been opposed by Canada on the ground that it may cause injury to Canadian navigation and hydroelectric power interests. Canada's reasons for opposing the Chicago diversion bill are thus very similar to those of the United States with respect to the Columbia River diversion, and it would seem that H. R. 2, if enacted, could constitute a precedent to be used by the Canadian interests in support of their proposals on the Columbia."

In order that the legal adviser's excellent reasoning in support of his opinion, may be available to all, I read it into the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 29, 1958.

The Honorable RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: The receipt is acknowledged of your letter of July 24, 1958, requesting an opinion by the Department of the position under international law of the Chicago diversion project proposed by H. R. 2 and its legal implications, if any, with regard to our negotiations with Canada on the upper Columbia River development.

There has been a continuous diversion of waters from the Great Lakes Basin at Chicago into the Mississippi watershed since January 17, 1900, when the Chicago drainage canal was opened and 5,000 cubic feet of water per second (an amount greater than presently authorized) was diverted by permit by the Secretary of War. (Olis and Sprecher, Legal Aspects of Lake Diversion, Northwestern University Law Review, 656 (1957).) The amount of the diversion had been increased at the time that the treaty between the United States and Great Britain relating to boundary waters and questions arising between the United States and Canada was signed on January 11, 1909. (36 Stat. 2448; TS 548.) The treaty went into effect on May 13, 1910, and is still operative.

Canadian opposition to the Chicago diversion existed prior to the signing of the 1909 treaty. The Second Interim Report of the Canadian Section of the International Waterway Commission, dated April 25, 1906, contained the following reference to this diversion:

"At Chicago, the Americans have built a drainage canal which, when in full operation, will use about 10,000 cubic feet of water per second * * * which will have the effect of lowering Lake Michigan by over 6 inches, and Lake Erie by 4½ inches.

* * * * *

"It is exceedingly important in the interests of navigation, both to ourselves and to the people of the United States, that the diversion by way of the Chicago drainage canal should be limited. It is equally essential in the interests of both countries that no diversion or interference should be allowed in streams crossing the boundary which would interfere with the interests of navigation in either country."

The terms of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 do not appear to affect the legal rights of United States or Canadian interests in regard to the Chicago diversion. The preliminary article of the treaty defines "boundary waters" as "the waters from main shore to main shore of the lakes * * * along which the international boundary between the United States and the Dominion of Canada passes, including all bays, arms, and inlets thereof, but not including tributary waters, which in their natural channels would flow into such lakes." Lake Michigan is not a boundary water because it is entirely within the United States, and the part of the lake which is closest to Canada is about 40 miles from the international boundary. Secretary of State Elihu Root, who negotiated the treaty on behalf of the United States, explained in his testimony regarding the treaty before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that "the definition of boundary waters was carefully drawn in order to exclude Lake Michigan." (Naujoks' "The Chicago Water Diversion Controversy," 30 Marq. L. Rev. 228, 251 (1947).)

Jurisdiction and control over diversions from bodies of water, such as Lake Michigan, which do not fall within the definition of boundary waters are reserved to the State where such water is located by article II of the treaty which reads in part:

"Each of the high contracting parties reserves to itself or to the several State governments on the one side and the Dominion or Provincial Governments on the other, as the case may be, subject to any treaty provisions now existing with respect thereto, the exclusive jurisdiction and control over the use and diversion, whether temporary or permanent, of all waters on its own side of the line which in their natural channels would flow across the boundary or into boundary waters."

Injured parties are given certain rights and remedies in respect of diversions in the other country by the succeeding clause of the treaty subject to the proviso that such rights and remedies do not apply to cases already existing. The proviso thus eliminates rights of injured parties in regard to the Chicago diversion which was already an existing case.

Canadian Federal or Provincial interests which may be injured by diversions are not covered by the rights and remedies clause just cited or the proviso thereto. A memorandum by Mr. Chandler Anderson, who drafted the treaty, states as follows:

"The right of action for damages provided for in article II applies to private or individual interests in distinction from public or governmental interests. Any question on the point is set at rest by the use of the words 'injured parties.' Whenever the word 'party' is used in a treaty, referring to the High Contracting Parties, a capital P is used, so the absence of the capital and the use of the word in the plural indicates that it can refer only to individuals." (Files of the Department.)

The only other provision of the treaty which must be considered in connection with the Chicago diversion is the final paragraph of article II, which states:

"It is understood, however, that neither of the High Contracting Parties intends by the foregoing provision to surrender any right which it may have, to object to any interference with or diversions of waters on the other side of the boundary the effect of which would be productive of material injury to the navigation interests on its own side of the boundary."

Secretary Root, in his testimony cited above, made the following statements after citing the terms of the last paragraph of article II:

"There should clearly be a right, there would be a right to object to, for instance, drying up one of the lakes. Either country, for instance, would be justified in going to war to prevent the other country from drying up Lake Erie, and that right to object to the destruction of the navigation in these international waters is preserved. I did not want to press Canada to give up any such rights, and I did not want to give up any such rights ourselves."

And later on in his testimony, when the Secretary was explaining why Canada was allowed to take a greater amount of water at Niagara than the United States under article V of the treaty, he stated: "In the third place, they consented to leave out of this treaty any reference to the drainage canal, and we are now taking 10,000 cubic feet per second for the drainage canal, which really comes out of this lake system."

From the foregoing it would seem evident that Canadian interests which may be injured by the existing or continued diversion of waters at Chicago cannot rely on the terms of the 1909 treaty for relief from any injuries

[1] But Lake Michigan is one of the waters flowing into and affecting the level of boundary waters, and so within some provisions of the Boundary Waters Treaty of January 11, 1909.

which may be caused thereby. Such interests must, instead, rely on general international law for any relief to be obtained.

The opinion of Attorney General Judson Harmon, rendered on December 12, 1895, to the Secretary of State relates to the taking of water from the Rio Grande River for irrigation in relation to article VII of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hildalgo between Mexico and the United States of February 2, 1848. (21 Op. Attys. Con. 274.) He concluded that the United States as the upstream country in that case had an unlimited right to divert the waters in question and that injured Mexican interests were without right or remedy. The Department of State believes that a reiteration of the Harmon doctrine by any branch of the United States Government would not be in the best interest of this country or in line with the progressive development of international law during the last 60 years.

When the United States negotiated a treaty with Mexico relating to the utilization of waters of the Colorado and Tijuana Rivers and of the Rio Grande with Mexico which was signed at Washington on February 3, 1944 (TS 994) the United States no longer asserted that the upstream country had an unlimited right to divert waters within its boundary. At the time the Secretary of State made the following statement before the Senate:

"It must be realized that each country owes to the other some obligation with respect to the water of these international streams, and until this obligation is recognized and defined, there must inevitably be unrest and uncertainty in the communities served by them—a condition which becomes more serious with the increasing burden of an expanding population dependent upon the waters of these streams."

In addition the Assistant Secretary of State declared:

"The logical conclusion of the legal argument of the opponents of the treaty appears to be that an upstream nation by unilateral act in its own territory can impinge upon the rights of a downstream nation; this is hardly the kind of legal doctrine that can be seriously urged in these times." (Hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, 79th Congress, 1st sess., pt. 1, p. 19 (Secretary of State); pt. 5, p. 1762 (Assistant Secretary of State).)

The Supreme Court, in dealing with the problem of interstate diversions, has developed the principle of "equitable apportionment" in a notable series of cases. (*Kansas* v. *Colorado* (185 U. S. 125 (1902), 206 U. S. 46 (1906)); *Hinderlider* v. *La Plata Co.* (304 U. S. 92 (1937)).) In the development of this principle, the Court has indicated that it was acting, at least partially, in the field of international law. Thus, in the second opinion in *Kansas* v. *Colorado*, op. cit., the Court states, at page 97:

"Nor is our jurisdiction ousted, even if, because Kansas and Colorado are States sovereign and independent in local matters, the relations between them depend in any respect upon principles of international law. International law is no alien in this tribunal."

Principles similar to that of equitable apportionment have won increasing acceptance in international law. The Italian Court of Cassation, for example, stated in 1939:

"International law recognizes the right on the part of every riparian State to enjoy, as a participant of a kind of partnership created by the river, all the advantages deriving from it for the purpose of securing the welfare and the economic and civil progress of the Nation. * * * However, although a State, in the exercise of its right of sovereignty, may subject public rivers to whatever regime it deems best, it cannot disregard the international duty, derived from that principle, not to impede or to destroy, as a result of this regime, the opportunity of the other States to avail themselves of the flow of water for their own national needs. In order to settle this conflict between the exercise of the right of sovereignty and the fulfillment of the duty imposed by the comitas gentium, regulations have been laid down by international conventions." (Annual Digest and Reports of Public International Law Cases (1938-40), 120 at 121.)

Pursuant to your request and by way of supplementing the above observations regarding the status under international law of the diversion proposed by H. R. 2, the relation of this diversion to the Columbia River development will now be discussed briefly. The position which is being taken by the United States in its negotiations with Canada regarding the development of the Columbia-Kootenay River system is that there is no basis under either the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 or customary international law for any contention that Canada has a legal right unilaterally to divert within its own territory certain waters of this system, if such diversion may cause material injury to power and navigation interests on the Columbia River in the United States. The proposed legislation authorizing an increased diversion from Lake Michigan at Chicago has been opposed by Canada on the ground that it may cause injury to Canadian navigation and hydroelectric power interests. Canada's reasons for opposing the Chicago diversion bill are thus very similar to those of the United States with respect to the Columbia River diversion, and it would seem that H. R. 2, if enacted, could constitute a precedent to be used by the Canadian interests in support of their proposals on the Columbia.

You have also requested orally an enumeration of the legal objections which have been made by Canada to the proposed increased diversion of Lake Michigan at Chicago. These objections, which are set forth below, were directed to diversion bills similar to H. R. 2, which were then being considered by the 83d and 84th Congresses. Both bills were subsequently passed and then vetoed by the President.

Two notes from the Canadian Embassy to the Secretary of State dated February 1 and March 10, 1954, objected to the bill before the 83d Congress. In the latter note, the Canadian Government referred to article II of the Boundary Waters Treaty and stated:

"The terms of the last paragraph of that article clearly affirm the understanding that neither party to the treaty surrenders 'any right which it may have to object to any interference with or diversion of waters on the other side of the boundary the effect of which would be productive of material injury to the navigation interests on its own side of the boundary.' If the proposed increase in the diversion at Chicago were to take place, the Government of Canada would, in the circumstances described above, consider that there would be material injury to the navigation interests on its side of the boundary."

The Canadian note of March 10, 1954, concludes as follows:

"The Canadian Government wishes to draw attention once more to the fact that the Chicago diversion is one aspect of a matter now before the International Joint Commission and it is suggested that it would be in the best interests of Canada and the United States to allow the Commission to complete its study of this and related matters before any change in arrangements affecting the levels of the Great Lakes is authorized."

A third note, dated August 24, 1954, was sent by the Canadian Embassy to the Department of State. Attention was again drawn to the contents of its previous notes and the following statement was made:

"As mentioned in my previous two notes, the Canadian Government considers that the adoption of this measure would have an adverse effect on navigation in the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River. After careful consideration the Government of Canada has reached the conclusion that an increase in the diversion at Chicago by 1,100 cubic-feet per second as provided in this legislation would in fact result in injury to navigation in boundary waters, particularly during cycles of low levels on the Great Lakes.

"It is the view of my Government, therefore, that the implementation of this proposed legislation would constitute a diversion of water on the United States side of the boundary, the effect of which will be productive of material injury to the navigation interests on the Canadian side of the boundary. In these circumstances and in accordance with the right which is expressly reserved in article II of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, I am instructed by my Government to make formal objection to the proposed increase in the diversion of the waters of Lake Michigan and to request that the United States Government take whatever measures may be appropriate to insure that this proposal is not implemented."

In his further note of February 13, 1956, the Canadian Ambassador stated in the concluding paragraph that:

"I am accordingly instructed to make clear that, in the view of the Canadian Government, the enactment of the proposed legislation would be prejudicial to the navigation and power interests of both countries."

In addition, an aide memoire of January 6, 1958, from the Canadian Embassy refers to "useful conversations between United States and Canadian officials" on July 9, 1957, on various aspects of the proposed diversion from the Great Lakes system. While the aide memoire does not specifically object to the diversion, it states in part as follows:

"In considering the economics of alternative methods of improved waste disposal, it is assumed that full consideration will be given to the economic harm which may be done to navigation and hydroelectric generation in both countries by extended use of dilution methods.

"It is not possible to give a firm undertaking to provide flows of a particular volume through the existing Long Lac and Ogoki diversions to the Great Lakes Basin during the 3-year period envisaged by proposed United States legislation. However, if it were possible to offset part of the effects of the Chicago diversion by inflows from the Albany Basin in Canada, it would be equitable that an equivalent amount of water should remain available for use in hydroelectric power generation by the Ontario interests at St. Marys Falls, Niagara Falls, and in the international section of the St. Lawrence River until the effects of the proposed temporary diversion will have ceased to be felt in the Great Lakes system.

"All rights under the provisions of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 are specifically reserved."

It is hoped that the foregoing provides you with the information which you desire.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN M. RAYMOND,
Acting Legal Adviser.

SUMMARY

In summary, I should like to say the Senate should not be diverted from pressing national and international problems to debate Chicago's sewage problem.

The waters of the Great Lakes—a liquid gold to the bordering communities, States and nations—are their precious possession, which they use, purify and return to the lakes so that it will not be lost to them.

Chicago, on the other hand, still uses the antiquated system of flushing sewage down the river after partial purification.

Sanitation is a complicated, medical, chemical and engineering problem. But it is basically Chicago's problem. The Senate should not be called upon to solve it.

Other communities solve their own problem. Milwaukee, as previously stated, according to independent experts achieves 95 percent p. ity before the natural purification begins out in the lake so that the water becomes as pure as ever.

Chicago was directed by the United States Supreme Court years ago to adopt the best methods, but has not spent enough money to do so. Of course, their sewage works are large—they persuaded a society years ago to call them the "Seventh Wonder of the Nation." But their sewage works are not adequate since, by their own admission, they fail to purify the sewage equivalent of an 800,000 person city.

This is, in effect, a bill to subsidize Chicago's disposal of sewage by authorizing it to drain away water into another watershed—something other lake cities are not allowed to do.

We state again, Chicago's problem is not a navigation problem such as Congress is authorized and accustomed to handle. The Public Works Committee has prevented the recurrence of the transportation problem which occurred during the low-water period on the Mississippi River in December 1956. It has done this by authorizing water storage works on the Mississippi, near Alton, Ill. And the United States Supreme Court could again, as it did then (in 1956) authorize an emergency diversion. That one was of 8,500 cubic feet per second for about 130 days, as I recall.

Chicago has not made adequate use of the 3,500 cubic feet per second it now diverts (that is, 2,000 domestic pumpage and 1,500 specific authorization).

Another 1,000 cubic feet per second would raise the diversion to 4,500 cubic feet per second, with the open end of a domestic pumpage constantly increasing as the city grows.

This extra 1,000 cubic feet per second for 3 years or 1 year would induce Chicago to continue its present methods with the result that continued diversion would seem to be necessary and would become permanent.

Just a temporary diversion shown would lose users of the Great Lakes millions of dollars. Lower lake levels would lower harbor and canal depths and consequently decrease safe ship draft and reduce tonnage carried. Extra expensive dredging would be necessary. The beauty and recreational value of lakeshore property would be impaired to the injury of the tourist trade. Dock pilings would become exposed and rot. The daily posted guide to the safe loading of ships is figured down to the nearest inch. Every inch in lake height counts, particularly in this cycle of low water on the Great Lakes.

Over the last 50 years or so, Chicago has taken, I would roughly estimate, considerably over 14 feet.

THE LAW FAILS TO SUPPORT THE BILL

The Federal question

The Constitution of the United States, of course, gives the Federal Government jurisdiction to regulate interstate commerce. But this grant, although including authority to facilitate navigation, did not include authority to take from one State water for the sanitation of a city in another State.

The United States Supreme Court held that the permit of the Secretary of War dated March 3, 1925, was invalid because: "Merely to aid the district in disposing of its sewage was not a justification, considering the limited scope of the Secretary's authority. He could not make mere local sanitation a basis for a continuing diversion."

No navigation problem is involved. Even the Army engineers admit this. (Testimony of Colonel Naumann, 1958 Senate Public Works Committee hearing transcript, pp. 315–318.) The temporary navigation problem due to drought in 1956 which resulted in the emergency decree of the United States Supreme Court, has been solved for the future by a law authorizing water retaining works above Alton, Ill., on the Mississippi River.

Congress has no authority to divert water for the sole purpose of sluicing Chicago's sewage down the Illinois Waterway. *Wisconsin* v. *Illinois* (278 U. S. 367, at p. 418 (1929)).

Treaty rights

Either party to the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 can object to lowering of any waters (whether within the definition of boundary waters or not) which have the effect of lowering the level of the boundary waters to the injury of that party. As the Supreme Court said:

"With regard to the second ground, the treaty of January 11, 1909 (36 Stat. L. 2448), with Great Britain, expressly provides against uses 'affecting the natural level or flow of boundary waters' without authority of the United States or the Dominion of Canada within their respective jurisdictions and the approval of the International Joint Commission agreed upon therein" (266 U. S. 405, at 426).

The definition of boundary waters at the beginning of the treaty, about which so much has been said on the floor, is not a definition of all the waters within any jurisdiction of the treaty. Although Lake Michigan is not a boundary water and is obviously circumscribed by the United States, the lowering of the level of Lake Michigan does obviously affect adversely the level of the Great Lakes on which Canada borders and which Canada uses for navigation. Canada has the right to object to injury from lowering the level of the Great Lakes.

Report dated May 17, 1958, of the committee on uses of international waters of the American Bar Association, copy of which I read into the RECORD (see exhibit).

Opinion dated July 29, 1958, of the Legal Adviser of the Department of State, supra.

Memorandum entitled "Legal Aspects of the Use of Systems of International Waters" of William L. Griffin, attorney, Office of the Legal Adviser, Department of State, filed in the hearings of the Senate Interior Committee, April 1958, with respect to the Columbia River.

Herbert H. Naujoks, The Chicago Water Diversion Controversy, a series of three articles in Marquette Law Review (30 Marquette Law Review 149–176, 228–271, 252–253, and 30 Marquette Law Review 28–79).

Canada has objected (see aide memoire, dated January 6, 1958, and other documentation which I have referred to in section on Canada's Position).

"COMMITTEE ON USES OF INTERNATIONAL WATERS

"(American Bar Association, section of international and comparative law, May 17, 1958)

"To members of the section of international and comparative law: Members of this committee have exchanged views by personal discussion when possible or by correspondence with members of the committee who were not available in Washington.

"Diversion of water from Lake Michigan and the Great Lakes Basin to Mississippi Basin

"The following resolution met with the approval of the majority of the committee:

"Resolved, That the section of international law disapproves H. R. 2, 85th Congress, 1st session, entitled 'A bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes.'

"This bill was passed by the House of Representatives on May 22, 1957, and is now pending in the Public Works Committee of the United States Senate. It involves important principles of international law and provisions of the Treaty of January 11, 1909, between Great Britain and the United States in respect to Canada, generally known as the Boundary Waters Treaty. The diversion of waters of Lake Michigan dealt with in this legislation has previously been the subject of litigation between the States in the Supreme Court of the United States. Its jurisdiction is based upon article III, section 2, clause 2, of the Constitution of the United States which provides that:

" 'The judicial Power shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and Treaties made, or which shall be made, under their Authority * * * to Controversies between two or more States.'

"The diversion of water from Lake Michigan by reversal of the flow of the Chicago River and the digging of a canal across the Great Lakes-Mississippi River divide has been the subject of controversy for many years in the courts and in diplomatic correspondence of the United States and Canada.

"The Sanitary District of Chicago constructed the sanitary and ship canal, commonly designated as the main drainage canal, from Chicago to Lockport, Ill., 1892–1900, and extended it to Joliet, 1903–7. This canal was built with flow capacity of 10,000 cubic feet per second to pass the maximum flood from the Chicago area; to dispose of the sewage of 3 million people by dilution, and to provide deep draft (24 feet) navigation inland to Lockport, across the Lake Michigan-Mississippi River divide.

"1909 Boundary Waters Treaty

"The Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 with Great Britain in respect to Canada (36 Stat., p. 9) provides in Article I, as follows:

" 'The high contracting parties agree that the navigation of all navigable boundary waters shall forever continue free and open for the purposes of commerce to the inhabitants and to the ships, vessels, and boats of both countries equally, subject, however, to any laws and regulations of either country, within its own territory, not inconsistent with such privilege of free navigation and applying equally and without discrimination to the inhabitants, ships, vessels, and boats of both countries.

" 'It is further agreed that so long as this treaty shall remain in force, this same right of navigation shall extend to the waters of Lake Michigan and to all canals connecting boundary waters, and now existing or which may hereafter be constructed on either side of the line. Either of the high contracting parties may adopt rules and regulations governing the use of such canals within its own territory and may charge tolls for the use thereof, but all such rules and regulations and all tolls charged shall apply alike to the subjects or citizens of the high contracting parties and the ships, vessels, and boats of both of the high contracting parties, and they shall be placed on terms of equality in the use thereof.'

"Article II of the treaty reads as follows:

" 'Each of the high contracting parties reserves to itself or to the several State governments on the one side and the Dominion or provincial governments on the other as the case may be, subject to any treaty provisions now existing with respect thereto, the exclusive jurisdiction and control over the use and diversion, whether temporary or permanent, of all waters on its own side of the line which in their natural channels would flow across the boundary or into boundary waters; but it is agreed that any interference with

or diversion from their natural channel of such waters on either side of the boundary, resulting in any injury on the other side of the boundary, shall give rise to the same rights and entitle the injured parties to the same legal remedies as if such injury took place in the country where such diversion or interference occurs; but this provision shall not apply to cases already existing or to cases expressly covered by special agreement between the parties hereto.

" 'It is understood, however, that neither of the high contracting parties intends by the foregoing provision to surrender any right, which it may have, to object to any interference with or diversions of waters on the other side of the boundary the effect of which would be productive or material injury to the navigation interests on its own side of the boundary.'

"Article III of the treaty contains the following provisions:

" 'It is agreed that, in addition to the uses, obstructions, and diversions heretofore permitted or hereafter provided for by special agreement between the parties hereto, no further or other uses or obstructions or diversions, whether temporary or permanent, of boundary waters on either side of the line, affecting the natural level or flow of boundary waters on the other side of the line, shall be made except by authority of the United States or the Dominion of Canada within their respective jurisdictions and with the approval, as hereinafter provided, of a joint commission, to be known as the International Joint Commission.

" 'The foregoing provisions are not intended to limit or interfere with the existing rights of the Government of the United States on the one side and the Government of the Dominion of Canada on the other, to undertake and carry on governmental works in boundary waters for the deepening of channels, the construction of breakwaters, the improvement of harbors, and other governmental works for the benefit of commerce and navigation, provided that such works are wholly on its own side of the line and do not materially affect the level or flow of the boundary waters on the other, nor are such provisions intended to interfere with the ordinary uses of such waters for domestic and sanitary purposes.'

"Secretary Root's statement at the Senate hearing re article II reads as follows:

" 'The last paragraph of article II reserves our right to object to any interference with or diversion of waters on the other side of the boundary, the effect of which would be productive of material injury to the navigation interests on its own side of the boundary.

" 'There should clearly be a right, there would be a right, to object to, for instance, drying up one of the lakes. Either country, for instance, would be justified in going to war to prevent the other country from drying up Lake Erie, and that right to object to the destruction of the navigation in these international waters is preserved. I did not want to press Canada to give up any such rights, and I did not want to give up any such rights ourselves. There is a company incorporated in Canada, which involves very important political interests there, to cut a canal from Lake Erie to Ontario, across the Jordan River, and turning the entire current of Lake Erie down through that Canal for power purposes. It would dry up Niagara River and appropriate the entire waterpower design from the level of Lake Erie to Lake Ontario.

" 'Senator BACON. This treaty prevents that?

" 'Secretary ROOT. This treaty prevents that. It reserves our right to object to it, and it prevents its being done except by the authority of this Commission, which necessitates the consent of the American member of the Commission. The existing Waterways Commission has already reported against it.

" 'Article II also gives the parties on either side of the line certain legal remedies. That is, of course, new. That would make the people on either side of the line stand in the same relation as to the treatment of their watercourses as the people on either side of the line between New York and Pennsylvania.'

"Legal proceedings by United States Government against State of Illinois and by States of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and New York against State of Illinois and Sanitary District of Chicago

"The Attorney General of the United States brought an action in a district court of the United States on October 6, 1913, to enjoin the sanitary district from diverting from Lake Michigan more than an amount of water authorized by the Secretary of War. It was not until June 18, 1923, however, that a decree was entered by the district court granting the relief sought by the plaintiff.

"On January 5, 1923, the United States Supreme Court in the case of *Sanitary District of Chicago* v. *United States* (266 U. S. 405) affirmed a decree of the district court enjoining the sanitary district from diverting water from Lake Michigan in excess of 250,000 cubic feet per minute, the amount authorized by the Secretary of War. The opinion of Justice Holmes contains the following statement relating to the Boundary Waters Treaty of January 11, 1909:

" 'This is not a controversy between equals. The United States is asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. It has a standing in this suit not only to remove obstruction to interstate and foreign commerce, the main ground, which we will deal with last, but also to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power bordering upon some of the lakes concerned, and, it may be, also on the footing of an ultimate sovereign interest in the lakes. The Attorney General by virtue of his office may bring this proceeding, and no statute is necessary to authorize the suit (*United States* v. *San Jacinto Tin Co.*, 125 U. S. 273). With regard to the second ground, the treaty of January 11, 1909, with Great Britain, expressly provides against uses "affecting the natural level or flow of boundary waters" without the authority of the United States or the Dominion of Canada within their respective jurisdiction and the approval of the International Joint Commission agreed upon therein. As to its ultimate interest in the lakes, the reasons seem to be stronger than those that have established a similar standing for a State, as the interests of the Nation are more important than those of any States. (*In re Debs*, 158 U. S. 564, 584, 585, 599; *Georgia* v. *Tennessee Copper Co.*, 206 U. S. 230; *Hudson County Water Co.* v. *McCarter*, 209 U. S. 349, 355; *Marshall Dental Manufacturing Co.* v. *Iowa*, 226 U. S. 460, 462, pp. 425 and 426.)'

"On July 14, 1922, the State of Wisconsin filed a bill in the United States Supreme Court against the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago in which the States of Minnesota, Ohio, and Pennsylvania subsequently joined. The case was decided on January 14, 1929 (278 U. S. 367), with similar suits brought by the States of Michigan and New York. The Court's opinion in the case contains the following pertinent statements:

" 'There is a further prayer, that if the sanitary and ship canal should be used as a navigable waterway of the United States and be subject to the same control on the part of the United States as other navigable waterways, the defendant should be restrained from permanently diverting any water from Lake Michigan in excess of the amount which the Court should determine to be reasonably required for navigation in and through said canal and the connecting waters to the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers without injury to the navigable capacity of the Great Lakes and their connecting waterways' (p. 369).

"Chief Justice Taft stated:

" 'When master's (Charles Evans Hughes) findings on the subject of injury to the complainants are in effect as follows:

" ' "The diversion which has taken place through the Chicago drainage canal has been substantially equivalent to a diversion of about 8,500 cubic feet a second for a period of time sufficient to cause, and it has caused the lowering of the mean levels of the lake and the connecting waterways, as follows: Lakes Erie and Ontario approximately 5 inches; and of the connecting rivers, bays, and harbors to the same extent, respectively. A diversion of an additional 1,500 cubic feet per second, or a total diversion of 10,000 cubic feet a second, would cause an additional lowering in Lakes Michigan and Huron of about 1 inch, and in Lakes Erie and Ontario a little less than 1 inch, with a corresponding additional lowering in the connecting waterways" (pp. 407–408).

" 'It will be perceived that the interference which was the basis of the Secretary's permit, and which the latter was intended to eliminate, resulted directly from the failure of the sanitary district to take care of its sewage in some way other than by promoting or continuing the existing diversion. It may be that some flow from the lake is necessary to keep up navigation in the Chicago River, which really is part of the port of Chicago, but that amount is negligible as compared with 8,500 second-feet now being diverted. Hence, beyond that negligible quantity, the validity of the Secretary's permit derives its support entirely from a situation produced by the sanitary district in violation of the complainant's rights; and but for that support complainants might properly press for an immediate shutting down by injunction of the diversion, save any small part needed to maintain navigation in the river. In these circumstances, we think they are entitled to a decree which will be effective in bringing that violation and the unwarranted part of the diversion to an end' (p. 418).

" 'It therefore is the duty of this Court by an appropriate decree to compel the reduction of the diversion to a point where it rests on a legal basis and thus to restore the navigable capacity of Lake Michigan to its proper level.' (P. 420.)

"In a decision (vol. 281, p. 179) rendered on April 14, 1930, by Mr. Justice Holmes the litigation terminated in a decree providing in part as follows:

" 'That on and after December 31, 1939, the said defendants are enjoined from diverting as above in excess of the annual average of 1,500 cubic feet per second in addition to domestic pumpage.

" 'That the provisions of this decree as to the diverting of the waters of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system or watershed relate to the flow diverted by the defendants exclusive of the water drawn by the city of Chicago for domestic water-supply purposes and entering the Chicago River and its branches or the Calumet River or the Chicago Drainage Canal as sewage. The amount so diverted is to be determined by deducting from the total flow at Lockport the amount of water pumped by the city of Chicago into its water mains and as so computed will include the runoff of the Chicago and Calumet drainage area.' (281 U. S. 179, p. 201.)

"The decree was announced by Justice Holmes on April 21, 1930 (281 U. S. 696–697). Action with regard to this decree is reported in Supreme Court reports, 287 United States 578–579, and in 289 United States 395 (1933) in which Chief Justice Hughes states:

" 'Third. Similar considerations apply to the argument based on the provisions of the

Rivers and Harbors Act of July 3, 1930, and of the pending treaty with Canada as to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway, in relation to compensation works through which it is urged, the restoration of lake levels may be effected. The reference is to the construction of compensation works in the Niagara and St. Clair Rivers. Counsel for Illinois say that "upon the adoption of this treaty the appropriation made for the projects authorized in the rivers and harbors bill in 1930, including compensation works, by the War Department appropriation bill of 1931," becomes immediately available for carrying out this treaty requirement, and that the Court should assume that, either under the treaty or under the act of 1930, compensation works with the desired result will be installed. But it is apparent that there is no basis for the suggested assumption. It would be manifestly inappropriate to discuss the provisions of the pending treaty, bearing upon the diversion of water from Lake Michigan, as the treaty is not in effect. And there is no ground for concluding that the compensation works to which reference is made could be installed in the absence of treaty. What, if anything, will be done in the establishment of compensation works is undetermined.

" 'The decisive point is that nothing has been done which affects the operation of the decree and that the obligation of defendants to carry out its terms is in full force.' (P. 404.)

"Subsequent proceedings initiated by the defendants, State of Illinois and Chicago Sanitary District for modification of the decree were rejected by the Court on May 26, 1941 (313 U. S. 547). On October 23, 1950, the Supreme Court dismissed their petition for an interpretation and clarification of the decree of April 21, 1930.

"On January 28, 1957, the Court continued for 1 month permission it had granted to divert up to an average of 8,500 cubic feet per second in view of the continuing emergency in navigation caused by low water in the Mississippi River. It directed that this be restricted then to a diversion of 1,500 cubic feet per second pursuant to the decree of April 21, 1930 after February 28, 1957, in addition to domestic pumpage.

"Canadian objections to proposed diversion

"Canada has objected to recent proposals of Illinois and the Chicago Sanitary District for additional diversion of water from Lake Michigan. Two notes from the Canadian Embassy to the Secretary of State dated February 1 and March 10, 1954, set forth these objections. In the latter note, the Canadian Government referred to Article II of the Boundary Waters Treaty and stated that:

" 'The terms of the last paragraph of that article clearly affirm the understanding that neither party to the treaty surrenders any right which it may have to object to any interference with or diversion of waters on the other side of the boundary the effect of which would be productive of material injury to the navigation interests on its own side of the boundary. If the proposed increase in the diversion at Chicago were to take place, the Government of Canada would, in the circumstances described above, consider that there would be material injury to the navigation interests on its side of the boundary.'

"The Canadian note of March 10, 1954, concludes as follows:

" 'The Canadian Government wishes to draw attention once more to the fact that the Chicago diversion is one aspect of a matter now before the International Joint Commission and it is suggested that it would be in the best interests of Canada and the United States to allow the Commission to complete its study of this and related matters before any change in arrangements affecting the levels of the Great Lakes is authorized.'

"A third note No. 550 dated August 24, 1954, was sent by the Canadian Embassy to the Department of State. Attention was again drawn to the contents of its previous notes and the following statement was made:

" 'As mentioned in my previous two notes, the Canadian Government considers that the adoption of this measure would have an adverse effect on navigation in the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River. After careful consideration the Government of Canada has reached the conclusion that an increase in the diversion at Chicago by 1,000 cubic feet per second as provided in this legislation would in fact result in injury to navigation in boundary waters, particularly during cycles of low levels on the Great Lakes.

" 'It is the view of my Government, therefore, that the implementation of this proposed legislation would constitute a diversion of waters on the United States side of the boundary, the effect of which will be productive of material injury to the navigation interests on the Canadian side of the boundary. In these circumstances and in accordance with the right which is expressly reserved in article II of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, I am instructed by my Government to make formal objection to the proposed increase in the diversion of the waters of Lake Michigan and to request that the United States Government take whatever measures may be appropriate to insure that this proposal is not implemented. In this connection it is suggested that the interests of Canada and the United States would best be served by allowing the International Joint Commission to complete its study of this and related matters under the arrangements already agreed upon in the joint reference of June 25, 1952.'

" In his further note of February 13, 1956, the Canadian Ambassador stated in the concluding paragraph that:

" 'I am accordingly instructed to make clear that, in the view of the Canadian Government, the enactment of the proposed legislation would be prejudicial to the navigation and power interests of both countries.'

"It should be noted that H. R. 3300, passed in the closing hours of the 83d Congress, was not approved by President Eisenhower. In his memorandum of disapproval he stated:

" 'I am unable to approve the bill because:

" '1. Existing diversions are adequate for navigation on the Illinois Waterway and Mississippi River.

" '2. The methods of control of lake levels and protection of property on the Great Lakes should be considered before arbitrarily proceeding with the proposed increase diversion.

" '3. The diversions are authorized without reference to negotiation with Canada; and

" '4. The legitimate interests of other States affected by the diversion may be adversely affected.'

"A similar bill in the 84th Congress, H. R. 3210, was disapproved by the Department of State in a letter from THRUSTON B. MORTON, Assistant Secretary of State (now Senator MORTON), reading in part as follows:

" 'The Department has been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report and that the enactment of this proposed legislation would not be in accord with the program of the President since it considers the reasons for the President's memorandum of disapproval of H. R. 3300, 83d Congress, remain valid.'

"The effect of the increased diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second at Chicago was the subject of an investigation by the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army. (S. Doc. No. 28, 85th Cong., 1st sess.) [1] This report and other pertinent material from the Public Health Service were the basis of discussions between officers of the United and Canada. The result was a renewal of Canada's expression of disapproval on account of adverse effects upon navigation and power interests and boundary waters, including connecting channels, harbors and the St. Lawrence River power-seaway project.

"The proposed developments would also constitute an unfortunate precedent for the United States in its negotiations with Canada with regard to the proposal of some Canadian interests to divert the waters of the Kootenay and Columbia Rivers into the Thompson and Frazier Rivers for power development, thus depriving the dams constructed by the United States below the boundary on the Columbia of waters for power and navigation developments there.

"Further discussion of the Columbia River diversion project will be presented later."

It is clear that there is no justification, legal or equitable, for Federal action to divert water for Chicago's benefit.

CONCLUSION

Lastly, I should like to reiterate these few thoughts and sentences in summary:

1. Conclusive evidence shows Chicago is to blame for its own predicament, in that its sewage disposal plant, which was efficient 6 years ago, has not been kept up to date as Chicago has grown.

2. It has diverted 3 rivers which formerly flowed into Lake Michigan and has taken many hundreds of cubic feet per second, in addition, from Lake Michigan.

3. It has no basis for relief in law or in equity.

4. The St. Lawrence seaway and port project must not be jeopardized by this unreasonable demand. Chicago, the Wonder City, spends less per capita and has a lower tax rate than other cities. She should not expect to take from the other States. Let her tend to her own job.

TVA Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, in response to the reference to me citing a paragraph from my remarks of July 24, 1958, appearing at page 19756 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the distinction is

---

[1] Sec. 201 of this report reads in part as follows:

" 'The minimum estimated energy losses from a 3-year increase in diversion, as based on existing plants only, are 72,800,000 kilowatt-hours in United States plants and 115,200,000 kilowatt-hours in Canadian plants for a total estimated loss of 188 million kilowatt-hours. The maximum estimated losses from a 3-year increase in diversion, as based on existing and proposed plants, are 148,700,000 kilowatt-hours in United States plants and 294,300,000 kilowatt-hours in Canadian plants for a total estimated loss of 443 million kilowatt-hours. The energy losses are therefore estimated to be somewhere between 188 million and 443 million kilowatt-hours, and will vary with the timing of installation of additional generating capacity at the several power sites on the Niagara and St. Lawrence Rivers.' "

that the TVA bonds are not an obligation of the United States. They are not a part of the public debt.

The Atomic Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, just a few short years ago the American people and the entire world were suddenly and unexpectedly thrust into a new era of breathtaking progress. The mystery of splitting the atom and controlling this vast source of energy was unlocked by the tireless genius of our scientists. The circumstances under which this historic breakthrough was announced to the world has, unfortunately, cast doubts upon the value of this discovery to the advancement of civilization and even the survival of the human race. An atmosphere of fear for the power of this new source of energy has grown up in some segments of public thinking which has tended to retard progress in bringing about its peaceful application to a wide range of opportunities which can bring great benefits to all mankind.

The present world situation, beset as we are with the tensions which grow out of the cold war, has cast the power of the atom in a dark and frightening role. Pitted as all civilization is against the aggressive, totalitarian movement of Russian communism the power of the atom has been concentrated on defense of those human values which we hold to be as dear as life itself. The Russian leaders have acquired the secret of the atom and they boast of their rapid progress in making its destructive power an integral part of their war machine. Of late they have been threatening many free countries, particularly those allied with us in defense of human freedom, with the spectre of missile warfare—that is missiles carrying atomic and hydrogen warheads—unless they disarm and disassociate themselves from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. This Russian effort at diplomacy by ultimatum was clearly intended to stimulate widespread fear of atomic energy, to shake public confidence in man's ability to use this new power wisely. But these Russian efforts together with their refusal to enter into workable and enforcible agreements which would ban the use of this new energy for nonpeaceful purposes cannot stop the progress which has been made and will be made in applying atomic energy to programs which give great promise toward lifting the heavy burdens from the backs of all mankind.

It is the peaceful uses of atomic energy which today engage the genius of our scientists and technicians. It is in this direction that I and other members of my committee in Congress have been concentrating our initiative, encouragement, and guidance. This work which we have done and shall continue to do does not make headlines. It is exacting; requiring constant study, research, consultation, and committee inquiry in order to stay on top of the vast scope of work under way and to make certain that the funds authorized bring a maximum of results.

I think you will be interested in a highlight report on some of the outstanding work being done in the field of peaceful uses of atomic energy. Here are some of the most significant ones.

POWER REACTORS

The power reactor is used to produce nuclear power which in turn is used to generate electrical power. As you know the principal source of power to generate electricity at present is that which comes from harnessing the flow of rivers to turn huge turbines which generate electrical power or by using coal or oil to produce the energy needed to turn these turbines. Nuclear power is now being used to replace or to supplement electrical power which has been derived from these other sources.

At the beginning of this year the Atomic Energy Commission had in operation 7 experimental civilian power reactors of 6 different types. In addition an Army reactor which features direct civilian uses was in operation. Another experimental power reactor, the first in the country financed exclusively with private capital, was supplying electricity to company lines.

Construction was under way on four full-scale power reactors in which private enterprise is the sole or primary investor.

A contract was signed for the first nuclear-powered merchant ship and for its propulsion reactor.

These reactors in operation and being produced are located in widely separated parts of the country. From this one can observe that the Congress has not been neglectful in the overall national plan for the peaceful use of atomic energy and that we are today moving to the forefront in this important field.

One of the primary problems in connection with power reactors is fuel costs. To make this new source of energy economically competitive with the traditional sources of energy a way must be found to reduce the production costs of the fuel. Other economies can be made in the construction costs of reactors and in the reduction of operating and maintenance costs. These latter will come after we have had more experience with the experimental reactors now in use and in building. However, the problem of reducing fuel costs will remain the great challenge in the immediate years ahead.

The British have been making notable strides in the direction of economy in the development of reactor types and fuel utilization. It is a matter of extreme and practical necessity which urges them forward in this task. They are faced with the prospect of rapidly depleting coal reserves and the uncertainties of the source of their oil supplies, which are located in the fomenting Near and Middle East. The Suez crisis of a year ago, the upheaval in Iraq a few months ago and the threats being made against the protectorate of Yemen have been very discomforting to our British friends. The challenge of developing economical power reactors is one which the British must meet and win if they are to remain one of the great industrial nations of the world.

We must be ready to profit by the advances the British Isles have made and will continue to make in this vitally important area. I for one am keeping an open mind on both the type of reactors and the utilization of fuel which the United States Atomic Energy Commission should concentrate on. For example, on a visit to England last year to observe the methods they have developed I was impressed with the position they have taken on the types and uses of fuel. They hold that there are sufficient reserves of uranium ores available which should permit us to concentrate on more simplified methods of producing the source materials. Here in the United States we appear to be concentrating on methods for conserving these reserves at a time when we are told our known reserves are sufficient for the foreseeable future. The costs involved in creating and producing the perfect fuel far outrun the costs involved by using a process which would consume more basic uranium ores. The British, in my opinion, have taken a more realistic position on this problem than we have. As in the past this will remain a matter of continuing concern of and inquiry by my committee.

PROPULSION

In the field of propulsion there have been several sensational developments which demonstrate what can be done with the nuclear reactor. The press has reported a wide range of records set by the *Nautilus*, an atomic-powered submarine. It has proven its ability to practically circumnavigate the globe while submerged. Recently the *Nautilus* completed a journey from the Pacific Ocean to the Atlantic Ocean, crossing under the hitherto impenetrable Arctic icecap. It was but a few years ago that such a feat was considered possible only in the writings of the imaginative Jules Verne. When the atomic-powered *Skate* repeated the sensational, pioneer journey of the *Nautilus*, under the Arctic icecap, within a matter of days, the meaning of the atomic age was apparent. The use of reactors for the propulsion of underwater and surface craft gives promise of great benefits to mankind in this ever-shrinking world in which we live.

It will not be long before atomic reactors will be propelling huge and very fast aircraft through the skies and possibly even into outer space. There remain technical problems to be resolved before this additional chapter of Jules Verne's predictions becomes a reality, but with determination and persistence of scientific effort these problems can be resolved.

Speaking of determination and persistence, I am reminded of Admiral Rickover, who in the field of applied sciences stands as a splendid example. He was possessed of the belief that atomic energy could be harnessed to propel a submarine

for great distances under water. In his efforts to give the United States the first atomic-propelled craft or vehicle in the world, he was met with organized opposition and rebuffs that would turn back the vision of an ordinary man. He put pride and personal security aside as his determination to advance the security of the United States drove him forward to the successful launching of the *Nautilus*. It is to his everlasting credit that in the face of his latest official rebuff, following the historic journey of the *Nautilus* under the Arctic icecap, his only comment was that he was amply rewarded in the knowledge that his efforts had contributed to the safety and well-being of his country.

MEDICAL RESEARCH, DIAGNOSIS, AND THERAPY

One of the most interesting and useful byproducts of nuclear reactor operations is what the scientists call radioactive isotopes. They are so uniquely suited to the study of the human body and its diseases that they seem to have been created by the good Lord for this very purpose. Body processes, in sickness and in health, are fundamentally chemical but are carried out on such a dynamic, complex, and microscopic scale that they have most times defied ordinary procedures of study. The radioactive isotope has opened up new and exciting possibilities of research and study of the human being which hitherto have been impossible.

Today the medical scientist is using these isotopes as tracers to diagnose a wide variety of human ailments, to locate diseased parts of the body and to guide him in the safe use of powerful therapeutic machines. The discoveries have a most important bearing on studies being made of the causes of the dread disease of cancer, on experiments being made to arrest this disease, and we hope they will lead the medical researcher to the discovery of a cure for this greatest of all killers.

Today isotopes are used to diagnose or treat the ailments of 1 million patients a year in this country.

RESEARCH IN INDUSTRY AND CHEMISTRY

The magic isotopes are also used for a wide variety of industrial purposes. They can identify the specific properties of materials to be used in industry, the strength and weakness of given materials and the reaction of other or foreign matters on that material. For example, they can be used to find flaws in materials and manufactured products.

The isotope is also a helper in the sterilization and preservation of foods. They can be used for the pasteurization of perishable foodstuffs such as meats, bananas, potatoes, and beverages.

One can even detect leaks in waterlines, to ascertain their precise location so that they can be repaired with a minimum of disruption and thereby at greatly reduced cost.

Another feat of the isotope struck me as providing a significant answer to the old question of just how cockroaches get into the best-kept kitchens. The isotope discovered that one common mode of entrance used by the cockroach is the cleanest water tap. Once a colony of cockroaches is disturbed by overcrowding or other factors, they will range quite a distance to find a new haven. They are no respecters of the well-kept kitchen, if it is your bad luck to have them enter your waterlines. This piece of information may save the housewife embarrassment if her husband suddenly discovers one of these unwelcome visitors in her kitchen.

AGRICULTURAL STUDIES

The frontiers of farm science and land development must be pushed forward at an ever-increasing rate to provide for world-population growth and to improve living standards. Food production is not increasing as fast as population demands throughout the world. Some experts on this problem estimate that almost half the population of the world goes to bed hungry each night.

The isotope has stimulated research in the agricultural field which knows no equal in history. This new tool is unlocking the secrets of the growth of plants and animals and the scourges that injure or destroy them. Studies now going on in the field of soil fertility, the uptake of fertilizers, plant diseases and fungicides, root growth, photosynthesis, animal feeding, insects, and insecticides show that we can resolve the problem of growing sufficient food to meet the demands of an increasing world population. The magic isotope is working around the clock for the good of all humanity.

What I have said provides but a fleeting look at the great possibilities which are ours for the taking in this atomic age. These are the great hopes that we hold out for the American people. We have always stood ready to share our scientific and technological advances with all the other nations and peoples of the world. In generations past we Americans have made our share of worthy contributions to the progress of all mankind. We are inspired no less in this generation to share the blessings which the peaceful uses of atomic energy can bring to ourselves and thus to all humanity.

This is the real challenge of the atomic age. We must never allow fear for the nonpeaceful uses of this great source of energy to retard its full and fruitful utilization. It is our destiny to be makers of the peace and we must keep faith with that sacred trust.

Montana's Senior Senator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at the conclusion of the 85th Congress, my distinguished and able colleague, the senior Senator from Montana, JAMES E. MURRAY, has served the State of Montana in Congress longer than any other elected Representative from the Treasure State. His 24 years in the Senate have been marked by numerous accomplishments benefiting our great State and its people.

Senator MURRAY came to Washington in 1934 to fill the unexpired term of another great Montana Senator, Thomas J. Walsh. He has been elected to four full terms in the Senate. Senator MURRAY has become well known as a champion of labor, education, and the development of our natural resources. In his capacity as chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and more recently as chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, he has sponsored and supported much legislation which has made America a better place in which to live. He is also an active member of the Democratic Policy Committee in the Senate.

As a Member of the House of Representatives, I became acquainted with the Senator's fine work, and my admiration for his seemingly tireless efforts in behalf of Montana and the Nation continues to grow. I have come to know him as a valued friend and capable legislator in all matters of mutual concern. I consider it a privilege and honor to serve with Senator MURRAY in the United States Senate, and I know that our colleagues hold him in the highest esteem. No Senator could have a better, a more understanding, or a more knowledgeable and friendly colleague than I have in the person of the senior Senator from Montana, the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY. As his partner, I am indeed a fortunate man.

Congressman Joe Holt Reports on 85th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE HOLT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, each year upon the adjournment of the Congress, I send to the people of the 22d District, consisting of Hollywood and the San Fernando Valley, a résumé of the accomplishments of the Congress, together with my stand on the major issues which have come before us. The 85th Congress was a hard-working Congress, yet by far the most difficult in which I have ever participated. The country as a whole, and particularly the taxpayers, would have been a lot better off if Congress had quit many weeks before it did.

This Congress started out in the space age and faced an economic slump at home, but ended up worrying about inflation. Nearly everyone in the country will be affected by the actions taken by Congress this year. In recent months millions of dollars in defense contracts have been awarded to valley industrial firms, which are playing an increasingly important role in research, development and production of space-age weapons and scientific equipment. The country as a whole, and particularly the taxpayers, would have been a lot better off

if Congress had quit many weeks before it did.

It is always difficult when you have a President of one party and a Congress of another to accomplish what should be done, and then adjourn. This Congress went "nuts" on spending, setting a record with a budget of $80.9 billion, the biggest in peacetime history. The 85th Congress left many important measures undone, such as labor legislation, passport legislation—restricting Communists—and a sensible income tax revision, particularly education deductions.

BENEFITS TO OUR COMMUNITY

Many of the accomplishments of this past session of Congress will be of direct benefit to our community. The added $1.8 billion in Federal funds for highway construction will result in an earlier completion date for our long-awaited freeway system in the valley. In recent months millions of dollars in defense contracts have been awarded to valley industrial firms, which are playing an increasingly important role in research, development and production of space-age weapons and scientific equipment.

During this past year the new post office in Encino has been completed and construction is underway on the Canoga Park postal annex. In addition the Post Office Department is planning to build a new central postal annex to speed mail delivery throughout the entire San Fernando Valley. The erection of this modern facility will at last bring 1 day mail service to our community, and will bypass completely the overcrowded Los Angeles terminal annex.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT REORGANIZATION

Based on President Eisenhower's recommendations, Congress passed a Defense Reorganization Act. The bill consolidated full authority in the Secretary of Defense and gives him the authority and flexibility to transfer funds from one function to another, as well as streamline military command channels. Of great importance in the act is the improving of the Department's research and development organization in an attempt to eliminate waste and duplication among the various services. Increasing defense costs, which amount to $40 billion in this year's budget, necessitate taking every action possible to eliminate waste and inefficiency.

NEW SPACE AGENCY

Acting on the President's recommendation, Congress established a National Aeronautics and Space Administration. This agency, under civilian control, will be responsible for the planning and direction of aeronautical and space activities.

Developments of the past year, including launching of the Russian sputnik, point to the urgency of establishing this new agency. By clearly defining responsibility in a single agency, it is anticipated that the space program, so vital to our defense, will be greatly accelerated.

GREATER AIR SAFETY

Congress acted to create a new Federal Aviation Agency. This new agency will go a long way toward solving the accident problem and insuring safety in the air.

For the first time, a single Federal governing authority will have control of both military and civilian aircraft operations. This will be particularly important to the people of southern California, who have long been plagued by heavy uncontrolled military and civil air traffic.

FLOOD CONTROL

This year Congress has appropriated an additional $18 million for flood-control projects in the Los Angeles area. The last major link of the federally financed Los Angeles River Channel improvement in the West Valley from Corbin to Owensmouth in Canoga Park has all but been completed. Correction of remaining drainage problems is the responsibility of the county and city of Los Angeles.

RECESSION AND UNEMPLOYMENT

To meet this challenge, Congress took the following action:

First. Speeded up action on military and civilian contracts that were pending. This assisted our community a great deal because of the large volume of defense work in which we participate.

Second. Extended unemployment benefit compensation up to 15 additional weeks by providing loans to States who are unable to meet increased demands from their own funds.

Third. Aided small business by giving permanent status to the Small Business Administration; increased its lending authority and reduced interest rates to small-business concerns. Legislation was also passed making it possible for State development agencies or investment agencies to lend money to small business on a long-term basis for financing expansion or modernization. The new law also allows for increased tax writeoff on new plants and equipment during the first year.

Fourth. Excise taxes were reduced by $42 million.

Fifth. Congress passed an $1.8 billion emergency housing program designed to encourage the building of an estimated 200,000 homes by extending the VA home loan guaranty and direct loan programs for 2 years. An extra $1 billion was also provided to the Federal National Mortgage Association for FHA and VA mortgages on new homes where loans do not exceed $13,500.

Sixth. Increased funds were made available for Federal highway construction to create jobs and expedite work.

GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION SAVES MONEY

Acting on recommendations of the Hoover Commission, Congress changed the system of appropriating funds for long-term projects. Under the new law, these projects must come under mandatory annual review, thus preventing the accumulation of vast amounts of unspent carryover funds which, under the old system, were often beyond further Congressional control. Many millions of dollars will be saved annually under this revised budgeting system.

NATIONAL DEBT INCREASE

I did not support Congressional action increasing the national debt to $288 billion. Even with recession spending and the space age, money could have been saved from obsolete military spending and wasteful practices to finance these new projects without increasing the national debt. Many new projects could have waited until our country could afford them. My voting record, which follows, will show you which ones I voted against. "Lend it out, give it away, throw it away and print some more" is not a good policy for our Nation's currency. Fiscal responsibility must be maintained in our Government.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS AND TAXES INCREASED

To the 12 million people on the social security rolls, the most important legislation of the session is the bill to provide a 7 percent increase in social security benefits. During this period of gradual, but steady, inflation, our senior citizens have been the hardest hit. The amendments provide an average increase of $5 a month in retirement income for this group. The total maximum benefits which may be paid to a family will be increased from $200 to $254 a month.

LABOR LEGISLATION

As a member of the Education and Labor Committee of the House of Representatives, I worked on labor legislation from the very beginning of the 85th Congress. I introduced President Eisenhower's labor reform recommendations on January 23, 1958, and fought from then on to get the Democrat controlled committee in Congress to take action. Finally, we got a bill passed on welfare and pension funds which provides for reporting and disclosure of employee welfare and pension benefit plans. This does provide good protection in that field.

I never could get the Democrats to take action on my comprehensive labor reform legislation to safeguard the interest and rights of individual workers, as well as the general public, from abuses of certain labor bosses. The Democrats resorted to every conceivable parliamentary move to strangle measures to enact much needed labor reform legislation.

While I could never get hearings on my bill in committee, the Senate did pass the weak Kennedy-Ives bill. Even this was not reported to our committee for 40 days and 40 nights as it was held up by the Speaker of the House. It was then brought up under a parliamentary procedure which allowed no amendments which were vitally needed to correct its flaws and weaknesses. The Kennedy-Ives bill was legislation that sounded good, but would not have gotten the job done. Senator McCLELLAN blamed the defeat of the bill to curb union abuses on too much politics and on the procedure under which the measure was brought up before the House. The only comprehensible and enforcible reform plan was the President's bill, which I introduced.

The country is a lot better off with no labor legislation than the bill we had a chance to vote on. When Congress reconvenes 4 months from now in January, I am confident that will be the first order of business. The Taft-Hartley law needs reexamining to correct some of its weaknesses.

EDUCATION IN THE SPACE AGE

Legislation was enacted providing for a $900 million, 4-year program to help raise United States educational standards to meet increased scientific needs of the space age. The act provided $300 million in matching funds for scientific and other equipment, and $295 million for student loans. Under this act, California students enrolled in colleges and universities will be eligible to receive $4.5 million. It is estimated that California educational institutions will be eligible for approximately $6 million in matching funds for the purpose of strengthening science, mathematics, and foreign language instruction.

CONFERENCE ON THE AGED

Congressional concern with the rapidly increasing problem of the senior citizen who is living longer on an ever-diminishing retirement income evidenced itself in the passage of a separate bill calling for a White House conference on the aged in 1960. To be preceded by State conferences and given leadership by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, this conference will be expected to bring to the President recommendations covering employment, housing, medical care and community care of the elderly.

ALASKA STATEHOOD

As you can see by my record, I voted twice on the Alaska statehood question. I voted once to send the legislation back to committee for improvement, and once against final passage. Frankly, I felt Alaska would be more ready for statehood after a year or two of planning by the residents of Alaska, but more important by the Federal Government.

The only big payroll in Alaska comes from the Federal Government, which receives its income from the taxpayers. Civil-service workers and military personnel make up the big bulk of this payroll. It is classified as a hardship post, so civil-service workers get additional pay, which is not true in other States. Alaska cannot support itself, Alaska statehood sounds good emotionally and everybody is for it becoming a State, but nobody is talking much about the cost to the taxpayers and the fact that the Federal Government will have to continue supporting Alaska for a long time.

As far as I am concerned, a lot more detailed work should have been done on developing minerals and natural resources. I think a better program could have been worked out for taking land from the military and using it for economic development as well as homesteading projects and improving general business conditions for self-help import and export programs. Once these preliminary steps had been taken, I would have voted for final passage of Alaska statehood and that is why I voted to send it back to committee.

CIVIL DEFENSE REORGANIZATION

In order to strengthen the country's civil defense organization, Congress passed a law giving the Federal Government joint responsibility with State and local governments. In addition, the Office of Defense Mobilization and Federal Civil Defense Administration have been consolidated into one agency. Under the new program the Federal Government is authorized to supply certain disaster detection equipment to the States.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

In order to protect the public health, Congress amended the Federal Pure Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the use in food of chemical additives which have not been adequately tested to establish their safety. Up to now it has been necessary for the Food and Drug Administration to prove an additive injurious before it could force its elimination in food and cosmetic processing.

The Hill-Burton Hospital Survey Construction Act, which has worked so well for the past 12 years, was extended for an additional 3 years. This is one of the best examples of State-Federal relationships in that funds are made available by the Federal Government to the States for hospital construction. The program is administered entirely at the State level by State agencies.

In addition to extending the Hill-Burton Act, Congress authorized the largest expenditures in history for medical research, $294,383,000. The amounts provided for the various research activities as compared with budget estimates are as follows:

General research	$28,974,000
Cancer	75,268,000
Mental health	52,419,000
Heart	45,613,000
Dental	7,420,000
Arthritis	31,215,000
Allergy	24,071,000
Neurology	29,403,000

Voting record on major issues of Congressman JOE HOLT, 2d sess., 85th Cong.

Stand	Issue
Voted for	Reorganization of Department of Defense.
Voted for	Defense Department appropriation, $39,600,000,000.
Voted for	Establishment of National Aeronautics and Space Agency.
Voted for	Holt bill to increase benefits for permanently disabled veterans.
Opposed	Increase in public debt limit.
Opposed	Resolution providing for consideration of a bill costing about $2,000,000 to assist certain communities in building local sewers, streets, and parks.
Voted for	Extension of the reciprocal-trade-agreements program.
Opposed	Original foreign aid authorization.
Voted for	Appropriation to continue Free-World defense against communism.
Voted for	Funds for construction, Van Nuys National Guard Armory.
Voted for	Holt bill to provide special education aids to deaf children.
Voted for	A bill to provide for admission of Alaska into the Union on motion to recommit to committee for improvement.
Opposed	Final passage on admission of Alaska into the Union.
Voted for	Jenkins-Keogh bill to encourage voluntary pension plans of self-employed individuals.
Voted for	$4,000,000,000 increase in FHA mortgage insurance authorization.
Voted for	Stepped-up highway construction program to promote employment.
Favored	Federal unemployment compensation benefits for jobless workers who exhaust their State benefits.
Voted for	Resolution requesting President to invite Free-World countries to participate in international trade fair and exposition to be held in Los Angeles Apr. 1, 1959.
Opposed	A resolution providing for the consideration of an act to provide retirement, clerical assistants, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States.
Voted for	H. R. 3. A bill protecting States rights on acts of Congress on State laws.
Voted for	Salary increases for postal, military, and civil-service employees.
Voted for	Hoover Commission recommendations requiring Federal budget estimates to be submitted annually on accrued expenditure basis.
Voted for	Extension of 52-percent corporate income tax rate and certain excise taxes, repeal of the 3-percent tax on transportation of property.
Voted for	Legislation requiring price labeling of new automobiles.
Voted for	Unemployment aid to speed up military and civilian construction programs where money is available.
Voted for	A bill to readjust postal rates.
Voted for	A bill to incorporate Veterans of World War I.
Voted for	Publication and protection of employee welfare and pension plans.
Opposed	S. 3974 on motion to suspend rules and pass, Labor-Management Reporting Act.
Voted for	3-year extension of school milk program.
Voted for	Increase in social-security payments.
Voted for	Establishment of Bureau of Older Persons to promote solution of problems facing senior citizens.
Opposed	H. R. 10881. Upper Colorado River amendment affecting southern California water supply adversely.
Voted for	National Defense Education Act of 1958.
Voted for	3-year extension of the Hospital Construction Act.
Voted for	Establishment of Federal Aviation Agency for greater air safety.
Voted for	Exchange of mutually essential atomic information with our allies.
Voted for	United States membership in the International Atomic Energy Agency.
Opposed	A resolution providing for construction of Federal farmers markets.
Voted for	Resolution giving President standing authority to use United States Armed Forces in the Middle East.
Voted for	Resolution of Congress expressing approval for establishment of United Nations Police Force.
Opposed	H. R. 13607 providing for establishment of a Federal food stamp plan.
Voted for	A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to strengthen and improve the national transportation system.
Opposed	An act to authorize appointment of 1 additional Assistant Secretary of State.
Voted for	A bill to consolidate Federal Civil Defense Agency with Office of Defense Mobilization.
Opposed	Subsidizing of certain strategic minerals industries.
Voted for	Establishment of humane methods in the slaughter of meat animals.
Voted for	Public Works, flood control, etc.

Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement on the unemployment situation:

UNEMPLOYMENT

While this has been a hard-working and greatly productive session in many ways, I have sincere regrets over the failure of Congress to act on two antirecession proposals that were made by myself and other Members.

One, of course, is the comprehensive public-works program that I introduced early in the session; the other is the tax rebate on last year's income which I had suggested be

paid in cash directly from the Treasury to the taxpayer.

The situation in which the average wage earner finds himself today, Mr. Speaker, is not good. Many are unemployed; many more fear that they will be shortly. The administration's own figures show that unemployment is expected to be greater next year than it is this year.

It was in light of these facts that I introduced my bills. One would have furnished employment to those whom private enterprise was temporarily unable to care for; the other would have provided badly needed rent and food money in the interim. Thus, many families would have been saved from privation and heartbreak.

I felt that these things were important. In fact, I felt that they were perhaps the most important things that we had before us.

I admit that global concerns are pressing, that foreign aid is of great moment, that the Military Establishment must be kept at peak efficiency, that business must be rescued from the doldrums, but first and foremost I insist that the welfare of the individual American family is paramount.

Twenty-five years ago, we found ourselves struggling through misery and want in a major effort to reconstitute the economy merely because relief had been too long delayed. I do not want to see our people go through that trial by fire again. I want to see palliative measures enacted to head off such a calamity. That is what I tried to do by introducing this legislation.

I shall introduce it again in January. I pray it may not be too late.

Report to My Constituents in the Sixth Congressional District of Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DeWITT S. HYDE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, as United States Representative for the Sixth Congressional District of Maryland, I would like to publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my voting record for the 2d session of the 85th Congress.

The record follows:

Voting record of Representative DEWITT S. HYDE, 6th District, Maryland, 85th Cong., 2d sess.

Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1958		
Jan. 15	H. R. 9739, authorize Secretary of Air Force to construct installations for research and development. (Passed, 374 to 0)	Yea.
Jan. 23	H. R. 9955, to provide for temporary increase in public debt limit. On motion to recommit. (Failed, 115 to 275)	Nay.
Jan. 23	H. R. 9955, to provide for temporary increase in public debt limit. (Passed 328 to 71)	Yea.
Jan. 23	H. R. 10146, supplemental appropriations for Department of Defense for fiscal year ending June 30, 1958. (Passed, 388 to 0)	Yea.
Feb. 4	H. R. 2151, to suspend for 3 years the import duties on certain coarse wool. (Passed, 250 to 129)	Yea.
Feb. 19	H. J. Res. 2, to provide transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir and payment to Crow Indian Tribe. On motion to recommit. (Failed, 152 to 197.)	Yea.
Feb. 26	H. R. 10881, second supplemental appropriations for fiscal year ending June 30, 1958. On amendment to restore $20,000,000 for Glen Canyon and Trinity River projects. (Passed, 200 to 184.)	Nay.
Mar. 6	H. R. 8002, to provide improved methods of stating budget estimates. On motion to recommit. (Failed, 119 to 275)	Nay.
Mar. 6	H. R. 8002, to provide improved methods of stating budget estimates. On passage. (Passed, 311 to 86)	Yea.
Mar. 11	S. 497, authorize construction of rivers and harbors public works. On motion to recommit to substitute Mack amendment. (Failed, 167 to 234)	Yea.
Mar. 11	S. 497, authorize construction of rivers and harbors public works. On passage. (Passed, 321 to 81)	Yea.
Mar. 19	S. Con. Res. 69, a resolution favoring acceleration of military construction programs. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 375 to 20)	Yea.
Mar. 19	S. Con. Res. 68, a resolution favoring acceleration of civilian construction programs. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 379 to 16)	Yea.
Mar. 19	S. 3262, to authorize activities by the Armed Forces in winter Olympic games. On motion to suspend rules and pass (⅔ vote needed). (Failed, 257 to 139.)	Yea.
Mar. 20	S. J. Res. 162, resolution to stay reduction in price support and acreage allotment laws. On motion to recommit with instructions to give price supports to milk producers. (Failed, 173 to 211.)	Yea.
Mar. 20	S. J. Res. 162, resolution to stay reduction in price support and acreage allotment laws. On passage. (Passed, 210 to 172)	Nay.
Mar. 25	H. Res. 507, resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 11470, to adjust basic pay for officers and enlisted members of the uniformed services. On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed, 382 to 5.)	Yea.
Mar. 25	H. R. 11470, to adjust basic pay for officers and enlisted members of the uniformed services. On passage. (Passed, 366 to 22)	Yea.
Mar. 27	H. R. 8290, to authorize erection of national monument. On motion to recommit. (Approved, 195 to 169)	Nay.
Mar. 28	H. R. 5822, to allow reinvestment by air carriers of the proceeds from sale or disposition of operating property and equipment. On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 276 to 63.)	Yea.
Mar. 28	S. 3262, to authorize activities by the Armed Forces in winter Olympic games. On passage. (Passed, 218 to 102)	Yea.
Apr. 1	H. R. 10589, appropriations for fiscal 1959 for executive offices and sundry general agencies. On amendment providing funds for Civil Rights Commission. (Passed, 273 to 98.)	Yea.
Apr. 3	H. R. 9821, to amend the Federal Highway Construction Act. On conference report. Motion to recommit. (Failed, 109 to 222)	Nay.
Apr. 3	H. R. 9821, to amend and supplement the Federal Highway Construction Act. On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 300 to 28)	Yea.
Apr. 22	H. Res. 465, resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 912, to amend the Navy ration statute to provide for serving of oleomargarine or margarine. On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed, 233 to 130.)	Nay.
Apr. 22	H. R. 912, to amend the Navy ration statute to provide for serving of oleomargarine or margarine. On amendment to use surplus butter when available. (Approved, 207 to 161.) (In joint committee hearing.)	Absent.
Apr. 29	H. Res. 551, to authorize consideration of H. R. 11451, for construction and sale of superliner passenger vessel. On motion, will the House consider the House resolution at this time. (Approved, 343 to 31.)	Yea.
Apr. 29	H. R. 11451, to authorize the construction and sale of a superliner passenger vessel equivalent to the S. S. *United States*. (Passed, 289 to 94)	Yea.
May 1	H. R. 12065, to authorize temporary unemployment benefits for those who have exhausted their benefits under existing laws. On amendment to provide for loan and repayment. (Approved, 223 to 165.)	Yea.
May 1	H. R. 12065, to authorize temporary unemployment benefits for those who have exhausted their benefits under existing law. On passage. (Passed, 372 to 17.)	Yea.
May 14	H. R. 12181, to amend the Mutual Security Act to require Congressional committees to report counterpart funds, and for other purposes. On passage. (Passed, 259 to 134.)	Yea.
May 15	H. R. 12428, appropriations for Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary and related agencies for fiscal year ending June 30, 1959. On passage. (Passed, 320 to 51.)	Yea.
May 21	H. R. 7999, provide for admission of the State of Alaska into the Union. On motion to go into Committee of the Whole House. (Approved, 217 to 172.)	Yea.
May 22	H. R. 5836, to readjust postal rates and establish Congressional policy to determine postal rates. On conference report adoption. (Adopted, 381 to 0)	Yea.
May 28	H. R. 7999, provide for admission of the State of Alaska into the Union. On motion to recommit. (Failed, 174 to 199)	Yea.
May 28	H. R. 7999, provide for admission of the State of Alaska into the Union. On motion to recommit. (Failed, 172 to 202)	Nay.
May 28	H. R. 7999, provide for admission of the State of Alaska into the Union. On passage. (Passed, 210 to 166)	Yea.
June 5	H. R. 12738, to make appropriations for Department of Defense for fiscal 1959. On amendment to increase funds for increased Army strength. (Approved, 225 to 159.)	Nay.
June 5	H. R. 12738, to make appropriations for Department of Defense for fiscal 1959. On passage. (Passed, 390 to 0)	Yea.
June 11	H. R. 12591, to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements. On motion to recommit. (Failed, 146 to 268)	Nay.
June 11	H. R. 12591, to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements. On passage. (Passed, 317 to 98)	Absent.
June 12	H. R. 12541, to reorganize the Department of Defense. On motion to recommit for amendments. (Failed, 192 to 211)	Yea.
June 12	H. R. 12541, to reorganize the Department of Defense. On passage. (Passed, 402 to 1)	Yea.
June 18	S. 3910, to authorize the construction, repair, and preservation of public works on rivers and harbors for navigation and flood control. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 374 to 17.)	Yea.
June 19	H. R. 12858, to make appropriations for civil functions administered by Department of Army, etc. On passage. (Passed, 362 to 18)	Yea.
June 19	H. R. 12716, to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. On passage. (Passed, 345 to 12)	Yea.
June 25	H. R. 11077, to incorporate the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America. On passage. (Passed, 389 to 2)	Yea.
June 26	H. Res. 609, resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 12954, a bill to extend and amend the Agricultural Trade Development Act, etc. On agreeing to resolution. (Failed, 171 to 214.)	Nay.
June 26	S. 1832, to authorize appointment of 1 additional Assistant Secretary of State. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Failed, 224 to 145)	Yea.
June 27	H. R. 12695, to provide a 1-year extension of existing corporate normal tax rate and certain excise-tax rates. On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 367 to 9.)	Yea.
June 27	H. R. 12181, to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954. On motion to recommit. (Failed, 134 to 238)	Nay.
June 27	H. R. 12832, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to improve the national transportation system. On passage. (Passed, 348 to 2)	Yea.
June 30	S. 3342, to continue special milk program for children. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 328 to 1)	Yea.
July 2	H. R. 11477, to amend code to provide for and clarify admission of evidence. On passage. (Passed, 294 to 79)	Yea.
July 2	H. R. 13192, to make appropriations for mutual security for fiscal 1959. On motion to recommit to increase funds for defense support. (Failed, 166 to 214.)	Yea.
July 2	H. R. 13192, to make appropriations for mutual security for fiscal 1959. On passage. (Passed, 253 to 126)	Yea.
July 10	H. R. 13015, to authorize certain construction at military installations. On motion to recommit with instructions to make permissive rather than mandatory the disposal of the San Jacinto Depot property. (Failed, 179 to 202.)	Yea.
July 10	H. R. 13015, to authorize certain construction at military installations. On passage. (Passed, 379 to 2)	Yea.
July 10	S. 495, to authorize the acquisition remaining property for extension of the site of Senate Office Building. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Failed, 232 to 150.)	Yea.

Voting record of Representative DEWITT S. HYDE, 6th District, Maryland, 85th Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1958		
July 10	S. 1411, to amend the act of Aug. 26, 1950, relating to the suspension of employment of civilian personnel of the United States in the interest of national security. On passage. (Passed, 296 to 46.)	Yea.
July 15	H. Res. 597, resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 3, a bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws. On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed, 268 to 114.)	Yea.
July 17	H. R. 3, to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws. On amendment proposed by Mr. Hyde. (Approved, 249 to 147.)	Yea.
July 17	H. R. 3, to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws. On motion to recommit. (Failed, 161 to 236.)	Nay.
July 17	H. R. 3, to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws. On passage. (Passed, 241 to 155)	Yea.
July 24	H. Res. 485, resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 4505, a bill to provide appropriations to build markets and parking lots in cities and towns throughout the country. On agreeing to resolution. (Failed, 164 to 211.)	Nay.
July 30	H. Res. 649, resolution providing for the consideration of S. 607, an act to provide retirement, clerical assistants, etc., to former Presidents of the United States. On agreeing to the resolution. (Agreed, 254 to 126.)	Yea.
July 31	H. R. 13549, to increase benefits under Social Security Act. On passage. (Passed, 374 to 2)	Yea.
July 31	H. Res. 659, a resolution certifying the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities as to refusal of Robert Lehrer to answer questions before subcommittee. On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed, 363 to 0.)	Yea.
Aug. 1	H. Res. 650, resolution providing for consideration of S. 3497, a bill to expand Community Facilities Administration. On agreeing to resolution. (Defeated, 173 to 187.)	Nay.
Aug. 6	H. R. 13015, to authorize certain construction at military installations. On adoption of conference report, which contained provision for $40,000,000 to transfer depot. (Adopted, 256 to 135.)	Nay.
Aug. 6	H. R. 13580, to increase the public debt level. On passage. (Passed, 286 to 109)	Yea.
Aug. 6	S. 4071, to provide more rigid programs for various agricultural commodities. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Failed, 210 to 186)	Nay.
Aug. 7	H. Res. 675, resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 13247, the national defense education bill. On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed, 266 to 108.)	Yea.
Aug. 8	H. R. 13247, to enact the national defense education bill. On motion to recommit. (Failed, 140 to 233)	Nay.
Aug. 13	S. 2266, to provide for fixing wage rates for employees of Portsmouth Naval Shipyard. On vote to override Presidential veto (⅔ required). (Failed, 202 to 180.)	Nay.
Aug. 13	H. Res. 684, resolution citing Bernard Goldfine for contempt. On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed, 369 to 8)	Yea.
Aug. 13	H. Res. 686, resolution citing Carl Braden for contempt. On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed, 365 to 1)	Yea.
Aug. 15	H. Res. 682, resolution providing for consideration of S. 3683 to establish loan program for economically depressed areas. On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed, 216 to 159.)	Yea.
Aug. 15	S. 3683, to establish loan program for economically depressed areas. On motion to recommit. (Failed, 170 to 188)	Nay.
Aug. 18	S. 4035, to extend and amend housing and renewal of urban communities law. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Failed, 251 to 134)	Yea.
Aug. 18	S. 3974, to provide for reporting and disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and employers and for other purposes. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Failed, 190 to 198.)	Nay.
Aug. 18	H. R. 13067, to provide for establishment of food-stamp program for the distribution of surplus foods. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Failed, 196 to 187.)	Nay.
Aug. 19	H. Res. 691, resolution providing for sending to conference H. R. 13247, national defense education bill. On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed, 259 to 110.)	Yea.
Aug. 19	H. Res. 689, resolution providing for consideration of S. 4036, to stabilize production of certain domestic minerals by subsidy. On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed to 196 to 165.)	Yea.
Aug. 20	H. R. 13450, to provide supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1959. On motion to recede and concur in Senate amendment, National Aeronautics and Space Administration. (Failed, 126 to 236.)	Nay.
Aug. 20	H. R. 13450, to provide supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1959. On motion to recede and concur in Senate amendment with an amendment (USIA) (acquisition and construction of radio facilities). (Approved, 190 to 172.)	Yea.
Aug. 21	S. 4036, to stabilize production of certain domestic minerals by subsidy. On motion to strike enacting clause. (Failed, 171 to 174)	Yea.
Aug. 21	S. 4036, to stabilize production of certain domestic minerals by subsidy. On passage. (Failed, 159 to 182)	Nay.
Aug. 21	S. Con. Res. 109, concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress on the establishment of the United Nations force. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 299 to 20.)	Yea.
Aug. 22	S. 3335, to provide for National Cultural Center to be constructed with funds from voluntary contributions. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 261 to 55.)	Yea.
Aug. 22	H. R. 13343, to authorize the appropriation of $500,000 for the Pan American Games to be held in Chicago, Ill. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed, 244 to 64.)	Yea.
Aug. 23	H. R. 13489, to make appropriations for military construction for Department of Defense for fiscal 1959. On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 300 to 1.)	Yea.
Aug. 23	H. R. 13247, national defense education bill. On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 212 to 85)	Yea.

Congressman Leonard Farbstein's Report to His Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I herewith record to my constituency in the 19th Congressional District of New York the activities of the 85th Congress, highlighting the important measures that I feel are of interest to the voters of that district.

I think it can be fairly stated that if the members of the President's own party had shown the degree of statesmanship exhibited by the Democrats, the record of the 85th Congress would have been very much better. In my opinion, the President was supported by as many Democrats as he was by members of his own party—and sometimes by more. I shall make this more evident in discussing some of the items of legislation which were affected by the lack of Republican votes. In numerous instances, a coalition between the Republicans and the southern Democrats effectively blocked liberal legislation which I feel should have been passed in the interest of all the people.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, I found that politics played a very small part in the deliberations of the committee. The attitude was generally taken by both Republicans and Democrats that politics end at the water's edge. Partisanship, therefore, cannot be blamed for the deplorable condition of our country's foreign policy. Call it what you will—war of nerves, cold war, hot war—whatever the conflict, our policy is a mess. The pity is that in these perilous times strong leadership is lacking. It is the brinkmanship policy of the State Department, which is no genuine policy at all, that has left this country in its present unenviable position.

At the time of the Suez crisis, we teamed up with our sworn Communist enemy, Soviet Russia, against our strongest friends, England, France, and Israel. When we had the opportunity of seeing Colonel Nasser, Egypt's two-bit Hitler, disposed of once and for all, thereby removing our greatest immediate danger in an area of vital interest to the Western World, we lost our nerve. History will charge the administration with one of the gravest blunders of our time for insisting that England, France, and Israel be denied the right to clean up the situation in Egypt after Nasser had seized the Suez Canal.

The Iraqi revolt was a serious blow to the West. The Baghdad Pact, our northern tier defense system around Russia, has been torn open. Iraq has ceased to be part of the Western alliance and moved closer to the camp of Nasser and the Pan-Arab pro-Soviet movement.

Just as it was impossible to do business with Hitler, so today is it impossible to come to terms with Nasser. The Pan-Arab movement is headed for Moscow whence it takes guidance. It agitates against free enterprise, democracy, tolerance, freedom of speech, and so forth. In all such matters it admires the Communist Russian model, the guided type of politics and economics. Nasser cannot accept any terms which would secure the West's positions in the Middle East because he plays the Kremlin's game. He has won popular support by driving the West from its former positions. He cannot now let the West return.

By the complacent attitude of the administration, we lost Iraq to the West. Had we moved into Lebanon sooner, Iraq might have been saved and Jordan would not be in such mortal danger. A 10-kopek bullet can snuff out the life of King Hussein, with the disintegration of

Jordan as the immediate result, and the loss of the entire Middle East to the Nasser-Moscow axis as the next consequence. Even now, no one can say how long the British will remain in Jordan.

President Eisenhower's statement at the meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations was a good one. But there was much that he omitted. The Israeli-Arab conflict was not mentioned, yet there is no doubt that without the help of the big powers it will be impossible to bring the Arabs to the table with Israel for talks leading to a settlement and peace.

Israel is by far the most advanced nation in the Mid-East. It is the only democracy in that region. It serves also as the advance guard of democracy among the new nations of Africa and an example of how freedom works. In many of these countries, Israel missions have been able to establish working relations far ahead of the agents of communism. Israel looks to us for friendship and help because, like us, it is fighting the battle of democracy against totalitarianism. In the present crisis it has been our strongest friend, but we have not treated Israel as an ally.

Here at home, Government releases cannot hide the fact that unemployment and the economic recession are continuing and may be getting worse than they were at the beginning of the year. Slight seasonal increases in employment and production during May and June and the movement in the stock market have been paraded by the Republican administration as an indication that the bottom of the recession has been reached and the upturn has begun. Actually, about all that has been going up are consumer prices.

Government news bureaus in the past several weeks have cheerfully announced declines in the number of eligibles drawing unemployment compensation. Actually, however, the fact is carefully concealed that much of the drop is either seasonal or due to workers having exhausted their benefits. Everyone knows that the cost of living has increased steadily over the last 22 months, and is still going up. The overall increase since 1952 is 8.9 percent.

Rents are up 16 percent and food is sky high. Increases to the average consumer such as these mean even greater hardships than can be calculated in terms of the average increase, as large as it is. Persons living on fixed incomes—older persons living on pensions, for example—cannot possibly afford a 21-percent increase in the cost of medical care.

I might say the effects of the recession will be felt for many years by United States taxpayers.

We tried to pass a school-construction bill to overcome the lack of adequate school buildings throughout the country. Northern Democrats not only voted for a liberal Federal law aiding education, but they offered the President's own measure as the Democratic bill in order that a bill be passed. Unfortunately, the bill was voted down. The southern Democrats said their basis for rejecting it was the Powell amendment, which would give Federal funds only to States opposing racial segregation. But the big question is, Why did the Republicans vote against it?

What the future holds I am unable to say at this moment. Yet not only I, but all the northern Democrats, will vote for any bill which would grant aid to education.

We tried, but we were unable to get a school-construction bill out of committee. The only bill that was presented to us for a vote was the defense education bill. This was to help young men and women who sought to continue their education in fields of science. They will get aid, however, only in the form of loans. The provision of the bill making scholarships available was stricken out by a western Republican Congressman.

Despite the administration's fanfare in launching its billion-dollar space-age science-education program, the true intentions of the administration became clear when the proposed expenditures for education appeared in the fiscal year 1959 budget. Expenditures for overall education in fiscal year 1959 are $172 million less than the proposed expenditures for education last year in the fiscal year 1958 budget.

It is axiomatic in warfare that when an attack has reached such proportions that it cannot be avoided, you reply with an attack of your own. This is what the administration is doing in the Sherman Adams affair. Now we find that Mr. Sherman Adams is being called a victim of a campaign of political persecution of unexampled viciousness. So speaks the Republican high command.

Vice President NIXON—"I challenge anyone in America to name one instance of unpunished corruption in this administration. President Eisenhower has given orders that where corruption rears its head it must be dealt with ruthlessly."—Omaha, Nebr., September 20, 1954.

How can one have confidence in this administration when the Chief Executive, in his state of the Union message, says that the most powerful deterrent to war today lies in the retaliatory power of our Strategic Air Command and yet we find that the fiscal 1959 budget contains no additional funds for purchasing or stepping up procurement of airplanes. Recognizing our unpreparedness gives Mr. Khrushche the boldness to speak in the threatening manner that he does.

In the field of research the President stated that he was asking for sizable increases in basic-research funds—actually the administration substantially reduced funds proposed by the National Science Foundation for basic research and research facilities.

When General Eisenhower came into office 5 years ago, he drastically reduced the military budget, cutting $5 billion from the Air Force alone. Some of the most severe reductions, percentagewise, were in the funds for research and development. The nation that economizes on research is like the homeowner who skimps on repairs to the foundation of his house and saves money by not fixing the roof. There is no graver indictment of President Eisenhower's stewardship than that he has practiced these penny-point economies.

To aid our senior citizens and special groups of aged widows to keep their heads above water in the floodtide of rising prices, I appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means and urged that social-security benefits be increased. When the average benefit of a retired single person on social security is only about $64 a month, it is clear that some adjustment must be made if mere subsistence is to be preserved. Since this was written the social-security bill was passed liberalizing payments.

I pleaded for governmental action to help solve the perplexing problem of the older worker. It appears that age 45 marks the point of no return for those who are unemployed. Something should be done, and I urged the adoption of legislation similar to that adopted in New York outlawing discrimination of age in employment. A White House conference on the problems of the aging will be held in 1961 before committees of Congress under a bill just passed.

I requested other benefits that space prevents me from detailing at this time.

I signed a letter together with many other Members of the House of Representatives notifying the chairman of the Agriculture Committee that I would not vote for the commodities farm bill unless there was restored to the bill the provision requiring food stamps for those people who are on relief. Unfortunately, here again southern Democrats teamed up with the Republicans to defeat the food-stamp plan. I voted for its passage.

On the Defense Department reorganization bill, I voted for the amendments requiring the streamlining of the Defense Department so that the Secretary of Defense would be given authority to consolidate and reorganize the various services without first obtaining the consent of the various service Secretaries; namely, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force. I thought that in times as perilous as these, when new weapons are being created constantly, the authority that the Secretary of Defense believes is required should be given him. I voted for the bill in its final form, which called for reorganization of the Defense Department. I believe that the amendments streamlining the Department, if passed, would have made the bill a better one.

I voted for the reciprocal-trade bill because I felt, and still feel, that you cannot sell without buying. The Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930, in my opinion, brought on the depression. We built a high protective tariff wall, making it impossible for our friends in foreign countries to sell us their merchandise. This caused a depression in those lands which eventually reached us, causing the greatest depression in our history. The recession in this country, at the time of this writing, is making it difficult for our South American neighbors to sell us their raw materials, the prices of which have fallen. Their economy has been hurt; and I venture to say that the treatment given Vice President NIXON was as much

due to our economic policies toward South America as to Communist incitement. I believe the treatment of the Vice President was caused by dissatisfaction over our inability to purchase coffee, metals, beef, and other products of those countries.

I voted for the mutual-security bill because I felt that unless we aid the underdeveloped countries in the world with grants and loans through the newly created Development Loan Fund, we would make it very difficult for those allies who think the way we do and who oppose communism the same way we do to maintain their situation. Korea cannot possibly oppose the Communists of the north and maintain an army unless we help her. Vietnam, a new country, similarly could not exist without our aid. Formosa cannot remain our outpost in the Pacific against the Communist Chinese unless we aid it with both military and economic aid. Just as we helped the various countries of Europe and Asia with the Marshall plan, when each one of them would have gone Communist, so we must aid the newly created Asian-African countries. The North Atlantic Treaty nations and other countries to whom we are bound by treaties must be aided if they are to stand up to the Communists militarily in Europe, Asia, and Africa. Communist Russia today is giving aid to those countries who they feel they can win away from the West both militarily and economically.

The McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, with its shocking inequities, still remains on our statute books despite all attempts to rewrite the law to make it conform with American ideals and principles and our professed desire to help the oppressed peoples of the world, who look to us for shelter.

The immigration bill passed last year is a mere drop in the bucket; it does not touch the glaring hardships and unfair provisions in existing law. Chief of the inequities is the national origins quota system using the 1920 population census as a basis for setting quotas. This provision was deliberately intended to discriminate among aliens on the basis of race and nationality. It failed to end present discrimination against naturalized citizens.

The inequitable McCarran-Walter Act must be amended, and undoubtedly will be amended, so that in due time it will become a law that befits the stature of this country, long a haven of refuge.

I voted for Alaskan statehood. It is high time that we do what we can to aid those of our Territories which seek to be recognized.

The housing bill came up for a vote at the tail end of the session and a combination of southern Democrats and Republicans voted it down. Inasmuch as last year's housing bill contained a 2-year guaranty by the Government of loans for builders, it may well be that big money Republicans felt no need for a bill this year to aid public housing and urban redevelopment. However, this is the first time in 10 years that an omnibus housing bill failed to pass. "The defeated bill opposed as inflationary by the administration and by Republican House leaders, would have provided a $400 million 1-year program for slum clearance and urban renewal" said the New York Times of August 19, 1958. I voted for the housing bill as did all the other New York Democrats.

The House defeated the Kennedy-Ives labor reform bill despite AFL–CIO backing. I have no doubt that a labor reform bill will pass at the next Congress. The Kennedy-Ives bill came to the House Labor Committee for consideration at the end of June. It was the contention of those who voted against the bill that insufficient time for its proper consideration was permitted. However, I voted for the bill on the recommendation of the AFL–CIO believing that something is better than nothing, and that any corrections and amendments could be passed next year.

In my voting record and in all my activities as a Member of the 85th Congress, I have tried to reflect the wishes of my constituency to the best of my ability. I hope I have succeeded.

85th Cong., 1st sess.

Roll-call No.	Date	Explanation	Vote
1	Jan. 3	Call of the House	Present.
2	Jan. 3	Election of Speaker	Martin.
3	Jan. 29	Quorum call	Present.
4	Jan. 29	H. Res. 123, resolution to take up H. J. Res. 117, authorizing President to undertake military and economic cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East. (Passed, 262 to 146.)	Yes.
5	Jan. 30	H. J. Res. 117, authorizing the President to undertake military and economic cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East. (Passed, 355 to 61.)	Yes.
6	Feb. 5	H. R. 4249, amendment to reduce by $2,000,000 the amount which States can spend for administration of public-assistance grants. (Passed, 205 to 168.)	Yes.
7	Feb. 6	H. R. 2367, providing drought relief payments to ranchers for deferred grazing. (Passed, 270 to 109.)	No.
8	Feb. 19	Quorum call	Present.
9	Feb. 20	Quorum call	Present.
10	Feb. 27	Quorum call	Present.
11	Feb. 27	Quorum call	Present.
12	Mar. 5	Quorum call	Present.
13	Mar. 6	Quorum call	Present.
14	Mar. 7	Quorum call	Present.
15	Mar. 7	H. Res. 188, providing for House agreement to Senate amendments to the Middle East resolution. (Passed, 350 to 60.)	Yes.
16	Mar. 12	Quorum call	Present.
17	Mar. 12	H. Res. 192, resolution to take up H. Res. 190, requesting the President to indicate where substantial reductions in the 1958 revised budget can be made. (Passed, 219 to 185.)	No.
18	Mar. 12	H. Res. 190, motion to return H. Res. 190 to committee with instructions to substitute resolution commending President for requesting departments to review budget requests to determine where cuts can be made and requesting President to make information received available to House. (Failed, 185 to 214.)	Yes.
19	Mar. 12	H. Res. 190, passage of resolution requesting President to indicate where substantial reductions in 1958 budget may best be made. (Passed, 220 to 178.)	No.
20	Mar. 13	Quorum call	Present.
21	Mar. 13	Quorum call	Present.
22	Mar. 13	H. R. 4901, motion to kill the bill establishing a minimum acreage allotment for corn. (Failed, 168 to 237)	No.
23	Mar. 13	H. R. 4901, final passage of bill establishing a minimum acreage allotment for corn. (Failed, 188 to 217)	Yes.

Congressman Chamberlain Has 97 Percent Voting Record on Legislative Rollcalls in 85th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, because I firmly believe the people of the Sixth District of Michigan are entitled to complete information as to the voting record of their Representative in Congress and because I am proud of the record I have made here I want everyone in my district to have the opportunity to examine and evaluate it. Thus I am pleased to present a complete report of my voting and attendance record on all rollcalls and quorum calls during the 1st and 2d sessions of the 85th Congress so that my constituents can see easily and quickly my position on each of them.

The description of bills is for identification purposes only. No attempt has been made to elaborate on issues involved in each measure but I have endeavored to eliminate confusing parliamentary terms. Because brief summaries cannot reflect the full significance of each bill, I invite the people of my district to write me or speak with me in connection with any vote about which they desire additional information.

It will be noted that there were 100 rollcall votes during the 1st session of the 85th Congress and that I missed only 1 of them, giving me an attendance record of 99 percent. In the second session I missed only 5 of 93 rollcall votes for an attendance record of 95 percent. My overall voting record on legislative rollcalls for both sessions of the 85th Congress is 97 percent, as I missed only 6 of 193 such votes.

The report follows:

85th Cong., 1st sess.—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date	Explanation	Vote
24	Mar. 14	Quorum call	Present.
25	Mar. 14	Quorum call	Present.
26	Mar. 20	Quorum call	Present.
27	Mar. 21	Quorum call	Present.
28	Mar. 25	Quorum call	Absent.
29	Mar. 26	Quorum call	Present.
30	Mar. 27	Quorum call	Present.
31	Mar. 27	H. Res. 85, authorizing House Banking and Currency Committee to conduct an investigation of national monetary and credit policies. (Failed, 174 to 225.)	No.
32	Mar. 28	Quorum call	Present.
33	Mar. 29	Quorum call	Present.
34	Apr. 1	Quorum call	Present.
35	Apr. 2	Quorum call	Present.
36	Apr. 3	Quorum call	Present.
37	Apr. 4	H. R. 6287, amendment to reduce by $30,000 the appropriation for new positions in the Department of Labor. (Passed, 286 to 126)	Yes.
38	Apr. 4	H. R. 6287, amendment to reduce by $204,000 the appropriations for new positions in Solicitor's Office in the Department of Labor. (Passed, 241 to 171.)	Yes.
39	Apr. 4	H. R. 6287, amendment to reduce by $46,300 the appropriations for new positions in the Bureau of Labor Standards. (Passed, 246 to 169)	Yes.
40	Apr. 4	H. R. 6287, amendment to reduce by $136,000 the appropriations for new positions in the Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment rights. (Failed, 137 to 275.)	Yes.
41	Apr. 4	H. R. 6287, amendment to reduce by $442,000 the appropriations for new positions in the Bureau of Employment Security. (Passed, 214 to 205.)	Yes.
42	Apr. 4	H. R. 6287, amendment to reduce by $12,186,000 funds for unemployment compensation grants to States. (Passed, 220 to 200)	Yes.
43	Apr. 4	H. R. 6287, amendment to reduce by $1,500,000 funds for unemployment compensation for Federal employees. (Passed, 253 to 167)	Yes.
44	Apr. 4	H. R. 6287, amendment to reduce by $263,800 the appropriation for new positions in Mexican farm labor program. (Passed, 242 to 77)	Yes.
45	Apr. 4	H. R. 6287, amendment to reduce by $346,000 the appropriation for new positions in the Bureau of Labor Statistics. (Passed, 217 to 202)	Yes.
46	Apr. 4	H. R. 6287, amendment to reduce by $31,000 the appropriation for new positions in the Women's Bureau. (Failed, 206 to 210)	Yes.
47	Apr. 4	H. R. 6287, amendment to reduce by $288,000 the appropriation for new positions in the Wage and Hour Division, Labor Department. (Passed, 214 to 205.)	Yes.
48	Apr. 4	H. R. 6287, amendment to reduce by $1,327,000 the increase in funds for the Food and Drug Administration. (Failed, 130 to 285)	Yes.
49	Apr. 4	H. R. 6287, amendment to reduce by $1,482,000 the appropriation for new positions in the Office of Education. (Failed, 206 to 207)	Yes.
50	Apr. 4	H. R. 6287, amendment to delete language providing $30,000,000 to States for local sewage disposal plant construction. (Failed, 185 to 231)	Yes.
51	Apr. 8	Quorum call	Present.
52	Apr. 8	H. R. 6306, authorizing an additional $10,500,000 for construction of a new bridge across the Potomac River. (Passed, 190 to 131)	No.
53	Apr. 8	Quorum call	Present.
54	Apr. 8	Quorum call	Present.
55	Apr. 9	Quorum call	Present.
56	Apr. 9	Quorum call	Present.
57	Apr. 10	Quorum call	Present.
58	Apr. 10	Quorum call	Present.
59	Apr. 10	S. J. Res. 72, approving an agreement amending Anglo-American Financial Agreement of 1945 relative to deferment of certain interest payments. (Passed, 218 to 167.)	Yes.
60	Apr. 11	H. Res. 191, increasing from $100,000 to $350,000 funds for Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee study of Federal regulatory agencies. (Passed, 225 to 143.)	No.
61	Apr. 15	Quorum call	Present.
62	Apr. 16	Quorum call	Present.
63	Apr. 17	Quorum call	Present.
64	Apr. 17	H. R. 6871, amendment to cut $7,039,958 from funds provided for United States contributions to international organizations. (Failed, 167 to 205.)	Yes.
65	May 7	Quorum call	Present
66	May 8	Quorum call	Present.
67	May 9	Quorum call	Present.
68	May 13	Quorum call	Present.
69	May 13	Quorum call	Present.
70	May 13	Quorum call	Present.
71	May 14	Quorum call	Present.
72	May 14	Quorum call	Present.
73	May 15	Quorum call	Present.
74	May 15	H. R. 7441, amendment to Department of Agriculture appropriation bill terminating Soil Bank program at the end of fiscal, 1957. (Passed, 192 to 187.)	No.
75	May 21	Quorum call	Present.
76	May 22	Quorum call	Present.
77	May 22	H. R. 7590, motion to return to committee bill appropriating funds for legislative branch with instructions to delete $7,500,000 for construction of an additional House office building. (Failed, 176 to 206.)	Yes.
78	May 22	H. R. 7590, passage of legislative branch appropriations bill. (Passed, 279 to 93)	Yes.
79	May 22	H. Res. 254, motion to take up H. R. 2 which would permit Illinois to increase diversion of Lake Michigan water. (Passed, 267 to 102)	No.
80	May 22	H. R. 2, motion to return H. R. 2 to committee pending United States-Canadian report on effect of increased water diversion on Great Lakes. (Failed, 143 to 225.)	Yes.
81	May 22	H. R. 2, permitting Illinois to increase diversion of Lake Michigan water. (Passed, 222 to 144)	No.
82	May 23	Quorum call	Present.
83	May 23	H. R. 985, motion to kill the bill relieving chief judges of Federal circuit and district courts of administrative duties when they become 75 years old. (Failed, 47 to 293.)	No.
84	May 24	Quorum call	Present.
85	May 24	Quorum call	Present.
86	May 24	Quorum call	Present.
87	May 27	Quorum call	Present.
88	May 27	Quorum call	Present.
89	May 28	Quorum call	Present.
90	May 29	Quorum call	Present.
91	May 29	H. R. 7665, motion to return Defense Department appropriation bill to committee with instructions to restore $313,000,000 cut by them. (Failed, 151 to 242.)	Yes.
92	May 29	H. R. 7665, passage of Defense Department appropriation bill. (Passed, 304 to 1)	Yes.
93	June 3	Quorum call	Present.
94	June 4	Quorum call	Present.
95	June 5	Quorum call	Present.
96	June 5	H. R. 259, motion to take up H. Res. 259, the administration's civil-rights bill. (Passed, 291 to 117)	Yes.
97	June 6	Quorum call	Present.
98	June 6	Quorum call	Present.
99	June 6	Quorum call	Absent.
100	June 7	Quorum call	Absent.
101	June 7	Quorum call	Absent.
102	June 7	Quorum call	Absent.
103	June 7	Quorum call	Absent.
104	June 10	Quorum call	Present.
105	June 10	Quorum call	Present.
106	June 10	Quorum call	Present.
107	June 11	Quorum call	Present.
108	June 13	Quorum call	Present.
109	June 14	Quorum call	Present.
110	June 17	Quorum call	Present.
111	June 18	Quorum call	Present.
112	June 18	H. R. 6127, motion to return civil rights bill to committee with instructions to add the jury trial amendment. (Failed, 158 to 251)	No.
113	June 18	H. R. 6127, passage of the civil-rights bill. (Passed, 286 to 126)	Yes.
114	June 18	Quorum call	Present.
115	June 18	H. R. 7221, motion to agree to Senate amendment to supplemental appropriation bill providing $14,000,000 for initiation of Federal flood-insurance program. (Failed, 186 to 218.)	Yes.
116	June 19	Quorum call	Present.
117	June 20	Quorum call	Present.

85th Cong., 1st sess.—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date	Explanation	Vote
118	June 21	Quorum call	Absent.
119	June 21	H. R. 6974, extending for 1 year the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act. (Passed, 345 to 7)	Yes.
120	June 24	Quorum call	Present.
121	June 25	Quorum call	Present.
122	June 25	H. R. 7963, making the Small Business Administration a permanent agency. (Passed, 393 to 2)	Yes.
123	June 26	Quorum call	Present.
124	June 26	H. R. 6287, motion to reject conference report on the appropriation bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. (Failed, 73 to 321.)	No.
125	June 27	Quorum call	Present.
126	June 27	Quorum call	Present.
127	June 27	S. 1428, motion to return to committee with instructions that specific cost figures be inserted, the bill authorizing furniture for the new Senate Office Building. (Failed, 135 to 232.)	Yes.
128	June 27	S. 1429, motion to return to committee with instructions that specific cost figures be inserted, the bill authorizing enlargement and remodeling of suites in the existing Senate Office Building. (Failed, 148 to 216.)	Yes.
129	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
130	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
131	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
132	July 8	Quorum call	Present.
133	July 8	Quorum call	Present.
134	July 9	Quorum call	Present.
135	July 9	Quorum call	Present.
136	July 10	H. R. 8240, amendment authorizing Defense Department to discontinue activities that compete in the private business without securing prior Congressional approval. (Failed, 183 to 230.)	Yes.
137	July 10	H. R. 7390, motion to return to committee for further study the bill limiting the use of advisory committees by the executive branch. (Failed, 183 to 225.)	Yes.
138	July 10	H. R. 8364, motion to return to committee for further study the bill extending the Reorganization Act of 1949. (Failed, 46 to 338)	No.
139	July 11	Quorum call	Present.
140	July 11	Quorum call	Present.
141	July 12	Quorum call	Present.
142	July 12	H. R. 72, motion to return to committee for further study the bill amending the World War Veterans' Act of 1924 to limit the number of relatives who could claim accumulated Government benefits of a legally incompetent veteran. (Passed, 191 to 161.)	No.
143	July 15	Quorum call	Present.
144	July 16	Quorum call	Present.
145	July 16	Quorum call	Present.
146	July 17	Quorum call	Present.
147	July 19	Quorum call	Present.
148	July 19	S. 2130, motion to return the mutual security bill to committee with instructions to delete the Development Loan Fund. (Failed, 181 to 227)	No.
149	July 19	S. 2130, passage of Mutual Security Act of 1957. (Passed, 254 to 154)	Yes.
150	July 22	Quorum call	Present.
151	July 23	H. R. 2474, increasing the basic salary of postal workers by $546 a year. (Passed, 379 to 38)	Yes.
152	July 23	Quorum call	Present.
153	July 25	Quorum call	Present.
154	July 25	H. R. 1, motion to kill the bill providing for Federal assistance to States for school construction. (Passed 208 to 203)	No.
155	July 29	Quorum call	Present.
156	July 30	Quorum call	Present.
157	July 30	Quorum call	Present.
158	July 31	Quorum call	Present.
159	July 31	S. 1856, establishing an Airways Modernization Board to development and modernize navigation and traffic control. (Passed, 375 to 17)	Yes.
160	July 31	Quorum call	Present.
161	July 31	H. R. 2147, motion to kill the bill authorizing Federal construction of a $32,220,000 irrigation and municipal water project at San Angelo, Tex. (Failed, 189 to 202.)	Yes.
162	July 31	H. R. 2147, passage of bill authorizing a $32,220,000 Federal reclamation project at San Angelo, Tex. (Passed, 201 to 190)	No.
163	Aug. 1	Quorum call	Present.
164	Aug. 1	H. R. 8643, authorizing the FPC to issue a license to the New York State Power Authority for power improvements at Niagara Falls. (Passed, 313 to 75.)	Yes.
165	Aug. 1	Quorum call	Present.
166	Aug. 1	H. R. 6763, motion to take up H. R. 6763 authorizing construction of a tunnel rather than a bridge across the Potomac River. (Passed, 297 to 76.)	No.
167	Aug. 1	H. R. 6763, motion to kill the bill authorizing the construction of a tunnel rather than a bridge across the Potomac River. (Failed, 175 to 194)	Yes.
168	Aug. 2	Quorum call	Present.
169	Aug. 2	H. R. 6763, motion to resume debate on bill authorizing construction of a tunnel rather than a bridge across the Potomac River. (Passed, 275 to 59.)	No.
170	Aug. 2	H. R. 6763, amending the bill authorizing construction of a tunnel across the Potomac River by substituting a bridge for a tunnel. (Passed, 226 to 109.)	Yes.
171	Aug. 5	H. R. 6709, approving the implementation of a treaty with the Republic of Panama. (Passed, 279 to 91)	Yes.
172	Aug. 5	Quorum call	Present.
173	Aug. 6	Quorum call	Present.
174	Aug. 7	Quorum call	Present.
175	Aug. 7	H. R. 9131, motion to return the supplemental appropriation bill to committee with instructions to reduce new TVA funds by $9,784,000. (Failed, 158 to 244.)	Yes.
176	Aug. 7	H. R. 9131, passage of supplemental appropriations bill. (Passed, 330 to 75)	Yes.
177	Aug. 7	Quorum call	Present.
178	Aug. 7	H. Res. 362, motion to take up H. R. 7244, amending Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, permitting deductions for a self-help meat promotion program. (Failed, 175 to 216.)	Yes.
179	Aug. 8	Quorum call	Present.
180	Aug. 8	H. R. 4913, adoption of conference report authorizing acquisition of certain land for a District Auditorium-Cultural Center. (Failed, 115 to 284.)	No.
181	Aug. 8	Quorum call	Present.
182	Aug. 8	H. R. 8992, amendment to delete from a bill authorizing United States participation in the International Atomic Energy Agency a section providing for Congressional control over transfer of nuclear material. (Passed, 298 to 100.)	Yes.
183	Aug. 9	Quorum call	Present.
184	Aug. 9	H. R. 8996, amendment eliminating $3,000,000 authorized for plutonium reactor study in bill authorizing appropriation for Atomic Energy Commission. (Failed, 197 to 201.)	Yes.
185	Aug. 9	H. R. 8996, amendment eliminating $55,000,000 for construction of a natural uranium and a plutonium recycle reactor in bill authorizing appropriation for AEC. (Passed, 211 to 188.)	Yes.
186	Aug. 9	H. R. 8996, amendment authorizing $132,621,000 for the cooperative power reactor demonstration program and deleting provision for Government ownership and operation of generating plants. (Passed, 213 to 185.)	Yes.
187	Aug. 9	H. R. 8996, passage of bill authorizing appropriations for AEC. (Passed, 383 to 14)	Yes.
188	Aug. 9	H. R. 2462, motion to kill the bill providing an 11-percent salary increase for classified Federal employees. (Failed, 70 to 319)	No.
189	Aug. 9	H. R. 2462, passage of bill providing an 11-percent salary increase for classified Federal employees. (Passed, 329 to 58)	Yes.
190	Aug. 13	Quorum call	Present.
191	Aug. 13	H. R. 8090, motion to accept Senate amendment to Interior Department and Corps of Engineers public works appropriations bill earmarking $500,000 for the Bruces Eddy project in Idaho. (Rejected, 23 to 363.)	No.
192	Aug. 13	H. R. 5836, raising 1st, 2d, and 3d class mail rates. (Passed, 256 to 129)	Yes.
193	Aug. 14	Quorum call	Present.
194	Aug. 14	S. 2130, adoption of conference report on the mutual security bill. (Passed, 226 to 163)	Yes.
195	Aug. 14	S. 1383, amendment of Interstate Commerce Act to change requirements for obtaining a freight forwarder permit. (Passed, 177 to 176)	No.
196	Aug. 15	Quorum call	Present.
197	Aug. 15	H. R. 9302, motion to return to committee with instructions to restore $715,000,000, the mutual security appropriations bill. (Failed, 129 to 254.)	Yes.
198	Aug. 15	H. R. 9302, passage of mutual security appropriations bill. (Passed, 252 to 130)	Yes.
199	Aug. 19	H. R. 7993, providing for Government guaranty of private loans to certain air carriers. (Passed, 242 to 94)	Not voting.
200	Aug. 20	H. R. 1937, adoption of conference report authorizing construction of a District of Columbia stadium on Federal land. (Failed, 135 to 234)	No.
201	Aug. 20	S. 1520, motion to return to conference committee with instructions to limit to $50,000 a bill authorizing $112,500 for disposal of a dam in West Virginia. (Failed, 137 to 232.)	Yes.
202	Aug. 21	H. R. 9131, motion to accept Senate amendment eliminating funds for additional airport in Washington in supplemental appropriation bill. (Failed, 125 to 233.)	No.
203	Aug. 21	H. R. 9131, motion to accept Senate amendment adding $475,000 for the Columbia River project in supplemental appropriation bill. (Failed, 141 to 216.)	No.

85th Cong., 1st sess.—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date	Explanation	Vote
204	Aug. 21	H. R. 9679, amendment restoring $30,000,000 for a program of cooperation with private industry in Atomic Energy Commission appropriation bill. (Passed, 214 to 135.)	Yes.
205	Aug. 22	H. Con. Res. 17, authorizing printing of 500,000 additional copies of an illustrated booklet on the Capitol at a cost of $95,000. (Passed, 183 to 129.)	No.
206	Aug. 23	Quorum call	Present.
207	Aug. 23	H. R. 9131, motion to agree to Senate amendment to supplemental appropriation bill providing $425,000 for the Columbia River project and $50,000 for Rathbun Dam. (Passed, 166 to 121.)	No.
208	Aug. 23	H. R. 9131, motion to agree to Senate amendment to supplemental appropriation bill providing $425,000 for Columbia River project but amending it to delete the $50,000 for Rathbun Dam. (Passed, 165 to 120.)	No.
209	Aug. 23	S. 2229, adoption of conference report providing for Government guaranty of private loans to certain airline carriers. (Passed, 203 to 77)	No.
210	Aug. 23	H. Res. 407, citing Louis Hartman for contempt of Congress for refusing to answer certain questions of the House Un-American Activities Committee. (Passed, 276 to 0.)	Yes.
211	Aug. 23	H. Res. 409, citing Bernard Silber for contempt of Congress for refusing to answer questions before the Un-American Activities Committee. (Passed, 263 to 0.)	Yes.
212	Aug. 27	Quorum Call	Present.
213	Aug. 27	H. Res. 410, motion to end debate on question of agreeing to Senate amendments to civil rights bill. (Passed, 274 to 101)	Yes.
214	Aug. 27	H. Res. 410, adoption of amendment to civil-rights bill limiting jury trials in criminal contempt proceedings. (Passed, 279 to 97)	Yes.
215	Aug. 27	H. R. 7915, amending United States Code to restrict use of FBI files by defendants in criminal cases, thus limiting effects of Supreme Court decision in Jencks case. (Passed, 351 to 17.)	Yes.
216	Aug. 27	Quorum call	Present.
217	Aug. 27	S. 2792, revising immigration and nationality laws to relieve certain "hardship" cases. (Passed, 295 to 58)	Yes.
218	Aug. 30	Quorum call	Present.
219	Aug. 30	S. 2377, adoption of conference report on bill to amend United States Code to restrict use of FBI files by defendants in criminal cases, thus limiting effects of Supreme Court's decision, Jencks. (Passed, 315 to 0.)	Yes.
220	Aug. 30	H. R. 9392, adoption of conference report on the mutual security appropriation bill. (Passed, 194 to 122)	Yes.

85th Cong., 2d sess.

Roll-call No.	Date	Explanation	Vote
1	Jan. 7	Quorum call	Present.
2	Jan. 15	H. R. 9739, authorizing the Secretary of the Air Force to establish and develop certain installations for the national security. (Passed, 374 to 0.)	Yes.
3	Jan. 21	Quorum call	Present.
4	Jan. 22	Quorum call	Present.
5	Jan. 23	H. R. 9955, motion to return to committee with instructions to reduce by $2,000,000,000 a bill authorizing a temporary increase in the public-debt limit. (Failed, 115 to 275.)	No.
6	Jan. 23	H. R. 9955, final passage of bill authorizing a temporary increase in the public-debt limit. (Passed, 328 to 71)	Yes.
7	Jan. 23	H. R. 10146, providing additional appropriations for the Defense Department and transferring $150,000,000 for the accelerated missile defense program. (Passed, 388 to 0.)	Yes.
8	Feb. 4	H. R. 2151, suspending for 3 years the import duties on certain coarse wool. (Passed, 250 to 129)	Yes.
9	Feb. 10	Quorum call	Present.
10	Feb. 18	Quorum call	Present.
11	Feb. 19	H. J. Res. 2, motion to kill the bill providing for payment of $25,000,000 to the Crow Indians in exchange for lands to be used in the Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir project. (Failed, 152 to 197.)	Yes.
12	Feb. 25	Quorum call	Present.
13	Feb. 26	Quorum call	Present.
14	Feb. 26	H. R. 10881, amendment to 2d supplemental appropriation bill to provide $10,000,000 each for Glen Canyon project and Trinity River project. (Passed, 200 to 184.)	Yes.
15	Mar. 4	Quorum call	Present.
16	Mar. 5	Quorum call	Present.
17	Mar. 6	Quorum call	Present.
18	Mar. 6	H. R. 8002, motion to kill the bill incorporating Hoover Commission recommendations for improved methods of stating budget estimates and estimates for deficiency and supplemental appropriations. (Failed, 119 to 275.)	No.
19	Mar. 6	H. R. 8002, final passage of bill incorporating Hoover Commission recommendations for improved methods of stating budget estimates and estimates for deficiency and supplemental appropriations. (Passed, 311 to 86.)	Yes.
20	Mar. 11	S. 497, motion to return to committee, with instructions to eliminate 4 projects and reduce Federal costs on 14 others, a bill authorizing $1,500,000,000 for rivers, harbors and flood control. (Failed, 167 to 234.)	Yes.
21	Mar. 11	S. 497, final passage of bill authorizing $1,500,000,000 for construction and repair in connection with rivers, harbors, and flood control. (Passed, 321 to 81.)	Yes.
22	Mar. 19	S. Con. Res. 69, requesting the President, as an antirecession measure, to accelerate spending of funds already appropriated for military construction projects. (Passed, 375 to 20.)	Yes.
23	Mar. 19	S. Con. Res. 68, requesting the President, as an antirecession measure to accelerate spending of funds already appropriated for civil construction projects. (Passed, 379 to 16.)	Yes.
24	Mar. 19	Quorum call	Present.
25	Mar. 19	S. 3262, motion to suspend rules and pass an act to authorize not more than $4,000,000 for construction by Armed Forces of sports arena for 1960 Olympic games (⅔ vote necessary). (Failed, 257 to 139.)	Yes.
26	Mar. 20	Quorum call	Present.
27	Mar. 20	S. J. Res. 162, motion to return to committee with instructions to limit to dairy producers a bill to prevent reductions in price supports and acreage allotments for all farm commodities below 1957 levels. (Failed, 173 to 211.)	Yes.
28	Mar. 20	S. J. Res. 162, permitting reduction in price supports and acreage allotments for all farm commodities below 1957 levels. (Passed, 210 to 172)	No.
29	Mar. 25	H. Res. 507, motion to take up the military pay increase bill. (Passed, 362 to 5)	Yes.
30	Mar. 25	H. R. 11470, increasing pay of military personnel by varying percentages and carrying out recommendations of Cordiner Committee. Passed, 366 to 22.)	Yes.
31	Mar. 26	Quorum call	Present.
32	Mar. 27	Quorum call	Present.
33	Mar. 27	Quorum call	Present.
34	Mar. 27	H. R. 8290, motion to kill the bill to permit a nonprofit foundation to construct a Freedom Wall National Monument on Federal land near Arlington National Cemetery. (Passed, 195 to 169.)	Yes.
35	Mar. 28	H. R. 5822, on adoption of conference report to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to permit airlines to retain net capital gains from sale of old equipment for reinvestment in new flight equipment. (Passed, 276 to 63.)	Yes.
36	Mar. 28	Quorum call	Present.
37	Mar. 28	S. 3262, authorizing not more than $4,000,000 for construction by Armed Forces of sports arena for 1960 winter Olympic games. (Passed, 218 to 102.)	Yes.
38	Apr. 1	H. R. 10589, appropriating $750,000 for the Civil Rights Commission. (Passed, 273 to 98)	Not voting.[1]
39	Apr. 3	H. R. 9821, rejecting the House-Senate conference report on the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958. (Failed, 109 to 222)	No.
40	Apr. 3	H. R. 9821, adoption of conference report on Federal-Aid Road Act of 1958 authorizing appropriations for continuing the construction of highways. (Passed, 300 to 28.)	Yes.
41	Apr. 16	Quorum call	Present.
42	Apr. 22	Quorum call	Present.
43	Apr. 22	H. Res. 465, motion to take up the bill permitting the Navy to serve margarine. (Passed, 233 to 130)	No.
44	Apr. 22	H. R. 912, amending the bill permitting the Navy to serve margarine to forbid the Navy from acquiring margarine when surplus butter available from CCC, except for use in overseas areas where use of butter impractical. (Passed, 207 to 161.)	Yes.
45	Apr. 29	H. Res. 551, motion to take up the bill authorizing Government construction and sale of 2 superliner passenger vessels. (Passed, 343 to 31)	Yes.
46	Apr. 29	Quorum call	Present.
47	Apr. 29	H. R. 11451, authorizing construction and sale by the Federal Maritime Commission of 2 superliner passenger vessels. (Passed, 289 to 94)	Yes.
48	Apr. 30	Quorum call	Present.
49	May 1	Quorum call	Present.
50	May 1	H. R. 12065, amendment embodying administration proposals to the bill authorizing temporary unemployment benefits for persons exhausting benefit rights under existing State laws. (Passed, 223 to 165.)	Yes.

[1]Excused, death in family.

85th Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date	Explanation	Vote
51	May 1	H. R. 12065, final passage of amended bill providing Federal loans to States to extend their unemployment compensation programs to persons who have exhausted benefits under current State law. (Passed, 372 to 17.)	Yes.
52	May 6	Quorum call	Present.
53	May 12	Quorum call	Present.
54	May 12	Quorum call	Present.
55	May 12	Quorum call	Present.
56	May 13	Quorum call	Present.
57	May 13	Quorum call	Present.
58	May 14	H. R. 12181, passage of the $2,958,900,000 authorization bill for the Mutual Security Act of 1958. (Passed, 259 to 134)	Yes.
59	May 15	Quorum call	Present.
60	May 15	H. R. 12428, making appropriations for the State and Justice Departments, the Judiciary, and U. S. Information Agency. (Passed, 320 to 51)	Yes.
61	May 21	Quorum call	Present.
62	May 21	H. R. 7999, motion to take up the bill providing statehood for Alaska. (Passed, 217 to 172)	Yes.
63	May 21	Quorum call	Present.
64	May 21	Quorum call	Present.
65	May 21	Quorum call	Present.
66	May 21	Quorum call	Present.
67	May 22	H. R. 5836, adoption of conference report raising salaries of postal workers and increasing postal rates. (Passed, 381 to 0)	Yes.
68	May 22	Quorum call	Present.
69	May 22	Quorum call	Absent.
70	May 22	Quorum call	Present.
71	May 22	Quorum call	Present.
72	May 23	Quorum call	Present.
73	May 26	Quorum call	Present.
74	May 26	Quorum call	Present.
75	May 26	Quorum call	Present.
76	May 27	Quorum call	Present.
77	May 27	Quorum call	Absent.
78	May 28	H. R. 7999, motion to kill the bill providing for admission of Alaska into the Union. (Failed, 174 to 199)	No.
79	May 28	Quorum call	Present.
80	May 28	H. R. 7999, motion to kill the bill providing for admission of Alaska into the Union. (Failed, 172 to 202)	No.
81	May 28	H. R. 7999, final passage of bill providing for statehood for Alaska. (Passed, 210 to 166)	Yes.
82	June 2	Quorum call	Present.
83	June 3	Quorum call	Present.
84	June 4	Quorum call	Present.
85	June 4	Quorum call	Present.
86	June 4	Quorum call	Present.
87	June 5	H. R. 12738, amendment to increase by $99,000,000 the funds allocated to the Army in the Defense Department appropriation bill. (Passed, 225 to 159.)	No.
88	June 5	H. R. 12738, appropriating funds for the Department of Defense. (Passed, 390 to 0)	Yes.
89	June 9	Quorum call	Present.
90	June 9	Quorum call	Present.
91	June 10	Quorum call	Present.
92	June 10	Quorum call	Present.
93	June 11	Quorum call	Present.
94	June 11	H. R. 12591, to kill the bill providing a 5-year extension of the President's authority to enter into trade agreements. (Failed, 146 to 268)	No.
95	June 11	H. R. 12591, final passage of bill providing for a 5-year extension of the President's authority to enter into trade agreements. (Passed, 317 to 98.)	Yes.
96	June 11	Quorum call	Present.
97	June 11	Quorum call	Present.
98	June 12	Quorum call	Present.
99	June 12	H. R. 12541, motion to return to committee to amend as requested by the President, a bill providing for reorganization of the Department of Defense. (Failed, 192 to 211.)	Yes.
100	June 12	H. R. 12541, passage of bill providing for reorganization of the Department of Defense. (Passed, 402 to 1)	Yes.
101	June 17	Quorum call	Present.
102	June 18	S. 3910, motion to pass revised version of the vetoed River and Harbor and Flood Control Act. (Passed, 374 to 17)	Yes.
103	June 19	H. R. 12858, making appropriations for civil functions of Army Corps of Engineers, the Interior Department, and the Tennessee Valley Authority. (Passed, 362 to 18.)	Yes.
104	June 19	H. R. 12716, amending the Atomic Energy Act authorizing transfer of atomic weapons, information, and certain material to allies, pursuant to agreements for cooperation subject to Congressional veto. (Passed, 345 to 12.)	Yes.
105	June 25	H. R. 11077, to incorporate the veterans of World War I of the U. S. A. (Passed, 389 to 2)	Not voting.
106	June 26	Quorum call	Present.
107	June 26	H. Res. 609, providing for consideration of an omnibus farm bill that included a separate commodity program extension of the farm surplus disposal law, and several milk programs. (Failed, 171 to 214.)	Not voting
108	June 26	S. 1832, motion to suspend rules and authorize appointment of 1 additional Secretary of State (⅔ vote necessary). (Failed, 224 to 145)	Yes.
109	June 27	H. R. 12695, adopting conference report on bill providing 1-year extension of existing corporate and certain excise tax rates and repealing excise taxes on transportation of property. (Passed, 367 to 9.)	No.
110	June 27	H. R. 12181, motion to kill conference report authorizing $3,031,400,000 for the mutual security program. (Failed, 134 to 238)	No.
111	June 27	H. R. 12832, authorizing Government insured loans to railroads. (Passed, 348 to 2)	Yes.
112	June 30	S. 3342, to continue the $75,000,000 yearly program to increase milk consumption by children in nonprofit schools and summer camps. (Passed, 328 to 1.)	Yes.
113	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
114	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
115	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
116	July 1	Quorum call	Absent.
117	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
118	July 2	H. R. 11427, Mallory rule bill to bar Federal courts from ruling confessions inadmissible in evidence solely because of delay in arraignment of defendant. (Passed, 294 to 79.)	Yes.
119	July 2	H. R. 13192, motion to return the mutual security appropriation bill to committee with instructions to increase defense support by $75,000,000. (Failed, 166 to 214.)	Yes.
120	July 2	H. R. 13192, passage of mutual security appropriations bill. (Passed, 253 to 126)	Yes.
121	July 9	Quorum call	Present.
122	July 10	H. R. 13015, motion to return to committee the military construction authorization bill with instructions to make permissive rather than mandatory relocation of an Army ammunition depot near Houston, Tex. (Failed, 179 to 202.)	Yes.
123	July 10	H. R. 13015, passage of military construction authorization bill. (Passed, 379 to 2)	Yes.
124	July 10	S. 495, motion to suspend rules and pass bill authorizing acquisition of land adjacent to Senate Office Building (⅔ vote necessary). (Failed, 232 to 150.)	Yes.
125	July 10	S. 1411, extending Government security program to all Federal employees and authorizing agency heads to suspend employment of any civilian employee in interests of national security. (Passed, 296 to 46.)	Yes.
126	July 14	Quorum call	Present.
127	July 15	Quorum call	Absent.
128	July 15	H. Res. 507, motion to take up H. R. 3, a bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effects of acts of Congress on State laws. (Passed, 268 to 114.)	Yes.
129	July 15	Quorum call	Present.
130	July 16	Quorum call	Present.
131	July 16	Quorum call	Present.
132	July 17	Quorum call	Absent.
133	July 17	H. R. 3, amending text of H. R. 3 by specifying that no subversive activities law previously passed by Congress should be construed as invalidating State antisubversive laws. (Passed, 249 to 147.)	Yes.
134	July 17	H. R. 3, motion to kill the bill providing that Federal law shall not replace State laws unless Congress specifically so provides or there is direct conflict between them. (Failed, 161 to 236.)	No.
135	July 17	H. R. 3, providing that Federal law shall not replace State law unless Congress specifically so provides or there is direct conflict between them. (Passed, 241 to 155.)	Yes.
136	July 18	Quorum call	Present.
137	July 21	Quorum call	Absent.
138	July 22	Quorum call	Present.
139	July 22	Quorum call	Present.
140	July 23	Quorum call	Present.

85th Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date	Explanation	Vote
141	July 24	Quorum call	Present.
142	July 24	H. Res. 485, motion to take up H. R. 4504, a bill to authorize Government-guaranteed loans to build wholesale marketing facilities for perishable agricultural products. (Failed, 164 to 211.)	No.
143	July 28	Quorum call	Absent.
144	July 30	Quorum call	Present.
145	July 30	Quorum call	Present.
146	July 30	H. Res. 649, motion to take up a bill to provide pensions, clerical assistants, and mailing privileges for former Presidents and their widows. (Passed, 254 to 126.)	Yes.
147	July 31	Quorum call	Present.
148	July 31	Quorum call	Present.
149	July 31	H. R. 13549, Social Security Amendments of 1958 to increase old-age survivors and disability payments. (Passed, 374 to 2)	Yes.
150	July 31	H. Res. 659, citing Robert Lehrer of Gary, Ind., for contempt of Congress for refusing to answer questions of the House Un-American Activities Committee. (Passed, 363 to 0.)	Yes.
151	Aug. 1	Quorum call	Present.
152	Aug. 1	H. Res. 650, motion to take up a bill to increase from $100,000,000 to $2,000,000,000 a fund for loans to municipalities to build various public facilities. (Failed, 173 to 187.)	Yes.
153	Aug. 4	Quorum call	Absent.
154	Aug. 5	Quorum call	Present.
155	Aug. 6	H. R. 13015, adoption of the conference report on the military construction authorization bill. (Passed, 256 to 135)	No.
156	Aug. 6	H. R. 13580, increasing the permanent debt limit to $285,000,000,000 and the temporary limit to $288,000,000,000. (Passed, 286 to 109)	Yes.
157	Aug. 6	S. 4071, motion to pass under suspension of rules a bill dealing with price, production adjustment, and marketing programs for various agricultural commodities (⅔ vote required). (Failed, 210 to 186.)	No.
158	Aug. 7	Quorum call	Present.
159	Aug. 7	H. Res. 675, motion to take up H. R. 13247 authorizing $900,000,000 in Federal grants and loans for a 7-year program of aid to the Nation's students and schools. (Passed, 266 to 108.)	Yes.
160	Aug. 8	Quorum call	Present.
161	Aug. 8	H. R. 13247, motion to kill the bill authorizing $900,000,000 in Federal grants and loans for a 7-year program of aid to students and schools. (Failed, 140 to 233.)	No.
162	Aug. 12	Quorum call	Present.
163	Aug. 12	Quorum call	Present.
164	Aug. 13	Quorum call	Present.
165	Aug. 13	S. 2266, motion to pass, over the President's veto, the bill to regulate wage rates at the Portsmouth, N. H., Navy Yard (⅔ majority required). (Failed, 202 to 180.)	No.
166	Aug. 13	H. Res. 684, citing Bernard Goldfine for contempt of Congress for refusing to answer questions of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Legislative Oversight Subcommittee. (Passed, 369 to 8.)	Yes.
167	Aug. 13	H. Res. 866, citing Carl Braden for contempt of Congress for refusing to answer questions of the House Un-American Activities Committee. (Passed, 365 to 1.)	Yes.
168	Aug. 14	Quorum call	Present.
169	Aug. 15	Quorum call	Absent.
170	Aug. 15	H. Res. 682, motion to take up S. 3638 authorizing Federal grants and loans of $279,500,000 yearly for redevelopment of certain distressed areas. (Passed, 216 to 159.)	Not voting.
171	Aug. 15	Quorum call	Absent.
172	Aug. 15	S. 3683, motion to kill the bill authorizing Federal grants and loans of $279,500,000 yearly for redevelopment of certain distressed areas. (Failed, 170 to 188.)	Not voting.
173	Aug. 18	Quorum call	Present.
174	Aug. 18	S. 4035, motion to suspend rules and pass the Omnibus Housing Act of 1958 (⅔ majority required). (Failed, 251 to 134)	Yes.
175	Aug. 18	S. 3974, motion to suspend rules and pass the Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1958 (Kennedy-Ives) (⅔ majority required). (Failed, 190 to 198.)	No.
176	Aug. 18	Quorum call	Present.
177	Aug. 18	H. R. 13067, motion to suspend rules and pass bill establishing a food-stamp plan for distribution of $1,000,000,000 worth of surplus food commodities yearly to needy persons and families (⅔ majority required). (Failed, 196 to 187.)	Yes.
178	Aug. 19	Quorum call	Present.
179	Aug. 19	H. Res. 691, expressing House disagreement to Senate amendments to a House-passed bill (H. R. 13247), the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and requesting a House-Senate conference. (Passed, 259 to 110.)	Yes.
180	Aug. 19	Quorum call	Present.
181	Aug. 19	H. Res. 689, motion to take up a bill (S. 4036) establishing program for subsidies for certain minerals. (Passed, 198 to 165)	No.
182	Aug. 19	Quorum call	Present.
183	Aug. 20	H. R. 13450, motion to agree to Senate amendment to the supplemental appropriation bill barring appropriation of funds for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration without annual authorization by Congress. (Failed, 126 to 236.)	No.
184	Aug. 20	H. R. 13450, providing $10,000,000 rather than the $15,000,000 voted by the Senate for the U. S. Information Agency radio facilities. (Passed, 190 to 172.)	Yes.
185	Aug. 20	Quorum call	Present.
186	Aug. 21	Quorum call	Present.
187	Aug. 21	S. 4036, motion to kill the bill providing for a program of subsidies for certain minerals. (Failed, 171 to 174)	Yes.
188	Aug. 21	S. 4036, passage of bill providing for a program of subsidies for certain minerals. (Failed, 159 to 182)	No.
189	Aug. 21	S. Con. Res. 109, stating the United Nations should consider developing an organization enabling it to employ U. N. forces for observation and patrol purposes where international peace and security are threatened. (Passed, 299 to 20.)	Yes.
190	Aug. 22	Quorum call	Present.
191	Aug. 22	S. 3335, motion to suspend rules and pass a bill providing for a National Cultural Center in Washington, D. C., to be constructed without cost to the Government. (Passed, 261 to 55.)	Yes.
192	Aug. 22	H. R. 13345, motion to suspend rules and pass bill authorizing appropriation of $500,000 for the pan-American Games. (Passed, 244 to 64)	Yes.
193	Aug. 23	H. R. 13489, adoption of conference report on bill making appropriations for Defense Department military construction $1,300,000,000. (Passed, 300 to 1.)	Yes.
194	Aug. 23	Quorum call	Present.
195	Aug. 23	H. R. 13247, adoption of conference report on the National Defense Education Act of 1958. (Passed, 212 to 85)	Yes.

Report to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRACIE PFOST

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, as the first space age Congress in history, the session which has just ended had to face up to the dazzling world of tomorrow as well as to wrestle with the complex problems of today. It did an impressive job. Many people are comparing its productive record to that of the first 100 days of the Roosevelt administration.

In this brief report to the people of the First Congressional District, I cannot relate all of the session's accomplishments. I will try only to touch on the most significant.

ALASKA—49TH STATE

This Congress added a new star to the flag, and passed a billion-dollar science education bill—the first general education bill cleared in a century.

It met a galloping recession head on with a program of increased public works, highway and emergency housing construction and unemployment benefits, and gave 12 million social security annuitants and countless senior citizens on public assistance a few extra dollars with which to meet the alltime high living costs.

DEFENSE

A permanent space agency was whipped through to help move us into the area of interplanetary travel. The President was given almost all of the authority he requested to streamline the chain of command in our military organization, and more dollars for missiles and military manpower than he asked for.

SMALL BUSINESS

The small-business man got his best deal in a decade with liberalized loan programs and tax relief. SBA loan authority was increased and interest rates lowered, and a measure establishing local small business investment companies was enacted.

The food and drug law was strengthened, and hospital construction and

water pollution control programs extended.

Federal and postal employees won 10 percent pay raises, and retired civil-service employees a 10 percent annuity boost. It was my privilege to chairman the House subcommittee which reported the retirement legislation.

Veterans of World War I were given a Federal charter for their organization, veterans laws were codified, and pensions were increased for widows of Spanish-American and other early wars.

THE FARMER

The most glaring omission was the lack of any constructive answer to the farm problem. The Congress cleared a bill to freeze farm price supports at their 1957 levels in an effort to bolster farm income—but the President vetoed it. This veto cost Idaho wheat and dairy farmers millions of dollars.

Secretary Benson opposed most of the bills introduced to give relief to any segment of the farm population. There were 1 or 2 happy exceptions. My bill to prohibit the trading of onion futures on mercantile exchanges was not vetoed. It had the unanimous support of the Idaho onion industry. Onion farmers are now in a position to control their own product—rather than having its control vested in the hands of unscrupulous manipulators on mercantile exchanges hundreds of miles away.

Another exception was the passage by the Congress, and the acceptance by the White House, of the bill to extend the National Wool Act. I was one of the cosponsors of this legislation which had the wholehearted backing of Idaho sheep growers.

The Government's authority to sell farm surpluses abroad was extended, as was the special milk program in nonprofit schools, nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, and summer camps. These programs help nourish millions and relieve farm surpluses.

RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

This Congress provided for the Nation's first inventory of outdoor recreation resources and needs. As chairman of the House Public Lands Subcommittee, I held hearings on legislation to establish the National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, and upon its passage was appointed by the Speaker of the House as one of the Commission's members.

Another important measure passed, of which I was a cosponsor, was the bill to prevent military land grabs on our public domain.

A half-million dollars was appropriated for Bruce's Eddy Dam studies, and $21,500 for a special project of mine—the preparation of a hydrographic map of Lake Coeur d'Alene by the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

TRANSPORTATION

This Congress provided considerable funds to help complete the construction of the Lewis-Clark highway, and repealed the 3 percent freight rate excise tax—both of which are providing a substantial boost to the State's economy.

The Nation's railroads were given a lift with loans to finance new equipment, operating expenses, and other obligations, and the Federal airport aid program was expanded. A single Federal agency was established to control both civilian and military planes, in an attempt to reduce fatal air collisions.

MINING

The loss of the minerals subsidy bill in the House was a body blow to our ailing lead-zinc industry, and ended hope for an immediate revival of tungsten mining in Idaho. The bill was defeated in the closing days of the session by a scant 23 votes. It was an administration-backed measure, but Republicans voted against it 2 to 1, while Democrats supported it 2 to 1.

A bill to change the mining assessment date, jointly sponsored by Senator FRANK CHURCH and myself, passed and became law. It should help Idaho's small mining companies and individual claimholders.

BIPARTISANSHIP

There was little opportunity for this Congress to make any contributions to a lasting peace. The shadow of the crisis in the Middle East hung over us, with the almost constant worry that our inept foreign policy would involve us in serious consequences.

Despite these fears, this Congress was notably bipartisan in its major actions. Never has a divided government—an administration of one party and a Congress of another—worked so well. The Congress was responsive to the President's requests, and passed much of his program, but it took the initiative in its own hands when the President was not meeting the needs of the country.

The demands upon the 2d session of the 85th Congress were great and its Members worked hard. I am proud of my 100-percent voting record. I was present to cast my vote on every rollcall on a bill, and missed only 2 out of 102 quorum, or attendance, calls. This is a record only a handful of other Members can equal. I was present to vote on every rollcall on a bill, and to answer my name on practically every quorum or attendance call.

President's Veto of H. R. 12261

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the President's veto of H. R. 12261 cheered advocates of economy in government. That bill, you will recall, would have cost the taxpayers of this country $465.81.

Without a crew, it costs about $22 an hour to operate the helicopter that flies the President to his Gettysburg farm on weekends. Without a crew, it costs $123.18 an hour to operate the *Columbine III*, which carried him to Newport for his vacation.

By his veto, the President saved the taxpayers enough money to buy gas and oil for a dozen or so round trips to Gettysburg, or the round trip to Rhode Island.

Accomplishments of the 85th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my statement relative to the accomplishments of the 85th Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a great regret to me that, due to unavoidable circumstances, I was not present during the closing hours of the 85th Congress and, therefore, did not have the opportunity to participate in any closing remarks. I want to add my word to the expressions of many others of my colleagues praising our leadership during this session of the Congress. Senator JOHNSON of Texas, as majority leader, and our own Senator KNOWLAND, as minority leader, both did outstanding jobs in coordinating our programs and working together in their leadership to carry out the main objectives of the President's program. Both exhibited real statesmanship and the kind of leadership that this great body needs and benefits from.

The 85th Congress, in my judgment, will go down as an outstanding, positive Congress of real accomplishments. In large measure, its greatest accomplishments resulted from a spirit of bipartisan cooperation. In the Senate, as I stated above, both Majority Leader JOHNSON and Minority Leader KNOWLAND worked tirelessly to achieve this record of effective bipartisanship, which realized most of the legislative goals set forth by President Eisenhower as critical for national security and world peace.

The 85th Congress, particularly its 2d session, met under the heavy pressure of crisis: The Communist strategy for world conquest had developed a total cold war—a full-scale offensive in the political, economic, and cultural spheres, involving the total commitment of science and technology, education, industry, and all the vast resources at the command of its totalitarian system.

In the face of this challenge Congress provided the machinery to meet our immediate security needs. Much must still be done, however, if we are to meet the greater challenge which lies in the years ahead. We must not only meet the Russian threat, we must counter it, and we must lay the groundwork for lasting world peace.

I have no intention of reviewing the legislative history of the past session at this time. Senators JOHNSON and KNOWLAND have already done this with clarity and in great detail in their majority and minority reports on the 85th Congress. I shall only attempt here to list some of the most important accomplishments and failures from my own viewpoint as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, both of which were closely concerned with much of the important legislation to come before this Congress.

I

In the field of foreign relations and national defense, I would note particularly:

(a) The passage of the Mutual Security Authorization Act which conformed closely to the President's recommendations. It was unfortunate that at the last moment the appropriation for this operation was severely cut, but this matter can be remedied if necessary in the early part of the 86th Congress.

(b) Reciprocal trade. Congress headed off an attempt to destroy this policy and passed an unprecedented 4-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act. In the legislation care was taken to protect the American economy and our domestic industries by a further development of the peril-point principle and an ultimate participation by the Congress in case of dangerous warning signals by the Tariff Commission.

(c) Defense reorganization. A sound law in line with the President's recommendations established the Secretary of Defense as the real operational head of the Pentagon and streamlined his command structure to prevent overlaps and conflicts.

(d) A promising science and education bill aimed to strengthen our educational system in the interest of national security was enacted. This was the first Feedral education bill that has been passed by the Congress for many years. The fundamental responsibilities of the States to determine their educational policies is strongly emphasized. It provides for student loans and equipment in the schools, especially for the development of scientific research. A companion bill increases the budget for the National Science Foundation for research.

(e) The Middle East resolution. Under the dynamic leadership of the President and Secretary Dulles early in the 1st session of the 85th Congress, the Congress adopted a joint resolution to promote peace and stability in the Middle East. This has come to be known as the Middle East Resolution. In effect, it supports the independence of the Middle East and authorizes the President to undertake in the general area military assistance programs with any nation or group of nations desiring such assistance. It provides further "if the President determines the necessity thereof, the United States is prepared to use armed forces to assist any such nation or group of such nations requesting assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism."

(f) Space agency. The Congress acted rapidly on the President's request to create a strong space agency in charge of space exploration.

II

On the domestic front.

(a) Farm policy. After prolonged and continued debate throughout the session a new farm law was passed which cut down the existing incentives to produce surpluses. This was a real victory for the administration, and especially for Secretary Benson's policies.

(b) This Congress established two outstanding landmarks. For the first time since the Civil War it was possible to pass a civil-rights bill with the full cooperation of both sides of the aisle. This bill insures the most basic of all civil rights. It protects the right to vote to all our citizens in all our States without regard to race, creed, or color.

The other outstanding event was the granting of statehood to Alaska, which added another State to the Union for the first time since 1912. I regret the failure of the Democratic leadership to recognize Hawaii's equally deserving case for statehood. I hope this omission will be speedily corrected by the 86th Congress.

(c) It should be noted that the Congress established another landmark by passing one of the primary goals of the Second Hoover Commission revising the budgeting and accounting system and providing for greater Congressional control over expenditures.

It is to be regretted that no other recommendations of the Hoover Commission requiring legislative action were passed in this Congress and here again we have need in the 86th Congress to consider again the remaining recommendations.

A disappointing failure of this Congress was its refusal to enact a labor reform bill, although some small progress was made in the specific problem of employee pension and welfare funds. The truly pressing and challenging problems of racketeering, abuses of union officials, and perversion of democratic procedures remain untouched.

In light of the widespread public indignation over the disclosures of the McClellan committee; its legislative recommendations; the President's 1958 program of labor reform and the extensive hearings by the Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, it is incredible that this Congress failed to pass appropriate legislation. We must have legislation to protect the basic rights and interests of union members from the corrupt labor leaders whose activities have cast a shadow over the integrity of all organized labor. This is a matter of great concern to all our people and to allow this clearly recognized moral problem to remain without remedy is a reflection on our democratic processes. In my judgment, adequate and prompt labor reform legislation should be given top priority when the 86th Congress convenes.

In conclusion, as this is my last year in the United States Senate, and as I look back over the 14 wonderful years of my participation here, there are certain deep convictions that stand out. My experience tells me that the real approach to human understanding between individuals in our country generally and in our relations with the other countries of the world, must be built upon the fundamentals of our Christian faith. The greatest Teacher of all time 2,000 years ago dramatized the sacredness of the individual and the significance of what we mean by "neighbor."

The freedom of the individual human being is a great challenge in the world today. The previous pattern of history has been one of external controls of the strong over the weak, but throughout history we find that the continual quest of man has been to be free from these external controls. The big world issue then is between communistic, atheistic totalitarianism which suppresses the individual and freedom of the individual under the guidance of God.

Our forefathers brought this concept to the new world.

We are challenged to preserve this precious heritage and to demonstrate its eternal truth if we are to find lasting peace among all nations.

Stopping the Flow of Obscene Literature Through Tougher Penalties for Violators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, among the most important of the so-called minor legislation passed by this Congress is the bill to halt the flow and distribution of obscene literature.

Under previous laws, the purveyors of this filth could be prosecuted only in their home locale where, frequently, too much leniency was provided for them. Now, however, these men can be prosecuted either in the area where the obscene literature was actually sold or even in some area through which it was transported.

The penalty for selling or sending this material to any youngster under the age of nineteen is a maximum of 10 years in jail or a fine of $10,000 or both.

Mr. Speaker, I have contacted the Department of Justice and have been informed of the best methods for parents harassed by this problem to get proper and adequate satisfaction. I have been advised that the best method is for any parents so troubled to contact either their local postmaster or their local FBI agents. In this, I believe it would be wise for parents to contact both since there is a split jurisdiction. It also might be wise for them to follow the matter up with a more formal complaint to their local United States attorney who will eventually have to handle the problem.

It has given me great pleasure to watch this bill become law. It is a problem that has plagued many of our fine citizens. It is a problem which teachers and parents alike have recognized as one that is growing worse by the year. I have high hopes that this bill will go a long way toward solving it.

Report of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy, New London, Conn., May 2, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PURTELL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the report of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy, New London, Conn., May 2, 1958.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY, NEW LONDON, CONN., MAY 2, 1958

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.
The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

GENTLEMEN: Pursuant to section 194 of title 14 of the United States Code, the following Senators and Members of the House of Representatives were designated to constitute the 1958 Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy:

By the President of the Senate: Senator PRESCOTT BUSH, Republican, Connecticut.

By the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, Democrat, Rhode Island; Senator WILLIAM A. PURTELL, Republican, Connecticut.

By the Speaker of the House of Representatives: Representative J. VAUGHAN GARY, Democrat, Virginia; Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican, New Jersey.

By the chairman, House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Representa-

tive THOMAS L. ASHLEY, Democrat, Ohio; Representative EDWARD A. GARMATZ, Democrat, Maryland; Representative WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD, Republican, California.

Ex officio members: Senator WARREN A. MAGNUSON, Democrat, Washington, chairman, Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce); Representative HERBERT C. BONNER, Democrat, North Carolina (chairman, House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries).

A meeting of the Board of Visitors was held at the Academy on May 2, 1958. The following members of the Board were present: Senator WILLIAM A. PURTELL, Republican, of Connecticut; Representative J. VAUGHAN GARY, Democrat, of Virginia; Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican, of New Jersey; Representative WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD, Republican, of California; Representative EDWARD A. GARMATZ, Democrat, of Maryland.

The following officials of the United States Coast Guard were also present from headquarters: Vice Adm. A. C. Richmond, Commandant; Rear Adm. R. M. Ross, Chief of the Office of Personnel; Capt. G. R. Boyce, Jr., Chief of the Personnel Training and Procurement Division; and Capt. David O. Reed, liaison officer; from the Academy, Rear Adm. F. A. Leamy, Superintendent; and Capt. G. M. Phannemiller, Assistant Superintendent.

Inspection tour of ground and buildings

Upon arrival of the Board at the Academy, the customary honors were rendered. Senator WILLIAM A. PURTELL inspected the cadet corps, and the battalion passed in review before the members of the Board. Accompanied by the Superintendent of the Academy and members of his staff, the Board then had luncheon with the corps of cadets.

Meeting of the Board

The Board members were joined by Admiral Richmond, Admiral Leamy, Admiral Ross, Captain Phannemiller, and Captain Boyce in formal session. Senator PURTELL was unanimously elected Chairman of the Board, with Representative GARY to serve as Chairman pro tempore upon Senator PURTELL'S departure.

GENERAL COMMENTS

The Superintendent of the Academy presented his formal report to the Board, giving the background and history of the Academy, the functions and requirements for admission, the curriculum and the status of accreditation, the staff, and the physical plant, together with proposed improvements and additional needs.

Changes in program

The composition of the student body at the Academy was discussed. The main group consists of the cadet corps of approximately 600, who participate in the 4-year course. In addition, the officer indoctrination school conducts throughout the year both the merchant marine officer indoctrination and the officer candidate program for college graduates and selected enlisted men of the Coast Guard.

The increasing size of the cadet corps has necessitated limiting the long summer cruise to the first and third classes. Only two of the Coast Guard cutters can be diverted from operational commitments of the Coast Guard to accompany the sailing ship *Eagle* on the 10-week cruise. The second class will have its concentrated small-arms training, its combat-readiness training, and its aviation indoctrination at Marine Corps, Navy, and Coast Guard facilities and will proceed on a short 3-week cruise aboard the practice squadron ships at the end of the summer. The new class entering in July will have completed its preliminary indoctrination at the Academy and will embark with the second class for the 3-week cruise.

The compulsory physical education program is designed to maintain the cadets in top physical condition, to improve posture, and develop coordination in the newly appointed cadets, and to teach leadership and organization of sports programs for the soon-to-be-commissioned ensigns. The staff of the commandant of cadets now includes a company officer for each of the four companies. They have been instrumental in increased athletic competition among the cadet corps and in detecting weaknesses in the cadets and assisting and counseling them in adjustments to Academy life and routine. The assignment of a well-trained hostess or social director to indoctrinate the cadet corps in social conduct and behavior is under consideration.

Other facilities

The functions of and facilities available in the library, the chapel, and the Academy hospital were presented by the Superintendent.

Buildings and grounds

The Superintendent reported on the buildings and grounds and pointed out various improvements noted on our inspection tour, such as the filling in of the lower field, which has provided additional playing area for increased athletic activity, the additional showers in the gymnasium also needed for this activity, and the new boiler plant, which has resulted in reduced fuel consumption and maintenance costs.

The Superintendent then reported on prospective improvements, the main one being the replacement by permanent fireproof quarters of the wooden barracks now occupied by one-third of the cadet corps. The Superintendent expressed his gratitude to the Members of the Senate and House who by floor amendment added the specific replacement cost, as a special item in the 1959 appropriation bill. The plan for an extension to Chase Hall which will include 150 additional rooms for the cadet corps has been submitted to the architect-engineer for implementation. The total plan includes necessary changes in the messhall facilities and also provides additional recreation halls within the proposed addition. The Superintendent reported that groundbreaking ceremonies are tentatively scheduled for September 1958 and the goal for occupancy has been set for September 1959.

The Superintendent then discussed the physical deterioration of the plant, since maintenance funds were inadequate for the numerous projects involved, and allowed little or no replacement activity. The members of the committee agreed that very often a penny-wise, pound-foolish policy resulted from appropriation of inadequate funds to permit early replacement rather than costly and excessive maintenance expenditures followed by eventual replacement of obsolescent buildings and equipment.

The following major needs were presented by the Superintendent:

Officer candidate and merchant marine indoctrination school

Replacement of wooden barracks, in which these students are quartered. Approximately 400 officer candidates are trained annually, together with 100 officers for Coast Guard indoctrination and merchant marine inspection duties.

Cadet classroom facilities

Rearrangement of present facilities to provide adequate classroom space for enlarged cadet corps.

Auditorium

This, too, presents a fire hazard, since it is a wooden structure and inadequate for the present size of the cadet corps.

Cadet recreation building

Another wooden building which needs replacement, both from a standpoint of its fire hazard potential and its lack of space to handle all cadet and officer student activities.

Fieldhouse

The cadet corps has outgrown the wooden fieldhouse constructed during World War II. An enlarged permanent fieldhouse is needed to eliminate excessive maintenance costs.

Main dock and causeway

Deterioration of these structures makes it impossible to truck material aboard the *Eagle*. A proper facility would save in maintenance costs and extra labor and insure the safety of personnel using the dock.

Grandstand

A new permanent grandstand is needed to replace the wooden structure, which must be repaired annually at an ever-increasing cost, without adequate assurance as to the safety of the structure.

Additional playing fields

To provide additional playing fields, filling of the waterfront area from dredging operations in the Thames is proposed. This would require permanent bulkheading.

Main gate

Relocation of the main gate is necessary to avoid dangerous traffic conditions.

Academy garage

This is no longer adequate to house the fire fighting equipment and Academy bus, and a new maintenance department building is needed.

Family quarters

No quarters have been constructed at the Academy since 1932. Additional quarters are needed to house at least the heads of departments on the Academy reservation.

Superintendent's quarters

The present quarters are inadequate for official entertaining and need to be enlarged.

Cadet attrition

The committee reviewed the relative costs for the 4-year period at the Academy, and noted that the attrition was higher than at other military academies. This may be attributed to the fact that the engineering curriculum and the accreditation by Engineers Council for Professional Development has demanded a higher scholastic achievement from Coast Guard cadets. It was noted that the accreditation by ECPD had been relinquished and the Academy has attuned its curriculum to meet the objectives and mission of the Academy; namely, to provide commissioned officers for Coast Guard service. The increasing number of applicants participating in the competitive entrance examination each year is providing a higher cutoff point for selection. It is expected that this, together with the addition of company commissioned officers as advisers and guidance personnel, will reduce attrition to a more acceptable level.

Cadet personal funds

The matter of cadet funds was discussed. The cadet now deposits $100 upon entrance and receives pay and allowances of $113 per month, with $1.35 a day for rations. After deduction of social security and income tax, and payment for books, uniforms, etc., the average cadet has only $115.80 available upon graduation. Tentative proposals have been made to increase the deposit to $300, which is now the permissible maximum at West Point and the Air Force Academy.

The Board met in private session with the principal battalion officers of the corps of cadets and the class president, without the presence of officials of the Coast Guard. The Board was impressed with the character and caliber of the members of the cadet corps and the excellent spirit and high morale of the cadets.

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Board express on the record its concern at the continued existence and use

of World War II wooden buildings for various activities of the Coast Guard Academy, and at the excessive maintenance costs which are incurred to keep these buildings in habitable condition when immediate replacement would result in long-range monetary savings and eliminate hazardous occupancy.

2. That an order of priority be established for the projects listed by the Academy Superintendent as vitally needed improvements. The Board and the Superintendent are in agreement that primary emphasis must be placed on the elimination of fire hazards, particularly in those buildings occupied by Coast Guard personnel as sleeping quarters.

3. The Board submits the following priorities:

(a) Replacement of deteriorated temporary World War II wooden structures: These buildings are old wooden structures that are dangerous to personnel, extremely costly to keep in repair and near the end of their existence. Replacement buildings would provide for the following in order of priority:

I. Barracks, classroom, and administration building for the officer indoctrination school.

II. Auditorium for the whole Academy.

III. Student activity building.

IV. Fieldhouse.

(b) Extension of classroom space: While this does not involve dangers to personnel, the project is necessary to provide an adequate number of recitation and laboratory rooms to accommodate an increased enrollment of 600 cadets.

(c) Renewal of necessary structures which will be dangerous to personnel and equipment, if not repaired:

I. Wooden grandstand at Jones Field.

II. Dock and causeway.

(d) Items that are required for the proper operation of the Academy:

I. Provide additional playing-field areas necessary for the development of the physical education program for the encouragement and supervised participation by all cadets in athletic activities and contests of their choice.

II. Alteration of main gate to eliminate traffic hazard.

III. Construction of a maintenance department building to provide necessary space for maintenance and repair shops, storerooms, maintenance offices, garaging and servicing of vehicles and equipment. Construction of this facility will release space in the engineering instruction building now occupied by the maintenance department. The space released will be utilized for the necessary extension of classroom space (item (b), above).

IV. Additional family quarters.

V. Adequate quarters for the Superintendent.

4. That the replacement of the barracks for the cadet corps reported by this Board last year is in process under a specific mandate in the 1959 appropriation for the Coast Guard, and that similar action be recommended to Congress to eliminate the hazardous structures listed above, in accordance with the order of priority established by this Board, unless funds for the replacements are included within the appropriation request ceilings.

CONCLUSION

The Board commends the Superintendent, Rear Adm. F. A. Leamy, and his staff for their efforts in maintaining the high standards of this institution and the excellent caliber of the Cadet Corps.

The Board wishes to extend its thanks to Vice Adm. A. C. Richmond, Commandant; Rear Adm. R. M. Ross, Chief of the Office of Personnel; Capt. G. R. Boyce, Jr., Chief of the Personnel Training and Procurement Division; and Capt. David O. Reed, liaison officer, for the assistance rendered by them. The Chairman and members of the Board wish to express their appreciation to the battalion officers, class presidents, and other members of the cadet corps for their very helpful assistance to the Board in expressing their views on the functioning of the Academy.

The Board earnestly recommends to all Members of the Senate and House of Representatives that they assist in every way possible in bringing the Coast Guard Academy to the attention of eligible candidates, and urging their constituents to participate in the nationwide competitive examination to be held on February 24 and 25, 1959.

The Board urges all Members of the Senate and House of Representatives and particularly the members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to visit the Academy, inspect its grounds and buildings, classrooms, and laboratories and judge for themselves its facilities and needs.

WILLIAM A. PURTELL, *Chairman.*
J. VAUGHAN GARY.
EDWARD A. GARMATZ.
WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD.
WILLIAM B. WIDNALL.

Report on the 85th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LUDWIG TELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. TELLER. Mr. Speaker, the 85th Congress, which passed the first general civil-rights law in three-quarters of a century, made substantial contributions to the Nation's well-being.

Many observers have expressed the view that our 85th Congress was a great Congress, a view which finds support in three of its main characteristics: It took the initiative and met major issues head on, it surmounted many fast-moving events both in our domestic affairs and in our international relations, and it kept partisan politics to a minimum. A spirit of constructive compromise, a forward-looking willingness to accept our historic responsibilities as a dominant world power, and an awareness of the sectional problems of our great Nation—all these gave vigor and balance to the legislative processes of our 85th Congress.

Civil rights was, of course, one of our major accomplishments. Among the other outstanding legislative accomplishments were reciprocal international trade, Alaska statehood, reorganization of our Defense Department to make it a more efficient instrument of national protection, creation of a space agency for peaceful exploration of outer space.

We increased social-security benefits as an expression of our constant responsibilities toward our senior citizens.

We established for the first time a system of Federal aid for higher education, a modest program—but at least a beginning which provides loans and post-graduate fellowships for higher education in mathematics, science, and modern languages.

We made significant contributions toward helping small- and medium-sized business, by making the Small Business Administration a permanent agency of the Federal Government, and by establishing so-called capital banks for making long-term loans to small- and medium-sized businesses. Special tax advantages were also given to small- and medium-sized businesses. We still face the problems of monopoly and bigness in business, however, and the next Congress will have to do something to halt the ever-increasing mergers and consolidations of businesses which have the effect of reducing competition and thinning the ranks of our independent middle class.

We passed a highway-aid bill for expanding our Interstate Highway System, and regulated billboard advertising along new stretches of interstate highways.

In the interest of economy and efficiency in government operation, we adopted a program of annual budgeting from which huge savings will result in future years.

I do not wish, of course, to be understood as saying that partisanship played no role in the workings of our 85th Congress. Our two-party system would lack vitality if there were an absence of differences over human values which have brought our Nation and its people forward in the programing of things which have to be done in the public interest.

I do not believe that President Eisenhower established sufficient liaison with the Democratic Members of the Congress, and many expert observers have justifiably complained that the President failed in too many instances to influence and lead the members of his own party in the Congress. I think it is fair to say that partly because of the failure of Executive leadership, the task of leading the Nation during the past 2 years fell primarily to the Congress, which was obliged not only to carry through but to initiate those significant subjects of legislation which have prompted many persons to speak well of our 85th Congress.

Here are some of the other issues we faced and tried to meet in the 85th Congress:

ANTIRECESSION; INFLATION

In wrestling with the recent recession, the Congress was faced with the obligation of providing increased unemployment insurance benefits, and opportunities for greater capital investment and necessary expenditures to restore confidence in the Nation's economy.

Much of the antirecession legislation will have lasting value. Some of the antirecession laws adopted by the 85th Congress satisfy neither those who desired greater expenditures nor those who opposed any expenditures at all. Our choice, therefore, was whether to go along with a program which had some value at least, or to see a more ambitious program defeated.

Our problems were complicated, moreover, by the persistence of inflation in the face of large-scale unemployment which followed the slowdown in production. I think we learned that juggling interest rates and making credit harder to get are not necessarily good cures for signs of recession, and hurt small- and medium-sized businesses without com-

ing to grips either with the problem of inflation or the essential responsibility for maintaining confidence in the Nation's economy. The pay raises we gave to military, civil service, and postal employees were no more than modest, having regard for the increased cost of living.

What we need, it seems to me, is a recasting of the Employment Act of 1946 so as to coordinate Government credit and employment responsibilities. The need is for long-range planning which would inspire confidence in the economy, thereby avoiding or at least cutting down on the necessity for costly and inefficient emergency measures which may do more to feed inflation than to solve production slowdowns or unemployment.

The aim should be to make our essentially free-enterprise system work, because only in this way can we preserve our free society and our cherished civil liberties. When emergency measures are taken in the face of a deepening recession, the result is often aimless spending which does not take effect until after the recession is over. This kind of spending is more apt to be inflationary than to solve the problems which existed when the spending was authorized. A balanced budget, which we all want, is difficult to maintain in these circumstances.

PEACE AND NATIONAL SECURITY

The Russian sputniks shook our complacency in the field of science, no less than the Suez crisis taxed our foreign policy in the field of diplomacy. We have learned—what we should have known all along—that our Nation's security and international peace cannot be fragmentized; the reciprocal-trade law which the 85th Congress adopted is no less important a part of our mutual-security program than foreign aid in helping to keep the peace.

Some persons have the impression that our foreign-aid program is nothing more than a vast and purposeless giveaway. This program consists of three main parts: First, military assistance; second, defense support; third, technical and economic assistance. The first two account for most of the money; they are expenditures for the upkeep of foreign bases which we maintain for our own defense. The third, technical economic assistance, is a relatively small part of the program which operates essentially in our own interests as a world power and helps in the overall maintenance of international peace.

The National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 is a significant step in the right direction. This act establishes a space-age procedure for maintaining our preeminence in the science of outer space. Who controls outer space may control the world. We cannot shrink from the complications of the space age. The new space law is dedicated to the use of outer space for peaceful purposes and to fortification of the national defense.

The possibility of nuclear war is too awful to contemplate, and all efforts should be made for international agreement to suspend testing of atomic and hydrogen bombs. Now that scientists have agreed that detection of such testing is possible, there is greater reason for believing that such an agreement can be policed. If such an agreement can be made, the nations of the world would be free to pursue the startling advantages which we now know can come from the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

We missed a great opportunity in the Suez crisis to use our influence and prestige for establishing peace in the Middle East. Instead we humiliated our great allies, Britain and France, and our staunch friend in the Middle East, Israel. The Eisenhower doctrine for the Middle East has proven insufficient. It is questionable whether our intervention in Lebanon was desirable either as to time or place, and whether it was a proper step in combating the international Communist conspiracy.

EDUCATION

Federal aid for local elementary and secondary school construction failed of enactment, partly because President Eisenhower refused to support it, partly also because of the baseless view held by some that Federal interference with local education would result. This is one of the things which ought to be tackled promptly by the 86th Congress, which is scheduled to convene on January 7, 1959.

We did, however, succeed in enacting a program of Federal aid for higher education in the fields of science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages. While the program adopted is a modest one, it is at least a beginning—the first measure of its kind to be adopted by the Federal Government.

It is clear that education is a national asset, and in the present world situation it is a national responsibility. Expanding Federal aid for education is a clear responsibility of the Congress.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

I am naturally gratified that my bill to compel disclosure of private welfare benefit and pension plans was enacted into law. Millions of employee beneficiaries will be enabled for the first time to obtain information regarding the financial operation of the plans or trust funds upon which they rely for protection against the consequences of accident, illness, retirement, and death.

The Kennedy-Ives labor reform bill was defeated. I voted for it. The 86th Congress ought to make labor-management reform one of its first orders of business. One of the reasons for the defeat of the Kennedy-Ives bill was that it did not limit itself to labor-management reform but extended to controversial labor policy subjects such as Taft-Hartley amendments. In the next Congress, reform in such fields as trade-union democracy and protection of union funds will probably have to be separated from other highly controversial labor-management policy questions.

Our free private system of union-management relations ought not to be made a political football. Accordingly I introduced a proposed joint resolution for establishing a bipartisan House-Senate Committee on Union-Management Relations. The joint committee would have value in working out professional approaches to the delicate problems which arise in the field of collective bargaining and would discourage at least some of the politically inspired proposals which, if adopted, might do great harm to industrial peace.

LOOKING AHEAD

The forthcoming 86th Congress will meet next year in an atmosphere of urgency, for our foreign policy is in need of substantial improvement and much remains to be done in our domestic affairs. For example, little was done in the 85th Congress to remedy our unfair immigration laws. Necessary housing legislation failed to pass. These and other things left undone point up the continuing responsibility of the Congress for the welfare of our Nation.

Respect for our traditions of constitutional government enabled our 85th Congress to defeat ill-conceived proposals which sought to overturn important civil liberties decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. It is my hope that the forthcoming 86th Congress will again stand fast. Whether the issue be school desegregation in the South or the rights of accused persons to a fair trial anywhere, we belie our professed belief in the dignity of the individual when we fail to safeguard it against assaults from whatever source.

The 85th Congress was in the main a constructive Congress, and I am deeply thankful for the opportunity and privilege of having participated as one of its Members.

The Airlines and the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, most Americans agree that, until some better means comes along, the United Nations is our best hope for preservation of peace throughout the world. But the United Nations, Mr. Speaker, can be only as strong as the attitude the public holds toward it. Public opinion, if informed and aroused, can be one of the greatest forces in the world. That is why it is most encouraging to learn that the United States Committee for the United Nations has under way a program to enlist the support of all people behind the U. N. through American industry.

I recently had the pleasure of discussing this program with Mr. Roger Enloe, director of the committee's industry-participation division, and Maj. Gen. John P. Doyle, USAF (retired), executive director of the Independent Airlines Association, which is coordinating participation of its 23 member airlines in the program. From what I learned, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that American industry is rallying behind the program in a most heartening and highly commendable manner. Since too little is known about the ways private industry and business enterprises are actively supporting the United Nations, I would like to share

with my colleagues what I learned from Mr. Enloe and Major General Doyle.

The airlines program, Mr. Speaker, as outlined by Major General Doyle, calls for the U. N. symbol, modified by adding the initials "U. N." and the affirmation "We Believe," to be affixed to the entire fleet of over 100 airplanes operated by the association's member airlines. It will be placed just beside the passenger entrance where it will be in clear view of air travelers as they go aboard.

Passengers will be given a pamphlet entitled, "The Airlines and the United Nations" which explains that the airlines are placing the U. N. emblem on their planes as a visible demonstration of their belief in the principles and purposes of the United Nations as set forth in the preamble to the charter.

It expresses the airlines' hope that the traveling public will also share their desire to support the United Nations as an indispensable instrument of peace and justice.

The brochure gives the preamble to the U. N. Charter and contains significant quotations from President Eisenhower, former President Truman, and Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., United States Ambassador to the U. N. It adds that information on how the reader may take part may be obtained from the United States Committee for the United Nations at 375 Park Avenue, New York.

Here, in his own words, is the way Major General Doyle explained his industry's reasons for taking part in the program:

> It is the hope of our member airlines, who have served the Nation in time of war and in time of peace, that such a public reaffirmation of their belief in the principles of the United Nations might be a positive contribution toward lasting peace. The members of the Independent Airlines Association fully recognize that the best hope for preservation of peace and security throughout the world lies in the promotion of international understanding and good will. They further recognize that until something better comes along, the United Nations is and must continue to be the most potent force toward this objective. The policy of the United States Government is to strengthen the United Nations. We are supporting our Nation's policy. Our member carriers welcome this chance to use their proven wartime energy and genius in the pursuit of peace.

Mr. Enloe pointed out that the idea of airlines demonstrating support of the United Nations was conceived by Capt. Charles C. Dent on a flight from Denver to New York when he, his copilot, Richard Munger, and his flight engineer, James Dunn, were reminiscing about their war experiences and were wondering what they could do as individuals to promote world peace. The three enthusiastic airmen encountered such a favorable response when they discussed their idea with other airline people that they decided to approach the United States committee.

Captain Dent received a $5,500 bonus for a skillful and safe landing of a crippled plane at Los Angeles which he donated to the United States committee to help promote the program. The committee then established a new division—the industry participation division—whose function is to develop and administer a program for the extension of the idea to all branches of industry and commerce.

Mr. Enloe told me that in addition to the member carriers of the Independent Airlines Association, 15 other commercial airline companies have expressed a positive interest in participating, and a number of business firms are placing the emblem on their corporate aircraft.

He also informed me that permission to use the modified U. N. emblem was originally granted in connection with the air transport industry, but recently the United Nations has given his committee authority to extend the use of the modified emblem to all branches of industry and commerce. Some of the other uses of the symbol as outlined by Mr. Enloe are: Business firms and professional men are placing the emblem on their letterheads. A jewelry manufacturer is planning to place it in his national ads. Over 10,000 retail stores across the country will feature the program in February. A chain of theaters will frame the emblem and hang it in their box office and lobbies. Another firm is using it in its postage meter.

It is the hope of the United States committee, Mr. Speaker, that just as the Army-Navy "E" flag in World War II identified a company with the war effort, so will the modified U. N. symbol identify firms and groups with the effort for peace being made through the United Nations.

The United States committee and the industries and businesses associated in this program, Mr. Speaker, deserve the highest praise for their efforts in behalf of world peace and security.

Testimony of the Honorable John D. Dingell, of Michigan, on Behalf of Further Civil Rights Legislation Before the House Judiciary Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on July 7, 1958, I testified before the House Judiciary Subcommittee No. 5 urging enactment of additional civil rights legislation.

I am proud of H. R. 6127, the first civil rights bill passed by any Congress in over eight long decades. I was a sponsor of that legislation and took an active and vigorous part in the cooperative effort which began in the 84th Congress and which culminated in its enactment into law during this 85th Congress.

The one premise which is the very cornerstone of our democracy is that all men are created equal. A necessary corrolative of that is the premise that all citizens have a right to enjoy equally the rights and privileges of citizenship.

Enactment of H. R. 6127 was a great milestone in human rights. Although moderate, it does a number of things most necessary in the fight for full equality.

First. It establishes a Civil Rights Division within the Department of Justice headed by an Assistant Attorney General, a Cabinet officer, charged with the responsibility of enforcing existing civil rights legislation.

Second. It establishes a Civil Rights Commission to study and to report on denial of the right to vote because of race, color, or national origin.

Third. It provides that the Attorney General shall seek injunctive relief on behalf of citizens denied the right to vote. Such proceedings will culminate in the use of the courts' contempt power, and where necessary, appropriate punishment.

In my testimony before the House Judiciary Committee, I pointed out that the passage of my bill, H. R. 9652, to authorize the Attorney General to institute in the name of the United States civil actions for injunctive or other relief on behalf of persons whose civil rights, other than the right to vote, are being denied or impaired, was not only a moderate second step but was imperative. I also urged passage of my bills, H. R. 140, 141, 143, and 144, the first civil rights measures introduced during the 85th Congress.

I intend to continue to do everything possible by introduction of legislation, by cooperative efforts with other Members of Congress, and by work on the floor, to see that the provisions of these bills become law at the earliest possible date.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point my remarks before the House Judiciary Committee.

The remarks follow:

TESTIMONY OF HON. JOHN D. DINGELL, DEMOCRAT OF THE 15TH DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5 OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. Chairman, and my colleagues, it is both an honor and a pleasure to appear before you again, to testify on pending civil-rights legislation.

I would like to commend my dear friend, the chairman, one of the foremost civil libertarians of our time, and the committee for their outstanding part in the passage of H. R. 6127, the first civil rights act passed by any Congress in over eight long decades. I am proud of that bill and of my part in the cooperative effort which resulted in its passage.

We are learning from that bill, a most moderate and temperate first step forward, that Federal action in the field of civil rights is most worthwhile, and is neither disruptive of the power of our States, nor is it destructive of civil harmony, as we were warned in the direct terms by the opponents of H. R. 6127.

I will bottom my statement on the self-evident premise that it is the duty of the governments, both State and Federal, to take all steps necessary to protect to the fullest degree possible the rights and liberties of all our citizens, white, brown, Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, or atheist, regardless of nation of origin.

All of us are aware of the great words in the documents of the Founding Fathers, that all men are created equal. We are equally aware of the fact that the Holy Bible states that man is created in the image and likeness of God, and that when all of us go to our last judgment, we will be judged as children of God, and sent to our reward or

punishment not according to the color of our skin, but according to our works here on earth.

In spite of the awareness of these great truths, we find that in all parts of our great land, north, south, east and west, discrimination against our fellow men still stains the society of the finest democracy in history.

I do not contend that passage of the last Civil Rights Act, H. R. 6127, or of any of my pending bills, even the most comprehensive bill, H. R. 140, would remove these vicious practices from our midst. I realize, as do all thinking men, that the end of discrimination must come from within the hearts and souls of our peoples.

We must not, however, forget the vital function served by the enactment of adequate civil-rights legislation. Such legislation helps to create the climate of lawful and orderly progress toward that great goal which we all seek, full equality and opportunity for all our people. It punishes wrongdoers and removes the premium on virtue. Laws passed pursuant to the authority of the Constitution on this subject put teeth in the lofty sentiments expressed in that great document and compel compliance with minimum standards of conduct toward our fellow men.

No one would contend that even the strongest civil-rights legislation would prevent some denial of these rights to our citizens. Yet, we legislators have passed and enthusiastically supported legislation against homicide, crimes of violence, crimes against property, and other conduct viewed by our society as against the interests of our people. Surely no one would urge repeal of such statutes simply because we read in the papers of these same crimes each day.

Basically we are a law-abiding people, with a tremendous respect for law. Our laws create the social climate in which we live; they are both enunciative of our morals and beliefs, and creative of our mores and customs.

Accordingly, it is in the best interests of all our people that we should make the necessary strengthening amendments to our existing civil rights statutes.

It is within the context of this thought that I would like to discuss and urge early and favorable consideration of any or all of my bills on this subject.

In so doing I would point out the appropriateness of these bills to the tension, strife, ill feeling, and abuses occurring now in Dawson, Ga., and Little Rock, Ark., among other places. The right to belong to the quasi-official District of Columbia Bar Association is denied citizens because of race or color in our own Nation's Capital, and violence and discrimination exist in cities in the North.

To follow passage of the splendid bill, H. R. 6127, enacted into law by this Congress, I urge a second step, most moderate and yet most necessary. That is my bill, H. R. 9652. This bill authorizes the Attorney General to institute in the name of the United States civil actions for injunctive or other relief on behalf of persons whose civil rights are being denied or impaired.

This was a part of the civil-rights bill passed this session, but was stricken at an early stage by a weakening amendment. My bill creates no new crimes, but imposes on the Attorney General the obligation of taking reasonably necessary steps to protect all the civil rights of our citizens, instead of only the right to vote, now provided by enactment of H. R. 6127. Thus the courts receive opportunity and authority to assist in the difficult problems of protecting our people's rights. If wrongdoers in this field are so recalcitrant as to refuse to comply with lawful court order they may be punished for contempt, both civil and criminal, to enforce compliance.

I also urge favorable consideration of my other bills on civil rights. These were the first bills introduced on this subject this session and are:

H. R. 140

This is an omnibus civil-rights bill, outlawing lynching, discrimination in voting, housing, employment, and education, and creating a Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission with full enforcement powers. This measure also outlaws the poll tax in Federal elections.

H. R. 141

This is a simple measure outlawing the payment of poll tax as a prerequisite for voting in a Federal election.

H. R. 143

This bill outlaws lynching, that is the act of committing violence or murder on a citizen because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

H. R. 144

This is my Federal fair employment practices bill. It includes the establishment of a Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission, outlawing discrimination in hiring because of race or color, and provides for vigorous and adequate enforcement powers. This bill is quite similar to bills now in force in many of our States, where they are working very well, with good reception from workers, employers, and the public at large.

Members of the committee will no doubt notice that I did not mention H. R. 142, which provides for the creation of a civil-rights division in the Department of Justice, to be headed by an Assistant Attorney General. It is unnecessary to state that I am as pleased as other Members that this provision is now law, since it was included in the Civil Rights Act of this session.

In conclusion I would like to thank each and every member of the committee for this opportunity to appear and be heard. I would like to leave expressing my feeling that great as the progress is to date, much more can be done, and must be done, if we are to continue to preach our proud and wonderful ideals of equality in America without hypocrisy and sham. We may deceive ourselves on this, but we cannot deceive the watching world, or history, on our action on human rights.

Farmers Are Better Off Because We Did Not Impose Restrictive Legislation on Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, we have with us a classic example of how upon occasion it is wisest not to rock the boat. I refer to the fact that farm income is up this year to a really surprising extent.

Figures released by the Department of Agriculture in July show that net income for farmers during the first half of 1958 totaled $13.3 billion, an increase of some 22 percent over the figure for the same period in 1957.

I can recall debate in the House of Representatives earlier this year when the House had under consideration the price-freeze resolution, the one which President Eisenhower had the courage and good sense to veto, in which it was alleged that if the bill did not become law, the farmers would perish. The farmer, we were told, was on the downgrade; his income was declining and he faced bankruptcy.

The figures for the first half of 1958 do not bear these allegations out. It would seem to me that a free economy is a healthy economy. If we need any further proof of this, let us only look at the farmers' income figures.

Clair Engle: His Record and His Views on Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. F. SISK
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I wish to commend my distinguished friend and colleague, Representative CLAIR ENGLE, for his past contribution to and continuing interest in the veterans' benefit program.

CLAIR ENGLE'S interest and participation in the drafting of both the World War II and Korean GI bills of rights are well known to his colleagues and are a matter of record. Public Law 346 of the 78th Congress, commonly known as the GI bill of rights, was enacted by Congress and approved by the President in the form written and reported by the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, of which Mr. ENGLE was a member. The record of the hearings shows that Mr. ENGLE participated actively in the development of the GI bill that eventually became law. In the 82d Congress, Public Law 500, the Korean GI bill, was enacted. This bill resulted from an investigation by a select committee of the abuses under the World War II program. Mr. ENGLE was the second ranking Democrat of this select committee which held frequent hearings from September 1950 to June 1952. Following the committee's extensive inquiry a bill reflecting the committee's findings and recommendations was prepared and introduced in the House of Representatives. This bill formed the basis for the Korean GI bill that was subsequently enacted. Mr. ENGLE'S service in the select committee has been singled out for special praise by the chairman of that committee, Representative OLIN E. TEAGUE, the present chairman of the standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the House of Representatives.

Mr. ENGLE'S interest in veterans' affairs and his sound understanding of the veterans' benefit program did not end with his service on the Veterans' Affairs Committee. This is clearly evident in a speech he made recently—excerpts of which I am pleased to include at this point:

EXCERPTS OF SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN CLAIR ENGLE

In bringing you a report on veterans' legislation in the Congress, I think that it is

appropriate that I begin by telling you that the Congress has almost completed action on the annual appropriation bill which will provide support for the Veterans' Administration for the next fiscal year. That bill will provide $4.9 billion and will support the finest veterans' program operated by any nation in the world. This appropriation will provide money for the continued operation of our 173 Veterans' Administration hospitals, which hospitalize 115,000 patients every day. It will continue operation of the veterans' insurance program, which provides coverage for 6 million veterans. The loan guaranty operation of the Veterans' Administration will provide housing loans for 350,000 veterans this year. Five hundred thousand veterans are currently receiving education and training benefits and the bulk of the appropriation, $3.2 billion, will go to the several million veterans and their surviving dependents who receive pensions and compensation. The continued support of our fine veterans' program by the Congress and by the public generally is demonstrated in this appropriation of nearly $5 billion. There are, however, some objectives which remain to be achieved, and I would like to discuss those briefly now.

Compensation to service-connected disabled veterans and surviving widows and children of servicemen who lost their lives during a period of war from a service-connected cause represents an obligation of the highest character in our veterans' program. All of our veterans' programs must take a secondary position to service-connected compensation. The Democratic 85th Congress has increased service-connected compensation for disabled veterans by rates varying from 10 to 25 percent. The Democratic 84th Congress increased rates of compensation to widows and children by about 30 percent. These recent increases have greatly improved the service-connected compensation program. However, there are several things remaining to be done.

The rate of compensation for a permanent and totally disabled service-connected veteran is $225 a month. In certain specific cases, this rate is increased by statutory awards. These statutory awards serve a useful purpose in the cases where they apply, but the whole system needs further study to insure that the totally disabled veterans not receiving a statutory award are being properly cared for. In my opinion, $225 is not sufficient compensation for a totally disabled veteran; yet that is all that a 100 percent disabled mental case, or a veteran confined to a bed from a constitutional disorder receives. We should study this category of seriously disabled and do more for them.

The present system of aid and attendance allowance for paralyzed veterans is inadequate. We should increase the aid and attendance allowance in an effort to remove these veterans from the hospitals and return them to their homes where they might enjoy some semblance of home and family life.

The Democratic 84th Congress passed one of the finest pieces of legislation in the veterans' program. I am referring to the War Orphans Educational Assistance Act of 1956. That law provides scholarship assistance to the children of servicemen who lost their lives in war service. I believe this program should be expended to provide the same type of scholarship assistance to the children of veterans totally disabled from a service-connected cause.

The veterans' hospital and medical program is one of the finest benefits available to veterans. We are, of course, obligated to furnish medical care for the veteran with a service-connected disability. In addition, we provide medical care for veterans with non-service-connected disabilities where the veteran is unable to provide his own care. There is nothing of greater importance to be done for a man than to give him medical assistance when he is unable to care for himself, thereby removing his physical disability and restoring his earning capacity.

The veterans' hospital and medical program is confronted with serious problems, and unless immediate action is taken by the administration and the Congress the Federal Government will no longer be able to fulfill its pledge to veterans to provide medical care second to none. There are several things which can be done immediately by the administration and the Congress which will improve medical services to veterans both in scope and quality.

As a result of the budgetary policies followed during the past 6 years, there has been a steady curtailment of the bed capacities of Veterans' Administration hospitals. On December 31, 1957, there was a total of 7,308 beds in Veterans' Administration hospitals unavailable for patient care. Of this number, 4,974 were unavailable for the care of veterans because of an administrative decision that these beds are not required to meet current operating plans. It would be more honest if these beds were placed in a classification "sufficient budget not provided VA to operate these beds." Of the 4,974 beds currently withheld from operation by administrative decision, 1,354 are in TB hospitals, 101 are in mental hospitals, and 3,519 are in general medical and surgical hospitals. These beds were constructed at costs to the Federal Government exceeding an average of $10,000 per bed.

Laws enacted by Congress state that care will be provided to eligible veterans to the extent that facilities are available to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The intent of these laws enacted by Congress is being circumvented by administrative and budgetary decisions which have closed 4,974 beds. The budget presented by the administration to the Congress for fiscal year 1959 contemplates a further reduction of services to veterans and, if approved, would reduce the average daily patient load in Veterans' Administration hospitals by an additional 1,000 patients per day. In other words, we have approximately 5,000 beds now withdrawn from the program, and if the current budget proposed by the President is accepted by the Congress this number will exceed 6,000 in another year.

This completely undesirable situation can be rectified by the Congress by adding to the Veterans' Administration medical budget, which is now under consideration, funds for inpatient care. However, it will also be necessary for language to be added in the appropriations bills directing the Administrator to place these vacant beds into use for veterans, thus freeing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs from the administrative control which is now being exercised in this field by the Bureau of the Budget.

Two years ago a program was devised by the Veterans' Administration, the House Appropriations Committee, and the Veterans' Affairs Committee which called for a long-range modernization and replacement program in Veterans' Administration hospitals. Under this program, 9 old hospitals were to be completely replaced and major repairs were to be accomplished in 50 other hospitals at a cost exceeding one-half billion dollars over a period of 8 years. It was agreed that the minimum level of activity should not be less than $50 million a year. The Veterans' Administration requested $43,374,000 for its replacement and modernization program for fiscal year 1959. The President's budget reduced this amount to $9,145,000, or a reduction of $34,229,000.

This reduction is not justified. It is not good business to neglect the state of repair of our vast veterans' hospital facilities, valued at more than $2½ billion, and certainly if the economic needs of the Nation justify increased expenditures for public projects, this category of projects should receive first consideration. Strangely enough, it has not been mentioned at all by the administration in the proposals for expanded public works. Here again action can be taken by the Congress to restore funds cut from the Veterans' Administration budget by the administration. Several California hospitals are involved in this program. Extensive repairs are planned in Veterans' Administration hospitals at San Francisco and Palo Alto, Calif.

The Veterans' Administration has been steadily losing ground in its efforts to recruit doctors, nurses, and technical medical personnel. The primary reason has been the inadequate salary structure in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration. As medical salaries rise in private, State and other public hospitals, the Veterans' Administration is experiencing greater difficulty in retaining its personnel. The Congress has passed a bill which gives substantial increases in the salaries for doctors, nurses, and technical medical personnel in Veterans' Administration hospitals. This legislation will do much to support the quality of medical care being provided in Veterans' Administration hospitals.

The following steps should be taken to maintain and support the veterans' hospital and medical program:

1. Adequate appropriations must be provided for high quality medical care.

2. The 6,000 beds vacant in VA hospitals through arbitrary administrative policy should be restored to use for veterans.

3. The replacement, renovation, and repair program for VA hospitals should be accelerated.

A serious discrimination exists in the pension program. Widows of World War II veterans are not permitted to participate in the pension program on the same basis as widows of veterans of World War I. A widow of a World War I veteran is eligible for a pension, provided she meets the income limitation set out in the law. However, a widow of a World War II veteran may not receive a pension unless her husband had a service-connected disability at the time of his death. Most of the deaths occurring at this time to World War II veterans leave a widow with small children; yet the widow is not given the small widow's pension at a time in her life when she needs it most. This discriminatory situation should be corrected by legislative action. In my opinion, this is the most important issue confronting veterans in the pension field.

There are some deficiencies in the veterans' pension program. There are 63,000 veterans receiving a pension who are so disabled as to qualify for an aid and attendance allowance. These veterans receive $135 a month. This amount is insufficient to provide adequate care for these seriously disabled persons.

There are some inconsistencies in the employability requirements of the veterans' pension program. The result is that some veterans seriously in need are denied a pension because they attempt to hold part-time jobs producing very little income. The pension program for veterans should be revised so that veterans with a limited income and serious physical disabilities may participate.

The Democratic 85th Congress has just passed a housing bill which will be of great benefit to veterans. The loan-guaranty program for World War II veterans was extended 2 additional years, and $350 million was made available for direct loans in small towns and rural areas. Korean veterans will continue to be eligible for home-loan benefits until 1965. Congress must continue to study the home-loan program to assure that this group of veterans have an opportunity to participate through the period of eligibility.

One of the most talked of veteran matters in Washington is the report of the Bradley Commission. In his budget message to Congress, the President promised that he would deliver a special message to Congress on veteran affairs, based on the recommendations of the Bradley Commission. Since I am on the opposite side of the political fence, the White House does not confide in me, but I will pass on to you the reports we are receiving around Congress regarding the Bradley Commission and the President's message to Congress.

It is understood that the message was prepared and presented to the Republican leaders of the House and Senate at the weekly legislative conference at the White House, and that these gentlemen in Congress were so incensed as to the proposed recommendations of the President that they insisted that the message not be delivered. The item was deferred from one week to another on the agenda of the weekly legislative meeting and at this point the belief is that there will be no message.

I can certainly understand why the Republican Congressional leaders were apprehensive about the message. If the message is delivered by the President based on the major recommendations of the Bradley Commission, it will not find acceptance in Congress and it will antagonize veterans all over the Nation.

Let me describe a few of the recommendations which are in this drastic category. The Bradley Commission recommended that statutory awards to disabled veterans be discontinued. They proposed that all veterans with service-connected disabilities be paid within the framework of 10 to 20 percent, and no additional statutory payments be made. This would mean that our most seriously disabled veterans, those who have been deprived of their sight, those who have lost limbs, those who are paralyzed, and those who have suffered a combination of these serious disabilities, would be curtailed in their service-connected compensation. Nothing could have less merit. Instead, we should be going in exactly the opposite direction and increasing compensation for the seriously disabled.

The Bradley Commission took a dim view of the payment of service-connected compensation to veterans in the 10 to 20 percent disability categories. It is indicated that many of these awards should be discontinued and that the rating schedule should be revised so that it would not be possible to obtain a 10 percent disability rating except under very limited circumstances. It is my opinion that a veteran suffering a disability deserves to be compensated for it, whether it is 10 percent or 100 percent.

The Bradley Commission's report paid lipservice to the idea that pensions for widows of World War I and World War II and Korea be equalized. It, in fact, recommended an identical program for all types of widows, a program which I think could be characterized, "Let's all starve together." The Commission proposed that widows with minor children receive pensions subject to an income limitation, but that when the widow no longer had minor children, she would no longer be eligible for a pension unless she could prove that she was unemployable or had reached age 65.

These are just a few of the recommendations of the Commission which were to provide the basis for the President's message on veterans. The prospect of this message has caused a great deal of unrest among veteran organizations, but I think I can assure you that there is no great cause for concern. Congress, over the years, has demonstrated a great concern for the welfare of the veterans of this Nation and it is not at all probable that such recommendations will be enacted into law, even if they are made by the President.

On the subject of legislation, let me make my position clear on an important part of our legislative program. The major veterans' organizations have passed resolutions supporting the formation of a Veterans' Affairs Committee in the Senate. I served on the Veterans' Affairs Committee in the House for several years and have a full appreciation of the legislative problems which are involved. If I am elected to the Senate, which I expect to be, you can count on my support for the creation of a Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

The Declaration of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent Fourth of July address delivered this year at Watergate, Washington, D. C., by our distinguished Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson.

I believe all who read it will find it inspirational. He speaks of the values, moral and spiritual, that have made this the greatest country in all history of mankind.

The address follows:

This 4th day of July 1958 is a day of remembrance. But it is even more a day of challenge.

What is it that we commemorate here today? Is it a document—a momentous event in Philadelphia July 4, 1776?

Yes, but much more than a document or an event.

Today we commemorate courage. One hundred and eighty-two years ago 56 men signed the Declaration of Independence knowing they might well be fastening the hangman's noose around their own necks. That was courage.

Today we commemorate the birth of political freedom. The founders of this Nation believed man had the right to be free and the right to grow in every aspect of his being. They believed "it is not right that any man should be in bondage one to another." They believed that men are capable of self-government and that it is the job of government to protect freedom and foster growth.

Today we commemorate faith. Where did the rights of man come from? From the God of Heaven. "Men," states the Declaration, "are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights." The founders of this Republic had deeply spiritual beliefs. Their concept of man had a solidly religious foundation.

Today we commemorate prayerfulness, for the founders were prayerful men. When Washington was desperately hard pressed at Valley Forge, his men found him on his knees begging for guidance and aid. Later, it became the custom to open deliberations of the Constitutional Convention of 1887 with morning prayer. This Nation has a spiritual foundation.

Courage, freedom, faith, and prayerfulness. These we commemorate this Independence Day.

But this July 4 is even more a day of challenge.

In country after country today, faith in moral principle is ruthlessly ridiculed. The belief that man has inalienable rights is rudely shaken. Godless men have seized power over one-third of the world's people. With iron fists they hammer down all who would oppose them in God's name or in the name of humanity.

Let us have no illusions about this. Their purpose is not alone to enslave us—they want to bury us.

What we face today is not just cold war, not just a struggle for the control of land, sea, air, and even outer space, but total competition for the control of men's minds. Unless we meet it and defeat it, we shall almost inevitably one day face total destruction.

Where communism prevails, faith, freedom, morality, and religion die.

We believe in an allwise Creator. Godless Communists hold that everything in existence came about as a result of ceaseless motion among the forces of nature.

We believe in the dignity of man. They hold that human beings are but graduate beasts.

We believe in a moral code. They hold that there is no such thing as innate right or wrong.

We believe in religion as a mode of life resulting from our faith in God. They hold that all religion must be overthrown because it inhibits the spirit of world revolution.

There is no compromise with evil such as this.

Can we meet the challenge? Yes, we can, through steadfast dedication to eternal principles of right.

True, the Iron Curtain countries are making great strides under forced draft. But science and technology have always flowered best where freedom prevailed. We know what freedom can produce in benefits to all people. Our free enterprise system is living evidence of the abundant fruits of freedom.

Ours is a more classless society by far than can be found anywhere back of the Iron Curtain. Here a workman off the job is hardly distinguishable from a high salaried executive. The office boy shaves with the same kind of razor as the tycoon. The little house in the valley has the same kind of heating and light as the mansion on the hill.

In a moment we shall see a display of fireworks. Let it symbolize the fire of devotion to freedom rekindled in the hearts of all of us.

Yes, let it symbolize a reaffirmation of patriotism, for this is a patriotic day. But patriotism is more than flag waving and fireworks. It is how we respond to public issues. If we ask only, "What's in this proposal for me?—what do I get out of it?"—we're not patriotic and we're not very good citizens. But if we ask, "Is this right?—is it good for the American people?—would it preserve and strengthen our freedom?"—then we deserve to stand in the company of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln. Patriotism is trying always to give a little more to the Nation than we receive.

This year we celebrate the centennial of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt. Half a century ago he said, "We hold in our hands the hope of the world, the fate of the coming years; and shame and disgrace will be ours if in our eyes the light of high resolve is dimmed, if we trail in the dust the golden hopes of men."

With God's help, the light of high resolve in the eyes of the American people must never be dimmed. Our freedom must—and will—be preserved.

Our problems today call for greatness and courage just as insistently as did the era of 1776. Just as then, a new age is dawning today. The world has suddenly become so small that all nations and all men are next-door neighbors. Just as our great-grandfathers of 182 years ago stood proudly for freedom in their new-dawning era, so today we must steel ourselves to the building of an era in which liberty can truly live.

Here in our free land let us preserve a true climate in which men can grow. Here with Lincoln we can say: "As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master." And here we can add, "But I will be free, free to worship, free to speak, free to grow."

This is a choice land—choice above all others. Blessed by the Almighty, our forebears have made and kept it so. It will continue to be a land of freedom and liberty as long as we are able and willing to advance in the light of sound and enduring principles of right. To sacrifice such principles for momentary expediency—often selfishly motivated—is to endanger our noble heritage and is unworthy of this great American people.

With each of you, I love this Nation. It is my firm belief that the God of Heaven guided the Founding Fathers in establishing it for His particular purposes. But God's purpose is to build people of character, not physical monuments to their material accumulations.

Our challenge is to keep America strong—strong economically, strong socially, and, above all, spiritually strong—so that our way of life may endure.

Daniel Webster said: "God grants liberty only to those who love it and are always ready to guard and defend it." The future of this choice land demands more than sound fiscal and economic policies—important though these are. Nations that truly love freedom love God. History is replete with examples of once powerful nations that have forgotten God. No nation ripened in iniquity can long endure. "Righteousness exalteth a nation; but sin is a reproach to any people" (Proverbs 14: 34).

Our forefathers gave birth to the ideal of freedom. Our fathers nourished and defended that heritage. Like them, we are resolved to make faith, morality, and freedom the vital forces of daily living, and because of this heritage and this resolution we shall climb through the years to new heights of well-being, strength, and peace. Then let us here and now rededicate ourselves to the unfinished task remaining before us. This Nation, under God, conceived in liberty, must and will have a new birth of freedom.

God grant it may be so I humbly pray.

Legislation of Special Interest to Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, as the 85th Congress draws to a close, we are happy to find that the 70 recommendations of the so-called Bradley Commission seem no nearer enactment into law than they were that day in April 1956, when these antiveteran proposals were recommended by this Commission. This Bradley Commission recommended the destruction or at least the limitation of certain rights which have been recognized as those due veterans for many years. Apparently there have been no further attempts to enact the Bradley recommendations because their proponents feel there is not a sufficient number of Congressmen who are willing to support them.

As soon as the import of the Bradley recommendations were known, I began to receive pitiful and even frantic communications from veterans and their widows who would be adversely affected by such legislation. I answered these communications and spoke at various veterans' meetings assuring them that I believed we could defeat most of these proposals. I am very pleased that these Bradley recommendations have not been enacted. It is well that the friends of veterans were able to accomplish more than they did when that ill-named Economy Act of 1933 was passed, which caused many veterans to be thrown out of hospitals without even clothing to cover their nakedness. In spite of the organized efforts of certain groups, the American people still respect and honor the veterans.

It is incumbent on all of us to see that this respect is always maintained. It is up to us as veterans to see that we do not ask for privileges in behalf of veterans which are unfair or unjust. To do so would tend to destroy that confidence and respect which the American people so justly give the veterans who defended our country in time of need.

VETERANS' RIGHTS WERE AFFIRMED BY THE COURT

A well-organized effort to destroy the accepted veterans' preference in employment in Federal agencies was initiated recently when a group filed a suit in the district court in the District of Columbia alleging that the veterans' preference provisions were unconstitutional. The title of the suit was Wesley D. White, and others, against Thomas S. Gates, Jr., Secretary of the Navy, and Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army. They lost in the district court and appealed to the United States circuit court of appeals, where the case was argued late in October 1957. Among other things the court held that "Veterans' preference in Federal employment has been an established policy of Congress for many years. Encouragement and reward of military service are its rational basis." In June 1958, this decision was appealed to the Supreme Court which ruled, "Certiorari denied," which means that the Supreme Court accepted the ruling of the circuit court of appeals and so affirmed the constitutionality of veterans' preference.

SOCIAL SECURITY FOR DISABLED VETERANS

Under legislation passed in 1956, a person who is covered by social security and becomes totally disabled after the age of 50 may draw social security benefits at that time instead of waiting until age 65. However, this legislation called for deducting from social security payments the amount of veterans' benefits—total non-service-connected pensions—which the veteran was drawing. That is, if the veteran was under 65 years of age and was drawing $66.15 for total nonservice disability and also eligible for a $90 social security payment because of total disability, then the social security payment was reduced by the $66.15 and he received only a total of $90 from both veterans' and social-security payments. The new social-security amendments eliminate this inequality toward the veteran.

COMPENSATIONS AND PENSIONS

Public Law 85–168, which became effective on October 1, 1957, increased rates of compensation for service-connected disabilities by a minimum of 10 percent and up to 24 percent for total disability. The law included liberalizations in other ways. We were not able to get the statutory compensation cases included in this legislation, but we hope to pass a bill affecting them in the near future.

Public Law 85–425, effective July 1, 1958, provides that the pensions for the widows of Spanish-American War veterans are increased from $54.18 to $65; and, if they were married at the time the veteran was in service, the pension is increased from $67.73 to $75. Widows of veterans of the Mexican War, of Indian wars, and of the Civil War also received increases in pensions.

VETERANS' HOUSING

The Veterans' Housing Act passed in the 1st session of the 85th Congress was vetoed but practically all of the provisions in the act have been incorporated in Public Law 85–364. It authorizes $150 million for direct loans for each of the years 1959 and 1960. It also increases the maximum amount of direct loans from $10,000 to $13,500. VA housing has accomplished a great deal of good, but it has not produced the results we had hoped for because of administrative difficulties and the difficulty of getting local lending institutions to participate. There is apparently a need for more money to be used in making direct loans.

HOSPITALIZATION AND HEALTH BENEFITS

The veterans' hospitalization program has progressed well. The quality of hospital service given the veteran is excellent, but there is still a shortage of hospital facilities and this especially applies to those for mental cases. Progress is being made but not with the speed many of us desire. The President's budget for 1959 requested $707 million for veterans' hospitalization. The Senate and House conferees approved a budget for 1959 of $717.2 million.

There has been a change in veterans' insurance. In the past a veteran could only buy $5 a month total disability income protection for each $1,000 of insurance carried pursuant to the National Service Life Insurance Act. This has been increased to $10 a month income protection for each $1,000 of insurance. Of course, the applicant must meet the requirements of good health and other usual specifications for this coverage.

Another bill, which probably will be signed into law, would permit veterans of the Korean war period to convert their national service life insurance to ordinary policies or to carry term insurance at greatly reduced premiums.

Public Law 85–674 increases the Federal Government burial benefits from $150 to $250.

OTHER RECENT VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Veterans of World War I organization received a Federal charter. In the last Congress, the House passed the World War I pension bill which generally followed the desires of this group, but the

Senate did not act on it. Legislation on this subject will be introduced again in the next session. I signed a petition to bring this legislation before the House but we did not succeed in accomplishing this.

Ten bills for the benefit of veterans passed the House but were not acted on in the Senate this session.

For many years there has been a need to have all of the legislation pertaining to veterans assembled in a single book and printed by the Government. It will be available in the next few months. I hope to have some copies for distribution.

Veterans are especially interested in legislation to curb communism and anti-American activities. The Supreme Court in recent years has made decisions which tend to nullify or prevent the enforcement of several laws passed for that purpose. In Congress we tried to pass legislation that would meet the demands of the Supreme Court, yet would prevent anti-American activities. We were not as successful as many of us desired in getting such legislation approved. The House did pass a bill giving our Government the right to deny passports to enemies of our country, but the Senate took no action on this legislation. I believe that we can get some tangible results in this field in the next Congress.

Trinity Partnership Will Pay for 10th District Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the good people in the Congressional District which I have the honor to represent have long been interested in sound water resources development.

We have been for the construction of the Central Valley project on which over $800 million of Federal taxpayers' money has been expended. They need over $250 million to complete this project. The San Luis project which will cost the Federal taxpayers over $300 million will probably soon be authorized.

More of direct interest locally, we have the San Lorenzo River project which requires about another $1 million to complete.

Many of us are interested in the Guadalupe flood control study which will require some $75,000.

The Soquel study, some $15,000.

The Pajaro project, some $50,000.

The Santa Cruz Harbor project will cost in the neighborhood of $1 million.

The Santa Cruz beach erosion correction will cost another $1 million.

Recently I introduced House Joint Resolution 585 which directed that a study be made by the Bureau of Reclamation to determine the feasibility and cost of integrating the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project with Santa Clara, San Benito, Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties by way of the Pacheo Tunnel. This development would cost approximately $29 million.

All of this represents a lot of money but the need is evident.

The fact is, however, that we are faced with a $12 billion deficit and Congress, just a few days ago again increased the Federal debt ceiling. It seems to me that we simply have to realize that we cannot have our cake and eat it, too. If we want these projects that I have just referred to we are going to have to pay for them and what is more important, we are going to have to find ways and means of being able to pay for them.

I have proposed that we do just this and have introduced and supported legislation which would provide the dollars required for these projects. I introduced a bill, H. R. 10005, which would provide for the joint development of the water power resources of the Trinity River division, Central Valley project. Hearings were completed on this legislation by the House Interior Committee last February but a final vote has never been taken.

Back in 1955, when the Congress authorized the Trinity River division of the Central Valley project, it specifically directed the Secretary of the Interior to submit to the Congress the results of his study and his recommendations on the question of the sale of Trinity falling water to a non-Federal agency.

The Secretary did exactly what Congress directed him to do. He gave the Congress the results of his study together with his recommendations.

While all qualified power agencies, public and private, were given the opportunity to submit a proposal for the purchase of falling water, only the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. submitted a proposal.

The Secretary studied this proposal for many months. He submitted it to the Congress and recommended its adoption. His reasons were clear-cut, concise, and to the point.

It is necessary that we bear in mind that Congress, when it authorized the Central Valley project back in 1937—and Trinity is now a part of the Central Valley project—it specifically directed that power revenues were to be used to financially aid and assist the water features of the project.

The Secretary's recommendations favoring partnership development of Trinity power facilities is fully in keeping with the Congressional directive of 1957 and is a logical outgrowth of that directive.

After the Secretary had submitted his recommendations, I introduced H. R. 10005, which would carry out the Secretary's recommendations. Identical bills were introduced by my fellow California Congressmen, HUBERT SCUDDER and JAMES B. UTT.

Remember, I said that I was convinced that my bill would help solve the financial problem of water development; so let us see just what passage of my bill would accomplish.

In the first place, the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., not the Federal Government, would build the Trinity power facilities. This would save the Federal Government $60 million. That is more than enough to build the Pacheo Tunnel, to complete the Guadalupe flood-control study, the Soquel study, the Pajaro study, the Santa Cruz Harbor improvement, and the Santa Cruz beach-erosion facility. It would also complete the San Lorenzo improvement, and still leave over $27 million to apply on completion of the Central Valley project or the San Luis project.

But that by no means is all. If the Federal Government builds the power facilities, it would actually result in a financial drag and a drain on the entire Central Valley project. Actually, power produced from Federal Trinity plants would cost between 7.3 and 8.9 mills per kilowatt-hour and would be sold for less than 5 mills per kilowatt-hour, principally to the Sacramento Municipal Utility District.

On the other hand, from joint development we find that the surplus in the entire Central Valley project fund over the repayment period would be $175 million more than under all Federal development. So here is $175 million, in addition to the $60 million mentioned before, which can be used to assure the construction of all these projects we have been talking about.

Nor is this even the whole picture. Under joint development, the P. G. & E. would pay over $80 million in Federal taxes. Apply this to the financial problem we have in California.

The State and local governments can certainly use the more than $60 million which would accrue to them from tax revenues on P. G. & E. plants. The need for more schools, police, and fire protection and other community facilities is growing constantly and the communities which supply these services certainly need all the tax revenue they can get.

Lest I be accused of unfairness, I will at least refer to the arguments used against Trinity partnership. Some so-called preference agencies might possibly be denied access to federally produced Trinity power. Even if this is so—can you think of a good reason why certain preferred customers should get some federally produced power even if this means giving up all of the advantages that I have referred to above. Are we not going to have to make up our mind on one point first: Shall Federal taxpayers' money be expended to benefit all the people or just a preferred favored few. Bear in mind that SMUD is right now getting two-thirds of all of the firm power of the Central Valley project at less than 4½ mills per kilowatt hour. They would get the biggest hunk of Federal Trinity power. So do you want a bigger giveaway to SMUD or do you want these projects that I have just enumerated and others yet to come.

Some of the fine cities in my Congressional District which own their own electrical distribution system might conceivably be served from Federal Trinity plants. How much they actually could save is problematical. I know they do not want the Federal taxpayer to pay part of their electric bill. The Secretary said that the cost of Federal Trinity

power production would be 8.9 mills per kilowatt hour.

So let us not be lead by ideologies and private against public power shopworn arguments. Let us apply common sense. Let us try to solve our financial problem.

Brief Filed in the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the issues involved in the proceeding before the Supreme Court concerning a delay in integration of Central High School in my State are so crucial to the future of the educational systems of many areas of our Nation, that I have requested the permission of the Supreme Court to file a brief expressing my views on the subject. I ask that the brief be printed in full in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the brief was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, AUGUST SPECIAL TERM 1958—JOHN AARON, ET AL., PETITIONERS, V. WILLIAM G. COOPER, ET AL., MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE LITTLE ROCK, ARK., INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT, AND VIRGIL T. BLOSSOM, SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, RESPONDENTS

BRIEF OF J. W. FULBRIGHT AMICUS CURIAE

It is not the purpose here to burden the record of this Court by a lengthy repetition of the facts or the legal principles developed by the attorneys for the respondents and in the opinions of the lower courts. The indulgence of this Court is respectfully asked to hear an individual who is deeply troubled for the future peace and happiness of the people of Arkansas and of this Nation, of all races and all creeds.

Special indulgence of this Court is requested to the arguments herein set forth, not because I am a legal expert or a social scientist, but simply because for more than 50 years, I have lived among the people of Arkansas, and for more than 15 years, I have represented them in the Congress of the United States, from which experience I claim some intimate knowledge of local conditions and of the mental and spiritual landscape against which the people of Arkansas live and move.

The people of Arkansas are as law abiding, as respectful of the traditions of our Anglo-Saxon heritage as are their fellow Americans; they abhor anarchy and disorder. In truth, until the recent violence, it had ben 30 years since racial disorder had troubled the people of Arkansas.

From the complete destruction of their economy during the War Between the States, the people of Arkansas have slowly rebuilt their fortunes and their standing in the Nation. It may be that they are more sensitive to criticism than is the average American.

By way of emphasis, I call the attention of this Court to certain considerations involved in the pending matter.

This Court has said the "constitutional principle" involved in the decision of *Brown* v. *Board of Education* (347 U. S. 483 (1954)), "may require solution of varied local school problems."

"Courts will have to consider whether the action of school authorities constitutes good faith implementation of the governing constitutional principles. Because of their proximity to local conditions * * * the courts which originally heard these cases can best perform this judicial appraisal." *Brown* v. *Board of Education* (349 U. S. 294, 299 (1955)).

The Court directed that the district courts should be guided by equitable principles, which, it said, traditionally had been "characterized by a practical flexibility in shaping its remedies and by a facility for adjusting and reconciling public and private needs" (id. at 300).

Judge Harry J. Lemley, of the Federal District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas, is the judge who is, in the words of the court, in proximity to local conditions and he has found positively and unequivocally that the Little Rock School Board has in good faith attempted to comply with the rulings of this Court in the Brown decisions, *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, supra, but that conditions are so chaotic that a delay should be granted the Litttle Rock School Board in order to enable calmer spirits to find a way to conform to the principles enunciated by this Court.

A review of the decisions of Judge Lemley and the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals leaves little doubt that the educational processes at Central High School were disrupted to an incalculable extent notwithstanding the good-faith efforts of the school board to comply with this Court's general rule in the first Brown decision. See *Aaron* v. *Cooper* (Civil No. 3113, D. Ark., June 20 1958); *Aaron* v. *Cooper* (Civil No. —, 8th Cir., August 18, 1958).

Judge Lemley, in his attempt to interpret and carry out the mandate of this court in the second Brown decision, determined that these disruptive conditions were intolerable. The circuit court of appeals did not deny this. Indeed, the opinion of the court seems to reinforce it. In summarizing the 11 events of the school year, the court said that, in general, "there was bedlam and turmoil in and upon the school premises, outside of the classrooms." *Aaron* v. *Cooper* (Civil No. —, 8th Cir., August 18, 1958). The court elsewhere, and in general, conceded that the normal educational processes were disturbed.

This Court in the first Brown decision (347 U. S. 483 at 493), observed that "education is perhaps the most important function of State and local governments." If this is true, then is not the primary duty of the school board that of providing proper public education? What more can the board do than that which it has done; that is, to attempt in good faith to provide that which it is its duty to provide, and which it cannot do under these circumstances?

The circuit court of appeals in its decision washed its hands of this question; that is, how white and Negro children can be accorded public education in compliance with this Court's ruling in the first Brown decision, without bedlam and turmoil.

"It is not the province of this court," said the circuit court of appeals, "to advise the board as to the means of implementing integration in the Little Rock schools." *Aaron* v. *Cooper* (8th Cir., supra). Whose province is it? Is it not the province of equity, to which this court was committed by the second Brown decision, to adapt its statement of constitutional principles to the purposes, functions, and abilities of the institution to which those principles are suddenly to apply—that is, the public-school systems of the South?

What, indeed, is the purpose of entrusting equitable jurisdiction to local Federal district courts, if it is not to permit an appraisal of what can be done to comply with the orders of this court in the light of good faith efforts of local school boards?

The circuit court gave no answer to this dilemma.

"Mindful as we are that the incidents which occurred within Central High School produced a situation which adversely affected normal educational processes, we nevertheless are compelled to hold that such incidents are insufficient to constitute a legal basis for suspension of the plan to integrate. * * * To hold otherwise would result in accession to the demands of insurrectionists or rioters." *Aaron* v. *Cooper* (8th Cir., supra).

While this statement, which surely is the essence of the decision, has validity as a general rule, how can it be adapted as pointing a way out of the dilemma of the school board? What guidance does it give to those who wish to abide by their duty to furnish adequate educational opportunities without defying this court? Of what value is equitable jurisdiction if it cannot adapt the otherwise immutable law to the needs of the parties, the particular circumstances and the function of the institutions affected. This last, it should be remembered, is to provide adequate public education.

I suggest that the circuit court of appeals was unduly preoccupied by the violent and unlawful acts of individual citizens and failed to give proper weight to the equitable nature of the proceeding and to the further fact that there was involved not simply the violence of individual citizens, but, in the words of an eminent commentator and historian, "a conflict between two sovereignties—between the State government and the Federal Government." (Washington Post and Times Herald, Aug. 26, 2958, p. A13, col. 3.)

I believe it is true that this conflict "poses problems which go far beyond, and are quite different from, the problems of dealing with lawless mobs. They are problems which are insoluble by exhortation, or by Federal injunction and law suits in the Federal courts. For the essential issue is the refusal of lawful State governments to accept the validity of a Federal law" (ibid.).

Chief Judge Archibald K. Gardner, of the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals, in his dissenting memorandum observed that "the action of Judge Lemley was based on realities, and on conditions rather than theories." *Aaron* v. *Cooper* (8th Cir., supra).

The meaningful realities of this situation are that due to unexpected developments of an unprecedented nature, this court's original objective of procuring for Negro children education on an integrated basis cannot be provided under existing circumstances. Time is desperately needed to enable the authorities concerned to find an adjustment of this conflict.

No decision which this court can make will assure the rights of the Negro children more effectively than those decisions which it has heretofore rendered. In spite of the full force of the executive power of the Federal Government, even the use of the Armed Forces of the United States, the children did not and cannot enjoy a better, not even as good an opportunity for education under the conditions of turmoil and bedlam which result from such extreme measures. The education of all children, white and Negro, suffers from such disturbed, abnormal conditions.

The argument that to accept the decision of the district court for a delay of 2½ years is an abandonment of the integration decision of this Court is without merit. Such an argument takes no account of the difference between the enunciation of constitutional doctrine, and the application of that doctrine through the principles of equity. More importantly, it takes no account of the obligation of the courts to adapt their powers to the purposes for which the institution or activity affected by those powers exists. The court has stated, "Courts of equity may, and frequently do, go much farther both to give and withhold relief in furtherance of the public interest than they are accustomed to go when only private interests are involved." *Virginian Railway Co.* v. *Federation* (300 U. S. 515, 552 (1937)).

It has become an axiom that the processes of education—and in this country, public education—offer the solution, if any is to be found, whereby men of different races may learn to abide one another, each in the full enjoyment of his rights. If this is agreed, then the systems of education must be respected, and social experimentation in them made tolerable to their purposes.

If I may repeat, this Court has observed that public education is the most important function of State and local governments. (*Brown* v. *Board of Education* (347 U. S. 483, 493).) To the extent that the school systems are successful, it is because local school boards, administrators, and teachers make them so. In this controversy, they are acknowledged to be men of good will. But if they are not supported by the courts, when acting in good faith, how can men of good will be expected to continue to function? It can be expected that the control of local school boards will fall into the hands of radicals and fanatics. Then neither the processes of justice nor education would be served.

The circuit court of appeals, in its opinion, had much to say about the activities of persons and governments outside this case. While these forces may be a part of the history of the case, and even if the Court deems them responsible for the present circumstances, neither their recollection nor the courts' despair of them afford the school board any solution to the problem of how to conduct public education in an acknowledged atmosphere of bedlam and turmoil. The Court's refusal to support the good faith position of the board can only intensify the effect of those outside forces. And, at least, for the present, they are beyond the reach of this Court.

The chief judge of the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals, in a passage of profound wisdom, said: "For centuries there had been no intimate social relations between the white and colored races in the section referred to as the South. There had been no integration in the schools, and that practice had the sanction of a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States as constitutionally legal. It had become a way of life in that section of the country, and it is not strange that this long-established cherished practice could not suddenly be changed without resistance. Such changes, if successful, are usually accomplished by evolution rather than revolution, and time, patience, and forbearance are important elements in effecting all radical changes." (*Aaron* v. *Cooper*, 8th Circuit, supra (dissenting memorandum).)

That former Justice Brandeis of this Court would have agreed with the reasoning of Judge Gardner is evident from his statement in Goldman's The Words of Justice Brandeis ((1952) at p. 116): "No law can be effective which does not take into consideration the conditions of the community for which it is designed; no law can be a good law—every law must be a bad law—that remains unenforced."

The failure of the majority of the circuit court to take note of these truths, in Judge Gardner's dissenting opinion, suggests that the members of the court are not familiar with the traditions, the cultural patterns, the way of life of our Southern States. Indeed it seems clear that implicit in this whole matter is a tragic misunderstanding of fundamental human instincts and impulses.

The people of Arkansas endure against a background not without certain pathological aspects. They are marked in some ways by a strange disproportion inherited from the age of Negro slavery. The whites and Negroes of Arkansas are equally prisoners of their environment. No one knows what either of them might have been under other circumstances. Certainly, no one of them has ever been free with respect to racial relationship in the sense that the Vermonter, say, has been free. The society of each is conditioned by the other's presence. Each carries a catalog of things not to be mentioned. Each moves through an intricate ritual of evasions, of make-believe, and suppressions. In Arkansas, one finds a relationship among men without counterpart on this continent, except in similar southern States. All this is the legacy of an ancient and melancholy history.

Under the circumstances, it is inevitable that there should have come into being what one might call a southern mind. And it is a grave error, it seems to me, to fail to realize that there is a southern mind. G. M. Young, the English historian, observed that it was dangerous for Victorian England to fail to see that time and circumstance had created an Irish mind; and it was also dangerous to fail to learn the idiom in which that mind * * * expressed itself; and to understand that what we could never remember, Ireland could never forget.

History tells us that race memories long endure. They are perpetuated in myths, and monuments, and a mother's lullaby. They are sentimental and emotional and when stirred up, they become irrational.

We are confronted here with a problem, novel and unprecedented in the history of our country and extraordinarily complex. In our congenital optimism, we Americans believe, or affect to believe, that social questions of the greatest difficulty may be solved through the discovery and application of a sovereign remedy that will forever dispose of the problem. Yet all this flies in the face of human experience. Thus, for example, a so-called Jewish problem has endured for more than 2,000 years. The Roman Catholic-Protestant problem has similarly endured since the Reformation, and one might add that the Islam-Christian problem and the Hindu-Muslim problem, among many others, plague various groups of men in this and in other countries. Millions of lives have been sacrificed to these problems and the end is not yet.

I would suggest, then, that the problem of school integration in Arkansas is more likely—bearing in mind that flesh and blood is weak and frail—to yield to the slow conversion of the human heart than to remedies of a more urgent nature.

In this general context, we must observe a constant in the affairs of men. It is this: When their ancient social convictions are profoundly violated, or when sudden change is attempted to be imposed upon attitudes or principles deeply imbedded within them by inheritance, tradition, or enviroment, they are likely to react almost as by involuntary reflex, and often violently.

These reflections and the inferences which may be drawn therefrom, at least as they pertain to the problem which presently confronts this court, recall to mind the words of a profound scholar, Morris R. Cohen, who wrote as follows:

"The clericalist and the legalist have an undue advantage in identifying their causes with those of religion and law, causes for which humanity is always willing to make extreme sacrifices. But that identity is not complete is seen clearly in the career of Jesus of Nazareth. In the days of Jesus, both clericalism and legalism were represented by the Pharisees, who carried the legalist idea into religion, and wished to control all life by minute regulations similar to those which governed the life of the high priest. To make the life of every individual as holy as that of the high priest was indeed a noble ideal. Yet it was also deadening through the mass of casuistry to which it gave rise. Jesus' protest that the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath, cuts the foundation of all legalism and clericalism. It makes us see the profound foolishness of those who, like Cato, would adhere to the law even though the Republic be thereby destroyed. Without a legal order and some ministry of religious insight, the path to anarchy and worldliness is, indeed, dangerously shortened. But without a realization of the essential limitations of legalism and clericalism, there is no way of defending the free human or spiritual life from fanaticism and superstition" (M. R. Cohen, Law and the Social Order; Essays in Legal Philosophy, pp. 160–161 (1933)).

For the reasons herein set forth, it is urged that this court deny the application of petitioners.

Respectfully submitted.

LEE WILLIAMS,
Attorney for J. W. Fulbright.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 27, 1958.*

As the 85th Congress Fades Into Time—Historians Take Up Where We Withdrew

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, the hour is growing near when I will return home, completing my stewardship in Washington for the 2d session of the 85th Congress. This has been the hardest working peacetime Congress in the entire history of our country. We have appropriated more money for more purposes than ever before, except during the war years of 1940–45—most of it in an effort to head off the continuing effects of the depression and it now begins to look like we may have succeeded, in spite of the many points of opposition put up from the Republican side.

We met at 12 noon on January 7 and adjourned at 4:11 a. m. on August 24, 1958. During this time we considered more than 6,000 bills and resolutions from both Houses of Congress. This meant many hours in committee hearings and debates on the House floor, and many more hours in my office, working on the things that could have a direct effect on each of us in the coming months and years.

Listed here are the major items that came before us and which were passed by both Houses and sent to the White House for action by the President. At the time of this writing, August 27, many of these bills are on the President's desk awaiting action by him. Two measures which I wanted very much to see enacted went down to defeat—the housing bill and the food stamp bill.

If there is any matter that you would like to discuss with me I will be in my Detroit office at 15403 Mack Avenue near Beaconsfield, phone: Tuxedo 5–5020.

BILLS THAT PASSED THE CONGRESS

INTERNATIONAL AID AND MUTUAL SECURITY

Mutual Security Act appropriating more than $3 billion for military and economic aid to foreign countries.

Exchange of atomic information and materials with allies. Financial assistance totaling around $330 million to

member nations of Euratom Organization to develop peacetime uses of atomic energy.

Request to United Nations to establish police force to patrol areas where peace is threatened.

Clearance for admission of Hungarian refugees into this country.

Reciprocal trade agreements continued 4 years.

LABOR AND BUSINESS LEGISLATION

Public price labeling of new automobiles.

Requirement for branding textiles to disclose fiber content.

Regulations for disclosure of data on employee pension and welfare funds.

MONEY APPROPRIATION BILLS

Raise in legal debt limit to permanent figure of $283 billion and to $288 billion temporarily.

Appropriation of more than $70 billion in regular and supplementary supply bills for operation of Government departments, agencies, and programs.

Provision of $260 million in tax relief for small businesses and a $250 million revolving fund for Small Business Administration. (Congress made SBA a permanent agency.)

Removal of the admissions tax on concerts and shows of nonprofit civic organizations and schools.

Loans to enable States to pay up to 15 additional weeks of unemployment compensation to jobless persons whose State payments have expired.

Emergency $1.8 billion program to stimulate home building. Highway construction authorized and apportionment of funds totaling $5.5 billion.

Loans and grants totaling $279 million to help areas distressed by chronic unemployment.

Increase in salaries of more than a million Federal classified employees and postal workers and provided for higher annuities to retired or disabled civil-service employees.

Revision of excise-tax structure, with some reductions. Numerous technical changes in income, gift tax, and estate provisions of Internal Revenue Code.

A 7-percent increase in social-security, old-age-insurance benefits, higher tax rates based on first $4,800 of income, $197 additional in Federal contributions to State public-assistance payments.

A year's extension, to retain $3 billion in revenue, of 52 percent income-tax rate on corporations, as well as existing excise rates on alcoholic beverages, cigarettes, and automobiles.

Repeal of 3-percent tax on transportation of freight.

Increase in postal rates to obtain $500 million extra revenue.

A $1.5 billion harbors, rivers, and flood-control program.

Extension of Renegotiation Act for 6 months.

Federal guaranty of $500 million in loans to railroads to finance new equipment.

NATIONAL-DEFENSE BILLS

Reorganization of the Defense Department.

Raises in pay of armed-services personnel.

Four-year extension of the President's standby powers under Federal Civil Defense Act.

Raises in monthly pension rates of widows of Spanish-American, Civil, and American Indian wars.

Authorization of $54 million to expand and expedite building of missile bases, detection and warning systems.

Authorization of $386 million for Atomic Energy Commission for construction and expansion of its programs and projects.

New construction and improved research facilities authorized for National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

A new civilian-controlled National Aeronautics and Space Agency.

Authorization of $100 million for new construction and conversion of naval ships, including nuclear-powered vessels. Also $1.6 billion for Air Force installations. Authorized nuclear-powered icebreaker for Coast Guard. Vetoed by President Eisenhower.

Establishment of Advanced Research Projects Agency in Defense Department.

A $39.6 billion Defense Department appropriation bill for fiscal 1959—$6 billion more than last year.

NATIONAL AID TO EDUCATION

Four-year program of $887 million in Federal aid to education to stimulate study and teaching of science, languages and other subjects.

A $10 million program to encourage the training of teachers for mentally retarded children.

NATIONAL GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION BILLS

Statehood for Alaska, the first new State since 1912.

Recommended code of ethics for Federal officeholders and employees.

Freedom of information bill limiting withholding of public documents and news.

Pensions for former Presidents and their widows.

A Federal Aviation Agency to supervise Nation's airways.

FEDERAL COURT SYSTEM BILLS

Judicial Conference directed to study and recommend uniform policies and standards for sentencing Federal law offenders, and for rules of Federal court procedure.

Chief Judges of United States District Courts and Courts of Appeals required to step down from those positions, but not necessarily retire, at age of 70.

A "not proven" verdict by a House Armed Services subcommittee that investigated complaints of possible improper influence of Sherman Adams in an Army textile contract refund case.

BILLS INTRODUCED WHICH WERE EITHER DEFEATED OR NOT ACTED ON

Kennedy-Ives labor regulation proposals.

Federal aid to States for school construction.

Extension of minimum wage law coverage.

Tighter regulations relating to Federal election campaign spending.

Fair trade pricing bill.

Revision of status of forces treaties affecting foreign trial of United States armed services personnel.

Stronger penalties for subversion and specific provision making Communist Party membership a crime.

Establishment of "public defender" plan for accused persons in certain Federal court cases.

Food stamp plan for distributing $1 billion in surplus commodities to needy persons.

Permission for Congressional committees to invoke Federal court aid to compel testimony by witnesses.

Tennessee Valley Authority to issue bonds for financing construction of additional plants.

Proposed $650 million subsidy program for domestic minerals.

Hawaiian statehood.

Creation of 45 additional Federal judgeships.

A 10 percent increase in railroad retirement benefits.

Procedures for Vice President to serve during disability of a President.

Relaxation of Federal controls on natural gas producers.

Federal antitrust law exemption for some features of professional sports.

Loan program to local communities for construction of public facilities.

Omnibus housing bill providing $975 million.

United States membership in Organization for Trade Cooperation.

Advance notice requirement for corporation mergers.

A final note on H. R. 3, the so-called States rights bill—the subject of my last newsletter—I am pleased to tell you that the Senate killed it in the closing hours of the Congress. So the measure found itself where I said it belonged—in the wastebasket.

This will be the last of my newsletters dealing with legislative matters until Congress reconvenes in January 1959.

Please do not hesitate to call on me for assistance on any matter of interest to you where you feel I can help.

I am looking forward to the pleasure of seeing many of you during my campaign for reelection.

Benjamin F. James

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, one of my very good friends in the Congress, BEN F. JAMES, has announced that he is retiring and will not seek reelection. This announcement has saddened all of his many friends in the Congress, on both sides of the aisle. He has served his District well and has given many years of devoted service to his District, State, and Nation. He has been a true statesman in every sense of the word, never compromising his true convictions, but always following through with the action he felt was right and just and in the best interests of the country.

When I was elected to the 84th Congress, I was fortunate in acquiring the office occupied by my father, Dwight L. Rogers, and also acquiring at the same time, as a neighbor, BEN F. JAMES. My father and he had enjoyed a close association for many years, and one of the great satisfactions I have received in occupying room 111 has been the privilege of being a neighbor of BEN F. JAMES. He has proven to be a real friend and neighbor in every regard. I have greatly enjoyed our relationship and I shall miss him very much. Although we are of different political faiths, I have found his advice and counsel to be sound and helpful. To him and his lovely wife, I wish continued happiness in the years to come.

Review of 2d Session of 85th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith my review of the 2d session of the 85th Congress.

Not in many years has any Congress had to deal with such momentous issues as those which faced the session just adjourned. We met last January in the acute consciousness of two Soviet sputniks; by the time we completed our work, a crisis had erupted in the Middle East, American forces had been landed in Lebanon, and American diplomacy and leadership were undergoing new tests.

The 2d session of the 85th Congress—the final session unless the President should summon us to Washington again—necessarily did a great deal of pioneering work. It created a new space agency under civilian control; it revamped and reorganized the defense structure to meet the severe requirements of the nuclear age.

At the same time, Congress had to handle the problems created by the recession, which threw millions out of work, closed down steel mills and put the automobile assembly lines on short workweeks, slashed Government revenues and turned the budget topsy-turvy.

The session had to deal, and deal firmly, with shortsighted proposals to cut back and eventually destroy many sound and well-established programs for the health, education, and well-being of our people. We had to wrestle with differences of viewpoint over farm legislation, labor legislation, the role of the Government in peacetime use of nuclear energy. We had all the normal housekeeping chores—the economic and useful appropriation of funds for the ordinary operations of the Government.

My own areas of concentrated interest were in the fields of national defense and nuclear energy. As most people know, the work of Congress is largely done through committees, which through long experience and the accumulation of testimony and expert guidance seek to become familiar with all the details necessary for sound and constructive legislation.

I served, as in many years past, on the House Committee on Armed Services and the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, and these two groups handled diverse subjects, including reorganization of the Department of Defense, the work of the Atomic Energy Commission, the cooperation of the United States in the atoms-for-peace program, and the promising new European six-nation nuclear unity known as Euratom.

Nothing surpassed in personal pleasure the fact that for the first time Congress was persuaded to authorize and appropriate for specific flood-control projects that in the future should help relieve the people of St. Clair and Madison Counties from flash floods of the type that did so much damage in June of 1957.

These projects were not budgeted in the appropriations for the Army engineers recommended by President Eisenhower. But I sponsored a resoluiton that was approved by the House Public Works Committee, and this was paralleled by a somewhat more extensive Senate authorization, and the money was voted for the vital preliminary surveys to be made by the Corps of Engineers.

I had the pleasure of appearing also before the Committee on Appropriations, to explain that the June 1957 floods which killed or injured so many of our people and did much property damage were the second major floods since 1946 due to flash runoff of rainwater. The Appropriations Committee is properly careful in approving expenditures that may be attacked as unbudgeted, but it granted funds for the surveys of these projects we need, and Congress sustained the committee.

There will be, therefore, an engineering survey of the streams in Madison and St. Clair Counties, and this is the first essential step toward the sensible solution of our problems in this field.

Both because of the interests of this Congressional District and because of my own interest, I sponsored, of course, legislation in various fields. I introduced a food-stamp bill, to deal with the problems of agricultural surpluses by making food available to families that need it at a price they can pay, and such a plan was approved by the House Committee on Agriculture. It was not passed by Congress but committee approval is the first step to future passage.

I was sponsor of a bill to protect the interest of workers in welfare and pension plans established for their benefit, and such a bill was passed after a long, hard fight. I was House sponsor, working with Senator HUMPHREY of Minnesota in the other Chamber, of a bill to protect the Rural Electrification Administration from what many of us believe is the determined hostility of Secretary of Agriculture Benson. The committee hearings and approval by the committee had the effect of serving notice that Congress does not intend to let the REA be destroyed or crippled by increases in interest rates or by secret administrative assault.

Two observations seem to me necessary after 6 years during which President Eisenhower has been Chief Executive and the last 4 years in which Democrats have controlled Congress while the executive department has been controlled by Republicans.

We may fairly claim in Congress that in these 4 years politics has ended for us at the water's edge. We have recognized that the President, under the Constitution, has both responsibility and authority for foreign policy and is Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. We of the majority party in Congress have never decided an issue as Democrats rather than as Americans; we have given the President the support he deserves to fulfill his constitutional duties.

This is how things should be. But it is not the way things have always been, as can be remembered from political war cries in campaigns not long in the past. Very recently Republican campaign orators pretended that there would be a "political cold war" if Democrats should control Congress. I hope we shall hear no more of that nonsense this year.

The other thing—and the President and his colleagues in the Treasury Department have had 6 years to learn about it—is that talking loud and long about "Government economy" does not produce balanced budgets.

We had a solemn pledge back during the 1952 campaign that the new miracle workers would cut down on spending until pretty soon we would be down to a $60-billion budget. Well, they partly did not mean it and partly did not understand what they were saying, and, partly, they forgot about the way our population is expanding, the way our economy has grown, the way new crises may arise for a nation bearing such responsibility as ours. The Eisenhower administration has just finished a red-ink year with a $3-billion deficit. It is in a year when another $12-billion deficit is expected, and we in Congress have had to answer its pleas to raise the ceiling and the national debt.

During 1957 we Democrats tried to cut President Eisenhower's budget, and we did cut it, for a time, although he himself deserted it under the criticism of the organized lobbies of professional drum beaters who pretend that they are speaking for American businessmen. But then the sputniks went up and the Middle East erupted and the recession hit. The administration that claimed credit for "peace and prosperity" cannot say it "was not their fault" when things began to go sour. "Economy in Government" is not really a slogan to be used loosely in election campaigns.

The major legislation passed by the 2d session of the 85th Congress in the field of foreign policy and defense adds up to an impressive total.

We passed the new statute covering the organization of the Department of Defense, giving broad new power to the Secretary of Defense subject only to the overriding authority of the President himself. In this Congress responded to the urgent request of the Chief Executive for a modern and flexible defense organization, with great emphasis on the security of the Nation in a time when

scientific breakthroughs have almost totally transformed the problems. We established what we believe are necessary avenues of approach from the traditional armed services, but we opened the doors to something that meets today's needs.

We created the civilian-controlled space agency, to coordinate and guide our approaches in a realm that only a few years ago would have seemed fantastic but now is recognized as the reality with which we must live.

We approved a law broadening our exchange of nuclear information with friendly powers and, within strict limits, our exchange of certain critical materials with friendly nations that have already made substantial progress of their own toward the nuclear age.

We approved extension of the reciprocal trade law, maintaining the program of expanding foreign trade that was initiated nearly a quarter of a century ago by Cordell Hull, who was President Franklin D. Roosevelt's first Secretary of State. I regret that certain safeguards were not approved to prevent individual industries and groups of citizens from bearing the burden that sometimes arises because of this sound national policy, but some advances were made in this direction.

Here, surely, is a record of cooperation between the Republican executive department and the Democratic Congress that makes nonsense of any talk of political cold war.

The picture is different, unfortunately, when we review actions on the major domestic issue—the recession.

Congress was able to pass a bill that extended, on an emergency basis, unemployment insurance payments for hundreds of thousands of jobless workers whose benefits under State law had expired while they still had not been called back to work. But this emergency law was a poor substitute for what should have been done—and here we face the clear fact that there is a difference in philosophy between the predominant forces in the administration and the majority of Democrats in Congress.

The Eisenhower administration had a chance to support a Democratic bill that would have provided jobless insurance to more than 4 million unemployed workers, who needed help because they were thrown out of work through no fault of their own and whose purchasing power was needed by the sagging economy. But the administration turned down that plan and finally accepted a very limited program—better than nothing but that is all to be said for it.

It was the same pattern on job-creating public works and on tax reduction.

The White House opposed public works by claiming it would take too long to get new programs started, that the recession would be over before plans were transformed into actual construction. And month after month it opposed tax relief, even for low-income and middle-income families, by saying it wanted to wait a little while and see what happened.

And all this time we heard optimistic statements by such administration spokesmen as Secretary of Commerce Weeks that things were looking better that the recession was bottoming out.

The President vetoed our first farm bill and our first rivers and harbors bill. He opposed a program of major Government loans for local facilities such as sewage disposal systems even though plans for these projects were already drawn and actual construction could have begun quickly. He opposed the program of Government aid to depressed areas—areas of heavy and chronic recession—that I sponsored in the House and the Congress actually passed. His opposition, because of the veto power, was enough to make action very difficult in a Congress narrowly divided between the two parties.

His opposition to tax revision was enough to make action impossible, because after he had insisted on waiting for months, he was able to block action by talking about the new deficits being piled up.

My viewpoint is that reasonable reduction of taxes on low-income and middle-income families was more likely to spread purchasing power and actually increase Government revenue rather than cut it. A reasonable reduction would have helped prevent the recession from feeding on itself. I introduced bills on these subjects.

Congress passed resolutions to speed up actual work on public works already authorized and appropriated for. It also passed a bill specifically stepping up highway construction this year and next under the defense highway program, and this means an increase in actual jobs for fully justified projects that the country needs.

But I do not think that the administration made an effective attack on the recession. Things may have bottomed out, as Secretary Weeks claimed, but the people who still do not have jubs are not likely to see the difference.

Just last month the nonpartisan experts of the Department of Labor came to Congress to ask huge supplemental appropriations to help carry the burden of expected unemployment compensation—not now but next winter and perhaps next spring. They indicated to the House committee that so far as they could tell unemployment would be just as heavy next January and February—perhaps at the level of more than 5 million, with about 60 percent eligible for jobless insurance benefits—as it was last January or February.

If these estimates are accurate, then a major job of the new Congress that meets in January 1959, will be to get the country off the bottom and started back to full economic activity with actual jobs for the skilled workers hunting for jobs.

A mark of distinction for the 85th Congress, I think, will be the fact that in defiance of predictions and in the face of great obstacles we passed the Alaska statehood bill.

Both parties for some time have made presidential platform pledges of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. But on Alaska, at least, President Eisenhower was hesitant; he repeatedly suggested that problems of defense were very complex. We could have dropped his formal proposals on statehood without doing any damage, and pointed to his own lukewarm attitude as revealed in press conferences as an excuse.

We chose to push the Alaska statehood bill through, and as one of the sponsors of bills on the subject and a longtime enthusiast for the program, I was happy that a Democrat, Representative LEO O'BRIEN, of New York, had the responsibility of getting the bill through the House. He did—although at times he thought that the lobby pressures against it would lead once more to failure.

It is a fine thing, a thrilling thing, to realize that a new State is born. I am looking forward to the time when Congress will redeem the pledge to the Territory of Hawaii, too. Hawaii has its claim to a place of full partnership in the Union.

This session of Congress also passed needed legislation in the interest of our service veterans and their families and survivors.

One law consolidates into a single act the bulk of existing legislation on service-connected disability or death and on pension, hospitalization, and medical care. The rates of compensation for service-connected disability were raised. A new system was authorized clarifying the rights of widows even if they did not qualify under the technicalities of previous law. A general housing act was passed which incorporated most of the safeguards and housing benefits for veterans that were originally passed separately but vetoed by President Eisenhower earlier during the 85th Congress—in 1957.

One of the actions by Congress of which I am especially happy grew out of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The administration has had a tendency to use the Atomic Energy Commission as an agency to attack low-cost public power, and I think there is an important place for both public power and private power. That is why in 1955 we blocked the administration attempt to use the AEC as a "power broker" to cripple the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The AEC under former Chairman Lewis Strauss always opposed efforts by Congress to have the Commission develop reactors that would give us experience with peacetime production of electric power. But the Committee recommended this year, and Congress approved, certain projects that will lead in this direction. I think the people have the right to expect that their investment of billions in tax money in nuclear energy should be used for their benefit in ordinary life, and that a balance shall be maintained between public and private-enterprise activity in this field. The Congress approved the Joint Committee's recommendation for participation in the Euratom program, implementing the "atoms for peace" program.

Congress this year made decisions that rejected an unwise administration effort to cripple Government health and education programs in the pretense of turning them back to the States.

The idea of turning something back to the States is superficially a pleasant-

sounding slogan, but the administration does not ask itself whether the services it wants to cut were ever actually performed by the States in the first place.

The President wanted us to cut Federal aid to school districts that are substantially enlarged, and handed greater burdens, by an influx of people on Federal payrolls or people called to certain communities because of Federal activities, such as construction projects or defense posts. Congress refused to do this and in fact took a forward step in the other direction by making part of the program permanent.

Congress also refused to begin the process of cutting down on Federal assistance in the public health field by slashing appropriations for hospitals under the Hill-Burton Act. Many hundreds of communities without adequate hospital and clinic facilities now have such services because of wise Federal encouragement and aid, and Congress chose to vote more money, rather than less, to carry this program forward.

The President wanted us to reverse ourselves, just after authorizing a program of Federal aid for local sewage disposal and water-pollution plants, and start cutting out that activity. Again Congress refused to follow his lead. Stream pollution is a national problem and a serious health menace for all our people, and the Federal Government must give guidance and aid to localities.

An effort to enact a housing bill—bigger than the one the President wanted but fully justified by the need, failed, and Congress passed a second farm bill and a second rivers and harbors bill that are not ideal but are within the scope allowed by the earlier vetoes.

We were not able to do anything in the field of minimum wages, particularly in the matter of enlarging the number of workers to include millions left unprotected by the present law. But Congress did pass amendments to the social security law, raising the benefits to those already drawing payments under this tremendous system and maintaining a sound tax structure to finance the program. In both cases, the pattern was the same: The administration showed a hostile or limited attitude, and Congress could do no more than this negativism allowed. We do not have the numerical strength to pass broader legislation by the necessary two-thirds vote over a veto.

The session of Congress just closed was the second session; the beginning of the 85th Congress goes back to January of 1957. The record of the 2 years together is one that allows some sense of achievement in retrospect.

During the period I sponsored a bill, which became law, to provide for Federal inspection of poultry and poultry products in interstate commerce. This is a protection of all our people from the danger of diseased or otherwise unfit poultry sold for food purposes.

I shared the sponsorship of other measures that became law in the provision of scholarships for students in the scientific field; the provision of liability legislation governing nuclear accidents; the protection of employee health and welfare funds.

As the sponsor of basic legislation which resulted, on Memorial Day, 1958, in the interment at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier of the Unknown Servicemen of World War II and the Korean conflict, I also sponsored the bill that provided that the bodies of these honored dead should lie in state in the rotunda of the Capitol before their burial in their final resting place in Arlington National Cemetery.

As chairman of the House Democratic Conference, which includes all Members of the majority party, I offered the resolution to elect the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, as Speaker of the House and, at various times, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, as Speaker pro tempore during the occasional absences of Mr. RAYBURN.

A groundwork has been laid for future action through bills I sponsored for the secure national control of missile disposal, to create a food-stamp plan, to grant Federal assistance to depressed areas, to expand the national program to cleanse our rivers of pollution, and to make sound revisions of our tax laws so as to reduce the burden on low-income and middle-income families.

When the 85th Congress passed legislation providing that the Federal Government accept responsibility for financing 90 percent of a nationwide network of 41,000 miles of multilaned interstate highways, the State of Illinois immediately stepped up its plans to construct 1,600 miles of the system within the State. The 1958 Federal Aid Highway Act provided for an acceleration of the Interstate System and Illinois, like most States, responded to the attitude of Congress to push for an early completion of the Interstate System. I have been informed by the Illinois Division of Highways that funds expended, contracts under way, and work programed in Illinois using 90 percent Federal participation at March 31, 1958, represents a total of $253 million.

The 85th Congress approved several measures designed to assist small business—one, the Small Business Tax Revision Act of 1958, and another the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. In addition there was some measure of tax relief for small business in the excise revisions approved by the Congress. The stencil-cutting machine industry in Belleville was particularly assisted here, as provisions of the Excise Tax Technical Changes Act of 1958 exempts such equipment, used in marking freight shipments, from Federal excise tax. I introduced legislation asking this exemption and devoted considerable time in seeking inclusion in the act of this relief to a small business operation providing employment in our area.

The Small Business Investment Act has as its primary purpose making equity capital and long-term credit more rapidly available for small business concerns. I am sincerely hopeful that interested groups in St. Clair and Madison Counties will examine the provisions of this act and work toward organizing a small-business development credit corporation to service our area.

The Small Business Tax Revision Act constitutes a step to deal with a few of the more important tax problems of small business. It is designed to increase the volume of outside funds which will be made available for the financing of small business; to increase the volume of internal funds which will be made available for small business; and the third goal of the act is to prevent the breakup of small businesses once they are established.

This Congress passed a bill raising the salaries of post office and civil service workers by 10 percent, and making the increases retroactive to last January 1. This was, fundamentally, a matter of simple justice.

It has been my view that the Federal Government should not be a bad employer, paying its hard-working employees less than would be paid in comparable work in private employment. The President has repeatedly opposed pay-increase bills, and last year he vetoed one by pocket veto after Congress had adjourned and could not take action to override his disapproval. This meant that Government workers were denied increases to which they were entitled by higher living costs and by comparative pay standards in other fields. The action of Congress this year restored the balance by making the increases retroactive.

Congress was unable to complete action on a bill to liberalize the Taft-Hartley Act and require certain minimum standards of labor unions and this was due almost entirely to partisan activity by the administration and particularly Secretary of Labor Mitchell. There is some danger that enemies of labor will try to put through a punitive bill next year, along the lines Mitchell demands, and this will have to be fought.

Few people realize the amount of work the average Member of Congress puts in on committee assignments—and the longer a person serves in the Congress the greater are his committee duties and the responsibilities placed upon him.

I serve on the two committees most vital to our national security, the House Armed Services Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I serve on two regular subcommittees of the Armed Services Committee and am frequently designated as chairman of special subcommittees. I am vice chairman of one of my regular subcommittees.

As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, made up of 9 Members of the House and 9 Members of the Senate, I also serve on 2 subcommittees and I hold the position as chairman of the Subcommittee on Research and Development, in which capacity in the past 2 years I have presided over hearings on scientific and engineering manpower shortages in the United States and hearings designed to create greater enthusiasm in America's basic research programs.

As a result of committee work I successfully sponsored legislation in the past session to insure the participation of universities in the United States in our research reactor program of the Atomic Energy Commission. Without the amendments to the Indemnification Acts, which I sponsored, practically every State-supported university in the Nation

would have found it impossible to operate a research reactor.

To give an idea of the time-consuming requirements of committee work, I might point out that I attended an average of 2 committee meetings a day for every day Congress was in session and frequently I was compelled to attend as many as 4 committee meetings in 1 day. At the same time it was necessary to keep abreast of activities on the floor of the House and in this connection my attendance record was again 100 percent. I did not miss a single rollcall.

Much of the effort of a Member of Congress does not show up in official records but most rewarding to any Congressman is the constructive work done through committee assignments. I feel this way as the result of the United States modification of its position on landholding practices in Okinawa, a problem I have been interested in since 1955, when I served as chairman of a special Congressional committee to study our land acquisition policies in the Ryukyu Islands.

The issue has been the source of endless friction, but now the old methods are to be abandoned and negotiations have begun on a plan acceptable to the Okinawans. More sympathy and tact will be shown to the people whose homeland we occupy as a military bastion to preserve peace in the Far East.

Statement by Hon. William E. Jenner, of Indiana, in Connection With the Senate Vote on Raising the Debt Ceiling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me in connection with the Senate vote in raising the debt ceiling.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JENNER

I am deeply concerned about maintaining the full faith and credit of the United States. Because I am so deeply concerned about the credit of the United States, I am unable to accept the bill to raise the permanent debt ceiling another $8 billion.

The Secretary of the Treasury is doing everything possible to meet our fiscal needs. He needs help. I submitted to the Finance Committee an amendment to give him all the borrowing authority he asked for, but on a temporary basis only.

I am strongly opposed to any increase by Congress in the permanent debt ceiling.

Either the statutory debt limit is a barrier to unlimited spending, or it isn't. Today we have a rubber debt ceiling, made to look as if it was a firm barrier, but actually responding to every lightest pressure for more funds. That is fooling our people. If Congress does not intend the debt ceiling to be a barrier to excessive spending, it should abolish the ceiling, and admit Government spending is unconfined.

Nothing is sillier than to have what looks like a guardrail when we know the guardrail will not hold.

Yes, I know that Congress has voted all the appropriations under which executive spending is carried on. I know Congress voted for the carryover appropriations which give the executive some $70 billion above the current budget. But the debt ceiling should be a barrier against Congressional appropriations as well as against extravagant Government agencies.

If Congress passes one law to impose a limit on the public debt, and a dozen other laws to send the appropriations far above that limit, Congress should meet the problem by reconsidering its excessive appropriations.

My proposal for a temporary increase would have given the Secretary of the Treasury the money he must have to carry him over the coming 6 or 8 months, and then it would have put the entire problem back where it belongs—in the lap of Congress.

There are plenty of places where our budget can be cut. They must be found. They never will be found, if we have this rubber debt ceiling which stretches upward another 5 or 10 billions every time Congress appropriates more than we can afford, because the executive branch wants to spend more.

Congress has never seriously set itself, since 1933, to the task given it under the Constitution—to control government spending in the interest of the people of the Nation who work to earn the money.

Arbitrary governments permit public officials to decide how much they want to spend, but free governments give to representatives of the people the decision on how much of their earnings is to be spent by the government. That right—to have the people's own representatives make the decisions on the government's use of our resources—is crucial for the preservation of our liberties.

Congress has never seriously set itself to the task of controlling the executive agencies which have been doing as they liked for 25 years.

Some one must speak out. The situation is already more serious than most people realize.

The Secretary of the Treasury has estimated that the deficit for next year will be about $12 billion.

But in the Senate Finance Committee hearings, the Senator from Nevada questioned whether the Treasury's estimates of spending included enough allowance for all the promises currently being made for foreign aid to one area and another. He warned that by the year's end the spending figure might be much higher than the present estimates.

The Senator from Illinois questioned whether the Treasury's estimates of receipts had not been higher, in the preceding year, than actual collections. He asked whether collections for 1959 might not again be lower than the Treasury estimates. The Secretary agreed that Treasury estimates had been running above actual collections.

The Senator from New Mexico questioned whether it would not be increasingly difficult to sell Government bonds with new deficits of $2.8 billion and $12 billion.

In addition, the inflation generated by the new deficits may well lead to price increases which will be an additional force sending expenditures higher than the current estimates.

The deficit of $12 billion for the current year is thus based on estimates of spending which may well be too low, estimated collections that may well be too high, an uncalculated allowance for inflationary price increases, and possible increases in the cost of marketing bonds.

I am not forecasting a higher deficit for fiscal 1959 than the $12 billion estimated by the Secretary of the Treasury, but it is my duty to warn that these estimates are tentative, and the gap between revenue and expenditures certainly might be greater than the figures we have now. It is the duty of Congress to face now the possibility that the deficit in June 1959 may be substantially higher, if they do nothing. When Congress raises the permanent debt ceiling and does nothing about spending, it is telling the spenders to go ahead, and telling investors to put their money in hedges against inflation.

If Congress refuses to raise the debt ceiling, at Treasury request, it will be telling the public that Congress is prepared to find ways to cut Government spending, until every dollar of waste and extravagance is squeezed out of the budget of the United States.

Everybody Interested in Tobacco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the tobacco program is important to all of the people of the State of North Carolina. The prosperity of the tobacco farmer is vital to the welfare of every worker, every business and professional man, and people in all vocations and avocations. When tobacco farmers are impoverished, every segment of our economy feels the impact. Should the tobacco program be lost, tobacco farmers would face bankruptcy. They would bury themselves beneath the abundance which would be produced.

The tobacco program has been and is now the best of all the commodity programs which have been undertaken. Tobacco farmers have received the benefits and they are willing to bear the burdens of the program. They have always been willing to accept necessary acreage allotments and marketing quotas in an effort to keep supply in line with consumer demand. It has been a profitable program and not a financial burden to the Government. Even the President and Secretary of Agriculture have publicly praised the program and have supported it until just a few months ago. Now they want to subject tobacco to the flexible price-support program which might very well lead to the complete destruction of the one program which has meant so much to so many.

Tobacco is of particular importance to those engaged in selling, processing, manufacturing, transporting, and exporting tobacco and tobacco products. The livelihoods of hundreds of thousands of nonfarm people are dependent upon the success of the program and appreciate its real value.

Actually the success of the program has been largely dependent upon the fine spirit of cooperation which has existed through the years between officials of the Government, tobacco farmers, and the workers, the business and profes-

sional men in the area where tobacco is produced. Each group mentioned has made an honest effort to understand the problems and difficulties involved. Such spirit of cooperation has resulted in unbelievable success.

Tobacco has contributed more than its fair share to the governmental revenue of our country. The total tax take by Federal, State, and municipal governments now amount to over $2,500,000,000 annually. Whenever governmental emergencies arise requiring additional revenues, tobacco products are always singled out for the levying of additional taxes. The total value of all the tobacco produced by all the tobacco farmers in the Nation is negligible when related to the tax burden which tobacco is required to share. Our tobacco is always taxed by foreign governments and provides a substantial part of the revenue of such governments. It is, therefore, important that we be prepared and have available the quality and quantity of the tobacco necessary to meet export demands. Over one-fourth of the total tobacco produced in the United States and about one-third of the total of our flue-cured tobacco is exported to and used in foreign countries. Foreign buyers and exporters must at all times have available to them the qualities of leaf they desire and the quantities they need.

The people of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Tennessee, and Kentucky, and in Connecticut and in Florida should be aware of the importance of tobacco and the tobacco program which has served all of our people so well and so long.

Testimony of the Honorable John D. Dingell Urging Liberalization of the Social Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud of my participation in the movement which brought H. R. 13549, the social security amendments of 1958, to the floor of Congress for passage.

IMPROVEMENTS IN THE OLD AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE PROGRAM UNDER H. R. 13549

First. The old age and survivors insurance benefits were increased by 7 percent for present recipients, with a minimum monthly increase of $3 and an average increase of about $4.75. Maximum benefits to retirees were raised from $108 to $116 per month with an ultimate maximum of about $127 per month for future retirees. It raised the maximum for a man and wife from about $160 per month to $190.

Second. It increased from $200 to $254 the total monthly benefits that could be paid to one family.

Third. OASI taxes were increased by one-fourth of 1 percent to 2.5 percent for employees and employers and three-eighths of 1 percent to 3.5 percent for the self-employed.

Fourth. The wage base on which benefits are computed and taxes paid was raised from $4,200 to $4,800, effective January 1, 1959.

Fifth. It speeded up the automatic OASI tax increases, and liberalized slightly the limitation on yearly earnings by changing the formula for reducing benefits for those earning more than $1,200.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

Technical changes were made in the public assistance program which reflect themselves in increased Federal participation in public assistance programs of the States.

I insert below 4 tables showing the increase under H. R. 13549, and the increase in indivdual benefits:

Old-age assistance	$139,788,000
Aid to dependent children	33,537,000
Aid to the blind	5,282,000
Aid to those permanently and totally disabled	19,383,000
Total, all programs	197,990,000

Michigan annual increase for all recipients

Old-age assistance	$4,214,000
Aid to dependent children	1,436,000
Aid to the blind	67,000
Totally and permanently disabled	170,000
Total for all programs	5,888,000

Increase of monthly level of benefits per individual recipient for the United States

Old-age assistance	$4.73
Aid to dependent children	1.17
Aid to the blind	4.36
Aid to the permanently and totally disabled	5.01

Increase of benefits per individual recipient for the State of Michigan

Old-age assistance	$5.32
Aid to dependent children	1.43
Aid to the blind	3.12
Aid to the permanently and totally disabled	3.77
Total all programs combined (per recipient)	3.16

I pledge myself to work for further liberalization of the social-security program, as set forth in that statement. I feel that the retirement age should be reduced to age 60 for men, and 55 for women. Sixty days free hospitalization should be given to all beneficiaries of the program. The present income limitation of $1,200 should be raised to $1,800. The permanent disability retirement feature should be amended to provide for immediate retirement for all persons concerned regardless of age.

I insert my remarks before the House Ways and Means Committee on June 27, 1958, urging liberalization of the social-security program.

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE JOHN D. DINGELL, DEMOCRAT, 15TH DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN BEFORE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE ON HEARINGS TO CONSIDER LEGISLATION TO EXTEND AND LIBERALIZE THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, JUNE 27, 1958

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I would like to extend my personal thanks to the distinguished and able chairman and members of the Ways and Means Committee for an opportunity to appear and discuss legislation to extend and liberalize the Social Security Act.

As you know, my dad was on this committee for better then 20 years and during his tenure the original Social Security Act was drafted, acted upon by this committee, and enacted into law. I am sure the membership can recall my dad's great interest in the original law and the efforts which he constantly made to extend and liberalize that finest of social legislation.

I will not devote my time today to unemployment insurance since I appeared before the committee recently to discuss legislation to extend and liberalize unemployment insurance. I would, however, like to thank the committee for the very splendid effort made by them to act in the present unemployment crisis, by reporting out the bill, H R. 12065, to make Federal grants to the unemployed of this Nation who have exhausted their unemployment compensation. The committee will recall at the time I appeared before you I urged, as one of the cosponsors, legislation to establish adequate fair Federal standards to compel payments of not less than one-half of the State's average weekly wage and to compel extension of existing State plans to 39 weeks' duration by Federal action.

I intend to confine my testimony today to the public-assistance phases and to the old-age and survivors insurance aspects of the social-security program.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

The present economic situation has enormously increased the burden of local welfare authorities. The number of general assistance cases rose by 43 percent from March 1957 to March 1958. Eight hundred and fifty-five thousand received assistance in 1957 and 1,310,000 received general assistance in March of 1958, just 1 year later. The report of the Social Security Administration on May 8 said, "All but 1 out of 48 States reported an increase in the ADC (aid to dependent children) caseload in March. The number of ADC recipients rose by 54,000, the largest monthly increase since October 1950, the first month in which one parent or other adult relative was included."

My own State of Michigan is experiencing the gravest difficulty in handling their local welfare programs. The burden in Detroit is so heavy it causes the most serious economic problems to the city, the cost having risen by millions of dollars each year. Additional Federal contributions to the public assistance program would be most helpful to the city of Detroit, and to our people.

Many persons are suffering tremendous hardship, but they are not reflected in public assistance cases for several reasons, either because they are excluded by technicalities and shortcomings of existing programs or because they are too proud to apply for public assistance. Few States have sufficiently comprehensive programs to cover all phases of public aid for needy persons.

There are certain hardships I would like to call to the attention of the committee. For example, about half the States do not provide any assistance to employable persons or their families. Sixteen States make no contribution whatsoever for the financing assistance. In other States, State assistance to welfare programs is so small as to not be really worthwhile. Most States have a requirement that persons reside within the boundaries of the State and be gainfully employed for a certain period of time before they can become eligible for public assistance.

Many public assistance agencies find they cannot make available to their clients even the minimum budgets which are theoretically essential for minimum living conditions.

The average monthly payments in March of 1958 across the Nation were as follows: Old-age assistance, $61.30; aid to dependent children, per child, $35.59; per family,

$102.22; per recipient, $27.26; aid to the blind, $66.70; aid to permanently disabled, $60.69; general assistance (per case), $61.23.

It should be remembered that these are monthly amounts. Divide them by 4 to give weekly amounts and the committee will find that they range from about $6 per week for aid to dependent children to about $15 a week for aid to the blind, certainly far short of a minimum living standard.

No figures are available to show what outside income is available to these people but it must be assumed that it is extremely small. Certainly there is not a sufficient income here for anyone who does not have some outside assistance to exist on even a minimum survival level. This is particularly true in my own city of Detroit where even the most minimal rentals run about $75 a month, and where food and other costs are higher than the average across the country.

The committee is, of course, familiar with the charitable aspect of the public-assistance program and it is certainly necessary, as the Bible commands us, to be generous to our neighbors. The committee is also aware of the fact that grants to persons in this category are most helpful in stimulating business, industry, farming and other occupations furnishing the goods and services which these people must use to live. Uniform Federal standards in this field to compel adequate payments and adequate participation by States on behalf of recipients of public assistance would be not only a humanitarian endeavor but would be a wise economic operation for the benefit of all phases of industry and business, too, which must sell the goods and services welfare recipients need to survive.

THE OLD AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE PROGRAM

I would now like to turn my discussion to vitally necessary improvements in the social security program. When the Social Security Act was first passed in 1936 it was contemplated that the program would pay retiring covered workers about one-half their weekly wage.

Since that time we are well aware of the economic history of this country. The 1936 dollar, in terms of real purchasing power, has shrunk to one-third or less than its value at the time of the passage of the Social Security Act. Congress has periodically reviewed the program and the needs of recipients and has made small upward adjustments in the amount of the monthly benefits to the retirees under the program, but these upward adjustments in payments have in no way reflected the real increase in the cost of living.

Certainly the committee is well aware of the increase in the real wage level, from some $90 a month to the average factory worker to something on the order of $90 a week or better, and these are not our highest paid workers.

These, among others, are reasons why I favor a substantial increase in the amount of monthly benefits to those retired and certainly favor an upward adjustment in the tax schedule and in the amount of payments to be made to those now working and contributing to the OASI fund.

I would like to comment briefly on the Forand bill and to state to the committee that I enthusiastically support and favor enactment of this piece of legislation at the earliest possible moment.

This bill embodies a proposal that I have long favored, that is, payment of up to 60 days free hospitalization for any recipient of social-security benefits. I need not point out to the committee how vitally necessary this feature is. The bill goes further and adjusts upward the amount taken into consideration in computing OASI benefits from $4,200 to $6,000 a year, a thing which would be most helpful to those retiring in the future. The bill would raise the maximum benefit payable under the OASI program from $200 to $305. The Forand bill would increase present retirees benefits by $5 to $10 a month. Such an increase is vitally necessary to our retirees, and should be given in the interest of both justice and humanity.

I would now like to turn my discussion to legislative proposals which I have advanced during this and other Congresses, naming each piece of legislation by its appropriate number.

H. R. 4765

This bill provides that up to 60 days free hospitalization be extended to recipients of social-security benefits.

People over the age of 65 are very prone to illness and this vulnerability increases with each passing day. Yet, it is the practice of many private health insurance plans to discontinue hospital benefits available to the insured person after age 60 or 65. Statistics show that fewer than one-third of the people over 65 and only one-sixth of those over 75 have hospitalization of any sort and none of this insurance gives anything like adequate coverage. For comparison, in the rest of the population more than 2 in every 3 have some form of hospital insurance or comprehensive health insurance.

The problem of paying hospital bills is particularly serious for our older citizens because their greater need is accompanied by reduced economic means. Their incomes on the average are much smaller than the rest of our people. Among our 14 million people 65 years of age or older, only about one-third have incomes exceeding $1,000 a year and only about 1 in 5 have as much as $2,000 a year income. The 6 million who depend on old-age insurance benefits are receiving on the average $105 a month for a retired worker and his wife, or about $64 a month for a retired worker alone. Even those who receive the maximum allowable retirement benefits get only $162.80 a month for a couple or $108.50 for an individual. This level of income cannot cover more than a few days of hospitalization a year and few of these couples have any significant additional income and still fewer have any savings to fall back on. To individuals in such reduced circumstances sickness and its attendant expenses are disastrous and the financial difficulties and worries which accompany a stay in the hospital also aggravate the difficulties of restoring good health.

Persons over the ages of 60 or 65 are generally unable to obtain hospital insurance coverage if they do not have it when they reach that age, and many who have such insurance find that they are no longer permitted to renew it after they reach 65.

Of course, the premium cost in health insurance for persons of such age is often beyond the reach of our older citizens.

A program of the type that I set forth in this bill is vitally necessary to the security of our older citizens.

H. R. 5263

This bill provides that social-security benefits shall be exempt from taxation.

The present law is muddled as to whether or not social-security benefits are taxable by Federal, State, or local governments. Because of the present uncertain status few governments attempt to tax social-security benefits. Of course, the low level of income of social-security pensioners generally makes tax liabilities small, in fact so small as to be administratively hardly worth the trouble. At the present time social-security benefits are exempt from Federal taxation through interpretative ruling only. In view of the extremely muddled situation as to taxation of these benefits and because of the desirability of protecting our older citizens in their enjoyment of their social-security benefits, legislation of this sort should be passed at the earliest possible moment.

H. R. 5737

This bill embodies my proposal to reduce the retirement age for men to 60 and for women to 55.

While I prefer that the retirement age should be reduced to this level, I would support strongly any reduction in the retirement age under the program.

The reasons for this change are both economically sound and of humanitarian appeal. As the committee will recall, the recent reduction in the age limit to 62 for women during the last session was a great step forward. This reduction from the once sacred age of 65 did not hurt the program, but its humanitarian impact was enormously beneficial.

The same logic applies here. Each year we find that our senior citizens, although desiring to work to support themselves, find it more difficult to locate or maintain jobs. When laid off, the older workers find it almost impossible to obtain other work. This is particularly true in the present recession. This is a hardship brought on by no fault of the worker, which gives no opportunity to the citizen affected, and which invariably reduces him to a charity case against his wishes. Few men or women retire voluntarily. Company regulations, difficulty in finding a job, sickness, and old age are the real causes. The Department of Labor found that employers were not hiring older workers because they believe them to be less productive and responsible for a tremendous increase in insurance and pension costs.

In 1955 a survey showed that the greatest number of people receiving benefits had been forced to do so for a reason beyond their control. The most common reason was age, the next number were retired because of ill health.

Certainly the low level of social-security benefits offer no great incentive. The average monthly benefits for October 1956 was $63.21 for a retired worker, $33.64 for his wife, and $49.24 for a widow.

The cost of this amendment is small, but its need is great.

H. R. 6107

This bill eliminates the requirement that a person who is permanently and totally disabled shall have to wait until age 50 to receive social security disability benefits.

As the committee will recall, the age 50 requirement for retirement under the permanent and totally disabled section of the law was a compromise, and not a good one.

To show the contradictions in this compromise, a man, regardless of his age, is entitled to take advantage of the disability-freeze provisions of the act, regardless of how long the permanent and total disability occurs prior to his 50th birthday, and to make no payments into the fund in the interim while retaining full coverage. A man of 50 may retire under these provisions who is no more disabled than a citizen of 30, 40, 45, or 49. Because of the requirement of the law that the worker must show both a substantial and a recent work history, it is possible that a younger man may have the same or greater disability and need, and may show equal or greater contributions to the fund, and yet he is compelled to wait for some distant and future date, while the worker age 50 may retire at once.

The cost of this proposal is negligible, and its enactment would add only one-eighth of 1 percent of payroll for both worker and employer, but would add security and protection for our people, whose worth cannot be valued in mere dollars or cents.

H. R. 7433

This bill would raise the amount of earnings which could be made by retirees under the social-security program from $1,200 to $1,800.

The reasoning and need for this legislation is clear. The cost to the fund would be negligible. It would be of immense help to our retirees who desire to and are able to find supplementary work. It is made necessary by the tremendous rise in the cost of living and by the deplorably low level of benefits to our social-security retirees. The anomalous situation in the law which permits a covered worker to retire and find no reduction in his benefits, even though he may have considerable savings, wealth, or some other type of exempt income is clearly unfair to the covered retiree who has no such outside income and who desires to supplement his small retirement benefits by his own labor.

This legislation requires virtually no change in the tax rate.

H. R. 7669

This is my bill which would raise the amount subject to taxation and on which benefits would be computed from $4,200 to $6,200.

Anyone earning under $4,200 would pay no increase in OASI taxes, and the increase in taxation on those earning between that amount and $6,200 would be quite small, about 28 percent to those covered under the system, for a maximum of about $45 per year, for both employer and employee. I am advised that this change will do much to improve the solvency of the fund.

The real effect of this change would be to raise the schedule of benefits from a present maximum of $108.50 for a worker, and $162.80 for a man and wife, to $141.70 for a worker and $212.60 for a man and wife. Thus our retirees would be much more able to cope with the problems of retirement with comfort and security.

H. R. 10578

This bill changes the definition of "permanently and totally disabled" under the act to cover one who is precluded by medically determinable physical or mental impairment which can be expected to result in death or to be of permanent or indefinite duration to engage in gainful activity which is the same as or similar to the occupation or employment last performed by him on a regular basis before the onset of such impairment.

The reason for this amendment is that the Social Security Administration has been construing permanent and total disablement to be only such as would preclude any and all gainful activity.

As a result of the administrative interpretation, the number of those who are unable to work gainfully in their employment, and who for all intents and purposes are unemployable are denied the benefits of this section. For example, where it was expected that the Social Security Administration would place on its rolls some 400,000 permanently and totally disabled persons, we find that as of last November, 1 year from enactment, the total number of beneficiaries had grown to only 160,500. The harsh actions of the Administration in this regard have caused widespread and justified criticism, and this bill is aimed at correcting the overstringent interpretations which have been used.

H. R. 10583

This is a very simple bill, amending the Social Security Act so that a person is considered permanently and totally disabled for purposes of drawing benefits under that section of the act, where he is so certified by another agency of the United States Government.

Failure of the Government to adhere to uniform standards in determining permanent and total disability has resulted in some strange absurdities and many very severe hardships, as I am sure the committee can very well understand. This bill is aimed at ending such an absurd situation.

In conclusion, gentlemen, I strongly urge this committee to liberalize and improve the Social Security Act along the lines of my bills which I have set forth above. Passage of such legislation would be of the utmost benefit to our people both presently retired and those who will retire in the future.

In addition, I stress that the amount of interest paid on the social security trust fund is neither just nor equitable. Presently it approximates 2.7 percent, where the Civil Service and Railroad Retirement trust funds bring 3 percent interest. In these days of high interest, this is a grave inequity, bearing heavily upon our retirees and those who will be dependent on the fund in the future. Raising the interest to 3 percent would permit additional benefits to our retirees with no additional charges to either workers or employers, and would certainly seem to be both just and proper.

I hope this great committee can take some action to liberalize social security benefits, and I am sure that any liberalization will be enthusiastically supported by our citizens.

Report to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I again take this opportunity of reporting to my constituents, the people of Berks County, the 14th Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

PURPOSE OF REPORT

This report deals with the work and the record of the 85th Congress. It summarizes my activities and the position I have taken on important issues coming before the Congress.

During the past 2 years, I have made weekly radio reports and have submitted weekly columns to newspapers in Berks County. I have also mailed monthly newsletters to those persons who have asked to be on my mailing list. This printed report supplements these periodic reports during the session, so that all citizens of Berks County may have the opportunity to know my legislative record and the record of the 85th Congress as a whole.

REPRESENTATION

As a Representative of the people of Berks County in Congress, I have made every effort to serve the public interest conscientiously and to the best of my ability. The views of every person who has discussed personally or written me on legislative issues have been afforded full consideration. Individual problems of constituents have been promptly handled by my office. Every possible effort has been made to be of assistance to everyone who has come to my office for information, advice, or service. My attendance record in the 85th Congress was again one of the highest.

READING OFFICE

My office in the Reading Post Office Building has been open 6 days a week year round for the convenience of constituents who have problems or who wish to present their views and suggestions. During the past 2 years, I have spent as many weekends as possible in Reading and have fulfilled many appointments with constituents who called at my office. I have also made my time available to discuss any issue, answer questions, debate or otherwise explain my views on specific issues at the invitation of any group in Berks County.

WASHINGTON VISITS

During the 85th Congress, it has been my pleasure to welcome many individuals and school groups, religious organizations, women's clubs, Boy and Girl Scout groups, and other organizations who have come to Washington and visited me at the Capitol. With the help of Mrs. Rhodes, I have tried to make these visits interesting, educational, and enjoyable.

COMMITTEE WORK

In this 85th Congress, I served on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and the Committee on House Administration. The Commerce Committee has wide jurisdiction over matters pertaining to transportation, communications, health, science, research, and related fields. I am also the ranking majority member of the Health and Science Subcommittee, which handled such important legislation as hospital construction and medical research facilities, public health matters, weather modification research, and matters affecting the Food and Drug Administration.

My views on pending legislation were presented to other committees of the House and Senate on such subjects as railroad retirement, social security, postal rates, postal pay, civil-service retirement, assistance to the handicapped, and various taxation measures.

BILLS INTRODUCED

I sponsored legislation to raise income-tax exemptions to $800 a year, establish a Bureau of Older Persons, reduce the retirement age and increase social-security benefits, establish an agency to assist the handicapped, reduce small-business tax rates, stabilize employment in the textile industry, and to increase railroad-retirement benefits.

Other bills I introduced would curb arbitrary cancellation of health, accident, and hospitalization insurance, prohibit destruction of the National Grange headquarters, grant tax deductions to handicapped persons, provide grants to schools of public health, liberalize public-assistance provisions of the Social Security Act, limit subsidies paid to second-class mail users, provide adequate funds for our participation in the Brussels World Fair, and provide income-tax exemption to teachers for expenses incurred in furthering their education.

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE

I have taken part in important debates on the floor of the House on such issues as postal rates, public-health funds, pension increases for Spanish-American War widows, exemption of nonprofit swimming pool groups from Federal excise taxes, additional wheat acreage allotments for feed grain use on the farm, social security, civil-service retirement, labor reform and pension welfare funds, depressed areas, community facilities,

public-health education, aid to railroads, the Brussels Fair, and weather modification research.

BOOSTING BERKS

Of special interest to the people of Berks County are the many Federal programs, projects, and defense contracts placed in our county, all of which directly benefit our people and our local economy.

The social-security program brings in a yearly total of $15 million to more than 22,000 Berks Countians receiving monthly benefit checks. The Federal surplus food disposal program brought needed assistance to several thousand unemployed and needy persons each month. Many disabled persons were restored to productive and satisfying lives with the help of the Federal-State vocational rehabilitation program.

As a result of the severe drought during 1957, Berks County was designated as an area where the Farmers' Home Administration could make emergency loans at low interest rates to eligible farmers. Federally guaranteed home loans have been secured by many citizens of Reading and Berks County. Several important federally assisted highway-construction projects have been undertaken.

The Walnut Street urban redevelopment project in Reading is well under way, aided by a $225,764 Federal capital grant. Ground has been broken on the $650,000 Naval and Marine Corps Training Center in Reading and $171,000 in Federal funds for construction of the Kutztown National Guard Armory have been released. This latter project is expected to be under way early next year.

Federal funds totaling $49,986 have been allocated to Cumru Township for completion of planning for construction of a sewage-collection system. The Borough of Birdsboro has received a Federal advance of $18,000 for preliminary planning for construction of a sanitary sewer system. Another Federal grant of $16,107 was made to the Womelsdorf-Robesonia Joint Authority for construction of a water-supply system for these 2 communities. A $92,000 Federal grant has been made to Muhlenberg Township for planning a sanitary sewer system, while Reading received a $165,970 grant for planning an extension of the sanitary sewer system to serve the 18th, 19th, and part of the 16th wards.

Many defense contracts have also been placed in Berks County. Well over $2 million in subcontract work on the most recent medium tank contract awarded by the Army is to be done by local concerns. I had previously arranged for a meeting of local businesses and company representatives on this procurement to help channel additional jobs and business into our area. Over $4 million in defense work has been placed in Berks since the spring of 1958, providing an important stimulant to our economy during this critical recession period.

THE 85TH CONGRESS AND THE CHALLENGE OF THE FUTURE

Seldom in history has our Nation been confronted with so many complex problems and serious challenges within our own economy, in our scientific and technological ability, and in our efforts to cope with the sinister advance of Communism throughout the world.

FIRST SESSION, 1957

The 85th Congress convened in January 1957. Soviet brutality in crushing the revolt of Hungarian freedom fighters and impact of the Suez Canal conflict were still fresh in our minds. The administration was pushing with renewed vigor its economic curtailment and hard money policies. President Eisenhower was inaugurated for a second term and sent to Congress the largest peacetime budget in our history. A gigantic economy pressure drive was soon directed toward Congress by hard money advocates. Administration leaders differed over the size and importance of various programs recommended. Treasury Secretary Humphrey refused to support the administration's budget and the orders finally went out to executive departments to hold spending to the previous year's level.

Funds appropriated by Congress for essential defense programs were held up by the Budget Bureau; other programs important to the Nation were similarly curtailed. By early fall 1957 industrial production had declined, inventories piled up, the home building industry was crippled by rising interest rates, and industrial unemployment began to rise sharply.

A Congressional investigation of the administration's monetary and fiscal policies was conducted to evaluate the effects of hard money, high interest rates, the rising cost of living, the increase in the public debt, and budgetary matters. But the administration refused to change its course, despite the growing economic decline and evidence that these fiscal policies were having a harmful effect on millions of small businessmen, farmers, retired folks, professional and industrial workers.

Meanwhile, growing scientific advancements of the Soviet Union were dramatically revealed to the American people by their launching of the first earth satellite. Congressional leaders had repeatedly warned of the rapidly closing gap between our country and the Soviet in guided missiles, in the development of atomic energy, science, technology and in research and development of modern military power. The nonpartisan Gaither and Rockefeller reports contained similar warnings. But the administration had largely ignored these ominous developments and we found ourselves totally unprepared to meet the challenges of the space age.

SECOND SESSION, 1958

The second session of the 85th Congress met in January 1958 with a strong sense of urgency to deal with the domestic and international crisis which seriously threatened our Nation. The record of accomplishment of the 85th Congress in enacting major legislation to meet these challenges presents remarkable evidence of the ability of our system of representative government to cope with any emergency, even in this new era of satellites, missiles, and outer space.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Department of Defense reorganization legislation was enacted, along the lines requested by the President, strengthening the authority of the Defense Secretary to eliminate wasteful duplication of effort among the services, to facilitate strategic planning, to improve command operations, and to expand defense research and development functions.

Congress appropriated a record peacetime defense budget of $40 billion, an increase of $5 billion over last year, to strengthen our national defense in such vital areas as missile research, development, and production, dispersal of Strategic Air Command bases, and the acquisition of missile bases. Funds were also provided for the construction of additional nuclear-powered missile submarines, jet bombers and tanker planes, as well as needed conventional weapons.

Major recommendations of the Cordiner Commission were enacted into law, increasing pay scales of members of the armed services to provide inducements for career military personnel, particularly in the technical fields. Eventual savings to the taxpayers are estimated at $4 billion. Career military establishment may also mean eventual elimination of the draft.

A civilian-controlled National Aeronautics and Space Administration was established to deal specifically with the development of a comprehensive program of research and operations in aeronautical and space sciences, space flight, development of aircraft, missiles, and other space vehicles.

A national defense education bill was enacted, providing fellowships and low interest loans to students to enable them to attend institutions of higher learning. Special consideration is given students with special abilities in the fields of science, mathematics, engineering, or modern foreign language. The bill also provides grants to States for strengthening instruction in these fields and in testing, guidance, and counseling services, and area vocational education programs.

ANTIRECESSION PROGRAMS

The 85th Congress enacted several measures to stimulate our sagging economy and to help alleviate the severe economic distress of millions of Americans bearing the brunt of the recession. Other important antirecession programs were blocked by the conservative coalition in the House.

The Federal interstate highway construction was accelerated by the appropriation of more than $3 billion this year, providing additional jobs in the road building industry and related industries. States were given bonus funds for the regulation of billboards along the Interstate Highway System.

An emergency housing program authorizing almost $2 billion in housing loan funds was enacted early this year. It was designed to stimulate the building industry by encouraging the construction of up to 200,000 homes, providing jobs for hundreds of thousands of building tradesmen in communities throughout the country. The impact of this legislation is already being felt, as

new housing starts have risen sharply in the past several months.

Unemployment had risen to almost 5½ million persons, the highest number since pre-World War II days. An estimated 2 to 3 million additional workers were on part time. Hundreds of thousands of unemployed workers were exhausting their unemployment compensation benefits each month, bringing severe economic hardship to them and their families.

Congress enacted legislation to permit States to borrow Federal funds to extend the payment of unemployment compensation benefits for a period equal to 50 percent of the number of weeks of payments authorized under State law. This meant a maximum 45 weeks coverage in Pennsylvania, highest in the Nation. Prompt action by Gov. George M. Leader in applying for the Federal loans extended benefits in Pennsylvania to provide emergency assistance to many thousands of our unemployed workers.

Efforts to modernize the unemployment compensation system and to further liberalize the emergency assistance program were blocked by a coalition of Republicans and some Southern Democrats.

The Congress enacted an excise tax revision measure which will provide relief in some segments of the economy. The excise tax on freight was repealed, benefiting the railroads and rail shippers, and a long-needed small-business tax relief bill was also enacted. Another technical income tax revision bill was passed, closing certain loopholes and correcting unintended benefits and hardships in the 1954 tax law. Efforts to close major tax loopholes, such as the 27½ percent oil depletion allowance, were blocked in the Senate.

The Area Redevelopment Act was passed by the 85th Congress, providing a long-range American point 4 program to assist economically depressed areas to help themselves in reducing unemployment and in bringing in diversified new industries to stimulate the local economy. This new law will be of extreme importance to Pennsylvania. It provides Federal loans for industrial projects, grants for public utility services for new plants, the retraining of workers displaced by the movement of industry, technical planning assistance for redevelopment programs, and urban renewal assistance. In a separate action, a Senate study of the depressed textile industry was authorized.

The Transportation Act of 1958 provides needed Federal assistance to the Nation's distressed railroad industry by authorizing $500 million in Government loans for capital improvements and maintenance. It also made important amendments to the Interstate Commerce Act to improve rail operations.

Long-needed legislation to provide equity capital and long-term loans to small businesses were enacted. Other important measures benefiting small business were enacted, helping to create new job opportunities in communities throughout the Nation.

Other important antirecession programs enacted by Congress included an accelerated $1.1 billion public-works program of flood control, navigation, and water resources construction projects and a $1.5 billion military construction appropriation measure.

A coalition of Republicans and Southern Democrats in the House, plus strong administration opposition, succeeded in blocking several other antirecession measures.

The community facilities bill would have made $2 billion in long-term loans available to local governments for planning and construction of public works such as hospitals, sewage projects, streets, recreational facilities, public buildings, urban-renewal projects, water-supply systems, and similar types of worthwhile community projects. Enactment of this legislation would have permitted more immediate construction of several public-works projects in Berks County, which are now in the planning and development stages.

Similar opposition killed an omnibus housing bill, authorizing funds for urban-renewal projects, VA and FHA home-loan programs, housing for elderly persons, college-housing loans, and military housing. This was one of the major setbacks suffered in the 85th Congress. The bill received a 251–134 favorable vote in the House, but fell 6 votes short of a two-thirds majority vote. The measure had been pigeonholed by the House Rules Committee and could only be considered under a special parliamentary device which requires a two-thirds vote for passage. This defeat prevented enactment of comprehensive housing legislation the first time in 10 years.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Domestic economic problems, national defense considerations in an era of atomic missiles and H-bombs, and our sudden entry into the space age have had profound overlapping effects on our relations with other nations of the world.

During the past 2 years we have lost ground in the cold war. The Soviets achieved a psychological victory last October by launching an earth satellite, proof that our supremacy in the scientific and technological fields was being successfully challenged and that our military position in the world was being seriously threatened.

This event temporarily shocked our Government and the American people out of the complacency which has marked the administration's foreign and defense policies. The clamor for action to meet the grave Russian challenges in education, scientific achievement, and missile development reached a peak with the leak of information on our inadequate defense posture contained in independent, semiofficial evaluations of our state of military preparedness.

The sense of urgency created by these events has not been sustained by the administration, despite efforts made by Congress to stimulate the type of action required to meet the challenge. With the launching of earth satellites of our own, complacency again has paralyzed many top echelons of the executive branch of our Government.

Other incidents have provided warnings that drastic changes in our policies are long overdue. The Vice President of the United States was attacked by a Communist-inspired mob during a South American "good will" visit. Cuban rebels seized American sailors and held them captive, defying our demands for their release. Finally, the outbreak of the crisis in the Middle East prompted the President to send American troops to occupy Lebanon, while the world trembled on the brink of nuclear war.

Through efforts in the United Nations, an acceptable plan has been devised to ease Middle East tensions. Some of our troops have been withdrawn from Lebanon. But the basic problems of the Middle East have not been solved. Such matters as the rise of Arab nationalism, Soviet infiltration and subversion, the role of Israel, and the Middle East oil supply remain to be dealt with.

Meanwhile, our Government has announced to the world that we are prepared to join other countries in halting the testing of atomic and hydrogen weapons for 1 year, pending the outcome of negotiations with other nations of an effective method of detecting nuclear explosions anywhere in the world. This would be the first step toward eventual disarmament and an end to the nuclear arms race which threatens to contaminate the world with radioactive fallout.

The 85th Congress enacted many significant measures in the field of foreign policy and trade with other nations. The mutual security program was extended; the reciprocal trade program was extended for 4 years; the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank was increased and its operating authority extended for 5 years; the President was authorized to lend economic and military assistance to Middle Eastern nations threatened by aggression; participation in the International Atomic Energy Agency and in Euratom was authorized, and the exchange of mutually essential atomic information and materials with our allies was also approved; Congress adopted a resolution calling upon the United Nations to establish a permanent emergency force to keep the peace and also a resolution condemning the secret trial and execution of leaders of the Hungarian revolt in 1956.

LIBERAL DEMOCRATIC PROGRAM

I joined a group of 80 northern and western liberal Democratic Congressmen in offering a positive legislative program to meet the needs and challenges of our modern civilization.

This broad program stressed important unfinished business in the fields of social security and other pension programs, health, welfare, and the needs of our elderly citizens, national defense, and foreign policy, civil rights, conservation of our resources, assistance to small business, tax reforms, full employment, and economic expansion, and many other related issues.

While all of our objectives could not be achieved in any single Congress, remarkable progress was made in these areas during the past 2 years despite the existence of the Republican-conservative southern Democratic coalition which dominated the makeup of the 85th Congress.

The efforts of liberal Democrats to further advance this program will continue in the 86th Congress.

Report to the Voters of the 10th Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the era of space, with its sputniks, established the tenor of the 2d session of the 85th Congress. The tenor was sombre because the leadership of the United States had fallen to an all-time low both at home and abroad. To many, it was not a surprise, for the slide to the bottom had begun earlier. The United States and the Free World were dangling over the brink. The diplomatic, political, and economic policies of the Eisenhower administration brought our Nation into deep trouble.

The Soviet launching of sputnik shocked the peoples of the world. People are always impressed by success. The impact was grave and I do not think it is possible at this time for the human mind to assess the true value to mankind of this exploration into outer space. We do know that such achievements in the possession of the Free World would be developed for the benefit of mankind and we are equally aware that in the sole possession of the Soviet, mankind is in danger of captivity and destruction.

Congress was placed in a most compromising situation. Implementation of the Executive's policies is its responsibility. Congress cannot set the policies. That is the responsibility of the executive branch of our Government. Congress can challenge, it can criticize, and it can try to reshape the policies, but even then, the decisions that are reached by the Congress can be vetoed by the Executive or even nullified.

The Democratic-controlled Congress exerted leadership during the entire session and discarded partisan politics on all controversial matters. What was said was brief and restrained by the ever-present crises. Although it was difficult, the Congress stood by the President in the turmoil of our foreign relations. We tried to protect the President during this critical period so that our Nation could stand united on basic foreign policy.

The threat of communism to the United States and to the Free World is grave. It is so grave that the scientific achievements of the Soivet threaten the very survival of civilization. The control of the instruments of destruction in the hands of the reckless and power-hungry leaders of the Kremlin affects every decision.

Mending our fences was the key purpose of legislation, not only on international problems but also on domestic issues. Unity within the United States as well as inside the western alliance was the objective of the Democratic Party. The importance of unity is greater than a large Military Establishment. Both, however, are prerequisites to a just peace in the world. To speak and to act in unity, to reaffirm again and again what we believe, to mean what we believe, and to be ready to defend our beliefs are the issues. To preserve the rights of man at any cost, the people of the United States and the world must be shaken from their apathy.

Many issues, both international and domestic, confronted the Congress; to mention a few, labor, recession and inflation, national defense, rockets, trade, agriculture, social security, and summit conferences. To its credit, the record reveals a nonpartisan approach and a grant of flexibility to the President to meet the rapid shift of events in a modern world. That the Eisenhower administration has failed to use this power wisely is becoming more evident as our Nation flounders when it should lead. The 85th Congress enacted essential legislation for the days ahead. The implementation and execution of this legislation, however, will require courageous, forthright, constant, and undivided leadership by the Chief Executive of our Nation.

BUDGET

The Federal Government operates on a budget that is presented to Congress at the beginning of the session. It represents the final determination of the requests by all agencies of our Government and is approved by the President. It is prepared by specialists who are well equipped with information on revenues, expenditures, and needs of the Government. Cushions are created to carry the shock of sudden changes. One of the first acts of the 2d session of the 85th Congress was the passage of deficiency appropriation bills which reflected the failure of the executive branch to properly gauge the necessary appropriations for the previous fiscal year. In 1958, the supplemental appropriation bills amounted to $6,613,905,042 as against $4,402,-010,737 in fiscal 1957.

In January 1958, the estimated budget for fiscal 1958–59 was $73.9 billion. Because of the many crises that have arisen during the succeeding months, the Presidential requests have increased that figure to about $79 billion. Congressional appropriations for that period are $72,-653,476,248.

In January 1958, the estimated revenue figure for fiscal 1958–59 was $74.4 billion. The recession, however, has reduced that figure to about $67 billion. The crises and the recession have created a deficit of about $12 billion. This can be attributed solely to the lack of foresight on the part of the Chief Executive.

The promises of the Republican Party to decrease the debt, reduce administrative expenses, and balance the budget on the assumption the world was enjoying peace and prosperity were all unrealistic pledges. And they were forgotten when the Eisenhower administration requested an immediate increase in the permanent debt from $275 billion to $285 billion with a temporary ceiling to $288 billion. Again, Congress implemented the Executive's request. The interest on the debt has risen from $6 billion in 1952 to $7.8 billion in 1958. In the light of the increased national debt, the interest will be substantially higher.

INTERNATIONAL

Most of the nations in the world today are in a state of tension, uneasiness, and fear. The Soviet Union and its satellites are engaged in a cold war with the United States and with all other free and independent nations. The Far East is in a stalemate since President Eisenhower negotiated a Korean truce which has permitted Red China and North Korea to be equipped by the Soviet, with the most modern atomic war potential known to man. Latin America is being infiltrated by the Soviet. Latin America has been neglected by the United States. It has been taken for granted. This is emphasized by the fact that assistance by the United States to all of Latin America for 1 year is less than our assistance to Yugoslavia for the same period.

The Middle East is a seething cauldron that may boil over at any time. The creation of a vacuum with the departure of the big European powers has brought nothing but strife and turmoil. The United Nations' efforts to establish peace and economic and political stability among the nations in the Middle East demonstrate very little success.

The foreign policy of the United States toward the Middle East has been a series of failures. Our foreign policy objectives are not successful because we have failed to understand the real nature of the problem we face. The Middle East faces us today like a smoldering forest fire. At best, our efforts to date have merely put off a sudden outburst of flame or halted momentarily a new outcropping of fire. It is conceivable that our efforts have fanned the embers for a major conflagration. A better understanding of the problem in this area is imperative.

The realities of the Middle East must be realized before any constructive results can be attained. This area is a region of vast property and, more important, of increasing awareness by its impoverished population that there is and can be a better way of life. Israel stands as a shining exception to this melancholy existence of a downtrodden people, still enchanted by the economic conditions and social patterns of a feudal past. The inspiring and fantastic development of Israel by her people has been one of the major forces by convincing evidence that the people in the Arab lands could live better if the same zeal were applied in their own efforts.

The Soviet Union in turn has been waging an all-out campaign to win the allegiance of the Arab States by appealing to the same emotions of discontent and nationalistic pride. The Soviets have been providing the tools with which national ambitions for prestige, power, and economic development can be realized. The most important Soviet weapon is the exploiting of Arab enmity toward Israel. The Free World fails to emphasize the captive plight of the 40 million Moslems within Russia in contrast to the insincere action of the Soviets to free the Moslems in the Middle East.

The foreign policies of the United States have followed an indefinite and erratic course in the Middle East in the past decade. The West has no shining

record of leadership in the area. Far too often we have failed to identify ourselves with this revolutionary upsurge and have clung to the past. What we have failed to see in the Middle East is the need to set our own priorities, our own policies, through our own initiative instead of merely reacting to the actions of somebody else, whether a Khrushchev or a Nasser. Instead of providing fulfillment of peace and economic stabilization for the area and safety for ourselves, the policies of rival powers have continued to bring chaos, strife, and mistrust between the West and the Arab nations. Our fruitless obsession for firm allies in the Middle East rather than friendly states is responsible for the dilemma we are in today. We have known the imperative need for the maintenance of peace and security in the Middle East must be one of the aims of our foreign policy. Also, we understood the vital importance of the Middle East oil to the economic and military strength of the Free World. But despite the Eisenhower doctrine, the Baghdad Pact, our dollars to King Ibn Saud, and our wooing of Nasser, peace and stability today seem farther away. One day we condemn the British for sending forces to Suez, and the next we join them with the landing of troops in the Holy Land. What assurance of peace and security can we give to any Middle East country without a definitive foreign policy? Our support of unpopular governments in this area has created only more tension and anti-American feeling.

It is time to ask why we are in this position. Why is a constructive policy in the Middle East lacking? Our fundamental interests in the Middle East should be the preservation of peace, the emergence of peaceful and popularly responsible governments, and the social and economic progress of the ordinary peoples of the Middle East, Arab, and Israeli alike.

The mutual security bill, generally known as the foreign-aid bill, is the implementation of our foreign policy with nations of the Free World. It is the cost to the United States for its alliances. Its purpose is both defense and economic. In the light of this atomic era, the administration did not recommend any vast change. This is the responsibility of the Executive.

In questioning Secretary of State Dulles on this point, I asked:

Mrs. KELLY. Now, in this mutual security bill which we are considering, are there any new methods or means of obtaining our objectives in the light of this new Russian look, or the new change as you refer, outside the Development Loan Fund and possibly long-range planning?

Secretary DULLES. No; there are no new instrumentalities that are to be created. We believe the existing instrumentalities are adequate and the only change is the possible enlargement and broadening of the United Nations technical-assistance program.

I believe it was for this reason that the Congress passed a foreign aid bill for $3.03 billion. This is, in my estimation, merely stopgap legislation. The Foreign Affairs Committee will have a complete review of United States foreign policy this fall in an endeavor to help reshape our foreign policy in the next Congress.

The Mutual Defense Assistance Act—the Battle Act—has been consistently weakened by the Republican administration since 1953. Under this law we have an agreement with our allies on the materials which can be traded to the Soviet, Red China, North Korea, and the Soviet-captive nations. A most radical change has been made in this agreement this year.

One hundred items or more have been removed from the list of strategic articles. These include manufactured goods, raw materials, oil tankers, fishing vessels, electronic equipment, and plants for producing chemicals. Does it make sense for the United States to wage a cold war with Russia and at the same time sell them strategic materials in short supply, and consumer goods? Is it commonsense to trade with the enemy in a shooting war or in a cold war? Is it commonsense to give assistance to the enemy thereby permitting his continued buildup of a military machine?

On the international scene during the 2d session of the 85th Congress, the following were enacted:

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, extending for 4 years the authority of the President to enter into reciprocal trade agreements.

Provision for exchange of mutually essential atomic information and materials with our allies.

Authorization of loans and research grants to carry out United States share in cooperative development of atomic power with European Atomic Energy Community.

Extension for 2 years, to June 30, 1960, the authority of the President to control exports of strategic materials.

An increase in the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank by $2 billion.

Provision for payment to Americans of their claims against Czechoslovakia from its blocked assets here.

Retroactive adjustment of status of 30,000 escapees from the October 1956 Hungarian revolution to permit permanent residence in the United States.

Record of lawful admission for permanent residence of certain aliens who entered the United States before June 28, 1940.

Simplification of procedure for nonimmigrant aliens to become permanent residents.

Authorized an additional $10 million for completion of the Inter-American Highway.

Extension to June 30, 1959, of suspension of import duties on metal scrap.

In addition, the Congress adopted the concurrent resolution which denounces the Communist execution of leaders of the 1956 Hungary revolt, and expresses the indignation of Congress and the Nation at this act of perfidy and barbarism.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNAL SECURITY

For greater national defense and internal security, the following laws were placed on the statute books:

Authorization of $54.6 million to expand and accelerate construction of missile bases, detection and warning systems.

Authorization of a $100.5-million program of new construction and conversion of naval vessels for fiscal 1959, including nuclear-powered and guided-missile warships, landing craft, and service ships.

Authorization of $1.6 billion for construction projects at Armed Forces installations and bases here and abroad.

Authorization of $386 million for Atomic Energy Commission construction, expansion, or acquisition of facilities, and $35 million for construction of reactor for an atomic-powered destroyer.

Authorization of $47.8 million for construction of new Space Projects Center, expansion of satellite launching and tracking facilities.

Extension to June 30, 1960, of the President's authority to allocate and fix priorities for strategic materials, grant loans and subsidies under the Defense Production Act.

Extension to June 30, 1962, of the standby emergency powers of the President.

Enactment into permanent law of authority of the President to expedite defense contracts during period of emergency.

Extension of the Renegotiation Act to June 30, 1959, to provide for recovery of excessive profits on defense contracts of $1 million or more.

Authorization of loan of reserve naval vessels to NATO and South American countries.

Authorization of deferments in certain cases to raise standards of selective service.

Authorized $18,800,000 Federal aid to States for radiological detection and protective devices; and, on a matching basis, for local civil defense personnel and administration.

GOVERNMENTAL REORGANIZATION

The most important of the reorganization programs effected in the 85th Congress was the reorganization of the Defense Department. This should provide a closer coordination of the armed services particularly in the field of missile research. Other enactments under this title were:

Establishment of the National Aeronautic and Space Administration.

Provision for admission of Alaska to the Union as the 49th State.

Establishment of the Federal Aviation Agency, a new independent agency to regulate air traffic and safety, supplanting the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Salary increases for more than 1 million Federal employees, including 500,000 post-office employees.

Pay increases for members of the Armed Forces, to encourage career service.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

In addition to raising the ceiling on the national debt, the 2d session of the 85th Congress saw the following enactments which will certainly show up in our national economy:

Extended to July 1, 1959, the 52-percent corporate income-tax rate and present schedule of excise taxes on alcoholic beverages, cigarettes, automobiles,

parts and accessories, repealed the 3-percent tax on freight by rail and oil by pipeline.

Provided $260 million a year tax relief for small business and made numerous technical changes in income, estate- and gift-tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code to eliminate unintended benefits and hardships and to correct errors and ambiguities.

Reduced the cabaret tax from 20 percent to 10 percent.

Increased by $4 billion the authorization for FHA mortgage insurance.

Authorized an emergency $1.8 billion Housing Act to stimulate homebuilding; reduced downpayments on FHA-financed houses; extended guaranty and direct loan programs for veterans; increased funds for FNMA mortgage purchases.

Authorized for apportionment among the States $5.5 billion for highway construction, including $1.8 billion additional to both the regular Federal aid and the interstate superhighway programs, to create jobs and expedite work.

Authorized—optionally to States—repayment in 5 years, up to 15 weeks additional Federal unemployment compensation for the jobless whose State payments have expired.

Created the Small Business Investment Administration to provide equity capital and long term loans to small business enterprises through investment companies chartered for that purpose and provided for a $250 million revolving fund; also broadened the authority of the Small Business Administration to permit loans in areas of excessive rainfall.

Enacted a law requiring price labeling of new automobiles.

Increased postal rates by $547 million a year; first class mail from 3 cents to 4 cents an ounce and airmail from 6 cents to 7 cents; second-class rates progressively on percentage basis over 3 years.

VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN

Of interest to our servicemen and to our veterans are the following provisions of this session:

Codified into a single act all laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

Codified the military laws enacted in 1955–56.

Increased the monthly rate of pension to widows of Spanish-American, Indian, Mexican, and Civil War veterans.

Provided for special training for handicapped war orphans.

Amended the Social Security Act to extend benefits of unemployment compensation to all ex-servicemen, heretofore available only to Korean veterans.

Increased premiums and benefits for total disability under National Life Insurance Act.

Increased burial allowance for deceased veterans from $150 to $250.

Increased special rate of compensation for certain blinded veterans.

Extended to July 16, 1959, time to apply for mustering-out payments under Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952.

AGRICULTURE

Although the residents of my District are not interested, as producers, in agriculture, they have a very great stake, as consumers, in the following enactments of the second session:

Established humane methods in slaughter of animals.

Extended authority of the President to grant special livestock loans.

Extended to December 31, 1959, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act for sale of surplus commodities abroad and authorized additional sales of $2¼ billion.

Extended the National Wool Act to March 31, 1961, and gave cotton and corn growers choice between Government acreage control with higher price supports or more acreage and lower supports; fixed acreage allotments and price supports for feed grains and rice through 1961.

SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, AND WELFARE

To those of my constituents who request it, I will be glad to send a copy of the Social Security Amendments of 1958. Briefly, these amendments included: An increase in old-age insurance benefits by 7 percent beginning February 3, 1959; an increase in the social-security tax on both employers and employees by a quarter of 1 percent effective January 1, 1959, based on wages up to $4,800 a year. Also, increased grants to States for public assistance and relief. Other enactments under this title were:

Requirements of registration, reports and full disclosure by all employee welfare and pension funds of their financial status.

Authorization of permanent program of assistance for construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities, as to children of persons who both reside and work on Federal property.

Authorization of a 4-year, $887 million program of student loans, fellowships, and other aid to improve teaching of mathematics, science, and languages.

Extension to June 30, 1961, of the special milk program in nonprofit schools, nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, and summer camps, with authorization for expenditure of $75 million a year of Commodity Credit Corporation funds.

Authorization of $1 million program of grants-in-aid to public or nonprofit schools providing training for specialists, technicians, and administrators in the field of public health.

Extension to June 30, 1962, of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act.

Extension to June 30, 1962, of the program of $30 million a year in matching grants for construction of facilities for research into cancer, heart disease, arthritis, mental illness, and other diseases.

An increase in annuities payable to retired and disabled civil-service employees.

Prohibition against the use of food additives which have not been adequately tested for safety.

Strengthening of the law against use of the mails or common carriers for transportation of obscene or crime-inciting matter.

Prohibition against interstate sale of switchblade knives.

Granting of consent to States to enter into compacts for highway traffic safety.

Granting power to the Secretary of Labor to make and enforce job safety for longshoremen and other dockworkers.

Authorization of Federal-State cooperation in control and regulation of small pleasure and passenger boats.

NATURAL RESOURCES

The Congress authorized flood control, navigation improvement, and beach control projects on rivers and harbors, totaling $1.5 billion.

Under Public Law 337, the approval of Congress is required in effecting withdrawals of more than 5,000 acres of public land.

CONCLUSION

In the foregoing, I have given many of the highlights of accomplishment in the 2d session of the 85th Congress, but there were, also, many measures which were defeated in the final vote or which never reached the voting stage. Prominent among the measures defeated were:

The Kennedy-Ives Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1958. One hundred and thirty-seven Republicans and sixty-one Democrats voting against the suspension of the rule defeated this measure. Voting for its passage were 149 Democrats and 41 Republicans, not a sufficient number for the two-thirds necessary to enact a bill under suspension of the rule. Racketeering in unions shocked many, but this bill which would have been a step to correct abuses in unions lacked the support of the Republican Members of Congress.

The omnibus housing bill was defeated by the vote of 251 to 134, a two-thirds majority being necessary for passage under suspension of the rule.

Also defeated by lack of a two-thirds majority vote was the expansion program of loans to local governments for planning and construction of public facilities, except schools.

The food-stamp plan, through which $1 billion a year in federally owned surplus foods would be distributed to America's needy, also met defeat in a vote under suspension of the rule.

In 1953, and in the succeeding years, I have introduced a resolution to create a Joint Committee on Intelligence. This committee would evaluate and coordinate all intelligence of the various branches of the Government. The need for such committee is agreed by many, particularly because of the failure of our intelligence services to alert us on the U. S. S. R.-Egyptian arms deal; the seizure of the Suez; the Suez attack by France, England, and Israel; the downgrading of Stalin; the Latin-American outbursts during Vice President NIXON'S visit; Syrian aggression by Nasser; the Hungarian Revolution; the situation in Iraq; and the launching of sputnik. Many other Members of Congress have recently sponsored this resolution and it appears certain that it will be scheduled for consideration early in the next Congress.

While it is agreed that the accomplishments of this Congress were great, I left Washington with the uneasy feel-

ing that much had been left undone. What was absolutely necessary and expedient was done. Legislative leadership alone is not sufficient to meet the grave problems of the world situation. Executive leadership is badly needed.

It has been my privilege and responsibility to serve you for over 8 years. My office is open 6 days a week and letters sent to my Washington office receive my immediate attention. My address is EDNA F. KELLY, Member of Congress, Washington 25, D. C. During adjournment I am at the Madison Club, 739 Eastern Parkway, Brooklyn, on Monday and Thursday evenings for appointments with my constituents.

Record of Committee on Public Works in the 85th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I include a summary of public-works legislation reported by the Committee on Public Works during the 85th Congress.

GENERAL ACTIVITIES

The committee had 748 bills for consideration during the 1st and 2d sessions of the 85th Congress dealing with such subjects as navigation improvements, flood control, water pollution, beach erosion, highways, public buildings, land conveyances, and water supplies.

Eighty-four bills were reported by the committee, 76 of which have been enacted into law. In addition, the committee adopted 76 river and harbor resolutions and 45 flood-control resolutions. These resolutions authorized survey studies by the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, that will ultimately result in project reports submitted to Congress if the projects are found worthy and are approved by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and the Chief of Engineers.

The committee also approved 13 watershed protection and flood-prevention projects transmitted to Congress by the Secretary of Agriculture through the Bureau of the Budget pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of Public Law 566, 83d Congress, as amended by Public Law 1018, 84th Congress—the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act.

The committee gave particular study and attention to the needs of every section of the country in reporting the omnibus river-and-harbor and flood-control bill—Public Law 85-500—and in acting upon survey resolutions pertaining to civil-works projects, especially with respect to flood-control remedial works necessary as a result of the last three major flood disasters—the hurricanes and floods of 1955, which left such a widespread path of destruction through the New England and Middle Atlantic States, the unprecedented rainfall and floods in California and adjacent States during the Christmas holidays of 1955 and the spring of 1958, and the floods throughout the southwest United States during May and early June of 1957. In this last instance, the committee appointed a special subcommittee which made an exhaustive, on-the-ground inspection, the results of which are contained in a report made by the subcommittee on June 29, 1957—Committee Document No. 85-4, the Southwest Flood of 1957.

The committee also designated a special subcommittee to inspect and report on severely flooded areas in central California in the spring of 1958. These same areas have been flooded at least 3 times in 8 years—in 1950, 1955, and in 1958, with cumulative damages of nearly $250 million. The subcommittee report is published as Committee Document No. 85-17, the California Flood of 1958.

The committee made an inspection of the progress of work on the Illinois road test on October 18 and 19, 1957. From October 23 to November 2 hearings were held in California on the highway program and various public-works projects. Beginning November 9 and continuing through November 19 the committee engaged in a substantial schedule of inspections and formal hearings on the islands of Oahu, Hawaii, Maui, Molokai, and Kauai. A report on these hearings is included in Committee Document No. 85-9.

OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1958

Three omnibus river and harbor and flood control bills were considered during the 84th and 85th Congress. These bills represented efforts by the executive and legislative branches to reach agreement on certain matters of fundamental policy. The original bill was H. R. 12080, which was approved in the 84th Congress and vetoed by the President on August 10, 1956. A second version of the bill, S. 497, was approved by the 85th Congress and vetoed by the President on April 15, 1958. The third bill, S. 3910, was signed by the President on July 3, 1958, and became Public Law 85-500. It represents the first omnibus bill enacted into law since 1954.

Public Law 85—500 is divided into three titles. Title I covers navigation, including beach erosion. Title II covers flood control and other related water uses. Title III liberalizes existing law with respect to the construction of water conservation storage in reservoirs under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. The number of authorizations for actual construction total 139 individual projects or project modifications in 44 States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. Increased monetary authorizations for 12 comprehensive river basin plans are also included. The total estimated Federal cost of work authorized is $1,556,230,500, of which $1,356,203,500 is for the Corps of Engineers and $200 million is for the Missouri River Basin work by the Department of the Interior. Also included in the act are authorizations for 61 survey studies in 27 States and Hawaii.

CODIFICATION OF FEDERAL HIGHWAY LAWS

Included in the major legislation enacted into law which originated in this committee is title 23 of the United States Code which is a revision and codification of the Federal highway laws enacted from the date of the original law in 1916. The first Federal-Aid Road Act was approved on July 11, 1916. Since that date, Congress has enacted about 40 separate laws on the subject, excluding appropriation acts. Many new provisions were inserted in the various enactments. These laws contained provisions which are now obsolete and which amended, supplemented, or repealed, expressly or by implication, earlier provisions of law. As a result, the necessity of dealing with these many enactments made the administration of the Federal-aid highway program difficult. The new law includes in a one-package enactment a clear, concise, up-to-date version of all the existing Federal highway laws, including the 1958 Federal-Aid Highway Act, in an orderly and logical arrangement.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1958

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958—Public Law 85-381—authorized funds for construction on the Interstate System, the regular Federal-aid highway systems, and public domain roads totaling $3,260,000,000. The act made available supplemental funds of $800 million for the Interstate System, $2,225,000,000 for the primary and secondary systems and urban extensions, and $235 million for public-domain roads. Included in the funds for the regular Federal-aid system is a supplemental amount of $400 million for fiscal year 1959 for the purpose of stimulating employment and the general economy.

The 1958 act authorizes the Government to reimburse the States for the value of materials stockpiled in the vicinity of Federal-aid highway construction. It adds a provision to the 1956 act concerning utility reimbursement requiring the States to submit evidence that the cost of utility facility relocation has been paid from State funds before Federal reimbursement can be made. The act amends the 1956 act by adding a requirement that States shall hold hearings, or afford the opportunity of hearings, to enable persons in rural areas to express objections they may have to the proposed location of the Interstate System through or contiguous to their property.

The 1958 act permits the Federal Government to extend an additional one-half of 1 percent aid on the interstate program to States which control outdoor advertising, in a limited manner, along the interstate highway right-of-way in compliance with Federal regulations. It formally approves the cost estimates for completing the Interstate Highway System—submitted to Congress by the Secretary of Commerce in January 1958; House Document 300—as the basis for making apportionments for fiscal year 1960. A bill enacted into law at the second session—H. R. 12808—following enactment of the 1958 Highway Act, extends approval of the estimate of cost of completing the Interstate System in each State for an additional fiscal year—

1961—and advances the date for submission of a revised estimate of cost for completing the Interstate System from January 12, 1962, to January 12, 1961.

The 1958 act suspends the pay-as-you-go provision—Byrd amendment—of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 for the fiscal years 1959 and 1960. Since highway trust fund revenues for these years are estimated to be insufficient to support anticipated expenditures authorized by the new law, money will be appropriated to the trust fund from the general fund of the Treasury as repayable advances.

FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT AMENDMENT

Favorable action was taken by the committee on H. R. 13420 to amend section 6 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act dealing with grants for treatment-plant construction. The bill would authorize: First, grants for projects in the amount of 30 percent of the estimated reasonable cost thereof or $500,000, whichever is the smaller; second, municipalities to join together to build joint treatment facilities with the amount of grant allocable to each community as if it were a separate project; third, reallocation of grant funds from States not using funds because of lack of projects to States having projects approved for which grants have not been made because of lack of funds; fourth, $100 million to be appropriated for purposes of construction grants for any fiscal year; and fifth, an aggregate $1 billion to be appropriated for such purposes. At the close of the Congress, H. R. 13420 was pending in the Rules Committee.

OTHER MAJOR LEGISLATION

Other important major legislation handled by the committee in this Congress includes an authorization to increase the borrowing authority of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, an authorization of $10 million to complete the Inter-American Highway, a law to extend from 5 to 7 years the period in advance of construction when rights-of-way may be secured for the Interstate System, a directive to the Secretary of Commerce to provide Congress next January with recommendations as to how the States might be reimbursed for toll and free roads already built on the Interstate System, an authorization for the construction of a hydroelectric power project on the Niagara River at Niagara Falls, N. Y., an authorization of $4 million to complete the Rama Road in Nicaragua, laws to authorize a National Cultural Center and a National Air Museum in the District of Columbia, a bill to authorize the Tennessee Valley Authority to issue revenue bonds for the purpose of financing new power facilities, and a bill to authorize the State of Illinois and the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway.

Bills and resolutions enacted into law

Public Law No.	Bill No.	Date approved	Title
3	H. R. 20	Jan. 25, 1957	Extend time for report of President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space.
23	H. R. 6092	Apr. 23, 1957	Merrimack River flood-control compact.
85	S. 1430	July 10, 1957	Increasing limit of cost fixed for construction and equipment of additional Senate Office Bldg.
93	S. 1428	do	Furnishings for additional Senate Office Bldg.
95	S. 1429	do	Remodeling of existing Senate Office Bldg.
108	H. R. 6728	July 17, 1957	Increase borrowing authority of St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, clarify general powers, and authorize deferment of interest payments on borrowings.
106	S. 1054	do	Extend times for commencing and completing toll bridge across Rainy River at Baudette, Minn.
113	S. 1361	July 26, 1957	Reenact authorization for highway bridge across Pigeon River below High Falls, Minn.
130	S. 2217 (H. R. 8171)	Aug. 14, 1957	Convey lands at McNary lock and dam project, Oregon and Washington, to port of Walla Walla, Wash.
138	H. R. 3077	do	Designate lake created by Jim Woodruff Dam, Apalachicola River, Ga., as Lake Seminole.
143	S. 1941	do	Authorize payment by Bureau of Public Roads of transportation and subsistence costs to temporary employees on direct Federal highway projects.
146	H. R. 3996	do	Authorize utilization of storage space in Lake Texoma for water supply for city of Sherman, Tex.
148	H. R. 988	Aug. 16, 1957	Extend period for amortization of indebtedness on toll bridge across Missouri River near Rulo, Nebr.
159	H. R. 8643	Aug. 21, 1957	Authorize construction of certain works of improvement in Niagara River, N. Y., for power and other purposes.
169	S. 620 (H. R. 6264)	Aug. 28, 1957	Transfer ownership to Allegany County, Md., of a bridge loaned by Bureau of Public Roads.
178	S. 1823	do	Convey Bunker Hill Island in Lake Cumberland near Burnside, Ky., to Commonwealth of Kentucky.
221	H. R. 6363	Aug. 30, 1957	Authorize additional bridge across Bear Creek at Lovel Point, Md., and collection of tolls.
230	H. R. 2580	do	Increase storage capacity of Whitney Dam and Reservoir, Tex.
242	S. 2603	Aug. 31, 1957	Amend act of June 3, 1896, re construction of piers on Gowanus Creek in Brooklyn, N. Y.
245	S. 268	do	Return certain mineral interests in lands acquired for Arkabutla, Sardis, Enid, and Grenada Reservoirs, Miss.
294	S. 1520 (H. R. 6535)	Sept. 4, 1957	Authorize expenditure of Federal funds to reconstruct lock and dam No. 3 on Little Kanawha River, W. Va.
327	H. R. 3770	Feb. 15, 1958	Rename Strawn Dam and Reservoir, Kans., as the John Redmond Dam and Reservoir.
329	H. R. 6660	do	Designate Tuscaloosa lock and dam, Black Warrior River, Ala., as William Bacon Oliver lock and dam.
[1] 341	H. R. 8576	Sept. 7, 1957	Convey lands within Old Hickory lock and dam project, Cumberland River, Tenn., to Middle Tennessee Council, Inc., Boy Scouts of America, for recreation and camping purposes.
363	H. R. 9653	Mar. 28, 1958	Rename Fort Gaines lock and dam, Chattahoochee River, Ga., as Walter F. George lock and dam.
------	H. Con. Res. 285 (S. Con. Res. 68).	Mar. 19, 1958	Acceleration of civil-construction programs.
381	H. R. 9821	Apr. 16, 1958	Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958.
429	S. 728	May 29, 1958	Authorize acquisition of additional property for new Senate Office Building or addition to U. S. Capitol Grounds.
452	H. R. 7870	June 6, 1958	Increase authorization for completion of Inter-American Highway.
480	H. R. 4260	July 2, 1958	Authorize Chief of Engineers to publish information pamphlets, maps, brochures, and other material.
484	H. R. 2549	do	Compensate owners of wells for losses sustained due to lowering of water level as a result of construction of New Cumberland Dam project, Ohio.
490	H. R. 12613	do	Designate lock and dam to be constructed on Calumet River, Ill., as the "Thomas J. O'Brien lock and dam."
494	H. R. 4083	do	Authorize adjustment of rentals under leases for commercial recreational facilities at Lake Greeson Reservoir, Narrows Dam, Ark.
496	H. R. 12059	do	Designate dam and reservoir at Stewarts Ferry, Tenn., as J. Percy Priest Dam and Reservoir.
500	S. 3910 (H. R. 12955)	July 3, 1958	River and harbor and flood control omnibus bill, 1958.
502	H. R. 5033	do	Extend times for commencing and completing bridge across Mississippi River at Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark.
504	H. J. Res. 382	do	Granting consent of Congress to amendment of agreement between States of Vermont and New York relating to creation of Lake Champlain Bridge Commission.
512	H. R. 11861	July 11, 1958	Authorize construction of new approaches and reconstruction, repair, or improvement of existing approaches to toll bridge across Mississippi River at Chester, Ill.
518	H. R. 11936	do	Extend time for collection of tolls to amortize cost of bridge across Missouri River at Brownville, Nebr.
522	H. J. Res. 633	July 15, 1958	Designate lake formed by Ferrells Bridge Dam across Cypress Creek, Tex., as Lake O' the Pines.
526	S. 2964 (H. R. 9924)	July 18, 1958	Granting consent of Congress to flood-control compact between the States of Connecticut and Massachusetts.
[1] 531	S. 3053	Aug. 5, 1958	Convey certain real property at Demopolis lock and dam project, Alabama, to heirs of the former owner.
535	S. 2109	July 18, 1958	Amend act extending authorized taking area for public building construction to exclude therefrom the area within E and F Sts. and 19th St. and Virginia Ave. NW., in the District of Columbia.
542	S. 2108	do	Amend Public Buildings Act of 1949 to authorize Administrator of General Services to name, rename, or otherwise designate certain buildings.
562	S. 1785	July 28, 1958	Designate reservoir above Heart-Butte Dam, Grant County, N. Dak., as Lake Tschida.
591	S. 495	Aug. 6, 1958	Authorize acquisition of remaining property in square 725, District of Columbia, for extension of site of additional Senate Office Building or for addition to U. S. Capitol Grounds.
592	H. R. 855	do	Designate dam at Eagle Gorge Reservoir, Green River, Wash., as the "Howard A. Hanson Dam."
597	H. R. 10426	do	Amend Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to increase period in which construction must commence on rights-of-way.
598	H. R. 11305	do	Authorize funds to finance 1961 meeting of the Permanent International Association of Navigation Congresses.
607	H. R. 7898	Aug. 8, 1958	Provide for adjustment of tolls on bridge across Mississippi River near Jefferson Barracks, Mo.
629	S. 3392 (H. R. 11248)	Aug. 14, 1958	Establish time for commencement and completion of reconstruction, enlargement, and extension of bridge across Mississippi River, at Rock Island, Ill.
636	S. 3177 (H. R. 10207)	do	Modify Crisfield Harbor, Md., project in the interest of navigation.
640	S. 2158	do	Amend Truman-Hobbs Act of June 21, 1940, relating to procedure for altering certain bridges over navigable waters.
643	S. 3833	do	Survey of Coosawhatchie and Broad Rivers, S. C., upstream to vicinity of Dawson Landing.
646	H. R. 13209	do	Reconvey certain lands acquired for Albeni Falls Reservoir project, Idaho, to former owners.

[1] Private law.

Bills and resolutions enacted into law—Continued

Public Law No.	Bill No.	Date approved	Title
653	S. 3987 (H. R. 12916)	Aug. 14, 1958	Granting consent of Congress to Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway development compact.
665	S. 2793 (H. R. 9173)	do	Provide for conveyance of a pumping station at Algiers, La., to Jefferson-Plaquemines Drainage District, La.
707	H. R. 3778	Aug. 21, 1958	Amend Capper-Cramton Act of May 29, 1930, with respect to stream valley parks in Maryland.
734	H. R. 6701	Aug. 23, 1958	Granting consent of Congress to Tennessee River Basin water-pollution control compact.
757	H. R. 4142	Aug. 25, 1958	Amend act creating City of Clinton Bridge Commission and authorizing a bridge or bridges across Mississippi River at Clinton, Iowa, and Fulton, Ill.
767	H. R. 12776	Aug. 27, 1958	Revise, codify, and enact into law, title 23 of the United States Code, entitled "Highways."
774	S. 3572	do	Authorize land exchanges for purposes of the George Washington Memorial Parkway in Montgomery County, Md.
802	H. R. 11607	Aug. 28, 1958	Extend to harbors of Hampton Roads, Va., and Baltimore, Md., the application of the act of June 29, 1888, relating to the prevention of obstructive and injurious deposits in the harbor of New York.
820	H. R. 8652	do	Rescind authorization for Waldo Lake tunnel and regulating works, Willamette River, Oreg.
822	H. R. 8160	do	Survey of the Tensaw River, Ala.
832	H. R. 13342	do	Survey of Parish Line Canal, La.
837	H. R. 13500	do	Provide for disposal of federally owned property of the Hanson, Company, and Houma Canals, La.
842	S. 3776	do	Extend time for collection of tolls to amortize cost of bridge across Missouri River at Miami, Mo.
843	H. R. 12216	do	Designate dam and reservoir to be constructed on the Cumberland River near Carthage, Tenn., as the "Cordell Hull Dam and Reservoir," and establish study commission on certain river basins in Texas and intervening areas.
845	H. J. Res. 654	do	Requiring Secretary of Commerce to submit reimbursement recommendations for certain highways on the Interstate System.
850	S. 4021	do	Establish study commission on the Savannah, Altamaha, St. Marys, Apalachicola-Chattahoochee, and Perdido-Escambia River Basins, and intervening areas.
873	H. R. 11456	Sept. 2, 1958	Authorize exchange of certain real property heretofore conveyed to the city of El Paso, Tex., by the United States.
874	S. 3335	do	Provide for a national cultural center in the District of Columbia.
885	S. 3712	do	Authorize appropriations for continuing construction of the Rama Road in Nicaragua.
895	H. R. 12883	do	Provide for improvements to Capitol Power Plant and its distribution systems.
899	H. R. 12808	do	Amend Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958 to extend for an additional year approval of the estimate of cost of completing the Interstate System.
935	S. 1985	Sept. 6, 1958	Authorize construction of National Air Museum building for the Smithsonian Institution.

STATUS OF OTHER BILLS REPORTED TO THE HOUSE

H. R. 2, providing for diversion of water from Lake Michigan, passed the House May 22, 1957, and was reported in the Senate August 20, 1958.

H. R. 4266 and S. 1869, to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act to provide for the sale of bonds to finance new power facilities, were reported from Committee on August 13, 1957, and August 1, 1958, respectively, and at the close of Congress S. 1869 was pending in the Rules Committee.

H. R. 13420, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, was reported from Committee on July 17, 1958, and at the close of Congress was pending in the Rules Committee.

S. 2261, to repeal the Lease-Purchase Act of 1954 and authorize construction of Federal buildings by direct appropriation, was reported from committee on July 29, 1957, and at the close of Congress was pending in the Rules Committee. Since the bill was reported the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954—lease-purchase—has expired.

S. 3653, providing for the acquisition of sites and construction of buildings for training school and other facilities for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, was reported from committee on August 14, 1958, and was pending on the Union Calendar at the close of Congress.

S. 3975, providing for construction of an annex building for use of the Government Printing Office, was reported from committee on July 2, 1958, and was pending on the Union Calendar at the close of Congress.

S. 497, the first omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill approved by the 85th Congress, was vetoed on April 15, 1958.

COMMITTEE WORKLOAD

The committee had an unusually heavy workload in the current Congress. It was necessary to conduct special studies and investigations of river and harbor, flood control, hurricane and beach erosion matters when the omnibus rivers and harbors bill was vetoed for the second time on April 15, 1958. The committee conducted hearings and investigations in preparation for 3 omnibus bills in a 4-year period. These were in addition to other hearings, investigations, and studies in connection with other programs handled by the committee.

In all of these accomplishments I have had the active cooperation and valuable aid of all committee members. I pay special tribute to Representatives GEORGE H. FALLON, CLIFFORD DAVIS, JOHN A. BLATNIK and ROBERT E. JONES, JR., who served as chairman of the subcommittees. I want to give credit, as well, to our efficient and hard-working staff.

Appointment of Ralph S. Fowler as Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Interior

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement regarding the appointment of Ralph S. Fowler as Special Assistant to the Secretary of Interior and as Assistant Director of the Department of Interior's Office of Oil and Gas:

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT, OF CALIFORNIA

Recently, Hon. Fred A. Seaton, the Secretary of the Interior, announced the appointment of Ralph S. Fowler as Special Assistant to the Secretary for oil import matters and as Assistant Director of the Department's Office of Oil and Gas.

The naming of a person to fill this important post is of considerable interest to me. When it is realized that adequate and readily available supplies of petroleum are absolutely essential for our national security and that oil on a global scale is the world's biggest business, being the largest single commodity entering international trade, and when one further takes cognizance of the fact that competitive free enterprise at home in this vital industry is inextricably linked with the pattern of business operations abroad, it appears clear that those whose duties require them to formulate and execute governmental policy in this field should be imbued with complete objectivity and possess an aura of dispassionate impersonality.

In 1957, oil and gas filled 69 percent of our total energy needs, or more than double that supplied from all other sources combined, and our domestic production was valued at almost $10 billion. It is a well-established fact that petroleum-producing activities are rooted in local areas and communities to a greater extent than any other major industry, except agriculture. It can in truth be stated that the petroleum industry is an exceedingly important segment of the Nation's economy. The influence of this industry upon the general economy and more particularly upon the very many small-business people cannot be overestimated.

The small-business segment of the petroleum industry embraces not only small producers and refiners, but also small distributors, such as wholesalers, jobbers, and retailers. There are about 250,000 gasoline filling or service stations in this country, which is but one branch of the industry. The economic welfare of all small business is of special concern to me.

Therefore, it appears to be a legitimate inquiry as to the background of this new appointee. Prior to Mr. Ralph S. Fowler entering Government service on August 7, 1956, as director of the voluntary agreement relating to foreign petroleum supply during the Suez crisis, he was a petroleum consultant in Rome, Italy, and New York City. What is of particular significance is that from September 1946 until the end of 1954, he was employed by the Aramco Overseas Co., which is a subsidiary of the huge Arabian American Oil Co.

Whatever I may say in this connection must not be misinterpreted in any sense nor as implying any reflection on the integrity, motives, performance of duties, or public spirit of this official. The criteria for being selected for any office should include not only ability, but also public confidence in the integrity and fairness of the appointee. While I fully recognize the necessity for maintaining avenues by which the Government may secure advice necessary for its officials to discharge their respective administrative responsibilities, realism demands

recognition of the fact that subjective judgment values are inseparable from a person's basic beliefs regarding the objectives and limits of governmental action. The danger is that inevitably personal biases and prejudices might be shown. There is always present in the Federal Government, because of its size and complexity, this problem of undue influence exercised, often unconsciously, by groups or individuals within the various departments or agencies. Once the illusion of cold neutrality of thinking is rejected, the possible dangers to be avoided in utilization of men with economic allegiances outside the Government will be better understood.

Here we have a man who admittedly is an expert in his field and who for over 8 years was connected with Aramco, a subsidiary of the Arabian American Oil Co., which has a 40-year concession in Saudi Arabia, granting it a monopoly position over the second largest oil reserve in the world. Under the circumstances it seems that a look into this vast monopoly with which Mr. Fowler was connected would be highly in order and timely.

The Wall Street Journal of June 28, 1956, reported that Aramco ranks as 1 of the 2 or 3 largest United States investments overseas. It is wholly owned by four of the major American companies, namely, Standard Oil Company of California, the Texas Co., Socony-Mobil Oil Co., and Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, all of whom are defendants in the world oil cartel case. The rapid development by Aramco of the oil resources of Saudi Arabia can be traced to the ingenuity and persistence on the part of the four participating American companies. The rapid growth of Aramco's production can be gaged by the fact that in 1950 it produced 547,000 barrels per day, and according to the figures in the Journal of Commerce of August 13, 1958, this production is now reaching almost 1 million barrels daily.

The Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary held that the agreements and arrangements between the four owning companies and Aramco may amount to a violation of United States antitrust laws. Its report (S. Rept. 1747, 85th Cong., 1st sess., p. 36) states:

"The agreement among four American corporations to divide the total production of Saudi Arabian oil, to exclude all others from access to this oil, and to purchase this oil at identical prices, may unreasonably restrain the foreign commerce of the United States in violation of the Sherman Act. * * *"

It is also worthy of note that Aramco has complete control of the Trans-Arabian Pipe Line Co. which is known as Tapline. This important pipeline, 1,067 miles long, was completed in December 1950, and delivers oil at the terminal at Sidon on the shores of the eastern Mediterranean from Dhahran, which is located on the Persian Gulf. Moody's Industrial Manual reflects that this pipeline last year delivered an average of 348,000 barrels of petroleum daily.

When it is realized that the four coowners of Aramco, Standard Oil Company of California, The Texas Co., Socony-Mobil Oil Co., and Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, last year had a gross operating income of over $14,800,000,000, its influence cannot help but become manifest. For many years now, it has been plain to everyone that the oil industry wields great political and economic power on a worldwide scale. Indeed, the power exercised by a few international corporations exceeds that of any other economic power in world history.

The vast scope of the petroleum industry and the huge interests of the big American oil companies in foreign lands are of extreme importance to the American people in general and to American small business in particular.

The international oil companies being motivated to obtain maximum profits have every incentive to import as much cheaply produced petroleum as possible. Middle East oil is low cost oil and very cheap to produce for many obvious reasons. With ownership of the oil fields being in the sovereign, drilling requirements, royalty and lease arrangements are quite simple. The question of correlative rights, so important in regulating oil production in the United States, has no meaning in the Middle East where there is but 1 landowner and 1 producer. Another very important and well-known factor is that labor, in relation to unit-production costs, are very much lower than is the case here. Thus, foreign oil, particularly in the Middle East, can be produced for a fraction of the cost of domestic oil. While its lower cost gives imported petroleum a competitive advantage over domestic producers, most of the advantage goes to the importing companies rather than to the consumer.

Of even greater significance is the fact that this cheap Middle East oil sells at the same price as higher cost domestically produced petroleum. I again cite the Senate report (S. Rept. 1147, 85th Cong., 1st sess., p. 3):

"Imports of crude oil into the United States have recently reached an alltime high. It is a well known fact that oil from abroad, particularly in the Middle East, is produced at much less cost than in the continental United States. Nevertheless, this cheaply produced imported crude sells at the same price as higher cost domestic crude despite the fact that excessive imports have contributed to raising crude storage stocks to an alltime high for this season of the year. American consumers do not get the benefit of this cheaply produced foreign crude. Because of the desire to maintain the world cartel price for oil, American importing companies are selling their products at prices based on high-priced American crude and pocketing the resulting high profits."

In addition, because of a 27½ percent income tax allowance for a wasting asset, the foreign subsidiaries of the American companies pay little or no Federal income taxes. It appears to be a little-known fact that this 27½ percent depletion allowance can be taken not only on the profits of oil produced in the continental United States, but by American companies operating overseas.

Although it was the clear intent of the Congress in 1955, that petroleum imports should be limited to the ratio which they bore to domestic production in 1954, that Congressional intent was not followed by the administration. In 1954, total United States crude oil production averaged 6,342,000 barrels daily. Total crude and refined product imports averaged 1,052,000 barrels daily, or 16.6 percent of domestic production.

By 1957, total imports had increased to 1,570,000 barrels daily, an increase of 49 percent over 1954, while crude production had increased only 13 percent to 7,169,000 barrels daily. The ratio of imports to production had increased to 21.9 percent in 1957.

The situation has grown considerably worse in 1958. It is now estimated that for the first 6 months of the current year, total imports will average 1,560,000 barrels per day and United States crude oil production 6,460,000 barrels per day. Compared with the year 1954, imports have increased 48 percent and production less than 2 percent. The ratio of imports to production, which is assumed would be maintained at the 1954 level, has increased from 16.6 to 24.1 percent.

As long ago as 1949 the National Petroleum Council, in its statement of policy, noted that imports in excess of our economic needs would retard domestic exploration and development of new oilfields and technological progress in all branches of the industry which is essential to the Nation's economic welfare and security.

Should imports now or in the future reach such proportions as to seriously discourage exploration and development in the United States, the result would be contrary to the interests of national security. National security encompasses economic and political factors as well as military. Imports and exports of petroleum have an important bearing on the potential supply position of the military services and the Nation as a whole in event of war.

It was in full recognition of the overriding consideration for our national security that the voluntary oil-import program was initiated. I also appreciate the necessity that a certain level of imports is necessary to meet all of the demands of the Nation's economy for petroleum and petroleum products. But it is also essential to strike a reasonable balance between imports and domestic production.

Due to the rising level of imports, cutbacks in our domestic producing regions have resulted in serious economic losses, detrimental to practically all businesses. Since the domestic oil industry is one of the pillars of our national economy, it follows as a matter of elementary logic that a weakening of one of these pillars would be inimical to the best interests of the American people. The very real problems and needs of small business should be fully considered.

There is another observation I wish to make which I believe is now quite obvious to all segments of the oil industry, both big and small. That is the resurgent nationalism of the Arab countries in the Middle East of which Nasser is but a symbol. The important economic fact is that the Arab nations want and are sure to get more money for their oil. Beneath the surface and between the lines of statements made by Middle East personages lie deep and sometimes violent pressures for bigger and larger slices of profits from foreign oil operations and a larger share in their control. That this is all too true can be gathered from a dispatch in the Journal of Commerce of August 20, 1958, to the effect that the United Arab Republic plans to seek more money from the Trans-Arabian Pipeline Co. (Tapline), which crosses Syrian territory. Even as long as 2 years ago Tapline offered to split its profits with the four countries through which the pipeline passes—Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon. Subsequent talks failed to reach a conclusion. It appears to me that the international oil companies face a threat of nationalization of their foreign holdings, which, though not imminent, still persists. Under these circumstances, one would think that the big petroleum corporations, in view of the possible assault upon their property rights and profits in the Middle East, would better appreciate the importance of not neglecting the North American reserves and encourage United States oil exploration, development, and utilization.

These are some of the considerations that have prompted me to voice the observations I made. I feel that the selection of a governmental official should be guided by the broadest viewpoint of what is best for the American economy rather than what benefits may accrue to any particular industry or any specified business. Impropriety need not result from deliberate intentions or bad faith, but, more likely, could result from an individual's orientation as a career member of the business or industrial world.

I shall continue to observe and study all facets of the problem with considerable interest.

Hon. William S. Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include various letters of commendation written to BILL HILL by his colleagues:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 25, 1958.

The Honorable and Mrs. WILLIAM S. HILL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL AND RACHEL: On the occasion of the richly deserved tribute being paid you by your Coloradans, may I, for myself and Blanche, extend warmest greetings.

It is not without sadness that we think of your retirement from the Washington scene. You will be missed.

We join, now, with your many friends in congratulations on the solid contributions you have made to our national life. And may you be blessed with many years of peace and contentment together in beautiful Colorado.

Sincerely,

CHAS.
CHARLES A. HALLECK.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 25, 1958.

The Honorable WILLIAM S. HILL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: I could not go to my home in Illinois, now Congress has adjourned, without writing you this note as you retire from Congress.

I regret that your service in Congress is ending, for you have made an outstanding record, not only for your District and the country, but as a good Republican fighting for the principles in which we believe. You are going to be missed around this place by those of us who happen to come back (assuming the voters agree we should come back). I hope you will return now and then to renew acquaintances and say hello to us.

I have appreciated your friendship and the privilege of knowing you, and, after all, those are the things that really count.

I want to wish for you all the good things in life. Wherever you may go, or whatever you may be doing in the years ahead, I trust you will find both peace and contentment and enjoy life to the fullest.

With warm regards,

Sincerely,

L. C. ARENDS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 19, 1958.

Hon. WILLIAM S. HILL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: As the 85th Congress draws to a close, we are not unmindful that adjournment will mean the severing of many fraternal ties that have bound us to good and true friends who, like yourself, have decided to seek a more relaxed routine in retirement.

Looking back over the past 12 years, I have marked our fine relationship as one of the high points of that period. During the present session when we have enjoyed your leadership on our side of the committee, I have had great pride in the forceful but even-tempered manner in which you have stated our position and insisted on its consideration.

As you and your good wife return to your home bailiwick to move once more amidst the people and scenes you love we want you to know that with you goes our affectionate regard as well as our warmest good wishes for your continued health and happiness, in which Mrs. Dague joins.

Sincerely,

PAUL B. DAGUE.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
CHAIRMAN, DISTRICT COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., August 19, 1958.

The Honorable WILLIAM S. HILL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: I want to take this opportunity to tell you how much I have enjoyed serving with you as a Member of the House of Representatives during the past 20 years.

I regret to learn that you are retiring at the end of this session; however, I hope that you and Mrs. Hill will enjoy some of the things you have been denied during the time you have been a Member of Congress.

Trusting that you will take time to visit South Carolina when you and Mrs. Hill decide to do some traveling and with kindest regards, I am,

Your friend,

JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, May 23, 1958.

DEAR BILL: It was a surprise to me when I heard that you would not want to come back in the next Congress as our ranking member or chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. I want you to know that I and the whole committee will miss your jovial and pleasing personality, your sound counsel, and tireless efforts on behalf of American agriculture.

It is a real joy and pleasure to have been privileged for many years to work with you. You have been a devoted advocate of legislation on behalf of the farmers of the country.

I wish for you and yours everything good in the years that lie ahead.

Sincerely, your friend,

TOOK.
E. C. GATHINGS.

Progress of REA Under Eisenhower Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. HUMPHREY, has included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution sent him by the president of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association that is obviously intended to discredit the good intentions of this administration toward the Rural Electrification Administration.

The Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, has addressed a reply to the president of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in which he expresses pride in the outstanding progress made by the REA-financed systems under this administration and promises his continued support of policies and actions that will keep this system strong.

Under permission previously granted, I include the Secretary's letter as part of my remarks.

The letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington.

Mr. JOHN M. GEORGE,
President, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Lewistown, Ohio.

DEAR MR. GEORGE: I have your letter of July 31 in which you quoted a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association during its recent meeting. The resolution protested to the President, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the REA Administrator, the use of their offices to pressure the rural electric systems into agreeing to, or advocating, changes in the existing method of financing the rural electrification program.

We are not trying to pressure any REA borrower into any course of action.

We consider it a part of our responsibility to pass along to REA borrowers any information that should be helpful to them in accomplishing the purposes of the act. We are going to continue to do this.

The REA-financed systems have made outstanding progress during the term of this administration. All of their loan requirements have been met effectively and with record promptness. We are proud of these fine rural systems and are going to continue to support policies and take actions which will enable them to become strong, locally owned and controlled service organizations.

Sincerely yours,

E. T. BENSON,
Secretary.

Record of Votes in the 85th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement I prepared on Senate votes effecting economy in government.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The 85th Congress has made the largest peacetime appropriations in history. During the second session we appropriated almost $13 billion in excess of the appropriations we made during the first session of this Congress. American taxpayers need relief. In fact, the burdens of taxation are partly responsible for the recession we have experienced.

On August 30 last year I submitted a study of the record votes during the 1st session of the 85th Congress involving economy in government. My analysis of these votes showed that there were 39 rollcalls out of the 111 record votes which directly or indirectly either affected the expenditure of public funds or government receipts. I found that 63.7 percent of the economy votes was

supplied by Republicans. Only 36.3 percent was supplied by the Democrats. On the other hand, 62.3 percent of the votes in favor of increased spending was cast by the Democrats and only 37.7 percent by the Republicans. In order that the record for the entire 85th Congress may be available, I have compiled a similar study involving the 2d session.

This year out of 200 record votes, 57 involved government spending or receipts. Again Republicans supplied 71.6 percent of the votes for a balanced budget, and the Democrats supplied only 28.4 percent. On the other hand, the Democrats accounted for 73.5 percent of the votes in favor of increased deficits, while the Republicans supplied only 26.5 percent.

Taking the 2 sessions together, during the entire 85th Congress there were 96 rollcalls involving government fiscal policy. Republicans accounted for 69 percent of the votes for a balanced budget, and the Democrats accounted for 31 percent of these votes. As was expected, the Democrats accounted for 68.4 percent of the votes in favor of more deficits while the Republicans supplied only 31.6 percent of such votes.

There can be little question but that the American taxpayer must look to the Republican Party if he is ever to obtain any relief from the present burdens of heavy taxation.

Unless the trend toward more government spending is reversed, ruinous inflation or confiscatory taxation will engulf us. This is the challenge which confronts the American electorate this November.

Immediately following these remarks I have listed the 57 economy issues during the 2d session of the 85th Congress and the position which represents the vote in favor of economy in each instance.

List of record votes involving economy in Government

Vote No.	Vote for economy position	Description
1	Yea	Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly (S. Res. 231)—Knowland (Republican, California) amendment to reduce from $305,000 to $250,000 the total expenditures authorized for investigation of antitrust and monopoly laws by Committee on the Judiciary. Rejected, 28 to 61, Feb. 5, 1958.
2	Yea	Committee on Rules and Administration (S. Res. 250)—Curtis (Republican, Nebraska) amendment to limit the total number of employees to 3 unless a greater number is authorized by a majority vote of the Committee on Rules and Administration. Rejected, 25 to 49, Feb. 5, 1958.
3	Nay	Postal rates and salary increase (H. R. 5836)—Monroney-Church amendment to eliminate 5-cent, 1st-class postage rate on nonlocal mail and substitute flat 4-cent rate. Rejected, 42 to 49, Feb. 26, 1958.
4	Nay	Postal rates and salary increase (H. R. 5836)—Monroney motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with instructions to eliminate 5-cent, 1st-class postage rate on nonlocal mail and substitute flat 4-cent rate. Rejected, 40 to 48, Feb. 27, 1958.
5	Nay	Postal rates and salary increase (H. R. 5836)—Carroll amendment to restore to the committee bill the present minimum rate of ½ of a cent on each individually addressed copy of newspapers or periodicals of nonprofit organizations. Rejected, 35 to 49, Feb. 28, 1958.
6	Yea	Postal rates and salary increase (H. R. 5836)—Carlson substitute amendment to amended committee amendment, calling for flat 8½-percent postal pay raise retroactive to Jan. 1, 1958. Rejected, 29 to 54, Feb. 28, 1958.
7	Nay	Postal rates and salary increase (H. R. 5836)—Long amendment to amended committee amendment, extending 3-year $240-a-year cost-of-living increase to practically all postal employees, instead of to just those in the lower grades. Agreed to, 50 to 31, Feb. 28, 1958. (This amendment was later reconsidered and rejected on a voice vote.)
8	Nay	2d supplemental appropriations, 1958 (H. R. 10881)—Thye motion to suspend the rules and amend the bill to provide that price supports for dairy products for the marketing year 1958 be no lower than those for the 1957 marketing year. Rejected, 30 to 59, Mar. 11, 1958. (⅔ majority vote required.)
9	Nay	Residential construction (S. 3418)—Monroney amendment to continue present interest rates on GI and military housing mortgages by eliminating provision authorizing the Veterans' Administration to raise the interest rate of GI loans from 4.5 percent to 4.75 percent. Rejected, 47 to 47, Mar. 12, 1958.
10	Yea	Residential construction (S. 3418)—Knowland motion to table the Capehart motion to reconsider the vote by which the Monroney amendment was rejected. Agreed to, 47 to 47, Mar. 12, 1958. (Vice President Nixon votes "yes" to break the tie.)
11	Yea	Residential construction (S. 3418)—Capehart motion to table Long amendment that sought to state that it was the sense of Congress that present interest rates on housing loans are too high, and that the Federal Reserve Board should use its powers to assure that enough money and credit be available so that Government-guaranteed housing loans would be available at a maximum interest rate of 4.5 percent. Agreed to, 45 to 43, Mar. 12, 1958.
12	Nay	Support prices and acreage allotments (S. J. Res. 162)—Passage of resolution to stay any reduction in support prices or acreage allotments until Congress can make appropriate changes in the price-support and acreage-allotment laws. Passed, 50 to 43, Mar. 13, 1958.
13	Nay	Dairy products (S. J. Res. 163)—Rejection of resolution to stay any reduction in support prices for dairy products until Congress can made appropriate provision for such support prices. Rejected, 43 to 50, Mar. 13, 1958.
14	Nay	Life insurance companies tax bill (H. R. 10021)—Douglas amendment to reduce individual income-tax rate applicable to first $1,000 of taxable income for 1958, and to repeal or reduce certain excise taxes. Rejected, 14 to 71, Mar. 13, 1958.
15	Nay	Life insurance companies tax bill (H. R. 10021)—Yarborough amendment increasing for the remainder of 1958 the personal income-tax exemption of every individual from $600 to $800 at the annual rate. Rejected, 19 to 64, Mar. 14, 1958.
16	Yea	Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, extension (S. 3420)—Aiken amendment to strike from the bill sec. 5, respecting barter transactions, and sec. 6, permitting duty-free entry of nonstrategic materials acquired by Commodity Credit Corporation through barter. Agreed to, 44 to 32, Mar. 20, 1958.
17	Yea	Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, extension (S. 3420)—Case (South Dakota) amendment providing that all foreign currencies received in payment for commodities sold shall be placed in a foreign currencies fund in the Treasury Department and that the Treasury shall pay to the CCC the dollar equivalent of any such payment. Rejected, 25 to 58, Mar. 20, 1958.
18	Yea	Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, extension (S. 3420)—Williams and Bridges amendment to limit extension of titles I and II of the act to 1 year instead of 2. Rejected, 38 to 42, Mar. 20, 1958.
19	Nay	Support prices and acreage allotments (S. J. Res. 162)—Ellender motion to concur in House amendments. Agreed to, 48 to 32, Mar. 21, 1958.
20	Nay	Public facilities loan program (S. 3497)—Mansfield motion to table Knowland motion for postponement of bill until Apr. 14. Rejected, 36 to 41, Apr. 1, 1958.
21	Nay	Public facilities loan program (S. 3497)—Fulbright amendment to limit interest rates on authorized loans to 3 percent, instead of 3½ percent as recommended by the committee. Rejected, 40 to 41, Apr. 15, 1958.
22	Nay	Public facilities loan program (S. 3497)—Modified Case (New Jersey) amendment providing that, in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, the prevailing wage rate and the 40-hour week shall apply to projects under the bill. Agreed to, 54 to 25, Apr. 15, 1958.
23	Yea	Public facilities loan program (S. 3497)—Thurmond amendments, en bloc, to permit the Housing and Home Finance Agency Administrator to charge States and municipalities "reasonable" rates for their Federal loans, rather than limiting him to a 3½-percent ceiling. Rejected, 33 to 53, Apr. 16, 1958.
24	Yea	Public facilities loan program (S. 3497)—Bush amendments to reduce the authorization in the bill from $1,000,000,000 to $500,000,000. Rejected, 33 to 53, Apr. 16, 1958.
25	Nay	Public facilities loan program (S. 3497)—Johnson (Texas) motion to table Bush amendment to allocate at least 50 percent of the authorized $1,000,000,000 for the purpose of financing school construction. Agreed to, 60 to 27, Apr. 16, 1958.
26	Nay	Public facilities loan program (S. 3497)—Passage of bill. Passed, 60 to 26, Apr. 16, 1958.
27	Yea	Depressed areas (S. 3683)—Bush amendment to prohibit any loan to assist industries relocating from one area to another. Rejected, 26 to 59, May 13, 1958.
28	Nay	Depressed areas (S. 3683)—Passage of bill. Passed, 46 to 36, May 13, 1958.
29	Nay	Unemployment compensation, temporary additional (H. R. 12065)—Kennedy substitute amendment to broaden coverage of unemployment compensation law, increase weekly benefits, and extend payments to uniform 39 weeks in each State. Rejected, 21 to 63, May 27, 1958.
30	Nay	Unemployment compensation, temporary additional (H. R. 12065)—Modified Kennedy amendment to provide that participation in program shall be mandatory, with duration of payments limited to maximum of 16 weeks and repayment waived under certain conditions. Rejected, 27 to 56, May 28, 1958.
31	Nay	Unemployment compensation, temporary additional (H. R. 12065)—Kennedy amendment to extend duration of payments 16 weeks with compulsory participation and repayment. Rejected, 26 to 47, May 28, 1958.
32	Nay	Unemployment compensation, temporary additional (H. R. 12065)—Long amendment to provide average increase of approximately $5 per month for the needy aged, blind, and totally disabled. Rejected, 40 to 40, May 28, 1958.
33	Yea	Unemployment compensation, temporary additional (H. R. 12065)—Knowland motion to table Dirksen motion to reconsider vote by which the Long amendment was rejected. Agreed to, 41 to 38, May 28, 1958.
34	Nay	Unemployment compensation, temporary additional (H. R. 12065)—Cooper amendment to make participation in the program mandatory upon the States. Rejected, 26 to 54, May 28, 1958.
35	Yea	Mutual Security Act of 1958 (authorization) (H. R. 12181)—Bridges amendment to eliminate language stating it to be the sense of Congress that it is in the interest of the United States to join other nations in providing assistance adequate for India to complete its current economic development program. Rejected, 35 to 47, June 6, 1958.
36	Yea	Mutual Security Act of 1958 (authorization) (H. R. 12181)—Ellender amendment to reduce by $200,000,000 authorized funds for military assistance. Agreed to, 43 to 28, June 6, 1958.
37	Nay	Corporate and excise-tax rates, extension (H. R. 12695)—Douglas amendment to cut personal income taxes by $50 per person, reduce or repeal certain excise taxes, and give tax relief to small business. Rejected, 23 to 65, June 18, 1958.
38	Nay	Corporate and excise-tax rates, extension (H. R. 12695)—McNamara amendment to repeal excise tax on autos and auto parts and accessories, and to reduce by 50 percent tax on trucks and buses. Rejected, 32 to 59, June 19, 1958.
39	Nay	Corporate and excise-tax rates, extension (H. R. 12695)—Kefauver amendment providing for refund to manufacturer of half of the excise tax on autos for allowance to ultimate consumer. Rejected, 24 to 66, June 19, 1958.
40	Nay	Corporate and excise-tax rates, extension (H. R. 12695)—Fulbright amendment for adjustment of corporate normal-tax and surtax rates, which would have had effect of reducing from 30 percent to 22 percent the tax rate on the first $25,000 of a company's earnings. Rejected, 34 to 45, June 20, 1958.
41	Nay	Corporate and excise-tax rates, extension (H. R. 12695)—Douglas amendment repealing some excise taxes and reducing others, including cut to 5 percent on tax on long-distance telephone calls. Rejected, 20 to 55, June 20, 1958.
42	Nay	Corporate and excise-tax rates, extension (H. R. 12695)—Douglas amendment repealing tax on local telephone service. Rejected, 32 to 43, June 20, 1958.
43	Yea	Domestic Minerals Stabilization Act of 1958 (S. 4036)—First Williams amendment eliminating tungsten trioxide from the provisions of the bill. Rejected 25 to 57, July 11, 1958.

List of record votes involving economy in Government—Continued

Vote No.	Vote for economy position	Description
44	Yea	Domestic Minerals Stabilization Act of 1958 (S. 4036)—2d Williams amendment eliminating section which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to borrow $350,000,000 from the Treasury for the purpose of making subsidy payments to domestic minerals producers. Rejected, 28 to 54, July 11, 1958.
45	Yea	International Development Association, establishment of (S. Res. 264)—Capehart amendment adding to the resolution the words "and study all existing international loan agencies in relationship to the proposed International Development Association." Rejected, 40 to 47, July 23, 1958.
46	Nay	International Development Association, establishment of (S. Res. 264)—Adoption of resolution. Adopted, 62 to 25, July 23, 1958.
47	Yea	Agricultural Act of 1958 (S. 4071)—Dirksen amendments, considered en bloc, to limit to 2 years minimum price supports on upland cotton, corn, and rice. Rejected, 33 to 51, July 25, 1958.
48	Nay	Agricultural Act of 1958 (S. 4071)—Proxmire amendment to add new title on dairy stabilization. Rejected, 20 to 57, July 25, 1958.
49	Nay	Agricultural Act of 1958 (S. 4071)—Humphrey amendment to add new section on national and farm feed grain bases. Rejected, 23 to 55, July 25, 1958.
50	Nay	Agricultural Act of 1958 (S. 4071)—Humphrey amendment extending price support to corn, oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghums at 90 to 60 percent and providing that corn price support shall be not less than $1.10 a bushel. Rejected, 24 to 49, July 25, 1958.
51	Nay	Agricultural Act of 1958 (S. 4071)—Modified Humphrey-Proxmire amendment to restore price support for manufacturing milk for 1959. Rejected, 24 to 49, July 25, 1958.
52	Nay	Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1959 (H. R. 11574)—Conference report. Magnuson (Democrat, Washington) motion to concur in a House amendment appropriating $589,000,000 to the civil service retirement and disability fund. Agreed to, 44 to 39, July 30, 1958.
53	Nay	National Defense Education Act of 1958 (H. R. 13247)—McNamara amendment to add to the bill a section authorizing annual grants of $1,000,000,000 for 2 years for public-school construction. Rejected, 30 to 61, Aug. 13, 1958.
54	Nay	National Defense Education Act of 1958 (H. R. 13247)—Morse amendment to add to each scholarship award $500 to be used by the colleges and universities attended by the scholarship holders. Rejected, 20 to 69, Aug. 13, 1958.
55	Nay	National Defense Education Act of 1958 (H. R. 13247)—Cooper amendment to reduce from $17,500,000 to $5,000,000 the annual authorization for the creation of national defense scholarships and limiting each scholarship award to $250 per year. Agreed to, 46 to 42, Aug. 13, 1958.
56	Nay	Supplemental Appropriation for Fiscal 1959 (H. R. 13450)—Sparkman amendment to add to the bill $75,000 for farm housing research by land grant colleges. Rejected, 31 to 47, Aug. 14, 1958.
57	Nay	Social Security Amendments of 1958 (H. R. 13549)—Yarborough amendment to increase OASI benefits and taxes by 10 percent. Rejected, 32 to 53, Aug. 16, 1958.

List of record votes involving economy in Government, U. S. Senate, 85th Cong., 2d sess.

Vote No.	Vote for economy position	Votes cast			
		For economy		Against economy	
		Republicans	Democrats	Republicans	Democrats
1	Yea	26	2	16	45
2	Yea	25		7	42
3	Nay	44	5	2	40
4	Nay	43	5	1	39
5	Nay	25	24	16	19
6	Yea	27	2	15	39
7	Nay	15	16	26	24
8	Nay	27	32	10	11
9	Nay	41	6	6	41
10	Yea	41	6	6	41
11	Yea	41	4	3	40
12	Nay	35	8	11	39
13	Nay	26	24	20	23
14	Nay	42	29	2	12
15	Nay	43	21	1	18
16	Yea	39	5	2	37
17	Yea	20	5	21	37
18	Yea	32	6	6	36
19	Nay	38	4	13	35
20	Nay	39	2	2	34
21	Nay	39	2	2	38
22	Nay	15	10	27	27
23	Yea	30	3	12	41
24	Yea	31	2	10	42
25	Nay	25	2	18	42
26	Nay	22	4	20	40
27	Yea	23	3	19	40
28	Nay	24	12	17	29
29	Nay	40	23	3	18
30	Nay	36	20	9	18
31	Nay	33	14	12	24
32	Nay	35	5	6	34
33	Yea	36	5	4	34
34	Nay	33	21	10	16
35	Yea	23	12	17	30
36	Yea	12	31	22	6
37	Nay	41	24	3	20
38	Nay	34	25	11	21
39	Nay	41	25	4	20
40	Nay	26	19	12	22
41	Nay	36	19	2	18
42	Nay	25	18	13	19
43	Yea	19	6	26	31
44	Yea	20	8	24	30
45	Yea	36	4	9	39
46	Nay	22	5	23	30
47	Yea	30	3	12	30
48	Nay	33	24	4	16
49	Nay	33	22	6	17
50	Nay	33	16	5	19
51	Nay	31	18	6	18
52	Nay	38	1	4	40
53	Nay	37	24	7	23
54	Nay	39	30	5	15
55	Yea	32	14	11	31
56	Nay	36	11	4	27
57	Nay	33	20	6	30
Total		1,791	709	600	1,609

Industry Versus Alcoholism—Chicago Fights Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by me and an article from the August issue of Manage—the magazine of the National Management Association—on combating alcoholism in the city of Chicago.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS

The city of Chicago, under the leadership of Mayor Richard J. Daley, has undertaken dramatic programs in combating alcoholism, which medical men recognize as the No. 3 threat to American health. The Chicago Alcoholic Treatment Center, established at Mayor Daley's direction, has attracted international attention, and its work was recently covered in an article in Manage, a monthly magazine of the National Management Association.

In addition to the Chicago Alcoholic Treatment Center, an inservice sobriety program was established through the Police Department Fellowship Club, and time off for police illnesses, incapacity, and so forth, has been reduced 67 percent in the police department since the fellowship program was established.

These are only two of the many dramatic human service programs which Chicago has established.

[From Manage magazine of August 1958]

INDUSTRY VERSUS ALCOHOLISM: CHICAGO FIGHTS BACK

Chicago's reputation for its Skid Row and its alcoholic problem may soon be a thing of the past. Business, industrial, and civic leaders are all cooperating with Mayor Richard J. Daley, who directs the new commission on rehabilitation, and the Chicago alcoholic treatment center.

The center completed its first year May 13, and it has had a phenomenal success: Out of the first 244 patients discharged, 129—or more than one-half—are maintaining posttreatment sobriety.

A much greater expansion in the treatment of alcoholics is ahead.

In July, the Chicago center received a grant of $22,500 from the Illinois Commission on Alcoholism for the expansion of its medical-psychiatric treatment programs. With these funds, the commission is expanding its staff of psychiatric social workers, adding one field worker to provide outpatient counsel and improving other medical facilities. The commission is also hoping for grants on applications made to the Cook County Department of Public Welfare and the United States Department of Health. Both agencies have made extensive studies of the CATC program and its first-year results.

Industry and management are well represented on the commission on rehabilitation which manages the center for the city. G. Murray Campbell, the chairman, is a Baltimore and Ohio Railroad vice president; Walter Krafft, another member, has many business enterprises; Milton H. Callner is a real-estate developer.

Early in its operations, the center contacted steel companies, electrical firms, building contractors, and many other lines of business, asking cooperation in finding jobs for those who are about to leave the center. Cooperation has been magnificent, in the opinion of Director Arthur J. Ward.

Considerably over one-half the men who leave the center have a job waiting for them. It had been the center's experience that having a job gives the patient a better chance to maintain sobriety than if he were dismissed without concern for his future.

"There is always room for more jobs," Ward says. "And there is always room for improvement. But we owe a debt of gratitude to Chicago business firms for the fine manner in which they have cooperated with us in giving jobs to those men we have rehabilitated.

"Of course, no one can guarantee that the alcoholic will stay sober on the job. Business has been willing to take that risk, in order to help us and to help the alcoholic who has been willing to accept treatment."

The Chicago Alcoholic Treatment Center was established under the personal direction of the mayor, who, since his term began in 1955, has planned, executed, and generaled what amounts to a war on alcoholism. Mayor Daley started the CATC off with a $120,000

city appropriation. The board of health gave over two floors at the Contagious Diseases Hospital, and Daley sent his personal troubleshooter, Arthur J. Ward, to set up and direct the center. It is frankly a pilot-plant operation, with only 36 beds in the Nation's second-city, in which there are an estimated 174,000 alcoholics.

After a little more than a year, the results were so formidable that now the center is taking over another floor of the hospital to double its facilities.

Half the patients discharged join Alcoholics Anonymous, the organization which has free access to the center at all times.

In about 50 percent of the cases, patients at the center had literally drunk themselves out of house, home, and family. There is an effort in all cases by the social service staff to reunite families—after having taught the nonalcoholic members the real nature of the illness. The hospital staff maintains that alcoholism is an illness, not just a habit or a weakness to be cured by willpower alone. When the families of patients are made to understand this, reconciliation is frequently possible. The staff points with pride to the scores of families reunited as a result of the center's work.

Women are not now treated at the center, although the female alcoholic problem is recognized. Starting from scratch with only 36 beds, it was decided to carry out the pilot-plant experiments, and basic research with male patients, before attempting to undertake the treatment of women too.

The treatment is under the direction of a qualified medical doctor, a psychiatrist, a staff of psychiatric social workers, a nursing staff with experience in treating alcoholics and a recreational director. Protestant and Catholic religious services are conducted in separate chapels each Sunday, and Wednesday and Saturday mornings are given over to AA meetings for such patients as wish to attend. But AA attendance is not required. Patients may ask and receive special religious or psychiatric counsel, besides regular interviews with the staff.

The center provides television, radio, a well-stocked library, cards, checkers, and other games, handicraft lessons, and special lecture courses in civics, government, civil defense, fire prevention, ethics, journalism, and other subjects. Group discussions are encouraged.

Hon. Robert C. Byrd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I join my friends in the House in paying tribute to our colleague from West Virginia, the Honorable ROBERT C. BYRD, who is retiring. Few men have commanded the respect and accomplished as much as Congressman BYRD has in only 6 years of service in the House. It is gratifying to know that he is not retiring from politics, but has chosen to seek a seat in the United States Senate.

As chairman of the Inter-American Affairs Committee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Congressman BYRD has proven his ability to ably cope with any situation which developed. He leaves the Congress with the best wishes of his friends for success in all future endeavors.

A Report to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, there is an old Biblical mandate which speaks of the moral obligation to "render an account of thy stewardship." I firmly believe that every responsible public official should fulfill this obligation. There is no better time than the present at the conclusion of the 85th Congress, when I round out my first term as the Representative of the people of the 18th District of New York. I feel it is my duty to keep my constituents informed about the legislative record, and particularly my efforts in serving the needs of the people and my views on major problems. I do not expect everyone to agree with all I have said or done; my primary interest is to give them a clear idea of where I stand on these issues. I leave it to the intelligence and the good judgment of my constituents to judge for themselves.

My District, which encompasses the areas of New York City known as Yorkville and East Harlem, is probably the most cosmopolitan district in the country. It is made up of sizable nationality groups, such as Italians, Slovaks, Irish, Germans, Hungarians, Rumanians, Spanish, West Indians, and others. We have Catholics, Protestants, and Jews. All of them have their distinctive customs and traditions which form the pattern of American life. The overwhelming majority are wage earners, people of low income, but industrious, hard-working, decent, and patriotic Americans. It is a high privilege to serve them in Congress.

WORLD PEACE AND NATIONAL SECURITY

The most important task of Congress is to work for world peace and to provide for our national security. Lasting peace in the world is the primary goal of mankind, but how to attain it in the face of Communist obstructionism is not an easy matter. It is my opinion that we must utilize every opportunity and every effort which holds the promise of peace, but at the same time we must always be prepared to defend our Nation and to make available to our people the most modern instruments of defense. This is my aim and my philosophy in Congress. As a member of the House Appropriations Committee, I supported legislation to strengthen our defenses and our national security.

Among the measures I supported to strengthen the United States and its allies were military appropriations for our Armed Forces; development of missiles, rockets, and other new weapons for our arsenals; research in the development of satellites and space explorations; expansion of warning systems against possible enemy attacks. Then there were a number of peaceful measures, such as the mutual-security program, to provide military, economic, and technical assistance to our allies; extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act, to improve trade relations; Public Law 480, to sell, at reduced prices, some of our surplus food commodities to underdeveloped and undernourished nations abroad, to help remove the breeding grounds for communism in those areas.

Although these programs are very costly, we need all the friends and allies we can get, and they must be strengthened to stand with us in the common struggle against international communism. Let us remember that the struggle between East and West centers around these countries in Asia, in Africa, and in Latin America. Russia uses fear and threats against them; she seeks to subvert them through propaganda in the effort to gain control over them and eventually domination over the whole world. The subjugation of any nation makes us weaker, while strengthening the free nations makes us stronger.

Our intelligence system has failed us in several instances. We were surprised by the Iraq coup and the Nixon "spitnik" in South America. Because of my dissatisfaction with our intelligence agency, I introduced several measures on foreign affairs, including a resolution to designate a committee to make a study of our methods of gathering intelligence affecting our national security and a resolution requesting our delegate to the United Nations to convene the Arab States and Israel to a peace conference. In the next Congress I shall continue all efforts toward a realistic foreign policy and genuine peace in the world.

THE RECESSION OF 1958

The economic recession of 1958 was unquestionably one of the major problems confronting Congress. The economy of the country suddenly took a sharp turn downward. Unemployment reached 5½ million. Unemployment compensation was being used up at a rapid pace. Small-business people were being pushed against the wall and bankruptcies were growing at an alarming rate. For a while it looked as if we were heading into a severe depression as in the 1930's.

Despite all efforts to get the Eisenhower administration to take bold action to end the recession, it showed lack of vision and preferred to sit back and wait. It was the Democratic Congress which responded to the urgent call of the people by the adoption of legislation to combat the recession. While I was glad to support all of these measures, it was my view that more should be done. The fact is, as I utter these words at the end of August, there are still over 5 million unemployed and many sections of the country have been declared as economically depressed areas.

To combat the recession, I supported and also proposed several measures designed to stimulate business, help the unemployed, and restore consumer confidence. One of the first measures to aid the economy was passage of an emergency housing bill authorizing almost $2 billion in loan funds for the construction of 200,000 houses and to provide 600,000 jobs in the housing industry. Next was the extension of unemployment insurance programs for those who had ex-

hausted their jobless pay; in New York State an additional 13 weeks of compensation were added. Other antirecession steps included acceleration of the Federal highway construction program, military construction program, tax relief for small business and lower interest rates on loans, and others.

I supported the marketing facilities bill which would in my opinion reduce the distribution cost and consequently the cost to the consumer. While farmers are receiving less and less of the consumer dollar, the price to the housewife has been increasing. The high cost must be reduced.

I supported the community facilities bill for local public works program, such as improved streets, parks, public transportation, hospitals, health centers, libraries, water and sewerage systems, and so forth. This would create many jobs and improve neighborhoods, but unfortunately it was defeated. I shall work for its enactment next year. I also supported the farm-price support bill to help the farmers—which helps the economy as a whole—and the rivers and harbors bill. Both of these are important for the economy of the country but the President vetoed both bills. I strongly criticized the administration and its supporters in Congress in recent years. They not only oppose every effort to safeguard the interests of the working people, but are doing everything possible to undermine organized labor and to destroy the unions. When the Kennedy-Ives bill, a major labor reform bill designed to crack down on racketeering as revealed by the McClellan committee, came up in Congress, it was defeated by the antilabor forces.

In my own way, I sought to help the wage earners. I spoke up against the fake right-to-work laws which are intended to undermine the security of the working people. I supported the bill for full disclosure and accounting of funds invested by unions or management in pensions or welfare plans, the bill to eliminate racketeering in unions which constitute a threat to organized labor in the United States, and the $280 million relief measure to aid depressed areas suffering from large unemployment.

In addition, I sponsored several labor bills such as: to increase the minimum hourly wage from $1 to $1.25; to extend minimum wage coverage to hotel workers and others who are earning substandard wages; to prohibit discrimination against workers because of age in employment by Government contractors; to provide additional State unemployment compensation benefits.

SOCIAL SECURITY

No group in America is more entitled to special consideration than our elderly citizens who are retired and no longer able to work. After a lifetime of service, they deserve economic security in their declining years. Congress voted to increase their monthly benefits by 7 percent to help the 11,800,000 Americans on social security to meet in part the rising cost of living. Minimum benefits will increase from $30 to $33 per month, while the maximum for husband and wife will go up from $200 to $214. This is a very modest increase, considering the skyrocketing prices of food and other essentials.

I had introduced several bills to liberalize the social-security system, most important of which was a bill to reduce the retirement age to 60 for men and 55 for women at full benefits. Another of my bills sought to provide medical and nursing care for persons eligible to social-security benefits. The mounting cost of medical care for the elderly is a serious problem. I personally appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee in June 1958 to plead for my bill, but no action was taken on it. Congress cannot ignore this problem too long. I shall continue my fight for medical care for older persons until it is achieved. Simple justice requires service workers to be covered in social security to the full extent of their earnings. I introduced legislation to include tips as wages for purposes of social security inasmuch as tips are included for income-tax purposes. I am confident that after the internal revenue and social-security department confer, this area will be covered to correct this injustice.

HOUSING

The need for adequate housing and slum clearance in the large urban areas, such as in my District, still remains a pressing problem. Earlier this year Congress passed an emergency housing bill authorizing about $2 billion in loan funds for the construction of 200,000 houses. While I was glad to support this measure, it was no solution to the housing shortage or slum clearance. This was primarily a measure to help private industry through loans.

What is needed is a large-scale public housing program for the construction of housing projects in the large cities where slums and crowded conditions are intolerable. A $2 billion housing bill had passed the Senate, but became bogged down in the House. It was subsequently reduced to a $950 million program, but this, too, was defeated. This bill was to provide housing projects for elderly people, college housing for students, insurance on home mortgages, redevelopment of urban areas, and the clearance of slums.

To alleviate conditions, I had introduced two bills dealing with housing. One provided for relocation payments to families or business firms displaced by low-rent housing projects. The other provided for an exemption of all the income of a minor in a family for admittance or continued occupancy of low-rent housing. The latter aimed to bring about balanced communities and prevent the development of economically poor ghettoes.

SMALL BUSINESS

The 85th Congress passed 3 major measures to help small business. The most important of these provides tax relief for small business estimated at about $260 million a year in the following ways: faster tax writeoffs on new equipment in the first year after purchase; extend from 2 to 3 years for applying a loss against previous income to gain a tax refund; extend to 10 years payments on estate taxes in closely held small businesses to prevent forced liquidation or merger to meet tax obligations; increase from $60,000 to $100,000 the minimum credit against income for tax purposes.

The other measures established the Small Business Administration as a permanent Federal agency, instead of temporary, raised the ceiling on loans, and reduced the interest rates from 6 to 5½ percent. This agency was authorized to set up a $250 million fund to furnish long-term equity capital to small business. I believe these measures should prove to be of great assistance to small business in the country, and for this reason I supported them. The latter measure is quite similar to a bill I introduced last January to create a Small Business Capital Bank System to provide equity and long-term loan capital to small business on reasonable terms.

SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM

The national school-lunch program is a very important phase of our national life of direct benefit to the younger generation. This program dates from the depression period of the 1930's, but in 1946 it became a permanent program having two major objectives: as an outlet for agricultural commodities, and to improve the health and well-being of the Nation's children by providing them with a well-balanced lunch at school to fill their daily nutritional requirements.

In recent years the administration has sought to decrease the amount of surplus foods available for donation to schools, and also to reduce the funds for this program. This year, for example, the administration recommended no increase in this budget which would have made the school-lunch program most inadequate in view of the growing school population. Here is one way in which the people in the large cities derive a specific benefit, and it was going to be reduced to practical purposes.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I fought for a larger school lunch program and feel that I was instrumental in obtaining additional funds for this program. I urged that it be increased by $55 million in order to insure an adequate food supply for the children. The result was that Congress voted to increase this program from $100 million to $145 million. Thus, more children will benefit from the school-lunch program during the coming year.

CIVIL RIGHTS

It is my view that the United States must take the lead in practicing toleration toward racial and religious groups and to eliminate discrimination against people on the grounds of race, creed, color, or national origin. We must live up to the civil rights and civil liberties as enunciated in the United States Constitution. For this reason, I was pleased that Congress for the first time in 82 years passed the Civil Rights Act of 1957. It is not an all-embracing law designed to eliminate discrimination and safeguard minority rights. It is limited merely to the protection of the right to vote, it provides for a Civil Rights Commission to investigate violations, and it sets up a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice. I felt privileged to participate in these historic debates.

This measure may be regarded as a starting point for civil-rights legislation.

Additional legal powers and remedies are required to guarantee the equal protection of the laws to every American and effective enforcement of these laws. Witness all the obstructions, the delays, and the tactics to undermine the integration in the schools in Little Rock and other southern communities which is contrary to the judicial decree of the United States Supreme Court. This is causing untold harm to the United States all over the world.

EDUCATION

The Russian sputnik and Russian advances in science have pointed up our own crisis in education, the lack of sufficient educational facilities and opportunities for our youth. Our national security was threatened by the inadequacy of our educational system, especially in science. We do not have enough classrooms or enough teachers. We did not provide enough help or incentive to deserving students seeking a higher education. Education has become most expensive and it is increasingly difficult for a family of limited means to provide their children with a higher education. This constitutes a tremendous waste of human resources.

When the national defense education bill to provide loans and scholarships to needy students came up in Congress, I was among the first to support it. I was terribly disappointed when the scholarship program was omitted from the bill; nevertheless, I voted for it since it would still be a help to students requiring loans and in other ways. It is urgent that the next Congress enact a scholarship program, and I will work toward that goal. We must give our young generation the best education possible.

IMMIGRATION

Throughout my first term in Congress I have been interested in efforts to liberalize the immigration laws and to eliminate the discriminatory national origins concept. The United States must live up to its tradition as a haven of refuge for the oppressed and as a citadel of freedom. One of the first bills I introduced shortly after coming to Congress in January 1957 was a bill to revise and rewrite the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act eliminating the national origins quota system and other discriminatory features of our immigration and naturalization laws. I also introduced a bill to facilitate the entry into the United States of adopted children and other relatives of American citizens.

The 85th Congress, however, passed two important immigration measures. One was to grant permanent status to some 32,000 Hungarian refugees who entered the United States after the Hungarian uprising in 1956. The other was a bill to permit the unification of families and utilization of unused visas left over from the Refugee Relief Act. Both of these were worthwhile measures and I was pleased to vote for them. I shall continue to strive for greater liberalization of our immigration laws.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Veterans and their survivors have been benefited in a number of ways through legislation adopted by the 85th Congress. Among the more important measures, all of which I supported, were the following: to increase the compensation for service-connected disabilities for all veterans and additional allowances for dependents; extension of the GI-loan bill for 2 years until 1960, but interest rates were increased to 4¾ percent; an increase in the burial allowance for deceased veterans from $150 to $250; total disability national service life insurance for veterans paying double the present benefits.

There were attempts on the part of the administration to make arbitrary cuts in essential veterans' services, especially hospital services. I strongly opposed such cuts either in services or in benefits to veterans and will continue to do so. The veterans of this country have made great sacrifices for the Nation and they deserve our fullest recognition.

POSTAL AND GOVERNMENT WORKERS

During my first year in Congress I served on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee where I had the opportunity to familiarize myself with the problems of the postal workers and Government employees. I am proud of our postal workers and their dedicated service. They had not received a pay increase in the last 3 years, and with the cost of living rising steadily I felt they were entitled to a raise. In fact, one of the first bills I introduced last January when the 1958 session convened was legislation to increase basic postal salaries by $546 annually. I voted for the 10 percent pay increase for postal and Federal employees, including the retroactive payments going back to January, which Congress enacted in June.

Similarly, I supported the measure to grant a 10 percent increase in annuities to retired Federal employees. Back in March 1957 I had introduced a bill, H. R. 5754, to increase annuities to civil service retirees under a graduated system of from 10 to 30 percent. Some of the features of my bill were subsequently enacted.

In the field of Federal employee legislation I look for early enactment, perhaps in 1959, of health and life insurance for Government workers at a low cost which would provide protection against long and costly illnesses. Other legislative objectives in this field are official recognition of Federal employee unions, crediting unused sick leave for greater annuity benefits upon retirement, an equitable system for settlement of employee grievances, correction of postal pay classification inequities, and others.

EQUALITY FOR PUERTO RICANS

An important segment of the population of my District is made up of Puerto Ricans, who are striving to attain equality as American citizens. I am happy to assist them in this effort. They are entitled to equal opportunity to advance by reason of ability, without regard to race, color, religion, or sex. These people are religious, they are friendly and hospitable. Their sons have fought to defend American democracy and our way of life. They have earned their rights to citizenship and equality.

Like all newcomers to our shores, they have encountered language difficulties and a lack of economic opportunities which create certain problems for them. Yet they are proving to be a valuable asset to our economy in several industries. Gradually these problems are being solved as the Puerto Ricans learn the English language and advance in education, in business, and in politics. Although Spanish is spoken in almost all Puerto Rican homes in New York, about 50 percent of these are already reported to be bilingual and that proportion is bound to increase in the years to come. In my Congressional District we have 1 Puerto Rican local district leader, a candidate for the State assembly, and 2 judges.

On August 11 one of the great television channels in New York initiated a program to aid the Spanish-speaking people learn English. This program aims not only to teach the Puerto Ricans English, but also a greater sense of participation in community affairs. As such, I feel that this program will prove to be an effective instrument of education and a way to equality for Puerto Ricans in New York.

OTHER ISSUES AND PROBLEMS

There have been a number of other issues and problems on which I expressed my view as a Member of Congress, the more important of these being the following:

I introduced a bill for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the 10th anniversary of the establishment of Israel. On that occasion I stated that Israel was the only stable and forward-looking country in the Middle East, while the Arabs are keeping the area in constant turmoil and are playing into the hands of the Communists.

Recent events prove that I was correct.

Another bill I introduced sought to prohibit the charging of a fee to view television programs in the home. There is a movement afoot to institute pay television, which I strenuously oppose because I believe it is not in the best interests of the public and it will affect primarily the low-income families who will not be able to afford to pay for such programs. It also constitutes a certain danger to our economy.

After the 1957 session I was privileged to visit Italy, examine their industrial plants and meet with the Italian businessmen and public officials. I enjoyed this experience.

Prior to the parliamentary elections in Italy in the spring of 1958, I called on the people of Italy to vote for those parties which stand for democracy and for cooperation with the West. I was glad that these parties were victorious in the elections and that one of the first tasks of Italy's new Prime Minister, Amintore Fanfani, was to come to Washington for consultations with our Government to establish better relations.

I protested against Communist inhumanities in Hungary, Poland, and other Eastern European countries where the people are suffering under the Kremlin's domination and expressed the hope they would soon witness the liberation of their countries.

I introduced the following additional bills: a resolution calling for the unification of Ireland; a resolution to declare March 9 of each year as Amerigo Vespucci Day in honor of the Italian navigator after whom the continent of America was named; a bill to establish recognition and observance by the Post Office Department of State holidays.

Among bills which I supported were: Admission of Alaska as the 49th State; Federal Aviation Act for airport development; extension for 3 years of the special school-milk program to cost $75 million annually; a program to help train public-health specialists and technicians; extension for 3 years of the hospital-construction program; authorization of $294 million for medical research in mental health, cancer, heart, allergy, and arthritis; control and elimination of water pollution, and many other worthwhile measures.

In addition, my offices in Washington and New York performed many personal services for hundreds of people who contacted me or my staff in person or in writing on various problems. This is a chapter of service in itself, but since it concerns problems of a very personal nature I shall only say that I am ready at all times to be helpful in every way possible to the people of my District. My staff and I will make every effort to carefully consider any problem submitted by residents of the 18th Congressional District. I take this opportunity to thank my Washington staff, namely, Mrs. Coutsonikas and Miss Gobbi. My work could not be done without their invaluable help. I thank my New York assistants, Mark Lane, Max Feigin, Modesto Munoz, and Michael Lazazzara. I feel confident that my constituents are receiving effective service while I am in Washington.

It is my hope to continue to serve you in the United States Congress. It is my obligation to know my community, to understand its problems, and to be dedicated to their solution. This makes it possible for me to serve in the best interests of my people.

This is the account of my stewardship in office which I present to my constituents. I know they will read it carefully and judge it on its entirety. Those who wish to write to me, either on a personal matter or to comment on this report, please address your letter to: Congressman ALFRED E. SANTANGELO, New House Office Building, Washington 25, D. C., or 1484 First Avenue, New York City.

Adm. Edward C. Stephan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement relative to the transfer of Adm. Edward C. Stephan, of the Navy Liaison Office.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I wish to call to the attention of the Senate the transfer of Adm. Edward C. Stephan, of the Navy Liaison Office.

Admiral Stephan has served in his present capacity for the past 2 years. He has done an admirable job representing the Navy and serving the needs of many of us here in the Congress.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I have found the admiral's assistance very valuable on numerous occasions. He has been here in Washington for several years, and I know that he is well known personally to many of us. We will all miss him in the next session.

But the admiral is going on to even more important duties elsewhere. I congratulate him on taking command of the South Atlantic force. I know that his services will continue to reflect credit upon the Navy and the United States.

Research and Development—Report of Committee on Government Operations—Comment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Government Operations, I desire to remark on the controversial staff work behind the 32d Report of the Committee on Government Operations entitled "Research and Development." This House Report, No. 2552, was printed August 12, 1958.

This staff-dominated report is typified by the subcommittee remarks taking up only 53 pages, while the staff study occupies the following 165 pages. Moreover, most of the problems with which the subcommittee was concerned had been recognized and met by the administration many months previously in the Defense Department Reorganization Act of 1958. This provided for slicing of red tape and sharpening centralized authority.

Thus, the subcommittee report largely came as an after-action survey for political, rather than constructive, purposes.

The staff study summary, however, requires comment which the minority members of the committee did not have time to prepare before its publication.

Frankly, the study is both unscholarly and unobjective.

Perhaps by pointing out its most glaring deficiencies, which indeed reflect upon the professional work of the staff, I can, in some degree, caution future staffs against such approaches. And if my remarks appear to hit the partisan level by references to the two political parties, my hand has been forced by the political tactics of the staff.

The staff report could have performed a valuable service by stressing the most serious danger confronting our entire defense effort. This is the inflationary trend encouraged by vast spending programs—of which the last Democrat-controlled Congress is replete with examples—producing constant pressures for price and wage increases. Together, these factors threaten to place research and development beyond reach. Time and again the staff mentions the rising cost of defense, but at no time is it willing to analyze this basic cause.

Surely, professional consciences must have been disturbed when criticisms conformed to party interests alone and avoided the heart of the problem.

As a result, much of the report remained on a superficial level, avoiding the real and propagandizing the apparent.

The report is replete with charts which reflect adjusted rather than actual obligations of funds to research and development. These adjusted obligations are derived from a research and development index which subtracts from the actual obligation in proportion to the declining value of the research and development dollar for that year. According to certain studies, it would take about $1.61 in 1958 to purchase the same amount of research and development that $1 could have bought in the 1947–49 base period.

After adjusting figures according to this index, the staff report declares that Department of Defense obligations toward research and development have expanded since fiscal year 1955, "but never reached the peak level of fiscal year 1952."

The report continues—page 82:

When the Korean hostilities were suspended, President Eisenhower instituted an economy drive which affected fiscal year 1954 and fiscal year 1955 Government activities. Expenditures of research and development funds were curtailed along with funds for all other activities. This resulted, of course, in a curtailment of direct research and development program.

Typical of the entire staff report is this inference that the administration followed a retrenchment policy after Korea which it never has abandoned. These inferences afford a good example of how statistics can be manipulated to paint a partial, incomplete, and unfair picture.

This picture is distorted in at least three respects:

First. As the staff report later admits on page 91—

Even the lines between research, development, and procurement cannot be drawn precisely, particularly in areas of rapidly advancing technology.

The Department of Defense has recognized the fact that the full cost of modernizing the military forces cannot be considered as research and development. The Department of Defense has also recognized the fact the effort supported by the research and development appropriations does not give a full measure of the effort devoted to the research, development, test, and evaluation programs, because support such as the procurement of items for engineering and service test are usually financed from other appropriations.

Actually, the indirect activities supporting research and development have more than offset the decline in the defense dollar. In some cases, the total amounts for supporting activities exceed

the amounts appropriated for direct research and development. It is regrettable that the staff report failed to stress that indirect support through procurement, personnel, administration, and production funds have more than provided for the dollar decline.

Second. There are many other unmeasurable variables which influence the picture. The management of the research and development program, for example, has vastly improved since the 1947 period, and hence there is a savings through increased efficiency. These saved management dollars, then, further expand the boundaries of the research program.

Third. The committee staff constantly makes comparisons with 1952 as "the peak year" of research and development obligations. Yet it fails to examine the content of that year. Even a school child knows that the Korean war was then being fought.

This so-called peak resulted, consequently, from efforts to satisfy research and development needs for the Korean battlefield. Meanwhile, long-range research was starved. Had the staff report separated the 1952 battlefield research expenditures from the 1952 long-range expenditures, for example in relation to ICBM's, a shocking picture of myopic vision on the part of the Truman administration would have evolved.

The following table shows how the Democrat administration retarded and the Republican administration advanced the IRBM and ICBM missile program:

United States missile programs, Department of Defense, fiscal year 1946 through fiscal year 1958

[Funds programed in millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Total missiles	Surface-to-surface missiles	Long-range surface-to-surface missiles	IRBM and ICBM
1946 and prior	70	19	9	1.95
1947	56	20	6	
1948	81	36	11	.27
1949	98	45	18	.1
1950	134	65	22	
1951	784	186	113	.5
1952	1,201	247	143	.8
1953	1,208	443	270	3
1954	1,067	350	258	14
1955	1,501	590	376	161
1956	2,683	959	679	515
1957	4,284	2,000	1,743	1,380

NOTES

1. Above estimates include research and development, production facility expansion and tooling, procurement and production for test, evaluation, and service use, construction or conversion of ships identified with the guided-missiles programs, and construction costs for the ballistic-missile programs and certain research and development facilities. They do not include military personnel costs and the full cost of operation and maintenance of guided-missile installations.

2. IRBM and ICBM expenditures for fiscal years 1953 to 1956, inclusive, and fiscal year 1957 were $258,000,000 and $982,000,000, respectively.

What is more, the appropriation figures for fiscal years 1954 and 1955 do not give the true picture of what was spent in the Department of Defense in those years and, hence, give rise to criticisms of certain cutbacks after the Korean war. In the Army, for example, pre-1954 appropriations from the Korean emergency were still available for procurement use well in 1956. Likewise, there were unspent Air Force funds which lasted into the following years.

The staff report purports to tell the full story of missile research and development efforts. Apparently, it did not consider the 1945–50 missile blindness of the Truman administration to be a part of this story. For it would have taken a nonpartisan staff to consider all the facts.

After the first sputnik, Dr. von Braun was quite clear in assigning responsibility for our lagging space program:

The main reason is that the United States had no ballistic-missile program worth mentioning between 1945 and 1951. These 6 years during which the Russians obviously laid the groundwork for their large rocket program are irretrievably lost * * *. Thus, our present dilemma is not due to the fact that we are not working hard enough now, but that we did not work hard enough during the first 6 to 10 years after the war.

Up to the present, more than 99 percent of the funds spent on development of these missiles has come from a Republican administration. Plainly, this is a Republican accomplishment, and no graphs can distort the fact.

In the graphs the committee staff devised, the research and development index, based on the declining value of the defense dollar since 1953, was utilized constantly.

But again the staff has picked a convenient cutoff date in order to show a half picture.

The drastic decline in purchasing power occurred before 1953, as the figures below make evident:

Purchasing power of the consumer dollar in United States cities 1933 to June 1958

[1933 = $1]

Date	Purchasing power	Date	Purchasing power	Date	Purchasing power	Date	Purchasing power
1933	$1.000	1941	$0.879	1949	$0.543	1957	$0.460
1934	.967	1942	.793	1950	.538	1958[1]	-------
1935	.942	1943	.747	1951	.496	-------	-------
1936	.933	1944	.735	1952	.487	-------	.452
1937	.901	1945	.719	1953	.483	-------	-------
1938	.917	1946	.663	1954	.482	-------	-------
1939	.931	1947	.579	1955	.483	-------	-------
1940	.923	1948	.538	1956	.476	-------	-------

[1] January.

Source: U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington, D. C., Aug. 18, 1958.

During the Eisenhower years, for example, the consumer dollar lost only $0.036 of its purchasing power, as compared with a $0.232 loss during the Truman years from 1945 to 1952. This feat of retarding the dollar decline stands as a major accomplishment of the Republican administration, especially from the research and development point of view.

Had the rate of decline characteristic of the Truman administration continued, literally, we would have priced ourselves out of survival.

In discussing cases where the amounts appropriated by Congress have been more than the Executive requested, the report reads—page 88:

The increase of $100 million in the fiscal year 1957 Air Force appropriation is the only one made by Congress for fiscal years 1953 and 1958, inclusive. Why this increase was granted, we do not know except that we were told it was the result entirely of inquiries and decisions of the Appropriations Committee.

This is to say the one time that Congress felt it wise to appropriate more money than President Eisenhower requested, it did so without clear purpose or concrete programing. There is not much credit in that.

In analyzing where Congress had cut the requests of the President, the staff report says, on page 87:

The amounts requested by the President were appropriated. Major exceptions occurred in fiscal years 1954 and 1955 when the Congress reduced the amounts requested by the President for the three services (Army, Navy, and Air Force).

This implied criticism of the Republican 83d Congress skirts the true issue. As already noted, large research and development sums had been devoted to immediate Korean war needs. With the peace, many such projects were no longer significant. The budget should have been and was reduced in this respect.

Most significant, however, is that the IRBM and ICBM development budget was increased. This dispels all staff charges of retrenchment in vital areas.

The staff report is quite unwilling to apply the same yardstick of criticism to Republicans and Democrats alike. In 1947, Mr. Truman impounded $75 million which a Republican Congress had appropriated, thus terminating the all-important Atlas project. When the program again was commenced in 1950, Mr. Truman a second time disrupted progress by impounding $735 million of Air Force funds. Had it not been for Mr. Truman's actions, it is possible the Atlas could have been operational in 1953 or 1954.

The committee staff turned a blind eye to the spring of 1957. On page 87 of the report, references are made to exhibit 1, which proposed that, on the whole, Congress had appropriated all the research and development funds the President had requested. This was indeed a daring assertion.

I will not repeat the entire story of the May 1957 Democrat slash in vital research and development which jeopardized our entire missile program. Of the several accounts of this given on the floor of the House, Representative SHEEHAN'S is the latest, and can be found on page 16983 of the RECORD, August 19, 1958.

Briefly, the Democrat-controlled Congress slashed $2.5 billion from the Defense Department budget for fiscal 1958.

In a radio and TV broadcast, President Eisenhower notified the Nation that this was a foolhardy gamble. In the House the Canfield amendment sought to restore $313 million to what the Appropriations Committee was willing to provide for our security. Seventy-eight percent of the Republicans voted for the amendment; 95 percent of the Democrats voted against it.

When sputnik streaked across the sky the following autumn, Democrat sponsors of the cuts saw their folly and feared the wrath of their constituents. In January 1958 when President Eisenhower asked for additional funds to repair the delay, Democrats had to comply. Con-

sequently, the adequacy of appropriations was restored before the fiscal year was out, and for this reason the year and statistics do not reflect the initial and harmful cuts.

By preparing graphs which use cutoffs and unique figures, painting rather than reflecting the facts, the staff has forfeited the chance of presenting a constructive report. Certainly, much could have been learned by both parties from a close examination of the Congressional attitudes on the eve of sputnik.

The staff report justifiably portrays an admiration for the World War II Office of Scientific Research and Development. OSRD essentially was a civilian agency in competition with the military research programs. In that wartime setting this worked well.

But there is a danger in such admiration for the past of trying to copy something not applicable to the space and supersonic age. OSRD did not face the complexity of problems or research programs which confront us today.

We can admire OSRD simplicity and comparative ease at decision making. But we must not blindly try to reproduce its type of organization in a different setting and circumstance. The study of OSRD successes, on the other hand, does illustrate the need to cut bureaucracy and speed up decisionmaking time.

This is exactly the purpose of the Defense Department Reorganization Act of 1958. What is more, the act molds the defense efforts into a centralized structure, integrating the military and civilian in a manner superior to that of OSRD.

As the staff report points out, many defects sprang from the National Security Act of 1947.

By 1953, for example, the Joint Research and Development Board had mushroomed into an unwieldly organization with more than 100 active committees, panels, and working groups.

President Eisenhower acted to stop this confusion. In February 1953 Secretary of Defense Wilson appointed a committee on "Organization of the Department of Defense" headed by Mr. Nelson Rockefeller. The work of the committee constituted the most thorough investigation of research and development in our history. Unfortunately, this study received no praise in the staff report.

As a result of this investigation by the Rockefeller group, a single coordinating official under the title of Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Development was established in place of the maze of committees and an inefficient board. This remedial action cut redtape and decision-making time.

The demands of immediacy versus the demands for long-range needs always create tensions.

The staff report could have performed a valuable service by analyzing how Pentagon officials faced these dilemmas during the years 1953–58. True enough, the 1953 reorganization had instituted sound organizational lines quite in contrast to those evident from 1947 to 1953. But with each year, the complexity of the research and development problem increased. It became evident that between the offices of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Development and the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Applied Engineering delay and duplication were growing.

The administration was aware of what was happening.

At the same time, it realized that the United States had fallen behind Russia in its emphasis on missile development from 1945 to 1953. In its determination to make up this lag, the administration created the Office of a Special Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Guided Missiles. This assistant could focus attention on the ballastic-missile problems and see that program was not downgraded as in the 1940's.

Although quite aware of the necessity to expedite specific projects such as this, the administration recognized, at the same time, the danger of a splintering of effort. Hence, on March 18, 1957, another major Pentagon accomplishment occurred when the Offices of the Assistant Secretary for Engineering and the Assistant Secretary for Research and Development were combined into the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Research and Engineering.

Then came the sputnik crisis with its great temptation to bow to Democrat missile hysteria.

Unfortunately, many Democrats used the opportunity to demand needless reorganization and overorganization. Following suit would have resulted in ill-conceived crash programs which, in the long run, would have spread the contagion of delay and duplication.

The administration, however, was determined to meet the situation without panic or hysteria, and despite wild Democratic demands for rushed reorganization. For great progress had been made in the missile field since the blackout during the Truman administration, and that progress had withstood the May 1957 Democratic attempts to retard it.

Now, the same Democrats who had favored retrenchment in missiles a few months earlier cried out that the President lacked a sense of urgency.

Discarding the panicmongers, the administration met the Soviet challenge with deliberate and wise measures. The authority of Special Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Guided Missiles was increased and he was redesignated Director of Guided Missiles. To accelerate the space program, the Advanced Research Projects Agency was created February 7, 1958.

With the missile and space programs in full swing, the administration then took a new look at the entire defense structure to insure that the new agencies would not produce decentralized effort.

Out of this scrutiny came the reorganization bill for the Department of Defense.

In the bill, all research, engineering, missile, and space projects in the Department of Defense would be under the Director of Research and Engineering. Decision time would be cut. Results would be expedited.

But Democrat reaction affords a study in contrasts. In the early sputnik days, Democrat Congressmen demanded missile czars and more missile czars.

When the President acted decisively to streamline and centralize the Pentagon structure, these same Democrats acted evasively. Those who recently had cried out against "splintering-off of Pentagon effort" now flipflopped and crusaded against centralizing Pentagon effort. They did their utmost to dilute the President's bill.

Obviously, the Eisenhower administration had been sensitive to reorganizational needs. Again and again it had acted to maintain a balance between the most immediate needs and overall efficiency.

The Truman administration, on the other hand, had failed to meet the change of times. It let the Pentagon stagnate.

Since the Eisenhower administration, however, Democrat military policy can be summed up: To oppose whatever position President Eisenhower takes. Like a high-school debate they would gladly switch positions every month if necessary.

I am not maintaining that Republicans have been free of mistakes. For the complexity of the research and development field compounds each year of the space and supersonic age. As Napoleon once said of the art of generalship, "All generals make mistakes. In war," he added, "the best general is he who makes the fewest mistakes."

The mark of leadership, on the other hand, is to be sensitive to all mistakes, to learn from them, and to act resolutely.

Plainly, the staff report with the vantage point of hindsight could have served a great cause by assuming an objective, nonpartisan position toward both successes and failures during Republican and Democrat administrations alike.

It is extremely regrettable that so-called professionals gave birth to a partisan report which aborts the truth and courts one party. This is not the way toward better defense.

Charter of Veterans of World War I of the United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, on July 18, 1958, President Eisenhower signed H. R. 11077, which became Public Law 85–530. This law grants a charter of incorporation to the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America. By the terms of the charter, membership is predicated upon honorable service in World War I during the period of April 6, 1917, to November 11, 1918. This law will allow World War I veterans to be accredited by the Veterans' Administration and permit them to ask for some of the privileges accorded to other veteran groups.

Back in 1949 this organization was organized in Cleveland, Ohio, and since that time has grown to include approximately 100,000 members in 1,000 local chapters in 48 States.

As far back as 1865 it has been the desire of Congress to encourage veterans to join together in organizations which would preserve group identity and which would best serve their needs. As a matter of fact, since the close of the Civil War, Congress has granted a total of 13 charters to various veterans' organizations. As you know, before H. R. 11077 was enacted into law, the veterans of World War I had no organization with a Federal charter that was designed solely to represent them. Before this legislation became law, it seemed to me as a veteran of World War II, that it was the obligation of Congress to give the same recognition to the doughboys who fought to retain our freedom in the First World War as the Congress gave to the other veteran organizations. Therefore, I am very pleased to have the RECORD show that I am wholeheartedly in favor of this legislation.

By placing this worthy legislation on the statute books it means that the 85th Congress recognized a vigorous group of veterans who have served this country admirably for many years. We all agree that the 2,876,000 living World War I veterans constitute a group which all Americans honor. Not only did this group of loyal Americans serve in the First World War, but many of them joined their sons and close relatives in the call to battle during World War II. As we all know, they have been called upon repeatedly to help carry out the principles on which this Nation was founded and to lift the banner of freedom. The record shows they have never let this country down. I know this to be true because as a Member of Congress I have been honored on a number of occasions by having the privilege of meeting and working with World War I veterans both in my Eighth Congressional District as well as throughout the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Therefore, I have personal knowledge of their true spirit and high citizenship qualifications. I have also had the pleasure of learning to know many of them personally during these several years.

Because of my relationship with this patriotic group I know how hard they have worked to increase their membership to approximately 100,000. The 39 departments with 1,417 barracks in the 48 States, the Philippines, Alaska, and Hawaii constitute proof that they are progressing toward a position of parity with the other veteran organizations in the United States. In the Commonwealth of Massachusetts we have 50 barracks with a membership of 5,548. Massachusetts ranks seventh in the Nation in membership. We are all very proud of the World War I veterans in Massachusetts and feel they are doing a wonderful and magnificent job in interesting themselves in the problems and welfare of World War I veterans.

Mr. Speaker, before concluding let me point out that the survivors of World War I are now approaching the later period of life when physical disabilities and financial resources frequently result in hardship. In fact, since July 27, 1957, 87,000 World War I veterans have passed to the Great Beyond. The average age of World War I veterans is now 64.5. With these facts in mind, I want to again congratulate my colleagues in both the House and Senate for granting a Federal charter to the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America. To me this is one of the finest tributes that the 85th Congress could pay to the aging veterans of 1917–18. I am, of course, happy that I could play a part in assisting this outstanding group of American citizens in having this most important legislation enacted into law.

Record of the 85th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this 85th Congress has passed some important measures to meet the problems facing the people and the Nation.

It has, I believe, failed in some important areas to meet the challenge of our times in education, health, housing, and in fighting the recession trend.

Listed herewith are some of the issues faced in the 85th Congress.

RECORD OF THE 85TH CONGRESS

The 85th Congress has been hailed as a working Congress. The 2d session has been compared favorably with the 1st session of the 73d Congress, which enacted much of President Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal antidepression program in the famous 100 days.

Like many other Members of Congress, I feel that this Congress has, for the most part, made an outstanding record of achievement. Of course, there were disappointments; some legislation which I felt was urgently needed failed to receive the final approval of Congress.

Among the notable achievements of this Congress was the admission of Alaska as the 49th State of the Union, the first State to be admitted in 46 years. The first civil-rights legislation in 82 years was passed by the 85th Congress last year. The first comprehensive Federal aid to education bill in 96 years was enacted, known as the Defense Education Act of 1958. All of these measures had my full and active support.

COST OF LIVING—HARD MONEY POLICIES

The cost of living has continued its almost uninterrupted climb to the highest point in our Nation's history. The value of the purchasing dollar has correspondingly dropped to its lowest point—48 cents of the 1939 dollar's value.

Hard money and high interest rate policies of the administration have failed to halt inflation and helped to bring on a severe economic recession. Unemployment rose to more than 5½ million workers, the highest total since pre-World War II days. Berks County unemployment rose sharply during the early part of 1958 to over 12,000 persons. A half million workers were idle in the State of Pennsylvania.

The Nation experiences a strange economic phenomenon—rising prices during a period of recession—which is working great hardship on millions of retired folks living on fixed incomes, on unemployed workers and their families, and on the hundreds of thousands of persons now existing on inadequate public assistance payments.

Hard money policies have added billions of dollars to the cost of interest on the public debt. Tax revenue has fallen off sharply during the recession and the administration ended the fiscal year more than $3 billion in the red. During the 5 years of the Eisenhower administration, the national debt has risen by $10 billion. Five increases in the legal debt limit have been requested in these 5 years. The debt limit was raised from $275 billion to $288 billion by the 85th Congress at the urgent pleading of the administration.

High interest rates are costing the American taxpayers an estimated $10 billion a year in higher payments on cars, homes, furniture, business loans, and other credit transactions. Big financial interests are enjoying record prosperity even during the recession because of the administration fiscal and monetary policies, which have been extremely costly to the average citizen.

Efforts in the House to conduct a full investigation of these fiscal policies have been blocked by the same coalition of Republicans and Southern Democrats. I have supported these efforts because I feel that the American public is entitled to know the details of "behind the scenes" financial dealings which are contrary to the best interests of all but a handful of Americans.

SMALL BUSINESS

The 85th Congress made an outstanding record on matters affecting small business. A $260 million small business tax relief bill was enacted, the Small Business Administration was made a permanent independent Federal agency, the ceiling on SBA loans has been raised from $250,000 to $350,000 and the interest rate reduced from 6 to 5½ percent.

Congressional investigations into Government procurement practices have resulted in additional contracts for many small businesses The Small Business Investment Act of 1958 provides up to $250 million in long-term equity capital for small business. The program is to be handled by locally operated investment companies who in turn will allocate loans to small businesses in need of capital for expansion and modernization of their plants.

Hearings were held on the national Fair Trade Act by House and Senate committees but final action was not taken in this Congress.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Despite administration opposition, significant improvements to the Social Security Act were made by the 85th Congress. The social-security system is an important part of our American way of life. Almost 12 million Americans are currently receiving monthly benefits; more than 22,000 of them live in Berks County. Over $15 million in social-security payments were distributed to these Berks residents last year.

Monthly benefits were raised by 7 percent, effective February 1959 to help retired citizens meet the rising cost of living; I sponsored legislation calling for a 10 percent increase. The solvency of the trust fund was maintained by raising the social-security contribution rate by one-fourth of 1 percent on both employers and employees, based on wages up to $4,800 a year; the disability offset restriction was repealed and maximum-family benefits were raised from $200 to $254 a month.

Also, dependents of disabled persons were made eligible for benefits; the monthly outside earnings limitation was raised; disability work requirements were liberalized;

Federal grants to States increased for public assistance payments to the aged, blind, disabled, and dependent children; and Federal authorizations for maternal and child health, crippled children, and child welfare services were increased.

I actively supported these liberalizing improvements to the Social Security Act. I also urged action on other improvements such as the lowering of the retirement age for men and women, improvement of the disability benefit program, a hospital-surgical insurance program for aged persons, and other needed amendments to the present law. These changes will be high on the agenda for action in the 86th Congress.

OTHER RETIREMENT PROGRAMS

Legislation to increase railroad retirement benefits was blocked in the House during the final hours of the Congress by the combined opposition of Republicans and some Southern Democrats. The bill, which I cosponsored, would have raised pensions and annuities by 10 percent, and made other liberalizing amendments to the retirement and unemployment insurance laws.

The measure had been favorably reported by the House committee and passed by the Senate, but opponents prevented its consideration by the House shortly before adjournment. The railroads vigorously fought the pension boost despite the valuable help which rail unions and retired railroaders gave to the industry's campaign for Federal aid.

Liberal forces look to the next Congress to right the wrong done to railroad pensioners. Retired railroaders, their spouses, widows and survivors, liberal Congressmen insist, are entitled to the 10 percent increase to help them meet rising living costs.

Retired employees of the Federal Government received 10 percent increases in their annuities, up to a maximum of $500 a year for retirement annuities and up to $250 a year for survivor annuities. Survivor annuities up to a maximum of $750 a year were provided for the first time to widows or widowers of former Government employees or retired employees who died before February 29, 1948. This legislation also had my active support.

PROBLEMS OF OLDER PERSONS

Congressional interest in the special problems of older persons resulted in the authorization of a special White House Conference to study these problems to develop programs to make their remaining years more abundant and meaningful.

Hearings were also held on a bill which I cosponsored to establish a Bureau of Older Persons in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to concern itself with the needs and problems of our retired senior citizens.

Congress also concerned itself with the medical needs of elderly persons and the problem of job discrimination because of age. Congress directed that a study be made of proposed hospital-surgical insurance coverage for recipients of social-security retirement benefits, the results of which are to be reported to Congress in February 1959.

VETERANS

Again in the 85th Congress, I opposed administration efforts to curtail essential veterans' services such as the cutbacks in disabled veterans' service-connected compensation by review of claims, budget cuts for hospitalization and medical care, and commission recommendations to the administration calling for reductions in many types of veterans' benefits.

Congress enacted legislation to increase rates of compensation for veterans suffering service-connected disabilities and their dependents. Pensions to widows of Spanish-American War veterans were increased. The marriage eligibility standards for widows' pensions were liberalized.

Also, the burial allowance for deceased veterans was raised from $150 to $250. Special training for handicapped war orphans was authorized and unemployment compensation was provided for ex-servicemen, as well as to those veterans who served during the Korean emergency. Total disability benefits payable under the National Service Life Insurance Act were raised. An amendment to the Social Security Act permits disabled veterans to now draw dual benefits from the VA and other Government agencies as well as social-security disability without any reductions. I actively supported all of these measures to benefit veterans, their survivors, and dependents.

The GI home-loan program was extended until July 25, 1960, for World War II veterans. Additional funds were provided for the purchase of VA mortgages by FNMA, but the interest rate was raised to 4¼ percent. Congress also enacted legislation granting a charter to the Veterans of World War I of the United States.

Legislation to grant a pension to World War I veterans was not acted upon, despite its support by many Members of Congress. An increase in the income limitations on veterans receiving VA pensions also failed to receive approval as did the bill to liberalize requirements for non-service-connected death pensions to widows and minor dependents of veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict.

HEALTH AND HANDICAPPED

In this vital area, so important to the welfare of all Americans, the 85th Congress made one of its greatest records of accomplishment. As a member of the Health and Science Subcommittee, I am particularly proud of this record and the role played by our committee in helping to make it possible.

Almost $300 million—highest total in our history—was appropriated for medical research in such areas as cancer, heart disease, arthritis, dental health, mental health, and cystic fibrosis, the dreaded children's disease.

The Hill-Burton hospital-construction program was extended for 5 years and funds were increased by $111 million over the administration's original budget request. The Health Research Facilities Act was extended for 3 years, providing additional funds for construction of laboratories and other medical research facilities needed by scientists in their research to find the cause and cure of the diseases which cripple and kill mankind.

My bill to authorize Federal grants to schools of public health to train needed public health doctors, nurses, and technicians for Federal, State, and local public health work was enacted into law.

Legislation was also enacted to protect the health of consumers by requiring manufacturers of food additives and food processors to pretest any potentially unsafe substances which are added to food.

Vocational rehabilitation programs to assist mentally retarded children, the blind, deaf, and other handicapped individuals were also extended. I sponsored and worked for legislation to provide special tax exemptions and deductions for handicapped persons and to establish a Federal agency for the handicapped. Both of these measures were considered by committees but did not receive final action before adjournment.

EDUCATION

Legislation to provide Federal funds to States to build needed school classrooms was defeated last year in the House by the reactionary coalition by a narrow margin of five votes.

This year, in the wake of the Soviet challenge, the defense education fellowship-loan bill was enacted. Teaching and research activities in the education of mentally retarded children were expanded. An Internal Revenue ruling now permits teachers to claim tax deductions for certain expenses incurred in furthering their education, retroactive to 1954. This action came after bills were introduced to provide for such tax deductions. I was a cosponsor of this legislation.

The program of aid for school construction and operation in areas affected by activities of the Federal Government was strengthened and expanded. The special milk program in nonprofit schools, nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, and summer camps was extended for 3 years. I strongly supported all of these measures, so important to the welfare of our children and the improvement of our educational system.

NONPROFIT SWIMMING POOLS

My 2-year fight to obtain tax exemption for nonprofit community swimming pool groups was won during the 2d session of the 85th Congress, with the enactment of an omnibus Federal excise tax revision bill. These swim groups furnish needed recreational facilities to the community and are important in promoting the health and welfare of our children, young people, and adults.

The effective date for this statutory tax exemption was made retroactive to January 1, 1958. I had sought an earlier date in view of the legal uncertainty over the tax status of these groups, but the 1958 date was the best obtainable.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The 85th Congress passed the first civil rights legislation in 82 years, designed to protect the voting rights of all citizens. It also establishes a Commission on Civil Rights and a civil rights section in the Justice Department. This measure is an important step forward in the important field of civil rights. It received my full support.

HUMANE SLAUGHTERING

Legislation to promote humane slaughtering of animals in the Nation's packinghouse industry was enacted. It forbids Federal agencies from buying meat after June 30, 1960, from any plant failing to use humane methods in slaughtering. Many individuals and humane societies have been working for the enactment of such legislation for a number of years. It had my full support.

CONSERVATION

In the important field of conservation, efforts to cripple the water pollution control program were defeated in the House. I voted for the full amount of funds needed to help States build sewage-treatment facilities to protect the public health and prevent destruction of fish in our rivers and streams.

The administration has threatened to cut off Federal participation in the water pollution control program next year and has already sent up legislation to turn this program over to the States. Liberal Members of Congress feel that polluting industries should be strictly regulated and that this could not be done effectively at the State level.

Legislation was enacted to require Congressional approval of military withdrawal of land from the public domain in excess of 5,000 acres and to require hunting and fishing on military reservations to be in compliance with State fish and game laws.

A section of the emergency highway legislation passed by Congress offers a Federal grant bonus to States which regulate the erection of billboards on the major part of the 41,000-mile Interstate Highway System.

In other conservation action, Congress approved a boating safety law, raised the duck-stamp price from $2 to $3, effective next July 1, and earmarked revenue for the purchase or lease of wetlands, thus putting

a halt to the administration's practice of diverting duck-stamp income for unrelated purposes. A pesticide research program was established to study the effect of aerial spraying on fish and wildlife. The wilderness bill, which had my full support, made progress, but more hearings have been scheduled between Congresses. Action on this measure is expected next year.

Harsh regulations proposed by the Internal Revenue Service on the sale and purchase of firearms and ammunition were modified after strong protests from Members of Congress and sportsmen's groups. Administrative action was also taken to protect wildlife refuges from the abuses resulting from the indiscriminate issuance of oil-leasing permits.

Employment Situation in Montana—Statement of Senator Mike Mansfield, of Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in January of this year, the State of Montana had the dubious distinction of having the highest rate of insured unemployment in the United States. The proportion of the national labor force out of work has remained above 5 percent since last December, the longest and deepest unemployment period since the war. For 7 weeks Montana had the greatest percentage of its insured working force unemployed, with a high of 14.9 percent.

While the Nation as a whole has not recovered as rapidly as most of us would like, Montana has done rather well, with the exception of the mining industry, where the largest number of unemployed is concentrated. The Montana average of insured unemployed at the end of the week of August 9 was 3.4 percent as opposed to a national average of 5.4 percent. There are 36 other States with unemployment rates higher than Montana's. I am delighted to see that my State has responded so well, but the picture as represented in these figures is not entirely correct, because they do not reflect the number of unemployed who do not collect unemployment compensation or whose 22 weeks have run out. At the present time over half of the miners in Butte, Mont., are unemployed, and a good many of them have exhausted their benefits.

The minerals-stabilization bill which was passed by the Senate would have provided a badly needed shot in the arm to the minerals industry, but the legislation was rejected in the House of Representatives. In view of these most recent developments the Montana delegation has resumed its contacts with the executive agencies, urging that they make use of existing authority to renew a minerals purchasing program. In the instance of copper, the stockpile inventory is below the minimum requirement.

The 85th Congress provided additional boosts to the economy of Montana in the form of direct legislation and those general programs such as social security which bring benefits to Montanans as well as the rest of the Nation.

New developments and expanded projects under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Army Engineers, an accelerated highway program, a stepped-up military construction at Montana Air Force installations and a number of smaller projects will mean new jobs and expanded income to Montana communities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a complete tabulation of the insured unemployment record in Montana, beginning on January 1, 1958.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1958 rate of insured unemployment in Montana

Week ended	Montana average	National average	Position among States
	Percent	*Percent*	
Jan. 4	9.9	6.8	
Jan. 11	11.1	6.9	
Jan. 18	12.3	6.8	No. 2.
Jan. 25	13.0	7.0	No. 1.
Feb. 1	13.3	7.1	No. 1.
Feb. 8	13.5	7.1	No. 1.
Feb. 15	14.4	7.5	No. 1.
Feb. 22	14.9	7.9	No. 1.
Mar. 1	14.9	7.9	No. 1.
Mar. 8	14.3	7.9	No. 1.
Mar. 15	13.6	7.8	No. 2.
Mar. 22	13.4	7.9	No. 2.
Mar. 29	12.7	7.9	No. 4.
Apr. 5	11.5	8.0	No. 5.
Apr. 12	10.5	8.1	No. 9.
Apr. 19	9.4	8.0	No. 10.
Apr. 26	8.7	7.8	No. 12.
May 3	7.9	7.7	No. 13.
May 10	7.2	7.4	No. 18.
May 17	6.4	7.2	No. 21.
May 24	5.5	6.9	No. 24.
May 31	5.5	6.7	No. 21.
June 7	5.1	6.7	No. 26.
June 14	4.9	6.4	No. 24.
June 21	4.6	6.2	No. 27.
June 28	4.5	6.1	No. 27.
July 5	4.6	6.2	No. 27.
July 12	4.4	6.2	No. 31.
July 19	4.2	6.1	No. 35.
July 26	3.8	5.8	No. 36.
Aug. 2	3.6	5.6	No. 36.
Aug. 9	3.4	5.4	No. 36.
Aug. 16	3.3	5.3	No. 36.
Aug. 23	3.4	5.2	No. 36.

Special Report on Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, as you know, during the years that I have been in Congress I have been fighting continually for improved social-security benefits. Needless to say, I am not alone in this fight, for many other Congressmen feel as I do, and, by combining our efforts, we have succeeded in getting changes made in the social-security law.

Two years ago, in the 84th Congress, I introduced legislation which permitted women 62 years of age to collect social-security benefits. I also introduced legislation that permitted a totally disabled worker to be eligible for social-security benefits at the age of 50. These were passed in that session.

Last month the 85th Congress passed legislation raising social-security benefits by about 7 percent and boosting the taxes to finance that increase. It has now been signed by the President, despite his original threat to veto it, and will go into effect in January 1959. The increased payments will be received in February 1959.

Twelve million men and women—retired employees and their wives or survivors—will receive these benefits. Under the new law, top monthly payments to a retired employee and his wife—both over 65—will move up from $162.80 to $190.50 per month. For a single retired employee the payment will be moved up from $109.50 to $127 per month. Top payments for a surviving widow or widower are increased from $81.40 to $95.30 per month, and the maximum for a widow with 2 children will be $254.10 a month instead of the present $200.

To pay for these increases, the payroll taxes for the 75 million employees, now covered, and their employers will go up on January 1, 1959. Both employees and employers will contribute 2½ percent instead of the present 2¼ percent of taxable pay. The taxable wage base will be raised from the present $4,200 to $4,800 a year, and the tax on the self-employed will be raised from the present 3⅜ percent to 3¾ percent.

In addition to this raise in taxes, a new schedule of tax rate increases for employers and employees has been advanced from every 5 years after 1960 to every 3 years. Under the new schedule the tax rate will advance to 3 percent in 1960—3½ percent in 1963, 4 percent in 1966, and 4½ in 1969.

The new law also provides for an increase of Federal grants to the States for aid to the needy aged, the blind, the disabled, and dependent children. About 5,600,000 persons now receive benefits under this phase of the social-security program. Provision was also made so that dependents of totally disabled workers will be considered similar to the dependents of the retired-workers.

The bill I introduced this last session would have given a 10-percent increase. However, it developed that in order to get any help for those receiving social-security benefits this year, it was necessary to make a compromise and accept the 7-percent increase this time.

This law will be taken up in the next session of Congress for future improvements, as a comprehensive study of the Social Security Act had been ordered by a previous Congress and the report is to be made in January 1959. During the next session we hope to secure an additional increase in benefits—to bring it to 10 percent—and to pass legislation similar to the Forand bill, which was defeated this session and which would have provided hospital, surgical, and nursing-home insurance to those receiving social-security benefits. I shall also reintroduce my former bill which would automatically make a wife of a retired work-

er eligible for social security at the same time her husband qualifies, regardless of age.

For your information, the following table will give you a short résumé of the new scale of social-security benefits as they compare to those now in effect.

Old-age benefits

Highest average monthly earnings	Employee alone [1]		Man and wife [2]	
	New bill	Old law	New bill	Old law
$50	$33	$30.00	$49.50	$45.00
$100	59	55.00	88.50	82.50
$150	73	68.50	109.50	102.50
$200	84	78.50	126.00	117.80
$250	95	88.50	142.50	132.80
$300	105	98.50	157.50	147.80
$350	116	108.50	174.00	162.80
$400	127	[3]	190.50	[3]

Survivors benefits

Highest average monthly earnings	Widow, widower, child or parent		Widow and 2 children	
	New bill	Old law	New bill	Old law
$50	$33.00	$30.00	$53.10	$50.20
$100	44.30	41.30	88.60	82.60
$150	54.80	51.40	120.00	112.00
$200	63.00	58.90	161.60	157.10
$250	71.30	66.40	190.10	177.20
$300	78.80	73.90	210.20	197.10
$350	87.00	81.40	232.00	200.00
$400	95.30	[3]	254.10	[3]

[1] Worker aged 65 or over at time of retirement, and wife aged 65 or over at the time she comes on the rolls.
[2] Survivor benefit amounts for a widow and 1 child or for 2 parents would be the same as for man and wife.
[3] Not applicable since maximum average monthly earnings amount possible is $350.

The Federal Credit Union Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on August 23, 1958, I introduced H. R. 13871 to supersede my bill H. R. 12877.

I hope that as a result of the introduction of the latter bill sufficient thought and attention will be given to the subject so that when we convene the next Congress we will be in a position to present a bill that will not only meet the approval of the credit unions of the country, both State and National, but will bring about an improvement of the Federal Credit Union Act.

Credit unions have long filled an important and necessary function in the financial life of our country. Not only do they promote thrift but they also make available small loans to persons, mostly wage earners, who otherwise can get no credit.

While they perform, in a limited way, a banking function, we must bear in mind that they are not intended to take the place of banks nor are they intended to render a complete banking service.

After I introduced my first bill on the subject, I had many conferences with State and National representatives of credit unions. I believe I brought to bear upon the rewriting of my bill in its present form, the best thinking on the subject. Needless to say, I do not believe that my bill is the last word on the subject.

I do hope that when the new Congress convenes in January we will have an opportunity to have hearings on bills of this kind and then try to perfect the existing statute.

Congressman Porter's Summary of the Work of the 85th Congress as It Relates to the Fourth District of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the 85th Congress has compiled a record of positive achievements. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I shall discuss that record with particular reference to the Fourth Congressional District of Oregon.

MAJOR ACHIEVEMENTS

Major achievements include: approval of Alaska statehood; extension of reciprocal trade and foreign aid; reorganization of the Department of Defense; passage of the student-loan program; lowering FHA downpayments; extending the National Wool Act; increasing the Small Business Administration's loan ceiling to $350,000; approval of a new public-works start in Oregon, one of several long overdue; and enactment of the Emergency Housing Act of 1958.

This list is not complete, and I will refer to other accomplishments later in this report. You, Mr. Speaker, say this Congress has been the hardest working one you have known with the possible exception of the first 100 days of the first Franklin D. Roosevelt administration.

I am familiar with those accomplishments and the new era they made possible. I believe the work of this 85th Congress, a quarter century later, has initiated similar sweeping changes. The changes include legislation requiring the full disclosure and accounting of all funds invested by management groups or unions in pension and welfare funds, and the bill which modernized and expanded the services of the Small Business Administration to provide positive help for small-business men of my District and elsewhere.

CURBING THE RECESSION

Moving swiftly to meet a national economic slump this spring, Congress enacted and the President signed Public Law 85-364, the Emergency Housing Act of 1958. This legislation was approved before April 1. It lowered FHA downpayments, provided a special Federal National Mortgage Association billion-dollar fund to buy mortgages up to $13,500 on new homes, and it revived the GI loan program.

Before Congress acted, housing starts were down to 990,000. The lumber market was sick. Home starts now have risen to 1,100,000. This legislation is credited with bringing relief to the industry and with providing 600,000 jobs.

This is why plywood prices are rising in the Pacific Northwest today. Tight money, not Japanese softwood plywood imports, had been wrecking the softwood plywood industry.

Congress also has moved to help chronically depressed labor-surplus areas. The Area Redevelopment Act of 1958 authorizes Federal grants and loans of $279.5 million yearly. I supported this legislation.

There are four labor-surplus areas in the Fourth District—Albany, Coos Bay, Roseburg, and Eugene. They are not now eligible, according to Housing and Home Finance Agency spokesmen, because they do not have 6 percent or more unemployed for 18 of the past 24 months. However, the administrator of this program has discretionary authority. If an area suffers 15 percent unemployment in a 6-month period, it can receive help under this act. Likewise, an area may qualify with 9 percent unemployment for 15 of 18 months or with 12 percent unemployment for 12 months. I consider this act a needed safeguard and a protection to the people of the Fourth District.

WIDE, WIDE UNIVERSE

This Congress looked skyward one day and saw a new unsupervised field. The Sputnik-Explorer-Vanguard impact made necessary the creation of a House Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration. This committee and its Senate counterpart have a big task ahead. Congress also established a National Aeronautics and Space Administration under civil control for unified air-traffic control.

There is plenty of work yet to be done.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Like the wife of Ulysses who unraveled her weaving to keep from completing her work, Congress did a little unraveling in the closing hours of the session. Despite efforts by many of us to pass the Senate's Kennedy-Ives bill which would curb some labor racketeering, the bill was defeated. It lost 190 to 198.

I am particularly concerned because many people were misinformed about the legislation. The Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1958, as it was called formally, was legislation in the public interest. With its defeat I fear existing poor practices in a very few unions may provoke harsh and unnecessary legislation at a later date.

HOUSING LEGISLATION

The 85th Congress made progress in 1957 with its lowering of FHA downpayments and by increasing the money available for the Federal National Mortgage Association. The Emergency Housing Act of 1958 was a splendid assist, but on August 18, 1958, the House rejected the Housing Act of 1958 by six votes.

The legislation which I supported actively would have extended and amended laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the stimulation of urban redevelopment activity. It provided a $400 million 1-year program for slum clearance and urban renewal and further liberalized FHA downpayment loans. It would have provided low-rent housing for the elderly.

The economy of Oregon's Fourth District is geared to timber and timber products. Oregon has started to regain its economic health, but we needed the Housing Act of 1958.

CAMP WHITE, OREG.

Waste of any kind is disturbing. The nonuse of facilities at the Camp White domiciliary in Jackson County is a problem for many southern Oregon residents. They feel existing facilities should be utilized and that a 100-bed general medical and surgical hospital could serve 60,000 veterans in the area. At my request, Veterans' Affairs Committee Chairman OLIN E. TEAGUE included this problem as part of the hearings he held this summer in Washington to determine the extent of veterans care.

The House committee first faces the problem of requiring the Veterans' Administration to use 5,000 hospital beds now empty before it can push for the Camp White Hospital. Right now there are many similar problems. Chairman TEAGUE is determined to come up with a positive plan for veterans care. He told me that testimony submitted by Oregon Congressional members and Mr. A. Eugene Orr, of Medford, was extremely beneficial to the committee.

REALISTIC APPROACH NEEDED IN SOCIAL SECURITY

Congress approved amending social-security legislation which boosted benefits 7 percent, effective January 1, 1959; increased taxable earnings to $4,800 and made the increases financially sound. There were revisions in the public assistance areas.

The Ways and Means Committee hearing in June on the Social Security Act brought Gov. Robert D. Holmes and Oregon Unemployment Compensation Commissioner Cecilia P. Galey to Washington to outline our State's economic needs. Also testifying was Dr. Wesley G. Nicholson, chairman of the Oregon Council on Aging. Congress passed legislation calling for a White House Conference on Aging to be held in January of 1961.

I introduced legislation during the 85th Congress to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to the States to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program. My bill, H. R. 11464, would have extended coverage of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. My bill, H. R. 10700, proposed removal of the limitation on the amount of outside income.

Hospital care for the older citizen is yet to come. I have sponsored legislation identical to the Forand bill. I will continue to support it.

A NEW STATE WAITING

Seward's folly became the 49th State of the Union this year. I supported this legislation and urged similar status be accorded Hawaii. The Hawaiian statehood bill has been reported favorably from the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I believe that Hawaii will become the 50th State early in the 86th Congress.

PROGRESS THROUGH COOPERATION

Cost share programs of the Federal Government and the local area benefit residents of the Fourth District. Airports are improved and made safer under the Federal aid to airports program; sanitation problems are solved with the Water Pollution Control Act; and slums can become modern, habitable business and residential areas under the urban renewal program.

On June 30, 1958, there were 543 federally assisted urban renewal projects under way in 328 communities in the United States. In the Fourth Congressional District an urban renewal planning advance of $65,975 and a capital grant reservation of $642,817 for Springfield have been approved, as have a $44,880 planning advance and a $211,260 capital grant reservation for Florence. Eugene's application is pending.

Five communities and one metropolitan area in the District have urban planning assistance programs. An $11,500 grant was approved for the Eugene-Springfield area. Grants for urban planning assistance to other communities in the District have been approved as follows:

Albany, $9,000; Coquille, $1,200; Grants Pass, $2,000; Sutherlin, $6,400; Sweet Home, $2,000. Applications for urban-planning assistance for Medford and North Bend are pending.

PENDING

The work still before Congress is vital. I speak now of the need to correct civil-rights inequities, the need to authorize approved public-works projects and to expand the civil-defense program, the need to provide funds for access roads and to work revisions in allowable cut procedures and the need to end wage discrimination in hiring and to make possible nonpolitical military academy appointments.

And I hope it will be possible to enact amending legislation next year which will enable the Douglas County Historical Society to maintain the Lillie Lela Moore pioneer home at its present site.

OREGON GROWTH POTENTIAL

My District depends heavily on its vast timber resources and on its beautiful, valuable rivers waiting to be harnessed and controlled. Its potential is immense. Such growth will mean more stable and higher incomes for Fourth District families. The growth hinges on better utilization and management of timber. More than 50 percent of the District is federally owned.

The Oregon potential includes its bright future as a maritime State. Development of rivers and harbors are important boosts to the Fourth District. I am proud to have helped found the Oregon Coastal Ports Federation.

And the 85th Congress has boosted Fourth District ports. The port of Siuslaw received its first Federal money in 40 years and legislation authorizing $1,693,000 more for improvements was enacted. In August, following weeks of conference negotiations, Congress approved one new public works start in Oregon at Gold Beach Harbor in Curry County.

FEDERAL FUNDS FOR THE FOURTH DISTRICT

The nature of my District makes vital the programs of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. Rivers and harbors development, bank protection, jetties, navigation, flood control, irrigation, power, stream clearance—each is a valuable aid to economy. During the 85th Congress some $50 million has been authorized and allocated to the Fourth Congressional District.

This sum is for preconstruction planning, surveys, examinations, and actual construction.

The tough no-new-starts policy of the administration was unfortunate for Linn County. There $60 million must be spent to build Green Peter Dam. It is a multiple-purpose flood control and power project. It is needed to encourage industry and to help farmers end soil erosion and crop waste.

LEGISLATION

The 85th Congress has enacted into law many proposals I was happy to introduce or cosponsor. These include measures to repeal the 3-percent transportation tax; increase Federal highways and access-road funds; initiate an education-loan program; authorize a Rogue River land exchange to preserve natural beauty; sponsor Korean orphan adoptions; establish a battleship *Arizona* memorial; assure preservation of Waldo Lake for recreation; authorize Port of Siuslaw improvements; increase salaries of postal and classified Federal employees; and increase civil-service annuities.

PRESERVING NATURAL BEAUTY

The Fourth District offers residents and visitors unsurpassed natural beauty. This Congress approved legislation I introduced which preserves the scenic treasures of Waldo Lake and the wooded banks of the lower Rogue River. My bill, H. R. 8652, now Public Law 85-820, protects the outstanding recreation benefits of Waldo Lake. And H. R. 13101, now Public Law 85-833 makes possible land exchanges along the lower Rogue. This prevents timber cutting along the riverbanks, preserving the natural beauty for all.

POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

As a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I am particularly proud Congress passed legislation increasing the salaries of postal and classified Federal employees—as a Member of Congress I am also proud that the armed service pay increase was passed.

I did oppose increasing the charges on first-class mail. It was nearly paying its way while second- and third-class mail were not paying their fair share.

As a committee member, I was chairman of several subcommittees. Among legislation my subcommittees examined was H. R. 10496, a bill to revise laws related to dispatch of mails from post offices. It passed the House but died in the Senate. My subcommittee examined H. R. 7710 allowing lump-sum payments

of annual accrued leave of deceased employees. This legislation has gone to the White House. And my subcommittee examined H. R. 7910, which concerned law revisions relative to the handling of short-paid and undeliverable mail. It became Public Law 85–371.

My bill (H. R. 6371) to provide fair mileage allowances for rural mail carriers became Public Law 85–399.

DOUBTS ABOUT POLICY AND LEGISLATION

Opposing policy is not easy. Neither is it easy to speak out against errors in behavior. But I shall continue to oppose the coddling of dictators, the political exploitation of service band members, vague and illegal cost-accounting procedures by the Postmaster General, unfair road-use taxes for log-truck owners, the exemption of natural-gas producers from Federal regulations, any return of political tests for ICA foreign-aid program employees, the continuation of nuclear testing.

I have seen the nuclear testing grounds at Eniwetok—as 1 of 2 Congressmen designated official observers for this series by the Atomic Energy Commission.

I have worked to learn what happened to Gerry Murphy, the Eugene youth who disappeared in the Dominican Republic. My investigation at the request of his parents has taken me to other Latin American countries where I found the people friendly toward individual Americans but not toward United States foreign policy.

I believe my efforts in both fields have been successful. United States foreign policy toward dictators has changed. We are now courteous but cool. Our friends in Latin America now may look toward us more as friends than benevolent exploiters. And it seems that the world may be heading toward the golden day of peaceful nuclear energy uses rather than the red nightmare of nuclear holocaust.

CONGRESSIONAL SERVICE FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE DISTRICT

Elected representatives serve the people they represent. We do this by helping them keep well informed about our work for them and about the important functions of Government. For these reasons I have made it part of my work to report monthly to my constituents by newsletter. The report is available to anyone who wants it. I have a report for weekly newspapers and I notify newspapers, radio stations, and television stations of events which concern the Fourth District. At the end of each session I prepare a report such as this.

Constituent mail is answered as rapidly as possible. The end of the session rush may delay some answers, but letters from the District mean a great deal. They receive every possible consideration. I have received a good number of comments from people in the District who say they appreciate this service and add that their letters got action more promptly than ever before.

I make it a point to keep in touch personally with the District when Congress is not in session. I plan to report to constituents on the work of Congress and my part in it this fall as I again visit throughout the District.

Statements on the United States Middle East Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in recent weeks the crisis in the Middle East has focused national attention on that area more than ever before. It is natural that in a crisis we concentrate on the immediate area concerned. But I have frequently had occasion to point out that in the conduct of foreign relations a careful, continuing reexamination of policy is essential, and that spasmodic attention to serious problems only after the crisis is upon us is not only shortsighted but can lead to great catastrophe.

In trying to practice what I have preached, I have myself on frequent occasions in the last 2 years spoken out publicly on and off the Senate floor about our Middle East policy. Naturally I have been critical in many things I have had to say, because I deeply feel that our Middle East policy has more often than not been no policy at all. However, I have tried to temper criticism with constructive proposals some of which, I am glad to say, have been adopted or at least espoused by the President and the State Department in recent days.

Simply as a matter of historical interest and as a means of organizing the continuity of my own analysis of our Middle East policy, I have assembled excerpts from statements I have made on this issue since the beginning of 1956. I am sure that some other members of the Foreign Relations Committee could compile a similar presentation. I earnestly hope that they will do so. I think it is good for the public to know that the Congress has attempted to participate—with whatever degree of success—in the formulation of constructive policies in the Middle East.

I ask unanimous consent that the excerpts be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM STATEMENTS BY HUBERT H. HUMPHREY ON UNITED STATES MIDDLE EAST POLICY (1956–58)

FEBRUARY 16, 1956: SENATE STATEMENT—UNITED STATES POLICY VACUUM

I charge on the floor of the Senate that our Nation has exemplified no consistent foreign policy in the Middle East * * * because we have been playing the policy of expediency when we should be principled. Ultimately such a course will lead to war.

Our desire should be to bring peace to the Middle East. Our desire should be to bring stability to the Middle East. No one will profit from the struggle in the Middle East except the Soviet Union. * * * I might say now for the RECORD that this is a very poor way of solving the problem—first by one country's getting arms and then another country's getting arms. But apparently we have no policy in the Middle East. I am afraid that now Pandora's box has probably been opened throughout the Middle East.

FEBRUARY 17, 1956: SENATE STATEMENT—NEED FOR CONSISTENT MIDDLE EAST POLICY

Our Government is not going to be respected, nor is its word going to be honored, unless we have a consistent, well-developed, clearly ascertainable and understandable policy in the Middle East.

FEBRUARY 17, 1956: NEWS RELEASE—CALL FOR INQUIRY INTO UNITED STATES MIDDLE EAST POLICY

Senator HUMPHREY today asked the Senate to take a careful look at the administration's policies in the tension-ridden Middle East.

FEBRUARY 21, 1956: SENATE STATEMENT—VACILLATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Our Near East policy has changed several times within the past few years. We must know what it is and whether we have really developed a carefully planned policy which will lead to peace, economic development, and democratic strength in the Near East.

APRIL 14, 1956: NEWSLETTER—UNITED STATES MUST ASSERT ECONOMIC LEADERSHIP

The moment when Russians are turning toward economic expansionism is hardly the time for our foreign economic policies to contract. With half the world's industrial production, we alone are in a position to render really substantial assistance to underdeveloped parts of the Free World.

MAY 12, 1956: AT JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY—MIDEAST POLICY POINTS

1. We must embrace that spirit of nationalism that grips the underdeveloped and underprivileged nations * * * we must remind these people that * * * we have never lost our goals of self-determination, freedom, and independence.

2. We must respect the so-called neutrality of new-born nations for what it is—a frank assertion that they do not want to become appendages to Soviet imperialism or Western collective security.

3. We should engage in greater use of our capital through international organizations such as the United Nations, the World Bank, and other international financial development groups. Above all, our foreign economic policy should be reviewed in the perspective of our long-term economic relations as part of a viable, integrated, Free-World economy rather than in the harsh terminology of "handouts for foreigners."

4. We should step up our technical assistance program, and add to it by working through the United Nations and offering to expand U. N. technical assistance. Our Government has consistently dragged its feet on the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development known as SUNFED, despite the fact that a majority of our friends in the United Nations have long begged us to support it. The administration still refuses to budge.

5. Let us use our blessings of food and fiber. We can proceed through the United Nations offering vast quantities of produce to be placed under the general direction of the U. N. Food and Fibre Reserve. Here we can seize the initiative. In the absence of administration action, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has scheduled hearings on a resolution of mine which would promote the development of a World Food and Fiber Reserve.

6. We should devote new emphasis to the United Nations agencies whose progress represents America's compassion and generosity on a world scale. These groups include the World Health Organization, Children's Emergency Fund, the Food and Agriculture Organization, and the International Labor Organization.

7. Let us again and again challenge the Soviet Union to fulfill the requirements of the United Nations Charter, asking her to join with us, not only in a program of disarmament, but in a program of economic

rehabilitation under the guidance and direction of the United Nations.

MAY 19, 1956: NEWSLETTER—FOREIGN AID CRUCIAL

It becomes ever more evident that the direction of our foreign and domestic economic policy will perhaps be decisive in the worldwide competition with communism.

OCTOBER 30, 1956: LIONS CLUB ADDRESS, ST. PETER, MINN.—POLICY OF EQUIVOCATION

In the Middle East, a vacillating policy has alternately exasperated the young democracy of Israel and won us increasing enmity among the Arab Nations as well. By her arms agreements with Egypt and Afghanistan the Soviet Union has obtained footholds in the Middle East which have been Kremlin objectives for generations.

NOVEMBER 17, 1956: AT WISCONSIN STATE CIO CONVENTION—URGING PERMANENT U. N. FORCE

The Middle East has been a tinderbox for years—a powderbox. In the Middle East, we have not had a policy. The United Nations has sent forces into the Middle East. It is our job to see that these forces remain there and that they are strong enough to do the job. I do not think that 6,000 United Nations forces in the Middle East are adequate. I think that we ought to be willing * * * to see that adequate United Nations forces are placed in that powderbox to prevent it from exploding right in our faces.

DECEMBER 20, 1956: ADDRESS BEFORE THE OVERSEAS PRESS CLUB—ARAB NATIONALISM

One of the basic facts of our time is the spirit of nationalism which dominates the thinking of most of the underdeveloped areas of the world. We are all familiar with the manifestations of this force, the antiwesternism throughout much of Asia and Africa and the irresponsible fashion in which the Soviet Union has tried to take advantage of this feeling. * * *

It is both useless and wrong to oppose nationalism, useless because any such opposition would be foredoomed to failure. Of course, self-determination of national groups has been a keystone of American policy since the days of Woodrow Wilson. * * * One reason we need the U. N. is to provide a constructive focus for this tremendous force of nationalism. What the Middle East needs desperately is economic development. The U. N. does not control nationalism, but it does provide a framework in which nationalism can find its proper and responsible place in a world society which is becoming increasingly interdependent. The problems we now face in Eastern Europe and the Middle East have little in common, but it can be said, I think, that the roots of the problems in both instances are nationalist in origin. I applaud the recently repeated statements by the President that * * * problems * * * in Eastern Europe and the Middle East must be dealt with by the U. N. The U. N. has an important role to play. It is dangerous for either the United States or the Soviet Union to try to be the dominant power in the Middle East; this is an area readymade for the kind of international ministrations that the U. N. is peculiarly equipped to undertake.

It might be useful to consider establishing under United Nations auspices a Middle East Development Authority. Most of the economic as well as other problems of the area are international in their scope. Most of them also require outside assistance, either in the form of capital, of technical aid, or of good offices. Why not, then, have an international agency to deal with them? The kind of Middle East Development Authority that I have in mind would have, on its board of directors, representatives of all the states of the area as well as representatives of the states furnishing capital and technical assistance.

DECEMBER 29, 1956: NEWSLETTER—INCREASED SOVIET INROADS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The increasing competition with the Soviet in the have-not areas from the Middle East to the Far East indicates a need for a new and broader program to help people of these areas help themselves.

JANUARY 11, 1957: NEWSLETTER—EISENHOWER DOCTRINE

What he (the President) is saying in effect is that he should have said what he did in the first place—that the United States would not assert its own power unilaterally in the Middle East. Much of the concern in Congress is centered on the fact that the Eisenhower proposal is directed solely against the Soviet Union in terms of military aggression. There is not a very clear view of what it would do in terms of offsetting Soviet political penetration and infiltration.

FEBRUARY 8, 1957: NEWSLETTER—EISENHOWER DOCTRINE

Nowhere in the proposed resolution was there any concrete proposal concerning the most urgent problems of the Middle East—the Soviet arms traffic, the control of the Suez, the open threats of the Arabs to overwhelm Israel, the danger of subversion and the emergence of pro-Soviet, if not necessarily Soviet controlled, Arab dictators.

By month's end I hope that the President will be presented with a more realistic resolution which does indeed put the Congress firmly on record that Soviet expansion into the Middle East of any kind will be resisted, but also will address itself to the hard, specific problems of the Middle East and will call for cooperation with the United Nations.

FEBRUARY 11, 1957: SENATE STATEMENT—NEW DIRECTIONS FOR UNITED STATES POLICY

We must do what we can as a nation to strengthen the military forces of the U. N. in the Middle East.

We should initiate proposals to end the arms race in the Middle East.

We should consider proposing a pilot project, an open-skies aerial and ground inspection system.

We should recognize the critical importance of reestablishing the principle of free navigation on the international waterways.

We should propose the establishment of a United Nations Good Offices Commission, whose purpose would be to reduce tensions in the Middle East.

We must help break the stalemates of inertia and blockade by promoting dynamic projects to help raise living standards, strengthen economies, and encourage orderly social progress in the Middle East.

MAY 3, 1957: NEWSLETTER—MILITARY FORCE OF LIMITED IMPORTANCE

Our military forces and those of our allies are only the shield which can permit us to go to work in a constructive way to help build a stable and durable relationship among the peoples of this tense and critical area.

MAY 17, 1957: NEWSLETTER—UNILATERAL ACTION

I thing we should not move unilaterally * * * in the Middle East any more than we have to. In many cases, our national objectives can best be accomplished through the United Nations, or in joint efforts with the European states such as Italy or West Germany, or with some of the states of the Middle East.

MAY 17, 1957: NEWSLETTER—CONSTRUCTIVE NATIONALISM

Certainly the challenge of economic development would focus the energies of the Egyptian people on constructive undertakings. A new approach is needed—perhaps in the form of a regional development agency under the United Nations.

MAY 24, 1957: NEWSLETTER—RIVER VALLEY DEVELOPMENT

The fact is that water is at least as important as oil in the Middle East if not more so. The Nile, the Jordan, and the Tigris-Euphrates are all international rivers, and if maximum use is to be made of their waters, it must be done under some kind of international arrangement. A new approach is needed—perhaps in the form of a regional development agency under the United Nations but operating independently through a representative board of directors.

JUNE 8, 1957: ADDRESS—FOREIGN POLICY CONFERENCE IN MINNEAPOLIS—40 MILLION PEOPLE

The foreign policy of the United States has failed to keep pace with our obligations and the responsibilities of the Middle East. Without further delay, the United States must formulate and implement a policy which comprehends the dimensions of our role in the Middle East and which responds realistically to the needs and aspirations of the peoples of the region. We have conceived of the security of our interest in the Middle East in terms of military pacts, arms agreements, and advance bases when it depends, in fact, on our ability to win the support and friendship of the region's 40 million people. The United States, in other words must now bolster the Eisenhower doctrine by a policy which comprehends and attacks the real causes of the social and political turmoil which threatens to destroy Free World interests in the Middle East.

The idea of creating a Middle East Development Agency, composed of all the states in the region and other states contributing to its capital, has much to commend it. Such an institution could be a decisive new element in the Middle Eastern situation and a catalytic agent which might precipitate solutions for many of the most vexing problems of the region.

Such a development agency could undertake projects itself, lend money to either private or public agencies, and participate in equity financing. It could manage projects * * * it could carry on long-term technical assistance.

It would divert the attention of the Arab leaders from military adventures to internal economic development. Turning Arab energies into constructive channels would eventually lead to institutional and social changes, such as the growth of a middle class, which would have a beneficial and stabilizing influence.

It would provide a means of channeling Arab oil revenues into productive uses which would benefit the entire area. * * *

It could work out a solution to the whole Palestine-Arab refugee problem. The only long-term solution for the refugees is basic economic development. * * *

It could encourage international acceptance of the Jordan River plan and similar developments involving more than one state. * * *

It could give technical assistance and supervised farm credit to farmers settling on new lands coming into production. * * *

Most important, perhaps, such an agency would encourage a regional approach to the problems of Middle East development. Isolated projects here and there * * * obviously offer no real answer to the needs of the region.

It is time that the nations involved (in the Arab-Israeli conflict) come to terms * * * nor can the United States afford to temporize further with the problem of Arab refugees.

We should improve the signal of the Voice of America.

We need more conferences on a regional level by American foreign service personnel in the Middle East.

We must increase the ordinary student exchange between the United States and the Middle East.

We should do more to encourage the operation of voluntary agencies such as CARE.

American food and fiber are vital to the very existence of thousands of undernourished people in the Middle East.

I have already mentioned that something tremendously important is happening to two-thirds of mankind living on three underdeveloped continents. Today the whole underdeveloped world is seething with what Arnold Toynbee has called a revolution of rising expectations. * * * the World Health Organization, the United Nations Technical Assistance Program, the Food and Agriculture Organization, the Children's Fund, UNESCO, the International Labor Organization. * * * It is to these agencies which the people on three continents look to satisfy their high hopes for progress. Through these various agencies, the United Nations is a living demonstration of another great truth about the world today—the truth that a multilateral approach to help underprivileged peoples to help themselves is a more efficient and satisfactory approach than many of the bilateral methods of medical, technical, and economic assistance which we have also used.

Not only should we utilize the specialized agencies which already exist under the United Nations structure, but we should press for the formation of new United Nations agencies * * * two of these agencies which I have recently proposed (are) a Middle East Good Offices Commission, and a Middle East Development Authority. * * * Others (are) * * * SUNFED, the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development * * * a new International Waterways Commission.

JUNE 3, 1957: SPEECH—FOOD FOR FREEDOM

Lack of adequate food is the underlying factor of many of the economic and political problems bringing trouble to this area of the world. Food is the common denominator of international life. American food and fiber is vital to the very existence of millions of undernourished people.

JUNE 6, 1957: NEWSLETTER—AFTER VISITING LEBANON

Here (Lebanon) seemed to be the brightest hope of the Arab world—a western-oriented nation of Christians and Moslems with a friendly government in power. But even in Beirut, we were warned of impending troubles that have subsequently happened—political riots spurred on by outside influences.

JUNE 8, 1957: NEWSLETTER—EMPHASIS ON THE PEOPLE

We need more of a human people-to-people approach to our international relations rather than just dependence on military might and security pacts.

JUNE 17, 1957: NEWS RELEASE—FOOD AND FIBER

I am convinced that our Government policy has been far too shortsighted about how powerful a factor sharing our abundance can be in our foreign relations.

JULY 1, 1957: REPORT ON THE MIDDLE EAST SUBMITTED TO SENATE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Our policy has concerned itself too much with kings and oil, too little with people and water. No country in the Middle East * * * has the experience or the skills * * * to stave off communism by pushing development on a scale commensurate with the need.

The imperatives of an effective American policy—

1. To attack on a regional basis the fundamental causes of economic instability which lie on the deprivation of the masses and their rebellion against poverty;

2. To remove the causes of political instability which lie both in the existence of 900,000 refugees whose hopelessness makes them readily susceptible to agitation, and in the lack of peace between the Arab States and Israel.

We should consider the idea of creating a Middle East Development Agency.

American policy should maintain a constant and unrelenting leadership for the state of this region to resolve this conflict (Arab-Israeli) once and for all.

The only possible solution—the provision for the vast majority (of refugees) with permanent homes and tolerable livelihoods in the Arab States.

We need more regionalism in the operation of our Foreign Service.

Take a keen interest in the American businessman abroad. * * * In the particular countries I visited, American business enjoys a deservedly good reputation.

A center of Arabic studies * * * supported by American funds * * * (has) frequently been proposed.

Improve the signal of the Voice of America.

USIA should concentrate more on libraries and visual education.

We ought to concentrate on developing a ne generation of friendly leadership in the Middle East.

There is an obvious need for stepping up our point 4 program in the Middle East, particularly as it relates to agriculture.

If American foreign policy, not only in the Middle East, but elsewhere is to be of maximum effectiveness, a drastic revision is required in the prevailing concept regarding disposal of our food and fiber in the world.

SEPTEMBER 19, 1957: ADDRESS BEFORE LOS ANGELES WORLD AFFAIRS COUNCIL—FOUR PROPOSALS

Let me suggest four recommendations toward easing the explosive tensions of the Middle East.

1. Leadership in the United Nations toward an outright ban on arms shipments into the Middle East.

2. Creation of a U. N. Good Offices Commission * * * with a mandate to seek both territorial and political settlements. * * *

3. Making permanent and expanded U. N. security force for the Middle East and other trouble zones that might develop.

4. Creation of a Middle East Development Agency * * * as a catalytic agent which might precipitate solutions for many of the most vexing problems of the region by encouraging a regional approach to developmental projects.

OCTOBER 23, 1957: ADDRESS BEFORE AMERICAN BAKERS ASSOCIATION—UNITED STATES-MIDDLE EAST POLICY RUDDERLESS

Within a few short months we have had evidence of gradual estrangement from the United States of hitherto friendly Arab nations—Lebanon, Iraq, Saudi Arabia. Instead of supplying affirmative, constructive leadership, the administration has drifted and hesitated. The only possibility of rescuing American Middle East policy is to face up to the challenges of that area in a variety of specific ways.

1. We should strengthen the United Nations Emergency Force.

2. We should initiate proposals to end the arms race in the Middle East.

3. We should consider proposing * * * an open skies aerial and ground inspection system.

4. We should realize the critical importance of reestablishing the principle of free navigation on international waterways.

5. We should propose the establishment of a United Nations Good Offices Commission.

6. We should help break the stalemate of inertia and blockade by promoting dynamic projects to help raise living standards, strengthen economies, and encourage orderly social progress in the Middle East.

OCTOBER 31, 1957: ADDRESS BEFORE INDUSTRIAL UNION DEPARTMENT, AFL–CIO—PEACE: OUR MOST URGENT BUSINESS

The crisis of the Middle East is a matter of the gravest urgency. * * * But it is well to remember that the Middle East is only the latest episode in the progressive deterioration of our position in the world. * * * The recent coup in Syria has given the Kremlin a military and strategic foothold in the Mediterranean. The Soviet Union is now in a favorable position to infiltrate its way into control of the Middle East.

First, we should join with the spirit of independent nationalism that grips the underdeveloped and underprivileged countries.

Second, we should respect the neutrality of newborn nations.

Third, we must make greater use of our economic strength to help other free nations develop themselves. * * * We should encourage the use of international machinery for economic development, not only the World Bank, but machinery of the U. N. such as SUNFED. * * * We must not use our economic-development funds to subvert the independence of other free nations by attaching military or political conditions humiliating to them.

Fourth, we should step up our own point 4 program * * * at the same time that we continue to work through the U. N. and help expand U. N. technical assistance.

Fifth, we should more actively, constructively, and imaginatively use our blessings of food and fiber as a powerful force for freedom. * * * We can use our abundant stocks of food and fibers not only to relieve acute emergency shortages elsewhere in the world, but also to help the economic-development programs where they are urgently needed.

A great crisis faces us today—the crisis of the Middle East. The situation is so acute, the danger so immediate that a broad program of international action is imperative. In this the United States should take the lead to initiate action through the United Nations.

We should initiate proposals in the United Nations to place the U. N. police force on a continuing basis.

We should seek the establishment by the United Nations General Assembly of a Special Commission on Arms Traffic.

We should propose the establishment of a United Nations Good Offices Commission, which purpose would be to reduce tensions in the Middle East.

We should take the initiative in the United Nations in proposing a Middle East Development Authority as an administering agency for the mutual pooling of technical and capital aids in the area. A Middle East Development Agency could demonstrate to the Arab leaders that they have more to gain by internal and cooperative development than from military adventures.

NOVEMBER 14, 1957: ADDRESS AT MACALESTER COLLEGE, ST. PAUL, MINN.—MIDEAST STILL THREATENING

The situation in the Middle East still poses the greatest threat of any outbreak of actual war * * * the urgent need to preserve the peace, the pressure for change, for social advance, for an end to poverty and ignorance will not wait for that region to mobilize and exploit its resources on its own.

FEBRUARY 14, 1958: ADDRESS BEFORE MIDDLE EAST INSTITUTE—MILITARY PACTS REEXAMINED

In our preoccupation with the least likely contingency—overt Soviet military aggression—we have tended to throw up our hands over the problems of subversion. * * * Most Middle Easterners feel that we have tried to force their countries to stand up and be counted, to be allied with us in premature—if not simply paper—alliances. Why is it that we cannot understand that the mood of nationalism in the Middle East today makes any

political leader recoil from any relationship with a more powerful Western nation which smacks of subordination or even implies political inferiority. * * * Our Government has never assumed the full responsibility which the United States must assume if the countries of the Middle East are to remain free and independent. And I know it takes a good deal more economic and technical assistance in the Middle East than we have given to date. * * * In the Middle East * * * where 90 percent of the people are living not on a subsistence but below a subsistence diet, where disease is rampant * * * to pour our military equipment into that kind of a situation is, to me, the height of madness. Our military policy is sterile because it is not accompanied by measures designed to cope with the underlying economic and political problems of the area.

JUNE 26, 1958: SENATE ADDRESS—WE SHOULD ACT IN CONCERT

I repeat that unilateral action on our part, outside the confines of the United Nations would be reckless at this time * * * we should support, in the United Nations, and not only support, but advance the establishment of a permanent U. N. police force.

JULY 14, 1958: SENATE ADDRESS—STERILITY OF UNITED STATES MIDDLE EAST POLICY

One after another of the so-called bastions of Western strength in the Middle East have come tumbling down. Our policy in the Middle East has supposedly been based on the Baghdad Pact and the Eisenhower doctrine. But apparently both of them have failed utterly in Iraq. The truth is, as I said almost 2 years ago, we have not any ascertainable or discernible policy in the Middle East. We have overemphasized military pacts to the neglect of popular strength.

In the 20th century aggression may take the form of political infiltration and carefully planned conspiracies having in mind the objectives of overthrowing a government * * * and taking control. But despite our knowledge of the fact that aggression needs to be redefined, we have failed to devise instruments to control this new kind of aggression.

Mr. President, I have said a number of times that our foreign policy has been too completely concerned about kings and oil, and too little concerned about people and water in the Middle East.

There is a revolution at work, not only in the Middle East but throughout the world. I am afraid that we have not been able to identify ourselves too well with that revolution.

The Middle East has been termed the cradle of civilization. It could well become the graveyard of contemporary civilization * * * unless policies of the wisest type are pursued.

The solutions to the problems of the Middle East are not military. Instead, the answer is to be found in policies which reach the basic needs of the area. The United States must learn that it cannot control events * * * by threatening massive retaliation.

JULY 16, 1958: SENATE STATEMENT—THE MARINES IN LEBANON

Out of loyalty and patriotic duty I support the United States, even though I believe the decision to send forces to Lebanon was unwise and filled with dangers. I repeat that we could make no greater mistake than to have the United States alone become the policeman of the world.

JULY 24, 1958: SENATE STATEMENT—USE U. N. MACHINERY

The United Nations provides the environment and the machinery conducive to fruitful negotiations. The United Nations offers an opportunity for quiet, secret talks as well as public platform appearances * * * invaluable opportunity at the United Nations for direct person-to-person negotiations which might not otherwise take place. I earnestly hope that * * * Middle Eastern leaders will come to New York during this session.

AUGUST 5, 1958: SENATE FLOOR STATEMENT—DISEASE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. President, for years the underdeveloped Middle East has needed medicine, not machineguns. It has needed schools, not soldiers. It has needed food, not foxholes. Today we have Marines stationed in the Middle East. But armed forces will not be able to cure disease, or instruct minds, or fill empty stomachs, either in the Middle East or anywhere else.

AUGUST 8, 1958: FLOOR STATEMENT—CONSTRUCTIVE USE OF NATIONALISM

One of the most obvious facts and developments in the Middle East is the rise of Arab nationalism. Nationalism as a psychological, political, and emotional force is neither good nor bad. It depends on the course of action that it takes and the objectives that it seeks * * * nationalism that is directed and charted into channels of political freedom and self-determination, economic progress and human betterment represents a constructive and positive force to be sought and nourished. It is this * * * possibility of nationalism that we should encourage.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to report to the people of the 18th Congressional District of New York, whom I have the high honor to represent, what I believe to be the major drives of the 85th Congress, what it accomplished and failed to accomplish, and the small role I played in the drama of these last 2 years.

The 2d session of the 85th Congress closed on August 24. The first session lasted from January 3 to August 30, 1957. Despite the fact that the President was Republican and control of Congress was in experienced Democratic hands, much has been accomplished and certain items have been left undone. Analysts who demand clear-cut verdicts will be disappointed.

Future generations will most likely remember the 85th Congress for two legislative accomplishments—first, the enactment of the first civil-rights legislation in 87 years, and, second, the admission to the Union of Alaska as the 49th State. However, I shall remember this Congress as a classic example of democracy responding to external danger and internal economic recession.

The second session began in a spirit of emergency and determination. The Russian sputnik, increasing unemployment galvanized the complacent into action. The leadership asserted themselves to prepare our country in an expanding world and resolved that indecision would not bring about a depression. While our minds and missiles projected themselves into the universe, our feet were on the ground, and we provided measures that would prevent the manpower of America from frantically walking the streets in search of employment.

The first beep of sputnik halted the economy drive which characterized the 1st session of the 85th Congress. The major drives of the second session were, first, defense in all its aspects, such as, reorganization of our defense forces, creation of a space agency, the sharing of our atomic secrets with our friends, the extension of reciprocal trade, the continuation of mutual-security program and funds and, second, economic recovery activities, such as extension of jobless pay benefits, emergency Federal housing loans to speed up construction, and Federal funds for highway construction. Tax cuts as an antirecession measure fell by the wayside.

While the President laid down a program, it was the cooperation and accommodation of the Democratic leadership which led to the enactment of so many measures. This 85th Congress was in no sense a "yes Congress" to the Republican President. It took the initiative in the development of urgent measures to meet the Soviet Union's space age bid for superiority in the futuristic implements of science and war. It did the same in attacking the economic recession.

Congress challenged particulars of the President's legislative program, changed, added to, rejected, or replaced some major features and, occasionally, produced legislation of its own. In the main, the end product proved satisfactory to the administration; and when it did not the President was quick to exercise his veto. While some of the President's recommendations were ignored or buried, the great bulk of his program was enacted in one form or another.

As a first-term Congressman, I have taken a keen interest in the debate and, on many occasions, participated. After 1 year of intense activity, my activity and contributions were recognized and I was assigned from the Committees of the Post Office and Civil Service and the Merchant Marine to the House Appropriations Committee, one of the most important and influential committees in Congress.

MY VOTE ON MAJOR ISSUES

I voted for the Mideast doctrine in the original and in its final form. I supported foreign aid with the cuts. I supported Federal aid to school construction, the protection of civil rights, and the right to vote. I opposed the jury trial amendment to the civil rights bill which would have made impossible the enforcement of the legislation. I voted for aid to small business and aid to private housing. I supported the immigration law which passed the House at the close of the session, which bill, while not completely satisfactory, was a step in the right direction. I voted for the postal pay and classified employee increases. I voted for the bill for the protection of FBI files from indiscriminate inspection and at the same time would permit a defendant the right to inspect statements by a Government witness if

the court determined it would not prejudice the safety of the United States

In the second session, I supported and voted to extend unemployment compensation benefits to those exhausting their benefits. I voted for the emergency housing construction and Federal highway program as economic measures to combat the recession. I voted for the omnibus housing bill which failed to receive a two-thirds vote although it received a vote of 251 to 134. I voted for a community facilities bill and marketing facilities bill, both of which failed to pass. I voted for foreign-aid appropriations and to reorganize the Defense Department. I voted for the science and language education bill granting scholarships and loans to needy and intelligent college students, although the final measure excluded scholarships. I voted and supported extension of social-security benefits and pay increases for our Government and postal workers. I voted and supported bills for the disclosure and reporting of welfare and pension funds and also supported the so-called Kennedy-Ives bill, which was designed to curb labor racketeering and corruption. I voted for the extension of the reciprocal trade agreements. I opposed passage of the bill to subordinate Federal statutes to State statutes unless Federal statutes expressly preempted the field. I voted for the appropriations to run the various agencies of Government.

In 1956, when I ran for Congress, the voters in my District, in response to a questionnaire circulated by me, indicated their viewpoints and preferences. From time to time, during the past 2 years, I have met with various organizations in the community asking their viewpoints and reporting to them on pending legislation. I have voted my conscience with the knowledge of what my constituents desired. It was an honor and a privilege to be the Representative of the 18th Congressional District of New York.

Legislative Program of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement showing the action taken by the 85th Congress on the various items in the 1958 legislative program of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which were referred to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. Proposal: Federal aid to education.

Congressional action: The Congress passed and sent to the President the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (H. R. 13247). On September 2, 1958, the President signed this bill into law (Public Law 85-864) even though it did not include the Federal scholarship program which he had recommended to the Congress.

2. Proposal: Medical teaching facilities construction.

Congressional action: The Congress passed and sent to the President a bill (H. R. 12876) which extended for 3 years the Health Research Facilities Act of 1956 which established a program of Federal matching grants for the construction of health research facilities. This bill has been signed into law (Public Law 85-777).

The Congress did not act on the President's proposal to amend and enlarge the Health Research Facilities Construction Act to include a program of grants to medical and dental schools for the construction of teaching facilities.

3. Proposal: Food additives.

Congressional action: The Congress passed and sent to the President H. R. 13254, food additives amendment of 1958, which amends the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1958 to prohibit the use in food of additives which have not been adequately tested to establish their safety. This bill was signed into law by the President on September 6, 1958 (Public Law 85-929).

4. Proposal: Indian sanitation facilities and services.

Congressional action: The Senate passed but the House did not act on S. 3694, a bill to clarify the authority of the Surgeon General with respect to sanitation facilities and services for Indians.

5. Proposal: Health insurance risk pooling.

Congressional action: The Congress took no action on the proposal (S. 1750) to allow agreements between private insurers for the pooling and coordinating their resources and efforts to provide health prepayment protection.

6. Proposal: Public Health Service Commissioned Corps Personnel Act.

Congressional action: The Congress took no action on this bill (S. 4912, H. R. 13812, H. R. 13814).

7. Proposal: Establishment of a teaching hospital for Howard University.

Congressional action: A bill, S. 3626, to transfer Freedman's Hospital to Howard University and to establish a teaching hospital for Howard University was reported by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. No further action was taken by the Congress.

8. Proposal: Cooperative Research in Education Act amendments.

Congressional action: The Congress took no action on a bill, S. 3802, designed to improve the flexibility of the cooperative research in education program and to extend its provisions to the District of Columbia and the Territories and possessions of the United States.

9. Proposal: Public Law 815-874 amendments.

Congressional action: The Congress passed a bill (H. R. 11378) to amend and extend the program of Federal financial assistance in construction and operation of schools in federally affected areas. This bill was signed by the President on August 12, 1958 (Public Law 85-620).

10. Proposal: Federal Advisory Council on the Arts.

Congressional action: No action whatsoever was taken on the administration's proposal (S. 1716) to establish in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, a 21-member Federal Advisory Council to make recommendations for methods to encourage creative activity in the performance, practice, participation in, and appreciation of the arts.

11. Proposal: Commission on the Blind.

Congressional action: No action was taken on the proposal (S. 2385) to establish a Presidential study commission on problems of the blind.

12. Proposal: Salary improvement for officials at St. Elizabeths Hospital.

Congressional action: No action was taken on the proposal (S. 2835) to provide a residence for the superintendent and to increase the salaries of the superintendent, assistant superintendent, and the first assistant physician at St. Elizabeths Hospital.

Congresswoman Martha W. Griffiths Reports to the People of the 17th District of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I take this opportunity to provide the residents of the 17th District of Michigan a brief résumé of major legislation and of my activities as their Representative in the 85th Congress.

In January 1957, when the 85th Congress convened, it was believed to be just another Congress meeting to cope with the usual problems of our day. Then in October 1957, the Russian sputnik sailed into outer space and Congress returned to the second session impressed with the Russian endeavor and determined to do something about it. In his opening speech on January 7, Senate Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON said:

> We must work as though no other Congress would ever have an opportunity to meet this challenge, for, in fact, none will have an opportunity comparable.

Bipartisan press across the country is in agreement that this Congress has been one of the most productive Congresses that has ever met.

EDUCATION

The first sputnik made quite evident the need to promote studies in science, mathematics, engineering, and modern foreign languages in the race to keep up with and surpass Russian scientific advances. Congress passed the National Defense Education Act. It authorized $887 million in Federal aid. Approximately one-half of this will be available for student loans and fellowships so that more boys and girls can go to college. The principals of the high schools in our District are very much in favor of this program.

Once again, however, Congress failed to pass school construction legislation. In 1957, the House, for the second straight year, defeated a bill to provide $1.5 billion of Federal money to build public schools.

Congress voted to extend until 1961 the present programs that provide Federal funds for school construction and operating costs in areas overburdened with Federal activities, such as Army installations and defense plants. The 17th District has already received $1,251,816 under this program.

LABOR

The failure of Congress to strike a blow at racketeering in unions, after the exposure of many shocking abuses, is a letdown for honest unionism, for employers who bargain in good faith, and for the public. A large majority of the votes which finally killed the labor reform bill were Republican. Of the Democrats who voted, 71 percent favored passage of the bill—I was among them. Of the Republicans who voted, 23 percent favored passage of the bill, 77 percent were opposed. Certainly there is a heavy responsibility on the part of Congress to work on this legislation in the early months of the next session.

Congress did pass the Welfare Funds Disclosure Act, requiring both unions and management to register, report, and disclose all employee welfare and benefit plans.

Congress convened this January in the midst of widespread and growing unemployment. Before a month had passed it was apparent that one of our major problems was a most peculiar recession—5 million to 6 million unemployed and yet the cost of living increasing daily.

ANTIRECESSION MEASURES

As a member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency I sat for weeks and heard governor after governor and the mayors of the large cities tell of legislation that was needed to help bring us out of the recession. Our own Governor Williams and Mayor Miriani most ably presented the needs of Michigan and Detroit. However, of the numerous measures proposed, few received approval.

A special program was enacted to extend State unemployment compensation programs.

The removal or reduction of many of our excise taxes—especially those on automobiles—could have given a quick boost to our economy but the only action taken was to remove the tax on freight transportation.

Legislation to provide low interest, long-term loans to communities to build much-needed sewers, streets, community buildings, and so forth, was defeated. All of the communities in the 17th District supported this legislation.

In 1956 a campaign pledge was made by both political parties to enact area redevelopment legislation. This would assist those areas which have suffered substantial and persistent unemployment for an extended period of time. A bill authorizing this program was approved by both the House and the Senate. The President vetoed the measure after Congress adjourned.

INFLATION

The very first people to be affected by inflation are those who live on fixed incomes; our senior citizens, disabled veterans, and so forth.

Congress passed legislation to increase the social-security retirement benefits by approximately 7 percent. The same bill requires the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to report to Congress next year on the need for increasing the $1,200 maximum amount a retiree can earn and still draw his benefits.

Pensions for veterans with service-connected disabilities were increased by approximately 10 percent.

Retirement annuities for civil-service workers were increased and postal and civil-service workers were given a pay raise.

Congress, for the first time since 1917, agreed to 2 separate increases in the public debt limit within 1 year. Raised to $300 billion during World War II, the ceiling had reverted to $275 billion in 1957. At adjournment it was up to $288 billion. I did not support the President's requests for authority to increase the Federal debt. Increasing the Federal debt is a serious thing. It is inflationary. It places additional interest burdens on the taxpayers. In my opinion other means are available to balance the Federal budget. For example the Defense Department, our largest spender, can reduce the budget by billions merely by instigating proper purchasing procedures.

The rising cost of living is of great concern to me—in this regard I introduced a resolution asking the House of Representatives to authorize the House Committee on Banking and Currency to make a full investigation and study of factors affecting the purchasing power of the dollar and the cost of living. The Detroit Common Council and the Livonia City Council have actively endorsed this proposal.

HOUSING AND PUBLIC WORKS

A new housing program for the elderly was instituted, providing long-term, low-interest loans to nonprofit corporations who will build housing especially designed for the needs of the elderly at low rental rates.

Early this session an emergency antirecession housing bill was passed by Congress to stimulate the housing business. The downpayment requirement for FHA housing was substantially lowered and additional money was made available for loans for low-cost FHA and GI housing.

Funds to complete the flood-control survey of the River Rouge were included in this year's appropriation for the Army Corps of Engineers.

Congress also appropriated $25,500,000 for further work on the St. Lawrence Seaway connecting channels.

THE CONSUMER

Always of primary interest to me is legislation that directly protects the consumer.

To provide the consumer protection against misbranding and false advertising of the fiber content of textile products Congress passed legislation requiring the labeling of all fabrics as to content. To protect the public health a law was passed prohibiting the use in food of additives which have not been adequately tested to establish their safety.

Poultry that crosses interstate lines, as well as meat, must now pass Federal inspection. I introduced a bill to require compulsory inspection of poultry because much of the poultry sold in the Detroit area comes from out of State. Diseased fowl is not only dangerous to the consumer but also to those who must handle it in processing.

An auto-labeling bill passed this Congress. It requires all manufacturers and importers of new cars to attach to the windshield a label listing the suggested retail price as well as other pertinent information relative to dealer cost.

My Committee on Government Operations has spent many hours investigating the subject of false and misleading advertising. These investigations are made to see if the laws now on the books are adequate to protect the consumer, and if so, are they being properly enforced. The advertising policies of obesity remedies, cigarettes, prescription tranquilizing drugs, and dentrifices were studied. It was found that many advertising claims are misleading and detrimental to the general health of the public. Proper measures must be taken to correct this situation.

SMALL BUSINESS

The awakened interest which this Congress has shown in the problems of small business and the actions it has taken to correct these problems, have been most encouraging. This Congress has made the best record for small-business legislation of any Congress in history.

Legislation was passed making the Small Business Administration a permanent agency of Government. The amount of a loan which the SBA can make was increased from $250,000 to $350,000. A small-business tax-revision bill makes some substantial adjustments which will be greatly helpful to small business.

But the Small Business Investment Act is the most important of all. This legislation will give small firms better access to capital than they now have. The House Select Committee on Small Business has prepared some explanatory materials on this investment plan. I have copies available in my District office for anyone who would like one.

GENERAL

To cope with the problems of space, a Special Committee on Astronautic and Space Exploration was set up.

Legislation to relieve the financial plight of the railroads was agreed to.

Congress created the new State of Alaska.

Our World War I veterans were granted a Federal charter. I was one of the signers of the discharge petition that brought this bill to the floor for a vote.

Once again, my efforts to expand the distribution of surplus foods to the needy of our country by a stamp plan met strong opposition from the administration and was not approved. It is difficult to understand the position taken by the administration when surplus foods are in such abundance and millions of pounds are shipped to foreign countries each year.

Postal rates were increased this year. I did not vote for the increase. First-class and airmail have long paid their own way. In my opinion, they should not carry the burden of the other classes.

Among the bills I have introduced are measures to put the House and its committees on television. I believe the people are entitled to see their Congress in ac-

tion; the conduct that surrounded the Goldfine hearings, in my opinion, brought out the real need for this legislation.

A bill to require humane methods in the slaughter of livestock passed this Congress. This issue received the greatest support from the public of any measure introduced in this Congress.

Since January 1957, there have been over 50 bombings or attempted bombings of churches, synagogues, and small businesses. The Justice Department and the FBI have refused to enter these cases. I introduced a bill which would permit the FBI to investigate these incidents immediately.

It was my privilege last year to designate the Wayne County public library system a Federal Government depository. Four branches of this library are in the 17th District plus a bookmobile service.

I have made a continuing effort to get more defense contracts placed in the Detroit area. This administration has consistently said that more defense contracts would go to areas of high unemployment, and more subcontracts would go to small business but in actual practice this has not been done.

PERSONAL REPORT

In addition to my legislative duties, I would like to make reference to my other work and responsibilities as your spokesman in Washington. I have attempted from the outset of my Congressional service to keep the residents of the 17th District as fully informed as possible.

To accomplish this, I have written a newsletter each month; I have maintained both a weekly and monthly radio series through the cooperation of radio stations WWJ and WKMH; and periodically I have given a report on TV through the cooperation of station WJBK.

I have taught civics in all the senior high schools in our District and I speak to many social and service groups. I was one of the principal speakers last fall at the annual convention of the American Association of Land Grant Colleges and State Universities in Denver and I spoke later to the American Medical Association in Chicago on civil defense.

I maintain 2 full-time offices, 1 in Washington at 1516 House Office Building, the other in our District at 16849 Grand River. My District office has enabled me to give you more prompt and efficient service.

Your letters, phone calls, and visits have been appreciated. I have attempted to assist you as promptly as possible. And it has been a pleasure to assist many residents of our District and our local and State officials in their dealings with various Federal agencies such as the Small Business Administration, Defense Department, Veterans' Administration, Social Security Administration, and the Internal Revenue Service.

In conclusion, let me say that I have done my best to be responsive to the needs and opinions of the residents of our District and to discharge my responsibility as your representative in Congress in a way which I hope meets with your approval.

Reminiscing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, as a prelude to my 1958 annual report to my constituents, I should like to call attention to my report at the close of the 84th Congress in July 1956, which read as follows:

REFLECTION IS GOOD FOR THE POLITICAL SOUL

(Extension of remarks of Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, of New York, in the House of Representatives, Friday, July 27, 1956)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago a giant hoax was perpetrated on the American people. They were promised a new approach to Government, one that truly was to represent them. In 1952, they were promised a world of peace and prosperity, lower taxes, higher wages, lower prices, and a balanced budget. The best business heads in America were to run our Government.

Two years went by, and the disillusioned American people went back to their own party, the Democratic Party, by electing a Democratic Congress. The administration moaned and warned of a partisan cold war, or a stalemate within the Government. President Eisenhower cried loudest. Let us now review what happened.

Whatever good there was in the President's program had more support in every instance from the Democratic Party than from his own Republican Party. The President, himself, presently admits that the Democratic Congress produced a substantial amount of worthwhile legislation.

In 1952, the American people were fooled into believing in a program that its authors themselves did not believe in. We hope in this election year they will not fall prey to the hoax that the elephant will again try to foist upon them.

Evaluation of the past will help us to spot the election-year myths when they are presented by Republican campaigners.

THE ADMINISTRATION—ABSENTEE MANAGEMENT; WHO'S MINDING THE STORE?

We were promised a President who would be a guiding knight, an active and strong manager, a leader of our country, an expert in military affairs, and a friend of our foreign allies.

Instead we have an ailing gentleman, who had no experience in government, and who has shown no interest or desire to learn about his tasks. On several occasions he has told his press conferences about seeking the enactment of bills he had already signed into law. This disinterest or lack of knowledge cannot be attributed to ill health. Eisenhower's pleasing personality and past military achievements are no substitute for political leadership. There can be no justification for his delegating the authority and responsibility vested by our Constitution solely in the President.

The business managers of our Nation, such as Secretary Wilson and Secretary Humphrey, may be fine in business, but they have proved they do not belong in Government. The promotion of the national well-being for the benefit of the many rather than the few is foreign to their philosophy.

It is not true that what is good for General Motors is good for the country. Profits of an automobile industry are not equivalent to the welfare of a people.

Our health program should not be measured with an eye to a balanced budget. Nor has Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey earned the right to act as an adviser to our Armed Forces. Defense and national security must not be impaired by a desire for a balanced budget.

THE CONSUMER, LABOR, AND THE FARMER—THE TIGHT SQUEEZE

The one problem common to the farmer, to labor, and to all of us, is that of the consumer.

Candidate Eisenhower promised us a lower cost of living. President Eisenhower will surely disclaim responsibility for a higher cost of living.

Consumer prices are at a record high. The National Consumer Price Index rose for the fourth successive time in a year. It has reached the highest peak in 5 years. Next month another rise is expected.

The Democratic farm program is based on the knowledge that general prosperity cannot be maintained while we continue to depress the farmer. President Eisenhower vetoed our Democratic farm price-support bill and then quickly raised price supports himself. Apparently his sliding scale had slid too far, for farm income is down 30 percent in the past year.

Milk prices to the consumer have continued to rise. Secretary Benson decided to raise dairy prices just when manufacturers had warehouses filled with cheese and butter bought at the lower price level. The farmer who sold his milk at the lower price then had to buy it back as high priced butter. This apparently is the Republican idea of how to aid the dairy farmer. No wonder so many of these farm families spread oleo on their bread.

Milk prices do not worry Secretary Benson who finds that the little farmer is of no importance. Benson is more concerned with the three members of his advisory board whose firms have been indicted for monopolistic practices. Mr. Benson is apparently fully occupied in directing the administration's ever-changing farm policy. He first opposed and then supported a soil bank; he first opposed and then approved the plowing under of crops; first opposed and then approved the idea of farm policy as a political issue.

The present administration makes many boasts as to the increase in the size of the labor force. This increase is largely a result of our ever-increasing population. Of far greater significance is the fact that at least 2,900,000 people who want jobs, cannot find them. In the past year 1 million persons have been added to our unemployed rolls. That represents a total of nearly 10 million American men, women, and children who have lost their means of support. The billion dollar year that General Motors has just concluded does not help these people.

The Democratic Party sponsored a bill to help our unemployed learn new skills when their previous trades no longer offer employment. Retraining these people will help to relieve all of us of the burden of support. This is the type of constructive, positive, legislation which brought our country to the prosperous state which it enjoyed in 1952 when Republican businessmen began to tear it down.

Candidate Eisenhower pledged himself to the amendment of the Taft-Hartley Act. President Eisenhower has consistently refused to live up to his campaign promises. Former Secretary of Labor Durkin offered the President 19 amendments, which were in accord with Candidate Eisenhower's promises. Eisenhower refused to go along with any of them. Instead he submitted to Congress a program which would toughen the Taft-Hartley Act. His Labor Secretary resigned and was replaced with another big-business man. Congress refused to go along with President Eisenhower's labor program as presented.

In an attempt to met the increased cost of living, Congress has raised the minimum wage to $1 per hour over President Eisenhower's protest that 90 cents was adequate.

The Republican Party as represented by President Eisenhower may be a party of the people, but of and for a very few people.

BAD GOVERNMENT

During his 1952 campaign Candidate Eisenhower had much to say about corruption in Government and useless personnel in Government.

We said then and repeat now, no political party has a monopoly in virtue or efficiency. Every party when trusted with the privilege to govern must be ever alert to weed out the loafers, the incompetent, and the criminal.

President Eisenhower has sadly failed the people in that regard.

The executive departments, in almost every instance, are employing more people and more top executives at higher salaries than in any previous administration. The exceptions are in the so-called service departments.

The Post Office Department, serving all of the American people, is using fewer employees and giving the worst service we have ever experienced.

The Veterans' Administration, serving our veterans and particularly our disabled veterans, has been reduced in force, moved around, kicked around, and made a less useful agency to those who need it most.

The Agriculture Department has been reorganized to take out of the hands of the farmers most of the things they can do best for themselves.

Misappropriating funds is the order of the day for this administration. This administration has appointed more corrupt officials than any other in our history.

Starting with Secretary Benson using Department funds to refurbish a Government lodge for his personal use, we find corruption rampant in every department.

Warehouses bursting at the seams, because improperly constructed; selling millions of dollars' worth of cheese to the processors and buying it back at higher prices, without the cheese ever leaving storage or changing hands; indictment of three members of Secretary Benson's advisory board; self-dealing for his private profit of one of his paid subordinates; loading the school-lunch program with more than $400,000 worth of phony transportation charges in Illinois for the sole benefit of one of his Republican friends. There are no doubt many more such incidents which have not yet been exposed. We are just beginning to investigate the monopoly enjoyed by three companies in disposing of surplus commodities.

Under 20 years of Democratic administration the Commodity Credit Corporation never exceeded an authorization of $6¾ billion. The total lost in those 20 years from operation of the program was about $1 billion. During 3½ years, the Republicans have increased that authorization to $14 billion. The losses have increased by at least $4 billion. No small part is attributable to the increased interest rates paid to bankers and much of it paid in violation of law.

Dixon-Yates was bad, so bad that even the Republican administration has backed down on its spurious claim of legality.

The cancellation of a Defense Department contract awarded to the Chrysler Corp. and awarding the same business to General Motors is only a small part of the wrongdoing in that Department.

The foot-and-mouth statements of Secretary Wilson is the least important of the many things that are bad in this administration.

The Small Business Committees of the Congress have devoted some part of almost every day to urging the Defense Department to follow the law and its own regulations in awarding contracts and making payments earned thereunder.

The Office of the Comptroller of the Currency and that of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation have also been managed in a manner adverse to the public interest.

The big banks and big holding companies have grown bigger with the aid and abetment of the Republican appointees to those agencies.

The responsibility for the Illinois bank scandal, the theft of State funds through bank manipulations, must be borne at least in part by those same Republican Federal appointees.

Internal mismanagement by those officials of their offices I hope will soon be the subject of thorough investigation.

Under the leadership of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Comptroller of the Currency attempts are being made to weaken our banking laws for the benefit of the big banks and to the detriment of the small banks and small investors. A part of that scheme was the abortive attempt to destroy the right of minority stockholders to minority representation on the directorates of national banks.

The full story about the giveaways by the Interior Department, the attempt to destroy TVA, REA, and our other public facilities and natural resources requires much more time than I can give here.

SMALL BUSINESS

Since 1953 our Government has been taken over by big business and the big banking interests of the country. The little fellow has had no representative in the Cabinet or at the top of any executive department. On the contrary, he has had as antagonist big business and the big banks, not only in the market place but also in every department of Government.

What is even worse, the so-called WOC—the big-business man on loan to the Government, drawing no compensation from the Government, but being paid by his big-business employer—has an inside track keeping big business constantly informed as to Government plans and channeling Government business away from the small-business man and to big business.

Credit restrictions are manipulated so as to dry up all sources of credit for the small-business man.

Except in times of war or emergency, WOC's should not be employed by the Government.

I have contended and will continue to urge that the Small Business Administration Act must be strengthened by eliminating the Policy Board now dominated by Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey and Secretary of Commerce Weeks. The agency must be made not only permanent, but permanently independent of the Treasury Department and the Department of Commerce.

The small-business man, displaced by slum clearance and highway construction, should be entitled to low interest rate loans based upon character and ability to perform, rather than bankable collateral.

The Defense Department must be directed by the Small Business Administration to discard, as required by law, the old arbitrary, numerical definition of a small-business firm, and follow a more realistic one. This will give small business a larger and more equitable share of Government contracts.

The Small Business Administration may boast that during 3 years, it has approved 3,560 business loans in an aggregate amount of $137,915,000 on account of which it disbursed $52,578,000. Compare that, however, to what this administration has done for big business in the same period through the Export-Import Bank alone, to wit: 805 loans for a total authorized aggregate amount of almost $7,500,000,000 against which it disbursed over $5,171,000,000. The Export-Import Bank made 22 percent as many loans with an average disbursement of over 426 times more per loan. To put it more simply, SBA's loan disbursements averaged less than $15,000 each and the bank's more than $6,400,000 each.

While big business has made more and bigger profits than at any time in the history of our country, small business has been going into bankruptcy in greater numbers than at any time since the depression days of the early 1930's.

For years, I have led the fight to establish offices of the Small Business Administration in Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico so to enable American citizens residing so far from the mainland to avail themselves of the privileges accorded by law to all. I personally urged the Appropriations Committee to give the agency the money for that purpose. The money was voted. I am still waiting to be informed that even one of those offices has been opened.

GIVEAWAYS: THE GOVERNMENT'S PRIVATE CHARITY

The administration in its "partnership" plan gives, and gives, and gives, and the people get nothing in return. First, it was offshore oil lands, then TVA, then natural gas. Now, any river or forest that big business wants, it can have for the asking.

The President wanted and got a Federal water storage project on the upper Colorado River. Since no big business wanted it, the President's partnership plan was forgotten. And Idaho Power Co. wanted to build a private power project at Hells Canyon, so the administration opposed the public sponsored Hells Canyon project. The administration opposed the idea of municipalities in New York State having priority purchase rights to the electric power which would issue from the Niagara River power development program.

The development of atomic energy for peace is an idea that the Democratic Party sponsors wholeheartedly. But we voted against the administration's atoms-for-peace program, since it would have given a few big businesses a monopoly in the development of atomic energy for peacetime use.

Incidentally, Attorney General Brownell now has completely disavowed the Dixon-Yates contract and has accepted the view of the Democratic Party that the whole agreement was illegal.

It took New Deal reclamation programs to give us back our forests. It has taken less than 4 years of an Eisenhower administration to lose them. The administration's policy is to lease them to private industry, which flagrantly abuses them.

We have no right to expect anything else of the Department of the Interior under this administration. Its consistent policy is to put political appointees in the place of ardent career men. It has been no accident that many of these political appointees have been anticonservationists. There is no necessity for commenting on the scandals that have evolved over the private uses that many of these appointees have made of the assets of the Department.

FEDERAL AND POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Anyone aware of the importance of all Federal and particularly the postal employees can see no reason why they should not have many of the rights that are accorded to workers in private industry.

We have, over the objection of the administration, raised their wages to enable them to meet the rising costs of living. This while the President kept clamoring for increased pay for those already in the highest brackets. We have also liberalized the civil-service retirement benefits.

We have not yet devised any method to stop administrative destruction of the merit system.

Nor have we been able to abolish the brazen gag order that Republican Postmaster Gen-

eral Summerfield has imposed on postal workers. He has forbidden them to complain about the post office to anyone but their superiors in the post office. Members of Congress and the press have become off limits to these employees. We must now write into the law permission for these employees to complain to their Congressmen without impairing their merit standing.

The Supreme Court's decision limiting the scope of the security program to those areas of Government which can be defined as sensitive would seem to have eliminated the problem created by the unwarranted administrative security-clearance procedures. The administration is now sponsoring a bill which would classify all Government positions as sensitive. The recommendations of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, which fundamentally agree with the decision of the Supreme Court, should be followed in this regard. No American wants subversives in our Government. We can and must provide adequate means for protecting the Government's best interests. But we must do it without needless duplication of effort and without destroying our fundamental principles of fair play and of good government.

VETERANS AND ARMED FORCES

Neither the veterans nor the Armed Forces have been forgotten by the 84th Congress. Aware of our debt, we, the Democratic Party, sponsored and supported measures to better their lot.

The veteran home-loan program has been extended, as have been the disability benefits for the veterans of World Wars I and II. Neither forgetting the youth of our Nation nor those who were their fathers, we are providing educational assistance to children of servicemen who died in World War II and in Korea. We have extended the Missing Persons Act authorizing continued pay for service personnel missing or captured in Korea.

To maintain a strong Armed Force, we have extended the draft law to 1957. To provide greater incentive for career personnel—a necessary essential in our defense program—we have placed all military personnel under our social-security program, and have increased the benefit payments to survivors of servicemen and veterans. We have also provided for medical care for the dependents of members of our Armed Forces. We have raised the pay of our 6-month trainees under the Reserve program as well as the pay of the Armed Forces in order to attract and keep better men in the service.

SOCIAL LEGISLATION—THE UNBALANCED SCALE

Social legislation is not a partisan matter to the Democratic Party. The welfare of the Nation is more important than party politics. We, of the Democratic Party, were happy to note that much of the welfare legislation of the administration was an extension of New and Fair Deal plans. These acts and others of a similar nature were supported wholeheartedly by the Democrats.

Over the administration's protests we succeeded in amending the Social Security Act by lowering the retirement age for women to 62 and permitting the disabled to become eligible for full benefits at the age of 50. Democratically supported and New Deal initiated, and administration sponsored, the benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act, and the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act were increased.

National disaster insurance for the victims of flood and hurricane disasters was established.

We have extended the Federal school milk program to include child care centers, nursery schools, settlement houses, summer camps and other similar nonprofit associations.

I sponsored a Federal Scholarship Act. Worthy students who desire a college education or postgraduate work, would be enabled to apply for these loans to aid them through school. This is no giveaway, since the students will repay these loans when their education has been completed. Such a program has been found feasible in prior years. It should never have been abandoned.

We have also authorized $378 million in Federal aid for school construction, in areas which have become overcrowded by increased governmental activity.

Little need be said of the failure of the school-aid bill. Due to a shameful coalition of a minority of the members of my own party and of a minority of the Republicans, this much-needed bill was defeated.

In matters of national health and medical research we went beyond what the administration requested. The Oveta Hobby attitude of health being a strictly private affair, did not reoccur during this session. Ninety million dollars have been set aside for medical research of crippling and killing diseases, for extended hospital construction, and for training nurses and health specialists. Four million dollars have been set aside for a dental research institute.

The housing bill authorizes a public-housing program of only 35,000 units a year for 2 years. The Democratic majority in the House felt that this was an unrealistic attempt to remedy the housing shortage. Administrative opposition proved too strong and we were compelled to settle for less than is needed. We did succeed in liberalizing the terms of Federal mortgages; for financing home improvements, for financing single-family home purchases, and for financing rental dwellings. We also liberalized, not enough, but somewhat, the Federal mortgage terms for elderly people and for urban renewal projects.

The administration sponsored a civil rights bill which was quite innocuous. It provided for things which the President now has the right to accomplish without any new laws. Once again a self-interested coalition of a few Democrats and a great many Republicans thwarted this measure. That action will no doubt be President Eisenhower's excuse to do nothing about the matter.

We did not enact the health-insurance program of the President, since it would have done nothing except help some insurance companies. It would have done nothing for the individuals who need medical and hospital assistance or insurance to pay therefor.

Throughout this program the unbalanced scale continued to dominate the administration's thinking. No matter who sponsored the legislation, the Democratic Party approach was: If it was for the benefit of the people as a whole, we supported the bill. This cannot be said of the Republican Party. Their narrow interests and petty insights have not yet revealed to them the importance of the broadest approach for the benefit of the greatest number.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS—PERILOUS PATHS

Under our system of government, the President must assume the leadership in the realm of international affairs. He must make the policy in the first instance. His State Department should be his spokesman. Congress may respond by approving appropriations or by senatorial action on proposed treaties.

The path of peace is always difficult. The Democratic Party believes it can only be maintained by an unequivocal but honorable approach to foreign affairs. To find a permanent peace, we must be vigilant and alert, honest with ourselves and with our allies, and firm with our potential enemies.

The ideological conflict between the East and West continues. The Communist countries have changed their outward demands, but they have not changed their aims of world domination. This administration has made no attempt to move forward in this field. It has mumbled and fumbled, it has bluffed and rebuffed, it has bleated and retreated.

The Democratic Party has supported President Eisenhower in his attempts to find a road to peace. We have supported his foreign-aid program authorizing $3.9 billion to be used for military, economic, and technical assistance to our friends and allies during the next year. Although the President asked for more, his aides have admitted that they cannot spend in the next year the funds now appropriated for those purposes.

The removal of United States troops from Japan is imminent and will permit her, as our ally, to regain her true place in the world of nations. The House passed a resolution asking that Japan be admitted to the United Nations.

I have been continually opposed to the Near East policies of President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles. Their blindness, if not stupidity, has helped raise Egypt's Nasser to a position in which he threatens the peace of the world.

Our demand for arms for Israel have been ignored. Instead of firmly insisting upon a cessation of hostility, Dulles has encouraged Arab fighting. We demanded that Dulles and Eisenhower protest against blocking the Suez Canal to Israeli and Greek ships. My question is still unanswered: "What will the United States do when American ships are barred?"

The anti-Semitic boycott by the Arab States has been approved by a delinquent administration. It has excluded American soldiers and American civilian employees of the Jewish faith from American bases in Saudi Arabia.

PROTECTING THE INTEGRITY OF UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP

From the very earliest days of the establishment of our Nation, we have insisted that American citizens, wherever they may be and wherever they may go, must be treated as such regardless of race, color, or religion. We have a long history of having come to the aid of American citizens wherever their rights have been threatened, impaired, or impeded.

This administration has sadly failed the American people and has repeatedly and constantly backed away from that fundamental principle of American freedom.

The protection of the integrity of United States citizenship and of the proper rights of United States citizens to lawful trade and travel and other activities abroad, is a basic principle of United States sovereignty. It is a primary principle of our Nation that there shall be no distinction among United States citizens based upon individual religious affiliations.

Any attempt by foreign nations to create such distinction among our citizens in the granting of personal or commercial access, or any other rights otherwise available to United States citizens, is inconsistent with and contrary to our principles. Any such distinctions directed against United States citizens is incompatible with the relations that should exist among friendly nations.

We should insist that in all negotiations between the United States and any foreign state, that every reasonable effort should be made to maintain these principles. We should carry on no negotiations and engage in no conventions, agreements, or treaties with any foreign nation that does not recognize these principles or violates them.

These principles have been so firmly imbedded in our tradition that up to 1952, no political party found it necessary to restate them in a political platform.

In 1952, however, the Republicans inserted these words in their platform, to wit:

"We shall see to it that no treaty or agreement with other countries deprives our citizens of the rights guaranteed them by the Federal Constitution."

That should have been a warning signal. We had no such treaties or agreements then and have none now. No prior administration, Republican or Democratic, ever permitted the rights of American citizens to be impaired by any foreign country.

This administration has ignominiously permitted the Arab States to disregard, ignore, and even trample upon the rights of American citizens in travel and trade. They prohibit Americans from traveling into, through, or over these nations because of religion. On the same basis they refuse to allow Americans to trade with their own citizens.

This administration has ignominously permitted a foreign nation to violate a treaty obligation and acquiesced in that country, Saudi Arabia, banning American citizens from an American base on the sole ground of religion.

CIVIL DEFENSE

To aid our civilian defense program Congress has increased the appropriation for construction of aircraft control and warning systems.

Testimony adduced before Congressional committees established that our so-called civilian defense is utterly worthless and completely valueless in the event of an atomic bomb attack. Every penny presently being spent by the so-called department of civilian defense is wasted.

Nevertheless, this administration would do nothing to improve this horrible and horrifying situation.

CONCLUSION

The record of the 84th Congress speaks well for our country. It could have been better. I am sure it would have been better if we had a Democratic President.

The levelheaded approach of a Democratic Congress under a Republican President produced meritorious legislation. We did not enact all the legislation that should have been passed. What was accomplished, in the main, is a record that the Democratic Party can be proud of. Even though we worked under an unsympathetic administration, the national interest was our first thought at all times. I am proud to have had the privilege to serve in the responsible 84th Congress.

My speech on August 30, 1957, was as follows:

DOUBLETALK

(Speech of Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, of New York, in the House of Representatives, Friday, August 30, 1957)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, this has been a most unusual legislative year. It started with much promise. The 1956 election had returned the people's hero to the Presidency with an unheard of popular vote.

At the some time, they showed their confidence in the Democratic Party by continuing it in control of both Houses of Congress.

Obviously, the American people agreed that control of the 84th Congress by the Democrats under a Republican President was indeed good for our country.

With the 1st session of the 85th Congress behind us, I believe we can demonstrate that the country would have been better off under a Democratic President. I, for one, am certain we would have had more real leadership and much less doubletalk.

Under our system of government we have a right to look to our President for leadership. Our Constitution requires him to send an annual message to Congress on the state of the Union. Traditionally, our Presidents have interpreted that to mean that they are required to submit a legislative program to the Congress.

Never before in our history have we experienced such a lack of leadership by the President, coupled with so much doubletalk.

Absenteeism is bad enough, of and in itself, in high places. Vacillation and indecision are much, much worse. I will concede that few persons reading the President's message to the Congress can disagree with the fine, high-principled generalities contained therein. But, by the same token, his campaign speeches in 1952 and again in 1956 were in the same vein.

But what are the specifics? What about the implementation of these fine principles?

Some of the President's supporters, even some of the members of his Cabinet, have been brash enough to label his campaign addresses as merely campaign promises. But his messages to the Congress were not campaign speeches.

It is all well and good for our Republican friends to say, "Oh, this is a Democratic Congress, the Democrats are in control. They can pass any legislation they want to."

Such statements, too, are mere doubletalk. The hard, practical facts of political life are that, in a Congress where the majority party does not have an overwhelming majority in both Houses, neither party can pass legislation without the cooperation of at least some members of the other party.

Wise Congressional leadership avoids bringing to the floor of the Congress legislation that the leadership knows will be opposed by enough members of the opposition party to defeat the bills.

In all those spheres of activity where our party platforms are in agreement, the President should have been in a position to deliver enough Republican votes to offset the defections in Democratic ranks, so as to give the people of the country a working majority in the Congress.

Permit me now to document my case with some specifics.

PARTY PLATFORMS AGREE, BUT THE PRESIDENT IGNORES THEM

Both parties agree that the minimum wage laws should have wider application; that distressed labor areas require Government aid; that the Taft-Hartley law requires amendment; that all Federal employees and, more particularly, the postal employees, are entitled to increased compensation. In most of these instances the President talked gently and fairly but in generalities. As to the Federal employees and postal employees he spoke specifically. He said they were underpaid. He said they were entitled to increased wages.

In none of these instances, except as to the increase of salaries for Government employees, were we able to enact any legislation, because the President and his appointed officers in the executive departments not only refused to help but actually opposed Congressional action.

As to the increases of salaries for Government employees, the President signed the bill which gave those in the highest brackets, big increases and more pay.

As to the little fellows, the civil-service employees, the career employees, the post office workers, he sent word to us that if we dared to legislate he would veto the bill. Unfortunately, we couldn't get the bills to him in time to override a veto. As of today—the last day of this session—it seems certain that the President will veto these bills which do only what he said was fair and just; that is, to give to the little fellow, the civil-service worker and the post-office employee, a cost-of-living increase.

BIG BUSINESS GETS BIGGER AND SMALL BUSINESS GOES TO THE WALL

Other spheres of activity where we got the same kind of doubletalk involved monopolies, trusts, and big business. The mergers continue. Big business gets bigger. Their profits grow. The small-business man goes into bankruptcy. The big-business man gets more and bigger tax cuts by way of fast writeoffs and obsolescence and depletion allowances and Government giveaways, and the little fellow gets the tax bills.

The President is still advocating a natural gas bill. One day he advocated an amendment to that bill, to protect the consumer, and the next day he said he would take the bill without the amendment.

He opposes the development of public power and tries to give the natural resources of the country to the big utilities. By his appointment to various Government agencies and commissions, he does all within his power to destroy TVA, rural electrification, and the other important Government agencies.

HUMAN RIGHTS ARE FORGOTTEN

He says he is for statehood for Alaska and Hawaii but will not lift a finger to bring that about. He says he is for liberalization of our immigration laws and, instead of trying to liberalize them, he condones the action of his State Department and his Attorney General in keeping out immigrants clearly entitled to entry into this country under existing law.

The civil-rights muddle in the Congress was as much his doing as that of anyone else. He did not know from press conference to press conference what was in the bill labeled "the Eisenhower bill." It is surprising that we got a bill at all under the circumstances. Time will demonstrate, in my opinion, that the bill will accomplish very little except to give him and some of his supporters an excuse for new campaign doubletalk. And all the time, the demagogs will continue to rabble-rouse.

He talked big about Federal aid to education. When it came to a showdown in the House, the bill was lost on a very close vote. It could have been won if the President had made three telephone calls. He could have telephoned one of his erstwhile campaign supporters who left the Democratic Party to urge the people to reelect Mr. Eisenhower and who was absent on the day this important bill was defeated. The other 2 calls could surely have changed 2 opposition votes into 2 votes for the bill. These were not just two votes of Republican Members of the House. These two men are the President's leaders of his party in the House. The three Members of the House referred to, Mr. Speaker, go unnamed as a matter of traditional Congressional courtesy. The record vote discloses who they are.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS CONTINUE TO BE BUNGLED AFFAIRS

The muddle in foreign affairs is the direct responsibility of the President and his Secretary of State. Those matters of maladministration have no direct bearing upon the legislative function of the Congress. I therefore make no further mention of them here, particularly since that subject alone would require much more time than I can devote today, and my remarks pertain merely to the legislative program.

Those who are interested may read my statements before the House Foreign Affairs Committee and on the floor of the House on this vital subject.

Suffice it to say, I foretold precisely what to expect with reference to the Middle East, including the recent events in Egypt and Syria. Although I did not pretend to set forth any timetable, the sequence of events was exactly as I predicted.

The so-called Eisenhower doctrine is preventing the spread of communism and sovietism exactly nowhere.

THE HIGH COST OF EVERYTHING

The increase of interest rates on Government and private debt is the direct responsibility of the President and his Secretary of the Treasury. They have increased the cost of living of every man, woman, and child in the country by increasing the expense of operation of every business enterprise in the country.

The increase in cost of Government is staggering. At the same time, while tell-

ing us that the people should save more money and spend less, the President and his Secretary of the Treasury keep the interest rates on Government savings bonds under other interest rates, destroying the incentive of our citizens to save.

He insists that mortgage interest rates be raised and because Congress refuses to increase the interest rates on veterans' mortgages, he threatened to veto the extension of the GI mortgage bill.

I, and many of our colleagues, have been urging that the veterans are entitled to direct loans from the Government. This would not be using Government money but would be using their own life-insurance funds.

Banks, trust companies, life insurance companies, pension funds, all invest their money in real estate mortgages. But some shortsighted people urge that the veterans' life insurance funds should be invested only in low-interest Government bonds instead of in 4-percent veterans' mortgages.

We could not prevail upon our colleagues to go that far. The bill we sent to the President, which he now threatens to veto, merely extends existing law, permitting veterans to get mortgages in those areas of the country where FHA is not operating and for reasons mainly of convenience, cannot or will not operate.

The President glibly talks about controlling inflation and urges voluntary restraint by labor and business to keep costs down.

Then he ridicules labor's promise to forego wage increases if big business will lower prices.

At the same time, he permits price increases in all Government restaurants serving the very employees whose wages he will not increase. He allows their rents and those of all others in FHA houses to be increased, thus setting the example for increased rents by all landlords.

That is not doubletalk; it is doubledealing.

SOME HOPE FOR SMALL BUSINESS

The House passed a Small Business Administration Act to make that agency permanent and to make it more effective in serving the small-business community of our Nation. Despite the fact that the President has not talked out in favor of this bill, we hope that in the next session of Congress, the Senate will pass the House version of that bill.

By that time, too, I hope we will have a good bill ready to give the small-business men some sorely needed tax relief.

FUNNY FIGURES MAKE PHONY BUDGETS

The worst example of doubletalk on the part of the administration, however, came with reference to the budget and the request for appropriations for defense, for foreign aid, and for operation of the Government.

In this field, too, no one knew where the President or his appointees stood from one day to the next. All sorts of ridiculous claims were submitted to the Congress for exaggerated sums. Probing by alert members of the Appropriations Committees showed how farcical some of these claims were.

Despite the disclosure of tremendous waste of money and property during the last 5 years, heads of the departments, aided and abetted by the President, came forth again urging more money than they needed and more money than they could spend.

After the money was appropriated and the bills approved into law by the President, he then directed the heads of various departments not to spend the sums appropriated.

I will refer to only two of the many instances of this heinous maladministration.

The United States Public Health Service has indicated its need for funds to prevent a yellow fever epidemic threatening the United States. The money was appropriated. The bill was signed. The Budget Bureau, under the direction of the President, has directed the Department not to expend those moneys, the sole purpose of which was to control the disease.

This is the Government that is conservative where property is concerned and liberal where human values are concerned. That is not my language. That is the modern republicanism of President Eisenhower.

One more instance of the same kind. After the appropriation for the Defense Department had been approved into law by signature of the President, he then directed that the money not be spent. Mind you, this is the very appropriation request which, when cut by the Congress, was declared by the President to be insufficient for our national security. Now he says to his department heads that they may not spend as much money as was appropriated.

Practically all of the Members of Congress from metropolitan New York attended a conference with Navy Department officials, urging them not to release skilled career employees. It was admitted that if these men were discharged their skills and services would probably be forever lost to the Government. It was further conceded that the full sum necessary to keep these men employed for the next year had been appropriated and that the men were being dismissed solely in order to come within the President's directive to spend less money than had been appropriated. The question of national defense and security was subordinated to the demand to save a few paltry dollars.

WASTE AND CORRUPTION

Congressional committees continue to uncover waste and corruption in every department of Government. At another time, I will discourse at length upon this subject, which continues to be ignored by our President, except on those occasions when he awards a medal or a certificate of merit to the head of the department whose misconduct is exposed.

All of these facts are borne out by the record.

Hon. William S. Knowland, of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement in tribute to Senator KNOWLAND on his departure from the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR YOUNG

I could not let this opportunity pass to pay a deserved tribute to a departing Member of the Senate, Senator WILLIAM S. KNOWLAND. BILL KNOWLAND and I came to the Senate at approximately the same time. During these nearly 14 years, I have been closely associated with him as a member of the Appropriations Committee, the Senate Republican Policy Committee, and Republican conference. BILL KNOWLAND has all the qualities that go to make the ideal legislator. He has great intelligence, integrity, and is a tremendously hard worker. Oftentimes I have seen him cast votes in the Seante that could well hurt him badly in some future election in his own State. He voted as he did because he thought it was the right thing to do and that it was in the best interest of his own State, as well as the Nation.

BILL KNOWLAND has constantly grown in stature as the years have gone by. He is one of the truly great men of the Senate in the past quarter of a century. Few men have ever attained the respect and admiration of the Members of the Senate as has BILL.

As a comparatively young man, as far as Senators go, he was selected as Republican leader. In that capacity he has performed admirable services, not only to his party but to the Senate of the United States and the Nation as a whole. We can ill afford to lose men of BILL KNOWLAND'S caliber. I wish him well in all of his endeavors, no matter what they may be.

Legislative Program of the Department of Labor, 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement showing the action taken by the 85th Congress on the 1958 legislative program of the Department of Labor, as recommended by the President in various communications to the Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. Proposal: Wage orders under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Congressional action: The part of the Department's proposal providing for biennial, rather than annual, review of industry wage orders under the FLSA was passed—Public Law 85-750. The part of the proposal to provide for review of these orders by the Secretary of Labor was not enacted.

2. Proposal: Pension and welfare plans.

Congressional action: Teller bill, providing for reporting by these plans, was passed—Public Law 85-836. It does not carry out the Department's proposals respecting adequate administrative and enforcement provisions.

3. Proposal: Longshore safety.

Congressional action: S. 3486, substantially the same as the Department's proposal, was passed—Public Law 85-742.

4. Proposal: Unemployment insurance for ex-servicemen.

Congressional action: Department's bill was passed—Public Law 85-848.

5. Proposal: Temporary additional unemployment compensation.

Congressional action: Temporary additional unemployment compensation under the Social Security Act was passed—Public Law 85-441. However, the proposal to include railroad workers in the temporary program was not enacted.

6. Proposal: Extension of Mexican farm labor program.

Congressional action: Passed. Public Law 85-779.

7. Proposal: Increase in ceiling for International Labor Organization contributions.

Congressional action: Ceiling was increased by a provision of the Mutual Security Act, Public Law 85-477.

8. Proposal: Depressed areas.

Congressional action: A bill, differing somewhat from the administration's proposal, was passed. This bill (S. 3683) was not signed (was pocket vetoed) by the President.

9. Proposal: Labor reform and Taft-Hartley amendments.

Congressional action: Not passed. S. 3097, S. 3098, S. 3099.

10. Proposal: Disclosure of union reports filed under sections 9 (f) and (g) of Taft-Hartley.

Congressional action: Not passed. Senate Joint Resolution 94, House Joint Resolution 335.

11. Proposal: Extension of coverage under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Congressional action: Not passed. H. R. 8413.

12. Proposal: Eight-hour laws revision.

Congressional action: Not passed. S. 814, H. R. 6588.

13. Proposal: Extension of unemployment insurance coverage.

Congressional action: Not passed. S. 2076, H. R. 6856.

14. Proposal: Extension of unemployment insurance system to Puerto Rico.

Congressional action: Not passed. H. R. 634.

15. Proposal: Safety of Federal employees (charge back).

Congressional action: Not passed. S. 816, H. R. 5928.

16. Proposal: Grant-in-aid occupational safety.

Congressional action: Not passed. S. 816, H. R. 5928.

17. Proposal: Equal pay for equal work.

Congressional action: Not passed. S. 817, H. R. 6089.

18. Proposal: Judicial review under Federal Employees' Compensation Act.

Congressional action: Not passed. S. 1653, H. R. 6308.

19. Proposal: Charge back of administrative costs under Longshore Act.

Congressional action: Not passed. S. 818, H. R. 5929.

20. Proposal: Veterans' reemployment rights.

Congressional action: Not passed. H. R. 8522.

21. Proposal: Revision of District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act.

Congressional action: Not passed. S. 1214, H. R. 6139.

22. Proposal: Protection of Department of Labor enforcement employees.

Congressional action: Not passed. S. 887, H. R. 4757.

A Report to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the events of the past 2 years opened like Pandora's box and smacked the whole world in the face.

A new era was born. Manmade moons and intercontinental missiles drew our eyes skyward and polar submarines sent our minds probing the deep.

Congress burst its working seams to grasp the load thrust upon its shoulders. This 85th Congress faced the onslaught at first with the normal amount of prodding and fretting, then swung in with the big stick when it really got into action.

A Government agency was born to handle our space business. A new State made the 49th. Congress' assembly line of legislation slowed down recession, boosted foreign policy, and strengthened defense.

The box score of major legislation for the 85th Congress is one in which America can be proud. Foremost is our defense reorganization program. Our defense must be strong to assure a peaceful existence. We have strengthened and improved our foreign policy.

Specific authority has been provided for more extensive research and for scientific construction of missile bases, detection and warning systems, nuclear-powered guided missiles, warships, and other necessary equipment.

Congress renewed the collective-security arrangements, extended our foreign-trade policy, and turned its attention to improvements of our educational system, taking cognizance of the fact that education plays an increasingly important role in determining our future position in the world.

Legislation has been enacted to extend aid to hospitals, increased benefits to the social-security annuitants, civil-service retired employees, and increased old-age benefits.

Moneys have been granted for road-building which has been sorely neglected. Mortgage money has been made more readily available and funds have been provided for surveys in distressed areas.

Specifically speaking of the Second Congressional District which I have had the honor to represent in the United States Congress for the past 10 years, Mr. Speaker, I point to the following accomplishments:

At Green Bank, Pocahontas County, W. Va., there is now under construction a National Radio Astronomy Observatory of worldwide interest. Scientific research that will be done at this observatory will be a part of our race for the conquest of outer space, and will strengthen the security of our Nation.

Near Sugar Grove in Pendleton County, the United States Navy is now erecting a giant radio research observatory which will provide navigation aid to our ships, as well as military research on problems of communication, navigation, and space physics.

In keeping up with the air age I am happy to report, my colleagues, that the Second District of West Virginia is making every effort to take advantage of its facilities in furthering jet age developments in air transportation and defense.

The Martinsburg Airport, only a few air miles from Washington, has received Federal assistance in its Air National Guard program. Runways have been lengthened and operational and training facilities have been built.

The Elkins Airport financial problem has been settled. This assures continued daily commercial service in all directions and provides emergency landing space for military planes. The Elkins Airport has already proved its worth many times in saving human lives and military aircraft.

Hardy County, in the eastern panhandle of our State, received a short-range navigation system called VORTAC, which is a navigation aid airway system in our vast radar air traffic control plan which is of such vital importance today.

In Webster County a very high frequency omnirange has been constructed to serve as an aid to airplanes and is one of many hundred navigation aids being built throughout our country.

Mr. Speaker, Federal aid is being channeled to many of our schools, colleges, and the West Virginia University. I feel it is not necessary to stress the need for aid for our educational system.

Hospitals in Hampshire, Grant, Monongalia, Barbour, Preston, Pocahontas, and Webster Counties are being assisted through Federal funds. Aid has been received for construction work, additional beds, and medical research.

Federal assistance has also been given to many cities and towns in the Second District of West Virginia for new waterworks, sewage plants, water pollution, and other health aids.

At long last the construction of a Federal building has been approved and money appropriated for Martinsburg, my colleagues. This will provide court and post office quarters.

The Harpers Ferry National Monument has become a reality. This has already become a mecca for tourists and will continue for many years to come.

It has been my pleasure to have assisted in production contracts for the Allegany Ballistics Laboratory, located in Mineral County, W. Va., and also for contracts for much needed road construction work. This Navy-owned laboratory is taking an essential part in our guided-missile program.

Much modernization of our civil-works program is underway in the second district. Substantial progress is being made on navigation facilities on the Monongahela River. Construction of Hildebrand lock and dam is under way and the improvements and construction work of the Opekiska lock and dam will be of great benefit to the entire length of the Monongahela River.

The water resources development program in West Virginia also includes a system of reservoirs and local flood-protection projects in the Ohio River and its tributaries. Local flood-control projects have been completed in Elkins and other points in West Virginia. Flood-control work in the District is progressing which will benefit areas in Petersburg, Moorefield, Ridgeley, Keyser, and Pocahontas Counties. Funds have been made available for dams and flood-control protection of the Potomac River and its tributaries.

Bayard, W. Va., has received an allocation for a flood-control project. Study is under way for a flood-control project in the Greenbrier River which would be a protection for Marlinton.

Recently, the Marlin Dam watershed project in Pocahontas County was approved. This will provide flood protection to the city of Marlinton.

The Morgantown Ordnance Works at Morgantown, W. Va., should not be allowed to close under any circumstances. Through my efforts it was reactivated after the war and it shall be my purpose to do everything possible to keep this large plant in operation. Many other projects have been completed and many others are in the offing.

It is true that all our needs were not met. Living costs are still high; taxes are excessive and our international problems are many. There were a number

of important bills that failed of enactment. Included among these are the railroad retirement; labor and housing bills; bills to revise the immigration laws and to curb corrupt practices in Federal elections.

Many feel that Congress did not go far enough in meeting the challenge of Russia's superiority in the space age. But it is my hope that the newly created National Aeronautics and Space Agency will step up our domestic atomic program for defense and missile research and development. If this does not prove adequate to safeguard our interests of national security, then further action should be taken in the coming Congress.

Although small business was given liberalized loan programs and some tax relief, I feel it must be given increased consideration in the next Congress. I have actively worked for the removal of the unfair excise tax which I believe would be a boost to small business. It is my belief, however, that further steps must be taken to bolster the confidence of the small-business man. He is vital in the preservation of competition in our economy and to our present and future prosperity.

For many years I have sponsored measures for a general cut in taxes for individuals. I shall continue to fight for this much-needed tax relief.

Generally speaking, the 85th Congress was responsive to the major problems of the day and made a record that is a source of pride to us who had the honor to serve in it.

But it is not all up to Government. You, and every man, woman, and child in this great Nation can strengthen this country by living democracy. We all must work more, teach more, learn more, and pray more for knowledge, understanding, and peace. We can be better citizens, better neighbors, and better travelers. Each American can tell and show the world that democracy is the way of life.

The time has come when Democrats and Republicans must close ranks and stand shoulder to shoulder as a united people in this desperate struggle for survival. This, I truly believe: The best way to stamp out communism and all other destructive "isms" is to prove democracy is so superior, so desirable, and so right, that no one would wish to be without it.

So long as we have leaders in our Government who believe in the inalienable rights of the human being and the majesty and glory of Almighty God, this country shall go forward. We must not stand still—we must progress and keep faith.

Hon. Ed Martin, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I note with a sense of deep regret that one of the great generals, one of the great governors, one of the great Senators, one of the great public officials is now retiring from public life. I refer to the distinguished Senator ED MARTIN, of Pennsylvania.

What a beautiful record of public service he has to leave for the future generations of this great Nation. Senator, to you and your gracious wife certainly go the best wishes, I am sure, of every Member of this legislative body, as well as everyone who knows you. Good luck to you and yours always.

National Education for Defense—Open the Door to Knowledge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, in the passage of the Defense Education Act of 1958 the Congress of the United States has recognized a growing need for assistance to American education, and has said in effect "no longer will the qualified American student have to be denied admission to our colleges and universities simply because he does not have the money necessary for further education." I say "no longer" because I believe in the American people—the American student, and the dreams that all of us have for a better education for our children.

This program is designed to aid Americans in securing an education, with particular emphasis on sciences and languages. It is an experiment in Federal aid to education in assisting both State and private schools in expanding their abilities to meet the evergrowing needs we face in today's world.

The vast majority of educators, student bodies and the general public have welcomed this act as a godsend, but there are those few who view with alarm this new democratic program as another effort to encroach on the States right to provide and govern their educational institutions.

I would like to state very clearly what my position is on this matter. I worked for the bill; I voted for passage of the bill. I think the American people need the benefits contained in it, and I know the United States as a nation needs the brainpower that will come from the benefits provided in it. In no way will the program interfere with the States' administration of their educational institutions. The purchase of Alaska in 1867 from royalist Russia was severely criticized and became known as Seward's folly. At that time we invested $7 million in America's future and we are investing $887 million in the form of loans and grants in America's future now. I personally believe that the dividends the United States received from its Alaskan investment will be more than equaled in its investment in American education.

On July 4, 1958, we celebrated our 182d year as an independent nation. In these years we have grown from 13 colonies rebelling against the most powerful nation on earth to the leading nation in the Free World. Surely it can be said—"God has blessed this land and all who live in it."

All of us know that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance, and a very large part of this vigilance is in our technical ability to see, hear, and think clearly in the ever-advancing world of science, foreign language, and human understanding.

To help meet this need we now have the National Defense Education Act of 1958, the purpose of which is to assist in the improvement and strengthening of our educational system at all levels and to encourage able students to continue their education beyond high school. It is designed to accomplish these objectives by establishing loan programs for students at institutions of higher education; providing grants to States for strengthening science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction; assisting in the expansion of graduate education, improvement of guidance, counseling, and testing programs; providing for research and experimentation in the use of television, radio, and motion pictures—for educational purposes; improvement of statistical services of State educational agencies.

Some of the major benefits available between now and June 30, 1959, are: (a) $1,700,000 for loans to needy students for tuition and materials; (b) $2,400,000 for equipment and materials to improve teaching facilities; (c) $223,000 for improved educational supervision and administration; (d) $677,000 for improvement in student guidance and counseling centers.

I have been informed by the Secretary for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that they are setting up the machinery necessary to administer this program and that applications for assistance under this act will be accepted immediately.

Further information concerning the application and administration of this program can be secured by writing directly to Dr. Lloyd E. Blauch, Assistant Commissioner for Higher Education, United States Office of Education, Washington 25, D. C.

The Derby and International Friendship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. PAT JENNINGS
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, we have devoted a good deal of time in this session of Congress to legislation and governmental programs dealing with international affairs. Today we are considering the mutual security appropriations bill that will allow billions of

American dollars to be spent in the helping of our neighbors and in promoting our relations with nations throughout the world.

Last Sunday an event took place in Akron, Ohio, that to me is a good example of how to build international goodwill. That event was the 21st Annual All-American Soapbox Derby.

Youngsters from throughout the United States, champions of their respective communities and States, gathered to compete for the derby championship. In addition, there were several representatives from other nations of the world—Philippines, Canada, Venezuela, and Germany.

Each of these derby champs from other nations had an opportunity to meet his counterpart in the United States. Each has learned of the United States and of our way of life, and I am sure that each has returned home with a better understanding of our interest in the world and of our desire to promote improved relations with all nations. Our own youngsters, in turn, learned of the other nations represented in the derby.

The derby has contributed much to our international program, and I would like to commend the sponsors and all of those having a hand in planning and carrying out this event.

Robert Dickinson, the champion from Venezuela, is a typical example of the youngsters from other nations. He won the crown in Venezuela and represented this nation with courage and determination. He did not emerge as a winner in the derby, but he undoubtedly contributed much to the mutual friendship between the United States and Venezuela by participating in the Soap Box Derby last weekend.

Developing a bond of friendship between the young people of the world nations is, to me, an excellent method of creating international goodwill. I hope that other nations will send their champions to the derby next year.

The Soap Box Derby not only calls for the best in courage, determination, and sportsmanship on the part of the participants; it calls upon all of us to be good neighbors to those visitors from other lands.

Israel, Our Ally in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, recent developments in the Middle East prompt me to remind my colleagues and the American people that we have a spunky, fighting, and highly intelligent ally sitting right in the middle of the political turmoil which holds the world's attention. I refer to the State of Israel.

Today the United States and the Free World need Israel as much as Israel has needed the help and cooperation of the West in the decade since her formation as a nation.

The Jewish people have contributed much to the Western World in the centuries since they began to spread across the face of the earth from their original birthplace in the Near East. In recent years some have returned to the land of their fathers and created a thriving democracy in the State of Israel. The Western World, particularly the United States, has been privileged to repay in some measure a long-past-due debt to this great people by giving them technological and financial help.

Now, as trouble piles up in the Near and Middle East, it seems that the United States and the free nations of the world once again find themselves looking to the State of Israel as a tiny democratic bulwark against Nasser riding the mad horse of Arab nationalism.

This brilliant and industrious race has played a vital role in the history of the United States—the place where they have had more real freedom than anywhere else in the world—and where today half the earth's Jewish population lives, that is, 5,250,000 people.

The Jews are as much a part of the American tradition as the Pilgrims, Capt. John Smith, and George Washington at Valley Forge.

The first 23 arrived in 1654 in New Amsterdam, now New York. The Statue of Liberty has opened her arms to them since that time, as she has to all the homeless and the persecuted—offering security, freedom, opportunity.

Their role in the annals of our country has been a picturesque and brilliant one. The Yankee peddler moving into the frontier with his pots and pans and goose grease and moccasins more often than not was a Jewish merchant. He carried civilization and a bargain on his cart. The frontier awaited his visits when he brought his goods on wheels and went eagerly to his shop when his sons and grandsons became the merchants in the towns and cities across the country.

And steadily thereafter Jews came to America to enrich her civilization.

The pogroms of czarist Russia were an ill wind that blew America the best good in this respect. Beginning in 1880 and for 40 years following, Russian Jews streamed into New York. And even today with their own country of Israel to which they might go, more than 5,000 Jews come to the United States every year from all over the world.

They have brought to us brilliance in law, medicine, engineering, architecture, merchandising. They have brought extraordinary talent in the creative arts and communications—and solid virtues such as temperance, industry, family solidarity, and a zeal for education.

In the United States names like Brandeis, Hyman Rickover, Louis Marshall, Benjamin Cardoza, Felix Frankfurter, Jonas Salk, Bela Schick, Edward Teller, J. Robert Oppenheimer, Isidore Rabi and Herbert H. Lehman and Senator Javits of New York are shining names in contemporary life.

And what specifically does the Israel of today mean to the American Jew?

For the most part, it means an even greater integration in American life and American tradition.

The United States has always been a melting pot of the older nations of the world and nearly every American has had a somewhere else to talk about, a somewhere else that belonged to him or to his grandfather or to his great grandfather. Because persecution in Europe and other parts of the world had prevented his owning land and kept him a homeless insecure group, the Jew had no somewhere else, even though his heart might have deeply loved the Ukraine or Berlin, or Warsaw. But these places rejected him as an alien.

The re-formation of the State of Israel gave to the American Jew the somewhere else of every other American. For the most part he had no more desire to resettle in Israel or to reestablish himself there than the Irish American had to go back to Ireland to stay, the Catholic American to the Vatican state, or the Polish American to Poland. For the most part the American Jew is a checkbook Zionist * * * he gives monetary assistance, or he goes to visit Israel or hears with delight and pride the reports or the nation's success.

With Israel, the Jews have achieved the somewhere else of most Americans: the place from which their ancestors came—the county Cork, the Heidelberg, the Marseilles, the Naples, the Copenhagen—and that somewhere else has been an increasing means of integrating them into American life.

Religious freedom and separation of church and state are part of the essential framework of American democracy. The ideal of religious liberty which our forefathers brought to the United States, and which has been spelled out in the first amendment to our Constitution, has remained the beacon in guiding the formulation of all legislation in the Congress.

The American Jew knows this. He will never have to take refuge in Israel to save his neck or his property as has unfortunately happened in parts of Western and Eastern Europe. He is more a part of America and her tradition and history and civilization than he ever could be of the newly formed State of Israel. And America and Israel have a strong bond in common. They have both from their beginnings granted equality under the law to the Jew, permitted the Jew full expression of his abilities, and as a result have benefited more from his brilliance and genius than any other nation.

And he, more than anyone else in these United States, will keep us alert to any threat of totalitarianism; for more than any other group the Jewish people have known in our generation that the most vicious of despots can exist even in civilized, highly developed industrial communities, as evidenced in Nazi Germany under the rulership of Hitler.

In this year of the 10th anniversary of the birth of Israel, as the world of their forbears seethes and boils with turmoil stirred up by today's dictators, I salute my fellow Americans of Jewish

faith or extraction. Unquestionably a large share of our hopes for the Free World resides in our valiant ally, the State of Israel.

Report to the People of the 12th Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS E. DORN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is my annual custom to make a report to the people of the 12th Congressional District of New York, whom I have the honor to represent.

Respectfully submitted is a report of the session of Congress just passed and my own activities as a Member of Congress.

At the beginning of the session, as has been done each year, I sent a questionnaire to all the registered voters of the District, regardless of party affiliations.

There are two main problems in getting out such a questionnaire. One is the impossibility of framing a question on an involved issue in such a form that a "yes" or "no" answer can reflect accurately or adequately an individual's views on the matter. Many of those who answered complained of this inadequacy, and I agree that a more pliable method of answering would be desirable, but I have found it would make the questionnaire and its analysis too detailed to be feasible. While "yes" and "no" answers admittedly cannot be complete, they are still very helpful. At least the general trends in thinking are clearly revealed.

The other problem is how to get the widest sampling of voter opinion. A telephone directory list in an urban district would be an impossibility, since that medium does not designate the Congressional District of a subscriber. Therefore, I must use the medium available, which is the list of registered voters. This I find desirable from every point of view, since it gives me a sampling of all shades of political thinking, even though I do not ask that the party affiliation be designated, nor even that their names be affixed if they do not so desire.

This year's questionnaire, the results and percentages, together with the actions of Congress concerning the issues, are:

The questionnaire asked—

Do you favor—

First. A crash defense program to restore our leadership in atomic and missile warfare? Yes, 71 percent; no, 22 percent; no opinion, 7 percent.

Congressional action: Appropriations for missile development and procurement almost doubled; increased from $2,800,000,000 to $4,800,000,000.

Second. A nationwide Federal bomb-shelter program? Yes, 48 percent; no, 44 percent; no opinion, 8 percent.

Congressional action: Hearings held but no bills reported by committees.

Third. Military forces to be maintained as now? Yes, 65 percent; no, 23 percent; no opinion, 11 percent. If "no"—smaller, 40 percent; if "yes"—larger, 59 percent; if none, 1 percent.

Congressional action: Authorized and appropriated $34,656,000,000, an increase of approximately $508 million. Also passed a resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the National Guard be kept at the strength of 400,000.

Fourth. Furnishing atomic missile weapons to NATO allies? Yes, 60 percent; no, 30 percent; no opinion, 10 percent.

Congressional action: Authorization approved by Congress and signed into law by President.

Fifth. Continuation of our present foreign policy? Yes, 47 percent; no, 37 percent; no opinion, 16 percent.

Congressional action: Extended for 4 years authority of the President to enter into reciprocal trade agreements.

Continuing foreign military aid? Yes, 63 percent; no, 26 percent; no opinion, 11 percent.

Continuing foreign economic aid? Yes, 61 percent; no, 29 percent; no opinion, 10 percent.

Continuing aid to India? Yes, 45 percent; no, 43 percent; no opinion, 12 percent.

Continuing aid to Poland? Yes, 36 percent; no, 55 percent; no opinion, 9 percent.

Continuing aid to Yugoslavia? Yes, 26 percent; no, 63 percent; no opinion, 11 percent.

Congressional action: Authorized and appropriated $3.03 billion mutual-security program of $2.4 billion for military assistance and defense support and balance for economic aid, technical assistance, and special projects. This was $1,093,000,000 under amount requested.

I should like also to mention the fact that I fought against and spoke against the continuance of aid to Poland and to Yugoslavia.

Sixth. Reduction of Federal debt before reducing taxes? Yes, 60 percent; no, 32 percent; no opinion, 8 percent.

Congressional action: Federal debt limit raised; debt increased.

Seventh. Reduction of Federal income tax in the event of recession? Yes, 64 percent; no, 27 percent; no opinion, 9 percent.

Congressional action: None taken.

Eighth. Federal legislation to ease the supply of housing credit, including greater support of the mortgage market? Yes, 71 percent; no, 19 percent; no opinion, 10 percent.

Congressional action: Authorized $1.9-billion housing program; increased FNMA borrowing authority for purchase of mortgages; lowered downpayments on FHA-insured homes; provided $350 million for urban redevelopment and slum clearance for 1 year.

Ninth. More liberal credit and lower interest rates for small business? Yes, 84 percent; no, 12 percent; no opinion, 4 percent.

Congressional action: Created Small Business Investment Administration to provide equity capital and long-term loans to small-business enterprises; gave permanent status to Small Business Administration, increased its lending authority, and reduced interest rates.

Tenth. Further reduction in age at which persons shall be eligible for social security? Yes, 61 percent; no, 36 percent; no opinion, 3 percent.

Congressional action: Provided increase in social-security payments, but did not act on reduction of age limits.

Eleventh. Direct Federal grants to States for education? Yes, 60 percent; no, 35 percent; no opinion, 5 percent.

Congressional action: Authorized a 4-year, $900-million program of student loans, fellowships, and other aid to improve teaching of mathematics, science, and languages.

Twelfth. Raising minimum wage to $1.25 per hour? Yes, 65 percent; no, 29 percent; no opinion, 6 percent.

Congressional action: Hearings held last session, but nothing further done this session.

Thirteenth. Extending Federal minimum wage laws to cover most retail and service businesses? Yes, 76 percent; no, 17 percent; no opinion, 7 percent.

Congressional action: No action this session.

Fourteenth. Wage and price controls to halt inflation? Yes, 64 percent; no, 31 percent; no opinion, 5 percent.

Congressional action: None.

Fifteenth. Allowing experimental pay TV? Yes, 29 percent; no, 64 percent; no opinion, 7 percent.

Congressional action: Hearings held on general subject, but no specific legislation.

Sixteenth. Requiring registration of pension and welfare funds of labor unions and disclosure of financial transactions involving them? Yes, 93 percent; no, 4 percent; no opinion, 3 percent.

Congressional action: Passed legislation requiring registration, and reports by all employee welfare and pension funds of their financial status.

Seventeenth. The enactment of a strong civil rights program to enforce voting rights of citizens? Yes, 80 percent; no, 13 percent; no opinion, 7 percent.

Congressional action: Hearings held, but no specific legislation.

Eighteenth. Putting the Post Office on a pay-as-you-go basis, increasing postage rates, including a boost in the first-class mail from 3 to 4 cents? Yes, 71 percent; no, 21 percent; no opinion, 5 percent.

Congressional action: First class mail rates raised from 3 to 4 cents; airmail rates raised from 6 to 7 cents.

Ninteenth. Reduction in nondefense spending even if existing functions are curtailed? Yes, 59 percent; no, 32 percent; no opinion, 9 percent.

Congressional action: House defeated redevelopment aid bill.

Twentieth. Enactment of Presidential disability legislation? Yes, 83 percent; no, 5 percent; no opinion, 12 percent.

Congressional action: No action this session.

In addition to the specific measures mentioned in the questionnaire, the Congress passed legislation authorizing

the reorganization of the Defense Department; authorized a $100 million program of new construction and conversion of naval vessels for fiscal 1959; authorized the construction of new space projects center. It also passed and the President enacted pay raises for postal and classified employees of the Federal Government. Passed, too, was the $5.5 billion highway bill, and legislation requiring the price-labeling of new automobiles.

I personally introduced a bill to provide that a restudy be made of the feasibility of a deepwater route from the Port of New York to the new St. Lawrence Seaway. While this was not enacted as a separate bill, it was included in the authorization bill for civil functions, and the study will be made. I believe favorable legislation will result, and that ultimately it will prove of great worth to port facilities of Brooklyn and bring millions of dollars worth of business to New York City.

During the debate of Defense appropriations, I argued in defense of the vital role played by the Navy and the necessity for a balanced defense program. As a result of this, Adm. Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations wrote: "I have read with the greatest interest the splendid statement you made during the House debate on defense appropriations, which dealt with the Navy's vital contribution to the flexibility of our Armed Forces. Your fine presentation of the role of the carrier striking forces was most gratifying. I want to express the Navy's appreciation for your continued strong support of balanced defense forces."

My interest in the Navy and its role in the national defense stems not only from my naval service, but also from my intense concern with the welfare of the United States Naval Shipyard here in Brooklyn, and all of its employees. I am constantly conferring with the Secretary and Undersecretaries of the Navy in an effort to obtain work for the shipyard so that its level of employment will remain constant. I am, I believe, justly proud of my achievements in this line.

All of Brooklyn is pleased that a Brooklyn boy, 2d Lt. George Walker, was graduated from the United States Military Academy in June 1958 as first in the entire graduating class, and the recipient of many awards. I am glad to report that I had the honor of appointing him. In this connection, I have always tried to appoint outstanding candidates for admission to the various service academies, and I am glad to report that another of my nominees, Mr. Richard C. Gallagher, stood first in the competitive examination among 450 contestants for entrance to the United States Air Force Academy from the State of New York. Another young man, Mr. Richard F. Davey, was among the top 10 of this 450. I have always extended to all the boys residing in my Congressional District the opportunity to compete for the nominations to appointments to West Point, Annapolis, the Air Force Academy, and Kings Point.

During the past year, I was appointed to represent the United States Congress at the inauguration of the President of Costa Rica. When there, I addressed the Costa Rican Assembly, their unicameral legislative body, in their native Spanish. This was highly approved by the Costa Ricans and did much to cement our friendship at a time when such action was badly needed.

In the preceding paragraphs I have tried to show you, the people of the 12th Congressional District of New York how I have personally tried to serve you. You are the people who elected me to represent you in the Congress of the United States. If there is any way in which I can be of service to you in my Congressional capacity, please do not hesitate to call upon me. Both my Washington and Brooklyn offices remain open. I have a competent staff, and my services and theirs are yours. I want you to know that even when the Congress is not in session, I am on the job.

The 85th Congress—Final Report by Hon. Carl Albert, of Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, once again we have come to the close of a successful Congress, and once again it has been a Democratic-controlled Congress. The 85th Congress made numerous major strides in the way of constructive and progressive legislation. This in itself is not the major achievement of the 85th Congress. It must be remembered that much of the constructive legislation was enacted in the face of considerable opposition from substantial portions of the President's own party.

Of course we Democrats are always ready to "bail out" Republican administrations. In the first place it is good for the people and in the second place it makes our task less burdensome when we regain the White House which, incidentally, will next be in 1960.

Now, I do not wish to be critical of all Republicans in Congress. Rather, I wish to take this occasion to compliment those on that side of the aisle who have worked equally as industriously and diligently as those on my side of the aisle in the interests of constructive and progressive legislation.

The success of the 85th Congress is essentially due to the cohesiveness and action of the Democratic Members of Congress. The rollcall votes of the Republican Members clearly show that the Republican Party in Congress is divided, broken up into blocs, and confused. Such votes also show that the Old Guard Republicans with their extreme conservative or reactionary actions have come out of the underground and are again taking control of the party machinery. This is due to a number of factors: First the President cannot be elected for another term; second, there is a lack of leadership in the executive branch, as expressed by some Republicans; third, failure of the President and his associates in the executive branch to give even minimum consideration to reasonable requests made by Republican Members.

Dissatisfaction with the leadership and policies of the President has developed to the extent that some Republican Members openly state that they "are on their own." In other words, the Republican Party has broken into a number of splinter groups. Under such conditions, a Republican House or Senate in the next Congress would be most unfortunate for the country.

The people of our country are concerned, and properly so, with the present spectacle of political confusion and economic incompetence, particularly in the face of a serious and mounting world crisis.

There are about 5 million persons out of work, and with the inclusion of additional part-time unemployment, we have the equivalent of over 6 million unemployed.

(NOTE: August figures will be issued September 9, 1958.)

At the beginning of this rise in unemployment it was apparent to many of us that we were having a recession and were faced with a possible depression.

The administration, at first was not particularly impressed and, in fact, took a rather optimistic view of the situation. They referred to this economic crisis as a "slight dip" which would soon take an upward turn. As increased unemployment figures poured into the White House the administration began to act. First it admonished those of us who were calling for Executive action and promoting legislative action to refrain from talking about the "slight dip" and it would go away. Second, the President delivered a "chins up" message to the American people. These actions were nice, of course, but were not exactly what we needed to stem the tide of recession and stimulate employment.

Democrat Members in both Houses of Congress took positive and tangible action. Numerous antirecession propoals were offered. Some were rejected and some were adopted.

The record of the 85th Congress is one in which we can all take a great deal of pride. It was one of the hardest working Congresses in the history of our Nation. Statisticwise the 85th Congress will rank high with other Congresses in the past 25 years in quantity of measures introduced, reported, passed, and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I would like to make a brief comparison of the statistics of the 85th Congress with those of other recent Congresses.

The almost 21,000 bills and resolutions put into legislative hoppers of the 85th Congress was the largest number in more than 20 years. The combined figure was 14,013 in the first session and 6,591 in the second. Not since the 72d Congress of 1932–33 has the number reached such heights. Of the total, 14,799 were introduced in the House and 6,392 in the Senate.

The 20,644 of the 85th Congress exceeded the 18,939 of the 84th, the 16,385 of the 83d, the 14,164 of the 82d, and the 16,670 of the 81st.

During the past 26 years, the totals have ranged between 9,536 and 20,644. In the 72d Congress the total was 21,191.

Measures reported totaled 5,252—2,498 in the first session and 2,754 in the second. Figures for the House and Senate were 2,450 and 2,802, respectively. The total compares with 5,751 for the 84th Congress, 5,263 for the 83d, 4,601 for the 82d, and 5,880 for the 81st.

Measures passed totaled 5,126—2,408 in the first session and 2,718 in the second. Figures for the House and Senate were 2,546 and 2,580, respectively. The total compares with 5,713 in the 84th, 5,201 in the 83d, 4,593 in the 82d, and 5,764 in the 81st.

Laws enacted reached the number of 936 for public laws and 784 for private laws, making an aggregate of 1,720 measures enacted during the Congress. The first session accounted for 316 public laws and 34 private laws; the second session accounted for 620 public laws and 443 private laws. By comparison, the 84th Congress enacted 1,028 public laws; the 83d, 781; the 82d, 594; and the 81st Congress, 921.

Measures vetoed totaled 51 for both sessions—12 in the first and 39 in the second.

The Senate confirmed 58,691 executive nominations. These statistics are only a part of the complete picture. The great achievement of the 85th Congress lies in the quality of legislation enacted.

Now I would like to outline some of the major accomplishments of this Congress.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Many of our recent Congresses have been defense minded. With the launching of sputnik the 85th Congress became even more so. The impact of this achievement by the Soviet Union presented many new problems. We have made some headway toward solving these problems and are constantly seeking ways and means to do a better job in this respect.

Congress authorized $54.6 million to expand and accelerate construction of missile bases, detection and warning systems, and created the Advanced Research Agency within the Department of Defense.

The National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics was authorized to expend $44.7 million for construction and equipment of research facilities.

Authority for the construction and expansion of atomic energy facilities was provided in the sum of $386 million. In addition, the Atomic Energy Commission was authorized to expend $35 million for construction of a reactor for an atomic-powered destroyer.

We extended until 1962 the standby emergency powers of the President under the Federal Civil Defense Act.

A $100.5 million program of new construction and conversion of naval vessels during 1959 was authorized. The program includes nuclear-powered and guided-missile warships, amphibious landing craft, and service ships.

The President requested and we cooperated to the extent of enacting a law reorganizing the Department of Defense so that there would be no question about areas of responsibility, authority, and so forth.

A total of $2.8 billion was authorized for construction projects at Armed Forces installations and bases here and abroad.

These by no means represent all the action taken by the 85th Congress to bolster our defenses. They are some of the major ones and call for vast expenditure of funds. The Congress recognizes this but at the same time, it recognizes, as does everyone, that broad defense programs cannot be purchased in bargain basements and we must pay the price, no matter what it is, that is necessary to retain our freedom and way of life.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

In the field of foreign policy, the 85th Congress continued the established tradition of bipartisanship which has become such a vital factor in the conduct of international relations.

One of the major actions in this field was the enactment of the Middle East resolution which authorized the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations of the Middle East to strengthen the defense of their independence.

We authorized $6.33 billion for the mutual security program.

Legislation was enacted authorizing the exchange of mutually essential atomic information and materials with our allies.

We extended for 2 years the authority of the President to control exports of strategic materials.

We increased the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank by $2 billion, a 40-percent increase to an aggregate of $7 billion.

Suspension of import duties on metal scrap was extended for another year.

An additional $10 million was authorized for completion of the Inter-American Highway.

AGRICULTURE

In the area of agriculture a Democratic-controlled Congress again demonstrated its appreciation of the problems confronting the farmers of our Nation. This appreciation developed into profound concern as the months went by and the economic plight of the farmer continued to deteriorate while Secretary Benson pursued his policies with little regard for either the plight of the farmer or the manifest dissatisfaction with such policies of an overwhelming majority of the people's representatives in Congress. The Congress finally took legislative action to alleviate the situation by passing a joint resolution which would have prevented a reduction of farm price supports for the 1958 crops below those for 1957, and would have barred cuts in acreage allotments for 2 years. This resolution passed the House by a vote of 210 to 172. The breakdown shows 166 Democrats and 44 Republicans supported the legislation while 141 Republicans and 31 Democrats voted against it. Convincing evidence of the President's support of Secretary Benson's policies, at whatever cost to the farmers, was provided in the President's veto of this resolution.

In spite of such administration response to the problems of the farmer much beneficial legislation has been enacted pertaining to agriculture.

The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act was extended during the first session for 1 year with the amount of surplus commodities authorized to be traded in under the act increased from $3 billion to $4 billion and with an increase from $500 million to $800 million of the amount for relief of needy persons abroad. Legislation extending this program to June 30, 1960, was enacted during the second session with additional increases in the amounts authorized of $500 million in 1958 and $1,500 million each for 1959 and 1960. A program for deferred grazing and protein feed production in drought-stricken areas was enacted, a compulsory inspection program for poultry and poultry products was provided for, price supports for the 1957 crop of extra-long staple cotton was continued at the same level as for 1956; legislation aimed at facilitating the control and eradication of plant pests became law; the authority of the President to grant special livestock loans was extended and the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to administer the soil-conservation program on a national basis was extended for 4 years and finally legislation establishing humane-slaughter methods for animals was enacted.

It should be kept in mind that legislation in the field of agriculture benefits not just the farmer but directly or indirectly each and every citizen. For example, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act is a vital program in the conduct of our relations with other countries and plays an important role in our relations with the countries of the Free World. The poultry inspection program is of obvious benefit to every consumer in supplying added protection against the marketing of impure poultry products and of course the humane-slaughter legislation although of no economic benefit to the farmer is considered extremely desirable by a great cross-section of our citizenry.

Legislation dealing with agriculture insofar as it contributes to the well-being and stability of an important segment of our people—the farmers—contributes to the economic health of all of us.

NATURAL RESOURCES

In the area of natural resources the Democratic 85th Congress again evidenced the longstanding devotion of the Democratic Party to the preservation and development of our natural resources for the benefit of all the people.

An extensive program of river and harbor development, flood-control projects, and beach erosion-control projects totaling $1.57 billion was passed by both the House and Senate during the first session in the hope that speedy implementation of such a program would act as a deterrent to mounting unemployment and stimulate economic activity. The President vetoed the measure and thus

frustrated for a time the achievement of this goal. The Congress, realizing the need and desirability of the legislation, passed in the second session a second bill with certain modifications designed to avoid a second veto—while recognizing that certain features of the first bill had to be sacrificed, however desirable, if any such legislation was to become law.

The program whereby exploration for critical materials by private industry under contract with the Department of the Interior is conducted—the Federal loans to be repaid out of royalties—was extended.

The increasing awareness by the Congress of the peaceful potential of atomic energy was demonstrated in the enactment of legislation authorizing a $382.6 million program for construction and development by the Atomic Energy Commission including $31 million for reactors to produce electric power.

The Democratic tradition of resource development for the benefit of the people was upheld in the enactment of legislation authorizing $600 million for Niagara River power development by the New York Power Authority under Federal license, providing preference to public agencies of 50 percent of the power.

Greater flexibility in the administration of the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1958 was provided with passage of legislation permitting the Secretary of the Interior to carry out contracts unless disapproved by Congress within 60 days.

The interest of Congress in the operation of the St. Lawrence Seaway was amply demonstrated by legislation enacted increasing the borrowing authority of the corporation from $105 million to $140 million as well as effecting certain other changes.

Other legislation: Provided for a program designed to encourage the development of phosphate production on the public domain; granted Congressional consent for compacts relative to flood-control projects, diversion of waters, pollution control, and other matters; extended until December 31, 1959, the purchase program for asbestos and fluorspar; for the construction of the San Angelo reclamation project and water-conservation projects in the Pecos River Basin of Texas and New Mexico; requires Congressional approval to effect withdrawals of more than 5,000 acres of public land; raised the limit of acreage which lessors of public lands may mine in order to increase coal production; and established a commission to review national outdoor recreation resources.

GOVERNMENTAL REORGANIZATION

After many years of deliberation a law was finally passed paving the way for admission of Alaska into the Union.

Laws were finally enacted giving substantial salary increases to Federal and postal employees; these coming after Presidential vetoes earlier in the Congress.

We enacted a law to increase postal rates by $547 million a year.

The House adopted resolutions creating a Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration, and creating a permanent Committee on Science and Astronautics. Another resolution was adopted by the House recommending a 10-point code for all Government employees and officeholders.

Loans up to $75 million were authorized to help finance public works in the District of Columbia.

A new agency, the Federal Aviation Agency, was established to regulate air traffic and safety.

VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN

This Congress increased the compensation of members of the Armed Forces by an amount in excess of $575 million.

Pensions were increased for widows of Spanish, Indian, Mexican, and Civil War veterans.

Congress passed a bill which was vetoed by the President extending the direct home-loan program for World War II veterans.

Rates of compensation for service-connected disabilities and dependency allowances were increased.

Career incentives for nurses and medical specialists of the armed services were provided for.

Eligibility standards for widows of veterans were liberalized.

All laws administered by the VA governing compensation, pensions, hospitalization, and so forth, were consolidated into a single law.

Other veterans' laws enacted include increase in burial allowance, increase in rate of compensation for certain blind veterans, and increase in premiums and benefits for total disability under the National Life Insurance Act.

SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, AND WELFARE

The Democratic Party has always been deeply concerned with matters affecting the security, health, and welfare of our people. This continuing interest in the improvement and expansion of our social-security program was evidenced by the enactment of Public Law 85–840. This legislation will place the whole program on a sounder and more realistic financial basis while at the same time increasing benefits to reflect the increase in the cost of living since benefits were last increased, and effecting certain other desirable changes which were needed.

The concern of the Congress over our educational achievements in the United States was reflected in the enactment of Public Law 85–864, which authorizes an $887 million 4-year program of student loans, fellowships, and other aid to improve teaching of mathematics, science, and language.

During the 85th Congress we enacted legislation extending for 3 years the special milk program in nonprofit schools, nursing schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, and summer camps. This act authorized $75 million annually for this program.

In the field of medical research this Congress has taken a great step forward by authorizing the largest expenditure in history for that purpose—$294,383,000.

Congress extended the Hill-Burton Hospital Survey and Construction Act for a period of 3 years.

Federal assistance programs for school construction in areas affected by Federal activities were extended.

We authorized a $1 million program of grants-in-aid to public or nonprofit schools to train public-health specialists, technicians, and administrators.

Civil service retirement annuities were increased; interstate sale of switch-blade knives was banned; Federal indemnity against atomic reactor hazards for the protection of the public was provided.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

The economic well being of our people has been a subject of primary concern to this Congress. During these 2 years we have witnessed on the one hand spiraling prices and on the other mounting unemployment, increased indebtedness, and shrinking incomes.

Some of the action taken by the Congress to aid in stimulating employment and general economic activity and which failed to become law as a result of Presidential veto is dealt with elsewhere. These include the rivers and harbors and flood control bill and the veterans' housing measure—both passed in the first session only to be vetoed by the President.

Other important progressive legislation bearing on our national economy did become law, however, under the leadership of the Democratic majority, sometimes with and sometimes without significant GOP support.

(a) Fiscal policy: The Congress enacted three necessary and important measures relating to Government fiscal matters. One, the Secretary of the Treasury now has the authority to pay up to 3.26 percent interest rate on savings bonds. Two, the authority of the Federal Reserve banks to make direct purchases of United States securities from the Treasury was extended until June 30, 1960. These two measures were needed to give needed flexibility to the management of Government fiscal matters during these times. A third measure sought by the administration to deal with the problem of rising Federal deficits, due in part to declining revenues as a result of the recession, was an increase in the statutory debt limit. Such an increase was enacted increasing the limit to $288 billion on a temporary basis to June 30, 1959, and to $283 billion on a permanent basis.

(b) Housing: Several important housing measures were enacted by the Congress. They reflect both the longstanding devotion of the Democartic Party to effective legislation aimed at encouraging the construction of adequate housing for our growing population and the immediate concern of the Democratic majority in the Congress with the recession.

The measures as enacted authorized a $1.9 billion and $1.8 billion home-building program for 1958 and 1959, respectively; liberalized downpayment requirements on FHA-financed houses; extended guaranty and direct loan programs for veterans; increased the funds for FNMA mortgage purchases; increased by $4 billion the authorization for FHA mortgage insurance and increased the borrowing power of FNMA by $0.5 billion to $1.6 billion as a means of easing the mortgage-money market.

In an effort to secure House passage under a suspension of rules of S. 4035, which provided for a $2.4 billion housing

program, 185 Democrats voted yea but were defeated by 134 nay votes, 111 of which were cast by Republican Members. Since a two-thirds vote for passage under suspension of rules is required this effort failed.

Specific measures enacted as an antidote to growing unemployment and a decline in economic activity included: an accelerated program of highway construction authorizing $5,500 million for construction by the States including $1,800 million additional funds for both the regular Federal aid and the interstate superhighway programs; provision for Federal assistance, to be repaid in 5 years, to the States on an optional basis for the payment of up to 15 weeks additional Federal unemployment compensation for jobless persons whose State payments under the existing program have expired; authority for Federal departments and agencies to currently purchase supplies and equipment in advance out of appropriations for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1958, as a stimulus to business recovery and an acceleration in the trade-in program for old vessels and their replacement by modern ships, under the Merchant Marine Act. Two concurrent resolutions by the Congress urging upon the administration the acceleration of Federal construction projects, both military and civil, for which funds had been appropriated were heeded and such a policy adopted.

(c) Small business: The difficulties of small business in the midst of increasing economic concentration were aggravated during the 85th Congress by prevailing economic conditions. In keeping with the leadership of the Democratic majority in attempting to find ways and means of combating these conditions—legislation enacted to aid small business is high on the list of accomplishments of this Congress.

During the first session the lending authority of the Small Business Administration was increased by $80 million to a total of $455 million. A second measure enacted during the session extended the life of the Small Business Administration to July 31, 1958, and further increased its lending authority to a total of $530 million.

In the second session, legislation has been enacted providing for the creation of a Small Business Investment Administration to provide equity capital and long-term loans to small business enterprises through investment companies chartered for that purpose. Most significant was the enactment during the second session of legislation making the SBA a permanent agency. In addition to the foregoing provisions this Congress has provided that: the maximum interest rate which can be charged by the Government on loans to small business shall be reduced from 6 to 5.5 percent; the maximum loan which may be made to a single firm be increased from $250,000 to $350,000; the SBA has authority to help small business engage more extensively in research by encouraging the building of laboratories, sponsoring applied research, and encouraging the exchange of research information; small businesses have access to research and development work done by large firms under Government contracts and the SBA has wider authority to grant loans in areas of excessive rainfall.

All of this legislation was enacted with one primary purpose uppermost and that was that every practical means possible be utilized to assist small business to retain its vital role in the economic life of our Nation.

(d) Taxation: The 52 percent tax rate on corporate income was extended for 1 year in each of the 2 sessions as was the present schedule of excise taxes on alcoholic beverages, cigarettes, and automobile parts and accessories. In addition legislation was enacted limiting issuance of tax-amortization certificates for fast writeoff of new defense plants and terminating the program December 31, 1959.

During the second session the 3 percent tax on freight was repealed; numerous technical changes were made both in the exercise provisions and in the income, estate, and gift tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code. These changes were aimed at eliminating inequities and unintended benefits, to clarify the law and to improve its administration.

The Congress wisely enacted legislation exempting from the 10 percent admissions tax musical and dramatic performances of nonprofit civic associations and school or college athletic contests proceeds of which benefit tax-exempt charitable institutions or organizations.

Other legislation of economic importance provided for: The labeling of automobiles as to manufacturer's suggested retail price; Federal guaranties of up to $500 million in loans by railroads to finance new equipment, provide operating expenses and meet other obligations; and grants the ICC power to permit curtailment of unprofitable services and facilities.

This presentation by no means is a complete picture of all the fine achievements of the 85th Congress. Based upon this record of progressive, enlightened leadership by a Democratic Congress, oftentimes in the face of administration indifference, every Democrat can go into the campaign this fall with a sense of achievement and pride in his association with a party that put principle and the interest of the people above partisan consideration; a party which cooperates with the President when the needs of the hour demanded such cooperation and a party which is always ready to shoulder the responsibility of leadership on the frequent occasions when this administration has failed to provide it.

Hon. Augustine B. Kelley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our able, distinguished, and highly respected colleague, Augustine B. Kelley, brought sorrow to all Members of the House.

Gus, as he was affectionately known to all of us, epitomized all the attributes that make a perfect gentleman. He was very devoted to his large family, and his exemplary life was a credit not only to himself, but to his family which he reared with great love and devotion.

He was a man of high Christian ideals and carried this doctrine into all fields of activity. He practiced Christian charity and worked tirelessly to bring social justice to his fellowmen. His great contributions in this cause will always be remembered by his colleagues and by millions of Americans who were benefited by his arduous work in pursuit of his ideals.

He had an enviable record of service to his constituents who recognized his loyalty to them by repeatedly reelecting him to Congress.

Gus was my warm personal friend and my office neighbor. I knew him well and greatly admired him. I am certain that his family will find much solace in the fact that he has well earned his eternal reward.

Report to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, many issues of great importance were acted upon by the 85th Congress. They included:

CONSUMER PROBLEMS

Significant activity on matters directly affecting American consumers indicates a genuine interest of the 85th Congress in this important field.

Determined opposition of liberal Members of the House blocked the passage of the natural gas bill, which would have cost the consuming public hundreds of millions of dollars a year in higher gas rates. I strongly opposed this legislation in committee, as I had done in the past whenever powerful gas and oil interests tried to force it through Congress.

A House Consumer Subcommittee conducted a thorough study of the causes of rising food prices to the consumer and lower prices paid to farmers for their crops. Legislation was enacted to curb monopolistic practices in the meatpacking industry and to provide for compulsory Federal inspection of poultry shipped in interstate commerce to protect consumers from unsanitary and diseased products. Another new law requires the price labeling of automobiles to protect the public from unscrupulous retailing practices.

A Government Operations Subcommittee conducted a series of studies of false and misleading advertising practices on such products as filter cigarettes, tranquilizer drugs, toothpaste, and weight-reducing preparations. Reports on each study were issued, providing useful information for the public on the merits of these products as contrasted with the advertising claims made for them.

The Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, under the chairmanship of Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, conducted hearings on the extent to which monopolistic practices of big business have contributed to rising living costs through the establishment of artifically high "administered" price levels on manufactured products.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Hearings before the McClellan committee investigating racketeering in labor-management relations clearly revealed the need for legislation to curb abuses in this field.

The Kennedy-Ives labor-management reform bill would have corrected the major abuses uncovered by the McClellan probe. It passed the Senate by an 88-to-1 vote, but was killed in the House. Seventy-one percent of the Democrats voted for the bill; 77 percent of the House Republicans voted against the reform measure. I strongly supported the Kennedy-Ives bill because I felt that it was a big step forward in curbing these abuses harmful to workers, the public, management, and honest and clean labor unions.

The measure would have guaranteed the secret ballot in union elections, protected union treasuries against embezzlement, limited the term of office of union officials, disqualified convicted criminals for union office, and imposed criminal penalties against the giver and taker of a bribe in labor-management relations. It also would have required public reports of unions' income and expenses, provided safeguards against the control of unions by gangsters, extortionists, thieves, and embezzlers, and provided for the ousting of union officials for misconduct. In addition, it would have required public reports by employers and their middlemen of expenditures to influence workers' union activities.

Responsible management and labor groups supported the Kennedy-Ives reform bill. It was opposed by the Republican leadership, big business leaders, and by national officials of unions whose corruption had been exposed by the McClellan committee investigation.

I also voted for a bill to protect the financial status of welfare and pension plans maintained by unions and employer groups. The measure was enacted into law. Some 80 million Americans are affected; they deserve protection of their economic stake in these plans. The new law requires disclosure of the financial details of employee welfare or pension plans, including the publication of descriptions of the plans and the annual reporting of their financial operations.

FARM LEGISLATION

During the 85th Congress, I actively supported legislation to permit farmers to grow up to 30 acres of wheat for feed, without being subject to penalty under the acreage-allotment program. This measure was enacted last year and was endorsed by all Berks farm groups.

The soil-conservation program was extended for 4 years and the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act was extended for 2 years, making possible the sale of surplus farm commodities to friendly foreign nations. I also voted for the bill to permit lower price support levels on feed-grain and other commodities.

The Little Schuylkill River watershed project, affecting Berks, Carbon, and Schuylkill Counties, was approved by Congress. Total cost of the 5-year project is estimated at $2,259,322, $1.9 million of which will be borne by the Federal Government. It will afford protection from floodwater, sediment damage, and crop damage.

POSTAL RATE INCREASE

Postal rates were raised 3 to 4 cents on first-class mail, 6 to 7 cents on airmail, and 2 to 3 cents on post cards. Second- and third-class rates are due to be increased next January.

My amendment to limit publishers' second-class subsidies to $100,000 a year was adopted by the House but was rejected by the Senate, despite a vigorous floor fight led by Senator JOSEPH CLARK, of Pennsylvania.

Efforts to retain the principle of subsidy limitation in the final version of the bill was unsuccessful. As a result of this fight, I appeared on the Ed Murrow, See It Now program, where public attention was focused on these gigantic handouts of taxpayers' dollars to the magazine-publishing industry.

ATOMIC ENERGY

One of the great needs in the field of atomic energy is to develop its peacetime uses, especially for the production of commercial power. The administration has failed to make satisfactory progress in this vital area, despite the urgings of Congress. In the attempt to stimulate action in the nuclear-power field, Congress enacted legislation authorizing the construction of a gas-cooled power reactor and other measures to expand the peacetime applications of atomic energy.

REGULATORY COMMISSION PROBE

A Congressional committee began investigations into alleged wrongdoing in Federal regulatory commissions and agencies, which, by law, were given an independent status to make them free from Executive pressures in carrying out their duties to protect the public interest.

Presidential appointments of persons to these regulatory agencies who have been closely associated with private interests raised serious doubts as to their ability to regulate these same interests to safeguard the public.

The investigation into the award of television licenses resulted in the resignation of an FCC Commissioner. The activities of several other regulatory agencies were also studied by the committee.

AVAILABLE FOR MEETINGS

In a report such as this it is not possible to discuss in detail all the issues before Congress. Again, as in the past years, I welcome the opportunity to appear before any group in Berks County to speak and answer questions on any issue which may be of interest. Contact my office in the Reading Post Office Building with any such request or on any other subject with which you are concerned.

Highlights of Congressional Activities of the Second Session of the 85th Congress

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. WATTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, with the outstanding successes the Russians had achieved in the satellite field a matter of history; with the downward trends of the economy gaining momentum at every turn; with the aftermath of the Nasser-Suez coup; and, with the critical developments in the Middle and Far East situations—evidencing a "falling apart at the seams" of our foreign policy—the second session of the 85th Congress convened on January 7, under an atmosphere of crisis, emergency, and deliberation. It remained in session through August 24. During this period, there were 6,591 measures introduced; 2,704 measures reported, and, approximately, 450 public and 300 private bills enacted into law. To record its proceedings, over 18,110 printed pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD were used.

The 85th Congress can be proud of its record of achievements. It can be proud of the bipartisan approach it made in meeting the difficult problems confronting it on both the international and home fronts. It can be proud of the affirmative and courageous manner in which it faced and met this "era of crises."

COST OF GOVERNMENT

While the moneys called for and those appropriated by Congress represented the highest peacetime expenditure program for any year's operation of our Government, an analysis of it discloses that approximately two-thirds of these expenditures are for military and defense purposes:

Appropriated (85th Cong., 2d sess.)	$72,650,000,000
Less deficiencies incurred in 1958	4,880,000,000
Appropriations for regular operations, fiscal 1959	67,775,000,000
Less:	
Defense Department's operations	39,600,000,000
Military construction	1,355,000,000
Mutual security (military assistance and defense support)	2,400,000,000
	43,355,000,000
Balance, other than military and defense activities	24,420,000,000

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Insuring the continuation of our military bases overseas, which is so vital to our adequate defense, the Congress extended the mutual-security program. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act—the main stem of our economic relations with foreign countries—was extended. The lending authority of the Export-Import Bank was extended. The exchange of essential atomic information and materials with our friendly allies was authorized, and the Congress requested the President to seek and to enter into international agreements looking toward the establishment of an effective national plan for the peaceful exploration of space.

NUCLEAR AND SPACE AGE DEVELOPMENTS

Direction and authority was extended by the Congress to expand and accelerate the activities in the missile- and satellite-launching fields. A substantial program of construction and equipment procurement was authorized for research facilities in the field of aeronautics. Authorization and direction for the construction of atomic-powered naval ves-

sels was forthcoming. A National Aeronautics and Space Administration with responsibility to develop a comprehensive program of research and development in aeronautical and space sciences: construction, testing, operation, and so forth, of space vehicles was created, and a Select Congressional Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration was established.

ON THE HOME FRONT

To stimulate the economy and arrest its downward trends, the Congress—

First. Liberalized and modified eligibility requirements under the housing program.

Second. Authorized financial assistance to States desiring to extend their unemployment compensation program.

Third. Made permanent the Small Business Administration, broadened its lending authority, reduced its interest rates, and made more liberal its eligibility requirements for loan participation. Also, the tax burden on small business was lightened.

Fourth. Established a small business investment company program, which contemplates the creation of local investment companies for assistance in the small-business field.

Fifth. Established a program of loan assistance to the railroads of our country, under which they would be enabled to provide themselves with new equipment, plant facilities, and moneys for operating expenses, and so forth.

Sixth. Extended and continued a program, under which our agricultural commodities are sold abroad.

GENERAL

First. Contingent upon its acceptance—which subsequently it has done by overwhelming majority—the Territory of Alaska was authorized to be admitted to the Union as the 49th State.

Second. Recognizing the demands of the times requires expedience of action, which necessitates permission to act authoritatively, deliberately, directly, and responsibly without regard for "in-line procedures," the Congress authorized the reorganization of the Defense Department and the Military Establishments thereunder.

Third. The Federal financial assistance school and hospital construction programs were extended.

Fourth. A program of loan assistance to qualified students interested in higher education was established. Special consideration is extended students specializing in the fields of science, mathematics, engineering, and so forth.

Fifth. The school milk program was continued, and the distribution of surplus foods to nonprofit children's summer camps was authorized.

Sixth. An increase in the annuities of our retired Government employees and the compensation for service-connected benefits of our war veterans was provided. The pension rates of widows of certain war veterans were increased and, for the first time, widows of the Confederate veterans of the Civil War were made eligible for pension.

Seventh. Eligibility requirements for benefit participation under the old-age, disability, and dependency assistance programs under social security were made less stringent.

In addition, the call upon me by individuals of our district was substantially in excess of any previous session. I received over 12,000 communications, many of which represented individuals seeking assistance in their own problems. It was a source of genuine gratification to witness this widespread interest in governmental affairs.

This résumé truly represents the high spots of the Congressional activities. The demands were great, but I feel, and I believe that the country feels, that it did an impressive, constructive, and adequate job. Its obligations to the Nation were responsibly discharged.

Federal Air Pollution Control Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, during the 85th Congress the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee examined activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare relating to air pollution control. The subcommittee gave particular attention to this subject because of a unanimous request by the California Congressional delegation that these activities be examined.

The subcommittee did not present a formal report on air pollution control activities to the 85th Congress since its study of this complicated subject has not yet been completed. However, it appears that progress is being made in certain aspects of the Federal program which have been subject to criticism. The subcommittee was particularly gratified by a unanimous resolution of the California Congressional delegation expressing appreciation for the subcommittee's work.

I should like at this time to give a brief outline of the subcommittee's examination of Federal air pollution control activities.

As a first step in its study, the subcommittee obtained background information from the United States Public Health Service concerning activities by that agency under the Air Pollution Research and Technical Assistance Act and other applicable legislation. In addition to a description of its responsibilities and the actions being taken to carry them out, the Public Health Service was asked to provide a summary of expenditures under the air pollution control program and information concerning officials having primary responsibilities in the program.

The subcommittee then contacted the heads of most of the larger local air pollution control agencies in the country, asking their advice and assistance in its study. Each of these local authorities was asked to give a brief description of air pollution problems in his area and the manner in which his locality was seeking to cope with them. In addition, local authorities were asked to give their comments on the Federal program and their suggestions for improving its effectiveness.

In October 1957 the subcommittee held public hearings in Los Angeles. In addition to local officials, witnesses included a number of recognized authorities in the field of air-pollution control. These hearings were particularly productive, in my opinion, because of the participation of Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, of Los Angeles, and Congresswoman FLORENCE DWYER, of New Jersey, two members of the subcommittee who have had a particular interest in problems of air-pollution control. The subcommittee is also indebted to Representative GLEN LIPSCOMB, of Los Angeles, a member of the Committee on Government Operations, for participating in the hearings.

Testimony at the subcommittee's Los Angeles hearings showed that local authorities had made impressive progress in solving air pollution problems in that area. However, local authorities did not then feel that the Federal program had given them any substantial amount of assistance. While recognizing the value of medical research on the effects of air pollution on human health, Los Angeles authorities expressed the belief that a larger proportion of the limited Federal funds available should be used for engineering research on methods of controlling pollution. It was suggested, also, that Federal authorities were not making full use of research work already done at the local level and that insufficient exchange of information was causing unnecessary duplication. Los Angeles authorities identified automobile exhaust fumes as the major remaining source of air pollution in that area and asked for more attention to this problem at the Federal level.

Following the subcommittee's hearings, there were a number of indications of improvement in the air pollution control situation. Federal officials held meetings with Los Angeles authorities concerning air pollution control problems. The Surgeon General advised the subcommittee in May 1958 that he believed local authorities were substantially satisfied with progress being made to meet their criticisms. A national conference on air pollution problems in urban areas has been scheduled for Washington in November of this year. An Executive order was issued directing heads of Federal departments and agencies to cooperate with State and local authorities to insure the prevention or abatement of atmospheric pollution caused by or resulting from Federal activities.

Air pollution is already a serious problem in many areas of the United States. Because of our increasing population and the tremendous growth of metropolitan areas, the problem will inevitably become more serious unless

we move promptly and vigorously to meet it. There is much that State and local governments can do to fight air pollution; they must take every practicable step that is within their power if we are to have clean air for our cities. However, there are certain things that local authorities cannot do by themselves. States and localities cannot control pollution which originates outside the limits of their jurisdiction, nor do they have the resources necessary to solve some of the more difficult technical problems of air pollution control. In such instances, the Federal Government can and should assist local authorities, particularly through engineering research concerning methods of controlling air pollution.

The forthcoming national conference on air pollution control, while encouraging, will in itself solve nothing. It will be effective only if its recommendations are translated into vigorous and determined action at all levels of government.

The subcommittee's hearings on air-pollution control, together with comments and recommendations of local authorities on this problem will be printed and made available for the use of those attending the November conference. I should like to suggest that, in its deliberations, the conference give careful consideration to setting up effective methods for accomplishing the following objectives:

First. The elimination of possible duplication of effort by Federal, State, and local governments through exchange of information and coordination of research activities.

Second. The encouragement of cooperative agreements among State and local governments for meeting pollution problems extending beyond a single jurisdiction.

Third. Increased attention, particularly at the Federal level, to developing practicable methods of controlling air contamination from automobile exhaust fumes and other major sources of pollution.

I am sure that the subcommittee will continue to give close attention to the very important problem of air-pollution control during the 86th Congress.

While I believe that all members of the subcommittee would agree with this statement, time limitations made it impossible for me to discuss these remarks with them in advance. However, I am pleased to be able to say that the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, Mrs. DWYER, of New Jersey, joins with me in this statement.

Voting and Attendance Record of Hon. Gerald R. Ford, Jr., of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report of my voting and attendance record during the second session of the 85th Congress.

The record includes all rollcall votes and all quorum calls. The description of bills is for the purpose of identification only; no attempt has been made to describe the bills completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved.

The purpose of this report is to collect in one place information which is scattered through thousands of pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I want to be able to provide any interested constituent with a simple compilation of my voting and attendance record.

It will be noted that there were 195 rollcalls and my attendance record was 98 percent.

The record follows:

Record of rollcall votes, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR.

No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1958		
1	Jan. 7	Quorum call	Present.
2	Jan. 15	H. R. 9739, to authorize certain construction for the Air Force. (Passed 374 to 0)	Yes.
3	Jan. 21	Quorum call	Present.
4	Jan. 22	Quorum call	Present.
5	Jan. 23	H. R. 9955, to recommit to committee the bill providing for a temporary increase in the public debt limit in order to amend bill raising the limit to $278,000,000,000. (Defeated 114 to 247.)	No.
6	Jan. 23	H. R. 9955, on final passage of the bill to temporarily raise the public debt limit to $280,000,000,000. (Passed 328 to 71)	Yes.
7	Jan. 23	H. R. 10146, on final passage of bill making supplemental appropriation for Department of Defense for 1958. (Passed 388 to 0)	Yes.
8	Feb. 4	H. R. 2151, to suspend for 3 years the import duties on certain coarse wools. (Passed 250 to 129)	Yes.
9	Feb. 10	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
10	Feb. 18	Quorum call	Present.
11	Feb. 19	H. J. Res. 2, on motion to recommit resolution to provide for transfer of right-of-way for the Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin unit, Missouri River Basin project and payment to Crow Indian Tribe in connection therewith. (Defeated 151 to 197.)	Yes.
12	Feb. 25	Quorum call	Present.
13	Feb. 26	Quorum call	Present.
14	Feb. 26	To adopt an amendment to provide $10,000,000 each for Glen Canyon project and Trinity River division of the Central Valley project. (Passed 200 to 184.)	Yes.
15	Mar. 4	Quorum call	Present.
16	Mar. 5	Quorum call	Present.
17	Mar. 6	Quorum call	Present.
18	Mar. 6	H. R. 8002, on motion to recommit bill to committee. (Defeated 119 to 275)	Yes.
19	Mar. 6	H. R. 8002, to provide for changing methods of stating budget estimates and estimates for deficiency and supplemental appropriations. (Passed 311 to 87.)	No.
20	Mar. 11	S. 497, on motion to recommit the bill with instructions to replace the text with the Mack amendment (deleting or modifying 18 projects which had been objected to by the Bureau of the Budget or the Corps of Engineers). (Defeated 167 to 234.)	Yes.
21	Mar. 11	S. 497, to pass and return to Senate S. 497, authorizing construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation and flood control. (Passed 321 to 81.)	Yes.
22	Mar. 19	S. Con. Res. 69, favoring acceleration of military construction programs for which appropriations have been made. (Passed 375 to 20)	Yes.
23	Mar. 19	S. Con. Res. 68, favoring the acceleration of civilian construction programs for which appropriations have been made. (Passed 378 to 16)	Yes.
24	Mar. 19	Quorum call	Present.
25	Mar. 19	S. 3262, to suspend rules and pass bill to authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic winter games (⅔ majority required for suspension passage). (Defeated 256 to 139.)	Yes.
26	Mar. 20	Quorum call	Present.
27	Mar. 20	S. J. Res. 162, to recommit motion in order to delete all commodities from the bill except dairy products. (Defeated 178 to 210)	Yes.
28	Mar. 20	S. J. Res. 162, to adopt bill to stay temporarily any reduction in support prices or acreage allotments after adopting committee amendment which limits the freeze on support prices to marketing year or season which begins in 1958. (Passed 210 to 172.)	No.
29	Mar. 25	H. Res. 507, to adopt rule to provide for 3 hours of debate on bill to increase military pay. (Passed 379 to 5)	Yes.
30	Mar. 25	H. R. 11470, to adjust method of computing basic pay for officers and enlisted members of uniformed services and to provide proficiency pay for enlisted members. (Passed 367 to 22.)	Yes.
31	Mar. 26	Quorum call	Present.
32	Mar. 27	Quorum call	Present.
33	Mar. 27	Quorum call	Present.
34	Mar. 27	H. R. 8290, to recommit bill to authorize the erection of a certain monument. (Passed 195 to 169)	Yes.
35	Mar. 28	H. R. 5822, to adopt conference report on bill relating to reinvestment by air carriers of gains derived from the sale or other disposition of flight equipment. (Passed 276 to 63.)	No.
36	Mar. 28	Quorum call	Present.
37	Mar. 28	S. 3262, to authorize certain activities by Armed Forces in support of the VII Olympic winter games. (Passed 218 to 102)	Yes.
38	Apr. 1	H. R. 10589 (appropriations for Executive Offices of the President), to adopt committee amendment providing $750,000 for expenses of Civil Rights Commission. (Passed 272 to 98.)	Yes.
39	Apr. 3	H. R. 9821, to recommit bill to authorize appropriations for continuing construction of highways. (Defeated 199 to 222)	No.
40	Apr. 3	H. R. 9821, to adopt conference report on bill to authorize appropriations for continuing construction of highways. (Passed 300 to 28)	Yes.
41	Apr. 16	Quorum call	Present.
42	Apr. 22	Quorum call	Present.
43	Apr. 22	H. Res. 465, to adopt rule making in order the consideration of H. R. 912 (to amend Navy ration statute). (Passed 231 to 130)	No.

[1] Speaking engagement in Michigan.

Record of rollcall votes, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR.—Continued

No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1958		
44	Apr. 22	H. R. 912, to adopt an amendment to H. R. 912 to provide that the Navy shall not buy margarine as long as surplus butter is available through the Commodity Credit Corporation except for use in certain overseas areas. (Passed 207 to 161.)	Yes.
45	Apr. 29	H. R. 11451, to adopt open rule (H. Res. 551) providing for 2 hours of debate on legislation authorizing construction and sale by Federal Maritime Board of superliner passenger vessel. (Passed 342 to 31.)	Yes.
46	Apr. 29	Quorum call	Present.
47	Apr. 29	H. R. 11451, to authorize construction and sale by Federal Maritime Board of a superliner passenger vessel equivalent to SS. *United States* and superliner passenger vessel for operation in the Pacific Ocean. (Passed 288 to 94.)	Yes.
48	Apr. 30	Quorum call	Present.
49	May 1	Quorum call	Present.
50	May 1	H. R. 12244, to adopt Herlong amendment to H. R. 12065 to provide for a loan and repayment system with no provision for employees who were employed in noncovered employment. (Passed, 223 to 165.)	Yes.
51	May 1	H. R. 12065, to provide for temporary additional unemployment compensation. (Passed, 370 to 17)	Yes.
52	May 6	Quorum call	Absent.[3]
53	May 12	Quorum call	Present.
54	May 12	Quorum call	Present.
55	May 12	Quorum call	Present.
56	May 13	Quorum call	Present.
57	May 13	Quorum call	Present.
58	May 14	H. R. 12181, to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954 as amended. (Passed, 259 to 134)	Yes.
59	May 15	Quorum call	Present.
60	May 15	H. R. 12428, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for fiscal year 1959. (Passed 319, to 51)	Yes.
61	May 21	Quorum call	Present.
62	May 21	To adopt a motion to resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of H. R. 799, to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union. (Passed, 217 to 172.)	Yes.
63	May 21	Quorum call	Present.
64	May 21	Quorum call	Present.
65	May 21	Quorum call	Present.
66	May 21	Quorum call	Present.
67	May 22	H. R. 5836, to adopt conference report on bill to readjust postal rates and to establish a congressional policy for the determination of postal rates and thus cleared the legislation for Presidential action. (Passed 381 to 0.)	Yes.
68	May 22	Quorum call	Present.
69	May 22	Quorum call	Present.
70	May 22	Quorum call	Present.
71	May 22	Quorum call	Present.
72	May 23	Quorum call	Present.
73	May 26	Quorum call	Present.
74	May 26	Quorum call	Present.
75	May 26	Quorum call	Present.
76	May 27	Quorum call	Present.
77	May 27	Quorum call	Present.
78	May 28	H. R. 7999, on motion by Representative ROGERS to recommit to committee the bill to provide admission of Alaska into the Union. (Defeated, 174 to 199.)	No.
79	May 28	Quorum call	Present.
80	May 28	H. R. 7999, recommittal motion by Representative PILLION (on bill to provide admission of Alaska to Union). (Defeated 172 to 201)	No.
81	May 28	H. R. 7999, to provide for the admission of State of Alaska to the Union. (Passed 208 to 166)	Yes.
82	June 2	Quorum call	Present.
83	June 3	Quorum call	Present.
84	June 4	Quorum call	Present.
85	June 4	Quorum call	Present.
86	June 4	Quorum call	Present.
87	June 5	H. R. 12738, to add $99,000,000 to defense appropriation bill. (Passed, 225 to 158)	No.
88	June 5	H. R. 12738, to pass defense appropriation bill of $38,400,000,000. (Passed, 389 to 0)	Yes.
89	June 9	Quorum call	Present.
90	June 9	Quorum call	Present.
91	June 10	Quorum call	Present.
92	June 10	Quorum call	Present.
93	June 11	Quorum call	Present.
94	June 11	H. R. 12591, on motion to recommit to committee bill to extend authority of President to enter into trade agreements under sec. 350 of Tariff Act of 1930. (Defeated 146 to 268.)	No.
95	June 11	H. R. 12591, to extend authority of President to enter into trade agreements under sec. 350 of Tariff Act of 1930. (Passed 317 to 98)	Yes.
96	June 11	Quorum call	Present.
97	June 11	Quorum call	Present.
98	June 12	Quorum call	Present.
99	June 12	H. R. 12541, recommittal motion designed to insert certain amendments in defense reorganization bill. (Defeated 192 to 211)	Yes.
100	June 12	H. R. 12541, to provide for reorganization of Department of Defense. (Passed 402 to 1)	Yes.
101	June 17	Quorum call	Present.
102	June 18	S. 3910, revised omnibus river and harbor and flood control bill. (Passed 374 to 17)	Yes.
103	June 19	H. R. 12858, making appropriations for civil functions administered by Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and TVA for fiscal year 1959. (Passed 361 to 18.)	Yes.
104	June 19	H. R. 12716, to amend Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to permit greater exchange with military allies of information and materials. (Passed 345 to 12)	Yes.
105	June 25	H. R. 11077, to incorporate the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America. (Passed 389 to 2)	Yes.
106	June 26	Quorum call	Present.
107	June 26	H. Res. 609, open rule providing 5 hours of debate and waiving points of order against the bill and committee amendments to H. R. 12954, omnibus farm bill of 1958. (Defeated 171 to 214.)	No.
108	June 26	S. 1832, to suspend rules and pass bill to authorize the appointment of 1 additional Assistant Secretary of State (⅔ majority required for suspension passage). (Defeated 224 to 145.)	Yes.
109	June 27	H. R. 12695, to adopt conference report on bill to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal tax rate and certain excise tax rates and to repeal transportation tax on property. (Passed 367 to 9.)	Yes.
110	June 27	H. R. 12181, on motion to recommit to committee the mutual security authorization bill for 1959. (Defeated 134 to 238)	No.
111	June 27	H. R. 12832, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to strengthen and improve the national transportation system. (Passed 348 to 2)	Yes.
112	June 30	S. 3342, to continue for 3 years the special milk program for children in the interest of improved nutrition by fostering consumption of fluid milk in schools. (Passed 327 to 1.)	Yes.
113	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
114	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
115	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
116	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
117	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
118	July 2	H. R. 11477, to amend ch. 223 of title 18 of United States Code to provide for the admission of certain evidence—statements and confessions. (Passed 294 to 79.)	Yes.
119	July 2	H. R. 13192, on recommittal motion designed to add $75,000,000 to funds allocated for defense support in mutual security appropriation bill. (Defeated 165 to 214.)	Yes.
120	July 2	H. R. 13192, making appropriations for mutual security for fiscal 1959. (Passed 253 to 126)	Yes.
121	July 9	Quorum call	Present.
122	July 10	H. R. 13015, on recommittal motion designed to make permissive rather than mandatory the disposal of the San Jacinto Depot property. (Defeated 179 to 202.)	Yes.
123	July 10	H. R. 13015, to authorize certain construction at military bases. (Passed 376 to 2)	Yes.
124	July 10	S. 495, to suspend rules and pass bill to provide for the acquisition of property for additional Senate Office Bldg. (⅔ majority required for suspension passage). (Defeated 232 to 150.)	Yes.
125	July 10	S. 1411, relating to the suspension of employment of civilian personnel of the United States in the interest of national security. (Passed 295 to 46)	Yes.
126	July 14	Quorum call	Present.
127	July 15	Quorum call	Present.
128	July 15	H. Res. 597, to adopt rule providing for the consideration of and 6 hours of debate on H. R. 3, to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws. (Passed 268 to 114.)	Yes.
129	July 15	Quorum call	Present.

[3] Attending funeral of friend.

Record of rollcall votes, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR.—Continued

No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1958		
130	July 16	Quorum call	Present.
131	July 16	Quorum call	Present.
132	July 17	Quorum call	Present.
133	July 17	H. R. 3, to adopt committee substitute amendment, as amended on bill to establish rules of interpretation (States rights). (Passed 249 to 147.)	Yes.
134	July 17	H. R. 3, to recommit to committee the bill to establish rules of interpretation (States rights). (Defeated 161 to 236.)	No.
135	July 17	H. R. 3, to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws. (Passed 241 to 155.)	Yes.
136	July 18	Quorum call	Present.
137	July 21	Quorum call	Present.
138	July 22	Quorum call	Present.
139	July 22	Quorum call	Present.
140	July 23	Quorum call	Present.
141	July 24	Quorum call	Absent.[3]
142	July 24	H. Res. 485, to adopt the rule permitting discussion of H. R. 4504, the wholesale terminal market facilities bill. (Defeated 164 to 211.)	Paired.[4]
143	July 28	Quorum call	Present.
144	July 30	Quorum call	Present.
145	July 30	Quorum call	Present.
146	July 30	H. Res. 649, to adopt the rule authorizing consideration of S. 607, the bill to provide retirement benefits and clerical assistance for former presidents. (Passed 254 to 126.)	No.
147	July 31	Quorum call	Present.
148	July 31	Quorum call	Present.
149	July 31	H. R. 13549, to amend Social Security Act increasing benefits and improving actuarial status of social security trust fund. (Passed 375 to 0.)	Yes.
150	July 31	H. Res. 659, citing Robert Lehrer for contempt of Congress upon recommendation of Committee on Un-American Activities. (Passed 363 to 0.)	Yes.
151	Aug. 1	Quorum call	Present.
152	Aug. 1	H. Res. 650, to provide for consideration of S. 3497, the Community Facilities Act of 1958. (Defeated 173 to 187.)	No.
153	Aug. 4	Quorum call	Present.
154	Aug. 5	Quorum call	Present.
155	Aug. 6	H. R. 13015, to adopt conference report on bill to authorize certain construction at military installations. (Passed 256 to 135.)	No.
156	Aug. 6	H. R. 13580, to increase the public debt limit. (Passed 286 to 108)	Yes.
157	Aug. 6	S. 4071, to suspend rules and pass bill to provide more effective price, production adjustment, and marketing program for various agricultural commodities (⅔ majority required for suspension passage). (Defeated 210 to 186.)	No.
158	Aug. 7	Quorum call	Present.
159	Aug. 7	H. Res. 675, to adopt the rule providing for the consideration of and 2 hours of debate on H. R. 13247 to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs. (Passed 265 to 108.)	Yes.
160	Aug. 8	Quorum call	Present.
161	Aug. 8	H. R. 13247, on motion to recommit to committee the National Defense Education Act of 1958. (Defeated 139 to 233.)	No.
162	Aug. 12	Quorum call	Present.
163	Aug. 12	Quorum call	Present.
164	Aug. 13	Quorum call	Present.
165	Aug. 13	S. 2226, to override the President's veto on bill to provide a method for regulating and fixing wage rates for employees of Portsmouth, N. H., Naval Shipyard. (Defeated 202 to 180.)	No.
166	Aug. 13	H. Res. 684, citing Bernard Goldfine for contempt of Congress. (Passed 367 to 8.)	Yes.
167	Aug. 13	H. Res. 686, citing Carl Braden for contempt of Congress	Yes.
168	Aug. 14	Quorum call	Present.
169	Aug. 15	Quorum call	Present.
170	Aug. 15	H. Res. 682, the rule providing for the consideration of the legislation (Area Redevelopment Act). (Passed 216 to 159.)	Yes.
171	Aug. 15	Quorum call	Present.
172	Aug. 15	S. 3683, on motion to recommit to committee the Area Redevelopment Act. (Defeated 170 to 188.)	Yes.
173	Aug. 18	Quorum call	Present.
174	Aug. 18	S. 4035, to suspend rules and pass omnibus housing bill with amendments (⅔ majority required for suspension passage). (Defeated 251 to 134.)	Yes.
175	Aug. 18	S. 3974, to suspend rules and pass Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act (⅔ majority required for suspension passage). (Defeated 190 to 198.)	No.
176	Aug. 18	Quorum call	Present.
177	Aug. 18	H. R. 13607, to suspend rules and pass with amendments	Yes.
		H. R. 13607, to provide for establishment of a food-stamp plan for the distribution of $1,000,000,000 worth of surplus food commodities a year to needy persons and families in the United States (⅔ majority required for suspension passage). (Defeated 196 to 187.)	Yes.
178	Aug. 19	Quorum call	Present.
179	Aug. 19	H. Res. 691, providing for House disagreement to Senate amendments to H. R. 13247 (National Defense Education Act of 1958). (Passed 230 to 110.)	Yes.
180	Aug. 19	Quorum call	Present.
181	Aug. 19	H. Res. 689, open rule providing 2 hours of debate on S. 4036 (Domestic Minerals Stabilization Act of 1958). (Passed 198 to 165.)	No.
182	Aug. 19	Quorum call	Present.
183	Aug. 20	On motion to recede and concur in Senate amendment 36 to supplemental appropriation bill to provide that no appropriation be made to National Aeronautics and Space Administration unless previously authorized by legislation hereafter enacted by Congress. (Defeated 126 to 236.)	No.
184	Aug. 20	To approve Senate amendment 113 to supplemental appropriation bill relative to U. S. Information Agency authorization for acquisition and construction of radio facilities. (Passed 190 to 172.)	Yes.
185	Aug. 20	Quorum call	Present.
186	Aug. 21	Quorum call	Present.
187	Aug. 21	S. 4036, on motion to strike enacting clause in Domestic Minerals Stabilization Act. (Defeated 171 to 174.)	Yes.
188	Aug. 21	S. 4036, to stabilize production of copper, lead, zinc, acid-grade fluorspar, and tungsten from domestic mines. (Defeated 159 to 182.)	No.
189	Aug. 21	S. Con. Res. 109, to suspend rules and pass bill to express the sense of Congress on the establishment of the United Nations Force. (Passed 299 to 20.)	Yes.
190	Aug. 22	Quorum call	Present.
191	Aug. 22	S. 3335, to suspend rules, bill providing for construction in District of Columbia of a national cultural center. (Passed 260 to 56.)	No.
192	Aug. 22	H. R. 13343, to authorize an appropriation for Pan American games to be held in Chicago, Ill. (Passed 244 to 64.)	No.
193	Aug. 23	H. R. 13489, on motion to adopt conference report on bill making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for fiscal year ending June 30, 1959. (Passed 300 to 1.)	Yes.
194	Aug. 23	Quorum call	Present.
195	Aug. 23	H. R. 13247, on adoption of conference report on bill to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs. (Passed 212 to 85.)	Yes.

[3] Speaking engagement in Michigan.

[4] In Michigan; if present would have voted "yes."

The Golden Era of National Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, a highly informative article on the collapse of the Czarist Russian Empire appeared in the recent edition of the Ukrainian Quarterly. It was authored by Dr. Edward Mark O'Connor, former Commissioner of Displaced Persons and widely recognized as one of our most realistic scholars and an authority on the age-long problem of Russian imperialism. The article is appropriately titled "The Golden Era of National Independence," because it examines the real causes for the internal collapse of the long reign of the Russian Czars and proposes a number of positive steps which the United States should take to recapture the initiative in the cold war.

The popular notion has been prevalent for some time that the Bolsheviks were responsible for the crackup of the Russian Empire. This is the main propaganda line of the Kremlin today as the new Russian leaders engage in celebrations of the 40th anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution. To a large degree this false belief has gained acceptance on the American scene, even among some who are referred to as experts on the subject. This article puts to rest this basic misconception and many others about the political trends within the Russian Empire during the period 1917–18. Offi-

cial documents of the Government from this period in history form the basis for this clear, informative, and provocative examination of a chapter in the affairs of nations which is practically submerged by time, Communist propaganda, Russian misinformation in the Free World, and the scarcity of objective scholarship and research.

As a member of the Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression, 83d Congress, I had the opportunity to work closely with Dr. O'Connor who served as staff director for the committee. His broad knowledge of the history of the Russian Empire, ability in original and objective research, together with his understanding of the aspirations of people and nations, earned him the respect and confidence of the committee and all those associated with its work. After 10 years of service to the Federal Government, he has recently become associated with Canisius College, Buffalo, N. Y., from which point it is hoped he will expand his writing and speaking activities on the Russian problem. Such a public service would be welcomed in these days when so little creative thought is given to this vital subject.

Rhode Island Leads Way in Vital Health Programs Says Fogarty Who Authored Laws—Second District Congressman Cites Rhode Island Neurological and Cancer Projects in Review of National Health Legislation in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, as the 85th Congress comes to a close I want to thank my colleagues for the fine support they gave to legislation affecting the health of the American people which I introduced during the past year.

Perhaps the most important bill I brought up this year was the annual appropriation for Health, Education, and Welfare. In this bill funds are provided for research and training and the construction of buildings in the various health fields the Federal Government supports by direct appropriations. During the 12 years that I have brought this bill to the Congress, as chairman of the Health Subcommittee on Appropriations or as the ranking minority member, you have responded well to the requests I have made for increases in funds.

This year you were particularly cooperative. In final form I brought before you a bill to increase the appropriations for the National Institutes of Health from $211 million to $294 million. You accepted my recommendations and as a result of that 40-percent increase, more research will be done in this coming year than ever before in cancer, mental health, heart disease, dental health, arthritis, and metabolic diseases, allergy and infectious diseases and neurology and blindness. I would like to remind you of the considerations which impelled me to ask you for this great increase and of the hope it brings for finding a solution to the killing and crippling diseases of mankind.

BASIC RESEARCH DOUBLED IN 1 YEAR

The first item of the budget of the National Institutes of Health is general research. This is research in biology, chemistry, physiology, pharmacology, biochemistry, and other basic sciences we must know more about in order to progress in the field of cancer, heart disease, and the other categorical areas. Last year, for general research, the Congress appropriated $14 million. I asked you to appropriate about $29 million this year, which you did. That increase means that every categorical field in medicine will be assisted in its basic and fundamental understanding. This is the first year in which we have had a sizable increase in the appropriation for general research. I shall come before you again next year and report the avenues of approach that are newly opened in the categorical disease fields as a result of this appropriation. I am confident the report will be a rewarding one.

RHODE ISLAND BENEFITS FROM CANCER APPROPRIATION

In cancer last year we appropriated $56.4 million. This year I asked you to approve $75.2 million which you did. Part of this increase will be used to step up the program of cytological testing of women for cancer of the uterus.

My own State of Rhode Island was one of the first in the Nation to establish a cancer detection center for cytologic testing of women as a part of this program. With the Public Health Service, the Rhode Island Medical Society and the Rhode Island Society of Pathologists, our State department of health is, for the third year, making the cytologic test available to all women over the age of 20 in the State. There are almost a quarter of a million women over the age bracket in Rhode Island who may receive the test through one of the State-sponsored cancer detection centers. For the great majority it will mean peace of mind and relief from needless worry. For those who have cancer, it will mean discovery at a time when the disease can be treated effectively and fatal consequences forestalled. I am glad this service is possible in Rhode Island by means of the national cancer program and I intend to make sure that the funds are provided each year to make it and keep it the best in the Nation.

MENTAL HEALTH, HEART, AND DENTAL STUDIES ACCELERATED

In mental health last year we appropriated $39.2 million. This year you approved the $52.4 million I requested on behalf of my subcommittee. With these increased funds there will be a step-up in studies on schizophrenia, alcoholism, and psychopharmacology. This last program contemplates the use of pharmaceutical preparations in mental health in a manner parallel to the one used in cancer. The cancer program is working with great success, and I expect the mental-health program to move forward the same way.

In the field of heart disease last year we appropriated $35.9 million, and this year you approved the $45.6 million I requested. The increase here will be devoted to three main fields: arteriosclerosis, strokes, and anticoagulants. Everybody of middle age in this country can appreciate the importance of research in this field. Even the younger people who see the effects of these illnesses in their families have a proper regard for their importance, and I am sure that progress in this field will be looked on with interest across the Nation.

In the field of dental health we appropriated $6.4 million last year, and this year you approved the $7.4 million I requested for our subcommittee. This increase will provide the means for more work on the study of heredity in dental defects and the mechanism of tooth decay as well as dental caries. The latter is particularly important in children and often foreshadows the health of their teeth for the rest of their lives.

ARTHRITIS, DIABETES, ULCERS GET NEW ASSAULT

In the area of arthritis and metabolic diseases the appropriation for last year was $20.3 million, and this year you approved the $31.2 million I recommended. That is a 50-percent increase in a field with a great many responsibilities which up to now have been given scant attention. My subcommittee has urged an intensification of research in rheumatoid arthritis and the development of drugs which would be more effective than cortisone. Also provided is a program for the development of a better oral agent for use in diabetes. We are looking forward to the time when a pill taken by mouth will solve the problem of diabetics and shots in the arm will no longer be necessary. Another program we have intensified is gastroenterology. This includes ulcers, an ailment affecting 10 percent of our entire population. It is my hope that by the intelligent application of these increased funds we can discover what causes ulcers and be able to prevent them.

CHILDREN'S DISEASES ATTACKED ON UNPRECEDENTED SCALE

In allergy and infectious diseases the appropriation for last year was $17.4 million and this year you approved my request for $24.071 million. A large part of the increase here is to be devoted to a study of cystic fibrosis, a disease of children which medical men think is a metabolic disease. Today antibiotics can stave off the pneumonia to which children with cystic fibrosis are particularly susceptible but until we know more about the disease and why it appears in some children and not in others, we must intensify our work and learn the processes and deficiencies that cause it to come about so that it may be prevented.

In neurology and blindness last year the appropriation was $21.3 million. This year the appropriation is $29.4 million. This increase is to go mainly to the study of infant deaths and malformations at birth some medical men think are a result of conditions affecting the mother before delivery of the child.

Work on multiple sclerosis, amytrophic lateral sclerosis, epilepsy, cerebral palsy, muscular dystrophy, and Parkinson's disease will also be intensified.

RHODE ISLAND'S PART IN NEUROLOGY

Rhode Island is playing a key role in the Nation's neurological program which I am very proud of. It is the home base of a collaborative investigation coordinated by the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness to study and evaluate the factors which bring on such diseases as cerebral palsy and mental retardation. There are 500,000 people in the United States who have cerebral palsy, traceable to brain damage occurring in the year or so surrounding birth. And there are an estimated 4,500,000 Americans with mental retardation, about one-third of them children.

Brown University's Department of Biology and Psychology was one of the first professional groups to join in this important collaborative study. Today the Providence Lying-in Hospital, the Rhode Island Hospital, Miriam Hospital, Emma Pendleton Bradley Home, and the Meeting Street School are all cooperating with the university in this program.

Though this broad-scale attack on the crippling disorders of childhood may take 10 years or longer, its implications for future and present generations are considerable. It is among the most hopeful studies in the medical field that the Congress has been called upon to consider in my 18 years' service with that body.

RHODE ISLAND INSTITUTIONS AIDED BY CONSTRUCTION FUNDS

The Congress also appropriated $30 million for the construction of research facilities in accordance with the request I made of you. This is the third year in which the Congress has appropriated funds in this amount and since it is a 50–50 matching basis on which the funds are appropriated, at the end of the current fiscal year we will have not $90 million worth of new research construction in the United States, but $180 million of it. That means more and better space in which more and better research can be done.

In Rhode Island two grants were made under this program, 1 to Brown University of $22,555 and 1 to the Rhode Island Hospital of $25,000. The research facilities construction program has been authorized to continue for 3 additional years and I trust that other institutions in Rhode Island will apply for grants and the State will be able to broaden and intensify its medical research activities. I shall certainly continue to see to it that funds are available for worthy institutions.

You also approved the request for an increase in the funds for construction of hospitals, diagnostic centers, rehabilitation facilities, and nursing homes. These programs, stimulated by contributions of the Federal Government, have created institutions through the whole country, including Rhode Island, which never would have been built otherwise. I am sure that the people of this land thoroughly support your action.

TEACHING MENTALLY RETARDED

I also want to thank my colleagues for their understanding and support of other measures I proposed. One, calling for a conference on aging, has become law. Another, providing a million dollars a year for a 10-year period for training teachers to teach mentally retarded children, has also become law. There are about 1 million mentally retarded children of school age in the United States, and only about 15 percent of them are getting the schooling they need. This law will provide the teaching facilities and the specialized training to take up a great deal of the slack in the program. It will make it possible for large numbers of the mentally retarded to become respected citizens, making a contribution to the community, by providing them with expert care and education in their early development.

Another bill I introduced, to provide scholarships and loans for the training of students in the sciences, was not enacted itself, but a bill containing the same features, sponsored by Congressman ELLIOTT, a fellow Member of the House of Representatives, has now become law. Under the terms of this legislation, known as the National Defense Education Act, Rhode Island will receive a 4-year total of $3,475,074. The funds will be for student loans, equipment, guidance and testing, and vocational education. The annual allotments are as follows: Fiscal year 1959, $729,840; fiscal year 1960, $875,384; fiscal year 1961, $915,078; and fiscal year 1962, $954,772.

PROBLEMS OF AGING TO BE STUDIED

I have said for a long time that we do not give enough attention and thought to our aging population. As people get older their problems change and they become acutely distressed because we fail to recognize them as a group with special needs. We cannot begin to find solutions for these needs until we have studied the nature of the problems, State by State, throughout the country. That is why I proposed in a bill to you that a White House conference be held, after the several States have had time to make a study of their own, so that we can pool the knowledge and experience of the different parts of the country, and, having assessed the needs, then study and provide the solutions that are necessary. The bill is now law, and I am confident that as a result of the conference to be held by January of 1961 we will soon have a blueprint for the care and protection of the older people in our national community.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT YEAR

I regret that the Congress did not enact the legislation I introduced for a 5-year program of matching grants for the construction of medical and dental school facilities. The House of Representatives held hearings on this legislation but did not pass it. The Senate did not get around to holding hearings. However, I have been assured that as a result of the testimony on the legislation and the discussions growing out of it, both the House and Senate will hold hearings early next year. I shall introduce legislation again at that time and I expect that it will be passed by both Houses and become law.

In the closing days of the session I introduced a bill to provide for the mobilization of the maximum international health and medical research resources. My colleague in the Senate, LISTER HILL, of Alabama, introduced the same bill. We both had in mind bringing the subject before the American people so that next year we will be able to undertake its passage. The purpose of the legislation is to pool the medical research resources of the world so that there will be a full exchange of medical information and knowledge. I believe a program of this kind will have implications far greater than the intrinsic good that will grow out of its medical advances. It will bring the nations of the world into a medium of understanding and harmony that no other program has yet been able to accomplish. I shall introduce this legislation again next year for your most earnest consideration.

1958 GREATEST YEAR FOR HEALTH IN OUR HISTORY

This past year has been a banner year for legislation in health. I want to thank you for the fine support you have given to all the proposals I brought before you. I assure you that I shall follow these programs with careful consideration and come before you often to report on their development and to ask for the additional legislation necessary to accomplish their purposes.

I am convinced that there is no greater resource this country has than the health of its people and I know I can count on the cooperation of the House and Senate to preserve that resource as it has for the 18 years that I have been a Member of Congress.

Hon. Robert C. Byrd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and especially those who served with him on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I join in expression of the deep loss we all feel in the retirement from the House of the Honorable ROBERT C. BYRD. But what will be the loss of the House will be the gain of the other body, and we rejoice with BOB at the prospect of the continuance of his brilliant and dedicated service for State and Nation in the Congress of the United States. When the 86th Congress comes into being, and the other body marches into the House Chamber for a joint session, we look forward to waving our greetings to our beloved colleague, who served in the House and Senate of West Virginia, and now after three terms in the National House is the nominee of his party for United States Senator from West Virginia.

I hold for BOB BYRD a warm affection. He has many great talents. He is a thinker and a hard worker, earnest and conscientious, diligent in his search for the truth and eloquently convincing in its presentment. But most I will remember BOB BYRD and the years of my association with him because of his moral cleanliness, his religious humility, his fine modesty, his never-absent consideration for others. His faith is in his God, and he seems always to walk among his fellow men by the precepts of that faith.

The 85th Congress Refused To Act To Deal With Supreme Court Coddling of Reds and Criminals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the failure to enact a number of bills dealing with recent Supreme Court decisions represents one of the most significant shortcomings of the 85th Congress. Many of these measures were of critical importance in our efforts to deal effectively with subversives and the criminal underworld. Congress' inaction dealt a serious blow to law enforcement and will be hard for the American people to understand.

There will be particular concern over Congress' complete lack of response to the three-pronged Supreme Court assault upon this Nation's attempts to combat the Communist menace. In three different cases the Supreme Court first held that the States could not act against Communists seeking the overthrow of the Republic—that was in the Nelson case—then held that the Federal Government's own antisubversive laws did not apply to the Communist Party—that was in the Yates case—and finally that the Federal Government could not prevent even known Communists and other subversives from leaving and returning to the country at will—that was in the Kent and Buehl cases. The result of this jurisprudential triumvirate was to immunize the Communist Party from either State or Federal prosecution and at the same time to permit its traitorous members to improve their techniques and spread their poison in foreign lands all over the globe. These decisions of the Court made a mockery of our national effort to keep this country secure against communistic treachery.

The Supreme Court's decisions were in large part based on misconstruction of Congressional intention. Whether the Court was right or wrong, certainly their decisions left it squarely up to Congress to restate its intentions in unmistakable terms. Many of us who were particularly interested in these vital internal security problems attempted to meet the challenge by corrective legislation. Under this legislation the States would have been authorized to prosecute all traitors; the Federal Government would have been authorized to prosecute the Communist Party for organizing to teach and advocate the overthrow of our Government, and the Secretary of State would have been authorized to deny passports to Communist Party members and their agents. None of these vitally necessary bills was enacted into law. Indeed, the passport bill was never even considered by the other body.

Other decisions revealed a marked tendency on the part of the Supreme Court to interfere with legitimate efforts by both the State and the Federal Governments to deal with security risks. In two of these cases the Supreme Court established itself as an overseer of State procedures and standards for admission to the bar by overruling decisions of the highest courts of California and New Mexico refusing to admit former Communists to practice. Those were the Konigsberg and Schware cases. In another case, the Slochower case, the Supreme Court assumed the role of a superstate board of regents in overruling the decision of a university that a person who refused to answer questions of a Congressional committee regarding his Communist activities was unfit to teach. Even if it be assumed that reasonable man may differ as to whether such persons should be eligible to serve as officers of the State courts or professors at a State university, certainly under our Federal system it should be up to the States to make that determination. The Supreme Court decided otherwise, however, and throwing jurisdictional limitations aside, a majority of the Court translated their personal views into due-process concepts and decreed reinstatement of the individuals involved.

Specific legislation was introduced to deal with a Supreme Court decision in the Cole case, which whittled down the Federal Government's employee-security program to meaningless proportions. No provision of the Constitution was relied upon for this invasion of the Executive's power to determine the suitability of Federal employees for Government service. In effect the Court simply said that the Congress did not intend to authorize the President to remove all security risks under summary procedures because it, the Court, considered such procedures too harsh.

A bill to remedy this distortion of intent and allow the Government to weed out all security risks did finally pass the House. However, in an apparent effort to avoid dealing with the problem before adjournment, it was suppressed by the leadership of the other body and died upon adjournment.

Congress' inaction also stymied law-enforcement efforts against the garden variety type of criminal. A number of Supreme Court decisions erected entirely unwarranted obstacles to anticrime measures. In the Mallory case, for example, the Supreme Court imposed a system of timetable justice on police officers which made it impossible to properly investigate crime. In the Benanti case the Supreme Court completely destroyed the effectiveness of State wiretapping laws and transformed the ordinary telephone into a privileged instrument for criminality. In the Sullivan case the Supreme Court gave entirely undeserved financial assistance to professional gamblers by ruling that they could deduct from their income taxes the expenses incurred in carrying out their illegal operations.

A number of bills were introduced in the last Congress to deal with these specific cases. They were designed to answer the pleas of civic, fraternal, and law-enforcement groups all over the country for some Congressional action to counter the Supreme Court's rulings. One proposal would have restored the constitutional test of voluntariness and rejected the Supreme Court test of timeliness in determining the admissibility of confessions. Another would have authorized any wiretapping by local law-enforcement officers which was sanctioned by State law. A third would have enabled the Federal Government to deal with criminal conspiracies operating across State lines. A fourth would have closed the tax loophole for gamblers.

These anticrime measures would have constituted an impressive law-enforcement program. The dismal failure to enact a single one of them is a blot upon the record of the 85th Congress.

Powerful elements frustrated every attempt by those of us who pushed this anticrime program to get some action. There were inexplicable delays in beginning hearings, delays in writing reports, delays in bringing these bills up on the floor for consideration. In some instances the majority leadership either refused to schedule bills for debate or programed them for the last day of the session when action could be frustrated by filibuster threats by just 1 or 2 Members. The result is that there was no opportunity at all to express the legislative will on some of these measures. This sorry performance will encourage criminals to continue to flout the law and make ever more difficult the drive against organized crime. The vast majority of law-abiding citizens cannot help but feel that Congress has let them down.

It was never the intent of any of the bills I have referred to to undermine the Court as an institution or to interfere with its jurisdiction or procedures. The attempt by some judicial activists to cast these bills in an anti-Supreme Court mold was therefore inexcusable. The only objective of these bills and their only consequence would have been to carry out the legislative responsibilities vested in the Congress by the Constitution.

History demonstrates that the judgment of the Supreme Court, like that of the other branches of the Government, has not been infallible.

It was a Supreme Court decision in the Pollock case in 1895 which invalidated the first Federal income tax law and required the 16th amendment. None of us particularly enjoys paying taxes, but think of where this country would be today if Congress had not reviewed and the people had not revised this decision by the Supreme Court.

The list of examples can be multiplied. A Supreme Court decision in 1908 held invalid a Workman's Compensation Act for employees of interstate carriers. A

Supreme Court decision in 1908 struck down laws prohibiting employers from discriminating against union members. A Supreme Court decision in 1923 held that Congress could not establish a minimum wage law for women in the Nation's Capital. A Supreme Court decision in 1918 held that Congress could not prohibit interstate shipment of goods produced by child labor.

These examples of cases in which the Court's decisions demanded revision demonstrate the necessity for constant surveillance of the operations of the judicial branch of the Government. Such study is as desirable for the public welfare as in other cases the review by the Court of the actions of its sister branches is desirable for the public welfare.

The judicial absolutists in the Congress who condemn every effort to study and, where necessary, modify the decisions of the Supreme Court overlook the tripartite nature of our governmental system. Because they believe that the present Court faithfully serves their libertarian interests, they undermine and belittle the legislative efforts I have described to curb the Court's encroachments on the lawmaking authority. By their zeal for a particular decisional doctrine these extremists strike a severe blow at the fundamental doctrine of checks and balances on which our governmental structure is based. They have done their work well and in the process have left the country dangerously vulnerable to the threat of organized crime and subversion.

Many eminent authorities with no axes to grind have recognized that the Supreme Court overstepped itself in the cases to which these bills related. Professor Corwin, a leading expert on the Constitution, has poin'ed to the problem of keeping the Court out of legislative and executive territory. In his characteristically blunt way, he has publicly stated that on one recent decision day the Court "went on a virtual binge and thrust its nose into matters beyond its competence, with the result that—in my judgment at least—it should have aforesaid nose well tweaked." He described as "irresponsible" the Court's decisions in the field of subversion, pointing out that the total result of its actions was "to leave the country exposed to unjustifiable propaganda urging the right of revolution." Professor Corwin concluded that "the country needs protection against the aggressive tendency of the Court."

For myself, I was not as much interested in having the Court's nose tweaked as I was in having Congress deal on a selective and sound basis with the substance of the Court's misconceived encroachments on the legislative power. I stand with the great and wise sage, Judge Learned Hand, in his criticism of judges who attempt to serve as communal mentors or who attempt to suppress measures of which they do not approve. I know that any true liberal interested in preserving our democratic form of Government will share Judge Hand's repugnance at being "ruled by a bevy of platonic guardians." The bills I am discussing, however, were not attempts to seek vengeance against the Court or retaliation against any member of it. They did not deal with matters of personality or abstract philosophy. They simply were attempts to enact commonsense laws to restore public protection against subversion and lawlessness.

There must be added to the voices of Judge Hand and Professor Corwin what is perhaps the most impressive of all warnings against the tendency of recent Supreme Court decisions to overrule legislative and executive policies. I refer to the action of the conference of chief judges in adopting a resolution and report highly critical of the Supreme Court for its lack of judicial self-restraint and its invasions of the field of legislation. This resolution expressly calls upon the Court to recognize and give effect "to the difference between that which, on the one hand, the Constitution may prescribe or permit, and that which, on the other, a majority of the Supreme Court, as from time to time constituted, may deem desirable or undesirable."

Knowing the traditional reluctance of judges to criticize the High Court, the approval of this resolution by the judges of 36 of the 44 jurisdictions represented attests to the serious proportions of the situation.

Congress has now gone home. In the frenzied drive for adjournment these important measures were swept under the rug. Valuable time has been lost. The traitors and rapists can continue their activities unhampered by the new restraints some of us proposed against them. The shameful fact is that the 85th Congress did nothing to halt the plunder of the people by organized crime or the attacks against the Republic by organized subversives.

Never before has there been such widespread clamor for forthright and effective legislative action against subversives and the criminal underworld. The people will not long tolerate the tendency to sacrifice their rights in protecting the conveniences of the enemies of society. All America had reason to expect their representatives in Congress to strengthen the Government's anti-crime and antisubversive activities. Blame for the woeful failure of the 85th Congress to fulfill this expectation must be placed squarely on the majority leadership.

The Outstanding Record of the 85th Congress on Small-Business Legislation

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement on the outstanding record of the 85th Congress on small-business legislation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The achievements of the 85th Congress with respect to the enactment of legislation in behalf of small business have been widely acclaimed. The press, the small-business community, and many professional observers have been generous with their praise of the decisive manner in which the 85th Congress moved to improve the competitive outlook of the Nation's smaller business concerns. These small enterprises, which have been struggling in recent years to maintain their position as independent elements of our highly competitive economy, may look upon the year 1958 as the start of an era marked by a new awareness of the vital role small business will play in the future of our country.

It seems fitting at this time, Mr. President, to call attention in summary form to the various ways in which the 85th Congress manifested its concern for the welfare of the more than 4,000,000 small and independent enterprises which constitute the foundation of our economic life. In so doing, I also wish to take notice—with what may be considered pardonable pride—of the part played by the Small Business Subcommittee of the Senate in helping to bring to fruition many of the long-sought small-business legislative objectives attained by the 85th Congress. The members of the subcommittee gave their time, energy, and counsel unsparingly. It is my belief that the small-business achievements of the current Congress may be credited in no slight measure to the untiring efforts of these members in urging favorable consideration of the legislation enacted in behalf of small concerns.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

One most significant action taken by the 85th Congress on behalf of small business was the passage of Public Law 85-536 which conferred on the Small Business Administration permanent status. This action allows the hitherto temporary organization to take its rightful place among the established agencies of the Federal Government.

I do not believe it is possible to overstate the importance of this Congressional action. More than any other Congressional act in our history, it marks a full acknowledgment that small and independent business concerns are a national economic resource whose vitality and success are essential to the proper functioning of our free-enterprise system.

In adding this small-business agency to the roster of permanent agencies of the Government, the Congress eloquently emphasized the importance of small businesses to our system of dynamic capitalism. I recall, Mr. President, that soon after the Korean war started, I proposed legislation to establish a small-business agency and that in 1951 a bill which I introduced created what was then known as the Small Defense Plants Administration. It is, therefore, of particular satisfaction to me that in making its successor, the Small Business Administration, a permanent fixture of the Federal Establishment, the Congress also provided for improved services to the small-business community by this agency.

Among these increased benefits to small firms I might mention that the interest rate charged by the SBA on loans to small concerns was lowered so that henceforth the maximum rate of interest is now 5½ percent instead of the former 6 percent. In addition, the Small Business Act of 1958 increased the allowable amount that the SBA might lend to any single company from $250,000 to $350,000. Another provision of

the act granted to the SBA additional powers to assure small business a more equitable share of research and development contracts placed by the Government. Sales of federally owned timber were also brought under the Small Business Act of 1958, so that small-business set-asides might be made by the Small Business Administration.

SMALL BUSINESS TAX ADJUSTMENTS

A second action of the 85th Congress which will greatly benefit our economy was the passage of a small-business tax adjustment act. Ever since the pioneering study by the Senate Small Business Committee in 1952 of inequities in the Internal Revenue Code, I have been convinced that our tax laws constitute major obstacles to the fulfillment of the role of independent business. While some improvements were made in the 1954 rewriting of the Code, much more remained to be done.

Therefore, during 1957, our Small Business Committee made an intensive study of the impact of Federal income taxes on small-business concerns. Public hearings were conducted in 14 cities throughout the country under my direction as committee chairman. The committee members and the many other Members of Congress attending these hearings shared my conviction that an urgent need existed for assistance to small firms in the field of taxation. Therefore, at the conclusion of the field trips, we worked actively to write a report summarizing our conclusions and drafted the Small Business Tax Adjustment Act of 1958, known in the Senate as S. 3194.

So widespread was the interest in and concern over the need for greater equity in Federal taxation for small businesses that 50 Senators joined with me as cosponsors of S. 3194. This clear majority of the Senate was convincing evidence that action to alleviate the heaviest impact of this tax burden was essential during 1958. I personally testified before both the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee on this subject and called for prompt and favorable consideration of a small-business tax bill.

Therefore, I was delighted, as I am sure all the cosponsors of our tax bill were, when the Senate, in the closing days of the second session, adopted the Small Business Tax Revision Act. A similar bill had already been passed by the House of Representatives, and the final version has become Public Law 85-866.

While not all of the provisions of S. 3194 were enacted into law, I am of the opinion that the changes which were adopted will materially benefit the rank and file of small-business concerns. Essentially, the amendments eliminate certain discriminatory features in the 1954 Internal Revenue Code and will permit tax savings by small firms which can be utilized to finance their sound future growth.

I wish to point out that I shall continue to press for the approval of the other sections of S. 3194 and that I shall offer a small-business tax bill to that effect in the early days of 1959.

Because of the significance to small-business men of these provisions of the Technical Amendments Act of 1958, the Small Business Committee has ordered an abstract to be printed. At this time, therefore, I shall merely mention some of the more important benefits for small companies that this measure contains.

1. In the past, awards to small firms in civil antitrust actions have been regarded as income to the recipient in the year of award, regardless of the length of time during which the competitive injury was suffered. Clearly, such an award, added to a single year's regular income, would cause a substantially higher tax bill to any small-business man injured by violations of the antitrust laws. Section 58 of the Technical Amendments Act of 1958 specifies that the recipient of any such award or settlement may be taxed as if the sums were received over the entire period during which the wrongs occurred.

2. Section 1361 of the 1954 Code allows certain proprietorships and partnerships to be taxed as corporations. This section has been little used because the Treasury Department has issued no implementing regulations. Section 63 of the new act provides that an election under section 1361 will not be binding on any taxpayer until regulations have been published. This amendment simply codifies the practice which the Treasury Department has followed by administrative ruling.

3. Section 64 of the new tax law complements section 1361 of the 1954 Internal Revenue Code by allowing small, closely held corporations to be taxed as partnerships. As a result, small firms will be able to select the form of business organization most suited to their needs without the necessity of considering the differences in tax consequences.

4. Section 202 is intended to foster the financing of small businesses by decreasing the risk in small-business investments. Under this new provision, an owner of stock in a small corporation may treat any loss from the sale or exchange of such stock as an ordinary loss, up to a maximum amount of $25,000 in any one year or up to $50,000 in the case of a husband and wife filing a joint return.

5. Small business is particularly subject to the ills of violently fluctuating income. For many independent firms a feast-or-famine existence is the rule, and without the income-leveling benefits of diversification the single-line producer or seller finds it difficult to even out his profit years and his loss years. Therefore, some smaller firms should be assisted by section 203 of the small-business tax law, since it will enable them to carry back losses over a 3-year period. This, along with the present provision permitting a 5-year carry-forward of losses, allows an averaging-out of business deficits over a 9-year period.

6. The heart of the Small Business Tax Revision Act of 1958 is contained in section 204. While this feature is not as broad as the reinvestment portion of S. 3194, and while it is more limited than some of us wished, I feel that it does represent a significant advantage for small concerns. Since the most basic business problem is the retention of earnings to plow back into the company, legislation which permits the entrepreneur to keep more of his profits is extremely valuable. The recently passed section 204 permits any business, individual or corporation, which buys depreciable property having a useful life of at least 6 years to take an additional first-year depreciation deduction of 20 percent of the cost of such property purchased in that year. The maximum special deduction is $2,000 a year, or $4,000 in the case of a joint return. This special allowance, of course, is in addition to ordinary depreciation on the remaining 80 percent of the cost. It applies to used as well as to new equipment or property.

7. Small companies have been troubled in the past by the accumulated earnings tax. The lack of specific plans frequently made it difficult for small-business men to establish the reasonable needs of their businesses for accumulated earnings. This problem brought about the establishment of a $60,000 minimum credit in the Revenue Code of 1954. Section 205 of the new tax act increases this minimum credit of $60,000 accumulated earnings to $100,000 in recognition of the rising costs since the lower figure of $60,000 was set.

8. Section 206 is of especial importance to small businesses because it permits the executor of an estate consisting of a closely held business to elect to pay the Federal estate levy in 10 or fewer equal annual installments rather than in one lump sum 15 months after the death of the decedent. All too frequently in the past, the necessity for a lump sum payment of an estate tax has forced the closing or merger of small, closely held companies.

Taken all in all, Mr. President, I believe that these changes in our tax laws will prove of inestimable benefit to the hundreds of thousands of small companies which have found present tax rates a problem almost beyond their ability to solve.

SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT

A third major legislative effort to meet the proven and legitimate needs of America's smaller enterprises came in the field of providing more adequate sources of credit and capital.

In turning now to a brief discussion of Public Law 85-699, the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, I may be pardoned for the deep personal satisfaction which the passage of this bill afforded me. Financing has long been recognized as one of the most pressing of small-business problems. Eight years ago I joined in introducing a bill designed to open up additional avenues of long-term capital for small enterprises. Since then, I have continued to work for passage of such legislation and gladly cosponsored S. 3651 when it was introduced by Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON on April 21. This act has as its objective encouragement of the growth of small concerns by providing long-term loans and equity capital to small businesses.

The law calls for the establishment of private lending institutions organized under State laws and chartered by the Small Business Administration. The capital requirements of such institutions are set at a minimum of $300,000, half of which may be borrowed from the SBA.

There are two methods by which these investment companies may lend to small businesses. Under regulations to be issued by the SBA, the investment companies may make regular bank-type loans or purchase debenture bonds convertible into stock of the borrowers. No limit has been placed on the maturity for convertible debentures. The act does fix a 20-year limit on conventional loans which may be extended for an additional 10 years.

As I explained in discussing the tax bill passed by the 85th Congress, investors in small-business investment companies can take an ordinary deduction on any losses instead of an off-set against capital gain. The investment companies themselves have the same privilege on losses on the debentures or stock of the companies they help to finance.

The SBA is also authorized to make unsecured loans to State development companies, as well as secured loans. Secured loans to State and local development companies must not exceed $250,000, must mature in 10 years, and be for the use of a specific small business concern. Under certain circumstances, these loans may be extended for an additional 10 years.

It is encouraging to find that the Citizens and Southern National Bank of Atlanta, Ga., has already authorized an investment of $325,000 in a new small-business lending corporation to be sponsored by the bank. I know that similar institutions are being formed in other localities to help fill the need of small companies for long-term venture capital.

A feature of this act which holds out the hope of incalculable benefit to small business is the provision whereby $27.5 million is made available to the SBA for grants to State and local governments and to colleges and universities. The purpose of these grants is to encourage studies and research

on the management and financing problems of small-business concerns. The act specifies that only 1 grant may be made in any 1 State in a given year and no such grant may exceed $40,000. I am certain that when these studies of small-business problems get under way and their results become published, an invaluable body of information will become available on problems of small-business management.

GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT

During the past year, as before, the largest customer for American business has been the Federal Government. The continuation of world tensions, inevitably accompanied by huge military budgets, indicates that this fact of economic life will remain true. The 85th Congress went on record, Mr. President, to voice its determination that small companies shall obtain a larger share of the goods and services purchased by the various agencies of the Government. The Senate Appropriations Committee report on the Department of Defense Appropriation Act (Public Law 85–724) called upon the military services "to award a much higher percentage of their prime contracts to small-business concerns." This admonition was strengthened when the Senate adopted an amendment to H. R. 12738, which specifically provided that in transporting military personnel and cargo by air, not less than 25 percent of the $84 million earmarked for such purposes should be spent pursuant to contracts with the small-business segment of the commercial aviation industry. The final version of the Act directs the Secretary of Defense "to utilize the services of civil air carriers which qualify as small business to the fullest extent found practicable."

It is well known, Mr. President, that the increasing complexity of military weapons has had a pronounced tendency to decrease the share of small business in military procurement. The Senate Small Business Committee has constantly urged the heads of the various military services to redouble their efforts to channel more prime contracts to small firms in the areas of their competence. For this reason I was pleased when the Appropriations Committee of the House, in its report on the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1959, directed the Secretary of Defense to take steps to increase the small-business share of defense contracts and to submit a written report to the committee prior to April 30, 1959, "setting forth in detail the action that has been taken and the progress that has been made in implementing these recommendations."

During the past session of Congress, the Senate Small Business Committee also held hearings in an effort to find out why small firms are not getting a fairer percentage of defense contracts. A report with recommendations will be issued on this subject by the committee in the near future.

At the same time, it is somewhat encouraging to learn that during fiscal year 1958, the Small Business Administration set aside for exclusive award to small concerns a record total of 17,819 contracts, totaling $1,062,454,031. This represented an increase of approximately 30 percent over the contracts set aside in fiscal year 1957. Without this increased set-aside, the percentage decline of defense contracts awarded to small businesses would have been even greater.

Other developments in the field area of Government procurement include the reenactment by Congress, as Public Law 85–804, of title II of the First War Powers Act which allows defense agencies to amend and modify Government contracts, make advance payments, formalize commitments, make indemnity payments, correct mutual mistakes, extend delivery schedules, and to waive liquidated damages. Also of interest to the small-business community was the passage of Public Law 85–800, a measure which gives contracting officers increased authority to make advance and progress payments, increases the maximum limits for local negotiated purchases, and unifies various Government procurement procedures.

ANTITRUST LEGISLATION

There is one legislative area, Mr. President, where, in my opinion, more progress might have been made by the 85th Congress. Several efforts to strengthen our antitrust statutes for the protection of business, both big and small, did not make significant headway.

I was disappointed, for instance, that S. 3079, my bill to make section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act an integral part of our antitrust laws, failed to win the approval of Congress. The necessity for this proposed bill arose from the January 20, 1958, ruling of the United States Supreme Court that section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act was not an antitrust law and, accordingly, that private suits for treble-damage redress or for injunctive relief could not be brought under its provisions. Bearing in mind that private treble-damage and injunction suits represent an effective means of antitrust enforcement, I feel that authority for such suits under section 3 should be established.

The members of the Senate Small Business Committee, Mr. President, are keenly aware of the importance of effective antitrust enforcement to the Nation's millions of small-business firms. During the past session of Congress, the committee held hearings on this subject and published a report entitled "The Role of Private Antitrust Enforcement in Protecting Small Business—1958." Shortly thereafter, Senator RUSSELL B. LONG, chairman of the Small Business Committee's Monopoly Subcommittee, introduced two bills to implement the recommendations of the report. S. 4224 would require the filing of evidentiary briefs by the Department of Justice with the court before accepting a consent decree. S. 4225 would make recoverable attorney's fees and actual costs of private antitrust actions for injunctive relief.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, chairman of the Small Business Committee's Subcommittee on Retailing, Distribution, and Fair Trade Practices, introduced three other measures to follow up on the recommendations of the committee's report on private antitrust enforcement. S. 4233 would amend the Clayton Act to declare private antitrust actions vested with a substantial public interest. S. 4234 would amend section 4B of the Clayton Act to prohibit the waiver of private enforcement rights under the antitrust laws. S. 4236 would require the Justice Department and the Federal Trade Commission to publish in the Federal Register, 30 days before becoming final, the terms and conditions of all antitrust consent judgments.

These bills will, of course, be placed before the 86th Congress, together with a measure which I introduced during the 85th Congress calling for advance notice to be given to the Justice Department and the Federal Trade Commission when companies of a certain size are contemplating a merger.

It was a matter of regret to me that S. 721, which was passed by the Senate, was not enacted. I introduced this bill in order to increase the effectiveness of cease-and-desist orders issued by the Federal Trade Commission. This measure would have made FTC's orders under the Clayton Act final 60 days from the date of issuance unless appealed. At present, the Commission must wait until offenders have violated its order, then seek an affirming court order so that a third violation would constitute contempt of court. This is an unnecessarily cumbersome procedure. I am hopeful that the next session of Congress will look with more favor upon legislation designed to correct the situation.

On the credit side of the antitrust legislative ledger, the 85th Congress passed Public Law 85–909, an Act giving to the Federal Trade Commission some jurisdiction over meatpackers and food chain organizations with meatpacking subsidiaries. Under the terms of this measure, the FTC will have exclusive jurisdiction of the retail sales of meat products, while the Department of Agriculture will retain jurisdiction of packing activities at the wholesale level. This legislation means that the Federal Trade Commission is now in a position to police the chain groceries in their sales of meat and related products.

SUMMARY

Any appraisal, Mr. President, of the efforts of the 85th Congress to help the small-business men of our Nation must conclude that more meaningful small-business legislation was enacted by the 85th Congress than in any other Congress. Perhaps typical of comments of observers on the small-business program of Congress was that of the noted economic writer, Sylvia Porter, who stated in a recent syndicated column: "When you put it together, it's an impressive package of aid to small business. * * * The small-business man can say truthfully today that the 85th Congress not only has talked piously about his plight, but also has done something great to ease it."

An article in the New York Times of August 17, carried this headline: "Small Business Hits the Jackpot—New Legislation Goes Long Way in Providing Tax and Financing Relief."

While much has been accomplished, additional small-business problems will confront us, I am sure, as our economy becomes more and more competitive in spirit. It is my sincere hope that some of the omissions of our small-business legislative program may be repaired during the coming session of Congress. As new problems become evident, the Senate Small Business Committee will, I feel confident, promptly bring them to the attention of committees having legislative jurisdiction. The most helpful indication that American small business has come of age is the by now virtually universal recognition that our free enterprise economy cannot function efficiently without a strong small-business community.

Statement by Senator Wiley on His Activities During the 2d Session of the 85th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement on my activities during the 2d session of the 85th Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY'S RECORD IN 2D SESSION OF 85TH CONGRESS

As senior Senator of Wisconsin, I am taking this opportunity to enumerate some of the highlights of my legislative activities during the 2d session of the 85th Congress.

This roundup will include legislation which I sponsored, cosponsored, and/or supported. Too, it will include my fights against

measures which I felt were not in the best interest of the Nation, as well as of my home State, Wisconsin.

In a brief résumé, of course, it is not possible to comment on all the issues raised in this session of Congress. I shall, however, attempt to hit the high spots, and provide you with an idea of my overall record in this session.

WILEY SUPPORTS STRONG NATIONAL DEFENSE

A major challenge in this missile-space age, of course, is providing for our Nation's security. To help accomplish this purpose, I supported—for the most part—the President's program for a strong national defense. In this jet-missile-hydrogen age, we do, indeed, need to maintain a mobile, hard-hitting modern-equipped Military Establishment.

The price of such defense is high. For 1959, the expenditures amount to about $40.4 billion. These costs, along with other related programs, account for over 50 percent of the overall Federal budget. Even though it is expensive, however, we can't afford to let down our guard. To the contrary, we need to be vigilant. The Communists are continuing aggression, either outright or subversive, on almost all fronts—economic, ideological, psychological, and military. Time after time, Khrushchev has stated that the aim of communism is to "bury us." Thus, we can't afford to do less than to be strong, ready, and able to defend our lives and country.

As we remain alert to protect our national interest from aggression abroad, we must also strengthen our laws, as possible, to stamp out the subversive activities at home.

NEED FOR HEALTHY ECONOMY

Next, of course, we recognize the need for a healthy economy at home, to provide our citizens with good standards of living and opportunities for the future. To achieve these objectives, we must have constructive programs.

Aid for small business: Small business, for example, is facing particularly difficult problems these days. That is why I cosponsored and supported legislation to help resolve some of these difficulties. These bills include: providing favorable tax adjustments for small business; establishing the Small Business Administration on a permament basis, to enable the designing of long-range programs; and the Small Business Capital Act of 1958 to provide financial assistance to small businesses and other private (local) or State development credit corporations; to establish small-business investment associations; and to make equity capital available through funds provided by the Small Business Administration.

PROTECTING OUR CIVIL RIGHTS

Civil rights are a precious heritage. To protect these rights, I have opposed the so-called Jenner-Butler bill, S. 2646. If enacted, this ill-advised legislation, I believe, would have served to gradually erode the foundation of freedom in our beloved country. Under the guise of attacking a few unpopular decisions, it would have the ultimate effect of undermining the Supreme Court and thus upsetting the constitutional balance of powers within the United States Government. Traditionally, the High Court has been a guardian of our freedoms.

Naturally, we do not all agree on all decisions. However, it would be ill-advised, indeed, to undermine the judicial process which aims at safeguarding our rights and freedoms.

ASSURING JUSTICE FOR OUR CITIZENS

To help assure justice for our citizens, also, I cosponsored S. 3993. The bill would provide a public defender to represent indigent defendants in criminal cases in the district courts. The objectives of my bill passed the Senate in S. 3275. Regrettably, however, it did not get approved by the House of Representatives.

RIVERS AND HARBORS PROJECTS

The development and expansion of our rivers and harbors is an important task confronting the Nation. The objective, of course, is to get maximum use, as well as to conserve a significant natural resource: water. To help accomplish this purpose, I cosponsored legislation along the lines of Public Law 85–500, a new law authorizing the construction and preservation of rivers and harbor projects for navigation, flood control, and other purposes. Among the Wisconsin projects included were: Saxon Harbor, Two Rivers Harbor, Port Washington Harbor, Upper Fox River; flood protection on Eau Galle River at Spring Valley; flood protection on Bad River at Mellen and Odanah; etc.

OPPOSING WATER STEAL BILL

You will recall too, my fight to halt the attempt to divert a dangerous volume of water from Lake Michigan at Chicago by the enactment of H. R. 2—the water diversion bill. The stakes in this fight were high.

If enacted, the measure would: (a) Threaten our relations with a good neighbor, Canada; (b) jeopardize the development of the St. Lawrence Seaway; and (c) seriously damage our port and harbor development projects.

How? If the diversion of more water into the Illinois Waterway had been approved, it would have lowered the water level of Lake Michigan, and all of the Great Lakes.

Happily, we won the battle. However, we must gird ourselves for the fight again next session.

INCREASING WATER SUPPLY

Our Nation faces a growing problem of inadequate sources of water. Ever-increasing consumption requires renewed effort to assure an ample supply for the future. For that reason, I cosponsored Senate Joint Resolution 135. The purpose is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct demonstration plants to transform saline, or brackish water to water suitable for agricultural, municipal, industrial, or other beneficial consumptive purposes.

With greater demands on our water supply, additional efforts are needed to better utilize the available water supply in whatever form it exists, as well as stepped up effort to transform saline or brackish waters for further utilization.

The bill approved by Congress, and signed by the President, is now Public Law 85–883.

BRIGHTENING THE FUTURE FOR ELDERLY CITIZENS

Our ever-increasing number of senior citizens in the Nation—now about 15 million—are facing increasingly difficult problems.

To provide an improved senior citizens program, I have taken the following actions:

Supported a 10 percent increase in social security benefits—affecting over 281,000 folks in Wisconsin. A lesser amount of 7 percent was approved in the new law, Public Law 85–840.

Sponsored legislation to increase the allotment for extra earnings for folks on social security from $1,200 to $1,800 annually—without suffering loss of social-security benefits.

Urged adequate, low-cost housing to meet the special needs of our senior folks.

Recommended greater opportunities for part-time or full-time employment, including getting rid of unfortunate prejudice against hiring maturing citizens.

Recommended counseling and vocational or avocational guidance to help our aging citizens make the occupational, physical, mental, and financial adjustments to aging.

Urged establishment of broader programs to enable our older folks to continue to participate in and contribute to community life.

As science opens the way to longer life, it is important that the opportunities for folks in the upper age bracket should have a brighter outlook. "For age is opportunity, no less than youth," wrote Longfellow, "though in another dress."

WHAT ABOUT AGRICULTURE?

Regrettably, this Congress has not enacted major legislation that would have outstanding benefits for the dairy industry—a major part of our Wisconsin agriculture. However, some progress was made in the general agricultural field.

These included: Extension of the soil-conservation program for 4 years; extension of the Armed Forces dairy-products program for 3 years, until December 31, 1961, to help improve the diets of our servicemen as well as provide an outlet for our dairy surpluses; extension of the brucelosis-eradication program. Even though Wisconsin has been declared brucellosis free, we still need a nationwide program of complete eradication of this disease. Extension of Public Law 480 to provide for export of our surplus dairy and other farm commodities; promoting more humane slaughter of livestock; providing more funds for forest research.

In addition to supporting the above measures, I sponsored legislation with the following objectives:

S. 2912 and S. 2924, designed to prevent the lowering of price supports for dairy products. The purpose, of course, is to prevent further reduction of farm income, already too low in relation to the high costs of farm operations. Regrettably, the objectives of this legislation as approved by Congress in Senate Joint Resolution 162, was vetoed.

Public Law 85–748 was enacted to extend, expand, and improve programs for distributing surplus milk to our school children as well as to summer camps, settlement houses, and other nonprofit institutions devoted to the care and training of children.

S. 3930, to improve the distribution of surplus foods to needy people. The purpose of this legislation is to provide additional funds for certifying needy people so as to facilitate the distribution of more of the surplus products to hungry people.

S. 4019, to liberalize Federal regulations so as to provide surplus grains to farmers in disaster areas.

PROTECTING THE INTERESTS OF OUR VETERANS

Over the years, our Nation has designed a system of benefits to help relieve the economic, physical, psychological, and other problems and difficulties suffered by veterans as a result of service. The recently adjourned Congress did not make broad-scale improvements in these programs.

However, legislation was enacted to: provide a 10 percent increase in special compensation to about 2 million veterans who are 50 percent or over disabled and have dependents; increases the pensions to those who have been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor from $10 to $100 a month; continue the Direct Loan Program for home purchases, increasing the amount of a single direct loan from $10,000 to $13,500; provide aid and allowance of $100 per month for paraplegics—those with loss of use of both arms or both legs through service-connected disabilities or disease—for veterans not in VA or other Government hospitals; and, provide other benefits.

A major victory of the Congress, of course, was the successful effort to block attempts to cripple veterans' benefits programs; for example, along the lines recommended by the Bradley Commission.

LEGISLATION FOR IMPROVED CONSERVATION

Our conservationist-minded folks—in making constructive efforts to preserve our natural resources—are serving both a personal, and a national, interest. Today, an ever-expanding population and a spreading industrial-residential complex, threaten to encroach further upon our natural out-of-doors.

To preserve our natural resources, particularly those included in natural heritage areas, the Congress has adopted a number of significant programs. These include: Public Law 85-470, to establish a Natural Outdoor Recreation Review Commission. The purpose is to carry on a nationwide survey and evaluation of outdoor recreation resources and opportunities. * * * The enactment of Public Law 85-510, the Cloud Modification Research Act, to establish a 5-year program of experimental research, in the field of cloud modification and general weather control, with special attention to rainfall. More effective weather control promises great things for our conservation program—including: avoiding floods, drought, tornadoes, cyclones and other natural disasters that ravage and deplete our natural resources.

Legislation, too, was enacted to carry out a study aimed at preventing the poisoning of fish and wildlife by forest and crop sprays. The purpose of the investigation, is to determine the ill effects of some insecticides, fungicides, and pesticides, upon fish and wildlife. The ultimate aim, of course, is to avert unnecessary losses of fish and wildlife.

Wiley bill to provide fair distribution of funds for wildlife projects: I introduced legislation to prevent a change in the formula for fund distribution under the Pittman-Robertson Act that would have resulted in unfair allocation of funds under this program. While action was not completed on the bill, the Secretary of the Interior has agreed to hold in abeyance any change in the fund-distribution formula until further consideration can be given to the factors involved.

MORAINE NATIONAL PARK STUDY FOR WISCONSIN

The scope and beauty of Wisconsin's 500-mile long moraine area—including formations of rock, gravel, sand, hills and valleys, sculptured by glacial action—is unsurpassed anywhere in the United States. I have urged the Department of the Interior to expeditiously complete and evaluate a study of these scenic topographical features, to determine the feasibility of establishing a Moraine National Park in Wisconsin. The challenge, of course, is to evaluate all the factors involved—including the costs, administrative problems, land areas to be affected, and other matters of local and State, as well as national, interest. If the survey reveals the feasibility of such a project, I will introduce legislation to establish a Moraine National Park in Wisconsin.

GREAT LAKES BASIN COMPACT

In support of Wisconsin interests and development of the Great Lakes area, I cosponsored legislation, S. 1416, to provide for Congressional consent to the formation of a compact between Great Lakes States. The purpose is to speed the development and utilization of industrial, commercial, cultural, residential, and other uses of the resources of the Great Lakes area. Although we succeeded in getting approval in the Senate, this measure, regrettably, did not pass the House of Representatives.

WILEY ON SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON SPACE AND ASTRONAUTICS

The exploration of outer space—a new frontier—is a challenge which the United States must successfully meet to protect its future. In 1957, the United States was shocked out of its astronautical slumber when Soviet Russia put its first satellite into orbit. Basically a scientific instrument, the satellite, however, has a tremendous military potential that can be a real threat to our security.

Responding to the challenge, Congress established a Special Committee on Space and Astronautics—of which I am a member. Following hearings, new legislation to establish a civilian-directed National Aeronautics and Space Agency was enacted in Public Law 85-568, to direct and control United States space programs.

A successful space exploration program, of course, is essential for the scientific and defense purposes of the Nation. Too, new data acquired is expected to have practical benefits for improved agriculture, weather control, communications, transportation, utilization of the sun's energies for heat and power, navigation, and other purposes.

OTHER LEGISLATION COSPONSORED BY SENATOR WILEY

I, of course, cosponsored other legislation, including the following:

To expand and improve our educational program, I cosponsored S. 3163, to help provide needed assistance for expansion and improvement of our educational program. The objectives include: better facilities, aid for teachers, loans to students to attain higher educational goals, etc. Legislation with these general objectives, Public Law 85-864, was approved by Congress. S. 3318, to extend the mutual security program for strengthening the Free World defense. S. 3335, to provide a National Capital center of the performing arts as well as to promote greater international understanding through the stepping-up of friendly exchanges of artists in these fields. This bill, now enacted into law, authorizes projects to be constructed with funds raised by voluntary contributions. The purpose is to improve our own presentations of music, drama, dancing, poetry, and other performing arts. Senate Joint Resolution 147, to designate the first day of May of each year as Loyalty Day. Senate Joint Resolution 201, authorizing a medal for Rear Adm. Hyman George Rickover in the recognition of his outstanding services to our country. Senate Concurrent Resolution 59, designation of the year 1960 as Visit U. S. A. Year to encourage visitors from abroad as a vital step in improving internation understanding and promoting world peace.

OTHER MAJOR LEGISLATION SUPPORTED BY YOUR SENIOR SENATOR

In addition to the legislation which I sponsored or cosponsored, let me also give you a thumbnail sketch of other legislation I supported. Why did I support these measures? Because I felt the enactment of these laws would be in the best interests of Wisconsin and the Nation.

The major bills included: The reorganization of the Defense Department; extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; admission of Alaska as the 49th State; enactment of the Federal Aviation Act; support of Emergency Housing Act, including increased authorization to FHA mortgage insurance program by $4 billion; expansion of the highway program; legislation to provide funds so that States may extend unemployment compensation to those unemployed workers.

Other legislation I supported includes: Extending the Hill-Burton Act for hospital survey and construction; legislation to require reporting and disclosure of employee welfare and pension funds to avoid embezzlement of such funds; expansion and improvement of our civil defense program with funds for State and local participation; establishment of a National Out-of-Door Recreation Resources Review Commission to study outdoor resources; increase in salary and retirement benefits for postal and other classified Federal workers; postal rate increases, a measure adopted to help wipe out the red ink finances of the Post Office Department; extension, with some modification, of corporate and excise tax laws to help provide revenue for Federal expenditures; legislation providing stricter penalties for the transmission of obscene matter through the mails.

LOOKING AHEAD

Thus, the record of the 2d session of the 85th Congress—as well as of Senator WILEY—of course, has been established by the action of the Congress on this and other legislation. However, we recognize that there is still hard work to be done in many fields. Now—and in the days ahead—we face such problems as: Attaining full economic recovery; holding down inflation; improving our senior citizen's programs; brightening the farm outlook; providing more opportunity for small business; improving and expanding educational programs; strengthening our security; promoting business, and other actions of local, State, national, and international significance.

The challenge of resolving these problems, of course, are not only for the Congress, but also for the American people.

Atomic Energy Development—Nevada Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my statement on the development of atomic energy for peaceful uses with special references to projects at the University of Nevada.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Atomic energy development, today's challenge, will change the course of history in the fields of engineering, agriculture and medicine. These changes will affect the lives and living standards of all of our citizens and the generations to come.

In 1949, I initiated conferences with the late Gordon Dean, chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC), on three projects for the University of Nevada, projects which will lay the groundwork for future projects. The work has been continued under Lewis L. Strauss, who succeeded Mr. Dean as chairman in 1953, and under the new AEC Chairman John A. McCone.

THREE NEVADA UNIVERSITY PROJECTS ACHIEVED

The radioactive fallout or radiation dust project, the uranium ore beneficiation project, and the reactor technology project were all part of our plan for my alma mater, the University of Nevada. All have been accomplished.

The radiation fallout project is in the college of agriculture under Dean James E. Adams and Dr. V. R. Bohman; the uranium beneficiation project at the Mackay School of Mines is under Dean Vernon E. Scheid and Dr. John N. Butler, and the radio technology project is under the committee of deans with Dr. S. W. Leifson, head of the department of physics, as chairman, and Dr. David F. Dickinson, the newly appointed professor of nuclear engineering.

A fourth project, which would include a complete accessory laboratory plant and machine shops for further study and application of atomic energy to new and constructive uses, lies ahead. All this means more Nevadans grounded in nuclear physics and reactor technology.

NEVADA ENGINEERS THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

Nevada University engineers have established successful careers in America and throughout the foreign engineering field for more than half a century. They have successfully competed with engineers from all areas of the world.

In mining, reclamation, and industrial engineering, Nevadans have had no peer. Today the new field of atomic energy research and development must be expanded in our own university if we are to keep pace with other seats of higher learning in preparing Nevada students for their respective professions, and I am confident that it will be.

NUCLEAR REACTOR TECHNOLOGY—A MUST

The new nuclear reactor technology course at our Nevada University is a must. Without it we would not only lack the training facilities for our young people but we would lose many of our engineering and science students at the end of 2 years to colleges and universities where such studies are available. We would, in effect, be a secondary school in this field. But with such a course we will be second to none.

Engineers, doctors, and agriculturists entering their respective fields 5 to 10 years from now without understanding the new nuclear reactor technology principle of the generation of power and the peaceful applications of atomic energy will be definitely limited in their competitive careers.

Nevada students who have acquired this knowledge will be in the forefront in their fields.

USES OF NUCLEAR TECHNOLOGY

Potential applications of atomic energy for peaceful and economic uses are infinite.

As AEC Chairman Strauss told University of Nevada graduates at the commencement exercises in Reno, June 2, 1990 most of our electrical energy will come from atomic reactors. The isotope U–235 separated from natural uranium will be fissioned to provide these kilowatts.

First use of electricity generated by atomic reactors should be in arid and less accessible areas of the West which hold our greatest mineral wealth and where power is needed for communities, mines and new industries, and to pump underground waters from far below the surface of the land.

This does not mean that we can mark time on our program for construction of new and extensive hydroelectric projects, or in the rapid and full development of our liquid fuel resources which are also an important source of electric energy. We will need all sources of energy, including atomic reactors, to meet our requirements in the not too distant future.

Adm. Hyman Rickover, "father" of the U. S. S. *Nautilus*, our first nuclear-powered submarine, tells me that to maintain our present energy margin the oil industry will have to drill 1,200,000 oil wells in the United States in the next 10 years.

ATOMIC ENERGY TECHNIQUES TO REVEAL HIDDEN MINERAL TREASURES

Admiral Rickover, with whom I have had a number of consultations since I attended the launching of the U. S. S. *Nautilus* at Groton, Conn., in January of 1954, envisions wide use of nuclear technology in prospecting for minerals now hidden far below the ground. This should prove a tremendous boon to Nevada, the most richly mineralized State in the Union.

Geophysical prospecting, states Admiral Rickover, will include measurement of radioactivity, measurement of local perturbation in the earth's magnetic lines of force, use of seismographic techniques to determine the depth of structures of various densities, and electrical techniques for the measurement of restivity of various ore bodies.

Atomic energy also has a role in geobotanical prospecting. As Admiral Rickover explains, this is a special case of geochemical prospecting which includes analysis of samples of soils, rocks and ground water, and in which frequently small increases over normal metal content indicates the presence of ore bodies in the vicinity.

In geobotanical prospecting, he adds, certain plants concentrate large amounts of certain metals from the ground. Analyses of the ashes of these plants may indicate that ore bodies are near, whereas chemical analyses of the rock and ground water may not be sufficiently sensitive. Admiral Rickover quotes AEC and United States Geological Survey authorities as stating that ore bodies under a cover of barren sandstone as much as 25 meters thick may be detected by testing plants growing above them for uranium and associated elements.

To date the use of atomic energy techniques has been largely limited to the location of uranium and thorium deposits, but a number of very powerful new techniques are under development for the discovery of other mineral deposits.

THE SECONDARY DEFENSE AREA

Our University of Nevada is located in the secondary defense zone, back of the Sierra Nevada Mountains.

Practically all of the technical brains and equipment on the Pacific slope, including the Universities of California, Stanford, California School of Technology, Southern California, University of California Los Angeles, and the laboratories, could be destroyed in a few minutes by missiles equipped with atomic warheads launched by enemy submarines offshore.

In the event of a real threat many of the scientists and engineers could move into the secondary defense area and continue their work at the University of Nevada.

THE IDEA—THE START OF THE PARTICIPATION

In 1951 I persuaded the then president of the university, Dr. Malcolm A. Love, to send Dr. Joseph E. Moose, head of the chemical department, and Mr. Roy Hardy, one of the regents and an engineer in his own right, to Washington to review the work then being done in the field of reactor technology.

When they arrived I left the Senate for a 10-day period and conducted them on a tour of the Oak Ridge, Tenn., atomic project and also the Long Island installation. This was the beginning.

In 1952 the project to determine new and improved methods of beneficiating uranium ore was established by Gordon Dean, Chairman of AEC, and $60,000 was allotted to the Mackay School of Mines to carry on the work.

This project, continued with substantial allocations each year since then, and with many accomplishments to its credit, is being completed as AEC advises that sufficient uranium ores have now been developed for the next 10 years. Dr. John N. Butler, project engineer, is preparing a final report in which new projects will be suggested utilizing the specialized equipment at the Mackay School of Mines, and its experienced personnel for further research.

THE RADIOACTIVE FALLOUT PROJECT

In January 1954, a project to determine the effect of radioactive fallout on the production of cattle and livestock on the ranges adjacent to the nuclear test site in southern Nevada was established in the animal husbandry branch of the Max C. Fleischmann College of Agriculture under Dr. Adams. Again AEC Chairman Dean cooperated in our efforts.

The project, which has important implications in range areas, was enlarged this year to cover the relation of atomic fallout to soil, plant, and animal life and will have far-reaching value to agriculture and husbandry.

AEC'S GRANT FOR A NUCLEAR REACTOR AT UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA

In June of this year we persuaded AEC Chairman Lewis Strauss to come to the university to make the commencement address, and to announce that AEC had just made a $40,000 grant to the University of Nevada to enable it to procure a subcritical nuclear reactor for instructing students in the fundamentals of nuclear physics and reactor technology.

The grant of $40,000 is identical to the amount that was granted to Columbia University in 1940 for the very first atomic-research project in the United States looking toward applications of atomic energy to national defense and military purposes.

It is my hope that the equivalent grant to the University of Nevada will be equally effective in advancing the applications of atomic energy to peaceful and economic uses and our national progress.

Mr. Strauss agreed that Nevada's university was ideally located for this pioneer work.

SUCCESS OF PROJECTS ALREADY GAINED WILL STIMULATE NEW ONES

Procurement of the subcritical nuclear reactor for the University of Nevada marks the completion of my initial three-project program for the university, conceived in 1949 with the cooperation of the AEC.

Necessary laboratories and machine-shop development should later become a part of this vital unit. Success of the projects already obtained will, I am sure, assist me in obtaining additional grants from AEC for future projects, so that our university may keep pace with the other higher institutions of learning in this field.

ATOMIC ENERGY A POWER FOR PEACE

While new peaceful uses of atomic energy are being developed we must not lose sight of the necessity of expanding the military application of this tremendous force which can give us the power to destroy any nation that may dare to attack us or serve as such a mighty deterrent to war that we can preserve the peace of the world.

Four years ago, when I witnessed the launching of the U. S. S. *Nautilus* at Groton, Conn., I realized what a potential power it could be for peace. That is even more apparent now that the U. S. S. *Nautilus* has crossed the North Pole under the Arctic ice, followed closely by its sister ship, the U. S. S. *Skate*, an achievement that will inevitably revolutionize warfare or deter our enemies from attack.

To date only the United States is known to have the atomic submarine, a tribute to the early vision and foresight of Admiral Rickover.

Nuclear-powered submarines, equipped with missiles armed with atomic warheads and lying under the Arctic ice, could utterly destroy Russia or any other nation that might attempt a surprise attack on the United States. An enemy that would be so rash might deal a devastating blow to our cities and towns, but the retaliatory power of our atomic submarine fleet would then utterly liquidate the enemy.

Foreign nations know that and this knowledge should be sufficient to deter any present or future enemy from contemplating aggression or a sneak Pearl Harbor type attack against us. Our capabilities for retaliation can be our best guaranty of peace.

GREATLY EXPANDED ATOMIC-POWERED SUBMARINE FLEET URGED

Twenty, forty, or a hundred sister submarines to the U. S. S. *Nautilus*—whatever

number our defense chiefs consider necessary to do the job—should be constructed as rapidly as possible. Then an ample number should be stationed under the Arctic ice pack where they would be in constant readiness to meet any threat to our security.

With the advent of the atomic submarine, supersonic warplanes, and intercontinental missiles little wars are almost past. The next great war, if it occurs—and it will not occur if we maintain air and sea supremacy and mind our own business—will be fought in the air and under the seas. But we must prepare as though we were facing an enemy attack tomorrow, with undersea and air striking power in being, and with increased technology that will assure permanent superiority. Brain must be matched to our military muscle, and that is why I am fighting for new and expanded projects for our university.

In Senate Report No. 1627 of the 83d Congress, issued in July 1954 by the Senate Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Economic Subcommittee, of which I was chairman, I called attention to the serious decline in the Nation's technical graduates and warned that if such a decline continued it could endanger our safety and security. One reason for that decline has been the meager remuneration that skilled engineers, physicists, and experts in other technological fields receive after years of concentrated study and experience. The need for more technologists is imperative and the young people of Nevada and the Nation must be encouraged in every way possible to study and prepare for this vital work

Admiral Rickover has been making similar appeals. Russia, he warns, is now training twice as many professionals in technical fields than we are, adding, "the scientific revolution is upon us and we have not prepared to meet its ever-spiraling demands."

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA CAN HELP SUPPLY VITAL NEED

"Atomic power," he reminds us, "calls for a higher plateau of engineering competence. We are constantly coming up against barriers built of lack of understanding for the specific requirements of this new energy source. To take just one example: Lack of basic theoretical knowledge in the whole field of metallurgy forces us to waste time in ad hoc experiments, simply because we do not yet know why metals act the way they do when exposed to radiation."

The admiral places the obligation to supply this need on our Nation's educational system, its schools and universities, most of them hard pressed for the revenues to maintain even their present curriculum. To get the work done the Federal Government must assist in financing these projects. With the projects the University of Nevada has already gained, and those that I am sure will come, our own university, I know, will help meet this national need by preparing more and more engineers and technologists who will find a place in the front ranks of science and achievement.

EXPANDED MONROE DOCTRINE NEEDED

Technical and scientific knowledge and the advanced weapons they produce must be balanced by policies of peace on earth and goodwill toward men.

The most successful policy for peace in the history of our Nation was the Monroe Doctrine of 1823 which barred further European aggressions in the Western Hemisphere. It was forceful and it was clearly stated.

Today, the Monroe Doctrine, clearly stated, should be extended to cover all other areas of the world where aggression would be a threat to our security. With such an expanded doctrine, backed by air and undersea power, we could prevent any aggressor nation from establishing its form of government—politically, economically, or militarily—within the areas our Government considers vital to our peace and safety. Should any nation in the face of such a doctrine attempt such domination we could destroy its warmaking capacity at home.

Under the present Monroe Doctrine no European power has succeeded in expanding its power in the Western Hemisphere in 135 years, and only one abortive attempt to do so has been made. An expanded Monroe Doctrine, in my opinion, would be an equally effective policy for peace.

PRINCIPLES WERE DEVELOPED IN MANY PARTS OF WORLD BUT APPLICATIONS ACHIEVED IN UNITED STATES

Many scientists in many countries have contributed to our knowledge of atomic energy since Becquerel in France discovered radioactivity in 1896; Pierre and Marie Curie and F. Joliet of France, New Zealander Ernst Rutherford, C. D. Anderson, of the California Institute of Technology, and the aforementioned Dr. Lawrence; W. Bothe, H. Becker, Otto Hahn, Fritz Strassmann, O. R. Frisch, and Lise Meitner of Germany, Niels Bohr of Denmark, Hungarian-born Leo Szilard, Eugene Wigner and Edward Teller, Walter Zinn of Canada, J. A. Wheeler at Princeton, Harold C. Urey, those previously mentioned giants Albert Einstein and Enrico Fermi, and a score of others. Many of the foreign physicists had escaped to America from Nazi-occupied areas of Europe. They discussed application of the newly discovered fission principle to military weapons with American physicists and, in 1939, sent Fermi to confer with Navy authorities. The latter asked to be kept informed. Later that year Alexander Sachs of New York delivered a letter written by Dr. Einstein to President Roosevelt and urging that the Government encourage further work in the atomic field with a view to determining its potentials for national security. In November 1941, Dr. Vannevar Bush informed the White House that developments were well enough advanced to justify efforts to produce an atomic bomb. Fermi, with some of his associates, was sent to Chicago, where, in an abandoned squash court beneath the stands of Stagg Field, they constructed a mysterious atomic pile. On December 2, 1942, the scientists achieved the first self-sustaining chain reaction. The principles had been evolved in the brains of men and women in many universities in many parts of the world. The application was achieved in the United States.

Record of Votes in the 85th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the 2d session of the 85th Congress has appropriated $80.9 billion, the largest peacetime appropriations in history. The record of this Democratic-controlled Congress would make it appear that we have operated on the philosophy of lending money, giving it away, throwing it away, and then printing some more. This course, if continued, will destroy the value of the dollar and impose vast additional tax burdens on our people.

On August 30, 1957, I reviewed the record votes involving economy in Government during the 1st session of the 85th Congress. Out of 100 rollcalls, there were 49 which had a direct effect on Government spending and Government income. My analysis showed that 63 percent of all economy votes were cast by Republicans, while the Democrats were responsible for 70.7 percent of all spending votes.

In order to bring the record up to date, I have compiled a similar analysis for the 2d session of the 85th Congress. This time, out of 93 record votes 31 effected economy in Government. This year the difference between the parties was even more marked. The Republicans were responsible for 75.6 percent of all the economy votes, the Democrats for 77.1 percent of all the spending votes.

For the entire 85th Congress, both the 1st and 2d sessions, there was a total of 80 issues effecting economy in Government. Republicans accounted for 67.5 percent of all the economy votes and the Democrats for 73.3 percent of all the spending votes. Democrats contributed only 32.5 percent of the votes for economy and Republicans, 26.7 percent of the votes for more spending.

Almost $9 billion of additional spending was prevented by Republican votes for economy during the 2d session of the 85th Congress. A review of the entire record provides ample evidence that the Republican Party believes in economy. The Democratic Party is apparently dedicated to the philosophy of spending money regardless of where it is coming from.

I am including an analysis of the 31 economy votes during the 2d session of the 85th Congress as an extension of my remarks. The tabulations speak for themselves.

List of record votes involving economy in Government, House of Representatives, 85th Cong., 2d sess.

Roll-call No.	Vote for economy position	Votes cast			
		For economy		Against economy	
		Republicans	Democrats	Republicans	Democrats
11	Yea	152	------	16	181
14	Nay	111	73	72	126
18	Nay	170	105	17	102
19	Yea	175	136	13	73
20	Yea	166	1	22	212
21	Nay	76	5	113	208
25	Nay	102	37	84	173
27	Yea	154	19	31	180
28	Nay	141	31	44	166
37	Nay	70	32	89	139
50	Yea	163	60	17	148
87	Nay	127	32	53	173
99	Yea	172	20	15	198
107	Nay	162	53	21	150
122	Yea	169	10	8	194
142	Nay	162	49	14	155
152	Nay	151	36	22	151
155	Nay	133	2	53	203
157	Nay	148	38	38	173
161	Yea	95	45	86	147
165	Nay	156	24	22	180
170	Nay	113	46	67	159
172	Yea	116	54	49	139
174	Nay	111	23	66	185
177	Nay	160	37	27	160
181	Nay	88	77	78	120
184	Yea	128	62	33	130
187	Yea	105	66	50	124
188	Nay	106	76	46	113
191	Nay	37	18	108	153
192	Nay	53	11	87	137
	Total	3,902	1,277	1,450	4,874

List of record votes involving economy in Government, House of Representatives, 85th Cong., 2d sess.

Roll-call No.	Vote for economy position	Description
11	Yea	H. J. Res. 2, providing for the transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir and payment to Crow Indian Tribe in connection therewith. Motion to recommit. Rejected 152 to 197, Feb. 19, 1958.
14	Nay	H. R. 10681, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1958. Amendment providing an additional $10,000,000 each for Glen Canyon project and the Trinity River reclamation projects. Passed 200 to 184, Feb. 26, 1958.
18	Nay	H. R. 8002, providing for revised methods of stating budget estimates. Motion to recommit. Rejected 119 to 275, Mar. 6, 1958.
19	Yea	Passage of bill. Passed 311 to 86, Mar. 6, 1958.
20	Yea	S. 497, authorizing rivers and harbors projects. Motion to recommit with instructions to include only projects which had been approved by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget. Rejected 167 to 234, Mar. 11, 1958.
21	Nay	Passage of bill. Passed 321 to 81, Mar. 11, 1958.
25	Nay	S. 3262, authorizing support by the Armed Forces of the Olympic winter games and authorizing appropriation of $4,000,000. Motion to suspend the rules and pass. Rejected 257 to 139, a ⅔ majority being required, Mar. 19, 1958.
27	Yea	S. J. Res. 162, preventing temporarily any reduction in agricultural support prices or acreage allotments. Motion to recommit, with instructions to make resolution applicable only to dairy products. Rejected 173 to 211, Mar. 20, 1958.
28	Nay	Adoption of resolution. Adopted 210 to 172, Mar. 20, 1958.
37	Nay	S. 3262, authorizing support by the Armed Forces of the Olympic winter games and authorizing appropriation of $4,000,000. Passage of bill. Passed 218 to 102, Mar. 28, 1958.
50	Yea	H. R. 12065, authorizing Federal unemployment benefits for individuals who exhaust their benefit rights under existing unemployment compensation or are not covered by State systems. Amendment substituting bill providing for loans to States for payment of extended benefits. Adopted 223 to 165, May 1, 1958.
87	Nay	H. R. 12738, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1959. Amendment increasing appropriation by $90,000,000 and requiring that the Army strength be maintained at 900,000. Adopted 225 to 159, June 5, 1958.
99	Yea	H. R. 12541, providing for reorganization of the Department of Defense. Motion to recommit with instructions to bring bill in line with President's recommendations. Rejected 192 to 211, June 12, 1958.
107	Nay	H. Res. 609, providing for the consideration of H. R. 12954, the omnibus farm bill of 1958. Adoption of resolution. Rejected 171 to 214, June 26, 1958.
122	Yea	H. R. 13015, authorizing certain construction at military installations. Motion to recommit with instructions to make permissive, rather than mandatory, the sale of San Jacinto Depot, Tex., property. Rejected 179 to 022, July 10, 1958.
142	Nay	H. Res. 485, resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4504, authorizing $25,000,000 for mortgage insurance on marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities. Adoption of resolution. Rejected 164 to 211, July 24, 1958.
152	Nay	H. Res. 650, resolution providing for the consideration of S. 3497, authorizing $2,000,000 in loans to municipalities for community facilities. Adoption of resolution. Rejected 173 to 187, Aug. 1, 1958.
155	Nay	H. R. 13015, authorizing certain construction at military installations. Adoption of conference report. Adopted 256 to 135, Aug. 6, 1958.
157	Nay	S. 4071, providing for price, production adjustment and marketing programs for various agricultural commodities. Motion to suspend rules and pass. Rejected 210 to 186, a ⅔ majority being required, Aug. 6, 1958.
161	Yea	H. R. 13247, authorizing $1,070,000,000 for Federal scholarships, loans and aid to the States for educational purposes. Motion to recommit. Rejected 140 to 233, Aug. 8, 1958.
165	Nay	S. 2206, providing that wage rates for employees of Portsmouth, N. H., Naval Shipyard shall be the same as rates established at Boston Shipyard. Motion to pass bill over veto of President. Rejected 202 to 180, a ⅔ majority being required, Aug. 13, 1958.
170	Nay	H. Res. 682, providing for the consideration of S. 3683, authorizing loans, grants, and other financial assistance to depressed areas (Area Redevelopment Act). Adoption of resolution. Adopted 216 to 159, Aug. 15, 1958.
172	Yea	S. 3683, authorizing loans, grants, and other financial assistance to depressed areas (Area Redevelopment Act). Motion to recommit. Rejected 170 to 188, Aug. 15, 1958.
174	Nay	S. 4035, authorizing $1,255,000,000 additional Federal housing program. Motion to suspend rules and pass. Rejected 251 to 134, a ⅔ majority being required, Aug. 18, 1958.
177	Nay	H. R. 13067, providing for the establishment of a food stamp plan for the distribution of $1,000,000,000 in surplus food commodities a year. Motion to suspend rules and pass. Rejected 196 to 187, a ⅔ majority being required, Aug. 18, 1958.
181	Nay	H. Res. 689, providing for consideration of S. 4036, subsidizing the copper, lead, zinc, acid grade fluorspar, and tungsten industries. Adoption of resolution. Adopted 198 to 165, Aug. 19, 1958.
184	Yea	H. R. 13450, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1959. Motion adding $10,000,000 for construction of additional radio facilities for U. S. Information Agency. Adopted 190 to 172, Aug. 20, 1958.
187	Yea	S. 4036, subsidizing the copper, lead, zinc, acid-grade fluorspar, and tungsten industries. Motion to strike enacting clause. Rejected 171 to 174, Aug. 21, 1958.
188	Nay	Passage of bill. Rejected 159 to 182, Aug. 21, 1958.
191	Nay	S. 3335, donating land and providing for construction in the District of Columbia of a national cultural center. Motion to suspend rules and pass. Passed 261 to 55, Aug. 22, 1958.
192	Nay	H. R. 13343, authorizing the appropriation of $500,000 for the Pan American games in Chicago, Ill. Motion to suspend rules and pass. Passed 244 to 64, Aug. 22, 1958.

Report of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith on Soviet Anti-Semitism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith has recently exposed another example of Communist Russia's ruthless persecution of minorities and religious groups. In its report on Anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union Today, the league documents the steady destruction of the civil rights of Jews living in Russia. The evidence set forth in this report shows that Russian Jews are being systematically excluded from political life; subjected to educational quota systems by which they are virtually excluded from institutions of higher learning; eliminated from the diplomatic and military services; and harassed by a Government-approved anti-Semitic press campaign. The report concludes that the prospects for Soviet Jewry are "dire and gloomy," and compares the Communist repression of the Jews to that of the Nazi's during Hitler's reign of terror.

This report is another example of the Anti-Defamation League's ceaseless efforts in behalf of minority groups all over the world. The league's determined fight to achieve equal justice under law for every man regardless of race, creed, or color deserves the commendation of all citizens interested in stamping out intolerance and bigotry wherever it exists.

The league's exposure of Communist anti-Semitism should not be regarded as a mere academic exercise. Certainly, the coordinated destruction of Jewish civil rights is a violation by the Soviet Union of the Charter of the United Nations, which expressly affirms the faith of the peoples of the United Nations in fundamental human rights. After reading the league's report, I called on our Ambassador to the United Nations to undertake a concerted effort to spotlight before the whole world the perfidy of the Soviet Union in this matter. I am gratified that both Ambassador Lodge and our Deputy Representative, James Wadsworth, have promised to do everything possible to have the United Nations deal with the problem.

Under leave previously granted, I include in the RECORD excerpts from the statement issued by the Anti-Defamation League, my letter to Ambassador Lodge, and the replies I received:

ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE STATEMENT

Soviet statistics highlight the steady destruction of the civil rights of Jews, who are being progressively squeezed out of educational, economic, political, and social life in the Soviet Union, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith reported today. This has been accompanied by a nationwide anti-Semitic campaign in the Soviet press and the continuing repression of the religious life of Jews, the league added.

The league's report, Anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union Today, made public by Henry Edward Schultz, its national chairman, marks the 10th anniversary of the arrest of 450 Jewish writers, artists, and intellectuals who were shipped to Soviet labor camps in 1948. Of these, one group of 24 were executed on August 12, 1952. The others have disappeared leaving no trace and have either died or been liquidated in the work camps.

A key to the systematic exclusion of Jews from Russian life comes to light from latest Soviet figures on Jewish membership in the Soviet parliament now in the possession of the league. Whereas in 1937 Jews constituted 4.1 percent of the total membership, in 1958 Jewish membership dropped to one-fourth of 1 percent.

Other statistics obtained by the league reveal a consistent effort by Soviet authorities to degrade Jews in various fields of Russian life, scientific, educational, and war services—as if Jews did not exist there.

Equally significant, the report declared, are statistics in the field of Soviet higher education. Noting that the existence of a quota system against Jewish students in Soviet universities and technical and academic institutes has been widely reported since 1955, the league said there is good ground for the belief that the barring of Jewish applicants has been extended. This is due in part to the increase in competition in recent years for admission to Soviet institutions of higher learning.

"Exact figures are naturally very difficult to come by," the league report points out. "But recently statistics have been obtained from a completely reliable anonymous source which provide an illuminating picture of these exclusionary practices.

"These figures concern the number and nationalities (in Russia, Jews, though a religious group, are designated by the Government as a nationality) of the students graduated last spring from two faculties, history and chemistry, at the University of Minsk, the leading school of the capital of White Russia.

"As a basis for comparison, it is interesting to note the population figures for the four leading cities of the White Russian Soviet Republic. Minsk itself, with a population of 412,000, has 40,000 Jews. Bobruisk—total population, 150,000; Jewish population, about 60,000. Gomel—total population of 144,000; Jewish population, 15,000. Mogilev—total population of 106,000; Jewish population, some 12,000. The Jewish population of these four major White Russian cities represents between 10 and 12 percent of the total population. It might be expected, therefore, that this proportion would be generally reflected at the university, especially in a region such as White Russia where Jews were traditionally bearers of a high educational and cultural standard.

"This expectation is not borne out by the figures. The history faculty at the University of Minsk graduated 213 White Russians, 70 Russians, 40 Ukrainians, and 7 Jews. The chemistry faculty graduated 224 White Russians, 76 Russians, 41 Ukrainians, and 8 Jews.

"Several points are in order. First, the proportions represented by the students of the other three nationalities reflect quite closely the general distribution of nationality populations in White Russia. Secondly, the figures for the students in both faculties are extremely close, which suggest an official policy of fixed nationality ratios at the university."

With respect to religious repression, the league noted, the Khrushchev regime is continuing in full force the old Stalin policy severely restricting the number of synagogues available to religious Jews, far below the number needed.

"It prevents the building of new synagogues or the repair of old ones, and imposes unusual restrictions on the availability of necessary religious articles, such as prayer books and prayer shawls. Printing of the Bible in Hebrew is prohibited, and Jewish religious instruction is illegal. At the same time, Jews are forbidden to have their own schools, newspapers, communal organizationsm, or theaters."

The league noted that there has been a gradual accommodation between the Soviet regime and the Russian Orthodox and Moslem groups, but that Jews have been treated as a special case and are forbidden to have any countrywide religious and community association.

Further, the league said, Jews are forbidden even the minimal advantages which have been extended in the Soviet Union to the other one-hundred-odd nationality groups, which have been permitted to retain some sort of cultural identity.

"Utterly deprived of any means of cultural or communal expression," the league added, "the Soviet Jew is yet required to identify himself as a Jew by nationality. The Jew's identity card, specifying as his nationality 'Yevrei'—'Jew'—is all that remains of formal, legal, official recognition of the Jewish nationality. This identification gains no rights for the Jew, but makes him an easier target for discrimination."

The league declared that while restrictions against Jews have been tightened in education, in the diplomatic and military services, in government employment, and in Jewish religious life, Soviet newspapers and periodicals in the past year have been publishing regularly articles that are clearly anti-Semitic.

These, the league said, "have resorted to obvious and crude forms of stereotyping, in order to demonstrate the 'antisocial, parasitical' behavior of Jews in Soviet life.

"The curious features of these articles are markedly similar. The word "Jew" never appears. But the villain invariably bears a name which will be recognizable to Soviet readers as obviously Jewish. Among such names are Rubinstein, Fineberg, Blonstein, Veidman, Frankel, Katz, Spector. The 'villain' is consistently described in terms designed to incite the maximum hatred and contempt.

The League said the regular appearance of such articles is reminiscent of the more violent and openly anti-Semitic Soviet press campaigns of 1948–49 and of 1952–53. "It is noteworthy," it added, "that currently, as well as during the earlier period, there has also appeared a series of vitriolic and inflammatory anti-Israel articles."

"There can be little doubt," the league stressed, "that this bears all the marks of an ominous propaganda campaign reflecting official policy. The objective and effect of the stereotyped anti-Semitic portraits, their conjunction with anti-Israel articles, and the nationwide distribution of both in the leading Soviet newspapers and journals, can only be kept alive and foster latent anti-Semitic sentiments as a popular bulwark for related Soviet policies and strategy.

"Such crude anti-Semitism has its deep roots in Russian life, nurtured for generations by the Tsarist regimes as a matter of state policy. The Soviets have evidently not hesitated to use similar orthodox anti-Semitic tactics in the furtherance of their own needs."

The league emphasized that "Soviet anti-Semitism and Soviet strategic objectives in the Middle East complement each other. The U. S. S. R.'s pro-Arab, anti-Israel diplomacy ties in perfectly with its older anti-Zionist policy as well as with its anti-Western strategy in the Middle East. Finally, the anti-Israel policy serves as a weapon to stifle Soviet Jewish sentiments for Israel and as an additional device for enforcing internal conformity and the rupture of all Jewish ties with the outside world."

The prospects for Soviet Jewry, the league declared, "are dire and gloomy: at best, the extinction of a once flourishing and rich cultural tradition and life; at worst, the completion by the Communists of the heinous work begun by the Nazis—the liquidation by forcible assimilation of this community of 3 million Jews."

LETTER TO AMBASSADOR LODGE

AUGUST 23, 1958.

The Honorable HENRY CABOT LODGE,
United States Representative to the United Nations and Representative in the Security Council, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: For some time I have been deeply troubled by reports of the persecution and repression of Jews within the Soviet Union. A report recently issued by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith details these charges and underscores the fact that the rights of Jews in Russia today are being systematically and savagely restricted. This organized anti-Semitic drive, reminiscent of Hitlerian tactics, threatens to wipe all semblance of Jewish culture from the map of the Soviet Union.

While we in the United States properly view these developments with revulsion and anger, there appears little this Nation can do directly to help these noble people behind the Soivet Union. However, it does appear possible that our Government, through its representatives at the United Nations, might well bring this problem to the attention of the world and seek some means of its solution.

Certainly, the coordinated destruction of Jewish civil rights in the Soviet Union is in bald derogation of the Charter of the United Nations. That Charter expressly affirms the faith of the peoples of the United Nations in "fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations, large and small. * * *" Are we to permit those words to become meaningless without protest?

Although territorial barriers may also inhibit the direct intervention of the U. N., surely that body provides a proper body for a full airing of this ghastly situation. The United States, with its strong and fine population of Jewish origin, and its long tradition as defender of human rights, should properly take the lead in exposing this matter before the world.

Knowing your high principles and ideals, I feel sure you are as distressed over this situation as I am. I hope you and your staff will take this whole subject under serious advisement and will undertake a concerted effort to spotlight before the whole world the perfidy of the Soviet Union in this matter. This situation provides another opportunity for the United States to reaffirm its moral and democratic leadership of the Free World.

Very sincerely yours,

KENNETH B. KEATING.

THE DEPUTY REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE UNITED NATIONS,
New York, N. Y., August 27, 1958.

DEAR KEN: In Cabot's temporary absence I am replying to your letter of August 23.

On a number of occasions in the past we have brought to the attention of the United Nations General Assembly the problem of the Soviet Union's persecution and repression of Jews and other minority groups. We remain, of course, anxious to do everything we can through the United Nations to seek some way to deal with the problem.

I am sending a copy of your letter to the State Department and am asking that the possibility of some action at the forthcoming 13th session of the General Assembly be carefully studied.

I will be sure to show your letter to Cabot when he returns to New York.

With all best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES J. WADSWORTH.

UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS,
New York, N. Y., September 1, 1958.

The Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Upon my return to the office I find your letter of August 23.

Rest assured that I completely share your revulsion and anger at the maltreatment of Jews in the Soviet Union and have tried in the past to leave no stone unturned to call attention to what has happened.

What you are doing in keeping world public opinion focused on this problem can be of the greatest value.

You are certainly on the right track, and you can count on my wholehearted support.

With thanks for your letter and its many helpful suggestions.

Very sincerely yours,

HENRY CABOT LODGE.

Small Business Hit the Jackpot in 85th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, while Congress this year made legislative history in many fields, I am particularly proud of the record we have made in attempting to meet the pressing needs of small business in the United States. The truth is, as the New York Times put it, that the Nation's 4 million small-business men hit the jackpot in the 85th Congress.

In my opinion, this decisive action by Congress to improve the competitive outlook for small business came none too soon. As a recent report of the Senate's Select Committee on Small Business said:

> Small business is the cornerstone of the free-enterprise system. Unless a climate is maintained in which such concerns may grow and prosper, our economic system cannot survive.

ACTION TAKEN BY 85TH CONGRESS

What we tried to do in the 85th Congress, Mr. President, is establish that climate in which small business might not only survive, but also thrive. To attain this goal, Congress this year provided vital tax relief for small business; established the Small Business Administration as a permanent Federal agency; increased the lending powers of the SBA; took positive steps to increase the small-business share of Government procurement; passed the Small Business Investment Act to encourage growth of small concerns by providing them with long-term loans and equity capital; authorized grants to educational institutions, State and local governments, for studies and research on management and financing problems of small business.

SMALL-BUSINESS TAX RELIEF

Every one of these actions has real significance for small business. But most important, Mr. President, is the small-business tax-relief bill—a measure I was proud to cosponsor in the Senate. This legislation does much to ease the tax burden for smaller firms. Let me briefly set forth its major aspects:

1. SPECIAL FIRST-YEAR DEPRECIATION ALLOWANCE

Of the six key provisions of this bill, the most valuable allows taxpayers a special 20-percent tax depreciation deduction the first year on up to $10,000 a year of investment in new or used equipment with a useful life of 6 years or more—up to $20,000 a year if the business is operated in a manner permitting joint return.

The items would have to be machinery, fixtures, or other tangible personal property—not buildings, real estate, or inventory—bought after December 31, 1957. The remaining 80 percent of the cost would be depreciated normally, with the first deduction in the year of purchase along with the 20-percent allowance.

While not as broad as desirable, Mr. President, this provision does help to meet the basic problem of retaining earnings to plow back into the business.

2. INSTALLMENT PAYMENT ON ESTATE TAX

A second provision goes far toward relieving pressure to liquidate a family business for cash to pay the Federal estate tax. Under existing law, unless hardship conditions can be shown, this tax must be paid within 15 months after the death of the decedent, with a 6 percent interest rate in effect on the unpaid balance at the end of this period. Under the new law, that portion of the estate-tax liability attributable to the decedent's interest in a closely held business may, at the election of the executor, be paid in 10 equal annual installments, plus interest at 4 percent on the unpaid balance.

To qualify for this privilege, the value of the decedent's interest must exceed either first, 35 percent in value of his gross estate; or, second, 50 percent of his taxable estate. Any of the following is considered an interest in a closely held business: (a) A sole proprietorship; (b) a partnership interest, either where there are 10 or less partners, or where decedent's interest amounts to 20 percent or more of the firm's capital; (c) stock in a closed corporation, under tests that parallel those for partnerships.

In applying the 35-to-50-percent qualification rule, 2 or more businesses may be treated as 1 if more than 50 percent in value of each business is included in the estate. And the 20-percent tests in the case of a partnership interest and of voting stock of a corporation is determined on the basis of whether 20 percent or more of the business in question is included in the gross estate of the decedent, whether or not the decedent owned 20 percent or more at the date of his death.

3. INCREASED ACCUMULATED EARNINGS CREDIT

A third important section, Mr. President, increases from $60,000 to $100,000 the minimum accumulated earnings credit—that amount of earnings which may be accumulated before any income is subject to the accumulated earnings tax. This tax has presented an especially serious problem for small business because the absence of specific plans often makes it difficult to establish the fact that the earnings are accumulated for the reasonable needs of the business. It was this very problem which led to establishment of the $60,000 credit. By raising this to $100,000, allowance is made for rising costs and a wider margin of accumulation is provided with respect to which small business can be free of worry concerning the accumulated earnings tax.

4. THREE-YEAR NET OPERATING LOSS CARRYBACK

A fourth provision extends from 2 to 3 years the period for which a loss may be carried back and applied against previous income to gain a retroactive tax refund. Under the new 3-year net operating loss carryback, a loss is first carried back to the third year before the year of the loss. If any loss then remains, it is carried to the second year before the loss—the balance of any loss remaining being carried to the first year prior to the loss. Any loss which still remains, as under existing law, is carried forward successively to the 5 years after the year of the loss.

Thus, Mr. President, the 3-year carryback combined with the year of the loss and the 5 succeeding years of the carryforward provide a 9-year span over which either corporate or unincorporated small businesses may average out their losses. Where the loss exceeds the income of the 2 prior years, the new 3-year carryback is most advantageous, because it allows a refund shortly after the loss is incurred, instead of requiring the business to wait and obtain the benefit by paying lower taxes in subsequent years.

5. ORDINARY LOSS ON SMALL BUSINESS STOCK

A fifth section permits investors in small business stock to offset their losses against ordinary income up to a limit of $25,000 a year—$50,000 in the case of a husband and wife filing a joint return. By allowing ordinary loss rather than capital loss treatment on the sale or exchange of small business stock, this provision should encourage the flow of new funds into small business by reducing the risk of loss. To limit its benefits to small business, the aggregate of the stock offerings of any corporation which are eligible for this ordinary loss treatment is limited to $500,000. Moreover, to be eligible for this treatment the total stock offering per corporation plus the equity capital of the corporation may not exceed $1 million.

6. CORPORATIONS TREATED AS PARTNERSHIPS

Finally, Mr. President, the new tax law gives small business corporations the right to be taxed as partnerships in the same way that certain proprietorships and partnerships may choose to be taxed as corporations. This provision defines a small business corporation to mean a domestic corporation which is not a member of an affiliated group of corporations and which does not have more than 10 shareholders, have as a shareholder a person—other than an estate—who is not an individual, have a nonresident alien as a shareholder, or have more than one class of stock.

The election to be taxed as a partnership, once made, may be revoked or terminated under certain circumstances. Examples are: lack of consent by a new shareholder, revocation by unanimous consent of shareholders, or the corporation ceasing to fit the definition of a small business corporation. If an election is revoked or terminated, the corporation may not make a new election until the fifth succeeding taxable year, unless

the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate consents to such an election.

These 6 provisions, Mr. President, do much to eliminate certain discriminatory features of the 1954 Internal Revenue Code. They do not include all the changes that should and must be made. But taken all in all, I believe they will prove of inestimable benefit to the hundreds of thousands of small companies which have found present tax rates a problem almost beyond their ability to solve.

PERMANENT SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Another action by the 85th Congress of vital importance to small business was the passage of legislation conferring permanent status on the Small Business Administration. The same bill also raised the ceiling on SBA loans from $250,000 to $350,000 and reduced the interest rate charged from 6 to 5½ percent. It granted additional powers to the SBA to assure small business a more equitable share of research and development contracts placed by the Government.

As a result of this enactment, the SBA is now a permanent, one-stop service station for small, independent concerns in all lines of business. Believing such action was long overdue, I was happy to support and vote for this legislation when it came before the Senate.

SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT

No summary of Congressional activity in this field would be complete without mention of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. As passed by Congress, the basic purpose of this measure is to make equity capital and long-term credit more readily available to small concerns. To fulfill this aim, the SBA is now authorized to make loans from a $250 million revolving fund to small business investment companies. The latter will, in turn, funnel long-term capital to small companies which are unable to obtain the needed financing elsewhere.

In reviewing these bills passed by the 85th Congress, Mr. President, I want to emphasize that they are by no means subsidies nor coddling of small business. They bring equity to a most important segment of our economy. They represent a wise investment in the future health and vigor of the Nation.

After all, the overwhelming number of all American enterprises—more than 98 percent—fall into the category of small business. They account for a good 35 percent of all dollar sales. The strength and growth of our economy rest in no small part on the outlook for small business.

MORE TAX RELIEF IN ORDER

The truth is, Mr. President, that Congress must continue to make special efforts to improve that outlook. Despite passage of the tax relief bill this year, we must recognize that small business is still seriously hampered by high tax rates. I have supported legislation to change the basic corporate tax rate in favor of small business. Last year I voted to reduce the tax burden on corporations with less than $225,000 of taxable income. A similar measure was again defeated this year. The need still exists. Such direct relief for small business must certainly receive top priority when Congress reconvenes. At the same time, we must broaden and liberalize the deductions available to small business where profits are reinvested in the enterprise.

Another area where Congress must continue to assist small business is that of Government procurement. Far too great a percentage of Federal contracts still go to the giants of American industry. In this connection, Mr. President, I was most pleased that Congress—in passing this year's defense appropriation—specifically called on the military to award a much higher percentage of their prime contracts to small concerns. But more pressure on the executive branch is called for if we are to achieve better results. I am confident that the SBA can play an increasingly important role in this respect. Not only did this Congress strengthen its powers and give it permanent status, it also increased by 50 percent the appropriation for SBA operations.

BETTER ANTITRUST ENFORCEMENT

Finally, Mr. President, Congress must give serious consideration to legislation that will give small business greater protection from the discriminatory practices of large competitors. A recent report from the Senate Small Business Committee indicates a substantial increase in the number of civil antitrust cases terminated by consent decrees. Notwithstanding the frustrating effect consent judgments have upon private enforcement actions, the Justice Department continues to show a readiness to accept, even to encourage, consent judgments. Recognizing this fact, Congress must seek means to bolster antitrust enforcement and guard against unfair competitive practices.

The 85th Congress made impressive progress in providing small business with the tools it needs to achieve success. We should not hesitate to seek action in those areas where much remains to be done.

A Report on the 85th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. S. SAUND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. SAUND. Mr. Speaker, now that the 85th Congress has come to a close, I want to thank my colleagues in the House of Representatives for their friendship and assistance and report to my constituents on my activities during this historic session of the Congress of the United States.

I was elected by the people of the 29th District of California to membership in the most powerful parliamentary body in the world. That is a high privilege.

I have worked for 2 years under the shadow of the majestic Capitol dome, symbol of the freedom of the American people and their Government. It has been a thrilling experience for me to live and work in the shadow of impressive monuments to American greatness. The Lincoln Memorial, which makes Washington one of the world's most beautiful cities, expressing the spirit of government of the people, by the people, and for the people. The Washington Monument, symbolizing the courage of our first President. The Jefferson Memorial, with its protest against any form of tyranny over the minds of men. The Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, where those known but to God silently challenge us to work harder for the world in which young men and their loved ones can live out their lives free from the terrors of war.

During my first term in office I have done my best to keep the people of Riverside and Imperial Counties informed of the developments in Government that affect their lives and business. I have made regular reports to farmers, small-business men, teachers, and other groups. I mailed a weekly report to all the radio stations and newspapers in my area.

As Congressman of the 29th Congressional District, thousands of veterans, servicemen, new citizens, farmers, businessmen, students and housewives have written to me about their individual and collective problems. I have attempted to answer each inquiry promptly and have been able to help my constituents in ironing out their difficulties.

For example:

The widow of a serviceman was in dire financial straits because the mailing of her $10,000 insurance check from Washington was delayed. In answer to her appeal, I made a strong request of the Treasury Department and the check was dispatched promptly. Her death compensation payments were increased from $69.50 to $87 a month.

A veteran and family man, well respected and liked in his community, suffered a serious accident that rendered him helpless. Funds for his care were exhausted. Yet the Veterans' Administration maintained that he could not be admitted to a veterans' hospital because his injury was non-service-connected. I waged a vigorous effort in his behalf—to no avail. Finally, I went to the chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, Hon. OLIN TEAGUE, of Texas, to present my appeal. The veteran was admitted to a veterans' hospital.

I arranged for an Air Force plane to fly a child to an eastern city for a special operation.

In several instances, I was successful in arranging for the hardship discharge of servicemen who were vitally needed at home.

Hundreds of other cases involved tax problems, radio and television licenses for individuals and communities, problems concerning public land and other matters between citizens of the 29th Congressional District and their Federal Government. I have received many letters of thanks and appreciation, which were ample reward for any efforts I made in behalf of these constituents of mine.

I cannot conceive of a group of men and women more courteous, better informed and willing to assist than the Members of Congress. Thanks to the

generous and competent assistance of my senior colleagues of the House of Representatives, I have been eminently successful in accomplishing my objectives for the 29th District.

Last year, Congress appropriated $4,924,000 for military construction at March Air Force Base. In January, 1958, the Air Force released $4,431,000 for construction of a taxiway, airmen's dormitory and dining hall, officers' quarters and communications center. In the military construction appropriation bill for 1959 is another $3,165,000 for this important base at Riverside.

More than $4 million was appropriated last year for the extension of runways and other improvements at El Centro Naval Auxiliary Air Station, but unfortunately, this money is being held back by the Navy Department and the Bureau of the Budget.

An authorization of $510,000 for a fuse test facility and laboratory facilities at Corona Naval Ordnance Laboratory is included in the military construction authorization bill for 1959.

In the vital field of flood control, sufficient funds were provided for the completion of the Santa Ana River levees at Riverside.

Money was granted for planning of the San Jacinto River-Bautista Creek project in the Hemet-San Jacinto area.

The engineer's report for the Tachevah Creek project at Palm Springs progressed through channels toward approval, and just before the 85th Congress adjourned, I introduced a bill to authorize construction of this important project. I have been assured of early action on my bill after the next Congress convenes in January.

New post offices were approved for Cathedral City, Elsinore, La Quinta, Palm Desert, Holtville, and San Jacinto. The new Cherry Valley rural branch post office was approved and dedicated. Mail delivery service was scheduled to commence this month in Sky Valley, near Desert Hot Springs.

Fast action by members of the House Armed Services Committee, at my instigation, rescued and made available the $660,000 appropriation for the Blythe-Glamis Road.

Funds were made available for improvements on several airports in Riverside and Imperial Counties.

More than $100,000 was appropriated for construction and alterations at the United States Salinity Laboratory in Riverside and $15,000 for the salary of a scientist conducting important research to develop a new variety of cotton at the Southwestern Irrigation Field Station in Brawley.

A contract was awarded for $93,728 for improvement at the border station in Calexico.

The chairmen and members of the House Agriculture Committee and House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee accepted my invitations to come to the 29th Congressional District for on-the-spot hearings.

I waged an all-out fight to save the Mexican national labor program after funds for its continuance were eliminated by the House Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee. Legislation was passed extending the program for 2 more years.

Throughout the 85th Congress, I made an unrelenting fight to defeat the Fryingpan-Arkansas project bill. This legislation, so potentially disastrous to southern California, was passed by the Senate. I fought it in the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and House Rules Committee. I wrote a personal letter to each of my colleagues of the House of Representatives, urging their opposition of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project. The bill did not reach the House floor.

It is very unusual for a freshman Congressman to have a major bill passed in Congress. But by hard and persistent work, in cooperation with a number of my colleagues, I was able to secure the passage of a bill to authorize $2 million for construction of irrigation lines and drainage works on Indian lands in the Coachella Valley County Water District. This proposal had been an objective of the Coachella Valley Water District for 8 years.

The first bill I introduced in Congress was a bill to authorize payment of a claim to Riverside County for damages inflicted by the Navy on Ryan-Hemet Airport during World War II. This claim had been before the Congress a number of times, but it had never received a hearing. I persuaded the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee chairman to hold a hearing and representatives of Riverside County came to Washington to present their case. Eventually, the committee approved payment of the claim in modified form acceptable to Riverside County, but too late for action in the House and Senate. I shall press for further action on this claim in the 86th Congress.

I am pleased to report that in my experience as a first term Member of the House of Representatives, contrary to the belief of many people, I did not find any signs of partisanship or political wrangling. Bipartisanship has been the keynote of Speaker SAM RAYBURN in meeting the critical problems which faced the representatives of the people in Washington. While I cast hundreds of votes on highly important and controversial issues, not once was I told by the leadership of the House how to vote.

President Eisenhower told Congress at the beginning of the second session that there were three pieces of legislation that he wanted passed by Congress: First, reorganization of our military defense; second, extension of the reciprocal trade on a more permanent basis; and third, a sound mutual security program.

I am happy to report that I gave my support to the President, with some modifications, on these programs, which are of great importance to the future of America.

On the mutual security program, also known as the foreign aid program, I voted to cut $688 million from the President's request. I voted for this cut because I believed that a large part of the military assistance and defense support money was being ineffectively spent. In many instances in past years, huge expenditures in foreign aid have failed to win friends for the United States in countries overseas.

I took the floor and made a speech in the House of Representatives defending the President's request for $10 million to build a powerful transmitter to reach the countries of the Middle East and countries behind the Iron Curtain. I believe that it was an outrage that the President's speech before the United Nations last month was drowned out because we did not have a strong enough transmitter. Here, I protested, we have given away thousands and millions of dollars over and over again to win friends in the Middle East and other parts of the world, and yet we cannot afford a transmitter strong enough to carry our President's message to those people.

Following my 15-nation trip last year to the Far East, Middle East, and Europe, I reported to my fellow members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee that the people of Asia and Africa are not unfriendly. They want freedom and the American way of life. Yet we—a Nation of supersalesman—are failing to sell our way of life.

In the Middle East, we are buying kings and protecting oil. The people of those countries do not want the status quo maintained; that is nothing more than a return to the feudalism of the Middle Ages. They want to have a sense of belonging and an opportunity for a free, fuller life. Until we expend our energy in working with the people, instead of placating the kings, we will not come out on top.

Despite a lull in the cold war in a military way, Communists threats continue unabated. The Soviets have launched three economic offensives. We are engaged in a one-game series with Russia, which we must not lose—because there will not be another game. We have to come out on top. There is no such thing as second best.

When Congress convened in January of this year, there were two major issues which overshadowed many other important problems. This was the post-sputnik period, and Soviet Russia had succeeded in launching into outer space a ton and a half satellite of steel and scientific instruments. This brought realization to the American people that the Soviets had attained mastery of science and technological developments. In terms of national security, it was known that the Communists had succeeded in developing an operational intercontinental ballistic missile capable of carrying hydrogen and atomic warheads for thousands of miles.

In addition to this threat from abroad, Congress also faced the brutal fact that this country was in the midst of a serious business recession. Five million Americans were out of work while, in the same time, the cost of living was constantly rising.

The Congress met the first challenge with prompt vigorous action only a week after it convened. On January 15, in an atmosphere reminiscent of the "Hundred Days" that began the Roosevelt Administration of 1933, the House of

Representatives—by a unanimous vote of 360 to 0—authorized the expenditure of more than half a billion dollars for military preparedness.

On July 24, the House and Senate gave final approval to the Defense Reorganization Act, along the lines requested by the President, strengthening the authority of the Secretary of Defense to eliminate wasteful duplication of effort among the services, to facilitate strategic planning, to improve command operations and to expand defense research and development functions.

This act makes the Secretaries of the three services responsible to the Secretary of Defense for the operation and efficiency of their departments, and it clarifies the Secretary's right to exercise direction, authority, and control over the services.

It created a new Director of Research and Engineering to centralize research and development in the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

It preserves Congressional surveillance over the individual services by retaining the right of service chiefs and secretaries of the services to present their complaints to Congress. Retained is Congress' veto power over the transfer, merger, and obligation of funds within the separate services.

In the spring of this year I expressed vigorous opposition to the proposed plan of the administration to cut the number of National Guard and Army Reserve divisions and reduce the strength of these services. I was familiar with the great contribution of the men of the National Guard and Reserve in our Nation's history and their vital role in national defense today, as well as their activities in their communities.

With this in mind, I joined with many of my colleagues in Congress in making a strong protest of the proposed cut. I was delighted when the Defense Department reconsidered its decision.

Full production, full consumption, and full employment are my motto for a growing, progressive America. I maintain that we cannot function under our dynamic, expanding economy without always keeping this in mind: Business expansion can be sustained only by expanding the purchasing power of the consuming public.

Feeling this way, I gave my full support to the program which Congress initiated at the begining of the second session in January to accelerate business and curb unemployment.

Acting swiftly, the Congress passed a resolution urging the President to expedite work on projects, both civilian and military, for which funds had already been appropriated. Then it embarked on a program of legislation that included:

An emergency $1.8 billion Housing Act.

Increased $4 billion authorization for FHA mortgage insurance.

Authorized $5.5 billion for highway construction, including $1.8 billion additional to create jobs and expedite work.

Provided optionally to States, for repayment in 5 years, up to 15 weeks' additional unemployment compensation.

Authorized Federal guaranty of railroad loans up to $500 million.

Increased postal rates and postal pay.

Authorized advanced purchases of supplies and equipment from fiscal year 1959 appropriations to stimulate business.

I supported and voted for the Kennedy-Ives labor reform bill. I personally asked the Speaker to bring the Kennedy-Ives bill to a vote before the House. This law had passed the Senate by a vote of 88 to 1 and the Senators voting for the bill included Senator McCLELLAN, of Arkansas, and Senator KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota.

This is what the bill required of labor unions:

It required comprehensive detailed disclosure of union financial data—to members, press, public, and law-enforcement agencies.

It required full reports by union officers on any personal conflict-of-interest transactions.

It imposed criminal sanctions for embezzlement of union funds, false reporting, false entries in books, failure to report, or destruction of union books.

It established right of suits by union members for recovery of funds embezzled or misappropriated by union officers.

It required secret ballot for all union officers and that officers be elected by secret ballot every 4 years for international unions and every 3 years by local unions.

It prohibited solicitation for payment of fictitious fees for unloading cargoes for interstate carriers.

It prohibited picketing for extortion or to secure payoffs from employers.

The bill was defeated because it was opposed by the Teamsters Union and Manufacturers Association. The Manufacturers Association lobbied furiously against the bill because it required the employers to report any expenditures in excess of $5,000 on their effort to promote good will and sound personnel practices. Under this section only a small fraction of American business would have any need to report at all. Only willful failure to report relevant material carried any penalty. Thus was lost the splendid opportunity to crack down and put behind bars such racketeers as Hoffa, Beck and Hutchinson.

But it was only a temporary victory for the forces against labor. The friends of trade unions and honest leadership in both management and labor are determined to root out corruption in this field. I pledge full support to legislation aimed at giving the average union member a real voice in the management of his union and in directing safeguards against misuse of union funds and a repetition of those atrocious collusions between unscrupulous employers and dishonest union leaders as revealed before the Labor-Management Committee. I will fight for legislation in the next session of Congress that will benefit this group. One hundred and forty-nine Democrats and 41 Republicans voted for the bill; 137 Republicans and 61 Democrats voted against the bill.

I vigorously supported and voted for the compromise farm bill which was finally passed by Congress near the end of the second session. I had received requests for support from the Farm Bureau and other organizations and individuals in my District. I conferred with the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, and I went with a delegation of my colleagues to ask Speaker RAYBURN to bring the farm bill up for a vote.

Another bill of importance to agriculture was a measure extending for 2 years the Agricultural Trade Development Act, authorizing the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities to friendly nations.

Worthy groups in the 29th District will derive benefits from action taken by the 85th Congress to amend the Social Security Act, including increases in monthly payments amounting to about 7 percent; give pay raises to civil service employees and military personnel; and increase civil service annuities.

The Veterans of World War I of the United States won an uphill fight to win national recognition through the granting of a Federal charter of incorporation. The VA direct loan program was extended; $150 million was authorized for the next 2 years and the maximum GI mortgages which the Government could purchase directly was increased to $13,500 from $10,000.

In the field of education, the National Defense Education Act was passed to promote an accelerated education program in the face of Russia's gains in this space-age era.

When Federal aid to school districts with large enrollments of children of Federal employees was endangered, I took prompt action, arranging for the appearance of representatives of the 29th District schools before the House Education Subcommittee. These vital funds were saved.

It has been a sincere privilege to serve the people of the 29th Congressional District in the House of Representatives for 2 years. I am here to assist all of the people of my District. I have studied carefully every piece of legislation that was presented before Congress and I have honestly and conscientiously tried to use my best judgment in voting on these vital issues.

Let this be an invitation to everyone. If I can be of service to you in any way, at any time, in Washington, please do not hesitate to write me.

Correction of Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, within the last few days, my individual voting record by rollcalls in the United States House of Representatives, 85th Congress, 2d session, was submitted to me by Ralph W. Roberts, Clerk of the House of Representatives. In examining this record,

I noticed an error had been made on rollcall No. 120, which was recorded on July 2, 1958. This was on H. R. 13192, a bill making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes. I was recorded erroneously as voting "yea" on this rollcall whereas in fact I voted "nay."

It should be further noted that the record vote shows that I am properly recorded in the vote against the authorization bill for this same measure—rollcall No. 58—and for the vote to recommit the mutual security appropriations bill—rollcall No. 119.

At the appropriate time, I shall have the RECORD on rollcall No. 120 corrected accordingly.

Southern Nevada and the Colorado River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the Colorado River is to southern Nevada what the Truckee, Carson, Walker, and Humboldt are to the northern part of the State.

On May 12, 1958, I testified before United States Supreme Court Special Master Simon H. Rifkind in connection with the Arizona against California Colorado River suit and with special reference to Nevada water needs and Nevada projects.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter which I have received from Mr. R. P. Parry, attorney for the Colorado River Commission of Nevada, my testimony before Special Master Rifkind, of the United States Supreme Court, and the special master's statement, made at the close of the testimony.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Honorable GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator,
Reno, Nev.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Knowing your personal interest in the Colorado River suit, now pending in the United States Supreme Court, as shown by your testifying at the San Francisco hearing, I am enclosing a copy of the special master's remarks at the close of the testimony. I especially call your attention to the tribute he paid to the high quality of the witnesses who appeared before him.

We face the inescapable fact that the future growth of the Las Vegas area will be limited by the amount of Colorado River water ultimately available for it. The fact that the past growth of this area has even exceeded predictions made by you a quarter of a century ago lends extra weight to your testimony predicting a population of over half a million in the area in the foreseeable future.

Your professional engineering qualifications, coupled with your intimate knowledge of the complex and complicated compact and statutory proceedings, gave added strength to your testimony as to the great recreational values, marvelous climatic advantages, and other inherent factors pointing to a great population and economic growth.

As usual, you have performed a great service for the State of Nevada in assisting us in this case. The attorneys involved appreciate it, and I am sure we are justified in expressing the appreciation of the State and its people also.

Sincerely,

R. P. PARRY.

ARIZONA VERSUS CALIFORNIA, COLORADO RIVER SUIT, NEVADA PROJECTS

Estimated gross areas of land considered suitable for development as small homesite tracts, domestic and industrial uses, in Las Vegas Valley, Eldorado Valley, Apex Dry Lake Valley, California Wash, Moapa Valley, Mormon Mesa, and land adjacent to Lake Mohave and Lake Mead below specified elevations, excluding irrigated and irrigable lands in Las Vegas Valley and Moapa Valley, and irrigable lands in the Big Bend, Fort Mohave area.

Location	Elevation below	Area acres
	Feet	
Las Vegas Valley	2,500	[1] 224,000
Eldorado Valley	2,500	[2] 86,000
Apex Dry Lake Valley	2,300	[3] 30,000
California Wash	2,300	[4] 80,000
Moapa Valley	1,800	[5] 48,000
Mormon Mesa	2,300	[6] 116,000
Big Bend-Fort Mohave	2,000	[7] 14,000
Adjacent to Lake Mohave	2,000	[8] 25,000
Adjacent to Lake Mead	2,500	[9] 50,000
Total		673,000
Round to		670,000

[1] Estimated approximate total area of Las Vegas Valley below an elevation of 2,500 feet, including 64,000 acres above 2,300 feet and below 2,500 feet, 21,000 acres within Las Vegas, North Las Vegas, Henderson, Basic Management, Inc., plant and ponds, Nellis Air Base and McCarran Field, but excluding irrigated land.

[2] 21,000 acres of capability VIII land above elevation 2,300 feet and below 2,500 feet added to total acreage below 2,300 feet elevation.

[3] 5,000 acres of capability VIII land considered suitable for domestic and industrial uses but not suitable for small homesite tracts, added to acreage of capabilities I, II, III, IV, and VII land.

[4] 15,000 acres of capability VIII land considered suitable for domestic and industrial uses but not suitable for small homesite tracts.

[5] 7,000 acres of capability VIII land considered suitable for domestic and industrial uses but not suitable for small homesite tracts, added to acreage of capabilities I, II, III, IV, and VII land.

[6] 30,000 acres of capability VIII land considered suitable for domestic and industrial uses but not suitable for small homesite tracts, added to acreage of capabilities I, II, III, IV, and VII land.

[7] Estimated acreage of land outside of boundary of Lake Mead National Recreational Area, excluding irrigable lands.

[8] Nevada side of Lake Mohave.

[9] Nevada side of Lake Mead.

TESTIMONY OF SENATOR GEORGE W. MALONE BEFORE THE SPECIAL MASTER, SIMON H. RIFKIND, UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., MAY 12, 1958

Question. Senator, will you please state your full name for the record?

Answer. GEORGE W. MALONE.

Question. What is your present occupation and residence?

Answer. I am senior United States Senator for the State of Nevada. My residence is in Reno, Nev. I reside in Washington, D. C., during the time I am obligated to be there on official business.

Question. For what length of time have you been United States Senator from Nevada?

Answer. Since 1946.

Question. Senator, I show you a statement of your professional qualifications which has been heretofore handed to counsel and would inquire if that is a correct and accurate statement?

Answer. It is.

I ask permission to have this statement of qualifications copied into the record as though read. (Not shown.)

Question. Senator, are you a licensed professional engineer?

Answer. Yes. I hold Nevada License No. 40 and California License No. 1–5303. I was the first chairman of the Nevada Board of Professional Engineers in 1935.

Question. During what years did you serve as State engineer of the State of Nevada?

Answer. From 1927 to 1935.

Question. During what years were you a member of the Colorado River Commission of the State of Nevada?

Answer. From 1927 to 1935—the same period.

Question. What was your regular occupation prior to and following your service as State engineer?

Answer. I was in the engineering business, including consulting engineering.

Question. During your service in the United States Senate, have you served on any committee having supervision over water resources, and particularly Colorado River problems?

Answer. I am the ranking Republican member of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which has jurisdiction over all legislation affecting such matters.

Question. In your capacity as State engineer, and continuously thereafter as consulting engineer, and as United States Senator, have you been familiar with that portion of the State of Nevada which lies in the drainage area of the Colorado River Basin?

Answer. Yes; I have been familiar with that area since 1925; have done professional work throughout the area; from 1927 to 1935 I attended all Colorado River power and water conferences and was generally familiar with the activities in the basin until 1946, and since that time have studied the activities of the basin closely as a Member of the United States Senate from Nevada.

Question. Have you had occasion to participate in various negotiations, meetings, and so forth with reference to the allocation and use of Hoover Dam power in that area?

Answer. Yes.

SURVEY OF COMPETITIVE POWER

Question. Will you state generally some of your activities in that respect?

Answer. I was consultant to the Secretary of the Interior in the allocation of power as provided in the Boulder Dam Project Act, one member from each Colorado River Basin State.

In addition, I made a rather exhaustive survey of the cost of competitive power; that is, the cost of steam power with oil and gas fuel.

Also, I made a close study of the distribution of the benefits from the power development at Boulder, now Hoover, Dam.

STUDY OF POPULATION GROWTH

Question. As a result of all of your activities and knowledge, have you studied the past growth of population in that area?

Answer. I have.

Question. Will you describe generally what has occurred with respect to the development of that area in the time you have been acquainted with it?

Answer. Las Vegas and the surrounding area have grown from about 7,000 to 120,000 population from 1927 to 1958. This marked a 113,000 increase in 31 years.

This growth largely took place following the completion of Hoover Dam in 1935.

In 1940 the population of Clark County in southern Nevada was 16,000; in 18 years it was 120,000, an increase of 104,000 people, sharing the accelerated rate of growth.

Nevada is one of the eight Intermountain States—the fastest growing State in the Union.

WATER SUPPLY ONLY LIMITING GROWTH FACTOR

The water supply is the only possible limiting factor in the future growth of the State of Nevada.

The limit of any State's development is the limit of that State's water supply.

Southern Nevada is a winter resort area. However, the advent of air conditioning whipped the desert, and southern Nevada is now an all-year domestic and industrial as well as agricultural area.

With Hoover Dam, the highest in the world—often referred to as the eighth wonder of the world—with Lake Mead behind it 100 miles long, with Davis Dam backing the water more than 60 miles to the foot of Hoover Dam—both with excellent year-round fishing, and with Charleston Mountains about 12,000 elevation, 30 miles from Las Vegas, there is no foreseeable end to the residential growth, and of the tourist traffic.

Within a decade southern Nevada should have a population of 250,000; and then the limit of the future population growth keeping pace with the irrigation, industrial and domestic use of water on the available 673,000 acres from Davis Dam to the Mormon Mesa under the 2,500-foot contour, will be determined by the decision of the United States Supreme Court in this case of *Arizona* v. *California* determining the proper division of the water allotted to the lower basin among the respective States.

Question. Have you made a study as to what factors are present in that area which would lead to future increased growth?

Answer. I have.

FACTORS AFFECTING LOCATION OF INDUSTRY BRIDGE CANYON

Question. For instance, what in your opinion, is the situation with respect to available locations for large industrial plants?

Answer. The locations of industrial plants are determined by a correlation of plant factors, including the availability and cost of power, water, plant sites, transportation, and employee living conditions, as major factors.

Schools, recreation and a number of minor factors influence such locations.

Future power is unlimited, since in addition to the allocation from the Hoover and Davis Dams a gasline connects the west Texas fields with the area, and a second gasline from producing fields is presently contemplated.

In addition, Bridge Canyon Dam on the Colorado River below Glen Canyon will be constructed within the reasonably near future. It becomes feasible when Glen Canyon Dam storage becomes available. Arizona and California have both indicated they would like to build it.

I have a bill in the Senate for the Government to build it—the Government money to be returned with interest.

No matter how it is constructed, Nevada should be allocated her fair share of the power which should not be less than 25 percent of the approximately 800,000 kilowatts to be generated.

The availability of water supply is in the hands of the Supreme Court of the United States. There is no other source of supply for this great area.

Abundant suitable plant sites are available at small cost.

Transportation includes a top transcontinental railroad and highway system, three transcontinental airlines and a five-State interstate air service.

Living and working conditions are first class.

First class schools from kindergarten to a branch of the State University are available.

Recreation facilities including boating, fishing, lakeside, desert and mountain resorts, and playgrounds are plentiful and reasonably priced.

These sites are available from below Davis Dam to the Mormon Mesa northeast of Muddy River, below the 2,500-foot contour line, a distance of approximately 125 miles.

SECONDARY DEFENSE AREA

Question. What areas are referred to as secondary defense areas?

Answer. The common reference, a secondary defense area, refers to that area east of the Sierra Nevada Mountains extending from Canada to the Mexican boundary.

This range of mountains generally form the boundary between the States of California and Nevada and range up to approximately 12,000 feet in elevation.

This range of mountains is from 250 to 300 miles inland from tidewater on the Pacific Ocean.

It has long been recognized by the armed services that any industry or defense area on the Pacific slope is vulnerable to submarine attack.

It was estimated a few years ago that probably 80 percent of such industries, defense installations, and atomic energy brains could be destroyed in 30 minutes by a few well-placed submarines.

This would include such outstanding research centers as California and Stanford Universities, and California Institute of Technology.

About 1954 the then Secretary of the Navy, after a thorough investigation announced for the armed services that there would be no new national defense industries located on the Pacific slope.

The State of Nevada is not the only area in the secondary defense area but it is strategically located.

The full appreciation of this condition by Congress and the Armed Forces portends future industrial growth east of the Sierra Nevada Mountains.

Evidence of this early realization was the location of the United States naval ammunition depot in 1928.

Senators Oddie and Pittman were representing Nevada in Washington at that time. Gov. F. B. Balzar was the current Governor and I was the State engineer. The secondary defense area argument was recognized by the Navy's top admirals at that time.

Subsequent location of the Atomic Energy Commission's atomic bomb testing area, the Stead Air Base north of Reno for survival training and helicopter training, and the Nellis Airfield advanced gunnery training is further recognition of the secondary defense area.

Question. Does this so-called secondary defense area factor have any application with respect to the Las Vegas area?

Answer. The secondary defense area factor certainly does have a direct relation to the future location of national defense plants and civilian manufacturing and processing factories.

The added security emphasis for such plants will almost certainly influence the location of future installations behind the Sierra Nevada Mountains.

OUTDOOR SPORTS, RECREATION

Question. What are the characteristics of the Las Vegas area with respect to outdoor sports and activities?

Answer. Outdoor sports and activities proceed the year around without interruption. The sun shines 360 days a year. The mean temperature is 64.5°. It is a dry climate with rainfall averaging 4.7 inches per year.

The elevation is 650 feet at Davis Dam, 12,000 feet on Charlestown Mountain and 2,000 feet in Las Vegas Valley.

Boating, fishing, hunting, horseback riding, tennis, water skiing, snow skiing on Mount Charleston, yacht racing on Lake Mead, and fine golf courses are all abundantly available in the sports field.

RESIDENCE DESIRABILITY

Question. What factors, if any, are there which contribute to the desirability of this area as a place of residence?

Answer. The factors contributing to the desirability of southern Nevada as a residential area are many and include the almost continuous sunshine, the dry climate, the absence of any disagreeable cold, and the best entertainment in the world.

The factors enumerated under the characteristics conducive to outoor sports contribute to the desirability of the area as a residence.

INDUSTRIAL DESIRABILITY

Question. Senator, do you have an opinion as to whether or not this Las Vegas area will be attractive as a future site for large industries of various kinds?

Answer. I have.

Question. What, in your opinion, are the types of industries likely to locate in this area, and what are the factors that would induce them to do so?

Answer. The types of industry likely to locate in the area from Davis Dam to the Mormon Mesa, including the Muddy River area, include a great range of national defense and civilian industries.

There are now five manufacturing plants in Henderson located 10 miles toward Hoover Dam from Las Vegas.

Henderson is an industrial town of 14,000 population and the industries there include Titanium Corp., and numerous electrochemical and chemical industries, and a $9 million ammunition depot between Nellis Air Base and Lake Mead.

Atomic energy laboratories and any type of civilian industry fitting into the "plant factors" already enumerated will find ideal locations in that area described.

WATER: LIMITING GROWTH FACTOR

Question. What, in your opinion, is likely to occur with respect to the population growth in that portion of the State of Nevada?

Answer. There is no foreseeable limiting factor to the population growth in southern Nevada except the water supply, which is in the hands of the Supreme Court of the United States.

There is no criterion by which to judge the growth. There is no saturation point. Water is the only limiting factor.

In the early history of southern Nevada, the Department of Commerce represented by the Civil Aeronautics Board always shied away from the additional air service—they were afraid of a saturation point.

I have appeared before this Board many times pleading for additional air service.

My statement from the beginning, and it has not changed, was that "Everybody wants to visit Las Vegas; most everybody who can find a way to make a living wants a home or headquarters there."

Therefore, it is up to us to provide transportation so that visitors can get in and out without delay and find a place to stay while there. And it is up to us to provide the plant factors, including the water supply for the future domestic, industrial and irrigation uses. It is reported that there are available more rooms in southern Nevada than in the city of San Francisco.

The Nellis Air Force Base reports 30,000 takeoffs and landings per month; that means one of the busiest airfields in the world.

The McCarran commercial airport will handle more than 1 million passengers in 1958.

SIX HUNDRED SEVENTY-THREE THOUSAND ACRES SUBJECT TO DEVELOPMENT IRRIGATION—DOMESTIC AND INDUSTRIAL

Question. Have you caused to be made under your supervision a compilation of the number of acres likely to be occupied in one way or another in that area?

Answer. An estimate of the acreage that may be utilized by domestic, industrial, and irrigation uses has been made under my direction.

The estimate includes the area from below Davis Dam in the southwest corner of the State of Nevada to and including the Mormon Mesa and the Muddy River area east and north of Overton, under the 2,500-foot contour.

This area includes 673,000 acres, 670,000 acres in round numbers, that can be utilized for domestic, industrial, and irrigation purposes.

From 1930 to 1935 I made a study of the area for irrigation and reclamation purposes and in 1935, while State engineer and member and secretary of the Colorado River Commission, had a map made under my direction showing 16 areas totaling 231,460 acres.

In 1951 and 1952 I introduced 6 bills in the United States Senate for the reclamation of the 231,460 acres including:

	Acres
Project No. 1, Senate bill 1297	7,660
Project No. 2, Senate bill 1298	20,600
Project No. 3, Senate bill 1299	61,200
Project No. 4, Senate bill 1300	40,000
Project No. 5, Senate bill 1301	60,000
Project No. 6, Senate bill 3245	42,000
Total	231,460

Question. What, in general, type of uses have you taken into consideration?

Answer. I submit for the record as an exhibit a reprint of my Senate statement, including the 6 Senate bills numbering S. 1297 to S. 1301 and S. 3245 in the 82d Congress which includes a map of the projects.

The reprint also includes the report of the three State engineers of Colorado, California, and Nevada, submitted to the Colorado River Conference in Salt Lake City, Utah, on March 1, 1935, showing that the State of Nevada could ultimately use 900,000 acre-feet from the Colorado River for agricultural purposes.

PRELIMINARY REPORT OF THE ENGINEERING COMMITTEE APPOINTED BY COLORADO RIVER CONFERENCE, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, MARCH 1, 1935

A study of the water ultimately available in the lower basin of the Colorado River including all tributaries, based on the report of E. B. Debler, December 1934; analysis of commitments thereon; and an assumed distribution thereof.

ASSUMPTIONS

1. Consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet annually in the upper basin as apportioned by the Colorado River compact.

2. Complete reservoir development in lower basin as set forth in the Debler report.

3. That Mexico will be allocated 750,000 acre-feet annually.

I. Ultimate usable water supply in acre-feet

1. Net supply for use from main stream below Boulder Dam	8,370,000
2. Net supply for use from Gila River	2,259,000
3. Net supply available for lower basin use above Boulder Dam	240,000
4. Waste crossing International Boundary and usable in Mexico	200,000
Total	11,069,000

(NOTE.—Items (1) and (2) are exclusive of waste into Mexico.)

II. Present commitments on lower basin supply (including total Gila River, vested rights and contracts)

1. Arizona: Total of Gila River	2,259,000
Vested in Colorado River below Boulder Dam	600,000
2. California contracts	5,362,000
3. Present lower basin uses above Boulder Dam in Arizona, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah	90,000
Total	8,311,000

III. Assumed distribution—additional assumptions

(a) Use in Arizona, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah above Boulder Dam of	240,000
(b) Total use in Nevada	900,000
(c) Allocations in Mexico	750,000

DISTRIBUTION

1. Arizona:		
(a) Gila River	2,259,000	
(b) Rights below Boulder Dam	600,000	
(c) Total above Boulder Dam	30,000	
(d) Remaining water in stream	[1] 988,000	
		3,877,000
2. California contracts		5,362,000
3. Nevada:		
(a) Above Boulder Dam	30,000	
(b) Balance of proposed contract	870,000	
		900,000
4. New Mexico above Boulder Dam		30,000
5. Utah above Boulder Dam		150,000
6. Republic of Mexico		750,000
Total		11,069,000

Available to Arizona from main stream of Colorado River

Present uses from Colorado below Boulder Dam	600,000
Assumed ultimate uses above Boulder Dam	30,000
Remaining water below Boulder Dam	988,000
Total	1,618,000

[1] Total available quantity for use in lower basin less allocations, contracts, and assumed distributions.

REMARKS

1. It is herein understood that water used or to be used above Boulder Dam as listed above, is assumed to come from tributaries of the main stream of the Colorado River. The Nevada contract for water deliveries proposed to the Secretary of the Interior for 900,000 acre-feet, includes both present and proposed uses

2. It is assumed that the water used by New Mexico from the Gila River is included in the Gila River commitments.

3. It is also assumed that Utah will use 150,000 acre-feet of the 240,000 acre-feet of the lower basin water to be used above Boulder Dam, as determined by the Debler report. If, as indicated by Utah, that State may require a total of 300,000 acre-feet, the additional amount must be deducted from the net supply listed as available for use below Boulder Dam.

4. It is not necessarily assumed that all members of the Commission agree in all particulars to the accuracy of the Debler report, but this report is a preliminary analysis of the water supply available for use in the lower basin, based on that document.

EDWARD HYATT.
M. G. HINDERLIDER.
GEORGE W. MALONE.

(Salt Lake City, Utah, March 1, 1935. Only official report of engineers of the area.)

STATEMENT OF SPECIAL MASTER, SIMON H. RIFKIND, AT THE CLOSE OF THE TESTIMONY

The MASTER. Yes. That does not prevent you from resting.

Well, gentlemen, this is a moment we have all looked forward to for quite a long time. I think it has been many months, indeed years, since we first assembled, and I think it is fair to state that all of us have been privileged to participate in one of the greatest causes of this type. Whether we do this task well or poorly, the results of the work we have done will inevitably affect the future of a great empire, the Southwestern States of the Union, and whatever we do here and whatever we have already done here is bound to affect the stream of law which governs the Colorado River and its tributaries.

To have had a share in it is inevitably to have had a share in the history of this region as it is developing, and indeed, as it first really is exploding into great prominence as one of the principal centers of activity in the United States.

I hope you will forgive me if I say for myself it has been a great opportunity. I want to express a great gratitude to all of the communities that I had occasion to visit in connection with the viewing of the rivers and works, all of whom extended to me every conceivable courtesy, and all of which I left with a feeling of warm regard.

I think one of the good decisions that we all took together very early in our proceedings was the selection of a site for these hearings. I think the desire that it be a neutral site has been fully vindicated. San Francisco has been very neutral in our proceedings. Sometimes I thought not unduly interested in our proceedings. The explanation for that, of course, is readily apparent, but the city has been very hospitable to us. The United States court for the northern district has been more than hospitable to us and they have been generous to us in every way, and the people of San Francisco have been exceedingly cordial and exceedingly hospitable to myself and to my family and to those of you who are here, as far as I know.

I think I should say a word about the vast number of distinguished scientists who have been on this witness stand. It has been a revelation to me to meet so many men of distinction, learning, experience and wide knowledge in fields with which I had had almost no previous contact, indeed did not know that there were so many men of high scholarship and learning in these specialties. We have had them teach us great courses, and I think both counsel and the master sat at their feet and learned a great deal in the science of statistics and the science of hydrology and the science of irrigation and soil conservation, and indeed, even mapmaking at times, cartography, and innumerable other branches and subdivisions of the sciences which pertain to this case.

I have a suspicion that as a result of the preparation for the testimony in this case some of the frontiers of those sciences, at least in their practical applications, may well have been pushed further than the lines they had occupied before this case began. To that extent, the effort, the time and the money which has been spent may well turn out to be its most important contribution towards the elaboration and the refinement of the concepts and tools which are used in these water studies and irrigation studies and soil studies.

I had a notion many times, as I listened to the experts who were testifying here, that

they had, under the necessity of presenting their case to lay listeners, refined their own thinking and clarified their own notions and coordinated their own ideas so as to enlarge the general body of knowledge with respect to this science.

Of course, the many actual written studies that have been prepared are bound to add to the library of knowledge affecting the welfare of the people of the States that we have studied. Some laymen may feel that perhaps we have spent too much time upon this litigation. I think that perhaps a word should be said in support of the lawyers who have participated in this case, that indeed that is not the fact. What even lawyers might overlook is that in a case of this magnitude there would normally have been a very long period of pre-trial examination. That was avoided in this case. In a sense, therefore, our pretrials and trials were run together. If you take account of that fact, there has not been such an undue expenditure of time from beginning to end as would otherwise appear. Of coures, it is true as far as the taking of testimony in this case it probably ranks as one of the very long cases in American history, but the legal problems underlying this case are so complex, the impact of whatever decision is taken is so vast, the sovereign interests concerned are of such important magnitude that it seemed to me to be unwise, or at least imprudent, to formulate decisions on narrow questions in advance of the fullest presentation of this case.

Consequently, I early adopted the practice of allowing evidence which had a bearing upon any practical theory of the law which may be developed in the final development of this case. It may, therefore, turn out in the conclusion that bodies of evidence over which we have struggled will not play a role in the ultimate decision; but it had to be received, both because it was impossible to foretell which way the decision or law would lead, and it had to be done because whatever we may do the Supreme Court may feel otherwise about it, and ought not to have to send it back for further trial in the event they choose a path different from what the master chooses in arriving at a conclusion.

Finally, a word about the attorneys. Most of the lawyers in this case presented faces that were new to me when I first arrived here, with rare exceptions.

I say, without meaning to pour oil upon anybody's brow that I have been delighted with the stature of the men whose proof I was privileged to hear. I think I may say to each of the sovereign States represented here that they not only were ably represented, but that they were represented by men of extraordinary zeal, and that literally no stone has been left unturned which might develop a thought, an idea, an item, a fact, a datum which would serve the interests of the State concerned.

I think the States should be congratulated upon that fact because this has been a work of major difficulty and called for heroic application. I think I can say without hesitation that each and every one of the States, without exception, has had that kind of attention and that kind of service, and that the men who have participated in it have a full right to congratulate themselves upon a job exceedingly well done.

I don't recall a case in my experience where there has been more thorough preparation of the material to be presented, and more energetic search for whatever fact might turn out to be helpful and useful.

Therefore, I think it is not out of order for me to say to you that I think you have done your task with exceptional skill, and with exceptional devotion, and now all I can say to you is I hope you will all get an opportunity to take a rest after these long and arduous labors. I have to go into another trial schedule, so that probably is not going to be my lot, and in due time we shall meet again, I suppose, to hear what the final words of either wisdom or the contrary thereof may be.

Thank you all.

Memorial Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on May 30 I delivered a Memorial Day address on the Public Square in Cleveland, and under unanimous consent previously granted, I insert my address in the RECORD:

Memorial Day in the United States began in 1868. It was established by Gen. John A. Logan, then commander in chief of the Grand Army of the Republic. He originally ordered that May 30 be set aside as Memorial Day, as a time to decorate the graves of the Civil War dead. This day coincided with the date of the discharge of the last volunteer Union soldier of the war.

Since that date all but a few of our States have observed Memorial Day each year. It remains an occasion when we honor the war dead by decorating their graves and holding ceremonies such as we are gathered here for today. In honoring the war dead, we pay tribute to the cause for which they fought and died. Today—Memorial Day—has deeper meaning to us Americans because the great and noble principles and human values, the defense of which took the lives of so many of our sons and daughters on distant battlefields, are being challenged by a ruthless tyranny on the march.

Within the memory of all of us gathered here are the events of the conflict of World War II and Communist aggression in Greece, Korea, and Vietnam. As a people who have sought nothing but peace and friendship with all the other nations of the world, we have always sought to avoid foreign entanglements and situations which give rise to war. That is why we entered World War II only after the sneak attack at Pearl Harbor. That also accounts for the fact that we, as a nation, were not prepared militarily or politically, for the tremendous role of world leadership that was so suddenly thrust upon us but a few years ago.

History records that once our Nation was aroused to the threat to our own survival, our people rose up and by united action and great sacrifice defeated the Axis Powers who had forced war upon us.

After our entry into World War II the realities of the situation made it necessary for our leaders to make a definitive statement of war aims. This necessity arose because of the uncomfortable and strange alliance between the forces of human freedom as represented by the Western European Powers and the United States on the one hand and the cynical despotism of Russian communism on the other hand.

The only thing in common between these diametrically opposed ideologies was the defeat of the Axis Powers. Consequently the Atlantic Charter was formed and enunciated by the leaders of the free nations. This charter set forth the war aims of free nations. Among the solemn pledges given were that there would be no territorial aggrandizement as a consequence of the war and that restoration of free, representative governments would follow in the wake of the war. The Russians later concurred in the war aims set forth in the Atlantic Charter.

As the war progressed, it became clearer and clearer that if the Axis Powers were to be defeated, the United States would be required to fight on two widely separated theaters, the European and the Pacific. With each passing year of the war, the burden for victory became heavier and heavier upon our people. The human sacrifices we were required to make on battlefields the world over increased with each passing month of the war.

Our people faced this superhuman task with faith and confidence because ours was a just cause, ours was the cause of all humanity, the cause of peace and human freedom.

As the war reached its climax stage, the strange alliance with the Russian Communists caused grave misgivings to the leaders of the Free World. The signs of Russian intrigue and duplicity were becoming more and more evident with each passing month. The strange alliance then became an uncomfortable one and finally a doubtful alliance. These circumstances caused the leaders of the Free World to take further steps to extract from the leaders in the Kremlin solemn promises that the liberated territories would have governments representative of the will of the people expressed by free and unfettered elections. With the surrender of Nazi Germany, the heavy burden still remained upon the United States to win the conflict in the Pacific theater. Other free nations, lacking the material strength of the United States, had almost entirely spent themselves in the European phase of the world conflict. It will be recalled that the Russians had maintained a studied neutrality with regard to the war in the Pacific, while carrying on normal diplomatic relations with the Japanese.

Behind the scenes the Russians were busily engaged in organizing Communist forces, not to take part in the war against Japan, but to destroy the freedom and independence of the Chinese nation. Thus the Russian vultures entered the conflict in the Pacific only after the Japanese had been defeated, but in time, however, to demand a strategic booty of war which today imperils all the still free nations everywhere in the world. In the aftermath of the war, the people of the United States and other free nations were shocked by the behavior of the Russians in the contemptuous disregard they paid to their wartime commitments and the ruthless manner in which they disregarded the freedom and independence of the liberated nations of Central and Eastern Europe. Our disillusionment became deepened by further Communist aggression in China, Greece, Turkey, Korea, and Vietnam. The great hopes of our people for a golden era of peace and freedom for all time had been struck a hard blow by the deceit of the Russian Communists during and following the war and by the Russian inspired tensions which grip the world of our day. But the American people have not and will not give up their quest for a peaceful world in which all nations and people are free and in which the rule of justice under law prevails.

It is fitting that on this day and in these circumstances, we recall to mind those great ideals and human values for which our men and women of the armed services sacrificed and died in the recent wars. They of our generation, no less than the heroes and martyrs of generations past, fought for those immutable values of individual liberty and freedom without which life becomes a hopeless drudgery. These same ideals caused our Founding Fathers to set forth the inspiring

Declaration of Independence. It is dedicated to these same ideals and moral values which have made our beloved land the hope and aspiration of people the world over.

The test to which our Nation is being put today as well as the tests of the future which are certain to come before peace and tranquillity return to the world, requires all of us to stand fast in our faith for our historic ideals.

During the course of World War I a young soldier in the British Army named John McCrae, wrote an inspiring and deathless poem called: In Flanders Fields. The closing lines of that poem touched the hearts and minds of thinking men everywhere. Speaking of the responsibilities of future generations to those who fought and died for the priceless values of life, John McCrae said:

"To you from failing hands we throw
The torch; be yours to hold it high.
If ye break faith with us who die
We shall not sleep, though poppies grow
In Flanders fields."

These immortal words stand as a challenge to us in our time. We must not break faith with those who fought and died in defense of the priceless values of our American way of life. We owe this to them, to ourselves, and to future generations of Americans. We must preserve and extend the blessings of human freedom.

It is the destiny of our country ever to remain the citadel of freedom. Each generation of Americans must keep this rendezvous with destiny. Daniel Webster, in his generation, when faced with tasks no less difficult than ours, inspired his contemporaries with these words: "God grants liberty only to those who love it, and are always ready to guard and defend it." We Americans love liberty and it is our heritage to guard and to defend it.

To you Gold Star Mothers here assembled, and elsewhere, may the wounds on your hearts be healed with the pride and knowledge that the heroism of your sons will be a guiding star for our younger generation, and that our heroic dead will forever live in the hearts of all true Americans.

With grateful hearts we bow our heads in honor of those who, throughout the history of our country down through today, have given their lives that freedom might live.

Summary—85th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHIL WEAVER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, at the close of the 85th Congress, I take this opportunity to summarize this Congress and its accomplishments. To inform the electorate is a practice of Congressmen representing both political parties. My thanks is extended to the many daily and weekly newspapers and radio and television stations in the area for conveying my legislative reports to the people of the district.

ATTENDANCE

As a representative of the people, I owe to my constituents the duty to be on the floor of the House whenever it is in session. To be present to help write legislation at committee meetings is vitally important. For this reason, my record of attendance in the House is one of the highest in House record votes, quorum calls, and committee meetings.

FIRSTHAND REPORTS

Congressmen should meet and discuss problems directly with the people they represent. A good Congressman should do a lot of listening. I make it a point to talk with as many people as possible, because the free and open discussion of ideas and problems must be maintained. Again this year I will visit the communities in the 26 counties of the First Congressional District, so that I can visit personally with constituents. Letters from citizens in the district have been the lifeblood of my Congressional office. It is through these communications that I know many of the problems which most disturb the people.

SPENDING IN GOVERNMENT

Big government and its companion, big government spending, is the No. 1 problem. This is the dominant issue of today. It might be summed up in two words: fiscal irresponsibility. The blame can be placed squarely on the Congress of the United States. The big spenders who control our Congress must take the blame, since not a single dime can be spent without Congressional approval.

Spending has become a disease in this country. Where once we thought highly of the slogan "A dollar saved is a dollar earned" we now tend to place great reliance on the idea that we can spend ourselves rich. In order to spend ourselves rich we must tax ourselves poor. I cannot go along with this philosophy.

At the end of the first session, we had sliced some $5 billion from the budget and other spending requests. But by the time we had adjourned the second session, we had replaced this $5 billion and added more billions. The result? The national debt limit stood at $275 billion in January of this year. Eight months later the debt limit had climbed to $288 billion. The Treasury Department had found itself forced to return to the well of tax dollars twice this year to ask for debt increases for nonessential expenditures.

Functions of Government needed for the safety and development of our Nation received my support. I did not support items which in my estimation tended to lead the Government into more socialism or to make Government bigger or increase the tax burden. In this, I voted as a conservative.

I refused to support either debt-limit rise. I did not feel they would have been necessary if other Members of Congress had voted as I did in support of economy in Government. As an example, I could not see my way clear to vote for a bill which would have given some Indians in Montana $2.5 million for land valued at $50,000 in the name of public power. Nor could I vote for a $125 million to build 2 steamers for a private steamship line. I refused to support funds for a new Senate and House Office Building. We have adequate offices—better than most of us have at home. The net result of this spending spree under the control of a Democratic House and Senate has been to increase the deficit for fiscal 1959 to an estimated $12 billion and to increase the debt limit to $288 billion.

DEFENSE REORGANIZATION

The most important single economy effort of the session was reorganization of the Department of Defense, which I supported. This act will do two things: tone up our military muscles and tone down our wastefulness.

H. R. 8002 (HOOVER RECOMMENDATION)

Our second economy effort was enactment of H. R. 8002—Hoover recommendation on budgeting procedures. Agencies will now be required to return to Congress every year for funds for any and all projects. This reform should tighten Congressional purse strings and permit substantial savings in the future.

FOREIGN AID—RECIPROCAL TRADE

While we were saving money in defense, we were spending in a crazy-quilt pattern for foreign aid, the greatest giveaway of all time. I fought to require foreign aid to be divided into three phases: the military, economic development, and technical assistance. Some of the military money can be justified in that soldiers of some of our allies would be replacing our own men in the firing lines. Phases of the technical assistance programs are justified, but even in this field there are some doubts. I learned that in India, where they are building a dam, the American-contributed equipment has had the "Made in U. S. A." labels carefully covered up so that the Indians will not know it is the United States which provided the help. Many natives are of the opinion the bulldozers are Russian made and donated.

While voting against foreign aid, I did support reciprocal trade, because basically I have found that America benefits. There is also, of course, the factor of trade, not aid involved.

ALASKA STATEHOOD

For the first time since 1912, Congress acted to add a star to the flag. The Alaska statehood bill was passed, and I think the benefits of statehood will so enhance the value of the territory that its population will soon start to swell. I supported the bill strongly both in committee and on the floor. I feel that this is one of the really major accomplishments of this Congress.

FARM LEGISLATION

Several attempts were made to pass farm legislation during the 85th Congress. A combination of big-city and southern votes knocked out hopes for constructive changes this year. However, two important bills were passed. One is known as the Agricultural Act of 1958, and the other is extension of Public Law 480, which would help move our farm surpluses overseas.

The new farm bill as it passed, dealing with corn, permits farmers to choose 1 of 2 alternatives in a referendum vote this December. If the farmers pick plan No. 1, here is what will happen: The term "commercial corn area" will be dropped along with acreage allotments. Price supports will be set at 90 percent

of the average market price over the past 3 years but will not be allowed to drop below 65 percent of parity. If this is rejected, then acreage allotments will be retained and price supports will be allowed to vary from 75 to 90 percent of parity, depending on the supply percentage as provided by the Agricultural Act of 1949.

The price supports for oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghums beginning with the 1959 crop will be at a level determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be fair and reasonable in relation to the price support for corn and considering the feed value of the commodity in relation to corn and the other factors specified in the 1949 act.

As for wheat, I joined other farm State representatives in supporting the two-price system. Our efforts were blocked by the combination of city and southern votes. The southern bloc, in return, however, was able to help its cotton producers. The Wool Act is extended for 3 years until March 31, 1962.

PUBLIC WORKS

Projects of economic value in the First Congressional District recognized by Congress include Salt-Wahoo and Red Willow.

HOUSING

We passed an emergency housing act which temporarily reduced the FHA downpayments and provided some direct loans on GI housing where private financing was not available. This bill, although not completely adequate, was the best we could agree on.

SMALL BUSINESS

We enacted two important measures to help small business. One provides methods of obtaining financing. The other measure extends the life of the Small Business Administration and makes it a permanent agency.

TAXES

We eliminated the 3-percent excise tax on freight shipments. We failed in our efforts to cut the telephone-telegraph taxes, and to cut other excise taxes. I strongly supported the effort to cut excise taxes, because they are wartime taxes and are now unfair.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The pressure of inflation forced us once more to increase the social-security payment program. I voted for the measure. I feel strongly that our senior citizens who depend on social security and who have made substantial contributions deserve reasonable treatment.

LABOR REFORM

Along with many Members of the House, I was disappointed that a reasonable labor-reform bill was not passed this year. Sensational hearings in the Senate pointed up the immediate need for this type of legislation.

The welfare and pension fund disclosure bill which did pass is a step in the right direction. Certainly, however, more must be done. We must have a curb on the men who dominate labor unions to the detriment of their membership, our citizens in general, and our country. The Kennedy-Ives bill pretended to do that; but it actually did not. Kennedy-Ives, in fact, would have weakened the Taft-Hartley Act in some respects and would have done little or nothing to insure fairness in the labor movement. The bill would not in reality have solved the problem of protecting the rank and file union member from the unscrupulous men who have infiltrated into many of the labor unions. The bill was held on the Speaker's desk for 41 days—a most unusual practice. This parliamentary maneuver engineered by the party that controls the Congress prevented open hearings in the House Labor Committee.

NATIONAL SECURITY

The Supreme Court issued 3 rulings during the past 2 years affecting directly the Nation's internal security. One opened the FBI files to inspection by any and every Communist lawyer who came down the road. This we were able to rectify last year through the FBI files law. The Court also shook the Federal loyalty security program by stating that it did not apply to those in nonsensitive positions. This, too, we were able to correct. But the third phase, opening the area of travel to Communists, subversives, saboteurs, and espionage agents abroad, we were not able to remedy.

SUMMARY

The President of the United States presented us with three important pieces of legislation which he said were on the must list this year. These bills were defense reorganization, foreign trade, and foreign aid. I was able to support him on two-thirds of his program. I supported the President in all of his defense program. I supported him on reciprocal trade. I did not support him on the foreign-aid program.

Congress did things that I regret. The debt limit increases are a good example. However, we helped break the back of a temporary economic setback of last winter. We made strides in development of peaceful atomic energy. We kept Government from becoming involved in projects which private enterprise could do better at no cost to the taxpayer. We helped build a stronger America, stronger in terms of military force and stronger in terms of that moral force needed to maintain world peace.

Congressman Dingell Reports to the People of the 15th District of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, as I have done at the end of each session of Congress, I am again reporting to my people of the 15th Congressional District of Michigan on my stewardship and program in the 2d session of the 85th Congress.

In this Congress I served on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

In addition to my office in Washington, D. C., I maintain an office in my District to serve my constituents, located at 7310 Grand River Avenue, Detroit, staffed by my able assistant John Conyers, and by Mrs. Theresa Tabin, my secretary in Detroit.

One of my endeavors during this session of Congress, and of which I am most proud, is my participation in the enactment of the civil rights bill, H. R. 6127, of which I was a sponsor. This bill provided, first, for the establishment of a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice headed by an Assistant Attorney General; second, for a Civil Rights Commission to investigate denial of the right to vote to our citizens; third, that the United States should seek injunctive relief on behalf of any citizen or group of citizens whose right to vote is being abridged because of race, color, or national origin; and, fourth, for making it a crime to deny any citizen the right to vote because of race, color, or national origin.

I am also particularly proud that my efforts contributed substantially to the defeat of the gas bill. This legislation would have greatly raised rates to consumers in my District thereby guaranteeing a $1 billion a year windfall to producers of natural gas.

I fought this bill in my own committee and before the House Rules Committee. We were able to slow the progress of that bill so that its sponsors were unable to secure its passage. May I quote Drew Pearson in his column of August 16, 1957:

> The reason for this (defeat of the gas bill) was the effort of some young vigorous Congressmen, led by MACDONALD, of Boston; JOHN DINGELL, of Detroit; * * * all Democrats, all first- or second-term Congressmen.

SECTION I. LEGISLATION WHICH I INTRODUCED SOCIAL SECURITY AND SOCIAL LEGISLATION

H. R. 5737 to reduce retirement age for men to 60 and for women to 55.

H. R. 4765 to provide up to 60 days' free hospitalization each year for all recipients of social-security benefits.

H. R. 7453 to raise the amount which can be earned, without loss of benefits, by recipients of social-security payments from $1,200 to $1,800.

H. H. 6107 to remove the harsh and unjust provision that persons who suffer permanent disability must await age 50 before receiving benefits.

H. R. 10578 to liberalize the definition of disability so that a person must only be so disabled as to be unable to continue in his usual occupation.

H. R. 6948, the Humanitarian and Old-Age Rights Act, to liberalize public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to eliminate inequities and restrictions on grants to recipients of old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and to eliminate the provisions requiring a pauper's oath by beneficiaries of these programs.

H. R. 4267, a bill to provide for a food stamp plan to facilitate distribution of surplus foods to low-income groups, retirees, pensioners, and recipients of public assistance.

CIVIL RIGHTS

H. R. 140, an omnibus civil-rights bill to protect citizens from discrimination in employment; political participation; travel and accommodations; to outlaw lynching; and to establish a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice for the protection of the rights of all citizens.

H. R. 141, a bill outlawing the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting in Federal elections.

H. R. 142, a bill to create a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice.

H. R. 143, a bill outlawing lynching.

H. R. 144, a bill outlawing discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin. This bill included a vigorous compulsory Federal fair employment practices section.

HEALTH INSURANCE

H. R. 3764, a bill to provide for a national contributory health insurance program sustained by contributions from employer and employee into a trust fund. From this, each citizen would be entitled to receive full payment of all hospital, doctor, and medical bills.

ANTIRECESSION AND URBAN REDEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION

H. R. 10752, to provide for a $500 million public works program to create employment and to provide necessary public facilities.

H. R. 10751, a bill to provide for uniform Federal standards for unemployment compensation and to provide that States should pay not less than 39 weeks' unemployment compensation nor less than two-thirds of the worker's weekly wage or two-thirds of the weekly average wage across the State.

H. R. 5302, a comprehensive Federal urban renewal bill to provide for redevelopment of idle factory areas and residential slum areas for both industrial and residential purposes, legislation vitally necessary to Detroit.

TAXATION

H. R. 7065, to raise individual income-tax exemptions from $600 to $700.

H. R. 7066, to raise individual income-tax exemptions from $600 to $800.

Both these bills are aimed at benefitting the low-income taxpayers and offer a family of four earning in the vicinity of $5,000 a tax reduction of from $120 to $180 per annum.

H. R. 2541, a bill to give tax relief to small businesses and to increase slightly the taxes on large corporations so as to avoid revenue loss to the Treasury.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

House Joint Resolution 307, a joint resolution stating the "sense of Congress" that a permanent United Nations police force be immediately established to prevent war and aggression wherever it might occur. Substantially identical legislation later was adopted by the Congress.

SECTION II. ACTIVITIES OF THE 85TH CONGRESS

The press has properly called the 85th Congress a "do something" Congress and one of the hardest working Congresses in history.

Remarkable legislation has come out of this Congress, including H. R. 6127, which is now Public Law 85–315, the first civil-rights bill passed in over 80 years; and Public Law 85–726 which provided for the admission of Alaska to the Union; Public Law 85–462 providing for a pay raise for over 1 million Federal employees, and Public Law 85–426 providing for a pay increase for 500,000 postal employees. I cosponsored these last two pieces of legislation; in fact, my bills were among the first introduced to grant these highly deserved and long overdue pay increases.

I would like to characterize briefly an additional number of the more important legislative actions of the 85th Congress, all of which had my support:

DEFENSE

Public Law 85–325, authorizes $54.6 million to expand and accelerate construction of missile bases and detection systems, and establishes an advanced research projects agency within the Department of Defense under direction of the Secretary.

Public Law 85–599, reorganizes the Department of Defense, eliminates waste, overlapping, and duplication.

Public Law 85–657, authorizes a space project center, expansion of satellite launching and tracking facilities.

Public Law 85–568 establishes a National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Public Law 85–477 authorizing expenditures for military, economic, and technical assistance. About $3.3 billion was appropriated.

Public Law 85–686, extending the Reciprocal Trade Act until 1962. This legislation was vital to Michigan since 1 job in 7 in our State is directly dependent on foreign trade.

Public Law 85–559 permits permanent residence to 30,000 escapees from the Hungarian revolt and will allow ultimate citizenship to them. This is similar to legislation I sponsored.

NATIONAL ECONOMY, HOUSING, UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION, SMALL BUSINESS AND URBAN RENEWAL

H. R. 8381 provides $260 million tax relief for small business, makes technical changes in income, estate, and gift tax provisions to eliminate unintended benefits and hardships. This bill awaits the President's signature.

Public Law 85–364, an emergency $1.8 billion housing act to stimulate home building, reduce downpayments, and extend guaranty and direct-loan programs for veterans.

Public Law 85–422 increases by $4 billion the authorization for FHA mortgage insurance.

Public Law 85–381, an antirecession highway bill to accelerate highway construction and to include $1.8 billion additional Federal aid for construction of roads to create jobs.

Public Law 85–441 provides loans to States to make additional grants of up to 15 weeks Federal unemployment compensation for jobless whose State benefits have expired.

S. 3683, a bill to aid depressed areas and areas of chronic unemployment with some $200 million in loans and $75 million in grants. This bill awaits action by the President.

S. 3651 creates the Small Business Investment Administration to provide equity capital and long-term loans to small-business enterprises.

Constituents interested in this or other small-business legislation, or who have problems concerning small business should contact me for particulars or assistance.

Public Law 85–536 gives permanent status to the Small Business Administration, increases its lending authority and reduces interest rates.

Senate Concurrent Resolutions 68 and 69 urge the President to accelerate Federal civil and military construction projects to stimulate the economy.

Public Law 85–500 authorizes $1.5 billion in flood control and rivers and harbors projects, to stimulate the economy and to provide jobs.

VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN

Public Law 85–638 extends until 1959 the time to apply for mustering out payments under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act.

Public Law 85–678 increases benefits for total disability under the National Life Insurance Act, allowing veterans carrying such insurance to double the amount of the disability benefits by passing a physical examination and paying a small additional premium. Local Veterans' Administration offices have full information on this.

H. R. 11382, which is now awaiting the President's signature, would permit Korean and certain other veterans with national service term insurance to convert it to more advantageous forms of NSL insurance.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND HEALTH AND WELFARE

H. R. 13549 increases present social security pensions by 7 percent, with a minimum of $3 per month per retiree, beginning with the January 1959 checks which will be received early in February. This bill increases Federal grants to States for public assistance and relief, raising Michigan welfare benefits by about $3 per month per case.

Public Law 85–664 extends for 3 years the Hill-Burton Act to continue Federal aid to stimulate badly needed hospital construction.

H. R. 12876 extends for 3 years a program of Federal matching grants for construction of facilities for research into cancer, heart disease, arthritis, mental illness, and other diseases.

LABOR

S. 2888 requires registration, reports, and full disclosure by all employee welfare and pension funds.

The 85th Congress failed to complete action on a Federal school aid bill, although Congress did for the first time authorize a Federal loan and scholarship program devoted principally to science and mathematics students who are so badly needed today. The Kennedy-Ives bill to protect union members from abuses failed of passage because of an almost overwhelming Republican vote against it in the House.

Last year's preoccupation with a balanced budget was replaced by a realization that the country was faced by a real economic recession induced by hard

money policies of the administration and by the knowledge that Russia threatened scientific ascendancy over the United States. Tax readjustments to assist low-income groups, closing of tax loopholes, and increasing of individual exemptions failed to secure proper attention. However, it can be seen from the above major actions that Congress has provided much of the means for early economic recovery.

The social security amendments adopted during this session of Congress will do much to aid both retirees under the social security system and those drawing public assistance under that program.

I have at all times attempted to carry out a liberal, vigorous legislative program on behalf of my people. I claim major responsibility for defeat of the gas bill, for Federal programs enacted during this session, for research into disease, and for hospital construction. I have constantly worked to expand the responsibilities and the capability of the Food and Drug Administration to protect our consumers from filthy, adulterated foods, from foods which have been given chemical treatments of unknown safety and to protect the Food and Drug Administration from constant attacks by special interest groups.

I have worked hard to secure passage of food stamp legislation to help all our people have an adequate diet and to see to it that our surplus food reaches those who need it most.

I worked for the expansion of the social security program and have testified before the House Ways and Means Committee urging enactment of my bills for the expansion and liberalization of that program.

I appeared on a number of occasions before the House Judiciary Committee testifying on civil-rights legislation and was one of the sponsors of H. R. 6127, the bill which finally became law.

I have attempted to follow a liberal, constructive program for the benefit of all the people of my District and of the country. I intend to continue this record as long as my people will have me serve them.

Accomplishments of 2d Session of the 85th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, once again we come to the close of a Congress, Democratic controlled, a most successful and historic one. At the end of the first session of this Congress I made a report on its accomplishments. In this report, I shall confine myself mainly to the record of this session. However, the record of both sessions constitutes the complete accomplishments of this outstanding 85th Congress.

The passage of the Eisenhower Far East (Formosa) doctrine, the admission of Alaska as a State of the Union, and the passage of civil-rights legislation, the first of its kind enacted in over 80 years, alone would make the 85th Congress an historic one. It is interesting to note that in the Republican controlled 83d Congress, with President Eisenhower in the White House, neither branch of the Congress even reported a civil-rights bill out of committee. In other respects this Congress made an outstanding record. The important thing is that this Democratic controlled Congress faced and met with vision and courage its responsibilities in the world of today.

The press of the country, overwhelmingly Republican, has been most complimentary of the accomplishments of the 85th Congress. This is the best evidence of the wisdom and good judgment of the people in the election in 1956 of a Democratic controlled Congress.

With his long years of experience in the Congress, with his wisdom and his fairness of appraisal, Speaker SAM RAYBURN called the recent session about the most fruitful he had ever served.

There is no person in the United States better qualified to express an opinion about Congress and its accomplishments than Speaker RAYBURN.

The record of the 85th Congress must be weighed and considered in the light of the world of today. For it is evident to all that we are living in one of the most important and trying periods of the world's history.

The record clearly shows that this Congress assumed and effectively met its responsibilities in the field of foreign affairs, in the field of national defense, and in the field of domestic affairs.

It must be remembered that while Congress legislates and appropriates, the administration and conduct of our Government rests with the executive branch, with the responsibility upon the President. This is particularly so in the field of foreign affairs. For in this field, under the Constitution, the President is the sole repository of policy and action. He is also the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces.

As has well been said, "the formulation of military policy—who decides it and how it is decided, is crucial to the question of peace or war. The success of the policies adopted determine whether the people will enjoy political liberty, and lead normal lives, or be hurled into a war for survival, with nuclear destruction bringing disaster to civilization."

We all have a stake in the plans of our country to prevent war, and in the plans which must be carried out if war occurs.

Modern warfare requires the close integration of political, economic, and military power. The weight of responsibility for war prevention lies in the area of politics and foreign policy.

To an immeasurable extent political power depends upon economic and military strength. If the enemy knows of both, of our will and the wherewithal to fight, then poltical power may be strengthened to the point where diplomacy may avoid total war.

It would be unwise, in fact dangerous, if we should underrate the potential enemy—the Soviet Union and Red China. Neither should we fear them so long as we understand their capabilities, as well as their weaknesses, and our capabilities, as well as our weaknesses, and to take all steps necessary to keep our defenses sufficiently strong to meet any challenge with which we may be faced.

And the 85th Congress by its actions recognized this duty. This Congress did not face our problems with a sense of despair, but from the viewpoint of destiny.

In the field of foreign affairs and of national defense this Congress has risen to great heights. Within its constitutional jurisdiction, the Congress has given to the President and the executive branch legislation and appropriations necessary to meet the challenge of international communism. It rests with President Eisenhower and those associated with him in the executive branch to give the leadership necessary to effectively carry out the powers vested in them by Congressional action.

There is justifiable concern on the part of our people in relation to the soundness of our foreign policy, with the frequent shifts that have taken place, and with the apparent uncertainty and inconsistency of leadership.

The fact that during the past 5½ years we have lost the friendship of so many nations, with others changing from friendship to neutralism, causes concern. This indicates that something is wrong.

The Democratic Party is not responsible for this. Whatever justification there is for such concern, the responsibility rests with President Eisenhower and the Republican administration.

In the field of foreign policy, the 85th Congress continued most effectively the established tradition of bipartisanship, which has become such a vital factor in the conduct of international relations.

I have already referred to the Far East doctrine.

Another major action in this field was the enactment of the Middle East resolution authorizing the President to undertake economic and military cooperation, when requested, and when threatened by Communist aggression, with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence.

Like the Far East resolution relating to Formosa and the offshore islands, the Democratic controlled Congress cooperated with President Eisenhower in acting favorably on his recommendations relating to the acute situation existing in the Middle East area. Congress, as requested, gave the President the authority he sought. His leadership in both areas is now being tested. Let us hope he will make decisions that will inure to the best interests of our country, and of a future world of peace.

This Congress has performed its legislative responsibility in a statesmanlike manner.

In the 2d session of the 85th Congress other important actions were taken in

the field of international affairs and related fields.

The Mutual Security Act of 1958, with the appropriations necessary to effectuate the same:

First. The amount appropriated was $3,298,092,500. While the amount appropriated is below that recommended by President Eisenhower, it is over $200 million more than the amount of the bill that passed the House. In the opinion of members of the Appropriations Committee who are authorities in this field, this amount is adequate to carry out our policy for the fiscal year 1959. However, if world events change and later developments prove the amount appropriated is not enough, a supplemental estimate can be submitted to the Congress next January by the President. It is felt, however, that efficient administration and the sound control of the spending of this amount, with money heretofore appropriated and available, will be adequate during this fiscal year, unless something unexpected develops.

I suggest that next year, when the new Congress meets, that the President send to the Congress as early as possible, his recommendations for legislation in this field, as well as his budget estimates.

Second. Extension for 4 years to June 30, 1962, authority of the President to enter into reciprocal trade agreements. This legislation is one of the keystones of our foreign policy. If an extension failed to pass, or if extended in crippled form, such action by Congress would have had serious adverse effect for us throughout the world, particularly among nations friendly to us.

It is interesting to note that while the bill was in conference for the purpose of adjusting the differences between both branches, President Eisenhower could not and did not receive the support of either 1 of the 2 Republican House conferees.

Third. Increases lending authority of Export-Import Bank by $2 billion.

Fourth. Approves Euratom agreement with Belgium, France, West Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg, signed at Brussels May 29, 1958.

Fifth. Provides for exchange of mutually essential atomic information and materials with our allies.

Sixth. Authorizes loans, research grants to carry out United States share in cooperative development of atomic power with European atomic energy community.

Seventh. Extends for 2 years to June 30, 1960, authority of President to control exports of strategic materials.

Eighth. Facilitates retroactive adjustment of status of 30,000 escapees from the October 1956 Hungarian revolution to permit permanent residence in the United States.

Ninth. Records lawful admission for permanent residence of certain aliens who entered United States before June 28, 1940.

Tenth. Simplifies procedure for nonimmigrant aliens to become permanent residents.

Eleventh. Denounces the Communist execution of leaders of the 1956 Hungarian revolt, expresses the indignation of Congress and the Nation at this act of perfidy and barbarism.

Twelfth. Urges establishment of international plan for peaceful exploration of space and requests the President to seek and enter into international agreements to that end.

Thirteenth. Expresses sense of the Congress that the United Nations establish a permanent emergency police force capable of enforcing its decrees or orders for purposes of peace.

Fourteenth. Authorized $10 million for completion of Inter-American Highway.

Fifteenth. Created a new Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs which Secretary Dulles has termed of high significance, marking the rapid evolution of Africa.

Sixteenth. Resolution, which I introduced as a result of a unanimous vote of the House select committee, requesting the President to negotiate with other countries, or to act through the United Nations for the exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes rather than for military purposes. It is pleasing to note that our Ambassador to the United Nations, Henry Cabot Lodge, upon the instructions of President Eisenhower, has implemented the Congressional resolution by proposing to the general assembly a program for international cooperation in the field of outer space.

The House select committee and the Congress recognized that if the use of outer space is to be prohibited for military purposes, or controlled—to be used for the progress of all mankind for peaceful purposes rather than for destructive purposes through military uses—the best opportunity for such a desirable objective being reached would be prior to a competitive military race starting between two or more nations.

While all nations of the world should be interested in a successful plan resulting, the smaller as well as newly constituted nations should be particularly interested; and in the United Nations doing everything possible to bring about successful results which will assure all nations that their sovereignty and independence will not be threatened by one powerful nation gaining a military advantage in the unknown field of outer space.

It should be apparent that unless a plan is arrived at that will outlaw or control the use of outer space for military purposes, an intense military race will take place by nations financially able to bear the burden. It should also be apparent to all nations that if negotiations and efforts fail, and a military competitive situation arises—for example, the United States and the Soviet Union—superiority by the United States would not be a threat to the sovereignty and independence of other nations of the world. The opposite would be true if the Soviet Union should gain a superiority. Small nations, as well as newly constituted ones should consider this important fact in their own national interest and survival.

Mr. Speaker, our recent Congresses have properly been defense minded. With the happening of the past 2 years, such as sputnik, the fact that in certain important military fields the Soviet Union has a noticeable, if not marked, lead on our country, the 85th Congress has been particularly concerned with our military capabilities, offensively and defensively.

Where we disagreed with the Republican administration, we did so on the side of strength, feeling that such action in the world of today was in the national interest of our country.

For example, we felt that the strength of our Army should be maintained at 900,000 officers and men, rather than to be reduced to 850,000 officers and men. We appropriated the necessary money to maintain our Army at the 900,000 strength.

We also appropriated sufficient money to keep our National Guard at a strength of 400,000 officers and men, rather than to be reduced, as intended, to 360,000 officers and men.

It will be interesting to see if the present Republican administration carries out the intent of Congress, or reduces our Army and our National Guard by freezing the money Congress has appropriated to maintain at their present strength.

The Congress took the same action in relation to the United States Marine Corps, by appropriating enough money to maintain the Marine Corps at its present strength.

The Congress also provided increased appropriations for the construction of additional nuclear-powered submarines armed with Polaris IRBM's, as well as for additional amphibious assault ships, also for a speed up for Air Force Minutemen, solid-propellant ICBM's, and Hound Dog Missile projects; production of additional Boeing KC–135 jet tankers and long-range transport aircraft.

The money Congress appropriated over and above the President's budget estimates was largely in connection with our national defense.

The Democratic-controlled Congress points to this with pride, confident that the great majority of our people approve such action.

In the field of national defense, it is better to keep our guard high. It is better to act on the side of strength rather than on the side of weakness.

During the session recently adjourned, history was made in the field of national defense.

The passage and enactment into law of the Defense Department Reorganization Act is a matter of major importance. Full and complete authority has been given to the Chief Executive and the Secretary of Defense to reorganize our Defense Organization to meet the military problems of the nuclear age, and at the same time recognizing the duties of the Congress under the Constitution.

The responsibility for making an effective and efficient reorganization now rests with the President and the Secretary of Defense.

Congress showed its assumption of responsibility by the passage of a strong, effective bill, many times stronger than was reasonably expected when President Eisenhower first submitted his recommendation to the Congress. The chairman and members of the Committee on

Armed Services of the House and the Senate are entitled to special words of commendation for their statesmanlike approach to the excellent solution of this most difficult question.

Other important legislation of the second session are:

First. Revised and improved military pay system increasing the pay for members of the Armed Forces, $577 million a year, which increase, in part, is based on proficiency. In addition to such an increase being justified, an important factor was to increase career service. A substantial increase in reenlistments would result in savings of hundreds of millions of dollars each year.

Second. Appropriations to maintain: (a) Army National Guard at a strength of 400,000; (b) United States Reserve at a strength of 300,000; (c) the active duty Army Establishment at a strength of 900,000.

Third. Military construction bill in the approximate amount of $1.7 billion for fiscal year 1959.

Fourth. Establishment of new research and development agency in the Department of Defense known as ARPA, of vital importance in connection with the exploration of what is commonly called outer space, the success of which could be vital to our survival as a nation, as well as to assurance for a future world of peace. We cannot permit the Soviet Union to be superior to us in space exploration—particularly from a military angle.

We have the brains, and we have the facilities. What we need is the leadership. The action of Congress, with its adequate appropriations, gives the new military agency the authority to go ahead, to gain the leadership that will place our country in a position of preeminence in this most important field of activity. We cannot afford to underestimate the importance through research and development of advancement in outer space, both from a military angle and from a civilian angle.

Recognizing the importance of space exploration from a civilian angle, the Congress, in response to President Eisenhower's recommendation, passed a bill—now law—creating a new civilian space agency. In addition to introducing the bill, I had the honor of being selected by Speaker RAYBURN to be chairman of the House select committee that considered this bill. Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON was chairman of the Senate committee. Between both committees and the White House close relationships existed. The result has been the enactment into law of a strong effective bill. It now depends upon the character of leadership those appointed to administer this new agency will give, not only within the agency itself, but in cooperating with other related research and development activities being carried on by other agencies of our Government, so that there will be understanding, efficiency, lack of unnecessary duplication, and the maximum of results.

If I may inject a personal note, I want to express my sincere thanks to all the members of my select committee and to our staff, for the outstanding contributions they made to this very important legislative achievement.

The official title of the new agency is the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The importance attached to it is shown by the fact that this new civilian agency has a national aeronautics and space council headed by the President, and among its nine members are included the Secretaries of State, of Defense, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Director of NASA.

Fifth. Adequate appropriations were made to maintain a powerful national defense, and for research and development work to improve our military capabilities so that we will be superior in all fields over any potential enemy.

Sixth. In connection with the Advanced Research Projects Agency, called ARPA, established by this Congress, and the importance of which I have mentioned, this Congress has given it full authority and all appropriations requested. The importance of this agency in terms of our very survival cannot be overemphasized.

Seventh. Authorizes $100.5 million program of new construction and conversion of naval vessels for fiscal 1959, including modern nuclear-powered and guided-missile warships, amphibious landing craft, and service ships.

Eighth. Authorizes $386 million for Atomic Energy Commission construction, expansion, or acquisition of facilities, including plutonium plant and civilian power reactors.

Ninth. Authorizes $35 million to be appropriated to Atomic Energy Commission for construction of reactor for an atomic-powered destroyer.

Tenth. Authorizes $29.9 million for new construction, and improvement of existing research facilities of National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

Eleventh. Authorizes construction of atomic-powered icebreaker for Coast Guard.

Twelfth. Authorizes $47.8 million for construction of new space projects center, expansion of satellite launching and tracking facilities, and for other experiments.

Thirteenth. Extends for 4 years to June 30, 1962, standby emergency powers of President under title III of Federal Civil Defense Act.

Fourteenth. Enacts into permanent law authority of President to expedite defense contracts during period of emergency, formerly exercised under expired title II of First War Powers Act.

Fifteenth. Extends to June 30, 1960, President's authority to allocate and fix priorities for strategic materials, grant loans and subsidies under Defense Production Act.

Mr. Speaker, our people are properly concerned with our present marked business recession, with 5 million persons out of work, and with the inclusion of additional part-time unemployment, the equivalent of nearly 7 million unemployed.

At the beginning of this rise in unemployment it was apparent to many of us that we were having a serious recession.

The administration at first was not particularly impressed and, in fact, took a rather optimistic view of the situation. They referred to this economic crisis as "a slight dip" which would soon take an upward turn. As increased unemployment figures poured into the White House, the administration began to talk. First, it admonished those of us who were calling for executive action and promoting legislative action, to refrain from talking about the "slight dip" and it would go away. Second, the President delivered a "chin's-up" message to the American people; but action, not speeches, was necessary to stem the tide of recession and to stimulate employment.

Democrat Members in both Houses of Congress took positive and tangible action. Numerous antirecession proposals were passed:

First. $1,118,128,835,000 public works appropriation bill to carry out and start river and harbor, flood-control, and reclamation projects of import to many citizens of our country.

Second. Emergency $1.8 billion Housing Act to stimulate home building; reduction of downpayments on FHA financed houses; extension of guaranty and direct loan programs for veterans, and so forth.

Third. Increase of $4 billion authorization for FHA mortgage insurance.

Fourth. Legislation hastening highway construction.

Fifth. Additional unemployment compensation for the jobless whose State payments have expired. With the refusal of the administration to accept the more liberal Democratic measure, and with the inability to pass it, the bill recommended by the administration became law. It will bring benefits to some of the unemployed but nowhere near the benefits provided for in the Democratic measure.

Sixth. Authorizing departments and agencies to currently purchase supplies and equipment in advance of appropriations for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1958, to stimulate business recovery.

Seventh. Extending Federal Airport Act of June 30, 1963, with an authorization of $100 million annually for 5 years on a 50–50 basis with local governments. Vetoed by the President.

This was a bill providing for grants to States and local communities for construction and improvement of civil airports. It is evident that many of our airports are inadequate and that, as a whole, there exists a most serious challenge for service, as well as for protection of life and property in the years that immediately lie ahead. Meeting this challenge should not be alone the duty and the financial burden of States and local communities. This is a national as well as a local problem. The Congress recognized the copartnership responsibility in the passage of the bill vetoed by the President.

In the light of the problem confronting us, which will increase as time passes, there are many who regret the Presidential veto of this important bill and consider such veto to be unwise. The immediate future will show whose

judgment was sound and correct—the Congress in acting to meet this serious and growing challenge—or the President by his veto, defeating the enactment of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, many cities and rural areas of our country are economically depressed, with a high percentage of unemployment, due to a number of factors, one of them being the flight of industry to other sections of the country—textile cities of the North being an example. There are many other such depressed economic conditions of a chronic nature in States that mine coal. This bill was in the nature of a self-help proposition to such distressed communities.

The bill authorized two $100 million revolving funds for loans to help finance industrial redevelopment, one for cities and one for rural areas with chronic unemployment. It also authorized $75 million of annual grants to help the installation of community facilities to enable cities to attract new industry. This bill was constructive and meritorius. It would enable cities and areas with economic unemployment to plan and bring about industrial redevelopment and rehabilitate their economy on a sound basis, eliminating the prospect for years to come of large-scale unemployment and the plight that such a condition brings to a community.

This bill passed the Congress by a large majority. It has been pocket-vetoed by President Eisenhower. Examination of the reasons for the President's rejection of this important bill will show that his veto was not only unwarranted but unwise.

The reasons given by the President for his pocket-veto clearly fails to recognize—which Congress did recognize—that we were considering in this legislation distressed American cities and areas whose tax revenues have been seriously reduced by large-scale unemployment and by the flight of industry, and so forth; also where the cost of local government has sharply increased as a result of the existence of the very conditions that this legislation would help to remove.

It is interesting to note that in his veto statement the President said he favored such legislation, but still he vetoed the bill. He apparently overlooked an important fact that experience in public life teaches that progress is made through reasonable compromise.

The next Congress, particularly if Democratic, will give early consideration to such legislation. However, the pocket-veto by President Eisenhower will hold back for many months distressed cities and rural areas from carrying out their plans for industrial redevelopment and economic rehabilitation.

Eighth. Reduce price labeling of new automobiles.

Ninth. Resolution urging the Executive to accelerate Federal construction projects, military and civil, for which funds had been appropriated in order to stimulate our depressed economy.

Tenth. Bill accelerating program of trade-in of old vessels, replacement by modern ships, under the Merchant Marine Act.

Eleventh. Railroad Transportation Act of 1958, the primary purpose to preserve and strengthen our railroad system.

Twelfth. Federal Aviation Act, designed to improve air safety.

Thirteenth. Authorizing construction and sale by the Maritime Board of 2 passenger superliners, 1 for Pacific operation.

Fourteenth. Providing pay increase for postal employees.

Fifteenth. Providing pay increase for civil service, judicial, and legislative employees.

Sixteenth. Increased annuities for retired Federal employees.

There are a number of other actions taken that will be helpful, if administered efficiently, as antirecession measures, some of which I have mentioned, such as legislation and appropriations for public works, flood control, military construction, accelerating highway construction, and so forth.

An important part of our national economy, Mr. Speaker, are the several millions of small and independent businesses throughout the country. It could well be said they are the basic strength and backbone of our business economy. The 85th Congress recognized their importance, and their difficulty to compete with big business enterprises unless given compensatory consideration and the necessity of positive action in order to preserve free American independent enterprise.

During this Democratic-controlled Congress, small and independent businesses have received consideration in several important respects to enable them to maintain a healthy and expanding condition.

The favorable action taken in connection with small and independent businesses is the best ever given to this important part of our national economy. The record of this Democratic-controlled Congress is one, I am confident, that the small- and independent-business men of our country will appreciate and recognize that the Democratic Party is their friend.

The significant record of this Congress and the past session, consists of these important measures:

(a) The Small Business Administration, established in 1953 as a temporary agency, has been made a permanent agency.

(b) The ceiling on individual loans it may grant has been increased from $250,000 to $350,000.

(c) The interest rate charged has been reduced from 6 to 5½ percent.

(d) The lending authority of SBA has been increased.

(e) One of the other bills is the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, which agency has $250 million loan authority to furnish long-term equity capital to small businesses through the medium of investment companies, as provided for in the law. These investment companies will furnish long-term capital to small businesses which are unable to obtain the needed capital from other sources.

(f) Of great importance is the tax relief bill for small business, amounting to $260 million a year. Among its effective features are, first, faster tax writeoffs on new equipment in the first year after purchase; second, 10 years, instead of 15 months, in which to pay estate taxes on a business owned by a small number of persons—the family-owned type of business—assuring continuity of business; third, extension of the period of time for which a loss may be carried back—from 2 to 3 years—and applied against previous income; fourth, an increase from $60,000 to $100,000 on the amount of earnings that may be retained without higher tax charges.

These bills will enable small business to survive and expand, and to withstand the competitive advantages enjoyed by big business.

In addition, the studies, inquiries, and recommendations of the small-business committees of both branches of the Congress have resulted in the Small Business Administration almost doubling the value of Government orders to small businesses of the country, and for SBA to increase management counseling services, and to increase loans by about 30 percent.

Mr. Speaker, the original Social Security Act was recommended by the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and was passed by a Democratic-controlled Congress. It is an important cushion against a depression. From time to time, during the years, it has been improved upon, increasing benefits and extending its coverage to millions of new beneficiaries.

In this field of interest to millions of our people, the 85th Congress made another important step forward by increasing old-age insurance benefits by 7 percent, and increasing Federal grants to the States for public assistance and relief. This action will bring further strength to the family life of America.

Another bill of major importance enacted into law was one to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs. Despite powerful opposition, a bill making progress was passed. It should bring favorable results. While this bill did not go as far as some would like, it represents decided progress, and can be improved upon in the next Congress. In substance, this bill authorizes a 4-year $887 million program of student loans, fellowships, and other aid to improve teaching of mathematics, science, and the languages.

Extended for 3 years the hospital survey and construction—Hill-Burton—act.

Extended for 3 years the program of $30 million a year matching grants for construction of facilities for research into cancer, heart disease, arthritis, mental illness, and other diseases.

Appropriated the largest amount ever made for medical research.

To encourage expansion of teaching in the education of mentally retarded children.

Made adequate appropriation for the school lunch program, and extended for 3 years the special milk program in nonprofit schools, child-care centers, settlement houses and summer camps, with authorization for expenditure of $75 million a year of Commodity Credit Corporation funds.

Authorized Federal-State cooperation in the control and regulation of small pleasure and passenger boats.

Enacted the humane slaughtering bill.

Mr. Speaker, having in mind the opposition and the sharp differences of opinion relating to farm legislation, the record of this Congress is a remarkable one. With increased Democratic representation in the next Congress, the basic democratic policy which has been so helpful to agriculture and which the present Republican administration has opposed can again be the basis for successful legislative action.

One of the bills passed was to stop the reduction of 1958 farm price supports below the 1957 level and to bar reductions in acreage allotments for 2 years in order to permit consideration by the Congress and its committees of any new general farm legislation. Unfortunately, and to the disadvantage of the farmers of America, President Eisenhower vetoed this meritorious measure.

In the light of the position taken by President Eisenhower and of that of the Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, of having their way or no legislation, with the veto power of the President, the record of this Congress on farm legislation is a remarkable one.

Mr. Speaker, a bill of major importance resulting from the McClellan committee hearings is the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act—the public disclosure of all welfare and pension plans maintained by employer and by employee organizations. This bill will contribute greatly to the prevention of the misuse of such funds and for the protection of the rights of the beneficiaries of such funds.

Another bill resulting from the McClellan hearings is the bill known as the Kennedy-Ives bill. This important bill goes a long way toward stopping or controlling widespread abuses and scandals, with the very challenge by some to Government itself. This bill passed the Senate by a vote of 88 to 1. When it came up in the House of Representatives, in the closing days of the past session, under suspension of the rules—the only way, at that time, action could be taken by the House—the passage of this bill was refused by a vote of 198 to 190.

While the bill was under debate, a prominent Republican Member of the House stated that he had just talked with Mr. Mitchell, the Secretary of Labor, who authorized him to inform the House Members that he opposed suspension of the rules, which meant that he was opposed, at that time, to the passage of the bill.

There is no question but what the position taken by Secretary Mitchell played an important part in the failure of the passage of the bill.

The rollcall vote, requiring a two-thirds favorable vote, of those present and voting, shows that only 41 Republicans voted for suspension and passage of the bill, and 137 Republicans voted against the same. On the other hand, 149 Democrats voted to pass the bill, and 61 voted against. In other words, an overwhelming majority of the Republicans voted against this much needed legislation, and an overwhelming majority of the Democrats voted for it. The passage of this bill would have prevented many of the abuses and dictatorial and illegal actions disclosed by the McClellan committee. The bill represented decided progress.

It is amusing to listen to Secretary Mitchell's remarks and the efforts of other Republicans in the part they played in the failure of the passage of the Kennedy-Ives bill.

The rollcall record, which no one can deny, speaks for itself as to where responsibility lies, particularly between both political parties in the Congress.

The press and the people of the country had properly taken the position that the House should vote upon this bill before Congress adjourned. Speaker RAYBURN wisely permitted the House to do so.

Another important bill that failed of passage in the closing days of the past session, when it was also brought up under suspension of the rules—the only way it could have been brought up before Congress adjourned—was the general housing bill. Suspension of the rules and passage of the bill, as Members know, required a two-thirds vote. This bill was of great importance in meeting a serious internal challenge confronting us. Its passage at that time would also have been most helpful as an antirecession measure. President Eisenhower opposed the bill in its then form. However, every provision he advocated was in the bill, with additional provisions deemed by the Democrats as necessary for the best interests of our people.

This bill failed of passage—a two-thirds vote being necessary—by a mere 6 votes—215 for suspension and passage, 134 against.

Again the rollcall record on this important and progressive measure is interesting and revealing, particularly from a party angle, as to where the responsibility lies for failure of favorable action thereon. The rollcall vote shows that 185 Democrats voted for the bill, and 23 Democrats voted against. On the other hand, 66 Republicans voted for the bill, and 111 voted against.

Following President Eisenhower's recommendation, the Congress passed a bill increasing the Federal debt limit from its present $275 billion level to a permanent ceiling of $283 billion, with a temporary ceiling of $288 billion until June 30, 1959. It is quite apparent, with the approximate $12 billion deficit of the present fiscal year, that another increase will be necessary sometime after next January; this despite repeated Republican campaign promises of a reduction in the national debt.

Under the circumstances there was nothing else the Congress could do to avoid placing our Government in a financial trap which would result in governmental stagnation, and which would particularly adversely affect our national defense.

The failure of President Eisenhower, in 1957, before the first session adjourned, to request an increase compelled the freezing of several billions of appropriated funds. During the last 4 months of 1957 the Government was unable to carry out many of its obligations, which sharply increased the recession, with resultant increased unemployment. These results could have been averted if judgment and leadership on the executive level had been exercised.

Mr. Speaker, also enacted was legislation to improve our nationality and immigration laws, some of which I have already mentioned; to improve the Bankruptcy Act; to improve the efficiency of the judiciary; the strengthening of existing law relating to the mailing of obscene or crime-inciting matter; authorizing the making, amendment, and modification of contracts to facilitate the national defense; amend existing law to authorize grants-in-aid to schools of public health and public health administration; to authorize loans for construction of hospitals and other facilities under title VI of the Public Health Act; granting consent of the Congress to the several States to enter into compacts for making traffic safety; Government guaranty of private loans to air carriers for the purchase of aircraft and equipment; established the Civil Aeronautics Board and a Federal Aviation Agency to regulate the use of airspace by both civilian and military aircraft; to authorize additional grants for the support of scientific research; extending the Public Health Service Act relating to health research facilities; authorized flood-control projects and acceleration of civil construction programs; Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958; rivers and harbors and flood omnibus bill of 1958; to provide for an increase in the minimum interest rate permitted on United States savings bonds; to permit importation, free of duty, of religious vestments and regalia presented without charge to a church, or to certain religious, educational or charitable oragnizations; increased exemption to theaters, particularly helpful to small moving-picture theaters; removal of a number of tax inequities and the reduction of several burdensome excise taxes; to extend unemployment insurance system to ex-servicemen; to provide for improved methods of stating budget estimates and estimates for deficiency and supplemental appropriations, which carried out a major Hoover Commission recommendation; extension of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended; to amend section 161 of the Revised Statutes with respect to the authority of Federal officers and agencies to withhold information and limit the availability of records; increase rates of compensation for service-connected disabilities and for dependency allowances; consolidation into a single act and simplified laws governing compensation, pension, hospitalization and administration of the Veterans' Administration; pensions increased for widows of Spanish, Indian, Mexican and Civil Wars; eligibility standards for widows of veterans were liberalized; increase of burial allowance for veterans; increase in rate of compensation for certain blind veterans; increase in premiums and benefits for total disability under the National Life Insurance Act; the much-needed retirement legislation for ex-Presidents, or widow of a President.

An important action in connection with the committees of the House of Representatives was the establishing of the new House Committee on Science and Astronautics, effective in the next Congress, with broad jurisdiction over legislation relating to basic research over a broad field, and with exclusive jurisdiction over legislation relating to outer space. This constitutes a recognition on the part of the House of Representatives of the tremendous importance of science, technology, and the exploration and use of outer space in the world of today and tomorrow.

One of the most serious problems confronting our people, particularly workers of all kinds, and farmers and their families, is inflation and the threat of further inflation, with the resultant high cost of living.

During the past 2 years an inflationary spiral has been going on, with the price index and cost of living increasing month by month, so that now the cost of living is the highest in our history—this despite Republican campaign promises to stop inflation and to reduce the cost of living.

The administration has failed to make any recommendations for legislation to the Congress to meet this situation. The high-interest and tight-money policies of the administration have, if anything, aggravated the situation. They were poorly thought out and unwisely timed, as many in and out of the Congress stated.

These policies of the administration have greatly aggravated the present recession and as well contributed to the inflation and high cost of living that has taken place. The responsibility for the present inflation and the high cost of living rests upon the shoulders of the Republican administration.

Mr. Speaker, the bills I have mentioned are but a small part of the measures that both branches of the Congress acted upon. However, they show the broad scope of important legislation acted upon by this Congress. In addition, there were the inquiries and investigations conducted by full committees or subcommittees.

The record clearly shows that in addition to the Democratic-controlled 85th Congress enacting legislation of an historic nature it was one of the busiest Congresses of all time.

The record of this Congress confirms the judgment of the people in electing a Democratic-controlled Congress in 1956. It is a record that will justify the election of a Democratic-controlled 86th Congress and with an increased number of Democrats in both the House and the Senate. I am confident of this result in the election in November.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, speaking for myself, and I know I also speak for you, I express my thanks to all Members for the consideration they have shown us, both individually and in our positions of leadership.

To my friend from Massachusetts, the Republican leader, Mr. MARTIN, and to his associates in leadership, I particularly express our thanks for the understanding consideration shown by them during the past 2 years.

My Last Report to My Constituents in the First Congressional District of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of regret that I make this my last report to my constituents of the First Congressional District of New Jersey.

With the closing of the present session of Congress it will have been my privilege to have served as a Representative in Congress for 32 years. There has been no one in the history of New Jersey who has served as a Member of Congress for so long a period, and only a few in the history of the Nation have exceeded it.

I am deeply grateful, as I bring to an end my Congressional career by my decision not to be a candidate for reelection, for the honor that the citizens of the First Congressional District have conferred upon me by election and reelection so many times. Their kindness in this respect has enabled me to serve not only for nearly a third of a century, but during a period that constitutes one of the most important eras in our history as a nation. The confidence that has been shown in me will always be a source of great personal satisfaction.

I confess with modesty and humility that probably the most outstanding evidence of confidence upon the part of my constituents, and the one that I cherish most, was to be reelected upon the Republican ticket in 1936, 1940, and 1944 when President Roosevelt on the Democratic ticket carried my Congressional district by majorities that were overwhelming. In 1936 his majority, as I now recollect it, was approximately 60,000; in 1940, approximately 50,000; and in 1944, approximately 52,000. I trust that my feeling of pleasurable satisfaction at the confidence displayed by the substantial majorities accorded me on the Republican ticket will be considered as justified and pardonable.

It has been a great privilege to have served in the House of Representatives such a long period of time—1926–58. These years with the varying and unusual problems that the changing conditions have brought—prosperity, depression, recovery, war with its problems, foreign affairs in all its varying aspects—together with policies for their solution that were new and untried have made this period of 32 years one of the most eventful in our history as a nation.

In the consideration of these important matters it has been most gratifying and assuring to note the sincerity of purpose and high ideals that have always actuated those who served as Representatives. Notwithstanding, they came from Congressional districts with differing interests and viewpoints, yet, each was actuated by the same high ideals and desire to serve the best national interests, promote the welfare of its people, and preserve the fundamental principles that have, under God, made this the greatest Nation in the world today.

My decision not to be a candidate for reelection was not an easy one to make. I have enjoyed the work and duties incident to being a Member of Congress. Aside from the feeling of privilege in being in a position that enabled one to participate in the great undertakings of our Government, the greatest pleasure that I have experienced has been the opportunity that has been afforded to be of service to people; to help them in all their numerous and varied interests and problems. This has given the greatest pleasure, the greatest satisfaction, and the greatest sense of compensation.

My retirement from Congress is in no sense due to lack of interest in the work of the Congress. I like it. I enjoy it. As I have already said, it has been difficult to make the decision that ends my duties with the closing of this session. My retirement is due entirely to a desire to participate more fully in the varied activities of private life for which I have had only limited opportunity because of my heavy official duties. I feel a duty in whatever years may remain to be helpful in civic, fraternal, and religious activities that mean so much in promoting the welfare of the people. Accordingly, in my retirement from my present public duties I will have an opportunity, with a continuance of my present good health with which God has blessed me, to participate in the activities I have mentioned as well as my chosen profession, the practice of law.

There is an old Chinese proverb that runs something like this: "It may be later than you think." It is in the spirit of this thought and with a desire to continue to be active in helpful ways of a local character that I say adieu to my colleagues in Congress and to my constituents of the First Congressional District of New Jersey, and may God's blessing rest upon each and may our beloved country enjoy prosperity in large measure and abiding peace.

Propaganda for Federal Aid to Education Exposed and Exploded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, during the debates on Federal aid to education in recent weeks, other Members of Congress and I repeatedly referred to or quoted from a report, School Needs in the Decade Ahead, prepared by Mr. Roger A. Freeman and published by the Institute for Social Science Research in Washington, D. C. It is a fully documented and reliable research study which presents the historic record of school finance on a comparative basis and projects school requirements in terms of teachers, classrooms, and money to 1970.

The book's enthusiastic reception by newspapers, magazines, public officials, and civic groups throughout the country proves that its findings are confirmed by the experiences of well-informed persons from coast to coast, and that its philosophy well expresses the concepts and sentiment of the American people.

I introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts from 31 editorials and short references to about 100 editorials, reviews, and feature stories on this book.

Typical comments were:

Raymond Moley in Newsweek:

A truly authoritative handbook * * * Nothing to equal this has yet appeared in the vast literature of American education.

St. Louis Globe-Democrat:

An exhaustive study of our schools.

Jule B. Warren in the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer:

Mr. Freeman's book is one of the best documented studies of the schools that has been written.

Ed Minteer in the Albuquerque (N. Mex.) Journal:

For the genuine and practical educators, it will be an awakening on school-finance problems.

The Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune:

He took the words out of our mouths.

UNFAIR ATTACK

Amidst all the voices praising the report, there sounded only one discordant note—an article by Mr. Edgar Fuller in the September issue of the monthly magazine the Nation's Schools. The article was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and widely circulated by the National Education Association as a preprint, in advance of its publication.

It purports to be a review of Mr. Freeman's study, but neither describes nor even refers to the book's major findings and conclusions. To some extent this is reassuring. Mr. Fuller, obviously is unable to counter the true facts which Mr. Freeman reveals, but is unwilling to accept them because they expose the propaganda which he and his friends of the National Education Association have been spreading for many years.

This is emphasized by press comments such as these:

The Detroit (Mich.) News:

Freeman deflates many of the education lobby's most extravagant and panicky claims—the disappearing teacher, the frightening classroom shortage—often with figures and reports out of their own mouths. He questions many of the assumptions they so blandly peddle as bedrock truth. And he roundly refutes the notion that Americans have been little short of criminal in neglect of their schools.

Louis Azrael in the Baltimore (Md.) News Post:

Mr. Freeman's technique in this book is first to quote the heart-rending, poor-mouth statements of leading educators, then to demolish them with figures.

Harold G. Pyle in the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle:

Nothing the advocates of far heavier school spending can say will effectively argue with those facts. Point by point, Freeman demolishes the claims of the professional educationists and their powerful claque.

Instead of discussing the report's contents, Mr. Fuller imputes to its author proposals which appear nowhere in the book. He distorts some of the author's statements and selects from the thousands of facts and figures a few minor items which he claims to be inaccurate or incorrect. Lest some readers of Mr. Fuller's article be misled, and under permission to extend my remarks I feel constrained to expose and refute the spurious claims.

MISLEADING STATEMENTS

Mr. Fuller alleges that Mr. Freeman's book "argues for restriction of public education by curtailing its financial support." This is exactly the reverse of what the book actually does. Nowhere does it propose to curtail the financial support of education. Quite the contrary. It discusses, in great detail and with a wealth of factual evidence, by how much the support of the public schools must be raised.

It states:

To be sure, over the next decade the schools must get additional billions of dollars if they are to give an adequate education to an ever-growing number of pupils. Deficiencies in many areas require the infusion of more money. Also, if teachers' salaries are to keep pace with the rising general wage level, they will have to go on increasing.

It then continues:

Will school requirements be up $5 billion, $10 billion, $15 billion, over the next 10 years? That depends, above all, on how efficiently school funds are spent. Large amounts are presently wasted in keeping alive thousands of tiny school districts and uneconomical small schools which should long have been consolidated. Much of the inevitable cost increase could be offset by a more efficient school organization and a fuller and more effective utilization of human and physical resources. The schools have been slow in abandoning a structure and methods which have long outlived their usefulness.

The book presents, as its title announces, a projection of school requirements to 1970. Its concluding chapter shows school revenues in 1956 at $9.7 billion, and projects needs in 1970—under varying assumptions of teacher-pupil ratio and rates of increase in teachers' salaries—between $14.6 billion and $26.6 billion. The lowest projection—$14.6 billion—is based on the assumption that the cost per pupil will remain constant. The author points out that this is not likely to occur in view of the historical trend which has doubled per pupil costs every 20 years. He places the probable revenue requirements—if present trends continue—between $21.5 billion and $23.5 billion. If the addition of many billions of dollars to school revenues can be called a curtailment of financial support, then Mr. Fuller must be using a different vocabulary than the rest of us.

Mr. Fuller's assertion that the book "argues for restriction of education" and supports the views that "education should be a private matter and that public education is socialistic," or that it approves "of general education through the high school at public expense for only an academic elite," are fictional and without substance. There is nothing in this book that even remotely makes these suggestions.

Mr. Freeman estimates public school enrollment in 1970 at 43 million. Mr. Fuller does not say that he regards this estimate as too low. I doubt that he will—for it is more likely to be on the high side. All of Mr. Freeman's need data for 1970—number of teachers and classrooms and amount of money—relate to this enrollment estimate. They are not based upon a restriction of access to public education.

BETTER EDUCATION

Mr. Freeman's strongest emphasis in this book is upon the imperative need for better education. He declares in his preview and summary—page xix:

It is now self-evident that a major improvement in the quality of our educational product has become a matter of national survival.

Later he adds:

Some of the most eminent men in the sciences and humanities have stated their conviction that the needed uplift in the level of American education requires a renewed emphasis upon subject-matter learning, a major raising of academic standards in the elementary-secondary schools, and a new direction in the training and certification of teachers. The sentiment of the American people in the post-sputnik period seems to demand just that.

He summarizes:

What is needed—and needed badly—is a general raising of educational standards in our public schools.

Mr. Freeman criticizes the introduction of, and the granting of credits for, courses in marriage and family relationships, child development, grooming, junior homemaking for boys, teen-age problems, co-ed cooking, et cetera, which have tended to lower educational standards, and permitted able students to avoid the hard subjects. Far from advocating a restriction of public education, Mr. Freeman proposes a strengthening of the schools' educational activities—even at the expense of limiting some of the good, clean entertainment which many schools have been providing for their pupils.

Mr. Fuller is critical of Mr. Freeman's question: "Why are graduates of our schools 2 or 3 years behind their European and Russian counterparts?" and his statement that "the children learn less, in terms of academic achievement, in American schools in 12 years than they do in Russian or other foreign schools in 10." Unfortunately, there is overwhelming evidence from numerous reports and studies to bear out Mr. Freeman's point.

Mr. Fuller tries to create the impression that the United States is unique in letting all children go through secondary schools while other countries permit only a small elite—10 percent to 20 percent—to do so. Nothing could be farther from the truth. In Great Britain, for example, 80 percent of the children go to so-called modern secondary and similar schools up to age 15. When they leave, they master the 3 R's and have a knowledge of basic facts comparable to that of our 12th graders. About 20 percent of the British children attend academic secondary—grammar—schools and, up-

on graduation, are at least 2 years ahead of our high-school graduates. A similar situation prevails in other culturally leading countries of Europe. European schools keep all children in full-time education only to about age 15 because they manage to teach them in 10 years at least as much in basic skills and knowledge as our public schools do in 12.

In recent arithmetic tests of 3,000 English and 3,000 California 11-year-olds, G. T. Buswell of the University of California found a 2-to-1 superiority in the achievements of the English children. Only 13 California children scored as high as 1,077 English children. Mr. Buswell concluded that California schools—as well as American schools in general—spread the program over a longer period of years than English schools.

Mr. Freeman summarizes the opinion of university presidents and faculty members, scientists, engineers, and businessmen "that the watering-down of the curriculum and the erosion of standards in the elementary and secondary schools are responsible for the absolute and relative decline in the educational level of our youth."

Mr. Fuller lists six technical points as examples of how Mr. Freeman reached his conclusions. He asserts that these examples illustrate lack of accuracy as well as other deficiencies.

1. FACTS CONCEALED

Table I in Mr. Freeman's book shows that between 1952 and 1956 expenditures for education increased 48 percent, the total of all other public expenditures—Federal, State, and local—4 percent. Mr. Fuller asserts that Mr. Freeman "uses a large decline in cost of national defense to conceal increased expenditures in public services fairly comparable with expenditures in education. Highway costs increased faster than those for education in these years, for instance, but the contrary impression is inevitable from table I."

Table I conceals nothing. It presents what it announces: a comparison between expenditures for education and the combined total of outlays for all other public purposes. Mr. Fuller states that highway expenditures increased faster than those for education. To be exact, during those 4 years, they grew 49 percent compared with a 48-percent rise in educational outlays. This diminutive difference is hardly significant. If national defense is omitted from public outlays, as Mr. Fuller suggests, the remaining combined total—including highways—shows an increase of 18 percent compared with a 48-percent increase in education. I leave it to your judgment whether an 18-percent increase can be called "fairly comparable" with a 48-percent increase.

2. POINT NOT PROVED

Mr. Freeman disproves the claim that the schools lose out in the allocation of State funds because of the availability of Federal matching funds for other activities such as highways and welfare. He demonstrates that educational funds increased 14.3 times—in constant dollars—between 1902 and 1956, despite the lack of Federal incentives, while State and local outlays for all other purposes multiplied only 10 times. During that time enrollment in the public schools grew 96 percent while total population expanded 112 percent.

Mr. Fuller still believes that without Federal financial incentives discriminating against education, the increase in education undoubtedly would have been greater. He produces nothing to back up his hypothesis. But there are ample facts to contradict it.

Federal highway aid does not attract State funds which otherwise might have gone to the schools because highway moneys, in almost all States, come exclusively from highway user charges which legally can be used only for highway purposes. They are not intermingled with general revenues from which school funds usually come. Nor can there be a competition between school and road appropriations, except possibly in 2 or 3 States. The Bureau of the Census Compendium of State Government Finances in 1957 shows that State highway outlays match almost exactly the proceeds of highway-user taxes and charges, Federal aid, and highway bonds. None of these could have been diverted to school use.

State expenditures for education increased at a much higher rate than State expenditures for public welfare and other federally aided activities although, simultaneously, the total population grew faster than public-school enrollment. This demonstrates clearly that State school appropriations were not diminished by lack of Federal aid.

3. TEACHERS PAID LESS

Mr. Fuller does not like table X in which Mr. Freeman compares the annual earnings of teachers and other employee groups. The table shows these earnings increases in constant dollars between 1929 and 1956:

	Percent
Public-school teachers	90
State and local nonschool employees	49
Federal employees, General Government	59
All wage and salary workers	81

Mr. Fuller would prefer a comparison with Federal civilian rather than General Government employees, so as to exclude members of the Armed Forces. This would change the increase of Federal employees from 59 percent to 57 percent. Mr. Fuller's assertion that this would reverse the relative position—of the salary gains of teachers and Federal employees—is incorrect. On either basis of comparison, teachers received larger increases—both dollar and percentagewise—than the other employee groups. That they outpaced Federal civilian employees should cause teachers to think twice before trying to become dependent upon the Federal Government.

Teachers scored an increase of $1,908 or 90 percent and left far behind their fellow State and local government workers who received only a boost of $1,208 or 49 percent. This again shows that the schools did better than other State and local services, despite—or possibly because of—the lack of Federal support.

4. CLASSES ARE LARGER

The NEA has for years been charging that classes are growing larger. Mr. Freeman now demonstrates that teacher-pupil ratios and class sizes have been consistently and substantially declining. He documents this with a wealth of statistics, some of them from the NEA. Mr. Fuller ignores this massive evidence, admits that the teacher-pupil ratio was reduced from 1:26.8 to 1:25.3 between 1949–50 and 1956–57, but claims that this was due only to the large relative increase in secondary enrollment.

Mr. Fuller overlooks an important fact: The higher grades increased proportionately less than the lower grades during the past 8 years. The big postwar baby crop started hitting first grade in 1951 and will reach ninth grade by 1959. Between 1949–50 and 1956–57—or 1957–58—enrollment in grades 9 through 12 declined as a percent of total enrollment.

Mr. Fuller states that between 1949–50 and 1956–57 the teacher-pupil ratio declined in elementary schools from 1:30.6 to 1:30.5 and rose in secondary schools from 1:20 to 1:21.1. These figures are incorrect. Based on the NEA's Advance Estimates of Public Elementary and Secondary Public Schools, 1950–51 to 1957–58, the ratio in elementary schools declined from 1:31.7 to 1:30.6, and rose in secondary schools from 1:20.5 to 1:21.1.

5. WAGES ARE HIGHER

The NEA has been claiming for many years that teachers' salaries have been lagging behind the increases of other wage earners. Mr. Freeman proves in the largest chapter of his book—56 pages with 17 tables—that teachers' salaries advanced more rapidly than the earnings of most other occupational groups.

Mr. Fuller objects to one table, No. XXXIII, because it uses the weekly wages of manufacturing workers for a 1909–57 comparison. Mr. Fuller claims that only a comparison of hourly pay rates would be valid. He increases the wage index of the manufacturing workers by 28 percent because of the shortened workweek, and reduces the teachers' salary index by 13 percent because of the lengthened school term. This is faulty reasoning. What counts to a wage earner is his take-home pay. That is what he lives on. A cut in hours means only better working conditions.

Mr. Fuller charges that Mr. Freeman ignores three factors:

(a) "The weekly hours worked in manufacturing declined from 51 to 39.8 during the period." Fact: Mr. Freeman states—page 128—that the manufacturing worker now puts in 20 percent fewer hours.

(b) "Classroom teachers' pay in 1909 is not comparable with the salaries of total instructional staff in 1957." Fact: The United States Office of Education made no such distinction in its biennial statistics. However, Mr. Freeman recognizes that the 1909 data may not include supervisory personnel and states in table XXXIII, footnote 2, that "the maximum possible adjustment amounts to 1 percent or $5 annually in 1909; most likely the difference is less."

(c) "The length of the school term increased more than 13 percent." Fact: The average school term increased from 157.5 days in 1909–10 to 178.6 days in 1953–54—most recent year available—as computed by the United States Office of Education—see page 104 of Mr. Freeman's book. That equals a 13 percent increase.

6. IGNORES MOBILITY

Mr. Freeman projects classroom needs to 1970, and accepts, for this purpose, the extravagant claims of classroom shortages of the Long Range Survey of 1955 and of the fall 1957 survey, both by the United States Office of Education. On the two bases, the annual construction need averages 55,700 or 57,100 classrooms respectively. To make allowance for minor factors, including "underuse because of migration"—page 200—Mr. Freeman places the annual construction need at 60,000 classrooms.

Mr. Fuller charges that Mr. Freeman omits the factor of mobility which increases need by at least 10,000 classrooms each year. He gives no basis for this unrealistic figure.

Mr. Fuller appears to have overlooked several facts: Some migration is offset by countermovements; mobility reduces construction needs in areas of net outmigration; couples move from the central city to the suburb when they start a family; the areas which lose population are largely in the oldest and most rundown sections of town or in farm country, and their schools often are aged and will be taken care of by the depreciation factor in Mr. Freeman's estimate; migration creates a need in the area of destination but adds to the national total only to the extent to which available facilities are not utilized.

PLATFORM

In his conclusion Mr. Fuller presents a "platform" which Mr. Freeman allegedly supports. Mr. Fuller would find it difficult to substantiate that platform with quotes from this book.

Anybody who wants to know what Mr. Freeman's platform is can find plenty of clear-cut and unequivocal statements in the book and does not have to conjecture what he supports or implies. Mr. Freeman proposes higher standards of curriculum, promotion, and graduation in the schools and a more efficient and effective use of the available human and physical resources. His book contains an ample number of details to back this up.

THIS ATTACK IS DEPLORABLE

The attempt in this unwarranted and unfair attack to belittle and discredit an excellent research study and its author is deplorable. I am confident that it will backfire. Mr. Freeman's reputation as the country's outstanding authority in the field of school finance is too well established to be affected by this column no matter how widely the NEA may distribute it.

When the United States Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in 1954 decided to undertake a study of education in the American Federal system, it chose Mr. Freeman to direct its research. In 1955 the Committee for the White House Conference on Education called him to serve as a consultant on school finance. Mr. Freeman is the only person in the country to have served on both Presidential commissions which studied school finance in recent years. His wide reputation is demonstrated by editorial comments such as these:

The Spokesman-Review (Spokane, Wash.):

Probably no man in the country has devoted more study to this particular subject than he.

Los Angeles (Calif.) Times:

We have quoted Mr. Freeman on school matters before. His credentials are excellent.

The Tidings (Los Angeles, Calif.):

It is doubtful that a more excellent authority in the field could be found.

Fort Worth (Tex.) Star-Telegram:

His credentials are impressive. We do not see how there could be valid disagreement.

The Evening Outlook (Santa Monica, Calif.) commented editorially:

In his book Mr. Freeman lays down a formula that we hope educators will heed.

And the New York Daily News added:

The book is recommended to boards of education all over the country.

To this I can only say, "Amen."

Small Business Progress, 1953–58

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in our peacetime history real progress has been made to develop programs within Government agencies which are designed to strengthen the small business segment of our economy.

We have heard much during the past 5 years from political critics that the Eisenhower administration is one of big business with little or no consideration for the balance of our business population. These critics ignore history. This group chooses to ignore the difference between an emergency wartime rescue operation and the calm constructive work of a peacetime operation. They ignore the accomplishments for small business in the Republican 83d Congress and gloss over the shortcomings of the Democratic controlled 84th and 85th Congresses.

Finally, they would like to ignore the achievements of the executive departments under President Eisenhower in the establishment of departmental programs to help small business.

Personally, I have great admiration for the large group of men in both parties who sincerely go about the task of strengthening our economic system. For them the reward of accomplishment for small business is the satisfaction derived from a job well done. It does not take a headline or a byline to make them happy.

KOREAN WARTIME CONTROLS—BIG BUSINESS IN CHARGE

Most of us will remember that during the Korean hostilities small business found it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to obtain relief from wage and price controls and to secure scarce materials and machinery with which to produce for the war effort. Big business not only received most of our defense contracts, but also acquired most of the tax-amortization certificates which permitted such firms to build up plant and equipment at the expense of smaller concerns within the industry.

While the Congress, through bipartisan efforts, established during these difficult years an agency designed to help small business overcome these problems, few, if any, effective programs could be developed. Those Members who were on the Small Business Committee of the House of Representatives during those Korean years will remember the months of investigation and the numerous reports designed to secure greater cooperation from President Truman's advisers so that this independent agency, the Small Defense Plants Administration, might function as the Congress had intended. Unfortunately, these efforts met continued resistance until President Eisenhower's administration took over on January 20, 1953.

SMALL BUSINESS ACT OF 1953—PREPARING FOR PEACE

In 1953 the Republican 83d Congress, with the full support of President Eisenhower, established a new small-business agency. The Small Business Administration, as we all know, is an independent agency, designed to act as the spokesman for small business within the executive branch of the Government and to assist small firms in those areas where obstacles exist that prevent more successful and competitive operations. I shall later discuss the details of SBA's operations over the past 5 years.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S CABINET COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

First, I would like to comment on other efforts of the Eisenhower administration to assist small business. Of particular importance has been the establishment by the President himself of a Cabinet Committee on Small Business. To my knowledge, this was the first time that a President had ever given formal recognition to the problems of small business at the Cabinet level. It was a long step ahead in the Federal Government's efforts to render assistance to small business.

The Cabinet Committee was established in May of 1956. Its members were the Secretaries of Defense, Commerce, and Labor; the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization; the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers; and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration. In August of the same year, the Cabinet Committee made a report to the President. Upon receiving this report the President stated in a letter to the Chairman of the Committee:

This administration is engaged in a continuing effort to insure that the American

economy is based on a strong, broad foundation of healthy free enterprises—small and large. The first progress report of the Cabinet Committee on Small Business is a further forward step in this effort.

The scope of the report's analysis and recommendations demonstrates that no constructive potential avenue of improvement either legislative or executive—is being overlooked in our search to widen the opportunities for small businesses in America.

We must continue to strive to eliminate obstacles hindering the growth of small businesses. I also firmly believe that uneconomic or sweeping nostrums have no place in this administration's program; such measures usually help no one and eventually injure all. I am glad to see that the Committee emphasizes the importance of maintaining competition and of continued vigilance against any outcroppings of monopoly; also that the Committee's report recognizes the need of preserving and increasing efficiency in business, and that it has focused on positive measures to help small businesses get started and grow.

In its studies of the problems of small business the Cabinet Committee found that small enterprises carried a disproportionate handicap due to the impact of income taxes under the Internal Revenue Code and consequently had retained insufficient earnings after payment of taxes to expand or modernize. The Cabinet Committee recognized the role of the Federal Government as the largest purchaser of goods and services in our economy. It was also found that small business was severely handicapped in its ability to undertake research and development programs, of particular importance in these days of rapid technological change. Finally, the Cabinet Committee found that the growth in advertising accompanied by rising family incomes tended to favor larger companies with brand names and complicated the marketing problems of small business both in manufacturing and distribution at the wholesale and retail levels.

Based on these findings concerning the several problems confronting small business today, the Cabinet Committee made some 14 recommendations for legislative and administrative action. These recommendations have had the serious attention of the executive departments and agencies as well as recognition by the Congress. I wish to comment on the progress which has been made in carrying out a few of these recommendations.

SMALL-BUSINESS TAX POLICY AND REFORM

The Cabinet Committee concluded that the most important contribution which the Federal Government could make to the economic health of small business was: "to pursue monetary, fiscal, and housekeeping policies that foster sustained expansion of aggregate economic activity and that avoid the illusions of well-being that are sometimes produced by price inflation."

In the area of tax reform for small business the Cabinet Committee recommended a reduction in the normal corporate tax rate from 30 to 20 percent on incomes up to $25,000, thereby helping smaller firms to finance growth, expansion, and modernization. Used property purchases not exceeding $50,000 in any one year would be subject to the accelerated depreciation formulas made available to purchasers of new property by the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. The Cabinet Committee also recommended that certain corporations be given the option of being taxed as partnerships and that taxpayers be given the option of paying the estate tax over a period of up to 10 years in cases where the estate consists largely of investments in closely held business concerns.

Mr. Speaker, a beginning was made during the Republican 83d Congress to provide business concerns with tax reform. At that time both large and small firms received more liberalized depreciation allowances, a corporate filing option for small, closely held partnerships, permissive deduction of research and development expenditures, relief from surplus accumulations, and extension of the net operating loss deduction and other measures.

The President's recommendations which were forwarded to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives on July 15, 1957 were introduced in the House by the Republican members of our Small Business Committee. Prior to that time, however, these same Members of Congress had introduced an omnibus tax bill for small business: H. R. 5631, Mr. HILL of Colorado; H. R. 5633, Mr. SEELY-BROWN of Connecticut; H. R. 5634, Mr. MCCULLOCH of Ohio; H. R. 5635, Mr. SHEEHAN of Illinois; and H. R. 5636, Mr. HOSMER of California. My bill introduced at the same time was H. R. 5632. The urgent need for tax reform for small business was set forth in statements made when the foregoing bills were introduced on March 6, 1957—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 103, part 3, pages 3222–3234. We, the Republican members of the Small Business Committee, are disappointed that the Democratic controlled 85th Congress has taken only a small part of these proposals and incorporated them into legislative enactment. At the time of the passage of the small business tax revision bill—H. R. 13382—the Republican members of the House Small Business Committee as a group went on record stating:

> We shall vote for the pending bill * * * because it is the only tax measure which will be presented to us in the 85th Congress in the name of small business. If we were to say that we are disappointed in the bill before us, it would only be a very mild expression of our opinion. The tax reform is so inadequate that we can only classify the provisions of H. R. 13382 as fringe benefits. Moreover, it is extremely doubtful that more than a small percentage of the 4 million small-business concerns in our country will benefit at all.
>
> The bill, H. R. 13382, does not go to the heart of the small-business tax problem: and that is, the ability to plow back earnings into the business. This legislation is based on a token principle: something to talk about as if it had substance and something that is deficient in objectives but which, nevertheless will be cataloged as an accomplishment of the 85th Congress. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 21, 1958, p. 13208.)

Some day soon the Congress of the United States must face up to the fact that a realistic tax policy must be adopted to assure the small-business concerns of our country proper and adequate tax reform if we expect small business to remain a vigorous sector of the economy. We Republicans will continue to introduce in future Congresses tax reform bills for small business until such recognition is achieved.

Any tax measure in the interest of small business should include the basic principles embodied in the foregoing bills. They are as follows:

First. Provide for the retention of earnings for capital which can be utilized without penalty for growth, expansion, and modernization;

Second. Apply to all forms of business enterprise, that is, to corporations, partnerships, and individuals;

Third. Apply to business enterprises engaged in manufacturing, wholesaling, or retailing which are engaged in trade or commerce;

Fourth. Apply to business operations commonly characterized as "service" establishments;

Fifth. Be confined to small business by appropriate ceilings depending upon the type of provision; namely, gross earnings, capital assets, number of shareholders, and so forth;

Sixth. Provide appropriate options to enable all small-business institutions to make periodic elections as to the various methods for computing income taxes under the Internal Revenue Code;

Seventh. Be designed to encourage private investment and private loans to small-business enterprises;

Eighth. Protect the good will of the business upon the demise of the owner or owners;

Ninth. Make certain that estate taxes may be paid in such manner as to provide for the continuance of the business rather than force liquidation, merger, or sale of a small business;

Tenth. Provide methods of amortizing and depreciating both new and used property which take into account the replacement or renewal of such property within its life expectancy; and

Eleventh. Classify family-sized farms or tenants of such farms as small-business enterprises in order to receive the benefits which would be derived by tax legislation applying to small business.

SMALL-BUSINESS PROCUREMENT POLICY AND PROCEDURES

Of major importance to small business was the recommendation of the Cabinet Committee that the President arrange for a comprehensive review of procurement policies and procedures of all Government departments and agencies with a view to facilitating and increasing the participation of small businesses in Government contracting. As a result of this recommendation the General Services Administration established a task force on which are represented the General Services Administration, the Department of Defense, and the Small Business Administration. This task force has over the past 2 years investigated many areas of Government procurement which have proved to work hardships on full small business participation such as specifications, lead times, availability of information, inspection

procedures, etc. Many recommendations for both legislative and administrative action have resulted from these studies.

For example, S. 3224, adopted by the Senate on August 14, 1958, and by the House of Representatives on August 15, 1958, and now awaiting the President's signature, is a result of one of the recommendations of the President's Cabinet Committee on Small Business which was: "That the President arrange for a comprehensive review of procurement policies and procedures of all departments and agencies, including the legislation pertaining thereto, with a view to facilitating and extending the participation of small business in work on Government contracts."

Among other things, this legislation authorizes the Administrator of the General Services Administration to extend to civilian executive agencies the flexible procurement procedures employed by the military departments and the General Services Administration. This should help eliminate inconsistencies in the purchasing procedures of the various civilian and executive agencies which frequently confuse the smaller business concerns.

Another change in the procurement legislation extends to $2,500 the present open-market limitations of $500 applicable to most civilian agencies and of $1,000 applicable to several agencies, such as the military and the General Services Administration. This change will permit agencies to avoid the formalities incident to advertised purchases when the amount involved is not in excess of $2,500 and thereby will permit the placing of more small orders of this type which small business concerns can readily accept.

Similarly negotiation of perishable and nonperishable subsistence supplies is authorized by this legislation. At present only the military departments have authority to negotiate in this area, and then only for perishable supplies. Commercial practices in subsistence markets do not fit in with Government advertising requirements. Small business concerns being limited in their resources should be particularly helped by this change.

Advance payments in advertised requirements are authorized by this legislation to be made on the operating level without the need for approval on the secretarial level, as is presently required. This legislation also permits both advanced payments and progress payments in advertised procurements to be limited to small-business concerns.

The final change which should be mentioned eliminates the need for filing formal affidavits of payroll data in Government construction and building repair contracts. This will permit the use of simplified statements and thereby relieve one of the burdens encountered by small-business concerns dealing in such contracts.

Also in the field of procurement, the Cabinet Committee recommended that procurement agencies assure small business that the need for advance and progress payments by a bidder will not be treated as a handicap in awarding a contract. Both the General Services Administration and the Department of Defense have issued regulations to carry out this recommendation.

OTHER CABINET COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Other recommendations of the President's Cabinet Committee covered the extension of the Small Business Administration; increasing the registration exemption of the Securities and Exchange Commission from $300,000 to $500,000; legislation concerning Federal scrutiny and advance notice of business mergers; easing handicaps of small business on contracts subject to renegotiation; and enforcement of antitrust laws and Federal reporting requirements of small firms. Bills have been introduced in this Congress covering each of the Cabinet Committee's legislative recommendations. A few have had consideration, but it is evident at this late date that we shall have to await another Congress to give small business the help it really needs.

THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION MADE A PERMANENT AGENCY

Certainly, the most important small business legislation passed during the 85th Congress has been the revision of the Small Business Act which among other things established the Small Business Administration as a permanent agency. As I mentioned earlier, the Small Business Administration was established in 1953 by the Republican 83d Congress as the first independent, peacetime agency with the sole purpose of providing assistance to the small-business concerns of our economy. In each succeeding Congress the minority members of our Small Business Committee introduced bills to make the SBA permanent. In early 1957 President Eisenhower strongly recommended a permanent small business agency. The House bill—H. R. 7963—making the Small Business Administration a permanent agency passed the House on June 25, 1957. However, permanency was not accomplished until a year later when an amendment was offered and adopted in the Senate making the Small Business Administration permanent rather than extending it until 1961, as was recommended by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. Fortunately for small business, this amendment was adopted in the Senate by a large majority.

I stress the importance of a permanent, independent agency to assist small business because it has been our belief that since World War II smaller concerns have encountered difficulties in three major fields of business operation; that is, securing adequate investment and working capital, obtaining a fair share of Government contracts, and obtaining up-to-date information on management and technical problems. In these particular areas the difficulties of small business over the years have varied only in intensity, not in the particulars. Too, the small-business men of this country have always needed a spokesman and champion within the executive branch of the Federal Government. Since 1953, the Small Business Administration has, with the full support of the President, rendered assistance to small business in each of these areas. The scope and volume of this agency's activities have been continually broadened. Every effort has been made to render effective and expeditious assistance. I believe that an excellent job has been done by the Small Business Administration—as a permanent agency I expect even greater progress to be made. I would like at this point to review briefly the activities of the Small Business Administration over the past 5 years.

SBA FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS—BUSINESS LOANS

The Small Business Act states that the Small Business Administration shall provide financial assistance to small concerns to finance plant construction, conversion, or expansion including the acquisition of land or to finance the acquistion of equipment, facilities, machinery, supplies or materials for war, defense or civilian production or as may be necessary to insure a well-balanced national economy. Such financial assistance is in the form of loans which may have a maturity of up to 10 years. The SBA cannot advance credit, however, unless private credit is unobtainable on reasonable terms, and each loan must be of such sound value or so secured as to reasonably assure repayment. The act stipulates, therefore, that the financial activities of SBA must supplement those of our private financial institutions, and it is expected that each loan will be repaid; these are not financial grants.

I might add, parenthetically, that it is the purpose of the act for banks and other private financial institutions to participate with the Federal Government in extending credit to small business. Under the act each businessman must attempt to secure financing from his own bank or secure participation by his bank with the Small Business Administration before the latter can consider providing the entire amount requested. This is most appropriate for as I have said, the Federal Government should only supplement the work of existing financial institutions, and participation loans enable a borrower to establish locally a line of credit for future use. That banks throughout the country have been truly cooperating with the SBA to provide credit to small business is indicated by the fact that approximately 70 percent of SBA loans are of the participation variety.

Since 1953, the Small Business Administration had approved through June of this year, a total of 11,110 business loans for $519,782,846. Of this amount $435,958,159 was SBA's share. Each year has seen an increase in the number of loans approved by the Small Business Administration. Starting with 473 loans for the fiscal year 1954, approvals increased to 1,172 in fiscal 1955; 1,915 in fiscal 1956; 3,536 in fiscal 1957; and 4,014 for the 12 months of fiscal 1958, that is, through June 1958. As a matter of fact, business loan approvals have reached new highs during this fiscal year.

Now it is axiomatic that not all loans approved by a financial institution are taken down, for one reason or another

they may be withdrawn by the borrower or canceled. In this respect the Small Business Administration has had the same experience as private financial institutions, and I might add, the same experience as its predecessor, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. An approved loan may be canceled because the borrower's plans have changed, because he secured financing from some other source, because his business has improved and he no longer desires SBA credit or for other reasons. An approved loan may also be canceled because the borrower's condition has changed so that a reasonably sound loan could not be made, because the borrower could not or would not meet the conditions necessarily imposed by the Small Business Administration to make it a sound loan or for other reasons. We find, therefore, that considering all things, SBA had, as of June 1958, a net business loan approval figure of 9,610 for $450,527,000. In other words, as of that date SBA had injected or agreed to inject a little under one-half a billion dollars into our economy.

As of May, the latest information available, it was indicated that of net loan approvals some 9,127 for $350,900,000 or 86 percent had been disbursed by the SBA. There is a natural delay in the disbursement of loans. Sometimes it takes a businessman several weeks to clear title of collateral offered to meet the terms of the loan. In other instances he may not ask for his check until some time after he has been assured of funds. In construction loans, often full disbursement is made only after work has been completed. In checking with the SBA on specific loan cases, I have found that once a loan is approved, a borrower can expect his check as soon as he completes his work on the contract and is ready to receive his money. I have also found in observing the SBA over the years that there have been few if any justifiable complaints as to delay in disbursement of SBA funds once a loan has been approved.

Since the beginning of the Small Business Administration, our subcommittee, which is responsible within the full committee for observing the activities of this agency, has noticed a commendable effort to assure the small-business man expeditious processing of his loan application. It is unfortunate that there have, at times, been insufficient personnel to carry the workload imposed by the increasing volume of applications. I know that every effort has been made to simplify procedures so that under normal conditions a business loan can be processed in 3 weeks.

The rate of applications has, however, increased each year and is now at a new high with 1,099 business loan applications received during the month of May. Beginning in fiscal 1954 with 2,289 applications, it increased to 3,318 in 1955; 4,081 in 1956; 6,864 in 1957; and 7,898 for the first 12 months of fiscal 1958. I mention the Small Business Administration loan application rate for one particular reason—it means that the agency workload has increased to a point where there is a backlog among the various regional offices. It was for this reason that our subcommittee testified in August before the Senate Appropriations Committee in an effort to assure the SBA of sufficient financial personnel to handle and process expeditiously any further increase in business loan applications.

DISASTER LOANS

In addition to its business loan program the Small Business Administration was given by the Congress the task of making disaster loans to businessmen or homeowners who suffered damage because of flood, hurricane, tornadoes, or other sudden catastrophies. Since the original Small Business Act of 1953, the Congress has also included within this program loans to businessmen suffering because of excessive drought or rainfall. Since 1953, the SBA has approved some 7,708 disaster loans for a total of $83,314,341. Fortunately, the number of disasters and subsequent applications for financial assistance have been relatively few in the past 2 fiscal years. I can say, however, that the SBA has been complimented most highly on its effort to afford immediate assistance to people who have had the misfortune to be struck by disaster. During fiscal 1956, which included the fall of 1955 when two hurricanes struck the east coast within a short time of each other, the SBA made some 3,300 disaster loans for a total of $44½ million. And only recently because of excessive rainfall in the Mississippi Valley, several hundreds of loans have been made for over $7 million. This is certainly a program essential to the welfare of our people.

SBA LOAN POLICY FLEXIBLE AND DYNAMIC

To me the most important thing about a Government lending program is not necessarily how many loans are made, since we know that if a firm can meet the criteria of the act, it will receive assistance, but whether the lending agency concerned has done everything possible to meet changing economic conditions and the needs of all small-business men—just as Congress has amended the Small Business Act to meet the needs of the times.

The first policy statement issued by the Loan Policy Board on September 16, 1953, gave preference to loans to manufacturers or processors of materials and products for military and essential civilian purposes and declared ineligible loans to certain types of industries or for certain purposes which were not considered to be in the public interest.

A revised statement, dated November 16, 1953, eliminated the preference formerly given to manufacturers and made possible loans to all kinds of business concerns on an equal basis except those specific types of businesses which had previously been excluded as not coming within the purview of the intent of the act. Since that time other changes have been made in SBA loan policy such as permitting use of funds to refinance indebtedness to a Government instrumentality, which would enable a firm owing money to RFC to obtain funds partially to refinance that loan.

The Small Business Administration will now make loans to bona fide businesses located in recreational areas—such loans had previously been excluded as recreational facilities—to effect a change of ownership in a business where such change is necessary to the continued existence of that business; for modernization and operation of four-walled theaters—this change recognized the economic value of theaters in bringing trade to other businesses within the area in which the theater is located—to small businesses which are practicing a profession or rendering professional services.

In addition to the activities specifically authorized in the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended, the Small Business Administration, as a part of its financial assistance operations, is cooperating with the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior in the administration of that Department's fisheries' loan program. The Small Business Administration develops the necessary credit information for such loans which are closed and administered through its regional offices.

The Small Business Administration has also been working closely with the Housing and Home Finance Agency in connection with its community facilities disposal program to determine whether the Small Business Administration loans may be made available to purchasers of Government-owned business properties held for disposal by that Agency and with the Medical Facilities Branch of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in developing a program of loans to proprietary hospitals, nursing homes, and medical and dental laboratories.

FINANCIAL COUNSELING

The Small Business Administration operates on the premise that it is the intent of Congress that Government funds should be loaned only after all other possible avenues for solving a small firm's financial problems have been explored. Frequently these firms do not need a loan but are most in need of counseling on financial management problems. Often they do not have the resources available to larger firms to obtain this specialized service in solving their financial problems. In such cases the Small Business Administration provides this assistance through its financial counseling program.

In response to requests for aid, or in examining applications for Small Business Administration loans, consideration is given to possible means of obtaining private credit on reasonable terms; to assistance available from local development corporations; to various alternative plans for financing production; to the adequacy of accounting and auditing methods and to other aspects of financial management; to the means of increasing equity capital; to the eligibility for V-loan financing of defense contracts; and to the feasibility of obtaining advance or partial payments on contracts.

Often the problem is undercapitalization or perhaps a need for liquidation of inventory or obsolete equipment, revision of credit policies or a change in product pricing principles. In other instances a contemplated expansion may not be justified. A firm's product line

may be too broad or too limited or its sales policies may need review.

These are a few of the possible factors considered by the Small Business Administration's specialists in counseling small businesses which have financial problems.

In many cases the financial specialists in the Small Business Administration's regional and branch offices assist in presenting the business's application for a loan to his local bank, often accompanying the company's representatives in their negotiations with that bank. Many times the proper presentation of the company's financial position through guidance of SBA's financial specialists has resulted in banks approving loans to these firms after they had previously refused to provide such credit.

Mr. Speaker, I should mention at this point the new legislation which provides for the supplying of so-called equity capital to small business. Our committee has long commented, at least since 1952, upon the need of small business for additional ownership capital to finance long-term improvements or expansion. As we all know, small businesses have been inaugurated too frequently with inadequate equity capital and have relied too heavily on borrowed funds. Too, small firms which have had adequate initial ownership funds are unable to expand through use of the regulated securities market. For these and many other reasons, the Congress has deemed it advisable to permit the Small Business Administration to assist in the establishment of small business investment corporations which in turn will provide long-term funds to small businesses through the means of convertible debentures.

My Republican colleagues and I have, of course, always believed that small business needs assistance in securing equity capital. We have felt, however, that the State investment and development corporation was the best medium through which to supply such capital, and we introduced bills incorporating this idea. It was our contention that a good start had been made on financial assistance through a limited number of State organizations and that with the Small Business Administration's assistance all States would be anxious to institute such programs. In other words, we preferred to operate at the State level. While we unanimously supported the present law, it was with some reservation. We do sincerely hope that the proposed system will work; if not, some other way must be found, for small business must have some means of supplementing its sources of private equity capital.

PROCUREMENT AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Mr. Speaker, while more publicity has been given the activities of the Small Business Administration in the area of financial assistance, their work in the field of procurement and technical assistance is of equal importance. For many years the Congress has been concerned with the role of the small-business man in Government procurement—whether he receives his fair share of goods and services procured, whether he is confronted with difficulties of specifications, short lead times, emergency and sole source procurements, and other matters. The Congress has also been concerned over the lack of managerial and technical know-how among smaller concerns. Historically, they have been handicapped by the lack of information and counsel on these subjects.

We, therefore, wrote into the Small Business Act specific directions that the Small Business Administration should exert every effort to assure small business a fair share of Government purchases and to provide technical and managerial services which would help these firms to become stronger competitors. As in its financial assistance programs, the SBA has increased each year its activities and scope of operations in the procurement and technical assistance fields. I wish to comment briefly on some of these activities.

SMALL BUSINESS SET-ASIDES

Primary emphasis is given by the Small Business Administration to the setting aside of Government contracts for exclusive award to small business concerns. Insofar as possible when there is sufficient small-business competition the SBA representative and the contracting officer will agree that all or part of a particular procurement will be set aside for award to small business. Agreements to joint set-aside programs have now been negotiated by the SBA with the Department of Defense; the General Services Administration; the Military Petroleum Supply Agency; the Departments of Commerce, Interior and Agriculture; the Post Office Department; the Atomic Energy Commission; the Veterans' Administration; and the Government Printing Office.

Since 1953, the Small Business Administration, in cooperation with these military and civilian procurement agencies, has succeeded in reserving $3 billion in Government procurements for small business. Starting with set-asides agreed to with military procurement agencies of $228 million in fiscal 1954, there has been an increase each fiscal year to over $1 billion in fiscal 1958. Similarly, some $8 million were set aside by SBA and civilian procurement agencies in fiscal 1956—over $51 million were set aside in fiscal 1958.

However, as our subcommittee testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee, the Small Business Administration has since its inception been handicapped in this most important program by a lack of personnel. This agency has been allotted funds for only 37 representatives to cover regularly some 27 Army purchasing offices, 21 Navy installations, 18 Air Force establishments, 27 Federal Civilian Agency purchasing offices and the Military Petroleum Supply Agency. In addition to these 94 installations at which the program was carried out on a regular basis, liaison was maintained with 74 other procurement installations. I believe that the continued increase in activity in the joint set-aside program with such limited personnel deserve commendation.

CERTIFICATES OF COMPETENCY

The Small Business Administration certificate of competency program, like the joint set-aside program, is detailed in the Small Business Administration Act itself. Under this program the SBA may certify as to the financial and technical competence of a particular small-business concern. The need for such a certificate arises when a contracting officer has declared a small-business concern, which is the low bidder, unacceptable because of either financial or technical ability or both. If, after the SBA has made its survey, it determines that the firm is competent, then a certificate may be issued which is binding on the contracting officer. Obviously these certificates will be issued only after a most careful survey, and when issued and the contract awarded, there is continual followup to check progress under the contract and to offer any assistance on production problems that may arise. Such followup will cover the prompt placement of orders, satisfactory delivery schedules, receipt of components and the need for additional financing.

It should be kept in mind that certificates of competency are issued with a great deal of caution. Any certificate issued to a concern which fails to satisfactorily complete a contract means: First, that the procuring agency fails to obtain the necessary items or service; second, that the company acquires a poor record, and third, that the certificate of competency program itself loses esteem within the affected agencies. Actually, the Small Business Administration has a good record in administering the certificate of competency program. Small-business concerns have acquired contracts which they would not otherwise have received, and the Government itself has saved money through obtaining a lower price. Since August 1953 through June 1958 a total of 916 certificate of competency applications were filed with the Small Business Administration amounting to some $186 million. Of this number some 432 certificates were issued for a little over $64 million.

GOVERNMENT-PROCUREMENT PROBLEMS AND ASSISTANCE

Continued progress has been made in many other areas of procurement and technical assistance to small-business concerns. I wish to cite additional figures covering these other activities not only to show the work which has been done but also to show the scope of these programs. The Congress directed that the Small Business Administration should attack the problems of small business on every possible front. This I believe has been done.

PRIME CONTRACT REFERRALS

During the calendar year 1957, the Small Business Administration's field offices made 38,595 referrals of prime contract opportunities to small business concerns. Procurement counseling to owners and operators was rendered to 23,583 small businesses in 1957. A total of 8,184 small firms were helped in technical problems on bidding for Government contracts. The SBA made 10,676 contacts in 1957 to develop additional sources of supply for bidders lists.

STANDARDS FOR PROCUREMENT OPERATIONS

The task force appointed by the President's Cabinet Committee on Small Busi-

ness has proposed standard operating instructions to be adopted by all Government procuring agencies. These instructions are being coordinated with all Government procurement agencies to resolve differences of opinion, which should permit releasing these instructions within a reasonably short period of time.

GOVERNMENT SPECIFICATIONS

In addition, the Small Business Administration has developed a program and is continuing to assist small firms with their specification problems. Due to the myriad specifications involved in the program, the SBA's efforts have been centered upon individual requests; and in most instances, specifications have been broadened to enable wider participation by small firms. The Small Business Administration regularly receives from the General Services Administration copies of all proposed interim and Federal specifications for the purpose of ascertaining any restrictive features which would prove a hardship on small business. Other requests involving problems on inspection procedures, packaging, and shipping have been referred to the above-mentioned task force for further study and possible regulatory amendments which would simplify the problem of small firms.

The Small Business Administration has a program designed to broaden the participation of small business in defense contracts by making available to small firms prints, specifications, and so forth, on items not previously known to them. This program has been instrumental in developing additional small-business sources for the contracting offices, which in turn has permitted set-asides not previously made.

GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT PROCEDURES

The Task Force To Review Government Procurement Procedures and Policies established pursuant to recommendations of the President's Cabinet Committee on Small Business has continued its functions during the past year. The Small Business Administration has designated a representative on the task force and has assigned a full-time technical employee to the task force working staff. The SBA works very closely with this group providing technical assistance on basic or typical problems experienced by small firms.

SBA FACILITIES STUDY

The Small Business Administration is making a study of Government-supplied facilities and equipment now being used which are available to subcontractors engaged in the missile program in order that it may better inform small firms of the possible use of this equipment.

SBA INFORMATION CENTER

Improvements have been made in providing publicity on negotiated procurements. In addition, there is now under study a program for creating a central information center in Washington, D. C., in order that procurement information may be readily available on both advertised and negotiated contracts. After experience is gained from the initial operation, further consideration will be given to the establishment of other information centers throughout the country.

SBA AND MOBILIZATION PLANNING

Through the Small Business Administration's liaison office to the Department of Defense more consideration is being given to small firms in mobilization planning. This is a continuous program and small firms are being continuously added to the planned list. The Administrator of the Small Business Administration is a member of the Defense Mobilization Board, and a full-time representative of the SBA is located at the Office of Civilian and Defense Mobilization.

The role of the Small Business Administration was formalized by the issuance on July 3, 1956, of Defense Mobilization Order I-24. This order officially recognized the working arrangements which had been in effect between the Small Business Administration and the Office of Defense Mobilization for some time prior to that date. Under the order, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration is called upon to:

First. Assist in the development of plans for bringing the productive facilities of small business to bear on mobilization requirements;

Second. Obtain information on the productive capabilities of small businesses for defense objectives;

Third. Assist other Federal agencies in providing guidance to small business in developing ability to participate in readiness programs.

The Small Business Administration was authorized to take additional preparedness measures in the form of planning for its continued operations under wartime conditions and developing methods for assessing attack damage to the small-business segment of the mobilization base.

REDUCTION IN EMERGENCY PROCUREMENT

The Small Business Administration procurement center representatives have been successful in eliminating a considerable number of so-called emergency procurements. This action has been limited to individual cases rather than policy, and an extension of lead time as well as delivery time has been granted to small firms in most cases, as requested.

SMALL BUSINESS OPPORTUNITY MEETINGS

The Small Business Administration has continued to cosponsor, in cooperation with local business groups and Government agencies, the small business opportunity meetings which have provided a medium where small-business owners and operators can get detailed information on Government procurement procedures. During 1957 there were 14 of the business-opportunity meetings held throughout the United States which had more than 8,500 owners of small businesses in attendance. Active planning is in process for conducting some 20 of these meetings during the next several months. At these meetings small-business men are informed of what various procurement agencies in the Federal Government are buying and of subcontracting opportunities with large prime contractors. They may also obtain answers to any detailed questions or individual problems they might have.

TECHNICAL AND DISTRIBUTION RESEARCH

The President's Conference on Technical and Distribution Research for the Benefit of Small Business was held in Washington in September 1957. Since then, the Small Business Administration has cosponsored nine conferences of a similar nature in as many cities throughout the country. These conferences have been conducted in cooperation with the Department of Commerce and other Government agencies, chambers of commerce, trade associations, State and local governments, universities, and other organizations and groups.

Emphasis at most of these 1- to 3-day meetings has been placed on technical and distribution research, although other subjects have been covered as well.

SBA PROCUREMENT PUBLICATIONS

Supplementing these procurement activities are the Small Business Administration publications which directly and materially aid small firms in bidding on Government contracts. SBA staff specialists also advise small firms on the necessary procedure for getting their products on Government-qualified products lists and of purchasing offices that need additional suppliers for specific items.

MANAGEMENT AND TECHNICAL PROBLEMS AND ASSISTANCE

With the exception of the need for financial assistance and for help in obtaining Government contracts, the most urgent need among many small-business concerns is for assistance in improving their production and managerial techniques and keeping abreast of technological developments. I have found that management counseling is an essential part of every major program of SBA. In providing financial, procurement, and production assistance, every effort is made to resolve managerial as well as technical problems affecting the individual small-business concern.

SBA MANAGEMENT COURSES

The Small Business Administration administrative management courses program has continued to receive nationwide acceptance and increasing interest. These courses bring the best in administrative management to small-business owners through cosponsored college courses. These courses, usually conducted in the evening, are taught by business leaders and college teachers. Through December 1957, more than 300 courses had been held and for calendar year 1957 the SBA cosponsored 121 courses. More than 10,000 businessmen and women have completed these courses which were held in cooperation with 114 educational institutions and organizations—71 such institutions and organizations conducting courses last year.

SBA MANAGEMENT AND TECHNICAL PUBLICATIONS

The Small Business Administration publishes four series of management and technical production publications. Three of the series are short, practical leaflets, written chiefly by specialists in private industry who contribute the articles without any charge to the Government. These leaflets are available

through request to the SBA, and more than 3¾ million copies have been distributed to date.

The Small Business Administration also publishes a series of management booklets, written by specialists under contract. These booklets are sold by the Government Printing Office at nominal prices. More than 525,000 copies have been sold. Since a significant portion of the Small Business Administration's publications are distributed through sales by the Government Printing Office, the income from these sales in part offsets the cost involved in the preparation and printing of the publications.

SBA PURCHASING DIRECTORY

The Small Business Administration also has made available to small firms a United States Government Purchasing Directory, which is a guide to who buys what and where in the military and Federal civilian agencies, and a United States Government Specifications Directory, which is a guide to sources of the specifications used by the Government in its purchasing. Businessmen and others have purchased more than 72,000 copies of these directories from the Government Printing Office.

SBA RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT INFORMATION

Another Small Business Administration service is to help small firms in gaining access to product research and development information available from both Government and industry. The SBA has two purposes here—to help small firms obtain data needed in solving problems relating to specific products and processes, and to provide them information on available products and processes that can be used to maintain, diversify, or expand their operations.

SBA PATENTS INFORMATION—NEW PRODUCTS

As a part of this service the Small Business Administration publishes each month a circular which lists privately owned and Government-owned inventions available for license or sale to small firms. This Products List Circular makes available to small business firms information on new products and processes that can be used by small plants having open capacity or seeking to diversify their business operations by adding new items. Also published in the Products List Circular have been the titles and patents released by the Department of Justice in connection with provisions of judgments in antitrust cases.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

Through calendar year 1957, the Small Business Administration aided more than 25,000 small business concerns in the solution of research and development problems pertaining to new products and processes or improving present products. In addition, approximately 7,000 requests for additional data on inventions listed in the Products List Circular were received by the SBA.

In the field of research and development, the Small Business Administration has compiled a list of small business firms qualified to perform research and development contracts. This list will be made available to the appropriate procuring offices as a reference.

SUBCONTRACTING MISSILES PROGRAM

There is one more type of procurement activity which should not be overlooked. I refer to Government purchases in connection with the missile program. It has been increasingly evident that a large proportion of the procurement dollar in military fields will be in the missile program.

Information is being developed to establish a realistic subcontracting program, tailored within the requirements of the weapons system concept of purchasing. Small Business Administration industrial and production specialists will assist small-business concerns in using this information as a guide for missile subcontracting. The Small Business Administration, with the cooperation of the Department of Defense, the mililtary services, contractors, and related sources, has accumulated and prepared a missile directory which contains a listing of missiles procured by the Army, Navy, and Air Force; the names and addresses of the prime contractors and large major subcontractors; a listing of the components, assemblies, subassemblies and parts required in the production of missiles and supporting equipment with technical information as to requirements for tolerances, temperature, humidity, and heat control, special tooling, machine tools, production equipment, test equipment, and special technical skills.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to reemphasize the fact that not only the Small Business Administration but all departments and agencies have been concerned with the problems of small business. President Eisenhower's administration through the Cabinet Committee on Small Business and the Council of Economic Advisers has made a permanent contribution to the growth and welfare of our small-business community. In every economic report of the President, the President has emphasized the competitive aspects of our economy; and in messages on the state of the Union and other messages President Eisenhower has made many specific recommendations in the interest of small business. I believe, viewed impartially and completely on a nonpartisan basis that greater progress has been made for small business during the years 1953–58 than in any other single period in our history.

Final Report of Hon. Florence P. Dwyer, of New Jersey, on the 2d Session of the 85th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the custom of Members of Congress, I am submitting this report as a final review and summary of the activities and accomplishments of the 85th Congress, which I believe will be of great interest to the people of Union County.

While all activities of Congress interest all the people, some of my constituents may be particularly concerned with those which have directly and immediately involved Union County. For their benefit, I have appended a list of such matters to the end of this report.

I have been deeply grateful during these past 2 years for the privilege of representing the people of the Sixth District of New Jersey here in the House. I am happy to report that I have missed only 1 day's session of the Congress in the 2 years I have been here; and that was made necessary by an important public meeting held in Union County earlier this year which was called to consider the proposed location of the new Federal-aid highway, FAI 102. I have cast my vote or declared my position on every issue which the House of Representatives was called upon to decide.

I recognize, of course, that no conscientious Member of Congress can please all the people all of the time, but I believe my record will show that I have considered every issue on its merits, and that every position I have taken was determined by what I believe to be in the best interests of all our people, and by what I believe will contribute most to keeping America strong and free and secure.

In many cases, Congress is faced with legislation which contains both good and bad provisions. I have weighed such legislation carefully and cast my vote for a bill when the good outweighed the bad, and against a bill when bad features were more important than the good.

The 85th Congress, now that it has adjourned, has been called one of the most productive Congresses in our country's history. Certainly, the 2 years it covered were momentous ones in the continuing struggle for peace and justice in the world and for economic stability and opportunity here at home.

MUCH STILL TO DO

But the 85th Congress, despite its achievements, also left much undone. An effective labor reform bill, for which I voted, failed to pass in the final days of the Congress. This should receive first priority next year.

No action was taken on legislation to encourage higher ethical practices in Government. From their response to my own views on the subject, I feel certain the people will demand early action in the next Congress.

The Congress has had 2 years to consider improving and expanding the training of people for foreign service, as proposed in my Foreign Service Academy bill, and there will be no excuse for continued inaction in this important field.

Nor has Congress solved all our education problems, especially the need for new schools.

Passage of the railroad relief bill has apparently only added to the woes of commuters; and Congress must act to protect their legitimate interests in public transportation.

We must also reassess the state of the national economy as soon as we reassemble in January, and plan whatever action

is then appropriate to hold down prices and/or continue the fight against the recession.

PARTISAN POLITICS

In spite of its record of bipartisan cooperation in the fields of defense and foreign policy, this Congress also displayed the kind of narrow political approach to many issues which emphasized again the special difficulties of running a government controlled by two opposing political parties.

During the first session, 1957, the majority in the Congress irresponsibly tried to outdo President Eisenhower in his efforts to economize by drastically slashing the President's budget even below the big reductions he had already made. In the second session, they attempted to outspend the administration by forcing it to accept more funds than it required to fight the recession.

In each session, my own aim was to achieve a proper and reasonable balance. In the first, I voted for several budget cuts because I believed that economy in Government was necessary to stop the rising cost of living. I opposed those budget cuts which would have deprived the people of essential Government services, or which would have weakened our Armed Forces and undercut our foreign policy to the point of jeopardizing our position of strength as leader of the Free World against the international Communist conspiracy.

In the second session I supported every reasonable measure designed to end the recession and get people back to work. But I refused to make the recession an irresponsible excuse for starting massive public-works programs, costing billions of dollars, which would have done nothing to end the recession. Had these huge programs been approved, our people would never catch up with the skyrocketing increase in the cost of the things we have to buy.

WORKING FOR PEACE

The most important work of any Congress is that of encouraging the growth of peace and justice in the world and ending the threat of war. For this purpose the Congress gave its approval to two of the bills which the President had termed essential—the 4-year extension of the reciprocal trade program and an adequate mutual security program. I voted for both bills in the conviction that they were vitally important if the United States is to continue to use its strength in cooperating with the rest of the Free World in the cause of peace.

Before extending the reciprocal trade program, however, Congress made it clear that we expect the administration to pay due regard to the rights of American industry threatened seriously by foreign imports. And before appropriating the funds the President requested for mutual security, Congress expressed its displeasure at the abuses and the waste uncovered in this program—several examples of which were revealed by one of my committees, the Government Operations Committee. We insisted that a more efficient and useful program be prepared in the future.

Congress also approved other means of increasing Free World cooperation; for instance, the sharing of atomic weapons information with friendly countries, helping other countries develop the peaceful uses of atomic energy, expanding the program of selling our farm surpluses to needy countries, and strengthening the Voice of America's broadcasts to the Soviet Union. I supported all these measures because I am convinced that Americans are determined to use the great power of our Nation on the side of peace in every way possible. But we do expect that our money will be used wisely, that constructive results will be achieved, and that our own national security will be protected.

KEEPING UP OUR STRENGTH

We can help to maintain peace, however, only so long as we maintain armed forces so strong and powerful that Soviet Russia will not dare to attack us or risk an all-out war. The power of our enemy and the need for staying ahead in developing the most modern weapons was never more dramatically emphasized than it was when Russia launched the first sputnik. After having cut the defense budget in 1957—a move I had strongly opposed—Congress came back this year to add new funds for missile development and air defense, and later passed a record peacetime defense budget considerably in excess of $40 billion.

It is worth noting here that the overall cost of guaranteeing our national security amounts to about 78 percent of our total Federal budget. It is clear, therefore, that any substantial savings in Federal spending can only come from the defense budget.

It is not a very good bargain, however, to save money by inviting the destruction of an all-out war. Yet, considerable improvement, and savings, can still be made. Congress cleared the way by approving the President's Defense Department reorganization plan, which I supported strongly and actively. This was one of the most important and far-reaching laws enacted by this Congress. It will help to give us a stronger, more effective, and more unified military force. And because it will eliminate waste and duplication and reduce the expensive rivalry between the services, it will save us considerable money at the same time. This plan makes good, sound commonsense.

Among the most far reaching of Congressional moves this year was creation of a new space agency—the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Along with it, both Houses formed permanent committees to exercise continuing jurisdiction over our efforts in the dazzling new universe of outer space.

FIGHTING THE RECESSION

The No. 1 domestic concern of the Congress this year—and of your Representative—has been the slowdown of the national economy and the resultant high rate of unemployment. From the beginning Congress acted to stimulate the economy and put men back to work—by speeding up the award of defense contracts, by rushing ahead the nationwide highway program, and by encouraging greater activity in the housing and construction fields.

One of the first things I did was to obtain the facts about the recession. I talked at length with several of the top officials and experts of our Government to learn the causes of the recession and the means of ending it. While I found that no two economists agree on very much, I became convinced that Congress must act rapidly and that its action should be designed to increase confidence, stimulate buying and production, and put men back to work as soon as possible.

One of the first obligations was to ease the burden on the unemployed. I introduced legislation and testified before the Ways and Means Committee in support of an emergency extension of unemployment compensation for those who had run out of their regular benefits. Congress passed a weaker bill, but one that has provided some help, at least.

Two other antirecession proposals, however, were defeated in the House. The housing bill and the community facilities bill contained many good features of special interest to areas like Union County, but the Banking Committee irresponsibly caused their defeat when they greatly increased the cost and added several unnecessary new programs.

Several other actions of great importance to the economy were also taken.

First. Railroad relief: The Nation's hard-pressed railroads obtained assistance, which Congress hoped would enable them to provide better service, through a program of guaranteed loans and the easing of Federal restrictions, giving them greater freedom to compete with other forms of transportation.

Second. Freight tax: The Federal tax on freight transportation was eliminated, with the hope it would help reduce prices and increase consumption and production; but Congress failed to take the tax off passenger transportation, which seemed to me to make even greater sense.

Third. Small business: Small business received the biggest boost in history—with the tax revision bill, a new program to provide badly needed long-term investment capital, and permanent status for the Small Business Administration along with increased authority to make business loans at lower interest rates.

As Congress adjourned, it was clear that the recession was ending. This encouraging development, I believe, was due both to the actions taken by Congress and the administration and to the people's confidence that their Government would never permit this recession to become a major depression.

It would be a mistake, however, to act as though the recession is over and full-scale prosperity has returned. There are still weak spots in the economy and far too many people are still unemployed. One of the first obligations of the new Congress in January will be to study the economic situation and take appropriate action.

HOLDING BACK INFLATION

Despite our concentration on fighting the recession, I shared the concern of many in Congress that prices were still going up. This seemed to me especially

hard on the unemployed and on those who were trying to get along on limited incomes. I strongly supported, therefore, several bills which I believe will do much to increase economy in Government and help keep prices from going up.

First. Price supports: A major victory for price-conscious consumers was won when the Congress approved a farm bill providing for an extension of Secretary Benson's flexible price support program rather than the high, rigid price support system which the House Agriculture Committee twice tried to pass. Both committee bills would have reversed all the good work Secretary Benson has done and would have brought skyrocketing prices for bread, milk, cheese, and many of the other foods we all need. The President's veto of one bill and the House defeat of the other—both of which I voted against—was a strong rejection of the false theory of paying farmers more to produce less at higher prices to consumers and higher taxes for taxpayers.

Second. Hoover Commission: To exercise greater control over Government spending, Congress passed, and I strongly supported, the Hoover Commission's plan—H. R. 8002—for more careful budgeting and spending of the people's money. This extremely important bill, which has been estimated to save billions of dollars, should help eliminate waste and force Government officials to account for every penny they spend.

Economy—and plain commonsense—were involved in several other less publicized issues, including two which I strongly opposed as unjustified extravagance:

Third. New building: I opposed the New House Office Building, despite the fact that more office space would be nice to have, because the need was not as urgent as it was for several more worthwhile projects. And it seemed to me that Congress should be the first to set an example for the rest of the country by cutting down on its own luxuries.

Fourth. Army depot: I opposed the mandatory sale of the Army's ammunition depot in San Jacinto, Tex., because the Army needed it and because it would cost an extra $30 million to build a duplicate facility in Alabama—merely to satisfy local interests. This was a flagrant violation of the public interest.

CREATING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PEOPLE

Congress took a number of big steps forward in its traditional task of helping people help themselves. Three of the biggest were the civil-rights bill, the Alaska statehood bill, and the national defense education bill.

First. Civil rights: One of the first actions I took was to cosponsor the administration's civil-rights bill, and it was a proud day for many when the Congress passed this first civil-rights legislation in 80 years. The House bill, I believe, was a better bill than the watered-down version passed by the Senate. But the civil-rights bill was a historic first step toward the goal of guaranteeing to all Americans that their rights as citizens and human beings will be protected. Congress and the administration must now go forward.

Second. Alaska statehood: A whole new world of opportunity was opened up when Congress passed the Alaska statehood bill. This surely must have brought a great thrill to all those with the imagination and courage to look ahead to the great future of America, full of almost unlimited promise. Alaska, our 49th State, is now our largest State; it is rich with natural resources; it is only sparsely populated and needs many more people; and it is bursting with the energy and opportunity of the old frontier.

It will be the responsibility of the next Congress to consider the matter of statehood for Hawaii.

Third. Education: Of first importance and of special interest to me was passage of the National Defense Education Act—with its loans for needy students, its help to elementary and secondary schools in the fields of science, mathematics, and foreign languages, its encouragement of teacher-training, and its other provisions designed to improve the quality of our education and extend educational opportunities to those who, without help, could not afford them.

I was disappointed, however, that the President's recommendation for scholarships was eliminated from the bill, and that the whole program was restricted to so narrow a field. As badly as we need scientists and language specialists, we also need better educated people in all walks of life. For instance, an education program should provide for those who wish to equip themselves for the foreign service, where many more well-trained people are desperately needed to carry on the work for peace among the peoples of the world. Such a goal is the purpose of the Foreign Service Academy bill I introduced early in the first session of this Congress.

The present education bill, as you know, made no provision for building schools. We recognize the increasing need for providing the schools necessary to care for fast-growing populations in States like New Jersey. For this reason, I have written the New Jersey State Commissioner of Education in order to obtain detailed information regarding the present and estimated future needs of schools and facilities.

The need, in turn, raises the question of how we are to divide the governmental responsibility for providing schools. The challenge has been directed to the States and local communities. If these governmental units cannot provide for the need in the future, then the Federal Government must, of necessity, step in.

ADVANCING THE PUBLIC INTEREST

First. Humane slaughter: Congressional approval of the humane slaughter bill, which requires that decent and painless methods be used for slaughtering animals, was due directly to the great popular support expressed for this legislation; it will be a monument to what determined people can accomplish.

Second. Social security: A landmark of the second session was passage of a 7 percent increase in social security benefits to help our older citizens meet part of the rising cost of living—and certainly no one needs this protection against inflation more than the retired and disabled people who must struggle along on low, fixed incomes.

Third. Pay raise: Cost-of-living pay increases were also voted for postal employees, classified Government workers, and those in the armed services.

Fourth. Air safety: Congress provided new protection for air travelers when it created the Federal Aviation Agency and gave it full authority to control the increasingly crowded airspace. By coordinating air traffic control, both military and civilian, and stepping up the development of improved navigation aids, the new agency will make a great contribution to air safety.

Fifth. Obscene materials: As a cosponsor, I took special pride in passage of a bill to improve enforcement of the law against distribution of obscene materials. I know the people of Union County have been vitally interested in this matter, as demonstrated by the fight they made in the State legislature against the spread of indecent literature. The new law will tighten up one of the biggest loopholes through which vicious people have been contaminating the minds of our youth with their trashy products, and it represents a great victory for those who have done so much work in the past.

Sixth. FBI files: Approval of legislation limiting the right of defendants to examine FBI files was a simple, but important, clarification of the Supreme Court ruling affirming this right. Without upsetting the Court's decision, the bill restricted examination of files to material directly relevant to the defendant's case and protected the files from unnecessary and dangerous snooping.

A MAJOR FAILURE

Unfortunately, I cannot report much success in the critical field of labor-reform legislation. The long series of hearings before the McClellan committee revealed in dramatic terms the great need for such legislation to protect the general public and the great majority of honest and decent union members and their leaders from the abuses and gangsterism of a relatively few crooks who have invaded the labor movement.

Congress approved only one reform bill—a rather weak measure requiring disclosure and accounting of employee welfare and retirement funds, a bill which fell short of the better Senate version and the recommendations of Labor Secretary Mitchell.

In its most disappointing performance, Congress killed entirely the major labor reform bill, which, despite its shortcomings, would have done much to clean up certain racket-ridden unions, increase control of unions by their members, make labor leaders more responsible to the membership, and in many ways help reinforce the respect of the American people for organized labor. It was not a perfect bill but, as Senator MCCLELLAN said, it was the best we could hope for in this session.

I hope Congress will act quickly next year to complete this cleanup job. Workingmen and most union leaders, as well as the people, want it. The American labor movement is too important to

tolerate the influence and exploitation of gangster elements who seek to control it.

ACTING IN COMMITTEE—GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Both committees to which I was appointed kept unusually busy throughout both sessions—and constructively so, I believe.

The Government Operations Committee, as you may know, has extremely broad authority to look into any area of Government in order to help improve the efficiency of its operations. In addition to our study of abuses and maladministration in the foreign aid program—and the constructive recommendations we offered—the committee considered such diverse matters as: aviation safety, the conversion of salt water into fresh water, false and misleading advertising and its control by the Federal Trade Commission, the availability of information from Government agencies, civil defense programs, various aspects of military procurement and the means of reducing waste in this immensely expensive field, the operations of the watchdog General Accounting Office, military air transportation, and a detailed study of administrative organization, procedure, and practices in Federal departments and agencies. There were others, but this will give you an idea of the fascinating range of problems one deals with on this important committee.

Since Members concentrate much of their attention on the particular subcommittees to which they are assigned, I was especially fortunate in obtaining a place on two of the best, the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee and the General Government Activities Subcommittee.

As the ranking minority member of the intergovernmental relations group, I had a leading role—unusual for a first-term member—in a 2-year study of the relations between Federal, State, and local units of government in the administration of the dozens of Federal grant-in-aid programs, by which the National Government helps States and communities provide many services considered essential by our people.

This study involved a series of hearings in all parts of the country and brought before us governors, mayors, Cabinet officers, county officials, and people in all walks of life; it was considered to be the most thorough and comprehensive inquiry into this field ever made by a Congressional committee. Our report, which we issued late in this second session, is a well-balanced discussion of the chief features of grant programs and makes what I believe are sound and realistic recommendations for future action to better distribute responsibilities between Federal, State, and local governments.

I expect we will be hearing a lot more about this in the future. For, if we believe what we preach about keeping Government close to the people, it is necessary to make it possible for States, counties, and local communities to accept the responsibilities for programs they are willing and capable of handling—without sacrificing, of course, essential public services.

This same subcommittee also investigated the polio vaccine program, and had a great deal to do, I believe, in improving the distribution of this miracle material to young people, and older ones, too, throughout the country—and at a considerable saving of money to the Government.

The chairman of my second subcommittee, the General Government Activities Subcommittee, estimated that the subcommittee's chief function of studying the sale of surplus Government property has saved the taxpayers more than $1.5 million in the second session of the Congress alone. Our subcommittee has insisted that Government agencies sell their surplus property for its full and fair value. And by investigating several cases, we have obtained considerably higher returns to the Government. In addition, we have recommended a permanent system governing the disposal of Government property which we hope will substantially increase the protection of the taxpayers' interest.

ACTING IN COMMITTEE—VETERANS' AFFAIRS

In approaching my duties as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I have been guided by the conviction that our primary obligation is to those veterans and their dependents who gave their lives or suffered injury in fighting for their country. We owe, too, of course, great gratitude and a sense of responsibility to other veterans who have served their country in war and peace, especially to those who now, through no fault of their own, need help.

This is why I believe first things should come first, and why I so strongly supported our committee efforts to assure sufficient and quality medical care through Veterans' Administration hospitals. I am pleased to report that both VA hospitals in our area, Lyons and East Orange, have been able to accept all patients with service-connected disabilities. But such is not the case in other parts of the country and our committee is doing something to improve this situation.

The committee has also been very active in reviewing the various benefits provided veterans by law, and in taking steps to simplify their administration and make them more useful to those veterans eligible to receive them. One of many examples was the extension of the GI home-loan program, which I supported in an effort to encourage greater private home building on the very reasonable terms provided by the program.

The committee also conducted a thorough investigation into various fund-raising activities by veterans' organizations and by several other groups operating on the fringes of respectability. The purpose of the study—and I believe it was realized—was to expose the more questionable methods of fund-raising as an aid to drafting legislation which could protect legitimate veterans' organizations in their praiseworthy fund-raising efforts, as well as the general public.

WORKING FOR UNION COUNTY

Many of the activites and accomplishments of the 85th Congress directly affected the people of Union County; these include some I have already mentioned, and the following:

First. Help for people: Assisted constituents in a multitude of immigration cases, veterans' problems, servicemen's cases, passports applications, service academy appointments, and all the other day-to-day relations of citizens with their Government.

Second. New Jersey channels: Testified before the Appropriations Committee, spoke on the House floor and voted for appropriations to continue dredging and widening the Arthur Kill and the Kill van Kull—the oceangoing channels that carry more commerce than the entire Mississippi River system and help make Union County an important port area.

Third. Green Brook: Helped win approval of $100,000 in Federal assistance to clear Green Brook and lower flood stages there sufficiently to protect communities from danger of costly floods.

Fourth. Service: Maintained District office in Elizabeth, held series of office hours in other communities in Union County, and continued legislative open house meetings, in addition to welcoming all visits and telephone calls at all times, in effort to stay close to constituents, provide best possible service, and know what our people need and want and expect of their Government.

Fifth. Postal affairs: Worked constantly to improve post office facilities and service in Union County, including new service for countryside in Summit, to obtain fair treatment and good working conditions for postal employees, and to appoint high caliber postmasters.

Sixth. Government liaison: Cooperated with local, county, and State officials to assure best possible service from and relations with Federal Government.

Seventh. Community needs: Testified before Congressional committees on legislation authorizing loans for construction of community facilities, and for loans to colleges to help meet classroom and housing needs—including Union Junior College.

Eighth. School equipment: Encouraged and coordinated program to help Union County schools obtain fair share of valuable, but surplus, machine tools distributed by Government agencies, as a means of improving caliber of technical training.

Ninth. New York tax: Introduced legislation—House Joint Resolution 501—to prohibit New York from taxing residents of New Jersey.

Tenth. Commuter tax deduction: Introduced legislation—H. R. 6939—to permit tax deductions for expenses of commuter travel to and from jobs.

Eleventh. Government contracts: Cooperated with Union County businessmen in securing information concerning possibilities of Government contracts, and in assuring fair and equitable treatment for those seeking contracts.

Twelfth. Newsletter: Utilized weekly newsletter and annual questionnaire as means of keeping constituents informed of their Representative's activities and of exchanging views on important public issues.

Thirteenth. Highways: Cooperated with county and local citizens and officials in obtaining information and making known views to Federal officials regarding location of proposed new route 22—route FAI 102.

Fourteenth. Commuter fares: Fought against unjustified ferry and commuter fare increases and expressed objections to Interstate Commerce Commission.

Fifteenth. Air pollution: Continued fight against air pollution, and studied problems in Los Angeles as they shed light on possible enforcement in Newark-Union County metropolitan area.

Sixteenth. Teen-age drinking: Carried fight against teen-age drinking to the Congress; interested Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency in problems created by New York law permitting drinking at age 18.

VALUABLE EXPERIENCE

My work during this term in the Congress has been made more fruitful, I believe, because of the 7 years of legislative experience which I enjoyed at Trenton. In knowing where to find information and how to use it, this experience was extremely important. I also benefited greatly from the generous spirit of cooperation displayed by other Members of the New Jersey delegation and colleagues, both Democratic and Republican, from all parts of the country.

In everything I have done here, I have kept in mind the fact that I was working as the Representative of all the people of Union County. As such, it has been my purpose to keep in close touch with my constituents, to seek their views on important public issues, to keep them fully informed of my votes and views, and to be available at all times to anyone who wanted to see me or who needed my help.

Pat Hillings Opposes Taxation of Private Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to publicly state my opposition to the taxation of private schools in California. This crucial issue will be decided by the voters in November's general election. As an advocate of education, both public and private, it is my belief that we must do everything possible to support private schools which, in turn, support themselves. Congress recently acted to encourage education and this is no time to put roadblocks in the path of our desire to raise the academic standards of all young Americans.

This vicious tax measure has been repudiated by the voters of California in the past and should be defeated again.

Having received part of my education in private schools, I believe it is my duty to speak out against this treacherous scheme of taxation.

At a time when we are fighting to improve and encourage our public and private school systems, it would be a major tragedy to throw an additional roadblock in the way of progress in our private schools.

Education, whether public or private, is the cornerstone of our liberty and the foundation for our future in a period of world history when our Communist enemies abroad are exploiting education in their drive for world domination.

This issue, commonly known as proposition 16, deserves national attention, for if it succeeds in California, it can succeed elsewhere.

I am sure that the voters of California will not stand by and see the destruction of our school systems.

I opposed taxation of private schools in the past when it was rejected by the people of California and I wish to go on record once again as being opposed to the ballot measure now known as proposition 16.

A Tribute to Retiring Senators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a tribute to certain of our colleagues who are retiring which I have prepared.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

The rapping of the gavel closing the 85th Congress is an occasion for sadness on the part of the Members of the Senate. Six of our outstanding colleagues are leaving us. They have decided for varying reasons not to stand for reelection to the United States Senate.

These six Senators are all Republicans. Yet I know that no one here thinks of them in political terms. To us they are Americans who have devoted many years of their lives to the service of their State and their Nation. They are fine public servants whose contributions to the general welfare of our people have inscribed their names indelibly in the record of achievement of this great legislative house.

Let us make the last rollcall. There is KNOWLAND, SMITH of New Jersey, FLANDERS, MARTIN of Pennsylvania, JENNER, and IVES. Each of them has earned a lasting reputation in the gratitude of their country for devotion to duty and magnificent accomplishment.

Is there a living American who does not know the distinguished minority leader from California, BILL KNOWLAND? When he stepped into the shoes of Bob Taft many wondered if he could fill them. Maybe BILL himself wondered, too. But the record of succeeding months and years confirmed the judgment of the great Taft. I am certain that if he can see us today he is smiling. BILL KNOWLAND has proved himself a leader and statesman of the highest order.

Then there is MARTIN of Pennsylvania who has devoted practically his entire life to public service; FLANDERS and SMITH who have, through their high standing in this legislative hall, contributed so much to the common good. There is IVES whose name is synonymous with much of the labor legislation that is on the statute books. There is JENNER who has fought the essential fight against Communist infiltration and the judicial infringement of the power of the national legislature.

Their loss is not to the United States Senate alone. The Nation can ill afford their loss in these times of peril in international relations. No one of them can be easily replaced.

Yet, I cannot deny them the well-earned retirement they seek for whatever reason. I can only join the swelling chorus of well done. I can only add my small voice in deep appreciation for their splendid service to their State and Nation and my sincere gratitude for their friendship. I can sincerely express my thanks for the splendid example they have set for others to follow and for their personal help to me in my desire to serve as well as they. Indeed, they have been an inspiration that has guided my footsteps in the path that, I fervently hope, leads to statesmanship of their own caliber.

And, Mr. President, I can say from the depths of my heart to these six colleagues: God go with you. If you seek other fields of public service may He bless your efforts. If you seek peace and rest may He grant your wishes, for you have served long and well. Beyond that, I say only a reluctant goodby, with the knowledge that absence will not dim the deep feeling of affection and admiration all of us here in the United States Senate hold for our departing colleagues.

Accomplishments of the 85th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, there has been much accomplished in this closing session of the 85th Congress that can prove helpful to our people and to the strength of our Nation.

The Congress was faced with numerous and varied problems. It is always difficult to accomplish all that is desired, or that may be needed, where there is divided authority and responsibility. At the present time, by reason of the fact that the President is of one party—the Republican Party—and the House and Senate is of another—the Democratic Party—we have some slight division of thought. However, it is gratifying to realize that much worthwhile legislation was adopted because of a willingness upon the part of each party to display an honest endeavor to resolve differences of opinion by reasonable compromise. And, of course, it is natural there should also be some disappointments.

FOREIGN RELATIONS

(A) MUTUAL SECURITY ACT

The Mutual Security Authorization Act and the appropriations thereunder commonly referred to as foreign aid, conformed closely to the President's recommendations, although in some particulars fell short of his full desire.

(B) RECIPROCAL TRADE

The President's reciprocal-trade bill met with considerable opposition. However, it was finally passed after the differing viewpoints were compromised. Although not entirely in accord with the Presidential recommendations, yet it was close enough to gain his approval. The most important change in the bill arose through a determined demand that greater protection be given to American industry. This was accomplished by giving Congress certain rights and powers in cases that carried a warning from the Tariff Commission.

(C) MIDDLE EAST RESOLUTION

Although passed in the 1st session of the 85th Congress, yet it seems appropriate to make mention of the fact that a resolution was adopted to promote peace and give security to the Middle East. It was under the provisions of this resolution that the President was empowered to recently send troops into that area when trouble started.

(D) SPACE LEGISLATION

Probably one of the most important problems confronting the 85th Congress was the outgrowth of Russia's ability to reach into outer space. The result was the passage by Congress, on the recommendation of the President, of legislation setting up a Space Agency in charge of space exploration.

DOMESTIC AFFAIRS

(A) REORGANIZATION OF THE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

One of the outstanding accomplishments of this session was the adoption of the President's program for the reorganization of the Department of Defense. The plan met with violent opposition from all directions. It was finally realized, however, that the President knew more about the subject and the need for it than anyone else. Thus, a bill was finally adopted which established the Secretary of Defense as the head in the Pentagon. It is expected this plan of the President, as adopted into law, will settle all the bickerings between our several military elements and promote efficiency in operation.

(B) SCIENCE AND EDUCATION

Another piece of legislation that grew out of the Russian scare because of its advanced scientific knowledge was the passage of a measure, on the President's recommendation, to provide the means of advancing science and education. It provides for student loans, equipment for schools, especially for scientific research. This measure likewise, as a result of compromise, was passed and approved by the President although short of what he desired in the way of scholarships.

(C) CIVIL RIGHTS

In the domestic field Congress for the first time since the Civil War days passed a civil rights bill. It is an important bill. It protects the right to vote of all citizens without regard to race, color, or creed. It is nationwide in the scope of its jurisdiction.

(D) STATEHOOD TO ALASKA

A notable event that should not be passed over without comment was the granting of statehood to Alaska. This is the first State to be admitted to the Union since 1912. The bill was adopted by an overwhelming vote in both the House and Senate. It had the approval of the President. He also desired to have Hawaii admitted as a State at the same time, but Congress did not act upon that bill.

(E) HOOVER BUDGET BILL

An important item of legislation was passed to which little mention has been given although it can be of tremendous value in providing a sound fiscal system. It was a bill recommended by the Hoover Commission. It revises our budgeting and accounting systems and provides for greater control by Congress over expenditures. It is expected that additional recommendations from the Hoover Commission will be acted upon by the next Congress.

(F) PENSION AND WELFARE FUNDS

It had been expected Congress would enact legislation dealing with labor conditions that have been revealed by the McClellan committee. However, such legislation was not passed. The only labor legislation of any consequence to be enacted related to employee pension and welfare funds. This, at least, was a step toward protecting the members of unions from improper diversion of their funds. It was passed without difficulty.

(G) FARM POLICY

After much debate and uncertainty the Congress finally adopted a new farm law. It was advocated by Secretary of Agriculture Benson and had the backing of the President. Its provisions, as they become effective, are expected to cut down existing incentives to produce surpluses. There is no doubt this was a real victory for the President and Secretary Benson.

(H) SMALL BUSINESS

An outstanding record was made in the passage of legislation to be helpful to small business. A $260 million small business tax-relief bill was enacted. The Small Business Administration was made a permanent independent Federal agency. The ceiling on Small Business Administration loans was raised from $250,000 to $350,000 and the interest rate reduced from 6 to 5½ percent.

(I) SOCIAL SECURITY

Improvements of great importance were made to the Social Security Act. There are over 12 million Americans currently receiving benefits every month from this fund. Monthly benefits were raised by 7 percent, effective February 1959. This was done to help meet the rising cost of living.

There were many other improvements made, including the raising of outside-earnings limitation; dependents of disabled persons were made eligible for benefits; Federal grants to States were increased for public assistance payments to the aged, blind, disabled, and dependent children; and Federal authorizations for maternal and child health, crippled children, and child-welfare services were increased.

(J) GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

A general salary increase of close to 10 percent was effected for all Government employees, including postal workers. Retired Government employees received a 10-percent increase in their annuities up to a maximum of $500 a year for retirement annuities and up to $250 a year for survivor annuities.

(K) PROBLEMS OF OLDER PERSONS

Interest in the problems due to age was shown by the passage of legislation for a Special White House Conference to study these problems and develop programs that would prove helpful in meeting the difficulties of old age.

(L) VETERANS

Legislation was adopted to increase rates of compensation for veterans suffering service-connected disabilities and for their dependents. Pensions to widows of Spanish-American War veterans were increased. Burial allowances for veterans were raised from $150 to $250. Special training for handicapped war orphans was authorized, and unemployment compensation was provided for ex-servicemen as well as veterans who served during the Korean emergency. Total disability benefits payable under the National Service Life Insurance Act were raised. An amendment to the Social Security Act now permits disabled veterans to draw dual benefits from the Veterans' Administration and other Government agencies as well as social-security benefits without any reductions. The GI home-loan program was extended to 1960 for World War II veterans.

(M) HEALTH AND HANDICAPPED

A great record of accomplishment was made in this vital area. Almost $300 million, the highest amount ever appropriated in our history, was approved for research in cancer, heart disease, arthritis, dental health, mental health, and other diseases.

The Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act was extended for 5 years. The Health Research Facilities Act was extended for 3 years and provided funds for laboratories and medical research facilities designed to find the cause and cure of the diseases that cripple and kill mankind.

Legislation was also enacted to extend vocational rehabilitation programs to assist mentally retarded children, the blind, deaf, and other handicapped individuals.

(N) NATIONAL DEFENSE

In addition to passing the Department of Defense reorganization bill, Congress appropriated a record peacetime defense budget of $40 billion to strengthen our national defense in all its elements, particularly in missile research and procuring missile bases. An increase in pay was also approved for enlisted men and officers to create inducements for career military personnel, particularly in the technical fields.

(O) HOUSING

An emergency housing program to assist in overcoming and eliminating the effects of the recession was enacted and authorized almost $2 billion in housing loan funds. It contemplated the erection of some 200,000 homes, thereby providing jobs for hundreds of thousands of workers.

(P) RAILROADS

The Transportation Act of 1958, as enacted, provides Federal assistance to the railroads in the amount of $500 million in Government loans. The distressed condition of our railroads made this absolutely necessary if we were to prevent the bankruptcy of many roads. The bill also provides important changes in the Interstate Commerce Act to improve rail operations.

There is much more that could be set out if the full story of the accomplishments of the 2d session of the 85th Congress was to be given in detail. However, I am of the opinion I have made a sufficient summary to demonstrate this session of Congress can well be termed "a working Congress."

It has been most gratifying to me to see such a splendid record of legislation in what is to be my last session of Congress after 32 years of service. I congratulate the Members, Speaker RAYBURN, JOHN MCCORMACK as majority leader, and JOSEPH MARTIN as minority leader, for the splendid results attained.

I. Does the Administration Base Its Power To Send Troops To Put Down Internal Conflicts in the Middle East Upon the Congressional Middle East Resolution?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of State Dulles recently told the Veterans of Foreign Wars: "Expediency and opportunism in policy are possible in an absolute despotism. There the people have no voice in the formulation of foreign policy. They are the slaves of whatever foreign policy it may from time to time adopt. But here the people are the masters and the government is the servant."

The idea that in foreign policy, "the people are the masters and the government is the servant" is an admirable one. The people of the United States, through their elected representatives in House and Senate, should certainly have a voice in determining the broad aims and ends of our foreign policy, as opposed to its day-to-day implementation. Sole jurisdiction to determine aims and ends should not be left to the military men and diplomats in the executive branch, who are insulated from that direct responsibility to the people which is ours as legislators. Where Congress has contributed to the setting of the aims and ends of our foreign policy—as in resolutions envisaging the United Nations, the Marshall plan, NATO, and more recently a United Nations Police Force—it has been constructive and helpful.

This philosophy of popular participation in determining the aims and ends of our foreign policy was departed from, I thought, on two occasions in July: When the President sent troops to Lebanon on July 15; and when Secretary Dulles signed the Declaration of London with the Baghdad Pact nations present on July 28. On neither occasion was Congress given the opportunity to debate issues involved.

Nevertheless, the administration has repeatedly given the impression that the actions it took on July 15 and July 28 were concurred in by the Congress. Accordingly, on August 7 I wrote the President the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 7, 1958.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On March 7, 1957, Congress passed the so-called Eisenhower doctrine resolution on the Middle East (Public Law 85–7), of which the primary language (sec. 2) is:

"Furthermore, the United States regards as vital to the national interest and world peace the preservation of the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East. To this end, if the President determines the necessity thereof, the United States is prepared to use armed force to assist any nation or group of nations requesting assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism: *Provided*, That such employment shall be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States and with the Constitution of the United States."

Passage of the resolution followed careful examination of the doctrine by the appropriate committees and by Congress itself. Congress was assured and reassured that the resolution meant what it said and no more: That Congress was concurring in the use of our Armed Forces only to assist a nation requesting assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism.

The testimony of Secretary of State Dulles at the hearings made it clear that our commitment was limited to cases of actual armed aggression from an outside country controlled by international communism:

"Senator MORSE. I think this clarification is very helpful, Mr. Secretary, because I find that a few of us are confused in regard to what the situation would be in any fact or circumstance in which actual military invasion of one of these countries in the Middle East by Russia did not occur, and whether or not this resolution, as far as the employment of troops is concerned, goes beyond a fact situation in which there is actual armed aggression by Russia against one of these countries. Now, am I correct in my interpretation of your statement that this resolution, as far as the use of American Armed Forces is concerned, is limited to the fact situation in which Russia commits a military aggression against one of the countries of the Middle East?

"Secretary DULLES. It is limited to actual armed aggression, armed attack by a country controlled by international communism."—(Hearings, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and Committee on Armed Services, on the President's Proposal on the Middle East, February 1957, pt. I, p. 150.)

And again:

"Mr. FULTON. Suppose that Israel is attacked by a nation that is either supplied with arms or advised by Communist-minded people, and Israel then says she is being attacked by such a country, and asks the United States for help. Then what happens under this resolution? Israel advises the United States, 'All right, we are about to be attacked. Here is the situation.' Here Israel's opponent may not be under the domination of international communism but certainly well supplied and well advised.

"Secretary DULLES. Under this resolution unless the country is under the control of international communism it would not apply.

"Mr. FULTON. So if there were technicians or military personnel or supplies and equipment from Communist sources in neighboring countries of some size, then am I correct, that without international communism domination of that nation threatening Israel, is not sufficient for this resolution to apply?

"Secretary DULLES. No."—(Hearings, House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Economic and Military Cooperation With Nations in the General Area of the Middle East, January 1957, p. 47–48.)

It was frequently pointed out during the hearings and debate that the real danger was not so much from armed Communist attack across a country's borders, but from subversion, revolution, so-called "indirect aggression." But Secretary Dulles made it clear that the Eisenhower doctrine's only safeguards against internal Communist subversion were to aid a country against outside armed attack, to arm that country's armed forces so as to put down subversion, and to provide it with a healthy life by economic assistance. The following colloquy is illuminating:

"Mr. BENTLEY. This matter of subversion that Mr. Fountain has raised has been of concern to me. Do you think it possible to write into section 2 a provision enabling a nation to protect itself against internal subversion?

"Secretary DULLES. We could, of course; and that is a purpose of this resolution, to protect against internal subversion. That is in the preamble of the resolution, and the economic and military assistance we would give would be designed primarily to assist in preventing subversion.

"As I indicated, there are, I think, three elements which are particularly to be watched if you are trying to guard against internal subversion.

"One is the fear that the country could be subject to overwhelming armed attack and therefore there is no use resisting the pressure of communism because if it does not come in one way it will come in another. That was the case in Czechoslovakia.

"The second thing is that the Government does not have the means to maintain a loyal and dependable security force of its own.

"The third is that the economic plight of the country becomes so bad the people grab anything as an alternative.

"This resolution was designed to meet these three conditions, and I believe in doing so it does all we can do consistent with our United Nations Charter and other obligations to check the danger from subversion.

"I recognize the danger from subversion is possibly the greatest danger of all, but it cannot be met by direct action. I think it is contrary to our principles, it is contrary to the charter, and, indeed, I think it is not likely to succeed.

"The recent action against Nasser did not succeed in changing that regime. You do not often change a regime by attacking it from the outside by force.

"I believe in covering the 3 points, we do the 3 things that are the best insurance we can provide against subversion. There are a few other things you can do of a coordinating nature which are not dealt with, and should not be dealt with, by this resolution.

"Mr. BENTLEY. I was surprised yesterday when Admiral Radford, as I understood him, said he did not believe under the terms of this resolution we could aid a nation to protect itself against an internal armed uprising, even if our assistance was requested.

"Secretary DULLES. I think that would depend on whether the armed uprising amounted in effect to an armed attack. I think that problem to some extent is dealt with under the North Atlantic Treaty. I remember there was some discussion of that in the report of the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee, and it was pointed out, I think, that if the armed force was of such a character that it amounted in effect to a Soviet attack, then it would be dealt with under the treaty.

"We have a provision in our security treaty with Japan, which I was responsible for very largely, which said that if the internal armed attack came from abroad or was instigated from abroad, we could act; and I think something like that would be applicable here."—(Hearings, House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Economic and Military Cooperation with Nations in the General Area of the Middle East, January 1957, pp.156–157.)

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs, in reporting out the Middle East resolution, explicitly accepted Secretary Dulles' assurances that the Eisenhower doctrine did not authorize armed intervention in cases of subversion:

"SUBVERSION

"The resolution avoids any specific statement of policy or any outline of a course of action with respect to subversion from within. The committee recognizes that the greatest danger of Soviet aggression lies in this direction. Nevertheless, the committee is convinced that most nations of the Middle East would regard a formal commitment to oppose subversion as an assumption by the United States of a right to interfere in their internal affairs. Subversion has to be fought from within. A nation which has the money and the equipment to maintain an effective internal security force, which is able to carry on a program for improving the living conditions of its people and which is protected against overt aggression from across its borders should be able to defend itself against subversion. The resolution provides for making such assistance available. The United States can contribute best to the prevention of subversion by making its possible for sovereign nations to fight their own battles effectively rather than by intervention."—(Report, House Committee on Foreign Affairs, January 25, 1957, p. 11.)

The report contained also the supplemental views of Congressman ALVIN M. BENTLEY, of Michigan, criticizing the Eisenhower doctrine for not authorizing intervention in the case of subversion:

"I am supporting House Joint Resolution 117 because its good points outweigh its imperfections, in my opinion. I want it clearly understood that I fully endorse the authority requested by the President and set forth in sections 1 and 2 of the legislation.

I regard this bill as imperfect because of a lack of any specific counteraction on our part to the danger of internal subversion. I believe that, in view of the admitted gravity of this menace, it should be specifically stated that the administration will employ all the authority contained in sections 1 and 2 to combat this threat. Naturally, it would only be used upon request of the nation concerned." (Ibid, p. 13.)

By both its plain language and its legislative history, therefore, the Eisenhower doctrine gave Congressional concurrence to the use of United States Armed Forces against outside Communist attack, but not against internal revolution, subversion, or "indirect aggression."

Within the last month a new United States foreign-policy doctrine of tremendous significance has apparently been created—that the United States will, upon the request of a foreign government threatened by internal revolution, subversion, or indirect aggression, send troops to put down the revolution or block the subversion or indirect aggression. This doctrine has been applied with respect to Lebanon on July 15 and with respect to the Baghdad Pact countries on July 28. The doctrine has been evolved without Congressional hearings or debate.

I do not question the right of this country, under international law, to take such action. Nor do I question the constitutional power of the President, as Commander in Chief, to direct such a troop movement.

The purpose of this letter, Mr. President, is to express my disquiet at the attempt of the executive branch to cover this new doctrine with the cloak of authority given by Congress in the Eisenhower doctrine resolution. The attempt to stretch the Congressional authorization for the Eisenhower doctrine so as to cover the new doctrine has taken two tacks:

(1) The "independence and integrity" point: At Secretary Dulles' press conference on May 20, 1958, some weeks before our troops were sent to Lebanon, he attempted to interpret section 2 of the Middle East resolution as covering the sending of troops to combat internal revolt in Lebanon:

"Now we do not consider * * * that there is likely to be an attack, an armed attack, from a country which we would consider under the control of international communism. This doesn't mean, however, that there is nothing that can be done. There is the provision of the Middle East resolution which says that the independence of these countries is vital to the peace and the national interests of the United States. That is certainly a mandate to do something if we think that our peace and vital interests are endangered from any quarter. * * * I would say that we are not anxious to have a situation which would be in any sense a pretext for introducing American forces into the area."

And after our troops had been sent to Lebanon, the White House press secretary, Mr. James C. Hagerty, likewise attempted to justify the action by the "independence and integrity" language in the Middle East resolution:

"THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 16, 1958.*

"(James C. Hagerty, Press Secretary to the President)

"The President today received the following cable from the Shah of Iran, the President of Pakistan, and the President of Turkey:

"'ANKARA, *July 16, 1958.*

"'The PRESIDENT,
"'*The White House,*
"'*Washington:*

"'We have been informed by the United States Embassy in Ankara that upon the request of President Chamoun to the effect that the Eisenhower doctrine be applied to Lebanon, the United States, in order to protect the independence and territorial integrity of Lebanon, has decided to act and accordingly units of the Sixth Fleet have landed in Beirut today.

"'This bold and appropriate decision of the United States will not only ensure the protection of the independence of Lebanon and the support of its legitimate government but will at the same time strengthen the determined position of Iran, Pakistan and Turkey and also renew and increase the faith of the free world in the leadership of the United States for the defense of the free nations.

"'We, meeting in Ankara, wish to convey to you, Mr. President, our appreciation and gratitude for this momentous decision in which we have deep satisfaction and relief.

"'MOHAMMAD REZA PAHLAVI,
"'ISKENDER MIRZA,
"'CELAL BAYAR.'

"The Middle East Resolution, passed last year by the Congress at the request of the President, declares that 'the United States regards as vital to the national interest and world peace the preservation of the independence and integrity of nations of the Middle East.' "

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, author of the independence-and-integrity sentence, has authoritatively and repeatedly repudiated the suggestion that that sentence in any way authorizes the use of United States Armed Forces for any purpose other than against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism. Surely the plain language of section 2 of the resolution supports Senator MANSFIELD on this. Secretary Dulles' testimony and the House Foreign Affairs Committee report indicate that the way chosen to protect a country's internal independence and integrity, and to defend it against subversion, is by protecting it against overt aggression from across its borders.

(2) The indirect-aggression point: The July 28 statement at London signed by Secretary Dulles, as well as by the Prime Ministers of Iran, Pakistan, Turkey, and the United Kingdom, contained the following:

"Article I of the Pact of Mutual Cooperation signed at Baghdad on February 24, 1955, provides that the parties will cooperate for their security and defense and that such measures as they agree to take to give effect to this cooperation may form the subject of special agreements. Similarly, the United States, in the interest of world peace and pursuant to existing Congressional authorization, agrees to cooperate with the nations making this declaration for their security and defense and will promptly enter into agreements designed to give effect to this cooperation."

The Congressional authorization referred to is, of course, the Middle East resolution of March 1957. This, as we have already seen, relates to United States armed intervention in opposition to overt Communist attack against a Middle East country. If this were all that were involved, all would be well: the Eisenhower doctrine clearly covers this, and its reaffirmation on July 28 is perfectly in order. However, the July 28 London declaration also contains the following:

"The members of the Baghdad Pact attending the ministerial meeting in London have reexamined their position in the light of recent events and conclude that the need which called the pact into being is greater than ever. These members declare their determination to maintain their collective security and to resist aggression, direct or indirect."

Here, then, is a second attempt to stretch the Middle East resolution—against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism—to cover United States military action against indirect aggression—subversion and revolution, rather than outside attack. Now, indirect aggression may be just as dangerous and deadly as overt armed attack from outside. My point is that Congress in the Middle East resolution concurred in the use of United States Armed Forces against outside aggression, not against indirect aggression. The entire history of the resolution, set forth above, shows that Congress expressly declined to include indirect aggression in the resolution.

Good relations between the Executive and the Congress depend upon truthful and straightforward dealing on both sides. Under section 5 of the Middle East resolution, the President shall within the months of January and July of each year report to the Congress his action hereunder. Your July report is due shortly.

I earnestly hope that in that report or in some similar report you will clearly set forth that the July 15 and July 28 actions described above were not taken pursuant to Congressional concurrence in the Middle

East resolution, but are constitutionally justified, as I believe them to be, under the inherent powers of the Presidency. Such a clarification by you will enable Congress and the Executive to go forward toward a sound reconstruction of our foreign policy with this cloud on their interrelationship removed.

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

II. Does the Administration Base Its Power To Send Troops To Put Down Internal Conflicts in the Middle East Upon the Congressional Middle East Resolution?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, my letter to President Eisenhower of August 7 was designed to clarify whether the administration considered its actions of July 15 with respect to Lebanon, and of July 28 with respect to the declaration of London, as taken pursuant to the Congressional Middle East resolution of March 7, 1957, or whether the actions taken were based upon the President's own constitutional responsibility. The administration's reply is contained in the following letter of August 22 signed by Acting Secretary of State Christian L. Herter:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
August 22, 1958.

The Honorable HENRY S. REUSS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. REUSS: I wish to thank you for your letter to the President of August 7, which has been referred to me for reply. I am pleased to have this opportunity to discuss the bases for the steps taken with respect to Lebanon and the Baghdad Pact powers to which you refer.

The increasing resort to indirect aggression in the world is, as you state, a matter of very great concern to the United States. The executive branch, in seeking to meet the recent problems resulting from indirect aggression in the Near East, acted after consultation with Congressional leaders and in accordance with existing constitutional and legislative authority. There has been no intention, I assure you, to create any new doctrine.

In his statement to Congress on the action in Lebanon, dated July 15, the President declared: "United States forces are being sent to Lebanon to protect American lives and by their presence to assist the Government of Lebanon in the preservation of Lebanon's territorial integrity and independence, which have been deemed vital to United States national interests and world peace." In sending United States forces to Lebanon in response to the request of the Lebanese Government the President acted under his constitutional authority as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces and under these provisions of the Constitution giving him special responsibility in the field of foreign affairs. The executive branch did not believe that the President required any further formal authority.

While the action was thus not sought under the specific authority of any provision of the Middle East Resolution, we would be less than candid if we did not state our belief that the strong expression of interest in the maintenance of the independence of the nations of the Middle East which was inserted by the Congress in that resolution gave eloquent evidence of the desire of the American people that the integrity of those states not be destroyed. It reinforced our conviction that it would be in the national interests of the United States for this country to take action to assist Lebanon in its hour of desperate need.

You are correct in understanding that the Secretary had in mind the Middle East Resolution in agreeing to the fourth paragraph of the Declaration in London of July 28, 1958, which he signed jointly with representatives of the member states of the Baghdad Pact, who participated in that meeting. However, the Secretary also had in mind the bilateral arrangements already concluded with these states under the Mutual Security Act. The first paragraph of the Declaration, which you quote in your letter, applied only to the member states of the Baghdad Pact attending the London meeting, and not to the United States or its legislation since the United States is not a signatory to the pact. The Declaration does not commit the United States to use Armed Forces nor does it go beyond existing Congressional authorizations in any respect.

We appreciate your bringing your concern on these matters to our attention. It is, you may be sure, our firm intention to maintain the closest association with the Congress on international problems of this nature and to act only in full accord with the authority for the conduct of foreign affairs as laid down by the Constitution and supplemented by the acts of the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
Acting Secretary.

Let us examine this reply of August 22 to my letter of August 7. The August 22 letter clearly enough states that the action in Lebanon on July 15 was "not sought under the specific authority of any provision of the Middle East resolution." This certainly seems at variance with what Mr. Dulles said at his May 20, 1958 press conference, and with White House Press Secretary Hagerty's press release of July 16, both set forth in my letter of August 7, which were both to the effect that the sending of troops to the Middle East in an internal dispute was justified under the Middle East resolution. Unfortunately, the ensuing language in Secretary Herter's August 22 letter, by implying that the "independence and integrity" language of the Middle East resolution justified the sending of troops to Lebanon, puts us right back where we started. Congress was told by the administration time and again that internal conflict would be met not by sending troops, but by a three-point program of guaranteeing against outside aggression, sending arms, and sending economic aid. If the administration wanted to find out what Congress thought of our sending American Armed Forces to put down internal conflict in the Middle East, it should have asked Congress' opinion during the 2 months of January and February 1957, when Congress was debating the much more remote contingency of outside aggression involved in the Middle East resolution. But this was not done.

The second question raised by my August 7 letter asked where in the Middle East resolution Secretary Dulles got Congressional concurrence in his pledge in the July 28 London Declaration to send troops to Baghdad Pact members menaced by internal conflict—"indirect agression." As I read the July 28 London Declaration, Secretary Dulles was saying that the United States would go to the aid of the Iranian Government, for example, if it were menaced by internal conflict. The Secretary did this, in my opinion, when he signed the fourth paragraph of the four-paragraph London Declaration setting forth that "the United States, in the interest of world peace and pursuant to existing Congressional authorization, agrees to cooperate with the nations making this declaration for their security and defense." In the first paragraph of the declaration, the Baghdad Pact members present had defined their security as including protection against "aggression, direct or indirect."

The State Department's letter of August 22 apparently takes the position that Secretary Dulles on July 28 was simply going along with the general security protections of the Baghdad Pact—to guard against external aggression—and not with the extension of this to internal conflicts. Nevertheless, I have the impression that the Government of Iran believes that Secretary Dulles on July 28 made it a commitment to come to its aid against internal conflict as well as against outside aggression. And, from the language of the July 28 Declaration of London, I cannot say I blame it.

Mr. Speaker, a foreign policy of "deliberate ambiguity" may possibly keep our enemies guessing. Unfortunately, it also keeps the Congress and the American people guessing. If I am right in my belief that Congress has not only the right but the duty to participate in formulating the broad ends of our foreign policy and our world commitments, clarity, not ambiguity, should be the goal.

The International Communist Conspiracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a number of my weekly newsletters which have been devoted to the machinations and scope of the international Communist conspiracy.

There being no objection, the newsletters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AT THE PRECIPICE
(A weekly newsletter by Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER)

WASHINGTON, January 13, 1958.—Today, as never before in history, the fate of humanity hangs by a thread. The dividing line be-

tween slavery and freedom has never been so narrow. A world half slave and half free cannot longer endure. It must become one or the other.

If the American people are determined to guarantee freedom for all mankind, we must thoroughly reappraise our foreign and domestic policies and squarely face the reality that unselfish hard work, sacrifice, and patience are imperative. We must abandon socialistic and welfare policies on the home front for these, by sapping individual spirit and initiative, are but an indirect path to slavery.

The dramatic launching of two earth satellites by Soviet Russia demonstrates far more than technological and scientific progress and capability. It shows that the Communists have become hard as nails, while we have become soft. Now, more than ever before, the American people must urge upon their Government less wasteful spending on welfare measures and more efficient spending on national defense. We must urge upon our educators less catering to lazy and unambitious students and more insistence upon the difficult but essential courses which will train our young people for leadership in business, government, science, and technology. We must drive from public life the political opportunists, the materialists, and phony liberals who would purge our way of life of its vast spiritual treasures.

We must pursue a realistic course of action in our dealings with the balance of the world. We must judiciously limit our associations with Soviet Russia. Since 1933 the United States and Russia have negotiated on significant issues in 3,400 meetings. From these have come 52 major agreements, of which the Soviets have since violated 50. Obviously, in the absence of any genuine act of goodwill on the part of the Kremlin, absolutely nothing can be gained from negotiating with them.

If we dedicate our efforts to a policy of conserving the best of the past; of profiting from the experience, wisdom, and mistakes of yesterday; of refusing to compromise with moral principles; and with being primarily and essentially concerned with what we can give to our country and not what we can get from it, we can be victorious in this bitter struggle.

1973—A Year to Prophesy?

(A weekly newsletter by Senator John Marshall Butler)

Washington, February 3, 1958.—The left wing sing-song which seeks to push us toward another summit meeting with Soviet Russia wantonly plays upon the fears of all peace-loving people with an alarming disregard of Communist devices. The momentum and force of this effort confuses and confounds those who work and pray for a genuine peace.

For those who join in this chorus, it might be helpful to spotlight a few regrettable gravestones of history.

Only 2 months ago, Vladimir Shabinsky, a lieutenant colonel in the Soviet Army until 1947, in testifying before a Senate subcommittee here in Washington said: "My leaders told me and other officers in Germany after World War II that the United States was our No. 1 enemy." He also stated that the Russians kidnapped 2,000 German scientists—missile and rocket experts among them—between 1944 and 1947.

Since the recognition of the Soviet regime in 1933, no corner of the globe has escaped the scrutiny and ravage of Russian espionage. This sordid record of subversion and infiltration has, in days past, been minimized, covered up, excused or wished away by the same group of self-styled saviors of the world who now call for blind adoption of Russian proposals. Mr. Shabinsky tells us he was 100 percent sure that Soviet espionage in the last 10 years had enabled Russia to acquire a scientific prowess superior in some respects to that of the remainder of the world.

The vast Communist reservoir of scientific knowledge was made possible as a result of blunder and stupidity—through floundering policies designed and developed by so-called liberals and misguided individuals who had a stranglehold on our governmental processes and mass information media during and after World War II. Characteristically, this same hysterical minority yells and chants for an end to necessary security regulations, scuttling of balanced budgets, wholesale Federal aid to education and an immediate, unqualified acceptance of Russian overtures inspired for purely propaganda purposes.

Dr. Frederick C. Schwarz, an authority on Communist tactics and objectives, tells us that the Kremlin has set the year 1973 as the deadline for complete control of the world. Therefore, to rule out the hope of some common ground for a meeting with the Soviets would be as suicidal as some of our policies of the past, but any such conference must be preceded by solid evidence and demonstrations of worthy and peaceful intentions on the part of the Russians.

Another Re-Evaluation Needed?

(A weekly newsletter by Senator John Marshall Butler)

Washington, February 10, 1958.—In these days of global confusion, with increasing emphasis upon summit meetings and other government-to-government conferences, the role of the United Nations as a galvanizer of peace would seem to call for reevaluation. Of this, one of the world's leading statesmen, Sir Winston Churchill, had this to say last summer:

"We have now reached the point where nations must contrive a system and practice to resolve their disputes and settle them peacefully. We have not so far succeeded in this. Some have tried, at one swoop in the hour of victory, to draw up an all-comprehending scheme to meet international possibilities, such as the Charter of the United Nations. In a recent speech, that most distinguished Australian statesman, Mr. Menzies * * * told us that justice was not being achieved in the Assembly. That is a serious charge. But it is true. I do not throw in my lot with those who say that Britain should leave the United Nations. But it is certain that if the Assembly sometimes, to make its decisions, continues to make its decisions on grounds of enmity, opportunism, or merely jealousy or petulence, the whole structure may be brought to nothing."

Churchill hits the nub of the problem of disproportionate impact in these words: "The differences between the great powers have thrown responsibility increasingly on the Assembly. This has been vastly swollen by the addition of new nations.

"We wish all these new nations well. Indeed, we created many of them, and have done our best to restore their integrity and prosperity. But it is anomalous that the vote or prejudice of any small country should affect events involving populations many times exceeding their numbers, and should affect them as momentary self-advantage may direct. This should be improved. There are many cases where the United Nations have failed."

Those dedicated to the proposition of peace for all mankind will find a great challenge in these statements by Britain's distinguished war leader and former Prime Minister: "I do not want tonight to suggest an elaborate new charter for the United Nations. But I think we can all agree that in its present conception, its imperfections must be changed. The mere creation of international organization does not relieve us of our individual responsibility. * * * It falls to the righteous man, individually, to do what he can and to form with his friends alliances which are manifestly crowded with justice and honor."

Propaganda and Survival

(A weekly newsletter by Senator John Marshall Butler)

Washington, February 24, 1958.—Propaganda has been a word of common usage since World War II. Propaganda themes, propaganda advantage, propaganda initiative, propaganda effectiveness, and propaganda victories now compose the lexicon of those who seek to bend public and world opinion to their particular cause. Foremost among these are the Russians. The skill with which they—our avowed enemies—employ this relatively new medium of persuasion has laid bare our own ineptitude in the essential endeavor of counterpoint.

Though the record of successes by the Soviets in this sensitive field has grown year by year, the pattern was easily recognized by the events of the Geneva Conference of 1955. In spite of our peaceful and humanitarian intentions, this gathering provided a cloak of respectability which the Russian leaders sorely needed at that time. To suggest that President Eisenhower's coattails were used for this purpose would not be an inaccurate statement.

More recently Communist propaganda has exploited a variety of incidents, developments, and claims in the Soviet Union, in this country, or in the international situation. These fall into four major themes: (1) The United States is warlike and imperialistic; (2) the Soviet Union is the real champion of peace; (3) American democracy is a fraud; and (4) the Soviet Union is technically advanced and militarily powerful.

With the launching of our Explorer satellite, some of the sting has been removed from category four. But, it cannot be denied that the manner in which earlier failures with rockets and missiles as well was treated by our official spokesmen and mass information mediums was an unwitting play into the hands of the Communist propaganda machine. As the clatter for another high-level conference increases, the other three categories have been ballooned with a measure of success here and abroad which is frightening to say the least. Lately, the erroneous image has been that the Russians are angels of peace, and that we, as a result of our rejection of the summit meeting proposal are warlike. Millions of unknowing persons have thus been duped—perhaps beyond the point of no return.

This unscrupulous phenomenon constitutes propaganda in its most perfect and most effective form. A floundering, disjointed, and unimaginative program on our part can only lead us further down the path of defeat in the unceasing battle between freedom and communism. A coordinated and realistic information policy, encompassing all agencies and activities of the Federal Government, is now as never before a mandatory ingredient for survival.

The Quicksand of Treachery

(A weekly newsletter by Senator John Marshall Butler)

Washington, March 10, 1958.—Amazingly, a constituent has written me saying that I am working too hard against Russia. The implication in this suggestion, that I should join in making things easier for Russia, I find preposterous and a positive indication of the extent to which well-meaning Americans have been duped by the calculating propaganda of the Russians. Their basic theme is always the same—the Soviet Union, not the United States, is the real champion

of peace. Actually, it would appear that many of our own people either accept this statement as truthful or they lack the courage to distinguish right from wrong.

Recently the Kremlin has appeared to take the initiative in promoting the idea of another summit meeting. And thus the erroneous conception, regardless of the thoroughly sound position of our Government, is that we are indecisive and irresolute. To the contrary, our national policy has never changed—an honorable and lasting peace for all mankind, not another propaganda achievement for a conspiracy which from its inception has been dedicated to our destruction.

That an effective Eisenhower-Khrushchev conference, including lesser lights in the community of free nations, could rise from the quicksand of Communist treachery is difficult, almost impossible, to believe. The give and take could be disastrous to our cause. Here are some of the demands which the Russians most certainly would make: (1) recognition of their grip on Eastern Europe; (2) withdrawal of the Seventh Fleet from the Formosa Straits; (3) withdrawal of our military missions in Nationalist China; (4) withdrawal of our support of South Korea; (5) dismantling of United States and NATO bases in Western Europe and the Middle East; (6) recognition of Red China and its admission to the U. N.; (7) liquidation of NATO and other alliances; (8) cessation of all forms of information to Soviet areas; and (9) liquidation of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Even if agreement were reached at such a parley, the illusion would soon be shattered for the Russians have flagrantly violated practically every treaty and agreement which they have signed in the past 25 years. This is an undeniable fact of history. The leopard has not changed its spots. He is only more cunning and we more gullible. In our gullibility how far will we go in appeasing the Communists? Are the results of a summit meeting, in the absence of a Bricker amendment, to be the law of this land without ratification by the Senate? These questions need answering.

ON THE HORNS OF STILL ANOTHER DILEMMA

(A weekly newsletter by Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER)

WASHINGTON, April 7, 1958.—It is undeniable that the Soviet Union and all Communists are reaping vast benefits from their present propaganda offensive. In the decisive battle for the minds of men they have once more appeared as champions of peace while the West, especially the United States, has appeared as warmongers.

At this juncture, we are confronted by the following dilemma: Either to yield to Soviet pressure and blackmail and agree to a summit conference on Soviet terms, or to persist in our refusal. In the first case, we would suffer a grave defeat even before the conference begins, since our acceptance of Russian terms would mean rejection of a basic element of American foreign policy—the liberation of peoples enslaved by communism. That in itself would be the greatest Communist political victory since World War II—since these peoples were enslaved by the Russians. In the second case, the Communists, headed by Moscow, would keep scoring important propaganda and psychological gains against us. Obviously, neither is good.

To defeat the Soviet summit conference propaganda offensive, we must first realize that the Khrushchev, and the Bulganin (lately departed from the Kremlin hierarchy) letters, and all Soviet propaganda for that matter, are aimed not at peace but at a "relaxation of international tensions"—the Communist term for the moral and psychological disarmament of the West in the merciless struggle between freedom and communism. While the Communists are relentlessly waging a war of annihilation, they want us to stop resisting.

Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam, and Geneva have not served the cause of peace and freedom, but the objectives of international communism. On the other hand, since a negative attitude of plain and stern refusal is unpopular not only among the uncommitted nations, but among our NATO allies as well, we must proclaim a definite willingnes to talk, but at the same time, we must aggressively and insistently indict the Soviets as vicious imperialists who have never kept their word. And, with facts, proofs, and arguments, we must brand them before the entire world as a real menace to peace, the vile enslaver of nations, the worst threat to mankind.

This seems the only way to reverse the present situation which is unfavorable to us, and growing more intolerable in view of Soviet aggressiveness and our formal stubborness, behind which the Communists can detect timidity and indecision.

SKILLFUL PROPAGANDA

(A weekly newsletter by Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER)

WASHINGTON, April 21, 1958.—Lately, the new Ambassador from Russia has been very much in the public eye. With gusto and studied casualness, Ambassador Menshikov has been traveling the time-honored diplomatic, social, and luncheon circuit in a vigorous endeavor to woo more converts to Communist sympathies. The reaction to these artificial gestures of friendship illustrates the manner in which Communist propaganda is successfully foisted upon the American public.

The transparency of this latest avalanche of smiles can best be described by these observations by Father Edmund A. Walsh, a longtime analyst of Communist deception, from his book Total Empire. "There is something fundamental, though elusive, about the Soviet mind which our people have not yet fully comprehended. * * * The revolution never relaxes though it has sometimes stumbled. * * * It substitutes new forms and places of attack but never relents in its conspiracy for world domination. * * * It pretends to love peace and justice."

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, in his superb and superlative Masters of Deceit, published recently, chose to characterize this continuing burlesque in these words: "For all too long, communism's true character has been concealed by its own propaganda, abetted by public ignorance and apathy."

Yet, in spite of these warnings by recognized experts, we are being led, step by step, through the quicksand of skillful propaganda to the summit. In spite of these and other admonitions, another meeting with Soviet leaders now is probable. The solution to our seeming vacillation might well be to turn the tables on Moscow and insist on such a conference while telling forcefully and mercilessly the plain truth about communism to the whole world and by defining our conditions as follows: (1) Russia must demonstrate a genuine desire for peace and peaceful coexistence. (2) Russia must agree to self-determination for all enslaved peoples, through free elections. (3) All Soviet troops must be withdrawn from each and every country deciding to reject communism. (4) Russia must renounce its policy of hostile and false propaganda against the Free World, especially the United States, as well as its subversion and incitement of national, race, and religious hatreds.

Since the Kremlin will not agree to these conditions, they would be put in a most embarrassing position—to be exposed before the court of public opinion for what they are, hypocrites, deceivers, and tyrants.

Small-Business Measures Passed By the 85th Congress May Turn the Tide of Republican Favoritism to Big Business

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the small-business legislation which this Congress has designed and enacted marks an achievement equaled by few Congresses in history.

Looking back over the record of the past 2 years, I find that we have succeeded in passing and getting accepted at least 5 Democratic measures which will be tremendously beneficial to the 4 million small-business firms of this country. These are not small-business measures in name only, but each and every one provides direct and practical help to small business.

FIVE NEW SMALL-BUSINESS LAWS

Repeal of the 3 percent tax on freight shipped by common carrier means that the small manufacturer can now ship his goods to buyers at less costs, and in many instances at costs no higher than are met by the big manufacturers who operate their own transportation systems and thus never paid the tax.

The revisions made in the laws prescribing Government contracting methods now mean that small firms may obtain small Government contracts without going through the expensive and troublesome rigmarole connected with the advertised, competitive bid method. And these revisions also mean that the Government agencies have a certain authority to make advance payments, and to make progress payments, for work on Government contracts, so that they need not exclude small firms from Government work by reason of their inability to finance the work for prolonged periods.

The new Small Business Act means not only that SBA is now a permanent agency of the Government, but that it has more authority and more provisions for advancing the interests of small firms. Most important, SBA now has a clear authority and a clear directive to obtain for small business a real participation and a real share of the benefits of the billions of dollars which the Government agencies are handing out each year to help finance industrial research, experimentation, and development.

The new small-business tax bill removes a number of unnecessary hardships which the Federal tax laws had imposed; and to assist small firms in making purchases of new machinery or equipment, it allows a postponement of taxes to cover up to 20 percent of the cost of the new equipment.

Finally, the new Small Business Investment Act—the Johnson-Patman Act—will offer small firms positive and practical assistance in overcoming a universal obstacle which small firms have faced. This is the obstacle of

being unable to obtain capital. This act is designed, not to create more Government bureaus, but to help small business help itself in a quite practical and down-to-earth way, and in this it holds great promise of success.

Certainly, these 5 small-business measures are 5 impressive steps. A great deal of the credit is due, I humbly suggest, to the Small Business Committee of the House of which I am honored to be a member. All of this legislation embraces proposals which had been recommended by our committee—or at least by the Democratic members of our committee, who have carried the responsibility for developing recommendations to meet the problems of small business. And special credit is due, of course, to the Democratic leaders of the House and the Senate. It was our Democratic leaders who had to guide this legislation through Congress and negotiate with the administration to accept it, and not veto it.

BIG-BUSINESS FAVORITISM HAS BEEN BAD FOR BUSINESS

Impressive as the legislative achievements of this Congress are, however, it does not remove all of the handicaps to small firms. Certainly none of the five measures I have mentioned has come any too soon. And, altogether, they will fall considerably short of bringing about a system of Federal laws, policies, and business incentives which are even-handed and equally friendly to all classes of business. They may be fairly said to represent, I think, not the most that should have been done, but the most that we could persuade the administration to accept. Even so, they are substantial achievements. And they seem to mark a needed change in the tide of Federal policies toward small business—at least we can hope so.

Certainly, the disastrous consequences of this administration's policies of exclusive and overabundant favoritism to big business have been no more clearly demonstrated anywhere than by what has been happening within the business system itself. Even in the years when the administration leaders were boasting that business was the most prosperous ever, it was all too evident that they were pointing with pride to a prosperity for the few. Yes, big-business prices and profits quickly rose to record heights with the lavish aid of this big-business administration. And just as quickly the place for small business began to shrink. While the giant manufacturing corporations built plants and acquired new equipment at a record rate, and bought up or built new distribution and retail outlets, the small manufacturers, the small distributors, and the small retailers were subjected to a great variety of squeezes, some subtle and some not so subtle.

In this era of big-business prosperity the number of small-business bankruptcies mounted from year to year. In the past 4 years small-business firms with Dun & Bradstreet ratings have failed at an average rate of more than 12,000 a year. And in the present recession year—1958—such failures will go to more than 16,000. Yet these figures do not include the many more thousands of small firms that have closed their doors and liquidated their accounts without loss to their creditors.

Just think of the economic waste and the loss to our whole Nation. Is it any wonder that this Nation's economic growth slowed to a snail's pace in the years of so-called Republican prosperity—even when the administration was able to boast that the amount of money being invested in new plants and new business equipment exceeded all previous records? Is it any wonder that consumer incomes have failed to keep pace with the growth in productive capacity? Is it any wonder that we now have 5 million of our labor force unemployed and idle along with idle productive capacity? These things are all part and parcel of the same policies. These are policies which would make a famine where abundance lies.

If the full creative and productive abilities of our business system are to be utilized, then surely one of the tasks ahead is to restore a real competitive opportunity for small firms.

ECONOMIC FREEDOM HAS BEEN GOOD FOR BUSINESS

Am I dreaming of a day when there will be no small-business failures? No, of course not. If the door of opportunity is really kept open, then there will always be room for business firms to experiment with new products and new services and with new ways of doing things. This is the way innovation comes. And this means there will be failures, as there will be successes.

No, it was not because of any guaranty against failure—such as the giant corporations seem to enjoy today—that the traditional business system of this country proved to be a fertile ground for the industrial revolution. Nor has it been in corporations where commercial success seemed most assured that the new scientific and technological progress of recent times has been most conspicuous. On the contrary, unless all our history books are completely wrong, our business system has been progressive and strong precisely for the reason that it has been a system which offered a fighting chance to firms of all sizes—not just prosperity to the firms with great financial resources behind them. And we have had such a business system in this country precisely for the reason that our traditional policy has been to encourage business of all sizes and to maintain a business climate where great numbers of independent business enterprises could exist and compete under fair rules of competition.

Saying these things today will, I know, seem "old hat." There has been a tendency, of which I am well aware, to dismiss our traditional precepts of economic freedoms as being incompatible with modern-day ideas about the scale of economic organization which is required to utilize up-to-date techniques of production and distribution. But have our historic ideas about freedom and independence really been made obsolete by modern technology?

It would be sad indeed to think that orderly economic processes can be achieved only by having all of the Nation's economic affairs under the control of but a few boards of central managers. And it would be equally sad to think that our country is so poor in talents for business management that only a few corporate boards and managements may be staffed with really topflight talent. The truth is, in my experience, that the directors and managers of many of the top corporations are no more talented, and no wiser in the ways of orderly economic processes, than are a great percentage of the people now operating small firms and pursuing professional careers. Indeed, I believe I have met quite a few small-business people who could and would, in the same jobs, run rings around the present managers of some of the giant corporations of this country.

No, there is no shortage of talent for business management. But there has been a shortage of talent for public management, or at least a failure on the part of public management to make our current economic policies in ways which combine and preserve both our traditional precepts of economic freedom and our traditional penchant for finding new and more efficient methods of producing and distributing economic goods. As I see it, this has been one of the great failures of our day. It is the failure which has allowed Federal policies to become policies of special advantage to big business. It is the failure which has allowed the creation of a great variety of seemingly small special advantages in the laws, in the programs, and in the methods of administration—all of which add up to an overwhelming advantage. It is the failure by which new kinds of so-called business incentives are continually being demanded and given—frequently in the name of small business—that turn out to be new incentives for big business and new hardships for small business.

To my mind, it is time, and past time, that our Federal policies be made more even and friendly toward business firms of all sizes. Obviously, this country needs big business and it needs prosperous big business. Yet it seems fair to think that if the big-business firms are as efficient and as necessary as we are led to believe, they do not actually need the kinds of Federal laws, regulations, and methods of administration by which they gain special advantages. This country also needs and will continue to need small- and medium-size business—and for more reasons than one.

MORE LEGISLATION NEEDED TO MAKE FEDERAL POLICIES EVENHANDED

But to restore and maintain a fair chance for small business, there are still some hard problems ahead. We must, then, continue to work for the future and begin now trying to find ways and means for putting across in the new Congress the further legislation which we know that small business needs and should fairly have.

During the past 4 years it has been my privilege to be chairman of the Small Business Committee's subcommittee which deals with the problems of small business in the distribution fields. Thus it has been my privilege to learn the practical problems of a great many

small-business people in retailing, in wholesaling, and other levels of the distribution trades. If I may suggest, then, what has seemed to me the most important problems in these fields, three stand out above all others:

First, Federal taxes are terrifically oppressive. Even in the most profitable small firms, these taxes leave very little in the way of capital for expansion and modernization.

The second problem is quite closely related to the tax problem. This is the problem I have already mentioned, which is that small firms as yet have very little opportunity to obtain from outside sources the capital needed for modernization and growth.

Third, our antitrust laws are badly in need of modernization and strengthening in certain respects. Small-business people are being victimized by a large variety of trade practices which would be labeled unfair by any civilized standards.

Here, then, it seems to me, are the three areas in which small-business legislation should be strengthened in the next Congress.

As to the tax measures which are needed, and as to the measures which will be needed to strengthen and improve the new Small Business Investment Act, these already seem clear—at least they seem clear to me. I have had the privilege of giving detailed study to both the tax and financing problems and in participating in drafting the legislation which this Congress has enacted on these subjects. So, if I may suggest, I believe that the important steps to be taken are those which were outlined in our earlier bills on these subjects and which were omitted from the bills as they finally were passed.

The small-business tax bill which was finally passed includes most of the provisions which were proposed by a bill I introduced, and on which the Ways and Means Committee of the House was good enough to hear my arguments. It also includes several good provisions which I had not thought to recommend.

Small corporations having no more than 10 stockholders may elect to be excused from paying the corporate income tax; small corporations suffering a net loss may carry the loss back and deduct it from income in the 3 preceding years, instead of only the 2 preceding years; corporations may have a $100,000 credit, instead of a $60,000 credit, for determining the special surtax on accumulated earnings; investors in small corporations who suffer a loss on their investment may take an ordinary-loss deduction, instead of the normal capital-loss deduction; where an estate consists mainly of an interest in a small business, estate taxes may be postponed and paid in annual installments over a period of 10 years; the same depreciation privileges which have applied to purchases of new machinery and equipment are now extended to purchases of used machinery and equipment; and finally, a small firm purchasing either new or used machinery and equipment may, for tax purposes, write off 20 percent of that cost in the tax year when the purchase is made. These are all good provisions. They remove unnecessary hardships from many small-business firms; and they should, to some extent, encourage investment in small firms.

This legislation did not, however, include a general tax reduction for small firms. And in one other respect the legislation falls short, I think, in not including a provision which would allow small firms to take a tax deduction for a certain percentage of the cost of new machinery and equipment purchases. The new tax law provides only for a speedup depreciation schedule, not for a tax deduction, and it thus falls short of providing all the assistance it might provide for small firms to expand and modernize their facilities. Last year—the year 1957—a staggering total of some $37 billion was invested in new business facilities. Even in this depression year of 1958, the level of business investment is expected to be in the neighborhood of $33 billion. And as I pointed out to the Ways and Means Committee, most of this is investment in expansion and modernization of the very big firms. It is perfectly obvious, then, that some further extreme distortions in the competitive system are going to occur unless small firms are given an opportunity to keep pace in this growth and modernization.

I do not believe that the incentives which I have proposed for small-business investment would actually result in any loss in revenue to the Government. On the contrary, it seems quite probable that an expansion and modernization of small firms would stimulate all business, increase employment and bring about a higher level of national income which would yield even more revenues at the present tax rates.

TAX CUTS AND CREDIT NEEDED FOR GROWTH CAPITAL

Finally, the absolute must legislation, as I see it, is a general reduction in small-business taxes. Plainly, the big corporations are not sharing a proportionate burden of the Federal income taxes. When a corporation acquires such a degree of market power that it can plan its production schedules and maintain its prices, then it has in effect acquired the power to tax. And when corporations have this effective power to tax, they also have the power to shift—onto consumers and the general public—a large part of any income tax which the Federal Government might impose. So, in spite of what may seem to be a general evenness and fairness about the present tax rates, the practical burden of these rates is falling disproportionately upon small firms. It is imperative then, as I see it, to reduce the tax rates on small-business incomes sufficiently to bring about an equal distribution of the tax burden.

Now I am not criticizing the Democratic leaders in Congress for agreeing to omit from the tax bill that was passed those provisions which would have cut small-business taxes. On the contrary, to have included tax reductions in the bill in the face of a certain Presidential veto would have imperiled the whole tax bill and would have most probably lost the benefits which were obtained. The Democrats have at best a thin majority in this Congress, and even if a 100 percent Democratic support could be mustered, we could not have hoped to obtain the two-thirds vote which would be necessary to override a Presidential veto.

What then about the new Small Business Investment Act? Clearly, if this act proves as successful as we all anticipate, more funds to finance the program will be needed. But as to the amounts that will be needed and the best ways to provide them, these are questions which can best be answered after we have had a chance to see how promptly and effectively the Small Business Administration puts this program into effect.

In certain respects the new Small Business Investment Act is most gratifying. It provides for the formation of privately owned and operated small-business investment companies. These investment companies will decide which small-business concerns to invest in, and which small-business concerns they will make loans to. This is as it should be. These new small-business investment companies will receive assistance through loans of Federal funds, but in each investment and in each loan they make to a small-business concern they will be lending or investing a substantial portion of private money. In fact, for the most part, they will be investing $1 of private money with each $1 of Federal money. To form one of these investment companies, the stockholders in the company must raise $150,000 from private sources in order to obtain $150,000 of Federal funds.

As to its operations at the local level, the new small-business program has the same general features of an earlier bill which I helped to draft and introduced along with WRIGHT PATMAN, the distinguished chairman of our Small Business Committee. This was the small-business capital bank bill which would have put control of the new program under an independent agency, rather than under the control of the Small Business Administration, and hence under the control of the White House.

It was originally hoped, and it is still hoped, with this kind of beginning the new small-business investment program would attract additional capital from private sources. Indeed, it was hoped that private capital will come in, retire the Government capital, and put the Government completely out of the program. And for this purpose of raising additional private capital, the bill introduced by several of the Democratic members of our Small Business Committee contained provisions which are missing from the bill as it was finally made acceptable to the administration and passed. Specifically, there were features, of the original bill, whereby additional private capital could be raised in the central capital markets. The central small-business bank contemplated by that bill was to be authorized to issue bonds under the same conditions which have proved so successful in the operations of the Federal National Mortgage Association. In other words, there were to be bonds, not guaranteed by the Gov-

ernment, but attractive to investors on the basis of their underlying assets. As matters now stand, the Small Business Investment Act does not provide a means for raising additional private capital in the national markets. Furthermore, the Federal appropriations for the program are quite small.

I do not mean to suggest that the program is inadequate. On the contrary, present appropriations and present financing arrangements are fully adequate to make a beginning. And this beginning, I might add, is one of the most progressive business measures ever enacted.

It is only because of the importance and the great promise of this program that I suggest that the next Congress should watch it, nurture it, and encourage it with all means possible.

Indeed, I believe and hope that the turning point for small business in this country has been made in the present Congress, and that, building on this foundation, the next Congress will do bigger and better things for small business.

The Great Conspiracy—The Soviet Road to World Conquest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the distinguished Director of the Federau Bureau of Investigation, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, has repeatedly warned his countrymen of the constant and serious menace of world communism. His observations are not capricious, and are predicated upon solid evidence and his great knowledge of this atheistic conspiracy. At times it would seem that his pleadings have fallen on deaf ears, but judging from the reaction I have obtained from certain newsletters on the subject, the American public is becoming increasingly concerned by the progress being made by the Kremlin and its partisans and dupes.

I therefore request, Mr. President, unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a number of my weekly newsletters which relate to the efforts of Soviet Russia to dominate the world.

There being no objection, the newsletters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AID TO COMMUNIST SATELLITES?

(A weekly newsletter by Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER)

WASHINGTON, April 28, 1958.—On the mistaken notion that we should support so-called national communism in certain Soviet satellite countries, the United States is pouring billions of dollars into Yugoslavia and Poland. Since the end of World War II, more than $1.5 billion has been appropriated for Yugoslavia, and in 1957 alone, total American aid to Communist Poland was in excess of $95 million.

Yet, Poland voted more against the United States position in the last session of the U. N. General Assembly than Russia itself. Both Poland and Yugoslavia voted against the U. N. resolution condemning the Soviet Union for its action against the Hungarian people in the freedom revolt. Poland voted against a resolution urging admission of South Korea to the U. N. and Yugoslavia abstained. Poland also voted against a U. N. resolution urging unification of Korea and again Yugoslavia abstained. On the 40th anniversary of the Russian revolution, Tito congratulated the Soviet Union and called for full unity of all Socialist (meaning Communist) forces.

Tito has declared that he would like to see Poland and Yugoslavia demonstrate that they are not adopting any form of national communism, but contributing by their conviction and attitudes toward a genuinely constructive cooperation among Socialist (that is, Communist) countries. Tito further stated that he and Gomulka were in complete agreement on questions of peace and war, on Middle East tension, German reunification, and European security—and he was said to have acknowledged that on these questions the Yugoslav attitude was identical with that of the Soviet Union; Yugoslavia formally recognized Communist East Germany.

Since last August, the Gomulka government of Communist Poland signed a declaration with Communist East Germany to strengthen the defense alliance which unites them with the Soviet Union and other members of the Warsaw Pact. Riot police charged into crowds after student uprisings had continued for 5 nights in early October last. Gomulka told the supreme Soviet meeting that Poland was making many changes to strengthen socialism according to the basic tenets of Leninism.

These are indisputable examples of the bold and defiant moves which are being consistently made by these Communist dictators while we in this country debate how much aid—how many dollars—we should be sending them. A ridiculous situation indeed. I, for one, have always held that we should send them no aid, and shall continue to take this stand.

THE PLAN TO SOCIALIZE AMERICA

(A weekly newsletter by Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER)

WASHINGTON, May 19, 1958.—I have before me a photostatic copy of a most amazing pamphlet which was received within the past 2 weeks by a labor union representing employees in a Maryland plant. This document, entitled "A People's Program for Jobs and Security," comes from 26 West 26th Street in New York City, the headquarters of the National Committee, Communist Party, U. S. A. Delivery was accomplished by way of the United States mails.

This masterpiece of Communist propaganda typically pits class against class with hackneyed clichés such as these: "A national emergency exists. * * * The giant monopolies, which profited heavily in the boom now seek to protect their profits at the expense of the working people. * * * Of key importance is the role of the unions, and especially the organization of the unemployed * * * The specter of depression and unemployment can be banished only in a Socialist America—an America in which the mines, mills, and factories are publicly owned and are operated for the benefit of all, not as a source of profits for the few. * * * To the realization of such a program, the Communist Party (a working class political organization, so says the brochure) pledges its fullest support."

For the attainment of the ultimate goal of a socialized America, the Communist Party, U. S. A. prescribes a 12-point platform, which has a striking resemblance to many of the plans of today being advocated by some of our less sanguine public officials, labor leaders, and political pundits. Here are the 12 planks: "(1) Boost purchasing power; (2) reduce taxes; (3) curb monopoly prices; (4) improve unemployment compensation; (5) provide adequate relief; (6) ease credit; (7) increase aid to distressed areas; (8) expand public work programs; (9) defend labor's rights; (10) end discrimination in employment; (11) aid to farmers; (12) promote peace and trade."

Admittedly, some parts of this type of package might be appealing. But its adoption would accomplish exactly what the Communists conspiracy hopes to accomplish—national bankruptcy. Men and women of influence and power in government, labor, business, and elsewhere are unwittingly contributing to the Communist goal of world domination when they advocate tax cuts, for example, simultaneously with reckless government spending. If we continue to ignore the economic facts of life, it is possible that Russia can socialize and communize America without the use of nuclear weapons.

ANOTHER FRANKENSTEIN?

(A weekly newsletter by Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER)

WASHINGTON, May 26, 1958.—With unfailing frequency, our information mediums are deluged with the idioms and epitaphs from the left side of the political spectrum carrying the label of the Americans for Democratic Action. It is amazing that these pronouncements should receive more than cursory attention, but last week, out of the ADA convention, came a resolution urging diplomatic recognition of Red China which was given extensive notoriety.

The dialect of this self-serving group of liberals is indeed curious, if not phony. Some observers have seen fit to describe it as a pinkish political potpourri. The ADA attempts to convince the American public that it opposes all forms of totalitarianism, including communism, and that it is nonpartisan in flavor. Both the aims and true character of the ADA have always been shrouded in doubletalk, but nonetheless the drift to the left is clear.

Advocacy of the admission of Red China into the community of free nations is not a new fancy for the ADA. Its opinions on this issue have been noisily advertised on previous occasions, even in the face of statements such as this from Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge in 1956: "On the question of seating Red China in the United Nations, there is no point on which I feel more strongly. It is unthinkable that a regime that stands convicted of aggression by the United Nations and whose conduct continues to be that of an international bandit and blackmailer should be permitted to sit in the United Nations as a representative of China."

Could it be that the ADA has its eyes closed to history? On November 16, 1933, the United States created a Frankenstein when the Soviet Union was recognized as the legitimate Government of Russia. That one solitary act was not only the concentrated essence of 20 years in the Communist struggle for world domination, but the intrinsic evil has grown in magnitude and prospered in portent far beyond the deepest fears of those realists who wisely advised against such action.

Today—almost 25 years later—that Communist Russia which we, in great measure, helped to launch on its diabolically conceived career of wholesale human slaughter and enslavement, holds life-or-death sway over half the human race. If the mouthings of the ADA are observed, we will create another Frankenstein which in the next 25 years

could insure the fulfillment of the Communist conspiracy in terms of the other half of the human race.

A Cadaverous Record

(A weekly newsletter by Senator John Marshall Butler)

Washington, June 30, 1958.—Since 1948 the tyrants in the Kremlin have endeavored to construct a facade of respectability about the Iron Curtain with the illusion that communism has changed. With beguiling smiles, empty gestures, and disarming platitudes, the world has been told that international communism is improving, that it is different, more democratic.

Those whose minds have been captured by this insidious propaganda must have had their fanciful notions shattered last week by the heinous execution by the Russians of four leaders of Hungary's courageous 1956 revolt. Vile, brutal, beastly—these adjectives hardly seem adequate to describe another in an ever-increasing list of detestable atrocities which have been committed by the Communists.

Khrushchev's path to power has been paved by the cadavers of those who dared to resist. To stamp out bourgeois nationalism in the Ukraine, this emerging Soviet leader, drunk with the taste of power, ordered the 1938 massacre of more than 10,000 people in the city of Vinnitsa. These unfortunate victims were shot in the back of the neck in the same manner as in the murders in North Korea of some 6,000 American POW's by Soviet Red Chinese and Soviet North Koreans. It might also be timely to recall that the self-styled symbol of virtuous communism, Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia had American fliers shot in cold blood, and doomed hundreds of Hungarian refugees to slaughter by refusing them sanctuary.

While all of this goes on, unknowing and unwitting Americans rush to give the Russian Ambassador Menshikov every opportunity to spew the Communist line. The press, radio, television, and many of our more sophisticated citizens are not guiltless. To them, it should be emphasized that Menshikov is "no lily white," in spite of his glistening smiles and studied charm. At a time when we were trying to aid the destitute people of Poland, this Soviet paragon occupied the strategic position of deputy director of the U. N. Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Menshikov made sure that food and clothing donated by the American taxpayers went only to Communists and their followers, while Polish patriots starved.

More than 10 years ago, a process of psychological deception was started by the Kremlin. Even our good deeds have been made instrumentalities of Communist propaganda. How much more evidence then is needed to prove that we are still being duped and that the process will not end until freedom reigns universally?

Who Is Kidding Whom?

(A weekly newsletter by Senator John Marshall Butler)

Washington, July 14, 1958.—Some weeks ago, following my newsletter opposing the recognition of Red China, the Baltimore Evening Sun printed a castigating editorial, titled "Kidding Himself," in which I was accused of making wild and fanciful statements. This tirade brands my position as nonsense and concludes with the contemptuous statement: "We don't know how many other people he (Senator Butler) is kidding, but he sure is kidding himself." Curiously, the editorial did not appear in all editions of the Evening Sun for May 26.

The vehemence of this criticism of my position prompted a deluge of encouraging messages which convince me that the shoe might well be on the other foot. Or, who is kidding whom? The Evening Sun, and its pro-ADA editorial writer, ignore the unanimous consensus of the Congress which was expressed by a 91–0 vote in 1954. My colleague, Senator Beall, found as a result of his more recent questionnaire that 64 percent of those Marylanders who responded likewise oppose the recognition of Red China.

Secretary of State Dulles reflected the sentiments of the administration on this issue in these words on January 17, 1958: "So long as the Communist regime (in China) is dedicated to opposing by all possible means the things which we believe to be in our interest, we do not see that there is any advantage to be gained by increasing its authority, its influence, and prestige to be used against us."

Our Ambassador to the United Nations, Henry Cabot Lodge, tells me on June 5 last, "I know of nothing which has happened that would cause me to revise the statement (opposing the seating of Red China in the United Nations) which you quote from my letter to you in 1956." Ambassador Lodge also said at the same time: "At the most recent session of the General Assembly a motion to discuss the question of Chinese representation at the United Nations was defeated by an overwhelming majority of the member states."

One Marylander defends my assertion, that to recognize Soviet Red China would be to create another Frankenstein, with this rebuttal: "To some readers of the Evening Sun, there appears to be a sound factual basis for holding that the granting of American diplomatic recognition to Russia in 1933 laid the groundwork for those subsequent developments whereby Russia was enabled, very largely by what it got from the United States, to become the power it is at the present time."

Again, I say, who is kidding whom?

The Bold Relief of Our Times

(A weekly newsletter by Senator John Marshall Butler)

Washington, July 21, 1958.—The daily conduct of the American people has become grist for the propaganda mills of unfriendly nations. Our slightest transgressions, imprudent actions, irresolute policies, and partisan squabbles have been employed, with considerable impact, to portray the United States in an unfavorable light. Any uncommon or eccentric behavior pattern is depicted as typically American.

While at the Brussels Fair on the Fourth of July, former President Herbert Hoover placed this phenomenon in bold relief in these words: "There can be no interpretation of the American way of life in its effects upon other nations without reference to the false legends, misrepresentations, and vicious propaganda which haunt the Free World. * * * These misrepresentations and this propaganda are inciting physical attacks upon American citizens, upon our officials, and abuse of our country."

It can be quickly demonstrated that the Russians are avid readers of American newspapers and periodicals. The Congressional Record and governmental proceedings are also required reading for the manipulators of Communist propaganda. Indiscriminate and intemperate comments, capable of misinterpretation, are circled in red for special attention. These, and detrimental items, are carefully assembled for mass dissemination at the most propitious moment.

At international conferences, the Soviet Union and its satellites, with alacrity, cite parts of Government documents to embarrass United States representatives. The United Nations Economic and Social Council has been a frequent forum for subtle attack upon our institutions and traditions. Once uttered, the worldwide facilities of the Communist empire give these damaging indictments the fullest possible coverage.

Obviously, if this disadvantageous trend is to be righted, all citizens, Members of the Congress, public officials, journalists, reporters, and commentators included—have a responsibility to avoid exaggeration, partisan statements, and criticism not supported by clear evidence. To do otherwise is to provide, unwittingly, propaganda which may be used to our detriment. Moreover, in terms of the national welfare, our presently confused and disjointed propaganda, information, and psychological warfare activities must be upgraded and coordinated at a high level of government. And, in all of this, national as well as individual discretion and restraint must be exercised.

Another Masked Purpose

(A weekly newsletter by Senator John Marshall Butler)

Washington, August 18, 1958.—Out of the morass of an 8-month exchange of correspondence between President Eisenhower and two successive Russian Premiers, a real objective of the Soviet axis begins to unfold. While placing major emphasis upon the call for a high-level conference, which patently could serve no useful purposes, the agents of international communism have used these letters as a wedge to advance the recognition of the People's Republic of China (Soviet China). The admission of Communist China to the United Nations, for example, would greatly strengthen the hand of Russia.

In a seemingly unshakeable pall of lethargy, the Free World moves willy-nilly toward acceptance of this band of cutthroats, murderers, and blackmailers. Trade barriers with the Chinese mainland have been relaxed. Red Chinese aircraft move more daringly toward the island of Formosa, the bastion of Nationalist China. And, a reality little known, Soviet China is to be a beneficiary of the results of the International Geophysical Year.

To this international mishmash add the fact that the nine-power treaty, signed here in Washington, February 6, 1922, in which the parties, among them the United States, pledged themselves to respect the territorial and administrative integrity of China, is still in force. For the reason that six of the signatory countries—the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and India—have already recognized Communist China, the Department of State characterizes this treaty as a kind of dead letter. It was not enforced when Japan invaded China in the 1930's, and is obviously just another piece of meaningless paper to be conveniently ignored as circumstances dictate. Perhaps this development signaled the start of the diplomatic mediocrity and ineptitude which have marked the past quarter century.

The United States is nonetheless morally committed in the interests of its own national security to keep Formosa out of unfriendly hands—Communist hands. If the progress of communism is to be opposed successfully in Asia it must be done with Asian manpower. Thus far, only four Asian peoples have shown a willingness to contribute to such an endeavor—the Koreans, the Japanese, the Philippines, and the Chinese. With the Red Chinese on the other side, backed by the Soviet Union, the three other peoples combined would be outmatched.

And so again, to recognize Soviet China would be to promote the causes of international communism on all fronts.

Let Us Keep the Record Straight on Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, it is increasingly evident that agriculture became a political football in this Democrat-controlled Congress. As I look over the record of the current session, it is startling to see the politically inspired and misleading statements of prominent majority party Members attacking the administration's leadership in agriculture. By twisting facts, they have attempted to give the impression that agriculture, under the present administration, is in a hazardous and weakened condition and that all the ills and problems of agriculture are due to the present administration.

I realize this is a political year. I realize that political sniping is in season for those who feel that their political tenure is in jeopardy. Nevertheless, it appears entirely inconsistent with statesmanship and administrative integrity to take a strictly partisan approach, particularly by leading spokesmen of a party, especially when such attacks are completely unwarranted and unjustified by the facts. There have been too many occasions in this session when leading spokesmen of the majority party in Congress have issued misleading information, using agriculture as a whipping boy to gain dubious advantage to themselves.

I believe it is generally acknowledged that probably no agency in our administrative arm of the Federal Government has made available to the Congress and the public more realistic statistical data and informational material about its operations than the United States Department of Agriculture. The Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, consistently has kept the Congress and the public informed on the status of agriculture, basing his evaluation on the official statistics gathered and reported by the Department and other agencies of the Government. A careful examination of the facts will quickly reveal that the information used by Secretary Benson in his statements on the condition of agriculture is reliable and accurate. The figures used by Secretary Benson consistently are those which are obtained by faithful career civil servants and are supported by the resources of the Department of Agriculture. They are not manufactured; they are not unsupported.

In comparing the factual information on agriculture as presented by Secretary Benson with some of the politically inspired analyses, including those by leading spokesmen of the Democrat Party, it is very easy to see which information is based on fact and which is purely politically inspired, unsupported and, in many instances, completely absurd.

Statistics by themselves, unless properly related and correctly interpreted, can be made misleading to those not familiar with the facts. This apparently is what has happened in some of the recent political utterings. After reading some of the political statements, I am surprised that we have any agriculture at all. In fact, recent Democrat statements lead to the conclusion that the farmers of the United States are in a terrible condition financially, productively, and progressively. This just is not so. Everyone knows the farm economy has rebounded greatly in the past 3 years.

As one who is bowing out of our Nation's Congress, I should like to cite a few of the inconsistencies perpetrated against agriculture by political demagogs. I should like to show how ridiculous these politically inspired statements are when compared with the facts. Time will not permit me to review all these irresponsible statements. But I believe a few plain illustrations will enable thinking people to draw correct conclusions about the accuracy or inaccuracy of the status of agriculture today and about the way some politicians of the opposition party are attempting to deceive the American public with regard to the welfare of agriculture under Secretary Benson.

For example, let us just take a close look at three sets of agricultural statistics which have been used as a basis of misinformation on agriculture. These statistics relate to, first, the farm population, second, farm debt, and, third, corporation farms.

First. One ridiculous claim is that great numbers of farmers are leaving the farm because of the present administration's program. As anyone who is familiar with the facts knows, the farming population has been declining throughout our history and particularly since 1933. Secretary Benson not only has agreed that this transition is occurring, but he also has published detailed statistics and explanations concerning this reduced farm population. Secretary Benson has attempted to give the full facts of the matter, not just half truths. In support of their wild claim, however, leading Democrats cite statistics which show that in 1952 there were 24,283,000 farmers and in 1957 there were 20,396,000 farm people. These figures are indeed accurate. They are taken from official and public USDA reports—the same reports incidentally which some irresponsible people claim are doctored by Secretary Benson. We must look at these figures a little more closely though before arriving at any wild conclusions. A closer look at the record will show that on:

April 1, 1910, there were 32,077,000 farm people or 34.9 percent of the total population.

April 1, 1920, there were 31,974,000 farm people or 30.1 percent of the total population.

April 1, 1930, there were 30,529,000 farm people or 24.9 percent of the total population.

April 1, 1940, there were 30,547,000 farm people or 23.2 percent of the total population.

April 1, 1949, there were 25,954,000 farm people or 17.5 percent of the total population.

April 1, 1950, there were 25,058,000 farm people or 16.6 percent of the total population.

April 1, 1952, there were 24,283,000 farm people or 15.5 percent of the total population.

April 1, 1953, there were 22,679,000 farm people or 14.3 percent of the total population.

April 1, 1957, there were 20,396,000 farm people or 12.0 percent of the total population.

When one studies the official reports, the politically inspired motives of the farm demagogues become obvious. For example, the comparison is made with 1952, the year of a Republican victory in November. The statistics cited by the opposition are population estimates as of April 1 of the year. It was not until 1953 that the present administration took office, and in April 1953, we were just taking off our coats to begin to clean up the mess in Washington.

If the Democrat Party is trying to compare farm population in the Truman administration with that population in the present administration, they should, in all fairness, use the April 1953 population estimates. While they are doing so, they might also point out that in the last 4 years of the Truman administration—April 1, 1949, to April 1, 1953—farm population declined from 25,954,000 to 22,679,000 or at a rate of over 800,000 per year, while the average decline from 1934 to 1957—and from 1953 to 1957—has been the rate of only 500,000 per year.

The decline in the farm population is not the result of Republican programs nor of Democratic programs. It is just an economic fact of life that all who are familiar with agriculture know has occurred because of the tremendous technological revolution in agriculture and our expanding industrial economy. Our farm population would have declined regardless of what type of farm program we had.

Second. In this election year we have heard over and over and over again, the following statement: "Farm debt is at an alltime high—over $20 billion." This is another Democrat farm fact, which standing alone leads to a ridiculous conclusion. This statistical hogwash is repeatedly applied by those who revel in accentuating the negative to prove that our Nation's farmers are on the brink of financial doom. We must again look at the record more closely to see the real sigrificance of this statement. It is quite true that total farm debt is an estimated $20.2 billion and that this is the highest on record, but that is only a part of the truth. The whole truth is that farm assets are also at a record high—$187 billion and likewise owners' equities are at an alltime $167 billion. Farmers have less than $11 in debt for each $100 of assets as compared to the 1940 ratio of $19 in debt to each $100 of assets.

The record also shows that farm mortgage foreclosures are near the alltime low (only 1 out of 3 farms has a

mortgage at all), while the level of living on farms is the highest in history, based on the percentage of farms with electricity, telephones, automobiles and the purchasing power of the average value of farm products sold or traded. In addition, farm ownership is at an alltime high.

Third. Another phantom ogre which certain farm fear peddlers display is the corporation farm. It would indeed be a sad day for America if giant corporate farmers were to supplant our family system of agriculture. That sad day is not today, however.

A close look at the census reveals that nearly 90 percent of the land in farms is owned by private individuals, with corporations, Federal, State, and local governments and Indian lands accounting for the balance of our farmland. Family-size farms continue to dominate agriculture. Ninety-six percent of our farms and ranches are family operations. In 1930 this percentage was 95.7 percent. In 1940 it was 95.4 percent. In 1945 it was 95.6 percent, and in 1950 it was 95.5 percent. In fact, the number of large-scale farms is now the lowest in the last quarter century—134,000 as compared to 205,000 in 1930, 195,000 in 1940, 175,000 in 1945, and 155,000 in 1950.

Another misleading statement used to pillory our Secretary of Agriculture is that the demand for agricultural commodities is at an alltime high; hence, we should have no surplus or price problems. There is no doubt but that domestic demand is at an alltime high. But as every student of agriculture knows, agricultural prices and use depend upon export as well as domestic demand.

For example, in 1956 over half our production of wheat, rice, and cotton was exported. We exported about one-third of our soybean and flue-cured tobacco crops. Consequently, what happens to farm prices and income depends to a great extent on what happens to export demand. One of our major agricultural problems in recent years is that we have priced ourselves out of export markets by legally required high price support levels which, at the same time, have encouraged production in foreign countries. This situation has made it necessary for this administration to undertake an extensive and costly disposal program. Through determined efforts, we are regaining our rightful share in world markets. But it is a difficult struggle and one that costs the taxpayers staggering amounts each year.

Perhaps the most vicious of all the misleading charges made against this administration is that it and it alone is responsible for the high cost of the present farm program. There is no doubt that our farm program is a costly one. The Secretary himself realizes this and is the one who, for the first time, developed and published statistics which show the cost of all the programs the Department undertakes to help farmers.

The reasons why these costs have been high in recent years are well known and are simply these:

First. This administration inherited a large inventory and commitment to acquire additional commodities when we took office in 1953. This amounted to over $3 billion.

Second. We inherited a 1953 crop program under which farmers were required to be given support at 90 percent of parity with no controls on production. This meant the Secretary of Agriculture could take no action to control production until the beginning of the 1955 marketing season by which time the CCC price support investments had jumped to over $6 billion. This was the first time the present administration had an opportunity to inject some flexibility into the price support program for agricultural commodities.

Third. We had to support the 1954 basic crop by law at 90 percent of parity which further added to the accumulation in inventories.

Fourth. We inherited farm legislation which failed to give the flexibility agriculture needs.

Now the losses this administration has incurred in price support programs in the past few years have been the losses in liquidation of these inherited surpluses. CCC losses are recorded in the year in which the commodity is moved out of inventory and not in the year in which it is acquired. These losses have been large because our major outlets have been donations and exports. Donations involve a 100 percent loss. Exports involve a large loss because United States prices have been kept so much above world levels.

The Democrats are proud of the farm program they created before we took office. Should they not at the same time accept responsibility for the results?

Perhaps no issue has invited so much discussion as has the question of farm prices.

If you would believe the Democrat Party orators you would conclude that prices moved only one way under the Democrats, that is, upward, and only one way under the Republicans, downward. All available statistics prove this is pure poppycock.

Farm prices reached their alltime peak in June 1948 as the result of war-inspired demand. They then started moving down except for a short period of time during the Korean conflict. As a result, one of the first jobs we faced was to check the sharp price decline which started under the Democrats long before this administration took office.

The demagogs never miss a chance to harp upon the plight of the small farmer, placing all the difficulties these small farmers now face at the doorstep of this administration. Waving the "magic wand" of 90 percent of parity, they claim, falsely, that all the problems of the small farmer would disappear overnight if we returned to 90-percent supports.

Now no one denies that we have a small-farm problem. The agricultural literature shows that we have had a small-farm problem for many years—far longer ago than 1953. We have had this problem because former administrations failed to take positive steps to correct it. Under the Democrats, too much emphasis was placed on price supports as the solution to the farm problem. Now we know that price support cannot be the solution because the small farmer produces too little to benefit much from price support regardless of the level. This was one of the first facts of life this administration stressed. In an effort to correct the situation, we have developed a special program tailored to the small farmer's needs in the form of the rural-development program.

Another big political football is the responsibility for agricultural surpluses. Since the surplus is one of the basic farm problems, and the Democrats bear the greatest responsibility for the surplus, it is easy to understand why they try to place the blame at the doorstep of this administration.

Unquestionably, one reason we have large agricultural production is that we are efficient producers. We have learned that we cannot control production by limiting acreage and fixing prices. This abundance would have been consumed domestically or exported if it had not been for high price supports which channeled them into Government warehouses. Again we find that it is the Democrats, not the Republicans who are responsible.

We should have learned by now that if we are to have a sound farm program we need to recognize the true facts about the program and how it operates. All of us have the same objective—namely, a farm program that will better serve the farmers and the Nation. Misleading statements and inferences do not help us achieve this goal. It is high time that demagogues stop playing politics with the farm program and think more about the welfare of the American farmer.

Improvement in Housing Conditions—Women's Conference on Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by me on the Women's Conference on Housing and its relation to conditions in the housing industry.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Because I am deeply interested in the improvement of housing conditions, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a project which promises to help this cause. This project is the Women's Conference on Housing, a meeting to be held in Washington October 14, 15, 16 to give homeowners from scores of our cities a chance to express their likes and dislikes, their needs and their hopes for the homes of today and of tomorrow.

The organizations sponsoring the Women's Conference on Housing are:

The Air Conditioning and Refrigeration Institute, Washington.

The Better Heating-Cooling Council, New York.
The Copper and Brass Research Association, New York.
The Oil Heat Institute, New York.
The National Association of Plumbing Contractors, Washington.
The National Bureau for Lathing and Plastering, Washington.
The National Association of Lumber Manufacturers, Washington.
The National Association of Home Builders, Washington.
The Plumbing Fixture Manufacturers Association, Washington.
The Portland Cement Association, Chicago.
The Structural Clay Products Institute, Washington.

Underwriting this conference are the National Association of Home Builders and the United Industry Committee for Housing. Here we see in action new forces—the builder and the manufacturer and contractor united to better the American home, to give the housewife what she wants and needs to strengthen the bonds of her family, to make the home the center of life for her children, her friends, and her neighbors.

It is interesting to me to note that the manufacturers engaged in this effort are competitive as to products—the brick industry and the lumber industry, for example—but in agreement that our homes should be improved, our communities strengthened by better planning, better building. Whatever the individual bent of these manufacturers and contractors and homebuilders, they believe that home ownership should be the first item in the American budget.

The United Industry Committee for Housing and the National Association of Home Builders are now conducting a nationwide survey of homeowner preferences, planning a conference agenda to discuss those preferences, and otherwise gearing their future to the expressed desires of the women who know best what makes a house a home.

I wish to express my welcome to the delegates who will come to Washington for the Women's Conference on Housing, and to promise that their findings and their hopes for the future will be watched attentively by the Congress.

Retirement of Hon. Alexander Smith of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by me regarding the retirement of the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The decision of the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] to retire at the end of this session is one that is a source of regret for those of us who have happily served with him.

Senator SMITH's contributions in the field of foreign affairs have been notable. Transcending this specialized field, however, has been his constant eagerness to accommodate divergent and conflicting positions on other troublesome issues before the Senate during his service here.

Without abandoning dedication to principle, Senator SMITH has, as a man of complete good will, enjoyed conspicuous success in harmonizing opposing viewpoints that at times seemed irreconcilable.

On many occasions I enjoyed serving with him when the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services conducted joint hearings on subjects of common interest, including the inquiry into the dismissal of General MacArthur and our military position in the Far East. Senator SMITH has at all times brought to such proceedings a constructive attitude and a wisdom that had a profound effect on any deliberations in which he participated.

As he returns to the tranquillity of private life I must express the high regard in which I hold him and the keen regret I feel over his leaving.

The Record of the 85th Congress as Regards the State of Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a joint statement prepared by the members of the Montana Congressional delegation, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Representative LEE METCALF, Representative LEROY ANDERSON, and myself.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Montana, in the words of one newspaper, "is the only State whose entire (Congressional) delegation works together so closely and harmoniously that their views and achievements can be and are combined in one bulletin."

This teamwork has resulted in the following 64 benefits, during the 85th Congress, of particular importance to Montanans.

CONSERVATION-RECREATION-TOURISM

1. Appropriation of $190,000 for initial development of the $1,250,000 Benton Lake Wildlife Refuge, which will assure annual production of many thousand more ducks.

2. Appropriation of $900,000 for Nation's first forest fire research laboratory, at Missoula, plus $100,000 for fire research.

3-4. Appropriation of $125,000 for research into the effects of chemical pest and plant controls upon fish and wildlife, subsequent to approval of authorizing legislation originally introduced by Montanans after DDT destroyed fish in Yellowstone River.

5. An act to add a 400-acre display pasture to the southeast corner of the National Bison Range near Ravalli to permit viewing of bison from U. S. 10A, U. S. 93, and Northern Pacific Railway.

6. An act permitting concessionaire leases in national parks to run for 30 instead of 20 years, thereby, by amortization over the longer period, permitting lower rates for park visitors and less financial strain on concessionaires.

7. Appropriation of $20 million for the Mission 66 program of modernizing national parks, as requested by the Montana delegation, instead of the $12.4 million requested by the administration. The larger appropriation permits the Mission 66 program to continue on schedule and includes $445,600 above the administration's request for Glacier National Park, with funds earmarked for headquarters, Lake McDonald and St. Mary's area for employee dormitories and residences, water and sewage systems, and other facilities. This appropriation also includes $411,000 for the lake area of Yellowstone Park and $256,400 to be used in the Canyon and Mammoth areas of Yellowstone for transmission lines, utilities, and other services.

8. Continuance at the 1958 level of the tree planting stock production program under which the State forester operates a nursery at Missoula to provide landowners with forest and wind-barrier planting stock. The Federal Government and State of Montana put from $11,000 to $14,000 each into this program annually, and landowners an additional $16,000 to $22,000. The administration proposed to cut the Federal contribution 80 percent.

9. Negotiations with Forest Service and State highway commission, following appropriation of increased funds pursuant to Federal Highway Act, leading to, construction of Grizzly Peak Road to new ski resort in Carbon County.

10. Senate approval of resolution requesting Secretary of State to bring to attention of appropriate Canadian officials the deep interest of the Senate in completion of the loop road linking Glacier National Park in United States and Waterton Lakes National Park in Canada.

11. Addition of $12 million for 1959, 1960, and 1961, by Montana members' amendment, for forest development roads and trails. Additional $525,000 of this amount apportioned to Montana in 1958 for 2 forest roads in Bitterroot National Forest ($200,000), 1 in the Flathead National Forest ($225,000), and 1 in the Deer Lodge National Forest ($100,000).

12. Appropriation of $75,107,000 for Forest Service, as compared with $68,357,000 requested by administration, for range improvement, operation outdoors, fire control, reforestation, maintenance and operations, and timber sales.

13. Increased protection of national wildlife refuges. New regulations, stemming from legislation introduced by Montanans in Congress, will provide for orderly development of oil and gas deposits under game ranges while at the same time protecting the wildlife for which these lands are being managed.

TRANSPORTATION

1. Removal of 3-percent excise tax on freight, by enactment of legislation similar to that introduced by Montana Congressional delegation early in 1957.

2. Hearings in Helena, upon request of Montana delegation, by Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, dealing with high Montana freight rates.

3. Hearing by Civil Aeronautics Board in Great Falls, upon request of Montana delegation, on Montana local (air) service case, which will be considered by CAB in Washington this fall.

4. Appropriation of funds for Chalk Butte Road near Cut Bank.

5. An act to extend to February 1, 1960, the life of the Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission, charged with studying additional highway and rail links between Alaska and the other States.

6. Appropriation of additional $3 million for public land highways for 1959, 1960, 1961, pursuant to Montanans' floor amendment, which permits construction of final portion of Lewis and Clark Highway.

7. Amendment of Forest Highway Act requiring cooperative study of forest highway formula by Bureau of Public Roads, Forest Service, and State which will lead to new formula for fund distribution. Amendment

also stopped administration from taking several hundred thousand dollars away from Montana in 1960 and 1961.

RECLAMATION

1. An act permitting establishment of adequate irrigation units on the $19.1 million East Bench unit in Beaverhead County. Water for some 28,400 acres now under ditch will be reregulated and irrigation for an additional 21,300 acres will be made possible as soon as construction funds are made available.

2. Appropriation of $2,538,000 for further work on the Helena Valley unit, for completion of pumping plant at Canyon Ferry Dam, 2.8-mile tunnel and 31 miles of main canal, and to continue construction of laterals and drains. This $12,516,000 project will furnish municipal water for the city of Helena, irrigation of 12,500 acres (some of which will start next spring) and may furnish supplemental irrigation for an additional 5,100 acres.

POWER

1–2. Allocation of funds, following approval of an act providing payment of $2.5 million to Crow Indians for Yellowtail Dam right-of-way, with provision that tribe may seek additional compensation in the courts.

3. Joint hearings by Senate Interior Committee and Senate Public Works Committee on management and operation of the upper Missouri River Basin, which helped lead to provision of 86,000 kilowatts of additional firm power to preference customers in Montana, the Dakotas, Minnesota, Iowa, and Nebraska.

4. Approval of Senate resolution, following joint hearings by Senate Interior Committee and Senate Public Works Committee, which directs these committees to continue their studies and submit findings as to ways and means of accelerating development and utilization of the natural resources of the United States.

5. Maintenance of 2-percent interest rate on REA loans, despite strong administration effort to increase rate.

AGRICULTURE

1. An act extending for 3 years the Wool Act under which wool sells at market price and domestic producers receive direct payments for the difference between the average market price and the support level.

2. An act providing bonus acreage allotments for production of durum wheat during 1957.

3. An act extending the farm export program.

4. Approval of 52,480-acre lower Willow Creek watershed project in Granite County, under which Federal Government contributes 35 percent of estimated $757,110 program of irrigation and flood-prevention work.

MINING

1. An act to extend the Defense Minerals Exploration Administration which provides Federal grants-in-aid for minerals exploration.

2. An act to increase from 5,120 acres to 10,240 acres the maximum acreage of public domain land which may be leased for the development of phosphate by any person or corporation in any one State.

3. An appropriation of $3 million which could be used, if the administration chooses, to start upgrading the $9 million Government-owned stockpile of manganese in Butte.

HEALTH

1–2. An act and appropriation of $1,750,000 for construction of community hospitals to be used by both Indians and white citizens, when the Surgeon General finds it more efficient to do so than to construct hospitals for Indian use only. Polson became the first community in the Nation to benefit from this act when it received $161,091 toward construction of a 40-bed community hospital. The communities of Wolf Point and Poplar are high on the priority list to receive aid under this program, after local problems are resolved.

3. Appropriation of $128,000 for Public Health Service to carry out its share of a cooperative study with the Bureau of Mines, of the cause and prevention of silicosis.

EDUCATION

1. Appropriation of $121,011 allocated to Montana for extending library service in rural Montana communities.

2. An amendment, to the act extending school aid to federally-impacted areas, which permits school districts to accept payments under Public Law 874 (Federal impact) without forfeiting right to seek payments under the Johnson-O'Malley (Indian education) Act, providing that duplicate payments are not made.

3. Appropriation of $360,725, or $54,380 more than last year, for the school lunch program in Montana. In addition, there will be a considerable increase in the allocation of high quality food, including protein items.

INDIANS

1. An act restoring to tribal ownership 41,450 acres on the Fort Peck Reservation and 5,481 acres on the Crow Reservation which were ceded by the tribe to the Government with the understanding that the lands would be sold and proceeds deposited to the credit of the tribe, but which were never sold.

2. An act providing compensation to the Crow Indians for 4,900 acres within the Huntley reclamation project. Under this act the tribe will get payment for the land ($70,000 to $75,000), an additional sum equal to the net revenues collected from leases since 1904 (estimated $56,000) and interest on the lease money which it should have been receiving since 1904 (estimated $30,000).

3. A detailed survey of Indian land sale practices, providing factual information upon which improved Indian land management policies may be based.

4. Initiation of successful effort to make surplus foods available to needy Indians on Montana reservations.

5. An act clearing title of Rocky Boy Indians to land previously added to their reservation.

WELFARE

1. Amendment of social security law to provide 7 percent increase in benefits, increase public assistance payments and provide benefits for dependents of disabled persons.

2. Reversal of Social Security Administration ruling, at behest of Montanans in Congress, so that victims of silicosis can receive social security benefits previously denied them.

VETERANS

1. Commitment by the Veterans' Administration to make modernization survey of Fort Harrison in September of this year instead of in 1962 as suggested by VA.

SMALL BUSINESS

1. Amendment of Small Business Act, by Montanans, to provide services of aid, counsel and assistance from SBA in Government sales, as well as procurement. This amendment was designed to meet the needs of small timber operators in Montana who will now be in a position to get advice and also borrow money from SBA for timber access road construction. Additionally, if they are unable to purchase Government timber, the small operators will be able to ask SBA to work out a set-aside sale for competitive bidding by small business.

2. Small Business Tax Revision Act, which provides small firms tax savings which can be used to finance future growth.

3. Small Business Investment Act which provides for injection of $250 million into small businesses, in the form of direct investment in the securities of small companies, or in loans.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

1. Amendments to Department of Defense appropriation bill specifically preventing reduction in funds and strengths for operation of Army National Guard and Army Reserve units. There are about 2,500 guardsmen and 5,000 Reservists in Montana.

2. Appropriation of $68,891,000 for military facilities in Montana.

GENERAL

1. An act amending the enabling act under which Montana entered the Union, to permit use of capitol building land-grant funds for reconstruction and renovation of the State capitol.

2. An act clearing title to lots in Harlowton.

3. An act to award $12,000 to the town of Medicine Lake, as compensation for the flooding of its municipal well because of flooding caused by a Fish and Wildlife Service dike and canal.

4. An act to retrocede jurisdiction over the Blackfeet Highway, previously held by the Federal Government, to the State of Montana.

5–6. Resolutions authorizing the statue of Montana cowboy-artist Charles Russell to stand temporarily in the Capitol rotunda and then be added to the permanent Statuary Hall collection.

INTERCESSION BY MONTANA DELEGATION WITH GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

1. Through negotiations with former Chairman Strauss of Atomic Energy Commission and the Small Business Administration, obtained for Roundup coal mines 100,000-ton-set-aside-coal contract in 1958 and 50,000-ton contract in 1957.

2. Obtained from Secretary of Labor surplus labor designations for Silver Bow, Flathead, Lincoln, and Meagher Counties. This designation gives affected communities preference by Government purchasers and makes it more difficult for a foreign firm to obtain a contract in this area.

3. Helped obtain from Internal Revenue Service retraction of its plans to require that purchasers sign for purchase of all firearms and ammunition and that retail salesman keep indefinitely the records of receipt and sale of the arms and ammunition. New regulations provide there will be no requirement that each purchaser sign for arms and ammunition, there will be no requirement that .22 caliber rifles and inexpensive shotguns be serially numbered, and records need be kept for only 10 years.

4. Helped obtain from Internal Revenue Service ruling that certain school expenses of teachers can be deducted for tax purposes.

5. Obtained from Internal Revenue Service decision of taxation of deferred payment wheat contracts which permits farmers to defer payment of taxes on wheat contracted in one year but paid for in a following year.

Sammy Cahn 25 Years a Songwriter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, during the month of September, one of America's greatest writers of songs, Mr.

Sammy Cahn, will celebrate his 25th anniversary as a songwriter.

Mr. Cahn is one of the most successful songwriters in the world today. He is a 14-time nominee for top academy award honors and his song, written with Jimmy Van Heusen, All the Way, was given an Oscar this year by the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences as the best song written for a motion picture, the Joker Is Wild, in 1957.

Mr. Cahn also wrote the first song written directly for a television production. This was Love and Marriage which was written for the TV production, Our Town, and it became an international best seller and was on the Hit Parade for 16 weeks.

Mr. Cahn is a dedicated songwriter. He has never lent his name to questionable music fads, but has written songs that come into the precincts of the family, and that have become a part of our treasure of American music.

America's writers of popular songs have contributed to the high morale of the American people in all times and under every vicissitude. Through wars and depressions, boom times and recession, when tragedy has stalked our paths as well as when happiness is on the faces of the American people, America's writers of songs have reflected the times in which we live, giving us songs of courage and faith in times of trouble, as well as songs of happiness and optimism.

Sammy Cahn is such a writer of songs. As one of America's greatest lyricists his succession of great and inspiring songs have over the years held top position on the Hit Parade more than 100 times. In excess of 10 million records have been made of these tunes and more than 50 million sheet music copies have reached the homes of people all over the world.

Sammy Cahn is not only a tremendously successful writer of songs, but is a very humble and grateful man, sharing the great gift God has bestowed upon him with the rest of mankind through the happiness a good song brings to people throughout the world.

The congratulations of the Nation go to Sammy Cahn upon the celebration of his 25th anniversary as a writer of America's songs.

Bridge Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an address delivered by Hon. CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, on the occasion of the dedication of the bridge across the Missouri River at St. Charles, August 16, 1958.

DEDICATION OF BRIDGE

Governor Long, members of the State cabinet, legislators of House and Senate, Mr. Whitton, officials of the Missouri State Highway Commission, Mayor Vogt, aldermen of the city, members of the chamber of commerce, distinguished visitors and friends, we dedicate today a great bridge, on a great highway, spanning a great river, in a great State and a great city, for the service of a great people.

Rivers—and especially the Missouri River, the longest and most uncontrollable in America and, with the Mississippi, the longest in the world—have been for time immemorial impassable barriers which interrupted commerce, delayed traffic, impeded progress, devastated cities, and divided peoples.

It follows that bridges are an index of civilization. Seeking a way to pass chasms too deep to climb or rivers too wide and too swift to swim, the story of bridge-building is a forward-looking chapter in the history of mankind.

Traditionally, the tide of empire has been westward. More than 2,000 years ago 25,000 men in China labored 18 years to build a stone bridge. Every vestige of that era has been swept away. Only the bridge remains. At Smyrna in Asia Minor there is a stone bridge across the Meles River which was used by Homer, the father of history, in his boyhood, and 850 years later, by the Apostle Paul on his divinely appointed mission to establish the Christian church. But today we build in America the mightiest, the strongest, the most serviceable bridges the world has yet seen, as is demonstrated here this afternoon in the year 1958.

The first highways were military highways. The Appian Way through the Roman Empire was built to facilitate the movement of Caesar's armies. Hitler's autobahn was built primarily to transport German troops and military supplies from one side of the empire to the other.

And so, the first bridges, likewise, were military in character and were protected by strong towers at either end from which the defenders repulsed the attacks of enemies seeking to use the highways to invade the homeland.

The longest bridge of ancient times was thrown across the Hellespont and across it the Persians marched 2 million men to conquer Greece. In our own history, the struggle for American independence began on a bridge—the Old North Bridge—on which the embattled farmer stood and from which he fired the shot heard round the world.

But the bridges of today are the products and instrumentalities of peace and progress. They are erected in response to economic and commercial needs and requirements and to promote the interchange of commerce, commodities, ideas, culture, and industrial prosperity.

They influence communities more directly, more permanently, and more profoundly than any other industrial development. The Eads Bridge determined once and for all the primacy of St. Louis among Mississippi River cities. It became immediately the focal rail and highway crossing of the Mississippi Valley. It directed to St. Louis the migratory routes of the Nation and centered there plants and factories, trade, financial, and industrial networks which could have been brought together so effectively in no other way.

In like manner this vast and dominating structure, which we open today to the traffic of the world, brings to this area, unerringly and inevitably, world note and world commerce which will grow and multiply with the passage of the years. St. Charles is no longer provincial. It is national. It is henceforth an integral part of a transcontinental system which reaches into every desirable avenue of thought and enterprise in the Nation. And there lies just ahead such a period of expansion and development as it has never before witnessed or dreamed of.

It is gratifying to note, incidentally, that this bridge joins and consolidates east and west highways into one great thoroughfare to be known as the Mark Twain Expressway. That name is characteristically and distinctively Missourian.

In earlier days when I went east and they learned I was from Missouri, they invariably asked me about the James boys. In later years they always asked me about Mark Twain. More copies of his books are sold today than during his lifetime.

But today when they learn I am a Missourian, they ask about our Senator SYMINGTON.

And with him, and over this great expressway, we drive ahead into a greater and better future.

But this bridge is not a mere physical structure of steel and concrete, a mere matter of money and blueprints and faultless engineering. It is wrought of the dreams of men. It not only marks the highest attainment of science and mechanics, it is a poem stretched across a river, a symphony in metal and stone, the mystical union of strength and beauty.

It is a symbol of friendship. It brings from the four corners of the world strangers who leave as friends. It beckons us. It welcomes us. It offers safe conduct to the other side. And in retrospect, it wishes us Godspeed.

And so we dedicate this bridge. With uplifted hearts and reverent faith and pride of accomplishment, we dedicate this bridge, as enduring as the pyramids, to enduring friendship with all who come this way. We dedicate this bridge to the promotion of commerce and industry, to the maintenance of safe and swift transportation, to the increased prosperity and happiness of every citizen of the State and city—and to the welfare and advancement of all mankind.

And we here, now and forever, consecrate it as an imperishable heritage to the service of generations yet to come.

Selah!

Needs of People Who Work for a Living Deserve Greater National Attention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, in these closing hours of the 85th Congress, as we try to clean up the multitude of loose ends in the flood of legislation which has been speeding through the Congressional process, I would like to take this opportunity to express my own deep concern over the lack of concern demonstrated by the Eisenhower administration over so many urgent needs of the general public.

This Democratic Congress has done, I believe, a remarkable job in drafting and enacting laws to improve living standards, increase social security benefits, guarantee the civil rights of the people, and otherwise reflect the humanitarian principles of the Democratic Party.

But the Congress, as we all know, has been rather narrowly divided between the two parties. In the Senate, for instance, the division has been 49 Democrats to 47 Republicans. It is not a situation in which the party in control

can always take uncompromising positions because frequently we have to make substantial concessions to the other side in order to assure sufficient votes for passage.

This has been true in many areas of legislation benefiting the average family. The concessions have sometimes had to be so significant that the final bill, when it emerges, is only a shell of what is was originally intended to be. The education bill is a good example of that—scholarships were eliminated in favor of loans.

HOUSING BILL DEFEATED

Even when the concessions were made, we could not always get through desirable legislation if the Republicans as a party refused to help. This happened, unfortunately, on the housing bill. The Republicans in the Congress, and Mr. Eisenhower, too, apparently preferred to have no housing legislation at all this year rather than a bill which would really spur forward in great strides the tremendous work now under way to eliminate slums and rebuild our great cities.

Philadelphia, under the leadership of former Mayor CLARK and of Mayor Dilworth, has made truly remarkable progress in urban renewal. These programs were launched, as we all know, under the Truman administration, when the urban renewal program was put on a practical basis and the pioneering legislation was enacted.

The urban renewal programs which we began in Philadelphia have become showplaces for the whole country, to demonstrate the value of this great Democratic program for rebuilding and renewing our cities and rescuing them from blight. As a result of the intense interest developed in this program by our programs in Philadelphia, every large city has now made strong demands upon the Federal funds for urban renewal.

The housing bill would have assured the steady expansion of the program. Instead, thanks to Mr. Eisenhower's opposition and the opposition of so many members of his party in the Congress, this program will slow down and die unless the new Congress can push through new legislation soon after the start of the new year.

AID TO SMALL BUSINESS

Throughout the past year, we on the Democratic side in the Congress have been deeply concerned about the business recession which has caused so many hardships in our major industrial centers. Small-business failures have been occurring at record levels. I have frequently called this fact to the attention of the House of Representatives.

Out of our concern, we have brought to enactment a far-reaching bill to provide new sources of credit for small business—a program which can rescue the hard-pressed owner of a small concern from exorbitant interest rates or impossible conditions connected with necessary loans for business purposes. The Small Business Investment Act is probably the most important piece of legislation in this field since the days of the early New Deal, when the full resources of Government were thrown into the fight against depression and businessmen found the means to borrow the money they needed at reasonable rates.

But I want to make abundantly clear that I do not believe we solve a business recession merely by lending money to business. That was the whole philosophy of the Hoover administration, and it has characterized much of the thinking of the Eisenhower administration.

The biggest need to assure prosperity is to assure, first and foremost, the purchasing power of the great mass of the public. If people have decent wages they will spend for the necessities and good things of life. If they are without jobs, or on unemployment compensation, they cannot be fulltime participants in the economy.

RECESSION BASED ON REDUCED PURCHASING POWER

We got into this tragic recession by short-sighted policies of squeezing down on credit and increasing interest rates and by neglecting the needs of the average family. As unemployment began to spread, the hardships multiplied, and soon we found ourselves deep in the morass of a depressed economy. Our major cities, as I said, joined the ranks of distressed areas—areas of substantial unemployment.

We have tried to devise plans for our National Government to follow in fighting the recession. But always, the remedies which would benefit the average family are disdainfully rejected by the Republican administration on the grounds that they would cost too much—or be inflationary—or would not be necessary.

I am reminded, of course, of Mr. Hoover waiting for prosperity to come around the corner in 1929, while the great depression continued to get worse.

For Mr. Eisenhower, too, has been waiting patiently for economic conditions to improve. That is not the way to fight unemployment. It takes imagination and boldness, not drift and apathy.

CIVIL RIGHTS ISSUE STILL URGENT

Even in the explosive field of human relations—civil rights—this dangerous policy of drift has been followed. We passed last year the first real civil-rights bill in generations, but it has not yet been used. Soon the schools will be reopening. Will the forces of decency prevail or will violence be permitted to keep American children out of classrooms?

We have known for months that the problem will arise and will be difficult to solve. But waiting for events and doing nothing to influence them, will not solve any problem—particularly one as important as this one to our Nation and to the Free World.

What a travesty it is on the traditions of American freedom that in some parts of the world the dictator countries are able to succeed in picturing Americans as inhuman beasts?

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take the time to go into great detail on all of the bills we have considered and the decisions we have reached. The 85th Congress has been a very productive one. The record is generally an outstanding one. It has been compared with the first 100 days of the first Roosevelt Congress in 1933–34. As I indicated, I think we left too many things undone and have much to do next year and the year after in the 86th Congress to continue to make this a better country for all of our people.

But I have been impressed in these past two years by the hard work and devoted effort which are necessary to get anything done of a new or progressive nature. From my husband's experience while he was a Member of Congress, I knew, in a general way, how much work and effort went into the legislative issues in which he was concerned. But now, I have seen at first hand the tremendous scope of this work.

CONGRESSIONAL WORKLOAD VERY HEAVY

I have tried in these past 2 years to learn as much as possible of the day-to-day operations of the Congress. I think my record for attendance has been an outstanding one. The Rules of the House are extremely complex, and learning them is a career in itself. I have tried to do my homework on legislation while also keeping up with all of the problems in my own Congressional District in Philadelphia. It has been hard work—very hard work. But I have never known any work more satisfying or more challenging.

I am grateful to the people of the Second Congressional District of Pennsylvania for having selected me in November 1956, to fill the unexpired term of my late husband in the 84th Congress and for election to the full term in the 85th. Thus, while I have actually been in office only since November 1956, I am for the purposes of committee seniority now completing my second term in the Congress, and this, of course, is a major advantage both for me and for the people I represent.

GRATEFUL TO DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP

I want to thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the Democratic leadership generally, and the dean of our own Philadelphia delegation, Congressman WILLIAM J. GREEN, Jr., and all my colleagues, for the many courtesies and the great assistance they have extended to me in innumerable ways during the past 2 years.

These have been challenging years involving many difficult decisions and much hard work. I have tried in every way to represent the best interests of all of the people of my District and of the whole country.

The needs of our people are the most important responsibility of Congress. The needs of the people who work for a living deserve much greater national attention. In social security, FHA and GI housing, unemployment compensation, education, the working conditions and pay of Government employees—on these and many, many other things we have compiled a generally good record. But there is so much yet to be done. The work of Congress is never finished. New problems present themselves and must be solved.

It is a great and wonderful thing for me to have the opportunity, in behalf of the people of my District in Philadelphia, to try to help solve these urgent national problems. I shall continue to try with all my might to do the best job I can. Thank you.

Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson at Colfax, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, it was my great honor and pleasure to have the distinguished Secretary of Agriculture visit my Congressional District, and to be privileged to introduce him to the vast crowd that attended the Tractorama, at Colfax, Ill. On this occasion there was on display the newest farm equipment, and on this occasion our Secretary of Agriculture delivered a very inspiring address.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am placing in the RECORD my speech introducing him and his fine speech to the farmers from all parts of the country who were present.

This is the third annual Tractorama. You see here today more dramatic and more emphatic than any words of mine what is, and has been, taking place in agriculture. What you see here today in mechanical equipment says more graphically than anything I might say how the science of farming has changed.

The number of farms throughout the country has been decreasing, but their size and production have been increasing. We have been experiencing an agricultural revolution, just as at one time in our history we experienced an industrial revolution. The industrial revolution ushered in the machine age, new and faster modes of transportation, on water, on land, and in the air. In due course, through the inventive genius of man the machine has been applied to farming. This is all a part of progress.

With the rapid transition from farming by horse and plow to farming by power-operated equipment there has inevitably arisen many problems, both to the individual farmer and to the country as a whole. But however pressing and however grave those problems may be, we will solve them. The American people have always been, and will continue to be, a people of imagination, ingenuity, and determination. That is why we are the most productive and the most powerful nation in the world.

Such events as this contribute immeasurably for giving us, as farmers and as city dwellers, as producers and as consumers, a better understanding of the Nation's overall agricultural developments and our mutuality of interests. As producers and as consumers we must work together for a sound solution of those problems that confront the farmer.

It is indeed a great honor for me to be invited to participate on this program. I have the distinct honor of introducing to you our distinguished guest speaker—the Nation's No. 1 farmer.

Perhaps, in the light of his duties and responsibilities as our Secretary of Agriculture, and especially in view of his personal dedication to a faithful discharge of those duties and responsibilities, it would be more accurate to say that our distinguished guest is the Nation's No. 1 farmhand. While an Idaho dirt farmer in his own right, he has devoted practically his entire life to serving the farmers. At one time he owned and operated his own farm; and, while so doing, he served as a county agricultural agent.

Beginning with his early college days at the Utah State Agriculture College, he has devoted his life to farming and farm problems—always seeking new opportunities and larger areas for service, and always assuming heavier duties and graver responsibilities in the service of agriculture.

His has been a life of service. Today he is our Secretary of Agriculture, the Nation's No. 1 farmhand, if you will, for that is the way he looks at his present job. He is daily working tirelessly for your welfare and for the welfare of all the farmers throughout the country.

I shall not take the time to tell you what our distinguished guest has accomplished, in spite of many obstacles placed in his way.

It has been my rare privilege to work closely with our distinguished guest speaker. I know him well. And the more I know him the greater becomes my admiration and respect for him. No man ever served in public office more devoted to public service. Whether you agree or disagree with what he advocates, there is no denying the fact that what he advocates is not based on any political consideration but simply on what he believes to be right. He is a man of high principle, firm in his convictions and with the courage of his convictions. He seeks only to serve, and he is serving well all of us who are so deeply interested in agricuture.

It is my high privilege and great honor to present to you our beloved Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable EZRA TAFT BENSON.

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE EZRA TAFT BENSON

It is an honor and privilege for me to be here today and to have been introduced by Congressman ARENDS.

As I look over this display of mechanical might here today, I recall my early days on the farm and the machinery, or lack of it, that my good wife and I had at our disposal. Many of you here can share similar memories with me. We've come a long way in a short lifetime.

The power and versatility of this equipment also reminds me that last month at a county fair near Washington I watched a pulling exhibition of draft horses. They are wonderful animals and I thrilled as I watched them perform. I began driving horses on a spike-tooth harrow as a 5-year-old and at 16 I was driving 8 head on a harvester. I've never been able to get as much of a thrill out of driving an automobile as I did from handling a good team. I love horses and ride at every opportunity.

But the workhorse is almost gone and with it an era has ended. It is difficult to realize that in our lifetimes we have witnessed this tremendous technological revolution that has done so much to change farming from a small, self-sufficient enterprise to a business.

This has meant great advancements in farm production and efficiency and has done wonders to promote the standard of living of farm families. It has meant, too, problems of adjustment between what almost amounts to two different ways of life.

We have moved from a world of horses, steam threshing machines, setting hens, country butter, family orchards, and general farming to a streamlined, mechanized, commercialized, specialized type of farming.

The farming business is no longer a simple way of life.

In but 17 years farmers increased their ownership of tractors from 1.5 million to 4.5 million; of grain combines from 190,000 to 1 million, and of milking machines from 175,000 to more than 700,000.

In short, we have substituted mechanical power for muscle power.

We are in the midst of that adjustment period now. Our agriculture is dynamic, and ever changing. We must keep an awareness of this as we face up to our problems. Our solutions must not be political panaceas, but programs based on the tradition of free enterprise in this the greatest of free nations.

We are concerned here today with the mechanics of farming and all that this implies. Farm mechanization is a continuing story of remarkable progress—progress made possible by the farmer, by industry, by government, and by the research scientists.

All four groups have important roles in developing mechanical equipment and the techniques for using them effectively, safely, and without damage to the greatest of all our natural resources, our soil.

Much of the push behind the rapid mechanization of agriculture is due to the vigorous and highly competitive farm machinery industry. This event today and tomorrow is a perfect example of this. The farm tractor companies represented here are not present to sell their products, although I suspect they have some interest in that aspect of the show.

They are here, rather, to sell better methods of farming to the men and women of the soil who have become the most efficient farmers in the world. Only a scant few years ago, in 1950 to be exact, the American farmer produced enough for himself and 14 others. Today he produces enough for himself and 23 others. Tomorrow who knows? Compare this with that well-known country in Europe which is trying to overtake us in farm production. There the farmer produces only enough for himself and three others.

Not only is the American farmer the most efficient in the world, he is also, I am sure, the most resourceful. Through his unequaled ingenuity he has been the source of many of the improvements in farm implements.

Much of the credit for these marvels of our mechanical age, of course, belongs to the brains, imagination, and competitiveness of American industry. I salute the companies represented here today and the many others who under our system of free enterprise have contributed to the productivity and abundance of this blessed land.

Credit must be given not only to the manufacturer and the farmer, but also to the man who harmonizes these operations, the research scientist.

Without our scientists and engineers, the farmer would not have been able to use his machinery properly and effectively. This research, conducted jointly by industry, the Department of Agriculture and State experiment stations, is all important.

I am speaking of three specific fields of research:

1. Research by engineers to establish principles for designing equipment especially suited to farm needs.

2. Research by crop breeders to develop varieties well suited to mechanized production.

3. Research by soil scientists to establish guides for using machinery on our land with the least amount of damage to our soil.

Some of you here may remember when the first cornpickers came to market more than 50 years ago. There are a number of reasons why they did not become popular immediately. One reason was that corn of the open-pollinated variety was not suited to mechanical harvest. The stalks were not strong enough. The ears were at various heights.

Scientists were just beginning then the basic studies that gave us hybrids.

So our crop breeder scientists went to work to suit the crop to the machine. The hybrid was developed from inbred lines that would produce corn more suited to machines—hybrids with stalks that would remain erect until harvest and with ears of uniform height.

The first of these were becoming available in the twenties when the tractor-mounted cornpicker was placed on the market. In the past 20 years we have watched the cornpicker follow hybrids into fields across the country. More recently, the cornpicker sheller has come into the picture.

In 1940, before hybrids were well established and machinery fully used, it took 33 man-hours to produce 100 bushels of corn in Illinois. With machinery and techniques in use today, the job can be done in just one-third of the time.

And further progress is in sight.

Experimentally, engineers and scientists in Federal-State research are producing good yields of corn with only three operations in the field:

1. When the corn is planted.

2. When additional chemicals for weed control are applied.

3. When the crop is harvested.

This not only saves labor, but more important, it will also protect our land. Too much use of heavy machinery can damage soils. Scientists have been aware of this for many years. They know some soils are more susceptible to damage than others. Recently, engineers have devised a strain-gage that can be planted in the soil for tillage tests. This will help in gaining better understanding of the effects of heavy machinery on soils.

The conservation of the land of our heritage has long been a vital concern to us. We in the Department have many services designed to protect and conserve this basic resource. We are constantly striving through educational and assistance programs to help farmers keep land not only productive for themselves but for the generations to come.

Only 2 weeks ago I attended the National Plowing Contests and Conservation Exposition. I imagine some of you here today were present at that affair in Hershey, Pa.

There we were reminded in the midst of acreage of great beauty that we are stewards of the soil and that we are entrusted with these magnificent resources of soil and water, grass, timber, and wildlife.

They have been entrusted to us by the Almighty to use wisely, to safeguard jealously, to improve diligently, and to pass them on in a better condition than when we received them.

To do less than this might well be to imperil the future of our Nation—and to jeopardize freedom, the most precious of our American birthrights.

This duty to preserve the soil must constantly be borne in mind as we find new and more efficient methods of causing the land to yield more and more of its abundance.

Although we have made enormous progress in farm mechanization, we haven't moved ahead at the same rate in all types of work.

Our big gains have been in the mechanization of field crops. We haven't done nearly so well in adapting machinery to the production of fruits and vegetables. And many of the chores around the farmstead are done today just as they were in grandfather's day.

In the past 20 years, here in Illinois, the labor required to produce 100 pounds of milk has been reduced by 1 hour and 12 minutes—or 36 percent. The labor required to produce 100 pounds of pork has been reduced by 24 minutes—or 14 percent. And that to produce 100 pounds of beef has been cut by 12 minutes—or 6 percent.

Meanwhile, there has been a great increase in the number of farms with electric power—from less than 4 in 10 at the beginning of World War II to more than 9 in 10 today. Nearly all of your farms are now receiving power from a central service.

At the same time, the farm equipment industry has developed many improvements for farmstead mechanization. On the market today are self-feeders and automatic watering tanks, self-unloading wagons, conveyors and blowers, tractor feed scoops, and gutter cleaners.

You have the power. Much of the machinery is available. The big task is to fit these things together into a labor-saving system that is well engineered and is economically sound.

We are making progress toward that goal. And here too, teamwork among scientists and engineers of many specialities is helping to get the job done.

I came to Washington in 1953 with only one purpose in mind—to do the best possible job I could for farmers. I am still in Washington and I am still dedicated to doing the best possible job I can for our farm families and all of our people.

Here are the things this administration stands for:

1. Freedom to plant. This means freedom to grow what you wish on your own farms. Not what some bureaucrat thinks you should grow.

2. Freedom for farmers to make their own management decisions. I believe and I know you believe that we can't run the Nation's farms from a desk in Washington.

3. Getting rid of every undesirable control and taking the shackles off farmers' efficiency. You American farmers are the most efficient in the world and we should not only be grateful for this, we should take advantage of it.

4. Building farm markets at home and abroad. We must accept the fact that in order to sell goods we must price them to sell—there is no satisfactory substitute for markets.

5. Getting food into stomachs instead of storage. Farm products are meant to go to market and a Government warehouse is not a market.

6. Helping all farmers to help themselves, especially those on smaller farms.

7. Using our ability to produce abundance for the blessing it really is.

Many of us have fought hard for this program and we have made progress. Not all of our problems are behind us by any means. It is well at times to take stock and see where we've been and what we've accomplished. Let's take a minute to do this now.

When this administration came into office in 1953 we found farm prices skidding downward and a large and fast growing stockpile of farm commodities. The production throttle had been left wide open with unrealistic Government price fixing that was losing us markets at home and abroad.

Price support provisions with bipartisan support had been enacted in 1948 which would have done much to prevent this. Both political parties endorsed a wider range of price supports in their 1948 platforms. But the act of 1948 was never allowed to take effect.

Had it gone into effect we would now have a more efficient agriculture, a stronger economy, fewer controls and more freedom, no need for a Soil Bank and huge surplus disposal programs.

In the past 5½ years we have done everything we could to remove the chains of unsound price supports and rid agriculture of the burden of price-depressing surpluses.

As soon as we could—in 1954—we introduced a measure of flexibility—all Congress would give us—into the price-support program. By law it did not become effective until 1955 and then the range was so narrow—82½ to 90—that it helped very little.

In the 85th Congress just ended we increased the range of price supports on a few crops. This is encouraging as it indicates a growing realization by the Congress of the merit of this policy. This wider range of supports will help meet our problems in cotton, rice, and corn when they begin to take effect in the next year or two.

We secured enactment of legislation which has helped and is helping to pull down our surpluses.

We obtained, and have used to the limit, legislation to speed up the movement of farm commodities—especially surplus commodities—into markets at home and abroad.

We started a rural development program to aid rural people in underdeveloped areas.

Appropriations for agricultural research have been increased by 95 percent since 1953. We are especially emphasizing marketing and utilization research—that is, new outlets and new uses for farm foods and fiber.

These have been sound and progressive steps—every one of them. And they have been effective. During the past 2 years the agricultural situation brightened and in the past few months has been the brightest spot in our national economic picture. There is no recession in agriculture.

Of course, there are bound to be some fluctuations in prices, such as we are experiencing now. In fact, it is normal for prices to change seasonally, particularly in the fall as the crops are harvested.

I am grateful that the first half of this year showed a net rise in income for farmers of 22 percent over the first half of last year. Crops are bountiful and prices are above last year. We can all be thankful for that.

There is a brighter light shining into the future, too.

Crippling allotments and artificial pricing have been a ball and chain on agriculture. It has had the effect of freezing agriculture in uneconomic patterns, destroying markets and piling up surpluses.

Fortunately, we were able to achieve in Congress another major step in reducing this handicap. Although it is not all the administration sought, the new farm law is based on the sound principle that a wider range of price supports will lead to expanded markets.

It will help our cotton, corn, and rice producers.

The new law takes a firm step toward making cotton more competitive with synthetic fibers and more competitive in world markets, and it will permit a wider use of our cotton by domestic mills.

It widens the range of price supports and provides greater acreage for cotton and rice.

It makes available a wider range of price supports for all corn producers and gives them an opportunity to decide on acreage restrictions by referendum not later than December 15 of this year.

If the majority of corn producers voting in the referendum approve, acreage allotments in the commercial corn area will be discontinued. If the majority disapprove, acreage allotments for corn will continue in effect. Price support will be continued in either case, but a different support is provided in case acreage allotments are discontinued.

Farmers voted against corn allotments in the referendum held in December 1956. At that time over 61 percent of the corn producers voting indicated that they preferred eliminating the allotments; but since a two-thirds majority was required in that instance, the allotment program remained in effect. Then farmers voted again, this time with their corn planters. Only 14 percent of the 1957 production in the commercial-corn area was eligible for price support, because relatively few farmers complied with their allotments.

Here in Illinois, about 80 percent of the farmers voting in the December 1956 referendum favored ending the allotments. And in 1957 only 1 acre in 7 was planted within the corn acreage allotment program.

The Congress continued the special school milk program, just as it was about to expire and deny milk to the thousands of children in summer schools and camps. After a costly delay, the Congress also extended the act

permitting us to market our surplus foods and fibers abroad. It also extended the National Wool Act which is designed to stimulate production of a deficit commodity.

But while we achieved some gains in legislation this year and although the farm economy is bright, some aspects of the agriculture problem are still with us. We need to continue to move forward.

Overplanting of corn, as we have been here [illegible] me in mind of hogs. The favorable prices for hogs in recent months in relation to feed costs may have encouraged some farmers to plan to increase their hog production.

I should like to again caution farmers that favorable hog prices can be maintained only if production is held to the quantity and quality that can be sold in the market place. An overexpansion in hog production will lead inevitably to lower prices and less income and unnecessary problems.

We still have problems in some commodities such as wheat and tobacco. Our wheat carryover looms large and we are continuing to lose our tobacco markets.

The cost-price squeeze still exists as a basic problem, because the damage was done years ago. During the period from 1940 to 1952, the index of prices paid by farmers increased more than 100 percent. Since then we have largely checked this rise in costs. From January 1953 through June 1958, this index rose only 7 percent.

We shall continue to face our problems realistically, and work with dedication toward their proper solution, holding always to this firm belief that under this blessed free enterprise system, we must steadily move toward freedom, freedom for farmers to plant, freedom to compete, to market, and to make their own decisions, free from any dictatorial dogmas from a desk in Washington.

We have made progress as you have seen. Let us take a glance at some of these results:

Realized net income of farm operators in the first half of 1958 was at an annual rate of approximately $13.3 billion, 22 percent higher than in the first half of 1957. Gross farm income in the first half of 1958 was the highest on record.

Income per person on farms, from all sources, was $967 in 1957, 8 percent higher than in 1956, and the highest since 1951 during the Korean war. And this average may well set a new record in 1958.

Farm assets are at an alltime high—$188 billion as of January 1, 1958.

Farm ownership is also at a record high. Two out of every three farms are free of mortgage debt.

The postwar downtrend in prices which started in 1951 has been stopped and turned up. Prices received by farmers in the first half of 1958 were 8 percent above a year ago and 10 percent above 2 years ago.

Farm exports set a new alltime high record in 1957 and continue at a high level in 1958.

The buildup of surpluses has been reversed. Government investment in surplus farm products owned and under loan has dropped about one-eighth in the past year and a half.

The standard of living on farms is the highest in history, based on the percentage of farms with electricity, telephones, automobiles, and the purchasing power of the average value of farm products sold or traded.

Such facts, and there are many more, shows great farm progress. Agriculture is marching forward.

As agriculture and our Nation march forward together, let us remember that there is no other span of time so bountifully endowed as the years of our generation. We occupy a very special spot of the world's surface at a very special time in history.

We have achieved this enviable position, due in no small measure, I believe, to our heritage of freedom and spiritual values. It is part of my religious faith that the God of Heaven guided the Founding Fathers in establishing this Nation.

It will continue to be a land of freedom and faith as long as we are able and willing to advance in the light of sound and enduring principles of right.

We exist in a world half slave and half free. There are those among us and about us who would snatch away our freedom if given the opportunity. We must be eternally on our guard against them.

Our challenge is to keep America strong—strong economically, strong socially, and, above all, spiritually strong—so that our way of life may endure.

Let us here today rededicate ourselves to keeping our Nation strong and free. Let us firmly resist every move to socialize and regiment our lives. We who are concerned with the cultivation and preservation of the soil have a specific task. We must constantly work toward an expanding, prosperous, and free agriculture.

If we achieve this—and we must, and will with the help of Almighty God—we will have done our small part in this life to preserve the principles laid down by the Founding Fathers of this great and blessed United States of America.

God grant that we may remain ever mindful of our blessed heritage and of our duty to preserve our free-enterprise system and our American way of life for our children and the generations as yet unborn.

America in Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, in recent writings, Lt. Gen. James Gavin has warned that America is in mortal danger.

The junior Senator from Massachusetts has reacted to the danger by a brash, imbalanced, and myopic speech of generalities with no detailed remedies. His apparent philosophy that we take a bow to Russian superiority, even before Russia is superior, and adopt the underdog strategy, constitutes great dangers in themselves.

I agree with General Gavin that we are in mortal danger. I believe this danger is even greater than he has realized, especially since Senator KENNEDY has spoken.

The Soviet strategy in the cold war is not bound by military objectives. It extends to the economic, psychological, and political fields. The Reds delight in making pretended attacks to distract their opponent into weak positions. Having thus made a sucker of the victim, they then attack the exposed flank.

The KENNEDY philosophy, I fear, will open up our flanks.

I do not believe the young man who has such lofty ambitions realizes that we must be wary of the mystification and deception of Soviet strategy. We cannot forecast with accuracy the exact pattern of zigzags, ebbs and flows, feints and spoofs the Russians will use.

But what we can do is to retain the initiative, not be trapped into false moves, and never give in to the defeatist attitude of adopting an underdog strategy.

The military danger confronting us is great, and General Gavin has tried in a constructive way to alert us to it.

But will not someone equally authoritative sound the alarm to economic danger?

The architect of communism, Karl Marx, predicted the fall of the West through the bloodless revolution rising from capitalistic bankruptcy. Sacrosanct to the true Communist is the belief that the fall of American way of life will come inevitably through a foreordained historical process seated in an economic dialectic.

Remember, Hitler did exactly what he notified the sleeping world he would do in Mein Kampf. The Communists might keep their word also.

The greatest danger in the Soviet threat is its multiplicity.

Yet multiplicity is not new to military problems. General Gavin has pointed out that he grew up reading the classical volumes of The Great Captains, by Col. Theodore Dodge.

The theme of Colonel Dodge's work is that the so-called great captains of history—Alexander, Hannibal, Caesar, Gustavus, Frederick, and Napoleon—were more than just brilliant battlefield generals. Their perception extended far beyond the clash of arms. They saw war as a whole and realized it is possible to win without a battle.

The great strategist of the future will be he who can see through and meet the multiplicity of the Soviet threat.

He will see total war, limited war, ideological infiltration, internal subversion, political maneuvers, and economic tactics as but the many facets of Soviet overall strategy.

Like the other great captains, he will realize that the response to this challenge certainly is not to fight a thousand battles on a thousand fronts.

That spells exhaustion.

He will follow Napoleon's sacred dictum that the best general is he who can separate the secondary from the vital, even in the fog of war.

He will recall that Hannibal won his most brilliant victory by leading the enemy at Cannae into a false attack on his center. As the Romans poured their legions into the jaws of Hannibal's yawning trap, his reserves closed in on their flanks and rear to consummate the classic encirclement of all military history.

The masters of the Kremlin hope to lead America into a Cannae.

If they can so mystify and mislead us into false and rash buildups, it will be easy for them to close the trap.

We cannot predict the exact design of the Soviet grand strategy, any more than the Romans could have predicted Hannibal's design. For deception is the heart of good strategy.

But we can do what the Romans did not do—we can look in more directions than one.

As head of research and development for the Army, General Gavin made an inestimable contribution to our country. Naturally, he concentrated on the Army's particular phase of the problem.

But now he has put aside the uniform. He has the opportunity to make a greater contribution to our country by looking in more directions than one. I hope that now he will take the time to study the grand strategical problems confronting our country in the economic, political, and psychological fields, as well as the battlefield problems of brush fire war. In this way, he can help us avoid a Cannae.

If General Gavin thinks as did such military intellectuals as Dodge, Von Clausewitz, Jomini, and Mahan, the concept of economy of force will take paramount position. Frederick the Great expressed it when he warned that the general who tries to be equally strong everywhere will end up being strong nowhere.

Misguided and reckless spending of energy in all directions has afforded time and again the prelude to crushing defeat.

In military history, the masters of strategy all recognized this.

When it seemed that Richmond would fall in 1862, that brilliant Confederate strategist, Stonewall Jackson, raced down the Shenandoah with a microscopic army to threaten Washington. The weakhearted defeatists panicked and forced Lincoln to retard McClellan's offensive on Richmond, which could have ended the Civil War.

Panic and defeatism destroy economy of force.

Panic and defeatism confuse the important and unimportant, and sap brilliant chances of success through fear of failure.

This leads to a consideration of Senator KENNEDY's remarks.

The comparison is obvious. Panicky inhabitants of Washington wanted Lincoln to adopt the underdog strategy when the greatest advances were being made on Richmond. They were suckers to the Confederate deception.

President Eisenhower is doing all possible to preserve our economy of force so that America can act at the decisive time and at the decisive place in the dangerous decades ahead. Granted, more money could be used in building defenses in all areas of the Soviet threat.

We could spend and spend.

We could initiate crash program after crash program.

But by listening to the cries of the defeatists who would forfeit the true initiative to the Soviet and accept the strategy of the underdog, we would walk into the trap of Cannae.

In the dangerous decades ahead, it is important that Members of Congress afford administrations constructive criticism. I strongly support Senator KENNEDY's efforts to point out the danger facing us. But, I strongly deplore his destructive and defeatist psychology propelling panic and fear.

His remarks were vague generalities. Afterward, Senator CAPEHART attempted again and again to extract from him some specific recommendations. About all the junior Senator from Massachusetts could offer was the suggestion that we build more submarines and airtankers and do more work on the Polaris.

He displayed no idea how much more money should be spent by the Military Establishment, and he begged off answers by saying he was not a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

By recommending that we follow the strategy of the underdog he actually encouraged further Soviet aggression. His timing of such remarks while our Nation was negotiating in the United Nations over important and sensitive issues was most irresponsible and deplorable.

His sense of history was out of kilter when he implied that his present role resembled that of Churchill warning England against the aggression of Hitler in the 1930's. For Churchill was always positive, and magnified the basic spiritual and moral strength of the great English-speaking peoples.

Senator KENNEDY has minimized our assets and maximized our liabilities.

Churchill demanded that the English seize the initiative from Hitler.

Senator KENNEDY asked that we forfeit the initiative to the Kremlin.

Churchill found counsel in his courage.

Senator KENNEDY found counsel in his fears.

In viewing the so-called missile lag, Senator KENNEDY entirely skipped the heart of the problem, which had been so well struck by Wernher von Braun.

When Russia fired her first sputnik, Von Braun assigned the responsibility:

> The main reason is that the United States had no ballistic missile program worth mentioning between 1945 and 1951. These 6 years, during which the Russians obviously laid the groundwork for their large rocket program, are irretrievably lost * * * thus our present dilemma is not due to the fact that we are not working hard enough now, but that we did not work hard enough during the first 6 to 10 years after the war.

There is a great gap between what Senator KENNEDY preaches and what his own party practices. Ninety-nine percent of the money spent on long- and medium-range guided missiles has been spent by the Republicans. As late as May 1957, the Democratic-controlled House of Representatives voted to slash $75 million from the Air Force missile development program. At that time, President Eisenhower clearly warned what would happen if Congress sustained such cuts.

President Eisenhower said:

> I believe the country would be taking a needless gamble. For myself, I have seen unwise military cuts before * * * I am determined to do all I can to see that we do not follow that foolhardy road again.

I suggest that Senator KENNEDY attempt to get his own house in order before pushing the panic button for the Nation.

Quite unlike Senator KENNEDY's negative generalities are General Gavin's specific comments on certain aspects of the defense problem.

But I hope that General Gavin will take a fuller view by studying the entire picture of our economy of force vis-a-vis Russia.

I am sorry that his book did not examine the psychology behind the missile blindness that occurred in the administration from 1945 to 1951. In both 1947 and 1950 our long-range missile program was brought to a standstill when Harry Truman impounded funds against the advice of competent military advisers. A close study of these disastrous years might help us avoid similar pitfalls in the future.

Since General Gavin does not concern himself with these decisive years, he attributed the weapons development lag exclusively to the decision-making process in our National Government. When he wrote his book, he was convinced that the most serious problem in the decision-making process lay in the organization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He wanted stronger centralized authority and a more powerful military staff reporting directly to the Secretary of Defense.

General Gavin's thinking, basically if not specifically, is in line with President Eisenhower's when he presented his defense reorganization plan. It was the Democrat-controlled Congress which watered down those Presidential proposals intended to prevent another Pearl Harbor and speed up decision-making time.

It is interesting to note that General Gavin has nothing but high praise for Mr. McElroy.

General Gavin is very concerned over our capability of waging limited war. The Republican administration is not spending as much money in this area as the general would like. I certainly agree that both parties should give close attention in the next Congress to General Gavin's proposals for the Army of the future.

At the same time, it should be noted that the Republican administration has done far more in answering the needs of brush fire wars than did the previous administration. I quote from General Gavin's own comment on Korea:

> Korea was for the Army a bitter and costly experience. When the North Koreans invaded, General MacArthur scraped together two companies of infantry and a battery of artillery and some supporting weapons and had the force flown to Korea. It was all that our limited airlift could transport. Thus the great might of this industrial nation, 5 years after the defeat of the Axis Powers, could airlift no more than 2 rifle companies and a battery of artillery to meet 6 aggressor divisions.

Contrast the delayed and piecemeal commitment of our forces to Korea, which nearly resulted in a Communist conquest of that peninsula, with the mobile and effective protective action of our forces in Lebanon.

General Gavin notes that the finest strategy is that which makes it unnecessary to fight a battle. This was the strategy which the administration applied in the Mediterranean. Its overall implications resulted in a serious rift in Russo-Chinese solidarity and Khrushchev consequently backing out of a U. N. summit meeting.

I think it is important that writers like General Gavin stress the role of our Army in supervising and technically supporting the vast armies of our allies throughout the world. The Army can be tremendously proud of its part in training and shaping the forces of such allies as Korea, Turkey, and Indochina. These men on the ground serve as a very

real and effective deterrent to creeping aggression.

Except for them, we would have been nibbled to death long ago.

So the role of our Army cannot be measured in terms of its combat division strength any longer.

The divisions of our allies, as well as our entire mutual security program, represent a part of our strength on the ground.

And, finally, we must all consider fully the danger of pricing ourselves out of survival. For the threat of inflation is just as deadly to General Gavin's army as is the threat of enemy missiles.

The diminishing value of the dollar and the increased cost of labor has already subverted part of our missile production program—so General Gavin admits.

The true perspective in the dangerous decades ahead can only be gained from looking in more directions than one.

We are confronted with the strategy of Cannae.

We must see the Soviet threats as a part of a grand strategical scheme to mystify, mislead, and distract.

And as we vie with the Soviets in the fields of missiles, rockets, and submarines, we must remember that panic, defeatism, and wild spending are the sure road into the Soviet trap.

We must preserve our economy of force, our initiative, and our economic health for the day when an enemy might descend on our flanks and rear.

The Overton Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, previously I have given facts and figures to show the widespread use of our inland waterways throughout the Nation. These figures are remarkable in that the use of our waterways surpasses anything the Engineers who planned and constructed these waterways envisioned.

Every part of Louisiana save northwest Louisiana has water transportation available. In New Orleans, Baton Rouge, Lake Charles, and even in Monroe, inland waterways are available to shippers. So as to meet this need for northwest Louisiana, the Army Engineers have drawn up plans for the Overton Waterway, running from Shreveport to the mouth of the Red River and emptying in the Atchafalaya. Congress has implemented already these plans to the extent of providing $400,000 and we have proceeded deliberately with them. The plans are now ripe to where with additional funds for engineering we ought to be able to proceed with this waterway which will mean so much to central and northwest Louisiana.

The highway program is consuming tens of millions of dollars. It is extremely important. This entire canal, 204 miles in length from Shreveport to the mouth of the Red River, can easily be built for less money than is being spent now for 10 miles of interstate expressway through some of our cities.

The amount of good which will come from this canal construction will compare, in my judgment, with any interstate expressway being built in the United States.

Representative Robert J. McIntosh Reports to Residents of Seventh District of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. McINTOSH
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. McINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD my report to the residents of the Seventh District of Michigan on major legislation and my activities as their representative in the 85th Congress. I also take this opportunity to thank my constituents for the helpful comments, observations, and recommendations submitted to me.

The 2d session of the 85th Congress was one of the longest, busiest, and most expensive in history. Looking at its record of solid accomplishments, it will be viewed as a constructive session, although the large amounts of additional spending are cause for justifiable concern.

Less than one-half of President Eisenhower's legislative recommendations were adopted by the Democrat-controlled Congress. However, because of bipartisan recognition that the basic problems of our times are those of preserving freedom and avoiding war, the President did obtain approval of his major recommendations affecting our national security.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The President's recommendations on important legislation in the field of national defense and foreign affairs received approval in the Congress. I supported this legislation which included: continuation of our mutual security program; 4-year extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; reorganization of Defense Department, giving wide authority to Secretary of Defense, subject to Congressional review; establishment of new agency for space exploration; creation of independent Federal Aviation Agency for safe and efficient use of airspace by civil and military aircraft.

NATIONAL ECONOMY AND DOMESTIC AFFAIRS

Among measures of national importance favorably enacted by Congress, to which I gave my support, were the following: Pay increases for postal and Federal workers and annuitants, as well as armed services personnel; 7 percent boost in social-security benefits; public disclosure of pension and welfare plan operations; removal of freight excise tax; minor tax relief, as well as long-term loan and investment aid for small business; extension of unemployment compensation benefits; Federal guaranty of $500 million in loans to railroads to finance new equipment; price labeling of new automobiles by manufacturers to protect purchasers; $3.26 billion in Federal funds for interstate highway construction; statehood for Alaska; adjustment of postage rates to put Post Office Department nearer a paying basis.

ALASKA STATEHOOD

The admission of Alaska into the Union is proof to the entire Free World that the United States does not approve of colonialism; it evidences our desire to give our dependent areas the maximum of self-government obtainable.

POSTAL LEGISLATION

The Congress responded to the long pressing need for adjusting postal rates to reduce the deficit being paid by taxpayers. Since World War II, the average annual deficit has increased to about $445 million. The fact is that, since 1950, every hour the taxpayers have had to put up more than $50,000 for someone else's postage. When all the postal-rate adjustments under the new law have become effective, annual postal revenues will be increased by $550 million.

The new law establishes a postal policy for the determination of postal rates, and represents the first time in over 100 years that a comprehensive set of ground rules has been laid down to serve as a guide for the Congress in its ratemaking legislation and for the Post Office Department in making its recommendations to the Congress, on the basis of review, study, and survey for each class and kind of postal service or facility.

EDUCATION

The Congress passed the National Defense Education Act which makes long-term, low-interest loans available to college students and assists in providing adequate science and laboratory facilities in high schools and public junior colleges. I was pleased to have the opportunity to work closely with other Members of Congress in the development of the student loan program. The bill also provides fellowships for teachers and grants to States for strengthening guidance, counseling, and testing services, and for area vocational education programs. The legislation, as finally enacted, except for the omission of a scholarship program, closely parallels the recommendations of the President, and it represents a positive step toward mobilizing our potential resources of talented manpower more effectively through the establishment of several related programs.

AGRICULTURE

After considerable delay occasioned by disagreements over cotton and rice programs, Congress finally approved a major farm bill adjusting support levels and acreage allotments in line with Secretary Benson's recommendations. The only portion of the bill directly affecting

Seventh District farmers is that of the proposed new corn program. Under the new law farmers will choose between the present corn program and a new one which would abandon commercial area designation, abolish acreage allotments, and set price supports at 90 percent of the average market price for the preceding 3 years, but not less than 65 percent of parity.

Federal activities of special interest to the Seventh District of Michigan are as follows:

POST OFFICE CONSTRUCTION

The completion of post office projects at Port Huron, Mount Clemens, St. Clair Shores, and East Detroit climaxes years of great improvement in the postal facilities of the Thumb District, bringing new and improved post offices to 25 communities. A number of projects are in the planning stage, but the backlog of postal construction in the District has been broken. The result will be better service from your Post Office Department, as well as better working conditions for postal employees.

RURAL MAIL SERVICE

Toward the close of the session, the Post Office Department announced that rural mail delivery service would be extended to serve an average of two families per mile. I was gratified by this announcement, since I had introduced legislation earlier to make postal service available to every residence, farm, or business situated on an improved road. In my opinion, our rural areas are entitled to the services of our Post Office Department just as city dwellers are, and I shall continue my efforts in this regard.

SELFRIDGE AIR FORCE BASE

The great airbase at Selfridge Field, for so many years important to our national defense and to the economy of our District, is slated to play an even more important role in the future. Over $28 million has been appropriated during the 85th Congress for its expansion and improvement. I am personally pleased with the developments at Selfridge Field, not only because of its value to the economy of the District but also because my last assignment during World War II was as an instructor pilot at Selfridge Field.

DEFENSE CONTRACTS

Over $65 million in defense contracts have been placed this year in the Seventh District, providing an important stimulant to our economy. This sizable amount has been made possible, in large part, by the development of missile production within the District.

NAVIGATION, FLOOD CONTROL, AND RECREATIONAL BOATING

Representing the "Thumb," which has a better claim to the title "Water Wonderland" than any other Congressional District in the State, I work closely with the United States Corps of Engineers, the Michigan Waterways Commission, and local groups interested in navigation, flood control, and recreational boating in our area. Good progress is being made. The Corps of Engineers has engaged in dredging projects in the Clinton River in Macomb County and the Sebewaing River in Huron County. The Port Austin Harbor of Refuge is also now in the construction stage. Several smaller dredging projects have been completed, including removal of navigational hazards in the Belle River at Marine City.

The omnibus rivers and harbors flood-control bill, approved by the President after the Congress removed objectionable projects, contains the preliminary authorization for the flood-control project on the Saginaw River, which is important to drainage problems in the counties of Sanilac, Tuscola, Lapeer, and part of St. Clair. It also contains authority to the Secretary of the Army to make surveys for flood control and allied purposes on all streams flowing into Lake St. Clair and the Detroit River.

At my request, the Coast Guard has announced plans to install improved waterway-channel markings and lights in the Lake St. Clair area. The House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, of which I am a member, developed and guided through the Congress the small-boat safety bill. Both of these actions are important to the Seventh District of Michigan, since we have one of the greatest concentrations of recreational boats in the United States. The legislation will contribute to safe boating in our area.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL PROJECTS

It has been a pleasure for me to work with and assist, wherever possible, local governing bodies in their participation in existing Federal programs. Substantial Federal participation was approved for the construction of the Community Hospital at Cass City and the Macomb County Health Center at Mount Clemens and of sewage-treatment plants at Almont, Imlay City, Marlette, St. Clair, and Lapeer.

School districts in Warren, Roseville, St. Clair Shores, Mount Clemens, Centerline, Fraser, New Baltimore, Algonac, Van Dyke, Otter Lake, and East Detroit have benefited under legislation providing assistance for the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities.

Urban renewal programs in Port Huron and Mount Clemens have made good progress, and preliminary approval was recently obtained for the St. Clair Shores urban-renewal program.

FEDERAL JUDGESHIP FOR EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

It is regrettable that the Congress adjourned without acting on legislation to create an additional Federal judgeship for the eastern district of Michigan. I shall renew my efforts in this regard at the beginning of the next Congress.

I have also been conferring with the appropriate authorities here in Washington in an endeavor to reestablish regular Federal court facilities at Port Huron.

MILITARY ACADEMIES

Some 200 young men from the Seventh District have participated in three preliminary qualifying examinations by the Civil Service Commission, in which they have competed for nominations to the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Merchant Marine Academies. I wish to express my appreciation to the schools in my District, as well as to the press and radio, for their excellent response to my request for assistance in acquainting young men with this fine opportunity.

MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

As a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I have attended hearings in many parts of the country. These hearings are conducted under the committee's authority to make investigations of un-American propaganda activities, in an effort to aid Congress in adopting any necessary remedial legislation.

REPORTS AND CORRESPONDENCE TO DISTRICT

While the Congress has been in session, I have written weekly newsletters, as well as periodic reports. I am sure you are familiar with my weekly broadcasts over radio stations WLEW, WDOG, WMPC, WTTH, and WHLS.

I always welcome the opportunity to be of any possible service in response to your inquiries and requests. These have involved problems dealing with servicemen's hardship cases, disability pensions, housing needs, social security, income tax, copyright and patent applications, postal route extensions, Soil Bank program, birth records, child adoption, small-business loans, immigration and naturalization, passports, and civil service and railroad retirement claims.

If the problem is one in which I cannot be of direct assistance, I always try to make recommendations, based upon the experience I have gained serving as your Representative here in the Congress. In a number of instances involving immigration matters and claims which could not be administratively settled, I have succeeded in introducing special legislation.

Early this year I mailed a questionnaire to residents of the District, asking your views on vital issues facing the Congress. Your responses were of great assistance to me in reaching my position on these important matters and brought me still closer to the people of the District in my effort to serve them in Washington.

PERSONAL VISITS

During the adjournment of Congress, it is my practice to travel through the District to discuss legislative problems personally with you. I always try to place myself within a few miles of every resident of the District. This year during the month of September I shall be in the District on my mobile office tour, during which I look forward to meeting and discussing with you matters of national interest or any individual problems you may have with the Federal Government.

My Washington office, located at room 1215 in the New House Office Building, remains open all year round. In addition, I maintain District offices in Mount Clemens and Port Huron.

Please feel free to write me any time at 1215 House Office Building, Washington 25, D. C.

CONCLUSION

As my first term in Congress draws to a close, I hope that my efforts to serve the

District and to bring Washington closer to you have met with your approval. It is my sincere desire to serve always in a manner so as to merit the confidence and trust placed in me by the residents of the Seventh District. It is also my wish to know my District so that I can solve its problems in a manner compatible with the national interest.

Special Report on Federal Scholarship Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, you will no doubt remember that since March 1956, your Congressman has been fighting for and sponsoring this type of legislation. After consulting and corresponding with the deans of 149 accredited engineering schools in the United States, my bill was prepared—with their cooperation, as well as with the cooperation of the National Science Foundation—and presented to Congress in May 1956. Although there was a hearing held by the committee considering this bill, it died with the adjournment of the 84th Congress.

In January 1947, I reintroduced this measure and fought hard to have some consideration given to the measure. It took sputnik—and Russia—to awaken the present administration to the seriousness of the situation, and in October 1957—after sputnik—President Eisenhower took action, on the part of the administration, and suggested legislation along the same lines as mine to encourage and help students further their education.

Similar bills were presented by numerous other Congressmen after the President's speech and hearings were held discussing all the various bills. The present legislation is a compromise between the House and Senate bills on this subject, as well as the administration's suggestions.

Your Congressman voted for the present bill, which is now law, although he feels that it is inadequate—but, at least, it is a step in the right direction.

As written, the bill deals with three different classifications, and I will try to outline them so that you may have a concise résumé of what opportunities are available to students, States, and private nonprofit schools.

Student opportunities: At the college level, $295 million has been set aside for long-term, low interest loans to bright but needy students. This amount will cover the years 1959 to 1962, and will be apportioned in ratio to the number of students enrolled full time in institutions of higher education in each State.

Preference will be given to students with a superior academic background who express a desire to teach in elementary and secondary schools in the subjects of science, mathematics, engineering, or a modern foreign language.

The college or university must agree to establish a student loan fund and provide for deposit in the fund $100 for every $900 loaned by the Federal Government; assure that the fund will be used only for loans to students; and provide that such loans will be easily obtained by eligible students.

No student may borrow more than $5,000 in a 5-year period. The repayment of this loan begins 1 year after the student ceases having a full-time course of study, and the interest on this loan will be 3 percent. It must be paid within 10 years; however, extension will be granted for good cause or it can be paid off sooner if desired.

If a student, upon graduation, teaches for 5 years in a public elementary or secondary school, 50 percent of the loan is cancelled.

To secure a loan, the student must apply through the college or university he, or she, is attending—and it is upon its recommendaiton to the Commissioner of Education, Mr. Lawrence G. Derthick, that the loans will be granted.

No college or university will be permitted more than $250,000 in loans per year.

At the graduate level: $59.4 million has been set aside for fellowships from 1959 to 1962.

This grant was made for the purpose of increasing the number of students in graduate programs, particularly those interested in teaching in institutions of higher learning—colleges and universities. It is an outright grant and the graduate student receiving a fellowship will receive $2,000 the first year of graduate study, $2,200 the second year and $2,400 the third and final year. $400 each year, will be paid in addition to the above, for each dependent.

The college or university, attended by the fellowship holder, will be paid a portion of the cost of the graduate program—not more than $2,500 per year per student.

To be eligible, the student must be accepted in a graduate school program that has been approved and accepted by the Commissioner of Education.

One thousand fellowships will be awarded 1959, and 1,500 in 1960, 1961 and 1962.

State opportunities: State school systems will participate in four parts of the 4-year program. The State Governments will share the costs with the Federal Government on a dollar-for-dollar basis.

State plans are required in order for each State to obtain its share of the money allocated, and the Commissioner of Education has scheduled meetings for the next three weeks to advise the chief school officer of each State on drawing up State plans.

The four fields for State participation are:

First. Grants to State educational agencies for loans to local agencies for the acquisition of laboratory or other special equipment for science, mathematics, or modern foreign language teaching in public elementary or secondary schools or junior colleges. Also for minor remodeling of laboratories.

Second. Grants to State educational agencies to help them establish and maintain programs of testing and guidance and counseling in secondary schools—both public and private—additional funds will be added for private schools if needed.

Commissioner of Education will contract with colleges and universities for short term or regular session to provide training of teachers preparing to engage in this work and such trainees will receive $75 per week—plus $15 per week for each dependent—during their training period.

A similar grant covers the training of teachers of modern foreign languages. It is in two programs, however. Students attending special schools for teaching modern foreign languages—and related instruction necessary to a full understanding of the countries involved—on a scholarship basis—one-half paid by the State and one-half paid by Federal Government—must be available to teach in a college or university or for service of a public nature.

Students can attend a similar training course—as guidance and counseling—who are teachers and train for supervising or training of teachers in public and elementary schools. Such trainees will receive $75 per week plus $15 for each dependent.

Third. Grants to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1946 were authorized to States to assist them in training individuals for employment as highly skilled technicians in occupations requiring scientific knowledge in fields necessary for the national defense.

Fourth. Grants will be made to assist the States to improve and strengthen their educational statistical services. If no such service exists now, they can start such a program.

Private and nonprofit schools: Loans to nonprofit, private elementary, and secondary schools for the acquisition of laboratories or other special equipment for science, mathematics, or modern foreign language teaching were provided for in this bill.

Such loans must be paid back in not more than 10 years and will bear an interest rate of one-fourth of 1 percent, plus what the Federal Government pays in interest on loans.

Eighteen million dollars set aside for research on visual teaching aids: Grants or contracts can be made by the Commissioner of Education—with the approval of the Advisory Council—with public or nonprofit agencies, organizations and individuals and private agencies, organizations, and individuals, for projects of research and experimentation in more effective use of television, radio, motion pictures, and related mediums for educational purposes.

The results of this research will be made available to State and local educational agencies and to colleges and universities.

Trade Association Political Action: Who Else Will Assume the Responsibility?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, I believe the following speech which I gave at the Ohio Trade Association Executives Conference—cosponsored by the Ohio State University and the Ohio State Council of Retail Merchants—Granville Inn, near Columbus, Ohio, brings up to date some new material that shows we are no longer a labor-socialist government, as we have been for some time, but a welfare state, which is more devastating, economically and morally, than socialism itself.

The speech follows:

TRADE ASSOCIATION POLITICAL ACTION: WHO ELSE WILL ASSUME THE RESPONSIBILITY?

Businessmen, trade associations, and chambers of commerce can no longer wait on George to attend to politics. Businessmen must do it themselves because it's their special job. For politics and labor, now so largely one and the same thing, burdens, interferes with, and destroys their business more than all the other factors in business combined.

This burden, this overhead cost of politics (national, State, and local) is now, according to the United States Department of Commerce, $128 billion annually. Total national production is $350 billion. So, at least 36 percent of the overhead cost of doing business is politics. It must all be paid for by business.

This is to say nothing of the slowdowns and featherbedding imposed on business by labor bosses and the bureaus and the ever-increasing laws and regulations that cost business another 35 percent annually. That's an estimate of the potential production that society loses because business is already weighted down by a ball and chain.

It is now becoming apparent, as some students have insisted, that whenever overhead costs of politics go above 10 percent of the national product, or $35 billion in our case, the burden is intolerable. It cannot be passed on to the consumer. When that overhead runs above 10 percent, and on up to about 23 percent, it must be paid by partial liquidation. That's being done to us now.

Taxes are taking, and weakening, and reducing in size our industrial plants. The starting of new plants by small business is slowed up.

Politics refuses to allow sufficient depreciation to be deducted as an expense of business. That leaves too little income after taxes for improvements, replacements and expansion. And there is too little income to pay artificially high wages. To meet these troubles there is an unbelievable forced political conversion of our accumulated wealth into debt.

From 23 percent to 36 percent of the overhead cost mentioned is being paid by inflation forced on business. This is the most wicked of all political deceptions.

Will businessmen continue to stand aside in stupid isolation or will they fight?

Another thing, roughly 35 percent of all dividends paid by their concerns are taxed away from their stockholders. So where can you find new capital?

The effects are already obvious in coal, steel, the automobile industry. The railroads are no longer self-sustaining. The hotel industry has shown a steadily declining percentage of room occupancy for 12 years straight. What a mess is our theater business.

The consumer is balking.

It would be fantastic to think that a modern business executive would let any part of his ordinary overhead costs fall into the hands of mere volunteers or untrained incompetent persons. Certainly not persons wholly unknown to 95 percent of the employers of the Nation. A test count shows that only 5 percent of the employers know how their Congressmen vote in this critical area of management of their business. These unknown men force onto industry an annual cost of $900 per worker in fringe benefits. Wage increases run as high as 7 percent annually. They should not exceed 2.1 percent, as you know.

What politics doesn't force upon business, labor organizations often times do by force and violence on the picket line—or by the threat of force and violence. Businessmen sitting on the other side of the bargaining table are no longer free men.

According to the newly elected president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Mr. William A. McDonald, in his speech on May 20 before the Connecticut State Chamber of Commerce in Hartford, the corporate industry as a whole showed a steady decline in net profit, after taxes, from 1948 when it was 9.2 percent, to 1957 when it dropped to 5.9 percent. Notes explaining why dividends are reduced are more frequent.

Who are these Congressmen unknown to the employers and businessmen of America, men who breathe down the necks of all departments of business?

A majority in Congress today favor a considerable part of 50 measures advocated by the welfare State program, and a majority votes for most of the measures in that program.

These include public housing, minimum wages, Federal aid to education, school construction, middle income housing, increase of the income tax, increase of the public debt, rent control, price and wage controls, foreign aid, mutual security act, subsidies for all manner of agricultural crops and health measures, the taking of power plants and irrigation projects from private ownership into public ownership. AFL–CIO welfare state government loans about one-fifth of all loans made in this country, and, of course, vast sums abroad.

Besides, they vote for an ever-increasing amount of foreign aid to the welfare states and Socialist governments abroad.

They vote to finance 700 wholly Government-owned business corporations. And so on.

If these activities were liquidated and Government employees reduced to legitimate numbers, viz, about 1 million instead of 2,400,000, all corporate taxes could be repealed.

More than 190 Members of the House of Representatives have voted right, according to labor's published reports more than 50 percent of the time.

I have with me the score sheets. As long as the supply lasts, you are welcome to them. I also have for several of the States, campaign contributions to elect Members to the House of Representatives. The score of performance is opposite each Member's name.

For example, I have before me the State of New Jersey.

FRANK THOMPSON, Democrat, received from the national labor organizations $1,750 for campaign funds. He voted 100 percent right for them.

PETER RODINO, Democrat, $3,150. He voted 98 percent right.

HUGH J. ADDONIZIO, Democrat, $2,650. He voted 98.1 percent right.

ALFRED SIEMINSKI, Democrat, $500. He voted 100 percent right.

GORDON CANFIELD, Republican, $500. He voted 75 percent right.

We know by experience that Representatives' campaign costs run often 10 times the amount of money reported; that is, $50,000 to $60,000 per candidate provided by AFL–CIO. I'm ashamed to mention that organized Republican business spends little or nothing on Republican campaigns except as individual businessmen give through the national or Congressional committees. Generally it amounts to $500 per candidate. Sometimes $1,000. Never above $2,500. Republican candidates are lucky if they can scrape together, all told, $15,000 each from friends and from their own pockets.

Besides the foregoing, there is the power of the labor press, a tremendous institution, half of which is devoted to political action. Republican candidates have nothing comparable to that in their support.

It must be also remembered that labor unions often spend more money trying to defeat conservatives, both Republicans and Democrats, than they do to elect their own candidates.

For example, in the States of Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio, labor reported to Congress in 1956, $29,800 to elect their own nominees, contributed by 8 labor organizations. At the same time they spent $132,110 to defeat candidates too conservative for their liking. The score is devastating. There are now left in Congress not more than 125 staunch conservatives (Republicans and Democrats) out of a total of 435 Members.

Take, for example, the State of Missouri. In 1948 before AFL–CIO got busy in politics, the State was represented by two Republican Senators. It had 13 Congressional Districts, 9 of which were held by Republicans. In less than 10 years tables are more than reversed. Now there is but 1 Republican out of 11 Districts.

The two Senators are Democrats supported by AFL–CIO. At least 10 Representatives are AFL–CIO approved and supported. Four of them vote 100 percent right according to AFL–CIO scoring. Three others have 93 percent, 80 percent, and 86 percent scores. None vote less than 61 percent of the time favorable to AFL–CIO programs. All but four got direct financial aid.

If labor organizations can do this in 10 years, why can't the business leadership make an even better showing for the reestablishment of sound government—limited constitutional government?

Indeed, it is doubtful if the labor bosses have ever really controlled more than 10 percent of the labor vote. But, that has been sufficient, by and large, to swing the balance in favor of AFL–CIO candidates. Less than 5 percent of the vote will determine whether candidates for Congress from a hundred districts will be conservative or socialist in character. The vote is that close.

I have used the words "welfare state" to describe our present political experiment.

We have already passed through our socialistic experiments. We shifted property from private hands into government ownership and operation; viz, the Tennessee Valley powerplants.

We have found socialism, a ridiculous economic scheme, utterly corrupt. It is a blight on every enterprise it touches and on every nation that has tried it.

The evil that grips us is not socialism, but the welfare state. That is, the compulsory taking of property from some and giving it outright in the name of humanity to other groups in return for their votes. It is the most evil of all concepts because it destroys not only the economic, but the moral foundations as well.

Government sets the pattern. It becomes the arbiter of what is right and wrong.

The policeman is no longer confined to the business of keeping law and order. He is entering our houses himself, by force, at night, and carrying off our furniture to be redistributed on the other side of town where, according to his judgment, the people need furniture more desperately than those he robs. If there are objections raised to his outrageous conduct, he arranges a community vote at the townhall. If the majority approve his depredation, he carries on without further interruption.

Here again both law and morals require that the trade associations, as well as all men, grapple with that policeman and stop him. Likewise, they are enjoined to stop and capture all Robin Hoods and their bands of outlaws wherever they appear across the land.

The mechanics of political action are as follows:

First of all, organized business must bring together a dozen leaders, business and professional, in each Congressional District, to do two things:

(a) Agree on what principles of government they believe in. If they don't know, their Congressmen will not know, either. They must stand firm on what the legitimate functions of government are, and reject as firmly the illegitimate ones. If they do not, no principle of government will emerge. Time to evolve a faith, a belief in what is right and wrong for government to do is required work. That means the natural and moral limitations on the functions of government must be formulated as a basis for political action.

If we want any part of the welfare state, we've got it. There will be nothing further to do but let things take their course. We shall continue to be governed by what pops out of the heads of mere men from day to day.

But, if we believe that politics without a principle of government is one of the deadly sins, then there is plenty of work to do.

Government must be reconfined to the business of protecting life, liberty, and property at home and from foreign enemies.

Businessmen may expect the people to follow their leadership in politics if they are inspired by sound principles of government for the good of all.

It follows that they must rid themselves entirely from all suspicion that they may use the power of politics to get any special favors or advantages for themselves.

(b) Cooperate with regular political parties to help find suitable candidates for Congress and the State legislatures. If candidates are not found and pledged to the right concepts of government, the people will continue to be ruled over by mere volunteers, many of whom have wrong concepts.

Find the right candidates to serve long before the primaries. Realize it takes time to pledge candidates to sound principles and to be able to assure them of adequate organized support.

Leading citizens who undertake this work will soon realize that willing and suitable candidates for high office are very hard to find. They prefer to stay in their regular business or profession.

The necessary information, research and organizational work in these first things to be done should be the work of regular paid staffs of the trade associations. We must recognize that this job of finding, electing and continuing to support men pledged to preserve freedom is definitely a professional job, a continuous job, a very burdensome one, a mass movement. The great reward is freedom itself.

Get the facts to show the impact politics and labor have on the annual results of all business.

Shame your fellow business friends and associates into a realization of the extent to which the more important political factors in their businesses are left almost wholly to volunteers. Don't let the genius of business confine itself to the lesser critical factors having to do with the success or failure of business.

Show that business is so deeply in politics business executives cannot stay out. Their self-imposed isolation from politics is over. Nor can they be afraid. They must fight.

Urge that your local business associations become active in political affairs immediately. Persuade individual corporations to do the same. Some are already coming forward. This means organizing to ring doorbells, to establish telephone brigades, to collect political contributions. It means registration and voting drives.

Insist that State and national business and professional associations, chambers of commerce, and other conservative organizations to which you undoubtedly belong begin to produce the kind of "educational" political material your local organizations for political action need.

Trade associations: Will you get the facts? Will you find out what the Representatives in the House and Senate are doing, how they are voting, whom they represent, who put them there, who paid for their campaign, and what the real effect of union political action has been?

Of utmost importance is a detailed comparison, issue by issue, between individual voting records and the stated political principles your business associations advocate.

You will lose no members advancing constitutional principles or the candidates committed to those principles. If you don't, you certainly will.

If the businessmen of America who already have and are paying for thousands of associations, chambers of commerce, etc., won't see to it that men are elected committed to restoring constitutional government, who else will?

If they do not, the labor bosses will continue to set aside the constitutional limitations on government and substitute the unlimited power of the labor-welfare state instead. Our labor bosses are closely associated with the world labor bosses who have already taken the nations in the rest of the world into socialism or communism with 2 or 3 exceptions.

As was stated by Donald R. Richberg, in his latest study of union power, entitled "Labor Union Monopoly", "labor's economic monopoly and political power are preparing the way for communism far more effectively than the Communists themselves."

Business organizations and associations must provide the leadership, the money, and the manpower for Americans for constitutional political action. And they must do it now.

Results of Annual Questionnaire Sent to Constituents by Hon. Wayne L. Hays, of Ohio

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the results of my annual questionnaire.

The replies to the questionnaire this year have been very encouraging and the many comments by those replying were particularly interesting. More than 2,500 questionnaires have been returned, giving an excellent cross section of the thinking in the 18th Congressional District of Ohio.

I am very grateful to all who took the time to fill out and return the questionnaire. The answers have been of great help to me in my job as their Representative.

The questionnaire and results follow:

ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE

The following are some questions pending before the Congress on which it will be helpful to me to have the opinion of my constituents. I hope you will take the time to answer, and may I say that your answers will be held in strict confidence, and how any single individual may answer these questions will not be revealed to anyone. If you care to make additional comment, please use the other side of the sheet.

	Total		Percentages	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Do you approve continuing United States foreign aid in our competition with the Soviet Union in the present cold war?	1,366	948	59	41
2. Do you approve extending the Trade Agreements Act for 5 years and authorizing a 25 percent reduction in any duty existing July 1, 1958?	872	1,222	42	58
3. Do you approve the agreement between the United States and Russia to increase their cultural, technical, educational, and sports exchanges?	1,736	640	73	27
4. Do you favor placing a single organization in charge of the development of all United States long-range missiles?	1,528	742	67	33
5. Do you approve spending Federal funds to build hospitals, highways, schools, flood-control projects, etc., to stimulate our economy when needed?	1,878	520	78	22
6. In economic recessions, do you favor a reduction in Federal income tax rates even though Federal spending exceeds estimated revenues?	704	1,668	30	70
7. Do you approve extending the life of the Small Business Administration with increased authority to make business loans and disaster loans?	1,984	710	74	26
8. Do you approve Federal grants to States to improve instruction in the fields of science, mathematics and languages, and Federal scholarships to be awarded by State agencies?	1,500	838	64	36
9. Do you approve increasing the present pay of our postal workers, Federal civilian employees, and members of our Armed Forces?	1,464	816	64	36
10. Do you approve increasing rates on out-of-town 1st-class mail to 5 cents?	1,252	1,164	51	49

Please check 5 of the following 16 issues you think most important today:

(a) Government spending	1,102
(b) Balancing the budget	628
(c) Reduction of debt of Federal Government	742
(d) Taxation	718
(e) Farm prices and policies	660
(f) Policies regarding small business and industry	602
(g) American foreign policy	1,010
(h) United States foreign trade policies	636
(i) Control of communism in America	1,228
(j) Labor policies	1,118
(k) Defense and war preparedness	870
(l) Maintaining peace	1,046
(m) Corruption in Government	718
(n) Administration of outer space programs	242
(o) Promotion of science	518
(p) Civil rights	444

Report on Major Legislation, 2d Session, 85th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. PAT JENNINGS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, each week during the time Congress is in session I prepare a legislative report for distribution in my District. This is a part of my efforts to keep my constituents advised of Congressional action on legislation affecting them.

As this 2d session of the 85th Congress ends, I have prepared—as an extension of these weekly reports—a brief summary of the major legislation approved during the almost 8 months of this session. Also, I include information on projects of special interest to the Ninth District of Virginia.

In my annual report last year, as the first session was concluded, I predicted that this Congress would go down in history as one of the most responsible to ever serve the people of this Nation. My prediction, I believe, has been borne out by the outstanding legislative record of this second session. I am extremely proud to have served as a Member of this Congress, which has acted upon many, many complex problems and issues in writing this record of achievement.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

The increased necessity to maintain an adequate defense program overshadowed every other action of the Congress and resulted in much important legislation being approved. Early in the session, $54.6 million was authorized for the expansion of missile bases and warning systems, and the Advanced Research Projects Agency was created within the Department of Defense. A major action was approval of the bill to reorganize the Department of Defense so that it can operate more effectively for the national security. Authorized, also, was new construction at military installations and for the Nation's reserves; new and expanded facilities for the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics; a program of ship construction and modernization; the building of an atomic-powered destroyer; and funds for the Atomic Energy Commission.

Realizing the urgency of the need, Congress approved the establishment of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to direct and conduct our program of space research and development; $47.8 million was authorized for construction of a new space projects center and expansion of satellite launching and tracking facilities.

The regular Department of Defense appropriation bill granted over $39.6 billion for the activities of this vital Government department. The Congress' concern over the national security is reflected in the increased defense funds approved above the budget request.

APPROPRIATIONS

Congress devotes a great deal of time each year to the appropriation bills for the several governmental departments. There were 14 regular appropriation bills for fiscal year 1959, and there was a supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1959 to provide funds for newly authorized activities or to increase the funds granted under the regular bills. The total approved in appropriations was over $67.7 billion, which was more than $596 million below the budget estimates submitted to Congress by the administration. There were also supplemental and deficiency appropriations for fiscal year 1958 totaling almost $4.9 billion, making the approximate total appropriated by Congress over $73.6 billion. The 1958 appropriation bills were also reduced, resulting in a total of $619.1 million being cut from the budget requests. The second session of the Congress did not cut the budget nearly as much as the first session, when approximately $5 billion was saved by reductions. Increased appropriations for fiscal year 1959 resulted from many reasons, national defense and programs to combat the recession being among the most important.

SMALL BUSINESS

This has been a significant session of Congress for the Nation's small-business men. First, we have made the Small Business Administration—SBA—a permanent agency of the Government. The ceiling on SBA individual loans was raised and the interest rate reduced. Second, the Small Business Investment Act was approved to authorize $250 million for long-term equity capital for small business through investment companies chartered for that purpose. Third, a tax bill was approved that, through its several provisions, will result in an estimated $260 million in tax relief for small business.

TAXES

Despite expectations of such action when the 1st session of the 85th Congress adjourned, Congress this year did not approve any general tax reduction. Extensive hearings on tax bills were held by the House Ways and Means Committee, but increased Government spending prevented any general tax bill from being reported. In addition to the small business tax bill, a measure was approved to extend the present corporate income tax rate and the existing schedule of certain excise taxes. This bill was amended to remove the 3 percent transportation tax on freight and the 4-cents-per-ton tax on coal. Two other bills of importance made several technical and clarifying changes in the excise, income, estate, and gift tax provisions of the tax laws, and provided some tax reductions.

Since these changes are numerous and cover many people and businesses, I will be pleased to provide answers to any questions on them.

SERVICEMEN AND VETERANS

The major bill for military personnel in the second session provided pay increases of $577 million a year to encourage career service. Such pay incentives should have a most favorable effect on the retention of trained military specialists, who are becoming more and more important in today's Armed Forces. Another bill extended the unemployment compensation program to all ex-servicemen.

Several veterans bills approved included: An increase in monthly pension rates for widows of the Spanish-American, Indian, Mexican, and Civil War veterans and the providing of pensions to widows of Confederate veterans and to the two surviving Confederate veterans; an increase in benefits payable for total disability under the National Life Insurance Act; increased burial allowance for deceased veterans from $150 to $250; the consolidation into a single act all laws administered by the VA; and improvements in the housing program mentioned later in this report.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

When the 2d session of the 85th Congress convened last January, the Nation faced a serious and growing economic recession. We have approved several bills aimed at curbing this recession and bringing about an improved economic outlook. Among the most important were: An emergency $1.8 billion housing act to stimulate home-building, reducing downpayments on FHA-financed houses, extending the guaranty and direct loan programs for veterans and increasing funds for FNMA mortgage purchases; an increase of $4 billion in the authorization for FHA insurance; an authorization and apportionment among the States of $5.5 billion for highway construction, including $1.8 billion additional to both the regular Federal aid and interstate highway programs; approval of legislation to extend to the States, on an optional basis, additional unemployment compensation for the unemployed whose benefits had expired; approval of an expansive program of assistance to areas of the Nation with chronic unemployment and underemployment; assistance to the Nation's railroads, including guaranty of loans to finance new equipment, meet operating expenses and other obligations; extension of the Federal Airport Act under which the Federal Government participates in the construction of local airports; authorization of flood control and

navigation improvement projects totaling $1.5 billion.

SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH AND WELFARE

The Social Security Amendments of 1958 provide for an approximate 7 percent increase in benefits for those persons now receiving monthly checks, liberalizes the provisions regarding benefits for the disabled and their dependents, and strengthens the financial basis of the system.

Receiving Congressional final approval also were: a 3-year extension of the hospital survey and construction—Hill-Burton Act; a bill to require registration, reports, and full disclosure of employee welfare and pension funds; the extension of the school-milk program for 3 years; an increase in annuities to retired or disabled civil service employees; distribution of surplus foods in nonprofit children's summer camps; a strengthening of the law against use of mails or common carriers for transportation of obscene or crime-inciting matter; a prohibition against the sale of switchblade knives in interstate commerce; and a 3-year extension of the $30 million per year program of matching grants for construction of facilities for research into cancer, heart disease, arthritis, and other killing disease.

EDUCATION

We have authorized a far-reaching program of aid to education known as the National Defense Education Act. This legislation provides loans to students in institutions of higher education and financial assistance for the strengthening of science, math, and modern language instruction, and for guidance, counseling, and testing programs. It has been estimated that Virginia would receive almost $3.4 million under the initial authorization with $832,000 becoming available this year. Also, we have extended the existing Federal assistance program for federally impacted school districts.

AGRICULTURAL

I serve on the House Agriculture Committee. We devoted many days and weeks to hearings on the farm bills introduced in the House with 19 subcommittees at work. The first bill approved by both Houses barred a reduction of farm 1958 price supports below 1957 levels, and, also, any cuts in acreage allotments for 2 years. This bill, aimed at economic improvements for the Nation's farmers, was vetoed by the President. After a dedicated effort by the House committee, an omnibus bill was reported but turned down by the House because of Secretary Benson's and the administration's opposition. Late in the session final approval was given to an amended version of a bill pertaining to cotton, corn, rice, other feed grains, and extending the Wool Act for 3 years. Other agricultural bills provided for an 18-month extension of Public Law 480, under which surplus agricultural products are sold abroad for foreign currencies and bartered for strategic materials; the establishing of humane slaughter regulations; extension of the authority to grant special livestock loans; continuation of the authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to administer the soil-conservation program on a national basis; the granting of authority to prevent monopolistic practices in the meat industry; and a change in the tobacco regulations to prohibit the growing and harvesting of sucker tobacco.

I believe the House Agriculture Committee will begin hearings early in the next Congress on new farm legislation.

MAJOR MISCELLANEOUS

Action on a variety of bills not classified under a specific heading include: increasing the national debt limit; approving Alaska as a new State in the Union; requiring automobile manufacturers to clearly label their product as to suggested price and other information of interest to the buyer; increasing postal rates; establishing the Federal Aviation Agency to regulate air traffic and promote safety in the air; granting a cost-of-living pay raise to postal and classified Government workers; providing pensions and clerical staff for former Presidents; and passing a freedom of information bill to limit authority of agencies and officials to withhold information and public documents; and a requirement that food additives be adequately tested and found safe before being sold to the public. A 4-year extension of the reciprocal trade program was approved and provisions strengthened to safeguard domestic industries from imports. An expanding trade program is, of course, vital to the Nation's economic future.

NINTH DISTRICT PROJECTS

Provided in the public works appropriation bill were $200,000 in additional planning funds for the Pound River flood-control reservoir in Dickenson County. This makes a total of $300,000 granted for this project and I have already requested the Corps of Engineers to budget sufficient funds for fiscal year 1960 to complete planning and begin construction of this facility. Also, $10,000 was provided for further surveys and investigation of the feasibility of the Haysi Reservoir in Dickenson County. During this session of Congress I have continued to seek expedited action on Corps of Engineers' studies of possible flood protection for several Ninth District communities. These surveys have included to date: Big Stone Gap, Bluefield, Cleveland, Clintwood, Coeburn, Fort Blackmore, Grundy, Haysi, Pound, Pulaski, and the Richlands-Doran-Raven area. Before Congress will adopt authorizing legislation or appropriate funds for such projects, the engineers must make a favorable report on the economic feasibility. Funds have been included in the independent offices appropriation bill for the construction of the Abingdon Federal building, which was authorized in 1955 and which has not been started under the old lease-purchase program. Other post-office buildings are being provided in the Ninth District under the commercial leasing program.

Airports are being developed in several Ninth District areas and I have been pleased to cooperate in the securing of Federal funds for these projects. Federal allocations have already been made for New River Valley Airport, near Dublin; the Lonesome Pine Airport, near Wise; the Mountain Empire Airport, near Marion; and the Richlands Municipal Airport. I am hopeful that a Federal contribution can also be made this year for the proposed Grundy Municipal Airport. Funds have been made available this year for Army National Guard armories at Gate City and Big Stone Gap. I am also seeking such allocations for National Guard construction at Richlands and Pulaski, and for Army Reserve facilities at Abingdon and Marion.

JENNINGS BILLS

Consideration has been given to several bills I introduced in both the 1st and 2d sessions of the 85th Congress. I plan to introduce again next year certain bills that were not approved. Among the measures I proposed: a bill relating to adopted children was incorporated into the omnibus social security bill and I plan to introduce again next year a bill to lower the retirement age for men to 62; my proposal that volunteer fire departments and rescue squads be made eligible to receive donable surplus Government property will also be introduced next session—the House approved a bill that was reported and which covered only volunteer fire departments but the Senate did not act; hearings were held on a bill that I proposed to establish an agricultural research and development board to find new industrial uses for agriculture products; legislation similar to my bill extending the special school-milk program was approved; consideration was given to an amendment I introduced to restrict imports of residual oil; and a bill similar to mine was approved to curb the practice of harvesting sucker tobacco.

Of special interest to the Ninth District has been legislation to establish a coal research and development commission to find new uses for coal. My bill was endorsed by the Bureau of Mines with suggested amendments. A similar bill was reported to the House, but because of the lateness of the committee's action, the bill was not scheduled for floor debate. An attempt to secure consideration under a unanimous-consent request was not successful when objection was made on the floor. I intend to again introduce this bill in the next session. Another of my bills to allow for the purchase of wheat flour and cornmeal for donation purposes was approved. This measure was aimed at simplifying the operations of the grain-processing program, which was started in 1955 from another bill I proposed and which utilizes surplus grains for donation purposes.

This listing of the bills I have introduced and the actions taken on them is by no means complete because of space limitations.

This summary does not attempt to cover all legislation taken up in this session of Congress, it does not present arguments for or against the bills, and it does not indicate my votes on the legislation covered. I have given a brief summary of the session's work and will elaborate on it upon receipt of any request. I have endeavored to always support the bills that seemed—after thorough

study—in the best interest of the Ninth District, Virginia, and the Nation.

I maintain a district office at 311 North Main Street, Marion, Va., that is open each day to assist my constituents. I can be contacted at this office during the adjournment period. My Washington office address is 1719 House Office Building, Washington 25, D. C.

Dr. Robert H. Goddard, Great Scientist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, far beyond the most vivid imagination is the future story of rockets and missiles that will lift man from his earthbound sphere and carry him into the incredible reaches of space.

Many have contributed to the great progress we have made in this field. Throughout history men have experimented with rockets and missiles, but it is generally agreed now that the real pioneer of present maximum development was Prof. Robert H. Goddard, of Worcester, Mass., a graduate of our world-renowned Worcester Polytechnic Institute and for years professor at Clark University as well as lecturer at his own alma mater.

In his early experiments which took place in Worcester and vicinity, Professor Goddard received little encouragement and no inconsiderable scorn and ridicule. Never dismayed by the taunts and jibes of the skeptics this brilliant man of science painstakingly continued his researches and experiments. Time and again in the fields near Worcester, he set off the crude rockets that he had fabricated, largely with his own hands. He was not deterred by failure, but clung stubbornly to his objectives.

He tried to interest people and Government officials in his ideas but met with little success, in some instances with the retort that his ideas were impractical. Few of his colleagues in the scientific world accepted his theories or approved of his experiments, which some regarded as publicity-seeking stunts.

As he became able to demonstrate that he was getting some results, and was actually propelling some rockets into the air, there was some, not much, change in the opinion of the scientific world, and the professor received some very limited funds from private sources and later from the Government to carry out his work. These funds were extremely limited, and did not permit him to conduct his experiments on the scale he deemed necessary to carry out and test his ideas.

At this time, when the professor was having great difficulty interesting anyone in his rockets, Senator David I. Walsh was one of the few who gave him encouragement. On several occasions he visited the distinguished and esteemed late Senator at his Clinton home and in his Washington office, and Senator Walsh not only conferred with him at great length, listened patiently to his dissertations on rockets, but also arranged appointments for him with officials of our armed services and urged that his ideas be carefully considered.

It is clear that at the time neither officials of the armed services nor other Government officials attached the value and gave the consideration to the professor which his ideas warranted. There was, it seems, almost a complete failure to grasp the importance of his ideas. It is lamentable, indeed, to state that by some he was almost regarded as a crank pursuing an impossible idea. However, he kept a careful record of all his experiments and wrote articles for current scientific magazines. These articles received little, if any, attention in this country, but the Germans, always science-minded and seeking new ideas, became interested and deeply impressed with the professor's work. They studied and restudied his theories and experiments as they were disclosed in his various articles and then started to work patiently to apply his theories and take advantage of his experiments. The ultimate result of this work was the so-called buzz bomb, the A–1 and A–2 rockets, fabricated at Peenemunde, that attacked England with such devastating results during the latter part of World War II.

From that time on rocketry and missilry developed with amazing speed and today we not only have our sputniks and Explorers but many other variations of rockets and missiles that are well on their way not only to produce revolutionary changes in modern warfare—that they have done, to be sure, but also to point the way to the astonishing future developments that will involve space travel, space exploration and in the course of time even astronautical adventures.

The point of these remarks is to emphasize Professor Goddard's brilliant, epochal contributions which mark him as one of the great creative minds of world history. For years, he had gone practically unnoticed, although there has been a growing realization of his greatness. I think that Professor Goddard is preeminently entitled to the posthumous recognition which his tremendous creative achievements merit. During his lifetime, he was never given the credit that was his due. Like other great scientists and conceivers of new ideas, in his lifetime he received more than his share of disbelief and skepticism. It is now most appropriate, I think, that the work and the valuable contributions of Prof. Robert Goddard be appropriately and officially recognized. For that reason, I propose when Congress reconvenes, to introduce legislation expressing the commendation of the Congress for his monumental work and otherwise memorializing his unselfishness, his high ideals, his originality, his great skill and genius, tenacity of purpose and painstaking labors in conceiving and carrying forward the great ideas which now form the basis of one of the most extraordinary concepts in the history of mankind—a concept that could lead men to universal doom, or lift them to the stars.

The following is the tentative draft of a bill which I intend to introduce at the next session of the Congress:

TEXT OF PROPOSED BILL BY HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO HONOR THE LATE PROF. ROBERT H. GODDARD (HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION)

Resolved, etc., That in recognition of the great, creative achievements of the late Dr. Robert H. Goddard for his pioneering research on space rockets, missiles, and jet propulsion, the chairmen of the House Committee on Science and Aeronautics and the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, on behalf of the Congress, are authorized to present to the family of the late Dr. Robert H. Goddard an appropriate gold medal. For such purpose, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to cause to be struck a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the chairmen of the House Commitee on Science and Aeronautics and the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $2,500 for this purpose.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause duplicates in bronze of such medal to be coined and sold, under such regulations as he may prescribe, at a price sufficient to cover the cost thereof (including labor), and the appropriations used for carrying out the provisions of this section shall be reimbursed out of the proceeds of such sale.

Congressman Tewes Has 100 Percent Voting Record Again on Legislative Rollcalls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD E. TEWES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. TEWES. Mr. Speaker, in conformity with my belief that the people I represent are entitled to complete information on my voting record in Congress, I am submitting my second annual report to the residents of Wisconsin's Second Congressional District. Included in the tabulation are all legislative rollcalls and all quorum calls. There have been no omissions and no censorship has been exercised.

Congressional actions are frequently cloaked in the technical terminology of parliamentary procedures. For clarity, I have attempted to eliminate all such terms and to state in ordinary language the point at issue when my vote was cast.

The table below indicates that I voted on all matters presented to the House in this session. As in 1957 I have again in 1958 achieved a 100 percent record of publicly signifying my position on every one of these issues of national significance. I was absent from the Chamber on three occasions when there were attendance calls not involving votes. Including these unavoidable absences, my general attendance average was above 98 percent.

As always, I am ready to explain and discuss these votes with constituents of mine who seek additional information.

Roll-call No.	Date	Explanation	Vote
1	Jan. 7	Call of the House	Present.
2	Jan. 15	H. R. 9739: Shall the Defense Department be given new authority to expedite the missile program? (374 yea to 0)	Yea.
3	Jan. 21	Quorum call	Present.
4	Jan. 22	Quorum call	Present.
5	Jan. 23	H. R. 9955: Shall the bill providing a temporary increase of $5,000,000,000 in national debt be returned to committee with instructions to reduce the figure to $3,000,000,000? (275 nay to 115.)	Yea.
6	Jan. 23	H. R. 9955: Shall the temporary debt limit be increased $5,000,000,000? (328 yea to 71)	Yea.
7	Jan. 23	H. R. 10146 Shall an additional $1,250,000,000 be for expediting the missile program in the Department of Defense? (388 yea to 0)	Yea.
8	Feb. 4	H. R. 2151: Shall the import duties on certain coarse wool be suspended for 3 years? (250 yea to 120)	Yea.
9	Feb. 10	Quorum call	Absent.
10	Feb. 18	Quorum call	Present.
11	Feb. 19	H. J. Res. 2: Shall the bill providing for payments for land for the Yellow-tail Dam in Colorado be returned to committee? (197 nay to 152)	Yea.
12	Feb. 25	Quorum call	Present.
13	Feb. 26	Quorum call	Present.
14	Feb. 26	H. R. 10881: Shall $20,000,000 in additional appropriations be added to this bill for western reclamation projects? (200 yea to 184)	Nay.
15	Mar. 4	Quorum call	Present.
16	Mar. 5	Quorum call	Present.
17	Mar. 6	Quorum call	Present.
18	Mar. 6	H. R. 8002: Shall the bill adopting the Hoover Commission recommendation requiring an annual review by Congress of all spending projects be returned to committee for further study? (275 nay to 119.)	Nay.
19	Mar. 6	H. R. 8002: Shall the Hoover Commission recommendation requiring an annual review of all appropriations by Congress be passed? (311 yea to 96.)	Yea.
20	Mar. 11	S. 497: Shall the Rivers and Harbors bill authorizing public works be returned to committee with instruction to remove many unauthorized local projects? (234 nay to 167.)	Yea.
21	Mar. 11	S. 497: Shall the Rivers and Harbors bill authorizing local public works be passed? (321 yea to 81)	Nay.
22	Mar. 19	S. Con. Res. 69: Shall military construction programs requiring no further appropriations be speeded to relieve unemployment? (375 yea to 20)	Yea.
23	Mar. 19	S. Con. Res. 68: Shall civilian construction programs requiring no further appropriations be speeded to relieve unemployment? (379 yea to 16)	Yea.
24	Mar. 19	Quorum call	Present.
25	Mar. 19	S. 3262: Shall the House suspend the rules to limit debate and amendment and pass a bill authorizing the Armed Forces to assist in the preparation and conduct of the VIII Olympic Games? (357 yea to 139; failed, ⅔ required.)	Yea.
26	Mar. 20	Quorum call	Present.
27	Mar. 20	S. J. Res. 162: Shall the bill be returned to committee with instructions to substitute the Tewes amendment striking cotton from the bill and extending price supports on dairy only? (210 nay to 173.)	Yea.
28	Mar. 20	S. J. Res. 162: Shall farm price support programs for cotton and dairying be extended? (210 yea to 172)	Yea.
29	Mar. 25	H. Res. 507: Shall the House consider a measure to increase and revise servicemen's pay on the basis of technical skills? (381 yea to 5)	Yea.
30	Mar. 25	H. R. 11470: Shall servicemen's pay be revised and increased on the basis of technical skills? (366 yea to 22)	Yea.
31	Mar. 26	Quorum call	Present.
32	Mar. 27	Quorum call	Present.
33	Mar. 27	Quorum call	Present.
34	Mar. 27	H. R. 8290: Shall the bill authorizing a $23,000,000 national "democracy" monument in Washington be returned to committee for further study? (195 yea to 169.)	Yea.
35	Mar. 28	H. R. 5822: Shall air carriers be permitted to retain capital gains obtained from the sale of old flight equipment? (276 yea to 63)	Nay.
36	Mar. 28	Quorum call	Present.
37	Mar. 28	S. 3262: Shall the Armed Forces be authorized to assist in the preparation and conduct of the VIII Olympic Winter Games? (218 yea to 102)	Yea.
38	Apr. 1	H. R. 10589: Shall funds be provided for Civil Rights Commission? (273 yea to 98)	Yea.
39	Apr. 3	H. R. 9821: Shall the bill authorizing accelerated appropriations for highway construction be returned to committee for further study? (222 nay to 109.)	Nay.
40	Apr. 3	H. R. 9821: Shall the bill authorizing accelerated appropriations for highway construction be adopted? (300 yea to 28)	Yea.
41	Apr. 16	Quorum call	Present.
42	Apr. 22	Quorum call	Present.
43	Apr. 23	H. Res. 465: Shall the House consider a measure revising regulations concerning the serving of oleomargarine in Navy rations? (232 yea to 130)	Nay.
44	Apr. 22	H. R. 912: Shall the Navy be prohibited from including oleomargarine in its rations when butter is available from Government surplus? (207 yea to 161.)	Yea.
45	Apr. 29	H. Res. 551: Shall the House consider legislation authorizing Government construction and sale of 2 "superliner" oceangoing passenger vessels? (342 yea to 31.)	Yea.
46	Apr. 29	Quorum call	Present.
47	Apr. 29	H. R. 11451: Shall the Federal Government build 2 oceangoing superliner passenger vessels for sale to private ship operators? (289 yea to 94)	Nay.
48	Apr. 30	Quorum call	Present.
49	May 1	Quorum call	Present.
50	May 1	H. R. 12065: Shall the bill extending benefits to those who have exhausted unemployment benefits be amended to provide that such additions be administered by the States from money loaned rather than donated by the Federal Government? (223 yea to 165.)	Yea.
51	May 1	H. R. 12065: Shall the additional unemployment benefits be extended for those who have exhausted such benefits? (371 yea to 17)	Yea.
52	May 5	Quorum call	Present.
53	May 12	Quorum call	Present.
54	May 12	Quorum call	Present.
55	May 12	Quorum call	Present.
56	May 13	Quorum call	Present.
57	May 13	Quorum call	Present.
58	May 14	H. R. 12181: Shall the Mutual Security Act authorization of $2,958,900,000 be passed? (259 yea to 134)	Yea.
59	May 15	Quorum call	Present.
60	May 15	H. R. 12428: Shall the appropriations bill for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies be passed? (320 yea to 51.)	Yea.
61	May 21	Quroum call	Present.
62	May 21	H. R. 7999: Shall the House consider legislation to make Alaska a State? (217 yea to 172)	Yea.
63	May 21	Quorum call	Present.
64	May 21	Quorum call	Present.
65	May 21	Quorum call	Present.
66	May 21	Quorum call	Present.
67	May 22	H. R. 5836: Shall the postal rates on 1st, 2d, and 3d class be increased? (381 yea to 0)	Yea.
68	May 22	Quorum call	Present.
69	May 22	Quorum call	Present.
70	May 22	Quorum call	Present.
71	May 22	Quorum call	Present.
72	May 23	Quorum call	Present.
73	May 26	Quorum call	Present.
74	May 26	Quorum call	Present.
75	May 26	Quorum call	Present.
76	May 27	Quorum call	Present.
77	May 27	Quorum call	Present.
78	May 28	H. R. 7999: Shall the bill making Alaska a State be returned to committee for further study? (199 nay to 174)	Nay.
79	May 28	Quorum call	Present.
80	May 28	H. R. 7999: Shall the bill making Alaska a State be returned to committee for further study? (202 nay to 172)	Nay.
81	May 28	H. R. 7999: Shall the bill making Alaska a State be passed? (210 yea to 166)	Yea.
82	June 2	Quorum call	Present.
83	June 3	Quorum call	Present.
84	June 4	Quorum call	Present.
85	June 4	Quorum call	Present.
86	June 4	Quorum call	Present.
87	June 5	H. R. 12738: Shall $99,000,000 be appropriated to increase the Army size despite opposition from the Department of Defense? (225 yea to 158)	Nay.
88	June 5	H. R. 12738: Shall the Department of Defense appropriations bill be passed? (389 yea to 0)	Yea.
89	June 9	Quorum call	Present.
90	June 9	Quorum call	Present.
91	June 10	Quorum call	Present.
92	June 10	Quorum call	Present.
93	June 11	Quorum call	Present.
94	June 11	H. R. 12591: Shall legislation extending reciprocal trade agreement authority be returned to committee with instructions to substitute the Simpson amendment considerably limiting the scope of the agreements? (268 nay to 146.)	Nay.
95	June 11	H. R. 12591: Shall the authority for reciprocal trade agreements be extended? (317 yea to 98)	Yea.
96	June 11	Quorum call	Present.
97	June 11	Quorum call	Present.

Roll-call No.	Date	Explanation	Vote
98	June 12	Quorum call	Present.
99	June 12	H. R. 12541: Shall the Defense Department reorganization bill be returned to committee with instructions to conform with the President's recommendations? (211 nay to 192.)	Yea.
100	June 12	H. R. 12541: Shall the Department of Defense be reorganized? (402 yea to 1)	Yea.
101	June 17	Quorum call	Present.
102	June 18	S. 3910: Shall the Rivers and Harbors bill, now in conformity with the President's veto message be passed? (374 yea to 17)	Yea.
103	June 19	H. R. 12858: Shall the appropriations for civilian functions of the Army and the Department of the Interior be passed? (361 yea to 18)	Nay.
104	June 19	H. R. 12716: Shall the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 be amended to permit greater exchange of information with military allies? (345 yea to 12)	Yea.
105	June 25	H. R. 11077 Shall the "Veterans of World War I" receive a Federal charter? (389 yea to 2)	Yea.
106	June 26	Quorum call	Present.
107	June 26	H. Res. 609 Shall the House consider an ominbus farm bill with new legislation for many commodities? (214 nay to 171)	Nay.
108	June 26	S. 1832 Shall the House suspend the rules (concerning debate and amendment) and authorize an Assistant Secretary of State for Africa? (224 yea to 145; failed, ⅔ required.)	Yea.
109	June 27	H. R. 12695: Shall existing tax rates for corporations and present excise taxes be extended for 1 year? (365 yea to 9)	Yea.
110	June 27	H. R. 12181: Shall the mutual security authorization bill for 1959 be returned to committee? (238 nay to 134)	Nay.
111	June 27	H. R. 12832: Shall legislation authorizing Government guaranties for railroad loans be passed? (348 yea to 2)	Yea.
112	June 30	S.3342: Shall the House suspend the rules concerning debate and amendment and continue the school milk program? (328 yea to 1)	Yea.
113	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
114	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
115	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
116	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
117	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
118	July 2	H. R. 11477: Shall the United States Code be amended to permit certain confessions as evidence? (294 yea to 79)	Yea.
119	July 2	H. R. 13192: Shall the mutual security appropriation for 1959 be returned to committee with instructions to add $75,000,000 for defense support? (214 nay to 166.)	Yea.
120	July 2	H. R. 13192: Shall the mutual security appropriation for 1959 be passed? (253 yea to 126)	Yea.
121	July 9	Quorum call	Present.
122	July 10	H. R. 13015: Shall this legislation authorizing military construction be returned to committee with instructions to eliminate a provision which forces the Secretary of Defense to sell an ordnance depot in Texas at a loss of $40,000,000? (202 nay to 179.)	Yea.
123	July 10	H. R. 13015: Shall the bill authorizing military construction be passed? (379 yea to 2)	Yea.
124	July 10	S. 495: Shall the House suspend the rules concerning debate and amendments and authorize the acquisition of additional property surrounding the New Senate Office Building? (232 yea to 150, failed; ⅔ required.)	Nay.
125	July 10	S. 1411: Shall the security regulations of civil service be made applicable to employees in now-sensitive positions? (296 yea to 46)	Yea.
126	July 14	Quorum call	Absent.
127	July 15	Quorum call	Present.
128	July 15	H. Res. 397: Shall the House consider legislation which establishes the rule of interpretation for the judiciary that Congress does not intend to replace legislation by the States unless it specifically says so? (208 yea to 114.)	Yea.
129	July 15	Quorum call	Present.
130	July 16	Quorum call	Present.
131	July 16	Quorum call	Present.
132	July 17	Quorum call	Present.
133	July 17	H. R. 3: Shall the House amend H. R. 3 to permit enforcement of State statutes prescribing criminal penalties for subversive activities? (249 yea to 147.)	Yea.
134	July 17	H. R. 3: Shall the legislation establishing for judicial interpretation that Congress does not intend to replace State legislation unless there is an express declaration to this effect be returned to committee? (236 nay to 161.)	Nay.
135	July 17	H. R. 3: Shall Congress establish the rule for guidance of the judiciary that it does not intend to replace State legislation unless it specifically makes such a declaration? (241 yea to 155.)	Yea.
136	July 18	Quorum call	Present.
137	July 21	Quorum call	Present.
138	July 22	Quorum call	Present.
139	July 22	Quorum call	Present.
140	July 23	Quorum call	Present.
141	July 24	Quorum call	Present.
142	July 24	H. Res. 485: Shall the House consider legislation to lend funds to local municipalities to improve marketing facilities for perishable agricultural commodities? (211 nay to 164.)	Yea.
143	July 28	Quorum call	Absent.
144	July 30	Quorum call	Present.
145	July 30	Quorum call	Present.
146	July 30	H. Res. 649: Shall the House consider legislation providing pensions for former Presidents of the United States? (254 yea to 126)	Yea.
147	July 31	Quorum call	Present.
148	July 31	Quorum call	Present.
149	July 31	H. R. 13549: Shall social-security payments and benefits be increased 7 percent? (375 yea to 2)	Yea.
150	July 31	H. Res. 669: Shall the House cite Robert Lehrer for contempt of Congress for refusal to answer questions of the House Un-American Activities Committee? (363 yea to 0.)	Yea.
151	Aug. 1	Quorum call	Present.
152	Aug. 1	H. Res. 650: Shall the House consider legislation to help finance construction of local community facilities and public buildings? (187 nay to 173)	Nay.
153	Aug. 4	Quorum call	Present.
154	Aug. 5	Quorum call	Present.
155	Aug. 6	H. R. 13015: Shall this legislation which forces the Secretary of Defense to sell an established ordnance depot in Texas at a loss of $40,000,000 be passed? (265 yea to 135.)	Nay.
156	Aug. 6	H. R. 13580: Shall the public debt limit be raised permanently to $285,000,000,000 and temporarily to $288,000,000,000? (286 yea to 108.)	Yea.
157	Aug. 6	S. 4071: Shall the House suspend the rules concerning debate and amendments, and pass an agricultural bill with provisions for many commodities? (210 yea to 186.)	Nay.
158	Aug. 7	Quorum call	Present.
159	Aug. 7	H. Res. 675: Shall the House consider legislation providing for various Federal aids to education including student loans? (265 yea to 105)	Yea.
160	Aug. 8	Quorum call	Present.
161	Aug. 8	H. R. 13247: Shall the bill providing for various Federal aids to education be returned to committee? (233 nay to 140)	Nay.
162	Aug. 12	Quorum call	Present.
163	Aug. 12	Quorum call	Present.
164	Aug. 13	Quorum call	Present.
165	Aug. 13	S. 2266: Shall the House override the President's veto of a bill fixing wage rates at the Portsmouth, N. H., Naval Shipyard? (202 yea to 80, failed, ⅔ required.)	Nay.
166	Aug. 13	H. Res. 684: Shall Bernard Goldfine be cited for contempt of Congress for refusal to answer questions of the Legislative Oversight Committee? (368 yea to 8.)	Yea.
167	Aug. 13	H. Res. 686: Shall Carl Braden be cited for contempt of Congress for refusal to answer questions of the Un-American Activities Committee? (365 yea to 1.)	Yea.
168	Aug. 13	Quorum call	Present.
169	Aug. 15	Quorum call	Present.
170	Aug. 15	H. Res. 682: Shall the House consider a bill providing Federal financial aid for chronically depressed areas? (216 yea to 159)	Nay.
171	Aug. 15	Quorum call	Present.
172	Aug. 15	S. 3683: Shall the legislation providing for Federal financial aids for chronically depressed areas be returned to committee? (188 nay to 170)	Yea.
173	Aug. 18	Quorum call	Present.
174	Aug. 18	S. 4035: Shall the House suspend the rules concerning debate and amendment and pass legislation extending the housing and urban renewal laws? (251 yea to 134, failed, ⅔ required.)	Yea.
175	Aug. 18	S. 3974: Shall the House suspend the rules concerning debate and amendment and pass legislation to regulate labor-management practices? (196 nay to 190, failed, ⅔ required.)	Nay.
176	Aug. 18	Quorum call	Present.
177	Aug. 18	H. R. 13067: Shall the House suspend the rules concerning debate and amendment and enact a food-stamp plan for the distribution of food commodities? (196 yea to 187, failed, ⅔ required.)	Nay.
178	Aug. 19	Quorum call	Present.
179	Aug. 19	H. Res. 691: Shall the National Defense Education Act be sent to a conference with the Senate to resolve differences? (250 yea to 110)	Yea.
180	Aug. 19	Quorum call	Present.
181	Aug. 19	H. Res. 689: Shall the House consider legislation providing for Federal subsidy payments to copper, lead, zinc, mining industries? (198 yea to 165.)	Yea.
182	Aug. 19	Quorum call	Present.
183	Aug. 20	H. R. 13450: Shall the House concur in a Senate amendment which limits the financial planning of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration? (236 nays to 126.)	Nay.
184	Aug. 20	H. R. 13430: Shall the House concur in a Senate amendment which provides funds for the United States Information Agency to acquire additional radio facilities? (190 yea to 172.)	Yea.

Roll-call No.	Date	Explanation	Vote
185	Aug. 20	Quorum call	Present.
186	Aug. 21	Quorum call	Present.
187	Aug. 21	S. 4036: Shall the House terminate debate on legislation providing subsidy payments for domestic mining industries? (174 nay to 171)	Yea.
188	Aug. 21	S. 4036: Shall the Federal Government make subsidy payments to domestic copper, lead, and zinc mining industries? (182 nay to 159)	Nay.
189	Aug. 21	S. Con. Res. 109: Shall the House suspend the rules concerning debate and amendment and enact this resolution, express the sense of Congress in favor of a permanent United Nations police force? (299 yea to 20.)	Yea.
190	Aug. 22	Quorum call	Present.
191	Aug. 22	S. 3335: Shall Congress donate Federal land in Washington for a national cultural center to be constructed with funds from voluntary contributions? (261 yea to 55.)	Yea.
192	Aug. 22	H. R. 13343: Shall the House authorize Federal funds if needed to augment private solicitations for the Pan American Games to be held in Chicago? (244 yea to 64.)	Yea.
193	Aug. 23	H. R. 13489: Shall the House adopt the recommendations of the House and Senate conferees concerning military construction appropriations? (300 yea to 1.)	Yea.
194	Aug. 23	Quorum call	Present.
195	Aug. 23	H. R. 13247: Shall the House adopt the recommendations of House and Senate conferees on the National Defense Education Act? (212 yea to 85)	Yea.

Hospitality Returned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 22, 1958

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, life is an echo. It all comes back.

It was fun at lunch today.

After solemnly hearing Chaplain Braskamp deliver the opening prayer, and after having all their questions answered on the proceedings in the House Chamber, Liz and Ann Jeronimus, aged 9 and 6, could hardly wait to be seated in the restaurant of the House of Representatives.

No navy bean soup for them; no sir. That was for their mother, Mrs. Betty Jeronimus and their grandmother, Mrs. Frank Duerr to have. It was ice cream and hamburgers for the girls. Yes sir, and all they could eat of it, too; this was heaven.

And it was easy with all that ice cream for the girls to greet Representatives EUGENE MCCARTHY and later JOHN BLATNIK, of Minnesota, because Liz and Ann were from Minnesota, too. And although they could not quite promise their votes to GENE and JOHN this fall, Liz and Ann Jeronimus thought GENE MCCARTHY and JOHN BLATNIK were very nice. But the nicest of all, of course, was the ice cream.

It was all so very like Minnesota, big and friendly.

That is the way we were treated on our inspection trip last autumn to International Falls and elsewhere along the Minnesota-Canadian border, big and friendly, and even over to Dunseith, in North Dakota, at the International Peace Gardens. The welcome mat was out. The food was plentiful and the biscuits always hot. Mr. Speaker, the finest home-cooked meals are to be had along the Minnesota, North Dakota, Canadian border, so it seems. Maybe it was the twang in the air and the open courtesy of our United States customs and immigration officials that whet the appetite that downed the food.

But whatever it was, I saw it at work with Liz and Ann Jeronimus in the House Restaurant today. Man, did that ice cream slide down easy. And did those hamburgers take a beating? Yes, sir.

Annual Report of Hon. Charles B. Brownson to the People of the 11th District of Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON
OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, this is my annual report to the people of the 11th District of Indiana, whom I am privileged to represent in the Congress of the United States.

The end of a Congress is actually a beginning. It is the beginning of new legislation, good and bad.

During the 135 days that the House of Representatives was in session—a total of 562 hours and 12 minutes of talking time—the House passed 620 public laws. Each of these new laws will, directly or indirectly, for good or ill, touch the life of every citizen in Marion County.

Adjournment in the early hours of August 24 touched off a round of self-congratulations among the Democrat leadership and the ultraliberal press. They compared the sweeping legislation enacted since last January 7 with the first 100 days of the Roosevelt regime.

The Democrats are calling the 85th a "do something" Congress.

It cannot be denied that it has been a "do something to everybody" Congress. Nor can it be denied that during this session Congress spent more of the taxpayers' money than ever before in peacetime.

Membership in the House was divided, with 233 Democrats and 198 Republicans, giving the Democrats a working majority of 35. A substantial Democrat majority controlled every subcommittee and every full committee. A Democrat chairman headed up each of these subcommittees and full committees. A Democrat Speaker determined which bills should or should not come to the floor.

Honest conservatism was in the minority. This is what a Democrat "do something" Congress chose to do in an election year:

It fought a brushfire skirmish with nuclear spending methods by voting $8 billion to $10 billion in new pump-priming schemes to combat a recession already on the route. It voted a record-smashing peacetime budget of $72,600 million. These tactics, of course, give aid and comfort to the Nation's grimmest enemy: inflation.

The 85th Congress justified its $3,298 million foreign aid program as a tool for fighting communism overseas. But, it refused to act on legislation to protect Americans at home from subversives—legislation which would not cost the taxpayers a cent.

While it admitted a 49th State to the Union, the Congress failed to enact any clear-cut measures to preserve the crumbling rights of the States. As a matter of fact, it passed measures encroaching on traditional States' rights, particularly in the field of education.

After parading corrupt union leaders, out-and-out racketeers, and their victims before a shocked American public, the Democrats wrote a labor bill so bad that representatives of both labor and management considered it a shabby joke. Even Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, in a written statement to the House Education and Labor Committee, said:

> As a result S. 3974, as adopted last night by the Senate, contains provisions which we are certain will prove unworkable; provisions which we know are unwise; provisions which are clearly unfair and unduly repressive.

Not one word in the bill was changed from the time it left the Senate until it came to the House floor. Republican efforts to bring out legislation which would correct the abuses uncovered by the Senate subcommittee were balked by the Democrat leadership, and the rank and file of labor and the consuming public were deprived of the protection they need and deserve.

BROWNSON VOTED FOR ECONOMY

Only a handful of economy-minded stalwarts seemed to recall the mandate handed them in the first session when the voters demanded that Federal expenditures be cut. The leadership saw to it that few record votes would be on a cut-and-dried economy basis to show up the spenders. Many of the multi-million-dollar spending bills were steamrollered through under parliamentary procedures permitting little or no debate.

One of these pump-priming schemes was a mammoth housing bill which the leadership attempted to ram through with only 40 minutes debate. This bill covered a multitude of spending proposals outside of the housing field. It is no exaggeration to say that it had everything in it but the kitchen sink.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, speaking on the floor of the Senate, said:

If a tough little group of last-ditchers in the House had not stopped the Senate-passed housing bill, another $26 billion in Federal cash and public credits would have gone over the dam.

That tough little group of last-ditchers consisted of 134 of us House Members who voted against the bill's passage under a suspension of the rules, which requires a two-thirds majority. One hundred and fourteen of the tough little group were Republicans—including myself—while only 20 were members of the Senator's own Democratic Party. Had passage been based on a simple majority vote, we would have lost to the spenders, 251 of whom voted to pass it. They were just 6 votes shy of the required two-thirds.

And, it was 157 Republicans, joined by a handful of Democrats, who defeated the rule which would have brought the $2.9 billion community facilities bill to the floor. This bill was part of the Rayburn-Johnson kit of recession cure-alls. The vote was a close one: 173 for and 187 against the rule. I voted against it.

I helped to lead the floor fight which preceded defeat of a $25 million agriculture marketing facilities bill, which would have loaded another extravagant expenditure on the Federal Government for a program being carried on willingly and well by the individual States. Once again my Republican colleagues lined up with me on the side of economy and the rule on the measure was beaten in a 164-to-211 vote. Of the 211 who opposed it, 163 were Republicans.

Victories for the taxpayers were pitifully few, however, when compared with the multi-million-dollar spending bills which were passed. The Democrat leadership was clever in manipulating many of them through under rules which called for tightly limited or even no debate. Both the $5.5 billion emergency highway bill and the $1.9 billion emergency Federal housing loan bill were passed in this manner.

President Eisenhower had outlined a program of sensible assistance to certain distressed-labor areas, but the Democrats emerged from committee with a bill representing such a complete boondoggle that it was unpalatable to the administration and to a majority of the Republican Members of the House. As the Democrats reported it, the area redevelopment bill called for an initial outlay of $279.5 million in Federal grants and loans, administered in such a way as to foster a Government-control system of industry production completely unrelated to good economics and traditional American principals of free enterprise. It thrust the Federal Government into yet another field belonging to the States and local municipalities and individuals. Attempts to send the bill back to committee were frustrated in an almost straight party-line vote of 170 for recommittal and 188 against recommittal; 115 Republicans voted to recommit. The bill met with a veto from President Eisenhower.

The gigantic rivers and harbors "pork barrel," calling for an outlay of $1.5 billion, passed despite the fight my economy-minded colleagues and I put up in the House. The bill met with a quick veto at the White House, and an appropriation bill of saner proportions for necessary projects ultimately was written, passed, and signed into law.

Twice within 6 months the Congress was called upon to increase the national debt limit—to pledge the wages of generations yet unborn as payment for the pump priming, the pork barrels, the wanton spending in which the Congress itself has indulged. On January 23, I voted against increasing the national debt limit by a supposedly temporary $5 billion. On August 5, I voted against making that $5 billion permanent, plus adding another permanent $5 billion and a temporary $3 billion.

My votes were protests against the real evil, which is Congressional approval of authorizations and appropriations which make such increases necessary. Both times I took the floor to point out the wicked folly of reckless spending which forces Congress to mortgage the future of our children and our grandchildren. That Congress should be forced to raise the debt limit by $13 billion in times of relative prosperity is a strong indictment of the spenders in Congress itself.

H. R. 8002: THE ECONOMY BUDGET BILL

The one important economy measure to become law during this session of spend and spend was H. R. 8002. This bill had the backing of President Eisenhower, the Bureau of the Budget, the Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report, most fiscal authorities, and the man the 85th Congress most often ignored—the taxpayer himself.

Mail from the 11th District of Indiana, which I represent, was constant during the year and a half it took Congress to consider, study, debate, and pass the bill. Most of my folks knew I had worked on this legislation in the Government Operations Committee on which I served, and they knew I was one of its first and staunchest backers. They wrote to me urging me to get my colleagues busy turning H. R. 8002 into law. They could not understand how the 85th Congress could allocate something like 3 minutes of time to slip through a $5.5 billion highway bill under a suspension of the rules, and yet take so much time in passing legislation which could save the Federal Government many millions of dollars every year. For that matter, I found it a little difficult to understand myself.

H. R. 8002 will place the Federal budget on an accrued expenditures basis, requiring annual review each year by Congress on both existing and proposed programs, and thus provides a financial tool for realistic Congressional control over the annual rate of Government expenditures.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNAL SECURITY—DEFENSE REORGANIZATION PLAN

President Eisenhower finally won his 12-year fight to eliminate the patchwork committee improvisation in Department of Defense administrative policies. After a nip-and-tuck battle between the Democrat-controlled Armed Services Committee—which sent his plan to the floor stripped of some of its most essential features—and those of us who respect the President's farsightedness in military matters, the Congress finally adopted most of his recommendations.

I supported the plan set forth by the President all the way. It clarifies the authority of the Secretary of Defense, steps up Pentagon efficiency, and streamlines the unified command structure. Party lines were clearly drawn on this measure, with House Republicans voting almost 100 percent in favor of the President's recommendations, and the Democrats voting almost 100 percent against it. Although his recommendations were not adopted in the House, they were added in the Senate, and became part of the bill which was signed at the White House. With much of the redtape cut away, the Nation can expect more defense for the dollar.

DEFENSE APPROPRIATION

While giving the reorganization plan to the taxpayers with one hand, the spenders in Congress took away with the other hand. President Eisenhower and his top military advisers assessed the Nation's defense needs at $38.7 billion for fiscal 1959. A majority in Congress insisted on giving him more than $815 million more than he requested.

Most of this padding was done in committee and some of it was done on the floor of the Senate. The full House had only one clear-cut opportunity to reject a part of these unasked-for funds. Representative SIKES, of Florida, proposed addition of $99 million to the bill—$99 million which the President specifically said was not needed. I voted against adding the funds, but the Sikes amendment carried in a rollcall vote of 225 to 159.

This desire to be lavish with the military probably was sparked by the Russian success with sputnik, and also may have resulted from a guilt complex dating back to the first session. In 1957, we trimmed about $2.5 billion from the defense budget. The President and his advisors agreed that they could live with the cut if the Congress would only restore $313 million in areas where no true economy resulted. In an almost 100 percent party line vote, the Democrats refused to restore this urgently needed $313 million for Army research and development, naval airpower, and planes for the Air Force.

Many of those who cast their false economy votes in 1957—and the author of the Sikes amendment was one of them—were eager this year to add $99 million the President said was not needed. I voted against adding the $99 million this year. I voted against cutting the $313 million in the first session.

As an active reservist, long acquainted with the military, I am aware that the Department of Defense is seldom self-denying in its money requests. I could not see the wisdom of handing them money they insisted they did not need. Ecclesiastes expresses my philosophy on appropriating money in the verse which says: "There is a time to keep, and a time to cast away."

MILITARY COMPENSATION ACT

Incorporating some of the highly publicized Cordiner recommendations, this bill increasing Armed Forces' pay was passed by Congress. Since I felt a little incentive pay for noncommissioned and company grade officers was better than no raise at all, I voted for the bill. I was disappointed that it did not distribute these increases more equitably, concentrating them in the areas in which incentives are most needed. I spoke out on the floor asking the House to send the bill back to the Armed Services Committee for further study. This request was voted down, and I subsequently voted for the bill's passage. I still feel that the 47 percent pay raise it gives to 4-star generals and the 36 percent raise it gives to other generals is completely out of line when compared with only 15 percent for company grade officers and a mere 7 percent for sergeants first class.

SPACE AND ATOMIC PROJECTS

Awareness of the Soviet challenge prompted the creation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, civilian-controlled, which received unanimous House approval. Congress authorized $47.8 million for construction of a new space projects center and for expansion of satellite launching and tracking facilities, and another $54.6 million to expand and accelerate present missile base construction projects. Three hundred and eighty-six million dollars were authorized for the Atomic Energy Commission for construction and expansion purposes. The Congress also approved exchange of atomic information with military allies of the United States.

In their enthusiasm, the spenders decided to treat the taxpayers to the luxury of an atomic-powered icebreaker for service in the Arctic and Antarctic, although they had Navy testimony showing that existing, conventionally operated icebreakers are doing a more than adequate job. This $40 million money bill met a firm veto at the White House.

LOYALTY SECURITY PROGRAM

I voted for this bill to place all Federal employees under the loyalty security program, while, at the same time, granting the right of appeal. Unfortunately, this is one of several worthwhile bills to fight subversion which died with the 85th Congress. It passed both House and Senate, the House approved the conference report, but the Senate leadership failed to call the conference report up for that body's approval, and the measure thus was killed.

PREEMPTION OF STATE LAWS

When a notorious Communist leader was freed because the Supreme Court ruled that a Federal law preempted the State antisubversion laws under which he had been convicted, a shocked and outraged public demanded Congressional action.

H. R. 3 was written in answer to that demand. It spelled out clearly that State laws in fields where Congress has acted are concurrently enforcible, and it specifically applied this principle to State antisedition laws. H. R. 3 was introduced January 3, 1957, the opening day of the 85th Congress. It was a year and a half before the House Judiciary Committee finally reported it.

During the long floor debate on H. R. 3, I voted four times to restore the balance of power to the States and to avoid further preemption rulings by the Supreme Court: I voted for the rule to bring the bill to the floor; I voted for the Willis amendment which broadened the scope of the bill; I voted against the motion to recommit, and I voted for final passage. A majority of my colleagues voted with me on all of these rollcalls and the bill was sent to the Senate. House Democrats split on this measure: 100 of them voted for it, 109 voted against it. Republicans lined up solidly behind States rights, giving the bill 141 yeas, and only 46 nays. The entire Hoosier Republican delegation in the House supported H. R. 3.

H. R. 3 was buried in committee when it reached the Senate, and S. 654, a similar bill, was called up for action. It was defeated in a 40 to 41 vote, with the majority leader, Senator JOHNSON, himself voting against the bill. With the Jenner-Butler bill ordered tabled in a 49 to 41 vote, S. 654 killed by 1 lone vote, and H. R. 3 locked in committee, all hope for preemption clarification was lost.

OTHER ANTISUBVERSIVE LEGISLATION

The Senate Democratic leadership also must answer for the failure to call before the Senate four House-approved antisubversive measures. These bills would have extended application of espionage laws to offenses against the United States anywhere in the world; provided for denial of passports to persons knowingly engaged in activities intended to further international communism; clarified the Criminal Code definition of "organize" relating to treason, sedition, and subversion cases, and fixed procedure for judicial review to prevent unjustified delay in execution of deportation orders.

All four of these bills provided desirable safeguards. Their defeat meant four more victories in the 85th Congress for the ADA lobbyists who so vigorously opposed them.

TRADE, NOT AID

Two of the most hotly disputed issues of the session were the foreign aid and reciprocal trade bills. I voted against the foreign aid authorization bill, and I voted against the foreign aid appropriation bill. I stood up the night of adjournment, when the appropriation conference report came to the House for final approval, to demand a final rollcall vote. It was refused. I voted against the program because I know the so-called defense support—economic aid—portions are wasteful, poorly administered, and fail in their objectives.

The International Operations Subcommittee, on which I am ranking minority member, issued two reports this spring on the deplorable situation we found during our tour of duty last fall in the Near East. Several of us appeared before the House Foreign Affairs Committee this spring to testify on the lack of effectiveness we found in the economic-aid program. I do feel that elements of military assistance to our allies are necessary, since much of the hardware used in these programs is obsolete to United States forces' use and has an actual value of its worth to the scrap dealer. I believe, too, that the low-cost technical assistance program has some value because it deals in knowledge shared, rather than in funds given away. Since all three phases of the program are lumped together in one bill, and because the economic portion is so highly objectionable, I voted against the bill. I think that the reports our committee sent to each Member, and the testimony we gave before the Foreign Affairs Committee, played an important part in final Congressional approval of a $618 million cut in the original budget request.

Hoosier House Republicans opposed the foreign-aid bill 8 to 1; both Indiana Democrats voted for it.

When the reciprocal trade bill came before the House, I bore in mind the fact that last year the United States exported $20 billion in goods, while importing only $13 billion. Ten percent of all the movable goods we manufacture are exported; nearly one-fourth of our cropland produces for foreign markets. To curtail the flow of these exports would have serious repercussions on our economy. The only way others can pay for these goods is either by our imports or our foreign aid. I prefer trade.

I had hoped for a rule which would have permitted the House to compromise somewhere between the administration request for a 5-year extension and the alternative bill calling for an extension of only 2 years. Such a rule was not granted, but the whole Congress eventually agreed on a 4-year extension, with adequate safeguards included for the protection of domestic industries.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

"A first big step that will lead to many more."

In these words a jubilant, left-wing east coast newspaper brazenly admits that the so-called National Defense Education Act was a tool to fling open the doors to all-out Federal aid to education and ultimate Federal control of the public schools.

This legislation is the most dangerous to pass Congress in the 8 years I have served in Washington. I, and the rest of the Hoosier Republicans in both House and Senate, fought a heartbreaking, losing battle to defeat this $1 billion bill.

I took the floor to speak at length during debate on the measure. I and the eight other Hoosier Republicans voted solidly to send the bill back to committee. We demanded a rollcall on final passage, but the requisite 50 Members failed to join us in standing up to request that the "yeas" and "nays" be recorded. The bill passed the House in a voice vote.

On the final day of the session, August 23, when the conference report came before the House, the Hoosier delegation worked feverishly to back up a request for a rollcall and this time we succeeded in obtaining a final vote for the record so the folks back home could judge for themselves the actions of the men representing them.

By succumbing to cunningly inspired panic techniques of such pressure groups

as the NEA, the ADA, and other proponents of big government, a majority of the Congress voted for a bill which study shows was not wanted by or desirable for the individual States.

The biggest portion of the bill grants direct annual Federal aid to public schools in the amount of $300 million for equipment for instruction in mathematics, science, and languages. Two hundred and ninety-five million dollars is for loans of $1,000 a year to college students. Five million dollars will be used to help States establish mathematics, science, and language programs in the public schools. Sixty-one million dollars will be used to establish rare-language centers for instruction of language teachers. This amount includes a stipend covering transportation expenses of the teachers and their dependents. Other Federal-aid portions of the program are for research on the educational uses of television, motion pictures, and radio in public schools; guiding and testing programs for public school children; additional guidance counseling, and administrative costs at the Washington end.

Hoosiers have never been deceived into thinking that Indiana gets 100 cents back on every tax dollar it sends to Washington. Of the hundreds of letters I received from the folks back home on this education bill, only one favored it and this letter originated from a pressure group.

Hoosiers are justly proud of their public school system, the high quality of their guidance and counseling programs, their capable and dedicated teaching staffs, and the many splendid private programs of scholarships and student loans.

At no time were they deluded as to the real purpose of this legislation. They may take some small comfort in knowing that their 2 Republican Senators and their 9 Republican Representatives never gave an inch in the fight to beat this very bad bill.

LABOR LEGISLATION

The most gigantic hoax of the session—the Kennedy-Ives bill—backfired on Democrats who were trying to be all things to all people. After spending thousands of tax dollars parading the Senate Labor Rackets Subcommittee procedures before the American people, the Democrats were unable to write a labor bill dealing squarely with the corruption the subcommittee had uncovered.

Their dilemma: How to calm an alarmed consuming public and labor union rank and file, while at the same time placating labor leadership to whom they are beholden for delivering votes in the fall.

Their solution: A bill they could call labor reform although it did not do the cleanup job that must be done.

Secretary of Labor Mitchell blasted the Kennedy-Ives bill as weakening "the already pitifully ineffective legal protection presently provided by law to union members and the public." He chided the Democratic leadership for ignoring the format for labor reform that President Eisenhower had handed them at the beginning of the year.

When the Kennedy-Ives bill came to the House, it was held by the Speaker for 41 days before he referred it to the House Committee on Education and Labor. No hearings were held on the bill and the Democrat majority voted against reporting it out for debate on the floor. A Republican labor reform bill, in line with the President's firm but moderate recommendations, also was voted down in committee.

The House leadership eventually took the Kennedy-Ives bill from committee to the floor under a rule which permitted no amendments and which allowed only 40 minutes' debate. The Kennedy-Ives bill is 48 pages in length. That meant the leadership was permitting less than 1 minute of debate per page on a bill of far-reaching and dangerous proportions.

I voted against the Kennedy-Ives bill because it was not an honest attempt to clean up corrupt practices in the labor union movement. It was opposed by many responsible leaders of both labor and management.

Under the suspension rule, the Kennedy-Ives bill required a two-thirds majority to pass the House. We repudiated the bill in a 190–to–198 rollcall vote, which meant it would not even have passed on a simple majority vote.

I immediately called on the Democrat chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee for a new bill to provide the safeguards both union members and the consuming public need and deserve. The session adjourned without such a bill. I have continued to press for prompt, vigorous action in drawing up legislation to be acted upon as soon as the 86th Congress meets.

Many honest folks were deluded by the Democrat leadership's high-powered public relations job to promote the Kennedy-Ives bill. Some of these folks have asked me why I voted against it, why a poor bill was not better than none at all.

These are my reasons:

The Kennedy-Ives bill did not provide for genuine democracy in unions.

It did not have enforcement sanctions on unions retaining officers who file false returns with the Secretary of Labor.

It did nothing about organizational and racketeer picketing, even when this picketing was done against the express wishes of the collective bargaining unit concerned.

It did not tighten secondary boycott provisions of existing law.

It did nothing to bar the use of union funds for partisan political purposes.

Kennedy-Ives would have narrowed the definition of supervisors contained in present law. This would have forced foremen into the same union-shop contract as the employees they are supposed to supervise.

It contained a section which could have been construed so as to make it criminal for an employer to raise employees' pay or benefits at the same time a union was attempting to organize the employees.

It did not make it mandatory that a union member be permitted to see the financial, and other, records of his union.

It did not provide that Government action could be taken against improper union leadership.

Kennedy-Ives did not impose financial responsibilities on union officials in regard to trust funds and properties of the membership, nor did it empower union members to go into State and Federal courts to sue for violations of trust by union officials.

One hundred and forty-nine Democrats supported the Kennedy-Ives bill in the House, and 61, including the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, voted against it; 137 Republicans, including all 9 Indiana Members, voted against the bill, and only 41 supported it.

Congress was successful in passing a pension plan disclosure bill, which requires both employers and unions to make available to participants in pension plans an annual report of the financial operations. The bill was an answer to disclosures in the Senate Rackets Subcommittee of abuses of various welfare and pension funds in previous years. I supported this measure.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

One of President Eisenhower's major victories came when the House rejected a Democrat plan for a Federal dole to the States for unemployment compensation. A substitute was adopted which acknowledges primary State responsibility in the unemployment benefits area by putting the program on a voluntary rather than compulsory State basis; made the money a loan to the States, rather than a grant, and preserved the insurance concept as well as the trust funds established to administer the program. It provided for extra payments ranging to $45 a week for a maximum of 13 weeks. I voted for the modified, States rights version, which was accepted in a 233-to-165 vote.

AGRICULTURE

In an almost straight party-line vote, the Democrat farm price support freeze passed the House last March, only to be brought up short at the White House by a Presidential veto and the President's dry comment that "farm prices need to thaw, not freeze." I voted against the freeze as did every other Indiana Republican.

The next Democrat move was to turn out a hodgepodge of agriculture legislation which Secretary of Agriculture Benson tagged as an "economic monstrosity." This bill was so bad that it was never even permitted to come to the floor, the rule being defeated in a 171-to-214 vote, with the Republicans lined up firmly against it.

As the session drew nearer and nearer its close, the Democrat leadership reluctantly surrendered—Speaker RAYBURN had threatened to allow no bill at all—and a bill lowering supports, in accordance with administration wishes, was approved.

HUMANE SLAUGHTER

Humane slaughtering methods long have been employed in Indianapolis meat packinghouses, a fact of which we

are proud. My mail ran very heavily in favor of a national law requiring similar methods in all packinghouses. I voted for the humane slaughter bill, which in its finally approved form prohibits Federal purchase of meat from packers not conforming with humane slaughtering standards. The bill has been signed by the President.

SMALL BUSINESS

The small-business man received two important boosts from the Congress. One, the Small Business Tax Revision Act, is designed to aid and encourage small-business expansion through an easing of certain tax regulations. The other, the Small Business Investment Act, authorizes an appropriation of $250 million to the Small Business Administration for the purpose of making equity-type capital and long-term credit more readily available to small-business concerns. I voted for these bills, both of which have been signed into law. I also voted for H. R. 10, to permit self-employed persons to deduct, for income-tax purposes, the amount paid as premiums on a restricted retirement policy. Such deductions are now allowed persons whose funds are paid into company retirement plans. H. R. 10 corrected what I feel to be a longstanding inequity in the law. The Senate failed to act on this legislation.

TRANSPORTATION

I fought for and voted for repeal of the wartime-imposed excise taxes on transportation of freight and passengers. The House had the opportunity to vote on only repeal of the freight tax, and I took the floor to speak in behalf of such repeal. An overwhelming majority of the House voted to remove the tax. I also saw the desperate need of assistance to the economically depressed railroad industry. Along with all of my colleagues in the House, I voted for a loan-guarantee program which will help put the railroads back on their feet.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Two compelling reasons prompted me to vote for the social security bills. First, folks on small, fixed incomes have felt the brunt of higher prices most keenly. The 41,423 Marion County folks who received old-age survivors and disability insurance benefits will be able to meet these costs better with the modest 7-percent increase the bill gives them beginning in 1959. Secondly, the legislation will bring in an additional $400 million annually to strengthen the reserve fund, which has been in shaky financial condition. The House approved this bill 375-2, and the President signed the bill August 28.

POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

I voted for an increase in postal rates because I feel that if the post office is not self-supporting, the alternative is a subsidy at the expense of all the taxpayers. It did not seem to me realistic, in the face of today's costs, to expect the Government to carry first-class mail at rates established in 1932. Post office studies indicate that 75 percent of all first-class material is sent out by business firms rather than individuals writing personal letters. The average person actually will pay less buying stamps at 4 cents each than he would if he were forced to subsidize post office losses in the form of appropriation of revenue derived from income taxes.

I also voted for a pay raise for both postal and classified workers, in the conviction that their wages and benefits should compare with those offered in private enterprise if we are to attract capable, dedicated personnel to the Federal service.

PENSIONS FOR EX-PRESIDENTS

I took a firm stand against legislation granting pensions to former Presidents of the United States. Within the last century, no ex-President has been in financial distress, and most of them have left sizable estates. The bill originally called for a $25,000 yearly pension, a $100,000 office staff, and free mailing privileges. We in the House succeeded in eliminating all but the pension, but the Senate conferees insisted on restoring $50,000 a year for staff and the mailing privileges. House leadership effectively blocked our attempts to obtain a rollcall vote on the report. The Speaker of the House himself took the floor to speak in behalf of the bill. President Hoover announced earlier that he would not accept a pension, and, since passage, has told the press he will turn it over to charity. Former President Truman, who publicly lobbied for the pension on a nationwide television program, has had no public comment since the bill was passed.

A pension bill I was glad to see finally passed by the whole Congress was one providing an increase in pensions for Spanish-American War veterans' widows. The House approved the measure in the first session, but the Senate waited until this year to pass it.

I also voted for a cost-in-living increase for civil service retirees. Money for this increase in benefits comes from the civil service retirement fund to which these ex-Government workers contributed, not from Federal tax revenue.

BROWNSON BILLS

During the 85th Congress I wrote nine public bills, several of which implemented Hoover Commission economy recommendations. These bills were:

H. R. 5792, March 11, 1957: This called for creation of a supply and service administration in the Department of Defense to coordinate the supply system to fill the needs of the Armed Forces for such common-use items as food, clothing, and fuel. The Hoover Commission report estimates savings of as much as $340 million annually if procurement practices were unified in this manner.

H. R. 5808, March 11, 1957: This would have eliminated Federal competition with private enterprise. Another recommendation of the Hoover Commission, H. R. 5808 would have eliminated most of the estimated 19,000 federally owned or partly owned plants and commercial-type facilities—worth $12 billion of the taxpayers' money—which now compete with private business.

H. R. 6522, March 29, 1957: A bill to grant a charter to the United Mexican Border Veterans.

H. R. 8097, June 13, 1957: Another Hoover Commission bill, this provided that military procurement be limited primarily to posts in tactical organizations and that civilian personnel be utilized increasingly in management and technical positions in support agencies. Top positions in Defense Department support activities have been filled by military personnel, frequently rotated into such assignments between tours of duty in military operations. Cost of this excessive rotation is estimated at between $33 million and $50 million a year. The Hoover Commission also found some 16,000 instances of dual staffing, which cost the taxpayers another $110 million a year. My bill would have eliminated this duplication and excessive rotation.

H. R. 9571, August 30, 1957: This measure would have made permanent "in lieu of taxes" payments with respect to manufacturing plants owned by the United States and located on property controlled by a State, county, or municipal government. The 85th Congress merely extended present laws by an additional 2 years. To date, in-lieu-of-tax payments to Marion County have totaled $404,065.57.

H. R. 11113, March 4, 1958: This bill would have repealed the $17 million appropriation for extension of the east front of the United States Capitol Building. Despite my vigorous efforts to preserve the historic east front, the House Public Works Committee declined to hold hearings on my bill. A Senate bill calling for a new study of the extension was defeated, and construction has begun on the Capitol Building.

H. R. 12215, April 29, 1958: This bill would have exempted transfer of real property to a State or political subdivision thereof as a result of condemnation or threat of condemnation from the Federal documentary stamp tax.

H. R. 13390, July 14, 1958: It came to my attention that 293 Americans had lost their unemployment compensation checks through garnishment for back taxes by the Internal Revenue Service. I immediately introduced H. R. 13390 which subsequently became a part of the social-security bill passed on July 31 by the House and signed into law on August 28.

House Concurrent Resolution 363, July 16, 1958: The sudden outbreak of hostilities in the Near East surprised the United States completely. This led me to introduce a resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence, composed of 6 Members of the Senate and 6 Members of the House of Representatives. This Joint Committee would make a continuing study of the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency, and of problems relating to the gathering of intelligence affecting the national security.

H. R. 13490, July 22, 1958: Patterned after the wool and fur labeling acts this bill protects consumers and others

against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of decorative wood and imitation wood products. The legislation has particular import to the 11th District, since five plywood mills are located in Marion County. The plywood industry in particular has suffered from competitors who imitate genuine plywood products but who are not required by law to stamp the inferior products as imitation.

In addition to the public bills, I introduced a number of private bills in behalf of 11th District residents. Private bills are introduced only when all efforts to assist a person in his problem with the Federal Government have been exhausted through normal channels. Although my 8 years in Washington have taught me many ways of cutting through redtape in the executive department to help 11th District folks, there are occasionally times when the only recourse is through private legislation.

Voting record of Hon. CHARLES B. BROWNSON, of Indiana, on major legislation, 85th Cong., 2d sess.

House roll-call	Description and House action	Date	Brownson vote	Result
5	H. R. 9955—A bill to provide for a temporary increase in the national debt limit. On motion to recommit: Failed, 115 to 275.	Jan. 23	Yea	
6	H. R. 9955—A bill to provide for a temporary increase in the national debt limit. On passage: Passed, 328 to 71	do	Nay	Public Law 85-330.
7	H. R. 10146—To provide $1,410,000,000 for emergency missile funds. On passage: Passed, 388 to 0	do	Yea	Public Law 85-322.
8	H. R. 2151—To suspend for 3 years the import duties on certain coarse wools not domestically produced. On passage: Passed, 250 to 129.	Feb. 4	Yea	Public Law 85-418.
14	H. R. 10881—Making supplemental appropriations for the 1958 fiscal year. On Dawson amendment granting $10,000,000 each to the Glen Canyon and Trinity River projects: Adopted, 200 to 184.	Feb. 26	Nay	Public Law 85-352.
18	H. R. 8002—Hoover Commission recommended bill to improve Federal budgeting methods. On motion to recommit: Failed, 119 to 275.	Mar. 6	Nay	
19	H. R. 8002—On final passage: Passed, 311 to 86	do	Yea	Public Law 85-759
20	S. 497—Rivers and harbors bill, $1,544,627,800 "pork barrel." On motion to recommit to eliminate certain appropriations: Failed, 167 to 234.	Mar. 11	Yea	Vetoed.
21	S. 497—Rivers and harbors bill. On final passage: Passed, 321 to 81	Mar. 11	Nay	Vetoed.
22	S. Con. Res. 69—Favoring acceleration of military construction programs for which appropriations had already been made. On motion to suspend rules: Adopted, 375 to 20.	Mar. 19	Yea	Adopted.
23	S. Con. Res. 68—Favoring acceleration of civilian construction programs for which appropriations had already been made. On motion to suspend rules and pass: Adopted, 379 to 16.	do	Yea	Do.
25	S. 3262—Authorizing certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic winter games. On motion to suspend rules and pass: Passed: 257 to 139.	do	Nay	Public Law 85-363.
27	S. J. Res. 162—To freeze agricultural support prices and acreage allotments. On motion to recommit: Failed, 173 to 211.	Mar. 20	Yea	
28	S. J. Res. 162—On final passage: Passed, 210 to 172	do	Nay	Vetoed.
29	H. Res. 507—Providing for consideration of H. R. 11470. On adoption of the rule: Adopted, 380 to 5	Mar. 25	Nay	
30	H. R. 11470—To adjust the basic pay of officers and enlisted members of the armed services and to provide proficiency pay for enlisted members. On final passage: Passed, 366 to 22.	do	Yea	Public Law 85-422.
34	H. R. 8290—To authorize the erection of a national "freedom shrine" monument. (No Federal appropriation required.) On motion to recommit: Motion adopted, 195 to 169.	Mar. 27	Nay	Failed.
35	H. R. 5822—Relating to reinvestment by air carriers of gains derived from the sale or other disposition of flight equipment. On adoption of conference report. Adopted: 276 to 63.	Mar. 28	Yea	Public Law 85-373.
37	S. 3262—To authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic winter games. On final passage: Passed, 218 to 102.	do	Nay	Public Law 85-365.
38	H. R. 10589—Executive offices appropriation bill. On committee amendment providing appropriation for Commission on Civil Rights: Adopted, 272 to 98.	Apr. 1	Yea	Public Law 85-402.
39	H. R. 9821—To amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act to authorize appropriations for continuing construction of highways. On motion to recommit conference report: Failed, 109 to 222.	Apr. 3	Yea	
40	H. R. 9821—On final passage of conference report: Passed, 300 to 28	do	Yea	Public Law 85-381.
45	H. Res. 551—Authorizing consideration of H. R. 11451 to authorize construction and sale of a superliner passenger vessel. On motion to consider bill: Motion adopted, 343 to 31.	Apr. 29	Yea	
47	H. R. 11451—To authorize the construction and sale by the Federal Maritime Board of a superliner passenger vessel. On passage: Passed, 289 to 94.	do	Nay	Public Law 85-521.
50	H. R. 12065—Authorizing temporary unemployment benefits for persons who have exhausted their benefit rights and for individuals who were employed in noncovered employment. On motion to substitute Herlong amendment providing for State participation on voluntary basis Adopted, 223 to 165.	May 1	Yea	
51	H. R. 12065, as amended. On final passage Passed, 370 to 17	do	Yea	Public Law 85-441.
58	H. R. 12181—Foreign aid authorization bill. On final passage: Passed, 259 to 134	May 14	Nay	Public Law 85-477.
60	H. R. 12428—State, Justice, and Judiciary appropriation bill. On final passage: Passed 320 to 51	May 15	Yea	Public Law 85-474.
62	H. R. 7999—To provide for admission of the State of Alaska into the Union. On motion to consider the bill: Motion adopted, 217 to 172.	May 21	Yea	
67	H. R. 5836—Postal rate increase, postal pay raise bill. On adoption of conference report: Adopted, 381 to 0	May 22	Yea	Public Law 85-426.
78	H. R. 7999—To provide for admission of the State of Alaska into the Union. On motion to recommit: Failed, 174 to 199.	May 28	Nay	
80	H. R. 7999—Alaskan statehood bill. On motion to recommit: Failed, 172 to 202	do	Nay	
81	H. R. 7999—Alaskan statehood bill. On final passage: Passed, 210 to 166	do	Yea	Public Law 85-508.
87	H. R. 12738—Department of Defense appropriation. On Sikes amendment to add $99,000,000 to the bill. Adopted, 225 to 159.	June 5	Nay	
88	H. R. 12738—Department of Defense appropriation. On final passage: Passed, 390 to 0	do	Yea	Public Law 85-724.
94	H. R. 12591—Reciprocal trade bill. On motion to recommit: Defeated, 146 to 268	June 11	Nay	
95	H. R. 12591—Reciprocal trade bill. On final passage: Passed, 317 to 98	do	Yea	Public Law 85-686.
102	S. 3910—Revised rivers and harbors bill. On motion to suspend and pass: Passed, 374 to 17	June 18	Yea	Public Law 85-500.
103	H. R. 12858—Public works appropriation. On final passage: Passed, 362 to 18	June 19	Yea	Public Law 85-863.
104	H. R. 12716—To permit greater exchange with military allies of information and materials: Passed, 345 to 12	do	Yea	Public Law 85-479.
105	H. R. 11077—A bill to incorporate the Veterans of World War I of the United States: Passed, 389 to 2	June 25	Yea	Public Law 85-530.
107	H. Res. 609—Open rule providing for consideration of omnibus farm bill. On the rule: Rejected, 171 to 214	June 26	Nay	Failed.
108	S. 1832—Authorizing the appointment of 1 additional Assistant Secretary of State. On motion to suspend the rules and pass (⅔ majority required): Failed 224 to 145.	do	Yea	Do.
109	H. R. 12695—To repeal the excise tax on transportation of freight. On adoption of the conference report: Adopted, 366 to 9.	June 27	Yea	Public Law 85-475.
110	H. R. 12181—Foreign aid authorization conference report. On motion to recommit: Rejected, 134 to 238	do	Yea	Public Law 85-477.
111	H. R. 12832—To strengthen and improve the national transportation system. On final passage: Passed, 348 to 2	do	Yea	Public Law 85-625.
119	H. R. 13192—Foreign aid appropriation bill. On motion to recommit to increase defense support appropriation by $75,000,000: Failed, 166 to 214.	July 2	Nay	
120	H. R. 13192—Foreign aid appropriation bill. On final passage: Passed, 253 to 126	do	Nay	Public Law 85-853.
122	H. R. 13015—Military construction at certain installations. Motion to recommit to make permissive rather than mandatory the disposal of the San Jacinto property: Rejected 179 to 202.	July 10	Yea	
123	H. R. 13015—Military construction bill. On final passage: Passed, 379 to 2	do	Yea	Public Law 85-865.
124	S. 495—Acquisition of property for additional Senate Office Building. On suspension of the rules (⅔ majority required for passage): Failed, 232 to 150.	do	Nay	Public Law 85-561.[1]
125	S. 1411—Relating to the suspension of employment of civilian personnel of the United States in the interest of national security. On final passage: Passed, 296 to 46.	do	Yea	Senate failed to act on conference report.
128	H. Res. 507—Resolution calling for consideration of H. R. 3, the States' rights bill to prevent further preemption of Federal law over State laws: Adopted, 266 to 114.	July 15	Yea	
133	H. R. 3—States rights bill. On amendment: Passed, 249 to 147	July 17	Yea	
134	H. R. 3—States rights bill. On motion to recommit: Rejected, 161 to 236	do	Nay	
135	H. R. 3—States rights bill. On final passage: Passed, 241 to 155	do	Yea	Senate failed to act.
142	H. Res. 485—Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 4504, a bill to provide agricultural marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities: Failed, 164 to 211.	July 24	Nay	Failed in House.
146	H. Res. 649—A resolution providing for consideration of S. 607, providing $25,000 a year pension, $100,000 clerk hire, and free mailing privileges to former Presidents of the United States. On agreeing to the resolution: Adopted, 254 to 126.	July 30	Nay	Public Law 85-745.
149	H. R. 13549—Increasing benefits under the Federal old-age survivors and disability insurance system by 7 percent, and improving the actuarial status of the trust funds of the system. On passage: Passed, 374 to 2.	July 31	Yea	Public Law 85-852.
150	H. Res. 659—Certifying the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities as to the refusal of Robert Lehrer to answer questions before a duly constituted subcommittee of said committee: Approved, 363 to 0.	do	Yea	Adopted.
152	H. Res. 650—Community facilities bill. On the rule for providing consideration of the bill: Rejected, 173 to 187	Aug. 1	Nay	Failed.

[1] Subsequently passed House in nonrecord vote July 30.

Voting record of Hon. CHARLES B. BROWNSON, of Indiana, on major legislation, 85th Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

House roll-call	Description and House action	Date	Brownson vote	Result
155	H. R. 13015—Military construction conference report: Adopted, 256 to 135	Aug. 6	Nay	Public Law 85-685.
156	H. R. 13580—A bill to increase the national debt limit by a permanent $10,000,000,000 and a "temporary" $3,000,000,000: Passed, 286 to 109.	do	Nay	Public Law 85-912.
157	S. 4071—Agricultural bill. On motion to suspend the rules and pass (⅔ majority required): Failed, 210 to 186	do	Nay	Public Law 85-835.[1]
159	H. Res. 657—A resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 13247, the National Defense Education Act of 1958, providing for scholarships, loans, Federal aid to public schools, etc.: Adopted, 266 to 108.	Aug. 7	Nay	
161	H. R. 13247—National Defense Education Act of 1958. On motion to recommit: Failed, 140 to 233	Aug. 8	Yea	Public Law 85-864.
174	S. 4035—Omnibus housing bill providing for $1,800,000,000 expenditures. On suspension of the rules (⅔ majority required): Rejected, 251 to 134.	Aug. 18	Nay	Failed.
175	S. 3974—Kennedy-Ives labor bill. On suspension of the rules (⅔ majority required): Rejected, 190 to 198	do	Nay	Do.
177	H. R. 13607—Food stamp plan. On suspension of the rules (⅔ majority required): Rejected, 196 to 187	Aug. 19	Nay	Do.
193	H. R. 13489—Military construction appropriation conference report. On House disagreement to Senate amendment relating to protective works at Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, Calif.: Agreed, 300 to 1.	Aug. 23	Yea	Public Law 85-852.
195	H. R. 13247—National Defense Education Act conference report. On adoption: Adopted, 212 to 85	do	Nay	Public Law 85-864.

[1] Subsequently amended to concur with administration farm policies and passed House Aug. 14.

The Great Gas Grab—Blackmail in Your Kitchen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, the natural-gas bill is a prime example of proposed legislation that would create a serious hardship for tens of millions of American consumers throughout the length and breadth of this land. It is class legislation at its worst and helps a small but influential segment of the national economy.

The reasons why I am so firmly opposed to this bill can be stated very simply. First, its passage would quickly be followed by substantial increases in the price of natural gas used by over 22 million householders and by 2 million commercial and industrial establishments in the United States. Second, it is a highly deceptive piece of legislation which contains the pretense of protecting the consumers, while in fact it affords no real protection at all. Third, the natural-gas producers, pipeline companies, and the distributors of natural gas have all been operating very profitably under present forms of regulation; this bill would grant them a totally unwarranted economic windfall.

On the first point, that prices of natural gas will go up if this bill is passed, there can be no argument. Proponents of the bill admit it as readily as do the opponents; only they are more callous as to its impact. It has been conservatively estimated that passage of this bill would cost natural-gas consumers approximately $1 billion annually Every family that heats its home with natural gas would find the gas utility bill hiked by some $40 or more per year. At a time when inflationary pressures remain as strong as they are today, it is little short of irresponsible folly to permit this legislation to pass which would further erode the purchasing power of the American family. The flames of inflation should be dampened and not fanned.

It should further be borne in mind that the millions of natural-gas consumers have an enormous investment in gas furnaces, stoves, and other gas-using appliances. It is an investment estimated at over $12 billion. These consumers are literally captive to the rates which gas companies charge. For most of them, even if they wanted to switch to other fuels, the cost of conversion would be prohibitive. If ever there was a case where the Congress should do all in its power to prevent an increase in consumer prices, this seems to me to be it.

Some of the proponents of this bill, while admitting that price increases will result if it becomes law, argue that such increases are necessary to provide the incentives necessary for the exploration for and development of natural-gas reserves over the years. As the demand for natural gas grows, as it has been doing for the past several years, the supply will become less and less adequate and the costs necessary to assure an adequate supply are bound to grow. Although on the face of it, this argument seems to have some merit, it does not stand up under closer scrutiny. Nothing in the law as it has been operating to date appears to have deterred the discovery and utilization of new gas reserves. Since the Supreme Court decision of 1954—in the case, *Phillips Petroleum Co.* v. *Wisconsin* (347 U. S. 672), which declared that the Federal Power Commission did have the authority to regulate the field price of natural gas entering into interstate commerce and which the current bill intends to reverse, drilling and the discovery of proven reserves has grown greater each year. During the first 16 weeks of 1957, gas-well completions in the United States totaled 1,216, compared to 1,132 in the first 16 weeks of 1956, and 1,023 in the first 16 weeks of 1955. The gain in gas reserves in 1956 amounted to more than 14 trillion cubic feet, the greatest gain in any single year since World War II. Thus discoveries and reserve supplies are both at an all-time high. We should not forget that the tax-depletion allowance is itself a generous incentive. It is clearly a fiction that higher prices are needed to stimulate exploration. What such prices would do would be to boost even further the record profits of natural-gas producers.

The sponsors of this bill have made a great point of the fact that this bill affords the consumers much more protection than the Harris-Fulbright bill that was passed early in 1956, only to be vetoed by President Eisenhower, because of the unsavory lobbying tactics that were resorted to in its behalf. They point to the fact that this bill, in contrast to the Harris-Fulbright bill, provides for regulation of the price of natural gas going into interstate commerce. What they fail to recognize is that this bill restricts the Federal Power Commission so severely in its regulatory authority that the consumers are hardly better protected than if the Commission had no control at all over the field prices of natural gas.

This bill sets up a great many factors which the Federal Power Commission shall consider in determining a "reasonable market price" which is then used as a basis for passing on the validity of contract prices of natural gas. But the bill expressly prohibits the Federal Trade Commission from considering costs or from using the public-utility rate base cost-of-service concept or formula. Without being permitted to consider costs, the Federal Power Commission is left without any definite yardstick for determining the reasonableness of a market price. Senator WILEY put his finger on this flaw immediately after the bill was introduced by Congressman HARRIS in April of this year when he said—

> It—the Harris bill—sets up a standard for a regulatory agency which the Commission would find it impossible to follow. The criterion would be a quicksand of uncertainty into which every regulatory case would founder if any attempt were made to actually enforce it.
>
> The reasonable market price would be changing constantly—upward.
>
> The Commission investigators would have to scramble to keep up interminably with what the latest market price was.
>
> Consequently, the Commission would be following the market price rather than leading, abjectly approving rather than independently establishing a fair regulated price, as all regulatory commissions are supposed to do (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 103, part 5, page 5706).

This bill is a windfall to natural gas producers and natural gas pipeline companies. It would bring additional profits to an industry that is already one of the most profitable in American history. Present natural gas reserves, which are largely owned by a small number of giant

companies, would be increased in value by as much as $30 billion. Actually about 3 percent of the gas producers control some 90 percent of our natural gas reserves. Little wonder that the Oil and Gas Journal, as a spokesman for the industry, stated editorially, on May 6, 1957—

> The more the new Harris gas bill is studied, and the more that is learned about the political jockeying behind its various provisions, the more it looks like a good buy for producers.

We should beware about passing a bill that a leading trade journal in the petroleum field admits is a good buy for natural gas producers. Let us instead make certain that consumers can continue to get a good buy in the natural gas they need to heat their homes and cook their meals. Let us not hamstring the Federal Power Commission as this legislation would do. I opposed this bill in 1957. A glaring speech, unprecedented in its boldness, delivered at the gas lobby dinner killed the bill in 1958. But it will be with us again in the new Congress and I intend to oppose it again.

Report by Senator Javits to the People of the State of New York, 85th Congress, Autumn 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report by me to the people of the State of New York, entitled "Report by Senator JAVITS to the People of the State of New York, 85th Congress, Autumn 1958." I am submitting this report in keeping with a long-standing tradition of mine ever since the 80th Congress; and I ask unanimous consent that the report may be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT BY SENATOR JAVITS TO THE PEOPLE OF NEW YORK, 85TH CONGRESS, AUTUMN 1958

This is the final report on the 2d session of the 85th Congress. It is the fourth report of this Congress intended to keep citizens of our State informed of the activities of the Senate and my part in them.

PROSPECTS FOR PEACE AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The latter part of the session was deeply concerned with the Mid-East threat of war. There was also discernible a gathering storm in the Far East, relating to designs by Communist China on Formosa and its outlying defenses in Quemoy and Matsu.

The people are in considerable doubt as to the policy of the United States respecting the threat of war in the Far East. This threat has been brought to the crisis stage by the Communist shelling of Quemoy and Matsu and by the apparent determination of the United States to utilize its Far Eastern defense forces to help to defend these islands. I deem it my duty to state the course of action which I believe we should pursue in this critical situation in pursuance of our quest for peace and for justice in the world, and to do everything I can to advance such programs.

Our policy should be composed of the following elements:

1. We should honor our mutual defense agreement with the Republic of China on Formosa to come to its aid if its main territory is imperiled by aggression, as the President has asked. This is the commitment supported by the Congress in the Formosa resolution of 1955. I do not find anything in the Formosa resolution or in the United States policy saying that we must aid in the defense of "such related positions and territories of the areas now in friendly hands" if the President finds any of them to be militarily untenable or unnecessary to the defense of the Republic of China on Formosa.

2. The Congress must bear its share of the responsibility in respect of the current crisis for the Congress has affirmatively acted to give the President support in the authority which he is now utilizing. The Formosa resolution, passed by the overwhelming votes of 410 to 3 in the House of Representatives, and 85 to 3 in the Senate, in January 1955, gave Congressional approval to the utilization by the President of full authority in his discretion to use United States forces to help defend Formosa and the supporting islands. One of the findings of this resolution was that the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores was "essential to the vital interests of the United States and all friendly nations in or bordering upon the Pacific Ocean." The Congress can review the policy upon which the Formosa resolution was based at any time, but in the meantime, the Congress is as much bound by this policy as is the President.

3. A resumption of negotiations which had been fruitless for so long at Geneva, as invited by the Communist regime, are certainly in order and the President has welcomed them on the ambassadorial level. But the United States should not be driven or coerced into agreements which can gravely imperil the Free World's position everywhere and particularly in south and southeast Asia and the Pacific. The policy of nonrecognition of Communist China has been repeatedly approved overwhelmingly without dissent by both Houses of Congress. The U. N., itself, as recently as the last regular session of the General Assembly, by a vote of 47 to 27, with 7 abstentions, decided to accept the decision of its steering committee to postpone for another year consideration of the admission of Communist China.

Certainly while Communist China is using force in the Formosa area; is summarily holding United States prisoners in violation of international law and morality; is defying the U. N. by its violation of the Korean armistice, its refusal to purge itself from its aggression in Korea, and its determination to prevent the coming into existence of a unified Korea, it would be nothing but appeasement with disastrous results to the Free World to recognize Communist China now. The arrogance of the threat contained in the letter of Premier Khrushchev to President Eisenhower of September 7, 1958, including the demand that the United States withdraw its naval forces from the Taiwan Strait must also be weighed in this connection.

4. Should the further use of force ensue in the Taiwan Strait, with increasing aggravation of the war danger, it would be our duty to lay the situation before the U. N. General Assembly as a threat to international peace before allowing a conflagration to develop in the Formosa area. In any case, this situation accelerates the need for establishment of a permanent U. N. force to discharge peace maintenance responsibilities when vested in the U. N.

The President had been willing to sit with the leaders of the world to resolve the Mid-East crisis, but at the last moment, after a secret conference with Communist Chinese leaders, Soviet Premier Khrushchev refused. The matter has gone before the United Nations which has vested in Secretary Hammarskjold authority to seek a solution whereby American troops can be withdrawn and peace restored.

President Eisenhower in his speech before the U. N. made very concrete and constructive proposals to secure the peace in the Middle East, a peace which was assured by the sending of United States troops to Lebanon as a temporary, stopgap measure in the absence of a U. N. police force in being for the purpose. I have advocated a concrete and strong Middle East policy recognizing the necessity for regional economic development, legitimate nationalist aspirations, the sanctity of the borders of all nations there, recognition of the right of Israel to national existence equally with other nations, and adequate assurances against internal subversion and indirect aggression.

The U. N. emergency force in the Egyptian-Israeli border area has maintained the peace in that once troubled sector. I supported the resolution adopted by both Houses of Congress favoring the establishment of a permanent U. N. emergency force. A suitable U. N. police force can do much to preserve that local peace which is the basis for world peace.

The Formosa resolution passed overwhelmingly by Congress in 1955 gave the President full authority to use United States forces to defend Formosa or the islands supporting it. It has been settled United States policy to require of Communist China, a regime not elected by the people of China, evidence of good faith and of obedience to the obligations of civilized nations under the U. N. Charter and international law before relations between it and the United States could be regularized. Certainly while Communist China is moving against the offshore islands by aggression with force, is summarily holding U. S. prisoners, and is in violation of the armistice in Korea, United States withdrawal from its solemn obligations in the Far East, including our defense agreement with the Republic of China, would be nothing but appeasement with disastrous results to the Free World and the whole Far East.

Negotiations as invited by Communist China are certainly in order and the President has welcomed them, but unless the policy which dictated the Formosa resolution is changed our Government has fundamental commitments which it cannot abandon except with the greatest peril to our own and Free World security. Americans should recognize this as a vital aspect of our leadership for peace. I have urged Congressional hearings to consider the policy of the Formosa resolution and that the President state the conditions under which we can treat with Communist China. Should further use of force ensue, it would appear to be our duty to lay the situation before the U. N. as a threat to international peace before allowing a conflagration to develop.

The announcement by the President last month requesting the Soviet to negotiate regarding suspension of nuclear testing is a most auspicious moment in postwar history. Our country's sincerity in seeking a true, scientific basis for an effective controls agreement to end nuclear testing was made clear by this announcement following the Geneva meeting of United States and Soviet scientists. The world now awaits with deep consciousness of its historic significance the demonstration of the U. S. S. R.'s real willingness to undertake the step-by-step agreements now beginning to be negotiated.

Congress took two significant steps forward in advancing President Eisenhower's historic atoms-for-peace and atoms-for-security pro-

posals. The Senate ratified the Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency, by which the United States participates with 79 other nations in developing atomic energy for peaceful purposes. In addition, legislation was enacted to permit the United States to share atomic information with its allies subject to security safeguards in the national interest. Financial and technical assistance are also to be rendered to the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom).

For the mutual security program the Congress appropriated $3,298,092,500, $652 million less than the administration request and $358,307,500 less than had been authorized by the Mutual Security Act of 1958. This amount included $1,515,000,000 for military assistance, $750 million for defense support, $400 million for economic aid (the Development Loan Fund), and $150 million for technical cooperation. Congress had earlier enacted into the Mutual Security Act my amendment calling for a Presidential study as to how United States foreign-policy objectives can be advanced through coordination of the activities of the private sector of the national economy.

Foreign economic- and technical-assistance programs for Free-World nations are as essential to national security as our defense expenditures. Directly related to progress abroad is our own long-range economic advancement at a steady growth directly affecting prosperity, increased job opportunities, and better living standards here at home.

I continue as a United States delegate to the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference and as Chairman of the Economic Section of the General Affairs Committee of that conference. In the latter capacity, I presided over a meeting in London in late August to determine what action NATO countries might take collectively, through not necessarily through the NATO organization, to help Free-World underdeveloped areas outside Europe and the economically underdeveloped countries in NATO.

A compromise bill extending the reciprocal trade agreements program for 4 years was enacted. This measure allows tariff cuts up to 20 percent below existing rates, but not more than 10 percent in a single year, and allows the cuts to be made any time within 4 years beyond the end of the act's extension. Also included in the compromise measure was a Senate-passed provision with minor changes that requires consideration of weaknesses in the internal economy due to excessive imports as a factor in determining whether imports should be reduced in order to prevent harm to the national security.

There are grave problems of certain businesses which are adversely affected by imports. I have urged that such businesses be given Federal aid to enable them to modernize their operations or to convert to other lines in order to continue economically sound and to provide employment. I am hopeful that a law for such adjustment assistance may yet be forthcoming. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Extension Act contains "escape clause" and other provisions to deal with the problems of United States businesses adversely affected by imports. I shall do my utmost to maintain a fair balance between the problems of such businesses and the national interest which requires broad and effective Free-World international trade.

The reciprocal trade agreements program remains a principal item in our national program to answer the challenges laid down by the Soviet in the military, scientific, and economic fields.

I sponsored a resolution calling for a meeting of foreign ministers of the American republics and of Canada to review policies of mutual understanding in the Western Hemisphere and, if advisable, to prepare the agenda for a summit conference of heads of state in the hemisphere. The shameful treatment accorded Vice President NIXON on his recent South American visit should serve as a solemn warning that many people in the other American republics can be moved by demagogic misinterpretations of our motives and policies.

I sponsored legislation to be studied during the Congressional recess proposing to establish a federally-chartered World Development Corporation, to expand materially the flow of private United States investment primarily into the private economies of less developed areas of the world. It would channel funds invested by small investors here and in other countries into overseas investments on a stock-equity basis in economic development projects and private businesses wherever consistent with United States foreign policy objectives.

Implementing the Randall Report on International Travel, which came about as a result of my amendment to the Mutual Security Act of 1957, I introduced a series of bills aimed at removing barriers to foreign travel and encouraging international tourism. One of these measures facilitating the border crossing of cars rented by American tourists was enacted into law. Stimulation of our domestic economy, expansion of foreign trade, and greater mutual understanding are all direct benefits to be reaped from increased international travel.

On another Free-World front the unrest and bloodshed in Cyprus is most tragic for all concerned. I have been urging for a long time self-determination for Cyprus under U. N. auspices in which full protection of rights of minorities is assured.

BUDGET, THE ECONOMY AND TAXES

Congress enacted a record budget of some $79 billion, of which approximately half went for defense purposes. Decreasing revenues, stemming principally from the economic recession, resulted in a fiscal year 1958 deficit of $2.813 billion, and the deficit for the current fiscal year, it is estimated, will be about $12.2 billion. Our gross national product, however, has risen to $429 billion, thereby enabling us better to deal with our problems of financing.

The increasing national debt has necessitated legislation raising the permanent public-debt limit from $275 billion to $283 billion and increasing the temporary limit to $288 billion through June 30, 1959.

On the other hand, Congress enacted a Hoover Commission recommendation (H. R. 8002) to authorize inclusion of expenditure limitations in appropriation acts and to revise budgeting practices of the executive branch so as to bring long-term spending projects under a mandatory annual review and prevent the accumulation of vast amounts of unspent carryover funds, often beyond further Congressional scrutiny. Also, passage of legislation decreasing certain present high farm price supports and the tapering off of the recession with a consequent upturn in revenues give hope for budget relief next year.

Present corporate and excise taxes were continued for 1 year to July 1, 1959. Eliminated, however, was the 3-percent tax on the transportation of goods; removal of this levy should aid in reducing the cost of goods to consumers in addition to helping the burdened transportation industry.

The tax on admissions to theaters, etc., was revised to exempt the first $1 of admittance charge from levy; exemption was given to private nonprofit schools from certain excise taxes; and exemption was provided for most admissions where proceeds go to an organization operated exclusively to provide scholarships, fellowships and study above the secondary-school level.

A technical tax bill was enacted to eliminate substantive unintended benefits and hardships in existing income, estate, and gift taxes and remove many technical errors and ambiguities in the tax statutes. Small-business tax relief is discussed later in this report.

The Area Redevelopment Act providing economic aids to low-income areas or those hit by severe and prolonged unemployment was passed by Congress but vetoed by the President on the main ground of excessive cost. I believe a measure of this type to be needed. It will undoubtedly be before us again in the next Congress.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Congress enacted legislation streamlining our National Defense Establishment in accordance with recommendations made by President Eisenhower. I joined in sponsoring important parts of this measure. This bill is designed to give the Secretary of Defense the flexibility he needs to manage the Defense Department but at the same time retains traditional Congressional control over the roles and missions of the military services. The bill gives statutory backing to the National Guard and the National Guard Bureau and reaffirms the intent of Congress that there shall be naval and marine aviation and a Marine Corps.

To make military service more attractive as a career and to give incentives to key personnel, Congress enacted pay raises for noncommissioned and commissioned personnel with at least 2 years of active duty, ranging from 3 to 41 percent. In addition, a system of proficiency pay for enlisted men and responsibility pay for officers was provided as a means of rewarding special skills and responsibilities. Military careers for nurses and medical specialists were made more attractive by increasing permanent grades for which they may qualify. Included in the bill was an increase of 6 percent for military personnel retired prior to June 1, 1958.

I supported the move to defeat the effort to restrict unduly funds available to pay for medical care in civilian hospitals of dependents of Armed Forces personnel.

Congress adopted legislation in which I joined as cosponsor authorizing the chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy to confer a medal on Rear Admiral Rickover for his outstanding efforts in development of the atomic submarine.

To meet the problems created by the space age, Congress enacted legislation establishing the National Aeronautics Space Administration and developing a comprehensive space program. I was elected to the newly-formed Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

The Federal Civil Defense Act was amended vesting responsibility for civil defense jointly in the Federal Government and the States and their subdivisions. The new law also authorizes the Federal Government to purchase radiological instruments and detection devices and repeals the prohibition against Federal financial contributions to States for civil defense personnel and administrative expenses. The fact that a modern nuclear bomb possesses 1 million times the destructive power of a World War II blockbuster and that 100 of these weapons might blanket the entire United States with fallout points up the necessity of new civil defense arrangements.

AGRICULTURE

Congress enacted an omnibus farm bill, the Agricultural Act of 1958, reducing price supports and easing production controls on cotton, rice and corn and extending for 3 years the incentive payment program for wool under the Wool Act of 1954. This legislation also offers an opportunity for

departure from the longstanding parity price support program which has cost billions of Government money without correspondingly adequate help to the farmer. For example, corn producers will have an opportunity to decide by referendum whether they wish to continue on a 65 percent parity price support program or one based on 90 percent of the average market price for the 3 preceding years.

Congress continued for 18 months Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, which provides for the barter program under which surplus American goods are traded for foreign strategic and other material, and authorized the sale abroad for foreign currencies of an additional $2.25 billion of surplus farm commodities.

Congress enacted legislation promoting industrial use of agricultural products and establishing the Agricultural Research and Industrial Administration to develop through research new and increased industrial uses of farm products. I was cosponsor of one of the measures which went to make up this final bill.

The problems of milk marketing in the New York area and of the milk marketing orders issued by the Department of Agriculture have been of prime concern to me. New York is the second dairying State in the country and milk is vital in the economy of our State. I have constantly sought the counsel and guidance of New York farmers and dairymen in respect of their problems and shall continue to do so. From experience with the milk-feed price ratio, it is clear that our agricultural situation in the State is not the same as that of Middle Western corn or wheatgrowing States or of southern cotton-growing States but must be considered as an element in our economy based upon its own facts and circumstances.

Jurisdiction over retail sale of meat and poultry products and oleomargarine was taken from the Agriculture Department and given to the Federal Trade Commission, thus strengthening antitrust enforcement and policing of unfair trade practices.

Trading in onion futures was prohibited, a measure much sought after by many onion farmers in our State.

COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY

Congress reacted to the drastic plight faced by the Nation's railroads by enacting the Transportation Act of 1958. This legislation authorizes the Interstate Commerce Commission to guarantee up to $500 million in short-term loans to railroads for purchase of capital equipment or for property maintenance, gives the ICC full authority to adjust intrastate rail rates that give others engaged in interstate commerce an unreasonable advantage; directs the ICC, in fixing reasonable minimum rates, to ignore the rates of competing modes of transportation unless the effect of a lower rail rate would be to destroy competition; and exempts truckers of certain agricultural products from ICC regulation.

I fought against an effort to allow railroads with commuter services to terminate any of such services solely upon the ground of a net loss in the operation of any such service or branch line. Commuter service should be rendered where at all practicable and not denied on the basis of a net loss on a particular branch but only if there is a total unreasonable burden on the subject railroad. I am pleased to say that my fight was successful and that the bill as it became law was based upon the principle stated. In this way, the legitimate interest of commuters and of big cities heavily served by commuter lines and branches was fairly protected. I have sponsored legislation, S. 4200, which would assure that where States and municipalities grant tax relief to commuter railroads to enable them to continue service, this relief would accrue, as intended, for the benefit of their commuter operations rather than being absorbed by increased Federal taxes. Thus municipalities desiring commuter service to continue should be able to contribute by tax relief or otherwise to make continuance of service possible.

I joined in sponsoring the measure now law to create the Federal Aviation Agency with authority to establish air traffic rules and develop and coordinate air navigation facilities for civil and military aircraft; this regulation will help to avoid an increasing number of tragic air accidents.

The Congressional session ended without action on the legislation to amend the Robinson-Patman Act (S. 11) to provide that the so-called good-faith defense is not a substantive defense in certain cases.

A study by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the many problems faced by the United States textile industry was authorized.

The Renegotiation Act was continued for 6 months instead of the 2 years originally requested by the administration in order that the next Congress might have an opportunity to go fully into the renegotiation program on defense contracts, especially in the light of recent court decisions.

LABOR

Congress enacted into law the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act (S. 2888). This bill requires the managers of all pension and welfare fund plans, except certain very small ones and those operated by governmental agencies or charitable and fraternal organizations, to register with the Department of Labor, giving all pertinent information about the fund's officers and finances; places responsibility for policing and improving these plans upon the participants; leaves to the States detailed regulation procedures relating to insurance, trusts, and other phases of operation; requires that managers of any employee-welfare or pension-benefit plans, unless exempted, register within 90 days after regulations are issued; requires annual reporting to show amounts contributed by employer and employee, amount of benefits paid or otherwise furnished, number of employees covered, assets, liabilities, receipts, disbursements, and other financial activities of the plan, salaries or fees charged to the plan, to whom paid and the purpose; and provides for public examination of these reports. Criminal penalties are provided for violation. This bill is, of course, very limited in scope, considering what was needed in the field, but is helpful as far as it goes.

The Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1958, known as the Kennedy-Ives bill, passed the Senate by a vote of 88 to 1 but failed of passage in the House and thus died at the end of the session. As passed by the Senate, it dealt with responsibility and full disclosure of union organization, membership rules, business procedures, and financial operations and contained provisions designed to bar many of the abuses and racketeering practices disclosed by the recent investigations of the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field (the McClellan committee). In addition, it proposed to deal with the "no-man's land" area where neither the National Labor Relations Board nor State authorities were able to assume jurisdiction in labor disputes, narrowed the definition of supervisor, made provisions for union democracy, looked to the definition and adoption of ethical practice codes by unions and barred convicted felons from union office.

To relieve the plight of some 5 million unemployed, many of whom had exhausted their unemployment compensation benefits, Congress enacted legislation, which I supported, authorizing additional unemployment compensation to individuals who had exhausted their rights under State unemployment compensation laws and under Federal laws applying to Federal civilian employees and veterans and appropriated $666 million for that purpose. New York promptly became a participating State under this new law.

The Senate approved a 10 percent increase in railroad retirement pensions and provided for the funds for which to pay this increase. This bill, which I supported, however, failed of passage in the House and consequently legislative action will be necessary next year; such action is much needed.

Revelations by the McClellan committee continue. The Senate has cited 13 individuals for contempt for refusal to testify fully before the committee; I supported these citations.

Legislation was enacted to establish enforceable safety regulations in longshore and ship repair work.

SMALL BUSINESS AND CONSUMERS

Legislation, of which I was a cosponsor of principal provisions, was enacted giving small business tax relief. This new law allows investors who lose money in small-business ventures to write off their losses against ordinary income up to $25,000 a year; extends loss carry-back privileges from present 2 years to 3 years; allows increased first-year depreciation credit on the first $10,000 invested in depreciable tangible property; increases from $60,000 to $100,000 the minimum accumulated earnings credit provided in determining the surtax on excessive surplus accumulations; allows payments of estate taxes attributable to ownership in a closely-held business over a period of 10 years; and allows certain closely-held corporations to elect to be taxed as partnerships.

I sponsored the Small Business Research and Development Assistance Act of 1958 to enable small businesses to set up joint research and development organizations by pooling their financial resources and with the aid of loans from the Small Business Administration subject to initial Government approval and periodic review of such agreements to insure that the projects operate in the best economic interest of the Nation. The principal provisions of this bill were incorporated into law (Public Law 85-536).

The Small Business Administration has been made a permanent agency, small business loan limits were raised from $250,000 to $350,000, the maximum rate of interest on SBA loans were lowered from 6 to 5 percent and the Loan Policy Board was continued.

The Small Business Investment Company Act which I supported was enacted into law. It authorizes the Small Business Administration and the States to charter small-business investment companies which in turn can make long-term loans and investments in eligible concerns. The SBA may make loans to such investment companies from a $250 million revolving fund to be appropriated by Congress and may also make loans to State and local development corporations.

I continue as a member of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business and the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of that committee. That committee continues its work on the problems of small businesses threatened by monopolies and to see that small business receives a full, fair share of Government contracts.

The cost-of-living index has risen to a new high. The threat of inflation is a very real one which must be dealt with if we are to maintain the integrity of our national economy.

The Textile Fiber Products Identification Act was passed to require labeling of household textile products and to bar misleading advertising of such goods. The bill contains some provisions considered highly unfair by small business and not deemed necessary to consumer protection; but I obtained a legislative interpretation that will enable the

Federal Trade Commission to deal with these questions in administering the law.

Also enacted was legislation requiring automobile manufacturers to label new cars as to their retail price in order to protect purchasers.

HOUSING

The Senate passed major legislation intended to liberalize mortgage terms for home owners, authorize additional funds for urban renewal and slum clearance, extend the public-housing provisions, and otherwise extend and improve Federal activity in housing. My amendment to this bill, which was accepted by the Senate, would have increased the amount payable to a family displaced from the site of an urban-renewal project from $100 to $200.

Unfortunately, this Senate-passed bill died when the House failed to pass it. It will, therefore, be necessary to act anew next year. This was a serious development for urban renewal (slum clearance) projects in big cities but will be somewhat alleviated by the $100,000,000 emergency fund available to the President.

The Community Facilities Act providing for Federal loans to aid cities and towns in the construction of public works passed the Senate but died in the House.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND CIVIL LIBERTIES

The intransigent fight being waged by certain States against desegregation of public schools, presents a major domestic crisis. I have advocated that the Department of Justice throw the full weight of the United States Government into current judicial proceedings; that the Civil Rights Commission established last year hold hearings; and that part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957, which section was eliminated by the Senate last year, be enacted to deal effectively with this situation. Part III would permit the Justice Department to take the initiative in local Federal courts in protecting the constitutional rights of individuals. There seems little likelihood of enacting such effective civil-rights legislation while a filibuster threat continues possible under Senate rules. I continue my fight to change Senate Rule XXII, the so-called filibuster rule. This struggle will come to a decision on the organization of the new Congress in 1959.

I opposed enactment of legislation which would have restricted the powers of the Supreme Court in interpreting the Constitution and protecting the constitutional rights of individuals. A number of proposals were before the Senate during the last weeks of the session which would have tended to destroy the traditional balance of power between the branches of our Government and weaken the effectiveness of constitutional assurances of individual liberty. Each of these proposals was eventually reviewed, returned to the Judiciary Committee for further study or died without being considered when the Congress adjourned.

While I do not believe that the Supreme Court nor any other branch of Government should be immune from the authority of law passed by Congress and signed by the President, I considered the general attack upon the Court as in the spirit of "kill the umpire" rather than an attempt to secure needed legislation upon its merits. For this reason, I introduced a constitutional amendment approved as a part of a larger amendment by the American Bar Association and other bar associations some years ago which would assure the Supreme Court of appellate jurisdiction in constitutional law cases.

The Senate passed my bill to provide free legal counsel for indigent defendants in criminal cases in United States district courts but unfortunately this measure failed of passage in the House. I will reintroduce it next year.

Congress passed the Mills-Hennings bill providing that Government officials could not withhold public information unaffected by security considerations from the public.

The Senate-passed bill which I cosponsored, providing for home rule for the voteless citizens of the District of Columbia, failed of passage in the House and it will be necessary to recommence the legislative process next year.

IMMIGRATION

Legislation was enacted regularizing the status as permanent United States residents of the some 30,000 Hungarian parolees, refugees, from the 1956 revolt against Soviet Communist tyranny.

I sponsored a resolution calling for a conference of Free-World nations to deal with the world's refugee problems which encompass an estimated 160,000 nonresettled refugees in western Europe alone. The resolution implements the report of the Zellerbach Commission of the International Rescue Committee.

I protested on the Senate floor the "gag rule" imposed on efforts to bring up for consideration legislation to modernize the immigration statutes. I received a pledge that next year consideration will be given to aiding 4th preference quota applicants, principally from Greece and Italy, now unable to enter this country, anti-Communist and other unresettled refugees still remaining in Europe, and that the question of the inequitable nationality quota system based on the outdated 1920 census will have a hearing.

Also enacted was legislation enabling aliens to adjust their legal status here without going through the traditional process of leaving and reentering the United States.

SOCIAL SECURITY, EDUCATION AND HEALTH

Legislation was enacted increasing social-security benefits 7 percent ranging from $3 to $54 monthly, raising the social-security tax on both employers and employees by ¼ percent to 2½ percent of payroll each on an increased ceiling of $4,800 annual wages and increasing Federal grants to States for public assistance and relief.

Efforts to increase this to a larger figure were voted down in the Senate. I was cosponsor of the Case bill providing for a 10 percent increase and urged the committee to take that higher figure. Also not included was my measure to permit orphaned children 18 to 21 going to school to continue to receive orphans' benefits under social security.

The measure passed was the best which could be achieved under the circumstances. It is not satisfactory in the light of the needs of our citizens, and I shall continue to work for a better law next year.

The measure which I cosponsored with Senator IVES to enable employees of the New York Port Authority to receive social-security benefits became law.

The Congress passed the National Defense Education Act providing for a 4-year $900-million program consisting of a $295-million authorization for student loans, $300 million to help schools buy scientific equipment, $34 million for institutes for teachers to learn counseling, $29 million for institutes for training foreign-language teachers, $59.4 million for fellowships, $60 million for guidance counseling and testing, $32 million for centers for teaching little-known modern languages, $18 million for research and experimentation on better educational use of television, radio, and audiovisual aids, $60 million for vocational education in skilled trades necessary for defense, and $6.5 million for improvement of State educational statistics.

The bill as sent to the President for signature into law lacked the scholarship program passed by the Senate, as well as provisions for aid to school construction. I regard it as falling short of our clear national need, and so protested in the Senate. However, it is a beginning of a catch-up education program, and therefore vital, and I finally supported it.

Congress made permanent the program under Public Laws 815 and 875 for financial assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities insofar as such programs relate to children of persons who reside and work on Federal property, and extended such programs until June 30, 1961, insofar as they relate to other children.

I supported allowances for tax deductions for amounts paid for higher education. Payments for higher education are an investment for the future which will pay high dividends to our national interest and should be given appropriate consideration.

I sponsored the Day Care Assistance Act of 1958 to make grants to the States to assist in providing facilities and services for children needing day care outside their homes. This bill would make available such care to children of working mothers and also to mentally or physically handicapped children requiring such special attention.

I also supported the bill, now law, to encourage expansion of teaching in the education of mentally retarded children.

Congress authorized $294,383,000 for medical research, the largest such expenditure in history. This amount included $28.974 million for general research; $75.268 million for cancer; $52.419 million for mental health; $45.613 million for heart diseases; $7.420 million for dental problems; $31.215 million for arthritis; $24.071 million for allergies; and $29.403 million for neurological problems.

Congress extended the Hospital Survey and Construction (Hill-Burton) Act for 3 years and extended its scope to include diagnostic centers, hospitals for the chronically ill, rehabilitation centers and nursing homes.

POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

First-class letter rates were increased for the first time in a generation to 4 cents, post cards to 3 cents, airmail letters to 7 cents, and air postal cards to 5 cents; increases were also made in second-, third- and fourth-class mail rates. These increases are expected to produce $550 million a year in additional revenues to meet the postal deficit approaching $1 billion annually with which the Nation has been faced.

The country's 500,000 postal workers received a much needed and well deserved 10 percent–11 percent pay increase which will cost $265 million annually. Civil service employees received a 10-percent increase.

VETERANS

Compensation for veterans with service connected disabilities was increased by 10 percent, allowances for dependents of veterans 50 percent or more disabled were increased 10 percent and pensions to war widows were raised. The burial allowance for veterans was increased from $150 to $250. Also, $25 million was appropriated for additional unemployment compensation to veterans.

The number of hospital beds for veterans, including veterans afflicted with tuberculosis, is being maintained at previous adequate levels. The children of totally disabled veterans have now been included under the benefits of War Orphans Education Assistance Act of 1956.

MATTERS OF SPECIAL INTEREST TO NEW YORK STATE

Congress enacted legislation authorizing the following public-works projects in New York State: New York Harbor improvements; Irondequoit Bay improvements; Fire Island beach erosion; Oswego Harbor and nearby beach erosion; Hamlin Beach erosion; Great Lakes to Hudson Waterway; Hammonds Cove survey; South Herkimer, Amsterdam, and Rome flood control; and Auburn and Lake Owasco flood control and channel improvement.

Congress appropriated money for the following public-works projects in our State: Barcelona Harbor; Buffalo Harbor; Endicott Johnson City and Vestal; Great Lakes to Hudson Waterway; New York Harbor channels; Oswego Harbor detached breakwaters; Staten Island Rapid Transit Bridge between New York and New Jersey; and the Allegheny River Reservoir.

The measure for additional needed Federal judges in New York which I sponsored and which passed the Senate last year failed of passage in the House and it will be necessary to reintroduce it next year.

Congress transferred Grant's Tomb in New York City to the jurisdiction of the Federal Government and hereafter that monument will be maintained by the Department of the Interior for the benefit of the public.

I opposed the Chicago water diversion bill which would have taken water from the Great Lakes for use by the city of Chicago, Ill., thus decreasing electric power and shipping potentials in the Buffalo, Ogdensburg, Massena, and other upstate areas. This measure passed the House but died in the Senate on the last day of the session.

I cosponsored legislation for eradication of starfish, so injurious to the Long Island Sound oyster industry. This measure failed of passage and I will work on it again next year.

My bill, S. 3571, providing for equal treatment of State-owned hydroelectric projects to help the St. Lawrence power project passed the Senate but died in the House. It will be called up again next year.

A $35 million atomic reactor will be erected in West Milton, N. Y.

The resolution giving Congressional recognition to the Baseball Hall of Fame at Cooperstown, sponsored by Senator IVES, Representative KEARNEY, and myself, was adopted.

I was designated a member of the Hudson-Champlain Celebration Commission.

MISCELLANEOUS

Congress enacted legislation providing for humane slaughter of livestock and poultry and authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research in the development of such humane methods. My amendment looking to fair consideration for religious practices in connection with food animal slaughter was included in the law. Following preliminary votes on the effect of the bill on methods of slaughter required by religious practices, I supported this measure on passage and in the vote against the recommittal motion.

The question of conduct in office by Government officials has come to the fore during recent months. I introduced legislation to establish a code of ethics for Federal officials based on the one now in effect in New York State. I also introduced a measure looking to Congressional study of standards of conduct in public service. This is based on my experience in establishing this work when attorney general of our State.

Now that Alaska has been voted the 49th State, which I supported, consideration of Hawaii for statehood must expeditiously follow. I will do all I can to bring this about.

My bill to liberalize treatment of imports of art objects will again be under consideration in the next Congress.

As a deterrent to juvenile delinquency, Congress enacted legislation tightening restrictions on the mailing of obscene matter and prohibiting transportation in interstate commerce of switchblade knives.

CONCLUSION

Increasingly the people of our State write on matters of national interest and on their problems with Federal agencies. The letters of opinion are of valuable aid in my work here and the citizen's Federal problems are part of my duty. I sincerely hope that you will continue to express your views to me in this way or to visit Washington.

Equity Capital for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, recently the Congress enacted a new small-business program which it is hoped will alleviate many of the financial problems of small and independent business. I am referring to the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, Public Law 85-699. The Small Business Investment Act was the result of many bills introduced in the 85th Congress by both Republicans and Democrats. It is the culmination of many years of study by people concerned with the financial problems of small business.

For many years the members of the Small Business Committee of the House of Representatives have commented upon the institutional gap that exists in our economy for the provision of equity financing for small-business concerns. High tax rates have consistently drained off the earnings of business concerns thereby preventing the accumulation of capital for growth and expansion. The normal channels for securing equity funds for both new and established small firms are to a large extent nonexistent while larger concerns have litle difficulty in securing such additional funds. Obviously, the competitive advantage accruing to the larger business concerns is a most important factor to be considered in the maintenance of the small-business segment of our economy.

The Republican members of the Small Business Committee introduced bills during this Congress to assist small firms in securing additional equity capital through the medium of State development credit corporations. We believed that with Federal assistance those corporations already in existence would be stimulated, while States in which no corporations exist would rapidly enact the necessary legislation. While the Republican members preferred an approach at the State level, we actively supported S. 3651, which ultimately became the new Small Business Investment Act of 1958. I wish at this time to make a brief analysis of this legislation.

PURPOSE OF THE ACT

The Small Business Investment Act is designed to stimulate the flow of private long-term capital to small-business concerns. Federal funds will only be used to supplement private investment, not replace it; and there will be no Government ownership of private business or of the investment companies established under the act. I firmly subscribe to this most fundamental principle of Federal financial assistance. This principle is set forth in the act in section 102, which states:

It is declared to be the policy of the Congress and the purpose of this act to improve and stimulate the national economy in general and the small-business segment thereof in particular by establishing a program to stimulate and supplement the flow of private equity capital and long-term loan funds which small-business concerns need for the sound financing of their business operations and for their growth, expansion, and modernization, and which are not available in adequate supply: *Provided, however*, That this policy shall be carried out in such manner as to insure the maximum participation of private financing sources.

ORGANIZATION AND FUNCTIONS OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

The responsibility of carrying out the program under the Small Business Investment Act has been given by the Congress to the Small Business Administration. The act stipulates that a new Small Business Investment Division will be established within the Small Business Administration to be administered by a new Deputy Administrator, who will, of course, act under the Administrator himself. In this manner, the lending function of the SBA can be kept separate from the investment function and yet the facilities of a going organization may be utilized to the greatest, practical extent.

May I state that I am proud to have introduced the first bill in the House of Representatives in 1953 to establish the Small Business Administration. I am also happy that after all these many years, the Small Business Administration has been made a permanent agency, an action I have requested in each Congress since 1953. The fine work done by the SBA during the past 5 years in the fields of financial assistance, procurement, production, and technical assistance justifies the faith we have placed in this agency.

Under the Small Business Investment Act, the Small Business Administration is authorized to charter and license small-business investment companies, to lend funds to such investment companies, to regulate and examine such investment companies, and to lend funds to State and local development corporations. The SBA will not itself provide equity funds to small business but will encourage increased private activity in this area. Funds for these purposes will be available from a revolving fund appropriated by Congress. Of the $250 million authorized by Congress for this program, $50 million has already been appropriated to cover the first year's operations.

ESTABLISHMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANIES

The Small Business Administration will, as I have said, charter or license privately owned and operated small-business investment companies. Such companies must conduct their business as required by the act and SBA regulations, must submit reports to the Small Business Administration, and be subject to examination by it.

The Small Business Administration is only authorized to grant Federal charters to small-business investment companies in cases where the applicant for a charter affirmatively establishes, to the satisfaction of the Small Business Administration, that it is unable to obtain a charter under the laws of its State and still operate in accordance with the intent of the act. Inability to operate will

mean that applicable State or local laws will not permit performance of the functions as authorized under the act. The authority to grant such Federal charters will terminate June 30, 1961.

The Small Business Administration has complete discretion concerning the issuance of a license to any particular investment company. It will determine whether to license a small-business investment company after consideration of the need for small business financing in the proposed area of operation, the company's proposed plan of operation, the charter itself, the ability of the company management, and other matters that the Small Business Administration may deem relevant.

Investment companies licensed under the act will need a minimum of $300,000 paid-in capital and surplus, but the Small Business Administration can provide up to $150,000 for such purpose through the purchase of subordinated debentures of the company. Further, SBA can lend such companies up to 50 percent of their capital and surplus. The initial purchase of debentures by SBA may be considered as part of the paid-in capital and surplus. Before making such loans, the SBA must be provided with satisfactory evidence that there is a need for such financing, and that the funds are necessary to encourage the formation and growth of the company and to provide adequately for the needs of small-business concerns in its area of operations.

Shares of stock in small-business investment companies may be purchased by national banks, by other member banks in the Federal Reserve System and by nonmember insured banks.

Maturities of subordinated debentures purchased by the Small Business Administration may not be in excess of 20 years. Amortization requirements, however, may be deferred during the first half of the term, at the discretion of the SBA.

The use of Federal funds for the relocation of industry is prohibited if such relocation would result in a substantial decrease in employment in any area of the country.

Small-business investment companies also may borrow money and issue their debenture bonds, subject to limitations to be prescribed by the Small Business Administration. In establishing such limitations, the SBA will consider the stability of the companies and the protection of Federal funds, if any, borrowed by such companies. In any event, the ratio of debt to capital and surplus—including subordinated debentures held by the SBA—may not exceed 4 to 1.

OPERATIONS OF INVESTMENT COMPANIES

The primary function of licensed companies is the purchase of debentures issued by small-business concerns, convertible to stock of such concerns. Such debentures are convertible at the option of the small-business investment company, or a holder thereof in due course, up to and including the effective date of any call by the issuer, into stock of the small-business concern at the sound book value of such stock determined by the parties at the time of the issuance of the debentures.

Upon the provision of equity capital by an investment company to a small-business concern through the purchase of convertible debentures, such concern will be required to become a stockholder-proprietor of the investment company by investing in the capital stock of the company, in an amount equal to not less than 2 percent nor more than 5 percent of the amount of the capital provided.

Also, investment companies can make loans to small-business concerns running up to 20 years plus an additional 10 years to aid in liquidation. These loans must be of such sound value, or so secured, as reasonably to assure repayment. They may bear interest at rates agreed upon between the investment company and the borrower, subject to applicable laws. However, if the Small Business Administration finds that regulation of such interest rates is necessary to carry out the objectives of the act, it may prescribe maximum interest rates to govern future loans. Without SBA approval, the aggregate securities and obligations of a small-business concern held by a licensed investment company cannot exceed 20 percent of the latter's capital and surplus.

The Small Business Investment Act provides that each small-business investment company shall be subject to examination, that it shall make such reports as are required, and that it shall be subject to regulations prescribed by the Small Business Administration. Such regulation and examination is to insure that companies conduct their activities in accordance with the act.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

In addition to financial assistance, licensed companies are exempt from the provision in the Investment Company Act of 1940 which requires 300 percent asset coverage after borrowings and are eligible for Securities and Exchange Commission discretionary exemptions under the Securities Act of 1933 and Trust Indenture Act of 1939. Further, investors in licensed small-business investment companies are entitled to an ordinary, rather than capital, deduction for any loss resulting from such investment. The companies themselves receive a similar tax deduction for any loss on the convertible debentures or stock of small-business concerns. A 100 percent dividends received deduction is also available to such companies.

The operations of a small-business investment company, including the generation of business, may be undertaken wherever practicable in cooperation with banks or other financial institutions. Any servicing or initial investigation required for loans or acquisitions of securities by the investment company may be handled through banks or other financial institutions on a fee basis. An investment company may receive fees for services rendered to banks or other financial institutions.

Small-business investment companies may make use of the advisory services of the Federal Reserve System and of the Department of Commerce which are available and useful to industrial and commercial businesses. They may provide consulting and advisory services on a fee basis and have on their staff persons competent to provide such services.

Any Federal Reserve bank is authorized to act as a depository or fiscal agent for any investment company.

Federally chartered small-business investment companies may within 2 years before their expiration apply to the Small Business Administration for approval to extend their corporate existence for an additional 30 years.

The Small Business Investment Act of 1958, in addition to providing for the formation of investment companies to provide equity capital and loans to small business, also provides for a program of loans by the Small Business Administration to State development companies and to local development companies. The funds will be advanced to State development companies in exchange for obligations of those companies. The total amount advanced by the Small Business Administration may not, however, exceed the amount borrowed by the development company from all other sources. The authority under this act to make loans to local development corporations expires in 1961. Under its regular lending program the SBA may lend to local development companies to assist an identifiable small-business concern.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is admittedly experimental. It may be some time before appropriate policy and regulations can be worked out. It may be perhaps that additional legislation will be considered desirable next year. Through this broad approach, however, to the financial needs of small business, that is, through investment companies and development corporations much can be accomplished to overcome the competitive handicap of these concerns.

Hon. Lawrence H. Smith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the sudden and untimely passing of our esteemed colleague, Lawrence Smith, was a great shock to all of his colleagues. Behind the mild manner and friendly disposition of our friend, Larry, there was a keen knowledge of national and international affairs and a driving force to enact legislation, the only objective of which was to preserve our American way of life and the security of our Nation. Larry was a prodigious worker, an avid reader, and a convincing speaker. He was devoted to his wife and family and he made a record in Congress of which his constituents can be very proud.

It was my privilege to serve with Larry Smith in Congress for 16 years, to know him well, and to number him among my personal friends. He will be sorely missed in the Halls of Congress.

The Small Business Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, now that we have enacted into law legislation making the Small Business Administration a permanent agency of the Government, in my opinion, a measure long overdue, I set forth below the testimony of myself and our distinguished colleague, Mr. RIEHLMAN, of New York, as given before the Senate Appropriations Committee on August 1, 1958:

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

(Statement of Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York)

PREPARED STATEMENT

Representative MULTER. I am ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Representative from the 25th Congressional District of New York.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to appear this morning. I am doing so by the unanimous direction of the Subcommittee No. 2 of the House Small Business Committee.

I have a joint statement prepared on my own behalf and on behalf of Congressman R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, of New York, who is the ranking minority member of the committee.

With your permission, I will ask you to make it part of the record and I will summarize it briefly.

Chairman HAYDEN. That will be done.

(The statement referred to follows:)

"STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, CHAIRMAN, AND HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, RANKING MINORITY MEMBER, SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2 OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

"Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my colleague, the Honorable R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, of New York, and I deeply appreciate this opportunity to appear before your committee and to testify with regard to the pending appropriation request of the Small Business Administration. Both Congressman RIEHLMAN and I have been members of the Small Business Committee of the House of Representatives for many years, and more specifically are chairman and ranking minority member, respectively, of Subcommittee No. 2 of the Small Business Committee which, within the committee as a whole, has the responsibility of reviewing the operations of the Small Business Administration as well as Government procurement. The other members of this subcommittee are: Hon. SIDNEY R. YATES, of Illinois; Hon. TOM STEED, of Oklahoma; and Hon. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, Jr., of Connecticut.

"This particular subcommittee during the past two Congresses has held extensive hearings and has made intensive investigations directly related to the programs of the Small Business Administration. Mr. Chairman, we believe that these studies with the resulting recommendations have contributed to a considerable degree to the Small Business Act as it exists today. It is because of the deep interest of our committee in the welfare of small business throughout the country and in the effectiveness of the varied programs of assistance within the Small Business Administration's legislative authority that my friend and colleague, WALTER RIEHLMAN, and I requested an opportunity to appear here today.

"Since the Small Business Administration request for funds will not be formally heard by the House Appropriations Committee, the members of our subcommittee will discuss the matter individually with members of that committee.

"SBA programs

"As you gentlemen well know, the Congress has designed the SBA programs to help small business in the areas of financial, procurement, management, and technical assistance since it is in these fields that small business concerns have encountered the greatest impediments to successful operation. We know you are well aware that the difficulties confronting small business have been very much the same over the years. The continuing and fundamental nature of the problems of small business which the Congress has long recognized, of course, was responsible for the establishment of the Small Business Administration.

"Through the financial assistance program the SBA has supplemented the assistance given by our private financial institutions by supplying credit which would not be obtainable otherwise. This supplemental assistance by the Federal Government, within the limits the Congress has decreed to be necessary to properly safeguard public funds, is essential to the well-being of thousands of small-business concerns and, we believe, to the welfare of our entire economic structure.

"The Federal Government spending for goods and services in the interest of our national defense and security has for many years had a serious impact not only on the type of goods we produce in this country but also on the productive facilities of our industrial complex. It has been a matter of great concern to our committee and, we know, to all Members of the Congress whether our smaller productive units are properly utilized in producing for the national defense. If they are not, then these effective units of industry may be lost to our civilian economy, and more compelling an integral part of any all-out defense effort may not be available when the need arises.

"It is axiomatic that small business is essential to a well-balanced, fully productive democratic society. In support of this principle the Small Business Administration has been diligent in its efforts to increase small business participation in Government procurement. Within the limits of its manpower, we believe, the SBA has used every possible means to make small business better aware of the opportunities in Government procurement and has assisted in the actual awarding of contracts to small business through the set-aside program and by the use of certificates of competency as provided in the act.

"We are sure you gentlemen are well aware that one of the biggest problems confronting small business is the lack of competent management and technical know-how. We believe that the SBA, through counseling and dissemination of carefully prepared and informative published material, has done much to assist small-business men all over the country to become more alert to the changing demands of markets and techniques, thereby attaining a stronger competitive position.

"Of particular importance has been the role of the Small Business Administration within the executive departments as the spokesman for the small-business concerns of our country. Through its efforts, and more than ever before, other Government agencies are aware of the need for adequate consideration of small business. The SBA has increasingly acted as an adviser and as a critic in the formulation of agency policy and in the administration of existing programs.

"Future success of SBA programs

"Mr. Chairman, the record of SBA speaks for itself. Much has been done to help small business; much more still needs to be done. Both the accomplishments and the need for future planning have, we are sure, guided the action taken by both the House and Senate when the Small Business Administration was made a permanent agency. But, Mr. Chairman, it is not enough that the SBA be made a permanent agency, it must have sufficient funds and personnel to fulfill the intent of Congress, to do the job that needs to be done.

"In this respect our subcommittee, for whom we are speaking today, wishes to point out certain areas in the operations of SBA where a lack of sufficient funds could seriously impair the effectiveness of the agency and which would, in turn, act to the detriment of small business.

"Procurement assistance

"We would like to call to your attention the fact that the Bureau of the Budget has requested funds for only 88 technical positions in the field to carry out all procurement assistance programs. The Department of Defense alone has designated about 380 small-business specialists or representatives assigned to its small-business programs although in most cases these employees have other assigned duties. Yet the Small Business Administration, which is assigned the primary responsibility of assisting small business to receive its fair share of Government purchases, is allotted but 88 positions. It is in the field offices that most procurement takes place and where the small-business man must have access to SBA services and assistance.

"We might say parenthetically, Mr. Chairman, that the Senate Small Business Committee has commented in its reports that the Small Business Administration has spent too few dollars on its nonlending functions. Our subcommittee concurs in this view. However, the SBA has fully utilized its appropriations for nonlending functions. The question of increased appropriations for procurement assistance and other nonlending functions is one which the Congress must decide because apparently the Bureau of the Budget fails to recognize the importance of the procurement-assistance program.

"Let us look at the small number of personnel now assigned to the small-business joint determination set-aside program. The agency indicates that 37 of its representatives are carrying on this program on a regular basis in 90 Government purchasing offices. In addition, these men are attempting to maintain liaison with 140 procurement installations and initiating set-asides when they can be present. There is no Budget Bureau request for additional personnel for this program.

"Frankly, we cannot visualize how a staff of 37 can adequately carry out the program at so large a number of installations. The adequacy of set-aside coverage by the Small Business Administration can be more seriously questioned when it is realized that there are approximately 800 military installations which make purchases, plus a greater number of Federal civilian agency offices. Gentlemen, we do not believe the beneficial results of the joint determination (set-aside) program as provided for in the Small Business Act will be achieved unless the Congress, on its own motion, provides the necessary personnel to prosecute the program vigorously as we certainly intended in drafting the legislation.

"In response to inquiry we have been informally advised that the Small Business Administration is limiting publicity regarding its procurement and technical-assistance programs because its present staff cannot adequately handle more inquiries and problems from small-business firms than are now being received. Yet only 18 positions (not new positions) are authorized to carry on the program of how to sell to the Government

and to handle casework where the SBA assists individual firms with their procurement problems. These 18 employees are also required to assist small firms in bidding in areas of procurement where small-business competition is needed and to notify them of prime contract opportunities suitable to their facilities. These are important programs, as we have said, yet only 18 positions are being requested to carry out these functions in the agency's 55 field offices.

"The agency has reported that during calendar year 1957, about 23,500 cases of procurement assistance, counseling and representation in behalf of small-business firms were handled. Gentlemen, we know that there are many more small firms needing assistance in selling to the Government. At present there are an estimated total of 309,000 manufacturing establishments in the United States. Of course, an undetermined number of these manufacturing establishments would necessarily be deducted to secure an accurate figure for the number of companies involved since many companies, we know, own one or more establishments. However, allowing for a certain amount of duplication, it is estimated that somewhere between 50,000 and 75,000 companies are interested in Government contracts, and most of them fall into the category of smaller companies. The SBA facilities survey of smaller manufacturing plants number approximately 40,000. We must assume that many companies require procurement assistance more than once during the course of a year; therefore, we believe that in this particular phase of SBA's activities the number of positions allotted should be doubled, that is 36 positions.

"Subcontracting assistance

"Another area in which small business deserves more assistance is in the field of subcontracting. The Small Business Administration provides assistance in this area by visiting large prime contractors and subcontractors to develop subcontract opportunities for small concerns. During calendar year 1957, the SBA reports that 3,926 calls or visits were made, from which it was able to refer 4,976 subcontract opportunities to small-business firms. The success of such a program depends upon a sufficient number of personnel to make repetitive contacts to firms which secure large Government contracts. It is our feeling that the agency's efforts in making less than 4,000 calls or visits to develop subcontract opportunities is merely scratching the surface. We seriously question whether the request for 11 positions (10 new positions) is sufficient to carry on this very important program. We must recognize that subcontracting has become most important to small-business firms because the volume of Government purchases devoted to the missile programs, to aircraft production, and to highly complex weapons has increased and will undoubtedly increase still more in years to come.

"Small-business firms cannot handle this type of prime contract and should receive greater assistance in their efforts to obtain subcontracts. The skill and inventiveness of thousands upon thousands of our smaller manufacturers and machine shops have been fully demonstrated in the growth of the aircraft industry. We must keep our procurement base broad in the missile as well as the aircraft industry. We need the skills which have been developed, and we need the small concerns which have grown up in the weapons industry during the past 20 years. They constitute a strategic reserve which must be kept in a position of readiness.

"Other procurement assistance

"Another SBA program of great importance to small-business concerns is that of certifying the credit and production capacities of small-business concerns that are low bidders on Government purchases. This program offers an appeal procedure for those small firms whose low bids on Government procurement have been questioned because of doubt as to their financial and productive capacities. Requests for assistance and for certificates of competency issued by the Small Business Administration are expected to increase as this program is extended to more military and civilian purchasing offices.

"Another factor which may add greatly to the number of requests for assistance is a recent decision by the Comptroller General stating Government contracting officers should apply the same standards to ascertain the fitness of the subcontractor as they apply in determining the fitness of a prime contractor. This may require the SBA to offer assistance in the form of certificates of competency to a large number of subcontractors. It would seem that the six positions (no new positions) for this program are too low to handle the number of requests for assistance which should be forthcoming.

"New responsibilities

"We are concerned, too, that only a total of 16 positions is requested to carry out the 2 programs which are new to SBA. These programs are: (1) set-asides on the sale of Government property, including timber leases; and (2) research and development assistance for small firms. In view of the importance of these programs, it would seem that this is a very modest request to cover the initial staffing requirements.

"Management service

"It is our subcommittee's feeling that the request does not include adequate personnel for the management services program. As previously stated, one of the biggest problems confronting small business is lack of managerial skill and technical know-how. Despite this, only four positons (no new positions) are requested for SBA's field offices to provide management counseling services and to assist educational institutions in providing management courses for small-business executives.

"Summary: procurement assistance

"We find, therefore, that there is no increase requested for personnel to further the following programs: Joint set-asides, procurement counseling, and prime contract referrals, certificates of competency, facilities inventory, products assistance, and the management series.

"For emphasis we desire to summarize the status of new positions which have been requested in the fiscal 1959 request for procurement and technical assistance:

"1. Ten additional positions are requested for subcontracting making a total of 11. These 11 men, we understand, will be expected to work with more than 400 large prime contractors in carrying out subcontracting projects.

"2. Twenty additional positions are requested for procurement and technical assistance for branch offices where there are no professional staff members for this work at the present time.

"3. Sixteen positions are provided to handle the work in connection with surplus property sales and research and development activities. These additional positions, however, were recommended by virtue of the adoption of the Senate amendments to the Small Business Act which provided for set-asides for small business in the sale of surplus property and assistance to small-business concerns in obtaining Government contracts for research and development as well as assistance flowing from other research and development activities sponsored by the Government.

"This matter, Mr. Chairman, is of the utmost concern to small business. The Small Business Administration has become, insofar as small business is concerned, an agency of major importance in our Federal Government. The Congress in delegating authority to the Small Business Administration has established many types of services which the agency must perform in the behalf of small business. We believe, as we are sure you can gather from our statement, that assistance to small business in securing an equitable portion of contract awards for goods and services is a most important function of the Small Business Administration. That assistance when combined with the work pertaining to subcontracts, managerial, production, and other technical services, assumes even greater importance.

"It is difficult to relate the results of the procurement assistance and collateral programs in definitive terms. The set-aside program can be evaluated in dollars and number of set-asides. Of course, we can also evaluate in dollars the direct contract awards which small business receives from our defense and civilian agencies; and we have some idea of the dollar amounts of subcontracting, but we cannot give exact figures. Other types of assistance may be, as we have seen, statistically calculated in various ways; but we cannot evaluate in dollars the results of such assistance accruing to the thousands of small-business men who are the recipients. We know that this assistance is sought by small business, and we know that the staff of the Small Business Administration has been zealous in its efforts to render maximum service. We mention these points because they are important in developing and crystallizing determinations relating to the procurement and technical-assistance programs.

"We as a Nation are spending some $20 billion a year for goods and services for our national defense and about $4 billion for goods and services required by our civil departments and agencies (including the Atomic Energy Commission). The Congress has placed a responsibility on the Small Business Administration to make certain that small business gets its share of the contracts awarded by the Government for goods and services. A procurement contract or subcontract provides employment, profits, and taxes and contributes to the growth of communities and of our economy as a whole.

"Procurement assistance translated into contract awards, broadens our procurement base and keeps active the skills, ingenuity, and inventiveness which have contributed to much of the building and success of our total manufacturing establishments. In many respects procurement assistance renders to smaller manufacturers and other small concerns supplying the Government a greater service than the making of a loan. In making this statement we do not intend to imply that the financial assistance program does not need every penny which has been requested; we simply use this known fact to emphasize the necessity of providing SBA's other programs with sufficient manpower and money to do the job.

"Therefore, we believe that an inequity exists in the current appropriation request because of the inadequate increase in funds allotted for procurement and technical assistance. This inequity may be illustrated by noting that, in fiscal 1958, 24 percent of SBA's administrative funds were allocated to the procurement, production and technical assistance programs, while in the present request for fiscal 1959 the Bureau of the Budget allocation is only 22 percent of the total administrative funds. It will be noted that the 1959 allocation is 2 percent lower than the 1958 allocation despite the fact that the 1959 request includes 16 new positions to carry out the requirements of the Senate amendments relating to surplus property disposal and research and development. To express this point in another way we refer to the 1959 request of $9,950,000 for

financial assistance which represents an increase of 45 percent over the 1958 actual expenditures, for the regular lending program. This figure, of course, does not include funds for making disaster loans, the contingency reserve of $1,750,000 or funds for the liquidation of RFC loans.

"We do not feel it proper to appear before the distinguished chairman and distinguished members of this great committee and offer what our subcommittee believes to be constructive criticism without offering for your consideration a suggested solution or compromise on the most important problem of procurement, assistance. We respectfully suggest that the appropriation for procurement and technical assistance be increased by an amount equal to the increase for the regular lending program. An increase of 45 percent over the 1958 actual expenditure for procurement and technical assistance would equal $3,240,750 exclusive of the sum recommended for personnel to administer surplus property sales and research and development activities as provided in the Senate amendments to the act. The addition of $150,000 for this work would make a total of $3,390,750. This, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, we believe would add sufficient manpower to the procurement and technical assistance programs to strengthen the areas of operation which we have previously called to your attention. Particularly, it would enable the Small Business Administration to extend its coverage of the principal military and civilian procurement operations, many of which are now covered only on a part-time basis. At present, out of the some 800 military and civilian agencies which procure for the Government, the SBA is able to cover only 90 of such operations and as indicated many on a part-time basis only. At the very least all principal procurement offices should be covered by the Small Business Administration's procurement specialists. That would cover only 175 offices of the 800 mentioned.

"At this very moment in our history when our national security is once again seriously threatened by the shadow of Communist aggression, all of us are concerned with thoughts of our national defense. It is of transcendent importance that every shop and factory in our country capable of producing for the national defense be given all possible assistance in connection with defense contracts when such assistance is required. We earnestly suggest that this is not possible unless the procurement-assistance programs, as provided for in the Small Business Act, are materially strengthened."

GENERAL STATEMENT

Representative MULTER. The appearance here on behalf of our subcommittee is to urge to add to the appropriation for the Small Business Administration approximately $600,000 in order that they can adequately perform the job that we in Congress expect them to perform.

Of course, most people look upon SBA as a financial agency giving lending assistance to small business. While that is a most important function of SBA, I think even though we cannot measure it in dollars and cents by far the most important function of SBA is the work it does on behalf of small business in connection with procurement, particularly Government procurement. They have a tremendous job that they have been trying to do and can do and will do much better if we give them the tools with which to work in getting prime contracts to small business, in having Government set aside particular parts of procurement for small business, and in addition not only getting prime contracts for small business but inducing prime contractors who have Government contracts to subcontract part of that work to the small-business man.

Procurement functions

In addition to the work that the agency has been doing to date, in the Small Business Administration Act which was approved by the President on July 18, 1958, we added at the instance of the Senate, with the concurrence of the House, new procurement functions for SBA.

We have required them now to take on the job of disposal of Government property including timber leases incidentally and in addition to that to do a job of research and development assistance for small-business firms.

The strange part of it is that the Budget Bureau has approved practically no increase for this very important part of the work of the Small Business Administration. As a matter of fact, while increasing the budgetary appropriation for the Small Business Administration for financial assistance by some 45 percent over the current budget they have actually recommended a 2-percent decrease in the procurement work despite the fact that the law, as now enacted, requires the Small Business Administration to do additional work and, as I say, very important work.

The House committee will not formally hear this matter, but we on the Small Business Committee have undertaken to approach the members individually on the House side and present this problem to them so that, when this bill gets back to the House, they will be favorably disposed to give this agency the money it needs with which to properly carry on.

I do hope that this committee will see fit to recommend and the Senate will follow the recommendation to give the Small Business Administration adequate money with which to carry on this very important work.

Chairman HAYDEN. I understand your colleague, Mr. RIEHLMAN, cannot be here today.

Representative MULTER. Mr. RIEHLMAN went to the Bethesda Hospital this morning and hoped to be able to get here. He went there for a checkup. He hoped to be able to get here in time to add his comments to what I have said. Unfortunately he has been delayed.

As I said at the outset, not only does Mr. RIEHLMAN agree with what I have said and with the statement but the statement has the unanimous approval of our subcommittee.

Senator YOUNG. Congressman, this would help small business a great deal. It is the small business that is in trouble much more than big industry.

Representative MULTER. There is no doubt, Senator. Big business can do this job for themselves and unless small business has an agency such as the Small Business Administration to help them do this job they are swallowed up in the mass.

Senator YOUNG. I certainly agree with you.

Representative MULTER. Thank you, sir.

Chairman HAYDEN. We thank you for your appearance.

Voting Record of Congressman Wayne L. Hays on Major Legislation of the 85th Congress

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my voting record on 30 of the most important bills to come before the House of Representatives during the 85th Congress. I have done this every 2 years since I have been in Congress and mailed out copies so that my constituents could have a convenient method of checking my record.

The 85th Congress has been a successful and historic one. Washington political writers have described it as a do-well Congress, which has made a formidable record of work done.

The record follows:

How I voted	Issue	Status
Voted for	Mutual security program to strengthen the Free World	Became law.
Voted for	National Defense Education Act of 1958	Became law.
Voted for	Bill increasing social security benefits by 7 percent	Became law.
Voted for	Kennedy-Ives labor reform bill	Defeated.
Voted for	Bill making Small Business Administration a permanent Federal agency and increasing loan authorization.	Became law.
Voted for	Department of Defense Reorganization Act	Became law.
Voted for	Highway construction bill	Became law.
Voted for	Civil Rights Act of 1957	Became law.
Voted against	Extension of Trade Agreements Act for 4 years authorizing a total of 20 percent reduction in any tariff rate existing on July 1, 1958.	Became law.
Voted for	Bill requiring disclosure of employee welfare and pension plans and annual financial reports.	Became law.
Voted for	Improvement of Federal Civil Defense Act	Became law.
Voted for	Tax revision bill, including admissions tax cut	Became law.
Voted for	Community Facilities Act of 1958, authorizing program of loans to municipalities for construction of public facilities.	Defeated.
Voted for	Depressed areas redevelopment bill	Vetoed.
Voted for	Ending issuance of fast tax writeoff certificates	Became law.
Voted against	Bill increasing first class postal rates [1]	Became law.
Voted for	Increasing pay of members of Armed Forces to encourage career service	Became law.
Voted for	Bill extending benefits of unemployment compensation, now available only to Korean veterans, to all ex-servicemen.	Became law.
Voted for	Bill establishing Airways Modernization Board to assure safe, efficient navigation system for all civilian and military planes.	Became law.
Voted for	Increasing pensions of widows of Spanish-American War veterans	Became law.
Voted for	Liberalization of requirements for veterans' widows' benefits	Became law.
Voted for	Reemployment rights for National Guard men	Passed House.
Voted for	Housing Act of 1958	Defeated.
Voted for	Bill extending time for disabled persons to file for social security	Became law.
Voted for	Improved annuities under Civil Service Retirement Act	Became law.
Voted for	Federal aid for school construction	Defeated.
Voted for	Bill increasing unemployment benefits	Became law.
Voted for	Alaska statehood bill	Became law.
Voted for	Bill establishing a civilian-controlled space agency to be called the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Became law.
Voted for	Humane slaughter of livestock bill	Became law.

[1] The Senate added the postal employees salary increase to this bill and so I voted for it when it returned to the House.

Social Security—Present and Proposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. BENNETT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, one of my principal concerns since I first came to Congress in 1943 to represent the constituents of the 12th Congressional District of Michigan has been the strengthening and improvement of our social-security system.

On July 18, 1958, I outlined a program to the Members of the House and urged its adoption. The amendments to the Social Security Act which were subsequently passed and approved by the President will undoubtedly be very helpful to the 12 million individuals who now rely on monthly checks from the social-security system as the foundation of their economic security. For the overwhelming majority of these aged and disabled persons, widows and orphans, these benefits are the major source of their support. However, these amendments fall far short of my program.

NINETEEN HUNDRED FIFTY-EIGHT AMENDMENTS TO SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

The amendments to the Social Security Act just passed by the Congress and approved by the President (Public Law 85-840) may be summarized as follows:

A. CHANGES IN OLD-AGE, SURVIVORS, AND DISABILITY INSURANCE PROVISIONS

Individuals now on the old-age and survivor insurance benefit rolls, and all future beneficiaries, will have their benefits increased, generally, by 7 percent effective January 1, 1959. The minimum increase in the benefit of a worker who retired on or after age 65 is $3 per month. The average increase for workers now retired is approximately $4.75 a month. The range in monthly payments under the new law is from $33 to $116, as compared with $30 to $108.50 under the old law. The new benefits will be reflected in the checks received in February 1959.

The ceiling on the total benefits payable to a family on the basis of an insured worker's earnings record is raised from $200 to $254 a month.

The total annual earnings on which benefits will be computed, and on which contributions will be paid, are raised from $4,200 to $4,800 effective on January 1, 1959.

Benefits are provided for the dependents of disabled workers like those now provided for the dependents of workers retired on account of age. Such dependents are wives and dependent husbands who have reached retirement age, unmarried dependent children, and wives, regardless of age, who have an eligible child in their care.

The provision which previously required payments under certain other disability benefit systems to be offset against social-security disability benefits was repealed. Hence, a person who is eligible for a social-security disability benefit and also for a disability benefit under another system may receive the full amount of his social-security benefits.

The work requirements that a disabled worker must meet to be eligible for cash disability benefits, and to have his benefit rights frozen while he is disabled, are changed to make it easier for a disabled worker to qualify when his disability has a gradual onset.

Disability insurance benefits are payable for as much as 12 months before the month in which an application for benefits is filed. Under previous law there was no provision for retroactive disability insurance payments.

The June 30, 1958, deadline for filing fully retroactive applications for the disability freeze is postponed for 3 years.

A person would not lose his benefit under the retirement test for any month in which he has earned wages of $100 or less, rather than $80 under previous law.

Where earnings exceed the amount allowed under the retirement test without loss of benefits, the excess earnings are charged to months beginning with the first month of the year. Under previous law, the excess was charged to months in reverse order beginning with the end of the year. This change means that where an individual's or a family's benefits are increased during a year, the benefits suspended by reason of earnings will be the smaller ones that were payable for the early months of the year.

Where a person over age 18 is the child of a deceased or retired insured worker and has been disabled since before age 18, benefits would, in general, be paid to the child without requiring the proof required under previous law that he has been dependent upon the worker for his support. The change would make the requirement for the disabled adult child the same as for the child under age 18.

Benefits are provided for the dependent parent of a deceased worker even though there is a widow or child of the worker who is eligible or may become eligible for benefits. Under previous law, a parent could qualify only if there was no such widow or child.

A lump sum is paid to the widow of a deceased worker only if she was living in the same household with him or has paid his burial expenses.

Benefits are paid to a child if the child has been living in the worker's household, if the child has not been supported by anyone else, and if he was adopted by the widow of the worker within 2 years after the worker died or 2 years from the date of enactment of this legislation.

Benefits are paid to the mother of a child if the child had been adopted by the mother's deceased husband even though they had not been married for as long as 1 year.

Benefits are paid to the adopted child of a retired worker even though the child had not been adopted for as long as 3 years.

Where a survivor of a deceased worker is, or might at retirement age become, eligible for benefits based on the worker's earnings but loses eligibility by remarriage, the survivor could become eligible immediately or upon attainment of retirement age for benefits on her second husband's earnings record.

Where two secondary beneficiaries marry each other, for example, the dependent parent of one worker and the widow of another, the payment of benefits to both beneficiaries would be continued. Under previous law, both lost their benefits. Childhood disability benefits would be continued when the person receiving them marries a person receiving old-age or disability benefits.

Changes are made in the coverage provisions of the program: First, to facilitate coverage of certain State and local government employees who are in positions covered by a retirement system; second, to facilitate coverage of employees of certain nonprofit organizations; third, to extend coverage to turpentine workers; fourth, to provide social security credits for earnings which a person has from a partnership during the year of his death; and fifth, to provide that social security wage credits of $160 will be credited for each month of service performed during World War II by American citizens in the armed forces of certain countries which fought against our enemies in that war.

The tax rates for the support of the system are increased by one-fourth of 1 percent each for employees and employers, and three-eighths of 1 percent for the self-employed, above the rates previously scheduled, and the scheduled increases in the rates are to take place every 3 years instead of every 5 years.

The actuaries of the Social Security Administration have advised that the financing of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system provided for in this new law will be adequate to pay for all benefits payable under this program and that the program can be considered as actuarially sound.

B. CHANGES IN PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROVISIONS

A new formula is provided for Federal participation in public assistance, providing additional funds to all States and maximum flexibility in meeting medical-care needs and other special needs. The formula also recognizes the limited fiscal capacity of the lower income States. The public assistance program is extended to Guam. The new law also increases the Federal fund limitations for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and extends for 2 years a special provision applying to blind programs in Missouri and Pennsylvania.

C. MATERNAL AND CHILD-WELFARE PROVISIONS

Authorizations are increased for (1) maternal and child health from $16.5 million to $21.5 million, (2) crippled children's services from $15 million to $20 million, and (3) child-welfare services from $12 million to $17 million. In the child-welfare-services program, existing differences in treatment of urban and rural children are eliminated and appropriate allotment and matching provisions are included.

PROPOSED PROGRAM

Mr. Speaker, in my statement to the House on July 18, 1958, I called to the attention of the Members of Congress the fact that there are many retired people today in every State of this Union whose social-security benefits are so small that they must seek public assistance from various welfare and charitable organizations to maintain the barest type of subsistence. No sound reason exists for allowing this lamentable condition to continue. I feel certain that most employees covered by the social-security system—and there are some 75 million individuals who are presently covered—would be willing to absorb their fair share of the additional cost for the support of the old-age and survivors insurance program if they were assured of receiving a pension at the time of their retirement which would enable them to live decently and comfortably without other assistance.

In my remarks of July 18, I called attention to my bill, H. R. 12977, which I introduced on June 17, 1958, which embodies my program of the changes which should be made in the Social Security Act. My remarks are as follows:

REDUCTION OF RETIREMENT AGE

My first change—reduction of the retirement age from 65 to 62 for men and from 62 to 60 for women—is one of the most important features of my bill. It will reach down to provide social-security benefits for millions of men and women today who have been arbitrarily retired from their jobs and must now wait months and often years—a period during which savings are depleted, assets are liquidated, and often charity must be solicited from friends, relatives, or public funds—until they can qualify for their social-security benefits. For the truth of the matter is that, even under the present law, less than 10 percent retire voluntarily to qualify for social-security benefits. Most people retire because of company retirement provisions or because of ill health.

Too often the eligibility age for social security is confused with a compulsory retirement age. Yet more than 20 years of experience with the system has shown us that the man or woman who is able to work beyond retirement age—and is allowed to work beyond that age—will almost invariably continue on the job. The fact that the average benefit under social security today is just under $65 a month is one understandable incentive.

Another compelling reason for lowering the retirement age is the tragic fact that older workers, who are the special victims of plant relocations and retooling operations, find it almost impossible to secure new jobs or the opportunity to develop new and marketable skills. It is an anomaly of our times that the new machines which add so greatly to our productivity as a Nation are viewed with fear and apprehension by older men and women who, after a long working life, find their jobs threatened by the age of electronics. With the laudable purpose of cutting administrative costs, the Social Security Administration itself installed, not long ago, a huge electronic machine to help keep the records in this largest bookkeeping operation in the world. In its administrative aspects, the social-security system has, therefore, recognized that we are living in a new age in which machine power is steadily replacing certain kinds of manpower. It is time that the program aspects of the plan recognize this fact as well. One necessary way of adjusting to this fact is by lowering the floor for eligibility so that the displaced workers of our modern productive plant can begin to receive benefits at an earlier age if they have been forcibly retired before they are 65.

ELIGIBILITY OF WIDOWED MOTHERS

My second proposal—to make widowed mothers eligible at age 50, instead of requiring them to wait until they are 62 as in present law—will round out the purpose of the 1939 amendments which took special account of the fact that the widows and orphans of workers who die prematurely are entitled to protection against wage loss caused by death of the family breadwinner. Under this provision each child was made eligible for a benefit during his minority and the widowed mother received her own benefit until her youngest child reached the age of 18. The purpose of the amendment was to make it possible for the widowed mother to remain in the home and care for her children—in the same way she would have done had her husband not died—by providing social security benefits in lieu of his wages. This is, indeed, a laudable purpose and one which I heartily endorse. But it does not go far enough. Too often, I am afraid, the cancellation of the benefit check because the children are grown, works a cruel hardship on the mother who, having raised her family, finds herself, in middle age, thrown off the social security rolls. According to the most recent figures available—for the end of the year 1956—approximately 40 percent of the women receiving mother's benefits were between the ages of 40 and 50. After age 50, as could be expected, the number of eligible mothers tapered off abruptly.

My proposal would accomplish two purposes:

First. For those mothers who are 50 or over when the youngest child reaches 18, the benefit would be continued for the rest of their lives.

Second. For those mothers who are younger than 50 when the youngest child reaches 18, the waiting period for benefits would be cut by 12 years because they would be eligible for benefits at age 50 instead of age 62.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that all evidence shows it is extremely difficult for women without work experience to find a job after 50. Only about one-third of the women age 45 to 54 are in the labor force today and of those who have jobs, about 80 percent are in the low-pay service jobs in private households, business establishments and industry. Therefore, this change is of the most urgent importance.

INCREASE MINIMUM BENEFIT

The third improvement I propose would increase the amount of the present minimum benefit from $33 to $50 per month—a change which would be of particular importance to those people who can qualify for social security only on the basis of low wages—especially domestic workers and those agricultural workers who do day work. Obviously, the minimum benefit of $33 a month cannot even be described as a subsistence income in our high-cost economy of today; yet about 13 percent of the people now receiving social-security benefits receive this minimum amount. Because this benefit is so low, it is necessary for the public assistance agencies to supplement these social-security benefits to bring them up to the barest minimum required for existence. As of February 1958, 24 percent of people on old-age assistance were receiving social-security benefits so small they required such supplementation, and this figure has been rising over the years. In February 1957, for example, it stood at 22 percent.

Moreover, a small increase in the social-security minimum benefit has no effect in situations such as this, as many of us in Congress learned in 1954. The $5 increase in the minimum benefit provided at that time was treated simply as additional income by the old-age-assistance people and the supplementary old-age-assistance check was reduced by the $5 increase in the social-security benefit. Thus, a man or woman receiving the minimum social-security benefit of $25 at that time and a supplementary old-age-assistance check of $25, for a total of $50 per month, still received only $50, since the new $30 minimum merely cut the supplementary old-age-assistance check to $20. The only way we can remedy this problem is to make a substantial increase in the minimum benefit to at least $50. This will not only make about 3,250,000 people eligible for substantially increased benefits, but it will also release some of the funds now being used by the States for old-age assistance payments so that people in need, who are entirely dependent upon these programs, could receive larger payments with the same expenditures of State and Federal moneys.

CHANGING BENEFIT FORMULA

The fourth provision would make a related increase in benefits for all people now receiving benefits and those who will apply for them in the future. This would be accomplished by changing the benefit formula so that it would pay 66 percent—now 55 percent—of the first $110 of the average monthly wage, and 20 percent—as in existing law—of the remainder up to the new maximum of $500. This revision will provide an increase of over 20 percent for those beneficiaries in the lowest brackets. Moreover, the maximum benefits which eventually can be paid when the new $6,000 wage base goes into full effect will be in excess of $150 per month.

I am concerned with the figures which show that at the end of 1956 only about 30 percent of the full old-age benefits were over the average of $64. I am equally concerned that some 400,000 families, who are currently drawing benefits for both the retired worker and his wife, are now receiving only $75 or less in the form of monthly benefits.

This revision in the benefit formula recognizes the fact that social-security benefits must reflect substantial increases that have taken place in the cost of living. For the same reason, the Congress voted increases in benefits in 1950, in 1952, in 1954, and again in 1958.

MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL CARE

The fifth improvement recognizes the inability of numerous retired people to pay for the cost of medical care associated with hospitalization on meager pensions which are now available to them. My plan would pay the cost of hospital care and surgical services provided in the hospital up to 60 days for people eligible for social-security benefits. If further care in a nursing home is indicated by the physician, additional costs up to 120 days of combined hospital and nursing home care is provided. It incorporates an income test, used in many private plans, by limiting this protection to those people whose total family income, including social-security benefits, does not exceed $2,400 a year. These modifications will, I believe, bring better medical care to those people who need it most, at less cost to the social-security system.

The method of confining payments to those hospital services where cost schedules have already been tested by Blue Cross plans, also preserves the professional independence of doctors. It is designed simply to provide a form of insurance protection for those people on social security whose income is so limited that they cannot afford to pay the premiums for this kind of prepaid care.

We must make this forward step because I am convinced our older people are not getting their share of the modern but increasingly costly miracles of medical care. The high cost of medical care is felt more acutely by older people, moreover, because their illnesses are usually of longer duration.

According to the most recent nationwide survey of medical needs and costs, conducted for the Health Information Foundation in 1952–53, the average annual cost for private care for people 65 and over was $102, as compared with $65 a year for the general population. Of the total of over $10 billion spent for private personal health services, 13 percent, or $1.3 billion was required for these older people. In other words, men and women 65 years of age and over were faced with charges 57 percent greater than was the general population.

The wider application of preventive measures which we are getting today will lead to less infirmity in older years in the future. This is one of the reasons why I am not persuaded by the argument sometimes presented that my proposal would lead eventually to excessive medical costs. Another is that I am confident the doctors of this country are competent enough, and honest enough, to insure against any abuse of this provision.

While progress is under way toward the goal of providing better voluntary prepayment coverage for older people, the fact still remains that although almost two-thirds of our people under 65 have some form of prepayment insurance, only 36 percent of people 65 and over are now insured. Moreover, among these older people, the proportion with insurance declines with advancing age so that fewer than one-fourth are insured among those aged 75 and over.

Finally, good evidence indicates that it is not through negligence that many older people are without medical care protection. It is simply because it is not available to them at a price they can pay. Thus, my plan with its $2,400 income ceiling is designed specifically to meet the medical care needs of people with a low-retirement income who would otherwise be self-sufficient. We will not only be preserving individual self-respect, but we will also be helping hospitals to meet the mounting costs of providing the best kind of medical care for people who cannot now afford it.

INCREASE IN SOCIAL SECURITY WAGE BASE

The sixth change proposed in the system is to bring the social security wage base, for benefit and tax purposes, more closely in line with modern price and wage levels. The original wage base of $3,000 covered the full earnings of 97 percent of all workers in covered employment in 1939. Now, for the present wage base of $4,200, the figure is only 72 percent. Of men with earnings during the whole year, only 60 percent have all their earnings covered under the present ceiling of $4,200. Thus, for a majority of men who are regularly employed, the present ceiling puts a dead stop to further benefit increases no matter how much their earnings rise. Under my proposed $6,000 wage base, 75 percent will have their entire wages covered.

LIBERALIZATION OF PERMANENT AND TOTAL DISABILITY

My seventh proposal would establish a more liberal definition of permanent and total disability for the benefits which were authorized by the 1956 amendments, and modify the stringent length of service requirements. These more realistic provisions would not only apply to the benefits payable to people 50 and over, but also to the disability freeze which applies to workers at any age.

I presume that every Member of Congress has received mail from people who have considered themselves qualified for these payments but have been rejected by the Social Security Administration. The definition of disability in the law is strict and it is even more strictly administered.

This conclusion seems to be borne out by the facts. In September 1956, right after the act was passed, it was estimated that about 400,000 people would qualify the first year. The President's budget message in January 1957 dropped the figure to 380,000 and later in the year the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance issued a revised estimate of 275,000. Actually, as of April of this year only 187,500 disability beneficiaries were on the rolls.

The change I propose would modify the requirement in present law that the disabled person must be unable to engage in any substantial gainful activity by stating that he must be unable to engage in a substantial gainful activity which is the same as or similar to the occupation or employment last performed by him on a regular basis before the onset of such impairment. This latter terminology is closer to what Congress really intended in passing the 1956 amendments and will insure administration of the act in a way that will give the American worker real protection against crippling injury or disease.

My bill will also reduce the quite stringent requirements that an individual to qualify, must have 20 out of the last 40 quarters of coverage before he is disabled. I propose that this period be reduced to 15 out of the last 30 quarters. Such a revision, I believe, will take care of some of the tragic cases of middle-age workers who are incapacitated in the early years of their coverage under this system.

In conclusion, let me say that we must keep our social-security system up to date because we believe in the inherent dignity and worth of each individual.

If the welfare and security of our social-security beneficiaries is to be properly protected, the Congress must no longer postpone action on these vital matters. My bill embodies the much-needed changes presently required in our social-security program. If I am privileged to serve again as a Member of the 86th Congress I shall reintroduce this bill and urge its enactment into law.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT LEGISLATION

Mr. Speaker, I cannot conclude my remarks without saying something about the railroad retirement program.

I regret very much that this Congress did not approve an increase in railroad retirement benefits. A bill providing for an increase of 7 percent in such benefits was approved by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on which I serve. However, the committee action came late in the session of the Congress and the bill could not be considered before adjournment.

I am glad to know, however, that the new law increasing social-security benefits will enable thousands of retired railroad workers, their wives and their survivors, to get some increases in their benefits. This is so because the Railroad Retirement Act contains a provision which guarantees that in no case will monthly benefits payable to retired railroad employees and their wives, or to the families of deceased railroad employees, be less than the amounts the social-security system would pay if railroad employment were covered under the social security system.

The Railroad Retirement Board has announced that some 30,000 retired railroad employees, 90,000 wives of retired railroad employees, and 160,000 widows, children, and aged parents of such employees, will receive increases as a result of the social-security amendments. In most cases, the increases will approximate 7 percent. The new rates will go into effect in January 1959, and in most cases will be reflected in the benefit checks dated February 1, 1959.

The benefits payable to some railroad disability annuitants would also be affected by the following changes in the disability insurance provisions of the social-security program: Provision for benefits to dependents of disability insurance beneficiaries; elimination of provision offsetting certain other disability benefits; provision for a 3-year postponement of the present deadline June 30, 1958, for filing fully retroactive disability freeze applications; provision for payment of benefits retroactively for as many as 12 months before the month in which an application is filed; and liberalization of the insured status requirements for eligibility for disability benefits.

With respect to those retired railroad employees and their families who will not benefit from the new social-security law, I am confident that at the beginning of the 86th Congress next January, legislation will be introduced to provide increases in benefits for these individuals. If I am privileged to serve again as a Member of the 86th Congress, I shall actively support such legislation, both in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Retirement of Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by me on the retirement of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN].

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I do not wish for the record of this session's proceedings to be finished without expressing my regret that the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is concluding his service in the Senate.

Although he is a man of unusually admirable characteristics, the eloquent tributes that have been paid him in recent days leave little for development if repetition is to be avoided.

His notable achievements in military and governmental matters have been reviewed in detail.

For my part, I express my admiration of him as a stalwart American and an exemplar of a type that is lamentably vanishing from contemporary life.

ED MARTIN has endeared himself to those of us privileged to serve with him in the Senate. He is an effective legislator and a true gentleman. He richly deserves the retirement he has chosen, but his decision leaves the Senate and the Nation poorer. The impression that Senator MARTIN has made on his colleagues and on our institutions of government will be long lasting. It is with a very genuine sense of sadness that I say hail and farewell, and Godspeed.

Development Program, State of Nevada: A Report to the Stockholders, the People of Nevada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my report on the development program for the State of Nevada.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM, STATE OF NEVADA: A REPORT TO THE STOCKHOLDERS, THE PEOPLE OF NEVADA—NEVADA'S FUTURE

(By Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE, of Nevada)

Nevada's future depends on projects and policies which will utilize her rich human and material resources.

Our human resources, spiritual, cultural, and intellectual are continuously being enhanced by projects and programs inaugurated by our churches, our university and schools, and our many organizations.

Expansion of our material resources is contingent on projects for greater utilization of our mineral wealth, our soil, range, and water resources, both present and potential, plus policies which will protect our production and producers from low wage foreign competition.

Ever since I left the University of Nevada—as head of my own engineering firm, State engineer, engineering consultant to the United States Senate Military Affairs Committee on strategic and critical minerals and materials, and as United States Senator—I have worked and fought to advance such projects for the benefit of Nevada and the Nation.

Sound policies and hard work are the foundation stones of constructive projects.

IRRIGATION, POWER, AND FLOOD CONTROL POLICIES

Legislation providing for Federal irrigation, flood control, and power projects is premised on policies established by Congress.

Reclamation policy was established by the Reclamation Act of 1902, sponsored by the late Senator Francis G. Newlands, of Nevada, who served our State 5 terms in the House of Representatives and was 3 times elected by the people of Nevada to the United States Senate. Under the policy he initiated public money is advanced for irrigation and repaid over an extended period of years without interest. The first project in the United States authorized under the Reclamation Act was the Lahontan project at Fallon.

Federal power policy was established in the 1928 Hoover Dam Enabling Act while I was State engineer and engineer member of the Colorado River Commission. Under this act a substantial part of irrigation and reclamation costs is paid by proceeds from sale of power developed by a project, and funds provided for power facilities are repaid with interest, which was first set at 4 percent and has been since reduced to 3 percent.

Flood control policy first became applicable about three-quarters of a century ago with initial work in the Mississippi watershed. Since that time hundreds of millions of dollars have been expended in that area, far less in our Western States. In 1928, in the Hoover Dam Project Act, $25 million was allocated to flood control, but repayment was deferred. Costs of a reclamation project chargeable to flood control are no longer repaid. As an example of this principle, approximately $6,150,000 of the estimated cost of the Truckee-Carson (Washoe) project has been charged to flood control, but this portion of the cost is not reimbursable to the Federal Government.

HOW NEW PROJECTS ARE OBTAINED

Application of these policies to benefit Nevada has been my endeavor throughout my career.

In line with these policies projects are proposed in Congress and Congress directs the United States Army Corps of Engineers to make investigations and reports on flood control and related problems in various drainage areas. As funds are made available surveys are completed and reports submitted to Congress for its information as to future action.

The Corps of Engineers is also charged with the responsibility of formulating rules and regulations for the use of space allocated to flood control at all reservoirs constructed wholly or in part with Federal funds. As an example rules and regulations for the operation of flood control storage space at Hoover Dam were developed by the Corps in cooperation with the Bureau of Reclamation.

Projects affecting our State which will be listed below all had their beginnings many years ago during the period 1919 to 1946, when, as a private engineer and as State engineer, I visualized their importance to Nevada and laid or helped lay the necessary foundation for the work ahead. For the past 12 years as United States Senator I have worked steadily to make these projects a reality. The fact that I have been a member of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee—I am now the ranking minority member on that committee—has been helpful in advancing needed projects for Nevada, and I believe the program has been satisfactory.

SENATOR MALONE PREPARES INDUSTRIAL REPORTS ON EACH OF NEVADA'S 17 COUNTIES

To prepare the way for new projects and new industries I have been and am engaged in preparing comprehensive resource reports on all of Nevada's 17 counties. Reports for Clark, Washoe, Elko, White Pine, and Lincoln Counties have been completed, and work is well under way on Churchill, Douglas, Esmeralda, Eureka, Humboldt, Lander, Mineral, Nye, Ormsby, Pershing, and Storey Counties, while a preliminary report has been prepared on Lyon County.

When the first Federal project in Nevada was authorized the population of our State was approximately 44,000. As new projects were added population rapidly expanded. In 1920 it was 77,407; in 1940, 110,247. Today it is more than 267,000, according to estimates of the Bureau of Census.

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT WILL ASSURE NEVADA'S RECORD AS NATION'S FASTEST GROWING STATE

Nevada, for the past 10 years, has been the fastest growing State in the Union. It will continue to be the fastest growing State in the Union as our Nevada development program is carried out and projects under way and recommended are completed.

These projects include:

Truckee-Carson (Washoe) project: This multipurpose $52 million project, authorized in 1956, is Nevada's greatest reclamation-power development since the construction of Hoover Dam. When completed the project will furnish water for the irrigation of approximately 50,000 acres of land in the Carson and Truckee River Basins, give drainage service to some 31,000 acres, and provide a steady flow of water to lands under the Truckee River and Newlands projects.

The first big boost given to the project by Congress was in 1938 when Army Engineers were authorized to make a flood-control survey of the Truckee River and its tributaries. In 1952, I headed a Senate Public Works Subcommittee which held hearings in Reno on flood control, power, and resource development of the Truckee and Carson Rivers. In 1955, I introduced the legislation which authorized construction of the project.

Three reservoirs will be constructed: Stampede, 126,000 acre-feet capacity, on the Little Truckee; Watascheamu, 115,000 acre-feet capacity, on the East Fork of the Carson River, and Prosser Creek Dam and Reservoir, located about 4 miles from Truckee, Calif., on Prosser Creek, a tributary of the Truckee River, 30,000 acre-feet capacity.

CONGRESS APPROPRIATES $800,000 TO COMMENCE CONSTRUCTION

Congress, in the closing days of the recent session appropriated $300,000 to commence construction of the Prosser Creek Dam and Reservoir, legislation of which I was cosponsor. This phase of the Truckee-Carson (Washoe) project, when completed, will facilitate flood control in the Reno and adjacent areas.

The entire project will augment power supply. Calvada powerplant below Stampede on the Main Truckee, and the Watascheamu hydroelectric facility will provide approximately 92 million kilowatt-hours annually.

Power revenues will repay about $35 million of the total cost. Flood control and recreational costs amounting to $8 million will be nonrepayable. Fish and wildlife protection and restoration facilities will be provided without a charge against the project. Water users will pay the balance of the total cost over a 50-year period.

GRANT OF $150,000 APPROVED FOR TRUCKEE CHANNEL PROJECT

Truckee River channel project: Located in both Nevada and California, this project is designed to supplement the flood-control features of the multipurpose Washoe project. The Nevada portion of the improvement involves, mainly, an enlargement of the channel through Truckee Meadows below Reno, reef removal near Vista, and debris clearance at Derby. Although authorized in 1954, the project did not become eligible for construction funds until the passage of the Washoe Project Act in 1956.

In May of this year I urged the Senate Appropriations Committee to approve $150,000 to begin reef removal operations below Truckee Meadows and this amount was included in the public works appropriation bill that passed in the closing hours of the session and was signed by the President after Congress had adjourned.

Removal of the reefs below Truckee Meadows will prevent a recurrence of the floods that were experienced in the area early this year.

Total cost of the entire channel project has been estimated at $1,213,000, of which $1,010,000 would be borne by the Federal Government and the remaining $203,000 by local interests.

Appropriation of the $150,000 marked a further step in my long endeavor to effect river improvements that would prevent disastrous floods.

In 1926, I completed organization of the Washoe County Conservation District resulting in the construction of the Boca Dam.

NEW APPROPRIATIONS PRECEDED BY PREVIOUS GRANTS

In 1951, I secured funds and the supervision of the Army Engineers in clearing the Truckee River channel through Reno ($50,000), and below Sparks ($25,000) following the disastrous flood of that year. The following year when floods again threatened I arranged for Army Engineers to stand by with 40,000 sandbags ready for instant use, but fortunately a succession of cool nights prevented a recurrence of the 1951 flood, al-

though there was an unprecedented snowfall in the Sierra Nevada Mountains.

In 1956 it was through my efforts that funds were made available for relief removal work on the Truckee River below Sparks, and in 1957 I requested that the funds saved in the Reno snagging and clearing project be used for additional work upstream, work which is being accomplished.

TRUCKEE RIVER SURVEY EXPEDITED BY NEW APPROPRIATION

Truckee River project: The Truckee River survey which this project entails is a complete investigation of the entire river from its headwaters throughout its drainage basin to Pyramid Lake, and was authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1938. The survey will determine the economic feasibility of additional improvements which would supplement flood-control features of the authorized Washoe project and the Truckee River channel project in providing a sound, basinwide flood-control plan.

Practicability of giving additional protection to the Reno area through river channel enlargements or by increased upstream storage is being studied by the engineers, and also possible solutions for the problem caused by streams from Peavine Mountain and the problem related to the high stages in Lake Tahoe.

The President's budget for fiscal year 1959 contained a request for $20,000 to continue work on this survey, but through my efforts an additional $10,000, or a total of $30,000, was appropriated to use toward completion of the investigation during the coming year. This leaves only $10,700 to be appropriated next year to finish this important study.

Earlier in the year Congressional approval was given to the Peavine Watershed project which embraces 9,378 acres and which involves a cost of $1,207,100.

LAS VEGAS WASH SURVEY NEARS COMPLETION

Las Vegas Wash: Congrers in 1952 passed legislation which I introduced authorizing the Corps of Army Engineers to make a study of the Las Vegas Wash which drains 2,240 square miles of desert northwest of Las Vegas. Flash floods in this area have caused heavy damage to highly developed properties in Las Vegas, North Las Vegas, and Henderson.

Initial studies were begun in 1955 with an appropriation of $32,000. As the work progressed it was found that the flood problems and rapid growth of the area made it necessary for more extensive studies than had been at first contemplated and that further appropriations would be necessary.

Consequently I appealed to the Senate Appropriations Committee in May 1957, to include $28,000 additional for this work in the new appropriation bill, which was done and cleared Congress 3 months later.

In April of this year I was informed that the total cost of the survey had again increased and that the study was being delayed due to the loss of experienced engineers, and the need to consider several alternative proposals to determine the most economical and effective flood control measures to accomplish the results intended.

Again I appealed to the Appropriations Committee, and of the $19,000 I requested $15,000 was appropriated in the closing days of the recent Congress. With this year's grant only $4,000 remains to complete the survey and that, I am confident, will be forthcoming early in the next Congress, which should permit the survey to be completed by the end of 1959. I will then introduce legislation to authorize construction of a comprehensive Las Vegas flood control project.

BRIDGE CANYON DAM BILL INTRODUCED BY SENATOR MALONE PENDING IN CONGRESS

Bridge Canyon Dam: A fifth dam on the Colorado River rivaling Hoover Dam in size is proposed in a bill I introduced now pending in Congress. The proposed site of the new dam would be in the main stream of the river at Bridge Canyon just above Lake Mead. Action on this measure in Congress has awaited the beginning of construction of the Glen Canyon Dam which is located above Bridge Canyon.

Glen Canyon Dam, which is now being built, has a storage capacity of about 26 million acre-feet of water, but being a low, regulatory dam, it is unsuitable for power production. The proposed Bridge Canyon Dam would store only 3,700,000 acre-feet of water, but it is a high dam and with the combined storage facilities of both dams, amounting to almost 30 million acre-feet, power output at Bridge Canyon would be approximately 750,000 kilowatts, almost as much as Hoover Dam.

DAM AT BRIDGE CANYON WOULD AUGMENT NEVADA'S POWER SUPPLY

Under the specifications of my bill Bridge Canyon Dam would be 740 feet high and 1,950 feet wide at the crest. Construction of the dam would make it possible to reduce storage space reserved in Lake Mead for flood control which would increase the average available power head for the Hoover plant.

It has long been my contention that the Bridge Canyon project would advance the interest of all the Colorado River Basin States, and that Nevada could easily utilize one-third of the power.

BRIDGE CANYON DAM TO SPEED SOUTHERN NEVADA'S INDUSTRIAL EXPANSION

Bridge Canyon Dam and project would require 5 years to construct following passage of my bill. I believe the project will be authorized within the next Congress.

Construction of Bridge Canyon Dam will expand industrial development in the lower basin States in accordance with the long-range plan I envisioned as Nevada's State engineer during the years 1927-35.

Hoover (Boulder) Dam, the first dam on the Colorado River, was initiated during the Coolidge administration and was built under the Boulder Dam Project Act. Since then two other dams, Parker and Davis, have been completed, and work on Glen Canyon Dam has begun.

The entire cost of the proposed Bridge Canyon Dam will be repaid with interest over a definite amortization period under the precedent set by Hoover Dam in 1928.

SENATOR FORECASTS DOUBLING OF SOUTHERN NEVADA'S POPULATION

Colorado River project: The Colorado River is to southern Nevada what the Truckee, Carson, Walker, and Humboldt Rivers are to northern Nevada. The limit of an arid State's water supply is the limit of that State's development.

Except for underground water which has been receding for more than two decades due to excess use, the only available water supply for the development and growth of southern Nevada is from the Colorado River and its tributaries.

Construction of Hoover (Boulder) Dam was initiated in 1928 with the passage of the Boulder Dam Project Act.

I predicted then that there would be 100,000 in southern Nevada in 15 or 20 years.

I am predicting now that southern Nevada with a present population of approximately 130,000, will more than double in population during the next two decades, and possibly earlier. The future growth of this vital area is now in the hands of the Supreme Court of the United States in the *Arizona* versus *California* suit.

NEVADA'S CLAIM FOR ADDITIONAL COLORADO RIVER WATER SUPPORTED BY SENATOR IN SUPREME COURT TESTIMONY

My interest in the growth of southern Nevada is what prompted me to testify before the Supreme Court's special master last May in support of Nevada's claim for additional water from the Colorado River. The Court's decision in this case will control distribution of the water supply, which in turn will govern in large measure the rapidity of growth.

My testimony, which was presented in San Francisco, May 12, 1958, before Special Master Simon H. Rifkind, of the United States Supreme Court, was supported by maps and engineering reports looking toward comprehensive development of the southern Nevada area.

SIX CLARK COUNTY PROJECTS URGED WHICH WOULD IRRIGATE TOTAL OF 231,460 ACRES

As State engineer I made surveys and prepared maps showing 16 separate areas within 6 proposed projects in Clark County which would be highly suitable for irrigation, and as United States Senator I have introduced bills to authorize these projects.

Construction of the projects would place a total of 231,460 acres under irrigation and utilize 900,000 acre-feet of water. Action on the bills awaits decisions of the Supreme Court in the suit referred to above to determine the division of Colorado River water in the lower basin States.

In 1935 an engineering committee on which I represent Nevada, and appointed by the 7-State Colorado River conference, recommended that Nevada be allocated 900,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water for irrigation and reclamation development, which would support our rapidly growing industrial population and assure the area a balanced economy. These findings I also placed before the Supreme Court.

SENATOR'S BILL SECURES TRANSFER OF PUBLIC LANDS IN ELDORADO VALLEY TO INDUSTRIAL USE

The Eldorado Valley, involving 126,000 acres of public land, and which enactment of my bill this year transferred to the State for industrial development, was included in this acreage. This transfer was made in Public Law 339, enacted in the last session of Congress.

Altogether there is an estimated 673,000 acres of land in the southwest corner of the State under the 2,500-foot contour level which is suitable for domestic, industrial, and small homesite purposes. In my opinion 3,365,000 acre-feet of water from the Colorado will be required for this acreage.

COMPACT METHOD PROPER YARDSTICK FOR SUPREME COURT ALLOCATION

As far as we are concerned the compact method is the only yardstick that the Supreme Court can use in the division of Colorado River water which will insure the full development and growth of southern Nevada.

The compact method was adopted by the seven States of the Colorado River Basin in 1923 at Sante Fe, N. Mex., when representatives of the States met and wrote the seven-State compact, dividing the water between the upper and lower States. This method should be respected in any decision by the Supreme Court in the Colorado River suit. It is not based on time of use or productivity.

VIRGIN RIVER STUDIES LOOK TOWARD WATER-POWER DEVELOPMENTS

Virgin River: An investigation of the Virgin River and its tributaries in Clark and Lincoln Counties was authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1938. When completed a comprehensive report of the entire basin will include a summary of the findings and conclusions of the interim report that was made to consider flood control in the Meadow Valley Wash.

Lincoln County's flood-control district is asking that a restudy be made of the area in the light of new developments.

Clark County interests have requested consideration of channel improvements on the Virgin River with dams on its tributaries and channel improvements on the Muddy River and its tributaries.

In addition to the Corps of Engineers' flood-control studies, the Bureau of Reclamation has been conducting detailed investigations looking toward water conservation and power development in this area. Work of the two Government agencies will be closely coordinated when the surveys are completed.

In 1925 my engineering firm surveyed and reported on flood control and irrigation possibilities of the Muddy River, the survey including the Meadow Valley Wash and the need for supplemental water supply in the Muddy River Valley.

LINCOLN COUNTY'S PINE AND MATHEWS DAM PROJECT COMPLETED

Pine and Mathews Dam: On April 3, 1957, I had the honor of breaking ground at the dual flood-control project site in Lincoln County about 20 miles east of Caliente. It was interesting to me that they found survey stakes I had set in private surveys in 1924.

The surveys culminated 11 years of legislative work which began in 1947 when, as a member of the Public Works Committee, I introduced the original bill authorizing construction.

The Pine and Mathews Dam project was completed in December 1957 and consists of two flood-control reservoirs in the Meadow Valley Wash drainage area, one in Pine Canyon, and the other in Mathews Canyon.

Mathews Dam is, 800 feet long and 71 feet high, and at the spillway crest has a maximum water surface area of 298 acres and a capacity of 6,260 acre-feet.

Pine Canyon flood-control reservoir is about 884 feet long and 92 feet high with a maximum water surface of 254 acres and a storage capacity of 7,840 acre-feet.

Both dams, built at a cost of $1,700,000 and paid for by the Federal Government, will prevent future damages running possibly into millions to farms, homes, mines, business enterprises, and transportation facilities. A disastrous flood in 1910 caused damages of more than $700,000 to railway facilities alone. Annual benefits are estimated by the Corps of Engineers at $111,000.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO COMPLETE GLEASON CREEK SURVEY

Gleason Creek, White Pine County: In 1950, as a member of the Senate Public Works Committee, I was able to secure authorization for an investigation of Gleason and Murray Creeks in White Pine County. These creeks, which join in the city of Ely, drain an area known as the Robinson watershed. Both streams drain mountain areas and normally carry little or no water, but during rapid melting of snowpacks or intense rainstorms they become a flood problem and cause considerable damage.

A hearing was held at Ely in September 1954 to determine the wishes of the local citizens, and in response to these wishes an initial sum of $9,500 was appropriated in 1956, and $17,000 in 1957. This year we were successful in having the final amount necessary to complete this survey, $13,500, appropriated in the closing days of Congress, and it should be finished by May of next year.

PARADISE VALLEY TO BENEFIT FROM MARTIN CREEK SURVEY APPROPRIATION

Martin Creek, Humboldt County: Like the Gleason Creek project, this flood control survey was authorized in 1950 while I was a member of the Senate Public Works Committee. A tributary of the Little Humboldt River, the creek drains 170 square miles along the east slope of the Santa Rosa Mountains onto the floor of the Paradise Valley.

Flood flows of 9,000 cubic feet per second, recorded in recent years, have caused considerable damage to farmlands and buildings. Army Engineers estimated that $6,000 would be needed to complete investigations to determine if the flood damage can be prevented by channel improvements and small storage reservoirs, and through my efforts the amount was appropriated at the close of Congress.

MULTIPUEPOSE STATUS SOUGHT FOR HUMBOLDT RIVER PROJECT

Humboldt River project: The $14,910,000 Humboldt River storage project for flood control and water conservation, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1950, will provide three reservoirs, channel improvements in the main stream, and drainage improvements for the Lovelock area.

Hyiton Reservoir on the south fork of the Humboldt River will have a 120,000 acre-foot capacity; Devils Gate on the north fork a capacity of 80,000 acre-feet; and Vista Reservoir on Marys River that of 50,000 acre-feet.

Federal share of the total cost has been estimated at $10,900,00C, which under the present plan would impose costs on local interests of slightly more than $4 million, a burden which they have found too heavy to assume. Total costs also are too high to enable them to qualify for a Government loan under the Small Projects Act.

For these reasons I have asked the Bureau of Reclamation to reconsider this greatly needed development as a multipurpose project similar to the Washoe project, and it is my belief that the multipurpose aspects of this development should qualify it as such. If given the status of a multipurpose project, as I have urged, it would mean full Government underwriting of the entire cost, of which the flood control aspects would be nonreimbursable, the remainder to be paid for by irrigation benefits.

Following commencement of construction, the project could be completed in 4 or 5 years. A major flood, the Corps of Engineers has estimated, could cause approximately $1.5 million damage, so the urgency of this project can well be appreciated.

SENATOR'S CONCERN FOR LOWER HUMBOLDT RIVER AREA DEMONSTRATED OVER LONG PERIOD

Lower Humboldt River: In 1925 and 1926 I made the initial surveys on the lower Humboldt River and organized the Pershing County Conservation District leading to the construction of Rye Patch Dam.

In 1952 I arranged for Army Engineers to construct 5½ miles of levee in the lower Lovelock Valley and to install a pumping plant and cam in the main drainage ditch to prevent the flooding of several sections of land in that area. I visited threatened areas near Winnemucca, Battle Mountain, Beowawe, and Elko, and arranged for Army Engineers to stand by in case of flood. A succession of cool nights, however, prevented excessive floods in these areas.

FLOOD THREATS ON LITTLE HUMBOLDT RIVER BRING ACTION

Little Humboldt River: When the Quinn River was threatening damage through flooding in 1952, I reviewed the Little Humboldt River areas in Paradise Valley, alerted the Army Engineers on possible floods and flew over the McDermitt area.

This year, during the month of April, a recurrence of flooding in the lower Paradise Valley prompted me to request the Corps of Engineers to again assist, and $50,000 was immediately made available to clear the dune sand blocking drainage along the channel of the Little Humboldt River where it joins the Humboldt River near Winnemucca.

TWO WALKER RIVER PROJECT SURVEYS IN PROGRESS

Walker River project: Two comprehensive investigations looking toward further development of water resources in the Walker River Basin of Douglas, Lyon, and Mineral Counties are in progress. One study is being made by the Corps of Engineers; the other by the Bureau of Reclamation. Findings will be coordinated when the surveys are completed.

Both studies are designed to develop plans for improvements that would prevent floods, furnish additional water for irrigation, and provide for generation of hydroelectric power.

Army Engineers are studying the possibility of upstream storage at Pickle Meadows and other sites, and also supplemental channel improvement work.

The Bureau of Reclamation survey embraces a tentative plan for construction of reservoirs at both Leavitt and Pickle Meadows and of one or more powerplants on the West Walker River.

Approximately 75,000 acres of land are presently irrigated in the Walker River Basin which includes Mono County in California, but in most years the water supplies available through present facilities is inadequate, requiring greater upstream storage. To repay costs allocated to irrigation in the proposed new development, engineers say that power revenues will be needed.

SENATOR'S SMALL PROJECTS ACT BENEFITS WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT

Walker River and the Small Projects Act: In 1956 we were successful in passing my bill which provides up to $5 million for interest-free loans to irrigation districts for construction of non-Federal projects. The President signed the bill, but held up contracting such loans until working technicalities were perfected. An amendment to the original act requiring the Secretary of the Interior to place approved applications before Senate and House committees for 60 days prior to Congressional appropriations was passed in May 1957, and was signed into law the following month.

First application of a loan under the act from Nevada was from the Walker River Irrigation District, and asked $693,000 to provide additional storage and river improvements. This application was the third in the United States approved and the amount was appropriated by Congress at the end of this session.

Of the total cost $563,000 will be repaid by the Walker River Irrigation District over a period of 40 years. The remainder will be written off by the Federal Government for flood control.

Improvement of existing facilities will make an additional 5,930 acre-feet of water available annually to supplement existing supply.

FUNDS SOUGHT TO COMPLETE CARSON RIVER SURVEY BY 1960

Carson River project: Authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1938, the Carson River survey is now underway to determine the need for additional flood control protection in the Carson River Basin. The principal flood problem in the basin, not taken care of by the Washoe project, is located on the West Fork near its junction with the East Fork. It is believed that local channel improvement, upstream storage, or a combination of both will solve the program. To complete the study an appropriation of $30,000 is needed. I am urging that these funds be provided in an early appropriation bill next session, which would enable the Corps of Engineers to complete their survey by 1960.

PROJECTS, STATE OF NEVADA

Completed projects

Pine-Mathews Canyon flood-control reservoirs; Lincoln; completed 1957.

Topaz Lake Reservoir, West Fork Walker River; Lyon; completed 1922.

Bridgeport Reservoir, East Fork Walker River (California); completed 1924.

Rye Patch Dam, lower Humboldt River; Pershing; completed 1936.

Boca Dam, Little Truckee River; Washoe; completed 1939.

Uranium ore beneficiation project[1] (Mackay School of Mines); Washoe; completed 1958.

Authorized projects

Humboldt (upper) River project, Marys River, North and South Fork, three reservoirs; Humboldt; authorized 1948.

Washoe (Truckee-Carson) project, Stampede and Watesheamu Dams; Washoe-Douglas; authorized 1957.

West Fork of Walker River, Small Projects Act; Lyon; authorized 1956.

Projects underway

Atomic effect on animal life, plants, and soils (University of Nevada agriculture department); Washoe; authorized 1954.

Nuclear engineering project (University of Nevada), reactor technology course, subcritical reactor); Washoe; started 1957.

Surveys underway

Truckee River flood control; Washoe; report due 1959.[2]

Carson River flood control; Ormsby and Storey; report due 1960.[2]

Martin Creek flood control and storage; Humboldt; report due 1959.[2]

Gleason Creek flood control; White Pine; report due 1959.

Virgin River flood control and storage; Clark; not scheduled.

Las Vegas Wash flood control; Clark; report due 1959.[2]

West Walker River storage; Lyon; report due 1961.

Under investigation

Delmue Dam, Meadow Valley Wash.; Lincoln; resurvey.

Proposals by the Mackay School of Mines for further projects using equipment and personnel of completed uranium beneficiation program.

Industrial surveys

Industrial surveys of the entire 17 counties are underway and should be completed by early next year. As those surveys are completed, they are put into the hands of the Government departments, including the armed services, and civilian contractors throughout the country.

County and status: Churchill, underway; Clark, complete; Douglas, underway; Elko, complete; Esmeralda, underway; Eureka, underway; Humboldt, underway; Lincoln, complete; Lander, underway; Lyon, preliminary; Mineral, underway; Nye, underway; Ormsby, underway; Pershing, underway; Storey, underway; White Pine, complete; Washoe, complete.

S. 3067 to construct Bridge Canyon Dam power project on the Colorado River—pending in the Senate Public Works Committee.

Many of these projects that are now completed, authorized, or surveys underway since I came to the United States Senate, were planned or laid out during my tenure as State engineer and Colorado River commissioner from 1927 to 1935.

MINES AND MINERAL POLICY

Nevada is the most richly mineralized State in the Union, and has the greatest diversification of strategic and critical minerals and materials vital to our military security and to an expanding economy than any other area in our Nation.

Each of Nevada's 17 counties has valuable mineral deposits. A map which I have prepared indicates which of 10 basic minerals are located in each county. Space did not permit indicating the other 20 minerals which were produced in our State last year, but had lesser commercial importance, although most of these are highly important to our national defense.

White Pine, Lyon, and Clark Counties led in value of total mineral production, in that order, followed by Lincoln, Pershing, Humboldt, Nye, Eureka, Lander, Douglas, Storey, Washoe, Mineral, Churchill, Esmeralda, Elko, and Ormsby.

But of major metals, only four, manganese, iron ore, gold, and mercury, increased in production value during 1957. Why?

MINERALS INDUSTRY SABOTAGED BY 1934 TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Utilization of our vast mineral resources to their fullest extent depends on national policy. Since 1934 and the adoption of the Trade Agreements (so-called reciprocal trade) Act, this policy has been adverse to maximum minerals development. Imports of large quantities of many minerals from low-wage foreign countries have been substituted for much of our potential home production by reason of trade agreements the Department of State has entered into under the authority given it in this infamous act, which I have consistently opposed.

Special legislation has, therefore, been required to keep alive segments of our mining and minerals industry which are vital to our national security, and perhaps survival.

Repeal of the Trade Agreements Act and reestablishment of an adjustable tariff or import fee on the basis of fair and reasonable competition, the chief factor of which is the difference between the wage standard of living wages here and abroad, would give the mining industry a new impetus and would encourage prospecting, exploration, and development.

MALONE-ASPINALL ACT OF 1953 BREATHED NEW LIFE INTO DYING MINING INDUSTRY

One of the most important laws passed by Congress to help the mining industry was the Malone-Aspinall Mineral Purchase Act, which was enacted into law August 7, 1953, and became Public Law 206 of the 83d Congress. This act provided for the domestic purchase of tungsten, manganese, chromite, mica, asbestos, and columbium-tantalum bearing ores.

My 1955 bill extending the Malone-Aspinall Act was vetoed by the President. However, through personal conferences with both the President and other top-level officials, I convinced the Executive and his advisers of the crucial impact of this bill on national defense requirements and the economic structure of the affected communities.

The Malone-Aspinall Act was extended in 1956 until December 31, 1958, and became Public Law 733 of the 84th Congress. Manganese, chromite, and mica were not included in the 1956 extension bill since Arthur Fleming, then Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, testified "on the record" before the Senate Interior Committee that the General Services Administration could and would continue their purchase programs for these strategic minerals during the life of the extended act.

HOUSE BLOCKS FUNDS FOR TUNGSTEN PROGRAM

As enacted in 1956 the mineral purchase program included authorization for continued purchase of tungsten, fluorspar, columbium-tantalum and asbestos but on four different occasions the House of Representatives refused to accept bills approved by the Senate providing for the appropriation of funds necessary to continue the domestic purchase of tungsten as provided by Public Law 733 of the 84th Congress.

To continue the program, $91,670,000 was authorized in 1956 to cover the purchase of these minerals for the 2½-year period to December 31, 1958, and Congressional debate, prior to passage of the 1956 bill, indicated that a supplemental appropriation of $30 million would be made to carry the program until June 30, 1957, and the balance of $40 million would be included in the Interior Department appropriations bill for fiscal 1958 in accordance with the authorization.

However, the House proved the stumbling block in the continued purchase of tungsten through refusal to accept any of the Senate bills appropriating funds for that purpose.

LONG-RANGE MINERALS BILL COSPONSORED BY SENATOR MALONE

A ray of hope came through this year when the long awaited long-range minerals program came before the Congress. The bill, S. 4036, provided for the stabilization of production of copper, lead, zinc, acid-grade fluorspar, and tungsten from domestic mines, and I was a cosponsor of the bill.

During Senate debate on the measure amendments to omit tungsten trioxide and acid-grade fluorspar were defeated and another amendment to strike out the section providing for the financing of the program was voted down 54 to 28. The amendment to kill tungsten was defeated 57 to 25. On July 11, 1958, the Senate adopted the measure by a vote of 70 to 12.

The bill, as it went to the House, established stabilization prices on four minerals and supports on the fifth, copper, under a Federal stockpiling program.

WHAT THE MINERALS BILL PROVIDED

The stabilization prices and tonnage limitations were as follows:

1. Lead, 15½ cents per pound with a 350,000-ton limitation.
2. Zinc, 13½ cents per pound with a 550,000-ton limitation.
3. Fluorspar, $53 per ton with a 180,000-ton limitation.
4. Tungsten, $36 per short ton with a 375,000-short-ton limitation.

On copper the bill called for the annual purchase of 150,000 tons of the refined mineral at a price of 27½ cents per pound.

A maximum limitation for stabilization payments for fluorspar and tungsten was set at $13 per ton and $18 per short ton respectively. A proviso aimed at helping the small tungsten producer assured a $4 per short ton bonus payment to any producer who did not sell more than 250 units during any quarter.

TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT MAJOR CURSE AFFECTING NATION'S AND NEVADA'S MINING INDUSTRY

On August 21, after 3 days of debate, the House again was responsible for killing this program by rejecting the stabilization program by a vote of 159 yeas and 182 nays. By this action, domestic industries producing these commodities face an uncertain future.

However, the major curse affecting the domestic mining industries is the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. The 1934 Trade Agreements Act is driving the Nation's mining industry out of business through imports from cheap labor foreign nations.

The Trade Agreements Act was extended again this year for a period of 4 years. As long as this infamous act is on the books we must have such special mining legislation if we are to have a going-concern mining industry.

MALONE REPORTS ON MINERAL RESOURCES OF FOREIGN NATIONS LISTED

Critical Materials Reports, Senate Resolution 225: In the 1st session of the 85th Congress I offered a resolution authorizing the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee to make a complete investigation and study of the critical raw materials and resources of the Soviet Union and satellite countries, as well as other countries in the Eastern Hemisphere which are supplying critical materials to the United States, and to report to the Senate the results of the investigation, not later than January 31, 1959.

---

[1] See "Investigation."

[2] Scheduled for completion assuming future appropriations.

This will complete the studies started by me in 1953 when I headed the Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Subcommittee of the Interior Committee. Senate Report No. 1627, 83d Congress, and Senate Document No. 83, 84th Congress, on the Western Hemisphere, are the results of this investigation of the accessibility and availability of supplies of critical raw materials and the factors affecting self-sufficiency within the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

EXHIBITS SUBMITTED WITH SENATOR'S REPORTS

Included with and supplemental to this report are the following:

A. Map of State of Nevada showing all projects discussed in this report with the exception of Bridge Canyon Dam which would be constructed at the head of Lake Mead.

B. Map of southern Nevada showing irrigable areas of the Virgin River Basin.

C. Map showing Carson and Truckee River Basins, areas benefited by project works, and surveys underway.

D. Map showing Walker River Basin, surveys underway, and irrigated areas.

E. Map showing Humboldt River Basin in northern Nevada, Humboldt project, reservoirs, reservoir sites, and channel improvements.

F. Map showing the 16 areas in southern Nevada which would be reclaimed and utilized for irrigation and industrial development under 6 project bills introduced by Senator MALONE.

G. Map of Nevada indicating the mineral riches in each of the State's 17 counties.

Record of the House Committee on Ways and Means in the 85th Congress

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Ways and Means, it is my practice to submit to the membership of the House the record of our committee work at the end of each Congress. The record of the House Committee on Ways and Means in the 85th Congress reflects accomplishment and is a record of work well done because of the diligence and attention to duty with which the committee membership performed its work. Unfortunately, that committee record is in sharp contrast to the ineptness of the Congress generally which was characterized by failures and shortcomings largely attributable to the abandonment by the Democrat majority of its responsibility to provide effective leadership.

Sadness overshadowed the events of the committee during the 85th Congress with the untimely passing of the beloved and esteemed chairman of the committee, the Honorable Jere Cooper, of Dyersburg, Tenn. Mr. Cooper had served with great distinction and patriotism as a member of the committee and as its chairman. His death marked the loss of a true friend and a distinguished colleague. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] succeeded Mr. Cooper as chairman at the opening of the second session of the 85th Congress. I need not tell the membership of the House of the very outstanding work and capable leadership Mr. MILLS has brought to his responsibilities as chairman of our great committee.

During the 85th Congress the Committee on Ways and Means had referred to it a total of 2,078 bills and resolutions including 1,189 tax bills, 352 tariff and customs bills, 511 social security bills, and 26 bills pertaining to miscellaneous subjects. In the course of giving consideration to these bills the Committee on Ways and Means met in public hearings a total of 88 days which usually included both morning and afternoon sessions. The committee heard from 1,057 witnesses, the record of testimony comprised 10,335 printed pages. The subject matter on which hearings were held included virtually every subject within the jurisdiction of the committee and specifically included tax legislation, customs and tariff legislation, social security, and unemployment compensation legislation, renegotiation legislation, and legislation affecting the public debt limit.

In addition to the public hearings held by the Committee on Ways and Means the committee also met 131 days in executive session, again both morning and afternoon sessions were usually involved. The committee favorably reported 105 bills and 71 bills acted on by the committee became public law. A breakdown of the legislation by subject matter indicates that of the 105 bills reported by the committee, 41 pertained to taxes, 42 pertained to tariff subjects, 18 pertained to social security, and 4 pertained to miscellaneous subject matter. Of the 71 bills becoming public law, 19 related to tax subjects, 35 related to tariffs and customs, 14 related to social security, and 3 related to miscellaneous subjects. The foregoing statistical recitation presents an arithmetic statement of the magnitude of work accomplished by the Committee on Ways and Means. It does not, however, adequately describe the substantive accomplishments of the committee. For that reason I will undertake to give a brief description of some of the more important legislative measures that were prepared and acted on by the membership of the Committee on Ways and Means.

TAX LEGISLATION

Of the 1,189 tax bills referred to the Committee on Ways and Means the committee favorably reported to the House 41 bills and 19 of them became public law. Included as a part of the bills becoming public law are several legislative proposals that were pending before the committee in bill form that were not individually acted on.

Three of the tax bills on which favorable committee action was taken might be termed major legislation.

The first of these bills, H. R. 7125, was the result of outstanding work done by the Subcommittee on Excise Taxes and by the full committee membership in its review of the subcommittee recommendations. The legislation made technical improvements in the administrative features of the Federal excise tax structure. Work on this measure was completed by the House in the first session of the 85th Congress and the Senate considered it during the second session. It became Public Law 859.

The second tax bill that might be termed major in character was H. R. 8381, the Technical Amendments Act of 1958. This legislation made significant changes in the income, estate, and gift tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code primarily in the nature of closing loopholes and removing unintended hardships from our Federal tax law. Of the 23 substantive unintended benefits that were corrected by H. R. 8381, 4 of them had their genesis in the 1954 Code with the remaining 19 loopholes originally becoming a part of our Federal tax structure through the 1939 Code and amendments thereto. The Senate in its action on this legislation included as an amendment to H. R. 8381 the substantive provisions of a third major tax bill that was favorably acted on by the Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 8381 became Public Law 866.

The third major tax bill that was prepared by the Committee on Ways and Means was H. R. 13382. This legislation provided meritorious tax changes for the benefit of small business. This legislation had its genesis in recommendations submitted to the Congress by the President of the United States as a result of a study of the problems of small business by the President's Commission on Small Business. In August 1957 the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means unanimously acted to call on the Democrat majority to enact legislation for the benefit of small business. As I have indicated, the Senate in acting on H. R. 8381, included the provisions of H. R. 13382 with amendments as an amendment to the former bill which became Public Law 866.

The remaining tax bills were of a somewhat minor nature with the exceptions of H. R. 4090 and H. R. 12695 providing extensions of existing corporate and Korean excise tax rates. In addition, H. R. 12695 as approved by the Senate repealed the Federal transportation taxes. Despite pronouncements by the Democrat House leadership that the House would resist the repeal of the transportation taxes and because of the effective work done by the Republican conferees on this legislation, the bill as it was finally approved provided for the repeal of the Federal excise taxes on transportation of property.

TARIFF AND CUSTOMS LEGISLATION

The Committee on Ways and Means had 352 bills and resolutions referred to it pertaining to the subjects of tariff and customs matters. Forty-two of these bills were reported favorably by the committee and 35 of them became public law with 2 of these bills being what might be termed major legislation.

The first major bill to which I will refer is H. R. 12591, the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958. This legislation provided for a 4-year extension of the President's authority to enter into

trade agreements with certain additional tariff-cutting authority. However, of greater significance to American producers, including agriculture, industry, and labor, are the improvements contained in the bill with respect to the tariff safeguards to protect domestic industry against unfair foreign competition. Examples of these safeguard improvements in H. R. 12591 are provision for more adequate time for peril point studies and more expeditious action in escape clause cases. In providing relief under escape clause actions, the President is authorized: First, to establish duties up to 50 percent ad valorem on articles presently listed on the free list; second, to increase duties up to 50 percent over the 1934 tariff rate instead of the 1945 reduced tariff rate; and, third, to use an ad valorem equivalent to fix duty rates where an increase in a specific or combined rate of duty would not be sufficient to adequately protect domestic industry. These and other improvements in the safeguards contained in trade agreements legislation will serve to strengthen the competitive position of our domestic industry against imports. This legislation became Public Law 686.

A second instance of major legislation being favorably acted on by the committee and becoming public law was with respect to H. R. 6006, relating to the Antidumping Act of 1921. This legislation was originally recommended by the Department of the Treasury and had as its purpose the improvement of the antidumping law to provide more effectively for the enforcement and the administration of the act. This legislation became Public Law 630.

The other tariff and customs bills on which the committee took action were minor in nature and ranged in subject matter from the tariff status of eviscerated pigeons to the tariff treatment of imports of religious vestments.

SOCIAL SECURITY LEGISLATION

The Committee on Ways and Means had referred to it a total of 511 bills amending the Social Security Act. The committee favorably reported 18 of these bills and 14 of them became public law. Two of these bills could properly be termed major legislation.

On March 8, 1958, the President of the United States in letters addressed to the minority leaders of the House and Senate urged as one of the steps to bolster the economy against downward adjustment legislation extending the duration of unemployment compensation benefits for unemployed workers. The Democrat Cassandras, motivated by political considerations, jumped with alacrity to propose an unworkable formula to establish an American dole system. The House of Representatives rejected the dole program as supported by the House Democrat leadership and approved instead a Republican-supported measure to provide supplementation with respect to unemployment benefits for those workers who have exhausted their benefit entitlement.

The second major bill in the area of social-security legislation was the Social Security Amendments of 1958, H. R. 13549, which became Public Law 840. The highlights of this legislation included provision for a 7-percent increase in OASI benefits with a minimum increase of $3 and a maximum increase for those individuals already on the retirement rolls of $7.50 per month for an insured worker. Under the bill, those individuals who retire in the future would be eligible for a maximum primary insurance benefit of $127 per month. The maximum family benefit was increased from $200 per month to $254. In addition to the benefit adjustments this legislation made important changes with respect to the coverage provisions of the law so as to eliminate inequities and hardships. Improvements were made in the disability provisions and benefits were made available for dependents of disability insurance beneficiaries. The Federal matching funds available for public assistance were increased and the maternal and child-welfare provisions of the act were liberalized.

In addition to these major bills in the area of social-security legislation the Committee on Ways and Means also took favorable action on other bills relating to such subjects as coverage and benefit entitlement of State and local employees and legislation liberalizing the Federal law with respect to provisions pertaining to State plans for aid to the blind.

Mr. Speaker, those are some of the highlights in the accomplishments of the House Committee on Ways and Means during the 85th Congress. They comprise a record that is a credit to the distinguished chairman of the committee during this recently completed Congress and to the distinguished membership of our great committee. In closing it is appropriate that I should commend the Treasury Department staff, the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, the staff of the House Legislative Counsel, the technical assistants from the other departments of the executive branch, and the staff of the Committee on Ways and Means for the indispensable part they have had in the achievement of this record.

Tax Reduction and Tax Revision Are Possible Through Tax Fairness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, Congressional hearts bleed—in public, that is—for the poor, overburdened taxpayer; for the little storekeeper, the much publicized small-business man, the manufacturer, the banker. We weep for the hardships the Congress has loaded upon them—quite unintentionally, of course. We commiserate with them because their competitors have been given advantages—again quite unintentionally—that are denied to them.

But when we have a chance—as we have had in recent weeks—to correct the blunders of the past, to give even a modicum of relief to the back-broken taxpayer, to the small-business man, we coldly turn our backs and say, "No; you shall have no relief." Like frightened babes in the woods, a majority of the members of the Ways and Means Committee muffed the one chance they had in the 2d session of the 85th Congress to perform an act of justice and equality to the entire business community of these United States.

Mr. Speaker, we had before the Congress a bill, H. R. 8381, that purported to close loopholes in our tax laws—a bill that purported to correct unintended benefits that have been bestowed upon certain favored groups in the past; a bill that purported to correct unintended hardships that were loaded upon the backs of many taxpayers in years gone by. A special subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee worked diligently, very diligently, upon this issue for months and months. And the full committee sat through interminable executive sessions, debating the placement of a comma or a semicolon, struggling with minor tax loopholes and minor tax inequalities.

But when it came, during all those months, to consideration of a matter of real importance, both the subcommittee and the full committee were tongue-tied and impotent. The tax-favored position of cooperatives, savings and loan associations, mutual savings banks, mutual fire and casualty insurance companies, and credit unions was mentioned only in whispers, and then with negative shaking of the head. I wonder why these tax-dodgers, these leeches on the body politic, are sacrosanct; why their earnings are in a different kind of money from the earnings of other companies; why the Congress fearsomely lets them keep a billion dollars each year that should be paid into the Treasury?

Nor is the Treasury itself blameless in this whole affair. Knowing the problem; understanding full well the plight of taxpaying merchants, bankers, manufacturers, and the so-called small-business man in their competition with nontaxpaying enterprises of all kinds; fully aware of the billion dollars of new revenue that would result from taxing these tax-exempts—knowing all this the Treasury ducked in pusillanimous timidity when the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee dared them to take a courageous stand on this matter a few months ago.

Mr. Speaker, what are they afraid of? What are we afraid of?

It is a matter of common knowledge—published officially until recently by the

United States Department of Agriculture—that cooperative corporations pay little or no Federal income tax on their huge earnings. It is a matter of common knowledge that great cooperative corporations like the California & Hawaii Sugar Co., like Land O'Lakes Dairy, like the Consumers Cooperative Association with all its oil wells, refineries, pipelines, and retail outlets, like the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, like the Southern States Cooperatives, like the GLF Cooperative Exchange, like the Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers' Association, and many more, pay little or no Federal income tax on their earnings, though they are all multi-million-dollar outfits.

It is a matter of common knowledge—because they have been advertising boastfully in the New York Times during the past week—that the tax-privileged mutual savings banks are increasing their interest rate to 3¼ percent at a time when the Federal Reserve Board will not permit a taxpaying bank to pay more than 3 percent. And it is a matter of common knowledge to anyone who reads our newspapers that savings and loan associations offer 3½ percent here and 4 to 4½ percent on the Pacific coast, with premiums of silverware, radios, fountain pens, and other gadgets, and that they are taking the savings of thousands of people out of taxpaying banks. How can they pay so much interest? The answer is easy, Mr. Speaker. It is because they are privileged by law to pay little or no income tax on their great earnings.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come when this matter of tax favoritism to certain types of business—cooperatives, mutual savings banks, savings and loan associations, credit unions, and other mutuals—must be brought to an end. I register herewith my disapproval and my disappointment that the majority of my committee lacked the courage to close this loophole at this time.

But I tell you now, Mr. Speaker, that the time will come—and it is not far off—when this injustice to every company and every individual that honestly pays income tax on earnings will be ended. When the tax rate is overwhelming, as it is today, favoritism will not be long endured. When the majority of the Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle are without courage, a new majority will be elected.

Mr. Speaker, why put off until tomorrow what should be done today? Why procrastinate longer? Why not establish tax equality between all business competitors now? When closing tax loopholes, when correcting unintended hardships, when removing unintended benefits, why overlook the biggest loophole and the most glaring hardship of them all—the billion-dollar tax equality problem that has become an octopus sucking the lifeblood from legitimate taxpaying American business? Members of Congress should act like men, not mice.

The Greatest Need of the Present Day Is Reasonable Hospitalization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a news release by Congressman USHER L. BURDICK on the present-day need of reasonable hospitalization.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN COMMENTS

(By USHER L. BURDICK)

WILLISTON, N. Dak.—A poor man cannot afford, under present hospitalization agencies, to be sick. In my own case I am not wealthy nor poor, but I soon would be as poor as a starved turkey if I patronized hospitals much longer. In one hospital a doctor looked at me twice and charged me $500, and the second look was more of a squint than a look. Hospital rooms, no better than a $4 room at a Williston hotel, cost all the way from $19.50 per day to $29. In addition, nurses charge from $1.50 per hour to $2. When you add to this X-rays and doctors' fees you can see that people with a fund even as high as $5,000 for sickness would find themselves stripped clean in a comparatively short time.

The public health of the Nation demands a different deal from this. At least an average citizen should have recourse to health improvement that does not make a pauper of him; or the alternative of going without medical care and dying before his time. In my judgment the private system of medical care is all right as far as the well-to-do are concerned, but the system does not reach the average citizen, of which there are many millions than can be found in the well-to-do class. If no one can survive the rigors of poor health or accidental disability except the rich, this great country can be said to be headed for trouble.

I have talked this matter over with my son, Quentin Burdick, who is a candidate for a seat in Congress, and he outlined to me the fact that this health question is one of the pressing needs of the country—more important than sending a mouse to the moon. I have always been of the opinion that a public-health bill can be written by Congress that will give the poor man a chance for his life. If we cannot do that we have dismally failed in our legislation. The preamble of the Constitution provides for this very purpose when it says:

"We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

Nothing could possibly promote the general welfare any more than the care of the health of the Nation. The bill should be written so as to provide adequate medical care to the many. The few can patronize the present system and get along well enough, as they are getting along today, but the many, many millions cannot do that. They have not the money to spend, and shall we say that because a family has no money available commensurate with charges under the present system, the United States is going to say: "Die if you haven't been smart enough to accumulate money enough to stand the drain of the present medical care and attention." Is this Nation not concerned with the general health of the Nation? Shall we abandon the millions who need medical attention just to preserve the present medical system?

Yes, this question can be solved, and I am glad to see younger men who aspire to a seat in this great Congress giving earnest attention to what I believe is one of the great failures of this Government. What can a world-renowned government amount to finally, without protecting the health of the huge majority of the people? Can we get fighting men from families broken in health? Can we lessen the great demand for hospitalization by providing a system that will check the ravages of disease before hospitalization is necessary? My fight for pure food and water is a part of this program, and one step further will be to provide facilities for the millions to be examined and treated, although they have no money at all. What is money compared to the results of nonattention to the health of the Nation?

Colleges and Universities Providing Specialized Training Courses for Teachers of Exceptional Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, it is seldom that the Government Printing Office makes even minor mistakes in the huge task each day of compiling and printing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The excellence of their work is truly amazing. Occasionally, however, even the GPO will make a human mistake, and since the RECORD is such an important source of research material it is important that the occasional error be corrected. That is the reason I am making this statement.

In connection with our debate and subsequent passage on Friday, August 22, 1958, of the bill, H. R. 13840, the bill to encourage the expansion of teaching in the education of mentally retarded children, I submitted my revised remarks and they appeared at pages 19223–19228, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This material, of course, is to be included in the permanent RECORD as part of yesterday's debate on H. R. 13840.

A tabulation which I submitted as part of my remarks, showing the colleges and universities, by States, offering programs for the preparation of teachers of various categories of exceptional children, was printed at pages 19224–19225, but with a number of unfortunate omissions, thus giving an incomplete picture of the extent of interest and work by the Nation's colleges in helping to meet this important educational problem. A number of schools and colleges in Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, and Texas were left out of the tabulation.

Thus I am now resubmitting the tabulation below to include all of the schools which should properly have been in-

cluded before. I understand that in the bound, permanent RECORD this tabulation will then be substituted for the inaccurate one which was printed as part of my remarks on H. R. 13840.

Since so many libraries, and particularly college libraries, are dependent upon the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and do not receive the bound volumes, it would not be fair to researchers seeking to use this material if the incorrect tabulation were allowed to stand in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; thus I think it so important to make the correction in this manner, and have it noted in the index which is printed periodically for the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In my remarks of Friday, August 22, on the bill to encourage expansion of teaching of mentally retarded children, I cited at some length the needs not only of the mentally retarded children for teachers specially trained to help them but of all other categories of exceptional children as well in requiring specially trained teachers. These categories include the very gifted children, the crippled, the deaf, the hard of hearing, the blind children with serious visual defects, those with serious health problems due to heart disease, epilepsy, or other debilitating conditions, those who are maladjusted or seriously disturbed, including the institutionalized delinquent, and so on. All of these categories of children would be helped to obtain better educational opportunities to develop their full potential if my bill, H. R. 9591, can be enacted to provide Federal assistance in the education of more specially trained teachers for these children. It is a serious educational problem in every community in the country.

Mr. Speaker, the tabulation containing the full list of colleges and universities which in the academic year 1954 were already engaged in offering courses in these fields—a tabulation made for me by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress—is as follows:

Colleges and universities having programs for the preparation of teachers of exceptional children, academic year 1954

State	Institution	Special education program
Alabama	University of Alabama	Speech correction.
	Birmingham, Southern College.	Speech and hearing.
Arizona	University of Arizona	Speech correction, speech and hearing.
Arkansas	University of Arkansas	Speech correction.
	Arkansas State College	Deaf.
California	Chico State College	Speech correction, speech and hearing.
	College of the Pacific	Speech correction, speech and hearing, socially maladjusted.
	Fresno State College	Speech correction.
	Los Angeles State College	Deaf, mentally retarded, speech correction, speech and hearing.
	Occidental College	Speech correction.
	San Diego State College	Mentally retarded, speech correction.
	San Francisco State College.	Blind, crippled, deaf, hard of hearing, mentally retarded, partially seeing, socially maladjusted, speech correction, blind and partially seeing, deaf and hard of hearing, and others.
	San Jose State College	Speech correction, speech and hearing.
	Stanford University	Do.
	University of California at Berkeley.	Mentally retarded, socially maladjusted, mentally retarded and socially maladjusted.
	University of California at Los Angeles.	Speech correction.
	University of California at Santa Barbara.	Do.
	University of Southern California.	Deaf, hard-of-hearing, speech correction.
	Whittier College	Speech correction.
Colorado	University of Denver	Mentally retarded, speech correction, speech and hearing.
Florida	Florida State University	Mentally retarded, speech correction, speech and hearing, overall.
	University of Florida	Mentally retarded, speech correction, speech correction and hearing, overall.
	University of Miami	Speech correction.
Georgia	University of Georgia	Do.
Illinois	Bradley University	Do.
	College of St. Francis	Do.
	Eastern Illinois State College.	Do.
	Elmhurst College	Do.
	Illinois State Normal University.	Crippled, deaf, hard-of-hearing, mentally retarded, partially seeing, socially maladjusted, special health problem, speech correction, overall.
	Northern Illinois State Teachers College.	Speech correction.
	Northwestern University	Speech correction, hearing.
	Rockford College	Do.
	Southern Illinois	Mentally retarded, speech correction, hearing.
	University of Chicago	Socially maladjusted, speech correction.
	University of Illinois	Deaf, mentally retarded, speech correction.
Indiana	Ball State Teachers College.	Speech correction, hearing.
	Indiana State Teachers College.	Mentally retarded, speech correction, hearing.
	Indiana University	Speech correction, hearing.
	Purdue University	Do.
Iowa	Grinnell College	Speech correction.
	State University of Iowa	Crippled, speech correction, hearing.
Kansas	Fort Hays Kansas State College.	Speech correction.
	Kansas State Teachers College.	Mentally retarded, socially maladjusted, speech correction.
	Municipal University of Wichita.	Crippled, deaf, hard-of-hearing.
		Speech correction, hearing, deaf, crippled, hard-of-hearing.
Kansas	University of Kansas	Deaf, hard-of-hearing, mentally retarded, socially maladjusted, speech correction.
Kentucky	University of Kentucky	Speech correction, hearing.
Louisiana	Louisiana State University.	Speech correction.
Maryland	University of Maryland	Speech correcting, hearing.
Massachusetts	Boston University	Blind, speech correction, hearing.
	Emerson University	Speech correction, hearing.
	Smith College	Deaf.
Michigan	Michigan State Normal College.	Crippled, deaf, mentally retarded, partially seeing, speech correction.
	Wayne University	Crippled, deaf, hard-of-hearing, mentally retarded, partially seeing, socially maladjusted, special health problem, speech correction, others.
	Western Michigan College of Education.	Speech correction, hearing.
Minnesota	University of Minnesota	Crippled, mentally retarded, speech correction, hearing, others.
Mississippi	Mississippi Southern College.	Do.
	University of Mississippi	Speech correction, hearing.
Missouri	Central Missouri College	Speech correction.
	St. Louis University	Do.
	Southwest Missouri College.	Do.
	University of Missouri	Speech correction, crippled.
	Washington University	Deaf, hard-of-hearing, speech correction.
Nebraska	University of Nebraska	Speech correction, hearing.
New Jersey	New Jersey State Teachers College.	Mentally retarded, speech correction, hearing, others.
New York	Brooklyn College	Mentally retarded, speech correction.
	City College of the City of New York.	Mentally retarded.
	Hunter College of the City of New York.	Blind, crippled, deaf, gifted, partially seeing, special health problems, others.
	New York University	Mentally retarded.
	Queens College of the City of New York.	Speech correction, hearing.
	State University of New York College for Teachers at Buffalo.	Crippled, mentally retarded, speech correction, partially seeing, others.
	State University of New York Teachers College at Geneseo.	Mentally retarded, speech correction.
	Syracuse University	Crippled, deaf, mentally retarded, partially seeing, speech correction, hearing, others.
	Teachers College of Columbia University.	Deaf, hard-of-hearing, mentally retarded, partially seeing, crippled, special health problems, others.
North Carolina	Eastern Carolina College	Speech correction.
North Dakota	State Teachers College	Do.
	University of North Dakota.	Speech correction, hearing.
Ohio	Bowling Green State University.	Do.
	Kent State University	Mentally retarded, speech correction, deaf, hard-of-hearing.
	Ohio State University	Mentally retarded, speech correction, hearing, others.
	Ohio University	Speech correction, hearing.
	Western Reserve University.	Speech correction, deaf, hard-of-hearing.
Oklahoma	University of Oklahoma	Mentally retarded.
	University of Tulsa	Speech correction, hearing.
	Oklahoma College for Women.	Deaf.
Pennsylvania	Franklin and Marshall College.	Speech correction, hearing.
	Marywood College	Mentally retarded.
	Mount Mercy College	Speech correction.
	Pennsylvania State University.	Gifted, mentally retarded, speech correction, hearing.

Colleges and universities having programs for the preparation of teachers of exceptional children, academic year 1954—Continued

State	Institution	Special education program	State	Institution	Special education program
Pennsylvania	State Teachers College, Bloomsburg.	Mentally retarded, speech correction, hearing.	Texas	University of Houston	Mentally retarded, speech correction, hearing.
	State Teachers College, California.	Mentally retarded, speech correction.		University of Texas	Mentally retarded, speech correction, hearing, others.
	Temple University	Speech correction.	Utah	University of Utah	Speech correction, deaf, hard-of-hearing.
	University of Pittsburgh	Deaf, mentally retarded, speech correction, hearing.	Virginia	University of Virginia	Speech correction, hearing.
South Dakota	University of South Dakota.	Speech correction, hearing, others.	Washington	University of Washington	Do.
Tennessee	George Peabody College for Teachers.	Mentally retarded, speech correction, hearing, others.	Wisconsin	Marquette University	Speech correction.
	University of Tennessee	Deaf, others.		University of Wisconsin	Do.
	Vanderbilt University	Speech correction, hearing.		Wisconsin State College	Mentally retarded, speech correction, deaf, hard-of-hearing, others.
Texas	North Texas State College.	Speech correction.	Wyoming	University of Wyoming	Speech correction.
	Southern Methodist University.	Do.	District of Columbia	Catholic University of America.	Do.
	Southwest Texas State Teachers College.	Crippled, mentally retarded, speech correction.		Gallaudet College	Deaf.
	Texas State College for Women.	Speech correction.		George Washington University.	Speech correction.

Had Enough?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, please pardon my partisan pride in saying that as surely as the 80th Congress has gone down into history as the do-nothing Congress, so will the 85th Congress be remembered as one with the greatest accomplishment under the most adverse conditions.

With no constructive leadership in the White House or from any of our President's appointees, the Congress could have sat on its hands. Instead, it worked harder to establish a good record of accomplishment.

Ignoring the campaign threats of the Republican Party and its titular leader, by dint of resolute, intelligent, and responsible legislating we put to shame the prophecies of a cold war between the White House and the Congress.

We proved once again that the Democratic Party, by and large, is the spokesman, yes, the protector of the people of our country, serving them so as to accomplish the greatest good for the greatest number.

I have placed in the RECORD the speeches I made at the end of the 84th Congress on July 27, 1956, and at the end of the 1st session of this, the 85th Congress, on August 30, 1957. I suggest that they make good reading as an introduction to these remarks. I will borrow some of the same titles I used then and bring the facts up to date.

THE CONSUMER, LABOR, AND THE FARMER: THE TIGHT SQUEEZE

The last year saw the laws of economics repealed by the facts of life.

In the midst of a most depressing recession with between 7 million and 8 million persons unemployed, the cost of living continued to soar.

As much as 7 percent of our total civilian labor force could find no employment. That is, 7 percent of those who were ready, willing, and able to work, were unemployed. In 5½ years of Republican maladministration, the cost of living rose by 9 percent, almost 3 percent in the last year alone. In 1958, the average American family is paying $406 more per year for the necessities of life than in 1953.

Why? Because the big-business men in control of the executive departments of Government, appointed by our President, tightened the money supply, made money harder to get, raised interest rates, increased rents on properties built with Government subsidies, gave away our surplus commodities or permitted them to be stolen by friends of big business appointees, squandered our money in boondoggles and refused to spend it for defense, national security, health, and education.

The unthinking may readily say: The Democrats were in control of the Congress and could have stopped all of that.

My answer is twofold: First, let the people in the next election give the Democratic Party a substantial majority in both Houses, enough to override Presidential vetoes, and we will do a real job. Secondly, all the reactionaries and all the conservatives are not in the Republican Party. I am sorry to say that some of them are in the Democratic Party too. If the President were really the leader he should be, he could have been able to get enough liberal Republicans to make up for the defections in the Democratic ranks.

Suffice it to say, in almost every instance a majority of the Democrats were found voting for what was best for our country and a majority of the Republicans voted the other way.

For instance, we could not get enough Republicans to join us in voting for a good housing bill, or for a community-facilities bill or a mining bill, or for scholarships for college students, or for higher minimum wages, or for aid for school construction, or for giving our surplus-food commodities to our needy, who are on relief, or for reform of our labor laws. Most of these measures were lost by a few votes on the floor or in committee. The President never raised a finger to help get these bills enacted. We did get enacted a bill to aid depressed areas. The rumor mill indicates the President intends to veto it.

HUMAN RIGHTS ARE FORGOTTEN

Of course all of this fits the pattern of modern Republicanism enunciated by the President and mouthed by his supporters. Remember it? "Liberal where human rights are concerned and conservative as to money matters."

None will deny that most of these bills would cost money. At the same time, no sensible person will dare challenge the statement that all of these bills vitally affect every human being in our country and all of their rights and privileges.

When talking of human beings and relieving their distress, we must not overlook the fact that we passed laws permitting some 30,000 Hungarian refugees to remain here and also permitting persons illegally here since 1940 to apply for permission to remain.

CIVIL RIGHTS

We can give our Republican friends credit for helping to get enacted a law to guarantee our citizens the right to vote.

Up to this minute, I have not heard of a single case instituted under that law by our President's Republican Attorney General.

The same law calls for a commission to be appointed by our President to impartially study and advise the President on conditions that may deprive citizens of the equal protection of the law because of race, color, or religion. Draw your own conclusions from the fact that one of the President's appointees to that commission contributed $500 to the campaign chest to elect to the United States Senate an avowed segregationist.

I refrain from any comment about the Little Rock fiasco.

SMALL BUSINESS

Big business and big bank mergers continue unabated.

There have been no big business failures.

Bankruptcies nevertheless are at a record high—yes, higher even than in the depression of the 1930's. They are 129 percent higher than in 1952, the last year of the Truman administration.

To the credit of our Republican colleagues, most of them joined us in supporting several measures to help small business.

These bills enacted into law were:

First. Making the Small Business Administration a permanent agency of Government and increasing the amount it may lend to any one small-business concern.

Second. Establishing in the Small Business Administration a new division for aiding small business concerns to get long-term risk and equity capital, and

Third. Giving to small business some long overdue tax relief.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS—PERILOUS PATHS—FOREIGN AFFAIRS CONTINUE TO BE BUNGLED AFFAIRS

The titles borrowed from my prior speeches tell the story.

American citizens abroad continue to be abused, affronted, jailed, and even murdered in cold blood.

Our State Department looks the other way.

In fact, the standing joke abroad is—the more degrading an act a foreign country can commit against our country, the more money it can get from us on the double quick.

Unfortunately, we still have no foreign policy other than to stumble from brink to brink and from crisis to crisis. Further comment is withheld lest I give comfort to our enemies.

Fortunately, there is a good Lord above who protects us. I pray He will never turn His back on us, no matter how sorely we try Him.

BAD GOVERNMENT—WASTE AND CORRUPTION

Add to my previous itemizations just a few more: vicuna coats, hotel bills, traveling expenses, "borrowed" rugs, non-interest-bearing "loans," valuable franchises to the favored few, Government contracts to friends, tax arrears settled, abated, or remitted for those who know the right people, and so on ad nauseam.

"Businesslike methods": Remember Ike's promise? Listen to just one of the many "businesslike" deals. The Department of Agriculture sold rice to private traders at $40 a ton. They sold the rice back to ICA, another United States Government agency, for $59.50 a ton, without even shipping it. A neat little profit of $1,650,000. I will not ask who got what lest I be told it was only a rice cooky.

PROMISE AND PERFORMANCE

It will take much too long to list all of the breaches of promise that are attributable to our Republican friends in high places. I give you just a few that are typical.

Promise: Leadership.

Performance: The general will be found far to the rear.

Promise: A cold war with Congress.

Performance: A Congress that produced a maximum of good legislation with a minimum of friction.

Promise: Increased prosperity.

Performance: A bad recession.

Promise: A lower cost of living.

Performance: A higher cost of living.

Promise: Full employment.

Performance: Distressful unemployment.

Promise: A balanced budget.

Performance: A $12 billion deficit.

Promise: Reduce the Nation's debt limit.

Performance: Increased it by $10 billion.

Promise: Get our boys home from Korea.

Performance: Put them in Lebanon, and I dare not predict where next.

Promise: Honesty in government.

Performance: My deep respect for our American institutions prevents me from labeling that one.

CONCLUSION

Remember the Republican slogan, "Had enough?" I will be watching for the democratic answer on election day. I intentionally spell "democratic" with a small "d."

Freedom for the Ukraine: A Challenge for the Free World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, one of the great challenges confronting the Free World is the problem of the brave people trapped behind the Iron Curtain. In the face of great odds and in the face of terrible threats of reprisal, literally thousands of these people have stood up to their Soviet overlords and continued their belief in freedom and democracy.

One of the tangible means by which the Free World can bolster the spirit of these people and assure them they are not forgotten, is by annual observances of their special days. Last January, it was my honor to be invited to address the United Ukrainian Congress meeting in Rochester, N. Y., on the occasion of the celebration of the 40th anniversary of Ukrainian independence. The remarks I prepared for that occasion have apparently won wide approval and a number of people have written me requesting copies. Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert my address prepared for that occasion, and place it in the RECORD with the fervent hope that the next time I am honored with an invitation to participate in this occasion, the freedom of the Ukraine will be much closer to reality.

The address follows:

SPEECH OF REPRESENTATIVE KENNETH B. KEATING ON UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY, JANUARY 25, 1958

It is a real and humbling pleasure for me to join with you tonight in celebrating the 40th anniversary of Ukrainian independence. These gatherings are, for me, a wonderful shot in the arm. The warmth of the fellowship, the exhibitions of folk music and dancing, the bandurists and the choir singing—all these things are distinctive with this group. May you ever cherish them, preserve them, and pass them on to your children and from them to their children.

The high esteem and genuine affection felt by the whole Rochester community for the fine Americans of Ukrainian descent in our midst is perhaps typified by the mayor's proclamation of last Wednesday as Ukrainian Independence Day. Also, on that day, in Washington, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—which travels to the far corners of the earth—my own tribute to this event.

This is an occasion which looks not only to the past, but perhaps more importantly, to the future. It is a time for remembrance. But it is equally a fitting opportunity to look ahead.

A heritage of freedom is a thing to be cherished, to be commemorated. But more significantly, it must be used to maintain and extend the liberties we in this country treasure so highly, to all the peoples of the world.

Tonight we gather to salute a nation and a people whose long struggle against oppression serves as a symbol of the never-ending desire of man to be free.

Tonight we gather to pay homage to those heroes who have fallen in liberty's cause.

Tonight we gather to rededicate ourselves to a rebirth of freedom in the noble Ukraine.

Forty years ago, the people of the Ukraine formed a free and independent national republic. Just as they had played an important role in overturning the Czarist dictatorship, now they expressed their desire to live in liberty by forming a popularly elected government.

It was not the first time. Down through the years, as all of you here tonight know from your history books, the story of the Ukraine's struggle for independence has been a prolonged and bitter one. Under a series of despotic governments the people kept alive the spark of freedom, nursing it for the day when it could best burst into flame.

Throughout the long periods of oppression and suffering the people did not lose heart. Through patriotic underground movements they kept alive the language, the national church, and many of their national cultural traits and traditions. That they taught their children well, you have seen tonight.

Though rebellion against their heartless oppressors was a constant thought, they knew they could not succeed without outside help. And so, the people waited and bided their time until the opportunity was ripe.

Then came World War I. It proved to be the aid from abroad the Ukrainian people needed to translate their wishes into reality.

As the war sapped the strength of the Czarist regime, the people of the Ukraine made their plans. And when the Russian Revolution of 1917 shattered the Czarist grip, the people were ready.

Yes, they were prepared. And the long years of planning, praying, and working reached fruition. The people witnessed the dawning of a new era.

In January of 1918 the western Ukrainians declared their independence. Some time later the national republic was proclaimed in Kiev, that historic national capital of the country.

Perhaps some of you here tonight took part personally in those stirring events. If so, you will recall the excitement and the hope they produced. You will remember the determination on the part of the people that this age-old dream which had at last become a reality should be maintained.

But it was not to be so. The brave, new republic was destined to lead a short and stormy life. At least, in that period, your people were able to bask in the warm sunlight of freedom. In that period, at least, they were able to taste the fruit of the tree we call liberty.

The specter of rising and advancing communism brought all this to a halt. Unfortunately, the free Ukrainian Government was not strong enough to ward off the Red tide. At the same time, western Ukraine was being callously divided among her neighbors.

By 1920, the Ukrainian National Republic was no more.

Of the years since then, we know all too much. Or perhaps all too little. We know the story of these last 38 years can only be described as one great tragedy on a scale that has rarely been equaled.

Millions have met their deaths, either through Kremlin-made famines, or through liquidation by the dreaded Soviet secret police. Countless others have been banished to slave labor camps scattered through the desolate reaches of the sprawling Soviet Empire. To these people we pay our deepest homage this evening. May their spirits never be quenched. May their memory never be erased from our minds. May the future they had prayed for never escape our vision.

The Ukrainian answer to the unparalleled brutality of the Soviet masters took the form it had taken for centuries. Underground resistance groups were formed. Insurgence and opposition to the hated Kremlin regime became the order of the day. Guerrilla warfare was commonplace.

The sturdy spirit of resistance has not been wiped out by the merciless suppression of the ruthless agents from Moscow. We know that well today, just as we knew it during World War II.

During that war, the hopes of Ukrainian nationalists rose again. When the Nazis attacked the Soviet Union, it appeared to the oppressed citizenry that they would have a new chance to free themselves from the clutches of the Communists.

The Nazis soon made it clear, however, that they came as conquerors, not as liberators. Ukrainians simply exchanged one set of alien masters for another. The haughty and brutal Nazis took the place of the corrupt and heartless Soviet overlords.

Hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians were shipped to the west to work in Nazi plants. Others who displayed nationalistic tendencies were carted off to concentration camps.

When the Nazi armies were driven back, the Red Army advanced from the east, trampling everything before it.

Once again, Ukrainians died by the thousands, for no other reason than that fate had made of them a human frontier between the East and West. Before the onrushing Red hordes more than a million Ukrainians fled their homes, preferring an uncertain and precarious existence in the West to certain misery at the hands of Communist rule. Many of those courageous people who braved the hazards of escaping to the West are with us tonight. We rejoice in their presence with us.

What followed the recapture of the Ukraine by the Soviets need hardly be repeated. It seems probable the world has never before witnessed a regime more savage and more efficient in its ruthlessness.

But the movement for Ukrainian national independence refuses to die. Even the worst of tyrannies cannot quench that spirit. I am told the guerrilla tactics and underground warfare which your liberty-loving countrymen have used through the years is again serving them well.

Their political and propaganda activities now embrace much larger sections of the Ukrainian people. They are employing all the means at their disposal to oppose the hated regime.

As word filters painfully through the Iron Curtain, the picture becomes clear. Once again, Ukrainians are sacrificing themselves for the age-old dream of national political independence.

I would need more than a mere crystal ball to prophesy when your people will be free. We know it will not be achieved overnight. We pray it will not be too long delayed.

Today, more than 1 million of your countrymen have settled in the United States. Your talents and culture, your skills and your arts, have enriched our land.

Here in Rochester, we are proud to claim leaders of Ukrainian descent in every line of endeavor. Wherever your people have practiced their arts and skills, they have achieved success.

You have become true Americans in heart and spirit. Yet you have retained the best of the rich culture, heritage, and traditions of your native land.

All of us may well, then, on this occasion, rededicate ourselves to two ideals. Freedom for America. And freedom for the Ukraine.

To those behind the Iron Curtain we must continue to give our assurance that their resistance is not in vain. Theirs is not a forgotten front. The power they possess—the power of the human spirit itself—the will to be free, these are forces greater than any tyranny ever forged by man. Their craving for liberty is far more powerful than man's most destructive weapons. It cannot be denied.

This country is stronger today for those valiant efforts behind the Iron Curtain. It is stronger just as it is richer for the distinct contributions over 1 million Ukrainians living in this country have made to America.

On this occasion let us look to the past. But let us also look to the future. Just as it is a time for remembrance, it is equally a time to look ahead.

May the day be not far off when the 40 million Ukrainians will again be a people who can breathe the fresh air of freedom. Then we all can join in the celebration of a new and lasting independence.

Accomplishments for Veterans by the 85th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SHUFORD
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. SHUFORD. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Housing Subcommittee of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I am pleased to report on the veterans' housing program. The figures which I am outlining below show dramatic increases since the enactment of Public Law 85–364 which was passed by the 85th Congress:

Month	Applications for loan guaranty or insurance				Types of loan applications received				
					Home loans			Farm loans	Business loans
	Number received	Number approved	Number closed	Number pending approval	Total	New and proposed	Existing and other		
1958—January	7,880	8,056	12,714	5,238	7,680	6,284	1,396	29	171
February	6,683	6,898	10,702	4,502	6,488	5,420	1,068	31	164
March	6,787	6,889	9,345	4,247	6,573	5,280	1,293	27	187
April	6,177	5,929	6,709	4,239	5,944	4,266	1,678	34	199
May	8,937	7,434	5,868	5,302	8,705	6,150	2,555	30	202
June	14,915	11,425	7,805	8,209	14,652	9,191	5,461	19	244
July	19,424	15,670	10,169	11,305	19,213	11,409	7,804	24	187

Month	Proposed new dwelling units			Defaults and claims					Number of loans repaid in full [1]
						Pending defaults and claims			
	Appraisal requests	Percent to be started with VA inspection	Starts under VA inspection	Defaults reported	Claims paid	Total	Claims and serious defaults		
							Number	Percent of outstanding loans	
1958—January	5,252	67.5	4,074	8,110	760	42,430	4,340	0.11	12,040
February	5,301	86.5	2,764	7,213	640	43,824	4,327	.11	9,971
March	8,406	63.7	3,092	9,181	671	46,013	4,800	.12	11,400
April	24,800	60.6	4,785	8,819	698	47,396	5,251	.13	14,878
May	29,170	63.1	6,043	7,764	700	47,866	5,611	.14	12,916
June	28,391	59.5	8,482	7,070	752	48,163	5,825	.15	13,527
July	28,510	67.0	10,620	7,664	820	48,936	6,308	.16	14,001

[1] Guaranteed only.

The major features of Public Law 85–364, which reactivated the veterans' housing program, are as follows:

Public Law 85–364: (While this law was a general housing act and considered by another committee, it contained the substance of H. R. 4602 which was reported by this committee and was vetoed in 1957.)

1. Substitutes a new section 512, establishing a new policy and program for 2 years.

2. Congressional intent as to declaration of direct loan areas is expressed to include small cities, towns, and rural areas.

3. Authorizes $150 million for each of the periods July 1, 1958, to July 25, 1959, and July 25, 1959, to July 25, 1960.

4. Increases the amount of direct loans from $10,000 to $13,500.

5. Provides for an advance commitment to a builder upon the payment of a commitment fee of 2 percent of the amount of the loan. The commitment to be valid for 3 months and subject to extension if the builder is active and has contracted with an eligible veteran.

6. Provides that the Administrator shall continue processing the direct loan of the veteran without delay, submitting the information to the voluntary home mortgage credit program and giving that agency up to 60 days after the loan is closed to find a lender to buy the loan from the Veterans' Administration.

7. Provides that the Administrator may make construction advances to the veteran and builder during construction, thereby eliminating the necessity of the builder obtaining a construction loan.

8. Provides discretionary authority to the Administrator to exempt new construction under this section from the subdivision and

land planning requirements. Permits the building of homes in keeping with the area in which they are located. The bill does not permit any deviations from the Veterans' Administration minimum construction requirements.

9. Extends the loan-guaranty program for 2 years, from July 25, 1958, and authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to set an interest rate not in excess of 4¾ percent.

10. Includes a technical correction requested by Veterans' Administration with reference to the guaranteeing of automatic loans.

11. Repeals laws relating to mortgage loan discounts.

12. Lowers the minimum downpayments required for FHA housing as indicated in the following table:

FHA approved value	Prior law		Public Law 85-364	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
$10,000	$300	3.0	$300	3.0
$12,000	600	5.0	360	3.0
$15,000	1,050	7.0	630	4.2
$16,000	1,200	7.5	780	4.9
$18,000	1,800	10.0	1,380	7.7
$20,000	2,400	12.0	1,980	9.9
$22,000	3,000	13.6	2,580	11.7
$25,000	5,000	20.0	5,000	20.0

13. Authorizes an additional $1.55 billion for the Federal National Mortgage Association to use in purchasing FHA and VA mortgages ($500 million to be allocated by the President, $25 million for regular military housing mortgages, $25 million for housing at research and development centers, and $1 billion for new FHA and VA mortgages not exceeding $13,500).

One of the most important bills providing benefits for veterans that was enacted by the 85th Congress is Public Law 85–168, which increased rates of compensation for service-connected disabilities. The provisions of this bill are as follows:

	Prior law [1]	Public Law 85-168
(a) 10 percent disability	$17.00	*$19.00*
(b) 20 percent disability	33.00	*36.00*
(c) 30 percent disability	50.00	*55.00*
(d) 40 percent disability	66.00	*73.00*
(e) 50 percent disability	91.00	*100.00*
(f) 60 percent disability	109.00	*120.00*
(g) 70 percent disability	127.00	*140.00*
(h) 80 percent disability	145.00	*160.00*
(i) 90 percent disability	163.00	*179.00*
(j) Total disability	181.00	*225.00*
(k) Anatomical loss, or loss of use of a creative organ, or 1 foot, or 1 hand, or blindness of 1 eye, having only light perception, rates (a) to (f) increased monthly by	47.00	*47.00*
Anatomical loss, or loss of use of a creative organ, or 1 foot, or 1 hand, or blindness of 1 eye, having only light perception, in addition to requirement for any of rates in (l) to (n), rate increased monthly for each loss or loss of use by	47.00	*[2] 47.00*
(l) Anatomical loss, or loss of use of both hands, or both feet, or 1 hand and 1 foot, or blind both eyes with 5/200 visual acuity or less, or is permanently bedridden or so helpless as to be in need of regular aid and attendance, monthly compensation	279.00	*309.00*
(m) Anatomical loss, or loss of use of 2 extremities at a level, or with complications, preventing natural elbow or knee action with prothesis in place, or suffered blindness in both eyes, rendering him so helpless as to be in need of regular aid and attendance, monthly compensation	329.00	*359.00*
(n) Anatomical loss of 2 extremities so near shoulder or hip as to prevent use of prosthetic appliance, or suffered anatomical loss of both eyes, monthly compensation	371.00	*401.00*
(o) Suffered disability under conditions which would entitle him to 2 or more rates in (l) to (n), no condition being considered twice, or suffered total deafness in combination with total blindness with 5/200 visual acuity or less, monthly compensation	420.00	*450.00*
(p) In event disabled person's service-incurred disabilities exceed requirements for any of rates prescribed, Administrator, in his discretion, may allow next higher rate, or intermediate rate, but in no event in excess of	420.00	*450.00*
(q) Minimum rate for arrested tuberculosis	67.00	*67.00*

[1] Peacetime rates are 80 percent of wartime rates.
[2] But in no event to exceed $450.

Additional disability compensation because of dependents [1]

	Wife, no child	Wife, 1 child	Wife, 2 children	Wife, 3 or more children	No wife, 1 child	No wife, 2 children	No wife, 3 or more children	Dependent parent or parents
Service on or after June 27, 1950								
World War II								
World War I								
Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, Boxer Rebellion	$21.00	$35.00	$45.50	$56.00	$14.00	$24.50	$35.00	$17.50(1)
	25.00	*39.00*	*50.00*	*62.00*	*15.00*	*27.00*	*39.00*	*19.00*
								35.00(2)
								38.00
Civil War								
Indian wars								
Peacetime service (under combat or extrahazardous conditions)								
Regular peacetime service	16.80	28.00	36.40	44.80	11.20	19.60	28.00	14.00(1)
	18.00	*31.00*	*40.00*	*50.00*	*12.00*	*22.00*	*31.00*	*15.00*
								28.00(2)
								30.00

[1] Above rates are for 100-percent disability. If and while rated partially disabled, but not less than 50 percent, additional compensation is authorized in an amount having the same ratio to the amount specified in the applicable table, above, as the degree of disability bears to the total disability; e. g., war service-connected disability of 50 percent, compensation rate, $100. If veteran has a wife, his compensation is increased as follows: $100+$11.50=$111.50.

NOTE.—Rates in italics as in Public Law 85-168.

Other important measures passed by the 85th Congress affecting veterans are as follows:

Public Law 85–171: Permits forwarding of all types of Veterans' Administration benefit checks where the person has moved and left a forwarding address instead of the prior requirement of returning the check to the Veterans' Administration.

Public Law 85–194: Increases from $10 to $25 the maximum amount that may be paid by VA for shipping charges on personal property of deceased veterans who die on VA property.

Public Law 85–200: Terminates, 60 days after enactment, the operation of the Veterans' Education Appeals Board and transfers its records to Archives.

Public Law 85–209: Section 1 provides a uniform alternative marriage date requirement for widows applying for pension or compensation. It provides that a widow who does not otherwise meet the applicable delimiting marriage dates as presently existing in the law be eligible for pension or for compensation if she was married to the veteran for 5 or more years or for any period of time if children were born as a result of the marriage. Section 2 permits women to receive pension, compensation, or other gratuitous benefits based on the service of a veteran even though there was a legal impediment to her marriage to the veteran which she entered into without any knowledge of such legal impediment, if other requirements are satisfied.

Public Law 85–311: This law excludes from computation as annual income in determining eligibility for non-service-connected disability or death pension as well as service-connected death compensation or dependency or indemnity compensation for parents, any payment of veterans' bonus by a State, Territory, possession of the United States, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, based on service in the Armed Forces of the United States and their widows and children.

Public Law 85–425 (effective July 1, 1958): In addition to providing monthly pension of $101.59 or $135.45 (aid and attendance rate) for two Confederate veterans, it provides pensions for dependents of veterans as indicated in the following table.

For non-service-connected deaths	Widow	Widow age 70	If widow was wife of veteran during service	Widow 1 child	Each additional child	No widow, 1 child	No widow, 2 children	No widow, 3 children	Each additional child
Mexican War	$65.00								
Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, Boxer Rebellion	65.00		$75.00	$73.13 83.13	$8.13	$73.13	$81.26	$89.39	$8.13
Civil War,[1] Indian wars	40.64	$65.00	75.00	48.77 73.13 83.13	8.13	73.13	81.26	89.39	8.13

[1] Includes widows and children of Confederate veterans.

Public Law 85-460: This bill amends the definition of the term "State" as set forth in the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, Public Law 550, 82d Congress (GI bill of rights for Korean veterans), and the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act of 1956, Public Law 634, 84th Congress, in order to make clear that the benefits of those acts may be given to persons pursuing a course of education and training in the Panama Canal Zone. It also authorizes training under Public Law 634 in the Republic of the Philippines.

Public Law 85-461: Authorizes modification and extension of the program of grants-in-aid to the Republic of the Philippines for hospitalization of certain veterans, to—

(1) Permit use of Veterans' Memorial Hospital for cases other than those involving service-connected disabilities.

(2) Permit treatment of service-connected veterans on outpatient basis.

(3) Extend period of assistance from December 31, 1959, to June 30, 1963.

(4) Place overall ceiling of $2 million on expenditures for this purpose in any one year.

(5) Grants hospitalization (service-connected and non-service-connected) to American veterans residing in the Philippines on a permanent or temporary basis.

Public Law 85-462: Section 5 of this act incorporates the general approach provisions of H. R. 6719 reported by this committee. It provides adjustments in organization and salary structure of the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration. Pay increases under this act averaged about 10 percent.

Public Law 85-586: Authorizes refunds of premiums paid by the VA in behalf of servicemen who had commercial insurance guaranteed during the period 1940-42. Premiums were later collected from policyholders. This bill would authorize repayment, pursuant to Supreme Court decision, of approximately $1,600,000 to 8,440 individuals.

Public Law 85-638: Extends the time for filing claims for mustering-out payments under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 to July 16, 1959 (previously July 16, 1956).

Public Law 85-652: Increases the rate for blind veterans with only light perception from $309 to $359 monthly.

Public Law 85-655: Places dependents of female veterans on a parity with dependents of male veterans.

Public Law 85-674: Increases the burial allowance from $150 to $250.

Public Law 85-678: Amends the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to accomplish the following:

(1) Increase from $5 to $10 per month for each $1,000 insurance in force the amount of total disability income protection which may be purchased by insureds;

(2) Provide for the first time for the addition of a total disability income rider to policies of insurance issued under section 621 of the act; and

(3) Permit holders of policies with existing $5 total disability income riders who are in good health and otherwise qualify to surrender their $5 rider and add the $10 provision to their policies.

Public Law 85-782: Increases by $150 a month compensation paid to severely disabled service-connected veterans who require an aid or attendant while they are not hospitalized at Government expense.

Public Law 85-807: Provides that any World War II or Korean veteran who has received a discharge less than honorable and who later has it corrected to a discharge under other than dishonorable conditions may have 4 years within which to initiate course of education and training under the World War II GI bill of rights or 3 years under the Korean GI bill of rights. All education and training is to be completed no later than January 31, 1965.

Public Law 85-857: Incorporates into a single act the subject matter of Public Law 85-56, together with the extensive body of existing legislation governing education and training benefits for veterans and war orphans; dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors; Government insurance; vocational rehabilitation; guaranteed, insured, and direct loans for homes, farms, or businesses; and Federal aid to State soldiers' homes. In addition, the law covers the subjects of unemployment compensation (administered by the Department of Labor) and mustering-out payments (administered by the military departments). Effective from January 1, 1959.

Public Law 85-871: Authorizes the Veterans' Administration to provide certain specialized vocational training for retarded children who are eligible for training under the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act.

Public Law 85-896: The law permits a section 621 policyholder (insurance taken out between April 25, 1951, and December 31, 1956) three choices:

1. Maintain his present term policy at the Commissioners standard ordinary premium rates.

2. Exchange his present policy for a limited convertible term policy with lower premiums based on the new X-18 table. Such policy would not be renewed after age 50 or September 1, 1960.

3. Convert to a permanent type policy with premiums based on the X-18 table.

Open Primary Election Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my statement on the open primary system of elections.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The open primary is the safeguard against professional political bosses and corruption.

I am an ardent believer in the open primary election law, and I warn the people who now have primaries that it would be a sad day for them if the open primaries were ever abolished and the convention system solely came back into being.

Under the open primary, any man—rich or poor—can become a candidate simply by filing his petition signed by the requisite number of voters, and this gives an opportunity for folks to get together and select a man or woman of the people as their candidate in the primary election of their party.

It prevents a few selfish politicians from getting together and handpicking candidates who may be opposed to the people's interests, or who may be representing giant monopolies from outside of the State and the "fat boys." Before the primary election law was adopted in North Dakota, a few politicians representing the railroads, the big banking interests of the Twin Cities, the grain and produce exchanges from without the State had met in the Merchants Hotel in St. Paul, Minn., and sometimes weeks before the convention met, announced who the candidates were going to be for the National and State offices in our State. They were able to carry out their plans of nominating the officers because Alex McKenzie, the then political boss of the State, handpicked the delegates and handed out free railroad passes and paid their expenses to and from the place of the conventions, where the majority of the delegates simply ratified what the bosses had agreed upon previously.

In 1906, when the late chief justice, A. M. Christianson, came from Towner, N. Dak., to the convention held at Jamestown, the then political boss, Alexander McKenzie, told him that if he wished to become a candidate for attorney general, he would have to "sign here." Mr. Christianson, being a progressive Republican, of course did not sign. He was not selected for attorney general and was helpless to run independently because the primary law was not then in existence.

Two years ago, a great outstanding progressive Republican, Congressman USHER L. BURDICK, was endorsed by the Republican Party at a so-called unity convention in North Dakota, and all during the campaign he led the so-called unity ticket—a ticket to allegedly unify all Republicans. So successful was that campaign that the professional political bosses this year figured that they no longer needed Congressman BURDICK and so the professional political bosses ignored him and although he was present at the convention they did not even accord the Congressman the courtesy of inviting him to the platform to address the convention. Mr. BURDICK walked out in disgust.

Of course, when it came to myself as a candidate for reelection on the Republican ticket, I was anathema to the political bosses, and a week before the convention convened, the Kingfish of the Republican bosses announced "anybody for the Senate but LANGER." Most of the daily newspapers took up the refrain. If we had not had an open primary, the political bosses would have succeeded in ending my political career. But all I had to do under the open primary, was to get 300 voters to sign my petition and file it with the secretary of state and I had

my name automatically on the ballot. Instead of 300 names, my supporters got 31,696, although they did not file all the petitions.

To show how the convention can be controlled, Bowman County had three delegates. At no time did any of the three vote for my nomination at the convention. Yet in the primary election, I carried the county 2 to 1. In Grant County, there were 6 delegates and I received 1 vote, while in the election I carried the county 5 to 1. In Kidder County there was 1 vote out of 5 delegates while I carried the county over 2 to 1, and in the county of Richland, where there were 17 delegates and only 1 voted for me, yet I carried the county by a vote of over 70 percent. I could go on and name other counties with similar results.

Mr. President, while I am addressing my colleagues today, I want them to know that I am giving this speech for the benefit of the people who reside in those States where they have open primaries, and I want this speech to be considered as a warning to the people never to let their legislatures abolish it, and if they do in those States where they have a referendum like we have in North Dakota, by all means to refer the action of the legislature directly to the people. It is the one and only way that professional political bosses can be controlled and put out of business completely. In those States which do not have the primary, in my humble opinion, in only too many cases men are chosen for public office who represent special interests or giant monopolies, and not the people. They, of course, owe their election not to the people, but to those who got them nominated at the hand-picked convention, and they usually vote accordingly.

One reason for my speaking today, is that I believe the people do not fully appreciate the value of a primary election, and that the number who go out and vote are much less than the number who vote in the general election although the primary in most cases is of even more importance than the general election. Now to confirm my statement, I refer to the largest newspaper in my State which for over 40 years has fought me—the Fargo Forum. On September 7, 1958, they became interested in the election of Congresswoman COYA KNUTSON, in Minnesota. I know the people of my State will rub their eyes in surprise and read and reread and reread the editorial contained therein entitled "Minnesota Voters Should Respect Intent of Primary." Here is what this newspaper has to say now which was directly opposite to what they said in June before the primary. It is as follows:

"Again, this practice is not limited to Minnesotans. In North Dakota Democrats often have voted for Senator LANGER on the Republican ticket, although it isn't quite as easy as in Minnesota where there is one consolidated ballot with both DFL and Republican candidates listed in adjoining columns. In North Dakota a voter must ask for either a Republican or Democratic ballot.

"Aside from the practical danger of such tactics boomeranging if LANGER gets a small vote in the primary, Minnesota Republicans should stay in their own column for the fundamental reason that a primary election is designed for the members of each party to pick the best possible candidates of the party. These candidates then oppose each other in the general election so the voters have a choice between men of different political philosophies.

"Probably few of today's voters or potential voters remember that prior to 1912 political conventions picked party candidates for office. The compulsory statewide primary became law in 1912, after reformers, as in other Midwestern States, successfully persuaded the Minnesota Legislature that political corruption and bossism could be brought under effective control if the rank-and-file voter were given an opportunity to help select directly the candidates of his party.

"Thus the primary is one of the keystones in our democracy even though political conventions endorse a slate of candidates. The primary enables anyone dissatisfied with a convention choice to seek office, and the Knutson-Evenson contest is an example of how the primary operates to give the DFL voters a choice of Congressional candidates.

"If the primary is to continue this important freedom of choice and the vital two-party system is to continue in Minnesota, Republican voters should not meddle in the DFL's primary Tuesday."

Thus, it is true, as this reactionary newspaper stated in the editorial above, that the direct primary was passed to give the people the opportunity to bring "corruption and bossism under effective control if the rank-and-file voter were given an opportunity to help select directly the candidates of his party."

There, Mr. President, is the reason for the open primary. There is the safeguard which the people have, and which, God forbid, I hope they never relinquish.

A Report to the People of the 11th District of Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, I am making this statement for the RECORD in reporting on some of our work and activities in the 85th Congress. We considered and passed 2,546 bills out of 15,660 introduced in the House of Representatives. We have achieved a good record of legislative work. No previous Congress has had so much responsibility. Among the history-making acts, the 85th Congress set up a new Government agency to cope with the problems of the outer space age and created a new State out of the Territory of Alaska.

First, and foremost important, is agriculture. The farmers of America are Democrats and they are Republicans. Their well-being and assurance of a fair and prosperous income should have no dependence upon or involve party politics. But it is clear that the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, has at all times injected partisan politics and has promoted political alignments in Congress during our deliberations on vital farm bills to the detriment of the farmer.

When this administration came into power in 1953, Hon. Ezra Taft Benson took over a farm program under which for 11 consecutive years—1942 to 1952, inclusive—our farmers had enjoyed their greatest prosperity in history. Farm prices in each of those 11 years were at or above 100 percent of parity. During these years our consumers bought food at fair and reasonable prices.

Mr. Benson, in 5 years, with the backing of the President, has reduced this program to a shambles.

In 1957, our total population consumed 11 percent more farm-produced foods than in 1952, the year before Mr. Benson took office, yet our farmers received $600 million less for that larger volume of production for domestic consumption in 1957 than for the more limited volume in 1952. And, in contrast, consumers paid food processors and marketing middlemen $6.1 billion more in 1957 than in 1952 for hauling, processing, and handling the food between the farm gate and the retail counter.

Here are the figures on the deterioration of farm income under Mr. Benson, taken from the books of the Department of Agriculture:

TOTAL REALIZED NET INCOME OF FARMER:

(After deducting agricultural production expenses from the total of cash income from farm marketings, Government payments to farmers, value of home consumption of farm-produced foods, and computed rental value of farm dwellings.)

5 pre-Benson years:	
1948	$16,057,000,000
1949	13,789,000,000
1950	13,185,000,000
1951	15,158,000,000
1952	14,416,000,000
Total	72,605,000,000
5 Benson years:	
1953	13,899,000,000
1954	12,201,000,000
1955	11,470,000,000
1956	12,111,000,000
1957	10,840,000,000
Total	60,521,000,000

The price support for dairy farmers was the first to be reduced by Mr. Benson after he became Secretary, and Government losses in the dairy program in the last 5 years have been greater than all costs of all Commodity Credit Corporation price support programs for all crops during the previous 20 years.

It is indeed a regrettable record that Mr. Benson has compiled as Secretary of Agriculture in the years he should have been the chief champion of our farmers. He has consistently made a dedicated drive for lower and lower farm prices based upon an absurd theory that a greater volume of farm products at a lower or poorer price will make a better income. In the application of this principle, he has set the stage for even greater losses within the next 2 years.

Record wheat and feed-grain crops in 1958, the weakening of production-adjustment programs, and further reduction in price supports which will encourage larger crops outputs as farmers seek to make up in volume what they lost in unit price—all these factors clearly foreshadow these distressing developments:

Farm surpluses will amount to a new record high.

Farm program costs will climb to new heights.

Meat animal prices and the income of feed and livestock producers will decline sharply. We may see hogs selling at $10 or $12 per hundredweight.

Farm debt will set a new high record.

Finally, unless an effective farm program is developed in the next Congress and put into operation, in spite of Mr. Benson's objections, farm income will soon establish a new postwar low, and the effects will be felt not only by our farm people but also by the Nation's total economy.

Mr. Speaker, the 85th Congress strove, with earnestness and dedication, to arrest the 5-year deterioration of our agricultural economy, and to return our farmers to a parity position in our free-enterprise society, but our efforts were thwarted—they were scuttled—by the veto power of the President.

This Congress worked constantly in the shadows of Mr. Eisenhower's veto power wherever the interests of agriculture were to be served.

The President put this power at the disposal of Secretary Benson.

Early in this session the Congress passed Senate Joint Resolution 162 intended to prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from cutting the price-support levels in 1958 for dairy farmers, wheat producers, and for several other crops, and also to forestall severe acreage reductions in 1959 for cotton and rice producers. This legislation was intended to prevent a loss this year of over one-half billion dollars to wheat, rice, dairy, and feed grain farmers. It proposed a reasonable solution in 1959 to the acreage allotment problems of cotton and rice farmers. The President vetoed this legislation. That was his constitutional right, but to the great injury of the farmers' interests. Mr. Speaker, we need and must have a stabilized farm program and an administration that is sympathetic to the principle and consider that the farm families of this Nation have a right and ought to be equal partners in the rewards and blessings of free enterprise and a 100-percent parity position in our great Nation's growth and prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, we finally passed another farm bill in the closing days of this session of Congress. The bill is not what I wanted. The bill is not what any friend of agriculture wanted. It is an offspring of necessity and fear of the President's veto power. It protects producers from something worse in 1959 but, unless it is repealed or changed it will create greater problems in the years ahead.

Mr. Speaker, agriculture is the only major element of our total economy that has no device, outside of the help of Government to pattern its production to market needs; farmers have no way of measuring what should be their individual contributions to a balanced national supply of food and fiber without Government help; farmers have virtually no bargaining power in the commerce they conduct; agriculture is the only major industry that does not set its prices to cover costs and reasonable profits but is compelled to go into the market place and ask: "What will you give me?"

I am pleased to say and I point with pride to the fact that I have always supported and voted for farm parity price support legislation and have always favored 100 percent parity price support for the farmers of America.

Mr. Speaker, when speaking on the subject of agriculture and farm parity price support programs, I naturally think of those who favor the so-called foreign aid programs. They are generally the same people who oppose the farm parity price support programs and other farm legislation beneficial to our own people in America. This foreign aid giveaway and our foreign policy has created for us more enemies and hatred throughout the world than any other program or policy adopted by our Government in the history of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, it has, these past several years, too often and too unhappily, appeared to me that in the zeal and zest to sustain our faltering foreign policy too many hasty programs, of too great, too extravagant, and too expensive a nature have been approved to assist foreign nations. I have consistently, in this period, warned that in our concentration upon the rehabilitation of the Free World there has been too great a neglect of the interests and welfare of our own American people and I have attempted to point out that the most important strength, underlying any foreign policy, is a continuation and encouragement of a high morale among our own citizens. If they lost confidence in this Government and its officials, then we are indeed in dire trouble. In my opinion this is one of the most important issues facing the people of the 11th Congressional District and all of the people of our great country. I have opposed and voted against this extravagant, wasteful, and dangerous policy and I believe that the people of the 11th District will support me on this stand at the coming election next November 4.

The Acephalous Democrat Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, informed observers of the American political scene have knowledgeably referred to the 85th Congress as being the sperdingest, the most disaster-proclaiming, and as being a gravy train Congress. Regrettably it is perhaps inevitable that such characterizations would result in view of the fact that the Democrat Party—presently in majority control of Congress—stands divided on virtually every major issue without effective leadership. My remarks will be addressed to the failure of the Democrat Party to provide adequate leadership in those areas affecting the well-being of our citizens and the security of our Nation.

The present leaders of the Democrat Party are today in wide open dispute on issues of fiscal and economic policy, social legislation, and national security. Their intraparty confusion and discord finds them united only in their covetous carping criticism in political hindsight of the great accomplishments of the Republican Party while suffering from astigmatic foresight that precludes their offering constructive solutions to the national problems that have been largely created by their ineptness in past leadership opportunities.

Edmund Burke, the English philosopher, once observed that a political party could be defined as a body of men united for promoting national interest according to some particular principle on which they all agree. On which national issue is there unity in the Democrat Party? Is it on civil rights? Does the Democrat from Boston agree with the Democrat from St. Paul with respect to the same principles of a sound farm program? Can there be unity between a Democrat from Nashville and a Democrat from Detroit on the issue of public power? Federal programs of aid to the States find the members of the Democrat Party in dispute as to the qualifying requirements and the methods of allocation under the programs. The record proves they cannot agree. This lack of party principle and the conflict of disunity preclude the Democrat Party from giving to the Nation the character and quality of leadership that America must have to provide for our security and to assure maximum national progress.

Mr. Speaker, I will now deal with specific areas in which the Democrat Party has failed to provide responsible leadership for our Nation.

I. FISCAL AFFAIRS

In regard to the management of our Nation's fiscal affairs no phrase describes more accurately the Democrat record than the expression—tax and tax, spend and spend. In the 46 years that have elapsed since the advent of the personal income tax in 1913, the Democrat Party has controlled the Congress for 30 years and the Republican Party for 16 years. In the 30 years of Democrat control they have given the Nation 20 major Democrat tax increases. The Republican Party on the other hand in its 16 years of stewardship as the majority party in Congress has enacted 9 major Republican income tax decreases. The profligate extravagance of Democrat leadership can be documented to show a Democrat increase of $250 billion in public indebtedness despite the succession of recordbreaking tax increases they have enacted. As a percentage of national income Truman-Democrat spending in fiscal year 1953 was 25 percent of the national income. The Republican Party reduced that percentage so that Government spending is now 20 percent of national income.

So that the tax records of the Republican Party and the Democrat Party can be available, I will insert in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a summary table of Federal individual income tax exemptions and first and top bracket rates for the period from 1913 through 1958. By referring to the years indicated in the left hand column of table 1, the party responsibility for tax changes can be determined.

TABLE 1.—*Federal individual income tax exemptions and 1st and top bracket rates 1913–58*

Income year	Personal exemptions					Tax rates			
	Single	Married				1st bracket		Top bracket	
		Dependents				Rate	Amount of income	Rate	Income over—
		No	1	2	3				
						Percent		*Percent*	
1913–15	$3,000	$4,000	$4,000	$4,000	$4,000	1	$20,000	7	$500,000
1916	3,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	2	20,000	15	2,000,000
1917	1,000	2,000	2,200	2,400	2,600	2	2,000	67	2,000,000
1918	1,000	2,000	2,200	2,400	2,600	6	4,000	77	1,000,000
1919–20	1,000	2,000	2,200	2,400	2,600	4	4,000	73	1,000,000
1921	1,000	[1] 2,500	2,900	3,300	3,700	4	4,000	73	1,000,000
1922	1,000	[1] 2,500	2,900	3,300	3,700	4	4,000	56	200,000
1923	1,000	[1] 2,500	2,900	3,300	3,700	3	4,000	56	200,000
1924	1,000	2,500	2,900	3,300	3,700	[2] 1½	4,000	46	500,000
1925–28	1,500	3,500	3,900	4,300	4,700	[2] 1½	4,000	25	100,000
1929	1,500	3,500	3,900	4,300	4,700	[2] 5½	4,000	24	100,000
1930–31	1,500	3,500	3,900	4,300	4,700	[2] 1½	4,000	25	100,000
1932–33	1,000	2,500	2,900	3,300	3,700	4	4,000	63	1,000,000
1934–35	1,000	2,500	2,900	3,300	3,700	[3] 4	4,000	63	1,000,000
1936–39	1,000	2,500	2,900	3,300	3,700	[3] 4	4,000	79	5,000,000
1940	800	2,000	2,400	2,800	3,200	[3] 4.4	4,000	81.1	5,000,000
1941	750	1,500	1,900	2,300	2,700	[3] 10	2,000	81	5,000,000
1942–43 [4]	500	1,200	1,550	1,900	2,250	[3] 19	2,000	88	200,000
1944–45	500	1,000	1,500	2,000	2,500	23	2,000	[5] 94	200,000
1946–47	500	1,000	1,500	2,000	2,500	19	2,000	[5] 86.45	200,000
1948–49 [6]	600	1,200	1,800	2,400	3,000	16.6	2,000	[5] 82.13	200,000
1950 [6]	600	1,200	1,800	2,400	3,000	17.4	2,000	[5] 91	200,000
1951 [6]	600	1,200	1,800	2,400	3,000	20.4	2,000	[5] 91	200,000
1952–53 [6]	600	1,200	1,800	2,400	3,000	22.2	2,000	[5] 92	200,000
1954–58 [6]	600	1,200	1,800	2,400	3,000	20	2,000	[5] 91	200,000

[1] If net income exceeds $5,000, married person's exemption is $2,000.
[2] After earned income credit equal to 25 percent of tax on earned income.
[3] Before earned income credit allowed as a deduction equal to 10 percent of earned net income.
[4] Exclusive of victory tax.
[5] Subject to maximum effective rate limitation: 90 percent for 1944–45, 85.5 percent for 1946–47, 77 percent for 1948–49, 87 percent for 1950, 87.2 percent for 1951, 88 percent for 1952–53, and 87 percent for 1954–55.
[6] Additional exemptions of $600 are allowed to taxpayers and their spouses on account of blindness and/or age over 65.

Corporation income tax rates also mounted under the Democrat Party's taxing and spending programs. I will at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks insert a table setting forth corporation income tax rates for the period 1909 through 1958 indicating the corporate tax rate changes. By making reference to dates in the left-hand column of table 2 it is possible to determine the action taken with respect to corporate tax rates by our two major political parties:

TABLE 2.—*Corporation income-tax rates, 1909–58*

Calendar year	Reduced rates on small corporations	General rate
1909–13	$5,000 exemption	1
1913–15	No exemption after Mar. 1, 1913	1
1916	No exemption	2
1917	do	6
1918	$2,000 exemption	12
1919–21	do	10
1922–24	do	12½
1925	do	13
1, 26–27	do	13½
1928	$3,000 exemption	12
1929	do	11
1930–31	do	12
1932–35	No exemption	13¾
1936–37	Graduated normal tax ranging from 8 percent 1st $2,000; over $40,000. Graduated surtax on undistributed profits ranging from 7 percent to.	15 27
1938–39	12½ to 16 percent 1st $25,000 over $25,000.	[1] 19
1940	14.85 to 18.7 percent 1st $25,000; 38.3 percent $25,000 to $31,964.30; 36.9 percent $31,964.30 to $38,565.89; over $38,565.89.	24
1941	21 to 25 percent 1st $25,000; 44 percent $25,000 to $38,461.54; over $38,461.54.	31
1942–45	25 to 29 percent 1st $25,000; 53 percent $25,000 to $50,000; over $50,000.	40
1946–49	21 to 25 percent 1st $25,000; 53 percent $25,000 to $50,000; over $50,000.	38
1950	23 percent 1st $25,000; over $25,000	42
1951	28¾ percent 1st $25,000; over $25,000	50¾
1952–58	30 percent 1st $25,000; over $25,000	52

[1] Less adjustments: 14.025 percent of dividends received and 2½ percent of dividends paid.

In addition to the tax changes set forth in the table relating to corporate income-tax rates, the Democrat Party also enacted corporate excess-profits taxes during the three wars in which our Nation became embroiled while the Democrat Party was in control of our Federal Government.

Despite the mounting and onerous tax burden imposed on our American citizens under Democrat leadership, the spending programs authorized by the Democrat Party regularly exceeded the Nation's ability to pay with the result that Democrat leadership has been the architect of unrestrained inflation, deficit financing, and increasing public indebtedness. To document this fact I will next insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks table 3, showing budget receipts and expenditures and the public debt for the fiscal years 1900 through 1959:

TABLE 3.—*Budget totals and public debt since 1900*

[Fiscal years. In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Budget receipts	Budget expenditures	Surplus (+) or deficit (−)	Public debt at end of year
1900	567	521	+46	1,263
1901	588	525	+63	1,222
1902	562	485	+77	1,178
1903	562	517	+45	1,159
1904	541	584	−43	1,136
1905	544	567	−23	1,132
1906	595	570	+25	1,143
1907	666	579	+87	1,147
1908	602	659	−57	1,178
1909	604	694	−89	1,148
1910	676	694	−18	1,147
1911	702	691	+11	1,154
1912	693	690	+3	1,194
1913	714	715	(1)	1,193
1914	725	725	(1)	1,188
1915	683	746	−63	1,191
1916	762	713	+48	1,225
1917	1,100	1,954	−853	2,976
1918	3,630	12,662	−9,032	12,455
1919	5,085	18,448	−13,363	25,485
1920	6,649	6,357	+291	24,299
1921	5,567	5,058	+509	23,977
1922	4,021	3,285	+736	22,963
1923	3,849	3,137	+713	22,350
1924	3,853	2,890	+963	21,251
1925	3,598	2,881	+717	20,516
1926	3,753	2,888	+865	19,643
1927	3,992	2,837	+1,155	18,512
1928	3,872	2,933	+939	17,604
1929	3,861	3,127	+734	16,931
1930	4,058	3,320	+738	16,185
1931	3,116	3,577	−462	16,801
1932	1,924	4,659	−2,735	19,487
1933	2,021	4,623	−2,602	22,539
1934	3,064	6,694	−3,630	27,053
1935	3,730	6,521	−2,791	28,701
1936	4,069	8,493	−4,425	33,779
1937	4,979	7,756	−2,777	36,425
1938	5,615	6,792	−1,177	37,165
1939	4,996	8,858	−3,862	40,440
1940	5,144	9,062	−3,918	42,968
1941	7,103	13,262	−6,159	48,961
1942	12,555	34,046	−21,490	72,422
1943	21,987	79,407	−57,420	136,696
1944	43,635	95,059	−51,423	201,003
1945	44,475	98,416	−53,941	258,682
1946	39,771	60,448	−20,676	269,422
1947	39,786	39,032	+754	258,286
1948	41,488	33,069	+8,419	252,292
1949	37,696	39,507	−1,811	252,770
1950	36,495	39,617	−3,122	257,357
1951	47,568	44,058	+3,510	255,222
1952	61,391	65,408	−4,017	259,105
1953	64,825	74,274	−9,449	266,071
1954	64,655	67,772	−3,117	271,260
1955	60,390	64,570	−4,180	274,374
1956	68,165	66,540	+1,626	272,751
1957	71,029	69,433	+1,596	270,527
1958	69,083	71,897	−2,813	276,343
1959 [2]	67,000	79,223	−12,223	283,000

[1] Less than $500,000.
[2] Current estimate.

NOTES.—Refunds of receipts are excluded from budget receipts and budget expenditures starting in 1913; comparable data are not available for prior years.

The change in the public debt from year to year reflects not only the budget surplus or deficit but also changes in the Treasury's cash balances, the effect of certain trust fund transactions, and direct borrowing from the public by certain Government enterprises.

In the area of legislative appropriations—which is the Congressional grant of license to spend—the record of Democrat leadership is equally as abysmal. In the last budget year of the Hoover administration Government spending totaled only $4.6 billion. In the last budget year of the Truman administration appropriations rose to $86 billion. During the Republican controlled 83d Congress appropriations averaged $61.7 billion compared with average appropriations of $72.7 billion in the 84th and 85th Democrat controlled Congresses. Comparing the foregoing averages of Democrat spending authorizations with Republican spending authorizations we find an increment of $11 billion a year which the Democrat leadership has authorized. This is $11 billion a year that could be divided between meaningful tax reduction to stimulate our economy and debt reduction to minimize the tax burden that we pass on to succeeding generations.

Mr. Speaker, the cause of increased Federal spending under Democrat leadership in the Congress can be readily understood when it is realized that in the 84th Congress alone the Democrat Party sponsored nearly 200 new or increased programs largely imposing Federal-aid programs on the States. In evaluating the desirability of these programs it should be realized that Federal aid to the States in effect necessitates

taxing the citizens of the States and then returning the tax collections to the States for programs that the States could better operate themselves if Federal taxes were reduced so that State taxes could be made adequate to finance the programs. Another indication of cause for mounting spending is found in the record of Democrat leadership in the recently completed 2d session of the 85th Congress when that Congress appropriated $7 billion more than the President asked for in his budget message for the fiscal year 1959.

Mr. Speaker, this review of fiscal leadership clearly demonstrates the great Republican record for economy and for responsible management of our Nation's fiscal affairs. This review also gives convincing evidence of the failure of Democrat leadership to provide anything but higher taxes, higher spending, and higher public indebtedness. This review proves that the Democrat leadership has learned well the spending lessons of their mentors Roosevelt and Truman in bankrupt economics and fiscal chaos with compound interest in perpetuity.

II. SOCIAL LEGISLATION

In the area of social legislation we find a Republican record of actual accomplishment compared to a Democrat record of cruel demagoguery and unfilled political promise.

The record of the Democrat leadership with respect to keeping promises in the area of social legislation is a sordid record of nonfulfillment, nondelivery, and nonperformance. The Democrat Party has disregarded the public need for responsible action; they have promised anything and everything but have delivered nothing. This record of broken campaign promises is the inevitable consequence of the Democrat campaign slogan, "You name it and we've got it." The Democrat Party has diligently worked to pit one class of Americans against another class. They have given lip service to human rights while practicing human intolerance.

Mr. Speaker, I will now cite specific instances of failure and ineptness on the part of the leaders in the Democrat Party with respect to social legislation.

The Democrat failure to provide responsible leadership for our Nation assumed the character of premeditated postponement in the case of meritorious and greatly needed improvements in our Nation's laws governing labor-management relations. Shocking disclosures of gangster domination of labor unions with specific revelations of murder, extortion, goon squad practices, and other crimes made the need for effective legislation in the 85th Congress a matter of urgency to protect not only the economic rights of American labor but also the liberty of its rank and file membership. The Democrat leadership with its political subservience to labor bossism turned its back on evidences of gangster infiltration of the union leadership hierarchy and ignored the needs of union members for protection against internal decay and corruption in the labor movement. The Democrat inaction is attributable to the political indebtedness and money domination of the Democrat Party by the labor bosses. It is a sell-out of leadership responsibility for votes promised to the Democrat Party by the thugs, goons, and socialists who have infiltrated labor officialdom.

The Democrat leadership vainly attempted to allay vulnerability on a charge of "do-nothing" in the face of public indignation over the disclosure of crime and labor abuses by presenting to the House an ineffective measure that was represented as being corrective legislation. Did the Democrat leadership want even this watered down labor legislation to pass? Let us look at the record. The Speaker of the House of Representatives held up reference of the legislation to the House Labor Committee for 41 days before referring it. That Democrat leadership then scheduled it for a vote in the House under a rule which permitted only 40 minutes of consideration and which precluded any and all perfecting amendments.

In summary, the importance the Democrat leadership ascribed to the defeat of this measure can be determined by a comparison of the 41-day Democrat bottleup of the legislation with the 40 minutes of consideration the Democrat leadership allowed in the House.

The Democrat Party has long campaigned on a promise to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act. Have they delivered on that promise? The Democrat Party has been in control of 4 of the 5 intervening Congresses since the enactment of Taft-Hartley but this act has not been repealed. The Democrat Party denounces Taft-Hartley as creating slave labor but the Democrats do not tell the people that nearly 50 percent of the complaints brought under this legislation by workers are against coercive labor practices by unions rather than against employers.

The minimum wage law is another instance of failure by Democrat leadership. The Democrat Party has pledged itself to create a minimum wage of $1.25 per hour. The minimum wage that the Democrats have promised to increase has actually been increased and strengthened under Republican leadership and in the face of Democrat opposition.

Another failure of the Democrat leadership in the area of social legislation has been with respect to unemployment compensation and the record of irresponsible Democrat political machinations on this important protection for the American workingman. The President of the United States on March 8, 1958, recommended temporary legislation extending the duration of unemployment compensation benefits for unemployed workers. The Democrat leadership disregarded the testimony of two Democrat Governors, Mr. Leader, of Pennsylvania and Mr. Williams, of Michigan, that the Democrat-proposed American dole system would delay giving effective help to the American workingman who needed unemployment compensation benefit supplementation. The Democrat Party sponsored in the House its American dole program which was rejected by the House membership and there was substituted therefor a Republican-supported measure to provide prompt benefit supplementation for those workers who had exhausted benefit entitlement.

Mr. Speaker, the record of the Democrat Party leadership of broken promises and breach of faith in the area of social legislation cannot be tolerated unless the American people are willing to subject our liberty and our freedom under our free enterprise system to the tyrannical assault of the labor czars who dominate the Democrat Party lock, stock, and barrel.

III. ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

The pronouncements of the Democrat leadership with respect to the economic affairs of our Nation are steeped in demagoguery and saturated with Democrat cries of doom and despair. The Democrat leadership has been verbose and vitriolic as professional prophets of gloom and doom. They have done their best for political gain to talk our Nation into depression. Fortunately they have not been able to accomplish their purpose. In the conduct of our Nation's economic affairs the Democrat leadership has stood for bureaucratic regimentation of all aspects of our economic life with a three-phase program of first, the Government domination of private enterprise, second, the seizure of our factories, and third, the drafting of our workers.

One of the most outspoken of the Democrat political Cassandras has been that eminent authority on economic crisis and unemployment, Mr. Harry Truman. This Mr. Truman, who in effect told a New York Times reporter that unemployment was good for the country at a time when the Democrat Party was in power, recently said that if he were President now he would be doing something about the current unemployment rate. He continued by saying "I would not be sitting still or playing golf." Let us look at the record and see what Mr. Truman did do in the 1949–50 recession. In November 1949 President Truman was informed that October 1949 unemployment amounted to 6.1 percent of the working force. After receiving that information Mr. Truman went to Florida. On November 28, 1949, he went to Key West, Fla., where he spent 24 days. He returned to Washington on December 21 and left 2 days later on a holiday trip to Independence, Mo. In March 1950 an unemployment figure of 7.8 percent of the working force was announced. Again Mr. Truman went to Florida, this time for 29 days. An examination of the record indicates that the Truman administration did little to cure the 1949–50 recession. The economy did not become revitalized until we were plunged into the Korean war. Contrast this Democrat failure in leadership with the action taken by the Republican Party in the current economic adjustment whereby over 50 different steps have been taken effectively to stimulate the economy.

So that the record may show the unemployment experience of the Nation

under the two great political parties, I will make a part of my remarks at this point table 4 showing unemployment for the period 1930–57

TABLE 4.—*Data concerning unemployment, 1930–57*

Year	Unemployed	
	Number	Percent
1930	4,340,000	8.7
1931	8,020,000	15.9
1932	12,060,000	23.6
1933	12,830,000	24.9
1934	11,340,000	21.7
1935	10,610,000	20.1
1936	9,030,000	16.9
1937	7,700,000	14.3
1938	10,390,000	19.0
1939	9,480,000	17.2
1940	8,120,000	14.6
1941	5,560,000	9.9
1942	2,660,000	4.7
1943	1,070,000	1.9
1944	670,000	1.2
1945	1,040,000	1.9
1946	2,270,000	3.9
1947	2,142,000	3.6
1948	2,064,000	3.4
1949	3,395,000	5.5
1950	3,142,000	5.0
1951	1,879,000	3.0
1952	1,673,000	2.7
1953	1,602,000	2.5
1954	3,230,000	5.0
1955	2,654,000	4.0
1956	2,551,000	3.8
1957	2,936,000	4.3

IV. FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. Speaker, it is in the area of the conduct of our Nation's foreign affairs and our military preparedness that we find the Democrat leadership most vocal in its oratorical hindsight to detract attention from its past and present tragic lack of foresight. The cornerstone of Democrat foreign policy has been geared to vacillation, intemperate declarations, and precipitous acts of belligerence followed by the piecemeal abandonment of our Free World allies one by one. The Democrat policy with respect to our military security is based on a philosophy of a feast and famine depending upon whether our Nation was at war or at peace.

Mr. Truman has advocated that the United States should forget about sputniks and concentrate on civil rights. When that Truman-Democrat panacea was rejected by the American people his alternative was to advocate higher taxes. He undoubtedly was proposing higher taxes to permit greater missile spending so that the United States could buy back the time that was wasted under his administration through his failure to undertake development of rockets and missiles. In the eight critical postwar years from 1946 to 1953 our Government spent only $3.5 million for the development of long-range ballistic missiles while in only 2 years in that same period the same Truman administration spent $50 million for price supports on peanuts. The present preeminence of the United States in modern day weapons of war can be attributed to the diligence and the vigilance with which the Republican administration immediately addressed itself to the problem of defense on assuming office in 1953.

The established authorities on international bungling that comprise the Democrat leadership have been persistent and clamorous in pronouncements of discord and dangerous manifestations of national disunity.

In an effort to conceal Democrat leadership failures the Democrat Party brashly and irresponsibly criticizes President Eisenhower for the international tensions abroad in the world today. Mr. Speaker, I am sure it is a reasonable question to ask the extent to which those tensions would exist or the extent to which they would be lessened if it had not been for the geographical sell-out to Russian imperialism by the Roosevelt-Truman-Acheson leadership at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam that put the Russians in the geographic locations to practice their game of international blackmail. Would not there be fewer tensions if we could reverse the Truman-Acheson abandonment of China?

Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of public record that in 1957 the Democrat majority in Congress criticized President Eisenhower's proposed defense expenditures and the Democrats sponsored a $2½ billion cut in those defense expenditures. This year, because of a change in the character in military weapons defense, expenditures were proposed by the administration at a level of $3½ billion more than the Democrat-controlled Congress was willing to make available last year. The Democrat leadership has criticized this proposed increase in 1958 with claims that it is not enough. What was too much in one year for defense has suddenly become too little in the next year, according to the politico-military hindsight of the Democrat leadership.

Mr. Speaker, this is but a brief recitation of a few of the failures of the Democrat leadership in providing for the essential needs of our Nation. This record of failure after failure makes it apparent that Republican leadership in the Congress of the United States is essential in the years ahead if we are to preserve the freedom of our national institutions, the liberty of our people, and the vitality of our American way of life.

The Role of Government in Maintaining a Stable Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article I have written entitled "The Role of Government in Maintaining a Stable Economy," appearing in the current issue of Social Action, published by the Council for Christian Social Action of the United Church of Christ, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT IN MAINTAINING A STABLE ECONOMY

(By Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota)

Before discussing the nature of the recession and what the Government should do—and what it should have done—about it, the seriousness of the recession might well be put in proper perspective.

THE RECESSION IS SERIOUS

We are not suffering from a depression. Nor is there likelihood that we will soon, or perhaps ever again, experience another economic catastrophe similar to that which paralyzed the United States in 1929–32. The legislative measures adopted during the Roosevelt and Truman administrations will prevent such a recurrence.

But we are experiencing a costly recession—the deepest and the longest economic decline in almost 20 years. The statistics speak for themselves. Our gross national product has declined since the third quarter of last year by an annual rate of $18 billion. Industrial production is down by more than 11 percent from August of 1957. Business failures are currently at the highest level since pre-World War II. Unemployment as of June stood at 5.4 million—the highest figure since 1941. Profits have fallen off drastically; for example, manufacturing corporations' profits in the first quarter of this year were down 39 percent from the same period of 1957. And the all-important expenditures by business for plants and equipment for 1958 are now estimated to be $6 billion less than last year, representing a drop of 17 percent. These statistics cannot be dismissed casually.

RECESSION IN THE UNITED STATES AFFECTS OTHER NATIONS

And unfortunately the repercussions of this recession are not confined simply to the domestic scene. International consequences are also involved. Last year the Soviet Union boosted its industrial production by 10 percent while our own production fell off by 10 percent. Coming on top of Little Rock and sputnik, this has dealt a further tragic blow to America's prestige and reputation. It has undermined the confidence of free peoples elsewhere in following the American economic system. We have exported the recession because our imports have declined and the prices of the raw materials we buy have fallen in relation to the prices of the finished goods we sell.

The underdeveloped countries are largely producers and exporters of raw materials. The volume and value of these exports are down. The underdeveloped countries have had to cut back their meager development programs. They are blaming the United States—and not without cause. In some degree, Vice President NIXON's reception in Latin America is a reflection of what the recession has done to the less developed countries of the world.

RESPONSIBILITY OF GOVERNMENT

In 1946, the United States Government adopted the Employment Act, which states clearly that it is the responsibility of the Government to maintain high levels of production, income, and employment. In spirit and in practice, this law has been violated by the Eisenhower administration.

The administration would have us believe that this recession is simply a natural phenomenon over which it can exercise little, if any, control. This is a myth which should be promptly exposed. For the plain fact of the matter is that this recession was aided and abetted by the planning, engineering, and policies of the administration itself.

The recession was instigated by adherence to the fallacious theory that the steadily rising cost of living was due to excessive wage demands forced upon business due to the labor shortage. The remedy was spelled out by the First National City Bank of New York in its newsletter of July 1957.

"The way to hold back the pressure of excessive wage advances on prices is to relieve the labor shortage created by attempting too many projects at one time. This can be done by making money harder to borrow and by curtailing public expenditures."

And the administration accepted in toto this recession blueprint. Tight money became even tighter and interest rates soared to new heights—the highest levels in fact since Herbert Hoover was President. This occurred several months after economic indicators clearly showed that the economy was in a decline.

TIGHT MONEY POLICY

Coupled with the administration's adherence to and defense of the tight-money policy, were sharp curtailments in public expenditures. The administration, in fact, issued secret orders last summer to Government agencies to cut back on spending to fiscal 1957 levels, which meant a slash of $2 billion from what President Eisenhower had publicly told the country he needed to run the Government in fiscal 1958.

The recession blueprint was reported by the authoritative Journal of Commerce on July 15, 1957, in an article stating:

"The evidence now points strongly to the conclusion that both the administration and the Federal Reserve authorities believe that a moderate recession now would be a small price to pay for the avoidance of another boom-and-bust later on."

The administration's recession blueprint as here outlined has now become a reality. It has achieved its goal of, to put it nicely, "relieving the labor shortage." But there is one serious flaw in the whole thing. Inflation is still with us despite mounting lines of jobless workers. The cost-of-living is at the highest level in the history of our Nation and it has moved up month after month despite rising unemployment and declining business activity. In the past 12 months alone prices have risen 3.3 percent.

POLICIES OF THE EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION

Having moved the country into this serious recession and having failed completely to stop inflation, what is the administration doing to get our economy back on the road to recovery? The tragic answer to this question is that the administration has been doing pitifully little. It has maintained a negative and defeatist approach. Rather, the criteria for action should have been the prospects and programs for quick recovery. Instead of doing nothing unless and until conditions became much worse, the Government should have acted promptly to bring about complete and total recovery.

It may well be that the recession will not get much worse. It may be that we have already hit bottom. However, there is little evidence and almost no confidence that an immediate and vigorous upturn is in prospect. In fact, most business analysts believe that the recovery will be gradual and slow and that unemployment a year from now may well be over 6 million.

It should be remembered that when we speak of "recovery" and "full employment" we do not mean merely regaining the levels of production of 1957 from which the decline began. Year by year the population grows and so does our capacity to produce, so that full employment of our manpower and other resources in 1958 would yield production 4 or 5 percent greater than in 1957. If full employment is not reached until 1959, it will have to be at levels 8 or 10 percent higher than 1957; and if it is not reached until 1960, it will require levels of 12 or 15 percent above 1957.

In view of our critical international situation, in light of Russia's economic offensive, and because of the terrible waste of manpower and material resources now being suffered by the people of the United States, the Federal Government is failing miserably to measure up to its responsibilities.

The liberalization of the Federal Reserve credit policies, and some legislation of remote or uncertain effect with respect to unemployment compensation and public works, have been wholly inadequate to serve the objective of restoring the vitality of our economy. In effect, the administration's program has reflected a "let nature take its course" or "do nothing" policy. Such bankruptcy of ideas and such violation of the principles of the Employment Act of 1946 cannot but result in the further deterioration of America's leadership in the Free World.

FIVE BASIC STEPS TOWARD A STABLE ECONOMY

There are five basic steps which should have been taken by the Government a long time ago and which ought still to be taken.

First, the administration's program with respect to unemployment insurance is miserably inadequate. The recession is a national phenomenon, and the Federal Government should provide directly for both higher levels and longer duration of benefits. The unemployed today receive lower benefits in relation to prevailing wages than they did 20 years ago. This is shocking in such a highly productive economy as ours.

Second, taxes ought to be cut for the middle and lower income groups to increase their buying power and thereby provide real markets for the goods and services which the increased capacity of our economy makes possible. Yes, this will further unbalance our budget temporarily, but in the long run it will result in a smaller accumulated deficit and a smaller increase in our national debt than if we continue to drift according to the policy of the Eisenhower administration. The Federal deficit is already running at a $10 billion annual rate, and this deficit financing will last longer and the increase in the national debt will be bigger unless steps are taken promptly to restore prosperity. The sooner we can increase personal and corporate incomes, the sooner Federal revenues will rise again, and the sooner we can achieve a balanced budget.

Third, there should be a substantial increase in essential public works and public services. Our needs for schools, slum clearance, health institutions, recreational facilities, conservation and resource development and the like are obvious. It makes no sense to deny our people these important needs while at the same time resigning ourselves to tens of billions of dollars of loss in production.

Fourth, we should scrap the Benson programs of trying to solve the problem of surplus by impoverishing or liquidating the family farms. Even if this would work, it would be a poor substitute for a positive policy of using our capacity for abundance to raise the consumption standards of our own people and to send food abroad under conditions that will both relieve hunger and promote economic development. A prosperous and productive agriculture is an indispensable ingredient of a prosperous and productive economy.

Fifth, we should expand our programs for the economic development of underdeveloped countries. This is good international policy in any case, and would benefit the United States as part of the Free World and the United States economy as part of the world economy. But particularly at this time, when our heavy goods industries are greatly under-utilized, we have a unique opportunity to provide machinery and other needed capital goods, through the Development Loan Fund and other sound financing devices. At the present time these industries are not producing to capacity for our own needs; and the industries and their workers, as well as the rest of us, would be better off if they were producing for needs abroad.

Without interfering with the basic principles of free enterprise, the role of the Federal Government can and must be positive and constructive in terms of providing an environment within which private business can prosper and provide jobs for all American workers. In essence, it is the failure of the Government to exercise this responsibility which weakens the free enterprise system and which brings more harm to business and labor and agriculture than all the Federal economic regulations.

CONCLUSION

In summary, I reemphasize that for our country to be strong and healthy we must have continued economic growth and development. We cannot permit our economy simply to level out in the face of constantly increasing productive capacity and an ever-growing work force. To permit such a course of action can only result in rising numbers of jobless workers. On the international level it means a lessening of the strength of the Free World at the very time the Soviet Union is stepping up its economic offensive in an effort to gain world power.

Complete Voting Record of Senator Proxmire in 85th Congress, 2d Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement of my complete voting record in the 2d session of the 85th Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PROXMIRE

In order that the people of Wisconsin may review the entire record of my votes in the 2d session of the 85th Congress, I am providing this record of my vote on every recorded rollcall taken in the United States Senate during the session.

I have given a brief description of each bill and the specific motions on which my votes were cast, in order that my position may be accurately interpreted. It is, of course, impossible to explain the parliamentary situation which prompted each of my votes in this summary. I will be happy to furnish a more complete explanation of my stand on any specific issue to anyone upon request.

Those who study this voting record will notice that it does not list the final passage of a number of the important bills passed by Congress this session. This is because, in many instances, final passage is by an unrecorded voice vote, usually after the vote on a preliminary motion has clearly drawn the lines on the issue. Therefore, my position on many issues is shown here in a key vote on an amendment or a parliamentary motion.

The interpretations of the bills and motions here is derived from a summary prepared by Congressional Quarterly, the highly esteemed, nonpartisan, independent service.

AGRICULTURE

Date	Measure, question, and result	Proxmire vote
Mar. 13	S. J. Res. 162, to bar any reduction in price supports or acreage allotments below the 1957 level for any farm commodity except tobacco. (Passed 50 to 43)	Yes.
Mar. 13	S. J. Res. 163, to bar any reduction in price supports below the 1957 level for dairy products. (Defeated 43 to 50)	Yes.
Mar. 13	S. 3420, to extend for 2 years Public Law 480 of the 83d Cong., under which agricultural surpluses are sold and traded to foreign countries; vote on Aiken amendment to eliminate requirement that Secretary of Agriculture barter up to $500 million of surplus commodities a year and permit duty-free entry of nonstrategic materials. (Agreed to 44 to 39.)	No.
Mar. 20	S. 3420; Case amendment to give Congress direct control over spending of foreign currencies received from sale of farm surpluses. (Rejected 25 to 58)	No.
Mar. 20	S. 3420; Jenner amendment to bar sales of farm surpluses to any country that has not assured the President it would not support a Communist country that went to war against the United States. (Rejected 24 to 53.)	No.
Mar. 20	S. 3420; Williams amendment to restrict extension to 1 year. (Rejected 38 to 42)	No.
Mar. 21	S. J. Res. 162, farm price-support freeze; vote on Ellender motion to agree to House amendments providing that price supports in 1958 and acreage allotments in 1958–59 could not be reduced below 1957 levels. (Agreed to 48 to 32.)	Yes.
July 24	S. 4071; Agricultural Act of 1958; vote on Young amendment adding to the bill a 4-year extension of the Wool Act of 1954. (Agreed to 67 to 9)	Yes.
July 25	S. 4071; Dirksen amendment to make dollar price-support floors on cotton, rice, and corn temporary rather than permanent. (Rejected 33 to 51)	No.
July 25	S. 4071; Proxmire amendment to add self-help dairy-stabilization plan to farm bill. (Rejected 20 to 57)	Yes.
July 25	S. 4071; Humphrey amendment to give corn and feed grain producers alternative price support of 85 percent of parity if they transfer 20 percent of feed-grain acreage to conservation reserve. (Rejected 23 to 55.)	Yes.
July 25	S. 4071; Proxmire-Humphrey amendment to increase dairy price supports for the marketing year 1959. (Rejected 24 to 49)	Yes.
July 25	S. 4071; Humphrey amendment to substitute price supports between 60 and 90 percent of parity but not less than $1.10 per bushel on corn for provision in bill of price supports based on previous market prices. (Rejected 24 to 49.)	Yes.
July 25	S. 4071; passage of Agricultural Act of 1958. (Passed 62 to 11)	No.
July 29	S. 4100, to establish Agricultural Research and Industrial Administration in the Department of Agriculture. (Passed 81 to 0)	Yes.
July 29	H. R. 8308, humane slaughter bill; vote on Senate Agriculture Committee version calling for a 2-year study of humane slaughtering methods. (Rejected 40 to 43.)	No.
July 29	H. R. 8308; Case amendment to clarify provision stipulating that humane slaughter laws shall not interfere with religious methods of slaughtering. (Accepted 44 to 38.)	No.
July 29	H. R. 8308; O'Mahoney amendment to recommit the bill to committee. (Rejected 29 to 53)	No.
July 29	H. R. 8308; passage of House bill forbidding Government agencies from buying meat from slaughterers who do not use humane slaughtering methods. (Passed 72 to 9.)	Yes.

APPROPRIATIONS

Date	Measure, question, and result	Proxmire vote
Feb. 3	H. R. 10146, fiscal 1958 supplemental defense appropriation bill to appropriate $1,260,000,000 and transfer $150,000,000 for accelerated missile defense program. (Passed 78 to 0.)	Yes.
Mar. 10	H. R. 10881, second supplemental appropriation bill; Hayden motion to suspend rules and amend the bill to allow cotton farmers to withdraw from Soil-Bank program and increase cotton acreage by 30 percent if they give up price-support rights on added acreage. (Rejected 36 to 48.)	No.
Mar. 11	H. R. 10881; Thye motion to suspend rules and amend bill to provide that price supports for dairy products for 1958 marketing year should not be less than 1957 year. (Rejected 30 to 50.)	Yes.
Mar. 11	H. R. 10881, Morse point of order against a section in bill providing $3,000 compensation for Chairman of Federal Power Commission for period between expiration of prior appointment and confirmation of present appointment. (Rejected 29 to 50.)	Yes.
July 30	H. R. 11574, fiscal 1959 appropriations for 16 independent Federal agencies; Magnuson motion to concur in a House amendment appropriating $589,000,000 to civil service retirement and disability fund. (Agreed to 44 to 39.)	Yes.
July 30	H. R. 12738, Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal 1959. (Passed 71 to 0)	Yes.
Aug. 14	H. R. 13450, supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal 1959; Sparkman amendment to add $75,000 for farm housing research by land-grant colleges. (Rejected 31 to 47.)	Yes.
Aug. 15	H. R. 13450, Russell amendment to bar payment of Federal funds for any study or plan for United States surrender to a foreign power. (Agreed to 88 to 2.)	Yes.
Aug. 15	H. R. 13450; Ellender amendment to delete $5,000,000 in funds for informational mediums guaranty fund of U. S. Information Agency. (Rejected 23 to 59)	No.
Aug. 20	H. R. 13450, conference report; Johnson motion to sustain Senate amendment barring appropriation of funds to National Aeronautics and Space Administration without prior authorization by Congress. (Agreed to 86 to 0.)	Yes.
Aug. 23	H. R. 13192, mutual security appropriations for fiscal 1959; Ellender amendment to reduce military assistance funds by $100,000,000. (Rejected 36 to 45)	Yes.
Aug. 23	H. R. 13192; Ellender amendment to reduce defense-support funds by $50,000,000. (Rejected 36 to 41)	Yes.
Aug. 23	H. R. 13856, independent offices appropriation; Williams motion to suspend rules to permit consideration of Williams amendment asking President to try to reduce Federal expenditures by 2 percent on defense appropriations and 4 percent on other appropriations. (Rejected 30 to 45.)	No.

EDUCATION AND WELFARE

Date	Measure, question, and result	Proxmire vote
Mar. 12	S. 3148, emergency housing bill; Monroney amendment to eliminate provisions authorizing Veterans' Administration to raise interest rate on GI loans from 4.5 to 4.75 percent. (Rejected 47 to 47.)	Yes.
Mar. 12	S. 3148; Knowland motion to table Capehart motion to reconsider vote on Monroney amendment. (Carried by Vice President's vote breaking 47–47 tie)	No.
Mar. 12	S. 3148; Capehart motion to table Long amendment that would urge Federal Reserve Board to try to stimulate flow of mortgage money so federally backed mortgages would be available at 4.5-percent interest. (Agreed to 45 to 43.)	No.
Mar. 12	S. 3148; passage of bill. (Passed 86 to 0)	Yes.
Apr. 1	S. 3497, Community Facilities Act of 1958, to increase from $100,000,000 to $1,000,000,000 the fund for loans to build public facilities; vote on Mansfield motion to table Knowland motion to postpone further consideration of bill until Apr. 14. (Rejected 36 to 41.)	Yes.
Apr. 1	S. 3497; Thurmond motion to amend Knowland motion by postponing consideration of bill until Apr. 2 instead of Apr. 14. (Rejected 40 to 40)	Yes.
Apr. 1	S. 3497; Knowland motion to postpone consideration of bill until Apr. 14. (Agreed to 41 to 39)	No.
Apr. 15	S. 3497; Fulbright amendment to lower effective interest rate from 3½ to 3 percent. (Rejected 40 to 41)	Yes.
Apr. 15	S. 3497; Case amendment to incorporate provisions of Davis-Bacon Act regarding prevailing wages and 40-hour week. (Agreed to 54 to 26)	Yes.
Apr. 16	S. 3497; Thurmond amendment to substitute "reasonable terms" in provision authorizing loans when credit is "not otherwise available on equally favorable terms or conditions." (Rejected 33 to 53.)	No.
Apr. 16	S. 3497; Bush amendment to reduce authorization from $1,000,000,000 to $500,000,000. (Rejected 33 to 52)	No.
Apr. 16	S. 3497; Johnson amendment to table Bush amendment to require that at least 50 percent of the funds authorized be used for public-school construction. (Agreed to 60 to 27.)	Yes.
Apr. 16	S. 3497; passage of the bill. (Passed 60 to 26)	Yes.
May 27	H. R. 12065, Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958; Kennedy amendment to expand coverage of the act, increase weekly unemployment benefits, set a uniform 39-week duration period for all payments, and provide benefits for 1 year, for all unemployed, financed by Federal grants. (Rejected 21 to 63.)	Yes.
May 28	H. R. 12065; Kennedy amendment to extend duration of benefit payments by 16 weeks and provide for Federal administration if States do not act; and to exempt States from repaying Federal aid under the bill if they liberalize their programs or if their unemployment reserve funds are low. (Rejected 27 to 56.)	Yes.
May 28	H. R. 12065; Kennedy amendment to extend duration of benefit payments by 16 weeks and provide Federal administration if States do not act. (Rejected 36 to 47.)	Yes.
May 28	H. R. 12065; Long amendment to increase public assistance payments to the aged, blind, and disabled about $5 per month by raising maximum monthly Federal-State payment per person to $70 and increasing Federal share of the cost. (Rejected 40 to 46.)	Yes.
May 28	H. R. 12065; Knowland motion to table a motion to reconsider the vote on Long amendment. (Agreed to 41 to 38)	No.
May 28	H. R. 12065; Cooper amendment to provide for Federal administration of the temporary benefit program if the States do not act. (Rejected 26 to 54)	Yes.
May 28	H. R. 12065, passage of the bill. (Passed 80 to 0)	Yes.
Aug. 13	H. R. 13247, National Defense Education Act of 1958, to authorize approximately $1,300,000,000 in Federal grants and loans for a 7-year program of aid to students and schools; vote on McNamara amendment to add section authorizing $1,000,000,000 for 2 years for Federal grants for public school construction. (Rejected 30 to 61.)	Yes.
Aug. 13	H. R. 13247; Morse amendment to add $500 to each scholarship award to be used by the colleges and universities of the scholarship holder. (Rejected 20 to 69.)	Yes.
Aug. 13	H. R. 13247; Cooper amendment to reduce from $17,500,000 to $5,000,000 the annual authorization for national defense scholarships and limiting each award to $250 per year. (Agreed to 46 to 42.)	No.
Aug. 13	H. R. 13247; passage of the bill. (Passed 62 to 26)	Yes.
Aug. 16	H. R. 13549, Social Security Amendments of 1958, increasing benefits approximately 7 percent and increasing Federal share of public assistance payments; Yarborough amendment to increase benefits by 10 percent. (Rejected 32 to 53.)	Yes.
Aug. 22	H. R. 12728, Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act revision bill; Morse amendment raising railroad retirement and unemployment benefits 10 and 20 percent, respectively. (Agreed to 80 to 2.)	Yes.
Aug. 22	H. R. 12728; Morse amendment to modify House bill by Senate bill, as above. (Agreed to 68 to 14)	Yes.
Aug. 22	H. R. 12728, passage of the bill. (Passed 71 to 12)	Yes.
Aug. 22	H. R. 13247, National Defense Education Act of 1958, conference report to authorize approximately $1,000,000,000 for a 7-year program of aid to students and schools. (Agreed to 66 to 15.)	Yes.

FOREIGN POLICY

Date	Measure, question, and result	Proxmire vote
June 4	H. R. 12181, Mutual Security Act of 1958; Proxmire amendment to place funds for military assistance and defense support under Defense Department budget. (Rejected 16 to 56.)	Yes.
June 5	H. R. 12181; Proxmire amendment to cut military assistance and defense support by $104,000,000. (Rejected 31 to 53)	Yes.
June 5	H. R. 12181; Williams amendment to bar aid to Dominican Republic. (Rejected 33 to 46)	Yes.
June 5	H. R. 12181; Knowland amendment to strike out permission for President to authorize aid to Communist-dominated nations other than Soviet Union, Communist China, and North Korea. (Agreed to 43 to 42.)	No.
June 5	H. R. 12181; Knowland motion to table a motion to reconsider vote on Knowland amendment. (Agreed to 45 to 30)	No.
June 6	H. R. 12181; Bridges amendment to eliminate provision that United States should join with other nations to assist India in completing current economic development program. (Rejected 35 to 47.)	No.
June 6	H. R. 12181; Bridges amendment to bar aid to Yugoslavia and Poland. (Rejected 22 to 54)	No.
June 6	H. R. 12181; Ellender amendment to reduce authorization for military assistance funds by $500,000,000. (Rejected 24 to 46)	Yes.
June 6	H. R. 12181; Ellender amendment to require that $200,000,000 of the $235,000,000 cut in military assistance and defense-support authorization would be taken from military assistance. (Agreed to 43 to 28.)	Yes.
June 6	H. R. 12181, passage of the bill. (Passed 51 to 17)	Yes.
June 19	S. Con. Res. 94, expressing the indignation of Congress at the Hungarian Government's execution of Imre Nagy and other leaders of 1956 revolution in Hungary. (Adopted 91 to 0.)	Yes.
July 9	Tax treaties. (Ratified en bloc 84 to 0)	Yes.
July 17	H. R. 12591, Senate committee version of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958; vote on Clark amendment to make reciprocal trade program permanent. (Rejected 4 to 85.)	No.
July 22	H. R. 12591; Johnson amendment to delete section providing that a Presidential veto of a Tariff Commission escape-clause finding shall not take effect unless it is approved within 90 days by a majority of both Houses of Congress. (Accepted 63 to 27.)	Yes.
July 22	H. R. 12591; Payne amendment to provide that Congress may override the President's disapproval of a Tariff Commission recommendation within 60 days by a majority vote of each House. (Rejected 34 to 57.)	No.
July 22	H. R. 12591; Magnuson amendment to provide that Tariff Commission may be bypassed in investigation of proposed import quotas on agricultural products in order to refer case to Agriculture Department for study. (Rejected 44 to 46.)	Yes.
July 22	H. R. 12591, passage of the bill. (Passed 72 to 16)	Yes.
July 31	S. Con Res. 109; Sparkman motion to table Jenner motion to reconsider adoption of resolution expressing sense of Congress that United Nations should set up a permanent police force. (Agreed to 66 to 14.)	Yes.
Aug. 11	H. R. 12591, Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958; adoption of conference report. (Adopted 72 to 18)	Yes.
Aug. 13	Tax treaties with United Kingdom. (Ratified 90 to 0)	Yes.

LABOR

Apr. 24	S. 2888, Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act; Allott amendment to exempt welfare plans established on level-of-benefits basis (principally employer administered). (Rejected 28 to 59.)	No.
Apr. 25	S. 2888; Knowland amendment to require election of union officers by popular vote at least every 4 years and make failure an unfair labor practice and crime punishable by law. (Rejected 37 to 53.)	No.
Apr. 25	S. 2888; Knowland amendment to set conditions under which trusteeships may be established over local unions. (Rejected 35 to 53)	No.
Apr. 25	S. 2888; Knowland amendment to make illegal any payments to union representatives by agents of an employer. (Rejected 35 to 52)	No.
Apr. 25	S. 2888; Knowland amendment to authorize the Secretary of Labor to make public union financial and other reports and to notify the Attorney General of any false information he believes has been filed. (Rejected 33 to 53.)	No.
Apr. 25	S. 2888; Knowland amendment to bar as an exclusive bargaining agent any union that refuses to grant equal rights and privileges to all members. (Rejected 28 to 53.)	No.
Apr. 28	S. 2888; Smith amendment to eliminate a Taft-Hartley Act provision barring strikers permanently replaced during a strike from voting in representation elections. (Rejected 33 to 50.)	No.
Apr. 28	S. 2888; Smith amendment to permit the National Labor Relations Board to certify unions in the building construction industry as exclusive bargaining agents without prior election. (Rejected 34 to 52.)	No.
Apr. 28	S. 2888; Mundt amendment to direct Secretary of Labor to publish reports on violations of S. 2888 or mishandling of union funds. (Rejected 22 to 67)	No.
Apr. 28	S. 2888; Watkins amendment to permit NLRB to decline jurisdiction in labor disputes which do not have a substantial effect on commerce and to permit the States to assert jurisdiction in such cases. (Rejected 35 to 51.)	No.
Apr. 28	S. 2888; Curtis amendment to tighten Taft-Hartley Act prohibition against secondary boycotts by prohibiting certain types of picketing and coercive acts. (Rejected 26 to 60.)	No.
Apr. 28	S. 2888; Mundt amendment to bar anyone ineligible to vote because of a State or Federal conviction from serving as a manager, trustee, or employee of an employee welfare or pension fund. (Agreed to 90 to 0.)	Yes.
Apr. 28	S. 2888; Knowland amendment to permit NLRB to invalidate a union election in which a member has been deprived of his vote contrary to union rules, provided denial could have affected the outcome of the election. (Rejected 35 to 53.)	No.
Apr. 28	S. 2888, passage of the bill. (Passed 88 to 0)	Yes.
June 12	S. 3974, Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1958; Cooper amendment to empower Secretary of Labor to subpena individuals and records when making investigations authorized by the act. (Agreed to 86 to 0.)	Yes.
June 12	S. 3974; Cooper amendment to require unions and their officers to report to each of their members the same information that must be reported to Secretary of Labor under the act. (Agreed to 85 to 0.)	Yes.
June 12	S. 3974; Javits amendment to bar from union office for 5 years any person found after a hearing to have failed to file information required under the act. (Agreed to 86 to 0.)	Yes.
June 12	S. 3974; Ives amendment to strike from the bill a provision exempting unions with less than 200 members from reporting and disclosure requirements. (Agreed to 79 to 1.)	Yes.
June 12	S. 3974; Goldwater amendment to strike out language narrowing definition of "supervisor" under the Taft-Hartley law. (Rejected 38 to 47)	No.
June 12	S. 3974; Allott amendment to assure that conferences and associations of labor representatives are subject to act. (Agreed to 83 to 2)	Yes.
June 13	S. 3974; Holland amendment to permit States and territories to regulate or prohibit strikes in public utilities. (Rejected 27 to 60)	No.
June 13	S. 3974; Ives amendment to substitute for pending Watkins amendment language to require NLRB to assert jurisdiction in all cases arising under National Labor Relations Act. (Rejected 43 to 46.)	Yes.
June 13	S. 3974; Watkins amendment to permit States to assert jurisdiction over labor disputes NLRB declines to handle. (Rejected 37 to 53)	No.
June 13	S. 3974; Smith amendment to impose fiduciary responsibility on persons handling union moneys and permit members to sue in Federal courts against misuse. (Rejected 42 to 47.)	No.
June 14	S. 3974; Smith amendment to bar access to NLRB to any union that has not filed with the Secretary of Labor and made available to members the organizational and financial documents and reports required by the act. (Rejected 30 to 53.)	No.
June 14	S. 3974; Knowland amendment to require unions, on petition of 20 percent of members, to hold secret-ballot referendums on recall of officers or changes in bylaws. (Rejected 31 to 52.)	No.
June 14	S. 3974; Capehart amendment to provide that on petition of ¼ of membership, a local union must call a meeting to consider removing officers. (Rejected 27 to 52.)	No.
June 14	S. 3974; Mundt amendment to provide that union officers may be removed by members' majority vote equal to at least 60 percent of total votes cast when the officer was elected. (Rejected 24 to 55.)	No.
June 14	S. 3974; Ervin amendment to require secret-ballot election of international union officers at least once every 4 years and of local officers at least every 3 years. (Agreed to 78 to 4.)	Yes.
June 14	S. 3974; Ervin amendment to insure union members the right to remove officers for cause by majority vote. (Agreed to 47 to 35)	Yes.
June 16	S. 3974; Mundt amendment to require employers to sign non-Communist affidavits in order to gain access to NLRB and to retain a similar Taft-Hartley Act requirement for union officers. (Agreed to 66 to 20.)	Yes.
June 16	S. 3974; Curtis amendment to bar "hot cargo" contracts and strengthen existing laws against secondary boycotts and recognition and organizational picketing. (Rejected 32 to 51.)	No.
June 16	S. 3974; Potter amendment to permit the Secretary of Labor, on complaint of union member, to bring civil suit for recovery of member's dues if union funds are not being used solely for collective bargaining and related activities. (Rejected 30 to 51.)	No.
June 17	S. 3974; Knowland amendment to bar union contract no-strike clauses unless approved by a majority of membership by secret ballot. (Rejected 32 to 57)	No.
June 17	S. 3974; Mundt amendment to require union elections to be supervised by a membership board of representatives of all candidates but excluding candidates and union officers. (Rejected 44 to 45.)	No.
June 17	S. 3974; McClellan amendment to strike out a provision permitting building trades and construction employers to conclude contracts with unions that have not won a representation election. (Rejected 29 to 60.)	No.
June 17	S. 3974, passage of the bill. (Passed 88 to 1)	Yes.

MILITARY AND VETERANS

Date	Measure, question, and result	Proxmire vote
Apr. 29	H. R. 11470, to raise pay of all military personnel. (Passed 87 to 0)	Yes.
July 18	H. R. 12541, Senate version of Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1958. (Passed 80 to 0)	Yes.
July 30	H. R. 13015, to authorize $1,700,000,000 for military construction in fiscal 1959. (Passed 80 to 0)	Yes.
Aug. 12	S. 2266, wage rates at Portsmouth (N..H.) Navy Yard; to override President's veto. (Passed over veto 69 to 20)	Yes.

MISCELLANEOUS AND ADMINISTRATIVE

Feb. 5	S. Res. 231, providing funds for investigations by Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly; Knowland amendment to cut funds to $250,000 instead of $365,000. (Rejected 28 to 61.)	No.
Feb. 5	S. Res. 250, providing $150,000 for investigations by Senate Rules and Administration Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections; Curtis amendment to limit subcommittee staff. (Rejected 25 to 49.)	No.
Feb. 6	S. Res. 256; Johnson resolution to establish a special Senate Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration. (Adopted 78 to 1)	Yes.
Feb. 26	H. R. 5836, Postal Rate Increase Act; Monroney amendment to set uniform 4-cent rate on 1st-class mail, deleting provision for 5-cent rate. (Rejected 42 to 49.)	Yes.
Feb. 27	H. R. 5836; Proxmire-Clark amendment to place $1,800,000 annual limit on mail "subsidy" received by any publisher of magazine or 2d-class mailing matter. (Rejected 33 to 57.)	Yes.
Feb. 27	H. R. 5836; Monroney amendment to recommit the bill with instructions to eliminate the 5-cent nonlocal 1st-class letter rate. (Rejected 40 to 48)	Yes.
Feb. 27	H. R. 5836; Morse amendment for larger increase in 2d-class rates for advertising in newspapers and magazines. (Rejected 17 to 71)	Yes.
Feb. 28	H. R. 5836; Carroll amendment to retain present 2d-class rate for nonprofit publications. (Rejected 35 to 49)	Yes.
Feb. 28	H. R. 5836; Javits amendment to provide 2-cent, instead of 2½-cent, rate on certain 3d-class mail. (Rejected 6 to 79)	No.
Feb. 28	H. R. 5836; Carlson amendment to revise pay increase provisions for postal workers. (Rejected 29 to 54)	No.
Feb. 28	H. R. 5836; Long amendment to provide temporary cost-of-living pay increases for postal supervisors as well as lower level employees. (Accepted 50 to 31.)	Yes.
May 14	Nomination of Gordon M. Tiffany as staff director of Civil Rights Commission. (Confirmed 67 to 13)	Yes.
May 21	H. R. 5836, Postal Rate Increase Act, including postal employees' pay increase; conference report. (Agreed to 88 to 0)	Yes.
June 27	H. R. 7999, statehood for Alaska; Monroney amendment to substitute commonwealth status instead of statehood. (Rejected 29 to 50)	No.
June 27	H. R. 7999; Eastland point of order to delete as unconstitutional Presidential power to withdraw lands for defense purposes. (Rejected 28 to 53)	No.
June 30	H. R. 7999; Eastland point of order on grounds of unconstitutionality of senatorial election provision. (Rejected 22 to 62)	No.
June 30	H. R. 7999; Stennis motion to refer bill to Armed Services Committee. (Rejected 31 to 55)	No.
June 30	H. R. 7999; Thurmond amendment to eliminate section for national-defense withdrawals by Executive order. (Rejected 16 to 67)	No.
June 30	H. R. 7999, passage of the bill. (Passed 64 to 20)	Yes.
July 1	H. R. 7963, Small Business Act; Thye amendment to make Small Business Administration a permanent Federal agency. (Accepted 55 to 26)	No.
July 1	H. R. 11451, to authorize Federal construction and sale to private steamship line of 2 super ocean liners; vote on adoption of conference report eliminating provision barring free or reduced rates for Government employees and Congressmen traveling at their own expense. (Agreed to 51 to 20.)	Yes.
July 1	H. R. 11451; adoption of the conference report. (Agreed to 41 to 18)	No.
July 23	S. Res. 264, expressing Senate's wish for Cabinet Committee study of proposed International Development Association as affiliate of World Bank; vote on Capehart amendment to provide for study of all existing international loan agencies. (Rejected 40 to 47.)	No.
July 23	S. Res. 264, adoption of the resolution. (Adopted 62 to 28)	Yes.
July 31	H. R. 8002, to provide that appropriations requests to Congress be accompanied by a proposed limitation on annual accrued expenditures. (Passed 63 to 6.)	Yes.
Aug. 6	S. 1846, District of Columbia Charter Act; Morse amendment to substitute Commission to draft home-rule charter to be voted on by District residents. (Rejected 17 to 63.)	No.
Aug. 6	S. 1846, passage of the bill to set up territorial government for the district. (Passed 61 to 22)	Yes.
Aug. 14	S. 2883, amended bill to block proposed 32-foot extension of east front of the Capitol. (Rejected 32 to 47)	Yes.
Aug. 18	S. Res. 362-374, citing 13 persons for contempt of Congress for refusing to answer questions of Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in Labor or Management Field. (Adopted en bloc 87 to 0.)	Yes.
Aug. 18	Nomination of W. Wilson White as Assistant Attorney General in charge of Justice Department's Civil Rights Division. (Confirmed 56 to 20)	Yes.
Aug. 19	H. R. 11477; Senate version of Mallory rule bill to bar Federal court judges from disqualifying confessions of suspects solely because of delay in bringing suspect for arraignment; vote on amendment inserting word "reasonable" before word "delay." (Accepted 41 to 39.)	Yes.
Aug. 19	H. R. 11477; Ervin amendment empowering trial judge to determine whether delay in arraignment is reasonable. (Rejected 18 to 62)	No.
Aug. 19	H. R. 11477; Morse amendment to bar interrogation of suspect or admissibility of suspect's statement unless he first was informed of nature of accusation and of his rights. (Rejected 13 to 64.)	Yes.
Aug. 19	H. R. 11477; passage of bill. (Passed 65 to 12)	No.
Aug. 20	H. R. 6789, minor court bill; vote on Hennings motion to table Jenner amendment to limit appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. (Agreed to 49 to 41.)	Yes.
Aug. 20	S. 654, permitting States to enact laws barring subversive activities; vote on Hennings motion to table McClellan amendment to provide that no act of Congress should be construed as nullifying State laws on the same subject unless Congress so specified or there was an irreconcilable conflict between a State and Federal law. (Rejected 39 to 46.)	Yes.
Aug. 20	S. 654; Bennett motion to table McClellan motion to reconsider rejected Hennings motion, as above. (Adopted 47 to 40)	No.
Aug. 20	Johnson motion to adjourn until noon, Aug. 21. (Adopted 70 to 18)	Yes.
Aug. 21	S. 654; Carroll motion to recommit bill to Senate Judiciary Committee. (Adopted 41 to 40)	Yes.

TAXES AND ECONOMIC POLICY

Feb. 20	H. R. 5822, to permit subsidized airlines to retain net capital gains from sale of old equipment for reinvestment in new flight equipment; vote on Lausche amendment to require payment of the capital gains to the Government over a 6-year period. (Rejected 14 to 70.)	Yes.
Feb. 24	H. R. 9955, to increase temporarily the national debt limit by $5,000,000,000 to $280,000,000,000; Cotton motion to recommit the bill. (Rejected 12 to 74)	No.
Feb. 24	H. R. 9955; Lausche amendment to limit the increase to $3,000,000,000. (Rejected 27 to 56)	No.
Mar. 12	S. Con. Res. 68, calling on President, as an antirecession measure, to accelerate spending of funds already appropriated for civil construction projects. (Approved 93 to 1.)	Yes.
Mar. 13	H. R. 10021, to extend 1955 formula for taxing income of life-insurance companies; vote on Douglas amendment to cut taxes $5,200,000,000 by reducing individual income-tax rate and repealing or reducing certain excise taxes. (Rejected 14 to 71.)	Yes.
Mar. 14	H. R. 10021; Proxmire-Yarborough amendment to increase personal income-tax exemption for individuals from $600 to $800. (Rejected 19 to 64)	Yes.
Mar. 14	H. R. 10021; passage of the bill. (Passed 61 to 19)	No.
Mar. 14	S. Con. Res. 69, calling on President, as an antirecession measure, to accelerate spending of funds already appropriated for military construction projects. (Adopted 76 to 1).	Yes.
Mar. 26	S. 3414, Federal Highway Act of 1958; vote on Hruska amendment to permit erection on interstate highways of signs of any size authorized by State law. (Rejected 31 to 58.)	No.
Mar. 26	S. 3414; Kerr amendment to strike out provision providing bonus in Federal interstate highway funds for States that regulate billboard advertising on new portions of Interstate Highway System. (Rejected 41 to 47.)	No.
Mar. 26	S. 3414; Hruska amendment to strike out provision limiting conditions under which Federal Government reimburses States for costs of relocating utility facilities on federally aided highways. (Agreed to 47 to 38.)	No.
Mar. 27	H. R. 9821, with Senate version substituted for House text of Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958; vote on passage. (Passed 84 to 4)	Yes.
Apr. 2	S. 497, River and Harbor Flood Control Act of 1958, authorizing $1,500,000,000 for construction by Army Corps of Engineers; vote on conference report. (Agreed to 52 to 11.)	Yes.
May 13	S. 3683, Area Redevelopment Act to provide $379,500,000 in Federal loans and grants for redevelopment of localities suffering chronic unemployment; vote on Bush amendment to prohibit loans to help an industry relocate from one area to another. (Rejected 26 to 59.)	No.
May 13	S. 3683, passage of the bill. (Passed 46 to 36)	Yes.
June 17	S. 3910, River and Harbor Flood Control Act of 1958, revised version of vetoed bill authorizing $1,500,000,000. (Passed 75 to 1)	Yes.
June 18	H. R. 12695, 1-year extension of existing corporate and certain excise taxes; vote on Douglas amendment to reduce taxes by $6,000,000,000 by cutting personal income taxes $50 per person, repealing certain excise taxes, and giving tax relief to small business. (Rejected 23 to 65.)	Yes.
June 19	H. R. 12695; McNamara amendment to repeal 10-percent excise tax on passenger cars, 8 percent excise tax on auto parts and accessories, and reduce from 10 to 5 percent excise tax on trucks and buses. (Rejected 32 to 50.)	Yes.
June 19	H. R. 12695; Kefauver amendment to refund to manufacturer ½ of excise tax on automobiles if paid by him directly to the ultimate purchaser. (Rejected 24 to 66.)	Yes.
June 19	H. R. 12695; Smathers amendment to repeal 3-percent tax on freight transportation. (Agreed to 59 to 25)	Yes.
June 19	H. R. 12695; Smathers amendment to repeal 10 percent on passenger transportation. (Agreed to 50 to 35)	Yes.
June 20	H. R. 12695; Potter amendment to reduce excise tax on automobiles to 5 percent. (Rejected 32 to 44)	Yes.
June 20	H. R. 12695; Fulbright amendment to reverse existing normal tax and surtax rates so as to reduce corporate tax rates on 1st $25,000 of taxable income by $2,000. (Rejected 34 to 45.)	Yes.
June 20	H. R. 12695; Douglas amendment to reduce certain excise taxes and repeal others. (Rejected 20 to 55)	Yes.
June 20	H. R. 12695; Douglas amendment to repeal 10 percent excise tax on local telephone calls. (Rejected 32 to 43)	Yes.
July 11	S. 4036, Domestic Minerals Stabilization Act of 1958 to establish support program for domestically mined zinc, lead, tungsten, and acid-grade fluorspar, and a 1-year stockpile-purchase plan for copper; vote on Williams amendment to delete price supports for tungsten. (Rejected 25 to 57.)	No.
July 11	S. 4036; Williams amendment to eliminate authority in bill for Secretary of Interior to borrow up to $350,000,000 from the Treasury. (Rejected 28 to 54)	No.

TAXES AND ECONOMIC POLICY—Continued

Date	Measure, question, and result	Proxmire vote
July 11	S. 4036, passage of the bill. (Passed 70 to 12)	Yes.
Aug. 11	H. R. 7125, Excise Tax Technical Changes Act of 1958; Thye amendment to strike out increase from 8 to 20 years for period in which excise tax payments may be deferred on whisky in bond. (Rejected 39 to 51.)	No.
Aug. 11	H. R. 7125; Williams amendment to reduce annual oil and gas percentage depletion allowance from 27.5 percent to 15 percent. (Rejected 26 to 63)	Yes.
Aug. 11	H. R. 7125; Proxmire amendment to revise oil and gas percentage depletion allowance to 15 percent for producers with gross annual income of $5,000,000 or more; to 21 percent for those with incomes between $1,000,000 and $5,000,000; and to 27.5 percent for producers with incomes under $1,000,000. (Rejected 31 to 58.)	Yes.
Aug. 12	H. R. 7125; Malone amendment to reduce cabaret tax from 20 percent to 10 percent. (Rejected 39 to 51)	Yes.
Aug. 12	H. R. 8381, Technical Amendments Act of 1958; vote on Kerr appeal from ruling of presiding officer that amendments adding text of Self-Employed Individuals Retirement Act (H. R. 10) were germane. (Ruling rejected 32 to 52.)	Yes.
Aug. 18	H. R. 469, Textile Fiber Products Identification Act; vote on Pastore motion to recommit the bill to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. (Rejected 36 to 47.)	No.
Aug. 22	H. R. 13580, to increase the permanent public debt limit from $275,000,000,000 to $283,000,000,000 and temporary limit to $288,000,000,000 through June 30, 1959. (Passed 57 to 20.)	No.
Aug. 24	H. R. 2, to authorize a 3-year diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway; vote on McNamara amendment to specify that the limit be for a 1-year period. (Adopted 29 to 28.)	Yes.
Aug. 24	H. R. 2; Potter motion to table the bill. (Rejected 28 to 30)	Yes.
Aug. 24	H. R. 2; Morton motion to table a Douglas motion to recommit the bill to committee with instructions to report back immediately with McNamara amendment removed. (Rejected 28 to 28.)	Yes.

VOTING PARTICIPATION

	Percent
Percentage of all rollcalls in which Senator PROXMIRE voted	100

ATTENDANCE RECORD

Percentage of all quorum calls in which Senator PROXMIRE was present	100

Conservation Reserve Program Limitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD letters relative to problems encountered under the $5,000 limitation in the conservation reserve program.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION
AND CONSERVATION COMMITTEE,
Fargo, N. Dak., August 12, 1958.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Enclosed is a copy of a letter which we sent to our Northwest area office in Washington relative to the $5,000 limitation in the conservation reserve program, and which further states the problems that will be encountered in North Dakota in administering the program with this limitation.

You may use this information for whatever purpose you wish to further the cause.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT J. SANDNESS,
State Administrative Officer.

AUGUST 12, 1958.

Hubert E. Dyke, Director, Northwest Area, CSS, Washington, D. C.

Albert J. Sandness, State Administrative Officer, North Dakota ASC Office, Fargo, N. Dak.

FIVE-THOUSAND-DOLLAR LIMITATION—CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM

In accordance with your request made at the regional meeting in Omaha, we are submitting information relative to the problems that will be encountered in North Dakota with regard to the maximum limitation of $5,000 under the conservation reserve program. This will also confirm information given to your office by telephone on August 11, 1958.

The State committee estimates that there will be 10,000 farms in North Dakota that will fall in the category of having more cropland than can be put in the program because of the $5,000 limitation. This estimate is based on the State average of an average farm in North Dakota.

The estimate of the number of farms with all eligible land in both conservation reserve and acreage reserve in 1958 and with not a sufficient amount of permitted acres to provide for planting of the acreage allotment in 1959 is 250 farms.

Example farm located in Barnes County:

Cropland, 652 acres.

Soil Bank base, 480 acres.

Nineteen fifty-seven conservation reserve (regular rate), 480 acres times $10 equals $4,800.

Nineteen fifty-seven conservation reserve (nondiversion rate), 65 acres times $3 equals $195.

Total in conservation reserve, $4,995.

Participated in acreage reserve with 107 acres, or the balance of his eligible land, in 1956 and 1957.

AUGUST 15, 1958.

Hon. ALBERT J. SANDNESS,
Administrative Officer, State ASC Committee, Fargo, N. Dak.

DEAR MR. SANDNESS: Thank you so very much for your letter of the 12th relative to the limitation in the conservation reserve program.

I am taking the liberty of placing your letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that I may bring it to the attention of every Senator and Congressman.

With kindest regards and every good wish, I am,

Sincerely,

WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator.

The Perfidy of Modern Soviet Colonialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the Communist masters of deceit have been able to get away with the greatest swindle of all in the area of their so-called colonialism. No other government or political party in the world has been so vociferously abusive of colonialism as that of the Kremlin. It is interesting to note that the official Soviet Encyclopedia—volume 22, second edition Moscow, 1953—devotes no less than 17 double column and fine print pages to "Colonialism" and "Colonies" in which we find such gems as the following:

In colonial possessions of the United States of America there were 48 banks in 1950. In addition, more than 10 United States banks function beyond the borders, mostly in dependent countries. Only the 4 largest banks of the United States of America (Bank of America, Chase National Bank, National City Bank of New York, and First National Bank of Boston) had in 1951 in colonial possessions of the United States of America as well as abroad 89 branches and 8 agencies, including: in Latin America 59 and 2 respectively, in Asia 20 and 1, in Africa 1 agency, and in Western Europe 9 and 4. A majority of Canadian banks, and other foreign banks are controlled by the United States of America.

According to Communist "science," and the word science is put here in quotation marks advisedly, the entire non-Communist part of the world is guilty of practicing colonialism, and mankind can hope for complete abolition of colonialism only under victorious communism.

In the Soviet and Communist vocabularly, all forms and aspects of a good-neighbor policy, reconstruction program, aid to underdeveloped areas program, and so forth, are branded as American capitalist colonialism.

Who else but we Americans, both those who descended from forefathers who broke the yoke of English colonialism in 1776, as well as those who are descended from or even personally fled from a colonial system including the Russian, to find a new life of equality here, have the right to tell the world and particularly the bosses in the Kremlin what colonialism means and what it does not mean, and tell the world who is today the one remaining true colonial empire in the world?

The Communists define colonies as follows:

Countries deprived of political and economic independence, countries oppressed and subjected to a rule of capitalist states. (Sov. Enc. vol. 22, p. 30).

We do not have to venture far to find which countries do, and which do not fit within the formula of this Soviet definition. Moscow would have us believe that all Latin American countries fit the definition, being allegedly deprived of economic independence by United States banks and their branches. Still, Communist-inspired mobs in these countries were free to stone and spit on Vice-President NIXON, and no tanks or machineguns were used against them in retaliation. On the other hand, "sovereign and independent" Hungary whose toilers merely demanded a voice in the management of their factories (establishment of so-called workers councils in each major plant was one of the main demands of the rebel workers in November 1956) and removal of Soviet troops resulted in a bloodbath the like of which the world had not seen in a long time. How far politically and economically independent are Poland, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and the Baltic countries, that they could qualify to be called noncolonies even according to the Communist definition? How much sovereignty and economic independence has been left to Ukraine, Byelorussia, Georgia, Armenia and the others of the 15 so-called sovereign Soviet republics that they could justly be defined as not being colonies, oppressed and subject to the rule of Moscow?

In the area of political independence, the attributes of sovereignty of the satellite countries are merely superficial: Supposedly independent delegations represent such countries as Poland and Hungary in the United Nations, but when the occasion arises to speak in the U. N. or to vote, they follow blindly the rote prescribed for them by Moscow; in military affairs, the situation is even more flagrant. Whereas Soviet diplomats were full of holy indignation at American landings of marines in Lebanon at the request of the lawful Lebanese Government, that same Kremlin thinks nothing of keeping Soviet troops in the hundreds of thousands on the territory of such allegedly sovereign states as East Germany, Poland, Hungary, and many others. The Kremlin never asked any leave or permission from a single one of the "people's democracies" before stationing its troops on their soil—and making them pay for their upkeep, too.

Two other countries conquered by Moscow, not in the category of satellites, are members of the United Nations. They are Ukraine and Byelorussia. Moscow goes to no end of trouble to tell the world that these countries are free and sovereign. And yet, cold facts prove that they are colonies of the most ruthlessly exploited rank. Some of these facts are: All economic plans, be it 5-year, or other, are laid down for these countries by Moscow, and they merely exercise the prerogative of supervising the exploitation and stripping of their lands to the benefit of Moscow. Ukraine, for example, produces about 70 percent of all sugar of the U. S. S. R., and yet the consumption of sugar per capita of population is well below the average standard in Ukraine, and much lower than in the Russian Soviet Republic. Iron ore, pig iron, and a number of rare nonferrous metals of which Ukraine is a leading producer are ordered by Moscow to be delivered to the metallurgic industry of Czechoslovakia and other satellites, to be made into arms and traded away by Moscow to areas where Moscow wishes to set incendiary fires for a future war which is to end in Communist or Moscow's conquest of the world.

One of the most cruel jokes played upon a nation proclaimed to be sovereign was the Kremlin's gift of a complete steel mill to India. This valuable gift donated by Khrushchev and Bulganin, and worth upward of $100 million, and for which the people and Government of India have been thanking the Soviet people, their government and Russia, was in reality imposed upon the shoulders of the Ukrainian people. The mill is being completed in Ukrainian plants and the workers are made to contribute their labor free while Moscow acknowledges the thanks of India. It is doubtful whether a like example of colonial exploitation ever occurred anywhere before.

It is very significant that the growth and expansion of the Soviet colonial empire centered in Moscow has not, in a single instance, been accomplished by any proletarian revolution, but always by maneuvers of Communist agents supported by the might of the Red army. In the early stage of the Communist empire such countries as Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Turkestan, and others were simply conquered by force of arms. A similar pattern was followed in the Baltic area—Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia—and subsequently Hungary, Poland, and others. Along this line of penetration where there was expectation of least resistance, the Kremlin is not too anxious to promote a proletarian industrial workers' revolution in highly developed countries such as Britain or Western Europe, but foments false revolutions in backward colonial countries. Along this line they have achieved notable results in Korea, Vietnam, and other parts of Asia.

Perhaps it would not be out of place to cite here portions of a very significant newspaper article which appeared in the leading Belgian daily, La Libre Belgique, in Brussels on August 21, 1958, and entitled: "Russian Colonialism at the Brussels Exposition."

It should be remembered that the U. S. S. R. is a multi-national state with over 200 million people and a territory of 23.3 million square kilometers, composed of 15 federated republics which, according to the most democratic Soviet constitution "are sovereign and independent." According to the constitution, the federated nations even have the right "to secede from the U. S. S. R." whenever they feel like it. Each of these nations has its own culture. Their languages are completely different from the Russian. The nature of their national aspirations, their histories, their governments and institutions are specific. The most divergent climates, civilizations, races, and religions create an imprint upon each of these nations of the Soviet empire, and Moscow always wants to keep that empire "one and indivisible."

The bulk of visitors to the fair does not notice the special aspect of Russian presence. But what is glaring is the absence at the fair of the non-Russian nations of the U. S. S. R., an absence, incidentally, willed by the Russians, mainly for political reasons. The entrance to the Soviet pavilion is decorated with 15 flags of 15 republics, reminding one of the multi-national character of the U. S. S. R. * * * In its propaganda Moscow alleges that the U. S. S. R. not only met the national aspirations of all nations, but also gave them the status of states, and brought Ukraine and Byelorussia into the United Nations, while the West continues its colonial policy in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. * * *

The coats of arms of the republics carry inscriptions in their native languages. * * *

How much, in truth, however, do these accessories of freedom give to their respective nations? And those too, whom Moscow promises to liberate?

If a visitor, however, wanted to ask in the Soviet pavilion about Ukrainian books, they will look at him with suspicion, nay, even with irritation. All scientific and literary books in the Russian language, however, are shown in massive numbers.

Near the books one can see a large portrait of the greatest Ukrainian poet, Shevchenko—but there is only his name without any explanation, and it hangs alongside portraits of Pushkin and Lermontov. A person not acquainted with Ukrainian literature—and this is true of most visitors—will take Shevchenko for a Russian writer (Shevchenko was sentenced for his Ukrainian patriotic works and deported to Asia in 1847 with prohibition of writing and painting).

It is really a difficult job to find any copies of Ukrainian publications in the multitude of journals, monthlies, and other publications in Russian, or of any other non-Russian nation. We cite the example primarily of Ukraine because this "independent Soviet republic" with over 42 million people and an area larger than France, occupies second place after the Russian Soviet Republic (R. S. F. S. R.). Ukraine's economic importance, strategic and political position, culture, and the Ukrainian struggle for freedom give Ukraine a key position not merely within the U. S. S. R., but in all of Eastern Europe.

If we compare these Soviet Republics, alleged to be independent, with British Dominions or with French mandates, we find that the latter enjoy much more independence than Ukraine, Byelorussia, Georgia, Lithuania. * * * "Colonial" France, however, has put up in her pavilion a special section for Algiers, "Colonial" Belgium built a separate pavilion for Congo and organized Congo National Days * * * but the U. S. S. R. did not even give a little stand to any of its "independent and equal" republics. On the contrary, great care has been taken to negate their national treasures in order to list them in the ledger of the Russian nation.

Such nations as Ukraine are fighting not merely for a change of the regime, but primarily for liberation from Moscow's imperialism imposed upon them by that regime.

Mr. Speaker, it is significant to note that these acid comments on the Soviet repression of the nations within its orbit, were printed in one of the most highly respected Belgian newspapers. La Libre Belgique has been published daily for the past 75 years and it enjoys a great prestige among a broad audience. Therefore, this paper's acute observations on the Kremlin's perfidy deserve special attention.

The ruthless and methodical manner in which the leaders of the Kremlin have attempted to obliterate the proud nations behind the Iron Curtain is a chapter written in treason and spelled out in

cruelty. It is a record which must be constantly brought home to the people of America and the people of the Free World, lest we forget the vile nature of the international Communist conspiracy which seeks to destroy all liberty everywhere.

As this session of Congress ends, it would be well for each of us to rededicate ourselves to the principle that the countries now chained in the Soviet prison of nations must one day be free. We must rededicate ourselves to the task of liberating the noble people trapped behind the Iron Curtain. Until these brave people bask again in the sunlight of freedom, until these valiant nations once more assume their rightful place among the family of free nations, no man of good will, no true believer in liberty and democracy can rest. I pledge myself to work unceasingly for this rebirth of freedom. I am confident my colleagues and the people of our Nation are joined with me in this mighty crusade.

Progress on the St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief statement which I have prepared on the progress of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

As a long-time battler for full development of the St. Lawrence Seaway, I am delighted that progress is moving ahead on this great project.

According to present schedule, completion of the seaway will be achieved by April 1959.

During this year there have been splendid advancements. Recently, I have had the pleasure of attending dedication ceremonies of the Wiley-Dondero locks and the Wiley-Dondero channels of the seaway. In addition, we witnessed the completion of the Eisenhower locks and other steps of progress.

A major challenge, of course, is to get completion also of the connecting channels at the west end of Lake Erie. The purpose is to deepen the channels for deep-sea shipping, to give the Great Lakes States, west of Lake Erie, including Wisconsin, full benefit of the seaway as early as possible.

Fortunately, we, as supporters of the seaway, were able to get the original budget request for work on the connecting channels raised from the $18 million, first, by $5.5 million to $23.5 million; then to $25.5 million, with additional authority for the Chief of Engineers to transfer up to 15 percent of that amount from other funds to construction work on the channels. As a result, the total of $29,325,000 is now available for construction work.

The completion of this great tradeway—accessible to western Great Lakes States through the connecting channels—promises great things for the people of the agricultural-industrial complex of the upper Midwest, including Wisconsin, and the Nation.

Report to 11th Congressional District of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR A. KNOX
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I take this opportunity to provide the residents of the 11th Congressional District of Michigan with a brief résumé of major legislation and of my activities as their Representative in the 85th Congress.

I consider one of my primary responsibilities is keeping my constituents informed of the activities of the Congress. During the sessions of the Congress I have reported to them by means of weekly radio and TV broadcasts. I have also dispatched press releases at times when I considered it imperative that they be informed. Now at the close of the 85th Congress there is a need of bringing the activities of the Federal Government close to those who are affected by the laws which we pass, and who must assume the burden of the cost of the vast operation of the Federal Government.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

To streamline the operations of our national defense program, Congress passed the defense reorganization bill, as recommended by the President, which promises both efficiency and economy in the most costly of our Government operations. The defense reorganization bill is a step in the right direction, and was long needed to eliminate overlapping of authority and certain rivalries between the various branches of the service.

To further enhance our national defense, Congress created a National Space Agency; passed the atomic facilities bill; raised military pay; and authorized nuclear navy construction.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Mutual security was authorized with an appropriation of $3,298,092,500. Reciprocal trade agreements were extended giving the executive department authorization to regulate and lower tariffs for 4 more years.

GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION

H. R. 8002, one of the major Hoover Commission recommendations which grants Congress control over unused appropriations was passed. This legislation makes it necessary for the various departments of Government to return to the Treasury surplus funds which previously had been carried over from one year to the next.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system were increased by 7 percent. Benefit increases will be provided effective with benefit checks received in February of 1959 with respect to the month of January 1959 by a minimum amount of $3 and the maximum amount of $7.50 per month for a primary insured individual who is currently on the benefit rolls. Persons retiring in the future will be eligible for a maximum benefit of $127 compared to the existing maximum of $108.50. The minimum primary insurance amount is increased from $30 to $33. Comparable adjustments will be made with respect to individual benefits and the maximum family benefits have been increased from $200 per month to $254.

The contributors' rate is increased by one-fourth percent applicable to both employee and employer over the rates provided under existing law with a corresponding increase for the self-employed of three-eighths percent. The schedule of four additional tax increases projected under present law at 5-year intervals up through 1975 are accelerated so that the contribution schedule will become fully mature at 4½ percent in 1969. This is applicable to both the employee and employer. The maximum annual amount of earnings on which workers will pay social-security taxes has been increased from $4,200 to $4,800.

The new law increases from $60 to $65 the maximum amount of public assistance benefits to which the Federal matching is available for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the disabled. In the case of aid to dependent children the maximum Federal matching is applied to a dollar figure of $32 a month for the first dependent child in the home, $23 for each additional child in the home, and $43 a month for the relative caring for the dependent child or children. The new average method of computing amounts to which a State is entitled to Federal reimbursement is included in the new law. This is expected to increase the amount of Federal funds available in a State such as Michigan. A new variable grant formula is included that places some discretion in the Federal Administrator as to amounts that will be received by the respective States. The committee report on this subject indicates that Michigan will receive with respect to all public-assistance programs combined, a monthly increase per recipient of $3.50.

The amount authorized for annual appropriations for maternal and child health services, crippled children's services, and child welfare services has been increased from $43,500,000 to $58,500,000. These programs are now extended to children in urban areas. Heretofore, child welfare services were limited to predominately rural areas.

TAXES

The Congress enacted legislation to repeal the Federal excise taxes applicable to the transportation of property, effective August 1, 1958. This is a very significant step in granting tax relief to the railroad industry, American agriculture, and to American small business. This is one of the provisions that were contained in the bill which I sponsored, H. R. 9166. I regret that the Congress did not see fit to repeal also the Federal excise taxes on the transportation of persons, but I assure you that I will continue to press for the repeal of this war-imposed tax.

Provisions contained in Public Law 866 improve the tax application to small business so as to facilitate the acquisi-

tion of growth capital, the more rapid write-off of depreciable assets, the carryback of net operating losses to a third year, and the avoidance of corporate mergers through liberalizing deferment of estate-tax payments.

VETERANS

The monthly rates of pensions to widows of Spanish-American, Indian, Mexican, and Civil War veterans have been increased. Public Law 168 will increase the rates of compensation for service-connected disabilities averaging from 10 percent to 25 percent. Also, Public Law 364 will provide for direct loans for veterans housing, increase the amount of such loans, and lower the downpayment for FHA housing.

HOUSING PROGRAM

There is a need for vast improvements in our highway systems. The Federal Government has tried to remedy this situation for the last few years. For the purpose of carrying out this plan, the Congress authorized to be appropriated the sum of $900 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960. Of this amount approximately $31,179,000 is designated to Michigan. The sum of $925 million is appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, of which an approximate appropriation of $32,046,000 is designated for Michigan.

LAMPREY EEL PROGRAM

The United States and Canada lamprey eel control program has shifted into high gear and it seems that an answer has been finally found to rid our streams and lakes of this salt-water bloodsucker. A substance called Dowlap was first tested in Little Billie's Creek near Cheboygan. Four hours after the chemical was introduced the dead lamprey larvae attracted hundreds of gulls and sandpipers. This research has been called unconditionally successful.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

The St. Lawrence Seaway is the second great project which is going to be the most advantageous to the growth and development of our district. While the Mackinac Bridge joins the people of Michigan, the seaway joins us to the peoples of the world. At last report the actual construction was ahead of schedule. If all continues to go well, we will see the opening of this multimillion dollar project in the coming spring.

DISTRICT BENEFITS

The 11th Congressional District of Michigan has benefited in many ways through legislation enacted during the 85th Congress. River and harbor projects for which funds were appropriated for advance engineering and for actual construction are Cooke and Indian Rivers, Devils River, Manistique Harbor, Poe Lock, Port Inland, St. Mary's River, and Whitefish Point Harbor.

Kinross Air Force Base was appropriated $9,948,000 for operation and training facilities and authorization was granted for 475 housing units at the base. Thirteen million five hundred thousand dollars was also authorized for the construction of the Bomarc missile base at Kinross. Alpena County Airport has been appropriated $171,000 for operation and training facilities for the Air National Guard. Two hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars has been appropriated for an Army National Guard armory and motor-vehicle-storage building at Sault Ste. Marie.

Included in the CAA budget for 1958–59 are improvements to the Escanaba, Gaylord, Pellston, Menominee, Rogers City, and St. Ignace Airports. VORTAC radar is planned for Grand Marais and Pellston.

POST OFFICES

In the past 2 years new post offices have been built in Alpena, Elk Rapids, Harbor Springs, Hillman, Indian River, Sault Ste. Marie, Stephenson, and Vanderbilt. New ones are being planned for Mackinaw City and Mackinac Island.

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED

H. R. 8456: To give the farmer the right to produce wheat for consumption on the farm where raised.

H. R. 9036: To amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide accounting procedures whereby dealers in personal property may exclude from gross income amounts withheld by banks and finance companies on notes purchased from such dealers employing the accrual method of accounting.

H. R. 9166: Repeal of taxes imposed on the transportation of persons and property.

H. R. 10115: To provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of milk and dairy products in interstate and foreign commerce.

H. R. 10492: To regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by establishing quantitative restriction on the importation of hardwood plywood.

H. R. 10860: To amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit schoolteachers and administrators to deduct from gross income certain expenses for additional education or training.

H. R. 10861: To amend the Internal Revenue Code to exempt from the club dues tax certain charges made by nonprofit clubs for the use of facilities.

H. R. 11221: Lower excise tax on automobiles, parts, and accessories.

H. R. 11453: To amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose an import quota on iron ore.

H. R. 13186: To amend the Social Security Act to authorize payment of old-age insurance benefits to all individuals who have attained age 70, and to increase the minimum amount of all monthly insurance benefits payable under OASI to $50.

H. R. 13217: To amend the Social Security Act to increase the maximum amount of monthly insurance benefits payable for any month where there is a disabled child over age 18 entitled to child's insurance benefits.

As a member of the Subcommittee on International Operations of the Government Operations Committee, I was afforded an opportunity to make an on-the-spot inspection trip and observe the administration of our foreign-aid programs in the Philippines, Taiwan, Vietnam, Cambodia, Thailand, Pakistan, Iran, Greece, and Spain. One of the direct results of this trip was an improvement in the administration of these programs which has saved the taxpayers $1,500,000.

While the 85th Congress enacted some important, necessary, and constructive legislation, it did not complete its job. Farm legislation beneficial to the small-family-size farm and the dairy farmer was overlooked. The revenue of these farmers should be increased, and the farmers should be released from many Government controls. The Democrat-controlled 85th Congress, for politically motivated reasons, was the "spendingest" peacetime Congress. It appropriated $7 billion more spending than was requested by the President without adequate study of the programs approved. The Democrat leadership in Congress thwarted the efforts of the Republican minority to pass meritorious legislation to protect the rank and file of labor from criminals, and dishonest and uncouth individuals who have infiltrated labor officialdom.

Dr. Gabriel Hauge, President's Special Assistant for Economic Affairs, Leaving White House Staff

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 23, 1958

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, on October 1, Dr. Gabriel Hauge, the President's Special Assistant for Economic Affairs, bids goodbye to his position at the White House and reenters private industry. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by me and a few of the many comments from leading newspapers and magazines regarding Dr. Hauge.

There being no objection, the statement and comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAPEHART

Millions of Americans are indebted to Dr. Hauge for the valuable services he has rendered in behalf of this administration and its policies since he joined the official Eisenhower family on January 20, 1953.

That was the date when Dr. Hauge entered Government service as a specialist on economic affairs on the President's personal staff. However, long before that date he had contributed liberally of his time and effort and talents in order to familiarize the citizens of the Nation with the Eisenhower program.

Dr. Hauge is still under 45. His future lies before him but as he leaves the President's staff he takes with him the good wishes of Americans all over this land. Particularly cognizant of the value of his services are we who have had the opportunity to work with him since 1953.

He is a man of great ability, unusual integrity and his judgment has been of a rare quality. President Eisenhower will miss this trusted assistant. So will Members of Congress.

Following are comments from a few of the leading journals throughout the Nation regarding Dr. Hauge's decision to leave the administration.

[From the Economist of July 26, 1958]

MR. HAUGE'S FAREWELL

Mr. Gabriel Hauge, the President's economic assistant, is leaving the White House to join the Manufacturers Trust Co., one of New York's largest banks, just as the statistics are vindicating the administration's approach to the recession—an approach for which Mr. Hauge was largely responsible. Indeed, in the exchange of friendly letters announcing his departure, it is a little surprising to find him writing to the President, instead of vice versa, that "you have charted a true course amidst changing economic conditions. * * * You have reminded us that only sensible economics, not razzle-dazzle substitutes, can truly serve the end of equity and social justice."

But Mr. Eisenhower's reply seems a statement of the obvious:

"Of course I agree in your economic convictions. I cannot help wishing that I could express them so well."

He may be wishing this even more sincerely before long if, as it is suggested may happen, no one is appointed to succeed Mr. Hauge.

During the early part of this year Mr. Hauge resisted all attempts to stampede the administration into a full antirecession program, with tax reductions, large-scale public works, and so on. Yet he was equally insistent that the administration should not dig in its toes completely, but should take restrained steps such as increasing outlays on housing and roads. That such measures were enough, and not too much, seems to be proved by the index of industrial output which has been rising for the past 2 months rather more sharply than it did as previous postwar recessions began to turn upward. However, it is likely to follow their pattern by falling once more before the rise becomes steady; this month's figure, affected by holidays and other seasonal factors, is almost certain to be below June's. June was particularly encouraging because the increase in production was concentrated in factories making durable goods and in the mines, the two basic sectors. But it will be autumn before it can be judged whether a dynamic upward trend has been reestablished. Mr. Hauge seems sure that it will be by then, and the general economic atmosphere is increasingly favorable, even though some observers are still doubtful about the future.

However, Government spending is definitely becoming a stimulating factor and it is expected to continue to go up, while the uncertain international situation may make businessmen less ready to run down their stocks than they have been recently and may even lead to a renewed accumulation of strategic materials and other crucial items. It may also perhaps encourage consumers to buy now in anticipation of possible future shortages, especially of durable goods. That they are in any case developing a more optimistic outlook about the economic future, and therefore about their own spending plans, is indicated rather tentatively by the latest survey from the University of Michigan's research center. And their incomes, which have remained remarkably steady throughout the recession, are now rising again in the all-important category of wages and salaries, out of which comes most of the country's private spending.

[From Newsweek of July 28, 1958]

IKE'S MAN AND RAYONIER'S

Few men have enjoyed the confidence of President Eisenhower to a greater degree than his young (44), scholarly Special Assistant for Economic Affairs, Gabriel Hauge. Ever since he joined the Republican campaign team in 1952 as a research and speechwriting aide, Hauge has done much to shape the President's economic thinking.

A Harvard-trained economist, World War II naval officer, and sometime editor, economist Hauge gained a Washington reputation for being right most of the time—and for forming instinctively good political judgments.

It was Hauge who persuaded Arthur F. Burns to come to Washington to beef up the President's Council of Economic Advisers. It was Hauge, more than any man, who developed the administration's philosophy that the United States could have a healthy, growing economy by moderating booms and busts. It was Hauge who fought for trade and tariff liberalization. And it was Hauge who recently tipped the scales against a tax cut by failing to side with Burns' successor, Raymond J. Saulnier. He lined up instead with Treasury Secretary Robert B. Anderson.

Last week, Hauge resigned to become chairman of the finance committee of New York's Manufacturers Trust Co. In an unusually warm letter, in which he thanked Hauge for his "valued friendship," the President made it clear he felt Hauge's shoes would be hard to fill.

Hauge's personal reasons for resigning were not hard to guess. With a wife and six growing children to provide for, he felt he couldn't turn down the opportunity to more than double his $21,000 Government salary.

In a top-level reshuffling at Rayonier, Inc., $205.7 million chemical cellulose producer, Russell F. Erickson, 48, took over as president and chief executive officer succeeding 68-year-old Clyde B. Morgan who moves up to board chairman. A University of Minnesota-trained engineer, Erickson joined Rayonier in 1946 after stints with two paper producers. Since then he has handled engineering in Rayonier's expansion program, and last November was elected executive vice president. To chairman Morgan goes much of the credit for doubling Rayonier sales since he moved in as president in 1951.

[From the Washington Post]

MR. HAUGE'S CONTRIBUTION

Gabriel Hauge's resignation as the President's Special Assistant for Economic Affairs comes at a time when the record furnishes a great deal of support for the economic views he has backed. His contribution to the administration has been substantial. Throughout his career at the White House he has urged a progressive trade policy, contributing to the President's firm stand for legislation and no doubt firming up White House opposition to isolated efforts to increase duties under existing legislation.

His advice on recession measures seems to have been quite generally followed. He stood neither with the advocates of "do-everything" or with the advocates of "do-nothing." He opposed tax cuts and massive public works, but he was for the housing program (which has begun to generate a good deal of recovery), and he favored hurrying up expenditures already planned. By such means, the administration sought to fight today's recession and tomorrow's inflation at the same time. The rise in income and production for the second consecutive month presently seems to vindicate the policy.

It is too early to say that that policy has been wholly justified by events. There has been a decline in gross national product every month of the recession, the cumulative effect of which on the national wealth and progress is not lightly to be dismissed. The difference between what gross national product is and what it might have been (if more vigorous antirecession measures had been taken) is enormous. Presumably Mr. Hauge would argue that these fluctuations, kept within due bounds, are a part of the normal rhythm of a healthy economy. Those who have been out of work may not be so philosophical about it. Those who have an anxious eye on the great race between the free and the Communist world are very properly concerned about the setback that this shrinkage in the national output involves.

There will be many who, on such accounts, will differ with Mr. Hauge. Such differences should not detract from a proper estimate of him as a public servant. He has acquitted himself well in a difficult period. His usefulness to the White House not only reflects great credit upon himself but also vindicates the wisdom of establishing such a position on the President's immediate staff.

[From the Minneapolis Journal of July 23, 1958]

A MINNESOTAN DEPARTS

Many of the Minnesotans and former Minnesotans who were called to Washington in the early days of the Eisenhower administration have been retiring for business, political, or personal reasons.

We think of such people as Harold Stassen, former White House Disarmament Adviser; Ancher Nelsen, former Rural Electrification Administrator; Bradshaw Mintener, former Assistant Secetary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Warren Burger, former Assistant Attorney General. No doubt there are others.

The latest to announce his forthcoming departure is Gabriel Hauge, the former Concordia college dean who has been President Eisenhower's Special Assistant for Economic Affairs and who will leave Washington with an enhanced reputation as a professional economist and as a public servant.

Hauge avoided the political pitfalls of his office and stuck to his assigned role with such effectiveness that he now is being hailed for his outstanding contribution to the Eisenhower administration's economic policies. The New York Times said he "has left in his quiet unostentatious way his impress perhaps more firmly and more continuously on administration policy than any member" of the White House family. The Washington Post said he "has acquitted himself well in a difficult period."

Basically, Hauge described his philosophy as "dynamic conservatism." While he opposed both massive public works and tax cuts as means to combat the recession, he also favored the increased housing program and the speedup in planned Federal expenditures for the same purpose. In general he wanted the Government to "reinforce rather than replace" the market system as the primary force for "freedom, economic well-being and dynamic personal security."

The country is better off as a result of his service. The public and the administration will miss him.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of July 16, 1958]

A NEW JOB FOR GABRIEL HAUGE

Gabriel Hauge's decision to resign as the President's Special Assistant for Economic Affairs will represent a loss both to the President and the Nation. Dr. Hauge's hard-headed economic common sense has been one of the built-in stabilizers in the administration's approach to the current recession. He consistently argued that it would reverse itself without the Nation plunging into any new inflationary measures, and the economy is now going to prove him right.

In his resignation, Dr. Hauge pays tribute to the President's policies. "You have reminded us that only sensible economics, not razzle-dazzle substitutes, can truly serve the ends of equity and social justice," but the President properly and deftly, bats that ball right back to Hauge: "* * * The passages in your letter * * * expressing respect for my own efforts toward creating a stronger American dedication to the timeless principles of competitive enterprise actually present in succinct terms your own economic philosophy."

The White House's loss will be the New York financial community's gain, but doubtless Hauge's counsel will still be on tap for the President when needed. He has served the country well, and we wish him well in his new career.